

PACIFIC COAST HIGHWAY PARKING STUDY

Appendix D Summary of Public Participation
May 2017

Appendix D SUMMARY OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Malibu Pacific Coast Highway Parking Study Public Meeting Overview

Public Meeting: PCH Parking Study
Malibu City Hall, 23825 Stuart Ranch Road, Malibu, CA 90265
November 29, 2016, 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm.

Meeting Notices: Notice of the PCH Parking Study Public Meeting was disseminated by the City of Malibu. It included posting on the City's website, Twitter, Facebook, Nextdoor, and issuing a Press Release.

There were email blasts sent to over 500 interested constituents from similar studies and HOA representatives as well as the business community via the Chamber of Commerce.

In addition, meeting flyers were distributed throughout the City offices, such as the Community Center and Library (Exhibit A Meeting Flyer).

Local news outlets, including the Malibu Times and Malibu Surfside News, ran stories about the PCH Parking Study meeting. The Malibu Patch also posted the meeting on its feed.

Purpose: The City of Malibu in collaboration with the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is conducting a study and preparing recommendations to improve parking along Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) within the Malibu City Limits to promote safety and mobility throughout the region.

The public meeting was held to solicit comments from the community, as it relates to the PCH Parking Study. Public comments will be used to analyze and develop a list of recommendations for the study.

Public comments are open from November 29, 2016 until December 16, 2016. Comments were solicited at the public meeting. In addition, the public was able to send their comments to the City by email.

Attendance: The PCH Parking Study meeting was open to the public and stakeholders. There were approximately 46 people who attended the meeting. The meeting participants included Malibu residents, businesses, press and neighboring community members.

City project staff in attendance included City Manager, Reva Feldman, Assistant to the City Manager, Elizabeth Shavelson and Public Works Director, Bob Brager. Some City Councilmembers and Commission members were also present.

Representatives from SCAG, Caltrans, County Sheriff and County Supervisor's Office were also in attendance.

Consultant team members were Rock Miller and Melissa Dugan of Stantec Consulting and Leslie Scott from Leslie Scott Consulting.

Introduction: Public Works Director, Bob Brager, opened the meeting at 6:35 pm. He introduced the City Manager, City Staff, Councilmembers, Commissioners, SCAG, Caltrans, County Sheriff and Supervisor Representative.

Presentation: The PCH Parking Study presentation was led by Stantec Engineering Consultant, Rock Miller. This included an overview of the project, goals, existing conditions, collision analysis and parking improvement concepts (Exhibit B Meeting Presentation).

Questions and Answers: After the presentation, Rock Miller, Stantec Engineering Consultant, opened the floor for general questions. Participants voiced their views about parking issues (Exhibit C Meeting Notes).

Public Comments: Following the open discussion, public participants were invited to discuss specific issues with the Stantec's consulting team, Caltrans and City staff. Members of the public provided suggestions at specific locations as well as general comments (Exhibit D Meeting Photos)

There were two options for commenting at the meeting; writing on project area maps and/or comment sheets (Exhibit E Comment Sheet and Exhibit F Area Maps). Additional comments could be submitted by email to Elizabeth Shavelson.

The comment period was open from November 28 – December 16, 2016. A total of 167 comments were collected. A breakdown of the public comments included:

- Meeting Question and Answers = 39
- Comments on Maps at Meeting Break Out Session = 73
- Comment Cards = 2
- Emails = 24
- Exhibits provided by the Public in their Comments:
 - Photos = 21
 - Exhibits = 8

All comments were recorded in a spreadsheet and included in Appendix D.

Website Meeting Material: The meeting presentation was posted on the City's website immediately following the meeting. The website also encouraged public comments until December 16, 2016.

Meeting Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 pm.

	Comment	Comment Source	Map Page (1 -13: west to east)	Map Description	Response
1	Add parking in County lot (Nicholas Beach parking county) 500 feet west of Newport Beach Rd	Maps	1	West City Limit to Decker Road	Potential improvement, noted in report. However, the area is an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA) - expansion of the parking lot may not be possible without extensive habitat mitigation. Further study will be necessary
2	Add in parking lot, 500 feet west of El Pescador Beach Rd	Maps	2	Decker Road to Broadbeach Road	Potential improvement, noted in report. However, the area is an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA)
3	Bad, shoulder in front of El Pescador Beach Road	Maps	2	Decker Road to Broadbeach Road	Included in report. The recommendation is to remove parking on inland side, widen shoulder on the ocean side, and add bike lanes in both directions in this area.
4	Bad, shoulder in front of La Piedra beach Rd	Maps	2	Decker Road to Broadbeach Road	Included in report. The Recommendation is to remove parking on inland side, widen shoulder on the ocean side, and add bike lanes in both directions in this area.
5	Add parking, parking lot on La Piedra Beach Rd	Maps	2	Decker Road to Broadbeach Road	Potential improvement, noted in report. However, the area is an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA)
6	small home business "rehab" pk staff on street take up beach parking, 500 feet east of La Piedra Beach Road	Maps	2	Decker Road to Broadbeach Road	Included in report. Vehicles parking all day that are taking spaces which would typically be used by beach visitors can be alleviated through use of time-restricted parking. This would not restrict beach or business visitors and would mitigate some of the parking needs.
7	Land side - crossing fatalities, 1500 feet east of Encinal Canyon Rd	Maps	2	Decker Road to Broadbeach Road	Pedestrian collisions were not analyzed unless they directly involved a parked vehicle; however, the recommendation is to remove shoulder parking from inland side in this area which would reduce the number of pedestrians crossing the highway at locations without traffic signals.
8	Consider pkg limit time based on demand	Maps	2	Decker Road to Broadbeach Road	Included in report. Vehicles parking all day that are taking spaces which would typically be used by beach visitors can be alleviated through use of time-restricted parking. This would not restrict beach or business visitors and would mitigate some of the parking needs.
9	Add parking to lot, El Matador Beach Rd	Maps	2	Decker Road to Broadbeach Road	Potential improvement, noted in report. However, the area is an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA)
10	Bad, shoulder in front of El Matador Beach Rd	Maps	2	Decker Road to Broadbeach Road	Included in report. The Recommendation is to remove parking on inland side, widen shoulder on the ocean side, and add bike lanes in both directions in this area.
11	State beach lot, add paid parking, El Matador Beach Rd	Maps	2	Decker Road to Broadbeach Road	The parking lot currently charges a fee for parking. Expansion of the parking lot may not be possible without habitat mitigation, further study is recommended in the report
12	Narrow shoulder limits sight distance - CAN NOT SEE ABOVE GRADE, from 500 feet east of El Matador Beach Rd to 1200 feet to the east	Maps	2	Decker Road to Broadbeach Road	This area is addresses in the report, which recommends removal of parking on inland side and widening the shoulder on the ocean side in this area improving sight distance on both sides of the highway.
13	Longer left turn lane, at Trancas Canyon Rd	Maps	3	Broadbeach Road to Trancas Road	Not parking related.
14	Needs proper rt turn lane, at Trancas Canyon Rd	Maps	3	Broadbeach Road to Trancas Road	Not parking related.
15	Please add meters on PCH adj to Zuma lot to encourage drivers to choose the lot	Maps	4	Trancas Road to Bonsall Drive	Included in report/recommendations. If the spaces along the highway charged a fee, the incentive to park there would be significantly reduced and the lots would fill first. However, introducing charges for formerly free parking can become controversial. Also, additional enforcement would be required but could be offset by the parking fee.
16	Fence along Zuma, from 500 feet east of Trancas Canyon Rd to 500 feet west of Busch Drive	Maps	4	Trancas Road to Bonsall Drive	The Parking Recommendation does not include removing parking on PCH adjacent the Zuma Beach parking lot. The shoulder, including dirt area, on the ocean side is currently more than 10 feet wide to accommodate parallel parking. Adding a fence will not solve the parking issues
17	Stripe parking spaces, from 500 feet east of Trancas Canyon Rd to 500 feet west of Busch Drive	Maps	4	Trancas Road to Bonsall Drive	Striping parking spaces typically results in a net loss of stalls. However, no parking removals are recommended for this location
18	Cut back vegetation along Zuma, from 500 feet east of Trancas Canyon Rd to 500 feet west of Busch Drive	Maps	4	Trancas Road to Bonsall Drive	Not parking related. If concern is about sight distance or narrow shoulder for parked cars, Project Recommendation would remove parking on inland side in this area.

	Comment	Comment Source	Map Page (1 -13: west to east)	Map Description	Response
19	Horrible right turn, Bonsall Drive	Maps	4	Trancas Road to Bonsall Drive	Not parking related.
20	Head in pkg on Westward Beach Road	Maps	5	Bonsall Drive to Cavalleri Road	Not located on PCH. Could be a potential source of additional/replacement parking
21	Clear veg that encroaches onto shoulder in May before summer. Here & elsewhere, starts at 700 feet east of Bonsall Drive (about 300 feet of veg)	Maps	5	Bonsall Drive to Cavalleri Road	Not parking related. If concern is about sight distance or narrow shoulder for parked cars, Project Recommendation would widen shoulder in this area to improve both issues.
22	Shopping center underparked west of Heathercliff Rd	Maps	5	Bonsall Drive to Cavalleri Road	No new parking spaces added to relieve parking at Point Dume Village, but the Project Recommendations would widen the shoulder on the ocean side west of the shopping center.
23	Left hand turn lane- extend/longer, onto Heathercliff Rd	Maps	5	Bonsall Drive to Cavalleri Road	Not parking related.
24	Extend/pave parking, 300 feet to the east and to the west of Heathercliff Rd	Maps	5	Bonsall Drive to Cavalleri Road	No new parking spaces added to relieve parking at Point Dume Village, but the Project Recommendations would widen the shoulder on the ocean side west of the shopping center
25	Veg vs sight distance, 100 feet west of Portshead Rd	Maps	5	Bonsall Drive to Cavalleri Road	Not parking related.
26	Too narrow for parking, 200 feet west of Kanan Dume Rd (100 feet long?)	Maps	5	Bonsall Drive to Cavalleri Road	Project Recommendation removes parking on inland side from this area.
27	Bad LT + queue, onto Kanan Dume Rd	Maps	6	Cavalleri Road to Old Road	Not parking related.
28	Sight lines, from Kanan Dume Rd	Maps	6	Cavalleri Road to Old Road	Not parking related.
29	LT lane too short, onto Zumirez Dr	Maps	6	Cavalleri Road to Old Road	Not parking related.
30	Sea Lane - (+/-) 16 parcel serviced by one driveway - needs more sight distance	Maps	6	Cavalleri Road to Old Road	Recommendation would improve sight distance by restricting parking.
31	On-street pkg congested from Zuma View Pl to Winding Way	Maps	6	Cavalleri Road to Old Road	Project Recommendation would widen or add parking spaces on both sides in some sections in this area.
32	Very narrow parking needs to be wider, 600 feet west of Paradise Cove Rd to 300 feet east of Paradise Cove Rd	Maps	6	Cavalleri Road to Old Road	Project Recommendation would widen shoulder in the area north (west) of Paradise Cove Rd and increase the amount of parking spaces on inland and ocean sides.
33	No parking, 250 feet east and west of West winding way	Maps	6	Cavalleri Road to Old Road	Parking recommendation would widen existing parking spaces on inland side while maintaining parking restrictions adjacent the intersection.
34	No right turn lane - need lane onto West Winding Way	Maps	6	Cavalleri Road to Old Road	Not parking related.
35	Sight distance, west of Winding Way	Maps	6	Cavalleri Road to Old Road	Recommended to restrict parking on the inland side approximately 200 feet east of the intersection and approximately 100 feet west of the intersection.
36	No parking, 250 feet east and west of Winding Way	Maps	6	Cavalleri Road to Old Road	The Parking Recommendation would widen existing parking spaces on inland side while maintaining parking restrictions adjacent to the intersection. This would move parked vehicles farther from the travel lane, improving sight distance.
37	Hiking trail pkg inland, on Winding Way	Maps	6	Cavalleri Road to Old Road	Parking recommendation would widen existing parking spaces on inland side but would not add new spaces for the hiking trail.
38	No parking, 300 feet to the east and west of Geoffrey's	Maps	7	Old Road to Latigo Shore Drive	Ocean side: parking is currently prohibited east and west of Geoffrey's driveways; however, No Parking signs are missing east of the driveway. Inland side: parking is currently prohibited in places opposite Geoffrey's (adjacent Meadows Ct intersection, adjacent fire hydrant, opposite Geoffrey's to opposite coastal access gate). Additional parking restrictions are not recommended at this time.
39	Needs to be wider. 700 feet west of Via Escondido Dr	Maps	7	Old Road to Latigo Shore Drive	Ocean side: parking is currently prohibited. Inland side: parking is currently prohibited although some No Parking signs are missing. Widening of the shoulder in this area is not recommended at this time.
40	Landslide issue, 1000 feet east of Via Escondido Drive	Maps	7	Old Road to Latigo Shore Drive	Parking is prohibited at this location, due to narrow shoulder (likely due to landslide)
41	Need RT lane onto Latigo Canyon Dr	Maps	7	Old Road to Latigo Shore Drive	Not parking related.
42	Add street parking in front of public lot, 700 feet west of Corral Canyon Rd	Maps	8	Latigo Shore Drive to Malibu Road	Parking is prohibited in front of Dan Blocker Beach parking lot for sight distance at the driveway. Adding shoulder parking on the ocean side is not recommended at this time.
43	Is this private property? Area between Corral Canyon Rd and east of Malibu beach RV park entrance	Maps	8	Latigo Shore Drive to Malibu Road	Not parking related.
44	Can we widen here, 550 feet east of Corral Canyon Rd	Maps	8	Latigo Shore Drive to Malibu Road	Paved shoulder width on ocean side is currently over 10 feet wide plus dirt area.

	Comment	Comment Source	Map Page (1 -13: west to east)	Map Description	Response
45	Very dangerous, jaywalking to Malibu Seafood, ocean side shoulder in front of Malibu Seafood restaurant	Maps	8	Laligo Shore Drive to Malibu Road	Existing parking not removed. Pedestrian activity not tied to parking
46	RT lane onto Winter Mesa Dr.	Maps	9	Malibu Road to Webb Way	Not parking related.
47	Limited access to older off-street parking (back out required)	Maps	10	Webb Way to Central Malibu Are	Not related to parking along PCH. Private parking areas not under the jurisdiction of this study
48	Malibu City Hall wrong location	Maps	10	Webb Way to Central Malibu Are	Moved to correct location. However, points of interest are represented in general locations to provide a reference point on the maps and are not intended to show the exact location.
49	Use part of park for parking, east of Webb Way	Maps	10	Webb Way to Central Malibu Are	Legacy Park was developed to provide treatment of stormwater runoff, restore native habitat, and preserve open space. The park may not be an appropriate location for additional parking on PCH.
50	Build parking, 1000 feet east of Webb Way to 1550 feet east of Webb Way	Maps	10	Webb Way to Central Malibu Are	This section of shoulder on the ocean side is currently used for parking – vehicles park on the dirt. Project Recommendation would install signs directing motorists to "Park Off Pavement" or add additional pavement.
51	Pedestrian over/under pass at Cross Creek Rd	Maps	10	Webb Way to Central Malibu Are	Not parking related.
52	La Paz commercial development turn lane treatment, from 1000 east of Webb Way to 250 feet west of Cross Creek Rd	Maps	10	Webb Way to Central Malibu Are	Not parking related.
53	State property	Maps	10	Webb Way to Central Malibu Are	Not parking related.
54	Saved tree	Maps	10	Webb Way to Central Malibu Are	Not parking related.
55	Curent underpass blocked	Maps	10	Webb Way to Central Malibu Are	Not parking related.
56	PCH affects side streets (ex. Serra/Civic Ctr Way). Can't ignore parallel streets	Maps	10	Webb Way to Central Malibu Are	Agreed, but the scope of this specific study is to look at PCH specifically and not side streets.
57	Signal at PCH/Sierra Rd	Maps	10	Webb Way to Central Malibu Are	Not parking related.
58	Existing sight lines must stay, from Serra Road to 1000 feet to the east	Maps	10	Webb Way to Central Malibu Are	Project Recommendation in this area would not reduce the sight distance at Serra Rd.
59	Meter parking w/ resident pass citywide	Maps	10	Webb Way to Central Malibu Are	The introduction of charging to park along PCH is introduced in the recommendations. However, introducing charges for formerly free parking can become controversial, and will require further study by the City
60	Provide parking meters esp. near paid lots to make drivers choose the lots	Maps	10	Webb Way to Central Malibu Are	Discussed in report (also see comment above)
61	Box trucks with advertizing park in line of sight	Maps	10	Webb Way to Central Malibu Are	Prohibiting oversized vehicles from parking near driveways can help improve sight distance at the driveways, without completely prohibiting the necessary parking spaces for smaller vehicles. The Parking Recommendations discuss vehicle size parking restrictions, especially near intersections
62	Nobu/Soho illegal red curb	Maps	10	Webb Way to Central Malibu Are	Legitimacy of red curb is reviewed under the existing conditions section, and recommendations are made on where curbs should be painted red in the future
63	Enforcement	Maps	10	Webb Way to Central Malibu Are	Code enforcement refers to the proper placement of legitimate signs (i.e., limiting removal or private signs), while parking enforcement refers to ticketing parking restriction violators. This study is providing a baseline to show the existing and recommended parking restrictions. This study will be used by the City and Caltrans in the future to make sure that any missing parking signs can be immediately replaced or that illegal No Parking signs can be removed. In addition, clarification of the existing signs will make enforcement easier.
64	Delivery trucks park in center lane from Sweetwater Canyon Dr to 1100 feet to the east	Maps	10	Webb Way to Central Malibu Are	Not parking related.
65	Need time limit or prohibit 12a-5a due to RVs + business vehicles trucks w/signs, surfride already has, between Malibu Pier to 700 feet to the east	Maps	10	Webb Way to Central Malibu Are	Discussed in report
66	Hotel will elim. 26 parking spaces will create u-turns/ circulation issues , 750 feet east of Malibu Pier	Maps	10	Webb Way to Central Malibu Are	Not parking related.
67	Bus is sign legal? Near Serra Rd	Maps	10	Webb Way to Central Malibu Are	Bus Parking Only sign is not MUTCD sign, but it is legal.
68	Can you underground parking? 2 mile from Pier to Las Flores	Maps	10	Webb Way to Central Malibu Are	Building an underground parking structure in the Pier/Central Malibu area is not feasible.
69	In the past 5-7 years, the entire section of PCH bracketed here has become 8-hour employee parking and contractor parking. We need 1 hour parking for an orderly change of customer parking, from 22541 to Carbon Mesa Rd	Maps	11	Central Malibu Area fo Las Flores Canyon Road	Time limits to parking are discussed in report

	Comment	Comment Source	Map Page (1 -13: west to east)	Map Description	Response
70	No parking, dangerous drunks, 500 feet east and west of Moonshadows	Maps	12	Las Flores Canyon Rd to Big Rock Drive	Project recommendations do not remove parking from around Moonshadows, but includes widening on the inland side where there are extra dirt areas. Unfortunately, drunk driving can not be regulated through parking restrictions
71	Add center divider paddles and make them turn into parking lot, 500 feet east and west of Moonshadows	Maps	12	Las Flores Canyon Rd to Big Rock Drive	Not parking related.
72	People cut corner 3'-4" outside lane & buses are the worst, 1000 feet west of Tuna Canyon Rd	Maps	13	Big Rock Drive to East City Limit	Not parking related.
73	Pave more of the inland side for improved "off-street" parking, from 1200 feet west of Tuna Canyon rd to Tuna Canyon Rd	Maps	13	Big Rock Drive to East City Limit	The Project Recommendations include widening the inland side shoulder west of Tuna Canyon Rd.
74	Is study looking at parking meters. Recommendations?	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	The Parking Recommendations do not specifically include installation of parking meters in the Central Malibu area; although, they are recommended for further study. Introducing charges for formerly free parking can become controversial.
75	Consider free parking on holidays or limited service days.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	Many different agencies operate the lots along PCH and each would be responsible for determining exceptions to the parking fees. Fees are discussed in the report
76	PCH is a state highway – issue of parking signs, speed, etc. City or State?	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	Caltrans is responsible for the operations and maintenance of PCH, including determining speed limits, installing No Parking signs, etc.
77	Analyze net loss? Question is demand.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	The net loss of parking spaces from the preliminary Project Recommendation is 675 spaces (25 from high-use areas). Demand for these spaces is also summarized.
78	Paving Gravel. Can it be on private property. Not likely to recommend on private.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	Pavement widening is not being recommended on private property.
79	Landslides – dirt in parking. Can someone clear it? REMOVE.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	Dirt on paved shoulders from landslides should be removed but is not within the scope of this parking study. If it appears to be difficult to remove, the parking is recommended to be prohibited due to narrow lanes.
80	Increase parking by removing vegetation – yes.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	The Project Recommendations include widening paved shoulder areas by paving additional dirt areas. This should include removing vegetation that encroaches on paved areas.
81	What is the line of sight on a driveway – book with calculation (400 feet or more)	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	Sight distance is dependent on speed of traffic and typically not measured or parking restricted for residential driveways
82	Is it a different formula for driveway or street – yes	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	There are 2 types of sight distance: stopping sight distance and corner sight distance. The corner sight distance would apply in determining the sight distance at intersections. Residential driveways are typically not measured for sight distance
83	Narrowing lane – how do you narrow lanes when bicyclists encroach the lane, plus three feet rule. Where there is space and room.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	By narrowing the travel lanes, the shoulder would be widened, providing bicycle lanes, or giving bicyclists more room to ride on the edge of the shoulder. In addition, it is safer for bicyclists to use the full than to try to share a 12-foot lane with a motor vehicle - narrowing the lanes would not change this.
84	Narrow median? To be determined by safety or use.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	The median is analyzed at various locations and would be narrowed where possible to provide additional width for the shoulders. If necessary for left turns, the median would not be narrowed below an acceptable lane width.
85	How do you know what is legal for "real red". Inventory red curbs.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	Locations of red curb were identified by field observation, and questionable/faded/compromised painted curbs were noted. We also researched Caltrans records of sign installation orders
86	Law enforcement – enforcement is difficult –cars speed puts officer in danger. SAFETY.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	Not parking related.
87	Offsite commercial parking – does it impact this study? Consider it.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	This study did not inventory or analyze parking on private property. The City's Municipal Code deals with off-street parking requirements. We also did not determine between types of parked cars
88	How far east is the study boundary? Up to city limits – American Apparel Store to Mullholland beach curve.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	The City border is the study limit on both ends.

	Comment	Comment Source	Map Page (1 -13: west to east)	Map Description	Response
89	Caltrans lane widths – 40 mph or lower 11 foot.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	11 feet is the minimum lane width that the Project Team recommends on PCH in Malibu.
90	Caltrans, will they consider lower speed limits.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	Not parking related. In order to enforce the speed limit on PCH with radar, by law the speed limit must be determined by the speed under which 85 percent of existing traffic is traveling.
91	Speed limits are based on speed of vehicles.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	Not parking related. In order to enforce the speed limit on PCH with radar, by law the speed limit must be determined by the speed under which 85 percent of existing traffic is traveling.
92	Event parking – can get overcrowded in Central Malibu.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	The parking study analyzed and made recommendations for the typical peak (i.e., summer weekend) parking demand, but did not make recommendations for special events. The City will have to determine the parking needs of specific special events as they are planned.
93	Off street parking – projects are under parked. Adds to on street parking. Should it (offstreet parking) be part of study?	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	This study did not inventory or analyze parking on private property. The City's Municipal Code deals with off-street parking requirements.
94	Parking Authority or City Committee?	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	The City contracts with the Sheriff's Department for enforcement, and also has a Volunteers on Patrol team.
95	Seasonal parking increases. Peak periods are summer and sunny days. Issue.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	The study took into account seasonal impacts. The Parking Recommendations would be appropriate for all seasons.
96	East Malibu 9 foot to 11 foot lanes. Was it an improvement? Vehicles are larger today.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	11 feet is the minimum lane width that the Project Team recommends on PCH in Malibu. The study did not analyze impacts of different travel lane widths on PCH.
97	Businesses that monopolize parking on street – example parking van by pier.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	both time limit restrictions and oversize vehicle restrictions near driveways are discussed in the report.
98	Can (City) impose parking hour restrictions or time limit – midnight to 5 am?	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	The Parking Recommendations do not currently include time-restricted parking, although the City could consider implementing time restrictions in this area. However, restricting parking to one hour would affect beach and business customer parking. In addition, increased enforcement would be needed to ensure the time limits are followed, which the City would have to allow for if considering time restrictions.
99	Bid to install new signs.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	Caltrans is responsible for the operations and maintenance of PCH, including installing No Parking signs, etc.
100	RV parking on street – can be restricted?	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	both time limit restrictions and oversize vehicle restrictions near driveways are discussed in the report.
101	On street parking meters. Yes, paid parking Central area. Show of hands 80/20 YES.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	The introduction of charging to park along PCH is introduced in the recommendations. However, introducing charges for formerly free parking can become controversial, and will require further study by the City
102	On street parking meters Central area.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	The introduction of charging to park along PCH is introduced in the recommendations. However, introducing charges for formerly free parking can become controversial, and will require further study by the City
103	Where does parking revenue go? To be determined.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	Different Cities/agencies have different methods. To be determined if a program is further studied
104	Can parking meter rates be \$1 sometimes and .25 cents other times? Rates set by City.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	Many different methodologies. To be determined if a program is further studied
105	Legal issues (up north) paid parking at State Park – research it.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	We have reviewed the case up north. Introduction of pay parking would require further study and coordination with the Coastal Commission.
106	Matador critical area. Speed, sight and safety. Social media (created) popular beach.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	Project Recommendations include improvements in the El Matador Beach area.
107	El Matador – no parking signs – some signs washed out – want sign replacement.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	The Parking Recommendations discusses appropriate signs and a replacement policy.
108	Replace signs. Need both signs – no parking with tow away sign.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	The Parking Recommendations discusses appropriate signs and a replacement policy.

	Comment	Comment Source	Map Page (1 -13: west to east)	Map Description	Response
109	Small parking lots at small state beaches creates more street parking – Need bigger lots at State beaches.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	Potential improvement, noted in report. However, the area is an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA)
110	Fatalities and injuries – study only 2 recorded. There are more unreported.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	The study only included reported collisions that directly involved parked and/or parking vehicles along PCH shoulder. We also unfortunately can not analyze those that are not reported.
111	Forward parking instead of parallel lines – look at it?	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	Unfortunately, there is not enough width along the roadway to provide forward parking.
112	Safe parking is more important than lots of parking. GOAL.	Question and Answer	N/A	N/A	The Project Recommendations include several areas where shoulder parking is widened to improve safety.
113	We need meters near the paid lots to push people into the paid lots. They should prefer to park off the roadway.	Comment Card	N/A	N/A	If the spaces along the highway charged a fee, the incentive to park there would be significantly reduced. The introduction of charging to park along PCH is introduced in the recommendations. However, introducing charges for formerly free parking can become controversial, and will require further study by the City.
114	My office is on the land side of Carbon Beach. The entire stretch of parking has been taken over by full time employee parking. We need 1 hour non-metered parking with no employee street parking. This would create a flow of customer parking.	Comment Card	N/A	N/A	both time limit restrictions and oversize vehicle restrictions near driveways are discussed in the report.
115	I realize it is past 12/16/16. I thought it doesn't hurt to send my comments and hopefully they will be considered. 1. Need more transparency from the Coastal Commission. --how many more parking spaces are they demanding? --they should realize increased parking will stress and damage the environment; is increased parking in the Land Use Plan? 2. There are already too many vehicles traveling in and through and parking in Malibu already. We have to accept we are not the only beach access area in So Cal and we should be discouraging vehicles travelling through the area. 3. Reducing the number of parking spaces will reduce the number of parked cars which will eliminate a lot of the concerns raised in the study. 4. If possible, Increase the capacity of the Zuma parking lot and (like every parking lot in America), increase the cost of parking. That is a proven technique to reduce utilization of a scarce resource. The City is now going to develop land near Trancas, where will all those fools park?	Email	N/A	N/A	1. The Coastal Commission is not requiring more parking, but they do not want to lose any existing parking spaces. 2. Not parking related 3. Agreed. Unfortunately, PCH is a public highway, and the beaches are public also. The City cannot restrict public access, including removal of parking spaces. The Coastal Commission will not approve a plan that removes parking spaces with the intent of reducing access to public lands. 4. Increasing the size of the existing lots and further study of fees for on-street parking are both recommended in the study
116	I am a Malibu resident, and have lived and worked here over ten years. Our main concern about PCH is pedestrian safety. What I would like to know is if there are any plans to purchase the stretch of PCH through our city that Caltrans maintains? I know this was successfully done in West Hollywood, with Santa Monica Boulevard, and the improvements there were long lasting. If that can't be done, is there any way to provide more space for parking along PCH - especially around Paradise Cove? There are so many deaths there, where there are no sidewalks, and inadequate parking space. Additionally I can never forget the young woman who lay there, for six hours before she was taken away after being struck and killed.	Email	N/A	N/A	The study's focus is parking along PCH but it has attempted to improve pedestrian safety. The City and Caltrans have no plans to transfer ownership of PCH. Project recommendations include shoulder widening in the Paradise Cove area.
117	1. I rely on the PCH parking along zuma beach everyday to take a walk there. Any removal or limitation of that parking option would seriously impair my daily access to exercise and the spirit of living in Malibu. 2. The parking on PCH near Winding Way and Paradise Cove are terribly congested areas on weekends and holidays. There isn't any space along much of these areas between a parked car and the traffic lanes. Drivers routinely dart into the roadway to walk toward the Paradise Cove entryway. This is a troublesome area to drive thru especially on summer weekends. 3. Also the area near Malibu Seafood is problematic with drivers parking on the land side and darting across the PCH to reach the beach. The use by Geoffrey guests to park along the PCH is another problem area. Geoffrey's should require guests to park using their valet service (as the valets wear appropriate safety vests) and prohibit walk-in diners...similar to the policy at The Malibu Getty Museum where walk-in visitors (other than bus riders) are denied entry. 4. This same policy could also be required at Paradise Cove Cafe. And could help cut down on visitors trying to save on parking fees. Efforts should be made with the state and county agencies that regulate the parking areas in Malibu to have lower rates to encourage greater usage. 5. The parking spaces around Cross Creek fill up daily with local employees parking all day. Some empty lot or other options should be considered for employee parking to open up the parking spaces on the roads for others. 6. Also, quite worried about the parking nightmare that will result near legacy park and cross creek if and when the community college (unfortunately) comes to Malibu.	Email	N/A	N/A	1. The project recommendations do not suggest removing parking adjacent to the Zuma Beach parking lot. 2. Project recommendations include widening of the shoulder area north of Paradise Cove Malibu Seafood area. 3. Geoffrey's and Paradise Cove Cafe - this study is only making improvements to physical parking and not making recommendations to private businesses 4. Lower parking fees at the State and County beaches can be requested but the cost is at the discretion of those agencies. 5. Time restrictions are discussed as a strategy in the report 6. not parking related

	Comment	Comment Source	Map Page (1 -13: west to east)	Map Description	Response
118	<p>TO MEMBERS OF THE CITY OF MALIBU CITY COUNCIL; TO CALTRANS OFFICIALS AND TO THOSE COUNTY AND STATE OFFICIALS CONCERNED WITH PARKING ON THE PACIFIC COAST HIGHWAY IN THE CITY OF MALIBU, PACIFIC PALISADES AND SANTA MONICA AREAS.</p> <p>As a Malibu Civic Center property owner, I am very concerned about overall traffic issues, traffic congestion and limited parking availability. I urge you to make your primary focus in your studies and recommendations on the needs for available, easily accessed, plentiful, adequate, convenient and FREE parking in the commercial and recreational areas of Malibu, as well as in the residential areas. Your primary focus related to parking appears to be limited to collisions and safety. Also, I urge you to expand and include in your focuses the needs for reducing congestion and traffic jams, and their impacts and the effect of parking on PCH and nearby areas on the congestion and traffic jams. Parking should not be considered in isolation from traffic flow and related areas.</p> <p>I also urge you to consider the impact on City of Malibu parking of traffic jams triggered by accidents outside of the City of Malibu, namely, those triggered by accidents and signaling outages at PCH and Topanga Blvd. in the Pacific Palisades, PCH and Sunset Blvd. in the Pacific Palisades, At PCH and Chautauqua in Santa Monica, and at PCH and the McClure Tunnel entrance to the Santa Monica Freeway/I-10 Freeway in Santa Monica.</p> <p>In my opinion, we are woefully under-assisted by traffic control law enforcement, and parking signs that can be changed in changing conditions.</p> <p>On Malibu Road, we are parking challenged, particularly during the summer, on weekends and during holidays, and during construction. Perhaps, we should limit parking to residents and their visitors in the Malibu Colony area outside the gates between 23950 Malibu Road on the west end and the Malibu Colony gates near the Los Angeles County Fire Department, Station 88.</p>	Email	N/A		<p>Project recommendations emphasize the safety of parking on PCH, and at this time do not include installing parking meters or charging for parking. The scope of this study is limited to shoulder parking on PCH, and does not include vehicle congestion, delay, or collisions outside the limits of the City.</p> <p>This study does not recommend permit or preferential parking for residents.</p>
119	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Pacific Coast Highway Parking Study.</p> <p>We have reviewed the November 29, 2016 presentation on this study. We appreciate the efforts of the City and Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) in considering important safety and public access factors when developing recommendations. We offer the following additional comments.</p> <p>Slide 23 of the presentation states (in part): "Please provide your input. Where is parking necessary for you?" Public parking is necessary for our organization at existing and proposed public access points, on coastal and inland sides of Pacific Coast Highway (PCH). These include existing parkland, existing trailheads, existing beaches and beach accessways, existing and other potential public access points (e.g., existing access easements, planned trails, proposed beach accessways to be improved, etc.). As stated in a February 10, 2016 email to you and to SCAG, we recommend that the City and SCAG fully address the relevant policies and implementation measures of the City of Malibu Local Coastal Program related to the provision of public parking. These include the following Land Use Plan policies: 2.27 The implementation of restrictions on public parking, which would impede or restrict public access to beaches, trails or parklands, (including, but not limited to, the posting of "no parking" signs, red curbing, physical barriers, imposition of maximum parking time periods, and preferential parking programs) shall be prohibited except where such restrictions are needed to protect public safety and where no other feasible alternative exists to provide public safety. Where feasible, an equivalent number of public parking spaces shall be provided nearby as mitigation for impacts to coastal access and recreation.</p> <p>2.31 The City should complete an inventory of existing public parking along Pacific Coast Highway and public roads seaward of PCH to identify all unpermitted signage or physical barriers to public parking and to establish a database to aid in preventing future loss of legal public access and parking.</p> <p>A local public agency exercising Joint powers of the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, the Conejo Recreation & Park District, and the Rancho Simi Recreation & Park District pursuant to Section 6500 et seq. of the Government Code. All unpermitted signs and/or physical barriers which prevent public parking near the shoreline shall not be permitted.</p> <p>One improvement concept in the presentation (Slide 16) includes the following text: "Consider restriping PCH to: Remove parking on the inland side and improve parking on ocean side." The City should reconsider this recommendation in areas where there are existing or potential public access points on the inland side of PCH. These include existing parkland, existing trailheads, and other existing and potential public access points (e.g., access easements, planned trails, etc.). The City should</p>	Email	N/A	N/A	<p>We understand that parking along PCH is a valuable resource.</p> <p>We are only looking to restrict parking where it is safer to do so than leave it, but improving where possible. We have also completed an inventory of existing parking and created a database of existing restriction as a part of this study. All areas seaward of PCH are outside the scope of this study.</p> <p>The City, Caltrans and this study agree that unpermitted signs and/or physical barriers preventing parking are not to be tolerated or allowed along PCH. Recommendations in this study approved by the City and Caltrans will not be "unpermitted."</p> <p>Off-street parking areas for visitors should be provided at new and/or improved trailheads on the inland side of PCH and not rely entirely on shoulder parking. However, the study recommends keeping (and improving) as much parking as possible.</p>
120	<p>I am going to address two areas northern beaches</p> <p>The problem here has ballooned rapidly as the area is posted frequently on social media and is now on trip advisor as a must see on the highway</p> <p>This could be our next Paradise Cove, while not a topic of your study roadside trash is a growing problem and some of it associated with illegal drinking (please visit on a Sunday morning)</p> <p>My principal concern is parking land side. I can see no reason why this should be allowed, why would pedestrians be encouraged to cross four lanes of traffic? For many users I suspect this is a pure pricing issue they do not want to pay the fee, parking in the lot is often empty but road side full. Recent intro of hourly fees was a good move.</p> <p>Support the ideas in the report related to the widening of lanes and a dedicated bike lane to avoid doors which is a real problem at weekends.</p> <p>During peak Triathlon training season at Zuma (June to Aug) the bikes and cars are not mixing well in this area.</p> <p>PCH: Morning view to Trancas : landside Should be a no parking zone Vehicles stopping and then backing into a space and then ped's crossing pch are a danger to all.</p>	Email	N/A	N/A	<p>Trash, illegal drinking are not parking related.</p> <p>Project recommendation eliminates inland side parking and provides bike lanes from the west Malibu border to Trancas Canyon Rd; however, the travel lanes in this area are not widened.</p>
121	<p>My PCH Parking Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Eliminate all "land-side" parking from East Malibu up to Trancas 2. Get LA County to slash lot parking fees by 50% - they will then see a big surge in paid parking 3. Hire more law enforcement 	Email	N/A	N/A	<p>Project recommendation includes elimination of parking on inland side from west Malibu border to Trancas Canyon Road.</p> <p>Parking fees at the County and State beaches are set by the respective agencies. A reduction in parking fees can be requested by the City.</p> <p>Law enforcement?</p>

	Comment	Comment Source	Map Page (1 -13: west to east)	Map Description	Response
122	<p>I live on Calpine Drive in western Malibu. My husband and I discussed the parking study. Here are our thoughts.</p> <p>*Parking fees are way too high at Zumba beach, the pier, the lagune and elsewhere. It's obvious because all of the visitors are parking on the land side of PCH to avoid paying these high fees. If you cut the fees you would fill the parking lots first not last and it would give visitors a much more reasonable fee to come and visit.</p> <p>Fees should also be cut at restaurants and local businesses where they charge parking fees these are exorbitant as well and once they are reduced, will allow people to park at the restaurants and other areas at a much more reasonable cost instead of parking on the land side of PCH.</p> <p>*If you move the fog line to allow more parking on the ocean side you are essentially cutting the traffic lanes into smaller sizes. It's already extremely dangerous with pedestrians and bicycles, so we do not think that is a workable solution.</p> <p>*Get more code enforcement and more police enforcement....people are putting up fake no parking signs constantly. Code enforcement has told me they're always having a problem with that and residents on ocean side are painting their curbs red which is illegal as well. Step up enforcement by both sheriffs and by Code officers and you will get rid of a lot of scofflaws.</p>	Email	N/A	N/A	<p>Parking fees at the County and State beaches are set by the respective agencies. A reduction in parking fees is unlikely. Parking costs are discussed in the report.</p> <p>By reducing the width of travel lanes and making the shoulder wider, more space is given to pedestrians and bicycles.</p> <p>City is making efforts to improve enforcement.</p>
123	<p>The Malibu Times did an article on the most problematic parking on PCH, without a mention of Paradise Cove. The intersection at the Cove and PCH is a time bomb waiting for a catastrophe. Masses of people parking and walking to the Cove. Cars blocking the intersection, along with masses of people walking down the hill impeding traffic. I believe there should be no parking on PCH until there is a solution.</p>	Email	N/A	N/A	<p>Project recommendation increases parking on PCH north of Paradise Cove, and widens shoulder to improve safety</p>
124	<p>I was unable to attend the meeting but I did look over the power point presentation online. I am very concerned with a solution which involves making the driving lanes narrower in Malibu east of Carbon Canyon. I feel tense and vigilant all the time driving in the area between Carbon Canyon/Las Flores and the eastern(southern?) City Limits (beyond, actually) I have had too many near-miss accidents to count, where drivers next to me have drifted into my lane--in straightaways as well as in the narrower, curving portions of PCH. Whether it's due to texting or trying to read phones while driving--or whatever--this has become a real issue in the last few years. If the lanes are narrower, I fear that there will be even more accidents--from people travelling in the same direction who swipe cars next to them. I hope the engineers will take this into account. The widest lanes in a large part of that area are the center left/right turn lanes, which I know cannot be eliminated because they provide access to dwellings. Perhaps that lane can be narrowed, but it's a terrible idea to narrow the lanes where people are driving 45-50 mph.</p>	Email	N/A	N/A	<p>Project recommendation includes narrowing the travel lanes by (to 11 feet wide) through central Malibu area. Wider traffic lanes are actually shown to increase speeds, while reducing travel lane width typically results in lower speeds.</p>
125	<p>My only comment is that the parking spaces should not be reduced in size and head in parking is not appropriate for PCH</p>	Email	N/A	N/A	<p>Project recommendations do not include reduced size parking stalls. Head-in/perpendicular parking is not recommended at any location.</p>
126	<p>I was not able to attend the PCH workshop on Nov 29, so I am sending you my comments:</p> <p>There are many problem spots along PCH, and I would have to agree with the article in the 12/7 Surfside News, that it seems to be worse on the ocean side with houses so close to the highway. PCH is now a commuter highway, and a year-round beach and bicycle highway, so, sadly, traffic and parking are going to increase. It is infuriating to live with.</p> <p>The dangerous spots regarding parking and drivers on PCH are Cross Creek, the Pier, Paradise Cove, Malibu Seafood, Duke's Restaurant (Las Flores), Moonshadows, Winding Way, Leo Carrillo Beach, and Latigo Shore Drive. Large numbers of visitors to Malibu park on the land side of these areas, and run across the highway, carrying surfboards and/or loads of stuff, or dragging children along. Very, very dangerous.</p> <p>If they don't make it all the way across the highway, they stop and stand in the middle. This is especially bad at Malibu Seafood, just before Corral Canyon, where there is a very narrow concrete island in the middle of PCH, so people stand on that, until they can get across to the beach side. I always slow down and honk, just to make them aware.</p> <p>Can an underground walkway, on the land side, just to the east of the restaurant, be constructed so people can walk under the highway?</p> <p>I live on Latigo Shore Drive, and the other thing I have noticed is that visitors do not use the Dan Blocker Beach parking lot, probably because they have to pay for it. Since the free beach access app came out a few years ago, there has been an increase of cars and parking at the top of Latigo Shore Drive. Visitors to that access stop their cars at the gate, unload all of their stuff, then go up and park on PCH. Those cars stopping there, and turning around in such a small space, are very dangerous, because they can block access to Latigo Shore Drive and Tivoli, and there is not enough room to safely make the right turn from PCH onto Latigo Shore Drive. I've almost hit people, as I slowly turn right from PCH onto Latigo Shore Drive -- the staircase access is too close to the narrow turnaround. Question: Can the beach access point at Latigo Shore Drive be moved to Dan Blocker Beach? That would be much a much safer access than the current one. Of course, people would have to pay to park in that lot, and they would avoid doing that. They would still park on PCH and walk down to the beach.</p> <p>Winding Way and Paradise Cove are also bad spots, because the lots are too small, and people start parking along PCH and walking along the highway side. The shoulders of those areas should be wider.</p> <p>The other problem is huge RVs, and campers parking on PCH, not only during the day, but at night. These vehicles are large, take up a lot of space, and block drivers' views of other cars that merge.</p>	Email	N/A	N/A	<p>Review of collision data shows that parking-related collisions are actually slightly higher on the inland side</p> <p>The parking study looked at these trouble spots and has recommendations to address parking on PCH.</p> <p>A pedestrian underpass at Malibu Seafood is not recommended.</p> <p>Beach access at Latigo Shore Dr will not be closed or moved.</p> <p>The Project Recommendation includes widening shoulders and allowing parking north of Paradise Cove.</p> <p>Vehicle size restrictions near driveways and intersections are not being recommended at this time but can be considered by the City.</p> <p>Parking structures are not being recommended.</p> <p>Introducing charges for formerly free parking can become controversial. Also, additional enforcement would be required but could be offset by the parking fee.</p> <p>Lowering of the speed limit is not being recommended; however, by making the travel lanes more narrow in areas, drivers might slow down.</p>
127	<p>One of the many areas affected by parking on PCH is Paradise Cove. I have lived in Paradise Cove for more than thirty years now. In the last few years with the popularity of the restaurant and beach in PC, the parking on PCH has grown increasingly more dangerous. It has become a common sight now for cars to park a significant distance from the entrance lining up and down highway. On any given day in the summer, car alarms can be heard sounding off disturbing residents living close by. As traffic speeds by, families with children in tow, seemingly unaware of any potential dangers, stream up and down the highway making their way to the famous Paradise Cove beach... In my humble opinion, it is just a matter of time before something tragic happens. Something that can be prevented by restricting parking on PCH.</p>	Email	N/A	N/A	<p>Project recommendation includes widening the shoulders north of Paradise Cove and adding parking.</p>

	Comment	Comment Source	Map Page (1 -13: west to east)	Map Description	Response
128	<p>At the workshop, traffic engineer Rock Miller of Stantec, the consultant firm undertaking the survey, described it as a thorough process and said he is optimistic that the study will enable the City to identify areas where parking safety can be improved, but cautioned that any proposed changes will face a complex approval process. "There are competing priorities with the City of Malibu, Caltrans and the Coastal Commission.</p> <p>Miller indicated that on several key stretches of PCH it may be possible to narrow the lanes and widen the shoulder. The restriping plan Miller proposed would remove parking on the inland side and improve parking on the ocean side, with the goal of creating more space between moving and parked vehicles and improved line of sight. He suggested that a wider parking area could help eliminate one major type of accident and would also improve pedestrian safety, and it might be possible to negotiate with Caltrans to try a mile-long test in a section of the highway like the area in front of the Malibu Pier.</p> <p>Malibu residents were encouraged to submit comments through Dec 16. We are in total agreement- This area described by Rock Miller for the mile -long test "in front of the Malibu Pier" is Phase 1 of the MALIBU BEACH ESPLANADE project and is the obvious choice for this "test" since the plans have already been approved by Caltrans, the Coastal Commission and past City Councils. . Construction drawings and a model of the "Test " area is available for review as well as the plans for phases 2 and 3 (from the Civic Center to Bluffs Park) completing the goal for connectivity ,circulation, and safety.</p>	Email	N/A	N/A	The recommendation is included in the report.
129	<p>For over 10 years, I have lost track maybe closer to 15, I have been actively engaged in trying to increase safety on PCH. I have submitted countless emails, many with pictures and suggestions. Improvements with cost has been a factor in my efforts, as Caltrans for a past period had a skeleton crew maintaining our main street. Virtually no surface maintenance, crack filling / slurry / repaving has occurred in years, except in limited specific areas (4 such short damaged areas in 2016) which many I had to submit multiple emails to get action, actual results.</p> <p>Having a smooth surface for cyclists is a serious safety factor, and interrelated to the parking. When I was on the safety commission, and time on the PCH Safety Task Force, much discussion occurs, but very little actual results are completed. Look at the Las Flores cross walk for instance. So, with any "parking study" findings, actual work must be completed.</p> <p>Several recent accomplishments to increase safety have been the placement of No Parking signs, and striping as done, in the following locations: either side of entrances of Matadore, Pescador, and Piedra. This affected parking but increased safety by reducing blocked visibility.</p> <p>Signs by Surfrider, either side of Malibu Seafood, by the guard rail s b north of Paradise Cove, are a start to increase safety. All were extremely dangerous, and still have safety concerns, but through a few signs, the safety factor has increased.</p> <p>Thank you to The City Manager Feldman for her help with sign improvement.</p> <p>There are certain priority locations which merit work first. These priority locations, and then others with could be improved cheaply, should actually be done.</p> <p>The area at Westward Beach Road should have the paving expanded on the ocean side to accomplish cars parking further toward the ocean, and then having a walk lane and a bike lane on either side. Maybe pave on land side all the way to hill side with surface all flush. The city public works dept was very responsive everytime I asked to cut the brush back along Westward Beach from PCH, and filling shoulder height differential, and this provides parking option and increases safety.</p> <p>Speed humps should be considered between PCH and the Zuma Lot cut trough as many drivers are at a dangerous high rate of speed, maybe beyond also.</p> <p>The City's Broad Beach shoulder widening and improvements is a good example of enhancing parking option with safety and design.</p> <p>With respect to Paradise Cove, the shoulders should be widened, with little retaining walls where necessary, to achieve a space to park wider for cars to park, for people to exit vehicles, pedestrians to pass a parked vehicle sometime several deep if there are people going different ways and then some width for passing bicycles.</p> <p>A shoulder 7' wide is not a safe place to allow parking. What is the minimum width of an acceptable</p>	Email	N/A	N/A	<p>Thank you for your efforts to improve safety along PCH in the City.</p> <p>Any changes associated with the project recommendations would include pavement rehabilitation to provide a safe environment for bicyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>The Project Recommendation at Westward Beach Rd includes restriping the travel lanes and widening the ocean side shoulder on PCH south of Westward Beach Rd. However, the Recommendations do not include any improvements on Westward Beach Rd.</p> <p>Speed humps will not be installed anywhere along PCH. Recommendations to install speed humps on other roadways is not within the scope of the parking study.</p> <p>The Project Recommendation at Paradise Cove consists of widening both shoulders north of the intersection to add parking.</p> <p>Caltrans Highway Design Manual specifies that the minimum width of a shoulder allowing parking is 8 feet, but 10 feet is preferred. Parking on a shoulder less than 8 feet is not illegal unless No Parking signs are posted; however, the vehicle must be parked completely within the shoulder to be legal.</p> <p>Improving the safety of parking on PCH is a goal of the recommendations.</p> <p>Controlling the number of visitors to Malibu is outside the scope of the parking study.</p> <p>The shoulder on the inland side of PCH north of Ramirez Mesa Rd is less than 8 feet wide, however, parking is not currently prohibited at this location.</p> <p>Project Recommendations include prohibitions</p>
130	<p>I have lived in Malibu for over fourteen years. During that period, the traffic on PCH has increased to the point where there are days when I am unable to leave me home. The congestion in the Summer is so bad that even emergency vehicles find it difficult to get through the congestion.</p> <p>Unlike most cities, Malibu has only one main road. Other cities have a main street and a highway. Therefore, an alternative route to take during peak traffic. Our highway and main street are only one, PCH.</p> <p>During peak season, mostly the summer months, hundreds of thousands of visitors add the already over taxed PCH. That coupled with other distractions such as parking, drinking, jay walking etc. has caused our main street to become non functional and extremely dangerous.</p> <p>There is no practical way to widen or modify the highway to safely accommodate the massively heavy traffic load that it must support.</p> <p>One idea that I feel has merit, is to limit the public parking along the road during at least during the summer months. If the public parking were restricted to limited hours during peak times, people who desire to spend a day at the Malibu beaches would have to use public transportation. As part of the restricted parking, increased bus and shuttle services could be employed to facilitate public access and use of all of the Malibu beach facilities.</p> <p>Malibu business should not be negatively impacted in that they have private parking facilities that will allow patrons both local and visiting full access to shop and dine.</p> <p>By restricting the parking, whether by time of day or limited hours (possibly no parking at all during certain hours), the volume of cars on the PCH will be significantly reduced. Emergency vehicles will be able to navigate safely, the community will be able to leave their homes, traffic accidents and injuries will be reduced and public safety will improve substantially.</p> <p>Visitors will still have full use and access to the amenities that our city and beaches has to offer but, they will have to use a public transportation system of buses and shuttles if they intend to spend a full day in Malibu.</p> <p>This idea may seem a little draconian but, when one considers the cost in loss of life that occurs on a regular basis in Malibu on PCH, I believe that such a measure is very justifiable.</p>	Email	N/A	N/A	<p>Removing all parking along PCH during the peak summer months is not an option.</p> <p>Shuttle service from off-site parking lots has been considered, but may not be feasible. It is discussed in the report.</p> <p>Increased use of public transportation would be beneficial, but parking cannot be removed to force its use.</p>
131	I'll believe Malibu is doing something about trash and parking on PCH when the City moves to rid PCH of overnight RV's, used car sales, car & truck storage, kayak renting and advertising.	Email	N/A	N/A	The issue of overnight parking of RVs, truck storage, advertising, etc. can be alleviated through use of time-restricted parking (such as midnight to 5am). This would not restrict beach or business visitors and would mitigate some of the parking needs. It is discussed in the report.

	Comment	Comment Source	Map Page (1 -13: west to east)	Map Description	Response
132	In the Hamptons telephone poles were placed under ground in order to create more space for parking. It was a win win since having the telephone poles under ground improved safety on highways in many ways	Email	N/A	N/A	Undergrounding of utilities would not increase available parking noticeably.
133	As a Malibu resident since 1972 I've seen the impact of posting "No Parking" signs in a number of places. This makes our City less attractive to visitors and, potentially, more dangerous as drivers try to be creative with parking. We should not eliminate any current parking. We already have too little. 1. The recommendation to widen the shoulder is an obvious solution and should be implemented whenever possible. 2. The recommendation to narrow the lanes on PCH is terrible. 3. The idea of bike lanes would be great if they can be done without: 1) narrowing traffic lanes, and 2) removing parking, & 3) being inconsistent and end abruptly where the highway is too narrow. Sorry to say, but the very few bikes relative to the number of vehicles means the overwhelming focus must be on cars and trucks. PCH is and will remain a very dangerous place for cyclists. This is exacerbated by many cyclists having an attitude of being "in the right," not realizing they can also end up with severe injuries. I have ridden - mostly on trails - since the 80s but one of our routes required riding on PCH for several miles. We always tried to stay as far as possible from traffic lanes as possible. Too many cyclists weave in and out or ride two abreast. One sees cars and trucks slowing and driving into oncoming traffic lanes to avoid these bikes, resulting in traffic congestion and near accidents. There is a tendency to favor bikes over cars in a value judgement that deems bikes as ecologically favorable, but with bikes being one tenth or one percent of traffic and 99% recreational, our focus must remain on vehicle traffic until we develop a viable alternative. Narrowing traffic lanes or removing parking to favor the few cyclist would be a terrible disservice to residents, commuters, and visitors, and a giant misallocation of resources. We should promote safety issues to the cyclists. 4. Parking is obviously inadequate in many areas, especially near restaurants and surfing beaches when the surf is up. We should consider a parking structure with a van shuttle for surf rider beach. 5. As noted, most free parking fills up before paid parking. A possible solution to this is to offer (I'm thinking of Zuma Beach & possibly Topanga) annual passes to encourage more people to use the paid lots. If a parking structure was built in the Civic center, it could also have a low cost annual fee with a shuttle during summer. This might reduce pedestrian accidents as well. 6. The busy restaurants like Maestros, Nobu, Moonshadows, Paradise Cove, and Geoffreys create big traffic problems. These establishments should bear part of the cost of widening the shoulder to accommodate their customers.	Email	N/A	N/A	Project recommendation is to eliminate parking in areas that are lightly used, widen shoulders where possible, and to reinforce areas where parking is currently prohibited with a consistent sign program. Narrowing of the travel lanes is necessary to widen the shoulders in some areas. By making the highway safer and more attractive to bicyclists, more bicyclists would be apt to use PCH for commuting, exercise, or recreation. The State is committed to providing safe and convenient highways for all travel mode users, with an emphasis on increasing non-vehicle modes of travel. An off-site parking structure with shuttle service could be considered by the City in the future, but is not part of the current Project Recommendations. An annual parking pass for the Zuma Beach lot could be beneficial for frequent visitors; however, the frequent visitors are also the ones that know to get to the beach early enough to park for free on the shoulder. Furthermore, this would not alleviate any parking problems at other areas along PCH. Existing businesses along PCH will not be required to pay for improvements to the public highway.
134	I was hoping to make the meeting, but couldn't get out there for it, so thanks for sharing the presentation. Here are some thoughts from the bike perspective: 1) Narrowing the lanes to help give more space to parking/biking/walking activity is definitely the right approach generally. Hopefully this will also help reduce the highway feeling that encourages people to drive way too fast for conditions. More crossing points for pedestrians in the business districts or other improvements would also help communicate that PCH is not a freeway. 2) There's an important caveat to the benefits of wider shoulders for bikes, which is that the worst parts of the highway for bikes are where there is some shoulder leftover from the parking, but it's in the door zone. What happens here is that drivers are super aggressive because they think you should be riding over in the shoulder, even though it is not safe at all to ride there. So when parking is up against the fog line, bikes have to be in the lane, but motorists respect that because they can see the shoulder is blocked. When parking is way back from the fog line leaving a good clear zone, that's great too because then it's safe for bikes to use the shoulder. Anything in between can be the worst outcome. 3) Following up on #2, this is a really important consideration if bike lanes are on the table. The presentation shows a 5' minimum bike lane next to a 7.5' parking lane, which basically puts the entire bike lane in the door zone. That might be ok on a low-speed street, but is definitely a no-go on streets with 40+ mph traffic, and where bikes are going 20+ mph. The minimum bike lane that should be considered should be 6', and even that would be better with a buffer. We have this problem on parts of the Zuma bike lane since the buffer wasn't included, so that project isn't as successful as it could have been. 4) Transitions between parking/no parking are really important. The most dangerous thing for a bike rider isn't being out in the lane, it's the merging. What happens sometimes in the less utilized parking areas is you'll get one or two parked cars, followed by a clear shoulder, followed by one or two parked cars. This is another source of stress because savvy bike riders will stay out to avoid having to merge back and forth, but aggressive drivers won't understand why you are in front of them when they think the shoulder is clear. 5) Areas where a clear bike lane or shoulder can't be provided, we should look at sharrows and BMUFL signs to help encourage safe lane positioning and respect.	Email	N/A	N/A	1. We have included these recommendations. 2. Bicycle lanes are also being provided where possible. 3. Unfortunately, there is not adequate width for 6-foot bike lanes. Bikes may still use the traffic lane adjacent to a bicycle lane, especially if the bicycle lanes have doors and/or pedestrians in them. The Project Recommendations have been developed with consideration for bicyclists to avoid the "door zone". Where the parking lane is shown as 7.5 feet and the bike lane is 5 feet, the intention is for the total shoulder width to be 12.5 feet without a stripe between the bike lane and the parking zone. 4/5. Additional signage for bicyclists is recommended in the report.
135	I live in Paradise Cove mobile home park, and I routinely take the 534 metro bus to and from Santa Monica and central Malibu. One issue I have, is that when the "white walk person" shows up for me to cross from the 534 bus stop area over to the entry road down to Paradise Cove, the cars waiting to turn left out of Paradise Cove almost hit me. They either don't look or don't wait to turn behind me, which is DMV law. I've had to wave my hands FOUR times in the last few months to indicate my presence, so they don't hit me. My recommendation on this issue, is that the light be staggered so that the driver coming out of Paradise Cove (to turn left onto PCH) has to wait for a green arrow. This would allow pedestrians to get across first and safely, thus walking when the "white walking man" is shown. Secondly, when I disembark from the westbound 534 at the stop (that is very near PCH on the far side of the street), I almost get hit if there are cars parked between the bus stop and the stop light. There is not room for pedestrians to walk around the edge of the cars, with incoming traffic. A bus rider has to wait for the bus oncoming traffic to STOP at the red light to be able to walk to the light without risking being hit. Most people getting off there ARE going across the street at that light. It's a VERY dangerous situation. My recommendation to remedy this problem is to NOT allow cars to park on the side of the street between the westbound 534 stop sign and the stoplight that enters into Paradise Cove. There are already signs with arrows that say "no parking", but they're very confusing and everybody ignores them and parks there anyway.	Email	N/A	N/A	Traffic signal is not parking related. The Project Recommendation includes widening the inland side shoulder north of Paradise Cove Dr, which includes the area between the bus stop and the Paradise Cove signal.

	Comment	Comment Source	Map Page (1 -13: west to east)	Map Description	Response
136	FYI the Original No Parking signs down this hill are over 30 years old and more were put up after that as a Contingency of The State Opening this little beach to keep the crowds small. It has gotten bad in last few years because of social media. We are Also trying to deal with State Parks as they are Supposed to close their beach gates at Sunset/ by dark. It is usually between 9 pm and Midnight, lots if partying and bon fires on the beach. It is a Whole different problem I know! NOW we have people coming up From the beach and breaking in to houses and cars in our driveways. Getting really bad.	Email	N/A	N/A	Not parking related.
137	I am the owner of an office building on PCH but will be unable to attend tomorrow night's meeting. However I feel strongly about the following: 1. A tree planting program along both sides of PCH where sidewalk widths allow would do wonders for turning a quasi visual freeway into a roadway that matches more a Malibu environment and would help with traffic calming. 2. Traffic calming would possibly go a long way toward minimizing parking related accidents. In addition to trees on PCH it certainly would be helpful for an ordinance that required more and meaningful landscape on adjacent commercial properties. 3. Signage on PCH restricts parking adjacent a driveway access and egress. However, invariably cars looking for parking space will ignore these signs and park within the restricted area. This leaves a completely dangerous situation when somebody is exiting from a driveway with virtually no view of oncoming traffic. I appreciate the opportunity to participate.	Email	N/A	N/A	Not parking related. Enforcement of existing signs is being worked on by the City
	FYI the Original No Parking signs down this hill are over 30 years old and more were put up after that as a Contingency of The State Opening this little beach to keep the crowds small. It has gotten bad in last few years because of social media. We are Also trying to deal with State Parks as they are Supposed to close their beach gates at Sunset/ by dark. It is usually between 9 pm and Midnight, lots if partying and bon fires on the beach. It is a Whole different problem I know! NOW we have people coming up From the beach and breaking in to houses and cars in our driveways. Getting really bad.	Email	N/A	N/A	Not parking related. Enforcement of existing signs is being worked on by the City
138	These pictures were sent to Skylar Peak and to Caltrans. Caltrans sent two people to check the situation but they came early on a day of light traffic and parking problems. Between El Matadore and the North end of Broad beach on the Ocean side of the highway, there are several signs washed out from age and several were knocked down from the Many car accidents. There have been many accidents weekly and many fatalities. A Week After the No Parking sign just south of the gate to El Matadore state beach was knocked down by a car accident, you will see in the one picture, their New No parking signs And the white stripes painted on the shoulder did nothing. Tons of cars parked. We told them the Only signs that work are the No Parking Tow Away signs like our City put along the highway all along Zuma. I was told the only way we got Those There is the Shoulder is narrow and dangerous. OUR shoulder is narrower! I Measured. AND it is on a Blind curved hill where the traffic is going much faster! 65-80 is the norm. (Also The Speed limit should Not go up to 55 at Trancas as there are More residential driveways between Trancas and the North Malibu City Limit than there are from Pepperdine to Trancas! Speed limit is 40-50 mph in the Rest of Malibu. We have been Begging for TWO Years for the Old warn out and knocked out no parking signs be replaced with the Tow Away No Parking Signs! The next email will show you what it looks like when there are cars parked all down this hill north of Broadbeach. It is SO dangerous the people open their doors, walk in the slow lane, parallel park, it is SO bad. Please excuse my late email to you before tonight's meeting, which I will attend, but I Just found out maybe YOU could be the one to speak out for 30 homeowners who can Not get out of our driveways about 6 months of the year. *Since the State put those three new No Parking signs on each side of Their driveway at the Top of our blind hill,(in last photo) they listened to me and SAW that the Only thing that works is "Tow Away" and Replaced the New signs with Tow Away No Parking Signs. I have been told Malibu City has recently purchased over 100 more of the Tow Away signs.PLEASE WE NEED THEM ALL THE WAY DOWN THE BLIND HILL BETWEEN EL MATADORE and North end of Broadbeach! The Mail Carriers and Delivery and Trash trucks are also having problems getting in and out of our driveways as WE are. Please look at the pictures in the next email you will see what I mean. Note: (see photos listed)	Email	N/A	N/A	The Parking Recommendations would replace legitimate faded, outdated, missing No Parking signs. The Parking Recommendations do not include changes to the speed limits. The Parking Recommendations would prohibit parking on the inland side and widen the ocean side shoulder from the Western City border to Trancas Canyon Rd. The type of signs to be installed are yet to be determined.
139	Parking land and ocean side with traffic - February 9, 2016	Photo	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions.
140	Parking people walking in travel lane - February 17, 2016	Photo	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions. Widening the shoulders will provide additional space for pedestrians
141	Parking and traffic in fog line - February 14, 2016	Photo	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions. Widening the shoulders will provide additional space for pedestrians
142	Bicyclist in travel lane next to parked cars - February 9, 2016	Photo	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions. Widening the shoulders will provide additional space for bicyclists
143	Parking encroaching close to resident driveway. Pedestrians walking in travel lane - February 9, 2016	Photo	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions. Widening the shoulders will provide additional space for pedestrians
144	Parking on land and ocean side with traffic and small painted median - July 3	Photo	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions.
145	Night traffic and poor visibility	Photo	N/A	N/A	Not parking related.
146	Pedestrians crossing and waling in travel lane - July 3, 2015	Photo	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions. Widening the shoulders will provide additional space for pedestrians
147	Pedestrian walking in travel lane - March 28, 2015	Photo	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions. Widening the shoulders will provide additional space for pedestrians
148	Car parking on shoulder near mailboxes - March 28, 2015	Photo	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions.
149	Car parking next to trash cans - March 28, 2015	Photo	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions.

	Comment	Comment Source	Map Page (1 -13: west to east)	Map Description	Response
150	Pedestrian crossing in center lane island	Photo	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions. Restricting parking on the inland side will reduce pedestrians crossing the roadway
151	Car parking close to residential driveway - June 19, 2016	Photo	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions.
152	Cars parking on ocean side with traffic driving by	Photo	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions.
153	Cars parking on ocean and landside, full.	Photo	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions.
154	Roadway with shrubs/vegetation creating blind spot. Sight line obstructed.	Photo	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions. Widening and prohibitions of parking for sight distance are included in the recommendations
155	Shrubs and plants in shoulder	Photo	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions.
156	no parking sign - July 5, 2016	Photo	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions.
157	Faded no parking sign. April 2, 2016	Photo	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions.
158	Illegible sign	Photo	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions.
159	No Parking Tow Away	Photo	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions.
160	Las Tunas - Harner/Hundley	Site 1 Exhibit	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions.
161	Las Tunas - MRCA	Site 2 Exhibit	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions.
162	Las Flores - Lent	Site 3 Exhibit	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions.
163	La Costa - Wayne	Site 4 Exhibit	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions.
164	Carbon - La Costa - SCC	Site 5 Exhibit	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions.
165	Escondido - Geoffrey's	Site 6 Exhibit	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions.
166	Escondido - Clard	Site 7 Exhibit	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions.
167	Escondido - Wildman/Mancuso	Site 8 Exhibit	N/A	N/A	All photos were reviewed to understand existing conditions.

Comments to the Final Report

Page No. (2/16/2017 version)	Reviewer	Comment	Response
General	Coastal Commission	Appreciative of informative verbal report, extensive graphics and data collection - > expect to be useful for years to come.	n/a
General	Coastal Commission	Supportive of recommendations to widen shoulders to provide more and safer parking, bike lanes, and narrower travel lanes for traffic calming as well as maximizing use of public lands to improve access and creating consistent easy to understand signing program (especially if helps reduce the number of signs in the corridor to reduce impacts on view corridors).	n/a
General	Coastal Commission	Concerned about recommendations that would result in the elimination or restriction of inland parking spaces and request more information be collected/analyzed with further public input prior to making final determinations.	Noted. As explained in the report, many of the spaces are currently unused and are being mitigated through improvement of other spaces and additional connection options (such as a bike lane).
General	Coastal Commission	Concerned that proposal to remove 675 parking spaces contradicts LCP policy to preserve or replace all existing parking capacity.	Noted. As explained in the report, many of the spaces are currently unused and are being mitigated through improvement of other spaces and additional connection options (such as a bike lane).
General	Coastal Commission	Request that additional strategies and possible alternative proposals be incorporated so recommendations include a package that demonstrates consistency with all applicable LCP policies.	All strategies are considered and discussed. Each recommendation has been given a priority, and can be implemented independent of the other recommendations.
General	Coastal Commission	We believe that some additional spaces can be created by reducing segments of unnecessary red curbing.	Red curbing has been installed for safety or for access to fire hydrants. Stantec's recommendations do not include removing red curbs needed for safety. Any unnecessary restrictions were recommended for removal.

Comments to the Final Report

Page No. (2/16/2017 version)	Reviewer	Comment	Response
General	Coastal Commission	A more comprehensive review of all public lands may help to identify opportunities to utilize some of those lands for additional parking, including possible shared management strategies with other City partners such as State Parks or LA County Beaches and Harbors. This approach should also include evaluating how illegal developments within both City of Malibu and Caltrans ROW or on public lands might be removed to provide more space for public use. We would expect this evaluation to include City-held ROW along City streets adjacent or in close proximity to the beach (for example: Beach Road, Malibu Road, & the Point Dume Area) which may be able to make up for some of the parking stock that might be lost along PCH. These reviews are especially important near the vertical access ways to the beaches throughout the City.	A discussion of additional partnerships with other agencies is being added to the report. Public property on adjacent streets is already providing parking where possible.
General	Coastal Commission	We encourage another look at possible shuttle options, as well as using underpasses/overpasses, additional crosswalks, and/or better timed traffic lights to provide more safe crossings for the public from both sides of PCH.	We do not recommend marked crosswalks at uncontrolled crossings since they can provide a false sense of security. In addition, they have been shown to be unused in the area. There are no signals within 5 miles at the west end of the City. Adjusted timing would not help pedestrians.
General	Coastal Commission	Disagree with implied elevation of 1973 baseline parking conditions (location and amount of public parking spaces and no parking signs in existence in 1973) to a special status that should serve as the baseline and not be altered. City's LCP acknowledges that there is a lack of sufficient parking for visitors and our goal through this study is to identify ways to protect or increase that parking reservoir in a safe and efficient manner for today's needs by clearly evaluating the need (or lack thereof) for any existing No Parking signs relative to current public access needs and traffic standards that apply within the City. Overall results of this study might include recommendations for removing No Parking signs in some areas and adding them in others based on 2017 conditions and public access goals.	The existing conditions identify parking as it exists in 2016 (the start of the Study), not in 1973. The goal of this project is to improve the safety of parking on PCH. The recommendations include removing parking in areas it is currently allowed and widening in areas to allow parking where it is currently prohibited or too narrow to support parking.

Comments to the Final Report

Page No. (2/16/2017 version)	Reviewer	Comment	Response
General	Coastal Commission	Malibu's PCH Safety Study was referenced a few times but we believe this Parking Study might benefit from more direct linkages to aspects of that report. Recommendations in the Safety Study, such as changing ingress or egress lanes to the coast, might also offer opportunities for providing additional parking and should be analyzed as part of this parking review.	Additional linkages are being reviewed.
Maps	Coastal Commission	Legend change: The parcels which are highlighted by a shaded green color, are identified as "Potential Future Public Access". However, these parcels actually have existing lateral beach access easements. Suggested Change: the legend should be changed from Potential Future Public Access to "Existing Lateral Beach Access".	The properties highlighted in green have existing vertical access easements, but currently have no public access to the beach.
Maps	Coastal Commission	There are four round dots that denote "Public Access Points": The Blue dot is not defined, the purple dot is defined as "Private Lot". It seems that the intent of the purple dot is to indicate where Public Accessways exist on Private Lots, however we do not believe that is the case. Suggested change: The Blue and Purple dots should be combined into one color and identified as "Existing Public Accessways".	As shown in the map legend, the blue dot indicates approximate public access points (i.e., gate). These are access points only without an associated parking lot. The purple dot indicates privately run parking lots that provide access to the beach (e.g. Malibu Pier parking lot).
Maps	Coastal Commission	The Green dot denotes "County Beaches". The Brown dot denotes "State Beaches". These public beaches are comprised of several parcels and/or large pieces of land. Suggested Change: The entire extent of the public property should be highlighted (similar to the green highlighted parcels discussed above which denote existing lateral beach access). The existing Green and Brown dots can remain to indicate the vehicular entrance into the public beach property, but all public parcels should be identified.	The dots indicate the approximate access point (driveway, street, gate, etc).

Comments to the Final Report

Page No. (2/16/2017 version)	Reviewer	Comment	Response
Maps	Coastal Commission	The maps do not identify all public land, whether fee or easement. As these public lands could be a source for additional parking, they should be identified and analyzed. Identify all Caltrans property; all Caltrans easements; all Caltrans under crossings. (Examples include: the 9 ft. wide Caltrans easement on 22108 PCH, Carbon Beach-page 53, and the beach access underpass at Corral Canyon Park, 26523 PCH -page 38). Identify possible locations where shared parking, or other beneficial uses would be feasible. For example, are there commercial or public agency lots that are not used during the weekends that could be used as parking for shuttle programs?	This is outside the scope of the existing parking study. The City feels there may be other agreements such as this, but including them all is outside the scope and perhaps irrelevant to current on-street parking.
Maps	Coastal Commission	Identify all publicly owned land along PCH. Identify possible locations where new parking, shared parking, etc. would be feasible.	This is outside the scope of the existing parking study. The City feels there may be other agreements such as this, but including them all is outside the scope and perhaps irrelevant to current on-street parking.
Maps	Coastal Commission	The maps do not include dedicated but not yet opened Public Accessways. In order to plan for those future accessways, they should be added to the map, so that parking needs can be accommodated and protected. Suggested Addition: All "Future Public Accessways" (recorded easements that have not been opened to the public) should be added to the Legend and identified on the maps. (For example, 20516 PCH - page 59, should be added as a "Future Public Access way", per a City permit recently approved for MRCA.)	<p>Properties with undeveloped vertical beach easements are highlighted in the Existing Conditions maps in App A.</p> <p>Although as much consideration was given to providing maximum parking, new accessways should also consider parking availability and restrictions and consider parking alternatives when opening, just as new commercial or residential developments must provide sufficient off-street parking.</p> <p>In addition, there are alternate modes of accessing the beach accessways, such as public transit, taxi/ride-hailing services (Uber/Lyft/etc), and bicycles. Bicycle access is enhanced in many areas of the project by restriping and providing wider shoulders.</p>

Comments to the Final Report

Page No. (2/16/2017 version)	Reviewer	Comment	Response
Maps	Coastal Commission	<p>The maps identify the boundary of each parcel with a solid blue line. It seems that this line adjoins the PCH right of way. For example, when we look at the Carbon Beach area, the inland edge of the beachfront parcels does not appear to include the sidewalk. We discussed this question at the meeting and the consultant stated that the sidewalk is located on private property and thus any encroachments such as mail boxes, landscaping, private pavers, etc. were not identified or evaluated. We believe these situations need to be more carefully analyzed. Requested Action: Confirm the location of the PCH right of way in relationship to the sidewalk. If the sidewalk is within the right of way, survey the encroachments within the sidewalk and identify steps to remove these encroachments.</p>	<p>This is outside the scope of the existing parking study.</p>

Comments to the Final Report

Page No. (2/16/2017 version)	Reviewer	Comment	Response
Maps	Coastal Commission	<p>The maps identify the locations of the existing curb cuts. For example, on the west end of 22108 PCH (Carbon Beach-page 53), there are four curb cuts which were created for former driveways to former garages. When those garages were relocated to the eastern end of the residential compound, per a CCC coastal development permit, the former garages were converted to living space. However the curb cuts were not removed. These four curb cuts and a short red curb run for a distance of about 75 ft. In Appendix C, Recommendations, it shows that these curb cuts are proposed to become one long red curb, for a total of about 75 ft. This 75 linear ft. could provide four parking spaces, especially valuable for the overall parking supply in this critical location where there is a popular Public Accessway (Carbon Beach East) directly adjacent to this site. At the meeting, the consultant stated that they specifically looked for nonfunctioning driveways and garages. Is there a list of these sites? Was 22108 PCH included? If so, how was the decision made to expand the red curb at this location?</p>	<p>The curb cuts/driveways shown on App A page 53 at the west end of 22108 PCH appear to be in front of active garages (per Google Street View).</p> <p>An attempt has been made through field reviews to identify abandoned driveways, but further research is outside the scope of this study.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Appendix C Recommendations Map does not show a recommendation to combine or extend the red curb at this location, it is showing the existing red curb/driveway condition (refer to the "Malibu Parking Recommendations Categories" legend in the lower right hand corner of the map to identify locations of recommendations).</p> <p>Additional correction: 75 feet of curb space would provide 3 spaces, not 4 (24 feet/space).</p>
Maps	Coastal Commission	<p>Requested Action: Submit the list of sites that contain non-functioning driveways or garages. Identify the proposed changes and how these changes would be implemented. For those sites where curb cuts and/or red curbs would be eliminated, identify the actual steps that would be taken to ensure that these impediments are removed (e.g. City action? Property owner action? Failure to comply would result in?) and the parking spaces will be returned for use by the public.</p>	<p>This is outside the scope of the existing parking study.</p>

Comments to the Final Report

Page No. (2/16/2017 version)	Reviewer	Comment	Response
Maps	Coastal Commission	The maps should overlay all public lands, public easements (open and not yet open) with currently restricted parking areas to determine if key areas need another review to determine opportunities for additional public parking. A critical area discussed on our meeting was at El Matador State Beach-page 10. Is there useable public land and/or public easements that could be opened for additional parking at El Matador? Other areas? Are creative new strategies possible to be developed with State Parks to meet visitors' needs?	<p>Public parks and parking lots are shown on the existing conditions map.</p> <p>Properties with undeveloped vertical beach easements are highlighted in the Existing Conditions maps in App A. This map also shows areas of restricted parking. These public easements on residents' private property do not provide any opportunity for additional public parking.</p> <p>Additional space was explored as a part of the study. Any appropriate strategies were discussed.</p>
Table 3-1	Coastal Commission	Off Street Parking Lots, should be updated to include the public parking spaces available at PC Greens 22601 PCH - page 51, 2nd and 3rd floor on weekends and holidays, per a Coastal Commission permit condition.	This is outside the scope of the existing parking study. The City feels there may be other agreements such as this, but including them all is outside the scope and perhaps irrelevant to current on-street parking.
Table 3-2	Coastal Commission	Coastal Access Points, includes a column titled: "Public-Private Access Path". The word "Private" should be deleted as these are permanent Public Access Easements (located on private property).	Table 3-2 revised.
2-10	Coastal Commission	A citation to the California Vehicle Code section 22514, states that no parking is allowed within 15 feet of a fire hydrant, however exceptions are allowed: "(b) if the local authority adopts an ordinance or resolution reducing that distance. If the distance is less than 10 ft ... then the distance shall be indicated by markings ..." Given the high number of fire hydrants (210) that are located along PCH, along with the 5459 linear feet of red curbs (portions of which protect fire hydrants), the study should analyze the positive results of reducing the length of the fire hydrant red curbs and thus providing additional parking.	<p>Stantec does not recommend that the City adopt a resolution to reduce the clearance adjacent to fire hydrants for the purpose of increasing parking.</p> <p>The City is not interested in adopting a resolution to reduce the clearance adjacent to fire hydrants to increase parking.</p>

Comments to the Final Report

Page No. (2/16/2017 version)	Reviewer	Comment	Response
51	Coastal Commission	For example: at 22432 & 22426 PCH (Carbon Beach-page 51), there is an approximately 75 ft. long red curb, and a fire hydrant located about 25 ft. into this red curb area. Thus, there is about 50 ft of red curb east of the fire hydrant that could be used for parking. Reducing the 15 ft hydrant buffer area would provide about two additional parking spaces. These parking spaces are critical support for the Public Accessway, Carbon Beach West, located 150 ft to the west.	<p>Stantec does not recommend that the City adopt a resolution to reduce the clearance adjacent to fire hydrants for the purpose of increasing parking.</p> <p>Additional correction: in order to provide 2 parking spaces adjacent to the fire hydrant discussed here, there would only be 2 feet of clearance on the east side of the fire hydrant (2 x 24 ft/space). Stantec does not support removing the clearance adjacent to fire hydrants.</p>
General	Coastal Commission	Did the study confirm that all of the identified structures are in fact operational fire hydrants? Did the study look at the location of the existing Public Access ways and the nearby red curbs and curb cuts to determine if these restricted areas could be reduced so as to provide additional public parking? If so, please identify. If not, please collect this information and identify the steps to implementing a red curb reduction program. As discussed above, who would administer this program and how would it be enforced?	<p>We did not confirm that the locations of fire hydrants provided by the City are in fact active fire hydrants. This is outside the scope of this study.</p> <p>The need for existing red curb was reviewed and locations were confirmed.</p>
General	Coastal Commission	There is only one paragraph discussing the possible use of shuttles. Page 5-25 concludes that the use of shuttles "may not be feasible" but provides no detail of what types and locations of shuttle programs were evaluated. Beach Shuttles from both Hwy 101 and from Santa Monica along PCH, especially from the Metro station, needs to be more fully explored and analyzed. Park and Ride lots should also be identified and analyzed as possible sites for shuttle stops. Are Malibu hotels supporting shuttle programs for their guests as a way of reducing traffic and parking demand?	<p>This is outside the scope of the existing parking study.</p>

Comments to the Final Report

Page No. (2/16/2017 version)	Reviewer	Comment	Response
General	Coastal Commission	The study does not identify locations of existing underpasses and how they may factor into improved parking strategies, nor does it examine how adding underpasses or overpasses might enhance parking strategies for moving people from the inland side of PCH to the beach side. The study should be expanded to include a list of existing underpasses (whether used by pedestrians or not) and include an analysis of potential uses for these underpasses and possible overpasses as elements of strategies to add to the available reservoir of parking opportunities.	Both underpasses and overpasses were discussed with the City and Caltrans and they were rejected as not feasible for financial reasons. Furthermore, pedestrians would not use them. The existing underpass is not an official underpass and Caltrans does not want it recognized as such.

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
Line	MRCA - March 29, 2017 Letter			
6	Overall comments	MRCA	<p>There would be a net loss of 675 equivalent parking spaces (p. 5.29). We are concerned with this proposed loss of parking, particularly near existing and proposed public access points (parks, trails, beach accessways, etc.). We recommend that the final report incorporate an increase in the number of new parking spaces and a reduction in the number of spaces to be lost.</p>	<p>The goal of the Study Recommendations was to increase parking as much as possible, enhance existing parking as much as possible, and minimize the loss of parking as much as possible; however, the main focus of the study is safety, and to prioritize human life and safety before the need for rarely used parking spaces. The study presents recommendations to improve the safety of parking along PCH - sometimes at the cost of losing questionable parking spaces.</p> <p>The LCP LUP allows the removal of parking for safety reasons (Policy 2.27 "The implementation of restrictions on public parking . . . shall be prohibited except where such restrictions are needed to protect public safety and where no other feasible alternative exists to provide public safety.)</p>
7	Overall comments	MRCA	<p>Need to Identify Encroachments and Opportunities for Enhancement of Public Parking</p> <p>Consistent with the City of Malibu LCP LUP Policy 2.31, the City should conduct an inventory of PCH to identify all unpermitted signage or physical barriers to public parking and to establish a database to aid in preventing future loss of legal public access and parking. The policy further states that all unpermitted signs and/or physical barriers which prevent public parking near the shoreline shall not be permitted.</p>	<p>A complete inventory was conducted and no unpermitted signs were identified in the public ROW. One of the benefits of this study was providing a database to both Caltrans and the City of parking-related signage.</p> <p>Since the inventory, temporary or unauthorized signs or barriers may have been placed in the public ROW. The City and Caltrans shall continue their proactive monitoring of unauthorized No Parking signs or barriers in the public ROW.</p> <p>Any parking restrictions implemented based on the recommendations will be posted with authorized signage consistent with the MUTCD. No unpermitted signs or barriers will be allowed.</p>

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
8	Overall comments	MRCA	<p>For example there may be dense landscaping, fences, or other physical barriers in the public PCH ROW, which results in narrow shoulder in some areas. It is not appropriate for the report to recommend that no parking signs be installed and no parking be instituted or enforced in this area without additional consideration of public parking need and alternatives such as removing encroachments. If the report recommends no parking be enforced in these areas with encroachments, the City is validating the encroachments.</p> <p>There may be relatively simple solutions in some areas, such as removing the encroaching landscaping or other barriers for one or two feet in width, to widen the dirt areas available for public parking. This is particularly important in areas near existing and proposed beach accessways, park entrances, and other public accessways.</p>	<p>An exhaustive land survey of the exact public ROW was not within the scope of the project. Preliminary ROW was identified through GIS database. Field reviews further identified locations where potential widening/landscape encroachment removals would improve parking or add parking spaces.</p> <p>The presence of overgrown vegetation, private fences, or barriers within the identified public ROW did not justify removing parking spaces.</p> <p>The removal of overgrown vegetation and private barriers should be done by Caltrans or the City as identified; however, the recommended removal of spaces is based on the width of the existing shoulder and a lack of relatively flat public land adjacent to the paved shoulder for potential widening, sight distance considerations at intersections and beach parking lot entrances, or roadway curve/grade.</p>
10	Overall comments	MRCA	<p>Need for Replacement Public Parking</p> <p>The report must fully address and implement LCP LUP policies 2.27 and 7.12, which specify requirements for replacement public parking spaces.</p>	<p>See comment (Line 6) above. Every attempt was made to keep as much parking as possible, except when it conflicted with public safety. In addition, feasible locations for improvements/widening to provide additional parking were identified. Both policies 2.27 and 7.12 specify requirements for replacement of spaces "where feasible".</p>
11	Overall comments	MRCA	<p>Need for Clarification of Existing Conditions in Order to Evaluate Opportunities for Public Parking Enhancement</p> <p>There is a red line of the maps (Appendix C-Recommendations) identified on the legend as "Parking Prohibited or <8' Shoulder." It is important that the figures distinguish between the areas where there is existing prohibited parking versus where the shoulder is less than 8-foot-wide. Currently, these two categories are lumped together. Lumping these two categories is a disservice to the decision-makers and public in evaluating the existing conditions and public parking opportunities. This is particularly important in areas where people currently park but where parking is proposed to be removed, near existing and proposed beach accessways, park entrances, and other public accessways (some specific areas described below).</p>	<p>Appendix A shows the shoulder widths and existing parking restrictions. An "equivalent shoulder parking space" size was identified in the report based on State and nationwide engineering practices. While some drivers currently park their vehicles in the areas smaller than the equivalent space or where parking is prohibited, this practice is not condoned by the City, Caltrans, or Stantec. Areas of parking are recommended based on engineering judgement and safety, not on whether drivers already park there.</p>

Comments to the Final Report

	<p style="text-align: center;">Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Author</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Response</p>
12	Overall comments	MRCA	<p>For example, there may be areas where the paved shoulder is less than 8-feet-wide, but there is one or two feet of existing dirt which could be used for public parking. That opportunity should be considered, particularly near existing and proposed public access points.</p>	<p>Areas where relatively flat dirt areas are adjacent to paved shoulders were not included as "parking prohibited or <8' shoulder". It is understood that dirt areas can be used for parking, and if 8 feet or more is provided for parking, whether paved or unpaved, it would have been included in existing parking. For example, on page 14, the paved shoulder is 7 feet wide, however, it is not identified by a red line in Appendix C because of the adjacent flat dirt area.</p>
13	Overall comments	MRCA	<p>On the other hand it is important to know where existing parking is prohibited and why it is prohibited (e.g. specific code). If parking is prohibited (per the sold red line) near key public access points, it is worthwhile to reconsider those areas to allow some public parking near these public access points.</p>	<p>It is outside the scope of this project to determine the reason for every previous/existing parking restriction along PCH in the City. For this study, each location of parking restrictions was reviewed and the current parking restriction was either verified or recommended to be removed based on safety (i.e., shoulder width, speed of traffic, and roadway curve and grade). If there was no reason to keep an existing parking restriction, it was recommended for removal.</p>
14	Overall comments	MRCA	<p>For example, while line of sight is important looking left when pulling out of a driveway, perhaps some public parking areas could be maintained in some areas looking right. This warrants additional consideration and discussion with the City, Stantec, Caltrans, Calif Coastal Commission, and the park agencies such as MRCA, particularly where no parking is proposed to be enforced near key public access points (existing and proposed).</p>	<p>Sight distance restrictions in both directions are important when exiting a street or driveway (unless left turns are prohibited).</p>
15	Appendix C- Recommendations p.31	MRCA	<p>Meadows Court, Inland Side There is an existing trail easement (running north-south) on the west side of easterly Meadows Court Road (by the guard gate), which then traverses in an east/west direction along the south border of the subdivision. The trail easement connects to PCH ROW at the east side of the subdivision. (The trail easement is depicted on parcel maps.) The upper (northerly) portions of this trail exist on the ground and are used. The southerly portion of the trail is not yet built within the easement.</p>	<p>The easement is shown on the maps in the appendices, but it is not labelled as a trail.</p>

Comments to the Final Report

	<p style="text-align: center;">Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Author</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Response</p>
16	Appendix C- Recommendations p.31	MRCA	Vehicles currently park along the shoulder west of the west side of Meadows Court subdivision. (For example, Google Earth shows ten vehicles parked between the parcel identified as 27355 and the Meadows Court driveway by the guard house.) Severe reductions in public parking are not warranted in this Meadows Court area. Public parking should be expanded in this Meadows Court area.	After further consideration and review, there is a section north of westerly Meadows Court and a section between westerly Meadows Court and easterly Meadow Court on the inland side which is wide enough to recommend removing the No Parking restriction. This results in approximately 14 new equivalent spaces. The report and the map in Appendix C have been revised to reflect this new recommendation.
17	Appendix C- Recommendations p.31	MRCA	It appears that there is an approximately 600-foot-long stretch south of the Meadows Court subdivision shown as a red line, identified as "Parking Prohibited or <8' Shoulder" (p. 31 parcels identified as 6428, 6437, 27353, and 27355). The report should clarify which category this falls into - parking prohibited, or less than 8-foot-shoulder. It appears that this would be left status quo - please let us know if our understanding is incorrect.	Appendix A shows the shoulder widths and existing parking restrictions. See above (Line 16)
18	Appendix C- Recommendations p.31	MRCA	At the east side of the parcel identified as 27405, it looks like the proposal shown as a light blue dashed line is to "Improve signs, install missing signs - existing parking restriction."	See above (Line 16)
19	Appendix C- Recommendations p.31	MRCA	Opportunities should be explored here in the Meadows Court area to make public parking available, particularly west of the Meadows Court subdivision. It is obvious that it is possible to park there, people park there now, and the current parking situation is good. The report must explicitly define why this area was designated as a red line and what minor improvements could be made to improve the existing parking, in front of the parcel identified at 27353 (approximately 300 feet long).	Areas of parking are recommended based on engineering judgement and safety, not on whether drivers already park there. See above (Line 16)
20	Appendix C- Recommendations p.31	MRCA	On the east side of the Meadows Court subdivision (by the parcel identified as 6447 on p. 32), we make similar recommendations. Google Earth shows about four vehicles parked along the shoulder at the east side of the parcel identified as 6447 on p. 32. The report should clarify which category this area identified as a solid red line falls into - parking prohibited, or less than 8-foot-shoulder. Parking enhancements should be considered.	Appendix A shows the shoulder widths and existing parking restrictions. The parking in this area is recommended to remain restricted due to sight distance at the intersections and driveways.

Comments to the Final Report

	<p style="text-align: center;">Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Author</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Response</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">21</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Appendix C- Recommendations p.32</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">MRCA</p>	<p>Via Escondido Drive, Inland Side Our agency has deeded road easement right over Via Escondido Drive to PCH, which were acquired along with the MRCA's Escondido-Flood property (APN 4460-003-900 and 4460-003-901). Parking in this area also serves the beach across the beach. There is an approximately 300-foot-long stretch east of Via Escondido Dr (on the ocean side) and an approximately 450-foot-long stretch west of Via Escondido Dr depicted as a solid red line. The report should clarify which category this falls into - parking prohibited, or less than 8-foot-wide shoulder. Vehicles can be seen on Google Earth parking on the dirt west of Via Escondido, outside the paved shoulder.</p> <p>Google Earth shows that vehicles park on the inland side of PCH between the west side of the Meadows Court subdivision and Via Escondido Dr. We recommend that parking be enhanced west of Via Escondido Dr and west of the bus stop (outside of the bridge) within this 450-foot-long stretch identified as solid red line. The final report must identify what minor enhancements would be implemented to improve the public parking. This can include expanding the pavement and/or reconsidering existing parking restrictions (if there are any). Another option would be to allow parking on the dirt and installing signage directing visitors to park outside of the white line. It would be unacceptable to lose the public parking here west of Via Escondido Dr (other than prohibiting parking at the bus stop). This is important so that public parking can be maintained for access to Via Escondido Dr, the trail easement (lower part of trail not yet built within the easement) at the Meadows Court subdivision, and the beach access across the street.</p>	<p>Appendix A shows the shoulder widths and existing parking restrictions.</p> <p>The parking in this area is recommended to remain restricted due to sight distance at the intersections and driveways.</p> <p>Cars are observed to be parking here on Google Earth, and our inventory identified that the Caltrans No Parking signs were missing from this section of roadway. However, the restriction is recommended to remain.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">22</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Appendix C- Recommendations p.32</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">MRCA</p>	<p>The text states: "Improve signage on inland and ocean sides to clearly prohibit parking on the bus zones." The report should clarify what is the length of PCH where the signage would be installed for the bus stop. Would signage be installed along this entire length (300 feet plus 450 feet), or just in a small subset of this stretch? It should just be a small subset for the bus stop.</p>	<p>As stated in the text of the Report, the length of the bus zones are determined by Metro, but are from 40 to 150 feet long, depending on location. It would not be for the entire length of existing parking restriction north of Via Escondido Dr.</p>

Comments to the Final Report

	<p style="text-align: center;">Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Author</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Response</p>
23	<p style="text-align: center;">Appendix C- Recommendations p.32</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">MRCA</p>	<p>Regarding the stretch of the PCH shoulder east of Via Escondido Dr, some of it is shown as a solid red line and some is shown as a dashed red line ("Prohibit Parking-New"). Again, it is critical information for Caltrans, the public, and decision-makers to know what public resources are there. The report must identify which category this area shown as a solid red line is designated as: parking prohibited, or less than 8-foot-wide shoulder, rather than hiding behind a catch-all designation. Is the red line in this area based on a code, or a subjective call?</p>	<p>The solid red line is based on existing physical conditions. Appendix A shows the shoulder widths and existing restrictions (and/or presence of a fire hydrant, as in the case in front of property 27146).</p> <p>The new parking restrictions provide the reasoning for the proposed restriction, and it's recommended to prohibit parking at this location due to narrow shoulder width, and the curvature of the roadway.</p>
24	<p style="text-align: center;">Appendix C- Recommendations p.32</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">MRCA</p>	<p>The City should explore widening the pavement into dirt areas in order to enhance public parking in some of this area, while still maintaining adequate sight distance to Via Escondido Dr. Enhancing public parking east of Via Escondido Dr may be more challenging than west of Via Escondido Dr. However, it should not be categorically dismissed without a more in-depth analysis.</p>	<p>The parking in this area has been recommended for removal due to safety (the width of the paved shoulder, lack of flat dirt area, and the roadway curve).</p>
25	<p style="text-align: center;">Appendix C- Recommendations p.29</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">MRCA</p>	<p>Escondido Beach Area, Ocean Side Google Earth shows vehicles parked along the shoulder on the ocean side where the map currently shows a solid red line identified as "Parking Prohibited or <8' Shoulder" along parcels identified as 27832, 27808, 27800, and 27768. The map also proposes new parking prohibitions on the ocean side along parcels identified as 27852, 27834, and 27768. However, Google Earth shows that vehicles currently park along the shoulder on the ocean side at these locations.</p>	<p>Correct. However, illegal and questionable parking locations were the reason for this study.</p> <p>In this area specifically, these cars are shown with portions encroaching into the travel lane, which is prohibited by the California Vehicle Code.</p>

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
26	Appendix C- Recommendations p.29	MRCA	There is a note on p. 29 stating: "Prohibit parking on ocean side from W. Winding Way to E. Old Road due to shoulder width and roadway curve." This would essentially create a solid wall of no parking approximately 600-feet-long in front of, and eastward, of a proposed beach accessway located at 27910 PCH. This is in addition to another 500 feet of no parking west of the parcel at 27910 PCH. This is unacceptable. The final report must clarify which category this falls into - parking prohibited, or less than 8-foot-wide shoulder, for the two solid red lines from 27910 PCH eastward to E. Winding Way. The final report must reevaluate the potential for enhanced public parking in the vicinity of 27910 PCH, such as widening shoulder, particularly in front of and east of 27910 PCH.	Appendix A shows the shoulder widths and existing parking restrictions. An "equivalent parking space" size was identified in the report based on State and nationwide engineering practices. While some drivers currently park their vehicles in the areas smaller than the equivalent space or where parking is prohibited, this practice is not condoned by the City, Caltrans, or Stantec. Areas of parking are recommended based on engineering judgement and safety, not on whether drivers already park there. By restricting some of the parking on the ocean side near Winding Way where the shoulder is less than 8 feet wide, the parking on the inland side can be widened/improved through restriping. It is also noted that by restricting some of the parking on the ocean side north of Old Road (4 equivalent spaces) it allows for an addition of 5 equivalent spaces on the inland side.
27	Appendix C- Recommendations p.29	MRCA	East Winding Way, Inland Side The public parking lot for Escondido Canyon Park is located on the inland side at the intersection of E. Winding Way and PCH. The parking lot fills up quickly, which frequently leads to visitors parking on the PCH shoulder. We support the proposal to widen the existing shoulder on the inland side of PCH, both west and east of E. Winding Way at parcels identified as 27841, 27777, 27727, and 27715.	Understood. Unfortunately, these improvements can only be completed through the restrictions on the ocean side. Unfortunately, the adjacent slope prohibits shoulder widening on either side of the roadway.
28	Appendix C- Recommendations p.31	MRCA	Geoffrey's Restaurant, Ocean Side A blue dot should be added to Geoffrey's Restaurant eastern driveway at the parcel east of the parcel shown as 27400 on p. 31, in order to depict an existing public access.	Accessways were provided from City data and show general access locations, but not exact pathways.
29	Appendix C- Recommendations p.31	MRCA	Many vehicles park along the shoulder from the Geoffrey's eastern driveway (across PCH from the parcels identified as 27355 and 27353 on p. 31) eastward to approximately the parcel identified as 27314. Much of this area is identified as a solid red line on p. 31. The report should clarify which category this falls into - parking prohibited, or less than 8-foot-wide shoulder. It appears that no action is proposed for this area east of the eastern Geoffrey's driveway - please let us know if our understanding is incorrect.	Additional information on shoulder widths and existing restrictions can be found in Appendix A (for this portion, as shown in Appendix A there are existing restrictions although the signs are missing, not width issues. Although we can't determine the reasoning at the time, it's likely for sight distance purposes). Your understanding is correct.

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
30	Appendix C- Recommendations p.31	MRCA	Based on our parcel data, it appears that there are encroachments (fences, landscaping, etc.) in the public ROW east of the eastern Geoffrey's driveway. These encroachments should be surveyed and the results included in the final PCH Parking Study. At the very least, the final report should include aerial photo with parcel boundaries, showing these encroachments (e.g. from the Los Angeles County GISNET website).	A complete land survey of Caltrans ROW is outside the scope of this project. However, it appears that the fence and landscaping in this area are outside of the public ROW and does not interfere with parking on the paved shoulder. Further, the parking restrictions directly south (east) of the Geoffrey's driveway are likely not due to shoulder width or encroachments, but are reasonable for sight distance issues, and an existing fire hydrant.
31	Appendix C- Recommendations p.31	MRCA	There should not be a loss of the high volume of parking in this area east of the eastern Geoffrey's driveway, particularly given the apparent encroachments and the adjacency to an existing beach access. The City should consider options for enhancing parking here, including removing encroachments and widening the pavement, or using the newly created dirt opening and/or removing any parking restrictions (if they exist).	The Study recommendations do not include removing any parking in this area, simply to reinforce existing parking restrictions with consistent signage.
32	Appendix C- Recommendations p.11 and 12	MRCA	Lechuza Beach The blue dot on p. 12 indicating Public Access at Lechuza Beach should be moved to Lot I, across from the Bunnie Lane cul-de-sac, along Broad Beach Road (between parcels 31712 and 31736). This should also be shown on p. 11. There should also be a blue dot at the intersection of E. Sea Level Dr and Broad Beach Rd.	Accessways were provided from City data and show general access locations, but not exact pathways.
33	MRCA - April 7, 2017 Maps & Aerial Photos / Letter Attachments			
34	Maps App C - p.29	MRCA	Photo Comments: Existing Conditions Near Escondido Beach - 27910 PCH (ocean side) Vehicles parked in Google Earth aerial (2/2016); more recent Street View shows cones present.	Cones were not present when field reviews were conducted. The City and Caltrans shall continue their proactive monitoring and removal of unauthorized No Parking signs or barriers in the public ROW.
35	Maps App C - p.29	MRCA	Photo Comments: Existing Conditions Beach access easement (not yet built). Vehicles currently park (arrows pointing between W. Old Road and E. Winding Way)	Properties with undeveloped vertical beach easements are highlighted in the Existing Conditions maps in App A.
36	Maps App C - p.29	MRCA	Map Comments: MRCA Recommendations April 7, 2017 and March 29, 2017 Letters Near Escondido Beach - 27910 PCH (ocean side) Reevaluate potential for enhanced public parking in the vicinity of 27910 PCH, such as widening the shoulder, particularly in front of and east of 27910.	The parking in this area has been recommended for removal due to safety (the width of the paved shoulder, lack of flat dirt area, and the roadway curve), and to improve and add additional parking on the inland side, which provides access to the trail without requiring pedestrians to cross PCH.

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
37	Maps App C - p.29	MRCA	Map Comments: MRCA Recommendation: Add dot (new category): Proposed Beach Access Point	Properties with undeveloped vertical beach easements are highlighted in the Existing Conditions maps in App A.
38	Maps App C - p.29	MRCA	Map Comments: MRCA Recommendation: Clarify if this red line means parking prohibited, or less than 8-foot-wide shoulder. Appears from "Existing Shoulder Conditions (Central Malibu)" Fig 3-19 that this is less than 8-feet-wide and a small portion 8'-10'. If parking prohibited, clarify why (e.g., what code?).	Information on shoulder width and parking restrictions can be found in Appendix A. It is outside the scope of this project to determine the reason for every existing parking restriction along PCH in the City. For this study, each location of parking restrictions was reviewed and the current parking restriction was either verified or recommended to be removed based on safety (i.e., shoulder width, speed of traffic, and roadway curve and grade). In this case, the restrictions are recommended to remain due to a narrow shoulder width and curvature of the roadway.
39	Maps App C - p.31	MRCA	Photo Comment: Existing Conditions Near Meadows Court (inland side) and Geoffrey's Restaurant (ocean side) Trail easement (lower/southern portion not yet built within easement) Existing Beach Access north of Geoffrey's Vehicles currently park south of Geoffrey's Encroachments in PCH ROW south of Geoffrey's trail easement on the inland side of PCH	Existing easements and general location of access points are shown on the maps, including Existing Conditions (App A) and Recommendations (App C). Current parking is not shown on the maps, and this area and any potential encroachment issues are addressed per the comment above.
40	Maps App C - p.31	MRCA	Map Comment: MRCA Recommendations April 7, 2017 and March 29, 2017 Letters Report should identify what minor improvements could be made to improve the existing parking, in front of the parcel identified at 27353 (approximately 300-feet-long).	Addressed under "Meadows Court" comment above (Line 16).
41	Maps App C - p.31	MRCA	Map Comment: MRCA Recommendations April 7, 2017 and March 29, 2017 Letters Clarify if this red line means parking prohibited, or less than 8-foot-wide shoulder. Appears from "Existing Shoulder Conditions (Central Malibu)" Fig 3-19 that this is greater than 10-feet-wide. If parking prohibited, and evaluate why (e.g., what code?). Clarify if report currently suggests this red line would be status quo.	Information on shoulder width and parking restrictions can be found in Appendix A. It is outside the scope of this project to determine the reason for every existing parking restriction along PCH in the City. For this study, each location of parking restrictions was reviewed and the current parking restriction was either verified or recommended to be removed based on safety (i.e., shoulder width, speed of traffic, and roadway curve and grade). The recommendation does not change the existing parking restriction in this area, due to sight distance needs.

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
42	Maps App C - p.31	MRCA	Map Comment: MRCA Recommendations April 7, 2017 and March 29, 2017 Letters Add blue dot - Public Access (in front of Geoffrey's Restaurant)	Properties with undeveloped vertical beach easements are highlighted in the Existing Conditions maps in App A.
43	Maps App C - p.31	MRCA	Map Comment: MRCA Recommendations April 7, 2017 and March 29, 2017 Letters Consider options for enhancing parking here (south of Geoffrey's southern driveway on the ocean side), including removing encroachments and widening the pavement, or using the newly created dirt opening and/or removing any parking restrictions (if they exist).	Discussed above (Line 31).
44	Maps App C - p.31	MRCA	Map Comment: MRCA Recommendations April 7, 2017 and March 29, 2017 Letters Survey potential encroachments in public ROW; include results in Final Study. At least, the Final Study should include an aerial photo with parcel boundaries.	<p>A complete inventory was conducted and no unpermitted signs were identified in the public ROW. One of the benefits of this study was providing a database to both Caltrans and the City of parking-related signage.</p> <p>Since the inventory, temporary or unauthorized signs or barriers may have been placed in the public ROW. The City and Caltrans shall continue their proactive monitoring of unauthorized No Parking signs or barriers in the public ROW.</p> <p>Any parking restrictions implemented based on the recommendations will be posted with authorized signage consistent with the MUTCD. No unpermitted signs or barriers will be allowed.</p>
45	Maps App C - p.32	MRCA	Photo Comment: Existing Conditions Near Meadows Court (inland side) and Via Escondido (inland side) Trail easement (lower/southern portion not yet built within easement) Vehicles Currently park MRCA has deeded road easement rights over Via Escondido Drive to PCH	Noted.
46	Maps App C - p.32	MRCA	Map comment: MRCA Recommendations April 7, 2017 and March 29, 2017 Letters Clarify over what distance the Stantec recommendation applies to improve signage to clearly prohibit parking in the bus zones. It should be just near the bus stops.	No change to the bus zone length is recommended, which is determined by Metro. The bus zone lengths are from 40 to 150 feet long, depending on location.
47	Maps App C - p.32	MRCA	Map comment: MRCA Recommendations April 7, 2017 and March 29, 2017 Letters Clarify if this red line means parking prohibited, or less than 8-foot-wide shoulder. Appears from "Existing Shoulder Conditions (Central Malibu)" Fig 3-19 that this is "<8 ft" and "Existing unpaved shoulder" could accommodate widening to 8' paved area.	<p>Information on shoulder width and existing restrictions can be found in Appendix A. In this area, the No Parking signs are missing.</p> <p>The existing parking restriction is recommended to remain due to sight distance issues.</p>

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
48	Maps App C - p.32	MRCA	Map comment: MRCA Recommendations April 7, 2017 and March 29, 2017 Letters Implement enhancements to improve public parking (e.g., widen pavement to at least 8-foot-wide) (north of Via Escondido Drive)	The No Parking signs in this area are missing. The existing parking restriction is recommended to remain due to sight distance issues.
49	Maps App C - p.32	MRCA	Map comment: MRCA Recommendations April 7, 2017 and March 29, 2017 Letters Clarify if this red line means parking prohibited, or less than 8-foot-wide shoulder. Appears from "Existing Shoulder Conditions (Central Malibu)" Fig 3-19 that this is "8-10 ft" with a small part "<8 ft." If parking prohibited, clarify why (e.g., what code?).	Appendix A shows the shoulder widths and existing parking restrictions. It is outside the scope of this project to determine the reason for every existing parking restriction along PCH in the City. For this study, each location of parking restrictions was reviewed and the current parking restriction was either verified or recommended to be removed based on safety (i.e., shoulder width, speed of traffic, and roadway curve and grade).
50	Maps App C - p.32	MRCA	Map comment: MRCA Recommendations April 7, 2017 and March 29, 2017 Letters Explore widening the pavement into dirt areas in order to enhance public parking in some of this area, while still maintaining adequate sight distance to Via Escondido Dr. (south of Via Escondido Drive)	Unfortunately, vertical grades/slopes prohibit widening of the pavement in this area. The parking restrictions must be kept to maintain sight distance.
51	MRCA - April 7, 2017 Letter			
52	General comment	MRCA	On March 29, 2017, MRCA staff provided written comments in a letter to the City of Malibu Public Works Commission and Public Safety Commission on the PCH Parking Study Draft Final Report. We ask that you fully address the comments in that March 29, 2017 letter and this current letter.	Comments in both letters have been addressed.
53	General comment	MRCA	One of our overarching concerns is an apparent rush to exclude public parking. The Study recommendations, if implemented, would result in a net loss of 675 equivalent parking spaces (p. 5.29). This is of particular concern near existing and proposed public access points, both ocean and inland sides of PCH. Proposed public access points include existing recorded trail easements or recorded beach accessways that are not yet improved or open (several are at various stages of design and permitting), and trails as shown on the Local Coastal Program Parkland and Trails Dedication Incentive Program Map (adopted by the City Council April 11, 2016; pending a final LCP amendment). For example, in our December 16, 2016 letter, we provided a map of proposed beach accessways. The final Study must maintain, and where possible, enhance parking near these existing and proposed public access points.	The Study reflects the recommendations of a year (plus)-long study. Attempts were made to preserve or increase parking along PCH as much as possible; however, safety and human life were prioritized over preservation of maximum parking spaces, and recommendations were based on safety and engineering judgement. These are Stantec's recommendations, and the decision-makers can implement these recommendations, conduct further analysis, or reject some or all of the recommendations.
54	General comment	MRCA	The City of Malibu LCP LUP Policy 2.1 quoted.	The LUP LCP policy quoted specifies that shoreline, parklands, beaches, and trails shall be protected, expanded, or enhanced as a resource. This policy does not address public parking.

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
55	General comment	MRCA	<p>The City of Malibu provides unparalleled opportunities for public access. Parking is a critical piece to ensure public access. Ensuring safety with respect to parking on PCH is clearly a fundamental goal for all stakeholders. The recommendations in the Study cannot be made in a bubble without a full consideration of the implications for public access. The final recommendations must be modified to ensure public access is adequately protected. The final Study must also include a full analysis of consistency with the City of Malibu LCP, including but not limited to policies 2.1, 2.27, 2.31, and 7.12 and LIP Sections 3.14.1(C) and (D). Implementation of recommendations as currently proposed will without question result in significant adverse impacts to public access.</p>	<p>Agreed, and the goal to maintain as much parking as possible was always considered. However, safety was given the highest priority. Conversely, opening new accessways should not be done in a bubble without consideration of the implications of a lack of safe parking.</p> <p>There are alternate modes of accessing the beach accessways other than parking of private vehicles, such as public transit, taxi/ride-hailing services (Uber/Lyft/etc), and bicycles. Bicycle access is enhanced in many areas of the project by restriping and providing wider shoulders.</p>
56	General comment	MRCA	<p>We reiterate three overall comments from our March 29, 2017 letter.</p> <p>1. It is important to identify encroachments in the public ROW and opportunities for enhancement of public parking, particularly in areas near existing and proposed public access points.</p>	<p>An inventory was conducted and no unpermitted signs were identified in the public ROW. Since that time, temporary or unauthorized signs or barriers may have been placed in the public ROW. The City and Caltrans shall continue their proactive monitoring and removal of unauthorized No Parking signs or barriers in the public ROW.</p>

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
57	General comment	MRCA	2. Per the LCP, replacement parking spaces must be provided to offset the loss of public parking.	<p>The goal of the Study Recommendations was to increase parking, enhance existing parking spaces, and minimize the loss of parking as much as possible; however, the main focus of the study is safety, and to prioritize human life and safety before the need for rarely used parking spaces. The study presents recommendations to improve the safety of parking along PCH - sometimes at the cost of losing questionable parking spaces.</p> <p>The LCP LUP allows the removal of parking for safety reasons (Policy 2.27 "The implementation of restrictions on public parking . . . shall be prohibited except where such restrictions are needed to protect public safety and where no other feasible alternative exists to provide public safety.")</p> <p>Every attempt was made to keep as much parking as possible, except when it conflicted with public safety. In addition, feasible locations for improvements/widening to provide additional parking were identified. Both policies 2.27 and 7.12 specify requirements for replacement of spaces "where feasible".</p>
58	General comment	MRCA	3. The Study must clarify existing conditions in order to evaluate opportunities for public parking enhancement. Specifically, in Appendix C-Recommendations, the figures must distinguish between the areas where there is existing prohibited parking versus where the shoulder is less than 8-feet-wide, as depicted by the red lines. The red line currently lump these two conditions together as "Parking Prohibited or <8' Shoulder."	Appendix A shows existing conditions, such as shoulder widths and parking restrictions.
59	Section 5.0, 5.1	MRCA	<p>Need to Expand Basis for Parking Recommendations in Order to Address Public Access</p> <p>We recommend changes to sections 5.0 and 5.1 pertaining to parking recommendations in order to ensure that adequate parking for public use is maintained, and where feasible, enhanced. These changes should be incorporated into the final Study to ensure consistency with the LCP.</p>	MRCA suggestions are considered, where they follow sound engineering principals.

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
60	Section 5.0, 5.1	MRCA	In particular, we disagree with the recommendation in the study to prohibit parking where the shoulder is less than 8-feet-wide. Instead, we recommend that the final Study encompass a full range of strategies including identifying and removing encroachments in the public ROW; widening pavement onto existing dirt areas; minor smoothing/grading areas adjacent to the paved shoulder; and allowing vehicles to park partially on dirt, partially on pavement, with adequate signage direction visitors to park outside the white line.	<p>The study will not recommend allowing parking where the paved shoulder is less than 8 feet wide for safety reasons. The existence of vehicles currently observed parking in less than 8 feet wide shoulders is not justification for permitting it.</p> <p>Where possible, recommendations were made to widen the paved shoulder to more than 8 feet wide, either through restriping of the travel lanes or paving additional available dirt areas.</p>
61	Section 5.0, 5.1	MRCA	Of note, in the strategy proposed in the Study "Improving Current Parking Restrictions" there should be a justification for parking restrictions, particularly near existing and proposed public access points. This justification must be based on existing parking standards. The final Study should identify which specific current code applies to which area, address current and future parking and circulation needs, and address consistency with Malibu LCP policies and measures, particularly existing and proposed public access points.	Generally, as outlined in Chapter 2, parking along a highway such as this would not be recommended at all, but we understand that is not possible for this highway. The justification for each recommendation to remove parking is spelled out in Chapter 5 and summarized on the maps in App C.
62	Section 5.0, 5.1	MRCA	To address some of our concerns, we recommend the following additional changes to the text addressing the main strategies (starting at p 5.1; strike-out means delete; underline means add):	n/a, preamble to below:
63	Section 5.0, 5.1	MRCA	Page 5.1, add "Another consideration is proximity to existing or future public access points."	Although recommendations were made based on safety and engineering judgement, consideration was given to location of and access to public access points. This was added to Report text.
64	Section 5.0, 5.1	MRCA	Page 5.1, add "Shoulder improvements. In addition to widening of shoulder pavement to provide additional parking spaces or enhance existing parking, other parking improvements can be made where the paved shoulder is currently less than eight feet. This can include one or some combination of the following: surveying and removing encroachment in the public ROW; allowing visitors to park with tires on the adjacent dirt and installing signs directing visitors to park outside the white line; minor smoothing/grading areas adjacent to the paved shoulder to expand the area available to park; and the option to also expand pavement. These options to improve the shoulder are a particularly valuable strategy in areas that are currently used for parking or anticipated to be used for public parking near to existing and future public access points."	The paragraph above includes widening which encompasses these items. While they are a particularly valuable strategy, they are also not possible for most locations and therefore they are not added as a separate paragraph.
65	Section 5.0, 5.1	MRCA	Page 5.2, add "or other shoulder improvements", "(and cannot be improved through shoulder widening or shoulder improvements)", and "(existing and future anticipated)".	Report revised.

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
66	Section 5.0, 5.1	MRCA	Page 5.2, add "(or otherwise improved)", "Notwithstanding, private encroachments in the Caltrans ROW will be evaluated and considered for removal to accommodate additional or improved parking, prior to re-designating such areas as parking prohibited, particularly in areas near existing and proposed public access points."	The City and Caltrans will and do review encroachments into the public right of way. According to City records, there are currently minimal infractions, which are not causing parking restrictions. Therefore, this is not a parking issue and it is not included in the report.
67	Section 5.0, 5.1	MRCA	Page 5.2, add "Eliminating Parking Restrictions. Existing parking restrictions should be evaluated to ensure compliance with existing codes, accommodate existing and potential future usage parking and circulation patterns, and comply with the City of Malibu LCP policies and measures pertaining to public access. Elimination of existing parking restrictions should be considered particularly in areas near existing and future anticipated public access points. Where there would be a loss of parking spaces due to unquestionable safety requirements, eliminating parking restrictions in other areas can be used as a tool to offset the negative impacts to public access and to result in no net loss of parking spaces."	Paragraph added to the Report text with minimal revisions.
68	General comment	MRCA	Critical to Ensure Adequate Parking at Existing and Future Public Access Points - Including Meadows Court, Via Escondido Drive, Geoffrey's Restaurant, and Escondido Beach There are many areas of concern in Appendix C-Recommendations, where it appears that public parking would be severely compromised near existing and future public access points. We reemphasize that clarification is needed regarding the proposed recommendations at existing and future public access points and that adequate public parking must be maintained. In many of these areas, there is existing public parking, that may be compromised if the Study recommendations are implemented. These areas of concern include but are not limited to the following locations:	See above (Line 6).
69	General comment	MRCA	Meadows Court (Inland Side, p. 31): Existing trail easement, lower portion of trail not yet built (see attached figures);	See above (Line 16).
70	General comment	MRCA	Via Escondido Drive (Inland Side, p. 32): Existing MRCA-deeded road easement rights (see attached figures);	See above (Line 21).
71	General comment	MRCA	Geoffrey's Restaurant (Ocean Side, p. 31): Existing beach access (see attached figures); and	See above (Line 31).
72	General comment	MRCA	Escondido Beach , 27910 PCH (Ocean Side, p. 29): Existing beach access easement, not yet improved/open (see attached figures).	Properties with undeveloped vertical beach easements are highlighted in the Existing Conditions maps in App A.

Comments to the Final Report

	<p style="text-align: center;">Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Author</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Response</p>
73	General comment	MRCA	<p>Need to Identify Public Land Boundaries We appreciate that the figures in Appendix C-Recommendations include locations of Beach Access Points, including Public Access, County Beaches, and State Beaches. It is important for the City to have a complete picture of all public land in the study area, in order to effectively evaluate and plan for public parking needs. Specifically we recommend that MRCA-owned "Local Beaches" be added. For example, MRCA owns five parcels at Las Tunas Beach (APN 4449-007-013 through 017); this should be identified on p. 63 of Appendix C-Recommendations.</p>	<p>The public land is shown in the aerial photograph, and the large beach frontage on page 63 is clear. The City also has an understanding of the public lands under their jurisdiction. However, the identified access points were taken specifically from GIS data, which is why the aerial information is shown. No additional restrictions are shown for this area, so no parking is recommended for restriction near this access.</p>
74	General comment	MRCA	<p>The specific property boundaries of all public land within the study area should be shown, both inland and ocean side. A dot does not accurately depict the existing conditions and may not accurately reflect the actual parking need, compared with a depiction of complete property boundaries within the study area. For example, the public property boundaries within the Study area of MRCA-owned Tuna Canyon Park, Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy-owned Corral Canyon Park, and MRCA-owned Carrillo Memorial Park should be shown (p. 62, 38, 5, respectively).</p>	<p>The general location of existing beach access points are shown by a dot on the maps in App A, B, and C. The usage of aerial photographs also allows the reader to see the underlying land uses.</p>
75	General comment	MRCA	<p>In addition, boundaries of the State Coastal Conservancy-owned land at Carbon Beach should be depicted on p. 54 (APN 4451-003-900, 4451-004-900). A brown dot should be shown in this location, depicting State Beaches.</p>	<p>The general location of existing beach access points are shown by a dot on the maps in App A, B, and C</p>
76	General comment	MRCA	<p>Anticipated Beach Accessways Should be Considered p. 3.12 of the report states that "the City of Malibu provided information on existing and anticipated locations of beach accessways." However, the Study only identifies existing conditions and accessibility of existing public beach accessways as listed in Table 3-2 and failed to include anticipated beach accessways in this table and in the Study considerations. Many of the anticipated beach accessways are legally recorded public access easements with improvement plans already underway. Thus the final Study should include the anticipated beach accessways in Table 3-2 and relevant figures, and ensure that public parking will be preserved as much as possible to accommodate future parking demand for the anticipated beach accessways.</p>	<p>Future, proposed beach accessways are not being shown with a dot on the Existing Conditions maps which reflect conditions that existed when the field reviews were completed.</p> <p>City data was used to identify properties with undeveloped vertical beach easements which are highlighted in the Existing Conditions maps in App A.</p>

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
77	General comment	MRCA	Need to Preserve Public Parking at Latigo Shores Accessway at Latigo Shores Drive The Study identifies the PCH shoulder on the ocean side north of Latigo Shores Dr as "Parking Prohibited or <8' Shoulder" on p. 35 of App C-Recommendations. Yet, the Study also identifies the same section of PCH shoulder as partially less than eight feet and eight to 10 feet in Figure 3-19 of the report. Although we recognize that a portion of the shoulder on the ocean side could potentially prohibit parking to extend the line of sight in the northbound direction for vehicles exiting Latigo Shores Dr, public parking should be preserved along the remaining length of the ocean side shoulder to accommodate public parking demand for the existing public beach accessway located at the lot identified as 26500 through 26508. The final Study should evaluate the potential to widen or enhance the shoulder, as appropriate, on the ocean side north of Latigo Shores Dr in order to preserve and maximize public parking for public beach access in this area.	As shown in the Existing Conditions map in App A, parking is currently prohibited on the ocean side of PCH north of Latigo Shore Dr; however, the No Parking signs are missing. Th recommendation in this area is to replace the missing No Parking signs on the ocean side due to sight distance north of Latigo Shore Dr and enhance the existing parking on the ocean side south of Latigo Shore Dr. No existing parking is removed.

Comments to the Final Report

	<p style="text-align: center;">Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Author</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Response</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">78</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">General comment</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">MRCA</p>	<p>Need for Public Parking for Budwood Motorway Trail, 19453 PCH The LCP Parkland and Trail Dedication Incentive Program Map (adopted by the City Council April 11, 2016, pending final LCP amendment) shows the Budwood Motorway Trail traversing the lot identified as 19453 on p. 62 of App C-Recommendations. To adequately address parking supply and demand for future public access points, including trails, the final Study should consider widening or enhancing the shoulder on the inland side, per the recommendations of this letter, near the anticipated Budwood Motorway Trail to ensure the availability of public parking when the proposed trail is realized.</p>	<p>The trail is shown on p. 63 of App C.</p> <p>From LCP Parkland and Trail Dedication Incentive Program Map which shows Budwood Motorway a Trail (May 2015): "Some of the trails shown on this map have not been developed and/or rights for the public to use them may not have been granted."</p> <p>As shown on the Existing Conditions map in App A, the inland side shoulder varies from less than 4 feet to approximately 7.5 feet adjacent to a severe vertical slope. There is no opportunity for widening the pavement on the inland side. The ocean side was recently widened. There may be an opportunity to restripe a section of PCH to reduce the width of the ocean side and add width to the inland side if/when the Budwood Motorway Trail is developed. However, this is a controversial item and requires significant coordination with Caltrans. If the trail is built/opened in the future, the project proponents should at that time consider adding parking somewhere other than on PCH or coordinating this improvement project with Caltrans to provide parking on the inland side. Until then, the recommendation for this area is to maintain the existing parking restrictions on the inland side of PCH.</p>

Comments to the Final Report

	<p align="center">Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation</p>	<p align="center">Comment Author</p>	<p align="center">Comment</p>	<p align="center">Response</p>
<p align="center">79</p>	<p align="center">General comment</p>	<p align="center">MRCA</p>	<p>Need to Widen Shoulders at Carbon Beach Between 21746 and 21660 PCH The Study is inconsistent in depicting the highway shoulder widths. For example, a solid red line identifies a small section of PCH shoulder on the ocean side near the middle of the highway-adjacent boundary of the State Coastal Conservancy-owned property between lots 21746 and 21660 as "Parking Prohibited or <8' Shoulder" on p. 54 of App C-Recommendations. However, Figure 3-17 of the report identifies the entire section of the shoulder along the same property as greater than 10 feet. Plans are currently underway to develop this site for public beach access. The Study is proposing to widen the shoulders to provide Class II bike lanes on the inland and ocean sides along this section. The final Study should consider potentially allowing public parking along the described red-lined section, and ensure that widening the shoulder to provide a bike lane would not result in a loss of existing or anticipated public parking at this key public access site.</p>	<p>As the Existing Conditions map in App A shows, the section is shown with a red line to indicate that shoulder parking is prohibited on the ocean side at the bus stop and opposite the Rambla Vista intersection although the width is greater than 10 feet as shown in Figure 3-17.</p> <p>The recommendation does not remove any parking from this area, it simply maintains the existing parking restriction at the bus stop and in the intersection.</p>
<p align="center">80</p>	<p align="center">General comment</p>	<p align="center">MRCA</p>	<p>Need for Public Parking at Public Parkland Near Decker Road Pages 5 and 6 of App C-Recommendations show predominantly red striping, indicating "Prohibit Parking - New," in front of and west of MRCA-owned Carrillo Memorial Park (west of Decker Rd), and in front of and east of National Park Service (NPS) land, just east of Decker Rd. It appears that the pavement is predominantly 8 to 10-foot-wide in front of Carrillo Memorial Park (Existing Shoulder Conditions, Figure 3-21). It may be less than 8-foot-wide and/or 8 to 10-foot-wide in front of the NPS parkland (unclear on Fig 3-21, no parcel lines shown). The City of Malibu draft LCP Parkland and Trails Dedication Incentive Program Map shows the Malibu Pacific Trail touching PCH both from the MRCA parkland and the NPS parkland.</p>	<p>The general location of parcel lines are shown on the maps in App A, App B, and App C.</p> <p>The paved shoulder on the inland side in this area is approximately 8 to 9 feet wide. This area is recommended to be restriped to reduce the shoulder width on the inland side in order to add width to the shoulder on the ocean side, improving the safety of parking, bicycling, and pedestrians on the ocean side. Unfortunately, the shoulders on both sides are not wide enough to allow for safe parking on both sides of the roadway.</p> <p>Although there is public land on the inland side, most of the parking demand in this area is on the ocean side. In addition, when parking is allowed on the inland side, many pedestrians are observed crossing the street, posing a safety hazard and leading to pedestrian fatalities.</p>

Comments to the Final Report

	<p style="text-align: center;">Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Author</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Response</p>
81	General comment	MRCA	<p>The final Study must accommodate adequate public parking in front of MRCA parkland and NPS parkland, both west and east of Decker Rd. Parking enhancements could include flattening the existing dirt adjacent to the pavement, with the option of extending the pavement. Specifically, in front of MRCA parkland, the optimal location would start approximately 150 feet west of the eastern property line (to avoid the stream along the eastern edge of the MRCA property), and near the existing dirt path that meets PCH (labeled Nicholas Ridge Motor Way on Google Earth). Parking enhancements could be implemented for a linear distance of at least 150 feet, westward of this starting point.</p>	<p>Safe, adequate, off-street parking should be provided by MRCA and NPS similar to any other new development in the City if/when the Malibu Pacific Trail section touching PCH is developed.</p>
82	General comment	MRCA	<p>East Winding Way Public Parking Lot between 27841 and 27777 PCH The report identifies the ownership of the public parking lot on East Winding Way adjacent to PCH as County-owned in several places such as Fig 3-7 (orange dot labeled with the number 12) and Table 3-1 (Map ID No. 12). The County has transferred fee ownership of the lot to MRCA. The final Study should correctly reflect the new ownership of the lot, and depict the boundaries of the lot on p. 25 of App C-Recommendations as publicly owned land (currently identified as lot "0" between lots 27841 and 27777).</p>	<p>The note in Table 3-1 was revised to show MRCA ownership of parking lot 12. Boundaries of parking lots or public land will not be shown in the figures.</p>
83	General comment	MRCA	<p>Two Distinct Beach Accessways at Escondido Beach, 27400 PCH and 27420 PCH Table 3-2 and Fig 3-9 of the report includes Map ID No. 6, which identifies one beach accessway located between 27400-27420 PCH. In fact, there is one accessway at 27400 PCH (as part of Geoffrey's Restaurant) and one existing accessway at 27420 PCH. Both accessways are currently open to the public. The final Study should identify these two accessways with distinct Map ID numbers and revise the Study considerations accordingly to ensure that public parking in this area is preserved as much as possible per the recommendations in our letter dated March 29, 2017 and this current letter.</p>	<p>The points were provided from City and County GIS records and are approximate. Whether there is one or two separate beach access points, does not change the recommendation for this area.</p>

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
84	General comment	MRCA	<p>Discrepancies in Table 3-2 and Fig 3-9</p> <p>Existing and anticipated beach accessways are inadequately identified by the Study. Table 3-2 and Fig 3-9 of the report should be revised further to ensure that both existing and anticipated beach accessways are included. In regards to the existing beach accessways identified by the Study, Map ID Nos. 19 and 39 are missing from the table and the figure. Map ID Nos. 18 (20356 PCH) and 26 through 30 (a variation of County and State beaches) are not shown on Fig 3-9. The report should also verify whether Map ID No. 28 (25120.5 Malibu Road) and Map ID No. 9 (Btw. 25120-25124 Malibu Road) have the correct addresses. Furthermore, anticipated beach accessways should be identified on Table 3-2 and Fig 3-9 for a comprehensive analysis of public parking needs for both existing and anticipated public accessways.</p>	<p>Map ID nos. 19 and 39 are not missing. The beach accessways were purposely numbered with gaps so that new accessways could be added as the study progressed without renumbering the entire list, so that the information could be changed, updated, and corrected during the year-long study process.</p> <p>Properties with undeveloped vertical beach easements are highlighted on the Existing Conditions maps in App A.</p>
85	General comment	MRCA	<p>Carbon Beach East Driveways, Ocean Side</p> <p>"Fake" driveways (i.e., that do not lead to a functioning garage) must be identified in the final Study, particularly where they are prohibiting parking in areas of current or future public parking need. P. 53 of App C-Recommendations depicts several "Active Driveways", with red lines, just east of the Carbon Beach East Accessway (accessway shown as a blue dot-Public Access, east side of parcel identified as 22140). The red line is identified in the legend as "Parking Prohibited or <8' Shoulder." Calif Coastal Commission staff has indicated that these are not active driveways (March 10, 2017 letter to City of Malibu). If that is the case, these should be shown as "Inactive Driveways" and the following actions should be identified in the final Study: eliminate curb cuts and red curbs.</p>	<p>An attempt has been made to identify abandoned driveways through field observations and discussions with City staff.</p> <p>Although a current tenant may not be using inactive curb cuts/driveways, access must be preserved for future use by the property owner.</p> <p>If appropriate locations were found where curb cuts were no longer necessary, the recommendation would be to remove the restriction and to allow parking at that location.</p>
86	Jenny Price letter, April 7, 2017			
87	General comment	Jenny Price	<p>As a co-author of the mobile-phone app Our Malibu Beaches, I have long been deeply concerned about both the availability and the safety of parking for the public beaches.</p> <p>On one hand, I am relieved that the city is addressing this problem with such determination, and I heartily support many of the recommendations in the report. The proposals to widen the parking shoulders and re-stripe the traffic lanes, especially, can potentially significantly improve the parking around such popular beaches as Paradise Cove.</p>	Noted.

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
88	General comment	Jenny Price	On the other hand, I am bewildered that the report proposes to remove a total of 675 parking spaces. The vast majority of the recommendations in the summary list begin with or include the words "prohibit parking"—which I fear tries to make public parking safer by not allowing the public to park.	The public will be allowed to park in thousands of remaining or new spaces, many of which would be widened/enhanced. The widening in some places cannot be accomplished without removing spaces on the opposite side of the highway where the demand is lower and requires pedestrians to cross 55-mph highway to reach the ocean side.
89	General comment	Jenny Price	I appreciate the city's attempts to distinguish "high demand" from "low demand" areas. However, lower-demand stretches can include beach accessways, and more worryingly, future beach accessways. The removal of hundreds of parking spaces sounds to me a little too much like trying to relieve elbow pain by cutting off the arm.	<p>The goal of the Study Recommendations was to increase parking, enhance existing parking, and minimize the loss of parking as much as possible; however, the main focus of the study is safety, and to prioritize human life and safety before the need for rarely used parking spaces. The study presents recommendations to improve the safety of parking along PCH - sometimes at the cost of losing questionable, and often unused, parking spaces.</p> <p>The LCP LUP allows the removal of parking for safety reasons (Policy 2.27 "The implementation of restrictions on public parking . . . shall be prohibited except where such restrictions are needed to protect public safety and where no other feasible alternative exists to provide public safety.")</p> <p>Although as much consideration was given to providing maximum parking, new accessways should also consider parking availability and restrictions and consider parking alternatives when opening, just as new commercial or residential developments must provide sufficient off-street parking.</p> <p>In addition, there are alternate modes of accessing the beach accessways, such as public transit, taxi/ride-hailing services (Uber/Lyft/etc), and bicycles. Bicycle access is enhanced in many areas of the project by restriping and providing wider shoulders.</p>

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
90	General comment	Jenny Price	<p>I am concerned, likewise, that the report makes little or no mention of two key strategies that could address safety and availability. First, as someone who often parks on PCH to enjoy Big Rock, Carbon, Escondido, and other beaches, I have long thought that one of the most effective interventions the City and Caltrans could make would be to install a crosswalk at every point for beach access. These are major public lands access points, and it seems to me very dangerous to not both allow inland parking to accommodate the demand and then also provide a pedestrian crosswalk or overpass.</p>	<p>This study is to review parking safety, and pedestrian crossings are outside the scope of the project. However, it does take the safety of pedestrians as a high priority. Therefore, if removing parking on one side of the highway allows improvements to the parking on the opposite side, which reduces the number of pedestrians crossing the high-speed highway at uncontrolled locations, then this parking study made those recommendations. But identifying and solving those uncontrolled pedestrian crossing locations is outside the scope of this study.</p> <p>Uncontrolled crosswalks are typically only installed under very specific conditions and can have negative consequences, especially on a high-speed highway. The City, Caltrans, and Stantec do not support installation of uncontrolled crosswalks across PCH.</p> <p>Overpasses would be safer than uncontrolled crosswalks, but are very expensive, and in most cases not feasible due to limited space. In addition, many pedestrians would not walk the distance to use one.</p>

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
91	General comment	Jenny Price	Or, alternatively, the city might consider a traffic signal at a few key access points—as the report repeatedly cites the absence of signals as a reason for why certain stretches have been lethal and yet does not propose signals as a solution.	<p>To clarify, the report does not make the statement indicated.</p> <p>Mid-block pedestrian crossing hybrid beacons or traffic signals at intersections could be considered by the City, but would have to be strategically located for maximum use by pedestrians to justify the initial and ongoing expense. Caltrans requires an engineering study of traffic conditions, pedestrian characteristics, and physical characteristics be performed to justify the installation of a pedestrian beacon or signal at a specific location on State highways. Minimum criteria has to be satisfied, need has to be demonstrated, and impacts to traffic flow have to be evaluated in order for Caltrans to consider installation of a signal.</p> <p>The identification of the best locations for and study of traffic signals is outside the scope of this parking study.</p>
92	General comment	Jenny Price	Second, the report makes little to no mention of the abundant illegal barriers to parking near beach accessways. These common barriers include "no parking" signs, mysterious red curbs, curb cuts with no driveways, orange cones, and encroachments by private development.	<p>An inventory of all parking-related signs, painted curbs, and other restrictions was performed.</p> <p>Residents and businesses are allowed to install No Parking signs on their private property. Unauthorized signs, red curb, and temporary barriers (i.e., cones) in the public ROW are removed by Caltrans when they are encountered.</p> <p>As for curb cuts with no driveways: the current tenant may not be using inactive curb cuts/driveways; however, these must be preserved for future use by the property owner.</p>
93	General comment	Jenny Price	My own experience, and the experience of many beachgoers who use the app, is that these illegal barriers substantially reduce the number of public parking spaces for Big Rock, LaJolla, Escondido, Carbon, and other beaches. And this reduced availability can be felt very keenly on weekends and holidays especially.	Unauthorized signs, red curb, and temporary barriers (i.e., cones) in the public ROW are removed by Caltrans when they are encountered.
94	Judy Villablanca - March 31, 2017 email			

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
95	General comment	Judy Villablanca	<p>I wanted to comment on Zone B, specifically the area adjacent to Winding Way East.</p> <p>I would strongly suggest consideration of widening the shoulder on the land side of PCH since MANY MANY people park and walk with young children/dogs along the parked cars to access Escondido Canyon trail. Your suggestion elsewhere of prohibiting parking on the ocean side to allow wider shoulder on the land side, and to prevent pedestrian crossing is also a good one here. MANY MANY people park on the ocean side and cross PCH which at 50 MPH in that area. Again, many are families, or with pets.</p>	<p>The recommendation for this area is to prohibit parking on the ocean side and restripe the travel lanes in order to widen the shoulder on the inland side.</p> <p>Although we do not recommend crossing the roadway here, there are other issues besides width limiting the restrictions (such as roadway curvature and sight distance issues) on the ocean side. There is also a public access on the inland side to public open space which MRCA has requested parking availability for.</p>
96	General comment	Judy Villablanca	<p>There is a traffic light at Paradise Beach Cove. That area also needs shoulder widening but if parking were prohibited on the ocean side except near that traffic light, and there was a wider shoulder from Paradise Cove going back towards Winding Way East then I think more people would park there and cross with the light.</p>	<p>The preference would be to prohibit parking on the inland side in order to widen the shoulder on the ocean side, so that people would not have to cross PCH to access Paradise Cove beach. However, the shoulder on both sides is over 8.5 feet wide, with the majority of the area over 9 feet wide, and the recommendation is to leave the parking on both sides of the highway. Expanding the pavement is recommended as an option in this area south of Paradise Cove Dr, but would be very expensive due to slopes on both the inland and ocean sides.</p> <p>In a coastal area, parking cannot be prohibited simply because it's far from a crossing location, so no prohibition is recommended.</p>
97	General comment	Judy Villablanca	<p>I would also encourage a sheriff to issue jaywalking tickets on weekends at many of the places where people run across PCH. That would really help to discourage dangerous crossings.</p>	<p>Crossing PCH at most uncontrolled locations, while not always safe, and is certainly not encouraged, is not illegal (CVC 21954, 21955).</p> <p>This parking study attempts to remove the need to cross PCH by widening parking on the side of the highway near attractions (beach accessways, trails, restaurants, etc.) that don't require crossing PCH by removing the parking on the opposite side of the highway.</p>
98	Matthew Goodwin, Surfrider Motel - April 7, 2017 email			

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
99	General comment	Matthew Goodwin	At the Surfrider I witness accidents almost daily, and literally as I write this a fender bender occurred in front of Jack in the Box. The Surfrider has always had two driveway areas, one for entering and one for exiting. When we purchased the property in 2014 both driveways had gates that would open and close as your car approached. We immediately removed the entrance gate, as it was a humungous safety issue with people having to pull off PCH from going 45/50 mph and all of a sudden approaching a gate right off PCH, where their cars tail end would be sticking into PCH, creating a big risk for that driver to get smashed from another driver behind them traveling north on PCH. In our final design, we will still not have those entry driveway gates, as we feel it is just too big a risk if someone gets in a serious accident, and we definitely do not want our patrons to be put in that risk.	Not parking related.
100	General comment	Matthew Goodwin	The driveway exit gate, however, we plan to maintain as we think it will slow people out of the driveway onto PCH, rather than just blindly rolling into PCH and potentially missing a car traveling northbound.	Not parking related.
101	General comment	Matthew Goodwin	Additionally, because we have these two driveway areas, we have red-painted curbs on each side for at least 8', allowing a decent amount of visibility to northbound traffic. I feel this alone is a huge benefit as it allows drivers the ability to properly see if there is traffic coming or not. I've seen so many times people get hit because a car is parked right up to the curb cut.	Recommendations for sight distance at driveways were made, to allow for these situations. Removal of these existing red curbs is not recommended.
102	General comment	Matthew Goodwin	Lastly, along with truly emphasizing the safety of parking and driving to our patrons, we are going to require they only go down to our adjacent pedestrian stoplight crosswalks, and ABSOLUTELY NOT cross PCH directly in front of the hotel.	Not parking related.
103	General comment	Matthew Goodwin	We know it's of no liability to us after they leave the property but we really care about our guests, their experience and their safety!	Not parking related.
104	Meril May, March 31, 2017 email			
105	General comment	Meril May	<p>Last night there was a joint commission meeting to review the PCH Parking Study in the City of Malibu Council Chambers, 6:30-9:20PM.</p> <p>At the end there was discussion and agreement to have special focus on the El Matorador area due to the past and current safety conditions. This was verified by Lieutenant Royal of the LA County Sheriffs Department.</p> <p>This is an area that I have focused on for several years as a past member of the Safety Commission & cyclist.</p>	Noted.

Comments to the Final Report

	<p style="text-align: center;">Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Author</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Response</p>
106	General comment	Meril May	Effective Important actions which have occurred are the replacement and installation of No Parking Tow signs, and surface stenciling by the park entrances especially, but also in adjacent shoulders. This has helped visibility when exiting, and enforcement. Excellent work, thank you Caltrans/ Joseph and City of Malibu/Reva especially for helping with essential sign procurement.	Noted.
107	General comment	Meril May	Immediate EASY action requested, re-requested.1) All brush should be cut back as far as possible to allow for parking and access to the right of vehicle. This can be done with in 24 hrs.	The removal of overgrown vegetation should be done by Caltrans or the City as identified.
108	General comment	Meril May	2) A past suggestion at Safety Commission meeting was for signs warning drivers of crossing pedestrians. Similar signs exist by San Diego. Request for such permanent signs has been made several times, none installed to date.	<p>Not parking related.</p> <p>This study addresses options for improving parking safety given the existing physical conditions, with the safety of pedestrians as a priority; however, pedestrian-only recommendations are not made.</p>
109	General comment	Meril May	Although last year, City Manager Feldman repositioned CMS (changeable message signs) signs by El Matador. Excellent interim solution, thank you Reva. We need these signs back until the permanent signs are installed. The CMS signs need to be set as far as possible to the right to allow for cyclists and pedestrians to pass. (Matador, Pescador, and Piedra need north and south bound permanent signs.) CMS signs possibly can be redeployed here within 24 hrs.	Not parking related.
110	General comment	Meril May	Previously requested #3 item from 2-27-17 email (and before) priority low hanging fruit items to be considered for Safety Optimization and now re-requested: 3) Improve parking in priority areas. Ask me or see studies	Recommendations have been made to improve the parking in high-demand areas. Unfortunately, in some cases that requires removing lower-demand parking on the opposite side of the street since the terrain or private ROW prevents widening of the shoulder.
111	General comment	Meril May	3.a) By El Matador, landside, widen shoulders immediately. (3-30-17 meeting preference to do away with landside parking, update: widen shoulders where parking appropriate)	The recommendation for this area is to prohibit parking on the inland side and restripe the travel lanes in order to widen the shoulder on the ocean side, which would be safer for pedestrians than to park on the inland side and cross PCH. Parking spaces are added on the ocean side where the shoulder is currently too narrow to allow parking.

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
112	General comment	Meril May	3.b.) Work with State Parks about adding parking to off PCH areas, there is a lot of room at Pescador, and some at Matador. (this idea was suggested to me last year by friend Greg and I have requested multiple times)	Requests can be made to the State Parks Dept, but the authority to increase parking at the State parking lots is outside the control of the City or Caltrans. Such parking lot expansion would likely require environmental review of the impacts.
113	General comment	Meril May	3.b) Install signs for both direction traffic to warn vehicles of Pedestrians Crossing, El Matador, Pescador, and Piedra. (see #2 above)	Not parking related. This study addresses options for improving parking safety given the existing physical conditions, with the safety of pedestrians as a priority; however, pedestrian-only recommendations are not made.
114	General comment	Meril May	3.c) Install signs at park exits warning pedestrians walking out, and drivers, of high speed traffic. DANGER, HIGH SPEED TRAFFIC, 2 WAY, 4 LANES, CAUTION. (I have requested several times, and one of the commissioners at the 3-30-17 meeting also suggested) THIS IS SIMPLE, SIGNS COULD BE IN PLACE IN 24 HRS, LET ME KNOW IF YOU WANT MY HELP)	Not parking related.
115	General comment	Meril May	3.d) Install signs at shoulders asking drivers to park to right, maximizing space to left by fog line, and warning of hazardous high speed traffic. (easy, 24 hr possibility)	Such signs would not be enforceable. Statistically, parking signs are not obeyed unless there is a direct threat of a ticket or being towed away. Although this is a relatively easy improvement, the likelihood of return on investment is unlikely.
116	General comment	Meril May	4) Keep brush cut back as far as possible, continually throughout year, aiding to usable shoulder for parking, pedestrians and cyclists. This also helps prevent fire threat from road to brush. i.e.: like several years ago to S of Pepperdine. (see #1 above)	See above (Line 107, #1).

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
117	General comment	Meril May	<p>I look forward to immediate action to achieve the most simplest of these by this weekend.</p> <p>Pictures and emails of specifics can be provided on request, some dating back greater than 10 years.</p> <p>Action, Now. Please let me know when the requested is scheduled, and completion dates.</p>	Noted. The City will be updating the project schedule on the website, with completion of the study phase expected by June 30, 2017.
118	Scott Dittrich, Public Works Commissioner - March 26, 2017 letter			
119	General comment	Scott Dittrich	<p>The Stantec team did an admirable job in compiling information, but their proposals for solving the parking issue fall short of what our City needs.</p> <p>1. The problem: Like many coastal cities Malibu has inadequate parking, especially on warm beach days, most holidays, weekends, and days with large surf. Many people knowingly park illegally in spite of posted signs because there is no other parking available. Unlike other coastal cities, we have a busy state highway with relatively high speed limits. This highway and the adjacent parking is also constrained by geography and established homes and business, which prevent widening in many locations.</p>	Noted.
120	General comment	Scott Dittrich	<p>2. The visitor serving element of Malibu is primary goal to the City and Coastal Commission and is in frequently in conflict with safety concerns. We must recognize, however, that this precludes elimination of any net parking. The 675 spaces Stantec suggests eliminating is a terrible idea, even though many of the spaces lost are currently not heavily utilized.</p>	<p>The goal of the Study Recommendations was to increase parking, enhance existing parking, and minimize the loss of parking as much as possible; however, the main focus of the study is safety, and to prioritize human life and safety before the need for rarely used parking spaces. The study presents recommendations to improve the safety of parking along PCH - sometimes at the cost of losing questionable parking spaces.</p> <p>The LCP LUP allows the removal of parking for safety reasons (Policy 2.27 "The implementation of restrictions on public parking . . . shall be prohibited except where such restrictions are needed to protect public safety and where no other feasible alternative exists to provide public safety.")</p>

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
121	General comment	Scott Dittrich	3. Parking should be expanded where possible. Table 3-1, however, shows that the beach parking lots with the most demand cannot be expanded, with the possible exception of Westward Beach. The Public Utilities Commission has discussed slant parking on Westward Beach Road to increase the number of spots.	Noted. However, Westward Beach Road is outside the project study area. Caltrans does not allow angled parking on state highways.
122	General comment	Scott Dittrich	3. Table 4-3 shows that approximately 74% of accidents involving parked cars are hit by another vehicle, while 21% involve a car attempting to park. (Accidents involving parking account for only 13 of the total number of accidents). As expected, there is a strong correlation between parking accidents and nice weather; as shown in Table 4-4. More interesting, Table 4-5 shows the time of day of such accidents. There is an increase during morning rush hour (8am) and a similar increase in the afternoon (2-4pm); presumably when visitors are leaving the beach and trying to pull into crowded traffic lanes, and during afternoon and morning rush hours. An increase again occurs around midnight, perhaps as people leave parties and bars. Some of these drivers will be drunk or otherwise impaired. We see evidence of late night crashes on a regular basis as we drive PCH.	Noted, with clarification. (Clarification: Accidents involving parked vehicles on PCH represented approximately 13 percent of the total number of all traffic collisions reported in the City of Malibu during the study period 2011 - 2015)
123	General comment	Scott Dittrich	4. Unexpected is the results of Table 4-7 showing a lack of correlation between accidents with parked cars and the width of the shoulder.	Noted.
124	General comment	Scott Dittrich	5. Challenges to Stantec's Parking Recommendations: a. Widen the shoulder (page 5.1). Why, when shoulder width does not appear to be a determinant factor in the number of collisions? However, if additional parking spaces can be created by widening the shoulder in some areas, this would be wonderful	Widening the shoulder area increases the safety of more than just the parked vehicle itself being hit, such as people exiting/entering parked vehicle, bicyclists, and pedestrians where there are no sidewalks. It also provides additional sight distance area for near-by intersections. The recommendations have identified areas where widening can create additional parking spaces.
125	General comment	Scott Dittrich	b. Restrict parking when shoulder less than 8 feet. There is no reason to do this per the statistical analysis on P 5.1. Parking should not be restricted unless it will lead to clear reduction in accidents.	8-foot shoulder width is the minimum Caltrans standard to allow parking. We are not recommending new restrictions for these areas. In addition, although there is not a large number of cars being hit in under 8-foot shoulders, that is likely because they typically do not fit there and the parking is often unused.

Comments to the Final Report

	<p style="text-align: center;">Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Author</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Response</p>
126	General comment	Scott Dittrich	<p>c. Change parking restriction signs (P 5.4) (section 3.5) This assumes drivers can't read or understand various "No Parking" signs. This is silly. During crowded conditions, drivers ignore the no parking signs. This points to the necessity to create more, not less parking. I hate the idea of tow away signs to penalize visitors who have no other choice than to park on shoulders as long as they do not actually physically block traffic.</p>	<p>Consistent signage is needed along PCH. The current assortment of signs along PCH may be confusing to motorists and lead to illegal parking. Caltrans has also expressed a desire to conform signage, without making driver assumptions.</p> <p>These visitors have the option to visit many beaches in the City or in other areas. If legal parking spaces are not available adjacent to a particular beach, the visitor can find another beach with parking available. For example, the Zuma Beach parking lot is rarely full and the free on-street parking is often crowded. There are also often unused spaces further from beach entry points.</p> <p>Public access to the coast is a right in California and should be protected. Parking wherever a driver wants is not a right, and providing parking is not the same as providing access. There are other options to access the beach besides private vehicle, such as transit, taxi/ride-hailing services (Uber/Lyft/etc), or bike.</p>
127	General comment	Scott Dittrich	<p>d. Narrow traffic lanes. (Page 5.2-5.3) This is a terrible idea. Perhaps there would be fewer accidents with parked cars but this will be replaced by many more accidents in the narrower traffic lanes. (Note there are fewer "dooring" accidents (as a percentage) with bicyclist when the shoulder is less than 8 feet compared to wider shoulders (Table 4.8). Apparently CalTrans studies show fewer moving accidents when lanes are narrowed, but this, I believe, is mainly based on Freeway studies and fails to take into account beach conditions where drivers are often severely distracted.</p>	<p>Recent research supports the conclusion that urban and suburban multi-lane arterials are safer at 10 - 11 foot lanes than 12-foot lanes, rather than more dangerous. Speeds (which is a common complaint on PCH) are reduced but capacity is maintained. Lower speed collisions are less severe than higher speed collisions. This refers to arterials and Caltrans does not support this on freeways. Prior to narrowing the travel lanes on PCH, under Caltrans's jurisdiction, a full study would need to be completed.</p> <p>Note that there are fewer parked vehicles in shoulders less than 8 feet wide for bicyclists to hit doors. Also, drivers that park in areas that are too narrow are probably going to be more aware of the fact that their actions may be unsafe, and are less likely to throw their door open into an unsuspecting bicyclist or passing vehicle.</p>

Comments to the Final Report

	<p style="text-align: center;">Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Author</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Response</p>
128	General comment	Scott Dittrich	<p>e. Pavement expansion on Westbound shoulder in conjunction with elimination of parking on Eastbound shoulder. This will result in more pedestrian accidents and these tend to be fatal.</p>	<p>We do not feel this would increase pedestrian collisions, and in fact feel that moving the parking from the inland to the ocean side and providing additional width on the ocean side will decrease pedestrian collisions.</p>
129	p 5.4	Scott Dittrich	<p>f. In paragraph 4 of Page 5.4 Stantec suggest eliminating all parking when the shoulder is less than 8 feet. There is no statistical evidence to suggest this will reduce accidents. This recommendation should not be followed.</p>	<p>8 feet is the minimum Caltrans shoulder width standard when parking is allowed. We are not recommending to remove this parking, as it is not currently allowed parking.</p>
130	p 5.7	Scott Dittrich	<p>g. Under Options on Page 5.7, Stantec suggests considering increasing the cost of parking or adding time restrictions. This ignores the necessity of residents and business staff needing to park somewhere, not to mention visitors, and for many locations in Malibu the somewhere does not exist or will require folks to take other valuable parking spots. We do not want employees to run across PCH in the middle of their shifts to move their car.</p>	<p>Recommendations in the Study do not include installing meters or implementing time restrictions. This section of the report is a discussion of other parking management options the City may want to consider.</p>
131	General comment	Scott Dittrich	<p>Some ideas to improve parking</p> <p>1. Require major restaurants & hotels to shuttle all staff and employees from off-site parking to the business. Currently restaurant & hotel staff show up before customers and take the closest on-street parking. For a restaurant like Geoffrey's this might mean having the staff park a mile away on an otherwise unused shoulder. Since weekends are the most crowded, the City Hall parking lot could also be utilized. Perhaps the restaurants and businesses nearest the Pier could utilize excess parking at the rear of Cross Creek shopping center. It would be instructive to know how many staff these businesses have. Mostly this will be the same number as the parking spaces gained. This would actually benefit the businesses by providing more spaces for customers. Perhaps the shuttle parking would be mandatory only on weekends and holidays to start.</p>	<p>The report discusses potential shuttle services as a parking management option the City may want to consider. Specifics on the shuttle services are not provided and are beyond the scope of the study.</p>

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
132	General comment	Scott Dittrich	2. What is the solution to the 74% of accidents where a vehicle hits a parked car that is sitting at the side of the road. If the driver has fallen asleep or is inebriated could an imbedded rough grid (rumble strip) on the highway be installed every so often to alert a drowsy driver? Would signage warning drivers to watch for stopped vehicles have any benefit? We know that visitors tend to be distracted when driving next to the ocean. Could an occasional jolt help?	<p>Shoulder rumble strips are intended to alert drivers by creating noise or vibration warnings that the vehicle is leaving the travel lane. The purpose is to enhance safety by preventing run-off-road collisions. However, bicyclists nationwide have reported safety problems associated with rumble strips at certain shoulder widths, including comfort, control, and debris. Furthermore, the noise created by them can have an effect on nearby residents (noise 24-hour/day).</p> <p>Approx 23% of the parking-related collisions on PCH (71 collisions) were caused by DUI/Sleep/Medical condition which could be affected by rumble strips.</p> <p>We do not believe that rumble strips would significantly reduce the collisions of vehicles hitting parked cars on PCH.</p>
133	General comment	Scott Dittrich	3. There is a significant problem with visitors crossing the highway. The City should approach the restaurants especially and ask them to post warnings (a sign created by staff) warning people of the danger of crossing PCH with speeding cars, especially at night. We have had too many deaths. We should contact the Park services in conjunction with posting such signs. Apparently Matador Beach is a very dangerous crossing. I do not believe the false sense of security offered by a crosswalk would be helpful. The sign should tell people not to cross until traffic is clear in both directions and warn them that cars may be traveling at high rates of speed.	Not parking related.
134	Susan Barge - April 7, 2017 email			
135	General comment	Susan Barge	I live on a lane off of PCH just before Winding Way (inland side). There is a large UHaul truck which stays parked near our lane entrance as his regular spot (he does move the truck up and down a few feet every three days to avoid a parking ticket). Having the truck parked there makes it very difficult to merge onto and off of PCH from our lane/driveway. Traffic comes speeding up the hill so fast and with the truck parked there, you have to merge more quickly with less room than would otherwise be necessary. I think it is a safety issue, particularly as we have several Senior Citizens that live on our lane.	Oversize vehicle restrictions can be implemented at specified locations. A discussion of potential oversize vehicle parking restrictions is included in the report.
136	General comment	Susan Barge	A business should not be allowed to use PCH as their permanent parking area, especially when endangering the safety of other residents.	Noted. Unfortunately, this is difficult to enforce and the City is exploring options to address this issue.

Comments to the Final Report

	<p align="center">Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation</p>	<p align="center">Comment Author</p>	<p align="center">Comment</p>	<p align="center">Response</p>
137	General comment	Susan Barge	As residents, we have placed many many notes on this truck asking the driver to park away from our lane. He has now made the habit of parking across the street on the southbound side; certainly better for us, but not for our neighbors who live on that side of PCH. And, he could be back at any time....	See above (Line 135).
138	Coastal Conservancy - April 12, 2017 letter			
139	General comment	Coastal Conservancy	<p>The Coastal Conservancy supports maximizing public access to the coast and views convenient, safe, and affordable parking as integral to the provision of public access. The proposed Draft Final Report recommends a loss of 675 parking spaces along PCH. A loss of 675 parking spaces is in direct conflict with the Conservancy's statutory authority to provide maximum public access to the coast (See Public Resources Code section 31400 et seq). We object to this recommendation of the Draft Final Report and request that the City remove it.</p>	<p>We agree that we should maximize public access to the coast. Per Section 31400: "The Legislature finds and declares that it is the policy of the state that the right of the public to access and enjoyment of the coastal resources should be effectively guaranteed. "</p> <p>Unfortunately, convenient and affordable public parking is not always safe in this instance. Safety takes precedence over convenience. It is noted that the LCP LUP allows the removal of parking for safety reasons (Policy 2.27 "The implementation of restrictions on public parking . . . shall be prohibited except where such restrictions are needed to protect public safety and where no other feasible alternative exists to provide public safety.)</p> <p>It is also noted that there are other means besides those requiring parking to access the coast, including transit, taxi/ride-hailing services (Uber/Lyft/etc), and bicycles. The recommendations include improving access for bicycles.</p>
140	General comment	Coastal Conservancy	Because the Conservancy supports maximum public access to the coast, we concur with the comments made to the City of Malibu by the Coastal Commission and the MRCA on the various versions of this Draft Final Report. We incorporate by reference into our comment letter the comments from the Coastal Commission and MRCA to the City on the PCH Parking Study, including but not limited to their letters dated March 10 and March 29 and April 7, 2017, respectively.	See responses to CCC and MRCA comments.

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
141	General comment	Coastal Conservancy	In addition to our support of the comments made by the Coastal Commission and MRCA, the Conservancy requests that the Draft Final Report include much more discussion of ways to improve pedestrian at-grade crossings in the vicinities of public beach accessways. The Draft Final Report includes a brief discussion of improving existing pedestrian under-crossings, but the Draft Final Report is weak on recommendations to enhance the safety and number of pedestrian crossings that include flashing lights and warning bumps.	This is not a pedestrian safety study. It is out of the scope of this study to provide recommendations for pedestrians.
142	General comment	Coastal Conservancy	The Conservancy also requests that the Draft Final Report include more analysis of opportunities to share public parking with commercial establishments, especially those that do not operate during peak-beach visitation periods.	The report has been revised to include parking lots as potential off-street parking locations for the City to evaluate; however, the study does not recommend providing off-street parking in private commercial parking lots.
143	General comment	Coastal Conservancy	Last, the Conservancy requests that the Draft Final Report include an analysis of parking opportunities along the truncated frontage roads, such as Malibu Road.	This is beyond the scope of work for this project.
144	Hans Laetz - March 23, 2017 email			
145	General comment	Hans Laetz	<p>I notice that the Stantec consultant is recommending Class II Bike Lanes east and west of Malibu Lagoon.</p> <p>At this time, Caltrans HQ in Sacramento is considering a request from La Paz and the other developers at the Civic Center area to remove the de facto Class II bike lanes from the PCH east of Cross Creek Rd, most particularly on the bridge over Malibu Creek.</p> <p>District 7 tells me the geometry has been approved in concept (but, with substandard lane widths) in LA and been sent up to Sacramento for approval by the big boss at DOT.</p> <p>Doesn't the City see that as contrary to the recommendations of the Stantec Parking Study?</p>	<p>The recommendation to restripe the area from Serra Road to Las Flores Canyon Road (south of Malibu Lagoon) with 11-foot travel lanes, 6-foot bike lanes, and 9-foot parking area would not affect the striping on the bridge over Malibu Lagoon or the striping north to Cross Creek Road.</p> <p>We do not know the final recommendations for the Cross Creek Road area, as there are more issues than bike lanes, and they are not finalized yet.</p>
146	General comment	Hans Laetz	Would it not be appropriate for the City to tell Caltrans to hold off on the Cross Creek turn lane decision until the Stantec plan is approved by the City Council?	The recommended striping does not affect the travel lanes at Cross Creek Rd. Unfortunately, Caltrans will not always hold a project for the City.
147	Hans Laetz - March 23, 2017 radio message			

Comments to the Final Report

	<p style="text-align: center;">Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Author</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Response</p>
148	General comment	Hans Laetz	<p>Local radio reporter message: After a quarter century of cityhood ... the municipal government of Malibu has just published its first comprehensive plan for taking care of parking ... bicycles and motorists on Pacific Coast Highway. A traffic safety consultant hired by the City of Malibu is recommending that lanes be narrowed ... and parking rearranged ... along the 22 miles of P C H within city limits. There are several recommendations for major changes in the road's layout in the 150-page study. On P C H west of Trancas ... the engineers recommend parking be prohibited along the land-side of the highway .. that the road lanes be shifted away from the ocean ... and that bike lanes be installed on both sides of the road. Parking would be allowed on the south side ... not the north side ... hopefully eliminating pedestrian crossings at the beaches. At Zuma Beach ... the parking study recommends banning all parking on the inland side of P C H as well. At Paradise Cove ... it recommends widening the highway's shoulder and restriping ... to make parking safer but not reduce the amount of parking available in the beach access area. And in eastern Malibu ... from Webb Way to Las Flores Canyon ... the report recommends narrower lanes for cars and a bike lane on each side of the pavement ... while maintaining existing curb parking. Citywide ... about 25 parking spaces would be lost in heavy demand parking areas ... but 660 parking spaces would remain and get safety improvements. Hundreds of parking places would be eliminated mostly west of Trancas where on-street parking demand is very light. And all along the highway nearly 1000 parking places would remain ... and every one of the them would get safety improvements such as a wider shoulder. The space for the bike lanes would be gained by restriping traffic lanes and the center left turn lane ... which in some places is 16 feet wide ... to a regulation 11 feet wide. P C H travel lanes are generally 14 feet wide.... which was the standard for a 55</p>	Noted.
149	Joan Lavine - March 28, 2017 email			
150	General comment	Joan Lavine	<p>This email is a supplement to my comment that I filed with the City of Malibu regarding a parking study, dated and which I sent to you and the City of Malibu on Friday, December 16, 2016, during the early afternoon around 1:00 p.m. PST.</p> <p>Without sufficient ingress and egress to PCH in Malibu, we probably cannot accommodate receiving more cars during peak visit times.</p>	Not parking related.

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
151	General comment	Joan Lavine	<p>I am concerned that we need to address solutions to the underlying ingress and egress, i.e. access, limitations to the entire Malibu area due to having just one main highway, Pacific Coast Highway, running through Malibu, from one end of Malibu to the other, and on into the Pacific Palisades, Santa Monica and the westerly junction and entrance to Interstate Highway 10/Santa Monica Freeway at the McClure Tunnel.</p> <p>I suggest the use of shuttle services, both locally from large parking spaces such as next to the Malibu Civic Center, LA County Building, and Pepperdine University, and from departure and public parking spots in Santa Monica, Venice, even UCLA, perhaps from the new MetroLink systems.</p>	The report identifies a shuttle service as a parking management option for the City to consider; however, this is not a recommendation of the study.
152	General comment	Joan Lavine	I do not find any public comments included with the downloads of the draft study. Did I miss them? Would you direct me to them?	Public comments and responses are in App D of the Draft Final Report.
153	Joan Lavine - March 29, 2017 email			
154	General comment	Joan Lavine	<p>Thank you for pointing out that there are comments referred to in Ex. D.</p> <p>However, the identities, i.e., names, of the commenters were omitted from what is posted in Ex. D online, as well as the captions and full texts of the comments have been omitted. The identification of the commenting persons is essential to understanding their comments.</p> <p>Please explain your justification for failing to identify the commenters and providing the full comments communicated.</p>	Not all of the people who made comments provided their names. Furthermore, the comments were transcribed as closely as possible to the actual comment or note -- they were not summarized or paraphrased.
155	General comment	Joan Lavine	Please circulate this email as a second supplement to the comments.	Included.
156	Scott Tallal - March 28, 2017 email			
157	General comment	Scott Tallal	<p>Thanks! It's a remarkable study, and every one of those recommendations is spot-on.</p> <p>I'm not sure if I can make it [to the council meeting], so my only comment is this:</p> <p>A few years ago, we were traveling alongside Zuma Beach when a car parked on the landside shoulder pulled out to make a four-lane left turn - only to be T-boned by oncoming traffic. As soon as we could stop, I immediately jumped out of our car but was unable to save the passenger who'd been fatally injured after being thrown from the car. All I could do was watch as the life went out of her eyes. It was a horrendous, living nightmare - something I'll never be able to forget, and something <u>directly attributable to existing coastal access policies.</u></p>	Noted.

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
158	General comment	Scott Tallal	Bottom line: if the Coastal Commission wants to oppose this, please ask them exactly how they are serving visitors by encouraging parking policies which regularly kill those visitors at least a dozen times a year.	The goal of the Study Recommendations was to increase parking as much as possible, enhance existing parking as much as possible, and minimize the loss of parking as much as possible; however, the main focus of the study is safety, and to prioritize human life and safety before the need for rarely used parking spaces. The study presents recommendations to improve the safety of parking along PCH - sometimes at the cost of losing questionable parking spaces.
159	Meril May, April 7, 2017 email			
160	General comment	Meril May	<p>Please review and use anything here that you can which would be associated with the Parking Study. Several are directly parking study related. #3 (special emphasis made at meeting about Matador. signs and stenciling installed at entrances last year VERY helpful, Josephs help and revas signs and volunteers telling me and me continually persisting)(see last added sample sign from up corral to warn drivers), I have been asking for warning signs as exiting beaches for pedestrians for months, #4, #5, #10, #13.</p> <p>smooth, thin tire high pressure sensitive smooth standard with less than 1/8' surface fluctuation, is important for safety, and directly related to parking as cyclists having to adjust for bad unsmooth unsafe surface ride in or near parked cars and in #2 lane.</p>	<p>Installation of signs warning drivers about pedestrians or warning pedestrians about high-speed traffic is not parking related.</p> <p>Many of the recommendations widen the shoulder area, which would give bicyclists more room to avoid parked vehicle doors and moving traffic, or prohibit parking where the shoulder is too narrow for vehicles to safely park, giving bicyclists more room to avoid moving traffic. It is noted that resurfacing may be necessary.</p>
161	General comment	Meril May	<p>Feb 27, 2017 email: One of the greatest problem relating to the amount of man hours actually worked on PCH has to do with active working persons. Caltrans has had a staffing problem at the Las Flores yard, understaffed for years. City Manager Feldman is aware of such and I believe is working with Caltrans to increase compensation to attract more workers. Reva can explain what current situation is and future expectations. Thank you for this City Manager Feldman. What is the date that work is supposed to cease/be significantly restricted on PCH? There is a lot of surface repair, to bicycle smoothness standards, now, and prior to restriction date.</p>	Not parking related.

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
162	General comment	Meril May	<p>The following is a list of some priority low hanging fruit items to be considered for Safety Optimization</p> <p>Some of the following concern PCH, and are recognized not to be under the City's jurisdiction, however a working relationship with Caltrans exists and is to be utilized to maximum.</p> <p>Over the past years improvement has occurred, but due to the complexity of PCH, differed work and maintenance which has not occurred, thru traffic and visitor demand, the need for work is vast. PCH is in significant maintenance deficit, which results in safety decreasing.</p>	The City is actively working with Caltrans to improve safety along PCH.
163	General comment	Meril May	1) fix pothole as they occur, resulting in a flush smooth consistent material surface repair, and cleaning up any debris which has been the result of deterioration.	Caltrans ongoing maintenance and repair.
164	General comment	Meril May	2) Improving and maintaining intersection at PCH and Las Flores. see past suggestions from me, other studies, and review and assess measures again which can be completed within a week, month, and longer term. #1, keep paddles replaced and surfaces refreshed.	Caltrans ongoing maintenance and repair.
165	General comment	Meril May	<p>3) Improve parking in priority areas. Ask me or see studies.</p> <p>By El Matador, landslide, widen shoulders immediately. Work with State Parks about adding parking to off PCH areas, there is a lot of room at Pescador, and some at Matador.</p> <p>Install signs for both direction traffic to warn vehicles of Pedestrians Crossing, Matadore, Pescador, and Piedra.</p> <p>Install signs at park exits warning pedestrians walking out, and drivers, of high speed traffic.</p> <p>Install signs at shoulders asking drivers to park to right, maximizing space to left by fog line, and warning of hazardous high speed traffic.</p> <p>Widen shoulders to south of Paradise cove, both sides.</p>	<p>Requests can be made to the State Parks Dept to expand the off-street parking areas, but the authority to increase parking at the State parking lots is outside the control of the City or Caltrans.</p> <p>Such parking lot expansion would likely require environmental review of the impact on the area surrounding the parking lot as well as the impact of a potential increase of visitors on the beach area itself.</p> <p>Where feasible, the recommendation was made to widen shoulders to improve or provide additional parking. Unfortunately in many locations, including many landslide areas, this is not possible.</p> <p>This is a parking safety study, not a pedestrian safety study. This study addresses options for improving parking safety given the existing physical conditions, with the safety of pedestrians as a high priority. This parking study attempts to remove the need for pedestrians to cross PCH by widening parking on the side of the highway near attractions (beach accessways, trails, restaurants, etc.) that don't require crossing PCH by removing the parking on the opposite side of the highway.</p>

Comments to the Final Report

	<p style="text-align: center;">Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment Author</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Response</p>
166	General comment	Meril May	4) Keep brush cut back as far as possible, continually throughout year, aiding to usable shoulder for parking, pedestrians and cyclists. This also helps prevent fire threat from road to brush. i.e.: like several years ago to s of Pepperdine.	Caltrans (and City) ongoing maintenance and repair.
167	General comment	Meril May	5) Restencil surface markings, or spot paint where worn, especially cross walks and STOP lines, PCH. see from city's responsibility on kanan s to by via venisa, and clean shoulders.	Caltrans ongoing maintenance and repair.
168	General comment	Meril May	6) This is more costly. Fill cracks with tar throughout PCH. I have been requesting this since 2013 when there was a fatality by Puerco Cyn. Puerco to Webb Way and back was done after repeated emails. Very little has been done since, even though it is significantly more expensive to do extensive work, re-paving. I estimate less than 5% of what is needed has been done. Eroding cracks, suffer deterioration exponentially with the intrusion of water, and become significantly more hazardous to a thin high pressure road cycle tire and the rider. When will improvement be actually done? Where deterioration has gotten bad to repair tar with crack filling , schedule repaving.	Caltrans ongoing maintenance and repair. (Clarification: The fatal bike/bus collision on PCH near Puerco Canyon occurred in Oct 2012).
169	General comment	Meril May	7) Keep drains and shoulders free of debris to optimize drainage, non flooding. I have repeated asked the shoulder north of Morning View be cleared of all debris (SOME 40" wide) to the curb. As of 1.1.17 it has not. see pictures. (as of today 2-27-17 this has been 80% done)	Caltrans ongoing maintenance and repair.
170	General comment	Meril May	8) Keep brush cut to avoid signs being blocked.	Caltrans ongoing maintenance and repair.
171	General comment	Meril May	9) Keep shoulders free of debris, and smooth (less than 1/4 inch differential) for cyclists. These shoulders need to be smooth to a higher standard than that for a truck tire. The highway needs to be to the highest standard for the most sensitive use, and cycling, with high pressure thin tires, around parked cars, sometimes in the #2 lane due to lack of any option, and near high speed vehicles 55mph plus, traveling at 20mph plus, might be the most sensitive use.	Locations where bike lanes are recommended would need to be evaluated for acceptable pavement conditions to provide a safe roadway surface for bicyclists. Similarly, where restriping is recommended to widen the shoulder, the condition of the pavement joint between the travel lanes and the shoulder must be evaluated.

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
172	General comment	Meril May	10) Have signs along Zuma installed asking for parking to be to the right. Some park like this now. Others park just to the right bike lane lane leaving no room for pedestrians or opening vehicle doors.	Such signs would not be enforceable. Statistically, parking signs are not obeyed unless there is a direct threat of a ticket or being towed away. Although this is a relatively easy improvement, the likelihood of return on investment is unlikely.
173	General comment	Meril May	11) Have Edison make improvement to pole and equipment box blocking visibility at PCH and N end Broad Beach rd. refer to many prior requests.	Not parking related.
174	General comment	Meril May	12) La Costa cross walk, get actual work done here immediately to improve safety. Insignificant "actual" onsite improvement has occurred over many years of attempts.	Not parking related.
175	General comment	Meril May	13) The Westward road ocean side needs widening and repaving to provide non impacted lanes in both directions, and room for pedestrians and cyclists.	Not PCH parking related.
176	General comment	Meril May	14) Keep up the good work city does in city areas of responsibility maintenance as you have done: brush clearing, repair, slurring, paving, sign repair.	Caltrans/City ongoing maintenance and repair. Report does mention this must be upkeep.
177	General comment	Meril May	15) add to guard rails, kraills, ASAP especially where none exist in Malibu Canyon. work with county to keep shoulders on Kanan and Malibu Canyon clean, and to increase safety at Mulholland intersections.	Not PCH parking related.
178	General comment	Meril May	16) appeal to owners between Trancas and Zuma ocean side, and the owners of Morning View land side to set their trash cans NOT in the shoulder. In one area cans go in the bike and walk area, in the other cans also impact school drop off traffic. Very silly, some shoulder ice plant clearing would alievate all drop off traffic from swerving around out into the #2 lane.	Not PCH parking related.
179	General comment	Meril May	Pictures and emails of specifics can be provided on request, some dating back greater than 10 years. Please let me know when the requested is scheduled, and completion dates.	The parking study is scheduled to go before City Council and be completed in June 2017.
180	Michael Shultz April 6, 2017 email			
181	General comment	Michael Shultz	My comment is to encourage the powers that be to narrow the PCH lanes so that safe bike lanes can be established on both sides of the highway. It's indeed a harrowing ride to worry about both car door openings as well as cars passing perilously close to the bike rider. I drive and ride on PCH (for many years) and am sure you've heard these comments from others.	The recommendations include 2 areas where the travel lanes would be made more narrow in order to provide 6-foot Class II bike lanes adjacent to wide parking areas.

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
182	General comment	Michael Shultz	Bikes are omnipresent on PCH and we should do our best to make the highway safer for all users.	Recommendations have been made to improve on-street parking for the safety of all roadway users, including people exiting/entering parked vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians where there are no sidewalks.
183 Public Comments at Joint Commission Meeting, March 29, 2017				
184	General comment	Meril May	Any improvement is good improvement and the sooner, the better. He commended Caltrans for improved maintenance on the shoulders along PCH. He stated how to manage overcrowded days needed to be addressed. He thanked the City for new signage. He suggested ensuring the road had a smooth surface after striping. He thanked the City, SCAG, Caltrans and Stantec for doing the study.	Noted.
185	General comment	Tara Trenda	Discussed recreational vehicles parking on PCH near Coastline Drive. Public Safety Commission Chair Randall advised Ms. Trenda that Coastline Drive was not included in the PCH Parking Study as it is outside the Malibu city limits.	Outside scope of work.
186	General comment	Annie Ellis	Thanked the City for replacing No Parking signs near El Matador Beach. She displayed photos of illegal and unsafe parking. She stated some vehicles parallel parked in the bike lane. She expressed concern about narrowing traffic lanes.	Noted. Narrowed lanes are discussed above, and have been shown to improve safety and decrease speeds, in addition to providing space for parking.
187	General comment	Andy Cohen	Discussed increased parking problems on PCH near El Matador Beach in recent years. He agreed with prohibiting parking on the inland side of PCH to prevent pedestrians running across the highway.	Noted.
188	General comment	Keith Canter	In response to Keith Canter, Deputy Winn confirmed a motorist parallel parking by stopping, using a turn signal, then backing into a parking space has the right of way.	Noted.
189	General comment	Cheryl Spurlock	In response to Cheryl Spurlock, Deputy Winn confirmed a cyclist may not enter the traffic lanes when there is a dedicated bike lane except to safely pass another bicyclist in front of them in the bike lane. Lt. Royal clarified that cyclists could use the traffic lanes rather than the shoulder if there was no dedicated bike lane. Ms. Spurlock expressed hope that adding dedicated bike lanes would alleviate some of the dangers from bicyclists riding in traffic lanes.	Noted.
190	General comment	Catherine Ferguson	Agreed with Ms. Ellis about the dangerous conditions near El Matador due to limited sight lines, speeding vehicles, and pedestrians running across the highway. She agreed with restricting parking on the inland side due to the blind hill. She commended the City for the bike lane near Zuma Beach.	Noted.
191	General comment	Norm Haynie	Discussed an area near Tuna Beach where approximately 70% of vehicles cut the corner on the eastbound curb by as much as two to three feet over the white line. He suggested making that area a No Parking zone and adding signage advising motorists not to cross over the white line.	Roadway curvature was one of the items reviewed when making parking recommendations

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
192	General comment	Ilana Urman	Suggested adding signs warning pedestrians to not cross or to cross at their own risk. She expressed concern that narrowing traffic lanes would increase traffic accidents. She questioned the justification for the cost of paving shoulders.	Pedestrian crossings are not parking related. Narrowing lanes is discussed above, and the shoulder paving is recommended to provide additional parking spaces.
193	Raymond Hall - March 30, 2017 email			
194	General comment	Raymond Hall	I live at 20747 PCH, there is a very treacherous entering onto the highway going either east or west bound on PCH. As you can see in the pictures attached, if you look left going out, you only have about 2 seconds to make a decision to go right or left. There is insufficient clearance of brush along the north side of the road.	The City and Caltrans shall continue their proactive monitoring and removal of overgrown vegetation in the public ROW.
195	General comment	Raymond Hall	I'm also suggesting either a mirror or caution light be set up in that area to warn drivers going westbound that there's an entryway. Approximately 30 cars enter and exit the entrance every day.	Outside the scope of this project.
196	General comment	Raymond Hall	Also, when going to the right (out of the driveway), there is a No Parking sign there that allows a little bit of entrance room. However, that exit sign should be moved westbound approximately 30 yards to allow the person entering the highway to have a right-sided margin of error. There will inevitably be an accident here sooner or later. I hate to say it but it's just the treacherous area and something needs to be done.	<p>Parking is prohibited along the frontage of the apartment building, although some of the Caltrans signs were missing during the study period. They have been, or are being, replaced.</p> <p>Review of parking-related collisions (App B p. 58) shows no parking-related collisions occurred at the driveway during the study period (2011 - 2015).</p>
197	Matt Drummond - April 7, 2017 voicemail			
198	General comment	Matt Drummond	Owns properties across the street from Geoffrey's and in Paradise Cove. Has concerns for the one across the street from Geoffrey's that people tend to park very close to the exit of his property onto PCH (by the mailboxes and American flag). People parking so close to this exit make merging onto PCH extremely unsafe because there is no buffer along the side of the road. He is very worried about people getting t-boned there as a result.	<p>The No Parking restriction adjacent to the mailboxes will remain to provide appropriate sight distance at the driveway; however, a section of the inland side shoulder which is currently prohibited is recommended to allow parking.</p> <p>The shoulder area is not intended as an acceleration lane for entering traffic. Parking restrictions along the shoulder are intended to allow proper sight distance.</p>
199	General comment	Matt Drummond	Specifically, someone keeps parking a U-Haul in this area which hurts visibility even more.	Noted. Oversize vehicle restrictions can be implemented at specified locations. Unfortunately, this is difficult to enforce and the City is exploring options to address this issue.
200	General comment	Matt Drummond	He knows that there needs to be parking allowed there, but it would increase safety tenfold if there was a No Parking sign right by those mailboxes so residents would be given more time.	See above (Line 198).

Comments to the Final Report

	Page No. (3/22/2017 version) March 29, 2017 Safety Commission Presentation	Comment Author	Comment	Response
201	General comment	Matt Drummond	Concerns with Paradise Cove are regarding all the people who park east bound by Paradise Cove, there is very little space there and it is very hard having people with doors wide open into the lanes of PCH.	The recommendations include widening the shoulder on the ocean side north of Paradise Cove Road to provide 10-foot wide shoulder by narrowing the travel lanes. In addition, a recommendation to widen the ocean and inland side shoulders with additional pavement south of Paradise Cove Road is proposed; however, this would require extensive embankment construction.
202	General comment	Matt Drummond	Also, as a cyclist, putting in bike lanes in that area similar to the ones by Zuma would help these problems immensely. It would not only give the parked cars more space but additionally provide more safety to cyclists.	The recommendations include 2 areas where the travel lanes would be made more narrow in order to provide 6-foot Class II bike lanes adjacent to wide parking areas. In other areas, the proposed shoulder widening would provide more room for cyclists even though Class II bike lanes are not included.
203	William Horner - April 7, 2017 voicemail			
204	General comment	William Horner	Biggest concern is that a lot of overflow parking takes up all the parking along PCH by his house which is south of Dukes. His house was built in the 1920's so it does not have a garage, and he is subsequently left without any legal parking. He and his wife are in their late 60's and worry about their safety when they need to park across PCH and walk across with fast and distracted drivers. Is there any way for he and his wife to get designated parking because it is unfair to be penalized for not having a garage.	Unfortunately, preferred or designated parking is not an option along PCH.
205	General comment	William Horner	Secondly, downtown has become a nightmare parking wise. He and his wife have stopped going places due to lack of parking available. Even going to a friend's house by Nobu is difficult because Nobu overflow parking always takes up that street parking.	Noted.
206	General comment	William Horner	Parking at the Pier is difficult because \$15 is a lot of spend on parking for lunch, but parking on PCH is impossible because everyone feels this way. Is there any way for lunch places on the Pier to be able to validate parking. That might ease parking on PCH in that area.	Local restaurants and businesses could provide validated parking at the Pier parking lot but this would have to be negotiated between the City, the private company that runs the parking lot, and private business owners. This is outside the scope of this study.
207	General comment	William Horner	A parking structure could take the pressure off PCH.	A public parking structure on PCH is not feasible; however, consideration of remote parking with shuttle service is discussed in the report.