

Santa Cruz/Alameda Safety – Public Meeting Notes

On April 18th, County Public Works (DPW) held a public meeting with about 60 community members. They provided a high-level overview of the up coming Santa Cruz/Alameda Safety project that may start in the summer of 2024. After the meeting's overview of the project, DPW opened the meeting up for written questions. While DPW was provided questions before the meeting, they seemed to only address questions they received at the actual.

A common response to questions was that DPW would look into the issues and see what could be done to address the problems/concerns raised. Some of those DPW action items are to send the community various items:

- Street Lighting Request Form - DPW is excluding street lighting from the project. To address lack of street lighting, the form will need to be filled out
- Send Detail on Medians, where rolled curbs vs hard-tall-curbs - It was unclear which medians could be accessed by Fire Department and which would block FD trucks.
- Median placement and use - this was to be re-looked at medians and refine them to see what might be adjusted, hopefully DPW will engage community in this process
- DPW plans to remove a significant number of parking areas - DPW to identify all parking in the corridor - both those proposed to keep and those planned for removal
- Followup and respond to past emails to DPW [over the past 3 years]

There were a lot of detailed items that could not be addressed with such a large group of people at the meeting. The community's goal is to address those issues in a one-on-one style meeting with DPW engineers in the near future.

This paper is organized as follows:

<u>Questions and Answers - from the meeting</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>Questions Provided DPW Before the Meeting</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>Closing Remarks and End of Meeting</u>	<u>19</u>

Note: The Q&A was difficult to hear, so while some of the narrative is close to verbatim it is not an exact quote. Some back and forth with DPW and Audience was summarized.

Questions and Answers

Q: Have PW been in contact in West Bay Sanitation District?

A: They are aware of our project and they have not let us know of any work they are planning.

Q: What is County doing to reduce speed on NB SCA? Cars use it as a super-highway and use bike lane as a traffic lane.

A: Once road diet is implemented the raised medians will have a traffic calming effect — expect the speed on the corridor will drop. Expecting to have speed limits posted along corridor throughout to make sure it is consistent. 25 MPH will . A small segment of Alameda is 30 but wanting to make it consistent.

Audience: Can you clarify that for the N. SCA segment will that be 25 mph?

A: So [N.SCA speed] not part of this project but County is looking at that the overall area - that will be for our Traffic Division.

Q: I don't want a 103' median in turn lane at Palo Alto Way. One it takes 2' away from traffic/bike lanes; and Two, it blocks ingress/egress from to 2125 SCA. Takes up space.

A: Continue to look at those islands and slow traffic - looking to channelize and slow traffic. Will continue to look at those to refine and if they are over designed. Layout "we will continue to look at that... are open to looking at islands. We will look at those to see if they are over designed or need adjustment.

Legend:

DPW	Dept. of Public Works
PAW	Palo Alto Way
SCA	Santa Cruz Ave
ADLP	Alameda de las Pulgas
SHR	Sand Hill Rd
NB	Northbound
NACTO	National Assoc. of City Transportation
FWHA	Federal Highway Administration
MPFD	Menlo Park Fire District

Q: Where are the possibilities to use greening to calm traffic?

A: By greening you mean plants (yes). All medians are hard shaped - solid. We can look into the possibilities we have there, but generally we (PW) prefer hard scape easier to maintain. mumbled that that was preferred alternative.

Q: Please acknowledge that the design set preceded to far without community input, you went to high level concept to low level design with no community engagement.

A: Don't agree with that comment. Believes the preferred alternative gave clear direction on what was shown and approved by community. As shown in the presentation the majority, if not all of the design, we are at now lies very closely to that of the preferred alternative. As well as the balances of bicycles, pedestrians, and vehicles. There are areas where we had to fine tune it, but we believe it still met that study.

Q: People drive 70mph between SHR & Y, how will this be improved?

A: We touched on this before, we believe the design will have a traffic calming effect by narrowing the lane and other features being installed.

Q: The county made agreement with Property Owners along SCA (SHR - Y). Now you are taking away that space so will County reimburse those property owners for what they are now giving up? 22 spots are a lot of spots to remove!

A: Something showing what Parking spots were affected. I know the Preferred alternative exhibits had them and probably was not clear to see them.

In terms of the agreement with property owners, I am not aware of the agreement. That [agreement] doesn't seem out of the realm of possibility, but we can take a look at our files

to see if there is any kind of agreement when that original widening occurred. We can look into our files and see if there is any agreement for that widening of SCA.

I know the preferred alternative had parking marked but were probably difficult to see.

Q: Driveways to 2160 and 2140 SCA [Menlo Commons] are often blocked with back up of traffic, the two Keep Clear marks are too far apart. Please paint two “Keep Clear”, one in front of each driveway.

A: We definitely can take a look at that to see if there is an opportunity to better delineate the ‘Keep Clear’ and make sure that is understood by motorists.

Audience: Monitoring of Keep Clear and enforcing it!

A: We will notify Sheriff office (CHP) keep them in the loop, but DPW is not involved and doesn’t do enforcement.

Q: Important to plan on excellent warning signals and overhead night lighting way before the project is fully completed, as well as afterwards for a period of months.

Audience: I will speak to that, you have not mentioned lighting as there is a lack of street Lighting. Paraphrasing: Her main concern was the various medians, especially at Liberty Park, where medians are in the middle of traffic lane alignment. These need to be made aware to motorists. This includes steps to make them highly visible: Street lighting, warning lights on/near the medians, and that “People need to see well ahead of time”. She used the example of the medians on Junipero Serra in Stanford, that have been hit innumerable times, including by her. What will be done to make sure these medians are clearly visible and that vehicles will have plenty of notice so they will not strike them?

A: You know it a lot better than we do. You know what you are going to do.

Note: County then seemed to talk over the audience member and sidestepped the question’s intent of addressing visibility and motorist awareness of medians on Alameda / SCA.

A: “In terms of lighting, lighting is not included as part of the project. This would be part of Menlo Park lighting district. [County] has a process to request lights along the corridor that we can provide you guys.”

What we can do is include in the specs that the contractor include changeable message signs when there are going to be striping and lane re-configuration a couple of weeks ahead so that people are aware that there is going to be a change that they should be aware of. Generally, once we are done with the roadway work, we have the contractor go do temporary striping as soon as possible. Noted, we will try to include in our specifications.

Q: Can you display the [presentation] slide on Santa Cruz south of the Y for my question, I have concerns about that bike lane. I would like to see the one that shows the approach.

If I understand, NB bicycles will be to the left. There is a barrier there. Is that to protect cyclists?

A: Yes, there is a small raised median there.

Q: I am a cyclist, that NB approach getting into the bike lane towards the Y is far too short for the cyclist to move over to that left [Alameda lane] side. I would not like to be caught dead, literally, between cars on either side traveling 25 mph (nominally) and maybe 45 mph against that barrier. So please, I think the neighbors are very unhappy about that barrier, some of them, because it impacts their access. If the barriers are only there to help the cyclists, I think cyclists won't want to be in that spot.

I think a preferred opportunity is to put shadows that left lane, the whole way, and let the bikes and cyclists work together to figure out how they want to go and the cars, they will have to slow down. Cars are learning how to slow down. I have been cycling in this area for 40 years - cars are learning how to adapt to cyclists. Some of the old rules about 'stay out of the way' no longer apply.

I really encourage you to look at that [sharrows] option because cyclists are not going to want to do this [the current plan].

A: This comes from the preferred alternative. A couple of things: 1) this small island here (2' x 436') is also intended to stop those vehicles that are making.... the idea is to channelize the vehicles and have them make that decision about which direction they are going to go at the Y and eliminate that as an activity or movement that could strike a cyclists...right? Because we know folks that make last minute changes to cut over to go up Santa Cruz. And so, this prevents that from happening. Vehicles need to make that decision back here [PAW area on map] and get into the right lane in order to make that maneuver.

Q: Sorry, I don't see that because that barrier is to the left of both lanes? they have free latitude to make that change

A: If I am going up Santa Cruz, I need to move over here [right lane] and if I am in this lane [left Alameda] I need to make that decision here.

And then, just to go back to here [short bike merge - conflict zone] I mean really the approach for this weaving movement as we are doing that .. is to shorten that. I know we have all seen really long sections for that, but the industry is moving to minimize this distance.

Cyclist1: I really prefer shadows the whole way. I can take the lane.

Cyclist2: Yes, I agree [sharrows the whole way]

A (continued): I am not here to debate all the issues on this.

Audience 1: Used to be [at the Y, NB] cars would continue on green when traffic was stopped on red. At the moment, and going forward, there will still be red [for all vehicles] So they changed that so that all cars stop on red. I notice a lot less cars jumping and changing lanes at the last minute.

A: I don't have information on the timing of the signal, but I believe they are not separated - they are either both red or both green.

Q: What I am gathering from this meeting. This feels like a crank down to me. We coming back to the “Preferred Alternative” as if that was set in stone in Jan 2020. Speaking for myself, I don’t think a lot of the community at all appreciated, as covid was hitting, and then for the next several years the design came out. I never heard about any [DPW activity] — I think on the county website the 60% design came out and said there were zero comments received? This body [attending audience] tells you something was sort of slipping by silently. I resent coming back to the idea that this is fixed. Because i don’t think it should be. I appreciate that you guys have done a lot of work and that you had worked with the community to try to come up with that is best for everyone, but I am not getting a good feeling tonight.

A: (Ray Mueller) I appreciate the comments. But I also want to say, please don’t take it out the professional staff, they worked really hard. Trying to what they thought was community consensus, and then to go out and get all that grant money.... they really have... I tell you in my district, District 3, there aren’t projects like this one in every part of the district. So for them to have done this, they really tried for the best in this community.

So that said, if you see a disconnect, it is really important to provide the feedback. Because I heard what you just said, but what I didn’t hear was was the why. And what is really important, and I see hands on, and I appreciate it, but what is really important you can provide that input tonight, that is why we have the meeting, but what is really awesome is to write it out on a piece of paper. And the other thing that I always remind everybody, and you guys are doing a good job it, but always remember, I always try to tell people to never under estimate the power of a kind voice and sincere and sharp mind.

Q: Can I respond to Ray. One of the things that has not been said here is that after 2020, even though DPW received scores of emails, many in the community have written, a lot of people here [audience] have written, and virtually nothing— absolutely nothing — has been responded to.

The questions we asked for the last 3 years have not been answered. The concerns we have expressed, haven’t been addressed. So while we were doing good at the beginning of the project, we had input, we had a Task Force, — basically in 2020 that all disappeared.

Ray, I think we should be adding comments to DPW so they can respond, but the thing is they have not responded for the last 3 years. I think that is one of the problems why this ‘Preferred Alternative’ is something that evolved from the 2020 meeting, Jan 2020 Las Lomas.

So there are a lot of things here: Parking is an issue because it’s not just parking. When a street sweeper comes down that narrow little lane NB Santa Cruz approaching the Y, it’s going to block traffic. When people put out their trash bins, it’s going to block traffic. When the postal service comes, I don’t know where they are going to stop. So there are a lot of different issues that are beyond just a parking spot.

All along this way, people’s properties have been struck by cars. That means the car crossed the sidewalk and entered the property, okay so this is not just one occurrence, this is like a dozen occurrences.

What we want, is not to lose the buffer, which is a safety factor, So parking is not just parking it is also a way to move the traffic away from the properties. So there are other

issues here and I think one of the things we are trying to do is have a sit down, at an engineering level, where we can point out these issues that you are not aware of. We live here, we know of these issues. So to just ignore that and not sit down with us at an engineering level, is not appropriate. We want that to happen.

A: Thank you for that Ron. I would like to respectfully disagree. We have responded to emails. We had an infield meeting with you and County Manger, You gave us a list of priorities, we work to address those, what we saw was there was a lot of other public comment so that is why we decided to have this meeting to try to resolve all of these issues in the one setting, as opposed to having one off responses to everybody that emailed. Did we respond to every single inquiry that came in? No. But I feel we were trying our best to manage questions, address concerns, respond appropriately while continuing to respect and adhere to what was done in the past.

Note: County refers to an infield meeting Jan 10, 2022. That meeting was to implement short term safety steps now, prior to the full project. Those steps addressed lack of driver awareness and current confusion. That meeting also addressed items that could greatly improve residential and pedestrian safety for the interim - before the project implementation.

County had not responded to the scores of email and feedback about the project for the past 3 years.

Q: I made comments on the 60% plans and I have not received feedback and justification.

A: We received your comments, we forwarded them over to the design, I think that was an over sight by us, but we do have your comments.

Q: John L.: I would appreciate your entering the comments - the feedback?

A: We can follow up ... I don't have it in front of us, you had several comments about several bike related issues so we definitely will take under consideration.

Q: What specific parking is being eliminated?

A: Unfortunately we don't have the information in here. We definitely can followup something we can post on the public website that we Identified. After the meeting, just go to that website [county DPW site] and subscribe. If we have time after the meeting we can go to the back and go over some of the parking that we know is being eliminated.

Q: Are there any design elements to protect cyclists from getting into the left hand turn lane on to Sand Hill?

A: As far as cyclists moving into making a left there at Sand Hill, yeah, right now, yeah there is not a bike lane proposed or even a bike box in that area. If that is a major movement for cyclists and something that is of interest then certainly that is something we can continue to take a look at. That is a very difficult movement to make across traffic there so I tend not to be a real big fan of those types of bike facilities; however, some of us cycle more often — like I would be comfortable doing that myself. If that is something of interest then we can look at the possibility of incorporating something there for cyclists that are comfortable getting out to make that left turn, with a left turn movement.

Q: Describe what happens to the lane southbound from Campo Bello to Sand Hill.

A: [mixed discussion to get bearings] This is 1 lane [SB Santa Cruz towards Sand Hill]. It is 1 lane to 1 lane. [discussion of 1 lane]

Q: How do the two schools and parents feel about traffic cutting through Sharon Rd and Avy Ave to get to Sand Hill Rd?

Audience: That was my question. I don't have kids in school any more, but I know the city has spent money to fix Sharon Rd. to make it safer for the kids to use their bikes or walk. But everyone is going to start to cut through and I do that now with 2 lanes in each direction. Common sense just tells you that people are going to start cutting through on Avy and if they don't cut on Avy they will cut on Sharon.

A: What I can do is go back and look at the work leading up to the preferred alternative selection.

Audience: I have two neighbors with kids at those schools and they think it is ridiculous.

Audience: I live at the intersection of Alameda and Sharon and in the last few months there have been 4 car crashes. And, I had to grab a child and pull him out of the way as a truck went around 1 car, ran a red light, and nearly hit a cyclist.

Q: Quick question, who here is from the Fire District. how does Fire District feel about emergency vehicles on the way to the tram center at Stanford.

A: Jon Johnson is in the back, who is Fire District.

FD-Jon: So for us, our goal is whole aspect is to what' the community wants and needs, I work with designers to make sure that the fire district responds, that we are able to make our turns in to and out of all the roads and when it comes to the medians, these are all rolled curbs where we can actually roll over the medians so if there is any traffic backed up we can roll over and continue on. This is a primary response route for the fire district and we are looking at that we feel we can work in the confines and appears still meet the needs of the community.

Audience: Can AMR [ambulance] roll over those [medians] as well?

A: Not easily. It is very common for us to incorporate this special curb that fire trucks can mount, but it is not necessarily something that a vehicle could easily mount.

Audience: Can you confirm that? An ambulance needs to get through there.

A: Well, an ambulance is different than a fire truck. I mean, a fire truck has a very large turning radius and that is where these challenges ... we work with Fire to make sure that these vehicles that have a difficult turning radius can make all the maneuvers they need to make. As part of the rest of the design, we look at the turning movements of a typical vehicle can make, and that includes ambulances.

So the medians have been addressed in a way to address fire trucks [not ambulances].

A: FD-Jon: So, one of the things we will look at is any roadside...obviously we want more lanes if we are dealing with congestion traffic, that is our preference, but we understand that when it comes to road diets we want to relay is the ability for people to pull over to the right when we do have fire [response]. So ambulances that is where we are actually okay without a bike lane etc. because it allows traffic to pull over so we can continue to pass by. When there is backed up traffic and that doesn't occur, we do have the ability to use the other side [opposing traffic]. We do not like to go against traffic, because we still need to abide by the rules of the road, but that does occur during limited times of intense traffic. My whole thing is not to constrict traffic so narrow that ... and having, whether its a hard median, we can't cross over a hard median, or blub out, or trees or planters that do not allow the public to move over, or we can not pass safely. So with this design, we have the ability to let the public do that and operate the considerations to fulfill the needs.

Audience: Can you confirm that? The 90% plans show A-8 curbs for the medians, which are sharp curbs that are 8 inches tall for the medians. Is the plan now changed to have different kind of curb?

A: Well there are 2 types of curbs. Some are going to be non-mountable and the ones that Fire had identified will be mountable curbs. So we will have 2types of median curbs.

Audience: Can you send out something that points out where those are? later, after the meeting?

A: Yes, we can identify those.

Q: Please clearly mark with large signs the street names, Alameda and Santa Cruz, at the Y. Currently there is only one set of signs many yards in front of the Y, once drivers are at the Y they don't know where to go.

A: So we can try to address through a combination of pavement markings, and I know there is an overhead sign, like you said in advance of the Y. Some of the pavement markings identify which lane to queue in and so we can take a look to see if there are other opportunities for overhead signage to better delineate, but I think we need to take look at so...

Audience: That sign you are referring to is very high and obscured. It is very small.

A: We just had that replaced, so it should be fairly new, I mean it is an overhead sign near Palo Alto Way, So we can take a look there and see if we can install a bigger sign.

Q: Please consider the impact on nearby neighborhoods as people cut through to avoid Alameda with it being 1 lane. Lucky would be one obvious cut to get to Avy and Downtown MP and we got 7 huge new homes which were built on in the middle of Lucky Ave so traffic will already be massively increased with many more residents on the street and more parked cars on the street.

A: That cut through issue is going to be, definitely thru a road-diet, that is one of the cons items as vehicles try to find different ways around, but we feel the overall benefits of the project are there.

Q: Are there islands and staggered crossings on Santa Cruz?

Audience: that is me, so Santa Cruz is a very wide crossing. So at Sand Hill instead of a very wide crossing is there any ability to put in an island so to allow people to cross one side of traffic at a time. Instead of crossing all of that at one time?

A: That used to be, I mean I understand what you mean, but now it is just not something we do any more. We don't want to leave someone stranded in the middle of the road. So when we have these long crossings we want to make sure we give the signal enough time to for someone to cross the entire street.

So these are signalized intersections so they

Audience: What about Palo Alto Way?

A: So this is an RFB, a flashing indicator to tell vehicles that you are there

Audience: that is the one that is very dangerous and that could split. Construction of the road diet could come later and install an island now.

A: The real estate, or roadway width, is tight for us to fit much in, but we can look to see if there is an ability to put something in there, yeah.

We would do all of this at once - we would include this as one entire project we would have the contractor do all of the concrete work and improvements.

Audience: I want to point out that that crosswalk is the site of one of two fatalities so anything you can do to make sure there is not another fatality would be wonderful. I think the point is that the person was killed in the crosswalk, struck, and killed. I think if there is any place we should look at if we can do more, that is a good spot (PAW Crosswalk]

A: He is just mentioning that coming out of PAW the sight distances are challenging as you are making a right, you can see the flashing beacon if someone is crossing as well as the cars, and so we have highlighted that as an area we will take a closer look at to see if there is anything else we can do better to inform both people on PAW as well as people coming out of ...

Audience: A traffic signal?

Audience: Possible to remove it? [response through audience was 'no, don't remove crosswalk']

A: We want to keep it [crosswalk] because the distance between the Y and Sand Hill is pretty large and so it seems like an appropriate place to have a crossing. There is also a bus stop there as well as Menlo Commons.

Q: I live on PAW and notice the traffic in the mornings is slowed down going SB on SCA approaching SH. We lived here for over 30 years and people take that left turn on to PAW when they are in a hurry and bomb down our street to Vine St to get to SHR. Do you have plans for no left turn onto PAW for 6am to 9am in the morning?

With 1 lane SB, on SCA, people are going to be backed up and frustrated and they will want to cut down PAW. I think it is incumbent to put a no left turn in the morning.

A: So the current design doesn't have that. We definitely take a look at the feasibility of adding that. Again, that would be something that would have to go....

Q: We have an oak over hanging the Alameda will sidewalk accommodations be made to not affect the root system of this tree? It is close to the street.

A: Yes, we have identified several trees that we will accommodate and make sure we either jog the sidewalk around the root system and make sure we protect them in place. Requirements to contractor to not disturb roots.

Q: My wife is disabled and can't walk up the driveway she has bars to help her to get in her car down the driveway ... can the [construction?] crew check when her driveway is blocked? Will our driveway be blocked for any extended period of time?

A: If you are talking about construction, we can definitely work with specific property owners to accommodate them and we can do that through our contractor. We provide notification when the project is about to start - 10 days ahead and again 48 hours ahead. When the driveway is affected we will make sure to contact those specific property owners so you will know when you are not going to have access.

Q: There are [unheard] accessed by Sand Hill and Alameda, it is short sided to reduce lane access by 2 lanes should be changed. Not in favor of lane reduction.

A: The just of this is that they are not in favor of the road diet. That is an integral part of the project. So that is one way we get to room to do all of the other improvements.

Q: Are the [traffic] lights on Junipero Serra and Alpine going to be timed to prevent backups from Sand Hill and Santa Cruz

A: We are in coordination with the City [of Menlo Park]. I believe they manage that intersection and we will make sure to coordinate with them on timing. What we see is once this project is completed we will take a look at how that timing works and we will have an ability to adjust it based on duration and times so that we get the most flow through.

Q: My concern is how emergency vehicles will be able to get through traffic problems. We should test this first by putting up cones plus pylons.

A: We are in coordination with emergency services and fire and we believe the current design is adequate for getting access .

Q: Issue of constructing entrance and exit of driveway of residences on Santa Cruz Ave

A: We touched on that, we can take a look to see if there is an ability to shorten some of those barriers.

Q: My main concern is a safe walking / bike path along [Santa Cruz /] Alameda, from Sand Hill road to La Entrada, off Sharon Rd. 25 mph sounds reasonable.

A: Yeah, definitely part of this project will include widening of sidewalks as well as improved crossings. We feel it will be a better walking feeling as you're going to the schools.

Q: Can you more accurately mark the lefthand turn from going to Campo Bello from Santa Cruz? I was sideswiped by a car going in the left turn lane and proceed to go straight [down Alameda.]

A: So I think we can try to address this with more signage in advance of the intersection in addition to pavement markings. To make it clear to motorists what to expect as they approach the Y.

Q: Please outline how a car will turn left onto Oak Hollow from Santa Cruz if they are coming from Sand Hill. Is there still a center turn lane?

A: There is a center turn lane pocket that allows that lefthand turn on to Oak Hollow.

Q: Palo Alto Way intersection is still very dangerous and the design and visibility is a challenge. Exiting PAW, speed will continue to be high for NB SCA.

A: So I think we talked about that.

Q: Can you make the traffic lights more visible at the Y intersection? It is very confusing now.

A: So I believe as part of this, we are adjusting and modifying the traffic signals. We are going to modify the alignment so that it points at the new configuration at the Y. I think there are opportunities to put in blinders to make sure that only certain people see the Red or Green. We will definitely take a look at anything available so that it is clear what light is directing which vehicle.

A: (Supervisor Mueller) The community is strongly in favor of preceding with these traffic improvements without embarking on another pilot. We have secured funding. This is not the time to slow roll or restudy the project viability. Please support this project.

Audience: laughter

Q: Why not make bike lanes green, especially at the Y. Cars and bikes have to share the right turns at the Y. It will still be confusing. Why have a island near Palo Alto Way?

A: I believe we do have bike lanes painted, especially at conflict areas at the Y. I think [john?] explained some of the challenges going southbound and why we are using sharrows.

On the 'why the island at PAW' We don't... Oh, the barrier.... we will take another look at that to see what we can do.

Q: Is there to be a red light on the right turn on to Sand Hill Rd?

A: So we don't control that intersection. We can check in with the City of Menlo Park. I don't know if that is a no right turn on red over there.... I don't think we would do that, there is plenty of room there, especially with the red turn pocket.

A: Alright, so that is all of the written comments.

Audience: Not all, you did not read mine...

Q: I think generally there are a lot of issues. In 2020, when this went to the board of supervisors, the Dept of PW, Jim Porter identified that the Y intersection would be much narrower. That the crosswalks would be much shorter. And yet, what we have here are crosswalks that are even longer. It just doesn't make sense : Those crosswalks are about 9 lanes long on the Alameda crosswalk [at the Y] - so it doesn't make sense to take 9 lanes [in width] to cross a 2 lane road.

So those are some of the things that we were hoping to get done. Following the guidelines that county own infrastructure plan for transportation. Crosswalks should be shorter, they should be well lighted, They need to be safer and follow guidelines that are given by FHWA, DOT, NACTO.

The speed is the issue. We are always wanting to make sure speed is slower. That can be done through some of the design aspects of things. For instance, we don't need a 50 mph turn at the Y. If that turn were [designed] for a 25 mph turn, appropriate to the speed limit, it would be more appropriate.

Safety for bicyclists - I think we are jeopardizing that. All through the corridor we should be having buffered bike lanes. There is room for that. Yet some of this design is narrowing that to just 5' bike lane with no buffer and sometimes the bike lane is 9' or 8'. We also wanted the traffic lanes to be 10', but there are situations where lanes are 11½', even 16'.

So we want to make sure the cyclists are safe here. An example is, if you look at your NB merge zone - just above PAW and right before those long medians, that will be the most chaotic point on SCA. And so you are asking bicyclists to join into that chaos. Where instead, if you were to move that merge lane all the way down to the Y intersection, they

would only have to deal with 1 lane of traffic instead of all that merge activity. Just one example.

Residential Safety got sidelined here. We want our residents to be safe. We want them to be able to pull out of driveway, or get into their driveway, without having to get hit by other cars. There are sight line issues, speed issues, and there is just a buffer there so they can get in out of their driveways. I had mentioned earlier that parking was not just for parking, but a safety buffer and service area — won't repeat what was said earlier.

All of this represents a quality of life issue for the people that live here. The more we can get these safety issues in, the higher our quality of life will be. We just don't want to be safe, we want to feel safe.

That is why that some of these issues we need to sit down one on one with the engineers and go through these to make sure the community's goals for safety are addressed

Audience: Applause

A: That is it. (Ending of meeting)

Questions Submitted to County Before Meeting

Q: After all this time and history of so many accidents and with speeding a major problem, why is county keeping that 50+mph turn at the "Y"? It doesn't make sense!

The speed limit is 25, lets have a turn that is 25 mph — that would slow down traffic! Get rid of that highway style turn and put in an appropriate speed turn for a residential area.

Q: It is not clear what the posted speed limit is at the 'Y' intersection. There is a 25MPH regulatory speed sign on NB Santa Cruz. Additional speed control signs should be added approaching each arm of the intersection and additional traffic calming measures considered (e.g. lateral rumble strips). Four intersections in the City of Menlo Park are equipped with automated red light cameras for red light enforcement. They should be considered at the 'Y' intersection to address community concerns on high speed traffic — especially on NB Santa Cruz through movements.

Q: Please have DPW provide example locations in County or Peninsula where long medians similar to those planned on NB SCA (just south of the Y) are actively being used.

Q: It is unclear what safety analysis and action DPW considered and implemented relating to those homes along NB SCA between Sand Hill and past the Y. Please state what safety improvements will occur for those residents.

- Q:** The unusual double side by side left turn lanes planned on top of the hill at Alameda & Liberty Park seem confusing. Please provide a couple of locations in County or Peninsula where a similar configuration is being used currently.
- Q:** What guidance is DPW providing residents that have their driveways blocked by new medians? These residents can't access their properties from the North. Nor can they enter the SB SCA traffic flow and most can't enter the NB Alameda traffic flow. What is DPW suggesting residents do to mitigate this limited access?
- Q:** Similar to the prior question, please provide analysis on the impact on residences that are blocked by these long medians, particularly impact on service and delivery vehicles that need to access these properties: Postal, parcel, gardeners, tree pruning, house cleaning, medical care professionals, trash/recycling, etc.
- Q:** On removal of parking, please provide a projection of impact on other neighbors for that displaced parking? You mentioned a significant number of parking being removed, much more than what KH said in Jan 2020. Where will that parking now occur and what impact will that displaced parking have on the neighborhoods?
- Q:** With NB SCA traffic lanes being pushed next to sidewalk by removal of the parking buffer, there is high potential for reduced value of these properties. What will County do to compensate these property owners for such a significant drop in property value? It seems that each property could be negatively impacted by 20% to 30% in value, based on the experience of the Sand Hill Frontage road (between east of Leland Ave thru west of Stanford Ave) where property values went up \$500K to \$750K when the main Sand Hill traffic moved away from those properties.
- Q:** Menlo Park, KH and past County studies all report that unacceptable congestion will occur at the "Y" by removal of the SB Santa Cruz Ave lane from Y to Sand Hill Rd. These projections date back to the 1990s. In the Task Force, mitigation steps for this projected traffic queue were to be identified and implemented in the design. It was because this issue would have effective mitigation that Task Force members supported lane removal in order to establish buffered bike lanes. Please identify the mitigations to address this long traffic queue to avoid congestion at the Y.
- Q:** I have been an owner of tax paying property on Santa Cruz Ave. for over 35 years.
- I want to make several points in response to the Proposal of San Mateo County to remove parking and other adjustments on Santa Cruz Avenue between Sand Hill Road and the Y junction.
- I am member of a neighborhood that is active and connected one to each other. We are not just renters who have no stake in the outcome of this proposal.
 - The most important goal is community safety, with a priority on the Community that actually lives on the road and in this neighborhood!

- This proposal will have significant negative property value impacts on our owned properties.
- The distance to reasonable and available parking from this proposal is too far for our service providers, family and elderly who do not want to walk to visit our properties.
- We have NOT been contacted about this project in any form at all since 2018. I am indignant about the posting of a 'Final' plan without the input of the impacted neighborhood stakeholders.
- This proposal has the likely outcome of even faster and unsafe speeds for cars traveling on Santa Cruz Ave.
- Please research the traffic violations in this stretch of road. The lanes are not the problem. Speed is.

Q: Am disappointed, disgusted at Counties delay and lack of respect for the residents safety. My garbage can was hit and needs to be replaced. Second time in 1 year, due to speed and disregard to correct Lane.
Have had car totaled in Parking position few years ago.
Speeding car ,, using bike lane as 2nd lane.
Am fed up, give up!

Just waiting for inevitable fatality,
Have had zero influence , having attended in person, all my letters to county, which Ron is aware, gone to deaf ears, County employees collect their Salary, smile at our frustrations and keep delays so their jobs are solvent — while there IS AN ISSUE! Good luck.

My biggest issue is Speed NB SCA, It's used as a SUPER Highway.

Q: I did not see any stage construction/ traffic handling plans in the 95% plan set. How does the County propose to maintain safe and efficient operations for vehicles/peds/bikes during construction, including maintaining private driveway access?

Q: All of these concerns need to be addressed by any plans for this area:

1. Reduction of traffic speed
2. Pedestrian safety and accessibility
3. Safe access to and from property
4. Safe street parking
5. Safe accommodations for cyclists

It's unclear to me why we need so many lanes in this stretch of Santa Cruz Avenue when it gets reduced as soon as you continue in either direction. Alameda and Alpine are reduced to two lanes as well as the Y Santa Cruz continuation.

If we reduce to two lanes with a center turn lane, the rest of the street can be used for adequate road parking with bike lanes and safety buffers on both sides of the street with normal and safe sidewalks.

Crosswalks are a major concern. If you did any observation or studies of how people use the street, you will understand how unsafe they are currently, so the 'improvements' will have zero impact on pedestrian safety.

Pedestrians walking NB on the West side cross toward Alameda at the middle of the intersection, they will not walk towards Santa Cruz and then cross over. Super unsafe, but it is the most direct path..

Q: The published plans don't seem to address the long traffic queues that County said would be an issue in one of the last public meetings, specifically that SB section of Santa Cruz Avenue south of the Alameda de las Pulgas intersection. The traffic lights at Sand Hill Road are inefficient and extremely long duration.

Knowing in advance that these long queues are likely to extend to this intersection and further north, what will be done to avoid this queue problem? Will the Sand Hill Traffic lights be programmed to discharge the queue more frequently? Will there be sensors along that SB Santa Cruz traffic lane [north of Oak Hollow] to identify the queuing issue to the Sand Hill traffic control system?

Q: Ref: 95% Design Plans, Sheet SS-02 (Santa Cruz/Alameda 'Y' intersection – signing/stripping plan)

1. There appears to be an unprotected crosswalk from SB Santa Cruz to WB Alameda (i.e. left side of large pork chop island). Also, the stopping sight distance for SB Santa Cruz traffic approaching this crosswalk appears inadequate due to existing property wall blocking the line of sight for a vehicle approaching the crosswalk. A pedestrian activated signal (or Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon) should be considered for this crosswalk. Alternatively, in-roadway warning lights or "flashing crosswalks" are a currently-accepted treatment in MUTCD for use at uncontrolled crosswalks.

2. 10' wide travel lanes are very narrow and a safety concern where there are a lot of turning movements and vehicles could encroach into bike lanes – particularly if large trucks are present. 11' is a preferred minimum travel lane width. Has a design exception fact sheet been prepared to document the use of the mandatory minimum lane width and protect the County from tort liability?

3. The pavement markings on NB Santa Cruz informing vehicles which lane to choose will be hard to comprehend, wear out over time, and may be obscured by queuing traffic. Placing direction signs on the signal arm at the intersection should also be considered to improve visibility. There are similar direction signs placed on an electrolier arm some distance east of the 'Y' intersection.

4. Can the median hard island be extended on the east and south legs of the 'Y' intersection. The other legs of the intersection have this feature to provide peds in the crosswalk some added protection.

5. Portions of the bike lanes utilize the gutter (e.g. NB Santa Cruz approaching the 'Y' intersection). Bikes don't like to ride in the gutter so the bike lane width is effectively narrower where gutter exists. Consider using curb with no gutter at these locations.

6. It is not clear what the posted speed limit is at the 'Y' intersection. There is a 25MPH regulatory speed sign on NB Santa Cruz. Additional speed control signs should be added approaching each arm of the intersection and additional traffic calming measures considered (e.g. lateral rumble strips). Four intersections in the City of Menlo Park are equipped with automated red light cameras for red light enforcement. They should be considered at the 'Y' intersection to address community concerns on high speed traffic – especially on NB Santa Cruz through movements.

Q: These questions primarily pertain to the “Y” intersection area of Santa Cruz and Alameda: (Note for illustration see Safer4Us.com/y)

- Why aren't the crosswalks lengths reduced to a minimum? The County plan crosswalks are 250% longer than the road diet on Alameda requires. They are excessively long even crossing Santa Cruz on the south side of the intersection. Guidelines recommend 90° crosswalks for a variety of safety considerations. Why are these crosswalks angled, especially the southern crosswalk?
- Why are the safety of residents not being considered in this new design? This design takes a significant step backwards from a safety perspective by eliminating the buffer between traffic and the properties. Can that be restored and provide safety to/from residential properties?
- Why isn't a slower speed turn being implemented? The slip lane design was designed for 45-50 mph. Why can't this be a curve rated more appropriately for our 25 mph speed? (We don't need a turn that allows a higher speed than the speed limit.)
- Why are residents being severely limited for access to and from their property? Currently residents have full access to exit and enter their properties from both the north or south directions. The County plan doesn't allow them to access their property from the north. Nor does it allow them to access southbound Santa Cruz, nor northbound Alameda. This seems overly restrictive and unnecessary. There is no mention on what the county road designer suggests for these residents to mitigate the access restrictions of their property.

Q: I agree with some neighbor's suggestions, i.e. speed bumps on the Y intersection, and speed bumps around the intersections closed to La Entrada school. More visible 25MPH signs from the Y to La Entrada school.

Q: Please improve in Menlo Park the crosswalk safety at Palo Alto Way and Santa Cruz Ave. Thank you

Q: I have looked at the County plan and the Safe4Us plan. As a car driver and as a bicyclist I like the Safe4Us plan and I don't like County plan. I don't like raised areas, the double left turn lane or the NB narrowing after Prospect. As a car driver this is complicated and confusing. As a bicyclist I don't want the car drivers around me to be confused. The complexity makes it more likely that cars will come into the bike lanes by mistake. I expect that the safety aspects of the County plan for slowing traffic will be more than undone by the unsafe actions drivers who are confused. The Safe4Us plan seems simple, straightforward and I expect it is less expensive. Why make things more complicated?

Q: Moving the shark teeth is just one safety improvement for this short corridor. The speed limit and monitoring also needs to be improved. Motorist drive so fast they don't even notice a pedestrian on the side of the road. The flashing lights should help motorist know pedestrians are about to cross, but they don't see it in time to stop. I would think an actual

stop light for motorist driving south would help tremendously and would make motorist have to stop if the lights were red.

Motorists driving north just came off a stop, so they shouldn't be driving so fast at that point, but seeing a pedestrian coming from four lanes over might be too difficult too. If a pedestrian is crossing and the light is red, they will see it in time to stop.

Q: I would like to petition against the plans to change the Santa Cruz/Alameda Y intersection in Menlo Park into a highway intersection.

I am a resident that lives on this intersection and have 2 young girls age 6 and 8. This intersection is already very dangerous. There have been many car accidents at this intersection and several years ago a car totaled our car that was parked in front of our house after speeding through the Y portion of the intersection from Alameda to Santa Cruz. Thank goodness my girls were not in the car or they would have been killed.

The county plans should focus on making residents more safe. I 100% oppose any plans to make this intersection higher speed, more unsafe, or more congested. Santa Cruz Ave is a community street with families and kids who want to ride bikes and take safe walks. Side walls should be extended down the Y portion of Santa Cruz Ave.

I also request more information on the proposed plans so I can share this with my neighborhood. We are mostly unaware of these plans. The site I read stated there are no comments when plans for this intersection were at 60% and now they are at 90%. This is not true, many neighbors have been fighting for years to improve the safety of this intersection and this portion of Santa Cruz Ave.

The site and plans are very tough to understand. Please send me a summary of the plans so I can understand and share with my neighbors. Anything less than improving safety and slowing down traffics through this intersection is unacceptable.

Q: We have lived here a long time. We have seen the County and DPW spend a good deal of money on consultants to solve the safety issues in the Y intersection area. Unfortunately for the community, and taxpayers throughout the County, the in-depth analysis from the community – the Safety4Us plan – has been ignored.

Please, San Mateo County, pay attention. Appreciate what a great resource you have. The community, because we live here and have poured our time and energy into understanding the situation fully, has repeatedly come up with sound ideas based on inarguable facts. Adopting the solutions of paid consultants is easy, but County's responsibility goes farther: consider what the consultants tell you and then consider what the locals add: the on-the-ground ability to discern defects and the vision to see how to avoid them — and reduce costs, too.
Thanks.

Q: We are out of town but fully support the community's 10.5 idea for Alameda Santa Cruz intersection.

The survey sent to residents some years ago was so badly written- not allowing residents to reject all the county ideas. If you remember, one had to agree or choose one of their

plans before continuing the survey. So the end result appeared to be support for plans that none of us wanted.

Q: After years of participating in polls and meetings and voicing our concerns that the NB section of Santa Cruz Avenue is missing completely in this discussion. It is frustrating and disheartening to see that again, there is still a 30 mph speed limit sign for the unsafest, narrowest part – single lane! – of this whole corridor, and not even a safety consideration regarding missing sidewalks and street lighting! We wrote to county and others to no avail. County residents are clearly, sadly second class. We will still participate but it is beyond frustrating to be left out.

Q: I always hold my breath when exiting Palo Alto Way and entering the Alameda de Las Pulgas Northbound or Southbound; the cars are already going very fast. Here's some of common sense needs for our neighborhood:

Residential Safety – Safe exit and entry for residents with buffer from traffic

Crosswalks – Well lighted speed limit, with speed bumps if possible – for the safety of our student walkers/bikers to La Entrada Middle School

Slower Speed – Lower speeds by road design

Sidewalks – Buffered from traffic – for our students, strollers, elderly, walkers and runners in our neighborhood

Thank you SMC

Closing of Meeting

Ray Mueller: Responds to a pilot question to see if that is possible - with a possible implementation. Started to discuss if that make sense. Needs to ... These people really care about your opinions...Applause

Audience: I want to thank everyone for coming and if it wasn't an issue of us coming together with the committee and public to see what we need. Can you me a big favor? I live at the Y and I do the walking -Palo Alto Way, Alameda, Santa Cruz. That sign, the 25 mph, opposite the senior center, it is too high - - it is not effective. They are using Santa Cruz Ave northbound as a super highway. I stood there 5 days in a row for 30 minutes. One car was at 25. One car. And all of these accidents and everything, whether it's Alameda, Sharon, Santa Cruz, can you help us do something about the speed? before you start the project in 2024? Could you work with the city for that?

Ray Mueller: I live really close to that Y and I have a conflict of interest ...

Audience: There is no conflict Ray, you just need to ante up there Ray.

Ray Mueller: Trust me, I do ... I do talk to county counsel about conflicts. I will make sure I check that out so I made the mistake once. But what I will tell you is that I will take a look at it.

There is a rule when it comes to speed: That you have to be within a certain percentage.

Believe it or not, to lower the speed limit you have to be within a certain percentile of that speed limit and that is what the average speed is through there. It doesn't have anything to do with...

Audience: Is there any...

Ray Mueller: Excuse me, If everyone is going to talk then we are going to stop!