

Public Comment

(Consent Agenda Items, County Manager's Report, Closed Session, and matters not listed on the agenda)

From: Sylvia Walker [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2020 2:28 PM
To: Don Horsley; Michael Callagy; safety@univpark.org; CMO_BoardFeedback; Jim Porter; Carole Groom; Dave Pine; David Canepa; Warren Slocum
Subject: URGENT:Please approve Santa Cruz/Alameda Safety Plan funding, with needed corrections

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

I respectfully request that County Supervisors approve the funding for agenda item 20-825, the SantaCruz/Alameda Safety project; however, I urge you to require changes to the detailed plan to eliminate certain dangerous and unsafe designs at Liberty Park/Alameda and Y intersections. Also, please require the inclusion of the northern Santa Cruz segment that starts at the Y intersection- 1/2 of the 20,000 car traffic flows on this exculded segment and has a major school crossing and a high accident rate.

With appreciation for your commitment and service to our communities,

Sylvia M. Walker
[REDACTED]
Menlo Park 94025
[REDACTED]

From: Dave Hershberger [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2020 2:49 PM
To: Don Horsley; Michael Callagy; +safety@univpark.org; CMO_BoardFeedback; Jim Porter; Carole Groom; Dave Pine; David Canepa; Warren Slocum
Subject: Please approve Santa Cruz/Alameda Safety Plan funding, with needed corrections

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

I request County Supervisors approve the funding for agenda item 20-825, the SantaCruz/Alameda Safety project; however, please also require changes to the detailed plan to eliminate certain dangerous and unsafe designs at Liberty Park/Alameda and Y intersections. Also, please require the inclusion of the northern Santa Cruz segment that starts at the Y intersection- 1/2 of the 20,000 car traffic flows on this excluded segment and has a major school crossing and a high accident rate.

As a resident living on Alameda de las Pulgas and a frequent cyclist, I would really appreciate safety improvements to Santa Cruz and Alameda de las Pulgas. It would be a shame if someone died along here because (a) the road were left in its current unsafe arrangement or (b) the road were modified per the current plan, which has serious safety issues.

Please see <https://univpark.org/safe/y/pro-con> for details including an alternate design with greatly improved safety.

In summary: please fund this project but fix the safety issues.

Thank you,
David Hershberger

From: Ron Snow [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2020 3:01 PM
To: Don Horsley; Michael Callagy; safety@univpark.org; CMO_BoardFeedback; Jim Porter; Carole Groom; Dave Pine; David Canepa; Warren Slocum
Cc: Ron Snow
Subject: Agenda 20-825: Santa Cruz/Alameda Safety Plan funding, WITH needed corrections and safety considerations

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear Supervisors and County Officials,

Please approve funding for Agenda item 20-825, the Santa Cruz/Alameda Safety Project; however, and a big **HOWEVER**, I request that you also require Public Works to adjust the detail design to address serious and dangerous safety issues in certain key areas of the corridor. The overall goal of this 4 year safety project, actually goes back over 10 years, is to create a safer Santa Cruz and Alameda corridor in West Menlo Park by implementing traffic calming features to reduce speeding and to finally have ADA compliant sidewalks, much safer crosswalks, safety for residential access, and defined buffered bike lanes.

I also want to bring to your attention the **poor workmanship of the Kimley Horn** engineering firm that has worked with Public Works on this plan for the last 4 years. I will cut to the chase: The design work they have provided over these years has been for very poor quality, with severe errors, poor safety engineering, and ignores common sense safety basics. They exclude several key traffic engineering recommendations provided County for our corridor. The result is that there are areas where this Plan greatly increases danger and risk of injury. Additionally, key existing safety dangers of the corridor are not addressed and therefore will still exist after spending the \$6 Million. For the amount of time and money, we would expect these serious safety issues to be resolved and I don't think any of us want to worsen the safety problems. Below, I have listed 3 example areas that need re-engineering.

Good news, the Plan at a high level and viewed from a funding perspective, should be funded. The global aspects of traffic calming via the proposed road diet and ADA sidewalks is good. It is just that the errors and safety issues need to be corrected before the design is finalized and actual work begins so that we can meet our goal of having safer crosswalks, bike lanes, and address residential access safety.

There are many issues that Public Works has neglected to address. While we on the Santa Cruz/Alameda Safety Task force and other voices in the community have identified these major flaws in the Plan's design, County has basically refused to address them. Rather than dive into the dozens of issues, there are 3 main design areas that demonstrate the poor workmanship by KimleyHorn and the safety problems that are retained and/or introduced by the Plan. All issues could be easily addressed and fixed, but thus far County is refusing to address them.

To keep this brief, I will try to discuss at an executive summary level and will only hit 3 example areas that are dangerous and need revision:

1) **Liberty Park, Prospect, Harkins:** If you look at the plan (page 1085-1086, the design for Alameda is just plain amateurish and dangerous. It does not meet engineering guidelines. It is much more dangerous than it should be.

This section of Alameda is much more dangerous and the opposite of our over all Plan objectives:

- Crosswalks are about 50% wider than needed
- Students and other pedestrians have to be in the intersection much longer
- Introduces significant risk and line of sight issues for Prospect and Harkin residents
- Traffic engineers ignored the nature of the road, it's sight problems, and it's slope issues
- Introduces a swerve in the road that is dangerous due to nature of road and motorist expectations
- Swerve in road also is dangerous to motorists and is unexpected, thus more dangerous for cyclists
- Introduces a conflicting and unusual opposing-adjoining-double left turn lanes — nowhere in County is this done
- Design will cause motorist confusion and distraction right at the point of a major school crossing
- The road travel way is 40+% wider than it needs to be at this location

All of these dangerous issues are avoided by the design our community drafted, based on engineering guidelines, traffic calming experts, and our own knowledge of the roadway problems at this section of the road, including the hill, lighting issues, sun glare, and line of sight issues. See [Safety Issues #18 - Liberty Park Crosswalk](#)

2) Santa Cruz/Alameda Y: Scores of our neighbors have voiced support for the community Safety Option 10.5 design for the Y intersection. There are many many reasons why. The main reason for such support is that our 10.5 design option actually addresses all of the identified safety issues at the Y and guarantees, by design, the elimination of the dangerous speeding issue there. So its not so much that 10.5 is the way to go, instead it incorporates the concepts and addresses safety in ways that should be considered and implemented.

Impart, the advantages of the 10.5 design option can also be viewed from the perspective of what the County Plan does not accomplish. The [Community Safety Option 10.5](#) has many advantages, and here are just a few:

- Reduces the width of the Y intersection, by 50% — smaller, less massive
- The 10.5 design prohibits speeding on NB Santa Cruz through the intersection
- Establishes a safe and calm egress/ingress for Y residents
- Eliminates the 2 blind corners
- Greatly reduces cyclists 'conflict' zones for the Y NB split
- Reduces speed for the cyclist conflict zones (accommodating the NB bike lane split)
- Crossing widths are dramatically reduced for all crosswalks
- Introduces a woonerf, a safe and shared pathway for pedestrians, cyclists, and the Y residents
- Woonerf safety design solves the major safety issue for residents
- Both blind corners are solved
- Simplified traffic lights (fewer and clearer - not confusing)
- See this comparison of the [County Plan and the Community Safety Option 10.5](#)

While the County Plan does not address the above safety issues, the County Plan also has the following undesirable impacts:

- Design of north crosswalks requires pedestrians to be in the intersection longer - the equivalent length of crossing 12 traffic lanes
- Raised medians/barriers are considered dangerous and traffic hazard (Ref Junipero Sierra Island collisions)
- Does not solve the blind corner
- Retains a high speed 'slip' lane — not designed for our speed limit, but designed for an expressway
- Continues with confusing and mal-aligned traffic lights
- Intersection is still the same width and with unrecommended approach skew as the current intersection, yet an elimination of 3 lanes should have yielded a much narrower and safer design
- A dangerous bike path arrangement with increased conflict/collision risks with cyclists

There is a more in depth discussion in the [above link](#), as well as an interactive visual comparison.

3) **Santa Cruz Ave:** There are a few issues that should be addressed by the County Plan that are not and a few problems introduced by the County Plan that should be redesigned or modified for safety sake.

- The County plan introduces barriers (aka medians) that block access to several homes. These homes will be significantly restricted from turning into or out of their properties.
- The Plan does not address an artificial narrowing of Santa Cruz by a driveway island near Sand Hill Rd. Not fixing this design mistake puts cyclists and motorists at increased collision risk, because the island extends 4' or so into the roadway. County should remove the portion of the driveway island so that the roadway can maintain adequate width for traffic and bikes.
- **IMPORTANT:** The safety improvements along Santa Cruz between the Y and Avy (the northern Santa Cruz segment) was dropped by Public Works. Our community had defined several low cost and effective safety improvements for this section. The effort of funding this \$6Million project would be the same if the improvements for this segment of Santa Cruz were included. Why do a 1/2 job? One half of the traffic on Santa Cruz, 10,000 cars a day, use this segment — it should be included in the safety plan.

SUMMARY:

So while there are serious and dangerous issues with parts of the Plan's design, demonstrating the substandard Kimley Horn work product, the overall goal of the **Santa Cruz/Alameda Safety project should be funded**. Please fund this project AND require Public Works to work with community and task force to fix the poor and unsafe design elements so that our \$6Million dollar investment actually provides a safe traffic corridor for all the Santa Cruz/Alameda corridor, including the northern segment.

We have spent thousands of hours over the last 4 years working with Community/County/City task force and communicating with the community. This project should be funded and low cost parts of the plans recommendations should be implemented in the short term, like the pedestrian activated lights at Palo Alto Way and Liberty Park, or the important NB shoulder line stripe for Santa Cruz Ave to protect residents and parked cars. Our community has a list of Short Term/Low Hanging fruit actions that have been delayed, yet are so very important to our safety.

Sincerely,
Ron Snow

[illegible]

Ron Snow

SantaCruz/Alameda For Everyone (SAFE)

[REDACTED]

From: Eric Cox [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2020 3:53 PM
To: Don Horsley; Michael Callagy; +safety@univpark.org; CMO_BoardFeedback; Jim Porter; Carole Groom; Dave Pine; David Canepa; Warren Slocum
Subject: Please approve Santa Cruz/Alameda Safety Plan funding, with needed corrections - newly proposed median on Santa Cruz is unacceptable

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

I request County Supervisors approve the funding for agenda item 20-825, the SantaCruz/Alameda Safety project; however, please also require changes to the detailed plan to eliminate certain dangerous and unsafe designs at Liberty Park/Alameda and Y intersections. Also, please require the inclusion of the northern Santa Cruz segment that starts at the Y intersection- 1/2 of the 20,000 car traffic flows on this excluded segment and has a major school crossing and a high accident rate.

I live at [REDACTED] santa cruz and a median preventing access to my house is COMPLETELY unacceptable. That wasn't part of any plan that we received and to add that in as "the plan" at the last minute is highly unethical.
Eric

From: Eric Cox [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2020 4:00 PM
To: CMO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Santa Cruz/Alameda Safety Plan - Public Comment During Teleconference Meetings

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

I require changes to the detailed plan to eliminate certain dangerous and unsafe designs on Santa Cruz Ave.

The plan adds in a center median on Santa Cruz Ave. This will prevent access to my driveway which is highly problematic. This wasn't part of any of the original plans and it will have a major negative impact on the livability of housing on the street. I was also under the impression that it was required by the fire department to have access to the center of the road.

Eric Cox
2159 Santa Cruz Ave
Menlo Park

--

Eric Cox
Marketing
Stanford Graduate School of Business

[REDACTED]
gsb.stanford.edu | Facebook [StanfordGSB](https://www.facebook.com/StanfordGSB) | Twitter [@StanfordBiz](https://twitter.com/StanfordBiz)

Change lives, Change organizations, Change the world

From: Ron Snow [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2020 5:32 PM
To: Don Horsley; Michael Callagy; safety@univpark.org; CMO_BoardFeedback; Jim Porter; Carole Groom; Dave Pine; David Canepa; Warren Slocum
Cc: Ron Snow; Janet Davis
Subject: Agenda 20-825: Community Comments in Favor Community Safety Option 10.5

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear Supervisors and County Officials,

Many in our community have participated in various forms of discussion and feedback. Our UnivPark.org website has a complete section on Safety and on the Santa Cruz/Alameda Safety Corridor specifically where safety issues are documented as are safety solution options. Community residents often enter the conversation by leaving feedback, suggestions, concerns, and general comments. Additionally, the Task Force and County have conducted surveys that also have captured community feedback. Below is a sampling from these sources, including the County January 30th Design Meeting survey where the County presented the Plan you are (hopefully) funding. In that survey, people had to 'write-in' requests for the 10.5 option consideration because it was excluded from the survey.

Below, you will see very strong support for our Community Safety Option 10.5 design concept for addressing the safety issues at the Y intersection of Santa Cruz and Alameda. Below is a sampling of the many public comments pertaining to the Santa Cruz/Alameda Safety Corridor, primarily on the Y intersection.

Sincerely,
Ron Snow

[Y intersection](#) by cc

Alt-C [County Plan] is not an improvement of what we have now. It does not address the speed of cars coming through the intersection and makes it harder to get into the homes in the Y.

As a pedestrian, this is not an improvement. I have witnessed most pedestrians continuing north on Alameda from the East side of Santa Cruz Avenue and walk directly into the street to follow the road instead of cross at the appropriate locations.

As a resident in the Y, I do not want an island right outside my front door. We cannot get into our property from the north and would have to navigate south past all the lane switching and make a u-turn to get into our driveway. This is worse than our current situation.

I also do not want a crosswalk coming directly into my house. I want to know exactly where street lights will be located to assure they are not in front of my property or line of sight through windows. If I take down my fence, the current plan has a crosswalk going directly into our home and I will not be able to reconfigure our driveway if we plan to remodel the property. Why would a crosswalk be permitted to direct people into the middle of a property.

10.5 has so much more improvements for calming and safety. I think we can move crosswalks and reduce the size of the island but the configuration makes more sense. Bike safety can be adjusted a bit for those going North and the sharp turns into Santa Cruz can be made more smooth. The turn from Santa Cruz onto Alameda can be improved as well.

There are two versions of 10.5 and it would be great to get the city planners to give recommendations on improving this option as it is the best option presented.

Thanks for putting these options together.

County Survey Comment: by M. Schmajuk

The 10.5a community design should be considered as an option

County Survey Comment: by J. Weiner

Please consider community alternative 10.5

Great Design Safe 10.5

This is a thoughtful and safe plan.

It provides safety for residents, pedestrians and cyclists.

It slows traffic.

It is easy for drivers to follow.

Alt C is a confusing, complicated plan that does not slow traffic, impedes residents access to their own driveways.

The long crosswalks are dangerous for slow walkers. The multiple lanes will confuse drivers and increase accidents as they cut into other lanes.

The original survey was so frustrating because one had to choose a design before proceeding to the next page - even if none were acceptable. One of the most flawed surveys I have ever seen.

What can we do to get the county to look again at 10.5?

A big thank you to those who came up with 10.5!

County Survey Comment: by Lynn Porter

I prefer 10.5 configurations parking, safety for walkers and bikers of concern. Full stop at red light as people seem to cruise through it at times.

Alameda Y by Kirby Wilkins

After more than 20 years living near the Y, I still have bad moments driving there. 10.5 is a wonderful solution and also in keeping with the times.

So many more people are out walking, jogging, biking this area since the pandemic. I think that trend will continue, especially if facilitated by the 10.5 design. Cities are closing streets, we can slow traffic

Y intersection by Lynne McClure

Please adopt Plan 10.5. This design calms traffic far more efficiently and is more clear to drivers in all directions about where to turn, etc. Further, this design allows for better speed control.

The County must also figure out how to monitor excess speeding in the Y area, both on Santa Cruz Ave. and on the Alameda.

County Survey Comment: by Albert Chu

I would like you to seriously consider "the 10.5a community design" as an option (see <https://univpark.org/content/safe-issue10-alameda-santa-cruz-y-intersection#compare>)

County Survey Comment: by Abby Collins

the 10.5a community design should be considered as an option

Task Force, great job on 10.5 by CJ

I think the community task force has worked hard and represented the regions and stakeholders of the community well. They came up with an alternate design they call "10.5a". 10.5a is full of very thoughtful and safety-promoting design features.

I really like the traffic calming that the curb/plantings aesthetic creates.

I like not having to go diagonally through an intersection where I'm halfway thru the intersection when it turns red (shorter, orthogonal intersections).

I like shorter crosswalks with great visibility of the pedestrians (mothers with walkers, children going to school, and me and my family and friends).

I like the ability of residents to safely pull out of their driveways into a buffer lane without fear of getting t-boned by a motorist in a hurry.

I like not having high-speed (large radius) turns to get people to slow down.

I like having traffic lights pointing at the correct lanes (not having to guess which light is mine since the County has a hard time pointing and shrouding the lights to limit visibility to only the intended drivers and cyclists).

Doesn't this look like the way the intersection should look and function? It does to me.

Great job and a shout out to the Task Force for continuing t

o work toward the best solution!

10.5 has my vote!

Like 10.5, seems safer -- Suggest slightly wider Rt Turn by CT

My only suggestion to that 10.5 design would be to make the right hand turn onto Santa Cruz northbound a smoother transition, meaning not such a sharp right turn.

(but wait, I couldn't vote for it here on [the County] Survey Monkey - I hope somebody is reading this.)

Entering and Exiting driveway by Charmaine

It is also very unsafe to enter my driveway. The cars driving along this section are going too fast, so when I slow down to enter my driveway, the cars behind honk or swerve around me as I am turning. This is dangerous for other vehicles as well as cyclists who are continuing down Alameda or Santa Cruz Avenue.

Santa Cruz Ave between the "Y" and Avy, unsafe egress by Carin P.

The north-south segment of Santa Cruz should be a residential street, with wide sidewalks, wide bike lanes, and slow traffic. The County has allowed it to become a speedway for overflow and cut-through traffic. Lack of traffic planning around transportation for the large and growing employers in the area has put school children and other pedestrians& cyclists at the mercy of out-of-neighborhood cars and trucks. A stop sign or traffic light will not remedy the actual problem, which is residential streets being overwhelmed by cut-through traffic.

Cars running the light at the Y by C. Conui

Walking across Santa Cruz Avenue toward Campo Bello.

Pedestrian walk signal indicated I could cross, but the car coming from Santa Cruz part of the Y continued through the intersection.

Either the light and indicator changes too fast or the car ran the light. Either way, the intersection is unsafe for pedestrians.

Suggested remedies:

Stop all traffic when the pedestrian signal is pressed.

Delay the change in signals so cars and pedestrians are assured the other direction is stopped before proceeding

Flashing pedestrian signs

Slowing traffic north of the "Y" by NC

Slowing down the Y off Alameda would be great. Not sure why people punch it when they come to this intersection, they are not going far as there is a four way stop. Maybe a few Silent Police (large speed bumps) may help.

Accident and dangerous lane change by A.Lee

About a year ago someone tried to pass me on the right, at the Santa Cruz-Alameda intersection.

Minor damage.

The street (Santa Cruz) does or did not clearly indicate lanes for south-bound & north bound vehicles. Some new painting has been done, but safety experts on lane painting would be welcome.

Accident at the Y Nov 29,2017 -- road bumps idea by YZ

Accident at the Y Nov 29,2017 : This is the same thing that keeps happening at this intersection. Similar thing happened a few years back when a driver crashed into my stone wall at 2099 Santa Cruz Avenue, and of course at the house with the destroyed wall right at the Y. The only way I can think of preventing this is to put speed bumps or pavement bumps at the roads leading to the Y. Has that been discussed as an option at all?

County Survey Comment: by Ron Snow

This survey should not force rank the Alternatives for Santa Cruz Ave and for the "Y", especially when there are alternatives that should not be getting votes at all; that is, where many several alternatives as no votes - non-starters. For instance, two of the alternatives don't provide bike lanes on SCA, that is a non-starter if this solution is dictating road configuration for the next 10+ years. Totally against County transportation planning. These are non-starters. The survey should also provide a "none of the above" and/or allow a "Other" with associated comment entry. The alternatives for the Y are all complex and problematic, keeping the underpinning dangerous configuration instead of correcting that skewed intersection is a fundamental problem. Correcting this design to be a much safer and probably significantly cheaper perpendicular intersection by making the northern Santa Cruz segment intersect at 90°. This is recommended by FHWA/DOT, Traffic Safety & Traffic Calming organizations, and recommended specifically for this intersection. Such a corrective alignment has all the advantages of safety while still supporting the volume of traffic projected for this corridor.

Modifying this intersection to remove the skew addresses all of the documented safety issues at this intersection, reduces conflict zones, provides significant safety for pedestrians, residents, and cyclists, eliminates problematic complexity of traffic lights, line of sight issues, removes high speed elements, and so much more. This is our community's option #10.5. Feedback from many neighbors is that this survey was confusing and that the numbers and other design information provided at the Jan 30th presentations seemed to have erroneous numbers and design problems. They felt that survey could not capture their input and concerns.

County Survey Comment: by Suzi Russel

I believe that what is being called Safety Option 10.5a is MUCH better than any of the options on which I just voted! PLEASE give 10.5 SERIOUS CONSIDERATION. Thank you.

County Survey Comment: by D. Bixler

The options provided for the Alameda-Santa Cruz intersection all seem to have serious safety issues. I think the option 10.5 that the community offers seems much safer and slows traffic - please make this 10.5 option a choice -- Thank you

County Survey Comment: by Cindy T.

The 10.5a community design should be considered as an option. I think this is a better overall option. One possible suggestion, however, would be to make the right turn onto Santa Cruz northbound a smoother transition, meaning not such a sharp right turn,

County Survey Comment: by Cameron W.

please include Option 10.5 - this is my MOST preferred option - above A/B/C described in earlier survey

County Survey Comment: by Patricia McBrayer.

Please consider the community's Safety Option 10.5 as a design alternative for the Santa Cruz/Alameda Y intersection. This is my preferred option.

County Survey Comment: by Dror Shimshowitz

the 10.5a community design should be considered as an option, and seems better than the alternatives shown in the survey

County Survey Comment: by Don Curry

The 10.5a community design should be considered as an option. Looks like the best option.

County Survey Comment: by Sara Shaw

The community proposal 10.5 is significantly better than the three choices offered. I urge the county to include this configuration which is superior to all others and meets the needs and desire of our community. This survey was very frustrating because it required answering every question - even if you preferred none of the options, which is not the same as preferring the current configuration. The comment section should have been at the beginning with the option not to choose any of the choices provided. NONE OF THESE should have been an option, while still wanted a change from existing layout. Please do another survey that includes the community's choice 10.5

County Survey Comment: by Sequoia

While I'm happy for your willingness to invite comment from the community, I find this survey notable lacking in that it fails to present any room for alternative input from the citizens and people affected by the subject. I'd greatly prefer the additional presenting of some community options such as option 10.5 which has the support of many of our neighbors most impacted by the proposed changes. One of the great things about American democracy is the ability to choose an option we believe is best. We do not vote by plebiscite but allow every individual a chance to render their input, however unwelcome it is to the current elected officials. Please follow the principles that are foundational to our great nation and allow a discussion on these issues that is not hamstrung by limitations on our options. So far I have seen little reason to support the current management of our local infrastructure, something I will certainly keep in mind when this November. Doing your job means having a physical impact, it means taking deliberate and intelligent action, not arguing for years to put forth plans scrapped of foresight or consideration without community input. It means standing up and being counted and doing what we have entrusted you to do. Democracy moves slowly, but your failure to provide a well considered option nor to convince the very people most effected by your proposed changes of their efficacy is not something that inspires confidence. I hope that this survey will be followed by a greater attention to the role you were appointed to and a renewed sense of good faith and trust in the community and the people whom you are meant to serve.

County Survey Comment: by Dave Gildea

I like the community 10.5 design for the safety benefits for bicyclists and pedestrians.

County Survey Comment: by R. McCutcheon

The alternatives for the Y intersection all seem to have major flaws. The best alternative that I see, is the community's option 10.5. This 10.5 seems to have the best solution and should be the preferred alternative.

County Survey Comment: by Tim Lee

The range of alternatives studies is inadequate. Options to reduce intersection skew should have been considered. See link below for rough sketch of one example to enhance intersection geometry. [based on Community Safety Option 10.5] http://wmhftp.com/restricted/?i=20765&u=Proposals+WMH&p=a58b82a98c8d8673bc0db80c859f7fc6&fp=%2FWMH+Proposals%2FSanta_Cruz_Alameda_Y%2F&exp=

County Survey Comment: by Roger Erickson

We would most like to see the community's "Safety option 10.5" for the intersection.

County Survey Comment: by Greg Faris

Please consider inclusion of option 10.5 in the evaluation

County Survey Comment: by Reese Zasio

Prefer option 10.5. This is the best solution that provides safety to pedestrians, cyclist, drivers, and the home owners.

County Survey Comment: by Chelsea Jonelle

I prefer the community option 10.5 to any of the options included in the survey. My primary concern is the flow of traffic. Additionally, looking at all of the different options in the survey highlights the poor design of the crosswalks. They are long and awkward, and seem extremely unsafe in every design shown in the survey. Also, this survey is very confusing and poorly designed. It was hard to visually parse the differences between the options.

County Survey Comment: by Paul Zander

I think the community task force has worked hard and represented the regions and stakeholders of the community well. They came up with an alternate design they call "10.5a". 10.5a is full of very thoughtful and safety-promoting design features. I really like the traffic calming that the curb/plantings aesthetic creates. I like not having to go diagonally through an intersection where I'm halfway thru the intersection when it turns red (shorter, orthogonal intersections). I like shorter crosswalks with great visibility of the pedestrians (mothers with walkers, children going to school, and me and my family and friends). I like the ability of residents to safely pull out of their driveways into a buffer lane without fear of getting t-boned by a motorist in a hurry. I like not having high-speed (large radius) turns to get people to slow down. I like having traffic lights pointing at the correct lanes (not having to guess which light is mine since the County has a hard time pointing and shrouding the lights to limit visibility to only the intended drivers and cyclists). Doesn't this look like the way the intersection should look and function? It does to me. Great job and a shout out to the Task Force for continuing to work toward the best solution! 10.5 has my vote! (but wait, I couldn't vote for it here on Survey Monkey - I hope somebody is reading this.)

County Survey Comment: by Chris Jones

I think the community task force has worked hard and represented the regions and stakeholders of the community well. They came up with an alternate design they call "10.5a". 10.5a is full of very thoughtful and safety-promoting design features. I really like the traffic calming that the curb/plantings aesthetic creates. I like not having to go diagonally through an intersection where I'm halfway thru the intersection when it turns red (shorter, orthogonal intersections). I like shorter crosswalks with great visibility of the pedestrians (mothers with walkers, children going to school, and me and my family and friends). I like the ability of residents to safely pull out of their driveways into a buffer lane without fear of getting t-boned by a motorist in a hurry. I like not having high-speed (large radius) turns to get people to slow down. I like having traffic lights pointing at the correct lanes (not having to guess which light is mine since the County has a hard time pointing and shrouding the lights to limit visibility to only the intended drivers and cyclists). Doesn't this look like the way the intersection should look and function? It does to me. Great job and a shout out to the Task Force for continuing to work toward the best solution! 10.5 has my vote! (but wait, I couldn't vote for it here on Survey Monkey - I hope somebody is reading this.)

County Survey Comment: by Dakota S.

I am most confident in the safety of the community proposal 10.5 which will physically and naturally reduce the speed of travel through the intersection, which would otherwise remain unresolved.

Comments pertaining to the Short Term Safety Changes at Y (Safety Trial at Y)

Our community, with the help of Mike Callagy and Don Horsley, manage to get a near term action in the Summer of 2019 to address a very dangerous design issue at the Y intersection. This was an outstanding success and greatly improved safety for everyone. This is a good example for the importance of implementing, as soon as possible, other low cost and near term (low hanging fruit) actions to achieve major safety for our community as.

Safety Improvements Have Been a Big Success. More is Needed. by Campo Bello Neighbor

The safety improvements that have just been tested at the Santa Cruz Avenue / Alameda de las Pulgas intersection have had a very positive effect.

As a resident of Campo Bello Lane, I have particularly noticed how the changes have sharply reduced the incidence of drivers running through the red light to turn right on northbound Santa Cruz Avenue as I am trying to cross out of Campo Bello to head that way. I feel much safer as a driver, and much safer using that crosswalk as a pedestrian, since I am no longer hidden by up to three lanes of stopped cars while a driver continues at full speed in the old right hand turn lane.

While stopped at the bottom of Campo Bello, I have noticed that cars exiting the Santa Cruz Avenue driveways into the intersection or near it, now have a much easier time getting out, since the light provides a break in the northbound traffic. This has also made it easier to turn left into or out of Oakdell Drive where it meets Santa Cruz Avenue.

The lower speed limit on Santa Cruz Avenue and on Alameda, when combined with the flashing speed signs and the intersection improvements, have made some headway in reducing the speeding on these streets. There are still drivers though who are determined to ignore the limits.

I encourage you to make the intersection safety improvements permanent. I also encourage you to add the following elements:

1. Add green painted bike lanes (with appropriate dashes through the intersection) for bikes continuing northbound on Santa Cruz Avenue and for bikes crossing to go northbound on Alameda. The temporary test setup has been too confusing for bicyclists and drivers, squeezing them too close together.
2. Reduce the stretch of Alameda between Santa Cruz Avenue and Avy Avenue to a single traffic lane in each direction. This will give you room to install real sidewalks on both sides of the Alameda and to have dedicated bike lanes in both directions, while retaining on-street parking. This will be a huge safety improvement for the school children walking and biking to La Entrada and for pedestrians and bicycle commuters through this corridor.

Much Safer Now by J.E. Jakubson

As a resident of Sunrise Court (off of Campo Bello), I feel MUCH SAFER with the new configuration. When there was a dedicated turn lane going towards downtown Menlo Park, a large number of motorists ignored the "No Turn On Red" sign and blasted through the intersection as if there was no traffic light, making it dangerous for us to exit Campo Bello onto NB Santa Cruz when we have a green light. The new configuration, even though there is still a dedicated turn lane, seems to have made motorists aware of both the traffic light and the No Turn on Red signs.

New safer configuration works! by S. Upadhyay

As a resident on a Santa Cruz Ave the new safer configuration is better. My children can cross Santa Cruz Ave at the cross walk with less difficulty.

We are able to get out of our driveway with out fear of our lives! There is more room for improvement, however we are moving in the right direction with the current new turning lane. Do not return to the old configuration please!

Working great so far by CC

I think the change of making the intersection a three-way signal (or is it four) has been working great so far. I haven't heard screeching cars or heard any fender benders. I can get out of my driveway pretty easily. We can time getting out and do not have to worry that a car will come across the intersection or change lanes and drive through the red light.

Anyway, the only problem that I have seen so far has been people running the light because they were already into the intersection when it turns red (probably driving faster than the speed limit.) The green light coming from the other direction needs to be delayed a bit so all cars can get through the intersection before the next direction starts going.

Thank you - Tremendous traffic improvement by Sheila Jun

A Huge Thank you getting rid of 3rd inner lane had worked tremendously in traffic improvement.

From: Roberta J Morris [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2020 5:51 PM
To: Dave Pine; Carole Groom; Don Horsley; Warren Slocum; David Canepa
Cc: Michael Callagy; Jim Porter; Joseph Lococo; CMO_BoardFeedback; safety@univpark.org
Subject: Safety Along Santa Cruz Avenue

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear Supervisors:

I am happy to see that the Board of Supervisors will take up the funding of safety improvements for Santa Cruz Avenue in the University Heights neighborhood of Menlo Park. Spending on improved safety benefits everyone.

I am, however, dismayed at how the design in some ways will create more danger, not less.

I appreciate that it is not your intention to reduce the safety of people on foot, on bicycles and in vehicles. (All those categories include school children because the project area includes schools). Yet the current design promises that result.

Please have competent engineers, who are willing to familiarize themselves by personal inspection with the location of this project, review the design and modify it to align it with your good intentions.

Thank you.

Roberta J. Morris
[REDACTED]
Menlo Park, CA 94025

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2020 6:32 PM
To: Don Horsley <dhorsley@smcgov.org>; Michael Callagy <MCallagy@smcgov.org>; safety@univpark.org; CMO_BoardFeedback <boardfeedback@smcgov.org>; Jim Porter <jporter@smcgov.org>; Carole Groom <cgroom@smcgov.org>; Dave Pine <dpine@smcgov.org>; David Canepa <dcanepa@smcgov.org>; Warren Slocum <wslocum@smcgov.org>
Subject: Santa Cruz/Alameda Improvemnt Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear Board of Supervisors:

We write regarding Agenda Item 47 for the Oct. 20 Board of Supervisors meeting -- Santa Cruz Ave. and Alameda de Las Pulgas Improvement Project. We live very near the Santa Cruz / Alameda intersection and travel through it multiple times per day by car, by bike, and on foot. While we support funding of this project and the application to the Transportation Authority for partial funding, we do not believe the project should be implemented until design and safety issues in the plan have been addressed. There needs to be much more time for public input regarding the details of the plan and the need for design changes to reduce safety hazards.

The supporting documents for Agenda Item 47 for the Oct. 20 Board meeting appear to have been posted only ONE DAY before the meeting date. We did not become aware that this important project was up for approval until the afternoon of Oct. 19, and it appears most neighborhood residents (who will be greatly affected by the project) are not yet aware of the consideration of approval by the Board on Oct. 20. There should be broad notification to the Santa Cruz/Alameda neighborhood of how to access the final report on this project, followed by a reasonable time period for the public to express their concerns.

Members of the SantaCruz/Alameda For Everyone (SAFE) organization have pointed out many important safety issues that need to be addressed before the project is implemented.

Please hold off on approving implementation of this project until there has been significant time for public input and until serious safety issues have been addressed.

Sincerely,

Jim and Kathy Lockhart
[REDACTED] Menlo Park

From: Susan Russell [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2020 7:42 PM
To: Don Horsley; Michael Callagy; +safety@univpark.org; CMO_BoardFeedback; Jim Porter; Carole Groom; Dave Pine; David Canepa; Warren Slocum
Subject: Please approve Santa Cruz/Alameda Safety Plan funding, with needed corrections

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear gentlepersons,

I urge the San Mateo County supervisors to approve the funding for the Santa Cruz/Alameda Safety project (agenda item 20-825).

However, changes recommended by the community--based on a great deal of research and input--have not been included, which I believe is a BIG mistake. Specifically:

- Parts of the designs for Liberty Park/Alameda and Y intersections are unsafe and need to be eliminated.
- The northern Santa Cruz segment starting at the Y intersection **MUST** be included. It has a high car-traffic flow, a high accident rate, and a major school crossing!

I travel these streets multiple times a week. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Susan H. Russell

[REDACTED]
Menlo Park

From: Karen Poza [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2020 6:41 AM
To: Sukhmani Purewal; Sherry Golestan
Cc: Don Horsley; Michael Callagy; safety@univpark.org; Cboardfeedback@smcgov.org; Jim Porter; Carole Groom; Dave Pine; David Canepa; Warren Slocum
Subject: Board of Supervisors Decision on Santa Cruz/Alameda Safety.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

San Mateo County Board of Supervisors:

I have been unaware of the details of this issue and all the planning involved, but now that I've received some information about the nature of the planning and viewed some documents and drawings of planned changes, I would like to say that many of the proposed measures by the county seem poorly planned compared to those proposed by the community, especially at the Santa Cruz Alameda Y intersection. It's already a confusing and unsafe intersection and the resident proposal looks much safer and less confusing for motorists than the county proposal.

PLEASE carefully consider the situation - the county plan actually looks awful! It sounds like the planning has not really been done from the perspective of community/resident safety and ease of use. Please don't spend this money on creating a substandard or worse situation than what we have, and seriously consider community input.

Thank you,
Karen Poza

From: cconui [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2020 11:56 PM
To: Don Horsley; Michael Callagy; safety@univpark.org; CMO_BoardFeedback; Jim Porter; Carole Groom; Dave Pine; David Canepa; Warren Slocum
Subject: Please approve Santa Cruz/Alameda Safety Plan funding, with needed corrections

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Hello Board of Supervisors,

I request County Supervisors approve the funding for agenda item 20-825, the SantaCruz/Alameda Safety project.

I would also request additional changes to the plan to eliminate some dangerous and unsafe designs at the Y intersection and other portions of the area. Also, please require the inclusion of the northern Santa Cruz segment that starts at the Y intersection- 1/2 of the 20,000 car traffic flows on this exculded segment and has a major school crossing and a high accident rate.

I would like consideration for the residents that live in the Y. To provide equal access to easily enter and exit our property while giving us clear line of site for safety. Any improvements should improve access, property values and safety for residents, pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.

Thank you,
Charmaine & John
[REDACTED] Santa Cruz Avenue

Sent from my iPad

From: Patricia Foster [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2020 7:53 AM
To: CMO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Extreme a Wildfire Danger

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The recent wildfire in San Bruno, involving a grove of Eucalyptus trees, is another stark reminder of the danger our communities are facing from the possibility of a catastrophic wildfire. The fact that Eucalyptus trees must be removed is not disputed. Pacifica and Half Moon Bay encourage their removal by eliminating the need for a permit to remove them. San Mateo County needs to do the same. This would enable private property owners to create defensible space around their homes without having to apply for an extremely costly, and almost impossible to get, tree removal permit. Replanting with suitable trees should be required. I think San Mateo County could be facing substantial liability issues by not allowing their property owners the same opportunity to protect their own, and possibly neighboring properties, as adjoining communities have done. It makes a lot more sense to waive these fees and restrictions now rather than have to reimburse people tens of thousands of dollars in tax credits after they have suffered substantial losses, as San Mateo County is now doing. This is something that could be done quickly while other more complex issues are sorted out.

Respectfully,

Patricia Foster
El Granada Resident

Sent from my iPad

From: Ron Snow [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2020 11:47 AM
To: Don Horsley; Michael Callagy; safety@univpark.org; CMO_BoardFeedback; Jim Porter; Carole Groom; Dave Pine; David Canepa; Warren Slocum
Cc: Ron Snow
Subject: Agenda Item 47 (20-825) -- Public Comment in funding support of the Santa Cruz/Alameda Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Honorable Supervisors and County Manager Mike Callagy

I am speaking in support of your taking action to approve the funding for the Santa Cruz/Alameda Corridor project. This corridor has terrible safety issues that need to be addressed. Pedestrians consisting mainly of families, school age children, and seniors are currently directed to walk in the roadway because of a lack of maintenance on our sidewalks and pathways. Our crosswalks are dangerous. Speeding is a major problem. Residents are not able to safely exit or enter their properties. You may have viewed the YouTube videos that document these issues.

Your funding of this traffic safety project is essential to protect lives and property. We already have a history of death, injuries, and major property damage from speeding cars crashing into peoples property and homes.

Our community, our SAFE committee, and the Task Force of County, City, and our Community members have invested thousands of hours over these past 4 years on this Safety Plan. The high level goals of this plan will calm traffic, finally provide ADA sidewalks and other critical pedestrian safety. It will deliver the county transportation goal of installing buffered bike lanes, and thus fill a major hole in the county transportation cycling map. The Plan will address the extreme safety issues faced by residents to safely park and access their homes. A huge majority of our community and commuters agree and support this plan's goals.

There are however, **serious flaws in certain design details** that need to be addressed. These design flaws create dangerous areas in the roadway that greatly increase risk of accidents and injuries. The design details ignore or avoid critical safety issues. These major problems are primarily a result of the poor and substandard work product that the engineering firm Kimley Horn continues to deliver.

Please **stop using Kimley Horn** and instead use another contractor to continue and finish this project.

A **key point**, in the class of 'the elephant in the room', is that this Plan arbitrarily excludes the County portion of Santa Cruz avenue north of the Y intersection. This segment services 1/2 of the 20,000 vehicles/day traffic. It has a high accident rate and hosts a major school crossing. Please include this section of Santa Cruz so we have a complete Safety Plan - The SAFE committee and Task Force have defined several safety actions for this section. Don't disenfranchise those in our community that need safety help and host half of the traffic in this busy corridor.

Lastly, as our community most recently brought up in August, there are several low cost safety actions that would make a major safety improvement in the short term, and should not wait for additional months and years for the full plan. I believe Don Horsley has committed to supporting these short term safety actions, like the **improvements to Palo Alto way crosswalk**. This safety action needs to be implemented now. The whole community looks forward to immediate progress on these short term/low cost actions. It is are expectation that

now that this plan has been presented to the Board, that the Palo Alto Crosswalk improvements, a very low cost item, will now occur.

Thank you for your considerations and the funding for this project.

Ron

\\ \\

Ron Snow

SantaCruz/Alameda For Everyone (SAFE)

Menlo Park, CA