ADLP and Santa Cruz Ave
Safety Improvements – Conceptual Changes

Community Meeting
January 30, 2020
General Introduction

Jim Porter, San Mateo County Public Works Director
Joseph LoCoco, San Mateo County Public Works Deputy Director – Road Services
Meeting Introduction
Who are the Task Force?

Task Force Members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda de las Pulgas</td>
<td>Hillary Stevenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclist with Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition</td>
<td>John Langbein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>John Loughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to Schools</td>
<td>Jen Wolosin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz from Sandhill Rd to Y</td>
<td>Cheryl Phan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Y</td>
<td>Molly Glennen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclist with Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition</td>
<td>Bill Kirsch (substitute for John Langbein)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member at large - University Park Inner</td>
<td>Ron Snow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Commons</td>
<td>Gwen Leonard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park resident</td>
<td>Troy Hayes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorists</td>
<td>Janet Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHP</td>
<td>Jason Ivey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHP</td>
<td>Chris Barshini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHP</td>
<td>Anthony Ruiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Works</td>
<td>Diana Shu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Works</td>
<td>Joe LoCoco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Works</td>
<td>Jim Porter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Works</td>
<td>Harry Yip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Works</td>
<td>Hanieh Houshmandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Fire District</td>
<td>Harold Schapelhorman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Fire District</td>
<td>Tom Calvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Fire District</td>
<td>Virginia Chang Kiraly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Fire District</td>
<td>Jon Johnston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park Police Department</td>
<td>William Dixon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park, Department of Public Works</td>
<td>Kevin Chen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>Chad Buck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Horsley's Office</td>
<td>Don Horsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Horsley's Office</td>
<td>Jazzalyn Lamadora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Horsley's Office</td>
<td>Carrie Dallman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy County Manager</td>
<td>Iliana Rodriguez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Meeting Agenda:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Presenter/Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 PM</td>
<td>General introduction</td>
<td>Jim Porter/Joe Lococo – County DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logistics of Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:05 PM</td>
<td>Task Force Collaboration and Previous Survey Results</td>
<td>John Loughlin – Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:20 PM</td>
<td>Presentation of Technical Alternatives</td>
<td>Adam Dankberg - Kimley Horn Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:50 PM</td>
<td>Breakout Session</td>
<td>Joe Lococo – County DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hands-on viewing of exhibits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Video simulations of alternatives on screen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Write down comment cards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:10 PM</td>
<td>Question and Answer Session</td>
<td>Joe Lococo – County DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adam Dankberg - Kimley Horn Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:50 PM</td>
<td>Closing</td>
<td>Joe Lococo – County DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Next Steps:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Anticipated milestones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting Logistics

Questions and Comments

- Questions and comments will be addressed in Q&A session
- All comments shall be made on comment card and placed in respective colored box

Preferences Survey

- Request your feedback through online survey
Task Force Collaboration and Previous Survey Results

John Loughlin, taskforce member & resident living on Santa Cruz Ave
Community Involvement Drives The Task Force

 AssertionError First Community Meeting Aug 2017: Significant Interest & Some Concern
  ○ Interest: strong desire for improved safety, but many options & constituencies
  ○ Concern: how to make complex tradeoffs clear & explicit; and, who decides?

Assertion SMC Task Force (Since Fall 2017): Open to, populated, and driven by residents, cyclists, motorists, pedestrians, Safe Routes to School Representatives. Also supported by MP Police, MP Fire, County DPW, & Board of Supervisors.

Assertion A powerful community forum for identifying the issues & opportunities, examining the options and arriving at the explicit benefits and tradeoffs…. All driving to this session to report back and gather another round of Community feedback
Understanding Community Priorities: the Survey

- Extensive survey formulated by full Task Force
- Community participation solicited via email, post-cards, social media, mail lists, electronic message boards, newspaper & door-to-door
- Survey conducted on-line from Sept 1 to Sept 23, 2018
- 701 Respondents

**WHO MAKES UP THE 701 RESPONDENTS?**

- Residents: 40%
- Users/Non-residents: 27%
- Commuters (motorists, cyclists): 32%
- Don’t use corridor: 1%
Major Findings of the Survey

- The vast majority of all respondents (residents, commuters and non-resident users) wanted **safety improvements** along the corridor.

- Respondents consistently ranked “**Safer flow of traffic**” as an improvement most important to them.

- Within each respondent group, almost all were willing to **reduce a travel lane in exchange for improved safety**.

- However, **specific priorities and tradeoffs varied by respondent group**.
All Respondents Want Safety Improvements

Respondents not satisfied with current conditions and desire changes to make all modes of travel safer.

“Maintain the current speed and flow of traffic even if it means minimal safety improvements.” (Q12a)

Respondents ranked “Safer flow of traffic” as the improvement most important to them (Q13).
All Respondents Want Safety Improvements Commuters

Respondents not satisfied with current conditions and desire changes to make all modes of travel safer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Improvement</th>
<th>Most</th>
<th>Least</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safer Flow of Traffic</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of Bike Lanes</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Pedestrian Crossing</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Sidewalks</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residents expressed strong preferences for pedestrian enhancements, safer traffic flow and improved sidewalks.
Residents consistently willing to reduce a traffic travel lane to achieve safety objectives

% Residents who agree with change

- Speed vs Safety: 67% agree, 33% disagree
- Ped Xing vs Travel Ln: 69% agree, 31% disagree
- Bike Safety vs Travel Ln: 62% agree, 38% disagree
- Sidewalk vs Travel Ln: 64% agree, 36% disagree
- Sidewalk vs No Bike Ln: 53% agree, 47% disagree
- Bike Ln vs No Sidewalks: 71% agree, 29% disagree
- Bike Ln vs Less Travel Ln: 53% agree, 47% disagree
Non-Residents and Commuters - Results

- When asked to trade-off competing improvements to account for existing roadway boundaries, both groups prioritized bike lanes over all other enhancements. (Q12)
The Challenge & Next Steps

- A clear expression of priorities for improved safety across all constituencies, although priorities differed by group.

- A fixed width of roadway and an inability to accommodate ALL of the desired improvements without removing one or more traffic lanes.

- The Task Force has spent 18 months distilling the options to FOUR, including “doing nothing”. These options will shortly be presented and explained by DPW and their expert consultants.

- As a Task Force, we want you to understand and study these options and then provide us with your preferences for next steps and action.
Presentation of Technical Alternatives

Adam Dankberg, Kimley Horn Associates
Technical Presentation Agenda

- Alameda de las Pulgas Section Concept
  - 1 Road Diet Alternative
- Santa Cruz Avenue Section Concepts
  - 3 Configuration Alternatives
- Y Intersection Concepts
  - 3 Configuration Alternatives
- Traffic Operations Analysis
  - Travel times, Queuing, Signal Phasing
Corridor Design Alternatives

Y Intersection
(ADLP/Santa Cruz Ave/Campo Bello Ln)

Alameda de las Pulgas
(Avy Ave to Santa Cruz Ave)

Santa Cruz Ave
(Alameda de las Pulgas to Sand Hill Road)
ADLP- Avy to Santa Cruz – Existing

Between Sharon Road and Prospect Street
ADLP- Avy to Santa Cruz – Existing

Between Sharon Road and Prospect Street Looking Towards Avy Avenue
ADLP- Avy to Santa Cruz – Road Diet

Between Sharon Road and Prospect Street
ADLP- Avy to Santa Cruz – Road Diet

Between Sharon Road and Prospect Street Looking Towards Avy Avenue
Santa Cruz – ADLP to Sand Hill Road – Existing

Between Oak Hollow Way and Palo Alto Way

Sand Hill Road

Avy Avenue
Santa Cruz – ADLP to Sand Hill Road – Existing

Between Oak Hollow and Palo Alto
Looking towards Alameda de Las Pulgas
Santa Cruz – ADLP to Sand Hill Road – Alt A

Btw Oak Hollow & Palo Alto (Alt A)

Between Oak Hollow and Palo Alto
Looking towards Alameda de Las Pulgas
Santa Cruz – ADLP to Sand Hill Road – Alt B

Between Oak Hollow Way and Palo Alto Way
Santa Cruz – ADLP to Sand Hill Road – Alt B

Between Oak Hollow and Palo Alto
Looking towards Alameda de Las Pulgas
Santa Cruz – ADLP to Sand Hill Road – Alt C

Between Oak Hollow Way and Palo Alto Way
Santa Cruz – ADLP to Sand Hill Road – Alt C

Between Oak Hollow and Palo Alto
Looking towards Alameda de Las Pulgas
Santa Cruz & ADLP “Y” Intersection – 2018 Conditions
Santa Cruz & ADLP “Y” Intersection – Alt A

Sand Hill Road

Avy Avenue
Santa Cruz & ADLP “Y” Intersection – Alt A

Santa Cruz Looking towards the “Y” from Sand Hill Road
Santa Cruz & ADLP “Y” Intersection – Alt B
Santa Cruz Looking towards the “Y” from Sand Hill Road
Santa Cruz & ADLP “Y” Intersection – Alt C

Santa Cruz Looking towards the “Y” from Sand Hill Road
“Y” Intersection – Right Turn Signal to Downtown Menlo Park

- Current Phase Plan (No Right Turn On Red)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Right Turn towards Downtown Menlo Park</th>
<th>Right Turn OK</th>
<th>No Right Turn</th>
<th>No Right Turn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
“Y” Intersection – Right Turn Signal to Downtown Menlo Park

- Phasing Plan 1 - No Right Turn on Red with new crosswalk

| Right Turn towards Downtown Menlo Park | No Right Turn | No Right Turn | Right Turn OK |
“Y” Intersection – Right Turn Signal to Downtown Menlo Park

- Phasing Plan 2 - Previous (2018)
“Y” Intersection – Right Turn Signal to Downtown Menlo Park

- Phasing Plan 3 - Right Turn on Red OK after Complete Stop if Clear

| Right Turn towards Downtown Menlo Park | Right Turn OK | Right Turn after Complete Stop if Clear | Right Turn after Complete Stop if Clear |
### Travel Time Forecast (Existing Volumes)

Forecast Average Travel Time - 5:00 PM to 6:00 PM (Existing Volumes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Time Route</th>
<th>No Build (min:sec)</th>
<th>Alt A</th>
<th>Alt B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Santa Cruz Ave NB*</td>
<td>01:30</td>
<td>+ 2 seconds</td>
<td>+ 2 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Santa Cruz Ave SB*</td>
<td>02:45</td>
<td>- 17 seconds</td>
<td>+ 38 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Alameda de las Pulgas NB**</td>
<td>02:17</td>
<td>+ 24 seconds</td>
<td>+ 9 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Alameda de las Pulgas SB**</td>
<td>02:41</td>
<td>+ 17 seconds</td>
<td>+ 51 seconds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Santa Cruz Ave travel time is from the intersection of Sand Hill Rd/Santa Cruz Ave to the intersection of Sharon Rd/Santa Cruz Ave

**Alameda de las Pulgas travel time is from the intersection of Sand Hill Rd/Santa Cruz Ave to the intersection of Avy Ave/Alameda de las Pulgas
### Travel Time Forecast (2030 Projected Volumes)

#### Forecast Average Travel Time - 5:00 PM to 6:00 PM (2030 Volumes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Time Route</th>
<th>No Build (min:sec)</th>
<th>Alt A</th>
<th>Alt B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Santa Cruz Ave NB*</td>
<td>01:30</td>
<td>+ 1 second</td>
<td>+ 3 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Santa Cruz Ave SB*</td>
<td>02:50</td>
<td>- 18 seconds</td>
<td>+ 145 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Alameda de las Pulgas NB**</td>
<td>02:31</td>
<td>+ 15 seconds</td>
<td>- 5 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Alameda de las Pulgas SB**</td>
<td>02:40</td>
<td>+ 19 seconds</td>
<td>+ 112 seconds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Santa Cruz Ave travel time is from the intersection of Sand Hill Rd/Santa Cruz Ave to the intersection of Sharon Rd/Santa Cruz Ave

**Alameda de las Pulgas travel time is from the intersection of Sand Hill Rd/Santa Cruz Ave to the intersection of Avy Ave/Alameda de las Pulgas

Alternative C would operate similar to Alternative A in the northbound direction and Alternative B in the southbound direction.
Queuing Forecast (Existing Volumes)

PM Average Queues (Existing Volumes) – Sand Hill Rd/Santa Cruz Ave

Legend:
- Existing Q
- Alt A Q
- Alt B Q
Queuing Forecast (2030 Volumes)

PM Average Queues (2030 Volumes) – Sand Hill Rd/Santa Cruz Ave

Legend:

- Baseline Q
- Alt A Q
- Alt B Q

Note: Queues extend beyond limits of the model along Alpine Road in Baseline and with Alternatives A and B.
Queuing Forecast (Existing Volumes)

Note: Existing reflects signal phasing and lane geometry at the Y as of 2018.
Queuing Forecast (2030 Volumes)

PM Average Queues (2030 Volumes) – Y Intersection

Legend:

- Baseline Q
- Alt A Q
- Alt B Q

Note: Baseline reflects signal phasing and lane geometry at the Y as of 2018.
Travel Time Forecast
No Right Turn on Red at the Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Time Route</th>
<th>Alt A</th>
<th>Alt A with No Turn on Red</th>
<th>2030 with Alt B</th>
<th>Alt B with No Turn on Red</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Santa Cruz Ave NB*</td>
<td>01:31</td>
<td>+ 14 seconds</td>
<td>01:33</td>
<td>+ 11 seconds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Santa Cruz Ave travel time is from the intersection of Sand Hill Rd/Santa Cruz Ave to the intersection of Sharon Rd/Santa Cruz Ave
Queuing Forecast (2030 Volumes)
No Right Turn on Red at the Y

ALT A - PM Average Queues for Northbound Right – Y Intersection

Legend:
Baseline
Alt A Q
Alt A Q with NTOR

ALT B - PM Average Queues for Northbound Right – Y Intersection

Legend:
Baseline
Alt B Q
Alt B Q with NTOR
Additional Information

- Full Conceptual Layouts for all Alternatives
- Micro-simulation Model for Alternatives A and B (Existing Volumes)
Questions and Answers

- Please fill out Q&A card for any questions to the Task Force
Breakout Session

Joseph LoCoco – San Mateo County Public Works Deputy Director – Roads Services
Next Steps

Joseph LoCoco – San Mateo County Public Works Deputy Director – Roads Services
Community Survey – Alternative Preferences

• Survey will be posted online at https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/SCA_ADLP by end of the day on January 31, 2020

• Survey will be closed on February 23, 2020
Next Steps

• Collect community feedback on alternative preferences………………………………........FEB 23, 2020
• Reconvene and review with Task Force........ MAR 2020
• Prepare Final Report........................................APR 2020
• Request Board adoption of plan..................JUNE 2020