

HOOVER AREA CONNECTION: LINKING FOR YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD

hoover area community mobility plan

FEBRUARY 2009

PREPARED FOR:
Redevelopment Agency of Redwood City

PREPARED BY:



Fehr & Peers

acknowledgments

This plan would not have been possible without the dedicated support of the following individuals:

Redevelopment Agency of Redwood City

Jeannie Young, Redevelopment Project Manager
Patricia Webb, Redevelopment, Housing, and Economic Development Manager
Mary Jean Robles, Housing Specialist

Caltrans

Emmanuel Mekwunye, Project Manager

City of Redwood City

Alicia Aguirre, City Councilmember
Peter Ingram, City Manager
Magda Gonzalez, Assistant City Manager

Community Development Services Department

Chu Chang, Acting Community Development Director
Peter Vorametsanti, Supervising Civil Engineer
Peter Delgado, Associate Engineer
Jill Ekas, Planning Manager
Blake Lyon, Senior Planning/Zoning Administrator
Susan Wheeler, Management Analyst II

Parks and Recreation Services Department

Teri Chin, Human Services Manager
Jodi Fernandez, Recreation Supervisor

Public Works Department

Marilyn Harang, Public Works Superintendent
Dave Larson, Public Works Supervisor

Police Department

Officer Jamie Mateo

Hoover School

Beatriz Rodriguez, Community School Coordinator
Amanda Neborsky, Principal
Greg Land, Past Principal

Boys and Girls Club

Dalila Amezcua, Social Education Director
Amal Aziz, Assistant Teen Director
Michael Jones, Unit Director

San José Obrero Church

Father Fabio Medina
Father James Garcia, Past Leader

Fair Oaks Senior Center

Zena Bigileos, Coordinator

Redwood Village Neighborhood Association

Keith Daum, Chairperson

Stambaugh-Heller Neighborhood Association

Maria Diaz Vivian, Chairperson

SamTrans

Marisa Espinosa, Manager, Planning and Research

Peninsula Conflict Resolution Center

Shauna Wilson, Manager of Facilitation Programs

County of San Mateo

Michael Costa, Legislative Aide to District 4
Sylvia Nunez, Past Legislative Aide to District 4

Redwood City Bicycle and Pedestrian Group

Multicultural Institute

Redwood City Day Worker Program

Cesar Meza-Esveile, Director

Consultant Team

Diana Sherman, Project Manager, MIG
Colin Burgett, Transportation Analyst, Fehr & Peers
Maria Landoni de Rose, Urban Designer, MIG
Patricia Algara, Outreach Specialist, MIG

Special thanks to the many residents and community members who participated in the meetings and workshops.

table of contents

executive summary	i	4: opportunities and needs	25
Community Outreach Process	i	Key Assets and Challenges	25
Existing Conditions	ii	Major Community Needs	28
Key Community Needs	ii	Crossing Woodside Road	28
Potential Mobility Solutions	iii	Crossing Middlefield Road	34
Next Steps	v	Crossing the Railroad Tracks	35
		Collision Locations	35
		Bicycles	37
		Public Transit	38
		Additional Needs	38
1: introduction	1	5: potential mobility solutions	39
About the Hoover Area	1	Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design	39
About the Study	1	Bicycling Improvements	40
About the Report	2	Walking Improvements	40
		Public Transit Improvements	42
		Location-Specific Improvements	43
2: community outreach process	3	6: funding and implementation	61
Outreach and Marketing	4	Implementation Steps	61
Workshop Process	4	Cost Estimates	61
Community Survey	9	Funding Priorities	62
Role of Outreach Results	10	Funding Opportunities	63
		Potential Funding Sources	65
3: existing conditions	11		
Roadway Network	11		
Walking in the Community	17		
Bicycling in the Community	18		
Access to Public Transit	20		

list of tables and figures

Figures

Figure 1-1: Map of Project Study Area	2	Figure 5-5: Woodside Road at Middlefield Road— Illustration of Potential Improvements	49
Figure 3-1: Key Roadways	12	Figure 5-6: Middlefield Road—Potential Improvements	51
Figure 3-2: Pedestrian Network	16	Figure 5-7: Charter and Stambaugh Streets—Potential Improvements	53
Figure 3-3: Bikeways	19	Figure 5-8: Charter Street at Stambaugh Street— Illustration of Existing Conditions	54
Figure 3-4: Public Transit	21	Figure 5-9: Charter Street at Stambaugh Street— Illustration of Potential Improvements	55
Figure 4-1: Community-Identified Issues and Opportunities	26	Figure 5-10: Chestnut Street—Potential Improvements	57
Figure 4-2: Community’s Improvement Wish List	27	Figure 5-11: Chestnut Street at Middlefield Road— Illustration of Existing Conditions	58
Figure 4-3: Woodside Road Crossing—Walking Distances and Traffic Volumes	29	Figure 5-12: Chestnut Street at Middlefield Road— Illustration of Potential Improvements	59
Figure 4-4: Middlefield Road—Distance Between Marked Crosswalks	32		
Figure 4-5: Collision Locations	36		
Figure 5-1: Identified Improvement Areas	41		
Figure 5-2: Woodside Road—Potential Improvements	44		
Figure 5-3: Woodside Road Crossing—Potential Pedestrian Crossing Improvements	47		
Figure 5-4: Woodside Road at Middlefield Road— Illustration of Existing Conditions	48		

Tables

Table 4-A: Travel Mode Split for Woodside Crossing (Through Movements via Middlefield and Stambaugh)	31
Table 4-B: Level of Service (LOS) Criteria— Signalized Intersection	34
Table 4-C: Existing and Future Level of Service (LOS)— Woodside and Middlefield Road Intersection	35