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I Introduction

1.1 Project Overview

In 2016, Redwood City initiated the Redwood City El Camino Real Corridor Plan study. The El Camino Real Corridor Plan provides an exciting opportunity for community members to engage in dialogue about El Camino Real’s future and consider its potential to be transformed into a “Grand Boulevard” that supports housing, economic development, transit, walking, and bicycling. The Plan will serve as a key implementation tool to guide future development and improvements. It will establish a strong policy framework and implementation strategies to realize this vision. For more information on the El Camino Corridor Plan process, please visit: http://www.redwoodcity.org/elcaminoplan.
A variety of outreach activities are underway or have been completed, which provide community members the opportunity to share their values and priorities for the project. Thus far, the outreach has included stakeholder interviews, four Citizens Advisory Group meetings, two community workshops, an online survey focusing on transportation within and near the Corridor, and development of the El Camino Real Corridor Plan website.

Concurrent with the community engagement process and to inform the development of the Corridor Plan, the consultant team prepared existing conditions reports documenting the current conditions with respect to land use, public realm, transportation, and the real estate market. This background research was discussed in the first community workshop, held in November 2016. The workshop focused on providing information about the study and the Study Area’s existing conditions, eliciting community members’ experiences of El Camino Real, and generating comments on key planning issues, such as how the roadway should be shared among different users and what community benefits the Plan should incentivize and/or require. The report summarizing the workshop and feedback received during it can be found here.

Recently, the team prepared a Concepts and Options report that discusses potential considerations to address key issues raised to date. These include considerations and options for accommodating bicyclists in the Corridor, enhancing pedestrian safety and comfort while walking along and crossing El Camino Real, managing vehicular traffic and parking, and fostering centers of activity (referred to in this Report as “activity centers”) and economic development along El Camino Real. The second community workshop was designed to prompt feedback and discussion on key concepts and options for the Corridor. This Report discusses the format and organization of the second community workshop and the feedback elicited at it.

### 1.2 Workshop Format and Organization

This report describes the process and results of the second community workshop conducted for the Redwood City El Camino Real Corridor Plan process. The workshop was held on March 1, 2017 from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m. at City Hall.

The workshop was designed to engage the attention, interest, and active involvement of a broad spectrum of Redwood City community members and provide opportunities for discussion and engagement. The workshop focused on reviewing the objectives of the Corridor Plan project, introducing concepts and options with respect to activity centers and the streetscape, and generating feedback. This will serve as a valuable resource to guide City staff, the Planning Commission, City Council, the consultant team, and others, as choices are further refined and implementation strategies are formulated.
Approximately 20 to 25 community members attended the workshop and were dispersed among five tables. City staff and the consultant team also attended as observers and facilitators. The workshop organization and roundtable discussions are summarized below.

WELCOME AND BACKGROUND

The workshop began with a welcome from Redwood City Senior Planner and Project Manager Lindy Chan. Consulting planner Sophie Martin, AICP followed with a presentation on the project’s purpose and process, activity center concepts, and options and tradeoffs with regards to roadway and public realm improvements, specifically with respect to bicycle lanes, parking, and pedestrian comfort and safety. The slides from the presentation are included in Appendix A.

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION

Following the presentation, participants were divided into small groups based on the number written on each participant’s name tag. This was done to encourage participants to engage with community members they may not know and with whom they may not share the same concerns or perspective.

Participants at each table were given time to consider and talk through prompts relating to five key components of the El Camino Real Corridor Plan. These five components were selected from the priorities identified by the Citizens Advisory Group, and are:

1. Bicycles
2. On-Street Parking
3. Activity Centers
4. Pedestrian Comfort and Safety
5. Identity and Branding

The purpose of these prompts, which may be found in Appendix A as well as in Chapter 3 of this Report, was to encourage participants to prioritize specific streetscape components, think about the distribution or centralization of
activity centers, and determine whether it was important to attribute a unique identity to the Corridor. Each table was also given a set of handouts to help visualize different options and a large table map of the Study Area. These tabletop materials are provided in Appendix B.

A member of City staff or the consultant team facilitated discussion at each table and recorded feedback on flip charts. Participants were also encouraged to provide feedback by writing and drawing on the tabletop materials. Summaries of each group’s flip charts and feedback written on the tabletop maps are included in Appendix C.

Twice, participants were asked to pick a spokesperson to report back to the entire group on their table’s overall preferences. First, a spokesperson from each table reported on preferences and feedback related to bicycles and parking. After further discussion, the spokesperson reported on the preferences related to pedestrian safety and comfort, activity centers, and branding and identity.
1.3 Next Steps

The El Camino Real Corridor Plan team will incorporate the feedback provided in the community workshop, stakeholder interviews, Citizens Advisory Group meetings, and online survey with the research, mapping, and analysis conducted in the Existing Conditions reports and the Concepts and Options report. This will serve as the foundation for the development of policy recommendations, development standards, design guidelines and a public improvement program for the El Camino Real Corridor.

The planning process is expected to be completed by the end of 2017, resulting in an El Camino Corridor Plan and a set of implementation strategies. Public outreach will occur throughout the planning process, giving the community ample opportunity to learn about proposals and provide input at all stages.
2 Executive Summary

The following is a summary of key themes that emerged in the second community workshop. A complete summary of the workshop prompts and results is provided in the next section.

- There is strong support for a Class IV protected bicycle lane, also referred to as a cycle track, along the entirety of El Camino Real within Redwood City.
- Many community members prioritize bike lanes over on-street parking, but are concerned about how the removal of on-street parking will impact local businesses.
- Dispersing multiple activity centers along El Camino Real is greatly preferred to focusing on one activity center near Downtown.
- Enhancing pedestrian facilities and safety is important to many community members; particular areas of improvement are Woodside Road and the intersection of El Camino Real and Whipple Avenue.
- Many community members view the El Camino Real as an unattractive place to walk and would like to see a variety of pedestrian improvements, such as public art and pedestrian-oriented lighting.
- Creating a “sense of place” by developing a unique brand or identity along the Redwood City portion of El Camino Real is seen as a way to improve pedestrian comfort and make walking a more attractive mode of transportation along the Corridor. However, other improvements, such as those focusing on mobility and safety, are seen as higher priorities; improving branding and identity is seen more like “icing on the cake.”
3 Small Group Discussions of Key Options and Tradeoffs

As described in the Introduction, the second community workshop involved small group discussions on five key components of the Corridor Plan. The discussion was designed to encourage participants to weigh different tradeoffs and options. Below, each topic is described and participant feedback is summarized. The summarized notes from each table are included in Appendix C.

3.1 Bicycles

Workshop participants were asked whether they supported the implementation of protected bike lanes, also known as Class IV cycle tracks, on El Camino Real and, if so, what measures should be put in place to ensure safety and mobility, particularly at intersections. Each table was also given handouts showing diagrams of bike lanes with painted buffers (Class II) and cycle tracks (Class IV) and examples of intersection designs for cycle tracks.

Participants supported bike lanes along El Camino Real and were provided examples of Class II painted bike lanes (left) and Class IV protected cycle tracks (right).

Most participants were in favor of physically protected bike lanes along El Camino in order to provide a safe, usable facility for cyclists of all ages and skillsets and to make destinations along El Camino Real more convenient for customers riding bicycles. Several participants noted that while El Camino Real is not often used by cyclists in its current configuration, that may change if and when cyclists are provided a safe and attractive option.

The majority of participants voiced concern about safety for current bicyclists and shared that unsafe conditions serve as a barrier for potential bicyclists. Some participants noted that certain issues require consideration, specifically how cycle tracks interact with driveways, how loading zones should be treated,
Redwood City El Camino Real Corridor Plan

and how to ensure that any new bike facilities connect to other existing and planned bike routes in Redwood City.

Not all participants expressed support for a cycle track along El Camino Real. Participants at Table 4 shared that a Class II bike lane on El Camino Real or routes that are roughly parallel to El Camino Real would be preferred. Participants reasoned that it is unsafe on El Camino Real, the elimination of on-street parking will be challenging for businesses, and people have the option of taking the bus. Participants at Table 4 also discussed piloting a cycle track to ascertain the impact of a protected bike lane on traffic and parking. They pointed out that a painted lane, involving less permanent infrastructure, would allow the City to “test” accommodating bicycles before committing to a protected cycle track. In a related vein, participants at Table 3 suggested phasing bike facility improvements, although their motivation was to allow the community to experience and use protected bike lanes in the near term.

There was also shared concern regarding intersection safety. Members of Table 2 believed that separating cars and bicycles as much as possible would be safest, and suggested eliminating right vehicle turns at red lights. Participants at Table 3 suggested improving left-turning movements for bicyclists, painting bike lanes green, and increasing the visibility of bicyclists. Participants at Table 5 supported the idea of a bike signal phase, which give bicyclists a green light a few seconds before motorists, if traffic was not too negatively impacted. One community member suggested that well-designed mixing zones, meaning zones that combine bicycle lane and motor vehicle turning lanes, are safer as they do not give cyclists a false sense of security.
3.2 On-Street Parking

Participants were asked to consider the importance of street parking along El Camino Real compared to bike lanes, as well as what locations would be ideal for alternate, off-street parking facilities.

While the majority supported protected bike lanes, there was no consensus on whether on-street parking should remain on El Camino Real. Some participants shared that parallel parking on the street is both challenging and intimidating for drivers and that removing parking would help traffic flow. Others indicated that some businesses rely on convenient parking and could potentially lose customers if it is removed.

In addition, some participants brought up the need to consider drop-off zones for ridesharing vehicles, such as Lyft and Uber. Participants also noted that autonomous vehicles may decrease the need for parking in the future. One community member suggested changing the number of required parking spaces to be based on projected single occupancy vehicle trips per day instead of a fixed ratio based on building square footage.

In regards to alternate parking locations, participants at Table 4 suggested turning the Caltrain surface lot into a parking structure. Table 5 thought that signage indicating where parking is located will be important. Another community member recommended reconfiguring side streets that connect to El Camino Real, particularly between Jackson and Vera Avenues, into one-way streets with additional diagonal parking on both sides of the street. This solution would accommodate some of the lost on-street parking from El Camino Real where there was available right of way on nearby side streets.

3.3 Activity Centers

Participants were asked how many activity centers there should be along El Camino Real and how they should look and feel. The two concepts presented at the workshop are shown below. Concept 1 presented one activity center focusing activity near downtown, between Brewster Avenue and Main Street. Concept 2 showed a series of activity centers spread throughout the Corridor.

Participants expressed overwhelming support for multiple activity centers, or Concept 2. Participants stated that multiple centers would prevent overcrowding, justify bike lanes along the Corridor, and create more of a “neighborhood” feeling, with each center fostering its own unique identity. Participants also expressed concern that having only one activity center along El Camion Real would take away visitors and customers from other areas of El Camino Real.
Concept 1: Focus Activity Near Downtown

Concept 2: Series of Activity Centers
Participants at Table 2 suggested shifting the northern activity center further north from Whipple Avenue to Edgewood Road; participants thought that this would support the businesses already anchored there as well as the adjacent historical neighborhood.

As for how the activity centers should look, members of Table 5 suggested small plazas at each, stating that each center needed interesting elements to encourage people to stay. They recommended places like restaurants, cafes, and book stores, as well as shade and pedestrian-oriented lighting. Other participants agreed, stating that the design of the streets, sidewalks, and ground floor uses should be interesting and inviting. Participants at Table 4 suggested that activity centers should support community gardens and farmers’ markets, and emphasized that activity centers should be geared to community members of all ages. A few community members at Table 1 supported increasing building density in each center to bring energy to the Corridor, but indicated that they did not want buildings to be out of scale with the community. Participants at Table 1 also indicated that in between the activity centers, residential uses should be permitted on the ground floor.

### 3.4 Pedestrian Comfort and Safety

Community members were asked what it would take to make El Camino Real an attractive place to walk. Participants were also asked to use the table maps to mark locations where it was most important to improve the safety and comfort of pedestrians.

Many participants expressed dissatisfaction with the current state of pedestrian safety along El Camino Real. Participants suggested several safety measures, including better pedestrian lighting, midblock crossings, and flashing lights on crosswalks, especially on streets with more than two lanes in each direction. Participants generally expressed a desire for crossing distances to be shorter. A few participants shared that unsignalized crossings did not feel safe. Some community members also did not find the Corridor an attractive place to walk, and recommended wider sidewalks, public art, landscaping, façade improvements, and more interesting destinations to walk to. Some participants noted that they would be willing to walk for about 10 minutes to their destination; however, this was dependent on the quality of the pedestrian realm.

“Spread out: justifies bike lanes on ECR”

“Small plazas at nodes: need interesting things to encourage people to stay”

“Make crossings appealing”

“Safety is important”

“ECR unattractive/unsafe”
There were a few specific locations along El Camino Real where participants noted that pedestrian safety improvements were needed. Many participants expressed concern with Woodside Road. Some participants suggested better lighting in that area; others suggested a well-designed pedestrian bridge there. Participants also identified intersections along El Camino Real with a high rate of pedestrian crossings, including Center Street, James Avenue, Whipple Avenue, and around Sequoia Station, as priority areas for pedestrian improvements.

### 3.5 Identity and Branding

The final prompts were related to Identity and Branding. Community members were asked if they thought it was important for drivers to know when they enter or leave Redwood City on El Camino Real and if the El Camino Real Corridor should express a cohesive brand or identity.

Many participants agreed that they would like to feel a “sense of place” along the Corridor, and supported visual improvements, at the very least, to make El Camino Real a more attractive place for pedestrians. Many participants suggested adding more trees. Some supported façade improvements. Other participants would like better placemaking around the Transit Center. Some participants emphasized the importance of wayfinding; participants stressed the importance of signage directing people to Downtown, the transit center, and Sequoia High School. Participants at Table 4 were the only members to comment on the importance of making it clear for drivers when they enter or leave Redwood City, and suggested gateway signage.
Appendix A: Workshop Power Point Presentation
Welcome!

• Short Presentation
  – Project Overview
  – Key Options and Tradeoffs
• Small Group Discussion
• Report Key Points from Small Groups
• Next Steps

What is a Corridor Plan?

A comprehensive, cohesive document to guide future development and improvements to the El Camino Real Corridor in Redwood City

Key Components:
• Roadway and streetscape improvements to improve mobility, safety, and aesthetics
• Consolidated zoning, development standards, design guidelines to better guide new development
• Community benefits
How will a Corridor Plan Benefit the Community?

- Create a cohesive plan for the Corridor
  - The plan will *not* increase existing height limits or allowable densities/intensities
- Develop strategies to address current development challenges and promote economic development
- Improve the Corridor’s relationship with the Caltrain station, Downtown, and surrounding neighborhoods

How will a Corridor Plan Benefit the Community? (continued)

- Improve the streetscape to promote walking, transit, bicycling, and economic development
- Incorporate community benefits, such as strategies for affordable housing, transitions from the Corridor to the neighborhoods, and public realm improvements
- Create a friendlier place for the people who live and work in the area
- Support small businesses

Study Area

Schedule

**Community Outreach**

- Summer 2016
  - CAG #1
  - Stakeholder Interviews
  - CAG #2
  - Community Workshop #1
  - CAG #3, 3.5
  - Community Workshop #2
  - Planning Commission Update
  - CAG #4
  - Online Survey
  - CAG #5
  - Public Hearings: Planning Commission & City Council

**Technical Work**

- Data Gathering and Technical Analysis
  - Develop and Review Potential Standards and Street Design Options
  - Drafting Corridor Plan
Key Options and Tradeoffs

Sharing Space on the Roadway

- The El Camino Real roadway has two purposes:
  1. Regional thoroughfare
  2. Road to access local homes, businesses, and destinations
- There is limited space to accommodate different uses and priorities
  - Vehicle Travel
  - Street Parking
  - Bicycles
  - Pedestrians
  - Transit

Bicycles

Feedback from Planning Process:
- Support for protected, Class IV bike lanes (i.e., cycle tracks) along entirety of El Camino Real
- Open to removal of on-street parking to make room for bike lanes
- Safety is a primary design concern

Bicycles on El Camino Real

- Advantages
  - Straightforward path for cyclists
  - Potential to increase business at local shops
  - Redwood City would be a leader on the Peninsula
  - Consistent with General Plan and Grand Boulevard Initiative
- Disadvantages
  - Safety is a primary design concern for painted lanes
  - Some cyclists may never feel comfortable biking along El Camino
  - In most instances, on-street parking will need to be removed
Bicycles at Intersections
- Intersections should be designed to reduce conflicts between vehicles and bicycles
- Multiple design options to consider:
  - Right Turn Pocket Maintained
  - Car/Bike Mixing Zone
  - Right Turn Pocket Maintained; Cycle Track Transitions to Bike Lane
  - No Right Turn Pocket; Bikes Go Through Bulb-Out/Buffer
  - No Right Turn Pocket; Bikes Go Around Bulb-Out

On-Street Parking
- On-street parking (~270 spaces, 60-75% occupancy) would be removed to make space to accomplish other objectives (e.g., bike lanes)
- Advantages
  - Locations for replacement parking would be identified
  - Signs would direct drivers to nearby parking sites
  - Improves traffic flow, as drivers will not slow down on El Camino to look for parking
  - Reduces potential conflicts between cars and bikes
  - Improves the visibility of business frontages
- Disadvantages
  - Removes a parking resource that many see as convenient and necessary for small businesses

Activity Center(s)
- High-visibility Crossings
- Pedestrian-oriented ground floor uses
- Plazas

Concept - Focus Activity Near Downtown
- Potential Activity Centers
- Brewster to Main
Concept - Series of Activity Centers

Activity Center(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Near Downtown</th>
<th>Series of Activity Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advantages:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Advantages:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Positions new development near transit</td>
<td>• Supports businesses outside of Downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contributes to Downtown</td>
<td>• Potential to create travel options and improvements along more of El Camino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supports redevelopment of Sequoia Station</td>
<td>• Supports shared parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disadvantages:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Disadvantages:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential strain on infrastructure</td>
<td>• May be less market support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• May not adequately support business elsewhere</td>
<td>• Potential to impact poor performing intersections (Woodside Rd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Many parcels aren’t good redevelopment candidates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pedestrian Improvements

Options for making El Camino safer and more pleasant for pedestrians include:

- Reducing distances between pedestrian crosswalks
- Widening sidewalks
- Adding pedestrian "refuges" and curb bulb-outs

Feedback from Planning Process:
- Safety (particularly while crossing the street) is a primary concern
- Some are skeptical that people will walk along El Camino Real, even if improvements are made

Narrow, obstructed sidewalks

Long distances between crossings – ~½ mile in some places!
Bicycles

- **Cycle Tracks**: Do you support putting protected bike lanes (a.k.a. cycle tracks) on El Camino Real, if they are safely designed?

- **Intersections**: What are the most important considerations for intersections that are approached from a cycle track? How best to ensure safety and mobility?

On-Street Parking

- **Priorities**: How important is parking on the street on El Camino Real?
  - More or less important than putting bike lanes on El Camino Real?

- **Alternate Parking Locations**: How far away from your destination might you be willing to park and walk?
Activity Centers

- **Number:** How many activity centers should there be along El Camino Real?
- **Look and Feel:** How should these activity centers look and feel?

Pedestrian Comfort and Safety

- **Pedestrian Improvements:** What would it take to make El Camino Real an attractive place to walk?
  - Do you walk El Camino Real now? Why or why not?
- **Priorities:** Where is it most important to improve the safety and comfort of pedestrians?
  - Use the map!

Identity and Branding

- **Driving Experience:** Is it important for drivers on El Camino Real to know when they enter/leave Redwood City?
- **Identity:** Is it important for Redwood City’s stretch of El Camino Real to have a cohesive brand or identity?
  - If so, what should this identity look like?

Ground Rules for Small Groups

- Speak one at a time
- Listen for understanding
- Suspend snap judgments
- Stay on the timeline, keep comments concise, avoid repetition
- Each member of the group is equal, all comments matter – One person reports out

**PARTICIPATE!**
Report Out to Whole Group

• Pick a spokesperson
• Share the group’s overall preferences and top three issues or topics of discussion

Wrap-Up and Next Steps

Continue to refine options:
– Complete Streets Advisory Committee on March 14th
– Planning Commission on March 21st
– Online Survey: ~March/April

Visit www.redwoodcity.org/elcaminoplan for information and updates
Appendix B: Tabletop Materials
Typical Existing Conditions on El Camino Real

North of Woodside Road: Four Lanes of Vehicle Traffic

South of Woodside Road: Six Lanes of Vehicle Traffic
**Striped Bike Lanes with Painted Buffer (Class II)**

North of Woodside Road: Four Lanes of Vehicle Traffic

South of Woodside Road: Six Lanes of Vehicle Traffic

**Protected Bikeway or Cycle Track (Class IV)**

North of Woodside Road: Four Lanes of Vehicle Traffic

South of Woodside Road: Six Lanes of Vehicle Traffic
**Stripped Bike Lanes with Painted Buffer (Class II)**

North of Woodside Road: Four Lanes of Vehicle Traffic

South of Woodside Road: Six Lanes of Vehicle Traffic

---

**Protected Bikeway or Cycle Track (Class IV)**

North of Woodside Road: Four Lanes of Vehicle Traffic

South of Woodside Road: Six Lanes of Vehicle Traffic
Examples of Protected Bikeways/Cycle Tracks Designs at Intersections

Right Turn Pocket Maintained; “Mixing Zone” of Vehicles and Bikes*

No Right Turn Pocket for Vehicles, Bikes Go Around Bulb-Out*

Right Turn Pocket Maintained; Cycle Track Transitions to Bike Lane*

No Right Turn Pocket for Vehicles, Bikes Go Through Bulb-Out/Buffer

Floating Bus Stop

*On-street parking would be removed on El Camino Real to accommodate protected bikeways/cycle tracks.
Activity Centers on the El Camino Real Corridor: Multiple “Nodes”

Figure 9: Small Activity “Nodes“ Concept

Potential Opportunity Sites By Category
- Vacant
- Underutilized (AV Ratio less than or equal to 0.5)
- Underutilized (AV Ratio over 0.5 and less than 1.0)
- Current Development Projects

Potential New Streets
- Study Area Parcels
- El Camino Real Corridor Planning Boundary
- Downtown Precise Plan Boundary
- Redwood City Limits

Potential Activity Centers
- 1/4 mile (5 minute walk)
- 2/5 mile (10 minute walk)

Legend:
- Potential Node

Data Source: City of Redwood City GIS, 2016; San Mateo County Geographic Information Systems, 2016; ESRI; 2016; Drey & Barts 2016
Activity Centers on the El Camino Real Corridor: One Large Center at Downtown

Figure 10: Focus Activity Near Downtown Concept

Potential Opportunity Sites By Category

- Vacant
- Underutilized (AV Ratio less than or equal to 0.5)
- Underutilized (AV Ratio over 0.5 and less than 1.0)
- Current Development Projects

- Caltrain Station
- Caltrain
- US Highway
- State Highway
- Ramps
- Railroads
- Potential New Streets
- Study Area Parcels
- El Camino Real Corridor Planning Boundary
- Downtown Precise Plan Boundary
- Redwood City Limits

Potential Activity Centers

- Potential Activity Center/Node

2/3 mile
(15 minute walk)

Data Source: City of Redwood City GIS, 2016; San Mateo County Planning Department

City of Redwood City, 2016
San Mateo County Planning Department, 2016
Possible Features of Activity Centers

- Outdoor seating
- Plazas
- High visibility crosswalks
- Wide sidewalks with landscaping
- Active, pedestrian-oriented ground floor uses
Identity, Branding, and Wayfinding
Appendix C: Table Notes

TABLE 1
Bikes and Parking
- Dangerous now with parked cars
- Concern about businesses leaving because of no parking
- Pedestrian sidewalks support buses
- Conflict with buses? Need good access
- Concern about conflicts with pedestrians
- Customer parking a higher priority than employee
- Connections with other bikeways? Big plan (Middlefield?), where else?
- Lots of pedestrians on “grand boulevards”
- Need to move traffic
- Unclear for drivers with bike lanes dotted at intersection

Activity Centers
- Want more nodes
- Want a neighborhood feeling
- Feels less crowded
- Willing to visit other El Camino Real areas with nodes
- One downtown node could take away visitors and customers from El Camino Real areas

Connectivity
- Need a well-designed pedestrian bridge at Woodside Rd.
  - Lighting/art
  - Wide sidewalks
- Tough to connect both sides of El Camino Real within a node
  - How can safe and inviting connections be made

Design
- OK to have residential on ground floor between nodes
• Sample images may not reflect what’s possible – seem too “main street”, not “regional thoroughfare”
• Design the streets/sidewalks/ground floor uses to be interesting and inviting
• Density could bring energy to El Camino Real, but shouldn’t be out of scale with our community

Table Map Notes
• What about bike lanes in median?
• Poplar Ave: biggest issue for both pedestrian and bicyclists
• Public art/lighting = more inviting

TABLE 2
Bikes and Parking
• Biking at night is not safe
• Safety is a barrier to cyclists
• Well-marked bike lanes are a good improvement
• Missing segments
• Support on El Camino Real – greater protection is better
• More contiguous the better – more predictable
• If you build it, they will come
• Bike lanes and bus stops ensure safety
• Where mix-with crossing tracks = tricky
• Actual safety vs. perception
• False sense of safety
• Driveway mixing too
• Removing parking will help traffic flow
• Hybrid: wouldn’t use alternate route, just continue on El Camino Real
• Make as simple and straight forward as possible
• They would support buses – making it easier for cyclists than cars
• Some shops rely on convenient parking
• More passenger loading zones for lyft/uber
Plan for it, keep flow moving

- Intersections: less mixing = better safety
- Eliminate right turn on red
- Prefer through bike lane crossing right – Sandhill over 280 is a great example of intersections

**Activity Centers**

- Multi-centers (nodes)
- Shift northern node further north: Whipple to Edgewood – already anchored by businesses and adjacent to historical neighborhood
- Whipple should be the edge of the node, not the center
- Different neighborhoods: own organic feeling, unique character, serve the neighborhood better
- Redevelopment potential for Sequoia Station
- Entry to transit center should be improved: more visible, clear
- James is not great, high school crossing
- Safety concern with crosswalks with more than two lanes in each direction
  - Use midblock crossing
  - Flashing lights potentially, but could be confusing
- No right turns on red lights
- Palo Alto signals allow pedestrians to go 1st – headstart
- More Redwood trees
- Authentic identity/character – not too cutesy

**Table Map Notes**

- LED lights to illuminate crosswalks
- More connections around Roosevelt Ave
- Too short of a left at Chestnut

**TABLE 3**

**Cycle Track**

- Concern about intersections and driveways
- Safety is a significant concern
• People already bike on El Camino Real
• There are ways to make driveways safe
• Protected cycle tracks make people cautious
• The on-street parking is used a lot between Woodside and Jefferson
• Sight lines for bike lanes is important for ensuring cyclist safety
• Self-driving car may not need parking
• Alternate bike routes undesirable
  − Bicyclists see businesses on El Camino Real
  − Bicyclists don’t access a main corridor of Redwood City
• Primary concerns:
  − Safety
  − Driveways
  − Intersections
• Phasing: with respect to separation for cycle tracks
• Intersection concerns
  − Left-turning bikes
  − Green paint helps
  − Good visibility is important
• Separated bike facility is preferred

**Pedestrian**

• El Camino Real unattractive/unsafe (Woodside)
• Beneficial improvements
• Wide sidewalks
• Right now, there’s nothing I want to walk to on El Camino
• Woodside Rd feels unsafe
• The existing bike/pedestrian bridge is unused/unattractive

**Branding**

• Create a sense of place
• Skip it
• Make it nice
• Façade improvements
• Unattractive buildings don’t matter if there are a lot of trees

**Pedestrian**

• Safety is important
• Attractive buildings lead to walking
• Wider sidewalks are desireable
• Signals aren’t prioritized for pedestrians
• Fences prevent street crossing
• More movement/permeability through neighborhoods
• Signal lengths are too long!
• Would be helpful if pedestrians could wait at protected bike lane buffer
• Pedestrians should be able to cross at all legs of intersections
• Make crossings appealing
• Unsignalized crossings don’t feel safe
• Crossings with flashing lights on roads are safer

**Table Map Notes**

• Diverting cyclists off El Camino Real for 5-6 blocks is not acceptable; the facility needs to be continuous on El Camino Real to serve cyclists traveling North/South and accessing Downtown
• Improve East/West routes so they do not dead-end at El Camino Real when approaching from the West
• Make unsignalized crossings more comfortable
• Open up all legs of intersections to pedestrians
• Parking/traffic nightmare between Roosevelt Ave and Oak Ave on ECR
• Trees are important: reduce heat islands and light pollution
• Improve pedestrian connections to Caltrain and the High School
• James Ave and El Camino Real intersection: high priority for improvements
  - Lots of pedestrian/bike activity accessing Caltrain and the High School
- Pedestrian access to train is poor

**TABLE 4**

- Right now, avoid at all costs
- Today, don’t see people on bikes, see women walking with kids (mostly south of Harry’s)
- People take the bus
- At Jefferson and El Camino Real, see a lot of awkward/unsafe bike activity, not a direct route
- James is a better route for bikes now
- Some business owners will fight back on losing parking
- Could do a painted lane, or another “pilot” to test it out
- There’s a learning curve for drivers too
- The primary goal for El Camino Real should be to move lots of people through
- Looking for street parking on El Camino Real is not the desired plan!
  - It’s hard to find and intimidating to use
- Caltrain surface lot → structure?
- Who’s using on-street parking?
  - Employees, patrons, residents?
- Walking on El Camino Real is better with lighting (parallel route)
- Discussion of pedestrian crossings
- Like Laurel St: farmers market with tot lot
- Signage for Downtown gateway
- Get coffee elsewhere, get something to eat
- Distance of activity centers from congestions
- Halfway between Woodside and Jefferson (too many signals, lots of pedestrians)
- Connecting across ECR

**Table Map Notes**

- Problem intersections: El Camino Real @ Broadway Ave and El Camino Real @ James Ave

**TABLE 5**

- Want “car free” bike lanes
- Need a regional facility on El Camino Real – one community needs to go first
- Like idea of linear park, but with so many cars El Camino Real might not be preferred location
- El Camino Real destinations are not convenient if bike route is off of El Camino Real
- Concentrated activity = more people riding bikes, many bicyclists avoid El Camino Real because it doesn’t have bike lanes
- Foster biking for all trips, not just recreational trips
- Tradeoffs: parking
- Many avoid parking on El Camino Real due to the high traffic speeds and volumes
- Need to understand who is parking on-street? Where are they going?
- Important to tell people where to park or where they can park if parking is removed from El Camino Real
- Like the idea of having physical barrier between bikes and cars
- Don’t like bike lane crossing right lane – see this as unsafe
- Mixing between bikes and cars is okay
- Pedestrian advance green/leading pedestrian interval – like this in downtown San Mateo
- Like separate bike phase if it works for traffic operations
- Separate bike and car movements
- Willing to walk if it’s attractive and comfortable (about 10 min.)
  - Wider sidewalks
  - Perceptions influence whether people are willing to walk
  - Maybe 2 blocks is how far people would be willing to walk
- Activity center in Downtown: could play off existing activity levels downtown, build on synergy between the two
- Multiple centers: spread out and alternatives for people who don’t like all the activity downtown (preferred by the group over the Downtown focus)
- Spread out centers: justifies having bike lanes on El Camino Real
  - More convenient for residents throughout the city with benefits to adjacent neighborhoods
- Small plazas @ nodes: need interesting things to encourage people to stay
  - Restaurants, cafes, book stores
- Shade, lighting

- Branding: would be icing on the cake
  - Placemaking @ Caltrain/Downtown

- Improve connections to Sequoia HS: it’s a major destination on the corridor

- (Design) details matter in making the area walkable
  - San Carlos and Belmont are good examples of connectivity between downtown and the train station

**Table Map Notes**

- Lots of pedestrian crossings at Center Street
- Need better lighting and activity near El Camino Real @ Poplar Ave
- Lots of crossings in front of Sequoia Station
  - Need better connection
- Lots of crossings at Whipple Ave

**PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED AFTER WORKSHOP**

- Bike Lane: Concept 1A w/ the physical buffer looks awesome!
- Yes to active Transit Signal Priority for busses
- Yes to the transferable development rights. Many of our clients want to maintain their business in their 1 or 2 story buildings along this corridor…giving them the ability to transfer the development rights to another property gives them a way to preserve their business while also benefiting from the strong local real estate market.
- (from the RWC Transportation Study flyer that was passed out at meeting) I think it said that total RWC population grew 4% over the last 10 years, while daily Caltrain ridership grew by 45% during the same period. This, in addition to the prospects of self-driving cars and TOD, seems to be a strong trend that our city’s parking demands (on street and off-street) are in the midst of experiencing a significant change.
- Wouldn’t the El Camino Real Corridor Plan be an appropriate time to adjust the parking requirements in the zoning code to reflect this rapidly changing demand? For example, the current fixed ratio (for every xxxx square feet of office you need x parking spaces) could be altered to reflect the actual need for spaces based on projected single occupancy vehicle trips per day. This could ensure that in 10 years Redwood City development isn’t stifled by outdated parking requirements.
- Parking Idea: southbound side between Jackson and Vera…there are a lot of side streets (and even an alley) that connect to ECR. These could be reconfigured into 1 way streets
connecting to ECR, leaving rooms for additional diagonal parking...sort of like Maple Street between Main St. and Middlefield (https://goo.gl/maps/k1h2TqeAUpM2) but with parking on both sides of the street.

- The protected intersection concept (No Right Turn Pocket For Vehicles, Bikes Go Through Bulb-Out/Buffer) gives a false sense of safety to cyclists (this is referred to as “the right hook”).

- Supports the intersection option in which a right turn pocket is maintained and the cycle track transitions to a bike lane. This option doesn’t give cyclists a false sense of security. It keeps all uses alert and aware of safety implications.