



Peninsula Conflict Resolution Center

1660 So. Amphlett Blvd. #219 San Mateo, CA 94402

T 650.513.0330 F 650.513.0335

www.pcrweb.org

**Redwood City Community Participation Program
Community Workshop for Farm Hill Rd. Road Diet
June 12, 2012
6:30 – 8:30 PM**

**Peninsula Covenant Church, Fellowship Center
3560 Farm Hill Boulevard**

Community Comments

	A		B		C		D	
	+	Δ	+	Δ	+	Δ	+	Δ
Segment 1	<p>2 lanes on side of street where there is high density</p> <p>2 lanes reduces issues with tail gaters (Hill areas)</p> <p>It flows</p> <p>Parking where high density</p> <p>2 lanes uphill can pass buses</p> <p>Works fine</p> <p>Like with flashing lights</p>	<p>Scary to cross</p> <p>No bike lane (Safety concern)</p> <p>Isn't room on side for ped or bikes</p> <p>Speed</p> <p>Noise</p> <p>Nothing to reduce speed</p> <p>Because it is downhill, people drive really fast</p>	<p>☺</p> <p>Parking on downhill side</p> <p>1 lane in each, parking biking</p> <p>Looks safer</p> <p>Like environment</p> <p>Seems more relaxed</p> <p>Safer for peds, less active traffic</p>	<p>Only 1 lane to 280</p> <p>If behind bus to Cañada, stuck behind until back up</p> <p>1 lane roads (both sides)</p> <p>Use middle lane to pass other cars (illegal use of lane)</p> <p>Because steepest section – it will be too slow for the large vehicles</p>	<p>2 lanes uphill</p> <p>Bike lanes</p> <p>2 lanes for slower cars</p> <p>Good hybrid</p> <p>Using 3rd lane as stopping point to turn when exiting from side street</p> <p>Take care of unavoidable parking</p> <p>Improves safety</p> <p>Illuminates parking on side not needed – accommodates speed going up the hill</p> <p>Would be nice having a turning lane</p> <p>Landscaped median</p> <p>Buffer</p>	<p>No parking on one side – flip parking</p> <p>No parking on uphill</p> <p>Potential tail gating</p> <p>No place for bus to pull off</p> <p>College kids using as an extra lane</p> <p>Speed way</p> <p>Turning lane unnecessary</p>	<p>Wide lanes improve sight</p> <p>Provides parking/buffer</p> <p>No houses on that side = no need for parking</p>	<p>Only one lane up</p> <p>Unable to pass</p> <p>Tailgating</p> <p>Want buffer on uphill, not needed on downhill</p> <p>It will back traffic</p> <p>People will use left turn lane as a passing lane</p> <p>Worst of all worlds</p> <p>Parking not needed = waste of space</p>

	A		B		C		D	
	+	Δ	+	Δ	+	Δ	+	Δ
Segment 2	Lots of parking	Same as 1A	Easier to get out of driveway	Traffic during rush hour- getting out of DW	As biker, need space	Parking is hard	N/A	N/A
	Bike lanes	Problem backing out	Center turn lane/bike lane gives better visibility about out	1 lane	Easier for buses to stop	1 lane is disaster		
	Parking on both sides	No bike lane	Parking	Congestion – not get out of driveway	Buffer zones between auto traffic/buffer traffic	Not practical		
	Same as 1A Love it	Too many speeding cars	Bike lane	Because it has parking on one side of street	Turning abilities	Lack of parking on one side		
	2 lanes	Danger getting out of DW & parked cars	Turning lane (2 way)	Could be worse <the turns>	Loss of parking negates any positives	Too many bike lanes		
	Flashing speed light	Doesn't like it	IDEA: Roundabouts! (1 way)		The buffer makes a little safer for everyone	Buffer waste area		
	2 bike lanes	Biking is a problem	Keeps parking for homes		“Curb is red in front of my house”	Loss of parking on 1 side of street		
		1 lane	Like turn lane in middle			Must have parking on 2 sides		
			Safer for ped, no less moving cars					
			Safety lines of sight lower speed					
			Gives a bike lane					
			It is sort of like what we have					

	A		B		C		D	
	+	Δ	+	Δ	+	Δ	+	Δ
			<p>anyways</p> <p>We eliminate on travel lane and slow down traffic</p> <p>Give a bike lane like parking on both sides</p> <p>Would slow it down</p> <p>IDEA: Would like in this intersection – NO U TURN sign in front of the park</p> <p>Parking on both sides C</p> <p>Have bike lane on both sides and center turn</p>					
Segment 3	<p>2 lanes</p> <p>NOTHING</p> <p>*Need to re-grade. Simple addition of lanes not enough</p> <p>Emergency traffic can go both ways</p>	<p>Parking cramped</p> <p>Hard to see and drive above/below lane divide</p> <p>1 lane</p> <p>Dangerous terrain</p> <p>Speeding</p>	<p>Bike lane</p> <p>More room for curve</p> <p>Wider lanes there existing</p> <p>Parking on uphill side</p>	<p>1 lane</p> <p>Green light for both traffic & ped – might create traffic</p> <p>Doesn't really address issues esp. downhill</p>	<p>Like turn lane</p> <p>No parking</p> <p>None due to loss of parking</p>	<p>Not different form 3B to comment</p> <p>Concern about going into 1 lane</p> <p>Right turn lane doesn't seem important – No easier for traffic</p>	N/A	N/A

	A		B		C		D	
	+	Δ	+	Δ	+	Δ	+	Δ
		<p>Light close by changes quickly (Speeding to beat)</p> <p>Dover & Jefferson intersection- DANGEROUS</p> <p>No bike lane</p> <p>Need to differentiate going up and going down</p> <p>Houses & Non-houses – can be dealt with in different ways</p> <p>Dangerous with cars parking on side walk</p>	<p>1 travel lane</p> <p>Force them to go together</p> <p>Keeping parking</p> <p>1 lane + shoulder helps prevent being pushed into shoulder/center dividers</p> <p>Wider lanes to turn</p> <p>More room for backing</p> <p>Works ok with emergency vehicles</p>	<p>Someone also feels is a negative because trying to get emergency vehicles – might not be enough room</p> <p>Because it's narrow some only want one lane of cars and like bike</p>		<p>Loss of parking</p> <p>OK going down but not OK going up because of parking</p> <p>Takes away travel lane</p>		
Segment 4	<p>2 lanes</p> <p>It flows</p> <p>Multiple lanes to Alameda</p> <p>Same as Seg 2A & D</p>	<p>Difficult intersection</p> <p>Parking congestion</p> <p>Speed</p> <p>Need more officers</p>	<p>Better for bikes</p> <p>Solves narrow close passing</p> <p>More consistent</p> <p>Parking area</p> <p>Bike lane</p>	<p>Concern about middle lane and collisions</p> <p>No buffer zone for bike</p> <p>Unused parking lane</p> <p>Blind turn at</p>	<p>Slower speed – safer</p> <p>Buffer</p> <p>Bicyclists: Buffers for bicyclists is a plus</p> <p>Bike lanes</p>	<p>No parking</p> <p>Buffers take away</p> <p>LAW ENFORCEMENT</p> <p>Doesn't give parking</p> <p>Loss of parking</p>	N/A	N/A

	A		B		C		D	
	+	Δ	+	Δ	+	Δ	+	Δ
		Narrow turn into oncoming traffic 1 lane on each side, difficult transition into Alameda	Still parking both sides Easier to make left turns	curve - Dangerous	Buffer can protect bikes form cars			

COMMENTS:

The most useful part of the meeting was:

- Realizing that R.C. is really aware of the problems relating to F. Blvd and is taking action to solve them.
- Using community input to assist decision making
- The presentation and the group discussions
- Having comments and ideas from neighbors
- Hearing and talking to other residents

What could have made this meeting more useful?

- Be more clear up front that opinions and comments will be in the groups – not at the Q & A
- Also let people know it’s not rote, but an opportunity to have their opinions recorded. They don’t need to try to convince others in this venue.

Comments/Suggestions:

Comments on Designs:

- Participants prefer consistency throughout segments
- Segment 1:
 - Want parking at least on the condo side
 - Don’t need parking bike on N. side/right side going up
 - Purple (refer to design) want parking
- Segment 2:
 - Slow down signal ahead
 - Radar speed sign
 - No colored comments
- Segment 4: Split between B & C
 - Provides buffer for bike lanes
 - Parking lost is not used anyway (2 people want C)
- It was a great meeting
- Thanks for including residents in the process

1st choice votes

	A	B	C	D
Segment 1	2.5		2	1.5
Segment 2	1.5	4.5		
Segment 3	1.5	3	1.5	
Segment 4	1.5	3	1.5	

CONCERNS:

- Riding bike is scary
- People are drag racing
- Skateboarding down Farm Hill
- Addressing traffic to 280
- Large vehicles for sale (Boats, cars, etc.)
- People try to beat light on to Glennan
- Cars stop, waiting for parking in road
- Kids running into street by park
- Turning right on red at McGarvey
- Stop in front of park * make U-turn
- High traffic times turning
- Look at Trousdale in Burlingame
- Enforcement of traffic

Likes	Dislikes
<p>Works well on Alameda</p> <p>Industrial works well</p> <p>Residential area on Alameda works well with slower speed limits</p> <p>Like middle lane, don't hold people up</p> <p>Experience with turn lane</p> <p>Need bike lane or more space</p> <p>Friendlier to drive for bikers (Safer to pedestrians) (Alameda de las Pulgas – good example)</p> <p>Easier to pull out of driveways and to get out of parked cars (more space –buffer areas)</p> <p>Protects kids pedestrians</p> <p>Like bike lanes/buffer</p> <p>It seems like it already is three lanes</p> <p>Will slow traffic down</p>	<p>Getting out of driveway</p> <p>Were there studies done in high density housing close to freeway</p> <p>Decreasing lanes close to freeway</p> <p>High density housing needs street parking</p> <p>Start with law enforcement revenue from city</p> <p>Having a middle lane</p> <p>Never seen parking on eastern side – can only park on one side</p> <p>Bike lane</p> <p>Artery to 280</p> <p>Financing</p> <p>Tailgaters going downhill – dangerous for 1 lane road</p> <p>Congestion if there is accident on the 1 lane road</p> <p>Wouldn't like it if "I" were a commuter</p> <p>Speed still an issue</p> <p>Favor of road diet as a commuter – do not think it reduces capacity of road</p> <p>Hard for people to get in and out of homes</p> <p>No parking</p> <p>If it gets changed it will increase the traffic</p> <p>If have a middle lane – it will become the "chicken" lane</p> <p>With 3 lanes – the center lane will become a passing lane</p> <p>Parking on one side of the street</p> <p>Garbage truck blocking the lane and visibility</p>