101/84 Woodside Road Interchange Improvement Project
Community Open House
Meeting Summary Report

The City of Redwood City hosted a Community Open House on March 31, 2014 from 6:30-8:00 p.m. in the third floor Community Room at the Downtown Library, located at 1044 Middlefield Road in Redwood City.

PowerPoint presentations were given on the half hour (6:30 p.m., 7:00 p.m. and 7:30 p.m.) and interactive stations were available throughout the evening. Community members were encouraged to drop in at a time convenient to them.

The meeting was noticed through bi-lingual Spanish and English flyers distributed at various stakeholder meetings and placed at City Hall; a mailing of the notice to the potentially impacted property owners and tenants in the project area plus 300'; through e-blasts from the Redwood City Public Information Officer to the broad city e-blast distribution list, a special e-blast to the Redwood City Neighborhood Associations; and postings on the city website.

When the attendees arrived they were asked to sign-in for notification of future meetings. The attendees were given the option of a fact sheet in Spanish and English as well as comment cards if they wished to leave written comments. Team member Connie Guererro was available to provide interpretation services. Although no interpretation services were required, several bi-lingual community members did attend the meeting.

The PowerPoint presentation covered the same content each time (See Attachment A). Outreach Coordinator Eileen Goodwin welcomed the crowd and explained the meeting format and the purpose of each input station. She introduced Paul Krupka, City of Redwood City’s Project Manager for this effort, who thanked people for attending and introduced Jessica Manzi, Senior Transportation Coordinator for the City. Paul introduced Scott Kelsey, Consultant Team Project Manager to deliver the PowerPoint. Scott introduced Jeff Zimmerman as the environmental lead and Abhijeet Bhoi as the engineering lead, and Tyson Tano as the specialty services lead with engineering background. Scott also introduced Jim McKim from the San Mateo County Transportation Authority. The presentation addressed the project area and existing conditions, roles and funding, the draft purpose and needs statement and three schedules (the schedule through construction, the schedule of the Project Approval and Environmental Document phase and the schedule of public input opportunities). The presentation took approximately 10 minutes to deliver. There was no question and answer session, instead attendees were asked to interact with all of the stations to give their input and get questions answered by the project team.
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At the 6:30 presentation approximately 50 community members were seated in the audience with additional people entering the room and standing along the back. At the 7:00 p.m. presentation approximately 15 community members were seated in the audience with additional members at stations or in the back of the room. At 7:30 p.m. there were about ten community members in the audience (including Mayor Jeffrey Gee) with a few more at the stations.
There were four stations for the public to engage with the project team.

**Station #1 Existing Interchange Use**

Attendees were encouraged to populate two charts with dots. Please note the different colors of dots do not signify any specific variables. The first chart asked the community when they were in the area by time: A.M. commute, Mid-Day, PM Commute, Night, or Weekends and by which mode they used: Pedestrian, Bicycle, Car/Light Truck, Bus/Shuttle or Heavy Truck.

Based on the input, the mode utilized the most was Car/Light truck. There was substantial bike rider representation as well. The use was spread evenly by time of day and day of the week for both modes.
The second chart asked people to place dots by time of day: A.M. commute, Mid-Day, PM.

Commute, Night, or Weekends and their destinations when they were in the area: Seaport Blvd/Points East, 101 Northbound, 101 Southbound, Woodside Rd/Points West, Downtown (SW Quadrant), North Fair Oaks (SE Quadrant), Docktown (NW Quadrant) or E. Bayshore Rd (NE Quadrant).

The destinations most represented were 101 Northbound and Southbound, Seaport Blvd, Woodside Rd./Points West and Downtown (SW Quadrant).
Station #2 The Goals of the Project

The draft Purpose and Need from the PowerPoint was provided on a board (in Spanish and English) and attendees were asked for their thoughts about any additions or deletions.

The public’s comments are attached as Attachment B (station feedback write up) and Attachment C (comment card feedback).

They generally fell into three categories:

1. Concern for more representation of non-motorized modes;

2. Skepticism regarding any improvements being able to make a significant impact since the area is currently very impacted by congestion; and

3. The impacts of future developments both currently permitted in the downtown area as well as possible future projects, such as the Saltworks project or redevelopment of the Port.
Station #3 “Our Questions Your Answers”

There were four questions posed to the community to stimulate discussion. The full transcript is shown in Attachment D. The report below summarizes the themes of the responses to the questions.

- **Where are the problem areas?**
  - Various specific vehicle movements within the interchange area were cited as less than ideal along with possible modifications
  - Several comments addressed the lack of adequate bicycle accommodation in the interchange area

- **Is there anything that works well that we should keep/maintain?**
  - The utilization of Veterans Boulevard as an access to downtown
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- The bicycle access via Maple Avenue

- **Is there a need for additional lighting? If so, where?**
  - The entire interchange area was recommended for more lighting
  - Broadway North of Woodside Road was also cited as lacking adequate lighting

- **Would you want to see public art displayed in the project area? If so, where?**
  - Soundwall art and gateway treatments were seen as desirable elements

In addition, there was a blank flip chart available for community members to provide feedback on other topics and questions. That feedback is also listed as part of Attachment D.
Station #4 Opportunities—Station with Maps

Aerial Project Area maps were laid out on a table and markers were provided so that community members could mark up and add sticky notes with explanations of sensitive areas, need for additional movements etc. Attachment E has a full transcript of the notes captured on the maps.

Feedback gathered at this station is similar to the feedback at some of the other stations, but with more specificity on suggested locations for the improvements. There were many comments regarding locations for bicycle lanes and accommodations, pedestrian improvements, and improvements that would make motorized vehicle travel easier and/or safer. In addition, the community members pointed out especially troublesome areas such as the egress from the Smart & Final store, off-ramp back-ups onto the freeway, and back-ups along local streets.
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Attachment A
PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda

• Project Overview

• Schedule

• Input, Comments or Questions
Project Area Map

Existing Interchange Configuration

Developed Area
- Hospitals, Commercial, Residential, Industrial, & Public Facilities

Major Utilities
- PG&E High Voltage Transmission Lines
- Pump Stations

UPRR

Under Construction
- One Marina
- Correctional Center

Future Public Improvements
- Trolley Corridor
Project Overview/Purpose & Need

The purpose of the proposed project is to:

- Alleviate existing and projected peak hour traffic congestion at the Route 101 / 84 (Woodside Road) Interchange,
- Provide traffic improvements near the interchange,
- Enhance mobility,
- Enhance Public safety, and
- Improve traffic operations at the intersections of Seaport / Blomquist - East Bayshore, Woodside Road / Veterans Boulevard, Woodside Road / Broadway Avenue, and Woodside Road / Bay Road.
Roles

- Caltrans is the lead agency for the project and the owner of the interchange.
- The City is the lead for public involvement and will provide input to help screen the alternatives.
- The Community is encouraged to participate as users and neighbors of the project.
Proposed Project Schedule (if all funding is available):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alts Analysis</td>
<td>6/06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Project Approval</td>
<td>1/14 – 12/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6/16 – 6/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4/17 – 9/18</td>
<td>4/19 – 12/21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Environmental Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternatives Investigation</th>
<th>1/14 – 4/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Studies</td>
<td>4/14 – 11/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Alternatives</td>
<td>6/14 – 12/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Environmental Document</td>
<td>7/14 – 2/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Circulation</td>
<td>2/15 – 3/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Environmental Document</td>
<td>3/15 – 12/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Approval</td>
<td>12/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Input, Comments, or Questions

(Please proceed to the Interactive Stations)
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Attachment B
Station #2 – Goals of the Project – Purpose and Need Feedback
Summary of concerns or points made at Goals of the Project - Purpose and Need Station

1. P&N should be expanded. The bullets on P&N statement are heavily weighted towards vehicle travel, and only one bullet about “enhance mobility” appears to possibly include other modes. Enhance mobility – what does that mean? This looks like an afterthought for the car oriented statements.
   a. Response: Will look into expanding the non-vehicle travel purposes. Team recognizes the numerous modes of travel and they will be emphasized: bike, ped, access to future ferry terminal, etc., and concerns noted and will be addressed. Explained also that the project has to fundamentally deal with addressing traffic on US 101 and SR 84, and how local street congestion can be improved as a core purpose.

2. How can you possibly address the traffic at this location? It’s backed up everywhere and if you free up something you still can’t get anywhere.
   a. Response: Situation is acknowledged, and recognized that problems at this location have been under consideration for many previous years. Planning for traffic will be based on 20 year horizon starting from construction year to 20 years out. Project design has to address projected traffic based on regional, planned growth.

3. What about the Salt Ponds development? It’s an enormous factor, and right now is dormant but if it is approved, won’t everything be overwhelmed?
   a. Response: The Saltworks project has not been approved. However traffic and planning studies usually look at approved projects or land use plans that are adopted by the City. It is not an approved project.

4. This project is not taking into account local improvements going on in Redwood City. Our study area is only focused around the interchange. He is a business owner in RC, and is more focused on the downtown area and not as much on east of US 101.
   a. Response: Point about study area is good, but also can’t address everything in the city within this project. Travel patterns will be considered and individual noted that he would like to make sure we are considering City’s needs and plans on the west side of US 101, not just at the freeways. I explained that project
does not just look at existing situation. Growth and land use is taken into account regionally and locally, through traffic planning projected out 20 years. Consideration of development that is in General Plan or potentially could be approved is included in studies.

5. What about Port of RC traffic? How are we taking that into account? Are we going to talk with them? (Yes). Do we know what they are up to, and do people think the industrial uses at the Port will remain as is or won’t they inevitably change as land becomes too valuable?
   a. Valid points. Port’s future plans will be considered. Bay Area ports fall within the BCDC/MTC SeaPort Plan, which helps protect port dependent uses (such as shipping) from development into non-bay dependent uses. We will look at what reasonable future planning is for the Seaport Boulevard area.

6. A bike user comments: Veterans to Woodside is “scary.” She travels Broadway to Chestnut to avoid risks at the intersections closer to US101.

7. What is a Gateway? (Scott included this concept in his presentation).
   a. I asked commenter her idea of a Gateway: She said a more inviting entrance. Concerned that people enter the city without much of a vision or theme, but she did not have any specific recommendations.
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Attachment C
Comment Card Feedback
Route 101/SR 84 Woodside Interchange Improvement Project
Public Meeting on March 31, 2014
Comment Sheets
(6 received)

1.

The 2011 Alternative Analysis Study does not show any bike lanes to provide for bicycle traffic. Bicycles must be considered as an important and growing component of the traffic stream!
Maple currently is the only safe bicycle crossing of 101. The use and safety of Maple by cyclists must not be compromised by increased motor traffic or construction, unless and until some better alternative crossing of 101 is in place.

2.

- Need bike access across 101
- Homeless camp under 101/84
- Timing of all lights
- Unclear how to get to “down town” - Not welcoming/poor downtown signage

3.

- Main post office access
- Pedestrian crossings on 84
- Landscaping
- Flooding issues for the future sea level rise
- Planning for traffic levels for the next 50+ years

4.

- Eliminate Weave

5.

1. 101 additional exits added at Maple St. Overpass for downtown and add housing on Veterans and Whipple St. overpass.
2. Expand exit at 84 to accommodate more traffic like 92/101 overpasses.
3. Plan for an additional 100,000 people moving in as population growing incrementally, FAST.
6.

Format was a bit “messy,” – too hard to hear the presentation with people at various stations talking loudly.
Thanks for opening this to the public.
Take out the streetlight on the offramp. North 101 exiting to Seaport – lane narrows – and creates a bottleneck – can create a continuous lane for people turning right on E. Bayshore.
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Attachment D
Station #3 - Our Questions, Your Answers
Where are the problem areas?
- Homeless (non-winter months)
- Ensure bike safety over 101 – maintain/create connections to existing bike network (2)
- SB 101 to Woodside – Afternoon backup to Whipple and beyond. Backs up on weekends also.
- EB Woodside to SB 101 – need sign for 2nd lane (left)
- Bikes vs. Trucks
- Left turns off Bay Rd to Woodside Road
- Inadequate lighting & road markings at Seaport Blvd
- Linden Street impacted (trucks) hard to get through
- SB off @ Broadway – lanes don’t line up
- Bike access across 101 to Seaport (4)
- EB Woodside to NB 101 hard to negotiate (people cutting in)
- SB 101 to Marsh back-up to Expressway (Bayfront)
- Veterans/Woodside Exchange is bad
- NB 101 to SB Broadway (need to cut across lanes)
- UPRR

Is there anything that works well that we should keep/maintain?
- NB 101 Exit ramp flyover seems to rarely backup
- Middle of night is OK
- Preserve bike access to Maple – Maple is unique and provides bike access. Non freeway
- Ravenswood & Belmont bike bridges
- Keep low traffic crossing of 101 for bikes on Maple
- NB 101 to downtown via Veterans works well
- SB on-ramp
- It all clogs up at commute times – signal at Broadway & Woodside is totally overloaded

Is there a need for additional lighting? If so, where?
- Kind of dark under freeway
- Broadway North of Woodside – PED Xing in dark
- Yes – hard to see bicycles & pedestrians under & around freeway
Would you want to see public art displayed in the project area? If so, where?
- Yes
- Not necessary, but maybe.
- Key entry to City – art would be wonderful!
- On freeway walls
- Could be distracting (2)

Additional Feedback
- Bike safety – Crossing Woodside & thru interchange as development occurs.
- Keep Freeway traffic off Maple – safe Xing on bike – w/ low volumes (don’t do Marsh!)
- Conflict between Seaport – SB101 w/ NB101 to Woodside
- Commuter parking structure (large) for ferry traffic, connecting downtown & Caltrain & the new Stanford facilities and Kaiser hospital on Veterans – so there is less congestion.
- Improve E. Bayshore connection/ Dumbarton connection to 101 (Improve on existing Marsh connection)
- I would ride Woodside if better bike facilities were available to get to Bayshore (future could be different)
- Bottlenecks/Congestion on Woodside by 101
- Clear signage directing people to downtown
- Woodside/ECR ramps – stop signs
- Ingress/Egress from Post office & Smart & Final
- Coordinating w/ Stanford and Streetcar
- How will community desire for bike/ped be communicated to Caltrans if they aren’t at the community meetings?
- Need better signal coordination along Woodside
- Something will change @ salt flats & impact interchange
- PWS yard could be redeveloped & impact interchange
- Ongoing demand for RWC -> SF Trips
- Arguello Weeds
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Attachment E
Station #4 - Map Station Feedback
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Regarding</th>
<th>Comment, Concern, or Idea</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marsh Rd</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Idea</td>
<td>Consider Marsh Rd for interchange improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Mid-Point Technology Park has 1500 car trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Mid-Point Technology Park has 5000 employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E. Bayshore Rd</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>Improve Access to Redwood Mobile Estates which only has two ways to get into the facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NB Off-ramp</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>There is a lot of back up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>E. Bayshore Rd</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>Has back up problems along E. Bayshore Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Charter St</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Idea</td>
<td>Possible location for on ramp at Charter St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>E. Bayshore Rd</td>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>Maintenance of existing Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>E. Bayshore Rd</td>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>Idea</td>
<td>Add bike lanes and sidewalk to E. Bayshore Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Add Mid-Point Technology Park at Stanford to project discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Woodside Blvd</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>This is a heavy truck route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>NB Off-ramp</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Idea</td>
<td>Have a continuous lane on the outside to Seaport and right turn pocket. (Can be an immediate improvement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>NB Off-ramp Loop</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>The traffic getting off the freeway is blocked by the traffic from seaport trying to get onto the 101 southbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Woodside Blvd</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Idea</td>
<td>Add lanes under the freeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Woodside Blvd</td>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>Idea</td>
<td>Add bike lanes under the freeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Woodside Blvd/Veterans</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>Traffic at intersection is really bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Woodside Blvd</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>A lot of weaving among cars happens before the Broadway Woodside intersection heading south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Veterans Blvd</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>Back up along Veterans Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>SB off ramp</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>Bad back up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Woodside Blvd</td>
<td>Traffic Concern</td>
<td>Traffic along NB Woodside creates a lot of back up. Backs up to Bay Rd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Broadway/Woodside</td>
<td>Traffic Concern</td>
<td>Traffic at intersection is very bad and has back up on all legs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Woodside Blvd</td>
<td>Traffic Concern</td>
<td>Traffic signalization isn't working on intersections along Woodside. Timing needs to be redone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bay Rd/Woodside Blvd</td>
<td>Traffic Concern</td>
<td>Intersection is bad and creates back up.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Broadway Blvd</td>
<td>Traffic Access</td>
<td>Turning left from Smart &amp; Final onto Broadway is very difficult.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Broadway Blvd</td>
<td>Traffic Access</td>
<td>Post offices turn left off Broadway into the parking lot.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>UPPR Line</td>
<td>Bike Idea</td>
<td>Use UPRR line near PG&amp;E station as a bike lane.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>UPPR Line</td>
<td>Bike Idea</td>
<td>Proposed undercrossing along UPRR line near Correctional Center as a bike lane which will go to Oddstad Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Broadway Blvd</td>
<td>Building Comment</td>
<td>Future hotel location where the existing City of Redwood City Municipal Service Center is currently located.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Veterans Blvd</td>
<td>Traffic Idea</td>
<td>Need crosswalks at Veterans Blvd and Chestnut St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Blomquist St</td>
<td>Traffic Idea</td>
<td>Widen Blomquist Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Maple St</td>
<td>Bike Comment</td>
<td>Heavy bike traffic uses Maple street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Bay Trail</td>
<td>Bike Idea</td>
<td>Extended the bay trail from Blomquist to the existing trail near the marina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Maple St</td>
<td>Bike Idea</td>
<td>Add bike trail at end on maple street along the harbor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Maple St</td>
<td>Bike Concern</td>
<td>Keep ramp traffic away from Maple St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Maple St</td>
<td>Traffic Idea</td>
<td>Likes the idea of diamond interchange at Maple St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Walnut St/Maple St</td>
<td>Bike Idea</td>
<td>Possible location for bike over pass over the 101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Middlefield Rd/Woodside Blvd</td>
<td>Traffic Comment</td>
<td>Expand construction to Middlefield Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Walnut St/ Bradford St</td>
<td>Traffic Comment</td>
<td>Future Apt building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>E. Bayshore Rd/Main St</td>
<td>Bike Idea</td>
<td>There is an undercrossing here that could be used as a path. But it floods sometimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Broadway Blvd</td>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>Improve bike entrance along Broadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Veterans Blvd</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>Veterans Blvd is to narrow when entering the interchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Broadway Blvd</td>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Add bike lanes on Broadway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Veterans Blvd</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>Improve Veterans Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>Does everyone know the way downtown?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Interchange</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Idea</td>
<td>One large round about for the whole intersection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Areas of Concern**
*note: these are areas community members circled, but did not leave a comment.*

- Public Storage Area
- San Mateo County Women’s Jail
- Redwood City Police Department
- Correction Center
- Malibu Castle
- UPRR
- Marina
- Friendly Acres
- Stanford