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The City of Redwood City hosted a Community Meeting on July 29th from 6:30 to 8:30 PM at the Downtown Library Community Room, Third Floor, 1044 Middlefield Road in Redwood City. This report documents the input received at the community meeting as well as the meeting notification, meeting format, and meeting materials.
SECTION ONE

Purpose
The purpose of this second community meeting was to present information and gather specific feedback on the alternatives screening process and the alternatives still under consideration. As a result, the meeting format included both informal open house style interactions with the project team at map stations as well as a more formal presentation and question and answer session.
Relationship to Community Meeting #1
The first community meeting, held in March 2014, focused on interchange area usage and problem identification. The meeting was held in an open house format where attendees circulated to various stations and provided their input through the placement of dots on charts, drawing on maps, or making handwritten notes on flip charts.

Based on the input in the above images, 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 destinations most represented were 101 Northbound and Southbound, Seaport Blvd, Woodside Rd/Points West and Downtown (SW Quadrant).

Feedback identified at the first meeting was related to congestion in the interchange area, as well as along Woodside Road; and lack of adequate bicycle and pedestrian facilities and lighting. The alternatives developed and presented at the second community meeting took this valuable information into account. The ability to address the issues identified at the first meeting became screening criteria for moving various alternatives forward.
SECTION TWO

Noticing
The meeting was noticed through bilingual Spanish and English flyers distributed at the City Hall and Library; a mailing of the notice to the potentially impacted property owners and tenants in the project area plus 300 feet; through eNews announcements from the Redwood City Public Information Officer to the City at large (a special distribution was directed to project stakeholders including the Postmaster, Stanford University, Kaiser Permanente, the school districts, the yacht clubs, Seaport Industrial Association, property management staff, Downtown Association, Chamber of Commerce), and postings on the project web page on the City’s website. Condensed versions of the bilingual flyers can be seen below. Larger images of the flyers can be seen in Appendix A.
SECTION THREE

Meeting Overview
Approximately 70 people attended the July meeting. About half had attended the open house for the project held in March 2014. Almost everyone in attendance indicated they had received the city eNews announcement. Fifty percent said they had received a meeting notice flyer. Sixty percent indicated they also were told about the meeting by someone else, and one person indicated she picked up a flyer at the City Library (and encouraged the team to continue to place flyers around town for those without computers). One-third of the attendees indicated they saw an article about the meeting in the local paper.

The Mayor, Honorable Jeffrey Gee, and a number of City Commission members were also present, including Ernie Schmidt, Nancy Radcliffe, Kevin Bondonno, Billy James, Tom Gilman, Dick Dodge, and Connie Guerrero (also a Consultant Team member). Gidget Navarro, Caltrans Public Information Officer for San Mateo County, and Jim McKim of the San Mateo County Transportation Authority also attended the meeting.
The meeting was coordinated by several project staff members: Senior Transportation Coordinator Jessica Manzi representing Redwood City, the City’s project manager consultant Paul Krupka (KRUPKA Consulting), Scott Kelsey the URS project manager and his team including Eileen Goodwin (Apex Community Outreach Coordinator), Abhijeet Bhoi (URS Design), Tyson Tano (URS Specialty Services), Jeff Zimmerman (URS Environmental), Kevin Kramer (URS Staff Engineer), Sarah Luce (URS Project Coordinator), Robert Eckols (Fehr & Peers Traffic Engineer), and John Lieswyn (ALTA Bicycle/Pedestrian Engineer).

After the open house, Mayor Gee welcomed the community members to start the meeting. The project team manager presented the project alternatives utilizing a PowerPoint presentation with video links and significant animation showing specific movements by mode. At the conclusion of the presentation, the audience had fifteen minutes of general questions with the project team and then adjourned to the interactive stations for the second half of the evening.

Overall the tone of the meeting was very positive. There were many comments in support of the meeting format and the graphic presentation. The input on the screening process and the various alternatives presented was valuable to the project team.

Format
When the attendees arrived at approximately 6:30 PM, they were asked to sign in to become part of a database for notification of future meetings. The attendees were given the option of a fact sheet in both Spanish and English, a fact sheet regarding the diverging diamond option, and
comment cards should they wish to leave written comments (see Appendix F). Spanish language interpretation services were announced and made available to attendees. Interpretation services were provided at the meeting, and the team received a comment card in Spanish that has been translated and made part of this record.

The agenda for the meeting was as follows:

1. Welcome and Introductions     Mayor Gee
2. Overview of Agenda     Facilitator
3. Overview of Project Purpose and Introduction of Team     Project Manager
4. Project Overview     Team Leader
5. General Q and A     Project Team
6. Community Input     At Stations

Community members were free to leave at any time after the formal presentation; however, most stayed about 30 to 45 minutes to give input at various stations. The four stations included:

- A “No Build Alternative” station including a map of the existing conditions;
- An “Alternatives Screening” station with three display boards with maps showing the alternatives considered and information regarding why these alternatives were not being recommended for further consideration;
- An “Alternative 3” station which included maps with the alternatives superimposed on them to help explain Alternative 3 and the two variations to this alternative; and
- An “Alternative 8B” station supported by a map.
All of the stations had staff available to answer questions and record comments. The comments are available in Appendices B, C and D. The summary of these comments by alternative appears in the following report section. In addition, there were comment cards available (see Appendix F) for meeting attendees to write out their own observations. The comment card comments are also available in Appendix E. The meeting ended by the anticipated 8:30 PM time.
Overview of Presentation
In the PowerPoint presented, the project team leader reviewed the purpose and need for the project, the results gathered at the first community meeting, and the development of a screening process. He then recounted how a variety of major ideas were considered and screened into alternatives. He explained that the team was recommending two main alternatives for further consideration in the environmental process along with a No Build alternative. He further explained that one of the two alternatives (Alternative 3) had a couple of variations.

The project team leader then utilized animation of various movements to help explain how vehicles and non-motorized users would be able to traverse the interchange area in all directions using all modes. He stressed the major ideas of separating Veterans Boulevard from Woodside Road with a fly-over; the concept of roundabouts; the use of potential grade separation of the through traffic on Woodside Road; and the diverging diamond alternative. At the end of the presentation, the project schedule was reviewed along with opportunities for additional public input.

The PowerPoint presentation can be found online at: https://www.youtube.com/v/a1uPVf0ZreE&autoplay=1

The general information web page can be accessed through the following link: http://www.redwoodcity.org/101-84
The participants asked general questions after the presentation. All questions were addressed before the presentation portion of the meeting was adjourned and the participants went to the input stations. Appendix E contains a list of those general questions and the answers given by the project team. The questions mainly related to construction impacts, city decision making authority and project costs and funding. In addition, there were questions about surrounding real estate acquisitions and the concept of a gateway treatment for the project area.
SECTION FOUR

Station #1 No Build/Existing Conditions Alternative
The “No Build,” map of existing conditions was utilized to remind attendees about the current configuration of the interchange.

There was comparatively little interaction and comment at this station. Meeting attendees supported doing something to improve the interchange from its current configuration and function. While attendees expressed interest and concern regarding construction staging and impacts as well as potential project cost, there were no formal comments registered to “do nothing” in this location or to protest the project.
Station #2 The Screening Process
The project team considered and documented its analysis of a variety of project alternatives, and variations of the alternatives, at this station. These alternatives included providing access to Route 101 from Maple Avenue, various roundabouts and interchange configurations. An Alternatives Analysis Matrix was prepared internally that included all of the alternatives. The alternatives were objectively assessed and ranked, based on 14 different categories considered. The categories were also weighted based on importance. The alternatives shown at this station (shown above) were the ones that did not rise to the top of the ranking, and each listed the main reasons why the respective alternative received a low ranking. The alternatives that received a low ranking are as follows:

**Alternative 1:**
South Bound (SB): Diamond, North Bound (NB): Partial Clover leaf with a partial interchange at Maple St.
Alternative 2:
SB: Loop Off to Veterans, NB: Partial Cloverleaf

Alternative 4:
SB: Loop off to Veterans with a Diamond off to SR 85, NB: Partial Cloverleaf

Alternative 5:
Type L-5 with Maple St. and One-Way Frontage Roads

Alternative 5A:
Type L-5 with Maple St. and Braided Ramps

Alternative 5C:
Type L-5 with Maple St. and One-Way Frontage Roads with no additional ramps.

Alternative 6:
SB: Diamond with 300’ 4-Leg Roundabout, NB: Partial Cloverleaf with 300’ 4-Leg Roundabout

Alternative 6A:
SB: Diamond with 400’ 6-Leg Roundabout, NB: Partial Cloverleaf with 400’ 4-Leg Roundabout

Alternative 7:
Single Point Urban Interchange

Alternative 8:
Diverging Diamond with no Veterans Flyovers

Alternative 8A:
Diverging Diamond with Veterans Flyovers, NB: Veterans off-ramp on the outside of Woodside off-ramp

Alternative 9:
SB: Diamond with 400’ 6-Leg Roundabout, NB: Partial Cloverleaf with 400’ 4-Leg Roundabout

Detailed comments from Station #2 can be found in Appendix B. The attendees indicated support for the project team’s analysis to not pursue many of the alternatives presented including Alternatives 1 and 6. Alternative 1 includes a diamond configuration in the southbound direction, partial cloverleaf in the northbound direction, a partial interchange at Maple Street, and elimination of the connection to Veterans Boulevard. Attendees indicated that this alternative did not address many of the issues. Alternative 6 includes a diamond configuration in both directions and roundabouts on both sides of the freeway. There were several comments related to dislike of roundabouts, including ability to accommodate trucks.
There was support expressed for the alternative that would provide access to and from Maple (Alternative 5) although it is not recommended to move forward. Other attendees utilized this station to explain what they saw as existing deficiencies in the system and ask for clarity in alternative designs.

At this station, area property owners asked specific questions related to right-of-way.
Station #3 Alternative 3 – Partial Cloverleaf/Diamond Alternative

Alternative 3
SB: Diamond with Flyover
NB: Partial Cloverleaf

Alternative 3 is a partial cloverleaf in the northbound direction and a diamond configuration in the southbound direction. It includes a direct-connector flyover to Veterans Boulevard. There are two variations to this alternative: (A) a roundabout at the Woodside Road intersection of the northbound ramps, and (B) a grade separation of the through Woodside Road movements at Broadway. Variation A (roundabout) is being considered due to its safety characteristics (fewer severe accidents) and more free flow conditions (no traffic signal). Variation B (Broadway grade separation) is being considered to separate/remove through traffic on Woodside Road from the intersection, which would significantly reduce congestion for local traffic (bicyclists, pedestrians, and vehicles) at the Broadway/Woodside intersection. The following is a summary of the comments received on this alternative and its two variations. Detailed comments from Station #3 can be found in Appendix C.

The comments and questions from the community related to construction impacts, costs and general questions regarding functionality. There was a question regarding how the project would be staged and built. Comments included adding left turn lanes on Bay Street at Woodside Road, adding more pedestrian facilities, and about restoring access to a particular property.
Alternative 3A
SB: Diamond with Flyover
NB: 250’ Inscribed Diameter Double Left Roundabout with bypasses for both NB on and off ramps

There were many comments against utilizing a roundabout design. Attendees expressed concern about driver confusion and truck incompatibility, especially regarding the tandem trucks.
Alternative 3B
SB: Diamond with Flyover, Grade Separated Intersection at Broadway and Woodside.
NB: 250’ Inscribed Diameter Double left Roundabout with bypasses for both NB on and off ramps

Comments were received both in support of and in opposition to this alternative. The supportive comments requested that the concept of undergrounding the Woodside Road though movement at Broadway be coupled with the diverging diamond design (a feature of Alternative 8B (Diverging Diamond)). There were concerns regarding global warming, as well.
Station #4 Alternative 8B – Diverging Diamond

Diverging Diamond w/ Veterans Flyovers
NB: Woodside off-ramp on the outside of Veterans off-ramp

The Diverging Diamond Interchange is similar to a typical diamond interchange configuration, except that the local street traffic (Woodside Road) shifts to the left side of the road. There are currently over 30 of these interchange configurations in the U.S. today.

This interchange concept has received two awards – one from Popular Science in 2009 and one from AASHTO in 2010 for innovative design. It includes two signalized intersections and two signals at two of the off-ramps. Each of these signals includes simple 2-phase signal timing. That means that six of the eight turning movements at this interchange are free-moving (no signal). It is a very efficient design, as the amount of pavement is minimized and the amount of free-flow is maximized (fewer signals).
A laptop was included at this station that displayed a computer simulation video showing general vehicular movements/patters of a generic Diverging Diamond Interchange concept. It highlighted how vehicles would cross over to the left side of the road and how vehicles would enter and exit the freeway.

The following is a summary of the comments received on this alternative and its two variations. Detailed comments from Station #4 can be found in Appendix D.

Comments on this alternative were related to ideas for specific additions and vehicular movements. This includes the desire for enhanced bicycle features. There were many expressions of support for this alternative. As previously mentioned there is a desire to combine this concept with the grade separation of Woodside Road shown in Alternative 3B (SB: Diamond with Flyover, NB: 250’ Inscribed Diameter Double Left Roundabout with bypasses for both NB on and off ramps).
SECTION FIVE

General/Other Comments
Several project team staff members were available to answer questions and clarify information throughout the evening. They circulated throughout the room or presented at the meeting. Comments and observations not specifically tied to Alternatives have been captured in this section. A detailed summary of general comments can be found in Appendix E.

There were comments made about meeting logistics and requests for additional meetings and materials. There were specific requests made related to bicycle issues and signage. There were comments and concerns registered related to construction impacts, project costs and the decision making process. There was specific concern raised regarding the shared use of the UP corridor and related safety concerns.

Summary of Notes from Comment Cards are also available for review in Appendix E. The comments in writing expressed concern that not enough emphasis on transit was provided in the alternatives, concern regarding a lack of connection to North Fair Oaks via a shared pathway, and additional concerns were expressed regarding bicycle issues, design speeds, and increasing vehicle miles traveled by easing up the congestion at the interchange area.
APPENDIX A

Meeting Flyer
Tuesday, July 29 | 6:30PM - 8:30PM
Downtown Library Community Room
Third Floor
1044 Middlefield Road
Redwood City

Presentation of Alternatives at 6:45 PM.
Learn More and See Alternatives Up Close at Interactive Stations.

FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT THE PROJECT MANAGER, PAUL KRUPKA
PHONE
650-504-2299
PROJECT WEBSITE
http://www.redwoodcity.org/bit/transportation/101.84.Interchange/101.html
EMAIL
PAUL@PKRUPKACONSULTING.COM
REUNIÓN PÚBLICA
07.29.14
ALTERNATIVAS A 101/WOODSIDE

Presentación de alternativas a las 6:45pm
Obtenga más información y vea las alternativas de cerca en las estaciones interactivas

PARA MÁS INFORMACIÓN, Póngase en contacto con el Director del Proyecto, Paul Krupka
PHONE 650-504-2299
SITIO WEB DEL PROYECTO http://www.redwoodcity.org/bit/transportation/101.84.interchange/101.html
EMAIL PAUL@PKRUPKACONSULTING.COM
APPENDIX B

Station #2
Screening Process Feedback
The Screening Process Station – Feedback

The following is a list of comments received by the public in regards to the “less viable alternatives,” that were mounted on display boards at Station #2. Kevin Kramer (URS) was present at this station and received several comments that gave specific personal views of the alternatives that scored lower than those currently being considered.

- Did not like Alternative 6 (SB: Diamond w/300’ 4-leg Roundabout, NB: Partial Cloverleaf w/300’ 4-leg Roundabout) because it was very confusing.
- Liked alternative 9 (SB: Diamond w/Direct Connector to SR 84, NB: Partial Cloverleaf w/Direct Connectors to SR 84), but was wondering if flyovers could go to Bay Street instead.
- Horrible traffic on Middlefield Road. Do any alternatives fix this problem?
- Traffic signals not timed going down Broadway. This is mainly caused by pedestrians. Maybe look into separating pedestrian project with raised walkways.
- Bike traffic tends to interfere with auto traffic.
- Use UPPR as an off ramp.
- On Broadway, east of Woodside needs improvements, but do not take away the parking spaces.
- Need a left only turn lane on Bay Rd to Woodside.
- There was talk about expanding East Bayshore Rd. Is this still going to happen?
- The most traffic is caused by too much truck traffic. Trucks should be separated.
- Liked Alternative 5 (Type L-5 w/Maple and One-Way Frontage Roads) because it would move some traffic away from Woodside.
- No roundabouts of any size. This would be too hard for trucks.
- No roundabouts these are too hard to drive.
- Worried that the Jay Paul development will change the traffic making the new design useless. Expressed concern that alternatives be developed to last and take into account future development.
- Does not want to share the undercrossing with pedestrians, separate them.
- Liked Alternative 5 (Type L-5 w/Maple and One-Way Frontage Roads) and 5A (Type L-5 w/Maple and Braided Ramps).
- Why do a Veterans flyover? Why not a Broadway flyover because that is where the most traffic is.
- Ramps are too short and create quick merge situations. Can we make them longer?
- Wanted to see animations of traffic for all of the alternatives, so they can see how they operate.
- Liked Alternative 5 (Type L-5 w/Maple and One-Way Frontage Roads).
- Alternative 1 (SB: Diamond, NB: Partial Cloverleaf, Maple: Partial I/C) is too simple and won’t fix the problem.
- Request for a safer interchange. The interchange area is too dangerous.
- Four attendees suggested widening Route 101.
- Alternative 1 (SB: Diamond, NB: Partial Cloverleaf, Maple: Partial I/C) won’t work.
- Alternative 3 (SB: Diamond w/flyover, NB: Partial Cloverleaf) won’t work.
- Alternative 5 (Type L-5 w/Maple and One-Way Frontage Roads) might work.
- Alternative 6 (SB: Diamond w/300’ 4-leg Roundabout, NB: Partial Cloverleaf w/300’ 4-leg Roundabout) very dangerous looking.
- Alternative 7 (Single Point) does not make sense intuitively.
- Alternative 9 (SB: Diamond w/Direct Connector to SR 84, NB: Partial Cloverleaf w/ Direct Connectors to SR 84) will not work.
- Frequenters of Smart & Final customers cannot currently make left turns out of its parking lot due to back up on Broadway (no gaps in traffic). It became worse when the City removed a center turn lane. Concerned it will get worse.
- Business owners concerned with continued access during and after construction. They are leasing property and hope to buy and are concerned whether project may affect access to their property.
- How do the bike lanes work on Woodside? They just seemed to end at each project limit.
- We live at the Mobile home park to the south, what are potential project impacts to our existing sound wall?
Station #3 Alternatives Feedback

**Alternative 3** – Partial Cloverleaf with Diamond

**Alternative 3A** – SB: Diamond with Flyover, NB: 250’ Inscribed Diameter Doubt Left Roundabout with bypasses for both NB on and off ramps, and

**Alternative 3B** – SB: Diamond with Flyover, Grade Separated Intersection at Broadway and Woodside, NB: 250’ Inscribed Diameter Double Left Roundabout with bypasses for both NB on and off ramps
Alternative 3 Station – Feedback

The following is a list of comments received by the public in regards to the Alternative 3 Station (Station #3). This station was staffed by Abhijeet Bhoi (URS) who interacted with those that had questions and comments regarding the 3 Alternatives. The station included large-scale exhibits of each alternative, including the base and the two variations.

Comments on Base Alternative (Alternative 3):

- Provide left turn pockets on Bay Road turning onto both directions of Woodside Road.
- What are the costs and relative costs of the alternatives?
- Who makes the decision on which alternative is built?
- Install a dedicated pedestrian signal at NB off ramp bypass ramp for Alternative 3A (SB: Diamond with Flyover, NB: 250’ Inscribed Diameter Doubt Left Roundabout with bypasses for both NB on and off ramps) and Alternative 3B (SB: Diamond with Flyover, Grade Separated Intersection at Broadway and Woodside, NB: 250’ Inscribed Diameter Double Left Roundabout with bypasses for both NB on and off ramps) consider putting in some traffic calming to slow the off ramp traffic.
- Broadway Auto gas station owner (at Broadway and Woodside intersection) described how difficult it is for drivers to exit from the driveway and turn right on Woodside Road to get on the freeway. He wondered if access on Bay Road can be restored, which was closed about 15 years ago.
- Describe staged construction and noise and dust during construction.
- Lyngso representative was concerned about addition of Class 1 trail along UP corridor as it would create a conflict with their truck operations.

Comments on Roundabout Alternative (Alternative 3A):

- Roundabout concept is not supported.
- Roundabouts were cited as too confusing.
- Tandem trucks will not work well with roundabout configurations.
- Prefer the diverging diamond over the roundabout (once they reviewed the animation and turning movements).

Comments on Woodside Road Grade Separation Alternative (Alternative 3B):

- Concern regarding impacts of global warming on all alternatives, especially the variation where Woodside Road is depressed (Alternative 3B).
- Can the Broadway/Woodside undercrossing could be included with the diverging diamond?
- Broadway grade separation and diverging diamond were supported.
APPENDIX D

Station #4 Alternative 8B – Diverging Diamond Feedback
Alternative 8B (Diverging Diamond) – Feedback

The following is a list of comments provided by the public regarding Alternative 8B. Tyson Tano (URS) was present at this station. The Station included a large-scale exhibit of Alternative 8B and a video of a generic simulation of vehicular movements/patterns if a Diverging Diamond were constructed at the 101/84 (Woodside) Interchange. It highlighted how vehicles would cross over to the other side of the road and how vehicles would enter and exit the freeway.

- Strong support for the diverging diamond concept.
- Request for left turn pockets on Bay Street approaches to Woodside.
- Request for “No left turn” from Smart & Final and USPS to Broadway.
- How will sun impact drivers in morning and evening?
- Add a Class 2 bike lane on WB Woodside to Spring Street.
- The Broadway/Woodside intersection is critical to all nearby developments including 24 Hour Fitness, Stanford in Redwood City, and others.
- Better operational improvements at Broadway/Woodside intersection are desired can the team investigate:
  1. Roundabout at Broadway/Woodside.
  2. Add Broadway undercrossing from Alt 3B (SB: Diamond with Flyover, NB: 250’ Inscribed Diameter Doubt Left Roundabout with bypasses for both NB on and off ramps) to Alt 8B (Diverging Diamond).
- Address the existing morning (9am) backup on the NB 101 off-ramp to Seaport.
- Chestnut Street should be used to continue under US 101 where the bike/pedestrian trail is shown.
- The northbound on-ramp looks like a very tight left turn, too tight.
- Desire for a shared bike path in the median for the diverging diamond alternative.
- What impact will the ramp metering have on ‘free flowing’ operations? –as they relate to the diverging diamond alternative.
APPENDIX E

General Comments, Questions and Answers
Questions received during the general session question period are as follows:
(The answers given are shown in parentheses.)

- Any difference in construction time between alternatives? (Very little.)
- What is a “Gateway project”? (One that provides enhanced access to the community; there is potential for specific funding for more landscaping, more prominent project with City planning.)
- If we want to raise comments or questions later, can we do so on the website? (Recommended they email Paul Krupka via the address on the literature available at the meeting, his contact information is also available on the City’s web page.)
- Costs of alternatives? (Not fully developed yet. Will be providing at third meeting.)
- Any alternatives more disruptive? (Impacts will be described in the environmental document and next meetings.)
- Any alternatives require eminent domain? (Hopefully not. Usually work out mutually agreeable compensation during right-of-way process.)
- Who ultimately makes the decision on the alternatives? (Caltrans ultimately, but the City is the project sponsor and funding the project, and City intends to be a significant partner in decision. Caltrans will not build something the City does not want.)
- Does City only advance one alternative/will environmental document have alternatives? (Most likely will be two, at least that is intent at this time, plus a “No Build” alternative.)
- Redwood City is providing the money for this? Are bond funds involved? (City funding is coming from the existing Transportation Impact Fees fund. About $400K for this phase of work from the City, and $3.4 M from existing sales tax funding. For this phase of work, no bond funds are involved.)

Questions received during the Open House times are as follows:

- Please send out reminder the day of public meeting.
- The mayor uses a website, “mind mixer,” that he engages the community. This would be a perfect place for a discussion regarding the project.
- Would like to have a meeting at the mobile home housing near the project.
- Concern about the noise from the project.
- Request for Class 2 bike lanes to have dashed continuity lines where motor vehicles are crossing to access a right turn lane.
- Right turn lanes should be designed as "add lanes" so that the sign "Yield to Bikes" can be implemented as per MUTCD.
- Lyngso representatives were very concerned about safety of bicyclists on the proposed multiuse path adjacent to the railroad at their site access to/from Seaport Blvd; they wanted to know about traffic control at this path/driveway junction.
- Lynsgo representative further indicated that truck movements are frequent and that there is not enough queuing space for right and left turns into the site. There are a few
movements in and out of Blomquist Street but the principal direction of travel is to and from Seaport.

- Global edit to the plans and documents - the term multi use trail should be replaced with "shared use path" as per AASHTO and Caltrans.
- Suggestion to relocate Woodside Road to the South, to help eliminate much of the detouring/traffic handling that would be needed to keep Woodside in its current location.
- What is the Transportation Authority and could it fund construction of the project?
- Who makes the decision about what gets built? This relates to the question raised about Caltrans's authority for approval of the project and the City's role in influencing what gets built, considering CEQA/NEPA.
- Very concerned about business and property access impacts during construction.
- Must take a long-term view to make sure we build a project that has a maximum useful life. Is addressing the 2040 horizon adequate or should we look at a longer horizon in years (50 or 100 years)? Can we build something bigger that will last longer? Need to compare the relative investment value of the interchange project to the massive investment in real estate developments underway when deciding what to build and who should pay. In other words, a $100M investment for the interchange pales in comparison to the massive ($Billion plus?) investment in major projects like Stanford in Redwood City, Crossing 900, Kaiser, numerous housing projects, etc.
- Desire expressed for digital images of the alternatives to share to help "talk up" the project.
- Desire for separate left-turn lanes on Bay Road at the intersection of Bay/Woodside, so that through traffic and right-turns are not blocked.
- Concern regarding left-turns into and out of the USPS and Smart & Final parking. These movements are too close to the Broadway/Woodside intersection. Turning restrictions to reduce the potential for accidents.
- Desire for clarity regarding the proposed alignment of the Blomquist connection between Seaport and the new Bridge.
- Blomquist/Seaport Intersection Operation – Poor operation at this intersection causes queuing back onto the US 101 auxiliary lane. Pedestrian/bicycle use is a contributing factor.
- Several comments in support of the under pass at Broadway/Woodside intersection were expressed.
- Near-term request to have a through-right and through-left on the eastbound approach at Veterans/Woodside intersection to allow more vehicles to access the southbound on-ramp.
- Support for the added bike facilities in the interchange area.
- Attendees expressed concern that the interchange alternatives were still too dangerous for bikes.
- There were a few questions on how pedestrians crossed some of the ramps within the interchange area.
- For bicyclists trying to get to the other side of 101, going through the interchange is really long. Crossing south of the interchange would be much shorter according to some attendees.
- Consider opportunities to segregate truck traffic from personal vehicles – if separate facilities are too expensive, perhaps time restrictions were offered as a solution to be explored.
- On Broadway, immediately south of Woodside Road, left turning traffic from the Smart & Final driveway and the Post Office are routine and observed to cause delays and collisions. A request for the City to prohibit left turns there.
- The absence of left turn lanes on Bay Road approaches to Woodside Road is observed to cause congestion and unsafe vehicle movements. Desire expressed for the City to add left turn lanes.
1. I would like more consideration of public transit routes and connectivity between future potential routes.
2. There are significant issues with the proposed trail routes – for bicycles and for people walking – it would be helpful to look at design from the point of view of welcoming & encouraging walking and cycling trips rather than merely “accommodating,” and addressing “safety,” Aesthetics of high concrete walls are lacking.
3. Be cognizant of design speed especially at non-peak hour where bicycles and pedestrians are crossing where cars should be encouraged by design to go slower – many of the turn radius’ on the drawings could encourage too fast ramp entry etc.
4. There is a social justice issue with the main multi-use path being unconnected to North Fair Oaks (on SE area) where lower income residents have higher bicycle (rest of comment is illegible).
5. I am concerned that this project appears to encourage increased car trips (VMT) rather than embracing a legislative goal to reduce VMT (o.f. legislation to change modeling of traffic issues on LOS (Delay to vehicles and instead to measure based on reduced VMT) – by the time this project is being built, the goals statewide may be contrary to the goals this project appears to address.
6. I appreciate the degree to which multi-use paths are included in multiple designs. I am pleased that there is willingness to add paths as well as bike lanes – the bike lane is old technology but will use it and it’s good you’re doing both.
7. Shared lanes are not recommended for roadways where speeds are above 30 mph. They are schematics (in my experience) (1) suggest cars in the interchanges will be traveling faster than 30 mph.

2.

1. Keep bikes completely segregated from the heavy traffic. The train track option is far better than mixing it with Woodside Road.
2. #1 on roundabout at Woodside x Broadway.
3. Below grade – water impacts. With rising sea level/water table?

3.

1. DD1 looks good.
4.

1. The E News blast is good to reach people concerning meetings, but there needs to be a reminder blast on the day before and again on the day of the meetings.

5.

1. Prefer 8A and 3B respectively cost and traffic disruptions should be taken into consideration on final design choice.

6.

1. I work beside this interchange option 8 with 3B underpass is my favorite.
2. Traffic must move freely off 101.
3. Bad 9am backup from 101N to Seaport at E. Bayshore must be fixed.

7.

(translated from Spanish)

1. I am interested in having a meeting in Spanish at Le Mar Trailer Park for people who live there since 90% of those that live in that area are Latino. I would like my neighbors to be informed of the project, its benefits and disadvantages.
APPENDIX F

Meeting Handouts
The City of Redwood City, in cooperation with the California Department of Transportation and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority, is proposing to reconstruct the Route 101/State Route 84 Woodside Road interchange. The intent is to modify the on- and off-ramp configuration at the interchange and adjacent local intersections to improve traffic flow, increase safety, and better accommodate pedestrian and bicycle access across Route 101.

PROJECT APPROVAL & ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT PHASE

Preliminary Engineering Studies Community Outreach Environmental Studies

Engineering and traffic studies are well underway. Community outreach efforts included coordination with stakeholders and City Council, and a community workshop in Spring 2014. Preliminary alternatives have been developed for a second community meeting in Summer 2014. Initial environmental studies have begun, and preliminary design will continue to develop the most promising alternatives.

PROJECT GOALS

- Accommodate existing and projected traffic congestion
- Enhance mobility and safety for all users and modes; and
- Improve traffic operations at nearby intersections

FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT THE PROJECT MANAGER, PAUL KRUPKA

PHONE 650-504-2299 PROJECT WEB PAGE www.redwoodcity.org/101-84 EMAIL paul@pkrupkaconsulting.com
**FOCUS**
- Introduction/Overview
- Purpose & Schedule
- Existing Conditions
- Gather Input

**FOCUS**
- Alternatives Presentation
- Updated Project Info
- Alternatives Feedback
- Environmental Scoping

**FOCUS**
- Alternatives Analysis Results
- Narrowing of Alternatives
- Feedback

**FOCUS**
- Alternatives Analysis Updates
- Draft Project Report
- Draft Environmental Document

---

**LEGEND:**
- **CS** Community Stakeholder Meetings (20)
- **CM** Community Meetings (3)
- **CSS** Council Study Sessions (4)
- **ENV** Environmental Meetings (2)

---

**COMMUNITY OUTREACH SCHEDULE**

**PROJECT APPROVAL & ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT PHASE**

101/84 Woodside Road Interchange Improvement Project

**UPDATED: 7/23/14**
La ciudad de Redwood City, en cooperación con el Departamento de Transporte de California y la Autoridad de Transporte del Condado de San Mateo, se propone reconstruir la Ruta 101/Ruta Estatal 84 Woodside Road. La intención es modificar la configuración de la rampa en la intersección y las intersecciones locales contiguas para mejorar el flujo de tráfico, aumentar la seguridad y mejorar el acceso de bicicletas y de peatones a través de la ruta.

**Objetivos del Proyecto**

- Acomodar la congestión del tráfico existe y proyectado; y
- Mejorar la movilidad y la seguridad para todos los usuarios; y
- Mejorar las operaciones de tráfico en las intersecciones cercanas
## Calendario de Alcance a la Comunidad

**Aprobación del Proyecto y Fase de Documentación Ambiental**

**Proyecto de Mejoras al Crucero 101/84 Woodside Road**

### Enfoques

- **Introducción / Información general**
- **Propósito y Calendario**
- **Condiciones existentes**
- **Recopilar información e ideas**

### Presentación de Alternativas

- **Información actualizada del proyecto**
- **Comentarios de Alternativas**
- **Estudios Ambientales**

### Resultado del Análisis de Alternativas

- **Disminución de Alternativas**
- **Comentarios**

### Actualizaciones de Análisis Alternativo

- **Reporte Preliminar del Proyecto**
- **Documento Ambiental Preliminar**

### LEGEND:

- **CS:** Reuniones de grupos o individuos interesados (20)
- **CM:** Reuniones Comunitarias (3)
- **CSS:** Sesión de Estudio con el Consejo Municipal (4)
- **ENV:** Reuniones Ambientales (2)

### Calendario de Alcance a la Comunidad

**Sitio web, hoja de Datos, Línea de Información y Apoyo al Alcance**

**Enfoque:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ene</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ene</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feb</strong></td>
<td><strong>Feb</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mar</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mar</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abr</strong></td>
<td><strong>Abr</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May</strong></td>
<td><strong>May</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jun</strong></td>
<td><strong>Jun</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jul</strong></td>
<td><strong>Jul</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aagos</strong></td>
<td><strong>Aagos</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scoping</strong></td>
<td><strong>Scoping</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proyecto de Mejoras al Crucero 101/84 Woodside Road</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proyecto de Mejoras al Crucero 101/84 Woodside Road</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calendario de Alcance a la Comunidad</strong></td>
<td><strong>Calendario de Alcance a la Comunidad</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aprobación del Proyecto y Fase de Documentación Ambiental</strong></td>
<td><strong>Aprobación del Proyecto y Fase de Documentación Ambiental</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENFOQUE**

- **Introducción / Información general**
- **Propósito y Calendario**
- **Condiciones existentes**
- **Recopilar información e ideas**

**ENFOQUE**

- **Presentación de Alternativas**
- **Información actualizada del proyecto**
- **Comentarios de Alternativas**
- **Estudios Ambientales**

**ENFOQUE**

- **Resultado del Análisis de Alternativas**
- **Disminución de Alternativas**
- **Comentarios**

**ENFOQUE**

- **Actualizaciones de Análisis Alternativo**
- **Reporte Preliminar del Proyecto**
- **Documento Ambiental Preliminar**

**UPDATED: 7/23/14**
DIVERGING DIAMOND INTERCHANGE

- There are over 30 DDIs already in use today in US. (Utah, Missouri, Tennessee, Kentucky, New York, Nevada (Reno), Minnesota, Georgia, Maryland, Idaho, Kansas, Wyoming, Ohio, Virginia and Colorado)... NO DDI exist in California!

- Common Congestion problems of Existing Conditions
  - Heavy exiting traffic from the freeways causing back up onto the freeways.
    - I-590 @ South Winton Road - Brighton, New York
    - I-15 @ American Fork Main Street - American Fork, Utah
    - I-86 @ Yellowstone Avenue - Chubbuck, Idaho
  - Heavy Traffic on local roads trying to enter the freeway.
    - I-15 @ St. George Boulevard - St. George, Utah
    - Bangterer Highway @ SR 201 - West Valley City, Utah
    - I-435 @ Front Street - Kansas City, Missouri - FIRST DDI !!!
  - The area around the intersections has been rapidly developed over the years increasing the amount of traffic.
    - Highway 15 @ County Road 120 - St. Cloud, Minnesota
    - I-270 @ Roberts Road - Columbus, Ohio
    - I-70 @ US 6 / US 50 - Grand Junction, Colorado

- Why the Diamond Sparkles
  - Improves traffic flow for user exiting the freeway. No more stopped traffic on off ramps trying to exit.
  - Improves traffic flow for motorist entering freeway. No more left hand turns onto freeway, instead motorist will have free flow access.
  - Safety
  - Cost Benefits

- Supporting Data
  - Operational Benefits
    - MODOT survey shows that 95% of drivers felt that there was less congestion in the new Springfield DDI compared to the previous interchange.
    - Daily traffic backups that sometimes had over a mile queue were completed eliminated.
  - Safety Benefits
    - MODOT survey shows that 97% of drivers feel safer in the new Springfield DDI compared to the previous interchange.
    - Crash data for the new Springfield DDI show a 60% reduction in collisions in a five-month comparison of the old interchange
    - Versailles, France DDI showed that within a five-year time span that was examined, there were only been 11 reported light crashes

- Cost Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interchange</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>DDI Cost</th>
<th>Alternative Design Cost</th>
<th>Cost Savings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-44 / Route 13</td>
<td>Springfield, MO</td>
<td>$3.2 Million</td>
<td>Over $10 Million</td>
<td>about 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-435 / Front Street</td>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>$6.7 Million</td>
<td>Diamond $11.4 Million</td>
<td>about 75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-265 / SR-62</td>
<td>Utica, IN</td>
<td>$52 Million</td>
<td>$118 Million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$66 Million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-590 / Winton Road</td>
<td>Brighton, NY</td>
<td>$3-54 Million</td>
<td>SPU $10 Million</td>
<td>about 75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Meeting
July 29, 2014

US Route 101/State Route 84 (Woodside Rd) Interchange Improvement Project

COMMENT SHEET

Comment Sheets may be deposited in the comment box tonight, or mailed to:

City of Redwood City
ATTN: Paul Krupka, Project Manager
Krupka Consulting
409 Rolling Hills Avenue
San Mateo, CA 94403

Name: ________________________________________________________________________
Affiliation: __________________________________________________________________
Address: ______________________________________________________________________

Comment/Question: __________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________

Please continue on back if necessary.