S.R. 92-82 (El Camino Real) Interchange Improvement Project  
Open House/Informational Meeting/Map Display  
San Mateo City Hall Atrium  
Wednesday, January 29, 2014 – 5:30 pm to 8:30 pm  

**SIGN-IN SHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Please Print)</th>
<th>Address (Please Print)</th>
<th>E-mail Address (Please Print)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laurie Watanuki</td>
<td>1007 E. STANFORD SM.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lwatanuki69@gmail.com">lwatanuki69@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Wang</td>
<td>149 21st Ave.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wang-j@gmail.com">wang-j@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Jordan</td>
<td>104 Hayward ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Gianzan</td>
<td>1322 Tulip Ave., SW</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scanzione@cityofsammtec.org">scanzione@cityofsammtec.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Friedman</td>
<td>1951 O’Farrell St. #314 SM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:howardfriedman@cei.com">howardfriedman@cei.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Brownan</td>
<td>134 12th Ave, SM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chrisbrownan@gmail.com">chrisbrownan@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathie Zemmit</td>
<td>350 W ZORRA AV SM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:czemmit@cityofsammtec.org">czemmit@cityofsammtec.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Kisper</td>
<td>404 SUGAR CREEK SM</td>
<td>JEFF <a href="mailto:KISPER@CBOUBLC.COM">KISPER@CBOUBLC.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Matriotta</td>
<td>3025 MANTLEY ST. SM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fmatricia56@comcast.net">fmatricia56@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S.R. 92-82 (El Camino Real) Interchange Improvement Project
Open House/Informational Meeting/Map Display
San Mateo City Hall Atrium
Wednesday, January 29, 2014 – 5:30 pm to 8:30 pm

**SIGN-IN SHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Please Print)</th>
<th>Address (Please Print)</th>
<th>E-mail Address (Please Print)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMITT WALLACE</td>
<td>19510 CARRELL ST 94021</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wallaces1951@aol.com">wallaces1951@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devra Harris</td>
<td>70 M. Leland Ave, 5M</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dwahams@gmail.com">dwahams@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Keane</td>
<td>1543 Yew Street 94022</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scott.ken@ymail.com">scott.ken@ymail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enca Gilbert</td>
<td>223 E. Bellevue 94001</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cardman49@aol.com">cardman49@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Cohan</td>
<td>1949 Ivy St 94003</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Pz2721@aol.com">Pz2721@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt &amp; Dee Fugio</td>
<td>198 Sparkway Dr, 5M, 94003</td>
<td>m*<a href="mailto:fugio524@gmail.com">fugio524@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard H.</td>
<td>1247 Madonna del Mar 94003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve &amp; Erika Herrick</td>
<td>1524 Kalmar ST</td>
<td><a href="mailto:SteveHerrick@ME.com">SteveHerrick@ME.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando Latios</td>
<td>204 Roselle St, 5M, 94003</td>
<td><a href="mailto:esnfern@aol.com">esnfern@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sign-in Sheet for Open House/Map Display (3 of 9)

**S.R. 92-82 (El Camino Real) Interchange Improvement Project**  
**Open House/Informational Meeting/Map Display**  
**San Mateo City Hall Atrium**  
**Wednesday, January 29, 2014 – 5:30 pm to 8:30 pm**

### SIGN-IN SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Please Print):</th>
<th>Address (Please Print):</th>
<th>E-mail Address (Please Print):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Kerekian/Jody Markham</td>
<td>578 S. Elwood Ave, SM</td>
<td>jenescboy @ area.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Lynn</td>
<td>935 S. Humboldt St, SM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nlynn@vivionics.com">nlynn@vivionics.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Carson</td>
<td>2813 Garfield St, SM</td>
<td>jandccarson @ comcast.net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Haber</td>
<td>200 W. 3rd Ave, SM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:4KHRE@ymail.com">4KHRE@ymail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Brinell</td>
<td>1814 Rd. Ave., SM</td>
<td>dosculltji2 @ gmail.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Everett</td>
<td>3529 Los Angeles St, SM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ecosande@gmail.com">ecosande@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Lower</td>
<td>155 Boulie Rd, SM</td>
<td>lowerpower @ yahoomail.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address (Please Print)</td>
<td>E-mail Address (Please Print)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane Costello</td>
<td>967 19th Ave, SM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dee.maki@gmail.com">dee.maki@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Makovski</td>
<td>120 Avenida San Pedro, CA 93401</td>
<td><a href="mailto:johnmakovski@gmail.com">johnmakovski@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeez Mahmood</td>
<td>2815 E. 23rd St., SM 9401</td>
<td><a href="mailto:LAHORE2002@gmail.com">LAHORE2002@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Diaz</td>
<td>526 Lodi Ave., SM 9401</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jesionia@gmail.com">jesionia@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Curdy</td>
<td>1917 Palm Ave. 94403</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lskepro@gmail.com">lskepro@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Shankle</td>
<td>1024 Tesla Ct. 94403</td>
<td>suzanshanklesowanet.net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie Radyk</td>
<td>244 Quarry Way, SM 94403</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mradyk@tigre.com">mradyk@tigre.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Bradly</td>
<td>226 S. Eldorado</td>
<td><a href="mailto:norman@pyanksters.org">norman@pyanksters.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sign-In Sheet for Open House/Map Display (5 of 9)

S.R. 92-82 (El Camino Real) Interchange Improvement Project
Open House/Informational Meeting/Map Display
San Mateo City Hall Atrium
Wednesday, January 29, 2014 – 5:30 pm to 8:30 pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Please Print):</th>
<th>Address (Please Print):</th>
<th>E-mail Address (Please Print):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minnie Dinges</td>
<td>1645 1st St, SM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dingsmarrnice@gmail.com">dingsmarrnice@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dina Antoniazzi</td>
<td>1740 Ivy St, SM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dantoniazzi@att.net">dantoniazzi@att.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Stone</td>
<td>315 11th St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:RBarrow73@gmail.com">RBarrow73@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doreen Miller</td>
<td>515 Birch Ave, SM</td>
<td>doreen@<a href="mailto:millen@hotmail.com">millen@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julalekovioli</td>
<td>42424a Rd, SM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jemlov@yahoo.com">jemlov@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Opat</td>
<td>611 Second Ave.</td>
<td>E D O 1 @ H O T M A I L . c O M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold &amp; Debbie Redman</td>
<td>29 Eucalps Pkwy</td>
<td><a href="mailto:computer-tek@po.tox.com">computer-tek@po.tox.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Southward</td>
<td>2052 Stratford Way</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jim@Southward-tax.com">jim@Southward-tax.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Smith</td>
<td>2033 Stratford Way</td>
<td>Barry <a href="mailto:Smith@Gmail.com">Smith@Gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S.R. 92-82 (El Camino Real) Interchange Improvement Project
Open House/Informational Meeting/Map Display
San Mateo City Hall Atrium
Wednesday, January 29, 2014 – 5:30 pm to 8:30 pm

**SIGN-IN SHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Please Print)</th>
<th>Address (Please Print)</th>
<th>E-mail Address (Please Print)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julie Hirsch</td>
<td>3809 Pasandu Dr</td>
<td><a href="mailto:CSRIALeu@AGL.com">CSRIALeu@AGL.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Spitali</td>
<td>15116 Edelmohe St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Brach</td>
<td>451-22nd Ave.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Edstrach@yahoo.com">Edstrach@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Bonilla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wes Tada</td>
<td>15116 Edelmohe St.</td>
<td>Togaran1n@<a href="mailto:Y@100.com">Y@100.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertha Sanders</td>
<td>1215 Dix Street</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Cabuglay@comcast.net">Cabuglay@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edith Cabuglay</td>
<td>1215 Dix St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacy Weiss</td>
<td>1215 N. Kingston St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Stacywaiss@mac.com">Stacywaiss@mac.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Elliott</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ycomt.sm@gattownd.com">ycomt.sm@gattownd.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name (Please Print)</td>
<td>Address (Please Print)</td>
<td>E-mail Address (Please Print)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Baxter</td>
<td>1537 Edinburgh St</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gilbarker@yahoo.com">gilbarker@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Page</td>
<td>222 23rd Ave</td>
<td><a href="mailto:KarlPage@gmail.com">KarlPage@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S.R. 92-82 (El Camino Real) Interchange Improvement Project
Open House/Informational Meeting/Map Display
San Mateo City Hall Atrium
Wednesday, January 29, 2014 – 5:30 pm to 8:30 pm
S.R. 92-82 (El Camino Real) Interchange Improvement Project
Open House/Informational Meeting/Map Display
San Mateo City Hall Atrium
Wednesday, January 29, 2014 – 5:30 pm to 8:30 pm

**SIGN-IN SHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Please Print)</th>
<th>Address (Please Print)</th>
<th>E-mail Address (Please Print)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tim Jad</td>
<td>1597 Yew St. S.M.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:timjad@gmail.com">timjad@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Costello</td>
<td>96-19th St</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chuck.castello@gmail.com">chuck.castello@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy Bacchi</td>
<td>1915 Dwy S. M.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tamara.bacchi@gmail.com">tamara.bacchi@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Marblestone</td>
<td>1439 Ashwood Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Michlin</td>
<td>2140 Genese Ave #1</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jay.michlin@gmail.com">jay.michlin@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marielle A. Cwison</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mariecelle.cwison@yahoo.com">mariecelle.cwison@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Hensley</td>
<td>1250 S 2nd Avenue NE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hensleyj@santana.com">hensleyj@santana.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Loring</td>
<td>1746 Caliente #1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Loring</td>
<td>1751 Caliente #1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name (Please Print)</td>
<td>Address (Please Print)</td>
<td>E-mail Address (Please Print)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Dixon</td>
<td>136 Woodside Ave, San Mateo</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joan.dixon@cityofsanmateo.ca">joan.dixon@cityofsanmateo.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Jo-Vogel</td>
<td>15933 Yew St, San Mateo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Spolar</td>
<td>702 E 1st Ave, San Mateo</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dbspolar@gmail.com">dbspolar@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Nigaki</td>
<td>N/A (C/CAG)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jnigaki@smc.gov.org">jnigaki@smc.gov.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dylan RHI</td>
<td>221 8th Ave #308, Sunnyvale</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dylansun@gmail.com">dylansun@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Boll</td>
<td>1914 Palm Ave, SM-4405</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jboll@barney.com">jboll@barney.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. D. Honore</td>
<td>1720 Ivy St, San Mateo</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rdHonore@gmail.com">rdHonore@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Hewitt</td>
<td>1531 Edinburgh St, S.M.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hhewitt@aol.com">hhewitt@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Binkman</td>
<td>1700 S El Camino Real, S.M.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:catherine.binkman@comcast.net">catherine.binkman@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S.R. 92-82 (El Camino Real) Interchange Improvement Project
Open House/Informational Meeting/Map Display
San Mateo City Hall Atrium
Wednesday, January 29, 2014 – 5:30 pm to 8:30 pm

SIGN-IN SHEET
Public Comment 1:

Comment received from T. Jack Foster, Jr.

T. JACK FOSTER, JR.
1840 Gateway Drive, Ste 100
Foster City, California 94404-4066

Phone: (650) 312-9700 x204
Fax: (650) 312-9708

February 11, 2014

Caltrans District 4
Attention: Yolanda Rivas
P. O. Box 23650, MS 8B
Oakland, CA. 94623-0650

Dear Ms. Rivas,

I have studied the proposed redesign of the 92/84 interchange and have some thoughts. I use this interchange two or more times a day.

Frankly, I think it works pretty well with one exception. On west-bound 92, the exit onto El Camino north bound (84) can back up. This could be relieved if on El Camino, the right lane were channeled in a manner to keep cars out of it. The only cars using that lane would be those exiting 92, west bound, on to El Camino, north. I frequently see a car using that lane when all the other northbound lanes are empty. Cars on the off ramp must wait.

Because local traffic uses the interchange to get across the railroad tracks, when they are going from El Camino to Delaware or vice versa, it would help to have the off ramp connect directly to the next on-ramp, without needing to get into the traffic lanes.

I would hate to see two more traffic stops on El Camino.

Very truly yours,

T. Jack Foster, Jr.
Caltrans Response to Public Comment 1:

Caltrans has received your comment on the proposed project and has the following response:

The proposed project would address the vehicle back-up at the westbound SR 92 to northbound El Camino Real off-ramp by signalizing El Camino Real at the off-ramp, thus providing a dedicated phase for vehicles to turn from the ramp.

The high volume of through traffic on northbound El Camino Real (expected to reach 3,000 vehicles during the PM peak hour by 2038) requires three through lanes. Reducing El Camino Real to two northbound lanes at the off-ramp would result in additional congestion on El Camino Real. Additionally, vehicles coming from the off-ramp and turning left onto Bovet Road would have a limited distance to weave across the through lanes and into the left-turn pocket, creating additional congestion. The proposed partial-cloverleaf addresses this issue by allowing off-ramp traffic to turn directly into their desired lane on a green light.

A direct connector between El Camino Real and Delaware Street is beyond the scope of this project.
Comment received from Susan Shankle
Susan Shankle
Paul Pittenger
1624 Toyon Ct.
San Mateo, CA 94403

February 9, 2014

Re: State Route 92-82 (El Camino) Interchange Improvement Project

Tc: Yolanda Rivas, District Branch Chief
    California DOT, District 4 Office of Environmental Analysis
    P.O. Box 23660
    Oakland, CA 94623

Cc: Senator Leland Yee
    Senator Jerry Hill

Dear Yolanda, Leland and Jerry,

We're very glad to see the proposed improvements on the 92/82 interchange here in San Mateo. I've reviewed the documentation available to the public and attended the public meeting last month. Thank you for the opportunity to offer our comment and feedback.

It seems that the insides of the cloverleafs are intended to be landscaped. This seems ill-advised and misses an opportunity to be more creative and efficient.

The current drought demands that we cut water usage, and the long-term probabilities of further drought and increased population surely require that we do not establish any more shrubbery on public land that will require irrigation and maintenance. Further, planting shrubs there would prevent us from using the space to install solar panels that would benefit the community by providing another power source.

When queried, our DOT reps at the public meeting rejected the idea as being “an eyesore”. We do not need such old-fashioned attitudes. I care about my own garden and neighborhood being attractive, but I do not care if my freeway interchange is. On the contrary, I hope that motorists maneuvering around the turns are watching where they are going and not observing the oleanders.

We live in a crowded part of the world and yet we continue to build more houses that are all going to need water and power. Why not use this precious land space to generate much-needed energy and save on water? Possibly a deal could be cut with one of our local solar companies who would welcome the PR and visibility.

I urge you to step up and get creative with this opportunity to capitalize further on a much-needed and apparently elegant interchange project. I'm sure I would not be the only taxpayer who would be outraged to see plants and irrigation installed on that valuable land.

Sincerely,

Susan Shankle
Citizen, Taxpayer, Motorist, Business Owner and Voter
**Caltrans Response to Public Comment 2:**

Caltrans has received your comments on the proposed project and has the following responses:

The insides of the loop on-ramps and off-ramps are to be replanted to replace impacted existing landscaping, and provide erosion control, storm water treatment, and visual quality. Caltrans policy is to provide replacement highway planting from construction impacts.

The project landscape design plan will be based upon drought tolerant principles, namely low-water irrigation (drip) and use of drought tolerant and California native plant species. Even in periods of drought or any water supply disturbance, the objective is for the planting to survive, just as native plants survive drought in natural settings.

Installing solar panels and generating electricity are not part of the purpose and need of the proposed project, which is to reduce existing traffic congestion, bottlenecks, weaving and queue spillback at the interchange on- and off-ramps.
Public Comment 3:

From: wallaces1951@comcast.net [mailto:wallaces1951@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, January 24, 2014 12:03 PM
To: Rivas, Yolanda@DOT
Subject: Comment on pedestrian concerns re: State Route 92-82 (El Camino Real) Interchange Improvement Project, San Mateo County

I have reviewed the above-described improvement project document. It is a very well-researched document with the exception of looking at pedestrian safety at the undercrossing of State Route 92-82. References to pedestrian traffic are at pgs. 15, 23, and 40. All I could find was a vague reference to "provide safe mobility to pedestrians, etc." There are no details, which I find alarming.

I live at Corte Bella on O'Farrel St. next to Highway 92. I have lived here 16 years. I have used the undercrossing of State Route 92-82 only once. I have not used it again because of the obvious danger to pedestrians. Traffic at the interchange moves at a high speed, making it difficult for a pedestrian to judge when it is safe to use the pedestrian crossings.

Highway 92 basically cuts off pedestrian traffic from our area to downtown San Mateo. Only the most brave pedestrians would choose to use the undercrossing.

There was talk a while back of creating a pedestrian bridge. Obviously, that has not worked out. My recommendation: Put more detail into the draft document about pedestrian safety and maximize the available resources to make it safer to use the undercrossing at State Route 92-82.

Sincerely,

Emitt Wallace
1951 O'Farrel St. #102
San Mateo, CA 94403

e-mail: wallaces1951@comcast.net

p.s. I will attend the January 29 Informational Meeting at City Hall.
Safe

Caltrans Response to Public Comment 3:

Safety for all users is the highest priority for Caltrans and the City of San Mateo. The project design shall apply the Caltrans Deputy Directive on Complete Streets – Integrating the Transportation System (DD-64-R1) to develop a transportation facility that is planned, designed, operated and maintained to provide safe mobility for all users, including pedestrians, appropriate to the function and context of the facility. Connecting to the existing network beyond the interchange, Caltrans is currently planning the following project elements that will be further refined in the design phase:

- A minimum 8- foot wide sidewalk on both sides of SR 82 from the outer edges of the on- and off-ramps. Crosswalks and pedestrian countdown signals are planned to be installed at all pedestrian crossings. Street lighting is planned for the safety of all users, which could include yellow flashing warning beacons. These safety devices significantly lower the chances of pedestrian crossing accidents. The project will also reconfigure the intersections such that the ramps meet SR 82 at right angles, which will slow turning vehicles. The proposed corner radii are the smallest that can be provided while still accommodating the turning movements of large commercial trucks.

- A Class II bike lane on SR 82 is also now planned between the ramp intersections that is 5-feet in width in each direction. The lane is adjacent to the sidewalk for the entire length of the undercrossing. At the end of the undercrossing, the lane angles 45 degrees left before realining at 90 degrees. This design moves the bike lane leftward to make room for a right turn pocket for vehicles driving onto the on-ramps.

- Class III bicycle routes with shared lane markings are planned on Bovet Road and 18th Avenue east and west of SR 82. Palm Drive, a parallel street to the east of SR 82 is the preferred bicycle route in the city. The proposed project would coordinate/synchronize the proposed signals on El Camino Real with existing signals at 17th Avenue/Bovet Road and 20th Avenue intersections. This would minimize stop and go conditions along El Camino Real with the additional two traffic signals.
Public Comment 4:

-----Original Message-----
From: Mary Robblee [mailto:mrobblee@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Saturday, January 25, 2014 7:21 PM
To: Rivas, Yolanda@DOT
Subject: Widening of highway 92

Is the redoing of the Delaware and El Camino 92 exits being done in preparation for widening highway 92? If so, when is this going to be done? The noise we hear now is horrible and two cars have already come thru the fence with one landing on my neighbors front lawn.

Sent from my iPad
Caltrans has received your comment and has the following response:

The widening of SR 92 is on hold at this time. In addition, it is not in the scope of work for the proposed project. The modification of the interchange exits are proposed to address the existing traffic congestion, bottlenecks, weaving and queue spillback at the SR 92-82 interchange on and off ramps.

The proposed project applies the federal regulations for traffic noise abatement. The regulations were applied to all of the interchange quadrants and detailed analysis determined that only the quadrant at the east-bound off-ramp from SR 92 was able to qualify for noise abatement.
Public Comment 5:

-----Original Message-----
From: David Vogel [mailto:dkvogel@att.net]
Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2014 8:51 AM
To: Rivas, Yolanda@DOT
Subject: Yolanda: Highway 92 Widening Project?

Hi Yolanda,

My family and I reside at 1533 Yew Street in San Mateo, and I recall seeing a notification a year ago regarding plans for a study to assess the impact of widening Highway 92 between 101 and 280. I’ve searched through the websites at CalTrans, MTC, and City of San Mateo, but I can’t find any information regarding this study. Do you know where we might find that information?

My wife attended the city meeting last night regarding the El Camino / Highway 92 interchange project, and she was told that there is currently no plan to widen Hwy 92 and that 2038 would be the timeframe that such a project might be considered (part of a 20yr planning cycle). Can you verify whether this information is correct?

Thanks in advance,
David Vogel
Caltrans Response to Public Comment 5:

A Project Study Report was prepared in July 2001 that addresses the widening of SR 92, however the project is on hold at this time, according to City/County Association of Governments-San Mateo (C/CAG). Other future widening project information can be found at http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/2035_plan/FINAL/T2035_Plan-Final.pdf.
Public Comment 6:

Comment received from Bernard Franklyn

Romaya, Leahnora@DOT

From: Bernard Franklyn [bgbr@operamail.com]
Sent: Monday, February 03, 2014 10:18 PM
To: Romaya, Leahnora@DOT, Romaya, Leahnora@DOT
Subject: Hiway 92 / El Camino Real improvement project

We have resided & worked in San Mateo & Foster City since 1981. We use this interchange or drive past it on a daily basis; either east & west on 92 or north & south on El Camino Real. We believe this proposal will solve several vexing problems this interchange has. We applaud CalTrans for coming up with such an imaginative solution.

Bernard & Linda Franklyn
1131 Compass Lane, #311
Foster City, CA. 94404
650 372 9877

--
Bernard Franklyn
bgbr@operamail.com
Caltrans Response to Public Comment 6:

Caltrans has received your comment. Thank you for providing your input on the proposed project.
Public Comment 7 (Page 1 of 3):

Comment Received from Pat Giorni (Page 1 of 3)

February 12, 2014

To whom it may concern;

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the SR 92-82 Interchange Improvement Project Initial Study with Proposed Negative Declaration. The purpose and need of the project is to reduce existing traffic congestion, bottlenecks, weaving and queue spillback at the interchange on and off ramps (Chapter 1 page 12).

Although the project is ostensibly presented as a means to securing greater vehicle, pedestrian and bicycle safety as well as a higher vehicle Level of Service rate on the El Camino Real at the intersections of ECR (SR82) and the on/off-ramps of SR92, the greater and clearer subtext is that this project has been designed to primarily reduce existing traffic congestion, bottlenecks, weaving and queue spillback at the interchange on- and off-ramps to and from SR92 to and from US101, with already constructed but as yet non-operating ramp traffic metering lights, in order to increase the LOS on US101. With the construction of wider off-ramps at the SR82/SR92 intersections that will in essence provide a parking lot allowing for higher vehicle egress onto ECR a higher negative impact than currently identified will be assigned to pedestrians and bicycle riders through unintended consequences not fully explored in this document.

The Proposed IS/ND, showing scant consideration for DD-64-R1, the Complete Streets Act (AB 1358), nor even brought for review to the Caltrans District 4 Bicycle Advisory Committee Project Matrix (http://www.dot.ca.gov/d4t4/transplanning/docs/d4bacworkplanexhibita102011.pdf) while completely ignoring the Grand Boulevard Initiative of which Caltrans District 4 (Bijan Sartipi, Task Force member) is a lead supporter, has not assessed the effectiveness of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo provision of ridesharing services and park-and-ride facilities to help manage the growth in demand for highway capacity under Caltrans Director’s Policy 30 (DP-30) Climate Change (June 22, 2012); nor mentioned C/CAG Smart Corridor Plan, should be submitted as an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and then re-circulated for public comment for the following reasons:

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/Traffic (Pg 131-132):

Would the project:

• Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

No one could reasonably argue that the installation of controlled traffic signaling at the on/off-ramp intersections at SR82 would not increase perceived pedestrian and bicycle safety unless consideration is given to existing conditions whereby there is no indication --- 1) that accidents and injuries involving pedestrians and/or bicyclists have occurred and been documented;
--- 2) that no pedestrian and/or bicycle usage surveys have been presented that specifically identify the project locus, and/or document current pedestrian/bicycle behavior and movement strategies;
--- 3) that especially with the release of significantly more vehicles on SR82 during timed sequences LOS will be decreased farther up/downstream of 17th and 20th Avenues then currently projected that will impact in-traffic bicycle maneuvers;
--- 4) that as a living document and already initiated applicable plan (SR82/Broadway, Redwood City) the Grand Boulevard Initiative provides for on-street bicycle accommodation on ECR, despite the acknowledged current lack of facilities and accommodation noted in the City of San Mateo Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, that is neither considered nor incorporated.

Although the checklist determination is No Impact, a Less Than Significant with Mitigation finding is warranted.

- b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

Full exploration of "the big picture" that is greater than simply providing all user safety at the called-out intersections is inadequate.

--- 1) That as a living document and already initiated applicable plan (SR82/Broadway, Redwood City) the Grand Boulevard Initiative provides for on-street bicycle accommodation on ECR that is neither considered nor incorporated.

--- 2) That no consideration is given to the Smart Corridor Plan already implemented by City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County whereby decreased LOS on SR82 at the project locus or further up/downstream will severely impact all congestion management to include bicycle accommodation, especially those ramifications due to prolonged Smart Corridor operation on SR82 caused by a catastrophic event that closes US101.

Although the checklist determination is No Impact, a Less Than Significant with Mitigation finding is warranted.

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

A dedicated right turn lane to access the on-ramps from SR82 to SR92 exponentially increases the risk of being "right hooked" or sideswiped to bicyclists who currently use the fog line demarcated shoulders where no parking is allowed as de facto bike lanes. Despite fast moving vehicles they are able to maneuver, most often using a hand signal, from the shoulder into the adjacent traffic lane which now is designated as a combined right turn and straight through. With this project the bicyclist will have to maneuver across the dedicated right turn lane to the through traffic lane in order to proceed.
--- 1) Proposed cautionary signage placement without a short Class II Bike Lane and/or sharrow installation is inadequate to safeguard bicyclist trans-lane movement.

Although the checklist determination is No Impact, a Less Than Significant with Mitigation finding is warranted.
XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE (Pg. 133):

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

This project encompasses a major portion of roadway that is incorporated into the Grand Boulevard Initiative. Any increase in LOS and/or greater vehicle volume that the SR 92-82 Interchange Improvement Project brings to the ECR in the short term will make it increasingly more difficult in future to implement Bus Rapid Transit, on-street bicycle accommodation, and wider pedestrian and ADA friendly sidewalks with the necessary traffic lanes reduction required.

--- 1) As a living document and already initiated applicable plan (SR82/Broadway, Redwood City) the Grand Boulevard Initiative provides for Bus Rapid Transit, on-street bicycle accommodation, and wider pedestrian and ADA friendly sidewalks on ECR that is neither considered nor incorporated.

Although the checklist determination is No impact, a Potentially Significant Impact finding is warranted.

- c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

The completed San Mateo County border to border US101 Auxiliary Lane Project, designed and constructed to alleviate freeway congestion, has done little more than encourage greater vehicular usage that approaches yet another saturation point. Although the intent of the SR 92-82 Interchange Improvement Project is to provide a solution to keep the traffic moving it, too, is doomed to fail because just as nature abhors a vacuum, the “Build it and they will come” single-driver mindset just moves the pressure from one pinch point to another. The elephant in the room is the obvious fact that there is no real incentive to deviate from “convenient” single-driver transit behavior if our only concrete solution is to continue to widen the roads. But that is an argument to be made in another venue.

--- 1) The direct substantial adverse effect on human beings is the degradation of air quality to waiting pedestrians stalled for at least 2 minutes in the epicenter of a virtual parking lot where concentrations of gasoline emissions may be at least 10 times greater than with current existent conditions while everyone awaits traffic signal controller phase allowance for movement.

--- 2) The direct substantial adverse effect on human beings is the degradation of air quality to bicycle riders with their noses 3 feet above tailpipes traveling on a significantly more heavily trafficked road than with current existent conditions.

Although the checklist determination is No impact, a Potentially Significant Impact finding is warranted.

Thank you for your consideration. I await your response.

Pat Giorni  1445 Balboa Avenue  Burlingame, Ca  94010  hcgomi@yahoo.com
Caltrans Response to Public Comment 7:

Thank you for your interest in the proposed project. Caltrans has received your comments and has the following responses:

The Build Alternative was thoroughly analyzed and the results produced adequately met the purpose and need (to reduce existing traffic congestion, bottlenecks, weaving and queue spillback at the interchange on and off ramps) of the proposed project.

Safety for all users is the highest priority for Caltrans and the City of San Mateo. The project design shall apply the Caltrans Deputy Directive on Complete Streets – Integrating the Transportation System (DD-64-R1) to develop a transportation facility that is planned, designed, operated and maintained to provide safe mobility for all users, including pedestrians, appropriate to the function and context of the facility. Connecting to the existing network beyond the interchange, Caltrans is currently planning the following project elements that will be further refined in the design phase:

- A minimum 8-foot wide sidewalk on both sides of SR 82 from the outer edges of the on- and off-ramps. Crosswalks and pedestrian countdown signals are planned to be installed at all pedestrian crossings. Street lighting is planned for the safety of all users, which could include yellow flashing warning beacons. These safety devices significantly lower the chances of pedestrian crossing accidents. The project will also reconfigure the intersections such that the ramps meet SR 82 at right angles, which will slow turning vehicles. The proposed corner radii are the smallest that can be provided while still accommodating the turning movements of large commercial trucks.

- A Class II bike lane on SR 82 is also now planned between the ramp intersections that is 5-feet in width in each direction. The lane is adjacent to the sidewalk for the entire length of the undercrossing. At the end of the undercrossing, the lane angles 45 degrees left before realigning at 90 degrees. This design moves the bike lane leftward to make room for a right turn pocket for vehicles driving onto the on-ramps.

- Class III bicycle routes with shared lane markings are planned on Bovet Road and 18th Avenue east and west of SR 82. Palm Drive, a parallel street to the east of SR 82 is the preferred bicycle route in the city. The proposed project would coordinate/synchronize the proposed signals on El Camino Real with existing signals at 17th Avenue/Bovet Road and 20th Avenue intersections. This would minimize stop and go conditions along El Camino Real with the additional two traffic signals.

The proposed project would not cause a degradation of air quality and no mitigation is required or planned. The project complies with the national ambient air quality standards of the Clean Air Act. The standards are designed to be protective of health. The scope and traffic volumes resulting from the proposed project changes
would be smaller than similar projects within the region, which are in compliance with the Clean Air Act. In addition, the proposed project was included in a region-wide emissions model and was shown to comply with the standards of the Clean Air Act. Cumulative impact studies were not required for this project. The project did not analyze cumulative impacts because there were no significant impacts, per the CEQA checklist. The CEQA definition of cumulative impact comes from the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) and can be found in Section 15355 of OPR’s CEQA Guidelines.
February 14, 2014

Caltrans District 4
Attn: Yolanda Rivas
PO Box 23660, MS 88
Oakland, CA 94623-0660

Re: SR 92-82 Interchange Improvement Project, Initial Study with Proposed Negative Declaration

Dear Ms. Rivas:

Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition (SVBC) is a membership-based organization working in Santa Clara and San Mateo Counties with the mission of promoting the bicycle for everyday use. I also sit on the Caltrans District 4 Bicycle Advisory Council (D4BAC), as well as the Caltrans State Bicycle Advisory Council (CBAC). We are writing to comment on the Proposed Negative Declaration for SR 92-82 Interchange Improvement Project and urge you to consider bicycle improvements in the planned redesign.

El Camino Real is a commute corridor for many bicyclists and it is a priority for SVBC to have it accommodate people on bikes better over time. Data indicates a high concentration of both bike usage and traffic incidents involving bicyclists on El Camino Real. The street should accommodate all modes, per Caltrans’ own Complete Streets Policy, which charges the agency with considering the needs of all users. In addition, Caltrans and SVBC are active participants in the Grand Boulevard Initiative, which seeks to revitalize the El Camino Real corridor.

The interchange redesign addresses vehicle traffic and performance without taking into account bicycle and pedestrian safety. The Negative Declaration mentions that El Camino Real does not have bicycle facilities and is not planned to in the City of San Mateo’s bicycle plan. However, this does not mean that there are not people who bike this corridor due to the many residential and commercial destinations on this main arterial. The planned improvements will reduce the collision points from four to two, but that is too many. There is still the possibility that a bicyclist could be right-hooked as cars turn onto on-ramps. Ideally, Caltrans would include a bicycle pocket lane with green dashed blocks in conflict zones through the entire interchange area in both directions. This would provide a safe space for bicyclists that is more visible to motorists. Caltrans allowed the County of San Mateo to
adopt a similar design on Alpine Road on Caltrans right of way in the vicinity of Highway 280.

In the future, we would like all projects involving highway crossings and El Camino Real in Santa Clara and San Mateo Counties to be taken up at the Caltrans District 4 BAC meeting. If this step had been taken, bike safety considerations would have been included earlier in the process. We urge Caltrans to consider bicycle safety in the plans to redesign this interchange, and would be happy to discuss this issue further.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Corinne Winter
President and Executive Director

Cc:
Beth Thomas, Pedestrian and Bicycle Coordinator, Caltrans District 4
Ken Chin, Project Manager, City of San Mateo
Caltrans Response to Public Comment 8:

Thank you for your comment and interest in the proposed project.

This project was reviewed by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Branch Chief and various staff, however was not reviewed by D4BAC. Caltrans is taking all the steps necessary to ensure that all future projects are reviewed by the Caltrans District 4 Bicycle Advisory Council (D4BAC).

Safety for all users is the highest priority for Caltrans and the City of San Mateo. The project design shall apply the Caltrans Deputy Directive on Complete Streets – Integrating the Transportation System (DD-64-R1) to develop a transportation facility that is planned, designed, operated and maintained to provide safe mobility for all users, including pedestrians, appropriate to the function and context of the facility. Connecting to the existing network beyond the interchange, Caltrans is currently planning the following project elements that will be further refined in the design phase:

- A minimum 8-foot wide sidewalk on both sides of SR 82 from the outer edges of the on- and off-ramps. Crosswalks and pedestrian countdown signals are planned to be installed at all pedestrian crossings. Street lighting is planned for the safety of all users, which could include yellow flashing warning beacons. These safety devices significantly lower the chances of pedestrian crossing accidents. The project will also reconfigure the intersections such that the ramps meet SR 82 at right angles, which will slow turning vehicles. The proposed corner radii are the smallest that can be provided while still accommodating the turning movements of large commercial trucks.

- A Class II bike lane on SR 82 is also now planned between the ramp intersections that is 5-feet in width in each direction. The lane is adjacent to the sidewalk for the entire length of the undercrossing. At the end of the undercrossing, the lane angles 45 degrees left before realigning at 90 degrees. This design moves the bike lane leftward to make room for a right turn pocket for vehicles driving onto the on-ramps.

- Class III bicycle routes with shared lane markings are planned on Bovet Road and 18th Avenue east and west of SR 82. Palm Drive, a parallel street to the east of SR 82 is the preferred bicycle route in the city. The proposed project would coordinate/synchronize the proposed signals on El Camino Real with existing signals at 17th Avenue/Bovet Road and 20th Avenue intersections. This would minimize stop and go conditions along El Camino Real with the additional two traffic signals.
Public Comment 9:

Comment received from John Langbein

Romaya, Leahnora@DOT

From: John Langbein [john_langbein@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 13, 2014 1:57 PM
To: Romaya, Leahnora@DOT
Subject: Fw: RT 92/82 Project

Perhaps this email should have been sent to you rather than Ms. Navarro.

John Langbein

----- Forwarded Message -----
From: John Langbein <john.langbein@yahoo.com>
To: "gidget.navarro@dot.ca.gov" <gidget.navarro@dot.ca.gov>
Cc: "Thomas Beth@DOT" <beth.thomas@dot.ca.gov>
Sent: Sunday, February 9, 2014 8:04 PM
Subject: RT 92/82 Project

I have looked at sketch provided on the Caltrans Website concerning the proposed RT82/92 interchange project. I have a few concerns about providing safe bicycle access to El Camino Real (RT82).

The proposed configuration of the entrance/exit ramps as they intersect RT 82 are better than the current configuration because the intersections are "squared-off". However, I am concerned that the radius of these turns are still much to large allowing motorists to make the turns at relatively high-speeds where there are pedestrians and cyclists trying to continue straight on RT82. The radius needs to be reduced at all 4 "intersections" for better accommodation of non-motorized users; this would be more consistent with the "Complete Streets" or DD-64 that Caltrans claims to follow.

It should be noted that, although El Camino does not have any formal bicycling facility, this route is used by cyclists as can provide direct links to their destinations.

I am curious why Caltrans is trying to avoid the public process usually involved with a "Proposed Negative Declaration", where other projects of similar scale, Willow RD and RT101, and Holly and RT 101, have had extensive public review.

John Langbein
Caltrans Response to Public Comment 9:

Thank you for your comment and interest in the proposed project.

Safety for all users is the highest priority for Caltrans and the City of San Mateo. The project design shall apply the Caltrans Deputy Directive on Complete Streets – Integrating the Transportation System (DD-64-R1) to develop a transportation facility that is planned, designed, operated and maintained to provide safe mobility for all users, including pedestrians, appropriate to the function and context of the facility. Connecting to the existing network beyond the interchange, Caltrans is currently planning the following project elements that will be further refined in the design phase:

- A minimum 8-foot wide sidewalk on both sides of SR 82 from the outer edges of the on- and off-ramps. Crosswalks and pedestrian countdown signals are planned to be installed at all pedestrian crossings. Street lighting is planned for the safety of all users, which could include yellow flashing warning beacons. These safety devices significantly lower the chances of pedestrian crossing accidents. The project will also reconfigure the intersections such that the ramps meet SR 82 at right angles, which will slow turning vehicles. The proposed corner radii are the smallest that can be provided while still accommodating the turning movements of large commercial trucks.

- A Class II bike lane on SR 82 is also now planned between the ramp intersections that is 5-feet in width in each direction. The lane is adjacent to the sidewalk for the entire length of the undercrossing. At the end of the undercrossing, the lane angles 45 degrees left before realigning at 90 degrees. This design moves the bike lane leftward to make room for a right turn pocket for vehicles driving onto the on-ramps.

- Class III bicycle routes with shared lane markings are planned on Bovet Road and 18th Avenue east and west of SR 82. Palm Drive, a parallel street to the east of SR 82 is the preferred bicycle route in the city. The proposed project would coordinate/synchronize the proposed signals on El Camino Real with existing signals at 17th Avenue/Bovet Road and 20th Avenue intersections. This would minimize stop and go conditions along El Camino Real with the additional two traffic signals.

Early and continuing coordination with the general public and appropriate public agencies is an essential part of the environmental process. Agency consultation and public participation for this project have been accomplished through a variety of formal and informal methods, including: Project Development Team (PDT) meetings, interagency coordination meetings and public environmental scoping meetings.

A open house by Caltrans at San Mateo City Hall was held on January 29, 2014, from 5:30 PM to 8:30 PM. The information presented was to outline the environmental process and to present the different design variations considered in the project.
Notices for the aforementioned meeting was published in the San Mateo Daily Journal on January 15, 2014. Additionally, announcements were posted on the Department’s District 4 Twitter account on January 29, 2014 at https://mobile.twitter.com/CaltransD4.

Input from the public is always encouraged and please call or write to Department of Transportation, District 4 Office of Public Affairs, P.O. Box 23660, Oakland, CA 94623; (510) 286-4444 (Voice), or use the California Relay Service 1 (800) 735-2929 (TTY), 1 (800) 735-2929 (Voice) or 711 at any time.
February 14, 2014

Yolanda Rivas
District Branch Chief
Office of Environmental Analysis
California Department of Transportation
111 Grand Avenue
Mail Station 88
Oakland, CA

Re: SR 92-82 Interchange Improvement Project Initial Study/Negative Declaration

Dear Ms. Rivas,

The Initial Study for the 92-82 Interchange Project has several significant flaws that need to be corrected before the project continues.

1. Goals Not Aligned

As stated in the IS/ND, "The purpose of this project is to increase performance at the on and off ramps and to address the secondary operation deficiencies on the SR 92 mainline. This would entail widening the existing ramps and reconfiguring the existing interchange from a full cloverleaf to a partial cloverleaf."

There are two problems with this goal. First, it focuses on adding capacity for motor vehicles. Second, it fails to mention how any road users other than motorists will benefit from the project. State, regional, and local policies make clear that we will de-emphasize motor vehicle travel for environmental reasons and emphasize road designs that are safe and convenient for all users. Specifically:

a. AB1358 Complete Streets Act of 2008. "... routine accommodation of all users of the roadway, including motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, individuals with disabilities, seniors, and users of public transportation."

b. Caltrans DD-64-R1. "The intent of this directive is to ensure that travelers of all ages and abilities can move safely and efficiently along and across a network of complete streets," and "Ensure incorporation of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit travel elements in all Department transportation plans and studies."

c. MTC Transportation 2035. "... aims to stimulate the use of public transit, increase the safety, utility and appeal of bicycling and walking, and reduce miles traveled and emissions by cars and trucks in the Bay Area while increasing the efficiency of the roadway and transit systems for all users."
Public Comment 10 (Page 2 of 4):

Comment received from Mark Eliot (Page 2 of 4)

d. **San Mateo General Plan.** "The City is striving toward making it convenient for many residents to travel to work, obtain services, shop, recreate, and travel to school without always using single occupant vehicle trips. To support that end the Circulation Element focuses on human mobility such as public transit, bikeways, pedestrian routes, roadways, and parking facilities."

e. **San Mateo Sustainability Initiatives Plan.** "Increase mode share for pedestrian and bicycle travel to 30% for trips of one mile or less by 2020." and "Reduce single occupant automobile usage for trips less than 5 miles in length by 20% by 2020."

f. **Grand Boulevard Initiative MultiModel Access Strategy.** "Create space within the right-of-way to accommodate multiple travel modes." and "Provide the facilities needed to promote multimodal travel." and "Provide a greater frequency of signalized pedestrian crossings." and "Maximum distance between signalized crossings in Link areas of 1,320 feet (1/4 mile)."

In short, the purpose of this project does not align with the goals of the city, region, and state. It is really about increasing capacity for automobiles and fitting in pedestrian and bicycling facilities where they do not interfere with automobile level-of-service. The purpose of this project needs to be re-examined.

2. **Alternatives Not Considered**

As stated in the IS/ND, "Nine alternatives were studied for this project including the No-Build alternative and Partial Cloverleaf Interchange alternative. Eight of the alternatives were rejected because they did not meet the purpose and need or were not within the scope of the project." If the purpose and scope are changed to accommodate all road users for the reasons discussed above, there are several other options to consider. All of these will probably work within the Partial Cloverleaf with compromises.

El Camino Real between 17th and 20th Avenues is currently inhospitable to pedestrians and bicyclists. It is more of a barrier than facilitator for any travel other than by automobile. It has narrow sidewalks, dangerous on- and off-ramp crossings, and no perpendicular crossings at all. Bicyclists must either ride in the right lane potentially impeding automobile traffic, ride on a narrow shoulder which is equally dangerous, or ride on the sidewalk. Even given this situation, people still choose to walk and cycle on El Camino because it is direct and centrally located, but they do so at risk.

The proposed alternative does include a signalized crossing of new highway on- and off-ramps for pedestrians. This is an improvement. However there are no other substantive improvements. The proposed pocket lane for bicyclists is actually not an improvement by itself because it is isolated from any other facilities — it must be connected to a complete lane system to provide any safety improvement.

Some options to improve pedestrian and bicycle travel include:
Public Comment 10 (Page 3 of 4):

Comment received from Mark Eliot (Page 3 of 4)

a. **Crosswalks.** Add crosswalks at the signalized intersections to allow pedestrians to cross El Camino Real (not just the on- and off-ramps). This gives pedestrians more opportunities to cross than those at 17th and 20th, which are over 1/3 mile apart. Signals can be timed to favor traffic on El Camino Real when there are no pedestrians ready to cross and favor pedestrians when they are waiting (i.e. by pressing a call button). This may affect traffic throughput at times, but will increase pedestrian convenience and safety.

b. **Bike Lanes.** Add Class 2 bike lanes on the far right in both directions on El Camino Real between the proposed intersections. Transition these lanes with dashed lanes to the proposed pocket lane before they reach the intersections. This will require reallocating lane space on the left and shoulder space on the right to create the bike lane. Narrowing and/or moving these traffic lanes may affect traffic throughput, but is absolutely required for bicycling safety.

c. **Shared Path.** The alternative to bike lanes is to create a shared path. Widen the current sidewalk by using existing shoulder space and by narrowing and/or realigning traffic lanes. The shared path would accommodate both pedestrians and cyclists. Include ramps to the shared path for cyclists transitioning from the right lane before the intersection to the path after the intersection. In fact, many cyclists already ride on the current sidewalk for obvious reasons but risk conflict with pedestrians due to the sidewalk’s width. See the attached photo taken yesterday afternoon of two men riding their bikes on the sidewalk.

The currently proposed alternative is a one of many design standards that Caltrans has applied for decades. It is an anachronism that does not reflect today’s requirements. Caltrans was roundly criticized in a recent independent review by the State Smart Transportation Initiative (University of Wisconsin) for an over-reliance on processes rather than outcomes and for following established standards "slavishly". As currently proposed, this project is a prime example.

Highway interchanges are rarely redesigned. As a San Mateo resident and someone who regularly walks and bikes on El Camino Real, I will have to live with whatever changes are implemented for a very long time. This project either is an opportunity for Caltrans to show that it really understands and embraces modern policies or will become monument to business-as-usual. I want to walk and ride my bike safely through this interchange. When I look at four traffic lanes and a five-foot unused asphalt shoulder (see attached photo), I think that there must be a way to better accommodate pedestrians and cyclists. I do not want people to look at this interchange in the future and say "What were they thinking?" Instead, I want people to say "They got it right."
Public Comment 10 (Page 4 of 4):

Comment received from Mark Eliot (Page 4 of 4)

Sincerely,

Mark Eliot
4020 Bayview Ave
San Mateo, CA 94403

cc: Jerry Hill, California State Senator
    Gidget Navarro, Caltrans
    Leahnora Romaya, Caltrans
    Beth Thomas, Caltrans
    Susanna Chan, City of San Mateo
    Ken Chin, City of San Mateo
Caltrans Response to Public Comment 10:

Thank you for your comment and interest in the proposed project.

Safety for all users is the highest priority for Caltrans and the City of San Mateo. The project design shall apply the Caltrans Deputy Directive on Complete Streets – Integrating the Transportation System (DD-64-R1) to develop a transportation facility that is planned, designed, operated and maintained to provide safe mobility for all users, including pedestrians, appropriate to the function and context of the facility. Connecting to the existing network beyond the interchange, Caltrans is currently planning the following project elements that will be further refined in the design phase:

- A minimum 8-foot wide sidewalk on both sides of SR 82 from the outer edges of the on- and off-ramps. Crosswalks and pedestrian countdown signals are planned to be installed at all pedestrian crossings. Street lighting is planned for the safety of all users, which could include yellow flashing warning beacons. These safety devices significantly lower the chances of pedestrian crossing accidents. The project will also reconfigure the intersections such that the ramps meet SR 82 at right angles, which will slow turning vehicles. The proposed corner radii are the smallest that can be provided while still accommodating the turning movements of large commercial trucks.

- A Class II bike lane on SR 82 is also now planned between the ramp intersections that is 5-feet in width in each direction. The lane is adjacent to the sidewalk for the entire length of the undercrossing. At the end of the undercrossing, the lane angles 45 degrees left before realigning at 90 degrees. This design moves the bike lane leftward to make room for a right turn pocket for vehicles driving onto the on-ramps.

- Class III bicycle routes with shared lane markings are planned on Bovet Road and 18th Avenue east and west of SR 82. Palm Drive, a parallel street to the east of SR 82 is the preferred bicycle route in the city. The proposed project would coordinate/synchronize the proposed signals on El Camino Real with existing signals at 17th Avenue/Bovet Road and 20th Avenue intersections. This would minimize stop and go conditions along El Camino Real with the additional two traffic signals.
Dear Ms. Romaya,

I am writing out of concern over the proposed alterations to the State Route 92-82 interchange. As a long term San Mateo resident, I am aware of the importance of the route as well as its current downfalls in terms of crowding and backups for motor vehicles. However, the proposed modifications fail to make any improvement in how bicyclists navigate North/South on 82, a consideration required under state law.

In 2008, our state adopted AB 1358. This legislation necessitates cities and counties plan for multi-modal transportation networks amidst any substantive revision to their circulation elements. The project under consideration at the 92-82 interchange certainly qualifies as substantive, however it fails to comply with the standards AB 1358 sets. Making El Camino bike friendly is the single best way to encourage cycling as viable transportation option on the Peninsula. Designated bike lanes painted in green is the best means of keeping cyclists safe, and should be incorporated into the 92-82 interchange improvement plan.

Until citizens are given a safe option for cycling in key circulation arteries we will not be able to reduce vehicle travel locally. Not only would I enjoy feeling safe riding my bike on El Camino, I would like to feel safe riding with my son. Under the proposed ‘improvement’ plan, this will remain impossible.

Kind regards,

Kam Cox
Co-leader of San Mateo Cool Cities, a local Sierra Club advocacy group
Caltrans Response to Public Comment 11:

Thank you for your comment and interest in the proposed project.

Safety for all users is the highest priority for Caltrans and the City of San Mateo. The project design shall apply the Caltrans Deputy Directive on Complete Streets – Integrating the Transportation System (DD-64-R1) to develop a transportation facility that is planned, designed, operated and maintained to provide safe mobility for all users, including pedestrians, appropriate to the function and context of the facility. Connecting to the existing network beyond the interchange, Caltrans is currently planning the following project elements that will be further refined in the design phase:

- A minimum 8-foot wide sidewalk on both sides of SR 82 from the outer edges of the on- and off-ramps. Crosswalks and pedestrian countdown signals are planned to be installed at all pedestrian crossings. Street lighting is planned for the safety of all users, which could include yellow flashing warning beacons. These safety devices significantly lower the chances of pedestrian crossing accidents. The project will also reconfigure the intersections such that the ramps meet SR 82 at right angles, which will slow turning vehicles. The proposed corner radii are the smallest that can be provided while still accommodating the turning movements of large commercial trucks.

- A Class II bike lane on SR 82 is also now planned between the ramp intersections that is 5-feet in width in each direction. The lane is adjacent to the sidewalk the for the entire length of the undercrossing. At the end of the undercrossing, the lane angles 45 degrees left before realigning at 90 degrees. This design moves the bike lane leftward to make room for a right turn pocket for vehicles onto the on-ramps.

- Class III bicycle routes with shared lane markings are planned on Bovet Road and 18th Avenue east and west of SR 82. Palm Drive, a parallel street to the east of SR 82 is the preferred bicycle route in the city. The proposed project would coordinate/synchronize the proposed signals on El Camino Real with existing signals at 17th Avenue/Bovet Road and 20th Avenue intersections. This would minimize stop and go conditions along El Camino Real with the additional two traffic signals.
Public Comment 12:

Comment received from Andrew J. Conway Jr.
From the desk of
Andrew J. Conway Jr.

When you come off the freeway onto the El Camino going south, the road has to be repaired. I've driven on better roads in Japan and Hawaii in 1953.

16. Since 1949, how many USF athletic teams have won national championships, and in what sports? [Please see answer key on last page.]
Caltrans Response to Public Comment 12:

Caltrans has received your comment and we acknowledge that existing conditions of SR 82 need some repairs. The proposed project will include re-paving SR 82 during the construction phase and thus should address your concern.
Public Comment 13:

From: Tom Blake [mailto:tomblake@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, February 09, 2014 9:02 PM
To: Navarro, Gidget R@DOT
Subject: HW 92-82 interchange improvement

Dear Ms. Navarro,

I wish to add to the public comment for the proposed HW 92-82 interchange improvement project. I live near this intersection and want to know what the project does not address the short merge between the 82 north to 92 east onramp. As I'm sure you are aware, the Delaware St. exit has an extremely short merge off of 92 east which is part of a side line that serves as the 82 northbound to 92 eastbound onramp. That intersection often causes 'weaving' because of the short merge which drives down 92 eastbound traffic speeds and appears to cause traffic collision close calls.

Has anyone studied the impact of this merge on 92 highway traffic speeds and collisions? Wouldn't the elimination of the northbound 82 to 92 eastbound onramp be better suited? Under the proposed project, there will be an onramp to 92 east for 82 southbound traffic. Why can't this onramp also serve 82 northbound traffic, especially since there will already be a new signal installed there? Wouldn't that give the onramp traffic more room to merge on to 92 east before the Delaware exit?

Thanks,
Tom Blake
(a concerned resident)
Caltrans Response to Public Comment 13:

Caltrans has received your comments on the proposed project and has the following responses:

Under existing conditions, approximately 660 vehicles per hour use the northbound El Camino Real to eastbound SR 92 on-ramp. This number is expected to increase to over 800 per hour by 2038. If the northbound diagonal on-ramp is removed, and instead this traffic turns left onto the eastbound loop on-ramp, two left-turn lanes would be required. The existing right-of-way is not wide enough to accommodate these additional lanes. An additional signal phase would also be required to allow left-turns, which would increase overall delay of the signal. For these reasons, the proposed project will not remove the diagonal on-ramp.
Hi Leahnora,

Email “Public Comment” below, in case you have not received it.

-Scott

Scott Bottari
Landscape Architect
Caltrans, District 04
Oakland, CA
510-286-5955

Dear Scott,

It was nice meeting you at the Open House - Informational Meeting for the 92-82 Interchange. I was the person who planted all the tall trees in the Caltrans right of way, 20 years ago, to hide the off ramp when I moved into our house. As you may remember, my wife and I talked to you about our concerns about the landscaping plan for the 1700 block of Ivy Street off ramp area. As the design process moves ahead, hopefully we will be able to meet on site with you to discuss types and placements of the new trees and landscaping.

Looking forward to working closely with you for the next couple of years as the project moves forward. Hope all is well with you and your family.

Below is a copy of the email that we sent to Yolanda Rivas expressing our comments and concerns.
Best regards,

Dino and Cindy Antoniazzi
1740 Ivy Street
San Mateo
650-341-3047

Begin forwarded message:

From: Cindy Antoniazzi <Cindya.buyavonhere@comcast.net>
Subject: 92-82 Interchange Improvement Project
Date: February 15, 2014 3:38:06 PM PST
To: Yolanda.Rivas@dot.ca.gov

Ms. Rivas,

We are writing to address the issues that we foresee in the Improvement Project for the 92-82 Interchange. We are homeowners on the 1700 block of Ivy Street, which is adjacent to the off ramp for Northbound 82 and the on ramp for Westbound 92.

Our concerns are:
1. The removal of mature oak trees and other mature landscaping that hide the current off ramp and also hide the view of vehicles. The new roadway would come within 60 feet of existing residential homes.
2. The new retaining wall that will be installed needs to be architecturally and visually beautiful because it faces houses worth $1,000,000 in this specific residential neighborhood.

These are major concerns that if not addressed, will devalue the homes in the neighborhood. Not only that, but many of our neighbors windows face the offramp and it will be visually unsightly to constantly have a view of 4 lanes of traffic while sitting in their living rooms or dining rooms.

To address these concerns, landscaping is of the utmost importance. We need mature, fast growing specimen trees that resemble those that are in the neighborhood, that will provide the screening which is required in order to obstruct the view of the traffic.
Hopefully as the design process progresses, the neighbors will be kept
informed as to what the proposed design of the wall will look like in addition to any landscape choices.

Another major concern of the neighbors is that Caltrans normally does their work at nighttime. We lived through the last time they repaved 92 and it started at 11pm and went until 5am….which, needless to say, had a major effect on our sleep. It was the worst 2 weeks for all of the neighbors…So we would hope, that they will figure out a way to do the majority of the work during the daytime….as we will hear ALL of the noise from all of the off ramps, not just the one by our house. The noise here carries from El Camino to our neighborhood so all of the heavy equipment noise will be heard here constantly. Not only that, but it would appear that most of the construction vehicle will be going down Ivy street in order to access the new construction sites. And if this is a two year project, these concerns need to be addressed before the project begins.

We appreciate having the opportunity to voice these valid concerns and hope that we can work together to resolve any upcoming issues. If you have any questions, please feel free to call us at any time.

Sincerely,

Dino and Cindy Antoniazzi
1740 Ivy Street
San Mateo

650-341-3047
Caltrans Response to Public Comment 14:

Thank you for attending the open house for the proposed project. Caltrans has prepared the following response to your comment:

The removal of existing large mature trees, including oak trees, will be kept to only where necessary to accommodate the projects construction elements. In particular, the removal of existing trees and plants, located on the outer road edges of the on-ramps and off-ramps will be kept to a minimum.

Construction methods that minimize tree removal will be utilized. Examples include: deploy construction equipment from above planned retaining walls, rather than below retaining walls and use standard Caltrans Retaining Wall-Type 5, which has no footing in front of face of wall.

The existing trees and plantings of the interchange will be identified and quantified in detail, including those that exist just outside Caltrans right-of-way.

Architectural treatment (texture, pattern, and color) will be applied to visible surfaces of retaining walls, including the walls facing Ivy St. The proposed design can be shown to any interested residents by contacting the Caltrans Office of Landscape Architecture.

Caltrans proposes to plant new tree and shrub species that will provide a visual screen to the residences, screening from the highway ramps and mainline traffic. The species will be similar to those removed, drought tolerant, attractive and fast growing.

As the project moves closer to the follow up landscape contract, the landscape plan can be shown to any interested persons.
Public Comment 15:

Comment received from Tim Jad

**QUESTIONS / COMMENTS**

- **Project**: 92/82 Interchange
- **Date**: 1/29/14
- **Location**: S.M. City Hall

**Name**: Tim Jad

**Phone/Fax**: 650 200 3499

**Address**: 1597 Yew St.

**City**: San Mateo

**State**: CA

**Zip Code**: 94402

**Comments**: I am in support of the proposed design.

Thank you very much.

For additional comments use reverse side.
Caltrans Response to Public Comment 15:

Thank you for attending the open house for the proposed project. We acknowledge your support of the project.