

Date	Constituent	Comment
2/17/2025	Matt Inkeles	

Hi Tim and team,

Thanks so much for the community outreach late last year and the survey. We really appreciate it and are excited to continue to partner with the project team on this initiative.

To provide your team with a bit more focused feedback from Ladera, the Ladera Community Association also did an informal poll (results attached here) to supplement the official one that your team created.

We received 205 responses (for context, there are about 500 households in Ladera). You'll notice that the neighborhood overwhelmingly supports the need to do something (e.g. not maintain the status quo). You'll also see the strong support for traffic circles vs. lights.

We recognize that the larger scale improvements (traffic circles, lights, etc.) will take quite some time to come to realization. That said, we continue to hear an incredible outpouring from the community with the desire to do something sooner to further mitigate the extremely dangerous situations at the Ladera intersections and Alpine road. This is coming not only from Ladera residents, but also from the hundreds of families dropping off and picking up their children at Woodland School - the vast majority of whom do not live in Ladera.

While we recognize it's the County's decision, we would strongly encourage additional near term mitigations such as reducing the speed limit during the business district adjacent to the Ladera Shopper area only.

Is this something that the County is open to considering in the nearer term?

Best,
Matt

6/11/2025 Matt Inkeles

Hi Tim and team,

Hope you're doing well! I wanted to follow up and see if there are any updates I can provide to the Ladera community on the progress of the Alpine Road corridor project.

There were a couple of recent accidents at the La Cuesta / Alpine intersection so have been getting more questions.

Thanks in advance.

Best,
Matt

8/5/2025 Matt Inkeles

Hi Tim and team,

Just wanted to follow up on this request. Any updates on progress or timelines / next steps that I can communicate to the Ladera neighborhood?

Would appreciate any info you can provide.

Best,
Matt

8/11/2025 Tim Cheng

Hi Matt,

Thanks for following up. We are still in the final steps of obtaining approval of our PID document from Caltrans, it has been a very lengthy process. I was able to provide the poll that your team conducted from the Ladera community to our consultant so that we were able to build that into our report.

In the meantime, the County has also been working on obtaining funding for the next phase of the project (PA/ED).

Thank you,
Tim

8/11/2025 Matt Inkeles

Hi Tim - thanks for the update and for all that you and the team are doing to move this forward!

Curious if the project team has considered any other interim near term mitigations such as reducing speed limit in the business district adjacent to the Ladera Shopper? I continue to hear a steady stream of concerns from the neighborhood about accidents and near misses at the intersections of Alpine and La Cuesta, and Alpine and La Mesa.

I'm sure it's annoying to get these kinds of mid-project asks, but given the really long timeline before ground breaks on a permanent solution, we would be very grateful for your consideration on these kind of things.

Best,
Matt

9/25/2025 John Langbein

Hello All --

I skimmed the recent report written by Kimley-Horn for the PSR-PDS stage for the Alpine Road Corridor project. I am extremely dissatisfied with the report as it completely ignores public input provided in the "outreach" sessions. In particular, I call your attention to item 7 of the Complete Streets Decision Document which is on page 140 of the pdf-file.

The item "Was there any known public and stakeholder opposition to any preferred complete streets elements identified for the project?" is checked as NO. This is false. I suggest reviewing the public input provided at first public outreach meeting, dated October 16, 2024 (<https://youtu.be/KpFybrNrJdk>) and the second outreach meeting a month later (<https://youtu.be/9yeJKf9QVnM>). Also, review the public input that is included in the 2017 study. There are many (if not most) comments from cyclists who find that the two alternatives provided are more hazardous to cyclists than the existing configuration; Hence, item #7 should have been check YES.

It is clear to me, that although outreach was conducted, its input was ignored, at least the input from the cycling community. (The results of the survey that was conducted as part of the last year's outreach effort have not been made public)

I would like to discuss this problematic report with you, perhaps as a Zoom-style meeting so that the deficiencies in the report could get addressed, and most importantly, that the flawed alternatives be modified to address the concerns of bike riders that traverse the Alpine Rd Corridor.

Thank you,

9/28/2025 Don Lapin

Both of these proposals put cyclists right in the path of cars and trucks as they are accelerating to get onto the highway. That puts them in extreme danger.

Both proposals are inferior to the current configuration, which allows cars and trucks adequate room to see and maneuver around cyclists.

Why are you so eager to place cyclists into a situation of imminent danger? Are you looking forward to another cyclist being run down here, by another large truck? Won't look good in the papers when another person is killed as a direct result of these foolish plans.

9/28/2025 Kevin Rennie To Whom it May Concern,

San Mateo County circulated two concepts that would change the configuration of the interchange of Alpine Rd and RT 280. They held two outreach events plus accepted comments about their proposed concepts. A number of cyclists spoke-up and stated that both concepts are flawed and that the current configuration is better than either of the proposed concepts, (but could be improved). The County has a webpage for the project, <https://www.smcgov.org/publicworks/alpine-road-corridor-project-pid>

Since the interchange is a 'Caltrans' facility, the County needed to submit an 'project initiation document' (PID). That report has been written and can be found at the above website (or cutting to the chase -- <https://www.smcgov.org/media/155788/download?inline=>

For those who made comments a year ago, it is worthwhile to examine the report. Basically, although we participated in the outreach events, the reports ignored our concerns. In fact, the report was very explicit -- There is a 'check box' asking whether any 'stakeholders' objected to the concepts and it was checked "no". (page 141 of pdf)

Respectfully,

Kevin Rennie
Bicyclist
Menlo Park

9/28/2025 Anne Paulson

I see that the county has now written a Project Study Report-Project Development Support on the proposed changes at the intersection of Alpine Road and Interstate 280, near Portola Valley, Palo Alto and Menlo Park. Last year, the county held outreach meetings about these proposals in Ladera. I attended one of those outreach meetings, as did other cyclists I know. All of the cyclists in attendance said the proposals were bad, and dangerous for cyclists. Some of us, myself included, gave written comments to that effect, but you are falsely stating there were no objections.

I am baffled that on page 141 of the report, I find this:

I and other cyclists are stakeholders; we are the ones who would be hit by drivers if one of your dangerous options was implemented. You asked for our opinions, and we expressed opposition. Please rewrite the report to at least reflect our opinions instead of saying our reactions—which you solicited!—do not exist.

This section right here (below) is one of the problems. Currently when I ride my bike past that exit heading toward Palo Alto, I don't have to merge. I just ride straight along, and the driver behind me who wants to exit has to yield to me. Under your flawed proposal, I would be expected to make two sharp turns on a narrow trail—difficult on a bike, especially a cargo bike, tandem, or any kind of loaded bike—and I would also have to wait for a period of no traffic, or for drivers to stop which they will not do since they're accelerating at that point. This is not a safe intersection as designed. I said so then, I say so now, and you are falsely stating my objections don't exist.

Please fix your report.

--

-- Anne Paulson

9/28/2025 Don Lapin

Correction:

I'm sorry, I mis-read the graphics for Alternative 1, which apparently preserves the existing Class II bike lanes. The existing bike lane for westbound travel on Alpine is needed to provide adequate time and visibility for autos/trucks to cross over to the I-280 SB clover leaf.

The abrupt, pedestrian-style crossings in Alternative 2 are dangerous for cyclists, as noted below. They create a "shooting gallery"-type situation where cyclists are the ducks.

9/29/2025 Tim Cheng

Good morning John Langbein,

Thank you for your email and continued engagement with the Alpine Road Corridor Improvement Project. I followed up with the project team and wanted to offer some clarification on the current phase of the project and how stakeholder input is considered.

During the PSR-PDS phase, the primary objective is to identify project scope, cost, and potential environmental constraints to inform the next phase – Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA&ED). Any Complete Streets elements discussed at this stage, such as pedestrian, bicycle, or transit enhancements, are conceptual and not final designs or commitments. These elements are identified and analyzed at a high level in the Preliminary Environment Analysis Report (PEAR, attachment Q of the PSR-PDS).

Formal public engagement, including thorough documentation of support or opposition to specific project elements, typically take place during the PA&ED phase. This is when project alternatives and design features are more clearly defined and undergo detailed environmental analysis. While we recognize that some preliminary stakeholder feedback has already been shared, formal record of opposition or support is not captured or reported until the PA&ED phase. The PA&ED phase will have extensive outreach and will provide more opportunities for you and others to provide feedback.

The County has submitted a funding application for the PA&ED phase and anticipates beginning this next step in early 2026 pending the outcome of the funding request. The project team is currently working on compiling and sharing the results of the community survey with the public. Please do not hesitate to reach out if you have any questions. We appreciate your close attention to project details and your interest in ensuring the public record is accurate. Your feedback has been shared with the project team for consideration as we continue to progress with the project.

Sincerely,
Tim

9/29/2025 John Langbein

For a report that claims to have public outreach then it should include a summary of the commentary from the public plus DPW's responses to those comments. Otherwise, the outreach appears to be a waste of time.

The public has pointed out that the two concepts have problems and the design team needs to solve those problems. In the PID, there is no reference to the problems of the two conceptual designs. And, going forward, the public has no assurance that the problematic, conceptual designs will be modified. The PID should state clearly that the concepts have problems and that the next phase, needs to solve those problems -- Granted that the next phase is 'environmental', but the solutions to the problematic concepts might have different impacts on the environment than the existing concepts.

Again, going back to the 2017 report (again, these were conceptual designs), that report included the comments from the public and many of those comments pointed out problems with those 'older' concepts, yet those older concepts, especially the roundabout option, continue to live and are presented in the PID and, again, stated in the Complete Streets check-list, that there was no opposition to the concepts. There seems to be a disconnect between the design team and the concerned public.

The design team needs to take seriously the input from the public and specifically address them in the PID. We need a written record that the concepts are problematic and that the design team will reevaluate the concepts --- stating that the public will have more opportunity in the future to provide input does not give me confidence that the design team is either listening or understanding the existing input.

John Langbein

10/18/2025 John Langbein Hello Tim.

When will the TA board discuss the Country's application for a grant to cover the next phase of the Alpine Rd project?

John Langbein

10/27/2025 Darcy Smith

Hi

I'm reaching out to learn more about the Alpine Road Corridor Project.

Can you provide a complete scope for this project? Are the off and on ramps affected at all? Is there any loss of lanes on Alpine Road?

Can we arrange a time for you to present the current project to our leadership team, including our Town Engineer?

Thanks

Town Manager Town of Portola Valley

10/31/2025 John Langbein Do you have a copy to share of the grant proposal that you are submitting to the TA for the next phase of the Alpine Rd Corridor project?

Thanks,

John Langbein