



Appendix G: Online Open-Ended Survey Responses

Question 1: Is there anything you would like to change about Alternative 1? If “Yes,” please specify.

1. No traffic signals at all.
2. No traffic signals anywhere, please
3. I think traffic lights would be too disruptive.
4. No signal lights!
5. No traffic lights
6. I don't think the center receiving lanes at Wildwood and Bishop are necessary.
7. I am concerned about long delays at the light preventing me from leaving Ladera.
8. Traffic lights are a mistake for any of these interchanges. Leave I280 interchange unchanged.
9. I think a light at La Cuesta is unnecessary.
10. Roundabouts at La Mesa and La Cuesta, rather than traffic signals
11. Do the bike part only
12. Cross walk with lights across from 3249 Alpine Road
13. During rush hour times, lots of traffic goes down Alpine Road to Arastradero to Page Mill because the line from 280 onto Page Mill is so long. Making Alpine Rd move faster will only increase this "short cut" around 280. We have lived on lower La Mesa Dr for 33 years, and the only change I would support is to make the 280 & Page Mill intersection more efficient at getting cars off of 280. This would significantly reduce the traffic on 280 and Alpine Road during rush hour. (nb: I have a degree in Civil Engineering...)
14. Traffic light would actually worsen the problem for laderans.
15. No lights at 280 intersection
16. Would like to see roundabouts at La Mesa and La Cuesta and no signals at the I-280 ramps.
17. No traffic lights, it destroys the quiet dark street. Signal lights come with street lamps.
18. Lights would have to adjust based on traffic. EG: no cars waiting, no light change.
19. Need a dedicated bike lane 10 feet wide on the East side of Alpine. Restrict all bikes to that lane. Would be much safer. Move the traffic lanes West as far as possible.
20. No changes in 280 interchange, circles at La Mesa and La Cuesta
21. Would like to see more data around roundabouts versus traffic signals at Alpine Road / 280 -- pros and cons
22. Lights at all 4 locations seems like overkill. A roundabout would work at La Mesa and La Cuesta but a light seems more appropriate at the 280 intersections
23. Roundabout is needed at La Cuesta drive, but La Mesa drive is OK as is.
24. Prefer roundabouts.
25. It is not necessary to have a stop light at BOTH La Mesa and La Cuesta. Traffic breaks created by a light at La Mesa would enable turns out of La Cuesta
26. We should add more street lighting so people who aren't familiar with the roads can drive safely.
27. Lights installed in the Peninsula/SMC are rarely "smart", in that they behave dynamically based on whether cars are actually waiting in one direction. Unless lights in these areas are 'smart', I would be very unhappy about having to sit at lights when there's no traffic in the other direction.
28. Prefer traffic circles over light
29. Prefer roundabout to traffic signal
30. No traffic lights
31. Roundabouts at la Cuesta and la mesa
32. Need traffic circles at La Cuesta and La Mesa intersections with Alpine
33. NO TRAFFIC LIGHTS! I'm strongly opposed
34. No traffic lights
35. No stop lights except at the freeway where people
36. No traffic lights at La Cuesta or La Mesa. Please!
37. I would change this completely, because I think it would cause a major increase in transit time for zero benefit.



38. La Mesa and La Cuesta should have roundabouts, even if 280 & Alpine have traffic lights.
39. I do not want lights at La Mesa OR La Cuesta
40. Don't want stoplights
41. I think the La Mesa and La Cuesta intersections should be considered separately.
42. La Cuesta/La Mesa traffic lights should be "timed" during commute hour(s) to coordinate traffic flow efficiently along Alpine.
43. Traffic signals (full red/yellow/green lights) would aggravate traffic patterns at 280, la mesa, la cuesta, possibly increasing probability of speed ups to avoid the long light waits during peak times.
44. Traffic light at 280N exit/entrance only. 280S roundabout only - only needed during peak times and for traffic making a left - also concerned about backups if there were multiple lights. No not believe controlled access required at la Cuesta / La mesa as long as turn lanes are used properly and could benefit from improved signage.
45. Don't do it
46. Roundabouts only - traffic signals would be a massive problem. Do NOT need a traffic signal at La Cuesta Dr. Do need a sign saying Use the Turn Lane
47. Leave stop signs at 280 off ramps, add traffic circles at La Cuesta and La Mesa Drive, improve pedestrian crossing at merge 280 S exit onto Alpine Rd
48. Traffic circles would be superior
49. Make the lights smarter. Waiting unnecessarily at lights as an issue. Also, what happens during major blackouts?
50. Absolutely NO traffic signals at La Mesa Drive and La Cuesta Drive. DO NOT INSTALL TRAFFIC LIGHTS
51. It has to be a smart light, and understand traffic so nobody's waiting one minute when there aren't other vehicles on the road.
52. Add crosswalk with solar powered button activated crossing lights from Webb Ranch Produce Stand at 2718 Alpine Road to access Stanford Dish and local community areas along the Alpine Road Trail.
53. No traffic lights
54. It does not specify, but I would prefer this only if the traffic signals are operational at peak hours only. Other times it should function as it is now; as a stop sign for those entering Alpine from La Mesa or La Cuesta
55. Don't put traffic lights everywhere! Especially a light isn't needed at the southbound side. Lights at la mesa and la Cuesta also don't make sense during off peak times
56. I do not believe traffic lights would improve traffic flow on either side of 280 during busy times. They would be useful at La Mesa and La Questa only if they were "demand" type lights that INTELLIGENTLY (possible these days) monitored traffic on Alpine and the cross streets. Timed lights would be a disaster.
57. Roundabouts instead of lights
58. I don't see a need for traffic signals at the I280 ramps. The stop signs are sufficient.
59. Unclear how this works and helps alleviate the problem
60. Traffic circle
61. Roundabout instead of traffic light
62. No lights
63. No stop lights. Roundabouts are much better.
64. No lights, but use of roundabouts
65. Traffic circles are the obvious best solution
66. Avoid use of traffic lights at La Cuesta and La Mesa intersections with Alpine Road
67. No lights at I-280 ramps
68. Prefer roundabouts
69. We don't need traffic lights, we just need people to follow the existing speed limits. If people drove how they should be driving, this would not be an issue. Currently, people speed aggressively along Alpine Road and there's no enforcement. The main offenders are Woodland parents - they are always speeding throughout Ladera and along alpine road to get their kids.
70. Traffic lights at the 280 ramps



71. They may be necessary, but please avoid traffic lights at all costs
72. Absolutely NO traffic Signals at La Mesa & La Cuesta
73. No traffic lights at La Cuesta and La Mesa-just a round a bout
74. No traffic lights.
75. Remove 50% of the county sign dump spot between 280 and La Cuesta Drive
76. Traffic lights will cause big back ups where circles will encourage constant move thru traffic
77. Traffic sign only at 280 and la mesa
78. I think there should be a study to determine how much extra traffic might occur on La Mesa to Alpine entrance with a stop light when woodland school and woodside priory start and end each day.
79. Reduce conflict points with bicyclists and make the ramp crossings safer
80. No lights at the 280 ramp. It moves quickly with the stop four way stop signs.
81. No signal lights; use a roundabout.
82. I don't think we need traffic signals at the I-280 ramp on the west side. The stop signs seem sufficient, but it might be helpful on the east side of 280 that gets more rush hour traffic.
83. A roundabout would probably be better than lights for La Cuesta/La Mesa: most of the day, there's very little traffic in that area, a light would affect everyone on Alpine all day.
84. There is already a center lane between la Cuesta and la mesa and it doesn't seem to help matters much.
85. I can't imagine sitting at 4 lights between La Mesa to get through 280 intersection. Especially at non-peak times. Much prefer roundabouts. Or roundabouts at La Mesa/La Cuesta and lights at 280.
86. We don't want traffic signals at Ladera intersections...that will just lead to more resident rage. Also please just improve the center lane signage -- CalTrans keeps removing our signs we put up explaining how the center lane works.
87. I do not like the idea of traffic lights as it clogs up traffic.
88. No traffic signals
89. Center receiving lanes are not terribly helpful. Alternative 2 is a much safer option.
90. Would prefer roundabout options at La Cuesta and La Mesa over traffic lights.
91. Roundable is better as traffic doesn't consistently flow and when it's light, other road users would be sat waiting for no reason
92. No lights. On 280 or la mesa and La cuesta
93. Anything to make it easier to turn left from La Mesa will be helpful.
94. Current design is better than any of the proposals
95. Remove the traffic signals, which are likely to exacerbate the problems with congestion during rush hour
96. Not use traffic signals at all. And if use traffic signals, only have them on the north side of 280. The Ladera traffic issues are nearly exclusively caused by traffic from the private Woodland school whose enrollment has doubled over the past ten years.
97. <https://www.sfgate.com/travel/article/new-intersection-project-first-kind-bay-area-19901199.php> might be an option to consider too. Might need to figure out how to have 3 lanes for evacuation.
98. I would have lights at 280, but roundabouts in La Mesa and La Cuesta. They work so well on campus.
99. I would NOT include lights at any of these sites - roundabouts would be better.
100. Eliminate traffic signals.
101. Lights at Alpine and Cuesta should be tested first. The wait times could make traffic backup on Alpine in either direction unbearable. Look at 84 for the example during rush hours.
102. Light
103. I do not like separated bikeways and buffered bike lanes. The former lead to conflicts at intersections where motorists do not expect bicyclists to emerge, the latter lead to debris accumulation on the bike lane and possibly to reduced visibility of bicyclists to motorists.
104. Remove traffic lights in Ladera. My average wait time is currently a few seconds, this will greatly add time, and is entirely unneeded. Also, It is an unnecessary interference in our quiet community that has no lights.
105. No traffic lights in Ladera. My average wait time is currently a few seconds, this will greatly add time, and is entirely unneeded. Also, It is an unnecessary interference in our quiet community that has no lights.
106. Make sure traffic lights are responsive to Ladera traffic, especially when Alpine traffic is lighter so we don't have even more trouble leaving than now.



107. I am skeptical that traffic signals at La Mesa and La Cuesta and at 280 would help reduce traffic backups
108. I would NOT install traffic signals at any of the locations.
109. Traffic light at 280 on ramp only. No lights at La Mesa or La Cuesta
110. Traffic signals at la mesa and la cuesta
111. Close the southbound ramp and make sb 280 accessible from the N side of Alpine. This would help bikers.
112. Traffic lights are not a good solution
113. Very opposed to stoplights at La Mesa and La Cuesta
114. Traffic signals are a terrible idea
115. Traffic signal unnecessary at the western most 280 exit ramps
116. Before installing a signal, do full evaluation of traffic impact as a result.
117. If installing traffic signals, lights should be actuated not based on time.
118. Traffic signals will contribute to traffic congestion, noise, and pollution as cars are forced to stop and start from a queue.
119. No traffic lights!
120. Lights at La Mesa, La Cuesta, and 280 are too many/too frequent/too close together. Consider lights at 1 of these and other traffic mitigation at the others.
121. Add pedestrian crosswalk across la mesa to access pedestrians signal to cross alpine
122. Do not try to make bicyclists use a separate bikeway. Existing bike lanes are the best approach.
123. I live on Aliso Way, and all of the properties on the south side of the street are right up against Alpine Road. The road and car noise is already intolerable and having a line up of cars waiting for red lingers to pass would increase noise. I would prefer roundabouts at La Cuesta and La Mesa.
124. No traffic signals. ***There is no answer for Question 2 for La Mesa or La Cuesta. I access Alpine road from La Mesa. There should not be a separate "side path" for bicycles along the 280 intersection
125. Most concerned with lights at La Mesa and La Cuesta
126. Don't need traffic signals at both La Cuesta and La Mesa
127. Traffic lights seem very inefficient
128. There is no reason to have stop lights at both La Mesa and La Cuesta. La Mesa has most of the traffic, and if there is a light at La Mesa, the traffic at La Cuesta will enjoy frequent breaks in the traffic from either direction on Alpine
129. Favor alternative 2, as it reduces hazards. Drivers are currently ignoring stop signs at 280 on ramps. Traffic lights would not alleviate the issue
130. Lights at I280 ramps but roundabouts at La Cuesta and La Mesa
131. Use roundabouts instead of traffic signals
132. Would it make sense to consider cat activated lights when traffic out of la mesa is busiest?
133. I prefer roundabouts over traffic lights. They allow for smoother flow, less car stacking, and a more rural feel.
134. No traffic lights.
135. Alternative 2 seems preferable as it would still permit smooth traffic flow without adding to Ladera/Portola Valley commutes.
136. Faster throughput for bicycle & pedestrian traffic
137. This proposal seems most feasible - we are concerned about the travel time increasing drastically due to long lights and want to avoid the 84 situation where it takes an hour to get to Middlefield Road - an hour!!
138. Roundabouts are VASTLY preferred
139. Do it, but without traffic lights at La Cuesta and La Mesa.
140. We don't have a problem most of the time. How about traffic lights only during the busy hour
141. No lights at La Mesa/La Cuesta
142. Build a traffic circle at LaMesa and Alpine
143. Delete it
144. IMO traffic lights at the I-280 ramps would just slow down traffic. The 4 way stop is just fine. Bikes are a problem because they run the stop signs. They would run the lights too, so lights don't help. La Mesa and La Cuesta could use lights if they were "demand" type lights. Most of the day it could be green on Alpine



- and red on the side streets. Only when cars are present on the side street would it change. This is IMO by far the best option.
145. Stop lights are a terrible idea. If they're timed it will create extreme delays in getting home.
 146. People don't know how to use center receiving lanes
 147. No traffic signals at I-280, La Mesa or La Questa
 148. All three of these traffic signals would be too much... I suggest putting one at 280, and one at EITHER La Mesa or La Cuesta.
 149. I believe this is a very poor option. I strongly favor Alternative 2, which is the use of roundabouts instead of traffic signals. Roundabouts will facilitate travel through the corridor much better than traffic signals. Roundabouts are much more in character with the rural nature of the area than traffic signals.
 150. The accommodations for bicycles are unsatisfactory and will largely be bypassed by cyclists anyway. The current configuration, while not optimal, is better than the proposed changes. Please note that the current survey is not really valid because the actual proposed changes are not shown. You need to show them in order to get legitimate feedback. Vague descriptions are insufficient.
 151. No traffic signals. one lane round-a-bouts only at La Mesa and La Cuesta. full stop at each 280-off-ramps=
 152. Improve exit/egress from Stanford Dish parking lot.
 153. No traffic lights
 154. I really don't like installing traffic lights on Alpine Road. Roundabouts are a far better solution in keeping with the rural nature on the area.
 155. Any side bike path must not impede the flow of a bike or the cyclist will not use it.
 156. No traffic lights. Lights yield less throughput than roundabouts do so they would measurably increase delays and congestion
 157. Traffic lights would be deadly for bikes.
 158. Putting bikes on side-paths won't work -- As shown on various concepts, the side paths (class 4) have sharp turns, require bikes to crossing entrance/exit ramps at uncontrolled intersections and are NOT conducive to the many riders that can bike in excess of 15 mph. Also, realize that cyclists travel at different speeds, from 5 mph to 25 mph -- the speed differential is too much for a narrow side path; Consequently many, if not most bike-riders will not use the side paths. However, that increases the opportunity for motorists to harass those cyclists that use the roadway as the motorists sees the side path and believes that's where the bike-rider belongs.
 159. It has too many traffic lights
 160. Traffic light forces many cars to interact with cyclists at once, and would race them in the mixing zone to get to the freeway.
 161. No traffic lights
 162. No one will use the bicycle paths. I do not believe it will improve safety. Current configuration with some modifications to slow traffic exiting I-280 is better. BTW, this is one of the most used bicycling corridors in the USA
 163. Do not like anything about this option as it only accounts for cars and not bicyclists use of this road.
 164. A signal light only increases the chance of a car ploughing in cyclists. This increases the average speed when there are green lights as opposed to having to stop for a stop sign.
 165. My understanding is roundabouts are substantially safer. I would love to see more roundabouts

Question 2: Is there anything you would like to change about Alternative 2? If “Yes,” please specify.

1. No traffic lights, please!
2. Prefer #1 (traffic signals) to #2 (roundabouts)
3. I strongly prefer roundabouts over traffic lights. However, roundabouts make it difficult for pedestrians to cross as the traffic never stops.
4. Please improve landscaping on islands dividing lanes near 280 intersection the way Woodside has done on the west side of their 280 intersection. Ours is an eyesore!
5. I find most people don't know how to navigate roundabouts and they cause more problems than they solve
6. I am concerned about the amount of traffic on Alpine and this preventing me from entering the roundabout to exit Ladera.
7. Traffic roundabouts might work for La Cuesta and La Mesa, but will be problematic for bikers. Leave I280 interchange unchanged.
8. I think a roundabout at La Cuesta is unnecessary.
9. Do the bike part only
10. I could see roundabouts at La Mesa, if it would make it easier for Laderans to access Alpine Rd. I would not support any improvements to the Alpine - 280 interchange because that would only encourage more traffic on Alpine during Rush Hour.
11. Roundabouts at La Cuesta, traffic light at La Mesa, keep 280 as it is
12. I would delete the roundabouts at the I-280 ramps as they are too costly to justify the benefit(s).
13. The problem with La Cuesta and La Mesa is the Woodland school drop-off and pick up times. Roundabouts would not perform well in that sort of peak traffic. Traffic lights are preferable.
14. Same as 8, above.
15. I don't like roundabouts generally
16. Would like to see more data around roundabouts versus traffic signals at Alpine Road / 280 -- pros and cons
17. A roundabout would work at La Mesa and La Cuesta but a light seems more appropriate at the 280 intersections.
18. Roundabout is needed at La Cuesta drive, but La Mesa drive is OK as is.
19. We should add more street lighting so people who aren't familiar with the roads can drive safely.
20. I think the La Mesa and La Cuesta intersections should be considered separately.
21. Concern over congestion at a roundabout at La Cuesta, unless perhaps by changing access routes to shopper and corner gas station. Do like the idea of a roundabout there to slow southbound traffic from 280 intersection.
22. Believe light is necessary at 280N exit/entrance given the large number of cars at peak times and on/off options. No not believe controlled access required at la Cuesta / La mesa as long as turn lanes are used properly and could benefit from improved signage.
23. Occurred bike lane on Alpine Rd., South with the stop sign works recently well. The proposed alternatives will make bike use MUCH more dangerous as presented.
24. Leave La Mesa Drive and La Cuesta Drive as is, possibly install roundabouts at I-280 ramps
25. Roundabouts slow traffic which means longer wait times entering Alpine Road. Two cars fighting for one space on the road.
26. Add crosswalk with solar powered button activated crossing lights from Webb Ranch Produce Stand at 2718 Alpine Road to access Stanford Dish and local community areas along the Alpine Road Trail.
27. Consider a traffic light on the northbound side of 280. A traffic circle may not be able to handle the traffic
28. Ensure roundabouts are well designed to incorporate plants instead of being big paved areas or large grassy areas
29. Leave 280 interchange alone. Alpine road traffic into the roundabout going north on 280 would have to mix with Stanford traffic. Bad idea. La Mesa and La Questa would not improve because you still need a break in the traffic to enter the roundabout. Same as turning into the middle lane.
30. I don't think the I-280 ramps need traffic signals or roundabouts



31. Roundabouts make no sense at the I280 interchange, and I don't see where there is room for them at La Cuesta and La Mesa. They would decrease bike safety as well.
32. Roundabouts are a bad idea
33. Cross walk across LA Mesa at Alpine.
34. Avoid use of roundabouts until feasibility of speed bumps has been assessed---they are much less invasive and more efficient!
35. We cannot lose the quick/easy access on-ramp to 280 south from Alpine road heading towards Menlo Park.
36. Traffic signal at 280
37. Roundabout only at 280 and la mesa
38. Single lane roundabouts at 280; make bike crossings safer
39. I don't like roundabouts - people always do it wrong and it can often be more dangerous than a simple stop sign or traffic light.
40. Regular signals rather than roundabouts at 280 ramps
41. Alternative 1 would cause less interruptions during construction, therefore my preference; but if alternative 2 were adopted I would eliminate the areas of 280 on ramps and La Cuesta.
42. Center lane doesn't seem to help much. But the roundabout might.
43. Lights at 280, roundabouts at La Mesa, La Cuesta
44. I am less confident in roundabouts at the 280 ramps. As someone who turns across Alpine Rd to get onto 280N, 25-50% of the time people don't give me my "allowed" right of way. I don't know if that's confusion or aggressive/unkind drivers. Roundabouts will be challenging with the second.
45. Roundabouts don't seem to make sense due to the different speeds and the fact that high traffic needing traffic control only occurs at specific times of day.
46. No lights
47. Roundabouts are preferable to traffic lights.
48. See above comment
49. Only have a roundabout on the north side of 280. On the south side of 280, reconfigure to slow traffic and improve compatibility with bikes. Roundabouts on La Mesa and La Cuesta compromise everyone else for the sake of Woodland-caused traffic surges.
50. Not sure that bike lanes are safe enough. need physical separation. Need to be able to have 3 lanes for evacuation. I prefer this option best.
51. Not sure roundabouts are appropriate here.
52. Need more information about separated bikeways, but the entry to and exit from them are where many designs fail.
53. Roundabout
54. Same complaint as with #1. Roundabouts OK if motorists and bicyclists can safely merge together the roundabout.
55. A bike lanes at 280 that stays with the traffic, not that extends up into the exit/on ramps. What is necessary for pedestrians isn't always good for bikers.
56. I wish to be sure those of us coming from Ladera have a priority lane at the 280 north exit because otherwise the freeway traffic will keep us from moving forward
57. I don't think people will stop for pedestrians at roundabouts.
58. Although a viable solution, I do not think there is room for roundabouts
59. Ok to do roundabout at 280 but not la Cuesta and la mesa
60. Do not try to make bicyclists use a separate bikeway. Existing bike lanes are the best approach.
61. I live on Aliso Way, and all of the properties on the south side of the street are right up against Alpine Road. The road and car noise is already intolerable and having a line up of cars waiting for red lingers to pass would increase noise. I would prefer roundabouts at La Cuesta and La Mesa.
62. There should not be a separate "side path" for bicycles along the 280 Intersection
63. Don't divert bikes to crosswalks - assume travel through the roundabout
64. Roundabout don't seem worthwhile
65. Lights at I280 ramps but roundabouts at La Cuesta and La Mesa
66. Lights at 280 but round about a at La Mesa and La Cuesta as long as it would make it easy to leave Ladera.



67. Better integrated bicycle connections - Add sharp angle turns so cars must slow down and move bicycle & pedestrian crossings closer to intersection. Example: <https://www.fietsen123.nl/thumbs/824x600c/2018-04/rotonde.jpg>
68. Roundabouts are not my preference I would prefer lights
69. Do it, but without roundabout at La Cuesta and La Mesa. La Cuesta and La Mesa traffic is primarily driven by pickup/drop off at the privately run Woodland school.
70. I don't think we have a big problem
71. No roundabouts at La Mesa/La Cuesta because Woodland School traffic would cause huge backups
72. All these roundabouts will suffer from the well-known fact that roundabouts do not work well when there is a predominant direction of heavy traffic. The La Cuesta and La Mesa roundabouts will be difficult to enter when Alpine Road traffic is heavy. This is the problem that the roundabout is trying to solve. There is a "middle lane" that allows left turn traffic to do so if there is a break in the Alpine road traffic. That same break is required to enter the roundabout. Thus no net benefit from a roundabout. Roundabouts will also require traffic on Alpine Road to slow down to enter the roundabout. While this may improve safety it will tend to slow the flow of traffic and thus increase congestion.
73. I think that roundabouts would be a great idea, if there is enough room for them. I work at Stanford where the new traffic circles have made a world of difference.
74. I would like greater attention paid to improving the Alpine Road multi-use trail as described below in question 10. I strongly prefer Alternative 2 to Alternative 1. I would prioritize Roundabouts at the I-280 on and off ramps. Roundabouts at La Mesa and La Cuesta are lower priority to me.
75. The accommodations for bicycles are unsatisfactory and will largely be bypassed by cyclists anyway. The current configuration, while not optimal, is better than the proposed changes. Please note that the current survey is not really valid because the actual proposed changes are not shown. You need to show them in order to get legitimate feedback. Vague descriptions are insufficient.
76. 2-lane roundabouts are extremely dangerous for cyclists, especially at freeway exchanges
77. Improve exit/egress from Stanford Dish parking lot.
78. Widen the bike lanes
79. Same as answer 8
80. Bike lanes crossing freeway ramps are inherently hazardous. Experienced cyclists will most like "take the lane" and ride at the speed of traffic in the roundabouts. Inexperienced cyclist will use the bike/ped path on the south side of Alpine.
81. Make it safer for bikes that stay in the roadway, rather than use the separated bike facilities. Both types of access are needed.
82. Again, see comment above about side paths; And, if the bike-rider chooses to ride through the 2-lane roundabout, it could be deadly with motorists changing lanes as they either won't see the bike rider or will not accommodate the bike-rider; One-lane roundabouts, if done correctly, could be OK for bikes and motorists to "share"
83. No roundabout as people don't know how to drive/use roundabouts.
84. Cyclists crossing the roundabout as pedestrians make no sense. Cars don't yield there even to pedestrians, especially in freeway merge mindset. See the roundabouts at Stanford for an example.
85. Roundabouts or Traffic Circles are a danger for Emergency Evacuation; see show document (portolavalley.net) Portola Valley Evacuation Study
86. Current configuration with some modifications to slow traffic exiting I-280 is better. Current configuration with some modifications to slow traffic exiting I-280 is better. No one will use the bicycle paths.
87. Make sure big trucks and emergency vehicles can drive straight through quickly, and that it's safe for bikes. I prefer this option to Alternative 1.
88. Do not like anything about this option as it only takes into account for cars and not bicyclists.
89. In my opinion roundabouts are the least bike-friendly option - it leaves too many variables open for distracted drivers or those unfamiliar with the area and how to get from point A to point B
90. The kind of roundabout, entry / exit speeds / number of lanes might make this safe for cyclists to mingle with cars. Might but I'm skeptical. A detailed roundabout plan should reviewed.



Question 3: Is improving the existing trail along Alpine Road important to you? If “Yes,” please specify.

1. Too narrow now
2. Don't widen the road please. Recognize too that biking is for a small demographic- younger people (not children or older people, usually not women because of heels, dresses and sweat, so carpool/ebus options would be better than anything that I see proposed.
3. Improve parking at Piers lane
4. Bumps and cracks in pavement make biking scary
5. Better cross walks with flashing lights when pedestrians are present
6. Yes. It is short and would be better it was more complete
7. It feels unsafe to travel by bike between Ladera and Stanford. In particular, the stretch between 280 and Stowe lane is treacherous with cars traveling very fast next to bikes.
8. I think the trail is good and I use it. I would just like to see a crosswalk on La Mesa from the shopper to the bank so that residents can safely cross there and use the existing Alpine cross walk.
9. Need an eight foot wide divided trail separated from Alpine Road for bike safety.
10. I use the trail often and it is fine for walking running, but unusable for biking.
11. Safe crossing
12. Should of had Stanford pay for it
13. Improve the surface of the trail so it is more useful for casual bicyclists and pedestrians.
14. Make it easier to access / cross alpine
15. The paved trail on the south side is great for pedestrians, but bikes are an issue there. If you improved the bike lane on Alpine itself, that would alleviate that issue.
16. The trail could be part of the bike lane. Also, have the trail located outside of the bike lane where land available.
17. Hard to access dish. Backs up traffic
18. If possible, move further from road
19. Would like to improve length and accessibility as it intersects main roads
20. It would encourage biking and walking
21. Make it wide enough for bikes and pedestrians since there the bike line northbound is narrow and sketchy north of 280
22. The existing trail is quite good. Please continue maintaining it. Maybe add some traffic lights.
23. As a frequent trail user, I'd like the trail to be widened, but that is less important to me than better traffic safety getting onto/off Alpine Road. An improvement I'd like about the Alpine Trail is to have it become a graded dirt/gravel path, like the nicely maintained ones throughout the towns of Los Altos Hills.
24. Improve crossing from opposite side of street
25. Trail improvements
26. Widen trail; grade separate near freeway entrances; repair potholes, bumps, tree roots etc
27. There is too little space between cars and bikes and unclear intersection at 280 and Jumpero Serra
28. We were promised a trail by Stanford, and we got a roadside path. More separation from Alpine Road would be the key improvement to make.
29. Less steep grade around underpasses, better connections to Arastradero trails, maps showing the wider trail network
30. Cycling is difficult because the trail is discontinuous. Travel from Menlo Park to Portola Valley is especially difficult: there is no safe crossing, and a cyclist is forced to travel against vehicle traffic at several spots.
31. Current path just need to be maintained across from the shopper
32. Widen it
33. Improve surface and make roadway crossings safer.
34. I worry about what "improve" means. I don't want to walk/run in a concrete canyon. The trail needs regular maintenance to clear vegetation, and safer controls at road crossings.
35. Yes, if improvement to trail included moving ALL bike and foot traffic to opposite side of Ladera shopper and business parks



36. Make it safe for walkers and bikers
37. Widen bike lane as possible
38. Resurfaced
39. Add mile markers
40. Trail improvements for bikes would be welcome
41. Bicycles on Alpine rarely stop at stop signs, they roll through. You can't have cars and bikes using different rules on the same roadway.
42. Further from road in some areas
43. Crosswalks at both entries to Webb Ranch at 2718 and 2720 would improve safety of customers that visit the business, local community members that park in the 2718 parking lot to hike the dish, and family members that use the trail.
44. Some areas have cracked or raised sidewalks or raised screws. I also feel like sections are a bit close to the road.
45. Bike lanes could be more protected
46. Pedestrian crossings on the east side of alpine road are important
47. More walking friendly and safe
48. Provide safe walking to the dish from 280 underpass - right now have to walk on road to get to Stanford dish
49. Address uneven surfaces, pot holes and broken bridge railing
50. It is too narrow and not consistently safe
51. Better bike access to Menlo park
52. Could be better b/t Ladera and Stanford.
53. Wider, consistent pathway to Santa Cruz ave
54. Needs to be safer! Our kids go to their public school in Menlo Park and need safe routes to school. This is critical.
55. Greater separation from Alpine Road
56. Yes, but lower priority than making intersections more safe.
57. I run and walk there all the time. Could be nicer, but not too bad as is.
58. Simply improve it to be wide enough for bikes and pedestrians to use it together and take it off the street at some points
59. It's falling and crumbling in front of the Shopper, please fix
60. Some improvements to the trail could be made between La Cuesta Road and the overpass as it feels exposed when traveling with small children. But otherwise, I wouldn't make any changes to the trail
61. Yes...should have been done 20 years ago when Stanford was required to do so
62. It is an important element of bike and pedestrian safety
63. Make it wide enough so that cyclists and pedestrians can use it.
64. Level the path and make it usable for kids
65. Full sidewalk/trail to the 280 ramps as there isn't a sidewalk on the other side
66. Yes - I use the trail frequently for biking and running. It could be widened and improved in the study area (to be more like the southern section in Portola Valley, beyond the study area).
67. N/A
68. Narrow at spots
69. Making sure all safety features are adequate by today's standards
70. Make it more clean and far from the road
71. It's very close to the road and not safe for foot traffic. I often see college students running along there and they're super close to oncoming traffic.
72. Continue beyond alpine hills club
73. Bike lane
74. Need a safer pedestrian crossing at La Mesa and La Cuesta, such as a stoplight.
75. Primarily the section between 280 and Junipero Serra.
76. Can any route go onto Stanford land for trails and bikes away from the road?



77. This is one of the most dangerous stretches of bike trail around (crossing under 280 and then going along Alpine to Weekend Acres. Finding a way to make it safe would be a huge improvement.
78. I ride my bike to work in Menlo park when I can it is very scary, especially when coming from Menlo Park to Ladera. Drivers are always drifting into the bike "lane".
79. More consistent trail width, at least 6 feet, paved
80. More handicap friendly
81. Greater distance from traffic and fewer driveways should be prioritized - and we'd like to see wildlife crossings as well.
82. I walk and run there
83. Biking to town would then be an option.
84. This and add parking access
85. This and add parking access
86. Get rid of the poison oak and widen the trail
87. The trail is too narrow and bumpy, and between 280 and Stowe Ln it barely qualifies as a trail...too narrow and dangerous
88. Improve pedestrian access
89. I regularly walk and bike along the trail and there are areas it needs upgrading
90. I assume the pedestrian trail would stay on one side of Alpine. If there is adequate traffic control at the SWA and Ladera intersections, people will be able to get. Out.
91. The trail on the north side of 280 is not easy for cyclists to use and we are forced onto the shoulder of the road. I would like that the trail be converted into a MUT all along Alpine Road. The trail on the south side of the road is in poor condition, but at least it is usable for cyclists.
92. The walking/biking path/trail all along Alpine road
93. Surface improvement and widening
94. I would walk on it more if I felt safer crossing Alpine Road. I was crossing at La Mesa on Monday with my dog and 2 other people. It was the middle of the day, we pressed the buttons to flash in the crosswalk and still someone just kept driving.
95. Just make it safer from the end of the fish path to Stowe.
96. The existing trail is falling into the creek and the abundance of flammable and overgrown brush makes the corridor a serious fire hazard to the area.
97. Only secondarily to traffic
98. The trail itself is good but access to the trail needs improvement. Cars rarely yield to the current crosswalks and flashing lights that cross over Alpine Rd to the trail.
99. Make it continuous through "weekend acres"
100. This trail is used by bikes, strollers, dog walking. Could be a little wider but would really prioritize traffic flow over this
101. Broaden and lengthen
102. Greater separation from cars would be nice
103. Create better barriers between the trail and car traffic. It is too dangerous in current state.
104. Resurface for biking
105. The trail is the best option for many in the area to have a flat length of land to exercise on.
106. Improving the trail is very important to me, mostly pertaining to being bike-able. Right now, it's narrow and not smooth. It needs to be wider and friendly to kids who want to ride their bikes into Menlo Park.
107. Better crossings would be great
108. The trail disappears often or is not maintained for bikers or people walking.
109. Pedestrian and biking along Alpine from Piers to Stowe is dangerous
110. Maintain and protect
111. Make it wider in the narrower sections so that there are 2 lanes
112. I'd like to see steps taken to shield the trail in some way from vehicular traffic (e.g. at the intersection of Westridge and Alpine where vehicle accidents happen and motorists can be particularly aggressive). Walking on the trail with my dogs and children is a daily activity year round. As traffic has grown over the last decade, it does not always feel safe especially when the kids are with me



- 113.Improving the trail between I-280 and Sand Hill road would allow kids to safely ride to school. This is currently not possible. A completely separate 2-directional bike path would be ideal.
- 114.Safe bike routes in each direction along Alpine Road. I would then bike with children to school every day
- 115.Safe routes to school was promised in 2001 and still hasn't happened. I worked hard on the Lower Alpine Road proposal & money from Stanford (te a GUP). We were promised that SM County would find funding elsewhere, but it has yet to happen.
- 116.Please consider a wildlife crossing overpass or tunnel. Need more distance between pedestrians and the road itself in some areas. Do not add more driveways along this route please it is too dangerous.
- 117.Trail isn't great by weekend acres
- 118.yes would like walking and biking access via that trai
- 119.Primary safety issue for me is due to large groups of bikes not fitting within the bike lanes.
- 120.Crossing the roads can be difficult. Perhaps widen at narrow points.
- 121.provide safety rails where path butts up to roadway
- 122.Widen trail for safe sharing by pedestrians and bikes
- 123.It's devastating how dangerous it is to access for kids and adults for walking and biking.
- 124.Safer crossing at 280 off ramp
- 125.I would like greater attention paid to improving the Alpine Road multi-use trail. The trail must be made safer. Users of the trail should not have to cross traffic entering and exiting I-280. Instead the trail should be routed under or over freeway on and off ramps, so pedestrians do not have to cross traffic. The narrow portions of the trail should be widened. There should be greater separation between traffic and the trail.
- 126.it has already become bumpy and unfriendly for recreational cyclists, and it is interrupted near Stowe Lane; out of scope of this project but relevant to bike commuting, the bike lane under Junipero Serra is extremely dangerous even for competent cyclists
- 127.for easy travel with strollers, kids, bikes between Menlo Park (Sharon Heights) and Portola Valley
- 128.No specific recommendations
- 129.so that inexperienced cyclists and pedestrians can safely get across the freeway ramps
- 130.I don't use the trail, but I see that it is heavily used and it is in poor condition. So, it should be improved -- And, for those bike-riders that are hesitant to ride Alpine, the trail provides an alternative (but not always a safe alternative as it crosses numerous driveways and side streets where motorist might not see the trail user)
- 131.the section of trail between Piers Lane & Junipero Serra
- 132.Widen it and improve connectivity to other trails.
- 133.Add an evacuation lane
- 134.Small signs for cyclists. Help to understand traffic rules apply to everyone.
- 135.crossing at 280 on the trail is difficult and dangerous for trail users
- 136.improve pedestrian access AND cycling safety
- 137.There has to be a way to slow the traffic down on the corridor between 280 and Junipero Serra. Cars go off the road at least every other year as folks are speeding. There needs to be a traffic light or something to slow the cars down. We are under the county sheriff and we never see them on the road. It is dangerous to walk as the bicyclists use the pedestrian lane as they are scared to use the bike lanes. It would be great to modify Wildwood as in your plans specify and to put a light at that spot. It would encourage folks to use Sand Hill or Page Mill to get to Stanford.
- 138.Remove poison oak, make sure it doesn't flood in the rainy season.
139. 1) Need to extend trail to Stanford golf course area. 2)Clear direct route under Hwy 280 and safer crosswalk at off ramp from Hwy 280 north
- 140.I would love it if the paved trail continued into the Stanford Trail Network. If that were the case, I would feel safe biking with my kids more.
- 141.make it wider and flat



Question 4: Would parking improvements near Piers Lane be important to you? If “Yes, other improvements,” please specify.

1. A crosswalk (with flashing lights) from Webb Ranch parking to the dish/Alpine Trail
2. Make safer for bikes and cars exiting left from parking area
3. Leave as is and eliminate the parking in the small wedge near the bridge. Seems pedestrians are always skirting cars here and short pullout for drivers into traffic
4. Make sure that vehicles turning in-and-out have sufficient space to avoid collisions, and slow down the through traffic on Alpine.
5. Formal is not needed, but more space
6. Parking can be difficult and in combination with no center lane for turning out, it can be dangerous with cars coming fast around Alpine Road. A more formal organized parking in combination with a center lane could improve safety.
7. Don't allow parking in the bike lanes. If providing formal parking does that, then great. If providing formal parking is in addition to cars parking in bike lanes, then that won't help.
8. I can imagine issues here, drive by here thousands of times...however have never seen any near misses like have at 280, La Cuesta, La Mesa. Would spend money elsewhere
9. Provide parking, "formal" sounds paved... Does not need paving.
10. Provide parking, "formal" sounds paved... Does not need paving.
11. Make it safer to enter and exit the dish parking area. It's a blind turn both ways and cars come around fast.
12. I either walk to the Dish from Ladera or park there when I know it isn't crowded. I usually avoid driving that section of Alpine because of all the cars parked on both sides (and some illegally) and people running across Alpine
13. Marked parking and a light
14. Perhaps a few more spaces further up the road
15. Not sure what this is, but it's a required question. However, question 2: "Where do you typically access Alpine Road from?" does not include La Mesa or La Cuesta, causing about 525 homes from Ladera inaccurately answering this survey.
16. The Alpine Road Trail should be routed more clearly through the parking area.
17. disorganized parking leads to vehicles exiting onto Alpine erratically and dangerously, and the drop-off from road to dirt is so large that vehicles have to accelerate to make it over the "lip" and pose risk other vehicles and cyclists
18. Make it safer to turn left to Alpine, it's a blind turn and cars are very fast in both directions. Formal parking doesn't address this issue.