

**From:** James Kuszmaul [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 26, 2023 3:35 PM  
**To:** , Public Works <[Public.Works@mountainview.gov](mailto:Public.Works@mountainview.gov)>  
**Subject:** Public comment on CTC Item 5.1 Transit Center (Castro Street) Grade Separation and Access Project, Project 21-35-Project Scope and Funding Options

**CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL - Ensure you trust this email before clicking on any links or attachments.**

Chair Kamei & members of the CTC:

Regarding the potential for cost cutting in the Castro Street Grade Separation project, I want to generally support the staff proposals in Tables 2, 3, and 4, and to particularly encourage the deferral or outright cancellation of the Evelyn Ave ramp onto Shoreline.

Regarding the design changes suggested in Table 4:

- I would encourage keeping the skylight; while not strictly necessary, natural light is a substantial quality of life improvement for users of these sorts of tunnels, and the 300 to 400 thousand dollar cost seems acceptable.
- Reducing the tunnel dimensions should be considered carefully. Given that even the “narrower” tunnels would still be 22’ wide, this seems like a reasonable compromise (although given that we will be using these tunnels for decades to come, maximizing width is understandable). The increased tunnel elevation (and corresponding decrease in ceiling height) is potentially desirable, as it will mean fewer stairs, and a slightly easier path for wheelchair users.

Regarding removing the Evelyn Avenue ramp:

- It is not clear at this stage that there is even a strong need for the ramp. The most compelling need I can see is that some bus routes could benefit from such a connection. However, with the plan to add more bus stops on Moffett & Central near the tunnel exits, there should be much less need for such a connection.
- The proposed ramp would actively decrease quality of life for people going from the transit center to downtown; the potential impacts of having to cross a busy road just to get from the transit center were a major concern at the [September 29, 2021 BPAC meeting](#) when discussing the options for the Evelyn alignment. By not having a ramp, we could potentially leave Evelyn closed to through traffic entirely, and even if connected through it would have much lower traffic levels than a ramp would create.
- As brought up at the [September 28, 2022 BPAC meeting](#), the ramp itself will create future conflicts with the planned improvements to the bike/ped path by the Shoreline Blvd overpass. By removing the ramp, we remove a potential conflict with pedestrians and cyclists.

Additionally, while the following may be out of scope for what is being considered, given the magnitude of the funding shortfall and potential savings, it seems worth raising: If we could justify terminating Moffett Blvd **before** it connects to Central, then there would only be need for a single tunnel crossing Central Expressway, and space would be freed up along the curb on Westbound Central for additional bus drop-off/pickup areas. A road diet of Central itself would also help with this, but I imagine that such a conversation is even more difficult to have.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment,  
James Kuszmaul

**From:** Lada Adamic [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 27, 2023 3:25 PM  
**To:** Public Works <[Public.Works@mountainview.gov](mailto:Public.Works@mountainview.gov)>  
**Subject:** comment on CTC item 5.1

**CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL - Ensure you trust this email before clicking on any links or attachments.**

Dear committee,

It is difficult to grasp the magnitude of the shortfall for the grade separation project, and I don't envy you for having to make tough decisions about which cost-cutting options to retain.

Some of the proposals, such as phasing Moffet and Evelyn, seem workable, even if it would be better to have everything delivered ASAP, especially with the dangerous high-speed, no bikelane situation on Moffet.

However, other parts, such as diverting funding from other bike/ped projects, I would not support. The reason for this project is to improve safety, and other bike/ped projects in the pipeline have exactly this goal. Sapping their funding in favor of this one would have a negative impact, given that the Central Expressway at-grade crossing, while dangerous, is just one such crossing, whereas the other projects include many such hazardous areas, and being less expensive, their proximate delivery is arguably more valuable.

I also oppose cutting costs in the area of "appearance" (with the exception of the skylight, which could plausibly be compensated for by LED lighting). For example, lowering the width and height of the tunnels would make them feel less safe. If there is an individual in the tunnel who is behaving erratically, a wider tunnel gives the option of circumventing them. The lower ceiling would also make the tunnel feel utilitarian and claustrophobic. Omitting the second wall in the tunnels or form lines on the retaining walls and having to slap paint on them instead will I think make the project look cheap. Many murals are garish and visually distracting. A few are outstanding, but unfortunately, many are not. Murals often feel like the last resort: we had to have an ugly concrete wall, and we are trying to cover it up. The total savings in the aesthetic category is modest (~\$5M) relative to the total shortfall, but the visual impact could be big if aesthetics were compromised on.

The proposal to take out the Adobe undercrossing while preserving an at-grade crossing for that side of the intersection may be OK, depending on what bikes, people with strollers, etc. would need to do. In the current design the need to use stairs and/or elevator to reach street level diminishes the utility of the undercrossing (though it is still very valuable for most pedestrians). Bicyclists may prefer to continue at-grade, in order to avoid the stairs. Removing the undercrossing to Stierlin would be a bigger loss that I hope can be avoided.

Sincerely,

Lada Adamic