

---

**From:** Daniel Hulse <  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 25, 2024 5:44 PM  
**To:** City Council  
**Subject:** 5/28 Council Meeting - Consent Items 4.7 and 4.8

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

Dear City Council,

As a cyclist, I'm writing to express support for Consent Items 4.7 and 4.8, which will both make progress towards the overall goal of creating a safe, extensive, high-quality bicycle network in Mountain View.

On Item 4.7, California Street is a very central bike route in our city and gets a lot of use, and I'm really glad we're working to improve it. When I used to bike this street on my way to work, I had a lot of stressful interactions with (1) busses and shuttles running into the bike lane to drop people off (2) cars parking or loitering in the bike lane, and (3) cars moving into the bike lane to turn. I hope that adding more protection to the lane and the intersections will resolve these issues and I'm glad staff has moved to extend this project beyond the original scope—in the future, I hope we can further extend it to Del Medio.

On Item 4.8, Middlefield Road is a very high-opportunity corridor for bikes because of all the space available on the road and all the development expected to go on in this area. Right now, this neighborhood is surrounded by freeways that make it difficult to get in and out of on bike or on foot. While there are already bike lanes on Middlefield, these lanes are often blocked (legally!) by an occasional parked car, which makes for very stressful interactions with vehicle traffic. Putting in class IV bike facilities and protected intersections will improve this situation immensely. I'm also happy to see the protected crossing at the light rail station, which should really improve the usefulness of that connection. One major change I would make to this project, however, would be to expand the scope to include a better connection to Stevens Creek trail. Right now, this connection is extremely limited because the entrance is on the south side of Middlefield, on the opposite side of the sidewalk. The result of this is that you can only really use the trail connection if you are biking (not walking) to the east entering or exiting the trail, or walking from the east, on the south side of middlefield. A good connection to Stevens Creek trail would truly unlock the potential of this project to improve the AAA cycling network in our city by making it possible to use these lanes as a part of a larger trip to or from the north or south of the city. There are a number of ways to implement this in the scope of a complete streets project (better crossings, moving the sidewalk to the south side, combined facilities, another trail entrance, etc), and I really hope that can happen as a part of this project. I also hope that in the future we can work on improving Middlefield on the other side of Moffett to eliminate the parking/bicycle conflicts inherent to the shared bike lane there.

P.S., I was really happy to see that Middlefield Complete Streets, Moffett Complete Streets, and El Camino Intersection Improvements won their MTC OBAG3 grants. Kudos to staff for taking the time to advocate for these projects. I'll also call attention to the fact that our city's early compliance with state housing law likely improved our standing in the grant selection process. This was a major win for our city, bringing in over 8 million dollars in funds from the regional level—keep up the good work, and happy bike month!

Sincerely,

Daniel Hulse

---

**From:** Eran Arkin  
**Sent:** Monday, May 27, 2024 11:32 AM  
**To:** Nguyen, Hoa; City Council  
**Subject:** California Street Project Questions

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

Dear City Council Members,

As a long-time resident of Mountain View, I live on \_\_\_\_\_, and I have firsthand experience with the challenges and safety concerns on California Street. From my driving to walking and biking, I've encountered numerous issues that must be addressed. That's why I'm writing to share my thoughts on the proposed improvements for California Street (Pilot Project 21-40).

While I commend the city's efforts to enhance safety and accessibility, I have a few concerns and questions based on my personal experiences:

1. **Goals of the Current Plan:** What are the specific goals of the current plan for California Street? What specific problems is it trying to address? It would be helpful to understand the city's objectives to ensure the proposed solutions align with them.
2. **Measuring Success:** How will the city measure the success of this project? What benchmarks or metrics will be used to determine if the project achieves its intended outcomes? Clear success criteria are essential to evaluate the project's effectiveness.
3. **Evaluation of Alternatives:** What alternatives has the city evaluated for this project? Were other potential solutions considered before deciding on the current plan? I believe it's important to explore all options to find the best solution.

Based on my personal experiences, I would also like to highlight a few key issues and propose a potential solution:

1. **Excessive Traffic Light Wait Times:** The long waiting times at traffic lights often lead to dangerous behaviors such as speeding and running red lights. I've personally witnessed drivers taking unnecessary risks to beat the lights, putting pedestrians and cyclists at risk.
2. **Unsafe Left Turns:** Residents making left turns into and out of apartment complexes risk other users. In fact, my wife was hit recently by a driver attempting a left turn from a complex near California and Escuella, and I've had a near-miss as a cyclist. These situations are all too common and could be prevented.
3. **Neighborhood Division:** The current street design divides the neighborhood, making it difficult and unsafe for children and pedestrians to cross. For example, my son used to have a friend on the other side of California, but there's no crossing on Palo Alto. As a parent, I worry about my children's safety when accessing parks or visiting friends across the street.

As far as I can tell, nothing in the current plan addresses any of these problems... Based on these experiences, I would like to propose the following solutions:

1. **Replace Traffic Lights with Roundabouts:** Roundabouts can significantly improve traffic flow and safety for both cars and bicycles. Research from Carmel, Indiana, shows a 47% reduction in injury crashes overall, with some designs reducing crashes by as much as 84% ([Environmental Resilience Institute](#)) ([wthr.com](#)). Roundabouts also

help in reducing fuel consumption and emissions due to less idling at traffic lights ([Environmental Resilience Institute](#)). Based on my experience, only in Shoreline, Regnestoff, and San Antonio, there's actually a need for a light.

2. **Prohibit Left Turns:** Prohibiting left turns across the street in and out of apartment complexes might seem like an excessive idea, but if we have roundabouts, it will be much faster for residents and simpler to simply get to the next roundabout and u-turn.
3. **Dedicated Pedestrian and Cyclist Paths:** Incorporating dedicated paths or lanes for pedestrians and cyclists would improve safety and encourage more environmentally friendly modes of transportation within our community.
4. **Traffic Calming Measures:** Implementing speed humps, narrowed lanes, or other traffic calming measures could help reduce excessive speeding and make the street more pedestrian-friendly.

Thank you for considering these matters. By addressing these issues and incorporating these suggestions, the city can create a safer and more connected California Street for all users, fostering a more vibrant and friendly neighborhood.

Regards,

--

Eran Arkin

**From:** [PEAR](#)  
**To:** [City Council](#)  
**Cc:** [, City Clerk; , Public Works; Community Development](#)  
**Subject:** Consent Calander For May 28, 2024, Agenda Item 4.7, California Street (West) Complete Street Improvements, Pilot, Project 21  
**Date:** Monday, May 27, 2024 12:26:22 PM

---

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

Dear Mayor Pat Showalter and City Council Members:

While we support the overall broad initiative as openly stated by the proponents who don't have a vested economic interest at stake "to get people out of [gasoline powered] cars" in residential neighborhoods, WE ARE OPPOSED to such road diets in commercial shopping districts wherein we already lost our land and house through eminent domain for California Street, and later in the 1970s, for the on-street parking on our side of California Street, as well as and more importantly, for the following reasons:

- The City of Mountain View did not notify us, the property owner from whom half of the length for California Street between Ortega Avenue and the Liquor Store just before Showers Drive came from our ranch, which was condemned for California Street. At least one other California Street commercial property owner was also not notified.
- No economic or environmental impact study as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) was performed on the road diet's effects on the existing commercial operations and future development under the San Antonio Precise Plan; therefore, there cannot be a finding that the "California Street (West) Complete Street Improvement, Pilot Project 21-40, is categorically exempt as Class 1, Maintenance and Minor Alterations of Existing Public Facilities, under CEQA Guidelines Section 15301."
- It unfairly overburdens our property unless we also receive a CEQA finding that we are categorically exempt from the traffic impacts it will impose on our property.
- It curtails retail and QSRs that require visibility and accessibility for sales.
- Rengstorff Avenue is a major arterial from Hwy 101 and El Camino Real to California Street that leads directly to the San Antonio Shopping District for not only customers but on-line consumers, vendors, and suppliers.
- Both Target and Wheel Works receive customers and deliveries from two driveways off California Street. Any reduction would curtail their deliveries and

sales.

- As previously shown and discussed with City Council Members we intend to complete the buildout of our center and require this access and traffic flow.
- Cargo bicycles are inferior to vehicles for shopping and cannot be used in inclement weather or by the physically challenged or seniors in any meaningful shopping experience way, and therefore this project discriminates against the physically challenged and seniors.
- Autonomous vehicles are evolving at an exponential pace that have far less environmental issues and will offer unlimited possibilities for the physically impaired, mobility challenged, and seniors, and in the case of hydrogen fuel cells, there are very limited environmental impacts.
- With the development of EV bicycles the need for separation diminishes as these “bicycles” are akin to motorcycles.
- No CEQA environmental impact or economic study has been performed and any pilot program is in violation of the basic legal principles and property rights afforded to the effected parties, especially when these property owners paid for the current width and capacities of these streets, and to reduce these lanes and in essence accessibility is to deny their property rights wherein they provided the land and paid the assessments for the accessibility and visibility provided by California Street.
- Target recently reported in its earnings report on its website that “Same-day services grew nearly 9 percent, led by more than 13 percent growth in Drive Up.” Drive Up will become an ever increasingly larger part of Target’s sales that requires this accessibility and traffic throughput.
- Our land was condemned for the entire portion of California Street at Ortega Avenue to the Liquor Store for which we did not receive compensation other than for our house but instead a smaller assessment, i.e., we received no financial compensation for the land other than a lower assessment, which we still could not pay from the income generated from farming. It was the Mountain View Bank of America branch manager that provided an interim loan - we were six months away from a tax lien foreclosure sale before we signed a very unfavorable long-term lease that still exists today and exposes us to market risk. The original taking was with the understanding that we would at least enjoy the commercial accessibility afforded by these major traffic arterials, which we are now in jeopardy of losing. Our access, traffic flow, visibility and exposure are being reduced without any guaranty that we will be able to develop our property under the same density that allowed adjacent properties much higher densities under the auspices of being “gateway properties” and as finally allowed for our property under the San Antonio

Precise Plan.

- Our property is incrementally being overly burdened with bicycle / pedestrian requirements on all four of our surrounding streets (Ortega Avenue, California Street, Showers Drive, and Latham Street and the City and County of San Francisco Hetch-Hetchy Right-of-Way for which we have surface rights. No other property in the City of Mountain View is as overburdened as our property. The City of Mountain View moved the proposed bicycle lanes from El Camino Real over to Latham Street due to the interference with commercial operations and sales. Yet no economic or environmental impact study has been performed as to what these bicycle lanes will do to our vibrant commercial operations from which the City of Mountain View derives sales tax revenues.
- We were denied an extension for our approved plans to expand Wheel Works which we attempted to place on-hold during our litigation with the City and County of San Francisco over our surface rights on the Hetch-Hetchy Right-of-Way (wherein we prevailed). Yet Merlone Geier Partners was not only granted a development agreement to extend their entitlements for their office building at the SEC of San Antonio Road and California Street, but they were also granted the sole use of one lane on California Street to turn into their project rather than taking land out of their property for this purpose that only serves their development. In our instance we were not granted an extension by the City Attorney even though we had a very valid legal reason for our request, and now we are in the process of losing valuable access for which we already paid and will now require upon development of our underutilized remaining property because a future project CEQA will penalize our property for lack of accessibility, traffic, etc. at a point in time when autonomous vehicles will be in greater use and on-line delivery and drive up the norm thus requiring this California Street traffic throughput.

Therefore, we ask that the California Street road diet and parking protected bike lanes end at Rengstorff Avenue so that we maintain traffic flow and accessibility for a vibrant shopping center and because we already lost our land and parking on our side in the early 1970s whereas it still exists on the northside of California Street.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of our request to end the proposed pilot project at Rengstorff Avenue.

**MATT PEAR**