

MEMORANDUM

To: Jim Lightbody
From: Nelson\Nygaard
Date: May 30, 2014
Subject: Summary of Public Outreach, Phase #2

OVERVIEW

On May 19, 2014, the City of Mountain View held its second community workshop for the Shoreline Boulevard Corridor Study at the Adobe Building. The meeting was advertised to the greater Shoreline and Mountain View community via e-mail blasts to both the City's and the project's contact lists, postings on the project website (www.shorelinecorridor.com), and a press release to local media outlets. Approximately 35 people attended the two-hour meeting.

On May 21, the City and the consultant team met with a group of stakeholders from the greater Shoreline Corridor area at the Computer History Museum. In attendance were representatives from major area employers (Google, LinkedIn, Intuit, etc.), agency staff (VTA, County of Santa Clara, Caltrain), property owners, developers, and smaller businesses. Approximately 25 people attended the meeting.

Both meetings began with a brief presentation by City and consultant staff reviewing the goals of the project, work completed to date, and key findings. An introduction to the small group exercise and the conceptual alternatives was also provided. Attendees then went to one of five small group stations where an overview of the key findings and initial recommendations was presented in more detail by a facilitator. The five stations were:

1. Mountain View Transit Center station area
2. Stierlin Road
3. Shoreline Boulevard
4. US-101 crossing
5. Transit network

Meeting participants were able to ask questions, provide feedback, and leave written comments on each proposed alternative. After 15 minutes participants rotated to the

next station. At the end of the exercise, each facilitator provided a brief summary to the larger group of the key discussion points at their respective station. Included below is a summary of the major themes from each meeting.

SUMMARY OF INPUT

Mountain View Transit Center Station Area

Participants consistently reinforced the finding that pedestrian and bicycle conditions in and around the station need significant improvement, especially at the intersection of Central/Moffett/Castro. This intersection is a significant challenge for all modes, but is particularly impactful on pedestrian and bicycle travel and safety. The short-term options were strongly supported and “could not be implemented quickly enough,” but many also felt that they did not go far enough to improve the intersection. The additional time for pedestrian crossings during the phase for passing trains was strongly supported, as well as the high-visibility crosswalks and marked zones for bicycles.

Meeting participants were somewhat mixed on the idea of closing the right turn slip lanes, as some thought it would benefit pedestrians, while others saw it as too impactful for vehicles. Reactions were also mixed regarding the medium-term options. In general, the community would like some form of physical separation of the intersection to improve safety and traffic, but opinions were mixed about whether it should be an elevated crossing or whether the City should move forward with full grade separation at the intersection. There was strong opposition to the overcrossing by some because of aesthetic/character impacts to Downtown and residential neighborhoods, while others saw it as a place making opportunity. One participant noted that full grade separation would have potentially more impacts on downtown than the overcrossing. Clearly, urban design and community character near the station were significant concerns. Finally, some attendees advocated for a complete and comprehensive redesign of the station area, as opposed to more incremental steps.

Stierlin Road

In general, the community recognizes the importance of Stierlin as a connection to Shoreline and North Bayshore and supports some type of new bicycle facility on the street. There was a difference on the preference on the type of the facility. Some thought that the bike boulevard would be sufficient given the residential character of the street, while others wanted more robust facilities offered by the buffered bike lanes. It appears that most of the difference in preference came down to parking, with local residents concerned about the loss of on-street parking with the bike lane options, while bike commuters were hoping to see dedicated bike lanes. Traffic calming measures for all alternatives received support, and the connection via Central Avenue to Moffett was also emphasized as a crucial improvement. Many also saw the project as a way to

improve landscaping, street trees, lighting, and general aesthetics within the neighborhood.

The improvements to the Stierlin/Montecito/Shoreline intersection were generally supported and encouraged. Many liked the closure of the Stierlin slip lane and conversion to a two-way cycle track, but it should be noted that representatives from the Buddhist Temple were strongly opposed to this idea as it would impact access to their southern driveway.

Shoreline Boulevard

In general, there was strong support for the addition of both transit and bike facilities to Shoreline. It appears that the one-way cycle track option was the preferred choice as it was the most intuitive for bicyclists and motorists and people felt it would minimize conflicts at driveways more so than the two-way options. The width of the facilities as a key design factor was highlighted, as bicyclists wanted to be sure that there would be enough room to pass, especially during peak periods. Some preferred two-way cycle tracks, but others noted the issue of limited access to the opposite side of the street with only a wide lane and sharrows. Some participants also emphasized the need for connections on Shoreline south of Montecito/Stierlin to El Camino Real, especially an improved crossing of Central Expressway. Several attendees advocated for a center-running cycle track not only for this southern section of Shoreline, but also for the whole corridor. Improved access to the Safeway on Shoreline was seen as a key factor, and installation of a new signalized crossing was strongly supported.

Participants were mostly split on the center- versus side-running transit lanes, but there appeared to be a preference for the center-running option, as it would have the strongest benefit for transit trip times. Some community members were very concerned about the loss of left turn access between Middlefield and Terra Bella and wondered if U-turns would be feasible. They encouraged outreach to specific businesses and properties on this issue. Right-of-way impacts were also raised as a potential concern and issue to address in more detail. Finally, some expressed concern about passengers accessing the center platforms and how that would impact signal timing.

US-101 Crossing

There was mixed opinions about the best way to get people across US-101. Some saw the center-running lane as the best alternative for transit, while others advocated for side-running lanes. Most people did not want to see basic Class II bike lanes on the existing bridge, as it still results in mixing conflicts with vehicles accessing the freeway on-ramps. If the bike lanes are to remain, they should be separated lanes.

There was strong support for a bike/pedestrian bridge, more so than a transit/bike/pedestrian bridge. Many saw the bike/pedestrian bridge as a significant improvement and a facility that many (commuters and families) would use. There were significant concerns about the right-of-way and traffic impacts of a

transit/bike/pedestrian bridge and whether it would add any value given that vehicles would have to go out of their way to access it and then connect back to Shoreline. Improved lighting was a strongly desired improvement for all alternatives.

Transit Network

During both meetings, there was a general understanding and consensus that current shuttle operations are inefficient and duplicative. Both the community and stakeholders were supportive of an effort to consolidate services and maximize resources. There was also general support for the proposed transit network as a free and public system, as many felt it offered a significant improvement over the current mix of services. The high frequency of the buses, including peak-period branch routes, was also seen as highly attractive. Residents were encouraged by the option for a transit connection to recreational opportunities on the weekend, as well as a way to get to Shoreline Amphitheater. The connection to El Camino Real was also seen as crucial.

Some of the employers expressed concern that Caltrain would be able to meet the future demand assumed at Mountain View. Others expressed concern about the size of the loading area required on Central Expressway and its impacts on traffic and the residential neighborhoods. Routing of a large number of buses through Downtown neighborhoods was also raised as a concern. A consistent question that was asked was who would operate and pay for the service, and to what degree would the new TMA play a role. Current TMA members wondered about how this service plan would integrate with the current transit planning underway by the TMA. One commentator encouraged the City to focus less on the routing and more on the infrastructure improvements, noting that much of the North Bayshore street grid would change in the coming years. Finally, many participants emphasized the need to focus on providing shuttles to and from San Antonio station as a way to mitigate traffic on Shoreline, better serve Intuit, and maximize on recent and planned growth in that area.