

From: [Lenny's Sonic](#)
To: [Ramirez, Lucas](#); [Hicks, Alison](#); [Kamei, Ellen](#); [Lieber, Sally](#); [Showalter, Pat](#); [Abe-Koga, Margaret](#); [Matichak, Lisa](#)
Cc: [City Council](#)
Subject: Forty feet
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2022 12:44:53 PM

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

In response to staff's answers (below) to Council questions for Item 7.1 tonight, I find staff's choice of a measurement technology appropriate, but their insistence on measuring flow line to flowline (bottom of curb to bottom of curb) is arbitrary. Indeed, I have yet to see a thoughtful traffic safety analysis supporting the forty-foot guideline.

This is important because the fraction-of-an-inch difference between flowline and top of curb would force numerous vehicle residents to move their homes from their current location, along the Highway 85 sound wall, where they do not pose a risk to traffic, there is no sidewalk, and there are no curb cuts.

Typically, oversized vehicle residences park with their tires against the curb. A small portion – at most a few inches - of each vehicle hangs over the curb. They could, under Mountain View's rules, park away from the curb. So I am mystified why forty feet is such a magical number.

I note that staff did not answer the question whether Council has “the discretion to adopt a different methodology.”

The City of Mountain View should drop the pretense that the “Narrow Streets” ordinance is about traffic safety. It grew out of discussions about homelessness, and there better tools to address traffic hazards created by oversized vehicles parked in inappropriate locations.

Lenny Siegel

1. Can staff explain the measurement methodology?

Street widths were measured from flowline (base of curb) to flowline, which accounts for the entire road surface area that can be used for parking and travel purposes. The streets at or near 40' wide were measured by a consultant using a Mobile Laser Scanning System, which is a land surveying method that uses laser systems mounted on moving vehicles to collect data points. The precision of the data acquired by this system is specified to be within 5 millimeters or 0.2 inches. All streets or portions of streets that had widths less than or equal to 40 feet were deemed narrow.

2. Since the Narrow Streets Ordinance does not specify a measurement methodology, does the Council have the discretion to adopt a different methodology?

Staff used a precise measurement device and public works methodology to measure straight across the road surface area. By using flowline to flowline, staff accounted for the entire road surface area available for parking and travel purposes, which is consistent with the traffic safety analysis that the

40' width is based upon. Using a different measuring device or technique is not recommended and would not be more precise in ascertaining whether the road surface area is 40' wide or less than the technical method used by staff.

—

Lenny Siegel



<http://lennysiegel.users.sonic.net/web/>

Author: *DISTURBING THE WAR: The Inside Story of the Movement to Get Stanford University out of Southeast Asia - 1965–1975* (See <http://a3mreunion.org>)

From: [Isaac Stone](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Agenda Item 7.1
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2022 1:10:03 PM

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

I don't understand the logic of keeping the 'no overnight parking' restrictions in residential areas. Do we assume that people living on View st never have friends or family from out of town come visit for a week or two? An anyway I thought the solution for parking problems in residential neighborhoods was to implement the parking permit program.

Keeping ~10% of the signs feels like inaction for the sake of inaction. If they did not currently exist would you recommend adding them?

Thanks for considering my suggestion and thanks to staff for all their hard work

- Isaac Stone, 