

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Questions
March 29, 2023**

6.1 California Street Complete Street Improvements, Pilot, Project 21-40

Question: What is the total change in parking availability along California? What is the change for each block?

Answer: Based on the concept layout, approximately 6 parking spaces generally spread along California Street will be lost. There may be a few additional parking spaces lost as the concept is further developed into final design and additional sight line analysis is done.

Question: Are there standard widths for travel lanes, parking, etc, or guidelines the city typically follows for these designs? Where could these be found?

Answer: Lane width is based on ASSHTO and Caltrans Standard, which range from 10' to 12' based on site conditions. Parking width is 8' per the City's Parking Standard.

Question: How are sight lines for the driveway exits calculated? Is there an assumed travel speed in these calculations, and if so what is it?

Answer: Sight lines are calculated based on local and Federal guidelines or requirements (i.e. AASHTO, NACTO, MUTCD) and are based on the 35 mph posted speed limit.

Question: For the bus stops, are the buses stopping in the bicycle lane next to the curb?

Answer: The design intent for the pilot project is to let buses park on the bike lane next to the curb.

Question: Could a configuration such as a floating transit island be added as a potential future improvement?

Answer: Transit islands will be evaluated in the final phase which involves converting to permanent improvements.

Question: How are the ramps being installed for the mid-block crossings? You will need to cut into the existing curb?

Answer: Curb will be cut at the location of new concrete curb ramps that will be installed for the proposed mid-block crossing.

Question: Was the possibility of cutting into the median at Mountain View Ave considered? Would it add significantly to the project cost or time?

Answer: This is not within the scope of work for this pilot project, but could be explored for the final buildout of the project. Cutting into the median would introduce new conflict points along California Street, remove trees, involve new traffic control devices, and significant civil work. There are significant trade-offs in introducing a crossing at this location that will require further analysis beyond the scope of this pilot project and would delay implementation of the pilot project. There are crossings are 300 feet away on both sides of Mountain View Avenue.

Question: When placing parking near the intersection of California and Chiquita, was the possibility of the parked car obscuring the view of a left-turning car (from California onto Chiquita), taken into account? Or is the parking space already positioned to allow the left-turning car to see oncoming straight-going bikes?

Answer: The sight line analysis for the three intersection at Chiquita, Pettis & Palo Alto is in process and adjustments to the parking locations will be made as needed based on the sight line analysis.

Question: In the figures, the buffer seems to be marked both by stripes and by black dots. Is there any meaning to the black dots?

Answer: Black dots are flexible posts, and the design intent is that no vehicle movement should cross the diagonal striping area.

Question: How will the buffer be protected? For example, at an intersection, will a vehicle be able to drive over the buffer area to cut the corner when turning right onto a side street, or will there be something to physically make it drive around the buffer.

Answer: Flexible post will be installed in conjunction with buffer striping to catch drivers' attention to keep cars away.

Question: What else goes into design beyond the drawings that were provided on pages 12-16?

Answer: A construction contract written specifications as well as detailed construction plans will be prepared to implement all design features as shown on the drawing.

Question: "The first phase identified a pilot phase from Showers Avenue to Ortega Avenue, including: a lane reduction (four lanes to three lanes)" -- It looks like there are currently 5 lanes on this segment (2 east bound, 2 west bound, 1 'turn only' lane). Which lane will be removed in the pilot?

Answer: This is the only segment that has an existing two-way left-turn center lane which will be retained. Two travel lanes in each direction will be reduced to one travel lane in each direction.

Question: Has a reduction in speed limit been considered? If so, why was it rejected?

Answer: The posted speed limit along California Street is 35 miles per hour. Speed limits are typically established on the basis of an Engineering and Traffic Survey based on speeds of actual

free-flow traffic conditions, and therefore enforceable speed limit reductions cannot be implemented on the basis of future proposed improvements. The most effective way to reduce speeds is through speed management strategies and roadway design similar to those being proposed in this project. Upon full implementation of the changes and once the improvements have been in place for a few months, staff will conduct a new E&TS to determine if Miramonte is eligible for speed limit reductions.

Question: Why was Shoreline to Bryant study segment excluded from the project?

Answer: The segment of California Street from Shoreline Boulevard to Bryant Street was recently improved with green bike lane infrastructure.

Question: Has the city considered returning the front yard easements to residents between (about) Chiquita to Shoreline? (that is, the more "East Coast" standard of sidewalk/green space easement/bike lane)

Answer: This has not been considered for this project.

Question: How does a cyclists going straight navigate the corner rubber curb bulb-outs in figure 4?

Answer: Bicyclists will have to follow the green striping markings when approaching a protected intersection.

Question: Are there plans to address the multiple sharp curb cuts in the sidewalk along the corridor?

Answer: This project only focuses on improvements within street pavement.

Question: Will this project also include installation of ADA compliant curb ramps? (as noted in item 6.2)

Answer: ADA curb ramps will be installed only at the mid-block crossings for the Pilot phase.

6.2 Miramonte Avenue Improvements, Project 20-01

Question: How are people expected to enter the two-way cycle track southbound from Castro? How wide is the exit from the cycle track going north across Castro?

Answer: The cycle track is ten feet wide throughout and at both egresses. To enter the cycle track as a cyclist heading southbound on Castro, the cyclist would need to follow the signalized intersection prompts for using the crosswalk at Castro St and Miramonte Ave. Alternatively, the cyclist can still cross Miramonte and use the buffered bike lane on the West side of Miramonte as they do today.

Question: Why was it decided to have buffered bike lanes? Were parking protected bike lanes considered?

Answer: Parking protected bike lanes were considered but the impacts to on-street parking would be high due to line-of-sight requirements for each driveway that fronts Miramonte Avenue. Residents have expressed concerns about losing parking during outreach efforts. The proposed vehicular lane reconfiguration retains on-street parking while also adding the buffer to the bike lanes.

Question: If the slip lane from Cuesta onto Miramonte Northbound were closed to vehicles, would Recology vehicles be able to make that right turn around the existing median island?

Answer: Closing the slip lane at Cuesta Drive is outside the project scope and therefore the fire and trash vehicle turning maneuvers have not been evaluated. The full reconstruction of the northeast corner at Cuesta and Miramonte could be evaluated as part of future projects.

Question: The Graham students who will use the 2-way bike lane to head toward Hans from Castro, will they be biking the "wrong" way in the Castro bike lane in order to do so? If so, is this a concern?

Answer: In the areal image below, the Graham Middle School bike parking area is circled, and arrows indicate the route towards the 2-way cycle track. Riding on the sidewalk along Castro Street until they enter the 2-way cycle track on Miramonte Ave is permissible, but bicyclists must yield right-of-way to pedestrians.



Question: Are there plans to address the multiple sharp curb cuts in the sidewalk along the corridor?

Answer: At this time there are no plans to address this issue, as it falls outside the Miramonte Avenue Improvements project scope of work.

Question: Have residents & PG&E Connected on potentially under grounding the utilities? I consider this a city issue to notify both parties, as individual property owners & residents are not aware of all of the project schedules and could miss a critical window to put utilities under ground.

Answer: The City is not aware of any plans for PG&E utility undergrounding along this section of Miramonte. Undergrounding PG&E utilities is an expensive undertaking that requires one to two years of design work by PG&E, is typically paid for by developers as a condition of approval for a subdivision or another project, and is done when PG&E has the resources and not based on City repaving schedules. Should PG&E inform the City of any planned undergrounding, staff can reach out to affected residents.

Question: What is the speed limit on this segment of Miramonte? Has lowering the speed limit been considered?

Answer: The posted speed limit along Miramonte Avenue is 35 miles per hour. Speed limits are typically established on the basis of an Engineering and Traffic Survey based on speeds of actual free-flow traffic conditions, and therefore enforceable speed limit reductions cannot be implemented on the basis of future proposed improvements. The most effective way to reduce speeds is through speed management strategies and roadway design similar to those being proposed in this project. Upon full implementation of the changes and once the improvements have been in place for a few months, staff will conduct a new E&TS to determine if Miramonte is eligible for speed limit reductions. It should be noted that this concept does include removing the pork chop island and tightening up the curve to slow vehicles down.

Question: The posted speed limit along Miramonte Avenue is 35 miles per hour. Speed limits are typically established on the basis of an Engineering and Traffic Survey based on speeds of actual free-flow traffic conditions, and therefore enforceable speed limit reductions cannot be implemented on the basis of future proposed improvements. The most effective way to reduce speeds is through speed management strategies and roadway design similar to those being proposed in this project. Upon full implementation of the changes and once the improvements have been in place for a few months, staff will conduct a new E&TS to determine if Miramonte is eligible for speed limit reductions.

Answer: This segment of Miramonte Avenue is almost exclusively single-family homes with over 40 driveways along the street segment spaced closely together. Implementing parking-protected bikeways along such a street would lead to eliminating a large number of on-street parking spaces due to sight line issues at the driveways. In comparison, most of the segments of California Street planned for parking-protected bikeways have multi-family housing with fewer than half the number driveways on some blocks spaced far apart; therefore, the impacts of providing parking-protected bikeways to on-street parking will be low.

6.3 Advisory Body Input on the Fiscal Years 2023-24 and 2024-25 Council Work Plan

Potential Projects

Question: What determines which projects are listed in the Council Work Plan vs. Capital Improvement Program? How do the two interact? e.g. a project that is in the Council Work Plan, does it always stay there (so the grade separation or Stevens Creek Trail extension would always be in the Council Work Plan and not in the CIP list?) Where does the budget for the projects in the Council Work Plan come from and is it distinct from the CIP?

Answer: Capital Improvements Program projects may be included in the Council Work Plan if they are of particular interest to the City Council. CIP projects included in the Council Work Plan are not removed from and still receive funding through the CIP. All other Council Work Plan projects receive funding through the annual budget adoption process.

Question: Where can I find more details about these priorities?

Answer: Some of the projects under consideration for inclusion in the Council Work Plan are already underway and have webpages on the MountainView.gov website. Others have not yet started or were put forth by the Council during the February 28 Study Session. Staff from the City Manager's Office will be in attendance at the meeting to answer questions about the proposed projects.

Question: What does "Expand the Safe Routes to School Program" entail, for example?

Answer: More information about the Safe Routes to School Program specifically can be found at: [https://www.mountainview.gov/depts/pw/transport/gettingaround/suggested_routes_to_schools_\(verbs\).asp](https://www.mountainview.gov/depts/pw/transport/gettingaround/suggested_routes_to_schools_(verbs).asp). Expanding this program entails investing additional resources in educating the community, parents, and children about road safety and bike and pedestrian routes to local schools, modifying infrastructure as needed, and providing crossing guards at local schools.

6.4 Work Plan

Question: Do we have updates or visibility on new dates for Middlefield Bikeway & El Monte Corridor Study?

Answer: We will provide an answer at the meeting.