

MOUNTAIN VIEW TRANSIT CENTER MASTER PLAN MEETING

Summary of Community Meeting #2

Tuesday, May 10, 2016

The City of Mountain View hosted a community meeting on May 10, 2016, from 6:00-7:30 p.m. to discuss the Transit Center Master Planning effort and related grade separation of Castro Street with the railroad. The meeting was held at the Adobe Building, 157 Moffett Boulevard in Mountain View. Approximately forty (40) community members attended the meeting.

City staff Linda Forsberg (Transportation and Business Manager) and Jim Lightbody (Project Manager) attended the meeting. Adam Dankberg (Kimley-Horn Project Manager), Brent Ogden, and Corbin Skerrit from Kimley-Horn and Eileen Goodwin (Apex Strategies, Community Outreach lead) represented the project team. Sebastian Petty from Caltrain was also in attendance.

This was the project team's second meeting with the community regarding this project. It was explained to the group assembled that the initial range of alternatives which had been shown at the first public meeting were subsequently presented to the Mountain View City Council in a Study Session and that the Council had screened down the group to include Alternative 1 (the straight-through Castro Street underpass grade separation) and Alternative 4 (Castro Street traffic re-routed at the railroad tracks and Evelyn Avenue extended west to connect to the Shoreline Boulevard bridge north of the Villa Street intersection). The purpose of this community meeting was to get input from the community on the two project alternatives. As a result, the presentation and open house materials focused on the two alternatives and the various elements and trade-offs between the two. The community members were asked to vote by marking their preferences on a provided voting ballot with room to explain why they preferred one option over another; there were three possible options, Alternative 1, Alternative 4, or Do Nothing which was the no build option. Comment cards were also available to capture additional comments or questions.

Meeting Summary:

The meeting started at 6:00 p.m. In addition to the personnel there to answer questions and present information, approximately forty (40) members of the public attended. About 40% of the attendees said the City's e-blast was how they found out about the meeting. Nextdoor was acknowledged as another way attendees found out about the meeting from 50% of the attendees. Word of mouth brought 15% of the attendees to the meeting. Five percent of the attendees saw something on social media and 15% saw something in other media (e.g., The Voice). The e-lists from the Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning sent out an e-blast and the City website calendar was mentioned by one of the attendees as the way she found out about the meeting.

After a brief introduction by the City’s Project Manager, the Kimley Horn project manager spoke to a power point presentation. The presentation was given to orient the attendees to the purpose of the project, project objectives, proposed alternatives, including their potential impacts on traffic circulation, and the evaluation criteria.

To close the presentation, the Kimley Horn Project Manager presented the process and a schedule of next steps. During and after the presentation many questions, suggestions and opinions were offered to the staff and project team. The comments and responses offered during the meeting are captured below in the order they were given.

This meeting summary also includes a tally of the voting ballots used to get input on the project alternatives. The ballot results were **three** for Alternative #1, **twenty** for Alternative #4, **two** for No-Build, **one** for a trench alternative (not listed on ballot), and **one** for either Alternative 1 or 4, as documented below:

Ballot Document Comments
Results: 3 for Alternative 1, 20 for Alternative #4, 2 for No-Build, 1 for a trench (not listed), 1 for either Alternative 1 or 4. 27 total ballots received.
Comments for Alternative #1
Keep Castro open, better bike/pedestrian options, better lower level openings to surface
Leaning toward Alternative #1 at this point. Saves significant time from N. Moffett for residents there and eliminates congestion that would be created on Shoreline with additional lights and drivers changing lanes within very short distances to make turns.
I don’t think that just connecting Evelyn through is enough. That Alt #1 connects Evelyn and keeps Castro open.
Comments for Alternative #4
Bike/ped improvements are better, less costly.
I appreciate the opportunity for the input and public workshops on the Downtown Transit Center redevelopment. I think the consulting team has generally done a good job of providing conceptual plans to react to for Phase I.
Given the choice of the two alternatives, I prefer Alternative 4 with some qualifiers. I think the alternative preserves the vibrancy of Castro Street and addresses the grade crossing issues. As you know, it generally takes 10 years from concept to completed construction and I also think Alternative 1 has the best chance of going forward in the needed time frame in align with Caltrain

electrification. My primary qualifier is the link on Evelyn to Shoreline. In asking questions of the consulting team, it is very conceptual, and it is known what the configuration will be at the street level, and what the design of the ramp will look like. That is understandable given the phase of the study. I'm concerned that that the ramp grade could have ADA accessibility issues. It should be able to provide a linkage for pedestrians and bicycles. My primary concern is one of urban design as many such ramps do not add value to adjacent land uses and can be an eye sore. I'd like to see a rendering of the look and feel of the ramp.

My hunch, and not backed by any analysis, is that Alternative 1 would induce much more traffic and congestion on Castro Street than what the consultant was showing. The trench on the first block of Castro could have a devastating impact on the sense of place that we all like about Castro. Therefore I cannot support Alternative 4.

I continue to be concerned about the lack of coordination of the study of link between North Bayshore and the Downtown Transit Center. There should be at least some consideration of the possible modes that will be studied and how they would integrate into the Transit Center. It should not be an afterthought.

I prefer this alternative for simplicity of construction to preserve the character of Castro Street at grade level. I love the idea of diverting Evelyn traffic to Franklin and Villa and then to Shoreline instead of the ramp up to yet another intersection on Shoreline—that's already a mess for bikes!

Cheaper, more likely to actually happen. I worry about trench in front of businesses in Alternative #1. Please reconsider removing any parking at Adobe House. After losing the lot at the Social Security Services Building it's hard to plan events here. Consider disabled access to Adobe too.

I live on W. Evelyn and the alternative makes it easier to approach my home by car when coming from other parts of Mt. View.

#4 frees up Castro Street for safer pedestrian crossings and sidewalk dining opportunities with less noise and exhaust etc. Eliminates much Castro Street traffic and makes it nicer for all. Cheaper and quicker construction.

Closing Castro reduces traffic and makes downtown more pedestrian friendly. The trench is undesirable. Reduced traffic will not diminish business revenue. It will increase revenues because more people will come downtown and stay longer. Also, this cost of \$40M is much more attractive and three years of construction would be bad. I strongly want a grade separation and I much prefer #4 to #1.

The cost is lower and Moffett will not be closed to traffic.

As a business owner on Castro Street, closing the road for 1.5 years for construction will be devastating to the local economy.
Drawbacks of Alt #1: 1) Trenching would significantly degrade the ambiance of Castro 100 Block one of our few historical downtown blocks. 2) With no expressway/Castro connections, drivers entering downtown from Central Expressway would certainly attempt to access Castro by making U-Turn and the intersection of Central Avenue and Moffett. Drivers leaving downtown via Central Expressway would do the same thing. The intersection is already problematic and accident-prone. (in my view this is a major flaw and should disqualify Alt #1.) 3) Would not be compatible with possible future trenching of High Speed rail. 4) Costly. Advantages of Alt #4: 1) Preserves the integrity of Castro 100 block. 2) Retains Castro through traffic via re-routed Evelyn to Shoreline 3) Would not interfere with possible trenching of High Speed Rail. 4) Lower cost.
The alternative #1 will create a barrier to pedestrians on Castro between Villa and the tracks. A pedestrian/bike underpass could be modified to create space for shops or services. I like what European cities have done with downtown train/tram stations. Salzburg, Vienna, Zurich for example.
Cost efficient, quickest to realize benefit (shortest construction) and most peak vehicles re-routed.
Alt #1 doubles down on Castro as a thoroughfare and I don't want that. I do strongly favor the north side (Moffett) being more integrated with downtown. Alt #4 is good but I was hoping for an even more pedestrian plaza at the end of Castro, not necessarily an optimization of Evelyn as a thoroughfare. That said, what you planned is a good way to mitigate traffic issues with closing the Castro crossing and I generally approve. If Dana could be enhanced to allow better traffic flow that might be better.
Doable in a short period (1.5) and reduced noise (no trenching) and lower cost. Preserves character of Castro. Turns Evelyn between Castro and Shoreline in useable space and addresses traffic flow issues between Evelyn and Shoreline.
Suggestions: 1) Projected noise level for each proposal.2) Crossing Mt. View East/west is not on the plans. Perhaps a more comprehensive plan including 85 connectivity. 3) Do nothing projections. 4) Emergency—mean time to respond.
Enhances downtown business environment. Three years of construction closure followed by forever zero visibility of any business on 100 block from cars in trench would be disastrous. Better plan for non-car mobility too.
Requires shift of all N/S transit services to Shoreline. Does that mean you are proposing to ban transit between El Camino Real and California? And if so why? This would be a transit catastrophe. Are you assuming, I hope, that people driving to transit center from north will be able to park north of Central? Where? I

<p>didn't follow proposed re-routing of shuttles but hope you know that they are currently often operating on residential streets they should not be on (and are not on the official shuttle map).</p>
<p>Businesses on Castro and Moffett not affected, avoids three-year construction, also devastating to businesses and neighborhoods, Lower cost--Significant! Maintains quality of existing neighborhoods. Keeps left hand turn from Moffett to central. Probably improves quality of life for pedestrians and customers on Castro Street.</p>
<p>Fast, Cheap. Soon. If, however, we anticipate a major Shoreline construction unrelated to the project or some sort of county-wide rail trenching then I would prefer we wait.</p>
<p>It preserves the walkable charm of downtown, which is the city's pride and has been recognized nationally (NACTO). I love the idea of a tunnel for bikes and pedestrians that requires no waiting for a signal. I like the re-connection of Evelyn across Castro and feel Evelyn is a good road to use to divert traffic, though I am a little concerned about how bike/ped safety will be affected on Shoreline.</p>
<p>If the objective is to mitigate congestion at Castro/Moffett/Central/Caltrain, then clearly Alternative #4 is the most sensible choice. Alternative #1 makes no sense economically or practically; through traffic (from Central or Moffett to Castro and vice versa) constitutes just a fraction of the downtown Mt. View traffic.</p>
<p>Comments for No-Build</p>
<p>It appears no thought has been given to mitigating traffic increases on the residential streets, therefore no action should be taken because our neighborhood streets are already clogged and cannot handle an increase. If you make a plan to direct traffic away from Dana and California onto Evelyn in conjunction with Alternative #4, then Alternative #4 is a good idea.</p>
<p>No build or trenching the rails and Central Expressway. Writing on the large pad in the front of the room was too tiny to be read so did you represent what we said accurately or not? Alt #1 and Alt #4 mess with the current success of Castro Street. Why mess with success? Don't. Get money from the state to depress high speed rail up the peninsula. It can sink from Mt. View on up to S.F. Depress Central Expressway too to connect with Sunnyvale. Other cities towards S.F. will join in this effort. Joe Simitian supports the rail trench and says it would get support in a ballot measure in November. Trench only in Mt. View continuing to S.F through cities along the way supporting it and the state too.</p> <p>Because traffic on Castro street moves slowly due to the rail crossing, your proposal to close it off so traffic doesn't go through at all forever? BAD. I do business frequently on Castro when heading home off 101 or Central Expressway. If I must access Castro Street from Shoreline I will most certainly</p>

skip it altogether. Others will too! 1) This is bad for business on Castro. 2) Hurts north-south traffic as it increases in the business park at Shoreline. (LinkedIn is coming and Google and many others.) (Use of Castro is down a bit now but will increase as the Business Park at Shoreline builds out!) 3) Does nothing to reduce traffic noise and train especially as light rail extends and high speed rail gets here—work together to depress rails and Central. Only depressing the rails makes sense. Depressing Central Expressway too will improve traffic flow on it and all cross streets!

Comments for Rail Trench

A rail trench is the only option that makes real sense. Moffett is one of the few gateways into Mt. View from Route 101. It should flow as easily as possible to the arterials such as Castro and central Expressway. The rails are only a part of the equation that don't need to turn/merge so it makes perfect sense to depress those and leave everything else as is. It would keep a good connection between the Moffett neighborhood and downtown. Let's spend on infrastructure it makes sense! We won't regret it in the future.

Comments for Alternative #1 and Alternative #4

I am still torn between the two alternatives, though I do think something needs to be done to improve bike/ped access and avoid grade crossing. In my view, there are pros and cons on why I am undecided: Alt #1 Pros: No entanglement at Shoreline and Evelyn Alt #1 Cons: Cost, time, increased traffic on Castro, difficulty crossing in last block. Alt #4 Pros: lower cost, less time, no depression of street Alt #4 Cons: I'm really concerned about the intersection at Shoreline and Evelyn. I frequently come off the Central off ramp onto Shoreline and it is difficult to cross left quickly across three lanes. The visibility of on-coming traffic is already bad. There isn't much distance between the Central off ramp and Evelyn, not Evelyn and Villa. I'm concerned about making this a major bus/shuttle route and backups. Further, the long-term Shoreline planners may shrink causing further backup. I wish there was a way to rely on Villa instead, especially if that last block of Villa to the tracks could become fully pedestrian plaza. I understand that might be too much traffic strain for Villa though. Thank you for thinking through this thoroughly.