

Council Transportation Committee Public Comments
June 1, 2021 CTC Meeting

From: Clare Cordero
Sent: Thu 5/27/2021 10:46 AM
Subject: Please support the Calderon Bike Lanes

To City Staff and City Council Transportation Committee,

I am writing in support of the construction of the Calderon Bike Lanes and offer the following reasons why the city should proceed – equity, safety, and city vision.

Equity: If the city of Mountain View is to be equitable and inclusive, it should support those who use a bicycle as their main means of transport. Not everyone in our city has access to their own private car for every trip they need to make. Cyclists should have dedicated lanes to travel, just as cars do, and public streets should be for all people, not for storing private vehicles.

Safety: Currently there is no safe way to cross El Camino by bicycle to get to downtown Mountain View. The intersections of El Camino with Grant, Calderon, Castro, and Shoreline are all very challenging for a bicycle rider to cross. Escorting children to Landels School, connecting to the MV Transit Center, going to the post office, and shopping at Ava’s grocery store are all activities that could be achieved much more safely if the bike lanes are constructed. There would then be at least one safe crossing over El Camino.

Vision: Promoting bicycling is one way to reduce carbon emissions, and it is important for the city to develop strategies to achieve a carbon neutral goal. With the increasing popularity of e-bikes and cargo bikes, it is likely that in the future some families will opt for bicycles instead of a second or third car. The city needs to plan for a future which could see an increase in bicycle trips. The city should also promote cycling as a way to enhance people’s active physical exercise as well as to improve the quality of our air and climate.

I urge the city to be strong and visionary. Please construct the Calderon Bike Lanes and take some positive action to show that the city is for the people and not just for cars and roads.

Best regards,

Clare Cordero
■ Loreto Street,
Mountain View, CA 94041

From: Ross Heitkamp
Sent: Thu 5/27/2021 11:44 AM
Subject: Support for Calderon Bike Travel Improvement

Dear City staff and Council Transportation Committee members,

As you can see from the subject line, I am writing to you to support the extension of the bike lanes on Caulderon from Mercy St. southward to El Camino Real where they already continue on Phyllis on the other side. This is an obvious GAP in our bicycle connectivity and it needs to be addressed.

I understand that we have already “spent” all our free space on existing roads devoted to travel by cars. Mountain View has done an admirable job in finding the easy places to squeeze in bike lanes and created a pretty good network, yet some glaring gaps remain where the bike lane disappears, maybe for only a couple blocks. These are enough make someone’s entire commute too unsafe feeling and prevent them from biking. We need to close these gaps. Yes, they are hard and come at a cost, maybe of on-street parking or something else. But our streets should be prioritized for moving people rather than storing inactive cars.

This is a strategic area to close a gap. These bike lanes are already identified and called for in the city’s Bike Plan. This street also connects to Landel’s elementary for grade school kids and that same neighborhood will later use them going the other way to Mountain View High. There isn’t really an alternative to this crossing area. The next streets are Hwy237/Grant Road or Castro, both pretty far away.

Thanks for your attention to this and listening.

Ross Heitkamp

██████████ Carol Avenue

Mountain View, CA 94040 ████████████████████

From: Aaron Grossman

Sent: Thu 5/27/2021 8:47 PM

Subject: Extend Calderon Bike Lanes to El Camino Real

Dear MV Council Members and Staff -

I have lived for years just off Calderon near El Camino Real, and frequently bicycle on Calderon in both directions. Proper bike lanes are sorely needed on my half of Calderon, from El Camino Real to Mercy.

Calderon is a busy street and major Mountain View route for both cars and bicycles, but it is not particularly safe nor friendly to bicycles where there are no bike lanes. Putting in bike lanes all the way through will encourage more people to bicycle and make them safer, and it will make me safer. The inconvenience of removing parking is secondary to bicycle safety, and can be addressed.

Thank you for your concern and work on this important issue.

Best regards,

Aaron Grossman

Montgomery at Centre Street, one block off Calderon

From: Susanne Martinez

Sent: Fri 5/28/2021 1:49 PM

Subject: Agenda Item 5.1, June 1, 2021 Council Transportation Committee, Calderon Avenue Bike Lanes, Project 20-47

Mountain View Council Transportation Committee

I am writing regarding the Calderon Avenue Bike Lanes, Mercy Street to El Camino Real proposal that the Transportation Committee will be considering on June 1.

First, I want to express my appreciation to the city staff for its work in listening to the local residents and modifying the original proposal to preserve a number of parking spots on the east side of the area between Centre and Church. The original proposal would have created an area of roughly two long blocks with no parking on either side and no easy access to side street parking for many of the residents. A number of the older homes, built in the 1920s, also have garages in the rear of the buildings with narrow driveways which require tandem parking. Without access to any parking anywhere on this long section of Calderon, residents might find themselves backing out one car, moving it two or three blocks away and then walking back to pull out the other car. Many of the residents are seniors for whom this would have been particularly burdensome. Visitors, tradespeople, child care providers and others would not have had the opportunity to park within a reasonable distance, forcing more and more cars into the narrow and heavily parked neighboring streets. By retaining parking along the east side of Calderon in this area, the current proposal makes the situation much more bearable and I strongly urge the city to accept the staff modification.

I do, however, suggest that the Committee reconsider the staff recommendation that no changes be made with respect to the 7 spots now available between Church and Jesse. The staff memo notes that the on-street parking utilization between Church and Jessie was observed to be very low. However, the parking utilization survey took place on several days in April 2021. The area discussed here is next to the small shopping center which has two hair salons, a laundromat, a small grocery store, several other small businesses and most importantly, a corner restaurant which has outdoor seating both in front and on the Church Street side. During summer months, and to some extent during late spring and early fall, in the past the restaurant attracted large numbers of patrons, particularly at lunch time when the hair salons were also busy, but often also in the evening, which created spill over parking on Calderon and Church Streets. A utilization survey taken during the pandemic period in April would not have captured the actual year-round utilization generated by the restaurant using both indoor and outdoor seating areas. This restaurant was closed to on-site service during the period the utilization survey was taken. I would recommend that the city maintain the parking spots on the east side of this area (two spots according to staff measurements), making it similar to the east side of Calderon on the other side of Church.

Finally, a number of residents at the community meeting have urged that the speed limit on Calderon be reduced from 30 miles to 25 miles and that the city consider adding speed bumps to this area of Calderon to help slow traffic. I do not recall any suggestions for curb bulb-outs as a traffic measure and concur with the staff observation that the four-way stop signs at Church and Calderon make curb bulb-outs unnecessary. However, a major problem right now is that as cars pass through the Church and Calderon intersection, those driving south on Calderon can see the traffic lights at the Calderon and El Camino Real intersection and often accelerate to “make the green light”.

If a primary purpose of the bike lane extension is to provide a safe route for school children biking to the various neighborhood schools (Landels, Bubb, Graham and even Mountain View High School), then it makes sense to at the same time reduce the speed limit. Several years ago, a speeding car hit a parked car in front of my house, pushing the vehicle into my driveway and more recently a car on Calderon smashed into another neighbor's front yard fence. With more children biking in this section of Calderon, I strongly urge that the city reduce the speed limit from 30 to 25 at the same time as the bike lane expansion is implemented.

The addition of speed bumps combined with a lower speed limit would also discourage large trucks from using this bike route. These trucks should be using Shoreline to access the freeways rather than a local bike route created in large part to facilitate biking to neighborhood schools.

Again, I appreciate very much the staff willingness to rework the initial proposal to make the proposed changes much less difficult for the local residents directly impacted. I hope that the Transportation Committee will consider modifying the proposal to incorporate more traffic safety measures and preserve additional spaces (2) in the area next to the shopping center.

Susanne Martinez

Calderon Avenue

From: John Cordes

Sent: Fri 5/28/2021 3:35 PM

Subject: Please create safer travel for everyone on Calderon Ave

May 28, 2021

Mountain View Transportation Committee
500 Castro St. Mountain View, CA 94041

Re: 5.1 Calderon Avenue Bike Lanes, Mercy Street to El Camino Real, Project 20-47 on the Agenda of the June 1st Council Transportation Committee meeting

Dear Mayor Kamei and Council members Lieber and Matichak,

On behalf of the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition (SVBC), a nonprofit creating a healthy community, environment, and economy through bicycling, we are writing to express our strong support that this committee recommend the City Council approve and fund the Calderon Avenue Bike Lanes Improvement project.

This project will close a critical gap in Mountain View's bike network by connecting existing bike lanes on the northern segment on Calderon Avenue with existing bike lanes on Phyllis Avenue. The project is identified as a planned bike lane in the City's council-approved Bicycle Transportation Plan (2015).

Currently people driving cars are protected by multi-thousand pounds steel cages built into their vehicles on south Calderon. However, the vulnerable users, people bicycling, including children riding to Landels Elementary have no dedicated safe space when riding a bicycle.

Public streets should prioritize safe travel for all users, not the storage of private vehicles as called for in Mountain View's Complete Streets policy.

The minor on-street parking removal needed to create a dedicated safe space for people riding can be minimized on the 40' wide blocks by removing the proposed painted buffer areas and using 10' wide lanes. This will allow preserving parking on one side of the street. Cities such as San Jose use 10' wide lanes as a standard width on streets without bus routes, as is the case with Calderon. Driveways are also available to store private vehicles. Nearby adjacent side streets such as Centre, Church and Dalma have capacity for any remaining parking demand. Repurposing on-street parking space for bike lanes is not unique. San Jose has removed more than 2800 on-street parking spaces to install bike lanes.

By creating a safer route to ride, this project will also advance the City's goals of reducing carbon emissions from transportation, which account for 61% of Mountain Views emissions, according to its Climate Protection Roadmap (2015).

Please approve this project which will provide a safer route to schools, jobs, transit, housing, and shopping for many residents.


Thank you very much for your consideration of this priority project.

Sincerely,



Shiloh Ballard
President & Executive Director

Council members Lieber and Matichak,

Happy when 

John Cordes

Santa Clara County Advocate (he/him/his)



[Get your free bike bag on Bike to Wherever Day!](#)

Like safer streets? [Donate here](#)

From: Sharlene Gee
Sent: Fri 5/28/2021 8:19 PM
Subject: Support Calderon Bike Lanes

Dear Mtn. View Colleagues:

I strongly support bike lanes on Calderon Ave. They were once there, in part, and were removed. This is an important route to Landels Elementary School, the MV Transit Center, the Stevens Creek Trail, housing, jobs and shopping/Castro St. It should be safe to bike on this street; it's a critical connector. I believe it would encourage more parents to allow their children to bike to Landels and to the trail. Children and families who bike together will be active and enjoy better health, and it will encourage such practices as the children grow up.

Please build the bike lanes south to El Camino.

Regards,

Sharlene Gee

Bush St.

From: Kermit Cuff
Sent: Fri 5/28/2021 9:26 PM
Subject: Calderon Ave. bike lanes

Dear Public Works staff,

I'm writing in support of the city's proposal to add bike lanes on Calderon Ave. from Mercy to El Camino Real. This is consistent with the previously approved Bike Plan, and would address the current gap of bike facilities in the area. Without the bike lanes, it's a tight squeeze riding a bike between parked cars and the travel lane. I feel that public streets should be prioritized for people and movement, not the storing of private vehicles, especially when parking impacts can be mitigated. In the long run, this project will increase bicycling in the community and make Mountain View a nicer place to live. I hope you agree and will help move this project forward.

Sincerely,

Kermit Cuff

■ Mariposa Ave. ■

Mountain View, CA 94041

From: Eugene Cordero

Sent: Sat 5/29/2021 2:25 PM

Subject: Support for Calderon Bike Path

Dear Mountain View City Council,

I live in downtown Mountain View, have been a bike commuter for many years, and prefer to get around town on a bike or by walking. Over the 12 years I have lived in Mountain View, I've been generally disappointed with the bike infrastructure within our city as most natural bike corridors are dangerous for cyclists.

For example, there is no safe way to cross El Camino in our city. Instead, cyclists including children have to ride on sidewalks or take their chances as bike lanes do not exist on both sides of El Camino at Calderon, Castro, Shoreline, or San Antonio.

East-west movement is also poor with El Camino very dangerous, California St. poorly designed for bikes, and Middlefield good during certain hours and dangerous on weekends when parking is allowed in the bike lanes.


For those who would suggest that Mountain View is a 'Bicycle Friendly' city, they have not spent time riding a bike in our city.

For this to change, we need to bring equity and justice into how we think about transportation planning. Is it fair that hundreds of miles of roads in our city are safe for cars to travel but only a few miles of unconnected streets have the appropriate designs to keep cyclists safe? And when I think about safety, I mean, would we feel comfortable for a ten year old to ride on that street?

The proposed Calderon bike lanes proposed are a step forward to creating a better bike network. This would create our first safe travel street across El Camino. However, if you allow even one street of car parking along Calderon to appease some land owner so that bikes and cars have to share the same space, then you will have missed this opportunity to create safer streets for all residents, especially those who are not in cars.

I hope you will support this project on Calderon and many others in the coming months and years.

Best, Eugene

Eugene Cordero, Professor
Department of Meteorology and Climate Science
San Jose State University


From: Polly Lawry
Sent: Sun 5/30/2021 11:10 AM
Subject: Support Calderon Bike Lane

Dear Public Works,

As a resident of Mountain View and one whose family rides our bikes as much as is reasonably safe, I would greatly appreciate it if you would move forward with the project to dedicate bike lanes on Calderon, as planned. I biked the south side of Calderon just this morning and I found myself straddling the bike lane, trying to split the difference between being side-swiped by cars or being thrown off my bike should a parked car owner open the door without looking. This is the most problematic stretch between Waverly Park and downtown. I am delighted to learn that the city is working to address this safety issue.

I frequently ride my bike to work in Menlo Park, but I take Stevens Creek and through Shoreline Park, eventually ending up on the Bryant Street Bike Boulevard in Palo Alto. I take this longer route to avoid the dangerous streets in the ever- increasing Mountain View traffic. This adds 4 miles to my ride, but it is worth it to feel safe.

The addition of bike lanes in Mountain View, wherever possible, will encourage more people to ride bikes. As we increase housing density, we need to consider ways for people to commute other than by car. I look forward to seeing this and further enhancements to support our efforts to bike around Mountain View.

Thanks as always.

Kind regards,

Polly Lawry

■ Bryant Avenue

Mountain View

From: John Brazil
Sent: Sun 5/30/2021 1:55 PM
Subject: Support Calderon Ave Bike Lanes

Council Transportation Committee:

Please approve the Calderon Bike Lanes project.

This project will **fill the bike lane gap** between existing bike lanes on south Calderon, Phyllis, Dana, and Evelyn. It will also provide **safe places for kids biking to Landels Elementary**, and for anyone biking to nearby jobs, housing, transit and shopping. **This project is identified in the city's Bike Plan**, and it will connect to the soon-to-be-constructed El Camino Real bike facilities.

Please prioritize public streets for safe travel of **vulnerable users** like bicyclists, not for the storing of private vehicles. Unlike people in cars, people biking do not have 3000 pounds of metal to protect them, and they do not have dedicated street space to travel on this part of Calderon. Any **minor parking impacts to can be accommodated by:**

- (1) using excess parking capacity on nearby cross streets Centre, Church, and Dalma;
- (2) parking in driveways and garages;
- (3) on blocks with 40' wide streets, preserving parking on one side of the street by removing painted bike buffers from the plans and using 10' lane widths (as done in many bay area cities)

According to Mountain View's 2015 **Climate Protection Roadmap**, 61% of MV's emissions are from transportation. This project will help reduce that number by making biking a safe option for all.

Thanks,

John Brazil

From: Elizabeth Schweinsberg
Sent: Sun 5/30/2021 4:21 PM
Subject: Support Calderon Bike Lanes

I'm writing in support of adding bike lanes to the southern section of Calderon Ave between El Camino and Mercy. This section of road has been a part of my regular bicycling routine for the last decade, and with the relatively recent addition of the northern Calderon bike lane, the lack of a bike lane is even more noticeable.

That section is tricky for an adult cyclist, particularly at rush hour when there are lots more cars and bikes trying to negotiate a slightly narrow section of road. Two cars and a cyclist cannot pass at the same time, causing a slowdown while the car waits for the space to pass the cyclist. I commuted this section of road twice a week for 5+ years, and the juxtaposition of the comfortable Stevens Creek trail and the wider northern part of Calderon against the narrow southern part is strong.

I use it now for recreational cycling, and though I don't cycle with children, I watch others do it and it seems too narrow to be comfortable and safe. Adding the bike lane would also increase the ability for children to bike through there.

I recognize that there is a downside of losing on-street parking. That area always has cars on it, and would feel the loss of the spots. The biggest benefit of the bike lane is for people who don't live there, but it would make the areas safer for more residents of Mountain View.

Thank you for your consideration.

Elizabeth Schweinsberg

██████████ Boranda Ave

Mountain View, 94040

From: Maia Coladonato
Sent: Sun 5/30/2021 10:56 PM
Subject: Agenda Item 5.1 Calderon Avenue Bike Lanes, Mercy Street to El Camino Real, Project 20-47

Hello CTC,

I am writing in support of the recommended bike lane on Calderon between Mercy to ECR. Increasing bikeability and bike safety in Mountain View is important, and this project adds a bike lane in a way that is safe, as well as joining other parts of the existing bike network.

Thank you,

Maia Coladonato

■ Leslie Court

Mountain View

From: Donna Davies

Sent: Mon 5/31/2021 8:23 AM

Subject: Agenda Item 5.1 Calderon Ave. Bike Lanes. Mercy Street to El Camino Project 20-47

Hello,

I am a long time resident of Mountain View and a cyclist. I use a bike the whole length of Calderon to get to the train station and to the Farmer's Market. I am writing to urge you to make my trip safe. Right now, I am at risk of injury or death when I ride on Calderon due to the parked vehicles blocking a safe path, a potential bike lane.

I was so discouraged when years ago, certain loud voices felt the road in front of their house was selfishly theirs, for just their car, and were rewarded whereas bikes and other Carbon Free means of transport were disregarded, as of lesser importance. I know of a person killed while commuting to work on a bicycle in San Francisco when someone opened the door of their parked car forcing her into the lane of traffic. It happened in an instant.

Let's make Mountain View a bike centric city, safe for all of us.

Sincerely,
Donna Davies

From: Serge Bonte

Sent: Mon 5/31/2021 9:12 AM

Subject: 6/1/21 CTC Meeting : Agenda Item 5.2 Neighborhood Traffic Management Program Revisions

Dear CTC Members:

Since it has become a habit to forward CTC recommendations to the City Council as Consent Items, I am copying the full council in hopes that they will at least have some visibility before approving without discussions.

I don't have any significant objections to the proposed revisions, they align with directions given by the City Council over 2 years ago in February 2019 ! I would suggest one slight modification, curbside trees should be a prioritized traffic calming measure because curbside trees also make our streets more walkable and our streets as well as the planet more livable.

Just like 2 years ago, I don't think the revisions will change anything as long as we keep treating speed limits as the ones most drivers choose to drive at, NTMP projects will still be rare, fastidious and long time sinks for the City. Equity will remain an issue with that program, just look at a map to see where these projects are typically adopted or proposed.

Once these revisions are approved , the City should quickly pivot to develop a far more systematic street calming program across the City.

One that would not be subjected to the tyranny of the California speed limit rules but one based on the data and equity driven principles of Vision Zero (unanimously adopted by the City in December 2019).or even Access MV (lots of data about walk ability / bike ability of our streets.)

Finally one word about COVID and calmer/slower streets. The City is to be applauded for many of its actions during the pandemic but I feel the City completely missed the boat when it comes to calmer and safer streets. During the pandemic, more residents have started to walk or bike in Mountain View: it was one of the only ways to safely exercise or get some fresh air, 2-3 times a day walks were also a necessity for the many residents who adopted canine companions..... It became very clear that our sidewalks were not wide enough to accommodate that surge in walking. especially not while keeping six feet apart from others.

Many cities implemented "slow" streets pilots (many to become permanent) where residential streets would give priority to pedestrians and cyclists and where barriers or obstacles would be erected in order to slow cars and trucks and dissuade cut through traffic. I'm disappointed the City didn't entertain any such pilot (Castro Eats is great but not in a residential area and a few miles away by foot from the majority of Mountain View residents); it is my hope that a systematic .streets calming program driven by Vision Zero will lead to a dozen : "slow" streets programs in a short time frame (how about before school restarts fully in person later this Summer?)

Sincerely,

Serge Bonte

Lloyd Way (a street our neighborhood tried but failed to get under the NTMP).

From: Serge Bonte

Sent: Mon 5/31/2021 10:20 AM

Subject: 6/1/21 CTC Meeting : Agenda Item 5.3 Residential Parking Permit Revisions

Dear CTC Members:

Since it has become a habit to forward CTC recommendations to the City Council as Consent Items, I am copying the full council in hopes that they will at least have some visibility before approving without discussions.

You recently had a study session on Parking Strategy for Downtown (the study area being vastly larger than the existing Downtown Parking District). The goal of that strategy is to look holistically to parking management issues in that vast section of Mountain View.

Parking Management has many facets but a Residential Parking Permit Program is only one of them. My first recommendation is to defer these revisions until you complete the Downtown Parking Strategy.. By doing so, you'll be able to see where these revisions fit in the strategy, if they can leverage a common enforcement system, if they help (or complicate) other parking issues in that vast area....

Should you decide to instead move these revisions forward without having a holistic view of the downtown parking situation, I want to object to some aspects of the proposed revised program:

- Having a RPPP permit allows the permit holder to ignore a time restricted parking sign (e.g if a street has a 2 hour parking limit during business hours, a permitted vehicle could be parked all day). However, there is no requirement that a street has existing time restrictions for parking BEFORE even considering a permit application.

Existence of time restricted parking SHOULD BE A PREREQUISITE.

otherwise what's the point of spending time and money issuing permits

in the first place: :) I am sure the City has a process to fairly

decide where parking time restrictions are required; that's what should drive the process not the RPPP.

- there should be uniformity across RPPP zones and an attempt to group zones together. If each street got its own program, it would be that much more difficult to enforce and for visitors (including Mountain View residents) to navigate such balkanized parking rules.

- Removing the requirement to provide vehicle registration doesn't make any sense as it removes an easy enforcement mechanism that MVPD is already equipped to use (running a license plate through a database). It's also the only way to avoid issuing residential parking permits to an Airbnb host for their transient guests. To the extent that all Mountain View residents will pay for these permit programs, I object to subsidizing hotels in our neighborhoods. Permits should be tied to a vehicle.

-Permits should not be free. There is always a City fee when one wants to have an exclusive or preferred access to a public space : residents have to pay a fee to use a BBQ spot in our parks, youth sports leagues have to pay a fee to secure practice fields, booking a room at the Community Center has a fee, The fees are regulated and subject to a yearly public hearing. Why on earth should a permit parking be free?

- The number of "free" permits is too generous.. Even if you adopted a modest fee instead of free, that should be limited to one designated vehicle per home. Any extra vehicle should be much higher. We need to encourage residents to first use the 2 off street parking spots their single family home is supposed to provide not to encourage more cars to park for free on our streets.

- the policy seems to distinguish between visitors and guests with guests being able to get a full year permit like an actual resident.

If a guest is expected to stay for that long they shouldn't they be considered residents for the purpose of this program? Consider removing the "guest" rubric in your fee table (it doesn't make sense to distinguish years long guests from residents).

Again, my preference would be for you to defer these revisions until you conclude the holistic Downtown parking strategy study.

Sincerely,

Serge Bonte
Lloyd Way, Mountain View

From: Annette Nielsen
Sent: Mon 5/31/2021 3:55 PM
Subject: Agenda Item 5.3 CTC Meeting June 1, 2021

For: Council Transportation Committee Chair Sally Lieber and Committee Members Mayor Ellen Kamei and Council Member Lisa Matichak

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Item 5.3: Residential Parking Permit Program. While I appreciate the revised Staff recommendation to make it easier to establish residential permit parking zones, I am disappointed that Staff continues to approach the issue with a one-size-fits-all process for obtaining an RPP.

The City acknowledged parking issues in parts of the Old Mountain View Neighborhood by having previously established time-restricted parking zones in the neighborhood: the 600 block of Yosemite has a two-hour limit; the 100 through 300 blocks of View Street (Evelyn to California) currently comprise a two-hour zone; the 200 block of Bush, the 500 block of Dana, and all the blocks of Villa Street between View and Calderon are part of a five-hour, time-restricted parking zone.

For the residents who live in these existing, City-imposed, time-restricted parking zones, the eight-step process in the current RPP guidelines is not viable—nor is it practical for the City in terms of cost and effort. Because these time-restricted zones already exist, there would be no need for the City to undertake the parking surveys (Step 2 of the process); no need to propose zone boundaries and time restrictions since these are already in place (Step 3); and no need to do postcard surveys (Step 4) since there would be NO new restrictive changes that would impact current residents in these zones. In addition, the City is already incurring expenditures to implement enforcement on these streets (i.e., there would be no additional enforcement burden to the City in terms of cost and manpower).

Rather than needing to qualify as zones according to the 8-step process, the residents of these existing zones should automatically and immediately be eligible for parking permits.

Having served on the Old Mountain View Neighborhood Parking Subcommittee for many years and having sat many times in stakeholder meetings with City Staff and the City's consultants, I recognize the challenge for Council in having to consider so many aspects and unknowns in developing the Downtown Parking Strategy – including the specific issue of residential parking permits. I appreciate the opportunity to provide stakeholder input and thank you for considering that a one-size-fits-all proposal does not meet the reality of the existing situation.

Sincerely,

Annette Nielsen

■ Minton Lane

■

From: Kevin McKee

Sent: Mon 5/31/2021 6:15 PM

Subject: Calderon Bike lane

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please support the Calderon bike lanes from Mercy to El Camino.

I have ridden this route as part of my commute to/from work for over 30 years.

The existing route isn't safe for the majority of people who would like to use it, including kids riding to school. Improving these lanes would allow more people to combine cycling & CalTrain & Light Rail.

Again, please support this bike lane improvement.

Kevin McKee

██████ Todd St

Mountain View CA 94040

From: Lisa Smith

Sent: Tue 6/1/2021 5:33 AM

Subject: Comment letter for the Council meeting June 1st about Calderon bike lanes

I've attached a letter regarding the bike lanes and parking removal on Calderon Ave. I also included a survey I did which counted the number of single width driveways, and number of homes on both the odd and even address sides of the street. Several properties have more than one home (ADU's, duplex, studio apartments, apartments, etc... With this data If parking were to only be kept on one side of the street it would be safer and meet the needs of more residents if it were placed on the even address (West) side of Calderon due to 38 homes on the even side vs. 7 homes on the odd side of the street. Plus, the even side doesn't have easy access to Centre St. for parking. They'd have to travel to El Camino Real or Church Street to cross the street to get to a parked car on Centre.

Thank you for kindly reading my letter.

Many thanks,

Lisa Marie Smith

5/31/2021

Dear Marichrisse and the committee,

Suddenly removing all parking will create a burden for many of the families from Mercy St. to El Camino Real as well as for families living on the side streets. From Church St. to El Camino Real there are a total of 45 homes on this stretch with 18 driveways. (See survey below) When Calderon homes were built back in the day.. 1903 onward, all were built with single width driveways. Over time it was dubbed a minor arterial road, but it is still home to hundreds of families. Families, visitors and service people (door dash, amazon, plumbers, roofers, gardeners, caretakers, babysitters, cleaners, etc.) will be forced to find alternative parking spaces. The assumption that families will suddenly sell their cars, stop having friends over, stop hiring gardeners, caretakers, house cleaners, Amazon, DoorDash, Uber is unrealistic. It is also Covid times, so families haven't been having people over, parties/gatherings, etc. so the parking surveys (counting of parking spaces and their usage) doesn't fully represent reality and the need. We have personally not had our

grandchildren/parents/friends over for over a year. And 2 of our cars were gone during some of the surveys due to us traveling to Reno for my ill parents.

Are the surveys statistically valid? First, I don't believe enough data was collected and families were never personally asked about their parking needs and how all the auxiliary parking requirements for doordash, uber, amazon, appliance delivery, handicapped vans, daycare providers, housecleaners, gardeners, etc... No one went door to door to ask. I went door to door and spoke with those that were home from Church St. to El Camino Real and found most were completely unaware of the impending parking removal. One resident even asked someone from the survey team in front his property about what was happening and he was assured he didn't have to worry about parking being removed by his houses (from Centre to El Camino). So, the property owner with several units ignored the white postcard. But, now the parking in front of his units is on the chopping block and the families living there will be impacted.

Residents also had concerns about the increase in Calderon traffic/speed since the closure of Castro St. They witness how cars don't fully stop at Church St. and accelerate to El Camino Real to make the light. Many like the idea of having bike lanes, but question how they could be installed while not creating a burden with parking. Most parking driveways are single width. How would multi family members park/drive out while parking tandem without access to Calderon for maneuvering cars? *This is a huge pickle of a problem.* Also, there is no crosswalk/stop sign at Centre St. to allow us on the even side to safely and conveniently park on Centre. We would need to jay walk an already busy street. Do we really expect them/us to walk down to El Camino and Church St. (even in the rain) to cross the street to get to parked cars on Centre? The solution is to paint a crosswalk and to erect a Stop Sign for pedestrian safety. Reducing the speed to 25MPH will also make it safer for bicycle traffic and pedestrians. And, there are many families on Centre, Church St. and Ehrhorn that will be affected by an influx of parked vehicles. It is easy for Mountain view residents to raise the banner for bike lanes and parking removal when it isn't on their street. We have 46 homes with families (probably 100-200 people) that will be impacted with no street parking from Church street to El Camino Real. This is a huge impact....and many/most residents are not aware.

Has there been a survey of how many bicyclists actually use Calderon Ave.? Most residents support bike lanes and bikes currently travel the length of Calderon. Does the actual bike usage warrant the removal of so many parking spaces? My perception is there are few bicyclists. and those riding with young children tend to use the sidewalks. Parents will still likely still ride on the sidewalks with very

young children even if bike lanes were created. Why hasn't anyone taken the time to count the bicyclists and speak with them?

There isn't enough time for families to create double width parking or circular driveways on their properties before street parking removal. This will be costly and time consuming. You have to go through the city to alter the curbs for double width and circular driveways. Will Mountain View allow home owners to create more parking? And, if the parking is removed in the near future how will the paving trucks, cement trucks creating the extra parking access our properties without parking on a now "no parking" street? Families will need time to plan and some will need financial help to create parking. Is there room in the budget to help families on Calderon address creating additional parking on their land? Will Mountain View planning department work with homeowners to create extra parking or will they say no to adjusting curbs and extra parking. I must assume all of us on Calderon bought our homes with the assumption there would be street parking. We would not have purchased our homes if Calderon Ave. was a no parking street.

Has the committee adequately considered other alternatives? Could we widen Calderon since there is a 10' easement? Then parking could be retained on both sides of Calderon and the bike lanes, new crosswalk/stop sign at Centre and speed humps could be installed. Plus, the utilities could be placed underground! This would increase the budget, but it would meet the needs of everyone (homeowners, pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles). Or, could we make Calderon a one-way street? This would create ample room for parking on both sides, a vehical lane and bicycle lanes!

I conducted a survey of driveways and number of homes on properties. If it comes down to the issue of which side of the street is to maintain their parking spaces the even side of the street has more homes/families impacted and the access to side streets for parking is more difficult due to no crosswalk/stop sign at Centre. And, parking spaces will be removed in the future on the odd side due to future home development on the corner of Church St. and Calderon Ave. They are hoping for a park...but there is a good chance it will be sold and developed. Extra homes will need driveways...which will eat up parking on the odd addressed side of Calderon Ave.

Sincerely,
Lisa Smith

I've attached the survey below.

Comparing odd and even sides of Calderon between Church St. and El Camino Real. Odd addressed side also has condominiums between Centre St. and El Camino Real which wasn't included, because they seem to have ample parking within their complex.

Even address side (difficult access to Centre St.)

1 home	704 Calderon	Corner home with driveway on Church St.
2 homes	728 Calderon	Single width driveway with expanded parking
1 home	742 Calderon	Single width driveway
2 homes	752/754 Calderon	Single width driveway with ADU under construction. Provides housing for a traveling nurse and family members.
1 home	756 Calderon	Single width driveway...home still under construction.
3 homes	768 Calderon	Single width driveway
1 home	780 Calderon	Double width driveway
2 homes	792	Single width driveway...but paved side portion for extra parking
3 homes	802	Single width driveway
2 homes	810	Single width driveway
2 homes (?)	812	Single width driveway
1 home	822	Single width driveway
5 homes	832,840,833,834,838	Single width driveway...but could turnaround @ end
12 homes	850	Single width driveway...all paved and must back out.

38 separate homes

11/14 properties have single width driveways

Odd address side (has easier access to Centre St.)

1 home	725	Single width driveway
1 home	731	Double width driveway
1 home	739	Single width driveway (shares with 757)
1 home	757	Single width driveway (shares with 739)

4) Additional parking will be needed in the future. The corner lot on Church/Calderon is now being sold with a possibility of dividing the lot for additional housing, which will increase the need for residential parking and parking for all the construction. If they build homes some street parking will most likely be removed due to new driveways being installed. If the parking is removed they will most likely be parking up and down church street.

5). Home owners need time to figure out parking before it is removed. Can they build more parking on their own land? How will they afford additional driveways? Can they install circular driveways? If they have a handicapped person/vehicle, how will they accommodate this? How do they carry their groceries, multiple children to their homes if they have to walk far distances to get there? There needs to be more time and allowances for folks to figure this out. *Could the city help supplement/compensate homeowners to create more parking on their lots?*

6). Can we move over the sidewalk and utility poles to create more parking? Think outside the box? There is a 10' easement I believe. Widen the road to accomodate traffic, bicyclists, and parking.

7). When I went up and down Calderon Ave. a couple weeks ago to talk to the neighbors about the parking removal almost all hadn't heard of the proposal or assumed at least half of the parking would be kept....and not removal of all parking.

8). Can we postpone the project between Church St. and El Camino until the construction of the new homes are complete on the corner of Church and Calderon? The street will need to be used for construction crews. Plus, the road will be torn up due to new sewer, and utilities being laid. You'll have to repaint anyways. It would be better to wait 3 years until this major construction project is complete.

I do like the idea of bike lanes. Calderon has had parking for probably 120 years. The homes were built with the assumption of street parking. There will most likely be new homes and homes being remodeled, torn down and rebuilt on Calderon in the near future. With removing all parking on Calderon this will force people to park on Church and Centre streets. With no stop sign on Centre, folks on the even (West) address side of Calderon will most likely opt to park on Church Street and even Ehrhorn when Church street fills up. The only way to get to Centre street from the even side of Calderon is to walk to Church street or El Camino to find a crosswalk. This is why folks will choose to park on Church street instead. Can they paint a crosswalk at Centre/Calderon to get from the even addressed side of Calderon to Centre Street? A stop sign would be even better!

Thank you for reading my letter. I do hope there will be a way to have both street parking, bike lanes, and a way to slow traffic.

Lisa Smith

From: BRUCE KARNEY

Sent: Monday, May 31, 2021 2:42 PM

Subject: Yes on Calderon Bike Lanes

Dear Transportation Subcommittee,

I write in support of better bike lanes on Calderon Avenue. Improving the bicycle-friendliness of this street would particularly benefit (1) students, staff, and faculty at Landels School (2) CalTrain and Light Rail commuters who use their bikes to commute to/from locations in southern Mountain View and the businesses between Landels and the Sunnyvale border.

Although Calderon is an arterial, its traffic volumes are moderately low and I think even children will feel safe biking on it once the proposed improvements have been made to the bike lanes.

Cheers,
Bruce Karney

From: Matthew Mueller

Sent: Tue 6/1/2021 11:28 AM

Subject: Calderon Av Bike lanes: avoid bike lanes next to car parking (June 1st agenda item 5.1)

I would like to provide some comments on the proposed bicycle lanes on the southern section of Calderon.

As someone who has ridden on Calderon numerous times while commuting, I support the addition of bicycle lanes, but I caution about some of the proposed designs.

I strongly oppose designs that place bicycle lanes directly next to on street parking. This is simply unsafe as bicyclists are at constant risk of being doored while riding in the bike lane, and if the cyclist chooses not to use the unsafe bike lane, drivers are then upset at the cyclist not "staying where they belong." This type of bicycle lane may make novice cyclists feel more comfortable, but does not actually make cycling safer.

I see some sections of the design have a 3 feet buffer plus 6 foot bike lane next to parked cars, which may provide enough room to avoid the door zone if you ride at the edge of the bike lane/buffer zone. However other sections call for a bicycle lane directly next to parking, with no buffer. I strongly oppose these designs as they do not give cyclists a safe place to ride. In these situations parking should be removed to provide an actually safe experience rather than just providing the appearance of safety. If parking cannot be removed, the road would be safer with no bike lane at all, so that cyclists can confidently take the lane without the appearance that they are doing something wrong.

Thank you for your consideration,

Matthew Mueller

(Mountain View resident)

From: Mary Dateo

Sent: Tue 6/1/2021 11:43 AM

Subject: 6/1/21 Agenda Item 5.1 Calderon Avenue Bike Lanes, Mercy Street to El Camino Real, Project 20-47

Dear Council Transportation Committee Members,

(formal letter attached)

We are writing in support of the plan for Project 20-47, to add Class II bicycle lanes to Calderon Avenue between Mercy Street and El Camino Real.

We feel this plan presents a good compromise between allowing space for parking and providing space for bicyclists / active transportation.

This project bridges an existing gap between existing bike paths on Phyllis and Calderon. As such,

- It will be a critical connector to access the Stevens Creek Trail
- it will become a critical connector to the proposed Evelyn Ave. bike path and the transit center
- it adds a pathway to one of the less intimidating intersections for crossing El Camino Real, at Phyllis and El Camino
- it supports the city's AccessMV plan to reduce the disconnected islands within the city.

As the memorandum states, the combination of new bicycle lanes, along with the reduced width of the traffic lanes, are expected to encourage reduced automotive speeds, which will provide a facility that feels much safer for bicyclists. This will positively impact hundreds of current cyclists every week. And this further supports other initiatives within Mountain View, including

- Vision Zero
- Safe routes to school
- Mountain View sustainability efforts.

This is the type of project that makes it so much more likely for hesitant bicyclists to feel comfortable using our streets.

To confirm that the changes have the desired effect of reducing vehicle speeds, we ask that the city monitor traffic speeds after the project, and follow up with additional traffic calming as needed, with the goal of reducing speeds to 25 MPH, to protect both pedestrians and bicyclists.

We do have another request for future projects of this type. We don't want to delay this project, but future such projects would be greatly improved by incorporating new greenspace, in order to further encourage active transportation, and for all the benefits that green space provides. We encourage integrating trees, native plants and biodiversity design to buffer bike lanes, promote necessary traffic calming, and vertically frame streets throughout transportation improvements.

We saw in the recent AccessMV report to Council that the Active Transportation Plan update will be developed in coordination with the City's Community Tree Master Plan.

We eagerly look forward to the development of guidelines that will incorporate more green space in future similar projects.

Please support staff's plan for Project 20-47.

Regards,

Mary Dateo for GreenSpacesMV

From: Bryan Malone
Sent: Tue 6/1/2021 11:49 AM
Subject: I support Calderon Avenue Bike Lanes

Hi,

I want to express my support for closing the bike lane gap on Calderon Avenue, here are a few points from my perspective.

- Calderon/El Camino Real is one of the few light protected crossings of El Camino Real, and currently there isn't an easy way to detour around the existing gap in the Calderon Bike Lane.
- Calderon is a great route that helps connect Housing, Landels School, MV Transit Center, Stevens Creek Trail, Farmers Market, Shopping and Jobs.
- There are a few spots on Calderon where vehicle parking would need to be restricted, however it's possible in those instances for those folks to either park in their driveways or on adjacent streets. Public streets should be for transportation whenever possible, not for storage of extra vehicles.
- The existing gap leaves cyclists in a quandary when they realize the existing Bike Lane ends.
- If people don't feel safe, or routing is too difficult they are less apt to use a bicycle as means of transportation.
- More cycling = less motor vehicle emissions and can help reduce our carbon footprint.

Kind regards,

Bryan Malone

Past Chair, Mountain View Bicycle / Pedestrian Advisory Committee

From: Mountain View MVCSP

Sent: Tuesday, June 1, 2021 12:31 PM

Subject: MVCSP comments on the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program to City of Mountain View City Council Council Transportation Committee

(formal letter attached)



Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning
c/o Aaron Grossman
817 Montgomery Street
Mountain View, CA 94041

June 1, 2021

City of Mountain View City Council Council Transportation Committee
City Hall, 500 Castro Street
PO Box 7540
Mountain View, CA 94039-7540

Re: 5.2 Neighborhood Traffic Management Program Revisions

Dear Chairperson Lieber and committee members:

The Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning (MVCSP) appreciates the opportunity to respond to your discussion about Neighborhood Traffic Management Program revisions. We have reviewed the agenda item materials, and we have the following comments and questions we would like to share with you.

- Can the Initial Inquiry and/or Petition by Residents steps be completed online as an alternative, at least in part? This would be more efficient in most cases, and it would reduce the use of paper, which we should be trying to do in general as much as possible anyway. For the same reasons, can Postcard Survey results be submitted online as well?
- For lower speed threshold considerations, while lowering the threshold to 31 MPH from 32 MPH is fine, it's a far cry from what we actually need; bear in mind that the City now has a Vision Zero policy, and lower speeds are key to our achieving these policy goals or even approaching them; for your reference from the policy: "Work to decrease traffic collisions involving fatalities or severe injuries (KSI collisions) by 50 percent by 2030 from a 2016 baseline of 15 collisions". Also, if we are going to realize the goals of the anticipated Active Transportation Plan, we need to see all residential areas traffic speeds not exceed 25 MPH, whether posted for this speed or not. To

this end, California needs to change their 85th percentile rules, but, until they do, cities need to be creative on how they achieve the necessary results in other ways (e.g., through driver education and traffic calming). Also, new traffic studies should be done routinely after traffic calming measures are completed in any location to help determine if lower speed-limit signing can be justified. Both the Vision Zero policy and the upcoming Active Transportation Plan must be cited in the NTMP documentation to remind all using the program that we have overarching goals to work toward.

- For eligible traffic calming devices, we strongly request that green complete streets elements be considered among them. MVCSP holds the general position that our city should expand our existing complete streets policy in a green complete streets direction, and, accordingly, curbside trees should be considered the primary calming device. April Webster discussed this in an MVCSP comment letter on the Capital Improvement Program update at the May 25th City Council meeting (“Redefining Complete Streets as Green Complete Streets”). And it is covered as well in Mary Dateo’s GreenSpacesMV letter for this meeting on the Calderon bike lanes agenda item.

Incidentally, Sunnyvale recently added green street elements to Caribbean Drive:

Caribbean Drive Green Street Project

Before

After

Bike and pedestrian path

Traffic calming

New parking spaces

Easy trail access

- 4,000 ft³ of rain gardens
- Treats ~41,000 ft² of upstream area

City of Sunnyvale – Leadership Sunnyvale – May 2021 18

- In the table covering the City Approval Process in the staff memorandum, we don’t agree with curbside trees decisions being made without an opportunity for open public comment. The choice of trees in locations adjacent to sidewalks and bikeways can impact those walking or biking through the area, and the public has an interest in seeing tree choices reflect native, drought tolerant, pollinator-friendly landscaping preferences for environmental sustainability reasons.
- Where new traffic circles and bulbouts are implemented, we would like to see consideration for what is planted in them. Again, with a preference for native, drought tolerant, pollinator-friendly landscaping choices, and with possible community engagement for independent landscaping projects groups such as GreenSpacesMV are hoping to institute and promote in collaboration with the Parks Division and possibly also with the City Cool Block program. Green elements can also include that those impose curves in the road, which can further slow

traffic. For example:



- We wonder why curb radius reduction isn't considered in the guidelines as a potential traffic calming device. Can you inquire about this during committee questions to Staff?
- We support the Staff request for approving means for requesting additional City funding in cases where current funding is exhausted or is anticipated to be.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,
Bruce England
for the Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning

cc:

Lorenzo Lopez, City Traffic Engineer
Edward Arango, Assistant Public Works Director
Dawn S. Cameron, Public Works Director
Ria Lo, Transportation Manager
Kimbra McCarthy, City Manager
Heather Glaser, City Clerk

About Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning

The Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning is a local volunteer-based organization dedicated to making Mountain View as beautiful, economically healthy, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian accessible, and affordable as possible. MVCSP member interest and expertise covers areas such as housing, transportation, the environment, the economy, and beyond!

For more information, see <http://www.mvcsp.org>.

To contact us, send email to mvcsp.info@gmail.com.

From: Mountain View MVCSP

Sent: Tuesday, June 1, 2021 12:59 PM

**Subject: MVCSP comments on Calderon Avenue bike lanes to City of Mountain View City Council
Council Transportation Committee**

(formal letter attached)



Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning
c/o Aaron Grossman
817 Montgomery Street
Mountain View, CA 94041

June 1, 2021

City of Mountain View City Council Council Transportation Committee
City Hall, 500 Castro Street
PO Box 7540
Mountain View, CA 94039-7540

Re: 5.1 Calderon Avenue Bike Lanes, Mercy Street to El Camino Real, Project 20-47

Dear Chairperson Lieber and committee members:

The Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning (MVCSP) appreciates the opportunity to respond to your discussion about additional Calderon Avenue bike lanes. We have reviewed the agenda item materials, and reviewed materials for and listened to the audio for the April 29th community meeting, and we have the following comments we would like to share with you.

This project is very much needed. Improving the bicycling experience on Calderon will help fill a gap in the current bicycle network in Mountain View (as described in the draft AccessMV documentation). We praise Staff for their work on this project to date. This said, we do have some concerns and suggestions we hope you will consider during your deliberations.

- Although there will be impacts on Calderon due to the removal of existing parking spaces, there is parking available on side streets, as John Cordes pointed out at the community meeting.
- Three schools exist as destinations from Calderon (Landels, Bubb, and Graham). This should be heavily considered in all work done on this project and related projects.

- Any parking areas should not be so narrow the bicyclists are vulnerable to door-zone areas. Otherwise, bicyclists might be injured or worse when car doors are unexpectedly opened ahead of them, or they might tend to ride far to the left in the bike lanes or even into lanes of traffic to avoid such issues.
- Although Staff correctly states traffic calming and other treatments and considerations for reduced speed limits fall outside of this project, MVCSP holds the general position that *all* public and private projects should take advantage of work done on one project to complete related projects at the same time or as logical next steps. April Webster pointed this out in an MVCSP comment letter on the Capital Improvement Program update at the May 25th City Council meeting (“Taking an Integrated Approach”). She also discussed green complete streets in that letter (“Redefining Complete Streets as Green Complete Streets”). And it is covered as well in Mary Dateo’s GreenSpacesMV letter for this meeting.
Accordingly, traffic calming and green complete streets elements should be considered at the same time as this project or as soon as possible after. Following this, a new traffic study should be completed with the goal of reducing the speed limit along Calderon from 30 to 25 MPH. 30 MPH (and given that drivers often drive above the posted speed limit) is simply too high for that street (if for no other reason than three schools are destination points bicyclists access to and from there).
- Calderon residents should be instructed to not place waste totes in the bike lanes. This might sound like an arcane point, but residents on North Whisman Road follow this practice, and the City has failed to compel them to change the behavior. At this location, let’s be sure the correction occurs right from the start.
- Also worthy of consideration is installing wayfinding signs as appropriate understanding that bicyclists use Calderon as a means to get to and from a variety of destinations including the three schools, Sunnyvale, the Transit Center, and the Stevens Creek Trail. John Cordes suggested this at the community meeting.
- In the staff memorandum under community outreach:
 - A statement is made about input on lack of spaces on side streets. What I heard was a member of the public pointing out that parking exists there, but it wasn’t cited in the presentation or materials for the meeting.
 - A statement on staff recommending no implementation of speed calming improvements. The details around this truly need to be discussed at your meeting. Traffic calming is actually key to making this project work successfully.
 - The discussion on losing needed street parking should not be a sole reason to reduce the number of those parking spaces. Street parking is a public amenity and is not a substitute for property owners’ need to accommodate parking on their properties.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,
 Bruce England
 for the Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning

cc:
 Marichrisse Hoang, Associate Civil Engineer
 Robert Gonzales, Principal Civil Engineer
 Ed Arango, Assistant Public Works Director/City Engineer
 Dawn S. Cameron, Public Works Director

Ria Lo, Transportation Manager
Kimbra McCarthy, City Manager
Heather Glaser, City Clerk

About Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning

The Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning is a local volunteer-based organization dedicated to making Mountain View as beautiful, economically healthy, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian accessible, and affordable as possible. MVCSP member interest and expertise covers areas such as housing, transportation, the environment, the economy, and beyond! For more information, see <http://www.mvcsp.org>. To contact us, send email to mvcsp.info@gmail.com.

From: Vannina Champenois

Sent: Tue 6/1/2021 1:27 PM

Subject: agenda item 5.1 calderon avenue bike lane, mercy st to el camino, project 20-47

dear City Staff,

I am a mountain view resident and member of the recent Sustainability task force.
I am an avid user of ebike for commute and private errands.
I recently broke my distal radius a crash on bike road in South Palo Alto.

I want to declare that bikers safety must be a high level goal for the city transportation planning. In particular, the notion of continuity of bike roads must be addressed with a thorough view integrating bikers feedback. All bikers can recognize places in town when they hear a description of fear experienced.

The contributing factor to my accident is the fact that on quiet street there is no horizontal marking of possible parking area. After being pushed to the right by two vehicles that ignored me, I crashed into a parked vehicle because of sun in my eyes. If I had been aware that this was parking zone it may have helped me.

I strongly support project 20-47 to increase continuity of the bike road. I recommend that attention is put to mark transitions between various sections which have different challenges and horizontal marking to help bikers recognize areas where they are more at risk.

Thanks for making biking a less risky transportation mode, much needed to reduce carbon footprint.
regards