

Public Comments  
BPAC Meeting October 25, 2023

**From:** April Webster <aprilweb@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 24, 2023 10:33 PM

**To:** BPAC Communication <bpac@mountainview.gov>

**Cc:** Whyte, Brandon <Brandon.Whyte@mountainview.gov>; Lo, Ria <Ria.Lo@mountainview.gov>; Cameron, Dawn <Dawn.Cameron@mountainview.gov>; Ahmed, Priyoti <Priyoti.Ahmed@mountainview.gov>; Gauss, Karen <Karen.Gauss@mountainview.gov>; Hosfeldt, Gregg <gregg.hosfeldt@mountainview.gov>; McCarthy, Kimbra <Kimbra.McCarthy@mountainview.gov>; Glaser, Heather <Heather.Glaser@mountainview.gov>;

**Subject:** SVBC Mountain View comments on Agenda Item 6.1 for the B/PAC Meeting on October 25, 2023

October 25, 2023

Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee  
City of Mountain View  
500 Castro Street, 3rd Floor  
Mountain View, CA  
94041-2010



**Re: B/PAC Meeting October 25, 2023 Agenda Item 6.1 (Existing Conditions Report)**

Dear City of Mountain View B/PAC:

The SVBC Mountain View Local Team has reviewed the Existing Conditions Report. We understand the purpose of this document is to identify the data that will be used to create a list of prioritized projects—using the output of AccessMV (2021), AskMV, and the ATP Survey (2023)—that City Staff will use over the next five years for identifying which projects they will recommend for the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). We also understand these projects will be prioritized at Staff's discretion in alignment with pavement quality projects and funding availability.

***Next ATP Update: Five years from completion of current ATP (2029) and to be budgeted in the CIP***

We would like to express our strong desire to see a timeline provided for the next update to the ATP. In particular, we would like the current ATP to specify an ATP update five years from

the completion of the current ATP, which is currently projected for September 2024. Moreover, at the approval of the current ATP, we would like to see money budgeted for the update in the 2029 CIP and approved by Council. We feel this is important as many things can change both within the community (e.g., precise plans, climate targets, etc.) and the larger transportation industry (e.g., design guidelines and standards). We need to be thinking ahead and planning accordingly.

### **Update Language in the DRAFT ATP Vision Statement**

We would like to see some minor, but nonetheless important, updates to the language in the DRAFT ATP Vision Statement. In particular, we would like to see the following bolded changes made:

*“The City of Mountain View will lead regionally by creating an active transportation system that strengthens the community’s access to housing, employment, schools, **parks**, and other destinations **to create a people-first city**.*

*The Active Transportation Plan will enable the City to intentionally plan with policies that support walkable and bikeable places, programs that create a culture of walking and biking, and projects that produce **an inclusive and equitable** connected,*

*low-stress, and inviting active transportation network that doubles as corridors of shade, habitat, and/or public open space. This network of streets and trails will encourage biking and walking, enhance biodiversity, and reduce climate change impacts.”*

### **New Active Transportation Policies and Design Guidelines**

There are several industry de facto policies and design guidelines we feel are important enough, and that are critical for achieving the City’s goals as expressed in the ATP Draft Vision Statement, to explicitly encode them in the ATP. We would like the B/PAC and City Council to direct Staff to evaluate these policies and design guidelines and adopt a resolution to be ratified when the ATP is approved. These include:

- **Daylighting**: Building on AB 413 to improve visibility and safety at all intersections and crosswalks throughout the City at a modest cost.
- **No turn on red (NTOR)**: Expanding on existing no turn on red signs as widely as possible throughout the City, maybe starting with Routes to Schools and Routes to Parks.
- **Adopt NACTO design guidelines and policies**: While our strong preference is to adopt NACTO as a blanket design standard, if this is not possible, we would at the very least want to see adoption of NACTO’s guidelines for a 10-foot car lane width. Speed is the most important factor in determining whether a car crash involving a person on our streets (a pedestrian or bicyclist) will result in a fatality. Narrowing car lanes is one of the best ways to force cars to slow by design, without involving enforcement, which isn’t always effective.
- **Revise the traffic calming process and reduce posted speed limit anywhere allowable**

**by law and without lengthy traffic studies:** Aggressively leverage any legislative opportunity (such as AB 43) to reduce posted speed limits “by right”.

- **City wide standards for streetscapes and sidewalks (preferably based on NACTO guidelines):** Every precise plan in our City defines its own standards. Some of these plans have been around from as early as the 1950s. We would like to strongly encourage the City to adopt citywide standards for streetscapes and sidewalks to (1) avoid reinventing the wheel with each new project and plan, and (2) introduce some consistency when making zoning updates (such as R3 upzoning) that span the entire City across many precise plans, as well as locations where no precise plan applies.

### ***Slow Streets Program***

In the 2029 ATP Update, we would like to see our active transportation network supplemented with a Slow Streets Program, similar to the [program](#) that’s been implemented in San Francisco to promote community-building. The goal would be to create some pedestrian oriented streets in neighborhood streets where there is slow traffic, and strolling is pleasant and comfortable.

### ***Request for Additional Data***

The Existing Conditions Memo contains an impressive amount of detail. However, there are some key categories of data where additional information would be helpful, such as the following:

- **Safe Routes to School (SRTS):** The SRTS program tracks an important demographic group. While we understand there is an entire department focused on the SRTS program, it would be useful to see the most current data included in the Existing Conditions Report to be complete given that it’s one of the variables used to prioritize active transportation projects.
- **Pedestrian data:** The ATP is intended to address the needs of all active transportation modalities, and the ATP needs to be well balanced between cyclists and pedestrians. We noticed the omission of the Pedestrian Quality of Service Analysis (PQSA) score data that was included in AccessMV (2021). Could this data be pulled in, and could staff also provide additional information about the Walk Score that was used to create it?
- **Green infrastructure data:** We look forward to seeing the updated map provided by Metta Urban Design detailing canopy trees seen on Mountain View streets. Canopy coverage by type can help us quantify the quality of the street canopy in our community.

- **Equity and Inclusivity:** The ATP Existing Conditions Memo in the “Access and Equity” section identifies addressing the different needs, abilities, and levels of experience of different people who walk, bike, or roll. However, as research has shown, other demographic information such as gender and ethnicity are much stronger predictive indicators for modality share. Could you please add the following:
  - We would like to acknowledge and thank Staff for their efforts to conduct outreach with an equity lens to ensure more equitable and inclusive representation from underrepresented ethnic groups.
  - Mode share at the global level of the City of Mountain View doesn't provide a very good indication of bicycling, walking, or other modality trends by different demographic groups. Providing this data by age, gender, and race provides more information that can help us better understand if there are differences in modality shift between different demographic groups to inform future mitigation strategies.
  - If mode share is also available for school aged children, perhaps even at the granularity of elementary school versus high school, this would be useful in informing our SRTS program and evaluating trends as children move through our school system.
  - We understand there are limitations to the U.S. Census 2021 American Community Survey in terms of being limited to commuting trips; however, if there’s an opportunity in the ATP Update to conduct collect and provide mode share data by other types of trips other than for community, this could provide value for informing future project prioritization.
  
- **All Ages and Abilities (AAA) Network**
  - The Existing Conditions Memo doesn’t specify that the [NACTO Designing for All Ages and Abilities Guidelines](#) were used to evaluate which routes in Mountain View meet the AAA guidelines. We realize this information was provided in AccessMV, but we feel it’s important to clearly attribute the source for the standards we’re targeting again in the Existing Conditions Report.
  - **Gap analyses in the AAA network:** It would be useful to have a map that identifies gaps between the AAA network and each element of the SRTS network, households without vehicles, key destinations, interconnectivity in Mountain View, and intra-connectivity with neighboring cities.

- **Intercity connectivity**
  - Mountain View doesn't exist in a bubble, and our connections to our neighboring communities include invisible boundaries that members of our community cross on a daily basis. While ensuring we have a robust and connected network of active transportation facilities within our City is critical, we do not want to diminish nor ignore the importance of collaborating and working with our neighbors to ensure our network can connect with theirs. We would like to request that Staff prioritize collecting this data to address intercity connectivity for the next ATP in five years. For example, one project that comes to mind would be upgrading the bicycle boulevard that extends along Montecito Avenue and Stierlin Road and connects to the Ellen Fletcher Bike Boulevard in Palo Alto. Similarly, there's been consideration of creating a Green Complete Streets Connector along Evelyn Avenue to connect the downtown centers of Mountain View and Sunnyvale.
  - The SRTS network is de facto an intercity network as many Mountain View school children go to public schools in Los Altos and vice versa.
- **Quantitative data for current state of MV streets:** In addition to a map of existing streets with bike lanes, we wonder if it might be possible to add tabular data identifying the miles of streets with bike lanes (further classified by facility type, AAA designation, green infrastructure) and sidewalks for the entire City, but ideally split up by neighborhood/region. Ideally this will help us track by neighborhood/region where bike infrastructure is being improved or not. This type of data is easier for users to evaluate, quantify, and track/compare over time than is map data, which is difficult to visually analyze.
- **Projected population density:** We would like to ask the City of Mountain View to create a projected population density map using the [2023-2031 Housing Element](#) that was submitted to and approved by the State to ensure we're building for the future projected population rather than the current population.

Sincerely,

Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition, Mountain View Local Team

cc:

TBD

Brandon Whyte, Active Transportation Manager

Ria Lo, Transportation Manager

Dawn Cameron, Public Works Director

Priyoti Ahmed, Transportation  
Planner Karen Gauss,  
Transportation Planner  
Gregg Hosfedlt, Assistant Public Works  
Director Kimbra McCarthy, City Manager  
Heather Glaser, City Clerk