

From: [Michael Van De Vanter](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: comments on Castro Pedestrian Mall, Study Session item 3.1
Date: Sunday, October 10, 2021 2:19:55 PM

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

I would like to comment on the upcoming City Council Study session Oct. 12.

I am thrilled that the City is moving forward with the “Castro pedestrian mall” concept, and especially that a three-block expansion is now under consideration. This makes me once again proud to be a (now 29 year) resident of Mountain View.

Please accept my enthusiastic recommendation for the maximally pedestrian/bicycle/transit friendly choices that are possible.

Michael L. Van De Vanter, Ph.D.



From: [Randy Strauss](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Please support options that keep the last 3 blocks of Castro closed
Date: Sunday, October 10, 2021 4:07:25 PM

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

Please support options that keep the last 3 blocks of Castro closed.

Note that with Castro closed, it would make sense to change the light at Castro and Alma/Central to be faster, so people heading to Moffett Field can use Shoreline to Alma and make the left onto Moffett blvd without that left turn lane backing up.

Randy Strauss

From: [Gordon Hamachi](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Re: Study Session item 3.1
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 3:35:52 AM

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

I am a Mountain View resident who would like to express a preference for permanently closing the Castro Street train crossing and making permanent the nice car-free and pedestrian-friendly changes to Castro Street.

What would make this especially palatable to me would be a bicycle and pedestrian crossing of the Caltrain tracks at or near Castro.

--Gordon Hamachi

From: [Yonatan Zunger](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Comment on agenda item 3.1 (Castro pedestrian mall study)
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 8:05:25 AM

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

Dear City Council,

I won't be able to attend tomorrow's session, but I wanted to express my support for the staff recommendation of moving forward with alternative B, adding the 200 and 300 blocks, considering alternative C for the future, and extending the temporary closure to match.

There were years of discussion around a pedestrian mall on Castro, and lots of very reasonable concerns about the impact on traffic and the like, but after circumstance forced our hand, everyone's had nearly two years to get used to it, and it's worked out really well. Pedestrian Castro is thriving (especially compared to the baseline of a pandemic situation) and traffic hasn't turned into a major problem at all. Let's make this permanent!

Sincerely,
Yonatan Zunger

From: [Cliff Chambers](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: 3.1 Castro Pedestrian Mall Feasibility Study and Future of 100-300 Blocks of Castro Street
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 9:47:07 AM

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

Mayor Kamei and City Council members:

I enthusiastically support the adoption of Alternative C as the preferred alternative for the 100 block of Castro St. While there are significant challenges to full implementation, this alternative provides significant long term benefits for the increasing pedestrian use in the area, including improved access to the future reconstruction of the Transit Center. I essentially support much of the Downtown Committee preferences, including the support of expansion of the pedestrian mall concept to encompass the 200 and 300 blocks with consistent design for all three blocks.

While there could be a need for a phased implementation approach to Alternative C, it is important to keep in mind the tremendous benefits that full implementation of Alternative C will have to full implementation of the Transit Center Grade Separation and Access Project. Both projects are challenging, but I am very confident that the City of Mountain View leadership has the wisdom and fortitude to have both plans come to full fruition for the long term benefit of residents and businesses.

Thank you City Council for hiring Gehl to conduct the Castro Pedestrian Mall Feasibility Study. I had the opportunity to read every word of their exemplary report and their observations and analysis were spot on. Particularly notable was the application of the three design principles including "Public Space is a verb." The opportunity for public input is most appreciated.

Finally, Alternative C, the Realignment of Evelyn Street, is also known as the "Hicks Alternative" to many of us. I would like to personally acknowledge and thank Council Member Hicks for her leadership and insights on this project.

I have a conflict and cannot attend the Study Session tomorrow night.

Thanks,

Cliff Chambers
City of Mountain View

From: [Toerless Eckert](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Cc: Lucas@ramirezforcouncil.com
Subject: Castro Street redesign opinions
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 12:47:13 PM

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

Reading the attachments to tomorrows council meeting, it seems as if a lot of the work done by Gehl et.al. was well-intentioned waterfall work that was invalidated by the CoViD changes that happened in 2020:

The A/B/C Alternatives only discuss the 100 block, and they do not show the difference of those proposals against our "new normal" (covid setup), but against the old normal.

It would be prudent for any future work to be defined as an agile process where it will be easier to factor changes in requirement in during the project.

It is also quite confusing to read about 100-300 block change desire by Staff, when in fact, there are no pictures showing/discussing 200-300.

The work from Gehl is optically very pleasing, especially the historic part, but given how its not comparing with the new normal and not showing blocks 100-300, i would suggest to ask for new output comparing with new normal and show pictures for block 100-300.

An for the meantime, 2022, just extend the new normal. It is IMHO working great.

The changes over our current "new normal" that i think are important seem to be very limited:

- Some amount of seating should be provided by the city, not only the restaurants (i am unclar if/how much this is already done).
- The bollards? to protect the pedestrian blocks from the crossing street traffic should be replaced by electrical ones that can be pulled down into street-level:
- The goal IMHO should be to keep the existing setup (give or take the changes needed at 100 for the caltrain project), BUT: it must still be possible to easily have our festivals, where public/restaurant tables have to be displaced by the street vendors booths.

I do not know how long such constructions would take, but it would be great to have at least one festival across blocks 100-300 in 2022, and after that festival one could put the electrical liftable bollards in.

- It sure would be looking "nice" to completely level the streets with the side-walks, but i really don't see why to spend the money. Whatever is good enough to make folks with mobility challenges happy enough should suffice:

Overall i think it does fit the culture of a young, innovative city quite well not to have overboarding, expensive long-term planning, but an agile, ad-hoc setup that evolves organically and may look like an ongoing provisional.

Cheers

Toerless

From: [Vince Leone](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Castro Pedestrian Mall
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 3:20:51 PM

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

Dear Council:

I support all the staff recommendations regarding the Castro pedestrian mall, specifically:

- [Moving forward with developing a pedestrian mall concept for the 100 block of Castro Street “based on Alternative B with the planning and design work considering the Alternative C concept as a potential future phase.” This would allow for a quicker and easier implementation of the pedestrian mall concept, with Alternative B “designed and constructed as an initial phase of a pedestrian mall with the additional improvements of Alternative C pursued as a later phase.”](#)
- [Adding the 200 and 300 blocks to the pedestrian mall concept.](#)
- [Extending the temporary closure of the 100, 200, and 300 blocks of Castro Street through January 2023. The current closure is scheduled to expire on January 17, 2022, and continuation of the closure is necessary to support businesses during the economic recovery.](#)

I strongly support adding the 200 and 300 blocks to the mall.

Sincerely,

Vince Leone



Mountain View

From: [Jennifer Dell-Ernstrom](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Feedback on Castro Pedestrian feasibility study
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 3:57:16 PM

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

Hi City Council,

I read the feasibility study and am glad to see that **Alternative C** is recommended. I also agree that this is the best long term solution.

It will really improve the Castro street area for bikes and pedestrians and be a plus for restaurants as well.

While the pandemic has had many devastating effects, I'm glad that it has helped us see the possibilities of our city becoming more people/bike friendly and less car-centric !

Best regards

Jennifer Dell-Ernstrom

 Mountain View CA

From: [Fred](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Castro Street
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 5:31:07 PM

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

Hello Council Members,

I would like to express my support for making the pedestrian mall on Castro Street permanent. The outdoor dining and open mall on Castro are great, a tremendous improvement over the old Castro Street. More public seating or other public gathering areas in addition to the current restaurant areas would be even better.

Thank You,

Fred Zack



Mountain View

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Castro Street Pedestrian Mall
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 5:49:12 PM

Hello City Council,

Please vote in favor of making the pedestrian mall on Castro St. permanent.

This would be such an improvement to the walkability / sustainability of our city, that it was included as one of the recommendations of the Environmental Sustainability Task Force-2 (ESTF-2).

Please include direction to staff to include in the design of the new mall: additional trees and native plants, to bring a bit more of nature into our city.

Regards,
Mary Dateo

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: FW: Pedestrian Mall
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 6:25:31 PM

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

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 11, 2021 6:23 PM
To: Lucas.Ramirez@mountainview.gov; city.council@mountainview.gov.
Subject: Pedestrian Mall

So mmuch for supporting the rights of citizens and voters. By passing the pedestrian mall act you are denying access for many of your voters to the restaurants and shops you are supposedly supporting. As a disabled person in a wheelchair it is difficult enough to go anywhere outside my own home, but I did enjoy going to Castro St for a nice meal. If my husband can't park, even temporarily, near the front door, to wheel me onto the sidewalk then I can't reach the restaurant. There is a definite limit on how far he can push me on the cracked and broken sidewalks between a parking space and the shop.

Thus passing the bill will mean I am forced to be a recluse or take my business to another town where we can survive. Perhaps someday you will be in the same position and understand how much this hurts me, my family, my future life and our voting.

**Mary Partlan
Mountain View**

From: [Serge Bonte](#)
To: [City Council](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: re: Castro Pedestrian Mall Feasibility Study and Future of 100-300 Blocks of Castro Street
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 6:35:16 PM

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

Honorable Mayor and City Council Members:

I am writing in full support of the staff recommendations:

- Immediately extend by one year the current closure of the 100, 200, and 300 blocks of Castro Street for vehicular and bicycle traffic
- Work diligently through the intricacies of a 60+ years old law to make that closure permanent
- Add the 200 and 300 blocks to the Pedestrian Mall study
- Choose Alternative B as the most realistic option to be implemented within the next 5 years.
- Expand to Alternative C when we get closer to implementing and financing the new Transit Center.

In terms of more immediate improvements to the current conditions, I'd like to suggest:

- making more room for pedestrians in the median of the 100 block; it feels congested both as a pedestrian and as a restaurant patron.
- improving lighting all throughout; maybe adding strings of lights across Castro? These lights could maybe be changed by season, theme, celebration...
- provide secure bike parking near the 3 blocks, my preference being a bike valet parking so that more visitors can feel confident biking to the pedestrian mall.
- providing more handicap parking closer to the 3 blocks (to make it easier for mobility challenged residents to visit)

Longer term, don't over program the pedestrian mall and keep an eye for flexibility in usage/configuration (as the pandemic taught us, we need to be nimble).

Sincerely,

Serge Bonte
Lloyd Way, Mountain View

From: [Ilya Gurin](#)
To: [Kamei, Ellen](#); [Abe-Koga, Margaret](#); [Matichak, Lisa](#); [Ramirez, Lucas](#); [Hicks, Alison](#); [Lieber, Sally](#); [Showalter, Pat](#)
Cc: [City Council](#); [McCarthy, Kimbra](#); [Shrivastava, Aarti](#)
Subject: Item 3.1: Castro Pedestrian Mall
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 8:22:27 AM
Attachments: [2021-10-12 Castro Pedestrian Mall.pdf](#)

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

To Mayor Kamei and the members of the City Council:

MV YIMBY writes in support of the proposed Castro pedestrian mall, specifically options B or C presented in the feasibility study, in accordance with staff recommendations.

The closure of Castro to vehicles that was implemented as an *ad hoc* response to COVID has been overwhelmingly popular, and allayed many of the concerns heard when pedestrianization was first discussed in 2019. We note that car access will remain on Bryant and Villa streets, and (one-way) Blossom and Wild Cherry lanes, whereas Castro alone will be reserved for pedestrians and bicyclists, who have always constituted the large majority of traffic on Castro during the evening peak hours. Eliminating cars on Castro will maintain the improved safety and overall visitor experience that exist now under the temporary closure.

We do not express a preference between options B and C. Making part of today's Centennial Plaza continuous with the Castro promenade (option C) would clearly benefit Castro. However, we expect more options for improving Centennial Plaza to arise during the anticipated design of the new transit center. We are also concerned that any option should provide direct and unimpeded access from the Central underpass to the transit center. We are also concerned that the additional expense of option C may take away from other public improvements.

Considering all of the above, we support the staff recommendations.

- *Proceed with option B, considering option C as a potential future phase:* We believe this is an expeditious and cost-effective approach.
- *Add the 200 and 300 blocks to the pedestrian mall:* We believe the distinction between these blocks and the 100 block is artificial.
- *Extend the temporary closure through January 2023:* We believe that ending the temporary closure before implementing it again under option B would cause needless

disruption.

Thank you for considering our opinion.

Kind regards,

Ilya Gurin

On behalf of the members of MV YIMBY

To Mayor Kamei and the members of the City Council:

MV YIMBY writes in support of the proposed Castro pedestrian mall, specifically options B or C presented in the feasibility study, in accordance with staff recommendations.

The closure of Castro to vehicles that was implemented as an *ad hoc* response to COVID has been overwhelmingly popular, and allayed many of the concerns heard when pedestrianization was first discussed in 2019. We note that car access will remain on Bryant and Villa streets, and (one-way) Blossom and Wild Cherry lanes, whereas Castro alone will be reserved for pedestrians and bicyclists, who have always constituted the large majority of traffic on Castro during the evening peak hours. Eliminating cars on Castro will maintain the improved safety and overall visitor experience that exist now under the temporary closure.

We do not express a preference between options B and C. Making part of today's Centennial Plaza continuous with the Castro promenade (option C) would clearly benefit Castro. However, we expect more options for improving Centennial Plaza to arise during the anticipated design of the new transit center. We are also concerned that any option should provide direct and unimpeded access from the Central underpass to the transit center. We are also concerned that the additional expense of option C may take away from other public improvements.

Considering all of the above, we support the staff recommendations.

- *Proceed with option B, considering option C as a potential future phase:* We believe this is an expeditious and cost-effective approach.
- *Add the 200 and 300 blocks to the pedestrian mall:* We believe the distinction between these blocks and the 100 block is artificial.
- *Extend the temporary closure through January 2023:* We believe that ending the temporary closure before implementing it again under option B would cause needless disruption.

Thank you for considering our opinion.

Kind regards,

Ilya Gurin
On behalf of the members of MV YIMBY



From: [Karin Bricker](#)
To: [City Council](#); [Kamei, Ellen](#); [Ramirez, Lucas](#); [Showalter, Pat](#); [Abe-Koga, Margaret](#); [Hicks, Alison](#); [Lieber, Sally](#); [Matichak, Lisa](#)
Cc: [McCarthy, Kimbra](#); [Hellman-Tincher, Micaela](#); [Gil, Vera](#); [Ramberg, Audrey Seymour](#); [Shrivastava, Aarti](#)
Subject: League of Women Voters Los Altos Mountain View letter in support of La Avenida
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 11:50:46 AM
Attachments: [LaAvenida.pdf](#)

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Council](#); [Kamei, Ellen](#); [Hicks, Alison](#); [Lieber, Sally](#); [Abe-Koga, Margaret](#); [Ramirez, Lucas](#); [Showalter, Pat](#); [Matichak, Lisa](#); [John Keen](#)
Subject: 10/12/21 meeting agenda item 5 -- Public comments re turn pockets, Middlefield at Shoreline
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 6:21:16 PM
Attachments: [AskMV.txt](#)
[Queues - October.txt](#)
[Queues - September.txt](#)

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

To: Mountain View City Council
From: Joel Dean, [REDACTED] Mountain View

This concerns a matter I attempted to call to your attention before your previous meeting. Ordinarily, I would not pester the Council about traffic signal anomalies, in the expectation that DPW would correct them when they are reported. But in this case, things are not working out that way.

A copy of my 9/27 report to AskMV, which should have been forwarded to DPW, is attached. In the interim, the situation has at times deteriorated into a public safety issue. For example, last Tuesday there was an interval when left turns from eastbound Middlefield to northbound Shoreline did not get a green light for almost ten minutes. The inevitable result was extremely long queues and frustrated drivers making risky moves to get out of the tangle. Also attached are tables of data -- so simple that even I can understand them -- documenting what has been happening. Samples of the videos from which the data was obtained are available at

<https://photos.google.com/album/AF1QipPFZegES-1ALnx6veW8KOFiG57-mlIMW3Dh10ql>

It should be obvious that turn pocket overflows at Middlefield and Shoreline can be corrected by modest changes to signal timing.

As of today, DPW has still not responded, and as of last Thursday, the problem had not been corrected. This further muddies the already murky waters surrounding DPW's intention to add second lanes to the turn pockets on at this location. I suggest the Council ask DPW for an explanation of why the signal control system currently performs so poorly, and what they intend to do about it.

Thank you for your attention.

The signal at Shoreline & Middlefield has been acting like an unguided missile during the 8 AM hour. For example, Monday morning starting at about 8:25, there were three consecutive green phases for left and U-turns from eastbound Middlefield with 10-15 vehicles waiting in queue which lasted just 13-16 seconds. Only about half the vehicles in queue were able to complete the turn. That was followed by a green phase lasting 36 seconds, when all 10 vehicles in queue cleared the intersection with several seconds to spare.

Pre-pandemic, when through traffic (but not left and U-turns) was heavier, the signal cycle did not vary much from an average duration of 2-1/2 minutes, the minimum green phase was 20 seconds long, and a few seconds would be added if necessary. That system worked very well and did not permit such long queues to accumulate. Was it changed deliberately, or is the control system outsmarting itself? Whatever the reason, it needs to be corrected.

Note: Through traffic was not seriously inconvenienced by the left-turn pocket overflows.

Thank you for your attention.

QUEUEING IN EASTBOUND LEFT TURN POCKET, MIDDLEFIELD AT SHORELINE

Phase duration = Green time + yellow time, in seconds

Held over = Vehicles in left turn queue at start of preceding green phase which were unable to complete the turn, i.e., Stymied

Newcomers = Vehicles arriving in left turn queue between the start of the previous left green phase and the start of the current one

Queue length = Vehicles in queue at the start of the current left green phase

Lucky latecomers = Vehicles not in queue at the start of the left green phase which were able to complete the turn anyway

Left & U-turns = All Vehicles able to complete the turn during the current phase; AKA vehicle count

Stymied = Queue length minus left & U-turns. Stymied in one cycle = held over in the next.

Date	Phase duration	Held over	Queue + Newcomers	Lucky length	Left & latecomers	U-turns	Stymied
Mon 9/20	13	x	~15-x	14 or 15	0	5	9 or 10
	16	9 or 10	4 or 5	14 +/- 1	0	5	9 +/- 1
	15	9 +/- 1	y	~9+y	0	7	~2+y
	36	~2+y	~10-2-y	10	0	10	0

Date	Phase duration	Held over	Queue + Newcomers	Lucky length	Left & latecomers	U-turns	Stymied
Tue 9/21	16	0	1	1	0	1	0
	17	0	11	11	0	7	4
	15	4	6	10	0	5	5
	28	5	6	11	0	11	0
	15	0	7	7	0	6	1
	15	1	5	6	0	5	1
	21	1	4	5	0	5	0
	15	0	3	3	0	3	0
	16	0	6	6	0	6	0
	17	0	7	7	0	5	2

Totals	175	11	56	67	0	54	13
Avg.	17.5	1.1	5.6	6.7	0	5.4	1.3

Queue lengths / Left & U-turns = 1.24

Date	Phase duration	Held over	Queue + Newcomers	Lucky = length	Left & latecomers	U-turns	Stymied
wed 9/22	13	0	9	9	0	5	4
	19	4	8	12	0	5	7
	15	7	~8	~15	0	5	~10
	15	~10	~5	~15	0	6	~9
	15	~9	~9	~18	0	5	~13
	17	~13	~5	~18	0	6	~12
	25	~12	~4	~16	0	8	~8
	22	~8	~4	~12	0	8	~4
	20	~4	~2	6	0	5	1

Totals	161	~67	~54	~121	0	53	~68
Avg.	17.9	~7.4	~6.0	~13.4	0	5.9	~7.6

Queue lengths / Left & U-turns = 2.28

Date	Phase duration	Held over	Queue + Newcomers	Lucky = length	Left & latecomers	U-turns	Stymied
Thu 9/23	17	0	3	3	0	3	0
	15	0	4	4	0	4	0
	23	0	6	6	2	8	0
	15	0	4	4	0	4	0
	14	0	12	12	0	6	6
	17	6	8	14	0	7	7
	19	7	4	11	0	9	2
	27	2	9	11	0	11	0
	16	0	7	7	0	5	2
	28	2	7	9	0	9	0
	28	0	6	6	0	6	0

Totals	219	17	70	87	2	72	17
Avg.	19.9	1.5	6.4	7.9	0.2	6.5	1.5

Queue lengths / Left & U-turns = 1.21

Date	Phase duration	Held over	Queue + Newcomers	Lucky = length	Left & latecomers	U-turns	Stymied
Mon 9/27	15	0	3	3	1	4	0
	17	0	6	6	0	6	0
	25	0	8	8	0	8	0
	15	0	9	9	0	4	5
	15	5	6	11	0	5	6
	26	6	1	7	0	7	0
	20	0	2	2	0	2	0
	19	0	3	3	1	4	0

Totals	152		11	38	49	2	40	11
Avg.	19.0		1.4	4.8	6.1	0.3	5.0	1.4

Queue lengths / Left & U-turns = 1.23

Date	Phase duration		Held over	+ Newcomers	Queue length	=	Lucky + latecomers	- U-turns	= Stymied
Tue	18		0	3	3	=	0	3	0
9/28	12		0	6	6	=	0	6	0
	18		0	8	8	=	0	6	2
	15		2	5	7	=	0	6	1
	27		1	7	8	=	0	8	0
	15		0	4	4	=	0	4	0
	23		0	6	6	=	0	6	0
	23		0	3	3	=	1	4	0
	20		0	3	3	=	1	4	0
	~14		0	2	2	=	0	2	0
	21		0	6	6	=	0	6	0
	17		0	2	2	=	0	2	0

Totals	223		3	55	58	=	2	57	3
Avg.	18.6		0.3	4.6	4.8	=	0.2	4.8	0.3

Queue lengths / Left & U-turns = 1.02

Date	Phase duration		Held over	+ Newcomers	Queue length	=	Lucky + latecomers	- U-turns	= Stymied
Wed	15		0	6	6	=	0	6	0
9/29	17		0	11	11	=	0	6	5
	15		5	4	9	=	0	6	3
	17		3	6	9	=	0	7	2
	17		2	5	7	=	0	6	1
	16		1	7	8	=	0	5	3
	33		3	7	10	=	0	10	0
	13		0	0	0	=	0	0	0
	17		0	3	3	=	0	3	0
	13		0	4	4	=	0	4	0
	20		0	4	4	=	1	5	0

Totals	193		14	57	71	=	1	57	14
Avg.	17.5		1.3	5.2	6.5	=	0.1	5.2	1.3

Queue lengths / Left & U-turns = 1.24

Phase | Held Queue Lucky Left &

Date duration | over + Newcomers = length + latecomers - U-turns = Stymied

Thu	16		0	3	3	0	3	0
9/30	18		0	7	7	0	5	2
	15		2	7	9	0	5	4
	31		4	7	11	0	11	0
	13		0	10	10	0	4	6
	27		6	4	10	0	10	0
	15		0	5	5	0	4	1
	22		1	6	7	0	7	0
	20		0	3	3	0	3	0

Totals	177		13	52	65	0	52	13
Avg.	19.7		1.4	5.8	7.2	0	5.8	1.4

Queue lengths / Left & U-turns = 1.25

QUEUEING IN EASTBOUND LEFT TURN POCKET, MIDDLEFIELD AT SHORELINE

Phase duration = Green time + yellow time, in seconds

Held over = Vehicles in left turn queue at start of preceding green phase which were unable to complete the turn, i.e., Stymied

Newcomers = Vehicles arriving in left turn queue between the start of the previous left green phase and the start of the current one

Queue length = Vehicles in queue at the start of the current left green phase

Lucky lutecomers = Vehicles not in queue at the start of the left green phase which were able to complete the turn anyway

Left & U-turns = All Vehicles able to complete the turn during the current phase; AKA vehicle count

Bailed out = Got fed up waiting in left turn queue, went straight or right instead

Stymied = Queue length minus left & U-turns. Stymied in one cycle = held over in the next.

Date	Phase duration	Held over	Queue + Newcomers	Queue length	Lucky + latecomers	Left & U-turns	Stymied
Mon 10/4	13	0	6	6	0	5	1
	23	1	7	8	0	8	0
	24	0	7	7	0	7	0
	17	6	6	0	0	5	1
	20	1	3	4	0	4	0
	21	0	9	9	0	8	1
	19	1	11	12	0	7	5
	24	5	5	10	0	8	2
	26	2	1	3	1	4	0
	17	0	4	4	0	4	0

Totals	194	10	59	69	1	60	10
Avg.	19.4	1.0	5.9	6.9	0.1	0.6	1.0

Queue lengths / left & U-turns = 1.15

Date	Phase duration	Held over	Queue + Newcomers	Queue length	Lucky + latecomers	Left & U-turns	Bailed out	Stymied
Tue 10/5	18	0	8	8	0	5	0	3
	26	3	6	9	1	10	0	0
	27	0	7	7	0	7	0	0
	27	0	5	5	2	7	0	0
	27	0	10	10	0	10	0	0

32		0	7	7	1	8	0	0
17		0	4	4	1	5	0	0
14		0	6	6	0	3	0	3
Skipped		3	7-12	10-15	-	-	0	10-15
Skipped		10-15	3-8	18	-	-	0	18
Skipped		18	0	18	-	-	10	8
14		8	0	8	0	5	3	0
16		0	2	2	0	2	0	0

* Left turn phase came at end of green phase for eastbound Middlefield. Previously, left phase was protected and preceded green for through traffic.

Elapsed time between green lights for left turns when phase was skipped: 9 minutes, 46 seconds.

Queue lengths / left & U-turns = 1.66

Date	Phase duration	Held over	Queue + Newcomers	Lucky = length	Left & latecomers - U-turns = Stymied
Wed 10/6	13	0	8	8	0 4 4
	36	4	7	11	2 13 0
	20	0	8	8	0 8 0

Queue lengths / left & U-turns = 1.08

Date	Phase duration	Held over	Queue + Newcomers	Lucky = length	Left & latecomers - U-turns - out = Stymied
Thu 10/7	28	0	8	8	0 8 0 0
	15	0	9	9	0 6 0 3
	33	3	14	17	0 14 2 1
	25	1	4	5	0 5 0 0
	21	0	6	6	1 7 0 0
	16	0	2	2	0 2 0 0

Queue lengths / left & U-turns = 1.12

Green/yellow duration (sec.) Average left turns

12-15	4.7
16-20	5.0
21-25	7.0
26+	9.2

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Correction to previous email
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 6:46:10 PM

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

To: City Council

From: Joel Dean

The link to the videos referenced in my previous message was changed without my knowledge and is now

<https://photos.google.com/share/AF1QipOVaOqwkc5KfSmAtnbGDks-ZPuzXk77R-qSTuodFJRvuPIP67g3uxOL850uEKivA>

I apologize for the error. Google should apologize, but that would be unprecedented.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Correction to previous correction
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 9:51:05 PM

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

To: City Council

From: Joel Dean

The previous attempt to send you a link to an album of videos of the Middlefield/Shoreline turn pockets has probably failed. If it has, this may work:

<https://photos.google.com/album/AF1QipNoETrMR4tXYclnTdCebrDHwpLpXMOYAeYOapk6>

Google photos is free, and worth every penny of it.