From: <u>Iman Saleh Moustafa</u>

To: <u>City Council</u>
Subject: Re: Middlefield trees

Date: Friday, October 22, 2021 4:16:46 PM

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

Hi,

We were just informed that the removal of trees on W. Middlefeld will be discussed Tuesday.

I would like to re-state my opposition as a mountain view resident that use that street everyday. The removal of the trees will not solve a real issue but will only make our city less green.

Thanks,

Iman

On Mon, Sep 13, 2021, 9:39 AM Iman Saleh Moustafa

wrote:

Hi,

I am resident of mountain View and using Middlefield every day. I would like to add my voice to NOT cut the trees to build a left turn lane. This will not solve any problem with traffic but will only replace valuable trees.

Thanks,

Iman

From: Albert Jeans
To: City Council

Subject: Public Comment on Item 8.1, Unfinished Business, Shoreline Interim Bus Lane, 26 Oct. 2021

Date: Saturday, October 23, 2021 11:37:09 AM

Attachments: <u>Item 8.1 Public Comment AJ.pdf</u>

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

Dear Mayor Kamei, Vice-mayor Ramirez, and City Councilmembers,

Please consider my attached comments on why no additional left-turn lanes are needed and Heritage Trees can be saved at the Shoreline Middlefield intersection, despite staff's most recent 24-page report trying to convince you otherwise. I would be happy to answer any questions you might have.

Sincerely, Albert Jeans

Oct. 23, 2021

Dear Mayor Kamei, Vice-Mayor Ramirez, and City Council Members,

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak out against the removal of the redwood Heritage Trees on W. Middlefield Rd. at N. Shoreline Blvd. for the purpose of constructing additional left turn lanes. Everything I said in my previous email on Sept. 14 still holds, but I would like to address several points in staff's Council Report for the upcoming meeting on Oct. 26.

Tree Transplanting

Staff proposes transplanting 3 small redwood trees from the east side median to replace the 3 large redwood trees previous approved for removal on the west side median. While I applaud any attempt to save trees and am a strong advocate of transplanting, I do not feel that this makes up for the loss of the 3 large trees which are at least 50 years old, with diameters ranging from 25" to 34" (54" above grade). I think staff's 5 year projection is far too optimistic. From Google Streetview, it appears that the small trees were planted around 2007:



Unfortunately, all of the lower branches were recently cut off so as to attach the Heritage Tree Removal signs, which will retard future growth of the trees. Note how the 3 older trees at the end of the median haven't gotten that much bigger in 14 years. (The transplant candidate trees have been highlighted to make them easier to see in the picture below.)



Second Left-Turn Lanes on West Middlefield Road

Previously staff tried to argue based on current conditions that the extra turn lanes were necessary and I showed that they weren't. This time staff presents a revised traffic analysis to justify the need for additional left-turn lanes on W. Middlefield Rd. The analysis supposedly corrects errors in the original North Bayshore Precise Plan (NBPP) EIR Traffic Impact Analysis and uses data for Existing+Project conditions. Of course, increasing the turn pocket capacity reduces the chances that the queues will overflow. However, I would argue that since realization of the NBPP is still several years off at best, the analysis should look at 2030 Cumulative Conditions, with and without mitigations. I've collected the four queuing analyses for these cases and put them into one table below. AM is the top row, PM is the bottom row, unmitigated is the left column, mitigated is the right column. The 95th percentile queues are highlighted in red for the east and westbound left-turn lanes on W. Middlefield. (Recall that the 95th percentile queue length means that 5% of the time, or once per hour in this case, the queue will be longer than this length.)

Queue Lengths, 2030+Project, With and Without Mitigation

	•	→	1	-	1	1	1	1			•	\rightarrow	1	•	1	†	1	↓	
ane Group	EBL	EBT	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBT	SBL	SBT		Lane Group	EBL	EBT	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBT	SBL	SBT	
ane Group Flow (vph)	276	663	408	1153	153	918	367	326		Lane Group Flow (vph)	194	520	245	724	235	1796	173	490	
c Ratio	1.42	0.89	2.09	1.46	0.83	0.59	1.88	0.20		v/c Ratio	0.76	0.85	1.06	0.90	0.81	1.06	1.09	0.33	
ontrol Delay	258.8	69.3	538.3	249.2	95.7	29.6	448.9	23.4		Control Delay	84.8	65.4	134.5	63.6	79.5	74.5	158.1	29.8	
ueue Delav	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
otal Delay	258.8	69.3	538.3	249.2	95.7	29.6	448.9	23.4		Total Delay	84.8	65.4	134.5	63.6	79.5	74.5	158.1	29.8	
ueue Lenath 50th (ft)	~349	316	~608	~733	143	318	~528	94		Queue Length 50th (ft)	94	226	~253	318	216	~991	~184	164	
ueue Length 95th (ft)	#536	#422	#822	#874	#257	386	#733	127		Queue Length 95th (ft)	#148	294	#431	#403	304	#1130	#340	224	
ternal Link Dist (ft)		836		508		796		722		Internal Link Dist (ft)		836		508		796		722	
ım Bay Length (ft)	220		230		160		145			Turn Bay Length (ft)	220	000	230	000	160	100	145	144	
ase Capacity (vph)	195	744	195	790	195	1556	195	1616		Base Capacity (vph)	260	658	231	846	354	1694	158	1474	
tarvation Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
pillback Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
torage Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		Storage Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
educed v/c Ratio	1.42	0.89	2.09	1.46	0.78	0.59	1.88	0.20		Reduced v/c Ratio	0.75	0.79	1.06	0.86	0.66	1.06	1.09	0.33	
Addoord to a tallo											75-7115							7/37/37/3	
tersection Summary Volume exceeds capac Queue shown is maximu 95th percentile volume Queue shown is maximu tueues	um after two exceeds cap um after two	cycles. acity, qu cycles.	ueue may	be longe	er.				Queues	Volume exceeds capac Queue shown is maximu 95th percentile volume Queue shown is maximu Queues	um after two exceeds cap um after two	cycles. acity, qu cycles.	eue may b	e longer			No		shore Precise Pl
tersection Summary Volume exceeds capac Queue shown is maximu 95th percentile volume Queue shown is maximu ueues	um after two exceeds cap um after two	cycles. acity, qu cycles.	ueue may	be longe	er.				Queues 2030 + Project PM Peak Hour	Volume exceeds capaci Queue shown is maximu # 95th percentile volume Queue shown is maximu	um after two exceeds cap um after two levard &	cycles. acity, qu cycles.	eue may b	e longer			No		shore Precise PI + Project PM Peak Hour
ersection Summary Volume exceeds capac Queue shown is maximu 95th percentile volume Queue shown is maximu JEUES	um after two exceeds cap um after two	cycles. acity, qu cycles.	ueue may	be longe	er.	1	\	1		Volume exceeds capaci Queue shown is maximu 95th percentile volume Queue shown is maximu Queues	um after two exceeds cap um after two	cycles. acity, qu cycles.	eue may b	e longer	1	1	No		
resection Summary Volume exceeds capac Queue shown is maximi 95th percentile volume. Queue shown is maximi Jeues E: Shoreline Boule	um after two exceeds cap um after two evard & I	cycles. pacity, qu cycles. Vliddle	efield R	oad WBT	↑ NBL	† NBT	SBL	↓ SBT		Volume exceeds capac Queue shown is maxim. 95th percentile volume Queue shown is maxim. Queues 38: Shoreline Boul Lane Group	um after two exceeds cap um after two levard & EBL	cycles. acity, qu cycles. Middle	eue may b	coad WBT	↑ NBL	† NBT	SBL	2030 +	
volume exceeds capac Queue shown is maxim. Queue shown is maxim. Queue shown is maxim. Queue shown is maxim. Queues shown is maxim. Queues hown is maxim.	um after two exceeds cap um after two evard & I EBL 400	cycles. pacity, qu cycles. Middle EBT 790	efield R	oad WBT 695	NBL 474	1485	337	1937		Volume exceeds capac Quoue shown is maxim. # 95th percentile volume Queue shown is maxim. Queues 38: Shoreline Boul Lane Group Lane Group Flow (yph)	um after two exceeds cap um after two levard & EBL 400	cycles. acity, qu cycles. Middle EBT 790	efield F	Road WBT 695	NBL 474	1485	SBL 337	2030 +	
Volume exceeds capac Queue shown is maximi 95th percentile volume. Queue shown is maximi ueues 3. Shorelline Boule ne Group ne Group Flow (vph) Ratio	exceeds cap um after two exceeds cap um after two evard & I EBL 400 1.98	cycles. pacity, qu cycles. Middle EBT 790 1.02	well so the state of the state	oad WBT 695 0.78	NBL 474 2.35	1485 1.17	337 1.27	1937 1.38		Volume exceeds capaci Queue shown is maxim. 95th percentile volume. Queue shown is maxim. Queues 38: Shoreline Boul Lane Group Lane Group Flow (vph) wic Ratio	um after two exceeds cap um after two levard &	cycles. acity, qu cycles. Middle EBT 790 1.16	efield F WBL 505 1.59	Road WBT 695 1.00	NBL 474 1.71	1485 1.01	SBL 337 1.07	2030 -	
Volume exceeds capac Volume exceeds capac Cueue shown is maxim. 95th percentile volume. Cueue shown is maxim. ueues 3: Shoreline Boule 3: Shoreline Boule The Group The Group Flow (vph) Ratio	exceeds cap um after two exceeds cap um after two evard & I EBL 400 1.98 489.2	cycles. acity, qu cycles. Widdle EBT 790 1.02 85.2	wBL 505 1.91 452.7	oad WBT 695 0.78 53.5	NBL 474 2.35 647.0	1485 1.17 125.6	337 1.27 195.1	1937 1.38 208.5		Volume exceeds capaci Queue shown is mis with a 95h percentile volume. Queue shown is maxim. Queues 38: Shoreline Boul 38: Shoreline Boul Lane Group Flow (uph) wic Ratio Control Delay	m after two exceeds cap um after two levard &	cycles. acity, qu cycles. Middle EBT 790 1.16 132.3	eele may be efield F WBL 505 1.59 318.3	Road WBT 695 1.00 87.3	NBL 474 1.71 367.1	1485 1.01 66.7	SBL 337 1.07 122.9	2030 - SBT 1937 1,24 150.3	
volume exceeds capac Coueue shown is maximum 95th percentile volume. Queue shown is maximum ueues 3: Shoreline Boule ne Group Flow (vph) Rabio ntrol Delay seue Delay	evard & I EBL 400 1.98 489.2 0.0	cycles. acity, qu cycles. Widdle EBT 790 1.02 85.2 0.0	wBL 505 1.91 452.7 0.0	oad WBT 695 0.78 53.5 0.0	NBL 474 2.35 647.0 0.0	1485 1.17 125.6 0.0	337 1.27 195.1 0.0	1937 1.38 208.5 0.0		Volume exceeds capac Queue shown is maxim. 95th percentile volume: Queues 38: Shoreline Boul Lane Group Flow (vph) wie Ratio Control Delay Queue Delay	m after two exceeds cap um after two levard & EBL 400 1.36 228.9 0.0	cycles. acity, qu cycles. Middle EBT 790 1.16 132.3 0.0	wBL 505 1.59 318.3 0.0	Road WBT 695 1.00 87.3 0.0	NBL 474 1.71 367.1 0.0	1485 1.01 66.7 0.0	SBL 337 1.07 122.9 0.0	2030 + SBT 1937 1.24 150.3 0.1	
ersection Summary Volume exceeds cape. Volume exceeds cape. Couse shown is maxim. 95th percentile volume. Couse shown is maxim. useues 3: Shoreline Boule 3: Shoreline Boule Reforup ne Group Flow (vph) Ratio nerto Delay use Delay tal Delay	evard & l EBL 400 1.98 489.2 0.0 489.2	cycles. pacity, qu cycles. Middle EBT 790 1.02 85.2 0.0 85.2	wBL 505 1.91 452.7 0.0 452.7	oad WBT 695 0.78 53.5 0.0 53.5	NBL 474 2.35 647.0 0.0 647.0	1485 1.17 125.6 0.0 125.6	337 1.27 195.1 0.0 195.1	1937 1.38 208.5 0.0 208.5		Volume exceeds capacicuses shown is maxim. 9 5th percentile volume: Queue shown is maxim. Queues 38: Shoreline Boul Lane Group Lane Group Flow (vph) wic Ratio Control Delay Queue Delay Total Delay Total Delay	Levard & EBL 400 1.36 228.9 0.0 228.9	middle BIT 790 1.16 132.3 0.0 132.3	wBL 505 1.59 318.3 0.0 318.3	Road WBT 695 1.00 87.3 0.0 87.3	NBL 474 1.71 367.1 0.0 367.1	1485 1.01 66.7 0.0 66.7	SBL 337 1.07 122.9 0.0 122.9	2030 + SBT 1937 1.24 150.3 0.1 150.5	
tersection Summary Volume exceeds cape. Volume exceeds cape. Soft percentile volume. Queue shown is maxim. UEUES 3: Shorelline Boule and Group ne Group Flow (vph) Ratio Article Delay seue Delay table Delay tabl	um after two exceeds caj um after two exceeds caj um after two evard & least two eva	cycles. pacity, qu cycles. Middle EBT 790 1.02 85.2 0.0 85.2 ~373	wBL 505 1.91 452.7 0.0 452.7 ~703	oad WBT 695 0.78 53.5 0.0 53.5 301	NBL 474 2.35 647.0 0.0 647.0 ~705	1485 1.17 125.6 0.0 125.6 ~845	337 1.27 195.1 0.0 195.1 ~386	1937 1.38 208.5 0.0 208.5 ~1233		Volume exceeds capac Queue shown is maxim. 9 5th percentile volume : Queues 38: Shoreline Boul Lane Group Flow (vph) wire Ratio Control Delay Queues Delay Total Delay Queue Length 50th (ft)	mafter two exceeds capum after two exceeds capum after two levard & EBL 400 1.36 228.9 0.0 228.9 -246	week and the second sec	wBL 505 1.59 318.3 0.0 318.3 -336	Road WBT 695 1.00 87.3 0.0 87.3 326	NBL 474 1.71 367.1 0.0 367.1 -633	1485 1.01 66.7 0.0 66.7 ~725	SBL 337 1.07 122.9 0.0 122.9 -338	2030 + SBT 1937 1.24 150.3 0.1 150.5 ~1156	
tersection Summary Volume exceeds cape. Volume exceeds cape. Soft percentile volume. Ocuse shown is maxim. UEUES 3. Shoreline Boule a. Shoreline Boule ne Group Flow (typh) Ratio nrtrot Delay sous Delay tal Delay sous Delay tal Delay sous Length 50th (tf)	evard & l EBL 400 1.98 489.2 0.0 489.2	cycles. pacity, qu cycles. Widdle EBT 790 1.02 85.2 0.0 85.2 -373 #506	wBL 505 1.91 452.7 0.0 452.7	oad WBT 695 0.78 53.5 0.0 53.5 301 376	NBL 474 2.35 647.0 0.0 647.0	1485 1.17 125.6 0.0 125.6 ~845 #986	337 1.27 195.1 0.0 195.1	1937 1.38 208.5 0.0 208.5 ~1233 #1372		Volume exceeds capac Queue shown is maxim. 9 59h percentile volume. Queues 38: Shoreline Boul Lane Group Flow (vph) vic Ratio Control Delay Queue Delay Total Delay Queue Length 50h (ft) Queue Length 50h (ft)	Levard & EBL 400 1.36 228.9 0.0 228.9	middle BIT 790 1.16 132.3 0.0 132.3 -422 #555	wBL 505 1.59 318.3 0.0 318.3	Coad WBT 695 1.00 87.3 0.0 87.3 326 #465	NBL 474 1.71 367.1 0.0 367.1	1485 1.01 66.7 0.0 66.7 ~725 #885	SBL 337 1.07 122.9 0.0 122.9	2030 + SBT 1937 1.24 150.3 0.1 150.5 ~1156 #1294	
tersection Summary Volume exceeds cape. Volume exceeds cape. Soft percentile volume: Ocuse shown is maxim. Soft percentile volume: Ocuse shown is maxim. UEUES 3. Shoreline Boules ne Group ne Group Fow (vph) Ratio The Cape of the Cape of the Cape Laboration of the Cape Labora	wm after two exceeds cay um after two exceeds cay um after two evard & I EBL 400 1.98 489.2 0.0 489.2 -565 #773	cycles. pacity, qu cycles. Middle EBT 790 1.02 85.2 0.0 85.2 ~373	wBL 505 1.91 452.7 0.0 452.7 ~703	oad WBT 695 0.78 53.5 0.0 53.5 301	NBL 474 2.35 647.0 0.0 647.0 ~705 #924	1485 1.17 125.6 0.0 125.6 ~845	337 1.27 195.1 0.0 195.1 ~386 #582	1937 1.38 208.5 0.0 208.5 ~1233		Volume exceeds capac Queue shown is maxim. 9 5th percentile volume : Queues 38: Shoreline Boul Lane Group Flow (uph) wire Ratio Control Delay Queue Delay Total Delay Queue Length 50th (tr) Queue Length 50th (tr)	wanter two exceeds cap an after two exceeds cap an after two levard & EBL 400 1.36 228.9 0.0 228.9 ~246 #353	week and the second sec	was befield F solution in the control of the contr	Road WBT 695 1.00 87.3 0.0 87.3 326	NBL 474 1.71 367.1 0.0 367.1 -633 #852	1485 1.01 66.7 0.0 66.7 ~725	SBL 337 1.07 122.9 0.0 122.9 -338 #535	2030 + SBT 1937 1.24 150.3 0.1 150.5 ~1156	
tersection Summary Volume exceeds cape. Volume exceeds cape. Soft percentile volume. Ocuse shown is maxim. UEUES 3: Shoreline Boule 3: Shoreline Boule ne Group Flow (vph) Ratio rhrito Delay sues Delay tal Delay sues Length 55th (ft) serse Length 55th (ft) serse Length 55th (ft) serse Length 55th (ft)	um after two exceeds cay um after two exceeds cay um after two evard & EBL 400 1.98 489.2 0.0 489.2 -565 #773 220	cycles. pacity, quecycles. Widdle EBT 790 1.02 85.2 0.0 85.2 -373 #506 836	wBL 505 1.91 452.7 0.0 452.7 ~703 #926 230	wat 695 0.78 53.5 0.0 53.5 301 376 508	NBL 474 2.35 647.0 0.0 647.0 ~705 #924	1485 1.17 125.6 0.0 125.6 ~845 #986 796	337 1.27 195.1 0.0 195.1 ~386 #582	1937 1.38 208.5 0.0 208.5 ~1233 #1372 722		Volume exceeds capac Queue shown is maxim. 9 95h percentile volume. Queues 38: Shoreline Boul Lane Group Flow (vph) vic Ratio Control Delay Queue Length 95h (ft) Queue Length 95h (ft) Internal Link Dist (ft) Turn Bay Length (ft)	mafter two exceeds cap un after two levard & lev	middle BIT 790 1.16 132.3 0.0 132.3 -422 #555 836	was to see the see that the see	Road WBT 695 1.00 87.3 0.0 87.3 326 #465 508	NBL 474 1.71 367.1 0.0 367.1 -633 #852	1485 1.01 66.7 0.0 66.7 -725 #885 796	SBL 337 1.07 122.9 0.0 122.9 -338 #535	SBT 1937 1.24 150.3 0.1 150.5 ~1156 #1294 722	
ersection Summary Volume exceeds cape. Volume exceeds cape. Side precentile volume: Ocuse shown is maxim. Side precentile volume: Ocuse shown is maxim. Useues Side Side Side Side Side Side Side Side	wm after two exceeds cay um after two exceeds cay um after two every & EBL 400 1.98 489.2 0.0 489.2 -565 #773 220 202	cycles. pacity, que cycles. Widdle EBT 790 1.02 85.2 0.0 85.2 -373 #506 836 778	well 505 1.91 452.7 -703 #926 230 265	oad WBT 695 0.78 53.5 0.0 53.5 301 376 508	NBL 474 2.35 647.0 0.0 647.0 ~705 #924 160 202	1485 1.17 125.6 0.0 125.6 ~845 #986 796	337 1.27 195.1 0.0 195.1 ~386 #582 145 265	1937 1.38 208.5 0.0 208.5 ~1233 #1372 722		Volume exceeds capac Queue shown is maxim. 9 5th percentile volume : Queues 38: Shoreline Boul Lane Group Flow (vph) wire Ratio Control Delay Queue Length 50th (tf) Queue Length 50th (tf) Queue Length 50th (tf) Queue Length 50th (tf) Turn Bay Length (tf) Turn Bay Length (tf) Base Capacity (vph)	mafter two exceeds cap um after two exceeds cap um after two levard & EBL 400 1.36 228.9 0.0 228.9 -246 #353 220 294	middle BIT 790 1.16 132.3 0.0 132.3 -422 #555 836 682	was befield F solution in the control of the contr	Road WBT 695 1.00 87.3 0.0 87.3 326 #465 508	NBL 474 1.71 367.1 0.0 367.1 -633 #852	1485 1.01 66.7 0.0 66.7 ~725 #885	SBL 337 1.07 122.9 0.0 122.9 -338 #535 145 316	SBT 1937 1.24 150.3 0.1 150.5 ~1156 #1294 722	
ersection Summary Volume exceeds cape. Volume exceeds cape. 95th percentile volume. Queue shown is maxim. ueues 3: Shoreline Boule 1: Shoreline Boule 1: Group Flow (yph) Ratio 1: Delay	um after two exceeds cay um after two exceeds cay um after two evard &	cycles. pacity, que cycles. Widdle BBT 790 1.02 85.2 0.0 85.2 ~373 #506 836 778 0	well 505 1.91 452.7 ~703 #926 230 265 0	0ad WBT 695 0.78 53.5 0.0 53.5 301 376 508 891 0	NBL 474 2.35 647.0 0.0 647.0 ~705 #924 160 202 0	1485 1.17 125.6 0.0 125.6 ~845 #986 796 1267 0	337 1.27 195.1 0.0 195.1 ~386 #582 145 265 0	1937 1.38 208.5 0.0 208.5 -1233 #1372 722 1406 0		Volume exceeds capac Queue shown is maxim. 9 59th percentile volume. Queues 38: Shoreline Boul Lane Group Flow (vph) v/c Ratio Control Delay Queue Delay Total Delay Queue Length 59th (ft) Internal Link Dist (ft) Turn Bay Length (vph) Base Capachy (vph) Base Capachy (vph) Starvation Capath (ft)	mafter two exceeds cap un after two levard & lev	middle BIT 790 1.16 132.3 0.0 132.3 -422 #555 836 682 0	wBL 505 1.59 318.3 0.0 318.3 -336 #451 230 318	Road WBT 695 1.00 87.3 0.0 87.3 326 #465 508	NBL 474 1.71 367.1 0.0 367.1 -633 #852	1485 1.01 66.7 0.0 66.7 -725 #885 796	SBL 337 1.07 122.9 0.0 122.9 -338 #535 145 316 0	SBT 1937 1.24 150.3 0.1 150.5 ~1156 #1294 722 1556 48	
ersection Summary Volume exceeds cape. Volume exceeds cape. Soft percentile volume: Ocuse shown is maxim. Sift percentile volume: Ocuse shown is maxim. USE Sift percentile volume: Ocuse shown is maxim. Sift percentile volume. Delay table percentile volume. The percentile volum	wm after two exceeds cay um after two exceeds cay um after two evant &	cycles. pacity, qu cycles. Middle EBT 790 1.02 85.2 0.0 85.2 -373 #506 836 778 0 0	wst. 505 1.91 452.7 -70.0 452.7 -70.3 #926 230 265 0	oad WBT 695 0.78 53.5 0.0 53.5 376 508 891 0 0	NBL 474 2.35 647.0 0.0 647.0 ~705 #924 160 202 0	1485 1.17 125.6 0.0 125.6 ~845 #986 796 1267 0	337 1.27 195.1 0.0 195.1 ~386 #582 145 265 0	1937 1.38 208.5 0.0 208.5 -1233 #1372 722 1406 0		Volume exceeds capse. Volume exceeds capse. Uses shown is maxim. Uses shown is maxim. Queues 38: Shoreline Boul Lane Group Lane Group Flow (uph) viior Ratio Control Delay Total Delay Total Delay Queue Langth 50th (tt) Queue Langth 50th (tt) Queue Langth 50th (tt) Cueue Langth 50th (tt) Starvation Cap Reductn Starvation Cap Reductn Starvation Cap Reductn Spillback Cap Reductn	### after two exceeds cap um after two exceeds cap um after two levard & ### EBL 400 1.36 228.9 0.0 228.9 ~246 ### 353 220 294 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	middle EBT 790 1.16 132.3 0.0 132.3 -422 #555 836 682 0 0	wBL 505 1.59 318.3 0.0 318.3 -336 #451 230 318	Road WBT 695 1.00 87.3 0.0 87.3 326 #465 508	NBL 474 1.71 367.1 0.0 367.1 -633 #852 160 278 0	1485 1.01 66.7 0.0 66.7 -725 #885 796 1464 0	SBL 337 1.07 122.9 0.0 122.9 -338 #535 145 316 0	2030 + SBT 1937 1.24 150.3 0.1 150.5 ~1156 #1294 722 1556 48 0	
ersection Summary Volume exceeds cape. Volume exceeds cape. 95th percentile volume. Queue shown is maxim, 95th percentile volume. Queue shown is maxim, ueues 3: Shorelline Boule 1: Shorelli	wm after two exceeds cay um after two exceeds cay um after two evard & least two exceeds a least t	cycles. aacity, qu cycles. Middle EBT 790 1.02 2.0.0 85.2 -373 #506 836 0 0 0	wBL 505 1.91 452.7 0.0 452.7 -703 #926 230 265 0 0 0	be longe WBT 695 0.78 53.5 301 376 508 891 0 0	NBL 474 2.35 647.0 0.0 647.0 -705 #924 160 202 0 0 0	1485 1.17 125.6 0.0 125.6 ~845 #986 796 1267 0 0	337 1.27 195.1 0.0 195.1 ~386 #582 145 265 0 0	1937 1.38 208.5 0.0 208.5 ~1233 #1372 722 1406 0 0		Volume exceeds capac Queue shown is maxim. 9 59th percentile volume. Queues 38: Shoreline Boul Lane Group Lane Group Flow (vph) v/c Ratio Control Delay Queue Delay Total Delay Queue Length 59th (ft) Internal Link Dist (ft) Turn Bay Length (ft) Base Capacity (vph) Starvation Capath (vph) Starvation Cap Reductin Spillback Cap Reductin Storage Cap Reductin	### Annual Process of the Control of	middle BIT 790 1.16 132.3 -422 #555 836 682 0 0 0	wBL 505 1.59 318.3 -336 #451 230 318 0 0 0	WBT 695 1.00 87.3 0.0 87.3 326 #465 508 696 0 0 0	NBL 474 1.71 367.1 0.0 367.1 -633 #852 160 278 0	1485 1.01 66.7 0.0 66.7 -725 #885 796 1464 0 0	SBL 337 1.07 122.9 0.0 122.9 -338 #535 145 316 0 0	SBT 1937 1.24 150.3 0.1 150.5 ~1156 #1294 722 1556 48 0 0	
ersection Summary Volume exceeds cape. Volume exceeds cape. 95th percentile volume. Queue shown is maxim. ueues 3: Shoreline Boule 1: Shoreline Boule 1: Group Flow (yph) Ratio 1: Delay	wm after two exceeds cay um after two exceeds cay um after two evant &	cycles. pacity, qu cycles. Middle EBT 790 1.02 85.2 0.0 85.2 -373 #506 836 778 0 0	wst. 505 1.91 452.7 -70.0 452.7 -70.3 #926 230 265 0	oad WBT 695 0.78 53.5 0.0 53.5 376 508 891 0 0	NBL 474 2.35 647.0 0.0 647.0 ~705 #924 160 202 0	1485 1.17 125.6 0.0 125.6 ~845 #986 796 1267 0	337 1.27 195.1 0.0 195.1 ~386 #582 145 265 0	1937 1.38 208.5 0.0 208.5 -1233 #1372 722 1406 0		Volume exceeds capse. Volume exceeds capse. Uses shown is maxim. Uses shown is maxim. Queues 38: Shoreline Boul Lane Group Lane Group Flow (uph) viior Ratio Control Delay Total Delay Total Delay Queue Langth 50th (tt) Queue Langth 50th (tt) Queue Langth 50th (tt) Cueue Langth 50th (tt) Starvation Cap Reductn Starvation Cap Reductn Starvation Cap Reductn Spillback Cap Reductn	### after two exceeds cap um after two exceeds cap um after two levard & ### EBL 400 1.36 228.9 0.0 228.9 ~246 ### 353 220 294 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	middle EBT 790 1.16 132.3 0.0 132.3 -422 #555 836 682 0 0	wBL 505 1.59 318.3 0.0 318.3 -336 #451 230 318	Road WBT 695 1.00 87.3 0.0 87.3 326 #465 508	NBL 474 1.71 367.1 0.0 367.1 -633 #852 160 278 0	1485 1.01 66.7 0.0 66.7 -725 #885 796 1464 0	SBL 337 1.07 122.9 0.0 122.9 -338 #535 145 316 0	2030 + SBT 1937 1.24 150.3 0.1 150.5 ~1156 #1294 722 1556 48 0	

What we see is that even with mitigation, all of the 95th percentile queues overflow, and if we look at the 50th percentile queues, which are representative of average queue lengths, 3 out of 4 are theoretically infinite. Even more alarming is that in the evening, every direction of motion except one shows this infinite queue, with or without the extra left-turn lanes. In practice this means gridlock! This is why the EIR stated that the impact of the NBPP on this intersection would be "**significant and unavoidable** under Year 2030 Cumulative with Project Conditions." Council approved the EIR with a Statement of Overriding Consideration, but that does not change the traffic that will result. Under

these congested conditions, it is hard to see how an extra left-turn lane will have any significant impact. In fact, it can be argued that since Shoreline is the main thoroughfare, you should NOT increase flow onto it from side streets such as Middlefield, just as freeway onramps are metered to reduce congestion on freeways.

Project Alternatives

Staff argues that not constructing the extra turn lanes will incur additional costs due to changes in design and material orders. Since all design is presumably done on computers using CAD systems, I would think that it wouldn't take so long to make changes. Since the new poles and masts will be longer than those needed without the lane additions, can't the same equipment be used for both if they've already been ordered? As for changes to the EIR, not putting in the extra turn lanes now does not preclude them from being added later, so there's no need to revise the EIR. Most of the mitigations listed in the EIR have not been started, as they shouldn't be since the future of North Bayshore is still far from certain.

One Additional Tree on Shoreline

Staff believes that one additional redwood tree needs to be removed from N. Shoreline



Blvd. due to interference with a bike lane and sidewalk. This is a particularly large specimen, measuring 33" in diameter 54" above grade, and is taller than its companion which also needs to be removed.

Staff's diagram (Council Report Fig. 12) of the root area with the overlying sidewalk and bike lane make me think that removal of the tree can be avoided if the sidewalk is allowed to be raised so that it runs over the existing roots so that no excavation is needed. Excavation for the bike lane should have minimal effect on the tree. This tree casts a very large shadow which I'm sure that pedestrians would appreciate.

PG&E Gas Regulator Station

I would of course prefer that the PG&E Gas Regulator be relocated to San Veron Park so that the much larger trees on Middlefield Rd. can be spared. The smaller trees at San Veron Park could be transplanted to other locations nearby if they interfere with the Regulator and would still be much larger than the 24" box trees proposed.

Conclusions

Every effort should be made to try and preserve Mountain View's valuable tree canopy. When you visit other areas in the Bay Area which aren't so fortunate, you realize what a valuable resource these trees are. There is not a pressing need for the Reversible Transit Lane; an additional delay of a few months or a year is not going to make much difference. As for the North Bayshore Precise Plan, there is reasonable doubt that it will ever be fully realized. On the other hand if these large trees are cut down, I doubt I'll see their replacements grow to the same size within my lifetime.

Albert Jeans

From: Bill Deegan
To: City Council

Subject: Heritage Tree Removal on W. Middlefield medium

Date: Saturday, October 23, 2021 1:15:47 PM

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

Greetings,

Please do not remove the heritage trees along W. Middlefield Road.

Changing roadways at this point is premature.

Given the likely massive increase in permanent or partial work from home it's hard to predict future traffic patterns.

It's very unlikely they will return to pre-covid levels.

Let's wait and see what traffic stabilizes to before we cut down some of the trees which make Mountain View beautiful.

Thanks, William Deegan Mountain View Resident since 1997.

Gutierrez, Jeannette

From: , City Clerk

Subject: RE: Letter of Support: 8.1 Shoreline Blvd. Interim Bus Lane Project

From: Roni Hattrup

Sent: Monday, October 25, 2021 12:32 PM

To: Kamei, Ellen < Ellen.Kamei@mountainview.gov >; Ramirez, Lucas < Lucas.Ramirez@mountainview.gov >; Abe-Koga, Margaret <Margaret.abe-koga@mountainview.gov>; Hicks, Alison <Alison.Hicks@mountainview.gov>; Lieber, Sally <Sally.Lieber@mountainview.gov>; Matichak, Lisa <Lisa.Matichak@mountainview.gov>; Showalter, Pat

Cc: Tom Harrington Cameron, Dawn

<Dawn.Cameron@mountainview.gov>

<Pat.Showalter@mountainview.gov>

Subject: Letter of Support: 8.1 Shoreline Blvd. Interim Bus Lane Project

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

Good afternoon Mayer Kamei & Councilmembers,

I hope this email finds you well. Please find attached, a letter of support from the Mountain View TMA regarding agenda item 8.1 Shoreline Boulevard Interim Bus Lane project, for your consideration.

Best regards,

Veronica 'Roni' Hattrup, Executive Director **Mountain View Transportation Management Association** Gray-Bowen-Scott 1211 Newell Ave., Suite 200

Walnut Creek, CA 94596 Phone (925) 937-0980, ext. 212 Mobile (925) 899-4246

www.mvgo.org





Mayor Kamei Members of the Mountain View City Council (via email)

Re: Shoreline Reversible Bus Lanes Project

Dear Mayor Kamei and esteemed Councilmembers,

I am writing this letter on behalf of the Mountain View Transportation Management Association (MTMA) to demonstrate our support for the proposed Shoreline Reversible Bus Lane project.

The MTMA funded MVgo Shuttle Program, currently serves the North Bayshore area by way of three fixed routes, providing a last-mile transit connection from Caltrain and VTA Light Rail services at the Mountain View Transit Center to a high-density employment area of Mountain View. As new residential development in the North Bayshore area begins to grow, the MTMA will continue to evaluate alternative transportation solutions to meet the needs of residents, including modifications to the shuttle program to adapt services for the benefit of the residential community. As the MTMA looks to expanding its network of shuttle services, dedicated access to North Bayshore will be key to ensuring effective and efficient use of our resources.

Prior to the pandemic, travel times along Shoreline Boulevard ranged from 10-20+ minutes within less than a 3-mile distance. This segment of our shuttle routes was most impacted by traffic and often resulted in delays of service and scheduling challenges with unpredictable travel times. While traffic levels have reduced significantly as a result of pandemic driven office shutdowns and shelter in place orders, we believe it is only a matter of time before those levels of traffic resume as people return to office. We also believe timing for construction is critical, as majority of the employee workforce continue to work from home over the next few months.

The MTMA appreciates staff's consideration of the recent concerns raised by the community and are pleased to learn of staff's proposed turn lane modifications, which we hope will be considered a winwin solution for both the project and the community.

We thank you for your further consideration of this project. Should you have any questions, I can be reached via email at

Kind regards,

Tom Harrington, Chair of the Board From: <u>Javier González</u>
To: <u>City Council</u>

Cc: <u>Cameron, Dawn; Shrivastava, Aarti; McCarthy, Kimbra</u>

Subject: [Letter] 10/26/2021 City Council Meeting - Item 8.1 Shoreline Boulevard Interim Bus Lane and Utility

Improvements

Date: Monday, October 25, 2021 4:35:35 PM

Attachments: Letter Google - Shoreline Boulevard Interim Bus Lane and Utility Improvements 2021-10-26.pdf

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

Hello Mayor Kamei and Members of the City Council,

On behalf of my colleagues Brendon Harrington and Michael Tymoff, I am sending the attached letter regarding tomorrow's City Council Agenda Item 8.1 - Shoreline Boulevard Interim Bus Lane and Utility Improvements.

Please let me know if you have any question. Happy to connect anytime.

Thank you, Javier

--



Javier González

Head of Local Government Affairs and Public Policy, California & Manager II, Government Affairs and Public Policy Google Voice: +1 (650) 495-3529

javiergonzalez@google.com



SENT VIA EMAIL



Google LLC 1600 Amphitheatre Parkway Mountain View, CA 94043 650-253-0000 main Google.com

October 25, 2021

The Honorable Mayor and City Council City of Mountain View 500 Castro Street Mountain View, CA 94041

Re: 10/26/2021 City Council Meeting - Item 8.1 Shoreline Boulevard Interim Bus Lane and Utility Improvements

Dear Mayor Kamei, Vice Mayor Ramirez, and Councilmembers Abe-Koga, Hicks, Lieber, Matichak, and Showalter:

On behalf of Google, we are writing to acknowledge the City of Mountain View's continuing efforts to advance innovative transportation plans and projects across Mountain View. We acknowledge the complexity of the Shoreline Boulevard Interim Bus Lane and Utility Improvements project, and appreciate City staff's efforts to address concerns expressed by the community. We support both the staff and City Council in balancing the many tradeoffs inherent in making transportation choices in the area.

We also wanted to take this opportunity to voice our support for context-sensitive bicycle and transit improvements throughout Mountain View, and particularly along Shoreline Boulevard. The proposed dedicated, reversible bus lane and separated bikeways, along with other multi-modal transportation investments throughout North Bayshore, are critical to the City's ambitious goal of delivering transportation infrastructure that supports new housing and development in North Bayshore.

We look forward to continuing to support your efforts to improve mobility in the area.

Sincerely,

Brendon Harrington

Buel Hay

Director

Transportation

Michael Tymoff

Director, District Development

Real Estate Development

Cc: Kimbra McCarthy, City Manager

Aarti Shrivastava, Assistant City Manager/Community Development Director

Dawn Cameron. Public Works Director

From: Cameron, Dawn
To: , City Clerk

Subject: FW: Shoreline Boulevard Interim Bus Lane and Utility Improvements, Design, Project 16-58, and Phase I

Construction, Project 18-43-Various Actions

Date: Monday, October 25, 2021 7:02:39 PM

From: Serge Bonte

Sent: Monday, October 25, 2021 7:02 PM

To: Kamei, Ellen <Ellen.Kamei@mountainview.gov>; Matichak, Lisa

<Lisa.Matichak@mountainview.gov>; Lucas Ramirez <Lucas@ramirezforcouncil.com>; Hicks, Alison <Alison.Hicks@mountainview.gov>; Abe-Koga, Margaret <Margaret.abe-koga@mountainview.gov>; Lieber, Sally <Sally.Lieber@mountainview.gov>; Showalter, Pat <Pat.Showalter@mountainview.gov>

Cc: Cameron, Dawn < Dawn.Cameron@mountainview.gov>

Subject: re: Shoreline Boulevard Interim Bus Lane and Utility Improvements, Design, Project 16-58, and Phase I Construction, Project 18-43-Various Actions

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

Honorable Mayor and City Council Members:

I was originally planning to question the need to remove so many trees but after reading the staff report I am writing in full support of the staff recommendations:

- re: number of trees removed; I am glad that staff reviewed the plans and is now proposing shorter left turns and only 3-4 trees transplanted (in close proximity), If I read the report correctly, only one heritage tree would have to be cut for PG&E (which sadly comes with the territory whenever PG&E needs to work on its gas lines or its electric lines).
- proposed left turn lanes are "right sized" but maintained in the proposal. While the pandemic has greatly reduced traffic congestion, it's just a matter of time before it comes back -and maybe for more hours during the day-. Pre-pandemic I frequently commuted that way (left on Shoreline from Middlefield) and frequently witnessed queuing. Queuing doesn't only cause commute delays, it creates additional risks when vehicles rush to try to make the green light and they have to pass queued vehicles to their right (at times intruding on the bike lanes).

The alternative of not building the additional left turn capacity would be misguided:

- as mentioned above, the need existed even before North Bayshore was fully developed.
- Since that extra capacity is required as a mitigation for the North Bayshore Precise Plan EIR, dropping it now would likely result in a lengthy and costly EIR amendment.
- the whole project might be frozen during the EIR amendment process.
- At the end of the EIR amendment process, alternative mitigations might be required that could prove more costly and/or more detrimental to Mountain View trees.

In summary, with the revised plans, impact on Mountain View trees is minimal (a few youngish trees transplanted, one still removed by PG&E but that could happen regardless)

and the whole project -many years in the making- will remain on track.

Serge Bonte Mountain View From: Susan Hayes- Schwartz

To: <u>City Council</u>

Subject: please save the Redwoods at Middlefield interesection

Date: Monday, October 25, 2021 8:49:53 PM

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

From: Sean Doyle
To: City Council

Subject: Redwoods at shoreline and middle field **Date:** Tuesday, October 26, 2021 5:36:44 AM

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

I urge you to pause the plans to cut down the mature redwoods. We cannot undo that once it is done. Trees offer tremendous benefits including processing CO2 into oxygen, moderating temperatures, aesthetics, etc. Speaking to my neighbors I have no doubt the majority of citizens are against this. Please represent the will of the people.

Regards, Sean From: Greg Stoltz
To: City Council

Subject: Fw: [EXTERNAL] ACTION NEEDED: Heritage Trees at Middlefield being planned to cut down by City

Date: Tuesday, October 26, 2021 7:56:45 AM

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

Dear city council

I agree with the below. We are going crazy with this growth thing. We are building like crazy yet have tons of vacant buildings. Cutting down trees CAN wait till all plans have been approved.

Haven't seen this many people upset.

Greg Stoltz

Mountain View, Ca 94043

From: Greg Stoltz

Sent: Tuesday, September 14, 2021 1:41 PM

To: city.council@mountainview.gov < city.council@mountainview.gov >

Subject: Fw: [EXTERNAL] ACTION NEEDED: Heritage Trees at Middlefield being planned to cut down by City

Sirs

Your plans are a travesty. Please do things smarter. Save the trees and keep the valley green and NOT like LA.

Greg Stoltz

Mtn. View, Ca 94043

From: stanton-place-families@googlegroups.com <stanton-place-families@googlegroups.com> on behalf of

Vishal Mishra

Sent: Tuesday, September 14, 2021 5:12 AM

To: stanton-place-families@googlegroups.com <stanton-place-families@googlegroups.com>

Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] ACTION NEEDED: Heritage Trees at Middlefield being planned to cut down by City

Thanks for your response, Steve!

Very valid points and I agree with you. For what it's worth, the plan is not yet approved yet and that's why there is a collective push from the extended community to save many of the neighborhood (Redwood) trees for questionable traffic improvements.

Here is a recent article by Mountain View Voice that may have more updates.

I really request you all to either (or both) email and attend the virtual Zoom

meeting and share your views.

On Mon, Sep 13, 2021 at 7:43 PM 'Patterson, Stephen J. (ARC-JO)' via Stanton Place Families <<u>stanton-place-families@googlegroups.com</u>> wrote:

I thought they already voted on this last week.

Been in the works for awhile:

http://laserfiche.mountainview.gov/WebLink/ElectronicFile.aspx?dbid=0&docid=225146&

I saw another project plan from the City of MV the other day, but can't find it now. The bus lane is supposed to run up to Montecito Ave, & the left-turn onramp to 85 S will be eliminated. Supposed to be bus loading stops on the Midddlefield median, could not find any renderings of the proposal, but that is why the trees need to go (supposedly)

I think the entire plan is stupid & should get cancelled, at least until the world gets back to some semblance of normal. It is definitely not needed now, and I doubt it will ever get very many riders (just like the light rail). Probably will make traffic even worse....

If the project proceeds, they should keep the redwoods all along Middlefield, & incorporate them into the design. Looks like they also want to cut down the maple trees, which are way down the street from Shoreline & shouldn't need to go. The maples do need to be trimmed back a bit

Just my 2c

-S

From: <stanton-place-families@googlegroups.com> on behalf of Vishal Mishra

Reply-To: "stanton-place-families@googlegroups.com" <stanton-place-families@googlegroups.com> **Date:** Monday, September 13, 2021 at 6:16 PM

To: "stanton-place-families@googlegroups.com" < stanton-place-families@googlegroups.com > Subject: [EXTERNAL] ACTION NEEDED: Heritage Trees at Middlefield being planned to cut down by City

Hello neighbors

Just wanted to bring to you attention this development that would impact us especially if you like a healthier, greener neighborhood.

If you are on Facebook, there is a group for our Stierlin Estates neighborhood, and a <u>recent post</u> by our amazing and helpful neighbor - Albert Jeans In case you are not on Facebook, I have copied the details below

What is happening?

See the pictures attached. You may have noticed the yellow ribbons around trees in the Middlefield median near Shoreline, those are trees which the city staff wants to cut down so that they can build ADDITIONAL left turn lanes.

From Albert's analysis

"Under existing (i.e. pre-COVID) conditions, analysis, simulation, and observations

show that the existing turn pockets rarely overflow. Under the year 2030 conditions with North Bayshore built out, which is the reason for the extra turn lanes, this intersection and many others will be so crowded that they will be gridlocked, so extra turn lanes won't make any difference."

How can we help?

- The easier way write to the city council
 at <u>city.council@mountainview.gov</u> and let them know before tomorrow's city
 council meeting. It's not too late.
- Slightly harder but more effective way Join the meeting virtually (Zoom)
 - On Zoom https://mountainview.gov/cc_speakers
 You will be asked to enter an email address and a name. Your email address will not be disclosed to the public.
 When the Mayor announces the item on which you wish to speak, click the "raise hand" feature in Zoom. Speakers will be notified of their turn shortly before they are called on to speak.
 - 2. By phone:

Dial: (669) 900-9128 and enter Webinar ID: 967 9560 8900 When the Mayor announces the item on which you wish to speak, dial *9. Phone participants will be called on by the last two digits of their phone number. When the Mayor calls your name to provide public comment, if you are participating via phone, please press *6 to unmute yourself.

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Stanton Place Families" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to <u>stanton-place-families+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com</u>.

To view this discussion on the web visit https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/stanton-place-families/CAMmyqHEw ipmDWozDeTLULr x%2BhtLoYhikcdke444SVJ85KQYA%40mail.gmail.com.

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Stanton Place Families" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to <u>stanton-place-families+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com</u>.

To view this discussion on the web visit https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/stanton-place-families/2F0D3C5A-D310-4B7A-A931-5F5906DC2CEB%40nasa.gov.

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Stanton Place Families" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to <u>stanton-place-families+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com</u>.

To view this discussion on the web visit https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/stanton-place-families/CAMmyqHFrKJN8LibUXJxKFEnYE755fOi%3DoTzKpyrHz4MSnfkPaQ%40mail.gmail.com.