

**From:** Maggie So <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Monday, May 4, 2026 6:08 PM

**Subject:** CTC Agenda Item 5.2 (May 5)

Dear City Council,

My name is Maggie So, and I am a resident of [REDACTED] in Mountain View. I am writing to express my strong support for the City's Active Transportation Plan (ATP) and to offer specific recommendations that I believe will meaningfully improve safety and accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists throughout our community. I am encouraged by the recent bicycle and pedestrian improvements on California Street and urge the City to continue and expand this important work.

### **1. Proactive Enforcement of Bike Lane Parking Restrictions**

Illegal parking in bike lanes and in white-striped buffer areas remains a serious and ongoing hazard on California Street. I urge the City to take a proactive rather than reactive approach to safety enforcement:

- Implement proactive police monitoring and ticketing of vehicles parked illegally in bike lanes or in white-striped buffer areas that block sightlines. We should not wait for a serious accident or fatality before taking action—enforcement must be a preventive measure.
- Install planters or plant trees in all white-striped buffer zones to physically prevent vehicles from parking there. Physical infrastructure is the most reliable long-term solution to deter illegal parking and protect cyclists, but the plastic bollards are already getting worn down and damaged, or in some cases have been destroyed by cars completely. Metal planters or trees will provide the safest long-term solution, and won't require constant maintenance/replacement like the plastic bollards.
- Strictly enforce parking restrictions on all protected bike lanes to ensure these facilities function as intended.

### **2. Enhanced Pedestrian Safety at Intersections**

I strongly support the adoption and expansion of Leading Pedestrian Intervals (LPis) at intersections across Mountain View. Giving pedestrians a head start before vehicles receive a green signal reduces conflicts and reinforces that pedestrians have priority at crosswalks. I recommend that:

- The City evaluate and implement Leading Pedestrian Intervals at intersections identified as priorities by staff, in order to improve safety and signal that pedestrians come first.
- The ATP update the “Leading Pedestrian and Bicycle Interval Policy” to explicitly clarify, through clear signage and signal design, that cyclists are legally permitted to proceed when pedestrian signals begin. New signal installations should make this unambiguous to both cyclists and drivers, like Palo Alto does.

### **3. Adopt NACTO Design Standards**

I urge Mountain View to formally adopt the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) Urban Street Design Guide as the standard for street design in the ATP. Specifically:

- Require narrower travel lane widths—such as NACTO’s recommended 10-foot lane standard—which reduce vehicle speeds, improve safety for all road users, and free up space for protected bike lanes and wider sidewalks.

### **4. Accessible Infrastructure: Flush Curb Cuts**

Current curb cuts with up to 2-inch lips create dangerous tripping hazards for pedestrians and present significant barriers for wheelchair users, cyclists, and those with mobility devices. The ATP should adopt a clear standard requiring all curb cuts to be fully flush with the street surface. This is a basic accessibility and safety requirement that should not be treated as optional. It’s very easy to crash a road bike with thin tires hitting those curb cuts at an angle.

### **5. Planning for Rideshare and Delivery Loading Zones**

Rideshare and delivery vehicles stopping in bike lanes and travel lanes are an increasingly common and dangerous problem. I encourage the ATP to develop a proactive plan for designated loading zones for rideshare and delivery vehicles as part of all new development

projects. Addressing this now—before the problem becomes entrenched—will prevent future conflicts between vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians.

Thank you for your dedication to improving active transportation in Mountain View. I am proud to live [REDACTED] has already seen meaningful improvements, and I am hopeful that the ATP will build on that progress citywide. I respectfully ask that ATPAC and City staff consider these recommendations as you finalize the plan. Overall, I'm very happy with the improvements to bike and pedestrian safety in California, and I hope they stay! Thank you for all your hard work making Mountain View safer.

Sincerely,

**Maggie So**

California Street Resident, Mountain View

**From:** James Kuszmaul <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Monday, May 4, 2026 10:27 PM

**To:** , Public Works <[public.works@mountainview.gov](mailto:public.works@mountainview.gov)>

**Cc:** Hicks, Alison <[alison.hicks@mountainview.gov](mailto:alison.hicks@mountainview.gov)>; McAlister, John

<[john.mcalister@mountainview.gov](mailto:john.mcalister@mountainview.gov)>; Kamei, Ellen <[Ellen.Kamei@mountainview.gov](mailto:Ellen.Kamei@mountainview.gov)>

**Subject:** Public comment on CTC Item 5.2: Middlefield Complete Streets

Chair Hicks and members of the CTC,

I am writing in my individual capacity to provide some comments on the Middlefield Complete Streets Project. I wanted to first express my appreciation to staff, current and past, for getting this project out there—this is not a project that the city would have done a decade ago, and wrangling the various grant applications to get these sorts of projects funded is not trivial. With that, I do want to provide some additional comments on this project, in part to highlight some of the discussion that came out of the BPAC meeting. As a reminder, this corridor is one that shows up prominently on the list of the city's most dangerous streets.

Firstly, I wanted to encourage a couple of modest alterations and considerations to this project:

- Make all of the bike lanes along Middlefield 24/7 starting as soon as reasonable, including sections of Middlefield not covered by this construction project. Ever since I was a middle school student walking and biking to Crittenden, the bike lanes have only been part time, meaning that kids getting to weekend events at the school fields are forced into traffic and creating a confusing situation where some drivers feel entitled to park in the bike lanes even during school hours.
- Take a closer look at what would be needed to make strong protected intersections where bicycles don't have to mix with right-turning cars near intersections. From the discussion at BPAC, it sounds like there are some geometric challenges with accommodating buses and shuttles at these right turns, but it also sounded like these problems may not be intractable—particularly if we adopt no-right-turn-on-red at these intersections.
- Following on with that, adopting no-right-turn-on-red. This is a standard practice for safety improvements, and some of these intersections do show up on the lists of the city's most dangerous intersections. This is also a strategy that is being proposed as part of the city's draft Active Transportation Plan, and we may as well get a start on that now.

- Reduce more of the travel lanes to 10'. Narrower lanes encourage drivers to drive at slower speeds, and while there is some utility to having the right-most lane slightly wider for buses & trucks, there is no need for the left lanes to be wider. And even an extra foot or two can help make the bike lanes more comfortable.
- Make sure to take measures to discourage parking and loading/unloading in the bike lane.

My second set of comments are on the proposed road diet (reducing the number of car through-lanes in each direction to one). The question of whether this would be a road diet has been on the table for well over a year, since the Moffett Complete Streets project, which is also an OBAG-funded project, came before BPAC without any consideration of a road diet (the question of a road diet actually came up very briefly when BPAC reviewed the complete streets checklist at the June 29, 2022 BPAC meeting). While I greatly appreciate that a road diet was at least evaluated in this case, it is frustrating to have it presented without serious discussion of the benefits of a road diet, at too late of a stage to readily follow through on changing the design for a road diet, and to have the analysis of said road diet rely on extremely speculative assumptions about future travel demand with poorly-documented assumptions and inputs.

Regarding the potential benefits of a road diet, there are a variety of things to be aware of:

- Road diets exist in a variety of forms, but in general they reduce traffic speeds, [significantly reducing collision rates and severity](#). This includes making streets safer for drivers—not just pedestrians and cyclists.
- Reduced roadway width reduces crossing times for pedestrians (and indirectly reduces traffic signal delay times due to pedestrian crossings).
- Creates more space for wider bike lanes. This creates more space to get around obstructions (e.g., fallen branches), ride side-by-side, pass other cyclists, or even for things like [emergency vehicle access so that emergency vehicles can bypass traffic](#).
- More space for additional street trees.
- Creating additional space for loading zones and short-term parking that do not conflict with the bike lanes.
- With additional space, it is possible to build “bus islands” that make it so that buses no longer have to stop blocking the bike lane, and so that buses no longer receive the time-penalty of having to merge in & out of traffic to stop.

- Having additional space to work with in the right-of-way should make protected intersections easier to build.
- For the CA-85 overpass, having the additional ~10' of right-of-way on each side of the street will help significantly with closing the sidewalk gap (note that this would be helped by just removing one lane and one side as well).
- Reduced paved area reduces repaving costs & urban heat island effects.

Regarding the traffic analysis done for the road diet, it is worth noting that this is “just” a repaving project—in fact, most of the cost of the project is in simply doing a repaving of the road, not in actually adding the bike facilities themselves. This also means that we will have additional opportunities to revisit this project when we next need to repave. As such, it is a bit silly to be using the 2050 General Plan (the “cumulative conditions”) as the baseline for most of our traffic analysis. It is also likely dubious to be relying even on the “baseline conditions” given that only some of the projects that are currently in things like the North Bayshore Precise Plan will even be completed on that time frame. It is also worth noting that the modelling assumptions in the staff report:

- Do not consider any mode-shift induced by a road diet—if it is easier to walk and bike, fewer people will be driving.
- Do not consider “demand destruction” or time-shifting—if there are congestion issues, people will tend to shift when they drive to less-congested times.
- Do not consider a potential road diet along Moffett in the proposed precise plan area, even though initial public outreach has indicated support for doing so. This road diet would likely help with traffic congestion at the Moffett/Middlefield intersection.

If we just look at the modelling of a road diet based on the existing conditions, it appears that there are basically no issues, which matches with [typical guidance](#)—Middlefield generally has around 13,000 average daily trips, whereas most sources say to consider a road diet when anywhere under 20,000 daily trips. There is a suggestion that we may need to increase the length of the left-turn lane from southbound Moffett onto Middlefield by 25 feet under existing conditions, but given that most traffic modelling is extremely uncertain at the best of times, we could likely wait and see how traffic patterns settle before committing to such a change. Similarly, if future growth did necessitate extending any left turn lanes, we could likely do so when we next are repaving or otherwise adjusting the roadway, rather than doing so now. Especially when the city’s long-term goals include **reduced** vehicle traffic (and increased people traffic), not more vehicle traffic.

Finally, staff have expressed that revisiting the design to implement a road diet would be infeasible given the OBAG grant timing restrictions. It is not clear to me how risky such a change would be at this stage, but I do urge at least the consideration of it and to definitely plan to bring such decisions before BPAC and Council early in the process in the future, in order to give time to actually provide more meaningful input.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment,

James Kuszmaul