

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: Vladimir Yakunin
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2017 2:55 PM
To: Anderson, Eric - Planning
Subject: Feedback on multimodal improvement plan

Hi Eric!

Thank you for your work on improving transportation in Mountain View and for listening to the public feedback. Congratulations on the project progress!

I agree with the plan's premise that traffic congestion solutions lie not in widening roads (except for very local connectivity improvements, such as tunnels/bridges across railroad), but rather in stimulating less infrastructure-demanding modes of transportation such as bikes, public transportation and walking. This was made very clear by the plan.

I want to emphasize the importance of 2-ways approach: while we want to stimulate alternative to car modes of transportation, we also want to de-stimulate car transportation, which can include very clear signals to the drivers, especially of single occupancy vehicles, that this mode is very expensive to the society. The stick and carrot work best together.

E.g. introducing comprehensive metered parking. Right now due to existence of free city parking along the streets and parking lots, car drivers have an illusion of some free parking space, that is there for them and they can rely on it. In fact, it's translated to a very material public cost of unusable area/building levels, which unnecessarily increases both construction and lots costs. These costs are paid by all people, including pedestrians, bikers, public transportation users, which is extremely unfair and stimulates everyone to drive a car. Introducing even small fee for all public parking would change the perception. Instead of free space it would be regarded as a limited resource. Also by locally (both geography- and time-wise) adjusting the prices we could achieve the desired parking availability and decrease the unnecessary parking-seeking traffic.

Another example could be introducing walking streets. Those proved very effective in both improving the community, decreasing traffic, promoting walking and generally better environment quality all over the world. You can take Barcelona with their superblocks approach as one great and scalable example.

Also carpool lanes are not very popular, but can be very effective if used wisely and consistently. E.g. "google" exit from 85 is constantly congested, and making one of 2 lines for carpool only (maybe even 3+ people carpool) would help a lot by incentivizing Googlers to use bus network, which is now useless for Googlers from the area (why would anyone spend 10 more minutes catching bus or 5 more minutes picking up a car-pooler if driving their own comfy car does exactly the same? However, if bus spends 0 time in traffic and the car spends 15 minutes, the picture suddenly changes to the opposite. And the more people use buses, the more routes it makes sense to build and the shorter intervals can be achieved, it's a positive-feedback process which needs a bootstrap).

And the carrot part could include planning streets with pedestrians and bikers in mind. Pedestrian/bikers-first streets. For example many of the existing bike lanes are just drawn on the side of the road, and they would have the worst quality surface, no car driver would appreciate. It's much more important for a biker to not have bumps, gravel and storm grates on their way than for the drivers, but in reality only bikers hit them constantly.

Same for the pedestrians. If you try to walk along any side-street, especially with a stroller, you'll constantly dive and jump on the driveways, that are made for the comfort of car drivers, going to and from their households, but completely ignore comfort of the pedestrians. On the vast majority of sidewalks two people can't consistently walk hand-in-hand, they have to make their way around fire hydrants, light poles, road signs that appear on their way.

Sometimes there are no sidewalks at all, you either have to walk along the road or make unjustified long detour (see [this](#) as an example).

Most of the lights phases are obviously designed with cars in mind. Pedestrians have to push the button and wait minutes before they are allowed to cross the street, even when there are not many cars around. In fact light phase waiting time is comparable to the total walking time of an average pedestrian. Of course removing these obstacles could make much more people walk or ride the bike. Now in extremely pedestrian-unfriendly street most of the people would choose to drive even if it's just 10 minutes walking.

So part of a solution should be a comprehensive research of pedestrians and bikers experience on all the streets, not just a few most congested ones, and consistently removing pain points and make the experience pleasant in the long run (obviously you can't fix it all in just a few years) so walking and biking could become a new norm instead of driving.

I'm very optimistic about this, because city has a consensus on the top priorities. Densification, on the other hand, having obvious negative sides, would actually allow and force us to move to a more sustainable, healthy, cheap and pleasant transportation model.

Thank you!

Vladimir Yakunin, Software Engineer at Google

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: Vladimir Yakunin
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 11:41 AM
To: Anderson, Eric - Planning
Subject: Re: Feedback on multimodal improvement plan

Thank you Eric!

Here's a great article about bike infrastructure and safety research, please take a note:
<https://momentummag.com/cycling-safety-in-numbers/>

Practical points:

Support bike share systems with significant buildout of bike lanes networks: Ensuring that people have places to ride where they feel comfortable and safe is essential to larger equity and mobility efforts. The safety benefits of increased ridership are enhanced when growth in cycling is matched with construction of new, better bike lanes.

Design for the "Interested but Concerned:" The majority of the U.S. public is interested in biking but concerned about safety. Their willingness to ride is highly influence by the quality of bike lanes available to them. Matching convenient bike share systems with a protected bike lane network is a recipe for success.

Remember who is already riding: Half of the people who bike to work earn less than \$25,000/year. Years of highway building, car-based zoning, and exclusionary housing policies means low-income neighborhoods are often separated from job centers by highways and dangerous streets with limited-to-no space for bikes or pedestrians. As cities build for more cyclists they should ensure that the bike lane network includes safe routes for existing riders.

Long term community engagement is essential: People in all neighborhoods want safe places to walk, bike, and play. Building long-term, reciprocal relationships in neighborhoods and with locally trusted community organizations is essential to spreading information, getting feedback, and building local support for projects.

Use bike share stations as tools for safety: Bike share stations can be placed in ways that increase overall street safety. Planners should strategically place stations in ways that define and protect bike lanes and pedestrian space, narrow streets to reduce speeding, and create pedestrian refuge islands that shorten crossing distances.

Eliminate mandatory adult helmet laws which restrict and reduce cycling: Mandatory helmet laws reduce the number people riding and negatively impact overall cycling safety. In addition, such laws can be prone to abuse and are often disproportionately enforced in low-income neighborhoods and communities of color.

Counting counts: Measuring the growth in cycling is one of the best ways to tell if a city is working effectively to make cycling commonplace, easy, and safe for everyone. Cities should focus on the trend of cycling and cycling risk—is it increasing or decreasing and by how much—year over year to get a big picture view of the success of their bicycle program.

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: Jeff Treuhaft
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2017 3:17 PM
To: Anderson, Eric - Planning
Subject: Grant Road traffic

Eric,

I found you via the post that someone @ MV city made to NextDoor. I have been looking for who in the city to send this to for a long time.

I am a long time (1996) Mountain View resident and tax payer. Our home is at 2680 Yorkton Drive in the Waverly Park neighborhood between El Camino Hospital and Highway 85. All my kids have gone through Huff, Graham and MVHS schools. I've worked in Mountain View (first Netscape then VeriSign) for more than 10+ years.

Shortly after our neighborhood lost the farm at Grant/Levin new traffic signal management cameras were installed along Grant road. They suck. Previously protected left turns off Grant road (onto Levin, onto South drive, onto Covington, onto Cuesta, onto Eunice, etc. were all triggered via pavement sensors. As was the crossing between Levin and Covington. As a long time resident and local commuter we all had gotten used to the logic behind how the sensors worked and we never seemed to wait for more than a few seconds to get a green light traversing the local neighborhoods. Some mornings congestion would appear around South Drive (St Francis), Martens (Huff) and Cuesta (Graham) during their school start times but otherwise I never heard a complaint. Then the camera sensors were installed and I must say they really are poor and many neighbors in our neighborhood say the same thing. Now all the same turns are camera operated. Or should I say camera based as I can't tell you the number of times I have sat at the Grant Road/Levin light after dark when there are literally no cars coming northbound from the Los Altos end of Grant Road and yet I am forced to wait 45 seconds until some software program decides its "model" is ready to switch the light and allow me to turn. And there simply isn't another car in sight.

I don't think anything was wrong with the pavement sensors. Traffic congestion on Grant road has increased since the camera installation. And what purpose were the camera systems really meant for? What was the goal. Had local traffic on Grant road really become a huge issue? Were other residents along Grant road complaining about traffic light issues? Perhaps the city was trying to alleviate congestion caused by traffic transiting from 280 to 237/101 via Miramonte/Grant/El Monte? If so this seems to be an awful way to do that. In my experience (and now with Waze and other traffic management systems) cars transiting mountain view on their commute will follow a path of least resistance. If you hold the Grant Road lights longer it is just inviting more people to come use grant road to transit the community between 280 and 101/237. Maybe it isn't possible to switch back but the vendor who supplied the system should be held accountable for its accuracy and the programming of its switch timing and making sure local residents using the cross-community roads are not prioritized below folks from SF and north who are simply transiting MV to shorten their commute.

Thanks for listening...

Treuhaft/Wayman family

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: M zachary
Sent: Saturday, November 05, 2016 4:13 PM
To: Anderson, Eric - Planning
Subject: MV Transportation Plan

Eric,

I am a MV resident (homeowner in Waverly Park). I can't attend the meeting on Nov. 7, but wanted to share a few thoughts:

1. Better coordination on the timing of stop lights. Very frustrating to get a green and then run into a red just ahead because of poor light timing coordination. This quite obviously adds to congestion by backing up the traffic. Reconsider the timing for lights for cross-traffic which cause the main streets to get clogged. A perfect example would be the light on Grant where the shopping center for the ATT store and Ranch 99 are. That light constantly causes the traffic on Grant to back up unnecessarily, at least at many times of the day. Change the timing. There are many examples of this throughout the city, and it is my guess (only a guess) that the city really hasn't paid enough attention to this issue.
2. Consider smart timers, too, if they exist, to be installed at every (or at least key) stoplight intersections. So, where no one is actually planning to take a left turn, or if a pedestrian has already successfully crossed, lights can revert to green instead of continuing to remain red. Or if a left turn is feasible because there is no oncoming traffic for a foreseeable distance, the left turn green light can be enabled to allow left turns instead of making the left turners wait. I am not sure this technology exists, but if it doesn't, it's probably only a matter of time.
3. Run our own bus lines or uber-like service in coordination with other cities, and bypass the VTA. The VTA has monster double-sized buses which block traffic, and are almost always empty. Because of the extra weight of the double-size, they must use up a lot of fuel and create unnecessary pollution. The VTA is heavy-handed, runs very few routes that are of use to people in MV, and also does not respond to local MV needs or the needs of other north county cities. Instead of double-sized buses, why not have MV build on the community shuttle concept with smaller vehicles, which might be self-driving, and which can shuttle people around the community, either on demand, or on more or less scheduled routes which are (a) frequent; and (b) cover a large number of popular routes and destinations and that run close to residential communities to allow for convenient pick up and drop off spots. An uber-like service also might work out well. Say, for \$5, any resident could take a ride from a specific pick up point to a specific drop off point, and perhaps pick up and drop others along or near the way. If coordinated with other cities, this could vastly change the way we handle transportation. It might be privately run, either on a profit or non-profit basis. It could provide a nice income for approved drivers, while serving the community well. This is just a concept I throw out there for consideration.
4. Bikes are great, but their limited utility and speed (and the fact that they sometimes expose the user to rain, heat or sun, or make us sweat at times when we can't or don't want to be sweaty) will never allow them to supplant the automobile as the main mode of transportation. So with respect to bikes, yes, make it so they can ride safely, which much legislation and some recent roadwork have helped, but don't fund too much more

for bikes at the expense of the far greater number of people who realistically can't use them for every day needs.

5. I don't see why traffic impact fees should be imposed on only new development. Why is it fair to charge the last person to build, so to speak, but not those who also contribute to traffic impact but who were earlier in time? Perhaps any business or dwelling unit with over a certain number of employees or units should be required to pay an impact fee. Office and residential rental rates have risen dramatically over the last several years. Why shouldn't all owners contribute some of that extra rent to mitigate traffic impact?

Thank you for your consideration of my ideas.

Michael Zachary

The purposes of the plan are:

- To comply with VTA requirements to address vehicle congestion and improve air quality
- To compile adopted multimodal improvements, programs and policies (such as from the Bicycle Transportation Plan) and develop new ones with city- and region-wide effect on transportation
- To provide a basis for a transportation impact fee on new development

If you want to provide your ideas on City-wide multimodal transportation, please attend the Council Transportation Committee meeting on November 7, 2016. The agenda and staff report are available here: [LINK]

If you wish to provide input at any other time, contact Eric Anderson, in the Community Development Department, at Anderson@MountainView.gov or 650-903-6306

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: Serge Bonte
Sent: Sunday, November 08, 2015 1:33 PM
To: Siegel, Lenny; Clark, Chris; Showalter, Pat; Inks, John; Rosenberg, Ken; Kasperzak, Michael; McAlister, John
Cc: Rich, Dan; Tsuda, Randy; Anderson, Eric - Planning; Fuller, Michael; Alkire, Martin; Gunn, Renee
Subject: re: 11/10/15 Meeting Agenda Item 7.2 Multimodal Improvement Plan and Citywide Transportation Impact Fee Scope of Work.

Dear Mountain View City Council:

I use at least one of the CMP intersections every day and can attest that they are getting very congested. The congestion certainly impacts my commute time when I drive but also when I bike or walk through these intersections (as it seems to take ever longer to get a green light). Also, increased congestion makes the intersections less safe (lots of impatient drivers) and creates more health hazards (increased air pollution) when on bike or on foot or simply waiting for a bus. Also, as the CMP intersections become more congested, more intersections in Mountain View will become congested and more traffic will divert to residential streets (the streets we feel safe -so far- for our kids to bike or walk).

While it's clearly imperative to address that congestion, I agree with the Staff report that the solution is not to add lanes or widen our streets (besides at the El Camino/Miramonte intersection this would literally mean trading ice cream for cars, who would want to do that?). I also agree that we should instead look at alternatives that would ultimately decrease the amount of vehicular traffic in Mountain View.

I do disagree however with the process (or lack thereof) to measure the efficacy of these alternatives. There seems to be a big disconnect between the way we propose to measure the issues (Level of Service -LOS-) and the success of the multimodal improvement plan (very vague "system wide" benefits). The same disconnect exists with the potential Transportation Impact Fee where the nexus study would be based on LOS and costs of "traditional" congestion management (add lanes...) while the fee would be used for alternate solutions (with different costs and different success criteria).

While I do not believe that LOS should be the sole criteria to assess an intersection (safety, walkability, livability... are just as important and not just at peak hours), it is nevertheless the only criteria used to identify and quantify the issues that are the basis for the nexus study and the Multimodal Improvement Plan. Consequently, I feel that the success of the Multimodal Improvement Plan should be measured against LOS. Intuitively, "system wide" improvements should result in less congestion. For example, looking at the El Camino/Shoreline/Miramonte intersection, a lot of that traffic goes from South of El Camino to Downtown or North Bayshore (and back). If we made it safer for commuters to bike or walk across El Camino or if we made it possible for the Mountain View TMA to pick up commuters in Los Altos, chances are the LOS could go down and that measurement would be consistent with the nexus study.

I also wanted to make a quick comment on the list of intersections to be studied. The staff report recommends adding some non-CMP intersections and list three examples. However, the scope of work document does not list them so it's unclear which intersections will be studied. In case they are not in the list, I would like to recommend adding the following intersections:

- El Monte/Springer

- Cuesta/Miramonte
- Cuesta/Springer
- Escuela/El Camino (unless it is already lumped into the El Monte/El Camino intersection)

Respectfully

Serge Bonte

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: Terri Goldberg
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2017 1:20 PM
To: Anderson, Eric - Planning
Subject: Suggestion

This link was posted on "Nextdoor Cuesta Park Neighborhood ". Here's my suggestion regarding traffic management and the good thing is that the City will end up with more money in its coffers. Post a traffic cop at the intersection of Grant & El Camino to cite red-light runners. There are likely a few other intersections that could be used as well. 50 citations a day X 365 would be a big boost for Mtn View, and might even save some road rage or fender benders.

Sent from my iPad

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: Daniel A Schaeffer
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2017 1:39 PM
To: Anderson, Eric - Planning
Subject: suggestions for mountain view traffic

More traffic circles!!!

Put in a huge park 'n ride (multi story) in the vicinity of 85 and 101

Also, I'd love to prototype an idea for a set of 'pacing lights' on freeway onramps to get people to slow down when they're attempting to merge onto freeways. people who are going 45 on an on-ramp trying to merge with prevailing traffic going 25 are only creating cascades of brake lights which bring everything to a dead stop.

regards,
Dan Schaeffer

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: Nadine OLeary
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2017 5:09 PM
To: Anderson, Eric - Planning
Subject: Traffic Improvement Idea

My idea to help traffic move smoother is:

Allow left turn at all times when safe. There is a signal on Castro Street at, I think, Villa that is a three-way allowing cars to turn left. It then turns to green, and if safe, cars going left can continue to do so. At intersections where it is deemed to not be safe, then a regular left turn signal would indicate that with its red arrow.

The reason I suggest this is that many times one sits in the left turn lane and there is no traffic coming in the other direction.

Nadine O'Leary
Thompson Square
Mountain View

