

**Subject:** Insufficient Time to Review 'Final' Complete Streets Master Plan b4 CSC Vote TODAY - 9/29/21

**Importance:** High

Dear Los Altos City Council, City Manager, Engineering Services Department, Transportation Services Department, Complete Streets Commission Liaison, and Complete Streets Commission,

Below please find an email that was shared with some, NOT ALL, of the Highlands Neighborhood Community late last night, nearly 10 p.m., on 9/28/21. It alerts residents to the fact that today, 9/29/21, the Complete Streets Commission (CSC) plans to vote to adopt the Complete Streets Master Plan & send it on to our City Council for approval thereafter. **This vote is scheduled today even though many of the neighborhoods across Los Altos who are significantly impacted by the proposed changes were not aware that a 229-page 'public draft' of the CSC's final revision was posted for review, or that the CSC plans to vote to adopt the revision TODAY!**

As an 18-year member of the Highlands Community who has attended all of the LA City reviews of the changes proposed to St. Joseph Ave. for our neighborhood, I can attest to the fact that the vast majority of our residents are NOT aware either that: 1) the 229 page public draft of the CSC Master Plan is posted and available for review, or 2) that the CSC would be voting to adopt the plan, presumably mostly as is, today.

Our community appreciates and applauds the approach of the CSC, as well as Los Altos City's Transportation and Engineering Services Departments, to hold public reviews of the changes proposed for each impacted neighborhood. We've had strong community participation throughout each review cycle.

The last virtual meeting of the changes planned for St. Joseph Ave. occurred on 8/12/21. Over 55 residents attended & there was a wealth of feedback and questions. At that meeting, our LA City hosts stated that the latest plan for the changes to St. Joseph was not yet available but would subsequently be posted for review. In checking with residents and neighbors, no one knew the updates had been completed, or that the *final* CSC Master Plan was also posted. **Hence, we respectfully request that today's CSC vote be deferred until such time that LA City can provide formal notice to impacted residents and**

**communities that a final rev of the CSC Master Plan is posted and available for review. Only after formal notice is provided and the impacted communities have had at least 30 days to review, provide feedback, and get remaining questions answered, should the CSC schedule a vote to adopt the plan.**

Please note, the LA City website does not provide email addresses for any Complete Streets Commission members. The website identifies Transportation Services Manager and Complete Streets Commission Liaison, Marisa Lee, as the conduit for communicating with the Complete Streets Commission team. Mr. Weinberg is identified as the City Council's liaison to the CSC. Both Ms. Lee and Councilmember Weinberg are copied on this email. **We would appreciate if one of them would ensure this request is routed to the CSC Chair and team before tonight's meeting which starts @ 5:30 p.m.**

LA City has done such a good job of proactively alerting impacted neighborhoods to the proposed changes and hosting virtual workshops for review and feedback, it would be unfathomable to compromise that effort by NOT giving residents sufficient time to weigh in on the *final version* of the plan that resulted.

Respectfully,

Elizabeth Montgomery  
Concerned Highlands Community Resident

Hi all--

This is sudden and unexpected. **There is a CSC meeting tomorrow (Wednesday) at 5:30 online. Agenda item #4 includes the ADOPTION of the Complete Streets Master Plan! After that, they will send it on to the council for approval.**

• **Link to the CSC meeting agenda for September 29, 2021:**

[https://www.losaltosca.gov/sites/default/files/fileattachments/complete\\_streets\\_commission/meeting/53461/csc\\_agenda\\_092921\\_r1.pdf](https://www.losaltosca.gov/sites/default/files/fileattachments/complete_streets_commission/meeting/53461/csc_agenda_092921_r1.pdf)

• **This is the public draft of the 229 page Complete Streets Master Plan:**

<https://losaltoscompletestreets.com/bicycle-and-pedestrian-plan/>

• **If you have questions or concerns or comment, you should contact the following people:**

**Marissa Lee, Transportation Manager** (the position formerly held by Aruna): [mlee@losaltosca.gov](mailto:mlee@losaltosca.gov)  
Phone: (650) 947-2626

**Jaime Rodriguez**, Transportation Consultant for the plan: [jrodriguez@losaltosca.gov](mailto:jrodriguez@losaltosca.gov)

**Jim Sandoval**, Engineering Services Manager (the position formerly held by Susana Chan): [jsandoval@losaltosca.gov](mailto:jsandoval@losaltosca.gov)

• **I strongly recommend that you include Jim Sandoval on any email--at least with a cc.** He seems like an ethical person who is conscientious and has empathy. I do not think he is a person who would be dismissive of resident's concerns. Also, he is the one who ultimately is in charge of transportation issues. I will try to obtain his phone number.

Some people feel it is a good idea to include (cc) some or all council members on these types of emails.

• **If you want to make written comments to the CSC, it is suggested on the agenda that you send your written comment to:** [Transportation@losaltosca.gov](mailto:Transportation@losaltosca.gov) (In this case, I recommend that you also cc Jim Sandoval.

**The "public" plan has only been available to the public on the complete streets website for about one month. I feel that one month is not enough time for people to review the plan, ask question of staff, get clarification and answers from staff, and to make written comments on the plan.** In fact, one of our neighbors still is waiting to get clarification that she requested from staff in July (in an email to Jaime and Marissa Lee). In other words, it may take time for staff to get back to you with clarifications. I believe that in the past, people have been given more than a month to comment on a final plan before it is adopted.

**In the plan, the consultant company who prepared the plan (Alta) made a big deal about how much time they spent doing outreach through online community meetings. They probably are using this as a reason to justify fast tracking the final, "public" version, and only allowing one month for people to review, ask question, and make comments. I attended most of those meetings, and they were not a substitute for actual, in person, community open houses, where you can ask questions and have a dialogue with staff or other residents. Also, usually there were up to four or more projects covered in an hour long meeting, (1.5 hours on one occasion). Typically, the consultants would rip through the descriptions of the projects at breakneck speed, using lots of technical jargon that most people did not understand. Often, the multiple projects were located in various parts of town.**

Some of you who attended one or more of these community outreach meetings can attest to what I am saying. In particular, the discussion about Loyola Corners on February 4th was a confusing mess! Even the line drawings for Loyola Corners still seem confusing (see line drawings which start on p. 196). Also, there are elements on the line drawing that are different than what was discussed with the public in the most recent community meeting when Loyola Corners was discussed on May 19th. For example, the line drawing shows that the bike lane on Fremont (in front of the business district) will be at the curb--with parking on the outside of the bike lane. At the May 19th meeting, it was stated that the the parking would be curbside, with the bike lanes to the left (outside of) the parking area.

Due to the relatively short amount of time to make oral comments at an outreach meeting on January 27th, attendees were encouraged to put our comments in writing in the comments section. One of the projects that was presented was for the Berry/Miramonte intersection. Two options were presented. One option included a raised crosswalk. The other option was for an all way stop, which was an entirely new concept being presented for the first time. Jon and I put our opinions in the written comments section, (as encouraged to do). However, subsequently, the consultant appeared to have not read those written comments when he reported back to the CSC meeting that immediately followed the community meeting. He appeared only to focus on the oral comments. He stated to the CSC that there was community support for all-way stop signs, which was based on about three oral comments (as I recall), made during the community meeting, even though there were written comments that were not supportive of the all-way stop, but were supportive of the original plan to have a raised crosswalk. The next month, the raised crosswalk option disappeared from the list of "spot"

projects, and only an all-way stop was listed at Berry. The decision appeared to have been made quickly in a month or less, unilaterally by the consultant to have an all-way stop, even though we had been told repeatedly over a nine year period that there would be a raised speed table at that intersection--either a raised intersection or a raised crosswalk. Furthermore, at a council meeting on November 13, 2018, when the Miramonte Path Project was discussed, the council directions to the staff included that hat there should be a raised crosswalk at the Berry intersection. (I included a transcript of the council directives in my last email.) Subsequently, at a Zone 4 community meeting, the consultant revealed that the all way stop option was the simplest I recall mentioning to several of you in an email I wrote about that January meeting that the city probably likes the all way stop because it is the cheapest and easiest. **Jon and I feel there are drawbacks to the all way stop at the Berry intersection, including increased vehicle emissions, reduced air quality, increased noise and possible increases in traffic congestion and back-ups, especially since there would be two all way stop controlled intersections within 0.12 miles of each other (about 1/8th of a mile), which is very unusual and typically not recommended in the traffic literature.**

**Also, there are elements in this final draft/public plan that have never been discussed with residents at all at an outreach meeting, or are different than what was stated at a public meeting, to my knowledge.** For example, at a CSC meeting last Summer on August 20, 2020, there was a discussion regarding what improvements would be made on the entire length of Covington. As I recall, the public was told there would be class 2 lanes most of the length, but that there would be sharrows on the section of Covington between Springer and Miramonte. The reason for this is that the city staff (including Jim Sandoval) had determined that there would be almost a total loss of street parking on Covington if there were formal bike lanes. **According to the bicycle network map in this final, public version of the CSMP, now they are showing that there will be formal, Class 2 buffered bike lanes (Class 11B)--which will be wider--on the entire length of Covington, including the section between Miramonte and Grant--which already has class 2 lanes (but not buffered). The question is, are they planning to replace sharrows with Class 2B lanes on Covington between Springer and Miramonte? Are they planning to replace the Class 2 lanes on Covington between Miramonte and Grant Road with class 11B lanes which are wider?. The existing Class 2 lanes appear to be working well. Why do they need to add buffers?**

**In addition, there is a plan for a Los Altos Loop for bicycles. This is described on p. 159. To my recollection, this concept was not presented to the public previously in any public meeting, at least not at any meetings I attended--which is all but one of the CSC meetings, most of the community meetings, and all but one CSC study session (which was awhile ago).** At the August 10th CSC meeting, the consultant for Alta (Jeff Knowles) seemed to be casually suggesting a concept or idea for the first time, for the city to have bicycle loops going throughout the city, and including loops that would connect to downtown Mountain View. He quickly threw out some examples, which included connecting Loyola Corners with downtown Mountain View. He did not give any specific detail and it was not discussed at length by either the consultant or the CSC members. As I recall, only one CSC member made a comment, (Stacey Banerjee), and she appeared to like the idea. **To my knowledge, this concept was not on any agenda and it was not discussed again at the next CSC meeting on August 25th. However, two weeks after being mentioned at a CSC meeting on August 10th, this concept showed up in the Master Plan.**

**Miramonte is shown as part of the Los Altos Loop, from Berry to Fremont. In the master plan, on page 159, it was mentioned that the city might want to put "separated bikeways" on high traffic streets that are in the loop. "Separated bikeways" appears to be in reference to Class 1V, protected bike lanes, which typically are created by using vertical elements, usually bollards, (flexible poles that stick up out of the ground).** The master plan even shows several streets on the network map as being slated to have Class 1V bike lanes, including on El Camino Real. It is mentioned in the loop plan that they might need to put protected lanes on parts of Los Altos Avenue, as I recall, for the purposes of the loop. I would need to go back and confirm this. Miramonte may be vulnerable, since it probably is considered to be "high traffic." **I should mention that Class IV paths appear to be controversial, and many people, including experienced cyclists,**

**feel they are more dangerous, rather than safer. I've never seen or heard of this type of path being installed on a two-lane, residential street.**

If you want to see an example of one type of Class IV path--there is one on Castro Street in front of Graham Middle School. Also, there was an example of bollards the city had been proposing to put in front of five houses on Almond Ave. near the high school to create a 2-way cycle track. The residents at the online meeting were outraged, and the city/CSC ditched the idea of the bollards. I will look for the picture that was included in the presentation, showing lime green bollards.

**This loop idea might explain why Jaime Rodriquez wrote in an email response to one of our neighbors that they were planning to put Class IV bike lanes on parts of Miramonte--specifically above Portland and below Eastwood, or that they might do "grade separation" (i.e., raised areas).** This was mentioned in a response to an email sent by one of our neighbors to ask about the fact that a Class 1 multi-use path was specified on a list of recommended projects. This neighbor asked for further clarification, but has not heard back yet. The public draft still is showing Class 11B lanes as being recommended for parts of Miramonte, above Portland and below Eastwood, as I noted in a previous email. As I mentioned in the previous email, this could result in a loss of parking in some places. At this point, it is not clear if the city still is considering putting a protected class 4 lane, grade separation or Class 11B (buffered) lanes on Miramonte. Any of these options will result in loss of some or most on-street parking. The bollards would be the worst option, since residents might have difficulty getting mail or garbage pick-up; it will make our street look even more industrial (along with the Water District's vinyl fence and the heavy trucks that appeared in 2016); and it would interfere with cars being able to pull over to let an emergency vehicle pass on a narrow, two lane road.

**These options suggested by Jaime Rodriquez, i.e., Class 11B lanes, (which are wider than Class 11 lanes), Class IV lanes, and grade separation are exactly the types of elements that residents were advocating against back in late 2017 and throughout 2018.** These types of elements most likely would result in significant loss of parking (or worse). In 2017 and 2018, many of us spent a year or more of our lives--or in some cases 6 months of their lives--trying to have our voices heard and to have a say in what was going to be built on our street. This included obtaining more than 100 signatures on a petition. Some of you were very involved in obtaining these signatures during the Summer and Fall of 2018, especially Henry, Becky, Margaret, Michele and Ronn--who printed up the petition and gathered many signatures earlier on--and kept track of all the petitions and printed them up and handed them in to the city, as well as other residents who collected signatures. Some residents got involved very early on--in the Fall and Winter of 2017, including Trina, Viviana, Jon and myself, Linda & Dave, to name just a few, in addition to dozens of other neighbors who attended countless meetings, wrote letters, spoke at council and BPAC/CSC meetings, attended 5 or 6 neighborhood meetings, attended numerous council open office hours, attended meetings with the VTA representative for our district, and so on. In the case of the Berry intersection crosswalk, the involvement of some residents goes back even further to early 2017, when several of us attended a BPAC meeting in January 2017, to give comments about a proposed public works project at the Berry/Miramonte intersection. The people involved in that meeting included Mina and Pushkar, Linda and Dave, Jon and I, and others. Some of us also wrote letters to staff. Mina was heavily involved in advocating for safety at the Berry intersection for a few years--which resulted in an actual public works plan and project for a raised crosswalk and geometric changes to the South West curb, (with its own TS# and funding in the CIP)--which was never implemented! Viviana and Trina were heavily involved at every stage for the entire time, including writing letters that were then sent out to residents. Trina was the one who found out about the VERBS grant, which locked the city into features that had never been discussed with residents, such as raised sidewalks made out of decomposed granite, with vertical curbs and gutters--which would have wiped out parking in many areas--among other safety drawbacks--such as increased difficulty and danger getting in and out of our driveways. There were so many other residents who attended the neighborhood meetings. Michele and Trina hosted meetings at their houses. **It is as if all the efforts of dozens of people, over a period of up to more than a year or two (in some cases) in 2017 and 2018, did not matter at all--like it never happened.** A petition with more than 100 signatures, which I

think included every household on Miramonte, as well as some other residents on adjacent streets such as Loma Prieta, Stanley and other streets in the Loyola Corners neighborhood--apparently also does not matter--like it never happened! This seems like a betrayal and a violation of trust. Some of us are finding this to be very frustrating. **I wonder if city staff (including staff consultants) are allowed to just ignore directives from a majority vote of the city council--even if it was from a council that included people who no longer hold office?** It seems very disrespectful of a large number of residents who worked so hard to have a voice.

In a previous email I sent on June 30th, I included the following information, which I have cut and pasted to refresh your memory:

**In the minutes of the council meeting on November 13, 2018, the following was recorded in regard to the Miramonte Path Project:**

*"the Council directed staff to discontinue the current design and construction of the Miramonte Path Project, and work with the neighborhood to redesign the project with an emphasis on traffic calming elements and bicycle and pedestrian safe facilities with improved bike lanes; informal walking paths, a raised crosswalk at Berry Avenue, and more parking in front of homes, by the following vote...."*

One of our neighbors included this information in her email to Marissa and Jaime in July, so we can assume that they are aware of this. I do not believe that Jim Sandoval was aware of council's directives. I'm speculating, but suspect that the former city manager did not inform him about this. Unless Jaime and Marissa brought it to his attention, he still may not be aware.

**I have some good news.** In response to her first email sent by our neighbor to Jaime and Marisa, Jaime clarified that the city will be keeping the multi-use path that is located on the East side, between Portland and Eastwood, in its current configuration. He explained that they listed it in the plan as a Class 1 path in order to secure funding for maintenance. I'm not sure why they had to list it this way for the city to provide funding and maintenance--it seems unusual--and leaving it in the plan as a Class 1 path might lead to misunderstanding in the future. However, I am glad they are not planning to destroy the existing path--including all of the trees.

Jon and I have spent several hours this weekend and yesterday, separately, plowing through this plan. Also, I took some notes as I was reading--four pages so far. I feel like I have just scratched the surface--and need to spend more time and take more notes. I will try to summarize for you in a future email--but I may not be able to do this before the CSC meeting. I am going to try to write an email to city staff and CSC requesting they give the public more time to respond to the public plan before they adopt it--if I can get it done in time, (since I have some other fires to put out).

I apologize for the length of this email, I put the most important parts in bold--for a quicker read. I know most of you had not been able to attend all the CSC and community meetings, and you may not have seen the latest "Public" CS Master Plan, and wanted you to have an update.

Best regards,  
Jane  
1240 Miramonte Avenue

E. Jane Osborn, Ph.D. Nationally Certified School Psychologist, NCSP 24709. Licensed Educational Psychologist, LEP 1610. Cognitive and Developmental Psychology. Cell: 650-346-6390. Land Line: 650-967-5167 (Preferred Option)



Complete Streets Commission Agenda and Staff Reports are uploaded for 9/29/21 meeting.

## [Complete Streets Commission - Online Meeting](#)

### **Calendar Date:**

Wednesday, September 29, 2021 - 5:30pm

This meeting will be conducted through Ring Central's online conference call. There will be no meeting location.

Please join the conference call with one of the following options:

Join via personal computer: Click or insert the following link to an internet browser [\[https://meetings.ringcentral.com/j/7531502130\]](https://meetings.ringcentral.com/j/7531502130) Please download and run the desktop application if you wish to speak during the meeting.

Call in with phone +1(623)-404-9000 and enter meeting ID: (753 150 2130) Please note, participants who joins via phone call-in will not be able to speak during the meeting.

## **Meeting Information**

### **Agenda:**

[CSC Agenda 09-29-21](#) (163 KB)

## **Supporting Documents**

[Item 2 - Staff Report - 349 1st St PPR21-0004](#) (192 KB)

[Item 2 - Attachment A - 349 1st St Architectural](#) (13 MB)

[Item 2 - Attachment B - 349 1st St Survey](#) (912 KB)

[Item 2 - Attachment C - 349 1st St Preliminary Application](#) (1 MB)

[Item 2 - Attachment D - VMT Policy Framework and FAQ Memo 081821](#) (11 MB)

[Item 3 - Staff Report - 374 Second Street](#) (242 KB)

[Item 3 - Attachment A Trip Generation 2008](#) (3 MB)

[Item 3 - Attachment B Packard Letter ATMP Activities](#) (214 KB)

[Item 3 - Attachment C D20-0008 Drawing Set Updated](#) (22 MB)

[Item 4 - Staff Report - CSMP Adoption](#) (1 MB)

[Unsubscribe](#)

**Subject:** 'Final' Complete Streets Master Plan b4 CSC Vote TODAY - 9/29/21 - PLEASE DELAY!!

To our Los Altos City Government and Street Planning Participants:

Over the past 38 years as a resident of the Highlands area of Los Altos, I have taken a keen interest in issues that are of concern to our neighborhood. Most recently, that interest has been directed to the proposed changes to St. Joseph Avenue via the Complete Streets Commission (CSC). I am grateful for the opportunities that the city has provided to the residents of our neighborhood to participate in the virtual meetings covering this topic and I have taken advantage to participate in all of them to learn more about the proposed changes and, along with 50+ of my neighbors, to express concerns and suggestions. Up until now, I would say the city has been doing a fine job of communicating with the various neighborhoods that will be impacted by the CSC in the 2021-2022 timeframe.

It appears that the communication system that has worked so well has hit a major bump in the road. It was only in the past few hours that I and most of my fellow neighbors in the Highlands area learned that the 'Final' draft of the Complete Streets Master Plan (CSMP) has been posted online and the CSC plans to vote at its meeting today (29 Sep 2021) with the intent to approve the CMSP and subsequently forward it to the City Council with the recommendation that the Plan be



adopted. All of this appears to be happening rapidly without notifying the impacted residents and providing them with the time for review and comment on the Plan. **This is no way for government to act.**

I have taken a quick look at the proposed CSMP and find discrepancies between the plan and what we have been told at the virtual meetings. This concerns me and suggests that a closer look at the plan and comments, questions, and recommendations would be expressed by the residents if we were given the time to properly review the Plan.

I ask that the vote of the CSC on the CSMP tonight be delayed until the citizens of Los Altos are given formal notice about the online publication (just as we have received formal notice about the meetings concerning the proposed changes to St Joseph Avenue) and then provided with a 30 day period to review and provide input to the CSC.

Marlene Zimmerman