

Miramonte Avenue Path, Project TS-01033

| No. | Comments / Questions | Date Received | Response References |
|-----|--|---------------|--|
| 1 | Raised Crosswalk @ Eastwood; Lights in pavement (IRWL) | 1/22/2018 | Raised crosswalk is not proposed at Eastwood. RRFB have a higher yielding rates than IRWL - and RRFB is lower mainenance. See Master Response 3 |
| 2 | Instead of concrete curbs next to the DG. Could we have wood (like LAH) or even asphalt? I moved to Los Altos to avoid the concrete sidewalks & curb of SV & MV | 1/22/2018 | LAH situation is different on Fremont Road because there is extra room for a planter between the curbs and the roadway. Miramonte project proposes all improvements within the existing public right-of-way.DG pathway was selected based on the input from the residents along Miramonte. |
| 3 | Love the DG! It keeps the rural feel. And thank you for not removing any trees | 1/22/2018 | acknowledged |
| 4 | Thank you for not adding street lights. And if you should decide to add them, please make them lower-level, post-type lights, charming & human-scaled | 1/22/2018 | acknowledged |
| 5 | No curbs coming into Loma Prieto Court please | 1/22/2018 | Current design does not show curb on Loma Prieta Ct., curb stop at the curb return and conforms to existing pavement |
| 6 | Have parking areas been addressed; if property is lost where do we have parking? | 1/22/2018 | Phase 1 of the project between Allegre and Berry includes parking areas in the design. There will be no loss of "property" |
| 7 | Why have flashing lights @ corner of Berry/Miramonte. Put in a regular street lights. Flashing lights would be a horrible distraction at night. Imagine living in that corner house & being bothered w/ flashing lights all night! | 1/22/2018 | See Master Response 3 |
| 8 | There should be a way to ride a bike from Berry Ave then turn right onto Miramonte. Berry Ave has a Class I bike lane, so bikes are coming on the sidewalk, not in the street | 1/22/2018 | see response #62 below |
| 9 | Having a sidewalk and bikeway on miramonte could make people's commute much safer | 1/22/2018 | acknowledged |
| 10 | The bike lane between Loma Prieta Court and Covington should be reduced to 5 feet. This would keep it consistent with the other side of Loma Prieta Ct. A 5 foot lane would not interfere with the water meters by the telephone post while the 6 foot bike lane currently in the plan would | 1/22/2018 | the dimension call-outs have been corrected from a 6' lane/2' buffer to a 5' lane/2' buffer |
| 11 | Summary of 3 people: This plan is overkill! Why fix Miramonte when Berry is <u>so unsafe</u> . No bike lanes there. This sounds like a totally disorganized piece-meal plan. Safety is not the issue - getting a construction deal thru to do a favor for someone or city council sounds more like it. Need more question & answered meetings - more discussion! Not so one-sided! | 1/22/2018 | Berry has a Class 1 pathway on the south side of the street. The current project will have connections to the Class 1 facility on Berry via curb ramps. See Master Responses 1 & 2 |

Miramonte Avenue Path, Project TS-01033

| No. | Comments / Questions | Date Received | Response References |
|-----|--|---------------|---|
| 12 | I fully support the project as presented. I hope the City will approve it and recognize that the vocal residents who oppose the plan do not speak for most of the community. The whole community needs to have safe access to across streets. Residents claim they want the "rural" feel of Los Altos. There is nothing rural about the traffic on Miramonte. We need real solutions such as those presented here | 1/22/2018 | acknowledged |
| 13 | Have talked to 5 people tonight who say the bulb-out corners <u>DO NOT</u> work. I've seen a fire engine which could not turn right from Springer to Berry & had to take the long way around. Other people complained 1. you have to drive into the opposite lane to get around the budge & then return to the correct lane, 2. many people have bumped into the bulb-out & scraped their tires or misaligned the car. Look at the black tire marks along Berry. This is a summary of 5 peoples' comments. | 1/22/2018 | The bulbouts will be designed to accommodate a passenger vehicle turning within the striping limits; and a fire truck turning with the curb limits. The bulbouts are effective for traffic calming, increasing visibility of pedestrians, and shortening the street crossing for pedestrians. |
| 14 | I like this proposed for Class II bike lanes with separate pedestrian walkways. While I normally prefer a Class I pathway, since it could only be for a short section, it doesn't make sense, especially with the impact to trees & utility poles. I like the addition of curb extensions, but they need to be set back from the white-line marked roadway edge sufficiently to keep cars, trucks, SUVs & tractor-trailers from cutting too sharp and hitting the curb or waiting pedestrians | 1/22/2018 | acknowledged |
| 15 | Seems like this project is being rushed - thru w/o much feedback from the people who's properties are affected. I was at the Aug'16 meeting which was a joke because the council members said they couldn't answer questions - the purpose was to hear the comments. Well, we never heard our questions answered - so why should we have confidence in decision-makers? You need more input from the citizens - we pay your salaries. More question/answer sessions - 1/2 hr was not long enough. The entire group needs to hear concerns and whether they will be heard & not just at the "open house" part. More meetings needed! And make sure all neighbors get the announcements. | 1/22/2018 | See Master Response 1 |
| 16 | where is the retention storm drain (not connecting to storm drain) | 1/22/2018 | See response to comment #33 |
| 17 | grading consideration prior to storm drain system | 1/22/2018 | grading and drainage is included as part of the project |
| 18 | would want a system where the pedestrian can see the flashing as well as the roadway vehicles | 1/22/2018 | See master response 3 |
| 19 | consider adding street lights | 1/22/2018 | Street lights are not included in the current project |
| 20 | STOP sign on Miramonte at Berry and other DO NOT wants it because too many stop along Miramonte | 1/22/2018 | Stop sign installation will require evaluation to comply with warrants; not included in current project scope. |

Miramonte Avenue Path, Project TS-01033

| No. | Comments / Questions | Date Received | Response References |
|-----|---|---------------|---|
| 21 | Who is asking for this project to be constructed? One resident on Miramonte stated he does not want this project. Why didn't the city ask the residents if they want the project? | 1/22/2018 | See Master Response 1 |
| 22 | Resident of the City of Los Altos - Why are we installing walkways on this project? Parking is more important than the walkways. There are a lot of residents who will not prefer this design? Is there someone at the City I can talk to about this project? Is the DG path permeable? | 1/22/2018 | See Master Response 2 |
| 23 | Are you removing any trees? | 1/22/2018 | No |
| 24 | Three people: We agree with the informal pathway between Eastwood and Berry on the west side. The existing Oak tree in conflict with the pathway is important and cannot be impacted. | 1/22/2018 | acknowledged |
| 25 | Can you consider adding a stop sign at Berry Avenue and Miramonte Avenue? | 1/22/2018 | Stop sign installation will require evaluation to comply with warrants; not included in current project scope. With the current project design, south west corner curb ramp at Berry will be improved (corner bulb-out) that will not only decrease the crossing distance for pedestrians, but all pull the stop bar along Berry towards Miramonte improving the line of sight. |
| 26 | Consider adding a three-way stop sign to the Berry/Miramonte intersection, instead of the flashing beacon. The stop sign is needed due to the poor corner sight distance for EB Berry Avenue traffic turning right or left onto Miramonte Avenue. | 1/22/2018 | Acknowledged; stop sign is not included in the current project scope |
| 27 | We should not be adding a stop sign at Berry Avenue as this will affect the traffic flow. | 1/22/2018 | See master response 3 |
| 28 | The pedestrian who would be crossing Miramonte Avenue at Berry Avenue will not be able to see the flashing beacons. Design the flashing beacons such that the person crossing the street can see the beacons. | 1/22/2018 | See master response 3 |
| 29 | Why is there a flashing beacon at Berry/Miramonte and is this the best solution for the crosswalk? There were questions about how the flashing beacon works (RRFB) | 1/22/2018 | Locations where existing mailbox access is affected, project design will include relocation of these mailboxes that will be included within the project scope |
| 30 | Will mailboxes be impacted with this project? | 1/22/2018 | Street lights are not included in the current project |
| 31 | Is lighting included in this project. There are several segments of this street which are very dark. | 1/22/2018 | Street lights are not included in the current project |
| 32 | Can we add lighting at the crosswalks? | 1/22/2018 | Street lights are not included in the current project |
| 33 | What are these storm water treatment areas. Explain how the inlets are connected to the storm drain system, or not connected. | 1/22/2018 | Planter at 990 Stanley Avenue has infiltration inlet with overflow curb drain; two planters at corners of 1059 and 1062 Eastwood Drive have underground piping connected to storm drain manhole. The planter at 989 Stanley has been converted to a Planter with no inlet. |
| 34 | How will bikes turn from EB Berry Avenue Class I onto SB Miramonte Class II. Possibly expand the curb ramp to accommodate bikes turning right at Berry and Miramonte. | 1/22/2018 | see reponse #62 |

Miramonte Avenue Path, Project TS-01033

| No. | Comments / Questions | Date Received | Response References |
|-----|--|---------------|--|
| 35 | Resident - Prefer a raised crosswalk at Eastwood Drive, similar to the raised crosswalk at Berry. | 1/22/2018 | Raised crosswalk at Eastwood is not included in the current project scope |
| 36 | Two residents want the parking sign on Covington road to state that there should be no limitations on the weekends along the Covington Road bike lane towards the school. There was confusion on the rules for parking on Covington. | 1/22/2018 | The signs along Covington have been replaced to identify restrictions during morning hour in the eastbound direction and afternoon hour in the westbound direction |
| 37 | Three residents were concerned about the lack of parking on Miramonte from Covington to Eastwood Drive. There may not be daily parking, but what if there is a party with excess parking? Two of the three residents were agreeable to parking on Stanley or Covington, one was not agreeable. | 1/22/2018 | See Master Response 2 |
| 38 | One person: I like the buffer bike lane, do not change it. | 1/22/2018 | Acknowledged |
| 39 | I am concerned my driveway will be closed during construction. | 1/22/2018 | Closure of driveway may be necessary during construction but we will restrict it to during working hours only and will provide advance notice to resident(s) |
| 40 | If the 10' vehicle lane provides more room for bikes and provides for buffered bike lane then I am agreeable to 10' wide. | 1/22/2018 | Acknowledged |
| 41 | Another person: I do not understand why some of the neighbors do not like this project, please construct the project as it is designed. | 1/22/2018 | Acknowledged |
| 42 | At 1011 & 1010 Loma Prieta Court the two property owners on both sides of the intersection have similar comments: | 1/22/2018 | Design has been revised to address these concerns. |
| | a. Make the curb ramps as small as possible - and make the ramps directional along Miramonte; not directed towards Loma Prieta Court | 1/22/2018 | |
| | Resident of 1010 Loma Preita Court - I have boulders and landscape rocks around the return on Loma Preita Court which acts as a curb. Will these be impacted with the design. Also some of the trees are very close to the walkways, will they be impacted. | 1/22/2018 | |
| | b. Eliminate the storm drain inlets and planting area | 1/22/2018 | |
| | c. Eliminate the curb & gutter at the corners. | 1/22/2018 | |
| 43 | Resident of 1010 Covington Road - I have a large family and I do have concerns about on-street parking. Is there a way the design accommodates more parking on-street? | 1/22/2018 | Parking has been accomodated in the design where feasible; see Master Response 2 |
| 44 | Resident on Miramonte - Is there a reason why we have 8' bike lane from Loma Preita Court to Covington and the bike lane reduces to 7' bike lane from Loma Preita to Eastwood? Can we make it 7' wide consistent to avoid/reduce impacts to property frontage? Will the water meters be adjusted to grade? | 1/22/2018 | Current design shows correct bike lane widths at this location; water meter is not affected at this location |

Miramonte Avenue Path, Project TS-01033

| No. | Comments / Questions | Date Received | Response References |
|-----|---|---------------|---|
| 45 | Resident of the City of Los Altos - Why are we installing walkways on this project? Parking is more important than the walkways. There are a lot of residents who will not prefer this design? Is there someone at the City I can talk to about this project? Is the DG path permeable? | 1/22/2018 | See Master Responses 1 & 2 |
| 46 | Resident of 980 Berry Avenue - Was inquiring about parking along Miramonte south of Berry. Is this proposed parking? What is this green island next to a driveway? One of my neighbors will be interested to look at this design, as they use parking on Miramonte Avenue. Also, inquired about the crosswalk, whether it's raised crosswalk and the type of path - decomposed granite material. Suggest not placing the sign in the middle of the crosswalk as it will impact turning movements and also cause hindrance to drivers. | 1/22/2018 | The sign in the middle of the road will be positioned to allow turning movements. |
| 47 | Resident - We would like to keep the rural look for Los Altos. We are not City of Mountain View. You should consider wooden curb or a curb less environment. | 1/22/2018 | See response above on comment #2 |
| 48 | Resident - Consider removing the curb to create a shared space where people can park on the walkways and there are not a lot of people walking and they can walk in the bikeways if there is a parked car. | 1/22/2018 | See Master Response 2 |
| 49 | Resident from 1400 block on Miramonte - Will be there sufficient sight distance when I back out of my car. I prefer the design with the DG walkway close to the curb, rather than way back with a planter. This will provide better visibility when backing out of my driveway. Will the color plot be available for download so we can mark up our comments? This question relates to the Phase 2 segment of the project. | 1/22/2018 | 1400 block is in Phase 2 |
| 50 | Resident - Does the design proposed to add pathways on both sides of the street between Manor Way and Portland Ave. Currently there is no pathway on one side of the street in this segment. This question relates to the Phase 2 segment of the project. | 1/22/2018 | Manor to Portland is in Phase 2 |
| 51 | Resident likes the raised crosswalk with in-pavement lights and prefer bike lane and path without curb | 1/25/2018 | acknowledged |
| 52 | Resident wants path to be flush and NOT raised; raised curb block water and into private property; felt curb is a safety issue for bike, ramping to driveway approaches is hard for ADA, | 1/25/2018 | Design is compliant with ADA standards; drainage improvements are included in the design |
| 53 | do not wants this project; don't like that they may not be able to get out of their driveway during construction; lose parking at frontage and have to walk further after park, and gas emission will increase | 1/25/2018 | See Master Response 2; construction management plan will be included as part of the construction package and will follow City's guidelines; |

Miramonte Avenue Path, Project TS-01033

| No. | Comments / Questions | Date Received | Response References |
|-----|---|---------------|---|
| 54 | CSC Chair, Suzanne Ambiel, likes to see crosswalk at Eastwood to be raised and wants to make sure that the project improve all gaps connecting to City of Mountain View. She like the separation of bike, pedestrian, and auto; safety over lack of parking at the front of the house. | 1/25/2018 | Acknowledged; raised crosswalk at Eastwood is not included in the current scope of project. Coordination with City of Mountain View for gap closure at the north end has already been initiated |
| 55 | CSC Commissioner Jerome Chester likes the narrow lane, which can help slow traffic, and raised crosswalk | 1/25/2018 | acknowledged |
| 56 | CSC Commissioner Randy Kriegh wants to see less curb but safety is important and Mirmonte is not a neighborhood street; it is a collector. Continuity of path from City of Mountain View need improvements. | 1/25/2018 | See response to Comment#54 |
| 57 | CSC Vice-Chair Wes Brinsfield likes the project and encourage to continue to construction | 1/25/2018 | acknowledged |
| 58 | CSC Commissioner Nadim Maluf said that this project is close to a "balance" project; it addresses traffic calming, bike and pedestrian path and safety, considering parking spaces | 1/25/2018 | acknowledged |
| 59 | CSC Commissioner Steve Hindman felt that 11 parking stalls is sufficient for 16 homes and that ADA concern is to be address in design | 1/25/2018 | acknowledged |
| 60 | <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 5px;"> <p><i>the City Clerk at (650) 947-2720</i></p> <p><i>plan Δs. concerned about raised/curb pathway → bikes use pathway.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>curb feel ped bump-out</i> - <i>curb is a safety issue prevents sharing pathway</i> - <i>curb may create ADA issues</i> - <i>drainage into properties, pouring of water.</i> - <i>concerns → mulch</i> </div> | 1/24/2018 | The project includes class 2 bike lanes; the design is complaint with ADA standards; drainage improvements are included in the design |
| 61 | <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p><i>the City Clerk at (650) 947-2720</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ① <i>does no one wants this project</i> ② <i>can't get out of driveway</i> ③ <i>unacceptable Δs.</i> ④ <i>slightly park 1/2 mile away</i> ⑤ <i>How many hours on proposed pathway?</i> ⑥ <i># house</i> ⑦ <i>lack of support</i> <div style="float: right; margin-top: 10px;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ① <i>Parking displacement 50 cars</i> ② <i>CO2 emissions will increase</i> ③ </div> </div> | 1/24/2018 | See Master Responses 1 & 2 |

Miramonte Avenue Path, Project TS-01033

| No. | Comments / Questions | Date Received | Response References |
|-----|---|-----------------------|---|
| 62 | <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; color: red; font-family: cursive;"> concerned about RT radius on the to Berry </div> | 1/24/2018 | The right turn will not be an issue in Phase 1 since there is an asphalt ramp down to the existing street in the SB direction along Miramonte. However, Phase 2 will need to include an extra bike ramp to address this condition. There is an expanded area on the Phase 1 corner to allow for bikes to make the turn onto Miramonte Avenue. |
| 63 | <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; color: red; font-family: cursive;"> - connection between P1/P2 Berry intersection - likes raised X walk - likes in road lights </div> | 1/24/2018 | At Berry, raised crosswalk is included. Studies show that an RRFB has better response rate than other devices |
| 64 | <p>I mentioned at the meeting that I would like to see the bike path on east side of Miramonte between Covington and Loma Prieta be 5 feet wide, not 6 feet so the easement can continue to be used for a large vegetation barrier that has an adequate undisturbed root zone for me and my neighbors at 1010 Covington. It will also prevent the need for moving our water meters which will inevitably result in damaging or removing part of our hedge and water disruption. The bike path design is to be 5 feet wide between Loma Prieta and Eastwood and should be the same between Covington and Loma Prieta. I also want to point out that there is a misconception that this section is a bike path to school. Kids going to Blach from Loma Prieta walk to school. Kids going to Blach from Stanley or between Loma Prieta and Berry, go to Blach via Eastwood to avoid congestion on Covington. Kids going to Mountain View High from this area go south on Miramonte and cut over on Portland to Grant. Kids going to school simply do not bike between Loma Prieta and Covington on Miramonte. The path does not need to accommodate large groups of bikers.</p> | 1/29/2018 by email | See response above on comment #10 |

Miramonte Avenue Path, Project TS-01033

| No. | Comments / Questions | Date Received | Response References |
|-----|---|-----------------------|--|
| 65 | <p>I would like to see the ramp and landing area on the north corner at Miramonte and Loma Prieta be considerably smaller. Why is it bigger than the area on the south corner of Miramonte and Loma Prieta? It seems excessively large. I would like to see the sidewalk area stop before the Loma Prieta street sign and go straight across like it does on the other side of the crosswalk. In other words, it should be the mirror image of the landing area the other side of the crosswalk. These areas are unnecessarily big but are parts of the root zone of several large trees. I believe we should maximize the natural and landscaped areas as much as possible and this seems like one spot that the sidewalk / landing area is just too big. There will not be people standing around waiting on this corner.</p> | 1/29/2018 by email | <p>These ramps have been reduced significantly. The ramps have been revised to a Case C which is the smallest ramp per Caltrans standards. And the current plan shows a half ramp with no concrete directed into Loma Prieta Court</p> |
| 66 | <p>will we be able to see the final design, and will someone let us know where the path will actually be located in front of our property before work begins? I would like to trim any bushes that are in the way. I do not want the City trimming my bushes. When the power company was working there and trimmed them, they sustained damage that took years to grow back. Will you eventually mark where the path will fall, so we can prepare?</p> | 1/29/2018 by email | <p>Hard copy of the final design will be available at the City Hall and will also be posted on the project website, when ready. Residents will be notified of the construction schedule.</p> |
| 67 | <p>I just review the latest information regarding the Miramonte Avenue Pathway at: https://www.losaltosca.gov/sites/default/files/fileattachments/public_works/project/5321/miramonte_ave_phase_1-_class_ii_bike_lanes_map.pdf</p> <p>I noticed that my driveway on Miramonte is connected to a yellow path, is this the composited granite? The asphalt that would allow me to get off my driveway is over one of the trees and obviously not connecting to my driveway. I looked the rest of the design and the other residents do have access to Miramonte. Could you please contact me ASAP before this project goes any further.</p> | 2/28/2018 by email | <p>Design has been revised to address these concerns.</p> |

Miramonte Avenue Path Project

Master Response 1 – Public Outreach

Below is chronology of public outreach related to the Miramonte Avenue Project:

- Blach Neighborhood Traffic Study – (A study to address multi-modal circulation around Blach School. The Study recommended sidewalk and Class I Pathway on Miramonte Avenue)
 - June 15, 2010 – Special Council Study Session at Los Altos High School to discuss the study
 - September 13, 2010 – Los Altos School Board Presentation of the Study
 - January 4, 2011 – Special City Council Meeting – Motion made by Council direct staff to prepare future CIP worksheets based on the consultant recommendations approved by the Council
- Bicycle Transportation Plan (The Plan identified Class I pathway along Miramonte Avenue from City limit to Loraine Avenue and Class II bike lane from Loraine Avenue to Fremont Avenue)
 - BPAC Meetings
 - June 16, 2010 – BTP Kick-off
 - July 7, 2010 – Bike Tour with Consultant (no quorum, special meeting)
 - July 21, 2010 – Bicycle tour with Consultant update
 - September 15, 2010 – BTP update
 - October 20, 2010 – BTP Update
 - Feb 16, 2011 – Review and comment on draft BTP
 - April 20, 2011 – BTP Update
 - May 18, 2011 – BTP approval by BACP (recommendation to Traffic Commission)
 - June 15, 2011 – Evaluation of the Class II and Prioritize the projects in BTP
 - August 17, 2011 – Prioritize the priority projects proposed in BTP
 - June 20, 2012 – CIP update (BTP is now adopted)
 - Public Meeting - October 21, 2010
 - City Council Study Session – June 28, 2011 (Joint study session with Traffic Commission and BPAC)
 - City Council - April 10, 2012 – Adoption of Bicycle Transportation Plan
- Pedestrian Master Plan (Miramonte Class I Path Project was identified as a high priority project in this plan)
 - Farmers Market – booth setup on two different dates
 - April 2014 - Public workshop at Grant Park
 - BPAC Meetings – August 28, 2013; February 25, 2015
 - September 16, 2013 – Joint commission meeting with City Council
 - Walk audits in Spring 2014
 - City Council meetings discussed the Pedestrian Master Plan - September 25, 2012; October 9, 2012; June 25, 2013; April 8, 2014; March 24, 2015; May 12, 2015; and June 23, 2015
 - City Council – August 25, 2015 – Adoption of Pedestrian Master Plan
- Capital Improvement Program
 - Miramonte Class I Path Project was first included in the Fiscal Year 2013-2018 CIP adopted by the Council on June 25, 2013
 - Miramonte Project has since been included in the CIP as an active project

- Special BPAC/Public Meeting – August 26, 2016 – Presented design alternatives and selected Class II bike lanes with accessible walkway as the preferred alternative
- Public Meeting at Hillview Community Center – January 22, 2018 – Presented draft design, answered questions and solicited input from public

Complete Streets Commission Meeting – January 24, 2018 – Presented draft design, answered questions, and solicited input from CSC. CSC supported the current design

Master Response 2 – Complete Streets Policy

In 2008 state legislation AB 1358 was passed: the California Complete Streets Act. In 2015, Los Altos City Council adopted a resolution to comply with the Complete Streets Act. This law requires the public agencies to address safe mobility for all users, including bicyclists and pedestrians.

Master Response 3 – Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB)

Per FHWA research, including RRFBs on the roadside increases driver yielding behavior significantly. Flashing lights only operate when they are manually activated by a pedestrian (ie. pushbutton) to use the crosswalk. Current design includes double sided LED pedestrian signs on each side of the street, so pedestrian will be able to see when the flashing lights are activated by the push button.