

El Camino Real Plan Advisory Committee (ECRPAC) Meeting #5 Summary Notes

Senior Center (Laurel Room) - 550 E Remington Drive, Sunnyvale

August 24, 2017 | 6:30-9:00 p.m.

ATTENDEES

ECRPAC:

Chris Figone, Michael Shum, Steve Pavlina, Gary Guiffre, Karen Galatis, Patti Evans, Tim Oey, Dan Hafeman, Sue Harrison, and Tracy Tripp

Members not present: Raj Singh, Linda García,

Project Team:

City Staff:

Rosemarie Zulueta (Acting Principal Planner/Project Manager), Andrew Miner (Planning Officer), Trudi Ryan (Director, Community Development Department), and Ralph Garcia (Senior Transportation Engineer)

Consultants:

Kristi Bascom and Geoff Bradley (M-Group), Magnus Barber (Nelson\Nygaard), and Dave Javid (Plan to Place)

Other Agencies:

Adam Burger (Senior Transportation Planner, VTA)

Community Members:

Approximately 7 community members were present at the meeting.

MEETING AGENDA

- I. Welcome and Introductions
- II. Project Update
- III. Draft Circulation Strategy Presentation and Discussion
- IV. Public Comment
- V. Next Steps
- VI. Adjourn

MEETING HIGHLIGHTS

Welcome Introductions

Patti Evans, Chair of the ECRPAC, welcomed Committee members to the fifth ECRPAC meeting. The ECRPAC, City staff and consultant team introduced themselves. Community members in attendance were also given an opportunity to introduce themselves.

Project Update

Rosemarie Zulueta provided a progress report on the project since the last ECRPAC meeting. The Vision Statement and Land Use Alternatives discussed at the previous ECRPAC meeting were brought to the Planning Commission for their recommendation on a Preferred Land Use Alternative, and then to City Council for selection of a Preferred Land Use Alternative. Rosemarie explained the development of Alternative R Plus, which enhances Alternative R with greater residential density and

mixed use potential at certain locations, particularly in the nodes, in anticipation of additional residential opportunities that City Council has requested in recent projects. The City Council selected Alternative R Plus as the Preferred Alternative at their meeting on August 15, 2017. With the Preferred Alternative determined, the project team can begin the environmental analysis and other elements of the ECR Corridor Plan (ECR Plan), such as the development standards, design guidelines, implementation programs, etc.

Draft Circulation Strategy Presentation and Discussion.

Magnus Barber, with Nelson/Nygaard, gave an overview of the preliminary design concepts and recommendations detailed in the document *Multimodal Access and Circulation Strategies*. ECRPAC members asked questions and provided comments during the presentation and then held a comprehensive discussion with City and VTA staff and the project team]. Members of the public joined the conversation after initial ECRPAC member comments. The following is a summary of the discussion on the topics/ideas presented at the meeting and detailed in the *Strategies* document:

- **General Comments**
 - The concepts presented in the *Strategies* document sound good and make the best of the assets and constraints of ECR. You can't get more land to widen the roads, so offering choices of other ways to get around makes the best use of the real estate available.
 - Street designs should consider the needs of all users.
 - Think out of the box (e.g., aerial pod cars along the median to transport people—*maybe in the next Plan update...*).
- **Street Typologies**
 - The two different treatments between auto dealer frontages and the rest of ECR is a good strategy (Auto Row vs. Grand Boulevard street typologies)
 - Consider Wolfe Rd as a "Transit Connector" street typology.
 - *Wolfe corridor does not currently have as high of ridership numbers, as Sunnyvale-Saratoga/Mathilda*
- **Biking and Facilities**
 - Consider Olive Ave. (possibly Iowa Ave. and Washington Ave.) as a Bike Boulevard.
 - *The challenge is crossing Mary Ave. at Olive Ave. Mary Ave. starts to narrow at Blair Ave.*
 - Consolidate bike terms in the ECR Plan – buffered vs. separated vs. protected, etc.
 - Consider how to help bicyclists with left turns, such as incorporating bike boxes.
 - *Bike boxes may not be appropriate with ECR's faster travel speed.*
 - Include strong design guidelines to ensure bike parking is more prominently located on a site and that areas around bike parking are kept clear and accessible (e.g. not blocked by outdoor seating, benches, etc.).
 - Consider bike sharing (e.g. Seattle and South San Francisco)
- **Parking**
 - Reducing minimum parking requirements could impact the number of ADA accessible parking spaces provided in new developments. Explore requiring the ratio based on parking maximums (instead of the number of parking spaces provided as required by Building Code).
 - There is a fine line to balance when determining modifications to parking requirements. Reducing parking may be appropriate for certain areas, but there still

needs to be enough parking for those who live too far from the nodes to walk or take transit.

- If you provide more parking, it will just get filled up. It encourages people to drive and they will take advantage of the parking available. More parking = more cars/more driving.
- Local apartment complexes should charge a fee for residents with more than one car to discourage driving.
- Think about how best to administer or implement shared parking between properties—lease spaces to other businesses outside of business hours, look at upcoming phone apps
- Plan for drop off zones for ride-sharing and future autonomous cars
- Metered/paid parking seems to be more of a penalizing tactic to discourage people from driving. Encourage use of other modes (biking and walking) by providing those facilities instead
- Keep ECR parking on ECR – avoid spillover into neighborhoods
- **Pedestrian Access along ECR**
 - More direct and shorter pedestrian crossings
 - Prioritize signals for pedestrians (look at Dutch video monitoring)
 - Consider more prominent pedestrian crossing lights to improve pedestrian safety (i.e. lights on the pavement as drivers may not always look up or “hawk signals” as seen on ECR in Santa Clara as it confuses drivers and makes them slow down)
 - Provide crossing lights near schools
- **Bus/Transit Movement along ECR**
 - Bus stop/bike and pedestrian conflict needs special attention– Would the bus have to be stopped on the bike lane?
 - *There is no ideal option—more about making the best of a bad situation*
 - Better to have a bike lane than nothing at all
 - Dashed lines to indicate bike lane at street (e.g. San Jose)
 - Allow enough room for buses to pull off road for safety—property owners should dedicate property for duck-outs when they redevelop
 - *Perhaps providing enhanced transit facilities (such as a duck-out) on private property in exchange for higher density development could be an incentive as we develop concepts for incentive zoning/community benefits program for the ECR Plan – Members and public expressed support.*
 - *On a wide road like ECR, stopping at the curb is often enough to get the bus out of the way; if on a narrower street like Hollenbeck, duck-outs would be more appropriate*
- **Vehicle Travel**
 - Consider reducing travel speeds on ECR—40 mph is too fast.
 - *Caltrans conducted a speed survey in 2011 and recommended retaining the existing speed limit of 40 mph*
 - *Speed surveys and recommendations are kind of a chicken-egg situation. Reducing the travel speed could later be warranted as land uses change, pedestrian activity increases and improvements are made to the roadway, such as the addition of bike lanes*
 - Explore coordination with Caltrans and other cities to improve synching and timing of signals along ECR

- 11-foot lanes on ECR may feel a bit narrow. Will this affect large emergency response vehicles, such as fire trucks?
 - *There are portions of Mathilda Ave. where the lanes are 11 feet wide.*
 - *Vehicles are required to yield out of the way of emergency response vehicles in the case of an emergency, so lane width is likely not a big factor*
- Hollenbeck peak hour traffic is terrible. What we do on ECR will affect the side streets
- **Public Comments**
 - Don't cause overflow onto surrounding streets.
 - 11 foot lanes +35 mph manageable - not lower
 - Transit stops must have cutouts (bus duck-outs)
 - Cut outs not a universal solution - can cause conflict.
 - VTA Bus facility needs bus shelters and signs (e.g. - ECR and Pastoria Ave).
 - Consider the stretch in front of Volkswagen as an "Auto Row" street typology
 - Parking should consider population growth. Parking may be underutilized now, but what about when population increases
 - People may shop elsewhere if there is inadequate parking.
 - Increase handicap spaces
 - Hollenbeck Ave turning into 4-lane road; How do you prevent diversion to adjacent/cross streets
 - Foothill Blvd. at 50 mph still safe for biking, but ECR is more dangerous due to many driveways.
 - Consider bike-only priority signals along bike boulevards.
 - Need better enforcement of crossings.
 - City should provide a map of all the City's bike lanes/routes
 - ECR is an arterial, a highway people use to get from one place to another
 - Treatment of ECR should serve the residents and businesses of Sunnyvale. It's not our job to get people from Mountain View to Santa Clara as quickly as possible
 - Increase efficiency of east-west roads.
 - Discussion has included a lot of good ideas in handling and managing parking
 - Consider E-Bikes.
 - Look at the underground pedestrian passage on The Alameda
 - Shuttle Pilot Program Update (Would help Seniors and drop-off parking issues).
 - Support bus cut outs (e.g. - Fremont High School).
 - Existing bus facilities are inadequate
 - Increase accessible parking.
 - Planning for multi-modal is fine, but recognize that cars are still predominant and we should plan to co-exist.
 - For managed parking, consider appropriate parking meter rates.
 - ECR is dangerous for bikes and pedestrians because of the number of driveways

NEXT STEPS

Staff and the consultant team will determine how best to incorporate the concepts and strategies discussed based on the feedback received. The project team will begin working on the development standards and design guidelines, which will be brought to the ECRPAC for discussion. The ECRPAC Meeting on design guidelines may span more than one session depending on the amount of material to be covered. The project team will also kick off the environmental review process in the next month.

IMAGES FROM THE ECRPAC #5 MEETING

