

# **MOUNTAIN VIEW AUTOMATED TRANSIT GUIDEWAY FEASIBILITY STUDY COMMUNITY MEETING**

---

## **Summary of Automated Guideway Transit Feasibility Study Community Meeting**

Monday, April 3, 2017

The City of Mountain View hosted a community meeting on Monday April 3, 2017, from 6:00- 7:30 p.m. to discuss a feasibility study project to look at automated guideway transit options in the corridor between the Downtown Transit Center area and the North Bayshore area. The meeting was held at the Old Adobe, 157 Moffett Boulevard in Mountain View. Eighteen (18) members of the public attended the meeting.

City staff Jim Lightbody, Project Manager, spoke at the meeting. Jenny Baumgartner, Project Manager, from Lea+Elliott and Eileen Goodwin, Apex Strategies, Community Outreach lead represented the project team as presenters.

This was the first meeting with the community regarding this project. The meeting was framed by a PowerPoint presentation that covered the purpose and goals of the project, the Study's approach, various technologies and their characteristics, as well as potential demand for the service. After the presentation, a half hour of questions and comments were taken in a facilitated session. Then the attendees were asked to go to each of three stations to give their thoughts and ask additional questions. At the end of the meeting, the facilitator asked each station lead for a debrief of their station topic. The notes are also included in this meeting summary. A summary of the community comments and questions follows.





The following summary of the meeting was prepared by Eileen Goodwin, Apex Strategies, who facilitated and documented the meeting.

### **Meeting Summary:**

The meeting started at 6:00 p.m. In addition to the personnel there to answer questions and present information, eighteen (18) members of the public attended. There were three City Councilmembers in attendance: Vice Mayor Leonard Siegel from Mountain View, Rod Sinks from Cupertino and Larry Klein from Sunnyvale.

About 25% of the attendees said the City's social media including Facebook and website were how they found out about the meeting. Nextdoor was acknowledged as another way attendees found out about the meeting from 50% of the attendees. The e-list from Mountain View's planning effort for the Transit Center and the Friends of Caltrain blog were also mentioned as notification methods.

Approximately 25% of the crowd identified as commuters/employer interests from North Bayshore while one-half identified as neighbors of the potential project. Others self-reported being policy-makers.

After a brief introduction by the City’s Project Manager, the Lea+Elliott project manager spoke to a PowerPoint presentation. The presentation was given to orient the attendees to the purpose of the project and technology alternatives. After the presentation questions, suggestions and opinions were offered to the staff and project team. The comments offered during the meeting are captured below in the order they were given.

Question/Comment	Response
The missing information is project costs. High costs will be a problem for taxpayers. The tax base won’t support an expensive option.	We will be looking at costs as part of the study. Also, some of the technologies may require right-of-way which could also be a cost.
Technology will evolve. We need to be careful that we don’t end up with something that can’t evolve along with it.	Good point. We are looking at using at adaptability as one of the criteria the technologies are screened against. This could mean ability to add on and/or trade the technology out for something else.
How will the Study address right-of-way? Will the City use eminent domain at some point?	These different technologies have different right-of-way needs those will be compared to each other. For example, something in the air on cables has different needs that something along the roadway. As much as possible the City will be looking to stay within the existing street network.
This Study should also look at an expansion from the Transit Center down Castro over to El Camino Real where the system could meet the future VTA Bus Rapid Transit system. That would increase ridership and connectivity.	Comment noted.
Assuming something is agreed to, when would it be built? Five years? Ten?	It is hard to guess but likely more than five years out into the future at the earliest.
Are there levels of readiness you are considering? I notice the photos are all from established providers. Are you only looking at technologies that are	We are looking at all technologies. Of course, photos are more readily available for the more established systems. It is really more about meeting the criteria and situation in

already somewhere?	Mountain View at this point. Not Every system will be a good fit. State of readiness is a consideration though.
The Downtown to North Bayshore commute will only grow given the planned growth and addition of residential. Has the Study taken that into account?	Yes, and that is why expandability and adaptability will be criteria for screening the technology options.
I really applaud the City of Mountain View for taking this on and leading. I want to see this succeed. I want to see a system that grows regionally. People want options, they are sick of being stuck in their cars. We need systems that are perpendicular to the Caltrain line that can really make the whole system work. Hats off to the most progressive City around.	Comment noted.
The materials should help us understand the relative size of the structures.	We agree. We tried to give more detail at the stations with photos that show some sort of scale of the structures. We will keep this in mind as we move forward.
Which systems are compatible for residential streets?	Automated Transit Systems and Personal Rapid Transit Systems are the most compatible. These are the smaller scale technologies. However, because of California earthquake standards the columns will still look quite substantial due to those requirements.
Is there anywhere where these systems are running in residential streets like ours?	Not really. There are some urban examples and some amusement park examples but nothing that is identical to the Mountain View streets.
You mentioned peak hour ridership, what would daily ridership be?	Probably about 8,000 riders a day.
Singapore system ridership?	The EasyMile system at Gardens by the Bay in Singapore serves

	approximately 42 people per day
What is capacity point to point? Or is the system considering multiple stops? Google employees are clogging up Middlefield Road. Would this system help relieve that?	This starting system will likely be from the Transit Center to a stop or two in North Bayshore, not much more. We hope Google employees will find it very attractive to use.
When you post the PowerPoint on the website can you also post the ridership study?	We can do that.
Will concert goers be able to use this system to get to Shoreline?	It is being designed for the commuter trips but if the City decides to run it for a day long service it could work for Shoreline trips as well.
Can the system be expanded to take into account the 10,000 new residential units planned for North Bayshore.	Yes, that would be a goal. The planning assumes the housing units are in when predicting the demand.
<b>Station Report Out</b>	
<b>Technology Station</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nothing intrusive</li> <li>• Frequent service and smaller vehicles especially in the residential areas</li> <li>• Land use consideration, concern about where the land will come from</li> </ul>	
<b>Priorities/Considerations Station</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weighing “fast service” versus “adaptable” which in some ways are contradictory technologies</li> <li>• Need to prioritize</li> </ul>	

### Situational Comparisons

**Faster but Less Flexible**

- More guidance infrastructure above ground
- Requires more construction time/cost to change to another technology
- Some technologies do not easily support intermediate/local stops
- Currently can operate at higher speeds (up to 50 mph)

**vs**

**Slower but More Flexible**

- Little to no guidance infrastructure
- Easier flexibility to change to another technology type
- Better accommodates intermediate/local stops
- Currently can operate at lower speeds (15 to 25 mph)

  

**Less vehicles/more people per vehicle**

- More noise per vehicle, but less vehicles operating
- Less maintenance costs
- Less storage/staging space required

**vs**

**More vehicles/less people per vehicle**

- Less noise per vehicle, but more vehicles operating consistently
- More maintenance costs
- More storage/staging space required

### Situational Comparisons

**Corridor-focused System**

- Service is on a schedule
- Best serves AM/PM commuter "rush"
- Serves dedicated/limited number of potential riders
- Reduces vehicle traffic along corridor
- Larger, but fewer vehicles
- Limited expandability
- Shorter travel times

**vs**

**Branch/Network System**

- On-call service - transit arrives as needed or when called
- Best for demand distributed throughout the day
- Serves larger catchment area
- Less efficient for commuter-driven demand
- Smaller, but more vehicles
- More space required at key stations for staging/storage
- Expandable to more areas- Longer travel times

  

**Express**

- Fast and direct service between stations
- Serves dedicated/limited number of potential riders
- Reduction of vehicle traffic during AM/PM commuter "rush"

**vs**

**Local**

- Provides more service for local residents/businesses
- More stops, but slower travel times
- More local impacts (i.e. stations, parking, etc.)

Automated Guideway Transit Feasibility Study  
CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW Community Workshop - April 3, 2017

## Goals and Values

- Adaptable, expandable connect multiple points
- Connect Mountain View and beyond
- Additional criteria:
  - Compatibility with multimodal transportation—i.e. bikes, personalized transportation
  - First and last mile connectivity is important—if this system isn't it then there is a plan for that first and last mile

