

ATTACHMENT 1

MOUNTAIN VIEW AUTOMATED TRANSIT GUIDEWAY FEASIBILITY STUDY COMMUNITY MEETING

Summary of Automated Guideway Transit Feasibility Study Community Meeting

Monday, September 25, 2017

The City of Mountain View hosted a community meeting on Monday September 25, 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 Historic Adobe Building, 157 Moffett Boulevard in Mountain View. Twenty-seven (27) 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 second 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; methodology and screening process; various technologies and their characteristics including renderings; as well as potential demand for the service and schedule of next steps. After the presentation, a half hour of questions and comments were taken in a facilitated session. Then the attendees were asked to go to their notes and give feedback about the various technologies in three main topic areas: passenger experience, infrastructure and technological maturity. The purpose of the exercise was to get feedback about the community's feelings about trade-offs between the options. A summary of the community comments, questions and feedback 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, twenty-seven (27) members of the public attended.

A small portion of the attendees said the City's social media was how they found out about the meeting. Nextdoor was acknowledged as another way attendees found out about the meeting from several 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 one-quarter of the attendees indicated they saw newspaper coverage regarding the topic and the meeting.

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 potentially impacted property-owners. One-quarter of the attendees attended the first community meeting in April 2017.

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 and screening criteria and methodology. 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
Is study looking at light rail?	No, the City Council direction was to look at automated systems and Light Rail needs a driver.
Is the Study looking at a loop from the Transit center in Mountain View out to San Antonio?	No that is outside the scope the Council asked us to look at. However, should this system expand it could be considered.
Do we have an implementation time yet?	No, not yet. We do not have a project until we get further along in the process.
Is the cable car technology the most mature?	Yes.
Can there be external bike racks?	No, due to how these systems operate.
Will there be cat walk type evacuation requirements?	That is not known at this time.
What technology is the BART to Oakland Airport train?	That is an Automatic People Mover (APM).
What group of technology does the monorail fit in. The monorails look more slender than your renderings show. That could be misleading.	Monorail is an Automatic People Mover (APM). There are various subcategories of all the technologies shown. There is no intent to mislead. The team was showing “typical/worse case” infrastructure to show how wide some of it might be.

I think we should minimize impacts. Can we keep the technology on the ground and take a lane of traffic?	Yes, that could be an option but of course it is also a trade-off.
I went to a briefing about the SkyTran which is an overhead monorail. It is much less expensive than what you are showing.	The team is familiar with that technology. We are looking at the broader categories. The City stands behind these cost estimates.
These \$200m projects that can add up to billions are an insult. We should do a project cheaply right now.	Comment noted.
Have first responders been coordinated with? That should happen immediately.	Not yet but the Team will be coordinating on those types of technical issues in a future phase.
How many years will it take to recover the costs? What will the City underwrite as a cost? What will the system charge riders?	We are not there yet.
Thank you for doing this work and Study. The City should look at proven technologies that can be put in place in the near future. We need more transit options. Can we look at driverless trams or trolleys?	Driverless trams and trolleys are in the Autonomous Transit Network category.
Is there a “car replacement value” that can be assigned as part of the analysis?	That concept is part of the overall goals for the effort but not specifically measured.
What is the likelihood of property acquisition and/or eminent domain?	The City is trying to fit the technologies into the existing public right-of-way. However, there are tight spots as were shown in the presentation. Yes, the City could possibly need to acquire right-of-way.
This will not lead to fewer cars on the road.	Comment noted.
Why was this Study’s work not included in the Transit Center planning effort?	This Study was not far enough along.
What would any of these systems take	It depends on which technology is developed. The team is analyzing the

off the roads?	future traffic demand once the North Bayshore is developed.
Did the capital costs presented include right-of-way?	No. The effort is looking to stay in public right-of-way as much as possible.
Light rail (LRT) was done for \$20m a mile.	LRT is not automated so it is not a similar technology; LRT costs today are closer to \$100 per mile.
The team should consider BART heavy rail style tracks.	Comment noted
Did anyone consider expanding LRT from Mountain View to Bayshore?	Yes, VTA has looked at that recently.

Topical Feedback by Category:

<p>Passenger Experience—Covering vehicle size and capacity as well as whether the service is direct point to point or more traditional routing with interim stops</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The non-stop version of the gondola technology is not an advantage—it will be hard for the elderly to use • There is no advantage to the small cars—neither in time or cost • Autonomous is risky—concerns regarding the homeless taking over the vehicles • 24/7 should be the goal for operations, there should be a variety of vehicles and a way to “right size” them, the fee should be reasonably priced, the system should be able to adapt to both point to point service as well as route service depending upon demand, it should be safe • Optimize vehicle size to make it difficult for homeless to take over • There should be point to point service and then arrests as a way to control unwanted behavior • The vehicles and service should be able to handle concert loads and should be sized for that • Predictable service frequencies is important, don’t want to use service in one direction but not be able to return because of long wait times • The wait of anywhere between 1-4 minutes is not an issue so technologies

are very similar that way, demand is an interesting concept

- They should stage vehicles to take care of events

Infrastructure—Covering such concerns and topics as Privacy versus Visual Impacts versus Noise Impacts:

- Noise is a consideration not just noise on the tracks but in and out of the stations
- Flexibility should be key—start something soon and modify it—start in the street rather than expensive tracks—add those other elements as funding becomes available and necessary
- No steel rails-no federal rules
- Less elevated systems are better for visual and noise reasons
- Go high so there are no right-of-way needs
- Monorail should be considered since it is a slender design and has less impacts visually
- Shelters should have rain protection

Technological Maturity—Including the concept of build something now versus waiting for certain technologies to mature before committing

- Get going—look at what is cheapest and easiest to get early start
- Losing a lane is not is not worth taking part of a street
- There are a lot of mature transit technologies that don't make a difference on the traffic on the street
- In two years—the time for this effort to get to a decision—the autonomous vehicles will make great strides—build it now—they will come—in 2 years things will be better and cheaper than today
- Expandability is very important



