



City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item-No Attachments (PDF)

File #: 17-0335, **Version:** 1

Study Session Summary of February 28, 2017 - Mary Avenue Overcrossing - Environmental Impact Report

Call to Order:

Mayor Glenn Hendricks called the meeting to order at 5 p.m.

City Councilmembers Present:

Mayor Glenn Hendricks
Vice Mayor Gustav Larsson
Councilmember Jim Griffith
Councilmember Larry Klein
Councilmember Nancy Smith
Councilmember Russ Melton
Councilmember Michael S. Goldman

City Councilmembers Absent:

None

Study Session Summary:

Director of Public Works Manuel Pineda, and Transportation and Traffic Manager Ria Hutabarat Lo presented information about the Mary Avenue Overcrossing Environmental Impact Report (EIR) including project background, a description of the five project options under consideration, design amendments made based on community and stakeholder input, project timeline, and public outreach processes.

Councilmembers asked questions, made comments, and requested additional information as summarized below:

- Make sure the project does not preclude future non-motorized connections to Moffett Park Light Rail Train (LRT) station and John W. Christian Trail.
 - Future connections would be separate from this project and would need to address feasibility issues such as height. If feasible, the 2-way cycle track would make such connections easier.
 - Mayor Hendricks suggested that access to LRT occur via 11th Avenue.
- What was the original objection raised in the law suit?
 - The lawsuit focused on the use of a 2020 traffic baseline.
- Only 10% of Sunnyvale residents work here, so what is the project rationale?
- Concern was expressed about creating another Sunnyvale-Saratoga Road.
- Why did people support complete removal from the General Plan?
 - Concerns generally relate to cost, traffic volume and safety on Mary.
- Public transit is minimal, so how would the transit/bike/pedestrian option work?

- The project team has met with Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) and shuttle providers and is seeking input to assess demand and/or interest.
- Appreciate the updates and amendments based on input.
- Include groups from the 2007 effort in outreach efforts for this work.
- What happens to the Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) if the project is removed from the General Plan?
 - This is not a California Environmental Quality Act issue, but there would be policy implications that would need to be addressed if that option were selected.
- After release of the Draft EIR, Council would like supporting material on a framework of criteria to help with selection of a preferred option.
- Do not increase the project scope in order to respond to input.

Public Comment:

Public speakers made the following comments:

- Please drop the four-lane option (Option 1) from consideration.
- Consider including an option for automated people movers (like a tram system).
- Concerns were expressed about the safety of 2-way bikeways including transition arrangements at either end and head-on collisions between bicyclists.
- Request that the project be brought to BPAC and the Sustainability Commission.
- The 4-lane option would result in increased traffic volumes along Maude Ave, Central Expressway, Fremont Ave by commuters trying to avoid traffic on the 85.
- What are the other potential uses of this money?
- It is important to use data as a basis for decision making (like Amber alerts).
- A property owner from the corner of Almanor and Mary expressed concern that a 4- or 3-lane option would block their building, eliminate 25% of their parking, and landlock the premises, which relies on a leased Hetch Hetchy easement for the other access path into the site. The speaker indicated that this could expose the City to eminent domain risk of up to \$30 million.

Adjournment:

Mayor Glenn Hendricks adjourned the meeting at 6 p.m.