



MEMORANDUM

To: City of San José and Kimley-Horn Project Team

From: Nelson\Nygaard Project Team

Date: January 14, 2020

Subject: En Movimiento Community Outreach 3 Summary

PROJECT INTRODUCTION

A successful *En Movimiento: A Transportation Plan for East San José* (formerly East San José Multimodal Transportation Improvement Plan) depends on an inclusive and equitable public outreach process with input from key individuals and organizations as well as a broad cross-section of East San José's communities and stakeholder groups. *En Movimiento* includes four rounds of targeted community engagement seeking public input through a combination of coordinated stakeholder communication and broad engagement. This memorandum summarizes Community Outreach 3.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The goal of Community Outreach 3 was to gather feedback from key stakeholders about design details for the potential projects in the East San José study area. The project team prepared potential design details for 24 projects, all of which reflected priorities and feedback from community members shared during previous outreach events and surveys.

STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP OVERVIEW

This round of community engagement included two stakeholder workshops on Wednesday, December 18, 2019. The stakeholder workshops were held at community gathering spaces in the study area during the morning and late afternoon. The morning workshop focused on projects in the west side of the East San José study area and the afternoon workshop focused on projects in the east side of the study area. Prior to the workshops, Nelson\Nygaard sent a save the date via email to about 60 project partners and stakeholders who have been engaged in previous phases of *En Movimiento*. During the workshops, the project team received input from ten stakeholders who represented seven organizations. The specific meeting focus, time, location, and types of participants of each event are included in Figure 1.

Figure 1 Stakeholder Workshop Details

Meeting Focus	Time	Location	Attendees
Projects in the west side of the study area	9:30 a.m. to 12 p.m.	Roosevelt Community Center	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ City of San José District 3 ▪ SOMOS ▪ Resident and property owner ▪ Veggjelution
Projects in the east side of the study area	2:30 p.m. to 5 p.m.	Mexican Heritage Plaza	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ride Eastside San José ▪ SOMOS ▪ Walk San José

The workshop meeting format provided opportunities for in-depth conversations about projects of interest to the attendees. Staff from the project team, including the City of San Jose, Nelson\Nygaard, and Kimley-Horn, facilitated conversations amongst stakeholders by walking participants through potential design details for specific projects and prompting participants with questions. Prior to the workshops, the project team prepared graphic materials to illustrate potential design details on an aerial image of the project corridor for 24 projects in the study area; stakeholders discussed 11 of these projects during the workshops.

WHAT WE HEARD

The following sections present the input received about each of the 11 projects discussed during the stakeholder workshops. The projects are listed in the order in which they were discussed.

East Santa Clara Street [17th Street to 34th Street] (Project 1)

Session: Morning and Afternoon

Comments:

- Support:
 - Support for bus lanes because there is a need to improve public transit, and more transit rider activity can bring economic vitality and community space.
 - Support for curb extensions to slow vehicle traffic; people tend to drive fast in this corridor especially near the freeway.
 - If public transit improves, the need for parking will decrease.
- Concern:
 - Concerns about on-street parking removal:
 - Negative impact on businesses because there is little off-street parking in this corridor, particularly between Coyote Creek and 24th Street.
 - New development will increase parking demand.
 - Could create a “ghost town” if people are not able to park here.
 - Impacts on businesses vary by business type (i.e. removing parking in front of a furniture store could be detrimental to the business).
- Suggestions:

- Add a crosswalk on the west leg of the 19th Street intersection.
- Recommend including Leading Pedestrian Intervals (LPIs) at crosswalks.
- Recommend including visibility improvements.
- Recommend including wayfinding to point people who bike along Santa Clara onto safer bikeways (San Antonio)
- Improve lighting.
- Recommend that the City to buy land on the north side of East Santa Clara to widen the street.
- Recommend that the City talk with businesses before removing parking.
- Request for the City to take a closer look at parking removal and supply between Coyote Creek and 24th Street.
- Request for more information about how the implementation of this project will differ from that of the Alum Rock corridor, and strategic phasing to minimize implementation impacts as possible.
- Request for project team to investigate what work has been done on this corridor related to Vision Zero.
- Can we move the eastbound bus stop at 21st Street to far-side? VTA is currently re-evaluating stop locations

28th Street Bike Boulevard (Project 5B)

Session: Morning

Comments:

- Support:
 - Support for traffic circles and other traffic calming measures; there is a lot of cut-through traffic and speeding on 28th Street.
- Concern:
 - Concern that plantings in traffic circles could get run over by vehicles.
- Suggestions:
 - Consider additional traffic calming on Bonita Avenue between San Antonio Street and William Street.

San Antonio Bike Boulevard (Project 10)

The project team presented three alternatives:

1. Alt. 1: remove parking and add protected bike lanes
2. Alt. 2: add traffic calming
3. Alt. 3: add traffic calming and close the 1010-overcrossing to vehicles

Session: Morning and Afternoon

Comments:

- Support:
 - Support for the idea of a diversion, but it could be tough to do that at the freeway

- Alt 3: Consider pilot project/phased approach to block the bridge. But only do the pilot if you also do traffic calming on the perpendicular streets
 - Start with adding traffic circles (alternative 2) and measure the impacts. Collect data on the perpendicular streets. Then close the 101-overcrossing (alternative 3) if further reduction in vehicle volumes/speed is needed.
 - A pilot could help to get community buy-in.
 - A pilot would need to last a couple of weeks so that people become familiar with the changes and make any adjustments to behavior that they would over time.
- Concern:
 - Alternative 1 was the least attractive to all stakeholders due to concern about removing parking that fronts residences.
- Concerns about alternative 3:
 - It could disconnect the two neighborhoods.
 - It could make traffic worse on other nearby streets.
- Suggestions:
 - Request to understand where people are going before deciding if/where to divert traffic. Uncertain about school traffic patterns – do students/parents need to cross US-101 to get to school? If people are making local trips between neighborhoods, they would be affected by closing this connection. But, if people are not making local trips and are traveling to downtown or to other areas, they would not be affected by closing this connection.

St. John/St. James BART Connection (Project 9)

Session: Morning

Comments:

- Support:
 - A bridge at St. James is more likely.
 - Support for the idea of the trail through the park as it is more direct, intuitive and puts more eyes on the park.
- Concern:
 - The pump station at St. John and Coyote Creek may pose an issue for getting approval from Homeland Security for the bridge.
 - Concern about running a public bikeway through a high school sports field.
- Suggestion:
 - Recommend moving the trail to go around the perimeter of the sports field or through the nearby park, which could be a good way to activate space in the park.
 - Include traffic calming at St. James and 27th or 28th Street to reduce cut-through traffic heading to BART.

Julian Street BART Connection (Project 8)

Session: Morning

Comments:

- Support:
 - Support for a protected bike lane east of 21st Street. Need to make sure it doesn't impact business access.
 - A bike lane west of 21st Street would be more challenging because there is more residential fronting property and parking is more important. Okay with bike lanes between 19th and 21st.
- Suggestion:
 - If an alternative alignment is necessary, 19th Street could connect to another bike lane, but this might have parking impacts so it's important to identify who the parking serves and how they use it before making changes to the supply.
 - Label the 5 Wounds Trail on project graphic.

King Road Transit Priority (Project 19)

Session: Afternoon

Comments:

- Concern:
 - No major comments.
- Suggestion:
 - Consider the intersection treatments for bike lanes to minimize conflict with the bus queue jump lane.
 - Show the existing bike lanes on the project graphic.

Lower Silver Creek On-Street Trail Connection (Project 20)

Description:

The project team presented two alternatives, one of which includes a sidewalk gap closure.

Session: Afternoon

Comments:

- Support:
 - Support for Alternative 2 because it fills a sidewalk gap.
- Concern:
 - Concern that a sidewalk could increase trash in the creek.
- Suggestion:
 - Recommend that if an advocacy group that focuses on the Lower Silver Creek Trail exists, the City may connect to discuss their preference between alternatives.

Jackson Avenue (Project 22)

Session: Afternoon

Comments:

- Concern:
 - No major comments.
- Suggestion:
 - Consider confirming the pedestrian crossing striping details with the Vision Zero team.

101 Overcrossings [McKee and San Antonio] (Project 14)

Session: Afternoon

Comments:

- Comments included under San Antonio Bike Boulevard.

San Antonio Major Street (Project 17)

Session: Afternoon

Comments:

- Support:
 - Support for trail connection and crossing.
- Concern:
 - Concern about the effectiveness of Rapid Rectangular Flash Beacons (RRFBs); this location may be worth a more upgraded signal if that aligns with the City's new Complete Street Guidelines. Suggest putting in an RRFB first and then assessing to determine if more is needed.
- Suggestions:
 - Request for traffic calming; concern about safety due to vehicles backing out of long driveways.
 - Recommend observing traffic flows around the church on a Sunday because a lot of people attend this church then.
 - Recommend a formalized crossing between San Jose Grail Family Services and Our Lady of Guadalupe Church.

Sunset Avenue Bike Boulevard (Project 23)

Session: Afternoon

Comments:

- Support:
 - Support for requiring a bike path easement in the development review process.
- Concern:
 - N/A
- Suggestions:
 - Suggest extending this over the bridge and incorporating light and artwork. This opportunity could be included in the Alum Rock Urban Village plan as a priority for new development.

General Comments

Session: Morning and Afternoon

Comments:

- Be mindful of the people who live in these neighborhoods who are car-dependent for work and other daily needs. Car dependency is a primary factor in residential parking needs, and is an important equity consideration.
- Be mindful of construction impacts.
- Emphasis that this project should be closely coordination with Vision Zero.
- Interest in understanding more about project prioritization process.
- Recommend including a metric around if a neighborhood has been disinvested in historically to assess equity impacts.