

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM XCAP ON 6/17/20

Comment Received				Response/Status
Comment By	Document Reference	Alternative Reference2	Comment	
Public	Factsheet	Ch	Under Engineering Challenges include bike undercrossing at Kellogg: Caltrain ROW required, Caltrain has not agreed to this yet. Partial acquisition of residential and school property also required.	<i>Will do.</i>
Public	Factsheet	Ch	Factsheet does not indicate loss of street parking and traffic flow impacts for the bike undercrossing at Kellogg.	<i>Will do.</i>
Public	Factsheet	M & C	Rendering packet and Factsheet rendering are not up to date.	<i>Will place a footnote on the Fact Sheet that the renderings are not consistent with the plan view layout and will provide a list of features not within the rendering but captured in the Layout.</i>
Public	Layout	All	Current Layouts for all alternatives shows sharp hairpin turns and narrow bike paths which is not a encouragement for people to cycle.	<i>Improvements to 90-degree turns can be made in most, if not all cases. These refinements will be made during the next phase of the project.</i>
XCAP	Layout	M	Round off or widen the west north south connection bike path to allow better cyclist turning movements.	<i>Widening at the 90-degree turns can be accomplished. On the south side of Meadow Dr, this will require additional property acquisition. Refinement will be made in the next phase of the project.</i>
XCAP	Layout	M	Review modifying the intersection to the north on Alma for U-turn movements for northbound traffic.	<i>A U-turn movement at Alma Plaza is possible for passenger vehicles only (the turning radius for trucks and buses would encroach well inside Caltrain's RW). In addition, this U-turn movement would likely require: 1) The southbound off-ramp be moved further north, 2) Narrow (10-foot) lanes on Alma (to avoid impacts to Alma Plaza) and 3) Channelizers along the U-turn lane to deter/prohibit vehicles from Meadow cutting abruptly across the northbound lanes on Alma. This can be explored further during the next phase and considered an "optional feature" of this alternative.</i>
XCAP	Layout	M	Review keeping westbound Meadow to northbound Alma turn at-grade and providing a roundabout further east of Meadow to facilitate more turning movements.	<i>Keeping a westbound lane at grade would require more width and require acquisition of the property at 171 E Meadow (NW corner of Emerson). It would also require a traffic signal at Alma (to allow left turns onto SB Alma)... while that may desirable for the westbound to southbound movement, the volume making that movement in relatively low and removing the signal at this intersection is a major benefit... improved traffic flow and a betterment to the surrounding neighborhood (less stop and go = better air quality and less noise). In addition, not having this at-grade movement removes the pedestrian/bike conflict with motor vehicles (ped/bikes travelling north/south along Alma can span over the vehicles heading onto northbound Alma from Meadow). A single-lane roundabout (140-150 foot diameter, including sidewalks) on Meadow is physically possible, but will require significant property impacts at say, Ramona St. In addition, the roundabout option is not useful on Meadow (like it is at Charleston) because the at-grade "frontage roads" that facilitate the turning movements do not exist at Meadow... the northbound Alma to westbound Meadow movement, for example. Instead, the current layout with the U-turn movement at Alma Plaza is a much better option for this alternative.</i>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM XCAP ON 6/17/20

Comment Received				
Comment By	Document Reference	Alternative Reference2	Comment	Response/Status
XCAP	Layout	M	Nadia to provide a drawing concept of an allowable westbound Meadow to southbound Alma movement. AECOM to provide response and analyze solution.	<i>I believe Nadia is referring to an at-grade connection to Alma from westbound Meadow (signalized intersection at Alma) to allow this southbound movement. This is physically possible, but would 1) Require property acquisition at 171 E Meadow, 2) Require a signal on Alma, and 3) Introduce a ped/bike conflict with motor vehicles (see response to previous comment). If the XCAP still desires this, it can be included as an optional feature of this alternative and studied further in the next phase.</i>
XCAP	Layout	M	AECOM to provide Hexagon response to a eastbound Meadow to northbound Alma movement left turn pocket response. Should the current one lane eastbound Meadow suffice to facilitate this movement.	<i>Hexagon: We checked the left turn from eastbound Meadow. AASHTO guidelines state that a left turn lane should be provided. AECOM: We looked into the feasibility of providing a ~100-foot left turn pocket. It would have the following impacts on the layout: 1) The Meadow/northbound on-ramp intersection would have to be moved further east and the majority of the apartment complex parcel would have to be used; leaving less, if any, land to be re-sold by the City. 2) The north/south pedestrian/bike movement would be less direct... a curvilinear alignment would be needed to span over the on-ramp to northbound Alma. 3) The span lengths of the bridges would be increased by about 11 feet, and thus, the Meadow profile will extend further (slightly) to the east and west. In summary, none of these are considered a fatal flaw and a left turn pocket is considered feasible and could be studied further in the next phase.</i>
XCAP	Layout	C	Layout to show bike/ped path all the way to Carlson Court to review	<i>We understand the importance of bike connectivity along the Charleston Rd corridor, but this is beyond the scope of analyzing the feasibility of the alternative. Carlson Court (~1,400 feet from Alma), for example, goes well beyond the limits of what was studied for the other alternatives at Charleston (hybrid, viaduct, etc.) and is not required to choose an alternative at Charleston, or said another way, won't be a differentiator. A corridor-wide, bike safety/connectivity study can, and should be treated as a separate project.</i>
XCAP	Layout	C	Check and confirm line of sight for traffic on westbound Charleston and traffic coming in and out of Ruthelma Ave.	<i>The crest vertical curve entering the underpass does reduce the sight distance from Ruthelma, but the beginning of the crest is relatively far from Ruthelma (~240 feet) and thus, the sight distance in the proposed condition, is still more than sufficient for a 35 mph design speed.</i>
XCAP	Layout	C	Check with Hexagon whether or not a left turn pocket is required for westbound Charleston to Ruthelma	<i>Hexagon's response: We don't have any (left turn) counts on any of those streets (Park and Ruthelma). However, those streets serve a very small neighborhood, so the turning volumes are expected to be minor. A car stopped to turn left would not block Charleston because there is another lane to get around a stopped vehicle, so a dedicated left turn pocket is likely not warranted.</i>
XCAP	Layout	M	All Bike paths with hard 90-degree turns needs to be looked at to provide a easier turning movement	<i>See response to previous comments... subtle improvements, such as these, can be made during the next phase of the project.</i>
XCAP	Layout	M	Bike path to the east needs to be extended to JLS, and how does this improvement integrate per the Meadow and Bryant Bike Improvements per the Cities Bike Plan.	<i>Similar to the response to the comment about showing the bike path to Carlson court, JLS is beyond the limits and scope for analyzing the feasibility of an underpass at Meadow. This should and can be treated as a separate project.</i>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM XCAP ON 6/17/20

Comment Received				
Comment By	Document Reference	Alternative Reference2	Comment	Response/Status
XCAP	Layout	M	Striping on Ped/Bike path shows pedestrian lanes split by the bike paths whereas on other project shows bike lanes on one side and ped lanes on another.	<i>As noted by Nadia, the Bay Bridge ped/bike path is striped differently (pedestrian walkway on one side). This is certainly an optional way to stripe it. The striping shown on the layout and renderings is based on the Homer Ave Underpass. The striping details can be evaluated further in the next phase.</i>
XCAP	Factsheet	M & C	Label Meadow Renderings not up to date and list updates that are not shown within Factsheets	<i>Will place a footnote on the Fact Sheet that the renderings are not consistent with the plan view layout. Will provide a list of features not within the rendering but captured in the Layout.</i>
XCAP	Factsheet	All	Implement Version control	<i>Version control is addressed by the date on the bottom left of the factsheets</i>
XCAP	Factsheet	M & C	Title to say "Meadow-Charleston Underpasses"	<i>All of the M&C factsheets use the singular to describe the alternative such as M&C Hybrid. Thus, we will keep "Underpass" for consistency.</i>
XCAP	Factsheet	M & C	Clarify cost breakdown is for both underpasses	<i>Will do.</i>
XCAP	Factsheet	M & C	Add property impact within Neighborhood Consideration	<i>Will do.</i>
XCAP	Factsheet	M & C	Change title from "What is an Underpass?" to "About the underpass!"	<i>Will revise on this factsheet and all the other factsheets.</i>
XCAP	Factsheet	Ch	Change title from "What is an Underpass?" to "About the underpass!"	<i>Will revise on this factsheet and all the other factsheets.</i>
XCAP	Factsheet	Ch	City Council Criteria facilitating movements - Qualify turning movements and negative impacts.	<i>Will do.</i>
XCAP	Factsheet	Ch	Add property impact within Neighborhood Considerations	<i>Will do.</i>
XCAP	Factsheet	M & C	Within Engineering Challenges include Caltrain ROW not currently granted by Caltrain.	<i>M&C do not require longitudinal encroachment of Caltrans R/W.</i>
XCAP	Factsheet	Ch	Within Engineering Challenges include Caltrain ROW not currently granted by Caltrain.	<i>Will do.</i>
XCAP	Factsheet	M & C	Renderings within Charleston are overly optimistic with trees and decoration.	<i>We will reduce the height of trees inside the roundabout to 10 feet (maximum). We will also remove any landscaping shown inside the Caltrans R/W.</i>
XCAP	Factsheet	M & C	Include visual representation of permitted vehicle movement.	<i>Will provide a graphic or additional text to define.</i>
XCAP	Factsheet	Ch	Include visual representation of permitted vehicle movement.	<i>Will provide a graphic or additional text to define.</i>
XCAP	Factsheet	M & C	Indicate clearly the property impacts with the alternative	<i>Will include a separate image indicating property impacts (partial acquisitions in one color, full acquisitions in another).</i>
XCAP	Factsheet	Ch	Indicate clearly the property impacts with the alternative	<i>Will include a separate image indicating property impacts (partial acquisitions in one color, full acquisitions in another).</i>
XCAP	Factsheet	M & C	Indicate within Meadow Layout as draft, incomplete due to needed refinement in bike/ped path options.	<i>The plans show the details at a conceptual level only. The plans are not intended for detail design which will be prepared in the next phase of design. The level of detail shown on these concept plans is similar to plans prepared for other alternatives.</i>
XCAP	Layout	Ch	Consider some bike path modification on the Kellogg undercrossing, flared out wing walls, 2 last box and/or lowering entire Embarcadero bike path.	<i>As discussed during the meeting, there are a couple of different options to improve the 90-degree corner (and limited sight distance) such as flaring out the end box segment to provide a better line of sight. Lowering the entire Embarcadero Bike Path (to allow space for a flare) is also feasible. These options can be evaluated further in the next phase of the project.</i>
XCAP	Factsheet	All	Orientation of the layouts within the factsheets is disorienting with north direction changing. Make layout orientation consistent across factsheets	<i>Meadow and Charleston Layouts will be rotated 90 degrees to have train tracks go left/right and consistent with all our other factsheets.</i>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM XCAP ON 6/17/20

Comment Received				Response/Status
Comment By	Document Reference	Alternative Reference2	Comment	
XCAP	Factsheet	M & C	Renderings shows trees between tracks and Alma, this is unrealistic, remove.	<i>This is showing replacement planting (where the shoofly requires the removal of trees). We consider this realistic.</i>
XCAP	Factsheet	All	Include sentence regarding ped/bike mode separation early on within the description of both alternatives to explain why these are developed	<i>Will do.</i>
XCAP	Factsheet	All	City Council Criteria Minimizing disruptions - Clarify closure and duration of each street. State this may vary dependent on construction methodology.	<i>It would take considerable time to review construction staging and narrow down the individual closure durations of this alternative and as we have not confirmed on a construction methodology, accuracy would be arbitrary. A breakdown to this level would then need to be conducted on all the previous alternatives for consistency which is a significant endeavor. This additional information could be developed during the next phase.</i>
XCAP	Factsheet	Ch	Bottom Right Rendering - Mariposa sidewalk same color as the retaining walls. Consider changing this to better indicate ped movement. Consider (Green/Gray)	<i>Will modify the 3D rendering to provide more clarity.</i>
XCAP	Factsheet	Ch	Bottom Right Rendering - Wall on Mariposa not needed.	<i>Will make this adjustment to the 3D rendering.</i>
XCAP	Factsheet	Ch	Mention width of bike path and Kellogg.	<i>Will do.</i>
XCAP	Factsheet	Ch	Concerns on level of completeness of the designs on all new alternatives before going out for public consumption.	<i>Many details will be deferred to the next phase of the project. Fine-tuning the designs at this planning level is unnecessary and typically not done because they are unlikely to be factors in the decision-making process (about which alternatives are recommended for further study). The XCAP may provide a recommendation on an alternative with footnotes regarding details, suboptions, or related studies that should be explored further in the next phase of the project.</i>
XCAP	Factsheet	M & C	Ely Place traffic movement is limited should be mentioned within Factsheet	<i>Will do.</i>
Public	Factsheet	Ch	Churchill layout plans does not show bike path south of Paly football field.	<i>The existing bike path on the south side of the Paly football field will remain as is. The magenta color is meant to represent the modified/new section of the ped/bike facility. In addition, the path is covered by the trees, so the image might give an appearance that it's not there, but it certainly is and this alternative will not impact it.</i>
Public	Factsheet	All	All alternative exhibits should have profile not just for the roadways but also the bike paths	<i>Exhibits displayed at future town halls will include profiles, however due to space limitations, these will not be shown on the Fact Sheets.</i>
Public	Factsheet	M & C	Charleston roundabout, the width of the bike paths leading to the roundabout crosswalks are not shown accurately and needs looking at.	<i>Subtle improvements, such as these, will be deferred to the next phase of the project.</i>
XCAP	Factsheet	All	Structures within Layout to be called "On-grade Structures"	<i>We have not identified above grade structure on other fact sheets, so on-grade would be inconsistent. The typical section illustrates what is above, below, and at-grade.</i>