PABAC

Palo Alto Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee

Tuesday, February 2, 2021 at 6:15 P.M.
Join Meeting Via Zoom
Join Online: https://cityofpaloalto.zoom.us/j/91805314002; Dial-in: 669-900-6833
Meeting ID: 918 0531 4002

PART I: TDA 3 – BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PLAN UPDATE

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL/CONFIRM QUORUM 6:15 PM
   A quorum of this Committee shall be a majority of its membership (10).

2. AGENDA CHANGES 6:18 PM

3. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES 6:20 PM

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS 6:22 PM
   Note: Written comments submitted by email to Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org before 12:00pm on January 25, 2021 are attached with the agenda packet.

5. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS
   a. Confirmation of the final Framework topic headings 6:28 PM
   b. Vote: Use of TDA 3 funds for the BPTP Update 7:10 PM

6. ADJOURNMENT 7:20 PM

PART II: OTHER ITEMS

1. AGENDA CHANGES 7:20 PM

2. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES 7:22 PM

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS
   a. Acknowledgement of Lefkowitz Undercrossing 7:24 PM

4. STAFF UPDATES
   a. Alma/Churchill Section 130 Project Status 7:27 PM
   b. VERBS Grant Project Status (Council Staff Report ID # 11757) 7:45 PM

5. DISCUSSION ITEMS – NONE

6. STANDING ITEMS
   a. VTA BPAC Update 7:50 PM

7. ADJOURNMENT 8:00 PM

PABAC

Palo Alto Pedestrian and
Bicycle Advisory Committee

Tuesday, January 5, 2021
6:15 P.M.

VIRTUAL MEETING
Palo Alto, CA

Members Present:	Ken Joye (Chair), Art Liberman (Vice Chair), Arnout Boelens, Nicole Zoeller Boelens, Bill Courington, Cedric de la Beaujardiere, Kathy Durham, Penny Ellson, Paul Goldstein, Robert Neff, Eric Nordman, Rob Robinson, Steve Rock, Jane Rothstein, Richard Swent, Alan Wachtel, Bill Zaumen
Members Absent:	Bruce Arthur
Staff Present:	Sylvia Star-Lack, Joanna Chan
Guests:	Francis Viggiano, Matthew Lefkowitz

PART I: TDA 3 – BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PLAN UPDATE

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL/CONFIRM QUORUM

Chair Joye called the meeting to order at 6:15 p.m. Joanna Chan called roll and announced a quorum was present.

2. AGENDA CHANGES

None

3. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES

Mr. Zaumen clarified his comments on page 2, lines 31-33, as referring to specific markings that indicate the part of a traffic signal that is sensitive and opening creek crossings for pedestrian use without implementing improvements that could make the crossings suitable for bicycle use.

Motion by Mr. Goldstein, seconded by Ms. Rothstein, to approve the minutes of the December 1, 2020 meeting, as amended. Motion passed 15-0 with 1 abstention and 2 absent.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

5. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Refinement of the draft Framework topic headings with simultaneous editing

Ms. Chan advised that staff seeks input and consensus regarding the proposed headings for the draft Framework. Specific text for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update (Plan Update) will be discussed as it is developed. In February, PABAC must vote to use, or not, TDA 3 funds for the Plan Update.

Mr. Goldstein believed the vision is directed too much toward projects rather than programs and suggested language of "the intent (1) to guide City staff on providing safe, accessible, and comfortable transportation options for everyone to assemble a menu of programs and projects taking into consideration priorities and available funds, and (2) to explain to the public how this plan fits into the City's transportation goals." The Executive Summary should include progress achieved under the BPTP 2012. Safe Routes for Older Adults is currently not a supporting program, and therefore should be considered under another section. Level of Traffic Stress under Section 4 needs to be Level of Stress for Bicycles and Pedestrians. Mobility needs to be defined. Gap Closure or Across Barrier Connection could reference High Speed Rail. Section 4 should have topics for governance, namely PABAC, and availability of information such as maps and signage. Incorporating bicycle and pedestrian count data into Section 5.1, Bicycle and Pedestrian High Injury Network, would be good. Categorization under Section 7 is confusing. Projects within a type are usually easier to prioritize. Projects should be ranked as high, medium, and low.

Ms. Ellson indicated Safe Routes for Older Adults should be a part of the Plan Update based on comments made during the December 2020 meeting and should be broadened to Safe Routes for Everyone or Safe Routes for the Community. Ms. Rothstein concurred.

Mr. Boelens proposed the Executive Summary be the first section. Section 2.2.1 could include a ten-year vision and best practices. The draft Framework needs to include programs for Safe Routes for All, electronic bicycle subsidies, and integrating walking and cycling with transit. Equity and population density may be criteria in Section 4. Section 5 could be Vision Zero or Systematic Safety rather than Collision Analysis. A map of desired primary, secondary, and tertiary bicycle networks could be contained in Section 8, and could assist with prioritizing projects. References to innovative design should be removed from Section 8. Design principles or desired design features could be a part of Section 8.

Mr. Zaumen suggested Vision and Goals include convenience. In Section 5, "collision" could be replaced with "safety."

Vice Chair Liberman proposed a new topic of Bicycle Infrastructure Recommendations, which would refer to a dynamic list of improvements on the website, for Section 2. Community Engagement should be Communities Engagement to include a variety of communities such as employers, commuters, school groups, neighborhood associations, recreational users, and seniors. Needs Assessment needs to include community engagement. "Chapter 5: Collision Analysis" should be added to Section 6.1. The public needs to be able to access the Plan Update easily, and the Plan Update needs to be updated regularly.

Mr. Robinson felt Section 1.2 should explain progress made under the BPTP 2012. Section 4 needs to contain historic traffic data. A new topic for Section 5 is electric modes of transportation. The draft Framework needs to include modes of transportation of the future. Readiness should be deleted from the second bullet point under Section 7.2.

Mr. Neff believed the Plan Update should contain a section that describes ways to improve City policies and plans in order to increase safety. Level of traffic stress and safety may be part of the same thing. "Accessibility" is a better term than "mobility" because accessibility means individuals can reach their destinations quickly and easily. Sustainability should be a goal. Programs may need to be incorporated into Sections 6 and 7.

Mr. Wachtel suggested narrowing the Vision and Goals and using several sentences. The draft Framework does not contain any principles to guide the document. Metrics and criteria should be distinguished in Section 4. Bicycle and pedestrian counts are needed to show the location of demand and to compare collision data. Recommendations in Sections 6.1 and 6.2 should not be limited to facilities.

Ms. Boelens proposed including a letter from the City Manager or the Mayor in support of the Plan Update and reflecting on the Plan Update's importance to the City. The headings could be simplified. The Executive Summary could include highlights of accomplishments. Safe Routes to School (SRTS) as an established program needs to be differentiated from Safe Routes for All as a conceptual program. Perhaps Section 3 could be titled Community Engagement, and Section 3.2 entitled Plan. Safety could be the first criterium in Section 4.

Ms. Rothstein indicated the language of the Vision and Goals should include "support." The Framework needs to include behavior change, education, and Safe Routes for Everyone, particularly older adults.

Mr. Nordman felt the criteria should be grouped into categories for scoring purposes. Section 5 should include a data needs assessment. Cost is a factor in determining the value of a proposed project.

Ms. Ellson suggested changing references to "projects" to "projects and programs" throughout the draft Framework. The Introduction should not use industry jargon and acronyms and should be written so that laymen understand it. Safe Routes for Older Adults or Safe Routes for Everyone should be moved from Section 2 to Section 7. Pedestrian and bicycle counts should be next to collision data. Knowing the causes of collisions in areas with high numbers of collisions could be helpful. In Sections 6.1 and 6.2, "facilities" should be replaced with "projects and programs." A new Section 6.4 could be policy changes and metrics to evaluate outcomes of the Plan Update. Section 8 should include a map of common or popular destinations.

Mr. Rock noted the draft Framework does not mention electric two-wheeled vehicles and how they integrate into the Plan Update. "adults with limited abilities" or "adults with limited physical strength" is a better descriptor than "older adults." Section 1.1 contains ambiguous terms such as accessible and comfortable. Community engagement for each project should include some type of graphic that represents accurately and simply the finished project. Information about single-vehicle collisions is needed as well as multiple-vehicle collisions.

PABAC should be interested in door-to-door or origin-to-destination transportation including travel on private property. The City should require existing multifamily housing to provide safe bicycle parking. Categories and criteria depend on what PABAC wants to optimize. Safety can be enhanced with more enforcement of traffic laws.

Mr. de la Beaujardiere noted counts should include historical and ongoing data in order to evaluate needs, projects, and programs. The draft Framework does not mention increasing wayfinding signage. Project readiness should be a factor in prioritization. Community engagement could emphasize building community consensus.

Ms. Durham preferred the term "safe by design." The Plan Update has to include driver awareness. SRTS includes parent engagement as well as route maps and strategies. Collision Analysis and Recommendations need to include all forms of micro-mobility and electronic transportation. Community engagement is more than talking to people who attend public meetings. In the current environment, increased enforcement of traffic laws needs additional thought.

6. ADJOURNMENT – 8:15 p.m.

PART II: OTHER ITEMS

1. AGENDA CHANGES

Chair Joye announced Items 4, and 6 are continued to the February 2021 meeting due to time constraints.

2. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS
- **a. Agenda Items Backlog**

4. STAFF UPDATES
- **a. VERBS Grant Project Status**
- **b. VTA Bicycle Superhighway**

5. DISCUSSION ITEMS:
- **a. Selection of 2021 Chair and Vice Chair**

Mr. Nordman nominated Mr. Joye for the office of Chair. By acclamation, PABAC members closed nominations.

Mr. Rock nominated Mr. Neff for the office of Vice Chair; however, Mr. Neff declined the nomination. Mr. Neff nominated Mr. Liberman for the office of Vice Chair. By acclamation, PABAC members closed nominations.

PABAC members approved the nominations of Mr. Joye and Mr. Liberman for the offices of Chair and Vice Chair respectively. Motion passed 16-0 with 2 absent.

6. STANDING ITEMS:

a. VTA BPAC Update

7. ADJOURNMENT at 8:21 p.m.

PABAC

Palo Alto Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

1. Churchill Avenue Enhanced Bikeway Project

The project provides improved facilities for all modes using Churchill Avenue and for vehicles turning into Palo Alto High School. This corridor sees substantial use by bicyclists and pedestrians as school commuters and is also used by automobile commuters who travel north and south through Palo Alto. The concept plan was approved by Council on January 20, 2015 after staff conducted outreach to the community, school district and PABAC. The project was placed on hold in Summer 2018 because of staffing shortages. It restarted again in October 2019 and is now at 95% design. Staff will be presenting to the PAUSD Board at their February 9th meeting, and anticipates their approval at their March meeting. Staff will provide a brief presentation to PABAC at the March meeting. PABAC's support for this important safety project is appreciated.

Below is a summary of the proposed improvements for the Project:

The proposed design plan extends the existing bicycle path along Churchill up to the intersection, where an improved crossing at El Camino Real would connect to the Stanford Perimeter Trail and onto the Stanford University campus. The proposed concept plan line includes extending the existing pathway that currently terminates at the Palo Alto High School driveway, to the west and terminating at El Camino Real where the modified traffic signal would be designed to accommodate users crossing El Camino Real.

Improvements include striping updates and high visibility crosswalks on Churchill, a raised enhanced crosswalk that would also act as a speed table at the intersection of Madrono and Churchill, and a sidewalk extension on the south corners of Castelleja Avenue to reduce pedestrian crossing distance and accommodate the rectangular rapid flashing beacons.

The design also includes a new decorative traffic signal pole at the intersection of El Camino Real and Churchill, removal of the existing "pork chop" island, addition of a pedestrian crosswalk across the north leg of the intersection, and addition of a right-turn vehicle lane on westbound Churchill. Textured, color treatments, and a new connection to Stanford University campus are also proposed as part of this modification, which requires consultation with Caltrans, PAUSD, and Stanford University.

Project website will be updated as more information becomes available:
https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/gov/depts/trn/transportation_projects/churchill_avenue_multi_modal_improvements.asp

CITY OF PALO ALTO

Public Comment Instructions For City of Palo Alto Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan Update

Members of the Public may provide public comments on the City of Palo Alto Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan Update as follows:

1. **Written public comments** (including visuals such as presentations, photos, etc) may be submitted by email to Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org. Please follow these instructions:

   A. Please email your written comments **by 12:00 pm (noon) on the Monday the week before (eight days before)** the upcoming Palo Alto Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee (PABAC) meeting, unless otherwise indicated. Details of upcoming PABAC meetings are available on the City's PABAC webpage.
      - Written public comments will be attached to the upcoming PABAC meeting agenda packet.
      - Written comments submitted after 12:00pm (noon) on the Monday before the upcoming PABAC meeting will be attached to the following PABAC meeting agenda packet.

   B. Please **lead your email subject line with "BPTP Update".**

   C. When providing comments with reference to the current City of Palo Alto Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan 2012, please be as specific as possible by indicating the chapter number, section heading number, and/or page number.

2. **Spoken public comments using a computer** will be accepted through the teleconference meeting. To address the Committee, click on the URL in the agenda packet for Zoom. Please follow these instructions:

   A. You may download the Zoom client or connect to the meeting in-browser.
      - If using your browser, make sure you are using a current, up-to-date browser: Chrome 30+, Firefox 27+, Microsoft Edge 12+, Safari 7+. Certain functionality may be disabled in older browsers including Internet Explorer.

   B. You may be asked to enter an email address and name. We request (but do not require) that you identify yourself by name as this will be visible online and will be used to notify you that it is your turn to speak.

   C. When you wish to speak, click on "raise hand." Staff will activate and unmute speakers in turn. Speakers will be notified shortly before they are called to speak.

   D. When called, please limit your remarks to the time limit allotted by the Chair.

3. **Spoken public comments using a smart phone app** will be accepted through the teleconference meeting. To address the Committee, download the Zoom application onto your smart phone from the Apple App Store or Google Play Store and enter the Meeting ID in the agenda. Please follow the instructions B-D above.

4. **Spoken public comments using a phone (cell or land line) without an app** will be accepted through the teleconference meeting. Use the telephone number listed in the agenda. When you wish to speak, press *9 on your phone to "raise hand." You will be asked to provide your first and last name before addressing the Committee. When called, press *6 on your phone to unmute. Please limit your remarks to the time limit allotted by the Chair.

Public Comments for
City of Palo Alto Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan Update

This Packet Includes:

A compilation of written comments on the City of Palo Alto Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan Update submitted by email to Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org.

From: Transportation
To: Chan, Joanna
Cc: Transportation
Subject: FW: BPTP Update
Date: Monday, January 4, 2021 9:41:32 AM

JC,
Forwarding.

From: Art Liberman <art_liberman@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 2, 2021 3:07 PM
To: Transportation <Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: BPTP Update

Joanna and Transportation Staff:

I have reviewed the Draft Framework for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Update. Creating the Draft Framework was a challenging task given the many inputs and ideas from PABAC and the public, and I compliment the staff on the work product. I do have some specific suggestions for modifications and changes of topic headings that I will propose at the January 5th PABAC meeting.

I previously submitted some general suggestions and comments to Transportation for the BPTP update in an attachment to an email I sent to Transportation on November 22. Those suggestions were in response to the October 23 Memo from Joanna Chan. Some of my suggestions for the new BPTP were incorporated in the Draft Framework and I thank the staff for considering them.

One issue that was not mentioned in the Oct 23 Memo, and which has puzzled me, was whether there are any required elements to be in the BPTP update. I have been puzzled by this. Are there some state or regional regulatory requirements or a need to include items because of funding requirements for the production of the plan or possible future grant submissions?

I would like to repeat one suggestion that I presented in my Nov 22 memo and that I repeated at the December PABAC meeting. Make as much of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan an updatable and online document as possible. As time moves on, even the best of plans become obsolete and it becomes harder to justify a new bicycle route because it was proposed in a plan that is 7 or 10 years old. Regulatory requirements, laws, economics and some important circumstances, such as the upcoming electrification of Caltrain and the issue of road crossings that have not yet been settled, can drastically change the considerations that are behind the needs assessment and priorities. I urge you to take advantage of the online technology and

make more of the plan a dynamic one, so that it remains a currently useful document. I suggest that as many sections as possible be on a Transportation BPTP web page, and kept updated. At a minimum, this should include the Executive Summary and the maps proposed to be in the Appendices.

I also suggest that Transportation, with input from PABAC, develop and post on this webpage the set of bicycle infrastructure projects and modifications that would be included in the BPTP update and that such webpage posting include BOTH design guidelines and functional definitions. How useful this would have been had such design and functional guidelines existed for a Bicycle Boulevard previously, before the development of the projects on Ross Road; this could have prevented the confusion that resulted and the displeasure that many residents expressed.

Arthur Liberman

From:	Robert Neff
To:	Chan, Joanna
Subject:	Written comments for tonight"s meeting
Date:	Tuesday, January 5, 2021 6:20:44 PM
Attachments:	Bike Plan Proposal comments 1_5_2021.pdf

Hello Joanna,

Attached are a written version of comments I plan to make at tonight's meeting.

--
-- Robert
robert@neffs.net

Bike Plan Proposal comments 1/5/2021

First, I want to thank Arnout Boelens for forwarding the information about “Systemic Safety”. Coincidentally, I read a description of one of the early “Vision Zero” proposals from the 1990s, from Sweden, and there were a lot of similarities (basically, it is the same vision), of making roads safe by design, and preventing potential conflicts that will endanger vulnerable road users. When a pedestrian or cyclist is seriously hurt, on a neighborhood street, we should view it as the fault of a poorly designed city that we would have so many risky pedestrian and cyclist locations. Palo Alto has averaged more than one fatality per year for the past 10 years for these vulnerable road users. We currently choose to live with routine danger.

So I have two suggestions for the plan outline.

First, a plan may start by showing how this plan fits into current city priorities and policies. I think this plan needs to go beyond that, to be more strident, to make significant suggestions to change city priorities and policies to improve systematic safety. For example, we cannot meet the systematic safety standards while maintaining a 25 mph neighborhood speed limit, and our current system of stop signs at every other block. The two together lead to speeding drivers who may make a turn at every corner to avoid stops. The standards and goals for our neighborhood streets need to be upgraded for safe active transportation routes. In the past advocates have requested safer crossings of neighborhood streets or arterials, but city staff looks to the current standards for auto flow, and has prevented changes.

Second, the programs list separately “level of traffic stress” analysis, and “safety”. I think these are really just two sides of the same coin. If we are serious about the safety issue, at the level that Arnout suggests, making sure that our streets are designed to prevent high speed injury collisions to humans, and making sure that complete routes are safe, then that will take care of the desire for a low stress network. We will probably find that there is a common set of specifications for both a low stress network, and a safe network, so we can use the same set of rules for evaluating safety and stress, and also use the complete network analysis to make sure Palo Alto has sufficient connectivity.

I have been tolerant of high stress, high speed traffic for a long time, riding as a “vehicular cyclist”, so I am served by our limited and at times harrowing bike network, but if we are to make Palo Alto accessible to all its citizens as pedestrians and cyclists as the first choice for their local trips, then we need to make these significant changes to our plans and policies for our streets.

Finally, about sustainability, an important city goal: Eliminating single occupancy auto trips by converting them to walking and biking is the most significant step we can take to make our transportations choices sustainable. Eliminating the trip is far better than just making the trip electric. Palo Alto can do this both by developing a successful, safe, and well used active transportation network, and by making land use choices that keep services accessible to people, and distances short.
-- Robert Neff

From: Transportation
To: Chan, Joanna
Subject: FW: Comments on Draft Framework
Date: Tuesday, January 5, 2021 6:53:15 PM
Attachments: image002.png

JC,
Forwarding.

From: Art Liberman <art_liberman@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 5, 2021 6:35 PM
To: Transportation <Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: Comments on Draft Framework

Here are my comments - which I may not have time to present at the Jan 5 meeting

Comments & Suggestions about Draft Framework Headings for Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Update

Art Liberman– for Jan 5, 2021 PABAC meeting

1. **In Section 2**: Relevant Plans, policies, guidelines and programs -

   Add 2 sections

   2.3 Bicycle Infrastructure Recommendations

   - The types of bicycle Infrastructure would be limited to those approved by PABAC and Transportation Staff for which there are both design guidelines and functional definitions (e.g. for Bicycle Boulevard, etc) that are posted on a Transportation Staff website.

   - Infrastructure projects will be implemented in a phased method, such as suggested by the CalBike “Quick Build”[1] process which features;

     - Low cost materials
     - Installation on Trial Basis
     - Rigorous Community Engagement

2. **In Section 3**: Community Engagement Summary -

   Change name and add sections and delete section 3.3

Change name to Communities Engagement

- Specifics to add in 3.2 Engagement Plan

    1. Engagement with Commuter Users: SRPGO, Stanford, other employers, Google
    2. Engagement with School Groups
    3. Engagement with Neighborhood Associations
    4. Engagement with Recreational Users and Seniors

- Delete 3.3 Outcome….the communities Outcome would be in section 4

3. **In Section 4**: Needs Assessment Criteria - Add another criteria for consideration

Add a section

- Communities Engagement: Outcome

4. **In Section 6**: Needs Assessment and Recommendations

Add language to each section

- To each section: …add some language to Evaluate existing conditions based on Chapter 4: Needs Assessment Criteria and Metric and Chapter 5: Collision Analysis

5. **Appendices-**

    a. Sections 8.1 and 8.2 Make separate maps for existing network and for progress network

[1] Quick-Build Bikeway Networks for Safer Streets - CalBike

Quick-Build Bikeway Networks for Safer Streets - CalBike

From: Arnout Boelens
To: Chan, Joanna
Subject: BPTP update
Date: Wednesday, January 6, 2021 11:48:40 AM
Attachments: BPTP_TOC.pdf

Hi Joanna,

Thanks for taking all the notes last night. Based on last night's discussion I attached my preferred framework for this February's discussion.

Kind regards,

Arnout

Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update

Draft Framework

Executive summary for the residents of Palo Alto should be the very first section. Even before the introduction.

1. Introduction

1.1. Vision and goals

- Intents: (1) To guide City staff on building an accessible and comfortable transportation network for everyone, taking into consideration program & project priorities and available funds. (2) To inform the public about walking and biking safely around the city.
- Audiences: For City staff and members of the public alike

2. Relevant plans, policies, guidelines, and programs

2.1. Supporting plans, policies, and guidelines

Brief description of related local, countywide, and regional policies and plans with links to each document

2.2. Supporting Programs

2.2.1. Safe Routes to School

· Include a route map, strategies, and the 5-year work plan, best practices?

BPTP is a 10 year plan, so there should be a 10 year vision.

3. Community Engagement

3.1. Purpose

3.2. Engagement Plan

3.3. Outcome

4. Needs Assessment Criteria and Metric

Some potential criteria for consideration:

- Level of traffic stress
- Mobility/Accessibility
- Gap closure or across barrier connection
- Connectivity to transit or destination (jobs, schools, senior centers, shopping, etc)
- Safety
- Equity
- Population density
- Origin-Destination data (e.g. streetlightdata.com and American Community Survey commuting survey)
- Counts

Criteria *Definition* *Metric* *Points*

5. Safety analysis

5.1. Bicycle and Pedestrian High Injury Network

5.2. Pedestrian collision trends

5.3. Bicycling collision trends

What is the right metric? Collisions? incidents? Near incidents? Stress levels?

5.4 Systematic safety/safety by design (Road safety needs to get priority over LOS)

6. Needs Assessment and Recommendations

6.1. Pedestrian needs and recommendations

Evaluate existing conditions and propose pedestrian programs & facilities based on Chapter 4: Needs Assessment Criteria and Metric

6.2. Bicycling needs and recommendations

Evaluate existing conditions and propose bicycle programs & facilities based on Chapter 4: Needs Assessment Criteria and Metric

- Safe Routes for All? With which age group can the most gains be made? Include a route map, strategies, and pilot program, best practices?
- Transit integration
    - Transit bikes (cheap daily bike rentals at transit centers (Dutch OV fiets))
    - Safe and cheap bike storage at transit centers

6.3. Across barrier needs and recommendations

Evaluate existing conditions and propose across barrier facilities based on Chapter 4: Needs Assessment Criteria and Metric

6.3 Policy recommendations

Evaluate existing policies and propose bicycle and pedestrian improvements

- Vision Zero
- Allow filtered permeability/traffic diversions as a cheap way to reduce non-local traffic on residential roads
- Make EV subsidies applicable to e-Bikes

7. Implementation

7.1. Project categorization and prioritization methodology

Description of the categorization and prioritization methodology

7.2. List of prioritized projects

Categorized by high, medium, and low

Prioritized by readiness, cost, and availability of funds

8. Appendices – Maps could potentially be web-based

8.1. Appendix A: City of Palo Alto Bicycle Network Progress Map and Existing Conditions

What is our (desired) primary network? What is our (desired) secondary network? (desired) tertiary network? Is the current infrastructure sufficient for the prioritization of the network?

8.2. Appendix B: City of Palo Alto Pedestrian Network Progress Map and Existing Conditions

8.3. Appendix C: City of Palo Alto Bicycle and Pedestrian High Injury Network Map

8.4. Appendix D: City of Palo Alto Safe Routes to School Route Map

8.5. Appendix E: City of Palo Alto Safe Routes for Older Adults Route Map

8.6. Appendix F: To make sure that the city fully considers all users when designing complete streets, the city should pick a set of design principles to evaluate infrastructure projects on. E.g. 5 design principles for bicycle infrastructure:

- Cohesion: bike from anywhere to everywhere
- Directness: create short and fast routes
- Safety: avoid differences in speed and mass of different modes of transport
- Comfort: minimal stops and nuisance
- Attractiveness: create infrastructure that people enjoy using

Or bicycle as Human Powered Vehicle (HPV) with design recommendations:

- Bicyclists need to keep momentum (i.e. minimize stops)
- Bicyclist need to keep balance (i.e. cannot take sharp corners)

- Bicyclist use their muscles (avoid steep gradients)
- Bicycling is social (Make sure people can ride two abreast)

8.6 Appendix G: Reference list of design manuals

- Nacto: Urban Bikeway Design Guide
- Nacto: Don't Give Up at the Intersection
- Crow: Design Manual for bicycle traffic
- Aashto: Guide for the development of bicycle facilities

From: Ken Joye
To: Chan, Joanna
Subject: January PABAC -- Framework comments
Date: Sunday, January 10, 2021 3:05:43 PM

There were so many comments given at the meeting on Tuesday the 5th, I did not want to extend the meeting by offering mine. I intended to write you the next day, but matters in Washington DC got in the way….

Topic heading comments:

4. Needs Assessment Criteria and Metric is missing "GHG Reduction"

7.2 List of Prioritized Projects (how do needs and categorization enter into sorting of priorities?)

Appendix 8.1 Bicycle Progress Map, Existing Network and Planned Network comparison [ala Mountain View]

Appendix: status of BPTP2012 projects

I don't know if any of those terse statements would make sense to you, please let me know if you would like me to elaborate. I mostly want to send this in case you wish to entertain more input (but know that you got tons at the January PABAC meeting…)

Ken

From: Transportation
To: Chan, Joanna
Subject: FW: BPTP Update - Comments on Safety
Date: Sunday, January 10, 2021 8:47:41 PM

JC,
Forwarding.

From: Nicole Zoeller <nicole.zoeller@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 10, 2021 4:06 PM
To: Transportation <Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: BPTP Update - Comments on Safety

Dear Joanna,

I would like to provide some additional comments based on the discussion during the last PABAC meeting.

In addition to my spoken comments, I would like to also voice my support for a systematic safety approach to road safety in Palo Alto. Since safety is consistently reported as the biggest concern for pedestrians and bicyclists, ideally the BPTP should include a vision zero component. As a second-best solution, the safety analysis in the BPTP should at least contain a section on how road safety in Palo Alto can be improved using a systematic safety approach. It is time that Palo Alto makes system design responsible for user safety, instead of blaming vulnerable road users for getting hurt.

Kind regards,

Nicole Zoeller Boelens

Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update
Final Framework Topic Headings

i. Letter from the Mayor or City Manager (tentative)
ii. Executive Summary
1. Introduction
- 1.1. Purpose
- 1.2. Principles
- 1.3. Goals, Performance Measures, and Policies
- 1.4. Palo Alto Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee (PABAC)

2. Plans, Programs, and Facilities
- 2.1. Relevant Plans
- 2.2. Supporting Programs
- 2.3. Supporting Facilities

3. Community Engagement for the Plan Update
- 3.1. Purpose
- 3.2. Process
- 3.3. Outcome

4. Safety Analysis
- 4.1. Bicycle and Pedestrian Volumes
- 4.2. High Injury Network
- 4.3. Bicycle Collision Trends
- 4.4. Pedestrian Collision Trends
- 4.5. Other Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Factors

5. Needs Assessment Criteria and Metric
6. Recommendations
- 6.1. Projects
  - 6.1.1. List of Bicycle Projects Recommendations
  - 6.1.2. List of Pedestrian Projects Recommendations
- 6.2. Facilities
  - 6.2.1. List of Bicycle Facilities Recommendations
  - 6.2.2. List of Pedestrian Facilities Recommendations
- 6.3. Programs
  - 6.3.1. List of Safe Routes to School Program Recommendations
  - 6.3.2. List of New Program Recommendations
- 6.4. Policies

7. Implementation
- 7.1. Methodology
- 7.2. List of Ranked and Prioritized Projects

8. Appendices

Note: City of Palo Alto Sustainability and Climate Action Plan is anticipated for Council in mid-2021, which may influence content of the Plan Update.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update
Final Framework with Potential Content

i. Letter from the Mayor or City Manager (tentative)

ii. Executive Summary

- Accomplishments and progress since the BPTP 2012
- Include links to quickly access sections of interest

1. Introduction

1.1. Purpose

- Audiences: For City staff and members of the public alike
- Intents:
  - To guide City staff on providing safe, accessible, and enjoyable transportation options for everyone
  - To assemble a menu of projects, facilities, and programs taking into consideration priorities and available funds
  - To explain to the public how this plan fits into city goals, including support for behavior change with more bicycle and pedestrian projects, facilities, and programs

1.2. Principles

- Complete streets
- Systemic safety
- Vision zero
- Sustainability

1.3. Goals, Performance Measures, and Policies

- Describe goals and how to measure success of the Plan Update
- Introduce existing policies and needed policy changes for a successful Plan Update (refer to policy recommendations in chapter 6.4)
- Potential goals for consideration:
  - Accessible
  - Equity
  - Inviting
  - Health
  - Safety
  - Sustainability

1.4. Palo Alto Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee (PABAC)

- Describe PABAC's role as an advisory committee to staff, including involvement in the Plan Update development

2. Plans, Programs, and Facilities

2.1. Relevant Plans (include links to each document)

- City of Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan 2030
- City of Palo Alto Green Stormwater Infrastructure Plan 2019
- City of Palo Alto Complete Streets Policy 2015

Note: City of Palo Alto Sustainability and Climate Action Plan is anticipated for Council in mid-2021, which may influence content of the Plan Update.

- City of Palo Alto Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan 2012
- City of Palo Alto Sustainability and Climate Action Plan (in development)
- City of Palo Alto Expanded Community Advisory Panel Final Recommendations Report (in development)
- Peninsula Bikeway Study (in development)
- Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Countywide Bicycle Plan 2018
- Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Bicycle Technical Guidelines 2012
- Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Bicycle Superhighway Feasibility Study (in development)
- Caltrans District 4 Bike Plan 2018
- Caltrans District 4 Pedestrian Plan (in development)
- Caltrans District 4 Bike Highway (in development)

2.2. Supporting Programs
- Safe Routes to School
  - Include route map with crossing guard positions
  - Include best practices, strategies like parent engagement, a 5-year work plan, and a 10-year vision

2.3. Supporting Facilities
- Bicycle parking
- Wayfinding

3. Community Engagement for the Plan Update

3.1. Purpose

3.2. Process
- Include the schedule, potential stakeholders, and different forms of outreach strategies

3.3. Outcome

4. Safety Analysis

4.1. Bicycle and Pedestrian Volumes
- Annual bicycle and pedestrian counts
- Annual bicycle and pedestrian counts on key bicycling and walking routes
- Annual bicycle and pedestrian counts on key school commute routes

4.2. High Injury Network
- Corridors and intersections (signalized and unsignalized)

4.3. Bicycle Collision Trends
- Killed, severely injured, visibly injured, not injured
- Location types, street types, and time of day
- Common causes (wrong side riding, left/right hooks, dooring, signals and signs, others)
- Age and gender

4.4. Pedestrian Collision Trends
- Killed, severely injured, visibly injured, not injured
- Location types, street types, and time of day
- Common causes (mid-block crossing, left/right hooks, signals and signs, others)

Note: City of Palo Alto Sustainability and Climate Action Plan is anticipated for Council in mid-2021, which may influence content of the Plan Update.

- Age and gender

4.5. Other Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Factors
- Aging infrastructure
- Lighting

5. Needs Assessment Criteria and Metric
- Categorized by projects, facilities, and programs
- Describe how each criteria will be measured and scored
- Potential criteria for consideration:
  - Accessibility
  - Community engagement
  - Connectivity to transit and destinations
  - Consistency with relevant plans and volumes
  - Cost
  - Equity including vulnerable populations and geographic inequities
  - Gap closure including across barrier connections
  - Bicycle level of stress
  - Pedestrian level of stress
  - Safety (refer to analysis in chapter 4)
  - Sustainability including GHG reductions

Criteria	Metric	Points
PROJECTS:		
FACILITIES:		
PROGRAMS:		

6. Recommendations

6.1. Projects

6.1.1. List of Bicycle Projects Recommendations
- Evaluate existing conditions and propose bicycle projects, including Safe Routes to School bicycle projects

6.1.2. List of Pedestrian Projects Recommendations
- Evaluate existing conditions and propose pedestrian projects, including Safe Routes to School pedestrian projects

6.2. Facilities

6.2.1. List of Bicycle Facilities Recommendations
- Evaluate existing conditions and propose bicycle facilities, including Safe Routes to School bicycle facilities

6.2.2. List of Pedestrian Facilities Recommendations

Note: City of Palo Alto Sustainability and Climate Action Plan is anticipated for Council in mid-2021, which may influence content of the Plan Update.

- Evaluate existing conditions and propose pedestrian facilities, including Safe Routes to School pedestrian facilities

6.3. Programs

6.3.1. List of Safe Routes to School Program Recommendations

- Evaluate the existing Safe Routes to School program and propose programmatic recommendations

6.3.2. List of New Program Recommendations

- Evaluate the existing citywide context and propose new programmatic recommendations that support and expand bicycling and walking to all user types
  - First Last Mile Connections
  - Safe Routes for Everyone

6.4. Policies

- Evaluate existing policies and propose policy changes that support and expand bicycling and walking to all user types
  - Electric vehicle subsidies to include electric bicycles

Project Name	Criteria	Points
PROJECTS:		
FACILITIES:		
PROGRAMS:		

7. Implementation

7.1. Methodology

- Describe how recommended projects, facilities, and programs are ranked and prioritized
  - Ranked by high, medium, and low
  - Prioritized by availability of funds, cost, and readiness
    - Availability of funds: Consider funding sources
    - Cost: Consider project cost estimates
    - Readiness: Consider project phase (feasibility, planning, design, engineering, construction) and implementation timeline

7.2. List of Ranked and Prioritized Projects

8. Appendices (potentially be web-based)

8.1. Appendix A: City of Palo Alto Reference Maps

- Mapping layers:
  - Roadway Pavement Conditions
  - Transit Routes

Note: City of Palo Alto Sustainability and Climate Action Plan is anticipated for Council in mid-2021, which may influence content of the Plan Update.

    - Across Barrier Connections
    - Parks and Open Spaces
    - Employment Districts and Business Districts
    - Shopping Centers and Neighborhood Commercial Centers
    - Community Facilities
    - Schools

8.2. Appendix B: City of Palo Alto Bicycle Network Progress Map, Existing Conditions, and Network Gaps
- Mapping layers:
    - Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan 2012 Existing Conditions
    - Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan 2012 Proposed Projects and Facilities
    - Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan 2012 Completed Projects and Facilities = Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update Existing Conditions
    - Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update Network Gaps

8.3. Appendix C: City of Palo Alto Pedestrian Network Progress Map, Existing Conditions, and Network Gaps
- Mapping layers:
    - Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan 2012 Existing Conditions
    - Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan 2012 Completed Projects and Facilities = Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update Existing Conditions
    - Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update Network Gaps

8.4. Appendix D: City of Palo Alto Safe Routes to School Network Progress Map, Existing Conditions, and Network Gaps
- Mapping layers:
    - Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan 2012 Adopted School Commute Network
    - Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan 2012 Safe Routes to School Existing Conditions
    - Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan 2012 Safe Routes to School Proposed Projects and Facilities
    - Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan 2012 Safe Routes to School Completed Projects and Facilities = Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update Safe Routes to School Existing Conditions
    - Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update Safe Routes to School Network Gaps
    - Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update Adopted School Commute Network

8.5. Appendix E: City of Palo Alto Bicycle and Pedestrian Volumes Map
8.6. Appendix F: City of Palo Alto High Injury Network Map
8.7. Appendix G: List of Design Manuals

Note: City of Palo Alto Sustainability and Climate Action Plan is anticipated for Council in mid-2021, which may influence content of the Plan Update.