



**Palo Alto Pedestrian and
Bicycle Advisory Committee**

Tuesday, May 4, 2021 at 6:15 P.M.

Join Meeting Via Zoom

Join Online: <https://cityofpaloalto.zoom.us/j/95919156143>; Dial-in: 669-900-6833

Meeting ID: 959 1915 6143

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 April 26, 2021 are attached with the agenda packet.
5. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS
a. Announcement: FY 21/22 TDA 3 Item to Council – Action to Consent 6:28 PM
Note: Anticipated on Monday, May 17, 2021.
6. ADJOURNMENT 6:30 PM

PART II: OTHER ITEMS

1. AGENDA CHANGES 6:30 PM
2. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES 6:32 PM
3. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS
a. 311 Requests – PABAC Pilot 6:35 PM
4. STAFF UPDATES
a. South Palo Alto Bikeways Special PABAC Workshop – May to June 6:40 PM
b. [5-Year Paving Plan](#) Presentation by Public Works 6:42 PM
5. DISCUSSION ITEMS
a. Subcommittee to Review Past PABAC Business 7:15 PM
6. STANDING ITEMS
a. Grant Update - NONE
b. CSTSC Update 7:25 PM

c. VTA BPAC Update

7:35 PM

7. ADJOURNMENT

7:45 PM



Palo Alto Pedestrian and
Bicycle Advisory Committee

Tuesday, April 6, 2021

6:15 P.M.

VIRTUAL MEETING

Palo Alto, CA

Members Present: Ken Joye (Chair), Art Liberman (Vice Chair), Bruce Arthur, Bill Courington, Cedric de la Beaujardiere, Kathy Durham, Penny Ellson, Paul Goldstein, Robert Neff, Eric Nordman, Rob Robinson, Jane Rothstein, Richard Swent, Alan Wachtel, Bill Zaumen

Members Absent: Arnout Boelens, Nicole Zoeller Boelens, Steve Rock

Staff Present: Joanna Chan, Rafael Rius, Ripon Bhatia

Guests: Frank Viggiano

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 determined a quorum is present.

2. AGENDA CHANGES

None

3. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES

None

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

1 **5. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS**

2 **a. Staff Update on FY 21/22 TDA 3 Funds**

3 Ms. Chan reported funds on hand and this cycle's allocation of TDA 3 funds total \$334,852. The
4 application deadline is April 16, 2021. Council review and approval of use of the funds is
5 tentatively scheduled for May 17, 2021.

6 In response to Vice Chair Liberman's and Mr. Nordman's questions, Ms. Chan advised that
7 approval of use of the funds will be an action item for the Council.

8 **b. Announcement: Submit comments by email on the potential content**
9 **document by 12:00 p.m. on April 26, 2021**

10 Ms. Chan indicated the latest draft potential content document was included in the agenda
11 packet. The document will form the basis of a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Bicycle and
12 Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update. She requested PABAC members provide their
13 comments by noon on April 26th.

14 In reply to Vice Chair Liberman's question, Ms. Chan related that the document content may be
15 shared and is posted to the website.

16 **6. ADJOURNMENT** at 6:23 p.m.

17

18 **PART II: OTHER ITEMS**

19 **1. AGENDA CHANGES**

20 Mr. Goldstein proposed an additional agenda item regarding appointment of an ad hoc
21 committee to draft guidelines for use of the PABAC email alias.

22 Ms. Rothstein requested a discussion of recreational vehicles (RV) parked in the bike lane along
23 Park Boulevard.

24 Mr. Swent requested an update regarding the Stanford and Park traffic circle.

25 Chair Joye announced the topics could be discussed late in the meeting if time permits.

26 **2. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES**

27 Mr. Goldstein corrected page 2, line 25, as "signage is an important component at intersections."

28 Vice Chair Liberman requested Mr. Arthur's comments on page 3, line 3, include his suggestion
29 for Foothills Expressway to be considered a route for a bicycle superhighway.

30 Mr. Zaumen clarified his comments on page 6, line 1. Ms. Chan expressed that she would follow
31 up with Mr. Zaumen offline for his exact wording.

1 Motion by Mr. Goldstein, seconded by Mr. Nordman, to approve the minutes of the March 2,
2 2021 meeting as amended. Motion passed 14-0.

3 **3. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

4 None

5 **4. STAFF UPDATES**

6 None

7 **5. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

8 **a. South Palo Alto Bikeways Special PABAC Workshop Timeframe**

9 Ms. Chan reported staff is planning a special workshop with PABAC members to discuss the
10 South Palo Alto Bikeways Project either during the May meeting or as a standalone meeting.

11 In answer to Mr. Goldstein's query, Ms. Chan believed the agenda for the May meeting would
12 accommodate a full discussion of the project.

13 A straw poll found that PABAC members preferred including the workshop in the May meeting.

14 In answer to inquiries, Ms. Chan stated she would email the community engagement plan from
15 the February 2021 staff report. The first phase includes an online survey; community meetings;
16 meetings with PABAC, City/School Transportation Safety Committee, and the school
17 community; posts on social media; mailers; and email blasts. Appropriate neighborhood
18 associations will be invited to meetings as stakeholders. The consultant for the project is Fehr &
19 Peers.

20 **b. Draft Outline of the Joint MV BPAC and PA PABAC Meeting**

21 Ms. Chan shared a draft agenda for a joint Mountain View Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory
22 Committee (B/PAC) and PABAC meeting on June 30, 2021, at 6:30 p.m. Because the meeting
23 will be subject to the Brown Act, a quorum of PABAC members is necessary.

24 In response to questions, Ms. Chan explained that members of both groups will have an open
25 discussion of items. The San Antonio Corridor discussion will pertain to travel along San
26 Antonio and the interchanges at Highway 101 and Alma. Discussion items are meant to be
27 brainstorming sessions. The goal of the meeting is to initiate discussion of cross-border issues
28 and other issues on which Mountain View and Palo Alto can collaborate. The meeting will
29 likely be a virtual meeting. Chair Joye added that the agenda for the April 28, 2021 B/PAC
30 meeting includes a discussion of the joint meeting.

31 Vice Chair Liberman suggested staff obtain and distribute to PABAC members the minutes of
32 B/PAC's last meeting so that PABAC members can understand B/PAC's priorities.

33 Mr. Goldstein proposed adding the goals of the joint meeting and topics for future meetings to
34 the agenda.

1 Mr. Neff noted one previous joint meeting was productive.

2 **Stanford Avenue and Park Boulevard Traffic Circle**

3 Rafael Rius advised that channelizing islands are not common features in neighborhood traffic
4 circles. If vehicles are driving in the bike lane or on the shoulder, channelizing islands could be
5 a corrective measure.

6 Ripon Bhatia explained that the project was completed and accepted by the City Council. Any
7 changes would be considered a new project. The addition of channelizing islands may not be
8 optimal under the traffic calming program. If a sufficient number of residents in the
9 neighborhood submit a petition expressing concerns, staff could evaluate the need for additional
10 measures.

11 Mr. Rius indicated the City Manager and Chief Transportation Official and their policies guiding
12 staff's work have changed since the previous discussion of modifications to the traffic circle.
13 Previous discussions and proposed modifications will more than likely be discarded in favor of
14 starting fresh.

15 Mr. Swent requested a future agenda item regarding the traffic circle.

16 Mr. Neff suggested PABAC request staff begin a traffic speed survey.

17 Mr. Goldstein proposed PABAC request a traffic and safety study as a way to initiate a project to
18 modify the traffic circle.

19 Vice Chair Liberman suggested staff consider temporary changes that can be implemented for a
20 trial period as the Council previously expressed a preference for trying out changes before they
21 become permanent.

22 Mr. Courington believed the traffic circle does not have sufficient diversion to slow traffic
23 traveling on Park.

24 Ms. Durham preferred to review the results of a speed survey before providing suggestions for
25 changes.

26 Mr. Swent supported either short-term or long-term changes.

27 **c. Carryover Ross Rd./Meadow Dr. Motion**

28 Mr. Swent reported the difference between his and Mr. Nordman's motion is small. He
29 originally believed the motion should express the rationale for PABAC finding that the
30 configuration is dangerous and confusing. The issues are numerous, and listing them all in the
31 motion would be cumbersome. Perhaps the Chair could write a letter detailing all issues.

32 Mr. Nordman objected to the language of not being in compliance with the California Manual on
33 Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). An argument of whether the intersection does or

1 does not comply is out of place when the issue is safety. He felt the motion needs to state the
2 primary problem with the intersection.

3 Mr. Wachtel noted that Mr. Nordman's motion clearly states that PABAC's objection is
4 confusion as to whether the intersection is a roundabout or a traffic circle and the resulting
5 ambiguity about right-of-way. That could be solved by adding yield signs on Ross, even though
6 yield signs do not comply with the MUTCD. Stop signs on Meadow do not comply with the
7 MUTCD if the intersection is considered a roundabout. Mr. Nordman's motion clarifies the
8 principal problem with the current configuration and does not suggest a solution. Mr. Swent's
9 motion clearly indicates PABAC's preference for a roundabout.

10 **Motion** by Mr. Nordman, seconded by Ms. Durham, that PABAC finds the current configuration
11 at the intersection of Ross and Meadow to be confusing and dangerous. In particular, the circular
12 geometry makes the driver think those in the circle have the right-of-way, but the absence of
13 yield signs gives the right-of-way to those entering the circle from Ross. PABAC recommends
14 that the intersection be re-designed by a licensed traffic engineer who is familiar with roundabout
15 design and California legal requirements.

16 Mr. Goldstein preferred Mr. Swent's motion because it supports a roundabout configuration and
17 rescinds the Council's mandate for stop signs. However, a unanimous recommendation is
18 important to emphasize the danger and confusion surrounding the intersection.

19 Mr. Neff proposed incorporating Mr. Swent's sentence about rescinding the Council mandate and
20 having a licensed traffic engineer redesign the intersection into the motion.

21 Mr. Robinson noted the twin traffic circle at Moreno and Ross is yield-controlled and has not
22 suffered the same problems. He supported Mr. Swent's motion.

23 In reply to Mr. Wachtel's query, Mr. Rius appreciated PABAC stating its wishes and concerns
24 about the intersection. The original design for the intersection was prepared by a licensed
25 engineer with heavy input from the then Chief Transportation Official. Staff feels the design
26 complies with the MUTCD as an all-way-yield traffic circle. The Council direction to modify
27 the intersection to a two-way stop-controlled neighborhood traffic circle also complies with the
28 MUTCD. There is not sufficient right-of-way to design a proper roundabout.

29 Mr. Bhatia added that any proposed changes to the intersection will be subject to public
30 comment. Additional modifications directed by the Council will move the design closer to a
31 neighborhood traffic circle.

32 **Substitute Motion** by Mr. Goldstein, seconded by Mr. Swent, that PABAC finds the current
33 configuration at the intersection of Ross and Meadow to be confusing and dangerous. PABAC
34 urges the Council to rescind its mandate for stop signs and other changes at this location and
35 recommends that the intersection be re-designed by a licensed traffic engineer who is familiar
36 with modern roundabout design, traffic patterns at that location, and California regulatory
37 requirements.

38 **Amended Substitute Motion** by Mr. Goldstein, seconded by Mr. Swent, that PABAC finds the
39 current configuration at the intersection of Ross and Meadow to be confusing and dangerous. In

1 particular, the circular geometry makes the driver think those in the circle have the right-of-way,
2 but the absence of yield signs gives the right-of-way to those entering the circle from Ross.
3 PABAC urges the Council to rescind its mandate for stop signs and other changes at this location
4 and recommends that the intersection be re-designed by a licensed traffic engineer who is
5 familiar with modern roundabout design, traffic patterns at that location, and California
6 regulatory requirements.

7 Mr. Wachtel understood that PABAC prefers redesigning the intersection to be a modern
8 roundabout with better design, but that is not likely to occur due to Council direction and the lack
9 of sufficient right-of-way. More appropriate language for the motion is that the current
10 configuration is dangerous because it is a hybrid of a roundabout and a traffic circle with
11 ambiguous right-of-way and that PABAC would like the intersection re-designed as either a
12 roundabout or a traffic circle. This re-design is likely to happen anyway, and a motion is
13 probably not necessary.

14 Mr. Goldstein called the question. The motion passed with two-thirds support.

15 **The Amended Substitute Motion passed 12-1 with 1 abstaining.**

16 **6. STANDING ITEMS:**

17 **a. Grant Update**

18 Ms. Chan advised that the City has up to \$167,073 from the Measure B Education and
19 Encouragement grant to support the Safe Routes to School program. A part of this grant is being
20 used to convert a cargo bike to a Mobility Information Kiosk E-Bike (MIKE). The City has been
21 awarded a grant of \$2 million for a two-year, on-demand transit pilot program. In 2018, the City
22 was awarded a \$919,000 VERBS grant for the South Palo Alto Bikeways Project, which includes
23 construction of enhanced bicycle facilities along the Waverley bike path, East Meadow Drive,
24 and Fabian Way. In January 2021, the Council approved a community engagement plan for the
25 project, and planning for the first phase of community engagement is underway.

26 In answer to queries, Ms. Chan explained that an appropriate level of City's matching funds for
27 the VERBS grant have been budgeted in fiscal years 2021 and 2022. The City did not apply for
28 the Measure B Bicycle and Pedestrian Capital Projects grant because the few projects that met
29 eligibility criteria were not ready. The City may apply for a Caltrans grant in fiscal year 2022,
30 but a project for the grant has not been determined. Most projects supporting the Safe Routes to
31 School program will likely be eligible for the Measure B Education and Encouragement grant.

32 **b. CSTSC Update**

33 None

34 **c. VTA BPAC Update**

35 Mr. Neff reported the VTA BPAC reviewed an annual report regarding transportation systems
36 and measurement and received an update regarding the Central Bikeway project.

1 **Ad Hoc Committee to Review the PABAC Email Alias**

2 Mr. Goldstein suggested guidelines for use of PABAC's email alias are needed.

3 Mr. Goldstein and Mr. Courington volunteered to serve on the committee.

4 **Recreational Vehicles Parked on Park Boulevard**

5 Chair Joye indicated a Vehicle Code provision addresses parked vehicles obstructing the
6 roadway. The Police Department should be able to use this provision to address issues along
7 Park Boulevard.

8 Mr. Nordman related that a safe parking lot for RVs is available on Geng Road.

9 **7. ADJOURNMENT** at 8:05 p.m.



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](#)
Subject: FW: BPTP Update
Date: Tuesday, April 6, 2021 1:48:34 PM

JC,
Forwarding.

From: Ken Joye <kmjoye@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 6, 2021 1:44 PM
To: Transportation <Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: BPTP Update

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

On Mar 29, 2021, at 2:29 PM, Chan, Joanna <Joanna.Chan@CityofPaloAlto.org> wrote:
We will be hosting our April PABAC meeting via Zoom as scheduled on Tuesday, April 6 at 6:15pm. Attached is the agenda for our April meeting.
[...]
<2021-04-06_PABAC Agenda Packet.pdf>

The agenda packet for the April PABAC meeting contains an invitation to "Submit comments by email on the potential content document" (for the BPTP update). Please add the following to the mix.

I note that section 4.1 is labeled "Bicycle and Pedestrian Volumes" and further on that section 6.4 contains the statement, "Evaluate existing policies on safety data collection and propose policy changes to improve the process". I propose that the BPTP update specifically address automated data collection via sensors or other automated technology. Similar to Mountain View's "Access MV" plan, the BPTP update should show maps of existing locations where automated data collection is done and of planned locations where it will be done.

Though it may have been discussed in prior PABAC meetings, the distinction between "Projects" and "Facilities" should be defined clearly in the content document (the distinction between "Projects" and "Programs" is more intuitive and may not need to be so articulated).

In section 1.3 is a list under the heading "Potential goals for consideration". A goal might be written: "increase number of bicycle trips from 3% to 6% by 2032" (see page 5 of "[SCAP Potential Goals and Key Actions](#)"). Perhaps that list can be revised before the RFP is issued; at the very least, each item

in the list could have an example of a goal for the given high-level topic. The consultant drafting the plan should write objectives associated with each goal. [One document](#) on the City of Palo Alto www site says that to meet the goal of increasing safety on El Camino Real, an objective is to improve intersections and add mid-block crossings.

In section 8.1 is a list of “mapping layers” for City of Palo Alto reference maps. What layers could be included in the plan which show connections to adjoining communities’ existing facilities and to regional facilities? That is, what are the important things which lie *outside* Palo Alto’s borders?

The number of items in section 5, “Needs Assessment Criteria and Metrics “, is already quite long but perhaps one metric to consider is a utility:recreation ratio. That is, does a given project primarily serve commute or transportation needs or primarily serve recreational needs? How would we score adding a climbing lane on Arastradero Rd between Page Mill & Alpine Rd versus rebuilding the Wilkie bridge over Adobe Creek?

thanks for your consideration,
Ken Joye

From: [Paul B Goldstein](#)
To: [Transportation](#)
Cc: [Chan, Joanna](#)
Subject: BPTP Update - Additional Comments
Date: Tuesday, April 13, 2021 3:00:21 PM
Attachments: [BikePed Plan Update PBG.pdf](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Here are some additional comments I have on the Final Framework with Potential Content

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 engage the public on how this plan fits into city goals, including support for behavior change with more bicycle and pedestrian projects, facilities, and programs, as well as education for driver awareness

I think it would be useful to state that this Plan fulfills requirement for grants, how it fits into the regulatory planning framework.

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)
- Consider Bicycle Friendly Community criteria
- Potential goals for consideration:
 - Accessible
 - Equity
 - Integration of all modes and users
 - Inviting
 - Health and Wellness
 - 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

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 Green Stormwater Infrastructure Plan 2019
- City of Palo Alto Complete Streets Policy 2015
- 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)
- City of Palo Alto California Avenue District Public Art Master Plan (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

This is fine as a topic heading, but where do we ask for a full and robust public engagement process in order to get buy-in from the community? There is much more detail about expectations in other sections

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 (near misses)
- Location types, street types, and time of day
- Common causes (wrong side riding, left/right hooks, dooring, signals and signs, others)
- Age and gender

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.

4.4. Pedestrian Collision Trends

- Killed, severely injured, visibly injured, not injured (near misses)
- Location types, street types, and time of day
- Common causes (mid-block crossing, left/right hooks, signals and signs, others)
- Age and gender

4.5. Other Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Factors

- Aging infrastructure
- Lighting

5. Needs Assessment Criteria and Metrics

- Categorized by projects, facilities, and programs
- Describe how ~~each~~ criteria will be measured and scored “criteria” is plural
- Potential criteria for consideration:
 - Accessibility
 - Community engagement
 - Community support
 - 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
 - Projected number of users
 - 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

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.

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

- 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 for all user types
 - First Last Mile Connections
 - Micromobility
 - Safe Routes for Everyone

Add: Educational and informational (encouragement) campaigns including for driver safety and awareness

6.4. Policies

- Evaluate the existing role and structure of the Palo Alto Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee (PABAC), and propose changes that furthers efficiency **typo: further**
- 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
- Evaluate existing policies on safety data collection and propose policy changes to improve the process

Reexamine policy on street closures to address whether benefits to bikes/peds might offset automobile inconvenience

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

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.

- 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
 - 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

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 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.

From: [Transportation](#)
To: [Chan, Joanna](#)
Subject: FW: BPTP Udate
Date: Wednesday, April 14, 2021 8:31:53 PM

JC,
Forwarding.

From: Art Liberman <art_liberman@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2021 7:27 PM
To: Transportation <Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: BPTP Udate

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

These comments are about the need to include **Community Support** in the Implementation section (section 7) of the BPTP update.

Whether by design or oversight, neither Community Engagement nor **Community Support** is listed as one of the prioritizing criteria for making decisions in the BPTP framework document included in the April PABAC packet. The only criteria listed are "availability of funds, cost and readiness." The prioritization of projects ought not be determined only by these three factors; instead, it must include the ranking of projects. The methodology for ranking of projects, which is not explicitly described in this framework document but needs to be, must include **Community Support** as a heavily weighted factor.

Inadequate Community Engagement and consequent lack of **Community Support** before deciding on the plans for the Ross Road and associated roadway modifications a few years ago led to significant community backlash when the project was being constructed and afterward.

Decisions on bike and pedestrian infrastructure plans require broad involvement of the Community at an early stage. The community (actually communities - residents in the neighborhoods, school parents and students, commuting groups) should be solicited for ideas for new routes and suggestions about existing routes that would make them safer and would encourage more people to use them. A pro-active and far reaching Community Engagement activity would insure that the projects selected have broad **Community Support**.

Respectfully,

Arthur Liberman