



**Palo Alto Pedestrian and
Bicycle Advisory Committee**

Tuesday, August 3, 2021 at 6:15 P.M.

Join Meeting Via Zoom

Join Online: <https://cityofpaloalto.zoom.us/j/93830274930>; Dial-in: 669-900-6833

Meeting ID: 938 3027 4930

PART I: TDA 3 – BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PLAN UPDATE

No items are scheduled for this meeting. No written comments were submitted by email to Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org between 12:00pm on May 24, 2021 and 12:00pm on July 26, 2021.

PART II: OTHER ITEMS

1. CALL TO ORDER 6:15 PM
2. AGENDA CHANGES 6:16 PM
3. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES 6:18 PM
 - a. Regular June PABAC Meeting
 - b. Special Joint Meeting with MV BPAC
4. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS 6:23 PM
5. STAFF UPDATES 6:25 PM
 - a. Staffing Update
 - b. South Palo Alto Bikeways
 - c. PABAC 311 Submissions
 - d. Peninsula Bikeway Study
6. DISCUSSION ITEMS
 - a. Comments from attendees about joint meeting with MV B/PAC 7:00 PM
 - b. Off-road access to Foothills Park, Gate D 7:25 PM
7. STANDING ITEMS
 - a. Grant Update – NONE
 - b. CSTSC Update – NONE
 - c. VTA BPAC Update 7:55 PM
8. ADJOURNMENT 8:00 PM



Palo Alto Pedestrian and
Bicycle Advisory Committee

Tuesday, June 1, 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, Steve Rock, Jane Rosten, Richard Swent, Alan Wachtel, Bill Zaumen

Members Absent: Arnout Boelens, Nicole Zoeller Boelens

Staff Present: Joanna Chan, Sylvia Star-Lack

Guests: Steve Davis

PART I: TDA 3 – BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PLAN UPDATE

No meeting scheduled.

PART II: OTHER ITEMS

1. CALL TO ORDER – 6:16 p.m.

2. AGENDA CHANGES

Chair Joye announced a report from the subcommittee reviewing work items will be added to the agenda as Item 6c.

3. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES

Motion by Mr. Goldstein, seconded by Vice Chair Liberman, to approve the minutes of the May 4, 2021 meeting as presented. Motion passed 14-0 with 2 abstaining.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Goldstein requested a standing agenda item listing future agenda topics with tentative dates. He also requested staff investigate the possibility of delaying the repaving of Addison Avenue until the entire substandard bike route along Addison can be designed and included in the repaving project as one.

1 Ms. Ellson thanked Mr. Neff for organizing events for Bike to Wherever Day and staff,
2 especially Ms. Chan, for supporting the event. The Council has fully funded Phase III of the
3 Charleston/Arastradero project.

4 **5. STAFF UPDATES – NONE**

5 **6. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

6 **a. South Palo Alto Bikeways Presentation and Discussion**

7 Joanna Chan shared the objectives and requirements of the grant funding the project, public
8 engagement opportunities, project segments, and charts for middle school and high school bike
9 counts. Earlier start times for Jane Lathrop Stanford Middle School (JLS) and Gunn High
10 School beginning in September 2021 could result in even higher rates of biking and walking to
11 schools.

12 Steve Davis, Fehr & Peers, reported the Fabian Way segment includes two vehicle travel lanes in
13 each direction, a westbound bike lane, and an eastbound shared bike and parking lane. Because
14 of crossing distances, traffic volumes and speeds, and the current lane configurations, riding and
15 walking on or crossing Fabian Way is a challenge. Two potential options for reconfiguring
16 Fabian Way have been identified, and potential improvements could include eliminating on-
17 street parking to add buffers and eliminate dooring risks while maintaining existing travel lanes
18 or reducing the number of vehicle travel lanes to introduce protected bike lanes while
19 maintaining existing parking in the eastbound direction. Improvements on Fabian Way would be
20 coordinated with the Charleston/Arastradero project.

21 Mr. Rock indicated that having the bicycle lane to the right of the parking lane seems to reduce
22 bicyclists' visibility of motorists. In addition, large vehicles and RVs park along the street.
23 These vehicles may not fit within the parking lane in Option 2.

24 Mr. Neff remarked that the parking-protected bike lane will result in less on-street parking.
25 Drop-off at the high school needs to be considered. The road diet makes a left turn easy and safe
26 for bicyclists. For bicyclists wanting to turn left from Fabian onto East Meadow, a design with a
27 center turn-lane is the best option.

28 Mr. Robinson wanted to know the types of road users, their numbers, and their use of Fabian
29 before discussing improvements for Fabian Way. Ms. Ellson reported Fabian has become a
30 school commute route because of housing built around the JCC Campus. Parents will not allow
31 their children to commute to school via Fabian Way because of safety concerns.

32 Mr. Goldstein remarked that a parking-protected bike lane is a new treatment in this situation,
33 and other treatments have been used successfully. New treatments were implemented on Ross
34 Road without success. A parking-protected bike lane seems to add unnecessary barriers and
35 confusion without providing much benefit.

36 Mr. Rock noted that the intersection of Fabian and Charleston is extremely busy during rush
37 hour. The number of lanes turning left from Fabian and right onto Fabian should be the same.

1 Vice Chair Liberman did not like protected bike lanes and rarely used them. A parking-protected
2 bike lane may not be necessary if existing on-street parking is not fully utilized.

3 Ms. Durham stated reducing the crossing distance could provide safety benefits for pedestrians,
4 bicyclists, and motorists.

5 In response to questions, Ms. Chan advised that driveways have not yet been counted. Some
6 traffic counts were conducted during the pandemic, but if necessary, a full traffic study will be
7 completed in the following phase. Mr. Davis stated parking along the Kehillah Jewish High
8 School side of Fabian Way would be eliminated in Option 2. Driveways with lower traffic
9 volumes typically have 40-60 feet of free space from the edge of the driveway to ensure clear
10 sightlines. Each driveway will be reviewed independently during the design phase. Ms. Chan
11 stated the Adobe Creek Reach Trail will open with the Highway 101 Pedestrian/Bike Bridge in
12 the summer. These improvements will not extend into Bayshore. Sylvia Star-Lack noted
13 bicyclists leaving the Oshman Family Jewish Community Center (JCC) may want to turn left
14 onto East Meadow. Staff will explore different ways for bicyclists to exit the protected bike lane
15 so that bicyclists of all skill levels are comfortable.

16 Mr. Davis continued the presentation with the segment of East Meadow Drive between East
17 Meadow Circle and Fabian Way, which includes one vehicle travel lane in each direction, one
18 bike lane in each direction, and a shared bike and parking lane in the westbound direction.
19 Option 1 provides buffered bike lanes in each direction and eliminates parking. Option 2 is
20 essentially maintaining the existing conditions. East Meadow Drive between Alma Street and
21 East Meadow Circle has a parking lane, bike lane, and a vehicle travel lane in both directions
22 with no physical barriers between any of the uses. Rolled curbs and cars parked in or
23 overlapping the bike lane and sidewalks are significant challenges for pedestrians and bicyclists.
24 The goal for this segment is to minimize the threat of vehicles parking in the bike lane and on the
25 sidewalk. Option 1 has buffered bike lanes in each direction with parking along one side only.
26 Option 2 provides a parking-protected bike lane in one direction. The parking-protected bike
27 lane may be located on either the westbound or eastbound side based on where the community
28 feels the greatest need is and based on geometric constraints. The segment of East Meadow
29 adjacent to Fairmeadow Elementary provides angled parking in the eastbound direction, a bike
30 lane in each direction, and some extra space between the bike lane and parking. Option 1 widens
31 the bike lane into the extra space. Option 2 includes parking adjacent to the drop-off loop at
32 Fairmeadow Elementary.

33 Mr. Rock did not perceive any difficulties with the improvements due to few cars parking along
34 East Meadow. In normal situations, vehicles turn left from westbound Meadow into
35 Fairmeadow Elementary, which delays traffic, and park in the bike lane. Left turns into the
36 school should be prohibited to improve safety.

37 Mr. Courington questioned whether back-in angle parking could be implemented on Meadow.

38 Mr. Nordman preferred Option 2, the road diet, for Fabian Way. Protected bike lanes are a
39 concern because of sightlines. Pylon barriers are less expensive than concrete barriers.
40 Implementing protected bike lanes on East Meadow is more difficulty due to the number of
41 driveways.

1 Mr. Swent supported a hybrid of Options 1 and 2, i.e., a road diet and buffered bike lanes, for
2 Fabian Way. The roundabout will be a challenge for bicyclists if there is a protected bike lane
3 on E. Meadow.

4 Mr. Arthur preferred locating a buffered bike lane on Fabian because there are fewer driveways.
5 Square curbs would do a lot to standardize traffic, cars, and parking. Aligning parked vehicles
6 would provide a huge advantage.

7 Mr. Neff concurred with Mr. Swent that a road diet, plastic buffers, and no parking is probably
8 the best option. Residents who are located across from JLS but have East Meadow addresses are
9 very uncomfortable with the idea of removing parking in front of their homes. From Waverley
10 to Alma, a buffered, separated bike lane is a good alternative. On East Meadow, plans to
11 construct a left turn pocket at the trail entrance needs to be considered.

12 Mr. de la Beaujardiere preferred bollards to a raised curb. Option 1 for East Meadow between
13 Alma and East Meadow Circle does not eliminate the risk of bicyclists being doored.

14 Mr. Davis concluded the presentation with the Waverley Multi-use Path. Existing conditions
15 and high demand during school peak periods have led to falls and collisions for bicyclists. In
16 some portions of the path, the usable width is less than 5 feet for both directions of travel.
17 Options for barriers include bollards or delineators, concrete curbs, and bike bollards. Option 1
18 widens the path into the adjacent grassy strip at pinch points where feasible and replaces the
19 fence with a different type of barrier. Option 2 widens the path towards either side where
20 feasible and again replaces the fence.

21 Mr. Swent supported removing the fence and Option 2.

22 Mr. Rock suggested widening the path into the grassy strip to provide a wider path and passing
23 areas.

24 Ms. Durham encouraged the design team to consider the path as three segments. The segment at
25 Charleston is constrained during school commute times by the large number of cars accessing
26 Hoover. Parking towards Hoover is constrained such that widening the path toward the roadway
27 may be easier. The segment at JLS may be the easiest to modify. People may object to
28 removing the fence.

29 Mr. Neff liked the fence separating the path from vehicle traffic. Whatever barrier is used, it
30 needs to prevent motorists from backing onto the path. Widening the entire path would be best.

31 Ms. Star-Lack noted that the path is located on PAUSD property and must maintain at minimum
32 a 20-foot fire lane. Parents prefer a fence or a continuous barrier.

33 Ms. Ellson commented that PAUSD may not agree to removing the fence when its risk
34 management team reviews the design. In response to her question, Ms. Star-Lack offered
35 options of mounting bollards on concrete curbs or installing a lower and artistic fence.

36 Mr. Wachtel was uncomfortable with the project. The main problem appears to be roadways that
37 are too narrow to accommodate parking, bike lanes, and traffic lanes. All proposals include

1 some level of parking removal and lane configuration. Inexpensive, flexible, easy-to-modify,
2 and expedient options have not been offered because the grant requires a bikeway with physical
3 protection. The separated bikeways are neither protected nor bike lanes. Drawbacks of
4 separated facilities include a bicyclist's inability to avoid debris and surface hazards, to pass
5 other users, to turn left, and to reach midblock destinations across the roadway without a break in
6 the barrier. At every driveway and intersection, separated facilities create geometric conflicts
7 unless mixing zones or separate traffic phases are provided. Recognized guidelines are
8 inadequate and should not be relied on to solve problems after the fact. Buffered bike lanes do
9 not prevent lateral movements, but they can create turning conflicts. Buffers are best used to
10 keep bicyclists out of the door zone. The experiment on Arastradero should be observed closely
11 before it is repeated.

12 **b. PABAC Email List Protocol**

13 Mr. Goldstein reported the subcommittee does not believe there is a grave problem. The
14 guidelines are guidelines; there will be no enforcement.

15 Mr. Arthur questioned the prohibition against using the list to advocate for or against issues or
16 policies. An email thoughtfully advocating for or against a topic is valuable for informing
17 decisions. Mr. Goldstein noted that PABAC is not subject to the Brown Act; therefore, staff is
18 not required to publish PABAC emails for public consumption. An email providing additional
19 information or suggesting ways to structure a discussion may be sent to the Chair for inclusion in
20 the agenda packet. The PABAC email list is not the appropriate place for advocacy.

21 Mr. Rock did not believe the email list has been used inappropriately and did not see a need for
22 guidelines.

23 Mr. Wachtel commented that PABAC's meetings, agendas, and minutes are available to the
24 public. It is not appropriate to conduct extensive policy discussions via the email list.
25 Comments should be reserved for the public meeting.

26 Mr. de la Beaujardiere indicated that the proposed guidelines align with practices.

27 Mr. Nordman suggested changing "protocol" to "guidelines" in the title.

28 Ms. Ellson advised that the guidelines will be helpful for new members.

29 Ms. Durham proposed including the fact that PABAC is advisory to staff and revising "other
30 communication platforms" to "for those interested, the following resources are available."
31 Walk/Bike Palo Alto does not have a distribution list yet.

32 Motion by Ms. Ellson, seconded by Mr. Goldstein, to adopt the proposed guidelines with
33 revisions to change "protocol" to "guidelines" in Heading 1 and add beneath Heading 1 "PABAC
34 is an advisory committee; advocacy is not part of this Committee's charter." Motion passed 15-1.

1 **c. Review of Past Work**

2 Mr. Swent advised that two items remain outstanding: the bollards on Louis/Moreno and the
3 Stanford/Park traffic circle. In February 2019, PABAC approved a recommendation for the City
4 to place adequate reflective material on all bollards on Louis/Moreno/Amarillo. In September
5 2019, staff talked about moving the existing bollards, and at least one bollard was moved. Since
6 2019, the intersection has been reconfigured, stop signs moved, and streets restriped, but
7 adequate reflective material has not been applied to all bollards. PABAC began discussing the
8 Stanford/Park traffic circle in April 2017, and staff provided an update in August 2017. In
9 January 2018, staff offered four alternatives for review and discussion. The minutes do not
10 indicate which alternative PABAC preferred. In January 2020, staff new to the City advised
11 PABAC that the project was included in Phase II of bicycle boulevard work, which was placed
12 on hold. Multiple requests for monthly collision data and for review of downtown pedestrian
13 safety have not been addressed. A number of items need staff updates. With funding of Phase
14 III of the Charleston/Arastradero project, PABAC needs to ensure the project is coordinated with
15 the Caltrans repaving of El Camino.

16 Chair Joye reported he and Vice Chair Liberman will work with staff to place items on upcoming
17 agendas. A joint meeting with the Mountain View BPAC is scheduled for June 30, 2021.

18 **7. STANDING ITEMS:**

19 **a. Grant Update**

20 None

21 **b. CSTSC Update**

22 None

23 **c. VTA BPAC Update**

24 Mr. Neff reported that the BPAC committee reviewed planning projects and recommended some
25 for grant funding. BPAC conducted a Complete Streets checklist review of projects submitted to
26 the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for the quick strike program. BPAC also
27 recommended the VTA Board of Directors to adopt the Bicycle Superhighway Implementation
28 Plan. The City may want to consider a project to fill the gap in the Bay Trail at Embarcadero
29 and West Bayshore or support a route on the off-street path.

30 Ms. Star-Lack noted a development application has been submitted for the property at the corner
31 of Embarcadero and East Bayshore. In a prior development application, staff required a bike
32 path across the property to the multi-use path leading to Geng Road. The property was rezoned,
33 but the development proposal was abandoned. The current development application proposes a
34 smaller project, and staff is again attempting to require a bike path across the property. PABAC
35 members may wish to submit comments to the Council regarding the project and bike path.

36 Ms. Chan stated the project will likely be listed by its address, 1700 Embarcadero Road.

1 Mr. de la Beaujardiere announced the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition is hosting a virtual bike
2 ride on June 3, 2021. Several years ago, PABAC identified many improvements for Park
3 Boulevard, such as wayfinding signage. Perhaps the subcommittee can investigate and resurrect
4 that piece of unfinished business. The Council may be scheduled to review the North Ventura
5 Coordinated Area Plan (NVCAP) on June 8, 2021. The Council's selection of an option for the
6 NVCAP or direction to staff could impact Park Boulevard.

7 **7. ADJOURNMENT** at 8:19 p.m.



**SPECIAL JOINT MEETING OF THE
MOUNTAIN VIEW BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
AND
PALO ALTO PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE
ADVISORY COMMITTEE**



Wednesday, June 30, 2021
6:30 P.M.
Virtual Meeting

1
2
3
4
5 **1. CALL TO ORDER – 6:30 p.m.**

6 **2. ROLL CALL/ESTABLISH QUORUM**

7 **2.1 Mountain View Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (MV B/PAC)**

8 Members Present: Chair Lada Adamic, Vice Chair Valerie Fenwick, Terry Barton, James
9 Kuzsmaul, Kalyanaraman Shankari

10 Members Absent: None

11 Staff Present: Ria Hutabarat Lo, Brandon Whyte

12 **2.2 Palo Alto Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee (PABAC)**

13 Members Present: Chair Ken Joye, Vice Chair Art Liberman, Bruce Arthur, Bill Courington,
14 Cedric de la Beaujardiere, Penny Ellson, Robert Neff, Eric Nordman,
15 Steve Rock, Alan Wachtel, Bill Zaumen

16 Members Absent: Arnout Boelens, Nicole Zoeller Boelens, Kathy Durham, Paul Goldstein,
17 Rob Robinson, Jane Rosten, Richard Swent

18 Staff Present: Sylvia Star-Lack, Joanna Chan

19 **3. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

20 Mr. England directed comments to Mr. Whyte and Ms. Lo.

21 **4. MINUTES APPROVAL**

22 **4.1 MV B/PAC Meeting Minutes for May 26, 2021**

23 Motion by Vice Chair Fenwick, seconded by Mr. Kuzsmaul, to approve the minutes of the May
24 26, 2021 meeting as presented. Motion passed 5-0.

1 **4.2 PABAC Meeting Minutes for June 1, 2021**

2 None

3 **5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

4 None

5 **6. NEW BUSINESS**

6 **6.1 Orientation to Mountain View B/PAC and Palo Alto PABAC**

7 Mr. Whyte provided an introduction to tonight’s agenda. Ms. Lo and Ms. Chan summarized the
8 roles and responsibilities of Mountain View B/PAC and Palo Alto PABAC.

9 **6.2 Pedestrian and Bicycle Issues that Cross City Borders**

10 Mr. Whyte presented on cross city borders issues.

11 Mr. Kuzsmal asked about the process and timeline of Caltrans’ El Camino Real project.
12 Specifically, who needs to approve the parking removal in Mountain View and how bus stops
13 will be redesigned. Mr. Whyte shared that Caltrans will provide design plans within the next
14 month, which staff will review and comment with regards to the bus stops. Ms. Lo mentioned
15 that Mountain View Council has already approved half of the parking removal and will need to
16 consider approving the other half.

17 Chair Joye stated that the presentation showed no parallel alternate route to El Camino Real, and
18 asked staff whether there is a reasonable parallel alternate route for San Antonio Road. Mr.
19 Whyte explained that the understanding isn’t to have a parallel alternate route for San Antonio
20 Road, but to develop San Antonio Road into a bicycle and pedestrian friendly corridor. Ms. Star-
21 Lack added that Palo Alto Council has asked for a corridor study along San Antonio Road.

22 Vice Chair Liberman questioned the types of protected bikeways that Mountain View has
23 envisioned for El Camino Real, as well as consideration for noise level on El Camino Real. Mr.
24 Whyte clarified that it will be a raised curb on El Camino Real. Ms. Star-Lack added that there
25 may be removal of two to three parking spots to accommodate the El Camino Real plans.

26 Ms. Shankari questioned whether there will be a connection between Cesano Ct to Del Medio
27 Ave without needing to travel along El Camino Real. Ms. Star-Lack and Ms. Lo mentioned that
28 there is a private property which was conditioned to close the gap between Cesano Ct and Del
29 Medio Ave.

30 Mr. Wachtel expressed that El Camino Real has multiple conflicts and should be carefully
31 addressed.

32 Ms. Ellson, Mr. Zaumen, and Mr. Rock noted El Camino Real as a dangerous bicycle route, and
33 that there are multiple safer parallel routes.

1 Mr. Neff asked whether there are plans to upgrade the Caltrain overpass at San Antonio Road.
2 Ms. Lo mentioned that the Caltrain Business Plan proposes a double track at the Caltrain
3 overpass, but details are not available at this time.

4 Public speaker Greg believed the El Camino plan is ambitious. San Antonio is a very poor
5 north/south connector and a barrier between Palo Alto and Mountain View. Bicyclists crossing
6 El Camino Real have to watch for right hooks. The bike lane ends abruptly at California Street.
7 San Antonio is dangerous for bicyclists, and the Central Expressway Caltrain overpass makes no
8 provision for bicyclists and pedestrians. There is no wayfinding signage for the tunnel at the San
9 Antonio station. The bike lane on West Middlefield through Mountain View is beautiful, but it
10 ends at the intersection with Old Middlefield Road.

11 Mr. Arthur noted overlap between the Park Boulevard and Ellen Fletcher routes and suggested
12 descriptions clearly indicate the Park Boulevard or Ellen Fletcher route. Figure 2 should be
13 updated to reflect the jurisdictions. He referred to a letter to the Mountain View Council
14 regarding Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects.

15 In reply to Vice Chair Liberman's questions, Mr. Whyte advised that the Class IV protected
16 bikeway project on California Street is in the very early stages and that details have not been
17 developed.

18 Chair Joye expressed interest in improvements to the intersection of Charleston and San Antonio
19 and encouraged Mountain View staff to recognize the issues of crossing El Camino versus
20 traveling along El Camino. In answer to his question, Mr. Barton indicated Google has proposed
21 expanding the North Bayshore networks and making them safer, but the Bay Trail is excluded
22 from the North Bayshore zone. Improvements to the connection to the new overcrossing have
23 been discussed, but plans have not been drafted.

24 Ms. Shankari and Mr. Barton discussed Fayette as a route to El Camino, and Ms. Shankari read
25 comments made in the chat feature.

26 Vice Chair Fenwick supported the proposal to remove parking along El Camino, expressed
27 concern regarding curb cuts and driveways, appreciated efforts to make El Camino safer, wanted
28 more improvements on San Antonio, and suggested improvements include signage.

29 Mr. Kuzsmal supported removing street parking on El Camino for a protected bike lane,
30 proposed minimizing bus and bike conflicts at bus stops along El Camino, preferred buses stop
31 in the travel lane, suggested extending the curb at driveways as far as possible to create a tight
32 turning radius for vehicles, supported extreme measures to improve San Antonio where needed,
33 and noted the West Middlefield bike lanes are not so good because they are time and day limited.

34 Ms. Ellson concurred with comments regarding crossing El Camino and San Antonio Road.
35 There is an unusually long wait to cross Nita, and motorists try to beat the signal or cross against
36 the signal. Wayfinding signage to the San Antonio station, bike parking at the station, and bike
37 connectivity to the station need improvements. San Antonio needs better bike facilities, but
38 improvements in the Palo Alto segments of the corridor may not be feasible due to rights-of-way
39 and redevelopment. A bike lane that connects to Latham and Church should be added when the
40 remainder of the San Antonio Shopping Center property is redeveloped.

1 Mr. de la Beaujardiere supported removing parking along El Camino Real to install semi-
2 protected bike lanes. The potential for right hooks at driveways is high, but the potential for
3 bicyclists being doored or rear-ended is greater. Turning left from Monroe onto El Camino Real
4 is difficult because there is no traffic signal. Regarding bus/bike conflicts, he suggested bus stop
5 islands. In response to Mr. de la Beaujardiere's inquiry, Mr. Whyte reported Caltrans is
6 preparing improvements for San Antonio Road over Highway 101, including sidewalks and
7 either protected bike lanes or a multiuse path, but the project is ten years away.

8 Ms. Shankari supported removing parking on El Camino for bike lanes. El Camino is a route
9 and a destination because of the businesses along El Camino. There is not always a connection
10 from a parallel route to El Camino.

11 Mr. Barton indicated any improvements to El Camino Real would be good and encouraged staff
12 to seek the City of Los Altos' approval for improvements, especially around San Antonio Road.

13 Mr. Neff supported a study to determine whether parking can be removed and believed the study
14 area should extend from Adobe Creek to Arastradero. With respect to San Antonio Road,
15 removing parking, making space on the road for bicycles, or building an off-street bike path are
16 the only options. Bus stop islands are a good way to reduce bus/bike conflicts.

17 Mr. Wachtel remarked that staff needs to understand the causes of bike/car collisions on El
18 Camino and San Antonio and determine whether proposed improvements address those causes.
19 The protected bikeways are in actuality separated bikeways or cycle tracks and may cause
20 significant increases in exposure to collisions at driveways and intersections.

21 Mr. Nordman agreed with removing parking on El Camino and disagreed with the comment to
22 extend the curb as far as possible at driveways. He preferred merging into the bike lane when
23 safe and turning from as far right as possible.

24 Chair Adamic supported removing parking and agreed that El Camino is a destination. A bike
25 lane on El Camino would increase safety and encourage bicycling.

26 Mr. Rock supported eliminating parking on El Camino. Being able to access businesses on El
27 Camino by bicycle is important, and El Camino does not have to be a through bicycle route.

28 Vice Chair Liberman expressed concern about Mountain View's community outreach plan for
29 separated bike lanes and supported removing parking from El Camino.

30 Mr. de la Beaujardiere suggested staff consider a bus, taxi, and bike lane in the center of streets.
31 Mr. Whyte related that staff would explore the concept, but it is not considered a best practice.

32 Mr. Courington encouraged Mountain View to establish criteria for the success of the project.

1 **6.3 Santa Clara Valley Transportation Agency (VTA) Bicycle & Pedestrian**
2 **Advisory Committee (BPAC) Update**

3 Chair Adamic reported the June meeting was canceled. In May, the VTA BPAC received
4 updates regarding the Safe and Seamless Mobility Quick-Strike Program, planning projects
5 funded with Measure B 2021 monies, and the Bicycle Superhighway.

6 Mr. Neff added that the VTA Board adopted the Bicycle Superhighway in June.

7 In answer to Mr. Barton's question, Ms. Star-Lack advised that the County would have traffic
8 counts conducted before and after the road diet project on Junipero Serra Boulevard/Foothill
9 Expressway.

10 Mr. Kuzsmaul assumed BPAC would obtain Mountain View B/PAC's input on a business plan.

11 **7. COMMITTEE/STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS, UPDATES, REQUESTS, AND**
12 **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

13 **7.1 Mountain View Staff Comments**

14 Ms. Lo announced the City of Mountain View hired Mr. Whyte as an Active Transportation
15 Planner. Attendance for Bike to Wherever Week was low this year. The City Council approved
16 the AccessMV Final Report and an extension of Castro StrEATS to January 3, 2022. The City
17 of Mountain View was awarded a grant for the Stierlin Quick Strikes.

18 Mr. Whyte presented the AskMV report for May and June 2021.

19 Mr. Skinner indicated that the City of Mountain View received a Measure B innovative transit
20 grant to expand shuttle hours for two years beginning September 2021.

21 **7.2 Palo Alto Staff Comments**

22 Ms. Chan reported the South Palo Alto Bikeways Project will be presented to the Planning and
23 Transportation Commission (PTC) on July 14 and the City Council on August 9.

24 Ms. Star-Lack noted that outdoor dining was extended through September 2021, the City
25 recertified as a gold level Bicycle Friendly Community, and staff hosted an adaptive cycling
26 program for special needs students.

27 **7.3 Mountain View B/PAC Comments**

28 Vice Chair Fenwick shared an incident with a personal delivery device that occurred at the
29 intersection of Shoreline and Villa.

30 Mr. Barton requested Mountain View and Palo Alto avoid using wood in bridge decks.

31 Chair Adamic proposed joint bike rides and walks with PABAC in the future. Ms. Ellson
32 concurred and volunteered to assist with arranging such events.

- 1 **7.4 Palo Alto PABAC Comments**
- 2 None
- 3 **8. SET DATE AND TIME FOR NEXT MEETING**
- 4 Wednesday, August 25, 2021 B/PAC Meeting at 6:30 p.m.
- 5 **9. CALENDAR**
- 6 Wednesday, September 29, 2021 B/PAC Meeting at 6:30 p.m.
- 7 Wednesday, October 27, 2021 B/PAC Meeting at 6:30 p.m.
- 8 Wednesday, November 24, 2021 B/PAC Meeting at 6:30 p.m.
- 9 **10. ADJOURNMENT** approximately at 8:30 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.