



**Palo Alto Pedestrian and
Bicycle Advisory Committee**

Tuesday, January 10, 2023 at 6:15 P.M.

Join Meeting Via Zoom

Join Online: <https://cityofpaloalto.zoom.us/j/9330561519>; Dial-in: 669-900-6833

Meeting ID: 933 056 1519

PART I: TDA 3 – BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN (BTP) UPDATE

1. CALL TO ORDER 6:15 PM
2. Adoption of a Resolution Authorizing Use of Teleconferencing for Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee Meetings During Covid-19 State of Emergency (See attached Resolution) 6:16 PM
3. AGENDA CHANGES 6:18 PM
4. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES 6:19 PM
 - a. November 1, 2022 PABAC meeting: Part I: TDA 3—Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update and Part II: Other Items
5. PUBLIC COMMENTS 6:20 PM
Note: Written comments submitted by email to Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org between 12:00pm on October 12, 2022, and 12:00pm on December 12, 2022 are attached with the agenda packet.
6. STAFF UPDATE 6:23 PM
 - a. 2022 BTP Update (*Ozzy Arce, OOT*)
Link to RFP: <https://pbsystem.planetbids.com/portal/25569/bo/bo-detail/98851>
7. ADJOURNMENT 6:25 PM

PART II: OTHER ITEMS

1. CALL TO ORDER 6:25 PM
2. AGENDA CHANGES 6:26 PM
3. PUBLIC COMMENTS 6:27 PM
4. STAFF UPDATES 6:30 PM
 - a. PABAC Google Group implementation follow-up
[Thank you Richard Swent for organizing the new Google Group!]
5. DISCUSSION ITEMS 6:35 PM
 - a. New Chief of Police Andrew Binder & Lt. Ben Becchetti: Introduction and Q&A

- b. Nominations and election of 2023 PABAC Chair and Vice Chair 7:10 PM
 - c. 2023 PABAC meetings post-expiration of State Emergency Ordinance 7:40 PM
6. STANDING ITEMS 7:55 PM
- a. Grant Update – None
 - b. CSTSC Update – October 20, 2022 & November 17, 2022 CSTSC Meeting summaries, attached
 - c. Caltrans Project—ECR Repaving 2023 Project Update
 - See Attachment 1, Emails between Chair Ellson and Caltrans staff
 - See Attachment 2, Caltrans’ responses to PABAC comments
 - See Attachment 3, Caltrans’ responses to City Comments
 - d. VTA BPAC Update (*R. Neff*)
 - e. Subcommittee Reports
 - 1. Rail Grade Separation Subcommittee (*B. Arthur*)
 - 2. Bike Bridge Maintenance Subcommittee (*Chair Ellson*)
 - See Attachment 4, Email update from Megha Bansal, Public Works
 - 3. Repaving Subcommittee (*R. Neff*)
 - 4. Muni Code Subcommittee (*E. Nordman*)
 - 5. Sight line and Safety Problem Reporting on Bike Routes (*E. Nordman*)
 - 6. Open Space & Parks E-Bikes Subcommittee (*P. Goldstein*)
 - f. Announcements
 - g. Future Agenda Items
 - El Camino Real (SR-82) plans from Caltrans (Last discussion: 10/6/2022)
 - Muni code clean-up progress update (Committee report delivered: 2018; Last update from staff: 11/1/2022)
 - PAUSD Hoover school campus reconstruction update (Last review: 5/3/2022)
 - S. Palo Alto Bikeways project status/grant proposal (Last update: 10/6/2022)
 - Rail Grade Separations (Last update: 8/2/2022)
 - Municipal Code re: micromobility issues
 - BPTP Update Implementation Status Item for the City website
 - PABAC assistance reporting sight line/safety issues on bike/ped network (Requested by Staff: 10/6/22)
 - Explore alternatives for bike/ped non-injury collision and near-miss reporting
 - Bike parking code updates for converting existing business-owned auto parking spaces to bicycle parking
 - Park Blvd to Portage Ave. (last discussion: 11/1/2022)
7. ADJOURNMENT 8:15 PM

END OF AGENDA

Resolution No. __

Resolution of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee (PABAC) of the City of Palo Alto

Resolution Making Findings to Allow Teleconferenced Meetings Under California Government Code Section 54953(e)

R E C I T A L S

- A. California Government Code Section 54953(e) empowers local policy bodies to convene by teleconferencing technology during a proclaimed state of emergency under the State Emergency Services Act so long as certain conditions are met; and
- B. In March 2020, the Governor of the State of California proclaimed a state of emergency in California in connection with the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (“COVID-19”) pandemic, and that state of emergency remains in effect; and
- C. In February 2020, the Santa Clara County Director of Emergency Services and the Santa Clara County Health Officer declared a local emergency, which declarations were subsequently ratified and extended by the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors, and those declarations also remain in effect; and
- D. On September 16, 2021, the Governor signed AB 361, a bill that amends the Brown Act to allow local policy bodies to continue to meet by teleconferencing during a state of emergency without complying with restrictions in State law that would otherwise apply, provided that the policy bodies make certain findings at least once every 30 days; and
- E. While federal, State, and local health officials emphasize the critical importance of vaccination and consistent mask-wearing to prevent the spread of COVID-19, the Santa Clara County Health Officer has issued at least one order, on August 2, 2021 (available online at [here](#)), that continues to recommend measures to promote outdoor activity, physical distancing and other social distancing measures, such as masking, in certain contexts; and
- F. The California Department of Industrial Relations Division of Occupational Safety and Health (“Cal/OSHA”) has promulgated Section 3205 of Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations, which requires most employers in California, including in the City, to train and instruct employees about measures that can decrease the spread of COVID-19, including physical distancing and other social distancing measures; and
- G. The City’s Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee (PABAC) has met remotely during the COVID-19 pandemic and can continue to do so in a manner that allows public participation and transparency while minimizing health risks to members, staff, and the public that would be present with in-person meetings while this emergency continues; now, therefore,

NOT YET APPROVED

The Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee RESOLVES as follows:

1. As described above, the State of California remains in a state of emergency due to the COVID-19 pandemic. At this meeting, PABAC has considered the circumstances of the state of emergency.
2. As described above, State and County officials continue to recommend measures to promote physical distancing and other social distancing measures, in some settings.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that for at least the next 30 days, meetings of PABAC will occur using teleconferencing technology. Such meetings of PABAC that occur using teleconferencing technology will provide an opportunity for any and all members of the public who wish to address the body and its committees and will otherwise occur in a manner that protects the statutory and constitutional rights of parties and the members of the public attending the meeting via teleconferencing; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the PABAC staff liaison is directed to place a resolution substantially similar to this resolution on the agenda of a future meeting of PABAC within the next 30 days. If PABAC does not meet under the Brown Act within the next 30 days, the staff liaison is directed to place a such resolution on the agenda of the immediately following Brown Act meeting of PABAC.

INTRODUCED AND PASSED:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTENTIONS:

ATTEST:

Staff Liaison

Chair of PABAC

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

APPROVED:

Assistant City Attorney

Chief Transportation Official



Palo Alto Pedestrian and
Bicycle Advisory Committee

Tuesday, November 1, 2022

6:15 P.M.

VIRTUAL MEETING

Palo Alto, CA

Members Present: Penny Ellson (Chair), Art Liberman (Vice Chair), Alan Wachtel, Arnout Boelens, Bill Courington, Bill Zaumen, Bruce Arthur, Cedric de la Beaujardiere, Eric Nordman, Jane Rosten, Kathy Durham, Nicole Rodia, Paul Goldstein, Richard Swent, Robert Neff, Steve Rock

Members Absent: Ken Joye, Nicole Zoeller-Boelens

Staff Present: Sylvia Star-Lack, Ozzy Arce, Shrupath Patel

Guests: Claire Raybould, Daren Anderson, Rose Mesterhazy

PART I: TDA 3 – BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PLAN UPDATE

1. Call to order

Chair Ellson called to order the November 2022 PABAC Committee meeting with a Roll Call by Ozzy.

2. Adoption of a Resolution Authorizing Use of Teleconferencing for Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee Meetings During Covid-19 State of Emergency (See attached Resolution)

Chair Ellson introduced the Adoption of the Resolution Authorizing Use of Teleconferencing for the November 1, 2022 PABAC meeting.

Mr. Paul Goldstein moved to pass the resolution, seconded by Mr. Bruce Arthur.

In addition to the motion, Mr. Goldstein provided comments with an interest in having future meetings in person with the option of phone in comments for any person wishing to address any future agenda items.

Upon call of the roll, the resolution was carried unanimously.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

3. AGENDA CHANGES

None

4. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES

A. October 6, 2022 PABAC meeting: Part 1: TDA 3-Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update and Part II: Other Items.

Mr. Bill Courington motioned to approve the minutes of the October 6, 2022 PABAC meeting as revised, Mr. Paul Goldstein seconded. Upon call of the roll the minutes were passed unanimously.

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Written comments submitted by email to Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org between 12:00pm on April 21, 2022 and 12:00pm on May 20, 2022 are attached with the agenda packet.

None

6. STAFF UPDATES

A. 2012 BPTP Project Update – Request for Proposals is out and live!

Mr. Ozzy Arce, Senior Transportation Planner & Project Manager reported the Request for Proposals (RFP) is out and live and proposals are due by Tuesday, November 15, 2022. Members and the public can view the RFP by visiting <https://pbsystem.planetbids.com/portal/25569/bo/bo-detail/98851>. Staff anticipates holding interviews in early December and hopes to have a contract signed and for the project to begin in early 2023.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Ellson adjourned the Brown Act Part I of the meeting.

PART II: OTHER ITEMS

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Ellson called to order Part II of the meeting.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

2. AGENDA CHANGES

Items 5 B and 5 C will switch places on the Agenda.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

4. STAFF UPDATES

A. PABAC Email List Update (Sylvia Star-Lack, OOT)

Ms. Sylvia Star-Lack provided comment that migrating the committee emails to another host would be on a future agenda; and responded to the Committee’s prior questions regarding the group utilizing an @CityofPaloAlto address by explaining that those email addresses are reserved for City Council members only, and no other committees or Boards are supported by IT. Other Boards and committees use their one email address (i.e. PTC@ CityofPaloAlto) which Commissioners and public both use for comments. Once a week, staff collects all the emails and includes them with the agenda packet for the meetings. Staff and the Board members do not send via email any potential agenda item topic and public emails to specific calendar information. When Agenda item emails are communicated to committee members, staff utilizes the BCC feature of email which eliminates the possibility of email recipients to reply to all with any comments. For non- Brown-Acted Agenda items, other groups such as the PTA Transportation Safety Representatives use text apps or separate email lists.

Mr. Cedric de la Beaujardiere commented that an independently managed email group would be the best to use since the likelihood of a group of emails being included in a package and actually being read is quite low.

Ms. Jane Rosten agrees with Cedric and commented she gets about 80% of the emails that goes through the City of Palo Alto address and noticed the ones that go to the email address with capital letters seem to go through but if the emails use the lower case they tend to not come through.

5. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Park Blvd. to Portage Ave. Bike Route ideas & feedback (Claire Raybould, Planning) – Please see Attachment 1 for materials

Senior Planner Claire Raybould provided a presentation about the proposed projects at 200 Portage Avenue for ninety-one townhomes and the Development Agreement Alternative listed at 3200

1 Park Boulevard which includes partial demolition of the cannery building for a parking structure
2 on part of the parcel and 3.250-acres of the parcel being donated to the City for the use for
3 affordable housing and a park. In the alternative agreement seventy-four of the original ninety-one
4 townhomes would initially be built. The EIP (Environmental Impact Report) that the City released
5 in September has a comment closing date of November 15th, shows a significant impact for
6 inconsistencies with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Circulation plan and the Countywide Trails plan.
7 Both plans show an enhanced bike connection between Park Boulevard and Portage Avenue.
8 Under the mitigation the owners are required to provide an enhanced bikeway to connect Park and
9 Portage. This is an optimal opportunity to provide something better than just the use of sharrows.
10 NVCAP provided an exhibit of future buildout concepts on how to make the two (2) bicycle path
11 connections and public access easements will be utilized by any portion of the bike path that could
12 encroach upon private property. The future build-out of the area will be mixed use with building
13 up to seventy-foot-tall buildings.

14 Mr. Goldstein questioned if the expected traffic data was available and commented that he likes
15 the idea and with the right surface treatment it could be a good location for low-speed auto traffic
16 sharing the space with bicycle traffic and was glad to see the North Ventura Group had included
17 input. Ms. Raybould responded she didn't have specific expected traffic data at hand but
18 commented there will be several entrance and exits to the parking area on both models.

19 Mr. Richard Swent suggested in the townhome development option they might consider using
20 Street A and Street C to make the connection instead of using Street B.

21 Ms. Nicole Rodia inquired about the plans for bike facilities on Portage Avenue and do they
22 anticipate cut-through traffic. Ms. Raybould stated with this part of the project currently there are
23 no bike facilities planned for Portage Avenue. As part of the NVCAP mobility exhibit they are
24 looking at eventual Class II bike paths on Portage and will note that in order to achieve Class II
25 bike paths on Portage they would need to eliminate parking. Cut-through traffic will likely be low,
26 as it doesn't provide any better cut-through than the ones that are already in place.

27 Mr. Robert Neff inquired about pedestrian access from Park Blvd. towards El Camino Real. Ms.
28 Raybould replied staff would also like to see pedestrian access and are trying to explore how they
29 might incorporate that as part of the project even though it's not a requirement. The City's portion
30 would likely be sidewalks. Mr. Neff commented there is a potential for vehicles to use this as a
31 way to get from California to El Camino Real and would like to see that as a consideration for
32 potential challenges in future studies.

33 Mr. Steve Rock inquired which schools would be used, Chair Ellson stated Barron Park and
34 Fletcher. Ms. Sylvia Star-Lack added that PAUSD will need to have a conversation about how the
35 additional students will affect the current schools in that district and indicated Ms. Raybould will
36 be making the same presentation to the School Board later in November. In response to Mr. Rock's
37 question about bike parking, Ms. Raybould stated staff originally inquired about bike parking and
38 the developers supplied a visual which included bike parking throughout the site. The cannery
39 building also will have bike parking for the retail space.

40 Mr. Cedric de la Beaujardiere commented that diagonal back-end parking might be considered
41 which is safer for bikes and the addition of gentle speed humps might be beneficial. In addition, in

1 the NVCAP discussions one-way conversions were suggested on Pepper and/or Olive to dissuade
2 potential cut-through traffic.

3 Mr. Eric Nordman would prefer a more consistent treatment along Portage if they are talking about
4 a Class II bike lane and it leery of the more European raised type intersections.

5 Chair Ellson wants to understand what the school commute routes would be for Barron Park,
6 Fletcher, and Gunn schools. Ms. Raybould responded that is something that will have to be
7 explored further and she would like to think to some degree this project would improve that
8 pathway and the NVCAP would consider future projects as well in how they plan to design that
9 pathway.

10 Chair Ellson requested Claire bring the project back to PABAC once they've added more specific
11 details to the plans so the Committee will have a better understanding of how the bike path impacts
12 will move forward.

13 Ms. Kathy Durham clarified that unless anything has changed, the Barron Park students cross at
14 Matadero, which could be better, but has been improved somewhat.

15 Ms. Rodia commented that the risks with parallel parking would be the bike lane would be in the
16 door zones, and requested when the project is returned, they include information on how the cut
17 through traffic will be minimized.

18 Ms. Raybould stated she will take the comments to Transportation and any additional comments
19 can be directed to her email.

20 Mr. Rob Turcini, the developer, expressed gratitude for everyone's comments and stated they will
21 work with Claire to incorporate suggestions and concerns moving forward.

22

23 **C. Bicycle-focused Muni code clean-up (Shrupath Patel, OOT) ***heard out of***
24 ***order - Please see Attachment 4 for materials***

25 Mr. Shrupath Patel reported on the Pedestrians and Bicycles Municipal Code Update. The draft
26 staff report that will be going forward to PTC and City Council is included in the package. The
27 presentation will be focused on additional changes staff felt should be included after having done
28 their own review regarding bicycle parking facilities on existing development and new
29 development. Staff has suggested removing mechanical standards requirements for bicycles under
30 PAMC 10.64.110. In section 10.64.130 restrictions are put on cyclists against riding on sidewalks
31 in all commercial districts citywide. Some commercial districts are located on school routes such
32 as Arastradero and Middlefield roads. The proposed change would allow for bicycle riding in
33 commercial districts except for the Downtown commercial district and California Ave.
34 commercial district and children ages ten (10) years and under are exempt from this provision;
35 Staff is also requesting further guidance if multiple bicyclists are present in regard to PABAC's
36 recommendation that "others" is replaced with "pedestrians." In section PAMC 10.64.240, the use
37 of roller skates, skateboards and coasters on public right of way except on city-controlled parking
38 lots/garages. Staff recommend revising the section to limit restrictions only to city-controlled

1 parking lots and garages except where parking lots and garages are used for accessing parking or
2 traveling through for accessing a destination. Section 10.64.241(a) does not permit the use of
3 skateboards on arterial and/or collector roadways in residential districts. The proposed changes
4 would allow the use of skateboards on these roadways providing the speed limit is 25 MPH or less
5 and bicycle lanes exist on the roadways. PAMC 10.64.243 proposed changes would allow
6 skateboarders on the roadways in certain locations. Staff believe skateboarders should obey the
7 rules the same way bicyclists do and would like further guidance on removing, modifying, or
8 keeping this code. Section 18.54.060 is in regard to bicycle parking: replacing non-conforming
9 parking with all major and minor improvements, fees shall not be collected towards replacing bike
10 parking, update long-term parking requirements for bike parking areas and parking space
11 requirements. Section 2.31.040 proposed changes would allow the City to distribute unclaimed
12 bicycles to any organizations that distribute free or low-cost bicycles.

13 Mr. Goldstein stated he has many comments and believes the current forum may not be appropriate
14 for them all and inquired if submitting comments via email might be a better choice for many and
15 possibly Mr. Patel could return with responses. In addition, he supports the removal of pedestrian
16 restrictions on Foothill Expressway, he does not understand the exemption of prohibiting children
17 under 12 from riding on commercial sidewalks as that is just as hazardous; in the skateboarding
18 codes mobility devices should be the verbiage used rather than listing each one separately and/or
19 be consistent with listing each device throughout each of the codes, there's not clarity with regards
20 to skateboarders on streets with a speed limit of 25-mph or below, and in the parking code he
21 would support a clause that says the Director should be allowed to make exceptions in his/her
22 judgements to all of the requirements.

23 Mr. Wachtel commented that aside from any policy considerations, the vehicle codes preempt
24 local regulations of all subjects unless expressly authorized. Many changes are in this spirit but
25 not all of them are, and added that the discussion of the City's authority of Foothill Expressway is
26 incorrect.

27 In an effort to stay on track, Chair Ellson requested Mr. Wachtel also submit his comments in
28 writing.

29 Mr. Swent agreed with Mr. Wachtel that the City's authority over skateboards and scooters has
30 not been granted by the State. In general, the City specific regulations should be minimized as it
31 will confuse people who travel from one city to another on bicycles and regulating the mechanical
32 condition of a bicycle should not be left to the City.

33 Mr. Zaumen commented that if the restrictions on the use of sidewalks include curb cuts, it should
34 be made more clear under 10.64.241 under item B.

35 Mr. Patel requested all further comments be forwarded to him via email and he will return to
36 PABAC with amendments and clarifications.

37

38

1 **B. Discussion with PRC staff and Ad Hoc Committee members re: DRAFT Open**
2 **Space and Parks E-Bike Policy (Daren Anderson, Open Space, Parks, Golf,**
3 **and Animal Services) ***heard out of order* – Attachment 2 for the Draft Policy**
4 *document and Attachment 3 for a Memo from Daren to PRC re: Policy Update*

5 Chair Ellson introduced Daren Anderson who presented the draft Open Space and Parks E-Bike
6 Policy. In 2016 the State changed the status of E-bikes, which had prohibited the use of them on
7 bike paths and trails. As a result, there has been a policy update. Electric mobility devices are now
8 allowed on trails, rules for bike path and trail use have been incorporated, in addition parking
9 requirements on trails and in paths for electric mobility devices have also been addressed. It had
10 been suggested in an October 3rd preparatory outreach meeting at PRC ad hoc request of the
11 PABAC Chair and Vice Chair with the PRC Ad-hoc Committee that Class III e-bikes be
12 considered the same as motorcycles regarding their entry into Open Space Preserves. E-bikes are
13 prohibited on the Foothills Preserve trails, however they have now been added as being allowed
14 to access the Baylands paved trails. Palo Alto wants to stay consistent with neighboring areas. The
15 Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District allows Class I and Class II e-bikes access on limited
16 improved trails at Ravenswood Open Space Preserve, allows Class I and Class II e-bikes on limited
17 improved trails where bikers are currently allowed at Rancho San Antonio Open Space Preserve,
18 and affirms the prohibition of e-bikers on District trails except for specifically designated trails
19 noted above. Most commuting e-bike traffic relies on the paved sections.

20 The draft policy was broken into three categories: one for open space, one for parks, and one for
21 both open space and parks. For Open Space, Class I and II e-bikes are allowed on paved trails,
22 Class III e-bikes are not allowed on any trails in open space preserves, Class I and II e-bikes are
23 allowed for City Staff in Open Space and parks for maintenance and enforcement purposes
24 consistent with PAMC 22.04.150(f), and other electric powered mobility devices are allowed on
25 paved roads and trails at the Baylands Nature Preserve and are prohibited in other open space
26 preserves. Under Parks Draft Policy, Class I and II e-bikes are allowed on paved and unpaved trails
27 in parks and prohibited elsewhere in parks, Class III e-bikes are not allowed in parks, and other
28 electric powered mobility devices are allowed on paved and unpaved trails in parks and are
29 prohibited elsewhere. The Open Space and Parks Policy states trail use speed limit will apply to e-
30 bikes and other electric powered mobility devices and the maximum speed for all trail uses is 15-
31 mph unless a lesser maximum speed is posted and no person shall exceed the maximum speed on
32 any trail, however no person shall operate a bicycle, e-bike or other electric powered mobility
33 device or ride a horse or other such animal at a speed greater than what is prudent, reasonable and
34 safe. In addition, everyone shall slow to a speed of 5-mph when passing others or approaching
35 blind turns. All electric mobility devices should be parked in designated areas, may not be left
36 unattended on trails, vegetation, landscaped areas or vehicle parking areas, and are not allowed to
37 interfere with access or use of any open space and park amenity. The Americans with Disabilities
38 Act (ADA) overlays all city policies and is specific to each individual person who may need an
39 adjustment of city policy or regulation. They intend to return to the PRC on December 13th for an
40 action item recommending the draft policy to City Council.

41 Vice Chair Art Liberman thanked staff for their work and commented he recognizes this is a
42 contentious issue with good intentions from both sides, however he feels this is not ready to be
43 finalized and has concerns with not allowing e-bikes on improved, unpaved paths in he Baylands
44 Open Space Preserve. Additionally, he has concerns with allowing mobility devices that can travel

1 up to 20 mph on the city park trail where there are many pedestrians at various ages. While the
2 trails are wide in the Baylands, the ad-hoc voted to not allow e-bikes. Usage is growing quickly
3 with adults and kids, the draft changes would allow inexperienced youngsters to ride e-bikes on
4 the unpaved trails in the City Parks.

5 Mr. Wachtel stated it isn't clear to him what the current policy is for e-bikes on unpaved paths and
6 trails and parks and preserves. Mr. Anderson responded that the current policy is outdated and
7 treats e-bikes as motorized vehicles and said it's not allowed in open space and parks. Mr. Wachtel
8 stated the proposed policy states e-bikes are allowed unless prohibited by a City Ordinance, and
9 he does not see an ordinance for such regulation. Related, under the Vehicle Code, Class III e-
10 bikes are different and prohibited and less permitted, but that is scheduled to change on January
11 1st, the default will be they will be permitted unless prohibited. Class III e-bikes can travel up to
12 28-mph and are inappropriate in many of these places. If the intent is to prohibit them, City Council
13 needs to enact an Ordinance doing so.

14 Mr. Goldstein concurred with the other members and particularly with doing something about an
15 ordinance for Class III e-bikes. There are many changes e-bikes are going through and while it's
16 important to keep up with the changes, it could be beneficial to wait until the updates to the BPTP
17 are completed so the professional consultants might be utilized in making the changes to policy.
18 When considering e-bikes and regular bikes there should be no difference in regulations; when
19 recreation is the objective, it makes sense to look at the differences between electric and human
20 powered. The paved sections of the Bay trails are the preferred alternative. The unpaved are
21 recreational, however there seems to be little reason to not allow e-bikes on the unpaved trails
22 which are wider and maintenance vehicles use them. Additionally, a strong regular biker can travel
23 at twenty (20) and twenty-five (25) miles per hour and the speed limit should be considered at
24 fifteen (15) miles per hour for all bikes.

25 Mr. Nordman doesn't see any issues with using Class I and II on the trails and unpaved Bay trails
26 and would rather encourage passing speed restrictions rather than an overall speed limitation.

27 Mr. Arnout Boelens agrees with the other members about allowing e-bikes in the same areas as
28 regular bikes.

29 Mr. Zaumen believes the real issue with passing is the amount of space between the passer and
30 who they are passing and there needs to be a restriction on the amount of space between them.

31 Mr. Rock commented that having a speed limit without enforcement is not going to work very
32 well. The main criteria need to be how crowded and how wide the trails are. There are cyclists
33 who can go fast but most don't, most bikes do. The consideration should be use and width.

34 Ms. Rose Mesterhazy (staff) spoke from experience as an e-bike user and believes the distinction
35 between a Class III and other e-bikes is very difficult to presume without asking the person to get
36 off the bike and physically inspecting the bike. Most families who choose to go car free choose
37 the Class III bike so they can get to emergency services quickly if necessary. The movement to
38 provide education and promote car-free is moving at the County level and at the State level, which
39 is opening up resources other than just local resources. In addition, Class II bikes have a push

1 button throttle and Class III bikes are pedal assisted which makes a difference when considering
2 restrictions.

3 Mr. Jeff Greenfield thanked everyone for their comments and appreciates the feedback and
4 commented that the focus on creating a policy that is easy to recognize and enforce is difficult.
5 The concern allowing Class II bikes in parks and on trails is how that would affect school
6 commuters. It's not just an environmental concern, it's a safety concern as well and is based on
7 many things such as speed, signage, and safety and will not be managed by staff. The Park and
8 Recreation Commission is still trying to wrap their arms around every aspect.

9 Chair Ellson appreciated the comment by Mr. Goldstein about the difference between
10 transportation and recreation facilities and that many of the trails are used as transportation
11 commute routes and perhaps the focus should be on working with the City on widening the paths
12 and making them ready for the amount of traffic that they will see. More and more families will
13 be transitioning to e-bikes. There is a high likelihood that soon parents will be using e-bikes to
14 escort children on regular bikes to school while on their way to work. This is a trend that is already
15 taking place. Taking a look at facilities is something that should be looked at while updating the
16 BPTP.

17 Vice Chair Liberman commented he agrees with many of the comments of the members and spoke
18 about the e-bikes ridden by youngsters on park trails, where there is a trade off between safety and
19 access. He sees a problem with the draft regulations that would allow kids to ride e-bikes any time
20 during the day. Pedestrians on park trails are used to seeing bicycles, but not ones at twenty (20)
21 miles per hour. Speed is a factor. Legal ramifications need to be considered with the use of e-bikes
22 as most manuals state in small print that they are designed for use by persons eighteen (18) years
23 and older. This is a contentious issue, and more outreach needs to happen with seniors, parents of
24 school aged children, the school district, e-bike educators, and health care experts. Studies have
25 shown that more injuries have happened to children using e-bikes than other modes of
26 transportation.

27 Vice Chair Liberman motioned that PABAC does not approve the draft e-bikes guidelines for Palo
28 Alto's open space and parks presented on November 1, 2022. PABAC recognizes e-bikes are
29 becoming more popular and there is a need to create guidelines. PABAC supports the guidelines
30 for the open space preserves, except for the Baylands in which e-bikes should be allowed on the
31 unpaved gravel trails. PABAC does not support e-bikes on the unpaved trails in City parks.

32 Mr. Swent requested the last sentence of not supporting e-bikes on unpaved City paths be removed
33 as there is a need for parents to take their kids to and through parks on their cargo bikes and posed
34 a second with this modification.

35 Mr. Bill Courington commented that this is futile as e-bikes are to be encouraged and enforcement
36 is impossible.

37 Vice Chair Liberman accepted the amended motion and reread the motion: PABAC does not
38 approve the draft e-bikes guidelines for Palo Alto's open space and parks presented on November
39 1, 2022. PABAC recognizes e-bikes are becoming more popular and there is a need to create

1 guidelines. PABAC supports the guidelines for the open space preserves, except for the Baylands
2 in which e-bikes should be allowed on the unpaved gravel trails.

3 Mr. Goldstein suggested a friendly amendment that the motion be reduced to the first two sentences
4 and maybe add that the BPTP update be completed prior to clarifying these policies and
5 commented he is not in support of some of the other things and cannot support the draft motion as
6 presented today.

7 Vice Chair Liberman did not accept further reducing the motion, however, he would be in support
8 of a comment regarding delaying further work on policies until after the BPTP is completed.

9 Mr. Goldstein suggested a friendly amendment to the motion to include, “We urge the PRC to wait
10 until the completion of the bike/ped plan update before submitting their recommendations to the
11 City Council.”

12 Vice Chair Liberman accepted the friendly amendment. Mr. Swent accepted the friendly
13 amendment.

14 The motion was passed with 15 raised hands. Mr. Neff abstained.

15 Ms. Rosten inquired how long the BPTP update will take, Mr. Arce responded it will be the end
16 of 2024 before it will be completed.

17 Mr. Wachtel voted for the motion because this is such a contentious issue, however, he agrees two
18 (2) years is a long time to wait before resolving this issue and wished there was more constructive
19 feedback that could be given.

20 Chair Ellson stated this is a new issue presented to PABAC within the last month and there wasn't
21 time to dedicate a full meeting to the topic and with Mr. Courington's reminder asked if any
22 members are interested in forming a subcommittee on this subject.

23 Vice Chair Liberman, Mr. Courington and Mr. Goldstein agreed to be on the subcommittee. Mr.
24 Wachtel commented he could be used as a resource but believes he does not have the experience
25 with e-bikes to be a member of the subcommittee.

26 Mr. Goldstein will head the subcommittee.

27

28 **D. Notice on the nominations and January 2023 election of PABAC Chair and**
29 **Vice Chair for 2023**

30 Chair Ellson requested members consider nominations for the Chair and Vice Chair of PABAC as
31 both Chair Ellson and Vice Chair Liberman will be stepping down.

32 **6. STANDING ITEMS**

33 **A. Grant Update – None**

1 **B. CSTSC Update - CSTSC September 29, 2022 Meeting summary attached**

2 The minutes have been attached to the Agenda packet.

3 **C. VTA BPAC Update (Robert Neff)**

4 Mr. Robert Neff reported at the October meeting, the BPAC approved the Measure B planning
5 study criteria. There are fewer specific items and more of a chance for public feedback. There has
6 been one round of funding, and this was a chance for staff to improve the criteria for making the
7 grants. There is a nominating committee. County is suggesting a guaranteed ride home program to
8 start next year. Three (3) videos are being created to support active transportation and adult bicycle
9 education and are seeking ideas.

10 Vice Chair Liberman inquired about PABAC’s ability to see the South Palo Alto Bikeways grant
11 application before it is submitted. Ms. Star-Lack responded that the grants have already been
12 submitted and staff is waiting to hear back, and the grant reflects what Council adopted as the
13 initial concept plan of widening the Waverly path where possible. The grant is a public grant and
14 can be viewed by PABAC members.

15 Ms. Rosten requested the contact information for the BPAC committee members working on the
16 three (3) videos.

17

18 **D. Subcommittee Reports**

19 **1. Bike bridge maintenance Subcommittee**

20 Chair Ellson reported the Public Works’ Wilkie Bridge pilot test of anti-slip decking materials is
21 still underway and it rained today so please visit the bridge if possible and submit your comments
22 to their survey on Public Works’ website. Additional signage is on the bridge on how to find the
23 survey. There are two separate surveys, one for dry conditions and one for wet conditions. Please
24 encourage others to do the same, one response per survey per person is allowed.

25 There is nothing new on the Bol Park front since last month.

26 **2. Repaving Subcommittee (Robert Neff)**

27 Mr. Neff reported they have received an updated list for the next five (5) years of repaving projects
28 and have entered it into a spreadsheet and have added their comments. The subcommittee will
29 forward that spreadsheet to committee members and staff so that they can look at which projects
30 are coming up and act accordingly.

31 **3. Muni Code subcommittee**

32 Mr. Nordman reported there is nothing new.

33 **4. Rail Grade Separation Subcommittee**

1 Mr. Arthur reported there was a City Council meeting regarding Rail Grade Separation. The
2 subcommittee will be meeting with Ripon this week.

3 Chair Ellson recommended everyone look at the presentation that Ripon provided at the City
4 Council meeting. A student shared a Gunn student survey about how construction will affect their
5 commutes to and from school. Staff summarized everything and presented possible improvements
6 to address some of the concerns. You can find it in the City Council’s Rail subcommittee meeting
7 materials. They pointed to the BPTP update and how they are going to use that document to
8 identify bike construction detours and bike pedestrian grade separation crossing needs and
9 introduced a new grade separation concept at the meeting which is also in the presentation. The
10 next steps identified were refining concepts based on committee recommendations, coordinating
11 with the PABAC subcommittee, update stakeholders, City Council’s review of revised plans, and
12 updating recommendations for Council’s approval. There were no explicit comments about the
13 letter sent from PABAC, however, the contents of the letter were reflected in some of their
14 comments.

15 Vice Chairman Liberman asked about how and when the comments and questions raised with the
16 underpass alternatives for crossings would be answered. The response from Ripon was that this
17 issue would be taken care of in the scope of work for the BPTP. Vice Chairman is not sure that it’s
18 in the scope of work for the BPTP.

19 Mr. Arce commented that the BPTP will lead staff into a discussion around the network and the
20 priority routes, but it will prioritize the routes based on a criteria that is being developed which
21 will include different elements such as access to schools, access to rail crossing, or equity
22 consideration. The criteria will help us prioritize routes, some of which may include underpass
23 elements. Staff will have a list of preferred alternatives or preferred routes, but staff will not drill
24 down or draw up conceptual designs. The BPTP will point to priority routes similar to the way the
25 2012 BPTP does.

26 Chair Ellson added to Vice Chair’s comments by saying that one of Ripon’s comments said one
27 option was to close either Meadow or Charleston and lengthen the construction period. Cost
28 information should be added to the options to help the City Council make a decision as informed
29 by the price.

30 Mr. Wachtel was bothered by one of the comments that Nadia made when she said that a decision
31 shouldn’t be made based on the final outcome of the product, that the decision should be made
32 based on the disruption during the construction period.

33 Chair Ellson said she believed Nadia was referring to South Palo Alto where there are zero existing
34 grade separated crossings. Mr. Wachtel disagreed.

35

36 **E. Announcements**

37 **1. Reoccurring calendar invite for 2023 PABAC meetings**

38 *Reminder: First PABAC meeting in 2023: Tuesday, January 10, 2023 at 6:15 PM*

1 Reoccurring calendar invites for meetings will be coming soon.

2

3 **F. Future Agenda Items**

4 *Please forward any future Agenda requests to Vice Chair Liberman or Chair Ellson.*

- 5 ➤ El Camino Real (SR-82) plans from Caltrans (Last update: 10/6/22)
- 6 ➤ Muni code clean-up progress update (Committee report delivered: 2018; Last update
7 from staff: 4/5/2022)
- 8 ➤ PAUSD Hoover school campus reconstruction update (Last update: 5/3/22)
- 9 ➤ S. Palo Alto Bikeways project status/grant proposal (Last update: 10/6/22)
- 10 ➤ Rail Grade Separations (Last update: 8/2/22)
- 11 ➤ Municipal Code re: micro mobility issues
- 12 ➤ BPTP Update Implementation Status Item for the City website
- 13 ➤ PABAC assistance reporting sight line/safety issues on bike/ped network (Requested
14 by Staff: 10/6/22)
- 15 ➤ Explore alternatives for bike/ped non-injury collision and near-miss reporting
- 16 ➤ Bike parking code updates for converting existing business-owned auto parking
17 spaces to bicycle parking

18

19 Chair Ellson adjourned the meeting.

20

21 **8. ADJOURNMENT** at 8:35 p.m.

22

CITY/SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY COMMITTEE

Minutes

Thursday, October 20, 2022

10:00 a.m.

Zoom Virtual Meeting | Palo Alto, California

Participants: Sylvia Star-Lack (staff), Rose Mesterhazy (staff), Jose Palma (staff), Christine Luong (staff), Eric Holm (PAUSD staff), Arnout Boelens (PTAC, Greendell TSR), Joslyn Leve (PTAC, JLS TSR), Amy Sheward (Nixon TSR), Stephanie Seale (Addison TSR), Audrey Gold (Gunn TSR), Rachel Croft (Escondido TSR), Tom Whitnah (Duveneck TSR), Juan Caviglia (Duveneck TSR), Jessica Asay (Barron Park TSR), Disha Chopra (Fletcher TSR), Jess McClellan (Palo Verde TSR), Ashley Tseng (Hoover TSR), Andrew Yee (Guest), Art Liberman (PABAC), Deborah Bennett (Guest), Gail Reeder (Guest), Brittany Luciano (Guest), Andrew Wilcox (Guest)

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m.

Rose Mesterhazy welcomed everyone and commented they have completed twenty-three out of twenty-four bike rodeos this season, with one more to go. In addition, she reminded everyone to please include their names in the chat box, mute yourself when not speaking and use the Agenda to follow along with the links provided.

A. Introductions/Welcome/Recognition (PAUSD, City Staff and TSRs)

1. Recognition

Recognition was given to the Silicon Valley Bike Exchange (BikeX) for their participation in this year's PAUSD School and Family Engagement specialists in making sure that no student was left without a bicycle for this year's Bicycle Rodeos. The City, PAUSD and BikeX provided scooters, bicycles (about two per school), lights, helmets, locks, and delivery and drop off. Rose hopes to expand on this effort and continue to make this opportunity available for future Rodeos

Andrew Yee, the Executive Director of Silicon Valley Bicycle Exchange (BikeX) provided a brief explanation about BikeX and the donation process in which they provide bike repair and bikes for community members who cannot afford them. Most of this is done through partner charities. This year their hope is to donate one thousand bikes to the community. Volunteer events are on the second and fourth Saturdays of each month (dates and times may change through the holiday season). Youth groups get involved, along with corporate volunteers. BikeX.org provides all the mechanic and delivery labor for the school bike events. People can get involved by volunteering, making donations of money or used bikes, shopping at BikeX, and spread the word!

Audrey Gold commented with the help of BikeX, they were able to repair sixty bikes at Gunn High School which was the most ever they've been able to do in a back-to-school event. A spring event is in the process of being scheduled for April, which will include bike donations along with the bike repairs.

Andrew Yee responded to Joslyn's question stating volunteers can track their hours through BikeX's logging system through Google Forms, and BikeX will sign community service letters. BikeX serves San Mateo and Santa Clara counties.

Sylvia Star-Lack thanked Andrew for all of his work through BikeX and commented throughout her years in the SRTS program, she has never attended a Bike Rodeo where every child had a bike until this year. Big props and thanks to BikeX for that effort.

Deborah Bennett stated she has a bike to donate and inquired if BikeX would like connections in the scouting community which could open doors for youth volunteers and provide potential Eagle Scout projects. Andrew directed Deborah to their online donation page and stated there are drop-off opportunities on Wednesdays and Fridays from noon to 1:00p.m.; he would definitely appreciate Scout connections. They have a prior Eagle Scout project they still utilize to this day.

Arnout Boelens thanked Andrew for his work and commented his question was answered in previous comments.

Rose Mesterhazy recognized Jess McClellan for the first Bike Bus coming from Palo Verde and read an email from Sylvia explaining the Bike Bus and all the partnerships who helped with educating the students and parents about the new striping, retiming of signals, and vests that were provided.

Juan Caviglia commented there were two bike bus events, but people showed up at only one. There was a large group that participated, and the event picked up others along the way. They are looking to plan more events in the spring, possibly one every other week.

Jess McClellan spoke about the event and commented that they are looking to do a return home bike bus event from Greendale to Palo Verde and thanked everyone for their support.

B. Administrative (City Staff/PAUSD)

1. PAUSD Recruitments for Sustainability and Maintenance, Operations, Transportation (MOT) Positions

Eric Holm commented the PAUSD Sustainability Coordinator position has been posted. The MOT positions are still in development with a possible re-organization, so those have not yet been posted. There have been no changes to staffing.

Audrey Gold commented the school district lost Chuck McDonnell after forty years of service with the school district. Eric added he left a huge hole to fill. Audrey and Rose offered PAUSD their condolences on this loss.

2. CSTSC Chair Election

Rose Mesterhazy explained the process of electing a Chair with an outline of the Chair responsibilities.

Audrey Gold moved to nominate Rose as Chairperson for the CSTSC Committee.

Arnout Boelens seconded the motion.

With a show of hands by the voting members, it was unanimous to keep Rose Mesterhazy as the Chairperson for the CSTSC Committee.

C. Engineering

1. Middlefield/Montrose Striping and Charleston/Louis Signal Improvements

Jose Palma commented the crosswalk had been restriped, and there is now a crossing guard in place.

In response to Arnout Boelens' concern about reports of student bicyclists not wanting to walk their bikes through the intersection, Sylvia Star-lack responded she has not yet seen how the light is operating, however, there is an analogous situation at Fletcher, and generally the student bicyclists will cross diagonally when there is an all-pedestrian phase in the intersection because there is a crossing guard. They intended the crossing signals in this intersection to be in all-pedestrian phase. Jessica added it is not currently working in all-pedestrian phase.

Sylvia Star-Lack said she would make sure that information was relayed to the engineer.

Eric Holm said there was a student who utilized the bus stop signs within the Greendell parking lot, as a route and then backtracked by walking his bike to the bike rack.

Charleston and Louis have also had signal improvements and the median work has been completed.

2. OBAG3 and ATP Grants Update: S. Palo Alto Bikeways

Sylvia Star-Lack provided updates for the OBAG3 and ATP grants for the City for the South Palo Alto Bikeways project. The OBAG3 was not put forward by the VTA to MTC for funding. The results for the ATP grant funding are expected in January or February.

The South Palo Alto Bikeways is a project to upgrade the stripped bike lanes on E. Meadow, Fabian, and the Waverly path adjacent to JLS, and Hoover. In addition, there are areas on E. Meadow where the striping for bike lanes will change to protected bike lanes. In the areas they can't protect they bike lanes the intention is to widen them or install buffers. This will be along to route to the new bike trail to cross over 101. The Fabian bike lanes would be fully changed to protected bike lanes with parking protection on one side and bollards on the other. The Waverly path would be upgraded starting at Waverly and Meadow and continue past JLS and Hoover. The path would be widened and smoothed for the students who use that critical link. Should the funding from the grant fall through, Sylvia will inquire as to why and use that information to continue applying for other grants as this project is a key piece of the infrastructure upgrades for South Palo Alto. The ATP grant source has stricter guidelines for using the funds so the City would have to utilize resources for additional funding.

In response to Audrey Gold, Sylvia Star-Lack replied that the Churchhill project has been funded and has not been delayed, as per the agreement with the School District, the engineer has had the project plans out for review and feedback.

3. Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan (BPTP) Update

Sylvia Star-Lack reported that Ozzy Arce provided the following update: Earlier in October the City released the request for proposals to onboard a consultant for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Update. The deadline to submit proposals is Tuesday November 15th. The City anticipates holding interviews with prospective consultants in early December and formally kick off the project in early 2023. They are looking forward to working with stakeholders such

as the City School Transportation Safety Committee on this important planning effort and will circle back with the Committee with any updates. If you have any questions or if you'd like to see a copy of the RFP, please contact Ozzy at ozzy.arce@cityofpaloalto.org.

Arnout Boelens commented this project is extremely important as any changes that anyone would like to see in the future regarding bicycling and pedestrian transportation has to be included in the Plan Update, or it won't happen in the near future. As such, submitting suggestions is very important during this phase. Staff will be returning to SRTS and CSTSC for suggestions a couple of times during the update process. The link to be added to the email updates for this project is at <https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/Departments/Transportation/Bicycling-Walking> and the link to Subscribe to Emails is in the middle of the page.

Rose Mesterhazy stated there will be future opportunities to be included in the BPTP updates so that the Committee won't miss deadlines for comments. She hopes to have a five-year SRTS plan set up by June for different projects.

Sylvia Star-Lack added staff will also make sure project feedback opportunities are brought before all the committees during the Bike Plan Update project.

4. S/CAP Mobility Update

Sylvia Star-Lack introduced Sustainability Manager Christine Luong who provided an update on the Sustainability Action Plan (S/Cap Update). Palo Alto's goal is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions eighty percent below their 1990 levels by the year 2030, twenty years ahead of the State's goal of 2050. Recently Council approved a new goal to also be carbon neutral by 2030, fifteen years ahead of the State's goal. An update to the plan was launched in 2020, and in addition to these goals, there are goals in energy, mobility, electric vehicles, water, climate adaptation and sea level rise, natural environments and zero waste that are included in this update. Council recently accepted goals and key actions which enables staff to begin their CEQA evaluation. The intent is to have the S/CAP package wrapped up and presented to Council by Earth Day in 2023 for CEQA certification and S/CAP adoption. With the approval of the goals and key actions, staff is working on a three-year work plan to prioritize strategies and hope to have that in front of City Council at the December 5th meeting. In order to reach the 2030 outcomes vehicle miles traveled (VMT) needs to be reduced, commute travel is reduced, 85% of all Palo Alto new vehicles will have to be electric vehicles (EVs), which includes delivery trucks. Single-family gas appliances will need to be electrified in addition to commercial and multi-family buildings.

Sylvia Star-Lack added that Council voted on the goals in the mobility area to include reduce total vehicle miles traveled by twelve percent in 2030 by reducing commute vehicle miles traveled 20%, reduce visitor miles traveled by ten percent, reduce resident vehicle miles traveled by six percent, and to increase the mode share for active transportation (walking, biking) and transit from nineteen to forty percent of local work trips by 2030. Key Action categories include promoting alternatives to single occupancy car trips, changing the way we think about parking cars, learning how the community can grow without increasing Green House Gas (GHG) emissions, and leveraging current tools to foster mobility related GHG reductions. Council is committed to expanding the availability of transit and shared mobility services from sixty-one percent of residents to one hundred percent, updating and implementing the Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan, establishing a Vision Zero data collection and analysis program, establishing a Safe Routes for Older Adult/Aging in Place program, and continuing the SRTS program. The link to all of the Goals and Actions can be found by visiting the website at <https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/City-Hall/Sustainability/SCAP>.

Sylvia Star-Lack responded to Deborah Bennet's question stating Stanford has their own Sustainability program for Transportation Demand Management (TDM) that is one of the best in the country. Stanford is technically in the county, so they do not have to adhere to Palo Alto's plan however, they are reaching out to Palo Alto Transportation staff and Utilities staff in an effort to be successful partners in the process and have a member of their team on the S/CAP working group team.

Christine Luong responded to Rachel Crofts question about GHG that cannot be mitigated, by showing a slide of Palo Alto's goals by sector. Natural gas consumption offsets are not included in the Green House Gas inventory. If those offsets continue to be purchased, they can be used to reach their goal of neutrality. The hope is to not have to rely on those offsets as they are limited in supply and that other options will be available as they get closer to 2030.

Sylvia Star-Lack responded to Arnout's question saying it's important to have a plan, like the S/CAP plan, and take it to Council showing what the goals are, which will increase the probability of receiving Council approved funding to help reach those goals. Christine further explained this project has been evaluated to include staffing needs and potential gaps so Council can prioritize what items they would like staff to work on and/or allocate for more funding and staffing needs.

Sylvia Star-Lack replied to Rose's Mesterhazy's question that in saying "to continue" the Safe Route's to School program does not mean it cannot grow, and they will change the wording of that item.

D. Encouragement

1. Walk and Roll Events Round-Up

Arnout Boelens thanked everyone for all the amazing events during Walk & Roll week.

Rose Mesterhazy thanked Arnout and Matthew for the logo and banners that were made.

E. Engagement (PAPD) - Lt. Becchetti (PAPD)

1. Lt. Ben Becchetti was not available for this meeting.

2. Crossing Guard Updates

Jose Palma reported Ohlone has a new crossing guard for the newly opened back entrance on Colorado, and the change has been made to the Walk & Roll maps.

F. Education (City Staff): Bike Mobile Scheduling

Rose Mesterhazy reported tomorrow is the last Bike Rodeo (the 24 one this season). A lot of changes and upgrades have been implemented. The communities got involved as well as transportation staff and Santa Clara County Health department staff.

Arnout Boelens thanked Rose and Jose for all their work in the Bike Rodeos.

Rose Mesterhazy thanked Sylvia for all of her work, support, and trust in allowing Rose and Jose grow in their responsibilities with the Bike Rodeos.

There are currently eight openings for the Bike Mobile events. Priorities will be given to schools that have not yet had one. There is room for most elementary schools to schedule an event if they would like, but schedule as soon as possible! It is funded by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. They are great educational events.

G. Evaluation (City Staff)

1. Status of Parked Bike Counts

Parked bikes count data is somewhat preliminary, waiting for official confirmation of attendance numbers. Slight decline relative to pandemic impacted community changes and school relocations. This does not yet suggest a trend, and staff looks forward to sharing official information pending improved response rates.

Sylvia Star-Lack stated the shuttle was discontinued during the pandemic, and the City plans to start an on-demand transit service in the spring with a limited number of vehicles. The service will not be free; however the hope is more families will choose to use the service rather than single occupant cars to transport the students to school.

2. Status of Classroom Travel Tallies

The completion of the travel tally data is still in process, and Rose is hoping to incorporate that data with the bike count data for a better overall accuracy and validity. Staff is working with PAUSD to encourage teachers to complete these tallies. The middle schools and high school data are also still a work in progress.

Next CSTSC Meeting: Thursday, November 17, 2022, 10:00 AM -11:30 AM

There is currently not a December meeting scheduled and likely will not be a meeting unless there is a need.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

CITY/SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY COMMITTEE

Minutes

Thursday, November 17, 2022

10:00 a.m.

Zoom Virtual Meeting | Palo Alto, California

Participants: Sylvia Star-Lack (staff), Rose Mesterhazy (staff), Jose Palma (staff), Shrupath Patel (staff), Eric Holm (PAUSD), Ben Becchetti (PAPD), Arnout Boelens (PTAC, Greendell TSR), Audrey Gold (Gunn TSR), Rachel Croft (Escondido TSR), Jessica Asay (Barron Park TSR), Jess McClellan (Palo Verde TSR), Ashley Tseng (Hoover TSR), Rachael Panizzo (Fairmeadow TSR), Kara Baker (Escondido TSR), Rich Marty (Walter Hays TSR), Shree Sandilya (President of the Gunn Bike Club), Gail Reeder (Gunn Parent Guest), Sarah Qadri (Guest), Bill Preucel (Guest)

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m.

Jose Palma reminded everyone to please mute their chat as they enter the meeting and the link to presentation can be found in chat box. Rose Mesterhazy welcomed everyone to the meeting.

A. Introductions/Welcome/Recognition (PAUSD, City Staff and TSRs)

1. Recognition

Arnout Boelens introduced Shree Sandilya, the President of the Gunn Bicycle Club, and recognized their work on the Grade Separation Survey for students and parents since their school is most affected by that project.

Shree reported the outcome of the survey results from Gunn students. There were one-hundred-forty-seven (147) responses from Gunn students and parents, one-hundred-fifteen (115) of which are bicyclists. There are approximately eighteen-hundred (1,800) students at Gunn, with about seven-hundred and thirty (730) who ride bikes. Forty-eight percent (48%) cross Alma at East Meadow, thirty-five percent (35%) cross at East Charleston, and eighteen percent (18%) don't cross Alma. Sixty-nine percent (69%) of students say biking over Matadero creek would take time, and ninety-one percent (91%) of parents say biking over Matadero creek would take more time. Sixty-eight percent (68%) of students say they would continue biking or walking, and fifty-six percent (56%) of parents say they would continue walking or biking. Forty-four percent (44%) of students prefer the trench option as opposed to equally twenty-eight percent (28%) of students who prefer the hybrid or partial underpass options. Sixty-one percent (61%) of parents prefer the trench option with twenty percent (20%) equally preferring the hybrid and partial underpass options. The project doesn't seem to discourage students and parents from walking or riding to school. Many students cross Alma by bike and closing Meadow and Charleston at the same time for construction would be a major disruption, even with a new underpass near Matadero creek, possibly causing many students to consider driving instead of walking or biking. The trench is the preferred option for both students and parents. Options that leave in place the intersections with Alma (trench and hybrid) are more popular than the partial underpass.

Arnout commented that the City is not currently considering an underpass at Matadero. This was a conversation that came out of other committees, and they were curious about how the students and parents would feel about it and is it something those groups should be advocating for. Another Grade Separation Survey is being conducted at Paly through Arnout and Shree.

Rose commented it's been awesome watching the Bike Club at Gunn grow, and Safe Routes to School supports continued growth. In addition, there has not yet been a decision about closing Charleston and East Meadow

Jose commented on the education and practice of student participation in planning these projects. This survey is encouraging and wonderful to see, as well as being a part of this growth in the direction of active transportation from Palo Alto students.

Rose recognized Jim Sherman, Hoover Principal, for recognizing Ashley for encouraging biking and walking to Hoover and increasing their active transportation numbers this year.

Jose reported he has updated the Walk N Roll Map to the Libraries, and the new version should be up and running by next week. A reminder will be in the next E-news ([Walk and Roll to Libraries Link](#)).

2. Oral Communications

Rose announced that SVBC (Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition) would be hosting a Winter Mental Health Ride that will begin at Mountain View CalTrain on Saturday, December 10th, from 10:15 AM – 1:00 PM. There will be free helmet fitting and bike safety checks, it's a short easy route, and the goal is for everyone to have a great time.

Jess McClellan is presenting on her efforts to set up Walking School Busses at Palo Verde at an upcoming SVBC Webinar.

There is a Ride Out the Drought program SVBC is also sponsoring.

On-Demand transit service is on track to start in the spring of 2023 and is being funded by a new VTA grant. Customers will be able to take trips that start and end almost anywhere in Palo Alto. The estimated cost is \$3.50 with \$1.00 fares available for disabled, low-income, youth (as young as 12), and seniors. There will not be predetermined routes, and service will be based on customer request/on-demand via a mobile phone app or phone call.

Rose mentioned Arnout's family was recognized in the Stanford Active Transportation newsletter. You can follow <https://transportation.stanford.edu/news/cargo-bikes-happiest-transportation-mode-earth> to read the full article.

B. Administrative (City Staff/PAUSD)

1. PAUSD Fencing Review

Eric Holm shared comments that were gathered about fencing around school campuses. PAUSD is working to incorporate more fencing, particularly at schools with future construction projects. PAUSD met with design architects for the Escondido project to work out biking, parking, and fencing related to school entrances, bike parking, and pedestrians entering and exiting the school, including limited bike parking for parents who come by cargo bike using inverted U bike racks. Biking arrival has been discussed for Hoover, and El Carmelo came up because that fence was put up pre-pandemic. The fence at El Carmelo, is going to be moved back to the Admin door and bike parking will stay outside and inside the fence and the entrance to the fenced area is going to be widened.

Rich Marty (Walter Hays TSR) inquired about who sets the timing of the fences, and Eric responded that, generally, the district level wants all fences closed during the day, and the site/principal decides/facilitates that. At the site level, there are often challenges with

chaining fences due to the potential needs for student access to leave a campus in the event of an emergency. There is often one general location for visitors to check in during school hours. Over the summer, some gates with padlocks were changed to include a panic bar.

Eric noted that fencing is currently being considered with schools with active construction in progress, with the goal of looking at all campuses in the future. Policies and processes are not currently in place. The official way of sharing concerns is to submit a "Let's Talk" request, which would then be re-routed to the appropriate team member. It would be better to submit concerns under facility concern rather than safety so that the correct facilities project staff will see the request. Safety concerns are routed by default to the safety team, who generally do not look at concerns from a biking perspective.

Rose stated there is a policy for Building for Excellence Guidelines which talks about PAUSD construction decisions and prioritizing active transportation within the context of those construction decisions.

Kara and Rachael raised concerns about the narrow gate for the bike parking at Escondido and are interested in seeing those fencing plans if possible. There has been continued concern over that area on Stanford Avenue with the amount of traffic that enters that gate with those very narrow sidewalks. In addition, hold off on the new bike racks because they are included in the new construction period.

Eric stated the Board decided on the contractor for the Escondido bid Tuesday night and said he included in the contract that all of the project bike racks were to be ordered on the front end of the contract, and the goal is to have those in place in January. He pulled that item to the front end of the contract for El Carmelo as well. He will continue to bring big construction projects expected to begin to the committee as they arise.

Rachael stated many families from Escondido are part of the Stanford community and are willing to advocate on Escondido's behalf for concerns the City of Palo Alto cannot address.

Rose commented in response to Sylvia's chat question about students carrying instruments on bicycles and stated she will reach out to the PAUSD Music Teachers for resources.

There are conversations taking place surrounding Class I, II, and III e-bike potential policy allowing them in all open spaces and parks. This will be reported on as information is confirmed.

2. Rethinking the 5 Year Plan

Rose Mesterhazy reported the 5 Year Plan has been put on hold for now. There is a team that is looking into how to best integrate a long-term planning process into other frameworks, such as the Bike and Pedestrian Transportation Plan (BPTP) update. For multiple reasons, it has been difficult to create new projects above current ongoing strategies ([link](#) to current 5 year Plan) and projects which are maintained by staff. This would open up more opportunities for new ideas, strategies, and projects.

C. Engineering

1. Muni-Code Update

Shrupath Patel reported on the Pedestrians and Bicycles Municipal Code Update, which is a Muni Code clean-up focused on removing outdated code regarding bicyclists and pedestrians. He highlighted the following sections that are relevant to CSTSC:

Staff has suggested removing mechanical standards requirements for bicycles under PAMC 10.64.110. In section 10.64.130, restrictions are put on cyclists against riding on sidewalks in all commercial districts citywide. Some commercial districts are located on school suggested routes such as Arastradero and Middlefield Roads. The proposed change would allow for bicycle riding on sidewalks in commercial districts except for the Downtown commercial district and California Ave commercial district.

Section 10.64.170 prohibits a second passenger when riding upon a public right-of-way or on open space lands except for bicycles which are built for two persons or when carrying a child.

Section 10.64.210 states: No person shall park a bicycle on the main traveled portion of sidewalks except when bicycle parking spaces have been established and designated by official signage and markings.

Section PAMC 10.64.240 allows the use of roller skates, skateboards, and coasters on public right of way except on city-controlled parking lots/garages. Staff recommends revising the section to limit restrictions only to city-controlled parking lots and garages except where parking lots and garages are used for accessing parking or traveling through to access a destination.

Section 10.64.241(a) does not permit the use of skateboards on arterial and/or collector roadways in residential districts. The proposed changes would allow the use of skateboards on these roadways providing the speed limit is 25 MPH or less and bicycle lanes exist on the roadways.

PAMC 10.64.243 proposed changes that would allow skateboarders on the roadways in certain locations.

Section 18.54.060 is regarding bicycle parking: replacing non-conforming parking with all major and minor improvements, prohibiting fees for providing or accessing bike parking, and updating long-term parking requirements for bike parking areas and parking space requirements. Please direct questions and comments to Shrupath.patel@cityofpaloalto.org.

In the new updated version, unless one type of transportation is called out by the state, all scooters, skateboards, roller skates, and coasters will be covered under "micro mobility devices".

The Muni Code draft document can be found by visiting <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1wl2xNmXjVVDzUNODOGFSXaDXuCYxsWluqn-Tf6TNP0o/edit>.

Sylvia stated the Stanford Mall is installing cargo bike parking areas on the El Camino side and by the Container Store.

2. 1700 Embarcadero Bike Path Update

This update includes a development project in which a proposed auto dealership will be installing an onsite bike path along East Bayshore Road and Embarcadero Road. Currently, there is no bike lane access on the frontage of the lot so as part of this project, the Office of Transportation requested a multi-use path be constructed to fill the existing bike connection

gap between East Bayshore Road and Baylands. Staff will be working with the applicant to design that multi-use path.

3. PAUSD Engineering: Bicycle Rack Request Process

Eric reported there are no further updates. He will be looking further at some of the TSR requests after thanksgiving. He is noting many TSRs (estimated 25% of bikes) are noticing many bikes are not being locked, so that may need to be a reminder to students.

D. Encouragement

1. Fall Walk and Roll Events Round-Up

Rose stated that El Carmelo had a record number (106 – almost double the previous year) of participants in their Walk n Roll parade. They created a pledge asking parents to pledge to ride their bikes for all trips two miles or less, not just back and forth to school, for five days, and offered free bike lights to the families who took the pledge. Twenty-six families signed up for the pledge. Rose proposed that this be utilized during the spring Walk N Roll events and included [walk parade resources](#) and signage ideas for upcoming spring Walk Parades in the TSR folders, along with “How to follow rules of the road” information for education purposes.

E. Engagement (PAPD) - Lt. Becchetti (PAPD)

1. Collision Updates.

Lt. Becchetti provided an update that October had forty-nine (49) collisions, with five involving bicycles and none involving pedestrians. November were nineteen (19) collisions through the 17th, with four involving bikes and one involving pedestrians.

2. Crossing Guard Updates

The crossing guard contract is coming to an end in 2023. The contract will be updated at that time, and they are considering feedback regarding guard locations, changes needed, or additions for the next meeting. There will be budget constraints that will need to be considered.

Rose will develop a google drive document for the TSR’s to utilize for that feedback.

F. Equity (PTA): Holiday BikeX Donation and Bike Builds

Rose Mesterhazy reported BikeX and Bike Builds are great organizations for anyone wishing to donate during the holiday season. A holiday donation gathering could be a great way to raise awareness.

Next CSTSC Meeting ***Updated***: Thursday, January 26, 2023, 10:00 AM -11:30 AM

Meeting adjourned at 11:31 a.m.

PABAC January 10, 2023 Meeting
Attachment 1: Emails between Chair Ellson and Caltrans staff

From: pennellson12@gmail.com
To: ["Saleh, Nick@DOT"](mailto:Saleh,Nick@DOT); ["Choi, Eunmi@DOT"](mailto:Choi,Eunmi@DOT); [Boyd, Holly](#); [Star-Lack, Sylvia](#)
Cc: [Patel, Shrupath](#); ["Morgan, Kerry S@DOT"](mailto:Morgan,KerryS@DOT); ["Sherpa, Ang@DOT"](mailto:Sherpa,Ang@DOT); [Tran, Young](#); [PABAC](#)
Subject: RE: 4J89U: mtg
Date: Sunday, December 11, 2022 12:31:41 PM
Attachments: [~WRD0000.jpg](#)
[image001.jpg](#)

Hello Nick,

Thank you again for meeting with us and for your response to my email. I still have several outstanding questions.

In the November 16 meeting, in response to Sylvia's inquiry about bicycle facilities you said, "The city can have any fancy striping it wants, but they will have to pay for its maintenance." We consider bicycle lanes, for which standards have long been defined in the Highway Design Manual and the California MUTCD, as well as pedestrian facilities, to be safety, access and mobility improvements, not "fancy striping."

In the meeting, Sylvia read from a city maintenance agreement with Caltrans which did not include any requirement for the city to pay for this. You seemed to have a different understanding of the agreement. Would you please direct us to the relevant language? We view the requests city staff has made as consistent with Caltrans Complete Streets standards, including DD-64-R2 and the Complete Streets Decision Document. In particular, DD-64-R2 states that "Caltrans views all transportation improvements as opportunities to improve safety, access, and mobility for all travelers in California and recognizes bicycle, pedestrian, and transit modes as integral elements of the transportation system," and sets out procedures and individual responsibilities for implementing the policy.

Here, for your convenience, are our questions that remain unanswered:

Request: Please send me the copy of the Caltrans agreement with City of Palo Alto you referenced in the meeting that would require the city to pay for bicycle striping maintenance.

Request: Please explain in writing the specific policy basis for your assertion that cities must pay for construction and maintenance of standard bicycle and pedestrian facilities within Caltrans ROW, given Caltrans Complete Street and Safe Systems policy directives and state and federal policies related to Safe Systems and Complete Streets.

Request: Please clarify in writing which of these requested improvements Caltrans intends to include in the 100% plans for the ECR Repaving project. Caltrans is presently at 95% plans and in process of moving toward 100% plans which could be done in 5-6 weeks. Let's please not run down the clock.

The ECR Repaving project presents a once in 30+ years opportunity to create striping improvements

that conform with Caltrans, state, and federal Safe Systems and Complete Street policy requirements. These could have been suggested by Caltrans in earlier design phases. Help us understand how, in your view, the city's requests qualify as "fancy striping" or more-than-standard treatments that Caltrans is not obligated to implement as a matter of policy in their ROW.

Hundreds of public school children cross El Camino every day on foot and on bicycles in Palo Alto. This crossing is unavoidable for families in our city and in other cities along the ECR ROW. Caltrans must also consider the needs of people of all ages and abilities who must use this state highway on foot and on bicycles to get to homes, jobs, schools, universities, shops and other services along the highway.

Please provide a clear response to these questions in the next few business days. Today is 16 business days since our November 16 meeting where they were asked.

Thank you in advance for taking time to work in partnership and toward the interest of improving safety by providing a clear and direct response to the questions city staff has asked and that I now ask for a second time on behalf of PABAC.

Sincerely,

Penny Ellson
Chair, City of Palo Alto Pedestrian & Bicycle Advisory Committee (PABAC)

From: Saleh, Nick@DOT <nick.saleh@dot.ca.gov>
Sent: Friday, December 2, 2022 4:46 PM
To: pennyllson12@gmail.com; Choi, Eunmi@DOT <eunmi.choi@dot.ca.gov>; 'Boyd, Holly' <Holly.Boyd@CityofPaloAlto.org>; 'Star-Lack, Sylvia' <Sylvia.Star-Lack@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Cc: 'Patel, Shrupath' <Shrupath.Patel@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Morgan, Kerry S@DOT <Kerry.Morgan@dot.ca.gov>; Sherpa, Ang@DOT <Ang.Sherpa@dot.ca.gov>; 'Tran, Young' <Young.Tran@CityofPaloAlto.org>; 'PABAC' <PABAC@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: RE: 4J89U: mtg

Good evening Penny and Sylvia,

It was great meeting you and I hope that you all had a wonderful thanksgiving!

Thank you Penny for capturing some of the highlights from our discussion.

First, I would like to assure all of you that Caltrans is committed to safety and partnership and will do our best to capture and incorporate all the comments and feedback from the City and from you.

In general terms, we discussed the project scope and description which calls for pavement rehab,

ADA upgrades including curb ramps and sidewalks, traffic signal upgrades, and other complete street components including pedestrian and bicycle improvements.

We have been working closely with the City of Palo Alto throughout the project development process including design where and the City and other cities & stakeholders have provided comments and feedback. Caltrans is in the process of evaluating those comments and will incorporate the feasible items into project plans and if not, will explain why in our comment responses. Once the comment responses have been compiled and addressed, we will be forwarding them to the cities & stakeholders who provided the input.

Regarding the maintenance of those facilities, as indicated in our meeting, Caltrans will continue coordinating with the City of any changes to the existing maintenance agreement between Caltrans and the City and at this time, I do not foresee any major issue with the current agreement.

Our goal is to work with all stakeholders on the timing and the scope of all the improvements along the corridor to be there once and to avoid any public inconveniences and a good example is the ongoing coordination and communication with all the cities and stakeholders on the encroachment permit projects and the major projects like the City of Palo Alto's sewer replacement project and with the County's Page Mill/El Camino project.

Have great weekend.

Thank youBe Safe

*Nick Saleh
District Division Chief, PPM- South
Office: (510)286-6355
Cell: (510)715-9046*

From: pennyellson12@gmail.com <pennyellson12@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 22, 2022 5:12 PM
To: Choi, Eunmi@DOT <eunmi.choi@dot.ca.gov>; Saleh, Nick@DOT <nick.saleh@dot.ca.gov>; 'Boyd, Holly' <Holly.Boyd@CityofPaloAlto.org>; 'Star-Lack, Sylvia' <Sylvia.Star-Lack@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Cc: 'Patel, Shrupath' <Shrupath.Patel@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Morgan, Kerry S@DOT <Kerry.Morgan@dot.ca.gov>; Sherpa, Ang@DOT <Ang.Sherpa@dot.ca.gov>; 'Tran, Young' <Young.Tran@CityofPaloAlto.org>; 'PABAC' <PABAC@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: RE: 4J89U: mtg

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.

Dear Nick, Eunmi and Kerry,

Thank you, Nick, Eunmi and Kerry for taking time to meet with City of Palo Alto (CoPA) Office of Transportation (OOT) staff Sylvia Star-Lack and Shrupath Patel and Public Works employee Young

Tran and me on November 16 to discuss the Palo Alto Pedestrian & Bicycle Advisory Committee's (PABAC) questions about the El Camino Real Repaving project communications and planning. I am following up with this contact report to make sure we understand what we can expect with next steps and what I may tell PABAC about next actions that may be needed from PABAC and City of Palo Alto.

I heard Nick Saleh explain that:

1. Caltrans views this as a repaving maintenance project with ADA Upgrades only

2. Caltrans is now working on 100% designs, incorporating "some of the city's comments."

Sylvia asked which of the city's comments Caltrans intends to incorporate in the 100% plans. Nick said he would follow up with a document in about six weeks explaining why City comments were or were not incorporated.

Nick also explained that bike facilities he described as "fancy striping," that the city requests will have to be maintained by the city, per the Maintenance Agreement between the two agencies. Sylvia explained that her understanding of the city's agreement with Caltrans differs from Nick's. Reading from the CoPA/Caltrans agreement she had with her, Sylvia shared a list of items that the city is responsible for. Striping maintenance was not on the list. Would you please confirm whether or not striping for bike facilities is Caltrans' responsibility? ***Request: Please provide said agreement.***

I interjected a query, asking why cities would be required to pay for maintenance of complete street facilities for bicycles and pedestrians on Caltrans ROW when such facilities are now required as a matter of Caltrans Complete Street and Safe Systems policy directives. Further, I wanted to understand why Caltrans is not integrating bike lanes and other bike/pedestrian facilities of their own accord, even without city request, when these are clearly required as a matter of Caltrans and State of California and U.S. government policy. I did not get a very clear answer. I am hoping you can explain to me Caltrans' position and the policy basis for it so I may understand it more fully. I may take up the matter with my elected representatives to understand the State's intent with regard to Caltrans policy and this project.

Request: Please explain in writing the specific policy basis for your assertion that cities must pay for construction and maintenance of bicycle and pedestrian facilities within Caltrans ROW given Caltrans Complete Street and Safe Systems policy directives.

New Safe Systems policies and directives, from my perspective, make it clear that Caltrans is expected to create and implement Complete Streets. This repaving, the first in about 30 or more years presents an important opportunity to implement bicycle and pedestrian improvements. As I mentioned in the meeting, like other communities along the ECR corridor, Palo Alto has numerous school commute route crossings of El Camino Real for k-12 public school students where children have been hit and injured or killed.

Though there are eleven school commute route crossings of El Camino Real (ECR) in Palo Alto, Sylvia limited her improvement requests to only two of these intersections where there are existing bike lanes on both sides of ECR that can be easily connected with dashed bike lane extensions across the

state highway. These are: Park/Serra Avenue and El Camino Way/Los Robles Avenue. In addition, Sylvia requested bicycle detector stenciling for left turn lanes. She also requested striping narrower auto travel lanes (going from 12-13' to 10-11') to align with narrower travel lanes and a wider curb lane that are planned in Mountain View and Los Altos.

I would prefer improvements at all eleven school commute crossings, including longer pedestrian crossing time at school commute crossings where there are traffic signals.

Request: In addition to the document Nick promised above, please clarify in writing which of these requested improvements Caltrans intends to include in the 100% plans for the ECR Repaving project.

We heard your concerns about sewer line work coordination. Though this is not her purview, Sylvia has told me that she will share your concerns with her supervisor to ask him to bring this question to the City Manager's attention. She will try to connect your team to appropriate staff contacts that way.

Thank you for considering these requests, and thank you in advance for providing timely answers in writing that I may share with my PABAC colleagues.

Sincerely,

Penny Ellson
2022 Chair, City of Palo Alto Pedestrian & Bicycle Advisory Committee

From: Choi, Eunmi@DOT <eunmi.choi@dot.ca.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, November 9, 2022 10:11 AM
To: Saleh, Nick@DOT <nick.saleh@dot.ca.gov>; Boyd, Holly <Holly.Boyd@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Star-Lack, Sylvia <Sylvia.Star-Lack@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Cc: Patel, Shrupath <Shrupath.Patel@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Ellson, Penny <pennyellson12@gmail.com>; Morgan, Kerry S@DOT <Kerry.Morgan@dot.ca.gov>; Sherpa, Ang@DOT <Ang.Sherpa@dot.ca.gov>; Tran, Young <Young.Tran@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: RE: 4J89U: mtg

Hi All,

The revised invite was sent for 11/16 (Wed) from 2-3pm.
Please check.

Thanks.
Eunmi Choi
Project Manager
Caltrans D4- South

PABAC January 10, 2023 Meeting
Attachment 2: Responses to PABAC from Caltrans on the ECR Repaving Project

Comment and Response Form

Rev.: October 2020

Document Type (e.g., PR): 95%pse for proposed project to: resurface roadway, upgrade curbramps, driveways and sidewalks
 Co: SCI Rte: 82 KP(PM): 18.2/26.4 Unit: _____ EA: 4J89U Proj Id: 0419000140 FA: _____ AO: _____
 MSA: _____ Proj Engr: Son Ly Proj Mgr: Eunmi Choi Dgn/Oversight Senior: Son Ly

ID #	Reviewer's Name and Branch/Unit	Comments/Questions Please reference document section (e.g., paragraph, page #, etc.)	Circulator's Response/Resolution to Comments/Questions
1	Art Liberman	Lists the street intersecting El Camino from the top as "Margarita"- This is incorrect. The correct name of the street is "Matadero" Margarita is the correct name for the street that intersects El Camino from the bottom.	Revised
2		Palo Alto is in midst of planning for a bikeway along Churchill that would cross ECR to connect with the Stanford perimeter trail. You should put bike lane markings on ECR. FYI, Churchill bikeways enhancement project includes bike improvements at Churchill/ ECR intersection. Please contact project engineer Shahla Yazdy (Shahla.Yazdy@CityofPaloAlto.org) for more information.	Noted. The bike lane is not planned under this project after the discussion with the City in the earlier stage of the project due to existing street parking.
3		I have questions about the landscaping proposals for the islands between the opposing traffic lanes. Will you be cutting down the mature trees? Some trees are inappropriate to put in these landscape islands because their roots rapidly cause deterioration in the roadway. I support the use of trees and plantings that are drought tolerant, slow growing, require little maintenance, and (for trees) are unlikely to drop limbs and create damage and dangerous disruptions to traffic.	There is no proposed tree cutting in the median. The city maintains median landscape.
4		The treatments at corners of streets that intersect with ECR are not readable on the drawings that were provided. Can you provide a list of corners in Palo Alto that are going to be modified and describe the changes that are planned?	Lambert, Portage, Acacia Olive(NE), Pepper(NE),Sheridan(NE), Sharman(NW), California(4 corners), Cambridge(4 corners),Oxford (3 corners;except SE), Leland, Park Ave, Park Blvd, Embarcadero(NE), Encina (NE is pending).
5		Will you provide improved bike detection on the streets intersecting ECR? This is important because there are many streets which intersect ECR that are used by school children (elementary, middle and high school) who bicycle between homes and school. Will you modify the signal lights at some of the intersections to provide a "Leading Pedestrian Interval?" Will Caltrans have a contact for Palo Alto engineers to contact in order to update and modify the signal timing at Palo Alto intersections as times and needs change and as new developments along the ECR corridor are created?	As part of the Project, the replaced loop detectors are for both vehicles and bikes. Please note that for the side streets, the existing loop detectors are outside of Caltrans right-of-way and will not be upgraded as part of this Project; several locations affected by signal upgrade will be replaced. Caltrans will be upgrading intersection with the Leading Pedestrian Interval (LPI) feature.
6		Are changes to the sidewalks, such as removing obstacles along pedestrian pathway and the bus stops(most of which do not have bus shelters, the responsibility of Caltrans, the County of Santa Clara, or the City of Palo Alto?	City is responsible for the sidewalk maintenance, and VTA maintains Bus stops.

7		Why didn't Caltrans conduct a study with Palo Alto's Office of Transportation before deciding on the number and locations for the HAWK beacons?	HAWK beacons are outside of the project scope. Another CT project proposes a HAWK beacons in Palo Alto.
8	Eric Nordman	With a wide road such as El Camino I would think one would put the crosswalks close to perpendicular to minimize the crossing distance. In particular, the crossing at Portage PD-21 and	Both Portage and Margarita x-walk layouts were revised but not perpendicular due to existing driveways at both locations.
9	Robert Neff	The El Camino Real / Charleston / Arastradero intersection is being reconstructed starting this month, and the plans will need to be updated to reflect those changes.	Noted.
10		El Camino Real / Los Altos Ave / Cesano Ct, the bike lanes marked from Mountain View end at the Palo Alto City limit, one property before Cesano Court. Instead of continuing to the intersection at Cesano Court, the bike lane stops mid-block. The city of Palo Alto should support removing those 3 parking spots, as there is adequate parking at the motel on that corner, plus on Cesano Court, so that the bike lane could continue to Cesano Court. (A right turn on Cesano leads to the Wilkie Way bike route to destinations across Palo Alto. A wayfinding sign should be installed there by the city of Palo Alto facing bicycle traffic in the bike lane.	The new bike lane to stop one block before the city limit due to existing street parking. A wayfinding sign are to be installed by the city as needed.
11		Palo Alto staff could consider extending the bike lane all the way to Monroe -- There are only a few available parking spaces in the next block - it is mostly no parking due to a fire lane, but I believe those parking spaces are more heavily used by the businesses at El Camino / Cesano. I hope the City of Palo Alto and CalTrans can agree on these changes, it is a relatively minor change to the striping plan, but I believe city transportation staff have to act to get this in, and save the cost/trouble of doing it later.	During the development of this Project, coordination efforts between the City and Caltrans concluded that bike lanes were not feasible at the time. Will work with the City to accommodate the future bike lanes.
12	Penny Ellson	Thank you for providing high visibility crosswalks at intersections on El Camino Real in Palo Alto. Please also provide green bike lanes at intersections where bike lanes exist on Palo Alto cross streets Palo Alto is a community where people bike a lot	Connection will be made as dashed lines to connect bike lanes at Park/Serra and Los Robles intersections.

13		<p>PAUSD k-12 school commute crossings of ECR (see letter pasted below) draw hundreds of youth pedestrians and bicyclists (many more bikes than peds, generally) every school day. At these crossings, please provide, at minimum:1) High visibility crosswalks (Done. Thank you.)2) Green bike lanes where they will connect to existing bike lanes on City of Palo Alto designated school commute routes. This will provide a visual cue to help drivers be aware to watch for bikes crossing.3) Signal detection and longer crossing time for small children and other slower walkers to cross safely. This is critically important at school crossings where there is no pedestrian refuge island.4) Please make sure existing bike sensors are operational and install new sensors at crossings where they are needed. (In particular, the one at Maybell has been a little on and off in its reliability. I haven't checked it recently, but it may need attention.School commute ECR crossings are identified in Walk & Roll maps that can be found on this page https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/Departments/Transportation/Safe-Routes-to-School/Walk-and-Roll-Suggested-Route-Maps . The El Camino Real crossings used by PAUSD public school students are: • Matadero Avenue• Portage Avenue• Hansen Way• Margarita Avenue• Curtner Avenue• Ventura Avenue</p>	<p>Noted. 1) Thanks. 2) At Park/Serra and Los Robles and ECR intersections, the dashed bike lanes will connect existing bike lanes 3) LPI(Leading Pedestrian Interval) will be implemented at the signalized intersections 4) The following side streets will have new loops: Hansen, S. California ave., Cambridge, and Stanford ave.(southside) because of the improvements such as new curb ramps or electrical system upgrade. Other side streets outside of Caltrans Right of Way are not part of this project.</p>
14		<p>There still is no web site on the Palo Alto portion of this project where a member of the public might find the repaving plans or a Caltrans contact to ask questions. I find this lack of transparency disturbing. Further, when I asked when PABAC might review the 95% plans at a planning meeting on August 10 last month, city staff said that "Caltrans directed staff not to share the plans with the public." I find this lack of transparency surprising, and I wonder if it is legal for Caltrans to withhold plans for public ROW within city limits from the public. Caltrans has now offered the plans to PABAC after some pushing, and I appreciate that. However, the fact that our citizen advisory committee to staff had to push to see them is disappointing.</p>	<p>Within the Caltrans project team, there is a dedicated public information officer that works to effectively communicate with all external stakeholders through different mediums. The project website has been published (https://dot.ca.gov/caltrans-near-me/district-4/d4-projects/d4-santa-clara-sr82-pavement-rehabilitation-and-ada-improvements) and the public can find the project information. Caltrans is also working closely with the City of Palo Alto and other neighboring towns to coordinate and make efforts for public engagement. In addition, Caltrans District 04 maintains a list of projects at the following website(https://dot.ca.gov/caltrans-near-me/district-4/d4-projects). The City of Palo Alto also maintains a list of projects at it's website. For sharing a draft plan, the project is still in its development stage and subject to change. To avoid any confusion to the public, Caltrans plans are disseminated at appropriate times. The Department adheres to the California Public Records Act and documents can be requested through the Office of Public Records, however, some records are exempt from public disclosure under federal and state laws</p>
15		<p>Please note my previous comments sent in 2021 to Project Manager, Ms. Kathy Karroubi. I view these changes as the most basic bike and pedestrian amenities across a multi-lane state highway on school commute routes where children must cross as many as seven high volume, high speed state highway lanes posted at 35mph.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

PABAC January 10, 2023 Meeting
Attachment 3: Responses to the City from Caltrans on the ECR Repaving Project

Comment and Response Form

Rev.: October 2020

Document Type (e.g., PR): 95%pse for proposed project to: resurface roadway, upgrade curbramps, driveways and sidewalks

Co: SCI Rte: 82 KP(PM): 18.2/26.4 Unit: _____ EA: 4J89U Proj Id: 0419000140 FA: _____ AO: _____

MSA: _____ Proj Engr: Son Ly Proj Mgr. Eunmi Choi Dgn/Oversight Senior: Son Ly

ID #	Revis ewer' s	Comments/Questions Please reference document section (e.g., paragraph, page #, etc.)	Circulator's Response/Resolution to Comments/Questions
1	OOT	Based on the lane closure chart it indicates that construction will leap into peak time hours. City recommends that construction be limited from 10:00 PM to 6:00 AM and all lanes are open to traffic during the early morning peak hours.	Work will commence per allowable hours provided in the Lane Closure Charts developed for this Project to maintain the schedule.
2	OOT	The project should upgrade all the crosswalk curb ramps at intersections that are not ADA compliant. If the ramp/corner is within City right of way, a no cost encroachment permit will be provided. Upgrading the crosswalk ramps will ensure uniformity and compliance to ADA Standards while also allowing all pedestrians using these facilities to benefit from accessibility; thereby reducing risk and liability for all. Confirm the curb ramp construction details meet guidance contained in Caltrans DIB 82-6 and the Access Board's (Proposed) Public Rights of Way Accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG). Specifically, PROWAG: R304.5.2 Grade Breaks and R304.5.5 Clear Space, R302.3.1 Medians and Pedestrian Refuge Islands (5 foot minimum clear width),	All curb ramps within Caltrans Right-of-way will be upgraded for ADA compliance within the Caltrans design guidance. Previously Caltrans offered to enter in a Cooperative Agreement during the development of this Project.
3	OOT	Recommend that Median island noses are painted, and appropriate markers are placed at the ends to provide for nighttime reflectivity/visibility	works are incorporated in plan
4	OOT	No detours plans for Palo Alto are presented. City requires the review of traffic control plans as part of the encroachment permit application which also requires adequate notification and outreach. Please also provide detour routes for City to review as they will go through City streets	The Detour plan is attached.
5	OOT	For all side street approaches, add Advanced Stop Line and Bicycle Detection symbol for all left turn and through movements (right-most through lane). Must include for all side street approaches and left turn movements that do not include phase "recall" setting. Relocate pavement arrows accordingly.	Work on side streets is outside of CT R/W

6	OOT	Add striped crosswalk for pedestrian crossing on all sidestreet approaches to ECR. Locations: Vista, Curtner, Military, Fernando, Barron, Wilton, Acacia, Pepper, Olive, Sheridan, Grant, Sherman, College, Oxford, and any other not listed here.	The listed locations are outside CT R/W. Unless affected by proposed work, work within state right of way will be upgraded.
7	OOT	At all signals, including but not limited to Cesano/Los Altos, Dinah's, Arastradero, Maybell/El Camino Way, Margarita, and Curtner, include CWL ladder crosswalks for existing crosswalks that cross side streets. Add advanced 12" White stop line.	unless affected by proposed work, work within CT R/W will be upgraded not the side streets where are outside CT R/W.
8	OOT	The extent to which LPI has been installed along ECR is unclear. Please implement LPI at all signalized intersections along ECR in Palo Alto.	LPI is implemented at all signalized intersections.
9	OOT	To maintain consistency with lane widths in Mountain View and Los Altos, City requests 11' travel lanes throughout the project where feasible to provide a wider curb lane and accommodate potential future bike facilities. This can be accomplished by narrowing lanes from 12 feet to 11 feet and providing wider outside lanes.	where feasible, CT will reduce the lane width either in the final plans or through an addendum.
10	PWE	City does not want the irrigation crossing. City will not be installing the crossing as a part of CAC Phase 3. Please remove from the plans per email correspondence with Kimberly White.	The irrigation crossing was deleted at this location
11	PWE	Is west Maybell ramp and east El Camino Way ramp going to be included in 4J89U?	No. It's outside of CT RW
12	PWE	Is west Los Robles ramp, north Ventura ramp, east and west Military ramps, and north Curtner ramps going to be included in 4J89U?	No. It's outside of CT RW
13	PWE	Is west Page Mill ramp included in 4J89U?	No. It's outside of CT RW
14	PWE	Is west Medical Foundation ramp going to be included in 4J89U?	No. It's outside of CT RW
15	PWE	Are the ramps at Sand Hill going to be included in 4J89U?	No. It's outside of CT RW
16	PWE	City has plans to upgrade traffic signal equipment as a part of CAC Phase 3. Please review traffic signal plans to avoid overlap.	NOTED
17	PWE	Add bicycle wayfinding sign on southbound ECR approach to Los Altos Avenue that reads: "To Wilkie Way Ped/Bike Bridge to Palo Alto" with Left Arrow. Add bicycle wayfinding sign on northbound approach to Cesano Court that reads: "To Wilkie Way Ped/Bike Bridge to Palo Alto" with Right Arrow.	CT generally defer to local jurisdictions to install bicycle wayfinding signage, including on Caltrans right of way via an encroachment permit, to ensure consistency and accuracy throughout the local network. Also, it'd be better for the City to maintain or update any directional signs based on any changes to the local network that Caltrans wouldn't necessarily be in the loop on.

18	PWE	Add bicycle wayfinding sign on northbound ECR approach to Monroe Drive that reads: "To Wilkie Way Ped/Bike Bridge to Palo Alto" with Right Arrow.	CT generally defer to local jurisdictions to install bicycle wayfinding signage, including on Caltrans right of way via an encroachment permit, to ensure consistency and accuracy throughout the local network. Also, it'd be better for the City to maintain or update any directional signs based on any changes to the local network that Caltrans wouldn't necessarily be in the loop on.
19	PWE	Signage plan to correspond with CAC Phase 3. CAC Phase 3 will be adding new signs and relocations.	Noted
20	PWE	Detail 39 protected double buffer line is missing between Cesano Ct. and Monroe Ave.	There is no bike lane between Cesano Ct. and Monroe Ave. along 82.
21		To maintain consistency with lane widths in Mountain View and Los Altos, City requests 11' travel lanes throughout the project where feasible to provide a wider curb lane and accommodate potential future bike facilities. For example: 1st Lane-11', 2nd lane -11' and 3rd lane-12' and keep shoulder for bike facilities.	where feasible, CT will reduce the lane width either in the final plans or through an addendum.
22		At Monroe Drive, re-stripe existing ladder (CWL) - Plans show standard crosswalk across Monroe Drive	It's outside R/W
23		High visibility crosswalks will be installed as a part of CAC Phase 3.	NOTED
24		Will Caltrans be installing the red bus lane in thermoplastic? The City will be installing the red bus lane temporarily in paint until Caltrans' grind and pave work.	Yes. This project will add red thermo stripes for the bus lane.
25		Add dashed bike lane line extensions across ECR for the westbound bike lane on El Camino Way to the receiving bike lane on Los Robles Ave. This is a school route crossing, and it is difficult for children to see where they should ride across ECR. See CA MUTCD Figure 9C-106 (CA) for example.	The dashed bike lane crossing ECR will be connected.
26		Rename street name to Matadero Ave instead of Margarita Ave. Margarita Ave becomes Matadero Ave west of El Camino Real.	Corrected.
27		City is requesting to add a bike detector stencil on the California Ave and ECR intersection	Yes. The bike dection symbol will be added at the intersection on the left turn lane and right most through lane.

28		<p>In 2011, the City of Palo Alto placed red-stamped thermoplastic crosswalks at the intersection of Stanford Avenue and El Camino Real, as part of the Stanford Avenue/El Camino Real Intersection Improvements project. If Caltrans is proposing to remove the crosswalks as part of the paving plan, then the City is requesting that the same type of crosswalk be placed back. The thermoplastic crosswalk is from Traffic Patterns XD and should be replaced with the same product. Stamped Thermoplastic details: Traffic Patterns XD : https://www.ennisflintamericas.com/catalog/product/view/id/942/category/64 Color: Santa Fe Clay Layout: Offset Brick ?12in white thermo stripe on both sides</p>	<p>It will be replaced in kind but not with exactly same specs; Colored Hot Mix Asphalt Color Coating- The color coating must be an integrally colored, polymer modified cementitious coating.</p>
29		<p>Add dashed bike lane line extensions across ECR for the eastbound bike lane/slot on Serra St and the westbound bike lane/slot on Park Blvd to the receiving bike lanes across ECR. This is a major bicycle gateway to Stanford University and it is difficult for cyclists to know where they should ride across ECR. See CA MUTCD Figure 9C-106 (CA) for example.</p>	<p>The dashed bike lane crossing ECR will be connected.</p>
30		<p>Curb ramps at pork chop island at Churchill Ave /ECR not ADA compliant. Crosswalks should also be ladder striped and yellow as it is within 500 ft of a school. Add Advanced Stop limit line for Churchill approach and Yield Line for right turn.</p>	<p>The City project at Churchill will remove the pork chop island.</p>
31		<p>Crosswalk striping for ECR / Embarcadero / Galvez: -New CWL should be Yellow (Existing is White)-Add advance stop limit line for Embarcadero and Galvez approaches as was added for ECR approaches(needed for all Yellow crosswalks)-Add yield lines for approaches to right-turn crosswalks which are yield control</p>	<p>Crosswalk color revised to yellow.</p>
32		<p>At Encina, include Striped CWL Crosswalk at Encina where new pedestrian ramps will be constructed per plan.</p>	<p>New CWL Crosswalk will be added.</p>
33		<p>At University Ramps, add Ladder Crosswalk (CWL) for crosswalk crossing NB on-ramp and for SB on-ramp at University Ave. Include CWL Crosswalks for University Circle as they are controlled by the same traffic signal.</p>	<p>This location will be updated by another CT project.</p>

From: pennyellson12@gmail.com
To: [Arce, Ozzy](#)
Cc: [Bansal, Megha](#); [Nguy, Roger](#)
Subject: FW: Wilkie Bridge
Date: Tuesday, December 20, 2022 3:28:46 PM
Attachments: [image001.jpg](#)

Hi Ozzy,

Please attach this update from Roger and Megha on the bike bridge maintenance projects to the January PABAC agenda.

Thank you!

Best wishes for happy holidays, all! --Penny

From: Bansal, Megha <Megha.Bansal@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2022 3:22 PM
To: [Nguy, Roger](#) <Roger.Nguy@CityofPaloAlto.org>; [Ellson, Penny](#) <pennyellson12@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: Wilkie Bridge

Hi Penny,

As Roger mentioned we'll continue to monitor the test products for durability and users experience. So far we have received a total of 110 surveys, 60 for wet deck and 50 for dry deck surface conditions. Also, in January, we'll begin design work for repairs to the three bridges (both Bol Park path bridges and Wilkie bridge) per assessment completed this year. I anticipate few months to complete the design work and then going out to bid sometimes in spring.

Thanks for your continued support and I hope you have a wonderful holiday!

Megha

From: [Nguy, Roger](#) <Roger.Nguy@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Sent: Thursday, December 8, 2022 12:58 PM
To: [Ellson, Penny](#) <pennyellson12@gmail.com>; [Bansal, Megha](#) <Megha.Bansal@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: RE: Wilkie Bridge

Hi Penny,

I have no new updates from my end. Now that the two test strips are installed, we need to wait and see how well they will hold up under bicycle traffic, and to the elements. In addition to needing to learn from riders how they feel about the strips (rideability and handling during wet/icy weather), the City also needs to know how the materials will stand up to the summer heat and UV sunlight. We can't install these materials unless we're convinced they'll work well, won't fall apart, or cause other unintended problems.

Megha and her team are handling the surveys and will determine the final course of action. I think PW Engineering's plan is to bring in a contractor to perform repairs on all 3 bridges asap (Wilkie and Bol Park). I'm sure Megha will share the results, coordinate with PABAC, as soon as it's feasible.

Thanks,
Rog.

From: pennyellson12@gmail.com <pennyellson12@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2022 7:41 PM
To: Nguy, Roger <Roger.Nguy@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Bansal, Megha <Megha.Bansal@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: Wilkie Bridge

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

Hi Roger and Megha,

I just got the message below from PA311.

"This 311 entered by Transportation staff on behalf of resident Penny Ellson. This is a bike bridge surface maintenance request for the Wilkie bridge. The Wilkie bridge does not have its own address, so, per the Transportation Planning Manager, we entered the address of 4297 Wilkie Way which is just next to the bridge. Sidenote: This request is similar to existing request 10911573 which is for resurfacing/maintenance of the two bridges on the Bol Park Bike Path."

It prompted me to touch base. How are things going? PABAC doesn't have a meeting until early January, but I can send out a message before then if you have an update for us.

Thank you for all you do...and **Happy Thanksgiving!**

Penny



Virus-free. www.avg.com

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: [Arce, Ozzy](#)
Cc: [Transportation](#)
Subject: FW: BPTP update
Date: Monday, November 14, 2022 7:43:35 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.png](#)

Good morning Ozzy,

Forwarding along BPTP update below.

Andria Sumpter

Administrative Assistant

Office Transportation

(650) 329-2552 | andria.sumpter@cityofpalocalto.org

www.cityofpalocalto.org



From: Ken Joye <kmjoye@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2022 9:34 AM
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.

In the BPTP update, please consider adding a section which discusses paving standards on designated bicycle routes (SRTS, bicycle boulevards, etc).

During the autumn 2022 sewer upgrades, the asphalt installed after installation looked like this at 3579 Park Blvd:



The quality of that patch is **significantly** better than the asphalt immediately adjacent at 3605 Park Blvd:



On those roadways to which we direct bicycle traffic, the standard for replacing road surface after excavation should be higher than that where the predominant traffic is motor vehicles. Establishing a higher standard would need to be done in conjunction with Public Works, Utilities and their sub-contractors (i.e., RFP's for paving jobs should specify paving standards and staff should inspect work done to ensure that specifications are met).

thank you for considering this input,
Ken Joye
PABAC member



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.