



**Palo Alto Pedestrian and
Bicycle Advisory Committee**

Tuesday, April 2, 2024 at 6:15 P.M.

Virtual Meeting

Join Meeting Via Zoom Online: <https://cityofpaloalto.zoom.us/j/84932715248>;

Dial-in: 669-444-9171 | Meeting ID: 849 3271 5248

1. CALL TO ORDER 6:15 PM
2. AGENDA CHANGES 6:16 PM
3. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES: 6:18 PM
 - a. March 5, 2024 PABAC meeting
4. PUBLIC COMMENTS 6:20 PM

Note: Written comments submitted by email to Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org between 12:00pm on February 13, 2024, and 12:00pm on March 23, 2024 are attached with the agenda packet.
5. STAFF UPDATES
 - a. Introduction of Charlie Coles, new Senior Transportation Planner, OOT 6:25 PM
 - b. [El Camino Real Repaving Project](#) (Sylvia Star-Lack, OOT) 6:30 PM
6. ACTION ITEMS
 - a. PABAC, the Brown Act, and voting on the list of small groups 6:40 PM
 - i. See Attachment 1 for tentative list
 - b. Vote to participate in a joint meeting with City of Mountain View Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) on Wednesday, June 26, 2024 at 6:30PM 6:50 PM
 - i. Virtual attendance is okay; PABAC quorum is not required. Calendar invite coming soon.
 - ii. Send agenda topic ideas to Charlie at charlie.coles@cityofpaloalto.org.
7. DISCUSSION ITEMS
 - a. PABAC recommendation: Grade Separation preferred alternative 6:55 PM
 - b. PABAC recommendation: Updates to Comprehensive Plan Policy T4.1 7:30 PM
 - c. PABAC recommendation: Enforcement of high-traffic areas in Palo Alto 7:45 PM
8. STANDING ITEMS 8:00 PM
 - a. Grant Update: None.
 - b. CSTSC Update: [Please review CSTSC Meeting Agendas and Minutes](#)
 - c. VTA BPAC Update (R. Neff)
 - d. Subcommittee Reports
 - i. Rail Grade Separation Subcommittee (B. Arthur)
 - ii. Bike Bridge Maintenance Subcommittee (P. Ellson)
 - iii. Repaving Subcommittee (R. Neff)
 - iv. Muni Code Subcommittee (E. Nordman)

- v. Sight line and Safety Problem Reporting on Bike Routes (*E. Nordman*)
- e. Announcements
 - i. Bike to Work Day 2024: Thursday, May 16, 2024
 - ii. BPTP Update: Community events (workshop, bike ride, walk) on April 16-18, 2024 and Earth Day on Sunday, April 21, 2024 1:00pm to 4:00pm at Rinconada Library
 - iii. February 2024 Collision Reports from PA Police Department–See Attachment 2
 - iv. SS4A Safety Action Team at May 4th May Fete Fair at Heritage Park
- f. Future Agenda Items
 - i. Muni code clean-up progress update
 - ii. PAUSD Hoover school campus reconstruction update
 - iii. S. Palo Alto Bikeways project status/grant proposal
 - iv. Rail Grade Separations
 - v. Municipal Code re: micromobility issues
 - vi. BPTP Update Implementation Status Item for the City website
 - vii. PABAC assistance reporting sight line/safety issues on bike/ped network
 - viii. Explore alternatives for bike/ped non-injury collision and near-miss reporting
 - ix. Bike parking code updates for converting existing business-owned auto parking spaces to bicycle parking
 - x. Park Blvd to Portage Ave.
 - xi. How to get more information on collisions

9. ADJOURNMENT

8:15 PM

END OF AGENDA



**Palo Alto Pedestrian and
Bicycle Advisory Committee**

Tuesday, March 5, 2024 at 6:15 P.M.

Brown Act Meeting

Location: Mitchell Park Community Center, Matadero Room

MEETING MINUTES

Members Present: Alan Wachtel, Art Liberman, Bill Zaumen, Eric Nordman (Vice Chair), Jane Rosten (late), Kathy Durham (late), Ken Joye, Nicole Rodia (late), Penny Ellson, Robert Neff, Steve Rock

Members Absent: Bruce Arthur (Chair), Cedric le la Beaujardiere, Paul Goldstein

Staff Present: Ozzy Arce, Sylvia Star-Lack

Guests: Amanda Leahy from Kittelson & Associates

1. CALL TO ORDER 6:15 PM

Vice Chair Eric Nordman called the meeting to order.

2. AGENDA CHANGES 6:16 PM

None.

3. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES: 6:18 PM

a. January 9, 2024 PABAC meeting

Ms. Ellson requested changes to be made on page 8, lines 27 and 28.

Male moved to approve the minutes from the January 9, 2024, meeting. Ms. Ellson seconded the motion. Mr. Arce did a roll call vote and the motion passed.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS 6:20 PM

Note: Written comments submitted by email to Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org between 12:00pm on December 11, 2023, and 12:00pm on February 13, 2024 are attached with the agenda packet.

None.

5. STAFF UPDATES

a. [El Camino Real Repaving Project](#) Updates (Sylvia Star-Lack, OOT) 6:25 PM

1 Ms. Star-Lack discussed a recent Caltrans Community meeting held the prior week. She
2 announced an upcoming meeting the following Thursday that would be a joint PABAC, City,
3 School and Transportation Safety Committee meeting focused on the El Camino Real Bike
4 Lanes Proposal. The following week, there will be a joint Planning and Transportation
5 Commission and Human Relations Commission meeting where Caltrans Staff will be in
6 attendance to make the same presentation. There is an April 1st Council meeting tentatively
7 scheduled for Council to consider the parking removal that would be required in order for
8 Caltrans to implement the Bike Lanes Proposal.

9
10 Male asked about Transportation planning and a report for the City Council.

11
12 Ms. Star-Lack answered a Staff report would be published the next day or Thursday for the
13 Planning Commission meeting the following week that will give background to the Caltrans
14 Project from the City side. Caltrans will provide a full Staff report for the April 1 meeting.

15
16 Mr. Liberman questioned what would happen if they do not receive the approval of the City of
17 Palo Alto.

18
19 Ms. Star-Lack answered there is a legitimate difference of opinion. The state wants to work
20 collaboratively with the City.

21
22 Mr. Liberman talked about bike lane removal and local jurisdiction of parking.

23
24 Ms. Star-Lack stated if you ask the City Attorney they would say something different.

25
26 Female precisely heard Caltrans twice say it was their role to cooperate with the City.

27
28 Ms. Star-Lack announced the video of Thursday night's meeting is now online at the City's
29 YouTube channel.

30
31 Mr. Rock wondered what the chances would be of a situation similar to one that happened on
32 California Avenue should occur.

33
34 Ms. Star-Lack could not answer that question.

35
36 **b. PABAC, the Brown Act, and small group discussions (*Sylvia Star-Lack, OOT*)**

37 6:35 PM

38 **i. See Attachment 1 for information**

39
40 Ms. Star-Lack commented the City Attorney said if PABAC would like to designate small
41 discussion groups, that could be done to discuss the Bike Plan outside of meetings. There
42 could be no more than four people per group. To avoid serial meetings, the groups cannot be
43 changed once they are set until the Bike Plan update is adopted by City Council. In order to
44 figure out who should be in those groups, the Chair, Vice Chair or someone they designate
45 can work with the members to divide the committee into groups and the list of groups will be
46 voted on so it is out in the open who is in which group.

47

1 Mr. Arce said a PABAC volunteer could randomly determine the groups, and the make up of
2 the final groups would have that be a part of the April PABAC meeting agenda packet for
3 PABAC to review and vote on.

4
5 Penny Ellson thought they needed to agree on a process to make it fair to everyone and
6 detailed how they could go about that. Ms. Ellson volunteered to develop the lists of groups
7 and share that information with City staff once ready.

10 6. DISCUSSION ITEMS

11 a. **Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update: Share and confirm**
12 **vision 6:45 PM**
13 **statement and goals, share and get feedback on existing conditions technical**
14 **analysis, share and discuss upcoming engagement activities**

15 (*Ozzy Arce, OOT; Amanda Leahy, Kittelson*)

- 16 i. Attachment 2: BPTP Presentation
- 17 ii. Attachment 3: Draft Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) Staff
18 Report for PABAC
- 19 iii. Attachment 4: Bicyclist Level of Traffic Stress Map (Draft)
- 20 iv. Attachment 5: Barriers Map (Draft)
- 21 v. Attachment 6: Collision Maps (Draft)
- 22 vi. Attachment 7: Bike Trip Origin and Destinations Map (Draft)
- 23 vii. Attachment 8: BPTP Update Vision, Objectives and Performance Measures
24 (Draft)
- 25 viii. Attachment 9: Existing Bicycle Facilities Map (Final)

26
27 Amanda Leahy from Kittelson & Associates gave a presentation on the Bicycle and
28 Pedestrian Transportation Plan update to include an agenda, PABAC meeting #1 recap
29 (November 7, 2023), PABAC meeting #1 comments and resolutions, PABAC meeting #2
30 feedback requests, baseline conditions – analysis topics, bicycle level of traffic stress, major
31 barriers – analysis locations, ten-year (2012-2022) collision history, five-year (2018-2022)
32 collision history, pedestrian collision, 2018-2022, bicycle collisions 2018-2022, walking
33 activity data, biking activity data, phase 1 engagement summary, Visioning Workshop, draft
34 vision statement, draft objectives, draft performance measures, next steps and the phase 2
35 engagement overview.

36
37 There was discussion and questions about the term barriers and the barriers represented on the
38 map.

39
40 Ms. Leahy defined barriers and answered the questions posed regarding the barriers
41 represented on the map.

42
43 There were questions regarding crosswalks, the term broadside, and explanation of the dots on
44 the walking map.

45
46 Ms. Leahy explained the data representing crosswalks, discussed the term broadside and gave
47 explanation of the dots and lines on the walking map. She explained that the analysis zone is
48 created by Replica and information about this could be found on their website. She added they
49 are aware of gaps and are seeking information to correct that.

1
2 Male suggested giving instruction on looking at the map when they go to the PTC the
3 following week.

4
5 Ms. Leahy thought it would be nice to validate and supplement data. She discussed what the
6 data represented and what it gave insight to.

7
8 There was discussion about community engagement and more questions and feedback
9 regarding the maps.

10
11 Mr. Arce stated he would compile PABAC's comments and send them to Ms. Leahy.

12
13 Mr. Wachtel mentioned that there is a part of the presentation on Performance Measures and
14 asked if they would talk about that today. He also mentioned the file is difficult to read.

15
16 Ms. Leahy answered they would not talk about that in depth on that day.

17
18 Mr. Arce stated they would look into sending the Excel file over email. He discussed an
19 upcoming scheduled bike ride in April.

20
21 Male asked to refer to the bicycle origins and destinations slide and asked if the duration of
22 trips was found somewhere in the agenda packet.

23
24 Ms. Leahy answered that is in the technical memo that accompanies the Replica analysis.

25
26 Male asked if the aggregated comments from the members of the community would be part of
27 the public record everyone can see.

28
29 Mr. Arce answered when comments are sent they should be labeled BPTP and it will become
30 a part of the record that they will publish.

31
32 Male thought it seemed possible if they are sending something to the consultant they could
33 make it part of the next agenda packet.

34
35 Mr. Arce said he could look into that.

36
37 Mr. Arce asked for feedback to be sent to transportation@cityofpaloalto.org to ensure it is part
38 of PABAC's next meeting agenda packet.

39
40 There was discussion about e-bikes, stress levels, a Stanford study on bicycle commuter
41 access in 2017, distinction between freeways and county roads, the possibility of using GoPro
42 to collect data, and the significance of the colors of lines and the labels on the maps.

- 43
44
45 **b. [Safe Systems for All](#): Project update, present collision analysis, High-Injury**
46 **7:30 PM**
47 **Network, and collision profiles (*Sylvia Star-Lack, OOT; Ashlee Takushi, Fehr***
48 **& *Peers*)**
49 **i. Attachment 10: SS4A Presentation**

1
2 Ashlee Takushi gave a slide presentation about the Safe Streets For All project to include an
3 agenda, project schedule, project objectives, collision landscape analysis, trends over time,
4 modal breakdowns for collisions, share of collisions by primary collision factor, share of
5 collisions by collision type, high-injury network, community feedback survey, key themes and
6 questions for specific areas within the City, additional comments to Office of Transportation
7 and on Interactive Map, explanation of collision profiles and an overview of the seven
8 collision profiles and potential counter measures.
9

10 Mr. Liberman asked if they were able to tell whether these collisions, particularly the bicycles
11 and pedestrians, occur along or crossing the 4 percent of streets.
12

13 Ms. Takushi did not know the exact total but noted a lot of the collisions did occur at
14 intersections. She added a lot of the location information is not accurate to what approach of
15 the intersection the collision is occurring on.
16

17 Mr. Liberman commented on the fact that some of the streets are longer than others.
18

19 Ms. Takushi noted that for this analysis they included it as one long segment but noted that it
20 is Arastradero and Charleston. She added 4 percent of streets indicated 4 percent of miles of
21 street so it did not really matter if it was counted as one or two streets.
22

23 There were questions regarding Charleston and Arastradero modifications.
24

25 Ms. Star-Lack commented that during this study period, Charleston and Arastradero were
26 being modified so it became clear that the collisions were happening in the areas that had not
27 been updated.
28

29 Mr. Liberman commented on the 90 degree angle collision with bicyclists slide stating
30 separated facilities do not address broadside collisions.
31

32 Ms. Takushi answered having a class 1 path would separate the bicyclists and they also need
33 to consider how bicyclists will cross the intersection, as well. They will need to consider the
34 separated facilities because it is part of creating a full safer environment for bicyclists at
35 intersections and along the roadways.
36

37 Mr. Liberman talked about what separating facilities would mean.
38

39 Ms. Star-Lack added issues that affect protected facilities.
40

41 Male talked about collisions occurring at night occurring due to cyclists not having lights and
42 there being nothing the infrastructure can do about that.
43

44 Ms. Star-Lack asked if the data indicated whether or not the cyclists have lights.
45

46 Ms. Takushi stated that was not in the data but could be included as part of the education.
47

1 Alexandra Lee-Gardner commented that part of the system approach is that even if they are
2 making mistakes that is accounted for so bicyclists should not have to have extra protections
3 to ride safely.
4

5 There was discussion about the low numbers of KSIs on the 90 degree angle collisions and
6 running statistics on them noting that there might be large error bars on those KSI numbers.
7

8 Mr. Liberman asked about restricting right turns on red.
9

10 Ms. Takushi explained how it separates the user in time and space.
11

12 Male commented that in the future the City may be adding a lot of housing along the San
13 Antonio Corridor so any countermeasures applied to the existing things on the map should
14 also be targeted for any development on San Antonio. He asked if the parallel roadways
15 mentioned in Safe Routes to School Crossing high stress would be parallel to the high stress
16 street that the routes are crossing.
17

18 Ms. Takushi stated it was hoped that creating parallel routes for bicyclists to ride on moves
19 them over from the high stress facility to one that is of lower stress. She commented a lot of
20 the collisions did occur at intersections so a lot of the treatments will need to consider the land
21 use contacts around as well as the roadway facility type and number of lanes. It is hard to say
22 one countermeasure treatment will work for all crossing or intersection locations. As part of
23 the countermeasure toolbox they are working on, they will look at these intersections on a
24 case by case basis for the identified profiles.
25

26 Mr. Liberman asked if the City would be enforcing the new California state that prohibits
27 parking within 20 feet of marked and unmarked crosswalks.
28

29 Ms. Star-Lack discussed a plan they are working on in order to be able to enforce this.
30

31 Mr. Liberman discussed a need to create more separated bike and ped crossings.
32

33 Nicole Rodia asked a question about the data source.
34

35 Ms. Takushi stated they did a thorough review of the TIMS data because they noticed a big
36 decrease in collisions and KSIs starting in 2019. They looked at the countywide data, as well,
37 to see if there was a trend and it looked like there was a sharp decrease in Palo Alto. In terms
38 of how it is reported, it is based on a police officer coming to the scene, writing it down and
39 putting it into the database. Unreported collisions could be missing from the database. She
40 stated the data years reported were discussed between the project team and City Staff and
41 those were the years they agreed upon at the beginning of the project.
42

43 Ms. Rodia further questioned the timeline of the data source.
44

45 Ms. Star-Lack explained why a five-year data set is used in making these plans.
46

47 Male stated most streets have not changed in the last 5 or 10 years and thought it would be
48 good to do an analysis that talked about when collisions occur relative to the changes.
49

1 Female discussed a list of projects that have not been completed.

2
3 Ms. Star-Lack answered they could look at it but she could not make any promises. They
4 would start with these five years and in a few more years they would do another data dive and
5 keep going.

6
7 Ms. Lee-Gardner added that it is helpful to see where the collisions were but it is possible that
8 there were other areas that collisions did not happen by chance. The idea of the profiles is to
9 take the data for the five years and extrapolating based on the context of those collisions to
10 make systemic profiles.

11
12 Ms. Rodia asked about a glossary and appendix.

13
14 Ms. Takushi answered not at this time but she would work with Ms. Star-Lack to have that
15 glossary and appendix prepared.

16
17 Male talked about riding on streets with bike facilities.

18
19 Ms. Star-Lack said many of them do not have bike facilities. She referred to the walk and roll
20 bike routes crossing higher stress streets map and explained that particular collision profile
21 talked about how 99 percent of them happened at intersections implying something is
22 happening at the intersection.

23
24
25
26 **7. STANDING ITEMS**

8:15 PM

27 **a. Grant Update – S. Palo Alto Bikeways Community Engagement; Striping**
28 **Trial to seek SS4A funds.**

29
30 Ms. Star-Lack wanted to let the committee know that they would be seeking grant funds from
31 the Safe Streets For All for a striping trial for the South Palo Alto Bikeways project. She
32 commented on the high rate of collisions on East Meadow in 2023. One way to push forward
33 with this project is through a quick build of the concept plan on East Meadow and Waverley.
34 She was not sure they could get Waverley into it but are going to try. They will keep pushing
35 forward with the project with community engagement so they can be ready for construction to
36 start once they have the grant money.

37
38 **b. CSTSC Update**

39 **I. For more CSTSC Meeting Agendas and Minutes, visit:**

40 [https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/Departments/Transportation/Safe-](https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/Departments/Transportation/Safe-Routes-to-School/Partners-and-Program-History)
41 [Routes-to-School/Partners-and-Program-History](https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/Departments/Transportation/Safe-Routes-to-School/Partners-and-Program-History)

42
43
44
45 **c. VTA BPAC Update (R. Neff)**

46
47 Mr. Neff described a presentation San Jose Monterey Road Corridor project at a VTA meeting
48 the prior month. There was also a discussion about getting city government committees
49 connected.

1
2 **d. Subcommittee Reports**

3 **i. Rail Grade Separation Subcommittee (*B. Arthur*)**
4

5 Male said the Rail Committee will have a big presentation the next month to make a decision.
6 He added the important thing is that Caltrain came back with their requirements which
7 dramatically changed all of the designs. He discussed what the Traffic Study review revealed
8 at their last meeting. He described an analysis of a transport plan for bikes and pedestrians that
9 was presented in the Rail Committee meeting.
10

11 Mr. Liberman talked about having the topic on the agenda for the next month.
12

13 Male stated the next Rail Meeting would be information so the appropriate time for PABAC
14 to weigh in is after they get the information.
15

16 Male discussed importance for PABAC to put the two best choices side by side and come to a
17 point where they can make a decision. He talked about the viaduct, a 40-year estimate and
18 high-speed rail, bicycle and pedestrian involvement and the money involved.
19

20 Male talked about the next Rail Committee meeting.
21

22 **ii. Bike Bridge Maintenance Subcommittee (*P. Ellson*)**
23

24 Ms. Ellson announced she sent everybody an update to save time.
25

26 **iii. Repaving Subcommittee (*R. Neff*)**
27

28 Mr. Neff stated he emailed everyone a spreadsheet that was sent to the City. He detailed what
29 the highlights were.
30

31 Female said discussed a timeline issue.
32

33 Ms. Star-Lack stated the issue is that she needs to do some kind of community engagement
34 with the folks on Addison. She discussed issues on the timeline. She thought educating folks
35 as to why their bike lane is being taken away will take time that she does not have.
36

37 Male talked about a similar issue and asked how it was handled.
38

39 Ms. Star-Lack did not remember how that was handled. She does not want to have a bunch of
40 people show up to Council and ask why they are taking away their bike lane.
41

42 **iv. Muni Code Subcommittee (*E. Nordman*)**
43

44 Nothing to report.
45

46 **v. Sight line and Safety Problem Reporting on Bike Routes (*E. Nordman*)**
47

48 Nothing to report.
49

1 **e. Announcements**

2 **I. BPTP Update: In-person field activities & work session: Tues. 4/16-**
3 **Thur. 4/18**

4
5 Mr. Arce discussed work session dates in mid-April.

6
7 **II. Bike to Work Day 2024: Thursday, May 16, 2024**

8
9 Ms. Star-Lack asked about the Bike to Work Day.

10
11 Male outlined plans for the Bike to Work Day.

12
13 **III. Request for a joint meeting with the City of Mountain View’s Bicycle**
14 **Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC): Wednesday, June 26 at**
15 **6:30p.m. virtual or in-person**

16
17 Mr. Arce discussed a request from the City of Mountain View for a joint meeting with
18 PABAC. Attendance can be virtual or in-person. He asked for agenda item suggestions to be
19 sent to him.

20
21 **IV. City recruiting for open seats on the Planning & Transportation**
22 **Commission and other Boards, Commissions, and Committees. Apply**
23 **by March 17, 2024**

24 **1. For more information, visit: www.cityofpaloalto.org/BCRecruit**

25
26 Mr. Arce discussed City recruitment for open seats on City Commissions, Boards, and
27 Committees.

28
29 **V. December 2023 and January 2024 Collision Reports from PA Police**
30 **Department—See Attachment 11 and Attachment 12**

31
32 Mr. Arce said collision reports from PA Police Department have been attached to the agenda
33 packet.

34
35 **f. Future Agenda Items**

- 36 ➤ Muni code clean-up progress update (Committee report delivered: 2018; Last
37 update from staff: 04/04/2023)
- 38 ➤ PAUSD Hoover school campus reconstruction update (Last review: 5/3/2022)
- 39 ➤ S. Palo Alto Bikeways project status/grant proposal (Last update: 02/07/2023)
- 40 ➤ Rail Grade Separations (Last update: 8/2/2022)
- 41 ➤ Municipal Code re: micromobility issues
- 42 ➤ BPTP Update Implementation Status Item for the City website
- 43 ➤ PABAC assistance reporting sight line/safety issues on bike/ped network
44 (Requested by Staff: 10/6/22)
- 45 ➤ Explore alternatives for bike/ped non-injury collision and near-miss reporting
- 46 ➤ Bike parking code updates for converting existing business-owned auto
47 parking spaces to bicycle parking
- 48 ➤ Park Blvd to Portage Ave. (last discussion: 03/07/2023)
- 49 ➤ How to get more information on collisions

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

8. ADJOURNMENT

8:30 PM

END OF AGENDA

PABAC April 2, 2024 Meeting
Attachment 1: Small Groups List for PABAC

Group 1

Alan Wachtel
Paul Goldstein
Kathy Durham

Group 2

Robert Neff
Nicole Rodia
Penny Ellson
Steve Rock

Group 3

Eric Nordman
Ken Joye
Bruce Arthur
Jane Rosten

Group 4

Art Liberman
Bill Zaumen
Cedric de la Beaujardiere

PABAC April 2, 2024 Meeting
Attachment 2: February 1-29, 2024 PAPD Collision Report for PABAC

#	Date	Time	Location	City	Caused By Juve?	Primary Collision Factor	Occurred On	At Intersection	Collision Type 555 Desc	Vehicle Involved With Desc	Vehicle Involved with Description	Number Injured 555
1	02/01/2024	809	893 LOS ROBLES AVE	PALOALTO	F		893 LOS ROBLES AVE		Side swipe	Other motor vehicle		0
2	02/01/2024	850	ALMA ST/COLERIDGE AVE	PALOALTO	F	22350 cvc	ALMA ST		Rear end	Other motor vehicle		0
3	02/01/2024	1008	1530 MIDDLEFIELD RD	PALOALTO	F	VC 21804 (A)	1530 MIDDLEFIELD RD		Rear end	Other motor vehicle		1
4	02/01/2024	1127	EL CAMINO REAL/EMBARCADERO RD	PALOALTO	F	VC 22107	EL CAMINO REAL		Side swipe	Other motor vehicle		0
5	02/01/2024	2104	.4200 EL CAMINO REAL	PALOALTO	F		4200 BLOCK EL CAMINO REAL		Head-on	Fixed object	TREE	1
6	02/02/2024	859	EL CAMINO REAL/ARASTRADERO RD	PALOALTO	F	21658(a) VC	EL CAMINO REAL		Rear end	Other motor vehicle		3
7	02/02/2024	1449	LYTTON AVE/ALMA ST	PALOALTO	F	22107	400 BLOCK OF ALMA STREET		Side swipe	Other motor vehicle		1
8	02/03/2024	229	EL CAMINO REAL/SAND HILL RD	PALOALTO	F	22350 CVC	EL CAMINO REAL	UNIVERSITY AVENUE	Hit object	Fixed object	STREET SIGNS	0
9	02/03/2024	939	100 BLOCK EMBARCADERO RD	PALOALTO	F	22107	100 BLOCK EMBARCADERO RD		Side swipe	Motor vehicle on other roadway		1
10	02/04/2024	111	STANFORD AVE/BOWDOIN ST	PALOALTO	F	CVC 22350	STANFORD AVE		Hit object	Fixed object	BALLARD/PRIVATE FENCE	
11	02/05/2024	1800	2200 E. BAYSHORE RD	PALOALTO	F	CVC 22350	2200 E. BAYSHORE RD		Rear end	Other motor vehicle		0
12	02/06/2024	1500	.00 ENCINA AVENUE	PALOALTO	F	22106	.00 ENCINA AVENUE		Other	Parked motor vehicle		1
13	02/06/2024	1820	OREGON EXPR/COWPER ST	PALOALTO	F	23152(a) VC	OREGON EXPRESSWAY,	COWPER STREET	Rear end	Other motor vehicle		1
14	02/07/2024	1720	PAGE MILL RD/FOOTHILL EXPR	PALOALTO	F	cvc 22350	PAGE MILL RD		Rear end	Other motor vehicle		1
15	02/07/2024	1920	4243 ALMA ST	PALOALTO	F	22350 VC	4200 BLK ALMA ST		Rear end	Other motor vehicle		1
16	02/08/2024	903	100 BLK HAMILTON AVE	PALOALTO	F	22107 CVC	100 BLK HAMILTON AVE		Side swipe	Other motor vehicle		0
17	02/08/2024	1005	.400 ARBORETUM RD	PALOALTO	F	21750(A) VC	.400 ARBORETUM ROAD		Rear end	Other motor vehicle		0
18	02/08/2024	1559	W CHARLESTON RD/WILKIE WAY	PALOALTO	F	21453(a)	W CHARLESTON RD	WILKIE WAY	Broadside	Other motor vehicle		2
19	02/09/2024	842	1700 BLK EMBARCADERO RD	PALOALTO	F	22107 CVC	1700 BLK EMBARCADERO RD		Broadside	Other motor vehicle		1
20	02/09/2024	1238	MIDDLEFIELD RD/FOREST AVE	PALOALTO	F	CVC 21801(A)	MIDDLEFIELD ROAD	FOREST AVENUE	Broadside	Other motor vehicle		0
21	02/10/2024	123	UNIVERSITY AVE/CHAUCER ST	PALOALTO	F	cvc 22350	UNIVERSITY AVE	CHAUCER STREET	Rear end	Other motor vehicle		0
22	02/11/2024	1222	SAN ANTONIO RD/MIDDLEFIELD RD	PALOALTO	F	CVC 22350	SAN ANTONIO RD		Rear end	Other motor vehicle		2
23	02/13/2024	1103	PITMAN AVE/NEWELL RD	PALOALTO	F	VC 22107	PITMAN AVE		Side swipe	Parked motor vehicle		0
24	02/13/2024	1700	555 WAVERLEY ST	PALOALTO	F	VC 22106	555 WAVERLEY ST		Rear end	Parked motor vehicle		0

PABAC April 2, 2024 Meeting
Attachment 2: February 1-29, 2024 PAPD Collision Report for PABAC

#	Date	Time	Location	City	Caused By Juve?	Primary Collision Factor	Occurred On	At Intersection	Collision Type 555 Desc	Vehicle Involved With Desc	Vehicle Involved with Description	Number Injured 555
25	02/13/2024	1744	250 HAMILTON AVE	PALOALTO	F		250 HAMILTON AVE		Head-on	Fixed object		0
26	02/14/2024	834	.900 COLORADO AVE	PALOALTO	F	VC 22517	900 COLORADO AVE		Side swipe	Parked motor vehicle		0
27	02/14/2024	1153	HAMILTON AVE/RAMONA ST	PALOALTO	F	21954(a)	200 BLOCK OF HAMILTON AVE		Head-on	Pedestrian		1
28	02/15/2024	1558	143 ALMA ST	PALOALTO	F	21801	ALMA ST		Other	Bicycle		1
29	02/16/2024	1744	SAN ANTONIO RD/E CHARLESTON RD	PALOALTO	F	22107 VC	SAN ANTONIO RD		Side swipe	Other motor vehicle		2
30	02/17/2024	1022	.3200 LOUIS RD	PALOALTO	F	21950(a)	LOUIS ROAD	LOMA VERDE AVENUE	Vehicle-Pedestrian	Pedestrian		1
31	02/17/2024	1046	EL CAMINO REAL/W CHARLESTON RD	PALOALTO	F	CVC 21703	ARASTRADERO ROAD		Rear end	Other motor vehicle		1
32	02/19/2024	1042	EL CAMINO REAL/RICKEYS LN	PALOALTO	F	21802(a)	SR-82	RICKEYS LN	Side swipe	Other motor vehicle		2
33	02/19/2024	2106	NEWELL RD/EMBARCADERO RD	PALOALTO	F	CVC-22350	EMBARCADERO RD (700 BLOCK)		Rear end	Bicycle		
34	02/20/2024	1609	E MEADOW DR/WAVERLEY ST	PALOALTO	F	CVC 22350	E MEADOW DR	WAVERLEY STREET	Rear end	Other motor vehicle		0
35	02/20/2024	1521	EMBARCADERO RD/NEWELL RD	PALOALTO	F	VC 21801(A)	NEWELL RD	EMBARCADERO RD	Head-on	Other motor vehicle		0
36	02/21/2024	835	ALMA ST/E CHARLESTON RD	PALOALTO	F		ALMA ST	E CHARLESTON RD	Rear end	Other motor vehicle		0
37	02/22/2024	2029	FOREST AVE/ALMA ST	PALOALTO	F	UNABLE TO DETERMINE	FOREST AVE		Broadside	Bicycle		1
38	02/22/2024	2140	.100 CHANNING AVE	PALOALTO	F	CVC 22106	CHANNING AVE (100 BLOCK)		Rear end	Fixed object	FIRE SUPPRESSION SYSTEM	0
39	02/24/2024	425	ALMA ST/PALO ALTO AVE	PALOALTO	F	CVC 23152	ALMA STREET	PALO ALTO AVENUE	Head-on	Fixed object	STREET SIGN	0
40	02/24/2024	1115	1161 EMBARCADERO RD	PALOALTO	F	21804 VC	1161 EMBARCADERO RD		Broadside	Other motor vehicle		0
41	02/24/2024	1116	N CALIFORNIA AVE/EMBARCADERO RD	PALOALTO	F	cvc 22350	N CALIFORNIA AVE	EMBARCADERO ROAD	Rear end	Other motor vehicle		0
42	02/25/2024	313	4201 MIDDLEFIELD RD	PALOALTO	F	22350 CVC	MIDDLEFIELD RD		Side swipe	Fixed object	UTILITY POLE	0
43	02/27/2024	715	ALMA STREET/W CHARLESTON RD	PALOALTO	F	21950(a) VC	ALMA STREET	WEST CHARLESTON ROAD	Vehicle-Pedestrian	Pedestrian		0
44	02/28/2024	1549	4 ARASTRADERO RD	PALOALTO	F	CVC 22350	4 ARASTRADERO RD		Broadside	Bicycle		1
45	02/28/2024	1713	GUINDA ST/HOMER AVE	PALOALTO	F	21804(b)	HOMER AVE	GUINDA ST	Broadside	Other motor vehicle		0



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

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

1. **Written public comments** (including visuals such as presentations, photos, etc) may be submitted by email to Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org. Please follow these instructions:
 - A. Please email your written comments **by 12:00 pm (noon) on the Monday the week before (eight days before)** the upcoming Palo Alto Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee (PABAC) meeting, unless otherwise indicated. Details of upcoming PABAC meetings are available on the City's [PABAC webpage](#).
 - Written public comments will be attached to the upcoming PABAC meeting agenda packet.
 - Written comments submitted after 12:00pm (noon) on the Monday before the upcoming PABAC meeting will be attached to the following PABAC meeting agenda packet.
 - B. Please **lead your email subject line with "BPTP Update"**.
 - C. When providing comments with reference to the current [City of Palo Alto Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan 2012](#), please be as specific as possible by indicating the chapter number, section heading number, and/or page number.
2. **Spoken public comments using a computer** will be accepted through the teleconference meeting. To address the Committee, click on the URL in the agenda packet for Zoom. Please follow these instructions:
 - A. You may download the Zoom client or connect to the meeting in-browser.
 - If using your browser, make sure you are using a current, up-to-date browser: Chrome 30+, Firefox 27+, Microsoft Edge 12+, Safari 7+. Certain functionality may be disabled in older browsers including Internet Explorer.
 - B. You may be asked to enter an email address and name. We request (but do not require) that you identify yourself by name as this will be visible online and will be used to notify you that it is your turn to speak.
 - C. When you wish to speak, click on "raise hand." Staff will activate and unmute speakers in turn. Speakers will be notified shortly before they are called to speak.
 - D. When called, please limit your remarks to the time limit allotted by the Chair.



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

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

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

This Packet Includes:

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



From: [Alan Wachtel](#)
To: [Transportation](#)
Cc: [Arce, Ozzy](#)
Subject: BPTP Update
Date: Friday, March 22, 2024 3:42:32 PM

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

These are my comments on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update presented to the Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee on March 5. Since the slides aren't numbered, I'll refer to page numbering in the PABAC agenda packet PDF. I'm also including comments on the draft staff report to the Planning and Transportation Commission that was also in the packet.

23, 54-56: Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress. The consultants' LTS-Lite Tool (according to their proposal) "relies on a simplified methodology due to the comprehensiveness of the datasets available, with a focus on travel speed, bicycle facility type, and functional classification. The analysis is conducted by pulling publicly available Open Street Map (OSM) data." The factors involved are explained in greater detail in the staff report, p. 45.

This methodology is, at best, a first approximation and might not accurately reflect actual bicyclist perception of stress, if it were surveyed. As mentioned at the meeting, for instance, Embarcadero Road is assigned LTS 3 based on its posted speed limit of 25 mph, when the 85th percentile speed measured in 2016 was 37 mph.

The highest stress roadway segments were located on El Camino Real, Alma Street, Oregon Expressway, San Antonio Road, and Foothill Expressway. Again, this seems to be an *a priori* assessment rather than bicyclist experience. In fact, because of the high stress there is little bicycle traffic along these roads, other than Foothill Expressway--which is much less stressful than any of the others named, because of its wide shoulder and limited number of crossings--and El Camino and Alma sidewalks. What may be important, then (with the exception of Foothill), is improvements not to bicycling along these roadways, but to crossing them.

24, 57-63: Major Barriers. El Camino Real and Alma Street should be included among linear barriers. It's not clear whether p. 62 is referring to Alma Street or the railroad tracks.

26: Ten-Year Collision History. These graphs show dramatic reductions in both pedestrian and bicycle collisions beginning around 2018 (before any pandemic effect). It would be very informative to identify possible causes of these reductions, if possible, in case they suggest actions that might be expanded or replicated. Otherwise, it might become difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of future interventions in the face of similar unexplained variation.

33: Phase 1 Engagement Summary. At the Bike Palo Alto Event on October 1, 2023, the participants were "supportive of separated bike lanes." It would be preferable not to use the term "separated bike lanes"; the Streets and Highways Code, Highway Design Manual, Design Information Bulletins, and California MUTCD refer to these facilities as Class IV *bikeways*, separated *bikeways*, or cycle tracks. Bike *lanes* are Class II *bikeways*. The distinction is important not only for design purposes, but because California vehicle law unfortunately requires bicyclists to use Class II bike lanes under certain conditions. There is no such restriction for Class IV separated *bikeways*.

It isn't surprising that participants would support bikeways they believe are separated from cars. In the same way, many bicyclists clearly prefer the apparent separation of sidewalks, even though it has been firmly established for many years that bicycling on sidewalks is often more dangerous than on the adjacent roadway, because of unexpected conflicts, possibly with poor sight lines, at driveways and intersections. Class IV bikeways have the potential to create the same unwarranted sense of security, with the added complications that bicyclists may travel faster than on the sidewalk and assume they always have right-of-way.

It would be a disservice to let bicyclists believe that facilities can and should somehow be fully separated (or "protected") from vehicular traffic, or that where they are not, responsibility for avoiding collisions lies entirely with motorists. Highway Design Manual Index 1002.1 says that, "Most bicycle travel in the State now occurs on streets and highways without bikeway designations and this may continue to be true in the future as well. In some instances, entire street systems may be fully adequate for safe and efficient bicycle travel, where signing and pavement marking for bicycle use may be unnecessary." Many neighborhood streets are perfectly fine for bicycle travel without the need for bikeways. Other streets might benefit from restriping, parking removal, shared-lane markings, or signage. These quieter streets, including bicycle boulevards, form the links in a cycling network and should not be ignored or disparaged.

Much bicycle travel necessarily occurs on such shared streets--there is no way to get anywhere otherwise--and bicyclists need to know how to share the road safely, including where to ride on the road, how to be visible and predictable, and how to comply with traffic law. This knowledge will also serve them well on busier streets.

Moreover, it's often necessary for either bicycle or vehicular traffic to change lanes, merge, turn, or cross intersecting traffic flows. For instance, traffic that starts out to the left of a bike lane, but plans to turn right at an intersection, needs to merge safely toward the curb before turning. Except for the unusual cases of grade separations or separate signal phases, this means that bikes and cars must share the road at least part of the time. This maneuver cannot be designed away by extending physical separation toward the intersection, forcing cars to make a sharp right turn that cuts off overtaking bicyclists. Making barriers longer and stronger may only recreate the right-hook geometric conflict that is already a significant cause of bike-car collisions.

All this is to say that though separation may be feasible in some locations, it's neither essential nor realistic to expect it to be widespread. Shared roadways are a feature, not a bug, and the public deserves an honest assessment of the benefits and drawbacks of various facilities.

37-38: Draft vision statement and objectives are suitably vague and anodyne.

71: Planning & Policy Performance Measure. "Lagging Indicator: Change or introduction of bicycle-friendly laws and ordinances." California law gives cities only limited authority to regulate bicycling. Cities may regulate bicycling on sidewalks and the parking and operation of bicycles on pedestrian or bicycle facilities; establish bicycle lanes on the roadway; permit or prohibit motorized bicycles and electric bicycles on off-road paths; prohibit or restrict pedestrians and bicycles on freeways to which vehicle access is completely or partially controlled; and regulate the licensing and registration of bicycles. Any broader regulation that the consultants might have in mind would have to be enacted at the state level.

Comments on the Planning & Transportation Staff Report

43: Update interpretation of most stressful segments and major barriers, as noted above.

44: "Broadside collisions are the most frequent type of bicycle collision that occurred in Palo Alto within the five year study period." This statistic indicates that to prevent collisions, intersections and other crossing and turning locations should be the focus, segments between intersections less so.

"The fatal and severe injury bicyclist-involved collisions predominantly occurred in areas where streetlights were absent." Here there is an obvious countermeasure.

45: Update discussion of most stressful segments, as noted above.

46: Update discussion of barriers to include El Camino Real and Alma Street.

48: "The most frequent type of bicycle collision that occurred in Palo Alto within the five year study period are broadside collisions, constituting 61% (156 collisions), followed by sideswipe collisions at 13% (34 collisions). Considering fatal and severe injury bicycle collisions, broadside collisions make up 54% (7 collisions), while head-on and hit object collisions comprise 15% (2 collisions) each. The fatal and severe injury bicyclist-involved collisions predominantly occurred in areas where streetlights were absent."

These numbers are consistent with the ongoing Safe Streets & Roads for All study, which found that 13 percent of all collisions in which a road user was killed or seriously injured were right-angle collisions involving bicyclists. This again points to the priority of intersection countermeasures.

I'd like to know more about those sideswipes. Did they occur midblock, when a driver or bicyclist strayed out of lane? Were they caused by inattentive merging? Or were collisions where a right-turning driver angled into an overtaking bicyclist possibly coded as sideswipes? Different scenarios call for different countermeasures.

In general, it is crucial to know more about the causes of at least the most serious collisions: not just "failure to yield," for example, but which party failed to yield and under what circumstances. Countermeasures might vary greatly accordingly.

51: "Suggestions to support more walking and biking included . . . separated bike lanes on higher speed higher volume roadways." Again, please avoid referring to separated bikeways as bike lanes. The cited statement might be taken only as what people are saying in meetings, not necessarily as a policy recommendation, but it is important to set appropriate expectations.

DIB 94 unaccountably neglects the importance of minimizing and regulating crossflows on separated bikeways. (The consultants might be able to shed some light on the reasons for this oversight.) DIB 89 (Class IV Bikeway Guidance), on the other hand, includes the following guidance, which applies to both major and minor intersections and driveways: "Intersection crossing points offer unique challenges to the design and operation of a separated bikeway. . . . [T]he usability and safety of the separated facility depends heavily on the manner in which intersections, driveways, and alleys, as well as pedestrian facilities, interact with and connect to the separated bikeway and bikeway network. The bikeway must provide adequate visibility at intersections, driveways, and alleys, to avoid right or left hook collisions in which vehicles turn in front of bicyclists traveling straight. As such, it is critical that careful thought and planning go into the design of all intersections, driveways, and alleys located along a

bikeway."

DIB 94 conflicts in the same way with long-standing and still valid guidance in Highway Design Manual Index 1003.1(8) about Class I bike paths adjacent to roadways: "Bike paths immediately adjacent to streets and highways are not recommended. While they can provide separation between vehicles and nonmotorized traffic, they typically introduce significant conflicts at intersections. . . . They are not a substitute for designing the road to meet bicyclist's mobility needs. . . . Factors such as urban density, the number of conflict points, the presence or absence of a sidewalk, speed and volume should be considered."

If they have significant crossflows at driveways and minor intersections, high-speed, high-volume roadways are therefore questionable candidates for Class IV (or Class I) bikeways. The rail side of Alma Street, Oregon Expressway (though it's a county road), and El Camino Real (though it's a state highway) along the Stanford and Palo Alto High School frontages are low-crossflow possibilities. Other locations should be viewed with caution.

Bike Palo Alto event. "The team received comments from about 40 participants who expressed concerns related to walking and biking safety, supported implementation of protected bike lanes." Again, this may only be reporting what people said. But both "protected" and "bike lanes" (in this context) are misleading terms and should be avoided, as noted before.

~ Alan Wachtel
Member, PABAC

From: [Transportation](#)
To: [Arce, Ozzy](#)
Cc: [Transportation](#)
Subject: FW: BPTP update - comments
Date: Monday, March 18, 2024 12:00:23 PM
Attachments: [memo on March 2024 BPTP update staff report.pdf](#)

Forwarding...

Andria Sumpter

Administrative Assistant, Office of Transportation

From: Art Liberman <bpawebman@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 18, 2024 11:44 AM
To: Transportation <Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: BPTP update - comments

You don't often get email from bpawebman@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Transportation staff:

Here are my comments on the presentation by the Kittelson & Associates consultant at the March 5th PABAC meeting & on the Transportation Staff Report: Update on the BPTP.

This document is also attached as PDF

Overall Comments:

1. The Staff Report should refer to the Scope of Work, adopted in 2022, with comments that point to the specific items in that report
2. All the Figures referenced in the Report should be labelled (Figure 1, Figure 2, etc.) WITH captions for each figure that identifies the information in the figure.
3. The Executive Summary should be updated based upon the comments on specific sections of the report.

Specific Comments:

1. Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (BLTS)
 - a. The text should state clearly how BLTS was determined in this report (by an algorithm and not by persons riding on the roadways). You should state the

limitations of using this algorithm and the issues associated with using an algorithm rather than actual personal evaluations to determine BLTS

a. why Foothill Expwy, with wide shoulders for bicycle lanes was considered the same level of BLTS as El Camino, which does not have shoulders nor bicycle lanes.

b. Why isn't Embarcadero Rd also a high level of BLTS, and University Ave?

c. Refer to the 2012 BPTP and determine changes to BLTS in Palo Alto.

b. The text should explain what is meant (for this report) by BLTS for cyclists and what the BPTP update intends to address to reduce the areas with high levels of BLTS.

c. Some streets in the Stanford Research Park are not included as having data in the 2nd map; this is a glaring omission.

d. The staff report has 3 maps (referred to as Attachment 4). The first map only labels Foothill Expwy and a section of Arastradero Rd near the Pearson Open Space, and this map is not useful. The second map has only a few points of information about Foothill Expwy, which do not justify it being identified as a roadway for cyclists having a high level of BLTS

e. Many cyclists ride to the Foothills Park- there is no information to guide cyclists about the roadways to this destination (this is first example where the maps in this report should require addition of areas outside of Palo Alto city limits and include bikeways in neighboring jurisdictions).

2. Major Barriers

a. The way that the figures address the issues with major barriers is FLAWED. The barrier information is NOT transmitted on the maps just by darkening the purple lines. You must find another way.

b. The text should highlight the Bike/Ped bridge over 101, which is the only major update since the 2012 BPTP.

c. The report should state the major cross barrier connections that were identified in the 2012 BPTP but were NOT done during the intervening 12 years.

d. How is the BPTP update going to interface with the Grade Separations?

i. Report should highlight the need for a bike/ped crossing(s) in south Palo Alto advance of major roadwork on Meadow and Charleston, causing disruptions to ways that school children East of Alma get to schools that are west of El Camino.

3. Collision History

- a. Report says a 'high-level' review was done of collision data: what does 'high-level' mean? This terminology requires an explanation
- b. The five-year collision data with a more detailed review you present for El Camino is not the same data as that presented by Caltrans. Is there a difference in data other than the difference in period covered?
 - i. You write that the most frequent accidents involving cyclists are broadside. This agrees with Caltrans statements, Caltrans said that about half of the accidents are caused by a cyclist crossing El Camino, as many students must do each day when they ride to school. Caltrans also said that about the other half of broadside accidents happen when a vehicle, not seeing a cyclist, turns right onto El Camino or turns right on leaving El Camino. Do you think that these would be reduced if Caltrans, who has jurisdiction of traffic lights on El Camino, would post NO RIGHT TURN ON RED at those intersections?
- c. Pedestrian injuries/accidents – Why have they decreased? Do these occur mostly at intersections? Have the number of pedestrian injury accidents been reduced by the advance timing of WALK light before drivers are given a GREEN light?
- d. A new state law was passed in 2023, often called 'Daylighting', that prohibits parking within 20' of marked and unmarked crosswalks. Citations will be given out in 2025. You should mention this new law. Do you have expectations that this will reduce the number of bicycle and/or pedestrian injury accidents?

4. Walking and Biking Activity

- a. **This section has a lot of problems.** The Replica website did not clarify how the data that the BPTP consultant presented at the PABAC meeting was acquired. There were many comments by PABAC members who pointed out the inaccuracies. Having some insight into what Replica did and clarifications of the data would be very helpful. And having reliable, accurate data is essential for the project. Having bad data may be worse than having no data.
- b. I looked at the website. It is full of jargon. It does not tell me what they did to obtain the data, which appears incomplete and inaccurate. Their data is very heavily weighted to Stanford. Page 7: "people age 18-34 made almost 45% of the total bike trips". "Highest number of bicyclists travel to or from Stanford University," "59 %of biking trips take place between 12 noon and 9 PM"
- c. It appears that the Replica data does not include the many school age kids, all who are under 18 years of age, who bike to school every day. I wonder if the Replica data includes the many workers who ride their bicycles to work at Stanford Research Park? The staff report did not show the large number of cyclists on the Bol Park Path, those who cross the Wilkie Bridge, and the even larger numbers who cross the San Francisquito Creek to/from Palo Alto Ave
- d. The Replica data seems radically wrong. It would be most embarrassing

for Transportation to present an update to the PTC with this data. It could permanently hobble the credibility of Kittelson & Associates, the BPTP consultant

5. Visioning Workshop

a. My 'breakout room' emphasized the need to show coordination between the Palo Alto bicycle routes and those of neighboring cities, in particular Mountain View Los Altos, Los Altos Hills, and Menlo Park. The maps in the report did not reflect this.

6. Draft Vision Statement

a. The draft vision statement is repetitive and unnecessarily wordy.

b. The Draft Vision statement does not say anything about E-bikes and the adoption of personal mobility devices

c. The first lines should state: "In Palo Alto, we envision a city where sustainable transportation thrives, supporting a network of low stress routes where an increasing number of people of all ages will choose to bicycle and walk, and be able to do so safely."

d. The sentence: "We invest more in walking and biking infrastructure, ensuring equity and accessibility for all." is unclear and is grammatically defective.

e. The inclusion of Safe System of approach seems just tossed in: "Embracing the Safe System Approach," If you are serious about embracing the Safe System Approach, then you should describe what it is^[1] and what it means for the BPTP and say that the BPTP is going to reflect it.

7. Draft Objectives

a. Missing – one objective should be to "Increase the Number of Cyclists:

b. One of the Draft Objectives is "*Integrated and Collaborative*: Collaborating with neighboring cities to create a seamless and integrated regional network of pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. There is NO draft map of this, nor anything in this report that says how this is going to be done.

c. A section of the report is devoted to describing the 'barriers' for cyclists, but there is no objective of addressing and reducing some of these barriers.

8. Draft Performance Measures-

a. This is very important but the way this page is formatted, and all squeezed onto one page, they are difficult to read

b. Drop the Leading Indicator and Lagging Indicator wording

c. I do not understand what is written under 'potential measures-modified for 2024' It seems like these are just placeholders. A meeting is mentioned -a multi-day meeting April 16-18; who will be there?

d. If you are serious, then make the performance measures as clear and as specific as the performance measures in the 2012 BPTP.

Art Liberman, PABAC Member

[\[1\]](#) "The Safe System Approach involves making a commitment to zero traffic deaths. This requires addressing all aspects of safety with layers of protection for road users.

The Safe System approach requires a supporting safety culture that places safety first and foremost in road system investment decisions.

Palo Alto Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan

Performance Measure Reference Table
2/15/2024

The tables below sort the 2012 Plan objectives and Bike Friendly Community criteria to corresponding 2024 Vision Workshop themes, where available.

Reduce GHG			
2024 Vision Workshop Themes	2012 Plan Objectives	Bike Friendly Communities Criteria	Potential Measure(s) - Modified for 2024
N/A	Convert discretionary vehicle trips into walking and bicycling trips in order to reduce City transportation-related greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions 15% by 2020.	N/A	Consider relying on the Palo Alto Sustainability and Climate Action Plan (S/CAP) to address GHG emissions GHG reduction is a lagging measure and an outcome of mode change which is contingent on availability of AAA cycling and walking infrastructure

Comments from Eric Nordman

Do we have a good measure of transportation GHG emissions. How frequent is it assessed?

Expand Walk/Bike Network			
2024 Vision Workshop Themes	2012 Plan Objectives	Bike Friendly Communities Criteria	Potential Measure(s) - Modified for 2024
Connected and Accessible: Featuring a convenient and interconnected network of sidewalks, bike lanes, and trails that provide efficient travel options and easy access to transit.	Develop a core network of shared paths, bikeways, and traffic-calmed streets that connects business and residential districts, schools, parks, and open spaces to promote healthy, active living.	High Speed Roads with Bike Facilities	Leading Indicator: Projects with Complete Street checklists completed and approved for AAA routes Direct Lagging Indicator: Percentage of households that live within 1000ft of completed and connected all ages and abilities (AAA) cycling infrastructure (bikeways, trails)
		Total Bicycle Network Mileage to Total Road Network Mileage	Leading Indicator: Miles of bicycle boulevards, enhanced bikeways, and trails developed Direct Lagging Indicator: Numbers of pedestrians and bicyclists on key facilities, as determined by counts.
		Bicycle Ridership Rate	Leading Indicator: Amount of grants provided to local residents and community groups to hold "open streets" events Lagging indicator: Number of annual street closure events Leading Indicator: Share of transportation budget spent on walking and biking Direct Lagging Indicator: Construction of new Across Barrier Connections within or near employment centers. Lagging Indicator: Census commute mode share, school commute mode share, TMP reports
	Double the rate of bicycling for both local and total work commutes by 2020 (to 15% and 5%, respectively).		

Don't count sharrows.

Number of pedestrians and bicyclists on key facilities is a critical metric. Do we have a good way to get this? Counter recommendation.

Open street events is not a good indicator for Palo Alto

Amount of active transportation grants also important. Census commute mode and school modes are important and available.

Safe and Complete Streets			
2024 Vision Workshop Themes	2012 Plan Objectives	Bike Friendly Communities Criteria	Potential Measure(s) - Modified for 2024
Safe and Inclusive: Prioritizing safety for all road users and ensuring equitable access to pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure across the community.	Plan, construct, and maintain "Complete Streets" that are safe and accessible to all modes and people of all ages and abilities.	Crashes per 10k bicycle commuters	Leading Indicator: Annual installation of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant curb ramps and accessible pedestrian signals
		Fatalities per 10k bicycle commuters	Leading Indicator: Percentage complete of pedestrian and bicycle collisions with KSIs improved or studied. Lagging Indicator: Annual pedestrian and bicycle collisions (either as 10k commuters or pr 100,000 residents)
			Leading Indicator: Number of street tree installations along key walking and cycling routes Lagging Indicator: Canopy coverage of key walking and cycling routes
Comfortable and Enjoyable: Enhancing the comfort and enjoyment of walking and cycling through amenities such as shade, greenery, and well-designed streetscapes.			

Better to specify percentage of compliant ramps and signals.

Fatalities is a small number. Instead combine Fatalities and severe or moderate injury

Not sure canopy or number of trees is most important. Unabstracted paths and stress are important but I'm not sure of metrics.

Planning & Policy			
2024 Vision Workshop Themes	2012 Plan Objectives	Bike Friendly Communities Criteria	Potential Measure(s) - Modified for 2024
Integrated and Collaborative: Collaborating with neighboring cities to create a seamless and integrated regional network of pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure.	Promote efficient, sustainable, and creative use of limited public resources through integrated design and planning.	Bike Plan is Current and is Being Implemented	Leading Indicator: Share of transportation budget spent on walking and biking
		Bike Program Staff to Population	Leading Indicator: Projects completed involving multiple agency or departmental funding sponsors
		Share of Transportation Budget Spent on Bicycling	Lagging Indicator: Change or introduction of bicycle-friendly laws and ordinances
		Bicycle-Friendly Laws & Ordinances	Leading Indicator: Number of connections to cycling infrastructure built by neighbouring municipalities

Probably relevant and relatively easy to measure.

Reword to number of connections built to cycling or walking infrastructure of neighboring municipalities.

Education & Encouragement			
2024 Vision Workshop Themes	2012 Plan Objectives	Bike Friendly Communities Criteria	Potential Measure(s) - Modified for 2024
Community-Driven: Fostering community engagement and participation in promoting active transportation, supported by education, programming, and infrastructure investments.	N/A	Bicycle Education in Schools	Leading Indicator: Number of walking and biking promotion events run per year at schools Leading Indicator: Number of schools with complete Safe Routes to School rolled out Lagging Indicator: school commute mode share
		Bike Month and Bike to Work	Leading Indicator: Amount of grants provided to local residents and community groups to hold "open streets" events Lagging indicator: Number of annual street closure events

Not all events are biking promotion. Bike rodeos should be counted.

School commute mode share is best measure.

Open street events is not a good indicator for Palo Alto

Community, Equity & Advocacy			
2024 Vision Workshop Themes	2012 Plan Objectives	Bike Friendly Communities Criteria	Potential Measure(s) - Modified for 2024
N/A	N/A	Presence of Active Bicycle Advocacy Group	Leading Indicator: Presence of Active Bicycle Advocacy Group
		Active Bicycle Advisory Comm	Leading Indicator: Presence of Active Bicycle Advisory Committee

From: [Transportation](#)
To: [Arce, Ozzy](#)
Cc: [Star-Lack, Sylvia](#); [Transportation](#)
Subject: FW: BPTP update
Date: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 1:27:06 PM

Forwarding along.

Andria Sumpter

Administrative Assistant, Office of Transportation

-----Original Message-----

From: Ken Joye <kmjoye@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 12:58 PM
To: Transportation <Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: BPTP update

[You don't often get email from kmjoye@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

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

How can the BPTP generalize safety requirements? How can the process to generalize from the high injury network be transparent to residents?

When assessing an incident such as a traffic fatality such as that which occurred at the intersection of Embarcadero Rd & Newall Rd on 19 February 2024, how can the circumstances there guide to to make safety changes at other locations in the community?

Can we say that all roadways which have direct access to/from Highway 101 or I-280 should be treated in a similar manner? Should SR-82 be treated in a similar manner?

Can we describe such roadways as “barriers” in a different sense than we normally use that term? How does a pedestrian or cyclist move across such roadways? How can their risks be mitigated?

thank you for focusing on the transparency issue raised above, Ken Joye PABAC member Ventura neighborhood resident

From: [Transportation](#)
To: [Arce, Ozzy](#)
Cc: [Transportation](#)
Subject: FW: BPTP update
Date: Thursday, March 7, 2024 4:56:03 PM

Forwarding...

Andria Sumpter

Administrative Assistant, Office of Transportation

From: Ken Joye <kmjoye@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2024 1:55 PM
To: Transportation <Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: BPTP update

You don't often get email from kmjoye@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

At the March PABAC meeting, the consultant briefly discussed the Biking Activity and Walking Activity maps generated via Replica tools.

On the replicahq.com website is this statement:

After each individual simulation is run, the modeled outputs are compared to aggregate control group data (i.e., observed counts, or “ground truth”) for quality and reporting purposes. This calibration process involves solving a set of large-scale optimization problems with an objective function defined as “fit to observed ground truth.” We strike a careful balance to ensure that the calibration algorithms do not overfit the modeled outputs to the calibration data, as both outliers and a certain level of noise are often present in every dataset. To complete this iterative calibration process, Replica always holds out some of its own ground truth data from the initial mobility simulation. Replica can also incorporate additional ground truth provided by its customers for additional quality enhancement. As noted earlier, when a completed model is published, customers also have access to an associated quality report.

Did we receive an associated quality report for the Biking Activity and Walking Activity maps? Are those available for review by PABAC? Did we offer “additional ground truth” to Replica as input to the model calibration?

Transparency into the methodology will help us produce a better Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan update.

Ken Joye
Ventura neighborhood

On Mar 6, 2024, at 1:40 PM, Ken Joye wrote:

I subsequently found this

document: <https://documentation.replicahq.com/docs/seasonal-mobility-model-methodology-summary-places>

On the left hand of that page is a list of Methodology links [...]

This became of interest because the consultant working on the Palo Alto Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan update said that Replica data was used to generate Biking Activity and Walking Activity maps. There was a *lot* of discussion about what those maps look like versus our real world understanding of where people go in Palo Alto.

On Wed, Mar 6, 2024 at 12:34 PM Ken Joye wrote:

This morning, I came upon a document written by Replica, in response to a U.S. DOT request for information: https://downloads.regulations.gov/DOT-OST-2021-0056-0223/attachment_1.pdf

I am trying to understand how Replica derives the data which it makes available to agencies

From: [Transportation](#)
To: [Arce, Ozzy](#)
Cc: [Transportation](#)
Subject: FW: BPTP update
Date: Friday, March 8, 2024 2:35:19 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)

I just found the email below in my junk folder, not sure if I already forwarded or not!

Andria Sumpter

Administrative Assistant, Office of Transportation

From: Ken Joye <kmjoye@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2024 12:17 PM
To: Transportation <Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: BPTP update

You don't often get email from kmjoye@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

On Feb 27, 2024, at 10:29 PM, 'Arce, Ozzy' via PABAC <pabacpaloalto@googlegroups.com> wrote:

We will be hosting the in-person [March PABAC meeting](#) in the Matadero Room at the [Mitchell Park Community Center](#), as scheduled on Tuesday, March 5, 2024 at 6:15pm. You can access the March meeting [agenda packet \[LINK\]](#) or from the City [PABAC webpage](#).

Among the materials for the March 2024 PABAC meeting are a set of maps/graphics prepared for the BPTP update. Also, there is a copy of the (draft) PTC staff report.

In reviewing those prior to the meeting, a number of questions came to mind:

PABAC slide deck =====

page 23-of-130:

The color coding of LTS2 and LTS3 is too similar for “reading comprehension”—please consider a more marked difference

How is level of stress (LTS) determined? The **methodology** used by the consultant team and city staff should be **transparent** to members of the public and PABAC.

NOTE: some of my questions may be addressed on page 45-of-130...

Why are only “roadway segments” depicted (colored line segments) and not “intersections” (e.g., colored dots or circles)?

Why is Oregon Expwy between St Francis and El Camino depicted LTS4 uniformly? I contend that the

segment below the rail tracks is clearly LTS4 (if not LTS5) but between Middlefield & Ross it could be considered LTS2 or LTS3 (wide bike lane, no driveways)

A bicyclist (or pedestrian) attempting to cross Charleston Rd on Park Blvd would consider that intersection to be LTS4 (e.g., making a left turn onto Charleston in order to cross the rail tracks toward Alma St)—no crosswalk, no HAWK beacon, intense traffic coming from Alma St

Why is Middlefield between Moreno and Wellsbury or between Keats and San Antonio not considered LTS4?

Why is Alma St considered LTS3 between Embarcadero and Palo Alto Ave? (particularly heading toward Mountain View...)—if Charleston between Carlson and Nelson can have two different LTS values (split designation), then Alma should as well

Why is Churchill between Castilleja & Alma “northbound” (toward Alma) not considered LTS4? I contend that the number of automobiles poised to turn right onto Alma illegally occupying the bike lane between Castilleja and Mariposa during the evening commute hours warrant that designation. Does the split designation on N. California between Bryant and Middlefield suggest an approach which can be applied elsewhere in the community? Presumably, LTS2 in the “northbound” direction is due to parking restrictions on that side of the street...

Why is Middlefield between Hawthorne and San Francisquito creek not LTS4?

Is there a pedestrian LTS map? If not, why not?

page 24-of-130:

Why are barriers only shown within the city limits? Certainly San Francisquito creek limits the permeability of our network.

Would the presence of a dedicated left-turn lane resulting in the removal of a bike lane automatically indicate that a roadway barrier exists? Yes, one can cross San Antonio on Middlefield, but San Antonio is a barrier to an Interested But Concerned cyclist ([Geller scale](#)). Which maps show the intersections where a bike lane disappears and a dedicated left-turn lane appears in its place? This indicates legacy LOS road planning...

Is it possible to weight the locations of collisions to show rate per “trips”? That is, downtown near University Ave there is a concentration of pedestrians, so the number of collisions might be high but the rate low (not asserting that is the case, only that it is possible).

Is it possible to have a map showing bicycle collisions where the cyclist was traveling along the roadway vs crossing the roadway? That is, are the collisions shown on Charleston of a different nature than those shown along Embarcadero?

Can this sort of map be dynamic, so that layers can be turned on/off to show fatalities vs severe injuries, to show travel along vs across a roadway or to show collisions involving persons according to their ages? A dynamic map could also be updated over time to show data since the BPTP update is completed...

page 30-of-130:

Does the “internal”/“external” labeling have to do with trip within or across a census tract boundary? (implied, not explicit)

Why is there no data for some census tracts? How was this data collected? How can we extrapolate?

For example, I regularly see people carrying grocery bags from the Grocery Outlet (5108.03) to the Ventura neighborhood (5107)

page 37-of-130:

The phrase “invest more” is a relative statement—invest “more” in what exactly?

If we embrace the Safe System Approach, how will we tangibly change our infrastructure? That statement should not be limited to convenience, sustainability or consecutiveness... What will be done to lower motor vehicle speeds, for example?

page 39-of-130:

This page contains text which I attempted to copy/paste into my email message here, but found that text was not accessible to me; in future versions of BPTP Update materials, **please make all text accessible**

“Reduce GHG” box has a typo, run spell-check?

Can the speakers be sure to describe what is meant by “lagging measure” and “leading indicator”?

How can we go beyond counting numbers of users on “key facilities” and determine where such facilities should be implemented based upon un-met demand? Don’t count simply where people currently go, determine where they would like to go if infrastructure were in place...

How is bicycle ridership rate affected by (modern) bicycle parking? Beyond employment centers, how can bicycle parking with two-point racks allowing secure locks affect number of bicycle trips to/from other destinations?

Are ADA ramps and signals supposed to be related to rate of collisions? Please explain...

How else can comfort and enjoyment be measured? Noise? Fumes? Bollards? Separated facilities?

In the Planning and Policy box, can the order of the Potential Measures be changed to first address the Vision Workshop Themes and subsequently the Bike Friendly Communities Criteria?

(draft) Staff Report #: 2402-2620 =====

page 44-of-130:

As noted above, a dynamic collision map with layers would permit more straightforward data analysis; the draft staff report mentions the incidence of nighttime pedestrian collisions but that is not evident on the map depicted on page 24-of-130.

Are broad-side bicycle collisions primarily found when a bicyclist is crossing a roadway as opposed to traveling along it? Is that a factor both on Embarcadero and Charleston (see above)?

page 49-of-130:

The Replica telemetrics methodology is described here but does not appear to suggest why is there no data for some census tracts. Is there an explanation? Or, does the methodology on this page not relate to what is depicted on page 30-of-130?

page 54-of-130:

Why does this map look so different than that on page 23-of-130 (or for that matter, from the oval

inset on this page?)?

Why does Geng Rd have an LTS2 rating? That short stretch which connects to the Bay Trail should be subject to very little traffic... (The LTS rankings may be fully automated, please confirm)

Why does the oval inset say "La Honda" just east of Portola Valley? Should that be Los Altos Hills instead?

What is the difference between this page and page 56-of-130?

page 55-of-130:

If the LTS rankings for intersections are fully automated, how is it that the selected ones were scored and others were not? What is the methodology to assign rankings?

Why would Oregon Expwy and Ash have a ranking on this page?

Why would Wilkie & W. Meadow have a LTS3 ranking (it is a 4-way stop, presumably that is low stress...)?

What is the ranking for El Camino Real and Park Blvd, a primary entrance to the Stanford campus for many commuters? Can the SR-82 logo be covering something, can it be removed?

Does this page attempt to show the existing, designated bicycle network in contrast to all city streets (on page 23-of-130)? If that is the case, is Castilleja/Park/Wilkie not a designated bicycle boulevard?

The BPTP2012 is ambiguous on page 3-19... Staff Report #5285 (11/12/2014) appears to list Park as an existing bicycle boulevard (https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/files/assets/public/v/1/agendas-minutes-reports/agendas-minutes/planning-and-transportation-commission/00-archived-agendas-minutes-and-reports/2014-agendas-minutes-reports/id5285_bikeblvd.pdf)

page 59-of-130:

Does this map purport to show detour burden of Adobe Creek without depicting the Wilkie bike bridge? This is confusing...

page 61-of-130:

Does this map purport to show detour burden of Matadero Creek without depicting the Bryant bike bridge? This is confusing...

page 62-of-130:

Does the heavier dashed line attempt to show the gap between California and Meadow? The legend lists "Churchill", perhaps that is a cut/paste error

page 63-of-130:

If the Homer tunnel were depicted here, that might add value to this map. I appreciate that it does mark areas which lack sidewalks (accessing the Homer tunnel from the northbound Caltrain parking lot is a bit of a challenge)

page 67-of-130:

Is it the case that this Origin/Destination map includes census tract 5117.03 (marked by a dot in the vicinity of the Dish)? This map is not labeled, what does it depict in contrast to that on page 68-of-130? If one is walking trips and the other is cycling trips, that could be made more clear with labels....

See, for example, the label “Pedestrian Collisions By Severity 2018-2022” at the bottom of page 66-of-130. Note: page 30-of-130 is labeled “**Walking** Activity” and 31-of-130 is labeled “**Biking** Activity”, perhaps this is what is needed here?

page 72-of-130:

As on page 55-of-130, should Castilleja/Park/Wilkie be depicted as an existing Class IIIb Bike Boulevard or not?

page 85-of-130:

Does this map differ in any way from that shown on page 27-of-130? If not, why two different maps? If so, how can the difference be succinctly explained?

Why is this map missing a red dot denoting a fatal accident at El Camino Real and California (2020)?

page 105-of-130:

If this map is showing the SRTS routes, then rather than depicting “education land use”, show PAUSD school sites only (as the SRTS program is a city/district program).

It is not clear whether KSI locations are depicted by a collision dot surrounded by a circular red border or whether non-KSI collisions and KSI collisions occurred at the same location.

From: [Transportation](#)
To: [Arce, Ozzy](#)
Cc: [Transportation](#)
Subject: FW: PABAC Meeting Mar 5 - Item 6
Date: Wednesday, March 6, 2024 8:04:35 AM

Hi Ozzy,

Sorry, the email below came in late Monday and I was out yesterday.

Andria Sumpter

Administrative Assistant, Office of Transportation

From: Natalie Geise <natalie.geise@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2024 6:45 PM
To: Transportation <Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: PABAC Meeting Mar 5 - Item 6

You don't often get email from natalie.geise@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Hello Palo Alto Bike Advisory Committee,

We are reaching out as employees of SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory* in relation to your Bike and Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update. Many of the undersigned bike to work and bike from or through Palo Alto to get there.

We are encouraged by and supportive of Palo Alto's goal of being a pedestrian and bike friendly community. We encourage you to adopt the specific goal of reducing traffic fatalities and critical injuries. Many of us are familiar with the challenges of biking along roads with faster-moving traffic as both entrances to SLAC are along such ones (Alpine Road and Sand Hill Road).

We advocate for safer infrastructure to protect pedestrians and bikers along roads like those in Palo Alto, such as Sand Hill, Foothill Expressway, Embarcadero Road, Page Mill, and El Camino. Those roads in some cases serve as the most direct ways to get across Palo Alto and we note that many other large employers like SLAC are along those roads, leaving workers who bike to those employers little/no choice but to bike along those roads.

Particularly along roads like this, we have noticed:

-
-
- Difficulty with left turns where

- bikes must cross two lanes of traffic.
- -
 -
 - Advocate for bike boxes at intersections
 -
-
-
- Cars, trucks, debris, buses stopping
- or parking in bike lanes, forcing bikes into the main lanes
- -
 -
 - Advocate for protected bike lanes
 -

With the Plan Update, we **broadly encourage the City to prioritize the safety of those using the public roads and infrastructure** (whether walking, biking/scootering, using public transportation or driving) over allowing cars to move more quickly to their destinations.

Sincerely,
21 SLAC* Employees

*Our views represent that of the undersigned, not of our employer.

Natalie Geise: Palo Alto resident and student/employee at SLAC for 5+ years
"I bike to work from Palo Alto almost everyday. I drafted a similar letter to Menlo Park and San Mateo County (given where SLAC's entrances are) in the late fall, making the same two specific points above. I am devastated to see those same points as possible contributors to the recent cyclist fatalities."

Meriam Berboucha, SLAC employee for 5+ years
*"I was **hit by a car** in the area. It was a **hit-and-run** and I'm still paying for my medical bills now which I cannot afford because I'm a student. Since then I've had debt collectors phone me and I still have many scars from the accident. It's also led me to be very scared to take my bike or electric scooter to work and now I don't do it anymore."*

Paul Jones, SLAC employee and Palo Alto resident
"I have stopped cycling to work due to road safety concerns, specifically the lack of protection for cyclists crossing Sand Hill Road and Alpine Road. I have also witnessed several near-misses in the area around the SLAC Alpine Gate, as pedestrians and cyclists attempt to cross to/from the Stanford Dish area."

Ryan McClanahan, employee at SLAC (2.5 years)

"I routinely bike to work from Palo Alto to SLAC. I use Sandhill because there are wide designated bike lanes. However, I see daily mis-use of the bike lanes by motorists, from pulling into the lane too early for a right turn, to parking in the bike lane and forcing me and other cyclists into the street or sidewalk. Protecting the bike lanes with concrete bollards, or a full curb, would be a huge boon to bicycle commuters on Sandhill, and would assist with car traffic as more people would commute by bicycle because they feel safe doing so. The break away flex posts are not enough, because drivers can still drive through these and hit a cyclist"

Brendan O'Shea:

I bike to and from work along Foothill Expressway and enter and exit SLAC through the Alpine Road gate. I've been a SLAC employee for 9+ years and a biker for the last two. Bike infrastructure is key to meeting the world's carbon emission goals. One reason people do not bike is they do not feel safe. Prioritizing biker safety is an admirable goal in and of itself, but the effects of robust and safe bike infrastructure help everyone, not just the people riding bikes.

Stefan Moeller, SLAC employee

"I used to bike from Palo Alto Caltrain station to SLAC for many years and have had several close calls with cars. I eventually stopped riding my bike to work mainly due to safety concerns."

Sarah Gaiser, student at SLAC

"I bike to SLAC multiple times per week, usually along Sand Hill Road. Recently, the bike lane has been blocked by debris or cars which left me feeling vulnerable having to bike in the car lanes."

Philip Mansfield, employee at SLAC for four years

"I periodically will try to bike to work along Sand Hill Road as my main form of commuting. I usually manage for a few months before having a frightening encounter with a car and swearing off it for half a year."

David Agyeman-Budu, employee at SLAC (4.5 years)

"I bike to SLAC using Sand Hill Road for most of my commute and the state of the bike lanes has steadily not been as safe as it has been before. There is vegetation that is on the path which is not routinely cleaned. Parts of the path have ongoing construction work, which is a nuisance especially at nighttime."

Christina Eshelman, employee at SLAC for 5+ years

Anthony Fong: SLAC employee for 5+ years

Eric Konzelmann, SLAC employee for 3 years

Shamin Chowdhury, SLAC employee

Sathya Chitturi, student at SLAC (5 years)

Sydney Erickson, student at SLAC (3 years)

Diling Zhu, employee at SLAC (15+ years)

Rhoda Kentin, employee at SLAC (2 years)

Xiao Cui, student at SLAC (4 years)

Vivek Lam, student at SLAC (4 years)

Diego Rivera, student at SLAC (2 years)

Eddie Barks, student at SLAC (6 years)

From: [EDUCATION](#)
To: [Arce, Ozzy](#)
Cc: [Transportation](#)
Subject: BPTP Update comments
Date: Friday, March 22, 2024 1:02:54 PM
Attachments: [BPTP Update Performance Measures Draft.xlsx](#)
[Replica-Overview \(1\).pdf](#)
[image001.jpg](#)

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

Hi Ozzy,

Amidst other projects, I reviewed the BPTP attachments you sent us, and overall feel there is good progress being made in many areas. Time permitting, I'll try later to review more closely the various maps you shared with high and low stress areas for bicyclists and pedestrians. But recalling today is your deadline for submitting comments, I wanted to share a few items I feel are important to comment on in this email to meet your deadline.

Having provided education and active transportation behavioral counseling for years at Stanford, I encourage:

1. **Education:** I was glad to see it listed in the Draft Objectives and various other parts of the plan. I see education listed for schools, including SRTS programs, which are very important. I think there also needs to be education for adults, which could be implemented at Palo Alto Adult School, e.g., and other community-based educational venues. Silicon Valley Bike Coalition provides good online and some in-person education already, often near San Jose, but I think more support for in-person, classroom and on-bike education in areas closer to Palo Alto would be helpful. Basic riding skills, and then more advanced skills such as riding when it's dark, cold, or rainy, are ways to divide the levels.
2. **Coaching 1-on-1** for any who would like individual attention in identifying and overcoming barriers to their biking and walking goals can be supportive and effective in increasing active transportation.
3. For the greenhouse gas reduction goals, via SCAP or other method, I think incorporating education on e-bikes, and electric cars is also important, for those who for whatever reason still need to drive or use a power-assisted bike. Biking, walking, and transit are best, but many folks still want to drive, and they may as well stop burning fossil fuels in the meantime. They can still be encouraged to include active transportation, but cutting their car ghg asap matters.

I hope this is helpful, and appreciate all the work put into it already by you, Ozzy, and others.

Many thanks,

Jane Rosten, MSW, LCSW
PABAC member for many years

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: 'Arce, Ozzy' via PABAC <pabacpaloalto@googlegroups.com>
To: Arce, Ozzy <Ozzy.Arce@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Sent: Wednesday, March 13, 2024 at 04:06:30 PM PDT
Subject: [PABAC] BPTP Update: Follow-up to PABAC's March 5, 2024 Meeting

Hi PABAC-

I'm following up on last week's (March 5, 2024) PABAC meeting with two **BPTP Update**-related items:

1. **Replica data:** We are working with the project consultant and Replica to provide you with more information into their methodology. Stay tuned for more on this. For now, from Replica: "*Part three of the [travel activity section of our extended methodology](#) goes into more detail about [Replica's] mode choice model, which determines the mode assign[ed] to each trip. In short, the proximity of origin to destination, the availability of roadways where bicycles are allowed, and household/commute characteristics determine the likelihood of a trip's assignment to a biking mode.*" Also see the slide deck overview.
2. **Performance Measures.** Please see the attached excel spreadsheet of the draft Performance Measures, per your request.

Also, friendly reminder to send comments and feedback on BPTP Update items by Friday, March 22, 2024 to transportation@cityofpaloalto.org.

Thank you.



Ozzy Arce (he/él) | Senior Transportation Planner

Office of Transportation | City of Palo Alto
250 Hamilton Avenue | Palo Alto, CA 94301

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "PABAC" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to pabacpaloalto+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit

<https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/pabacpaloalto/BY5PR09MB5985715625CF3D40C6C5E342892A2%40BY5PR09MB5985.namprd09.prod.outlook.com>.

From: [Nicole Rodia](#)
To: [Transportation](#)
Cc: [Arce, Ozzy](#)
Subject: BPTP: Feedback on BPTP Update from March 5 PABAC Meeting
Date: Saturday, March 23, 2024 12:22:48 AM

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

Hello,

Below is my feedback on the BPTP Update from the March 5 PABAC meeting.

Thanks,
Nicole

Feedback on Attachment 3: Draft PTC Staff Report for PABAC

1. I appreciate the overall thorough and data-driven approach to the analysis.
2. It is confusing to lump together barriers and locations analyzed for barriers into the section marked "Major Barriers". This makes it seem like Palo Alto Station, California Ave Station, and San Antonio Station are themselves barriers.
3. On page 4, Barron Creek: "While some paths across Barron Creek are longer than the straight long crossing distance" --> what does the "straight long crossing distance" mean? Is this a typo? This phrase is not intuitive to me.
4. It might be more clear to refer to the "rail" barrier specifically as "Caltrain Rail" to make it more clear that this refers to a single rail corridor. Also, other barriers are referred to by their proper names.
5. On page 4, Rail: It is a little misleading to say that rail is the only barrier, as Alma Street and the railway together form the barrier. Even if a crossing of the railway were added, it would also need to cross Alma Street. It should probably be named "Caltrain Rail / Alma St" or similar.
6. Palo Alto Station Barrier Analysis -- barriers not included in the report: no direct bike route to reach PA station from Stanford (Palm Drive) without walking bike or riding on sidewalk. There is no bike lane on University Ave between ECR and PA station.
7. Palo Alto Station Barrier Analysis -- barriers not included in the report: no direct bike route to reach PA station from downtown PA between Lytton and Homer without walking the bike or riding on the sidewalk.
8. California Ave Station Barrier Analysis -- barriers not included in the report: dangerous, steep, narrow tunnel required to reach Cal Ave from NE side of Alma St. Tunnel could have a better connection to N California Ave when transitioning between the street and the sidewalk/tunnel.
9. California Ave Station Barrier Analysis -- barriers not included in the report: when accessing the station from the southeast (from Park Blvd), it is shorter to take Page Mill Rd or Sheridan road to the station and most people go this way rather than going to California Ave and then coming back southwest to the train platform. The route coming from the southwest requires using the Page Mill Rd bridge over Oregon Exwy, which has no street lighting or bicycle facilities or sidewalks. There are also no pedestrian facilities from the Caltrain platform through the parking lot on the east end of the platform (pedestrians must walk through the parking lot).
10. San Antonio Station Barrier Analysis -- barriers not included in the report: to access San

Antonio Station from south Palo Alto southeast of Alma/Caltrain, there is no good, low-stress bike route that does not cross through private property (example: reaching SA station from Wilkie Bridge). Public bike routes require crossing San Antonio Rd via California St (long light cycle time, high stress turn lane and driveway areas) or riding on San Antonio Rd (no bike lanes).

11. San Antonio Station Barrier Analysis -- barriers not included in the report: no sidewalk on San Antonio Cir westbound side between SA station platform and Bruce Bower Lumber
12. San Antonio Station Barrier Analysis -- barriers not included in the report: PA station undercrossing tunnel for access from northwest side of Caltrain tracks has extremely narrow ramps and blind corners entering the tunnel.
13. On page 10, committee and working group meetings: typo "at during"

Feedback on Attachment 4: Bicycle level of traffic stress map

1. It would be helpful to include definitions and characteristics of the bicycle LTS accompanying the maps. I had to guess on how to categorize based on reading a few things online and comparing different street types on the city.
2. Park Blvd should be mostly LTS 2 (yellow) due to low traffic volumes and dedicated bicycle facilities. NW of Cal Ave should be LTS 2. From Cal Ave to Lambert Ave could be LTS 2 or LTS 3 due to bike lane being in door zone and many large RVs parked on the street pushing bikes into the traffic lane. If any part is LTS 3, it would be the section at the Page Mill Rd/Oregon Expwy interchange which is marked LTS 2. This is high stress due to many cars crossing the bicycle lane in multiple places in this section.
3. E Meadow should be LTS 2 (yellow) due to dedicated, wide bicycle lane and low traffic speeds, not LTS 3 (orange). The most stressful section is the approach and crossing of rail tracks / Alma St due to increased number of vehicle lanes, narrower bicycle lanes, right turning vehicles at Alma St, and missing bicycle lane section, which could be LTS 3 (it is currently marked LTS 2, lower than the rest of the street, which doesn't make sense).
4. Arastradero west of Page Mill should be LTS4 due to no bicycle lane or turnouts, high vehicle speeds, blind corners.
5. Page Mill Rd should probably be LTS 4 south of Junipero Serra due to very high vehicle speeds. Page Mill Rd / I-280 intersection should be LTS4 -- this is very dicey with vehicles crossing the bike lane going to/from I-280.
6. Charleston Rd should not be LTS1 due to high traffic volumes and lack of protected bicycle facilities. It should be LTS2 or LTS3.
7. Loma Verde should be LTS 1 or LTS 2, it is not comparable to Page Mill Rd which is LTS3.
8. Stanford Ave from Junipero Serra to ECR should be LTS 1 or 2 due to dedicated bicycle facility along most of length, low traffic speeds, and medium traffic volumes. The section from Hanover to Escondido does not have a bike lane, so could be LTS 2 or 3 in this section.
9. Several sections of California Ave are marked LTS 3. All sections of Cal Ave should be LTS 1 or 2 due to low vehicle speeds, only 1 traffic lanes each direction, and dedicated bicycle lanes on most sections.
10. S California Ave SW of ECR should be LTS 1 or 2 (not LTS 3) because it has bicycle lanes and is a low speed neighborhood street with low-medium traffic volumes.
11. N California Ave NE of Alma St between Alma St and Middlefield should be LTS 1 or

- 2 in both directions. Dedicated bike lanes, single vehicle lane, low traffic volume, low vehicle speeds.
12. N California Ave between Green Middle School and Embarcadero should be LTS 2 due to low traffic volume, low vehicle speeds, residential neighborhood.
 13. All sections of El Camino Way should be LTS 3. The section going from Los Robles/ECR to Meadow should be LTS 3 (not LTS 2) because the bike lane is only part time (7a-7p) and is frequently obstructed by parked cars, even during times when parking is disallowed. This is the only place in Palo Alto that I call PA Police to report cars parked in the bike lane because it happens so often.
 14. Matadero Ave between Park Blvd and ECR should be LTS 2 (not LTS 1). It is very narrow (<2 cars width when parked cars on both sides), no bicycle facilities, heavily populated with parked cars.
 15. No streets in Barron Park should be higher than LTS 2 because it is a residential neighborhood with low vehicle speeds and traffic volumes. Particularly, Laguna Ave and Amaranta Ave should probably be LTS 1, not LTS 3. They are wide and low traffic volume, lots of peds and bikes. Matadero Ave should be LTS 2 because no bike facilities and more traffic.
 16. Alma St between Palo Alto Caltrain and Palo Alto Ave should be LTS 2 (not LTS 3) because bike lane, single car lane, low traffic speed.
 17. Not sure why Coleridge Ave between Bryant and Middlefield is marked LTS 3. I haven't biked on it, but I suspect it should only be LTS 2.
 18. Lytton Ave between Bryant St and Tasso St has bike lane, low traffic speed, single vehicle lane. I think this should be LTS 2.
 19. Deer Creek Rd should be LTS 3 (not LTS 4) because it has wide bicycle lanes, 1 vehicle lane in each direction + center turn lane, and low-medium traffic volumes. Maybe it is marked as LTS 4 because of 40 mph speed limit? If Deer Creek Rd is LTS 4, it feels like there is no differentiation between Deer Creek and ECR in terms of LTS score, when they are very different experiences for cyclists.
 20. Coyote Hill Rd should be LTS 4 (not LTS 3) because 2 vehicle lanes in each direction, no bicycle facilities or shoulder at all, and 35 mph speed limit.
 21. Stanford Campus: Campus Dr should be LTS 2 (not LTS 3) due to wide dedicated bicycle lane, low vehicle speeds (25 mph), 2 vehicle lanes with directions separated by median.
 22. Sand Hill Rd between ECR and Arboretum should be LTS 2 or 3 (not LTS 1) because high traffic volumes, speed limit 30 mph and higher prevailing speed, medium width unprotected bike lane, and section with many vehicle lanes on ECR intersection approach (approx. 250 foot long pocket lane between straight and right turn vehicle lanes).
 23. Oregon Ave / Greer Rd intersection is stressful for cyclists on Oregon Ave because of 2-way stop sign and poor visibility. Would make this intersection LTS 2 or 3 (not 1).
 24. No intersections, even if signalized, with El Camino Real, Page Mill Rd, San Antonio Rd, the multilane portion of Sand Hill Rd, Foothill Expwy, or Alma Street should be LTS 1 unless they are grade separated. There are many lanes of high speed traffic to cross, vehicles on these roads often run red lights, many of the ECR signals don't detect bikes, and there are typically turn lanes involved where vehicles and bikes must cross paths. Furthermore, the amber traffic signal is not long enough to clear the intersection if an average speed cyclist enters the intersection at the very end of the green signal or the start of the amber signal. I'm not sure of the criteria for whether these should be LTS 2 or 3.

From: pennyellson12@gmail.com
To: [Arce, Ozzy](#)
Subject: BPTP Comments
Date: Friday, March 22, 2024 5:02:28 PM

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

BPTP Comments, 3/22/2024

-

Draft Vision (Wordy. This says the same thing a little more succinctly.)

Palo Alto aspires to be a city where sustainable, **active** transportation thrives, supported by safe, efficient, enjoyable street environments. We envision a connected, cohesive network of tree-lined street facilities, paths, off-road trails, bridges, efficient short cuts and secure bike parking designed to meet the needs of people of all ages and abilities who walk and bike for recreation and transportation. We commit to overcoming barriers, ensuring every part of our community is easily traversed on foot or by bike, creating a connected region where sustainable, active transportation is a shared priority. Palo Alto aspires to be a leader, with comprehensive programming that encourages people to embrace sustainable foot-powered transportation and teaches people skills to do this safely. We will invest more in walking and bicycling infrastructure, ensuring equity and accessibility for all. Embracing the Safe System Approach, our city prioritizes safety and aims for a future where walking or biking for short trips is more convenient than driving. We will shape a city environment that invites more people to choose active, healthy sustainable foot-powered trips more often.

Objectives

Overall, these read more like goals than objectives. Goals are typically broad, visionary statements focused on key priority topics. An objective is a specific, measurable statement that supports achievement of goals. Were goals or objectives or both your intent?

For this one, I would be more general about the types of facilities. Here's a suggested edit that relates that change.

Connected and Accessible: Featuring a convenient and interconnected network of facilities to serve the needs of people who walk and bike, including: sidewalks, bike lanes, and trails that provide efficient travel options and easy access to transit.

I see nothing here related to e-bikes, and I thought we'd agreed up front that we need to do some work on that front.

Draft Performance Measures

-

1). Please help me understand specifically what you mean by "relying on the SCAP to address GHG emissions. I do not want electric cars to be part of this planning. I have been dismayed by the strong emphasis that SCAP has placed on shifting people to e-cars, rather than mode shift to foot-powered transportation. E-bikes are fine if we set some parameters for their use. These bikes increasingly are creating safety problems for other road users (including dedicated pedestrian and bike facility users). As an e-bike owner/rider myself (for longer trips), I enjoy their use, but I do understand that

they are changing the streetscape. We need to address this in the plan. (Also, there is a typo in this section, in the word “infrastructure”)

2) Under Connected & Accessible—please add “well-maintained bike/pedestrian bridges”

Draft Bicycle Level of Stress Maps

- I believe the Middlefield approaches to San Antonio Road (where the bike lanes drop today) should be marked **red**. This is a very stressful intersection on a bike and on foot. It needs a lot of work. Once transit-oriented density housing is built on the south side of San Antonio, it will need to be much safer for foot-powered people of all ages and abilities who will want to get into town.
- Glad to see you flagged the entrance to Fabian. The **red** bit that is marked there is spot on. Turning left from EB Charleston to Fabian is very challenging at that intersection. I usually do a box turn.
- I strongly disagree with the **yellow** bits on El Camino Way. Cars/trucks are frequently parked illegally in the bike lane here. I agree it is lower level of stress when no one is parked in the bike lane, but vehicles often are, and enforcement cannot seem to manage the problem. Also, on recent observation, I noticed two drivers cut through parking lots going from ECR to El Camino Way, crossing the bike lanes. They did this to avoid the Los Robles/ECR traffic signal. Not good.
- Early morning (Gunn Zero Period) bike commuters tend to ride on the El Camino Way sidewalk going toward Maybell/ECR because the street is congested with cars. Later morning (Gunn 1st period) kids tend to take the lane if they are in a large platoon of bikes. I think El Camino Way needs work. I have previously suggested making it a one-way street to provide room for protected bike lanes (and possible future migrated auto parking if ECR parking removal moves forward).
- Did you mean to mark Loma Verde and Louis as more stressful than Embarcadero Road? Help me understand why. That is different from the experience I have on these streets.

Draft Major Barriers Maps

- Rail is listed as a linear barrier (I agree with that.), but not Alma Street. Why? I view Alma Street as a significant barrier to walking and bicycling.
- El Camino/Charleston is slated to be fixed before the BPTP Update is done. If that is still so, it probably should not be listed as a barrier problem in the BPTP Update.
- I would add the following roads to the linear barriers list: Alma, San Antonio Road, Foothill Expressway, El Camino Real.
- Comment: I think it would be useful to include bike/ped bridge connections between north Palo Alto and East Palo Alto to complete this map.

Walking Activity Maps

-

Draft Walk & Bike Origin/Destination Maps

The Replica model appears to miss a lot of trips.

It appears that these maps may capture Stanford and SRP bike/ped trips pretty well.

PAUSD school bike counts and student travel mode surveys document thousands of bike/ped trips that I do not see reflected in these maps. For instance, I see no evidence in these maps of hundreds of students who walk and bike to Gunn. Gunn HS bike trips alone easily exceed 1,000 per school day. Where are they? We have bike counts for each PAUSD school, and those counts are not at all reflected in this data. Most parents do not allow their children to use tracking apps. It is unlikely you will capture student trips in any way other than using bike counts and travel mode surveys as we previously have done.

My husband and I walk and bike for most of our trips, but neither of us uses apps that collect our trip data, so none of our trips are registered here. I wonder what percentage of people allow their trips to be tracked.

I suspect Stanford incentivizes use of such apps. They have good reason to do so. —which may be why their data is more complete. Maybe the PATMA does the same; however, how many Palo Alto residents are associated with either of these groups? This leads me to wonder how much Palo Alto resident trips data is missing. It would certainly explain why residential areas of the city record appear devoid of local walking and bicycling trips—a record that does not conform at all with my on-street experience.

To put a fine point on it, I am very skeptical about the completeness of data collection work that was used to create these maps.

Collision Data Overall

Collision History--PABAC asked staff to look at a longer period than five years because of pandemic-related overall trip reductions and mode choice shifts during that period. The consultant and staff opted to do only a “High Level” analysis of ten years of data. They did a more focused analysis on a five-year period. Three of those five years were affected by the pandemic. This doesn’t seem to me like a practical basis for planning.

Draft Collision Maps

A national pandemic emergency was declared March 13, 2020. The federal and county government each officially ended the Covid pandemic May 11, 2023 and February 2023, respectively. I think it would be useful to clearly indicate these important dates on all of the Collision History charts, as not everyone seems to remember the dates accurately.

It would be useful to include a full year of 2023 data, if possible, to see what the numbers look like after in-person presence was required again in schools and some work environments.

Note: Bike counts at PAUSD school sites have dropped significantly since 2019 (pre-pandemic), and appear to be in continued decline. *Question:* How might declines in youth school commutes relate to the decreases in collisions? *Question:* Has biking fallen off in other age groups as well during the same period? Where can we find that data?

It is important to understand crash rates, not just the numbers of collisions which, by themselves,

don't tell us very much.

-

Draft Walk & Bike Origin/Destination Maps

It appears that these maps may capture Stanford bike/ped trips reasonably well.

PAUSD school bike counts and student travel mode surveys document thousands of bike/ped trips that I do not see reflected in these maps. For instance, I see no evidence in these maps of many hundreds of students who walk and bike just to Gunn. These bike trips easily well exceed 1,000 daily. Where are they? We have bike counts for each PAUSD school, and those counts are not at all reflected in this data. Most parents wisely do not allow their children to use tracking apps. It is unlikely you will capture these trips in any way other than using bike counts and travel mode surveys as we have always done.

My husband and I walk and bike for most of our trips, but we neither of us uses apps that would collect our trip data, so none of our trips are registered here. I wonder how widely people allow their trips to be tracked. I suspect Stanford incentivizes use of such apps to help them collect their data. Maybe the PATMA does the same; however, how many residents are associated with either of these groups? This may also explain the demographic data.

The reliance on data collected this way concerns me very much. Almost none of this confirms with what I see on the street and other data I have seen.

Missing from Staff's list of Key Takeaways is: Any mention at all of rail crossings that are not grade separated. There are ZERO grade separated bike/ped crossings south of Oregon Expressway. There are FIVE bike/ped grade separated rail crossings north of Oregon Expressway. This disparity is a significant problem for people who walk and bike in south Palo Alto that should be addressed in this document.

-



Virus-free www.avg.com

From: [Transportation](#)
To: [Arce, Ozzy](#)
Cc: [Transportation](#)
Subject: FW: BPTP - Request update to bicycle traffic stress rating map.
Date: Monday, March 18, 2024 10:35:31 AM

Hi Ozzy,
Forwarding along.

Andria Sumpter

Administrative Assistant, Office of Transportation

-----Original Message-----

From: Robert Neff <rmrneff@sonic.net>
Sent: Sunday, March 17, 2024 9:29 AM
To: Transportation <Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: BPTP - Request update to bicycle traffic stress rating map.

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

Hello Transportation:

Sending feedback for BPTP:

The bicycle traffic stress map presented this month showed many streets at high stress across Palo Alto, and in some cases these did not match my experience at all. Perhaps I am somewhat mis-calibrated, but in general, the map assumed that traffic was running near the speed limit, (and also I wonder if actual traffic volumes were included.)

The city surveyed traffic speeds on most arterials and collectors across Palo Alto in 2017. I think this work should be redone using the measured traffic speeds, or at least a new look at Embarcadero and Middlefield. I am astounded that a realistic rating map would show the same rating for Loma Verde Ave and Embarcadero.

The city has traffic count data here from 2016:

https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/files/assets/public/v1/transportation/traffic-safety-projects/2016_traffic-count-data.pdf

The city has traffic speed survey data here:

<https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/files/assets/public/v1/transportation/traffic-safety-projects/2017-traffic-speed-surveys.pdf>

Please make sure the traffic stress information reflects the data we have for Palo Alto streets.

Thanks,

--

-- Robert Neff

robert@neffs.net

From: [Star-Lack, Sylvia](#)
To: [Transportation](#); [Art Liberman](#)
Cc: [Arce, Ozzy](#)
Subject: RE: BPTP update - what about our PA 311 comments?
Date: Monday, March 25, 2024 8:02:37 PM
Attachments: [image010.png](#)
[image012.png](#)
[image014.jpg](#)
[image015.gif](#)
[image017.png](#)
[image001.jpg](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Hi Art,

I sent the PABAC 311's to Kittelson in October last year. I don't expect Kittelson to respond individually to those requests as we don't have funding to cover the consultant's time for that. However, by copy of this email, I'm asking Ozzy to remind the Kittelson team that if they have questions about the PABAC 311 requests, they can reach out to City staff who can contact PABAC members for clarifications.

Thanks!

-Sylvia



Sylvia Star-Lack (she/her) | Transportation Planning Manager

Office of Transportation | City of Palo Alto
250 Hamilton Avenue | Palo Alto, CA 94301

T: 650.329.2546 | **E:** Sylvia.star-lack@cityofpaloalto.org

Please think of the environment before printing this email – Thank you!

Use Palo Alto 311 to report items you'd like the City to fix!! Download the [app](#) or click [here](#) to make a service request.

From: Transportation <Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Sent: Thursday, March 21, 2024 3:59 PM

To: Art Liberman <bpawebman@gmail.com>

Cc: Transportation <Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Star-Lack, Sylvia <Sylvia.Star-Lack@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Subject: RE: BPTP update - what about our PA 311 comments?

Good afternoon Art,

I have copied Sylvia on your email below. Please know she has been out of the office this week, and response may not come until next week.

Thank you for your email and have a great evening.

Andria Sumpter

Administrative Assistant

Office of Transportation

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

www.cityofpaloalto.org



From: Art Liberman <bpawebman@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, March 20, 2024 8:58 PM

To: Transportation <Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Subject: BPTP update - what about our PA 311 comments?

You don't often get email from bpawebman@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

This note is directed to Sylvia.]

Members of PABAC had, following your suggestion and directions, added items over a period of about a year to a category of PA 311 that you maintained. These were items that members considered of significant importance but required some/considerable staff work and possibly public works involvement (e.g. removing stop signs on Wilkie Way between Charleston and Meadow, adding a crosswalk across Hanover St at the Bol Park path entrance...).

Have these been given to the Kittelson consultants?

Will the individuals who submitted these requests be contacted by you or the Kittelson consultant- either to inform them of the outcome of their submittal wrt BPTP, or requesting more information?

Thanks, Art Liberman

From: pennyellson12@gmail.com
To: [Arce, Ozzy](#)
Subject: PABAC BPTP Small discussion group lists
Date: Monday, March 25, 2024 4:38:52 PM

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

Hi Ozzy,

Here are the group lists.

Group 1

Alan Wachtel
Paul Goldstein
Kathy Durham

Group 2

Robert Neff
Nicole Rodia
Penny Ellson
Steve Rock

Group 3

Eric Nordman
Ken Joye
Bruce Arthur
Jane Rosten

Group 4

Art Liberman
Bill Zaumen
Cedric de la Beaujardiere



Virus-free www.avg.com