



**Palo Alto Pedestrian and
Bicycle Advisory Committee**

**Tuesday, November 1, 2016 at 6:00 P.M.
FLEX ROOM, PALO ALTO CITY HALL
Ground Floor, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94301**

- | | |
|---|------|
| 1. CALL TO ORDER | 6:00 |
| 2. AGENDA CHANGES | 6:05 |
| a. DECEMBER MEETING? | |
| 3. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES | 6:08 |
| 4. VIMOC DASHBOARD OVERVIEW | 6:11 |
| 5. SRTS UPDATE | 6:16 |
| 6. STAFF UPDATES: | 6:24 |
| a. CITY STAFFING UPDATE | |
| b. CHURCHILL AVENUE UPDATE | |
| c. CA BIKE/PED STATE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE | |
| d. UNDERCROSSING/OVERCROSSING IFB | |
| 7. AMBLUR BIKE BLVD/TRAFFIC CALMING PROJECT | 6:44 |
| 8. STANDING ITEMS: | 7:15 |
| a. BIKE SHARE UPDATE | |
| b. GRANT FUNDING UPDATES | |
| c. VTA BPAC UPDATE [PAUL] | |
| 9. COUNTERS (ECO-COUNTERS, VIMOC, ETC.) | 7:30 |
| 10. BOL PARK PATH DISCUSSION | 7:45 |
| 11. ANNOUNCEMENTS: | 7:59 |
| a. 11/29/16 BIKE BLVD - TRAFFIC CALMING CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENT REVIEW MEETING | |
| 12. ADJOURNMENT | 8:00 |



**Palo Alto Pedestrian and
Bicycle Advisory Committee**

**Tuesday, November 1, 2016 at 6:00 P.M.
FLEX ROOM, PALO ALTO CITY HALL
Ground Floor, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94301**

AMBLUR BIKE BLVD/TRAFFIC CALMING PROJECT [75 Percent - Plans Part 1 of 2]

AMBLUR BIKE BLVD/TRAFFIC CALMING PROJECT [75 Percent - Plans Part 2 of 2]



Palo Alto Pedestrian and
Bicycle Advisory Committee

Tuesday, September 6, 2016

6:00 P.M.

FLEX ROOM, PALO ALTO CITY HALL

Ground Floor, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94301

Members Present: Robert Neff (Chair), Eric Nordman (Vice Chair), Bruce Arthur, Cedric de la Beaujardiere, Bill Courington, Paul Goldstein, Ken Joye, Rob Robinson, Bill Zauman

Members Absent: Ann Crichton, Steve Rock, Jane Rothstein, Richard Swent

Staff Present: Joshua Mello, Chris Corrao

Guest: Art Liberman

1. CALL TO ORDER at 6:00 p.m.

Chair Neff: Welcome, everyone, to the September meeting. Why don't we go around and introduce ourselves? I see we have (crosstalk). Give your name and your involvement with this, why you're on the Committee or whatever you want.

Chris Corrao: I'll start. My name's Chris Corrao. I'm a Senior Transportation Planner for the City of Palo Alto.

Vice Chair Nordman: Eric Nordman, Vice Chair.

Rob Robinson: Rob. I've been around a while.

Chair Neff: I'm Robert Neff. I'm the Chair, and I've been on the Committee about six years.

Bill Zauman: Bill Zauman, Committee member.

Ken Joye: Ken Joye.

Paul Goldstein: Paul Goldstein. I'm a Committee member.

Bill Courington: Bill Courington, the same.

Cedric de la Beaujardiere: Cedric de la Beaujardiere, also a Committee member.

1 Art Liberman: I'm Art Liberman. I'm a resident, a guest tonight.

2 Chair Neff: Thanks for coming.

3 Mr. de la Beaujardiere: Welcome.

4 Chair Neff: Do you have something for public comment or did you want to talk (crosstalk)?

5 Mr. Liberman: I'm here just to hear the meeting and listen to what goes on in the meeting. I'm
6 interested in a couple of things. I understand that what you people do is basically advising the
7 City of bicycle infrastructure. I'd like to hear what you do also in terms of advising the City on
8 appropriate policies for the safe riding of bicycles, which to me is a concern. As you probably
9 all are aware, there was a fatality of a bicycle, probably a bicyclist behaving badly, that didn't
10 stop at a stop sign and was killed by a pedestrian. I just wondered what happens in these
11 meetings in terms of that kind of issue. I'm also interested in knowing what the Committee does
12 in terms of enhancing the recreational use on shared-use paths for bicycle use and pedestrian use
13 and making sure that those things are safe, and how the Committee tries to get the City to solicit
14 community input when it makes decisions or before it makes decisions on changing the
15 infrastructure in the community, which has been an issue in our community where people and the
16 City staff have decided to change an infrastructure associated with the shared path on Bol Park
17 and is going to be happening next week without any real input or concerns of the community
18 (inaudible). Also just generally, this is a Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee. The title
19 on the webpage is Bicycle Advisory Committee. Some people call this the Palo Alto Bicycle
20 Advisory Committee, and the pedestrians get lost. I'm hoping to hear some things of the
21 pedestrian concerns in your deliberations tonight.

22 Chair Neff: Thanks.

23 Mr. Goldstein: May I just make a comment?

24 Chair Neff: Sure.

25 Mr. Goldstein: Please attend the meeting and learn what you can about our (crosstalk). To put it
26 in context, we are advisory to staff. We basically give a bicyclist and pedestrian perspective
27 from our own viewpoint about ways to improve situations. We are advisory to staff. We are not
28 per se an advocacy group. If you are interested in bicycle advocacy (inaudible) promoting
29 certain aspects of bicycling, then I suggest—many of us also are members of the Silicon Valley
30 Bicycle Coalition, which has a Palo Alto group, which is specifically to advocate in the political
31 forum and in the public media forum the bicycle safety and bicycle access and the like. I just
32 wanted to make that comment.

33 Chair Neff: Thanks, Paul.

34 **2. AGENDA CHANGES**

35 Chair Neff: Are there any agenda changes?

1 Mr. Corrao: Sure. I forgot to include the Safe Routes to School update on the agenda. Neither
2 Sylvia nor Rosie could attend tonight, but they gave me a list of updates that I can read.

3 Chair Neff: I think that's 4b. Actually, is there a VTA update?

4 Mr. Goldstein: I was going to suggest that we have VTA. It's going to be very brief.

5 Chair Neff: That's 4a 1/2. I wanted to fit in something on the Park Avenue/Stanford Avenue
6 roundabout. I'm sort of curious if anyone has ridden through there and if they have any feedback
7 on that. That would be at 5. We'll put that at 5.

8 Male: That's there.

9 Chair Neff: It is?

10 Mr. Goldstein: E.

11 Chair Neff: No, that's something else.

12 Mr. Corrao: That's different.

13 Mr. Goldstein: I'm sorry. That's F.

14 Chair Neff: I haven't talked to Chris about this. I rode through there yesterday. Let's see what
15 other people think. Any other agenda changes? No.

16 **3. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES**

17 Chair Neff: You have the minutes from last time. Can I have a motion to approve the minutes
18 or comments on them?

19 **MOTION**

20 Mr. Joye: If there are no comments or changes, I move to approve.

21 Vice Chair Nordman: Second.

22 Chair Neff: Ken Joye moved; Eric seconded. We have to remember, I have to remember,
23 everyone remember to introduce yourself with your name. In favor? Opposed? I think that
24 passed 8-0. A couple of people maybe didn't vote.

25 **4a. OCTOBER MEETING DATE CHANGE**

26 Chair Neff: For October, I think I sent an email about this. The first Tuesday will conflict with
27 the Council meeting. It also conflicts with something in my personal calendar. I suggested to
28 Chris, and he said it would be okay with him if we rescheduled it to the second Tuesday in
29 October. Is that the 11th? Do we have this space again?

30 Mr. Corrao: I'll go ahead and get it.

1 Chair Neff: There's no one saying they can't make it. That's a good sign. That was quick.

2 **4b. VTA UPDATE**

3 Chair Neff: We're ready for the VTA update.

4 Mr. Goldstein: There were several things. One of the things we did was look at the projects
5 submitted for the next round of the VTA plan. There's a big grant called the One Bay Area or
6 One Bay Area Grant, OBAG. Palo Alto submitted several projects for this, which I did push out
7 to the Committee. I hadn't seen them, and we hadn't really seen these projects. I mentioned to
8 Josh that we should have a discussion about it, because as the VTA rep I feel a little strange
9 being asked to comment on the Palo Alto submitted grant projects when that's the first I'd seen
10 them, specifically being asked to say does the rating that Palo Alto gave these conform to my
11 own view of what the project was. It was a little embarrassing. Palo Alto was not the only
12 agency that had this problem. I'd say most of the reps had seen their submittals. I thought we
13 were going to have a discussion about that on this agenda. It's not on the agenda. I don't want to
14 force it (crosstalk) ...

15 Male: It's not down at 8?

16 Mr. Goldstein: Maybe it is down at 8. Maybe that's what we're going to discuss (crosstalk).

17 Mr. Corrao: That was intended to be a standing update from staff. We're happy to have an open
18 grant discussion on that item. There's no reason we can't.

19 Mr. Goldstein: That's fine. I did have a conversation with Josh, and he explained to me that
20 very often—I do know this from years of experience—grants are applied to, it's a very
21 opportunistic situation. There's money, millions of dollars sometimes. A call for project goes
22 out. The deadline is ...

23 Mr. Robinson: Ridiculous.

24 Mr. Goldstein: ... maybe two months, maybe one month, maybe three weeks. The deadlines are
25 difficult. I do understand that PABAC does not want to have something that's going to hold-up
26 this project. You'll probably explain it on Item 8. I understand that there's a weekly meeting of
27 staff that talks about these. I feel like we could be just update in terms of that meeting. If there
28 is a deadline that goes in, I at least as the rep would like to be informed that we've applied for
29 this grant and, yes, Paul, you're going to see it in the next VTA agenda and here's what it's all
30 about. That's the issue. We did look at all of those grants. I have a huge packet, if anybody is
31 interested in what other cities have submitted as well as Palo Alto. We also talked a little bit
32 about the Page Mill Road intersection. I did mention to the Committee that the website was open
33 for comments on their latest version. We are going to get an update on that version tomorrow at
34 the meeting. The meeting is tomorrow. If anybody has any comments, please let me know. The
35 other thing that's coming up tomorrow on the agenda is an update on the Complete Streets policy
36 planning for Santa Clara County. That's all I have to say.

37 Chair Neff: Thanks. We'll talk more about grant funding when we get to 8, and what the City
38 has in the work.

1 **4c. SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL**

2 Chair Neff: The Safe Routes to School.

3 Mr. Corrao: Unfortunately, Sylvia couldn't be here this evening. She's bringing her son to
4 college in Minnesota. Rosie could not either. They've given me an email. I apologize if it
5 sounds like I'm reading an email, because I am. We are still hiring for a full-time Safe Routes to
6 School Coordinator in our Division. We're expecting that person to start in late October at the
7 earliest. Sylvia and Rosie are both part-time positions. We attended recently the City/School
8 Traffic Safety Committee meeting and gave updates on some projects. One of the projects was
9 the proposed concept plan that I brought to PABAC at Donald and Arastradero. There were a
10 couple of versions of a green bike box. The group generally seemed to like the version that had a
11 green bike box. Their only comment is to potentially add chevrons through the intersection so
12 it's really clear to motorists on Arastradero that cyclists will be making that movement. PAUSD,
13 Gunn High School received a TSCA bike rack voucher grant to add more bike parking capacity.
14 A preliminary survey showed that bike racks are full at MS, and they may need to seek
15 additional bike rack support for some schools or place toaster racks at Briones. Looks like we
16 have upcoming events. The Safe Routes champion orientation with Penny Ellson is on
17 September 8th. There are bike rodeos scheduled, a number of them, at various schools starting
18 on September 20th and ending on October 13th. There's a program called "Bringing Up
19 Bicyclists" that's at Ohlone on October 3rd from 7:00 to 8:30 p.m.

20 Mr. Robinson: October 3rd through the week is Walk and Roll. A lot of bike safety emphasis
21 that week preceded by Bike Palo Alto behind the yellow hand. This is a family, free event.

22 Vice Chair Nordman: Any comments on when the video cameras for the schools, the counting
23 ones, would be giving data?

24 Mr. Corrao: The data is being collected already by the cameras that are installed. We just don't
25 have the dashboard complete yet. We can't access the data yet. They're still building the Palo
26 Alto dashboard that staff can see, that presents the data to us. We actually will, once that's up
27 and running, have data back since the cameras were installed.

28 Mr. Joye: Chris, who is "they" that's doing the building? Some vendor?

29 Mr. Corrao: VIMOC, the company ...

30 Mr. Joye: VIMOC, they installed it?

31 Mr. Corrao: They installed it. It's the company that created the ...

32 Mr. Joye: Has VIMOC indicated when they expect that would be available?

33 Mr. Corrao: We've already been reviewing drafts of the dashboard, and we're giving suggestions
34 on tweaks. It's within weeks. We're really close to having it.

35 Mr. Joye: Thank you.

1 Mr. Corrao: Perhaps Josh Mello, who just walked in the room, Chief Transportation Official,
2 may have some clarification on that.

3 Josh Mello: Good evening, everybody. I just wanted to stop by while I was waiting for our item
4 at the Council and see you guys again. I haven't seen you in a while. Updates on VIMOC?

5 Mr. Corrao: There were just some questions about when we'll have the data from the cameras. I
6 was explaining that we already have the data from when they were installed, but that we don't
7 have the dashboard finalized.

8 Mr. Mello: Yeah. The dashboard's going to be really great. You guys will like playing around
9 with it. You can look at it by time of day, day of the week. We're hoping to be able to combine
10 different counters so you can look at trends in certain areas over time.

11 Male: Did you say when that might be available for us to look at?

12 Mr. Mello: We saw a draft two weeks ago. Any minute now, I'd say.

13 Mr. de la Beaujardiere: Is it something that will be available to the public or just more to staff?

14 Mr. Mello: I think we would make it available to the public. It's going to be an IP address, so
15 it'll just be a website interface.

16 **5. STAFF UPDATES**

17 **a. Churchill Avenue Meeting**

18 **b. Bol Park Path Cross Bike**

19 **c. Middlefield Rd Cycle Track Construction**

20 **d. Embarcadero Rd/El Camino Real Intersection Update**

21 **e. Park Blvd/Page Mill Rd Mini-Roundabout Concept**

22 Chair Neff: I think we're at the staff updates. Why don't we go straight to "b" and start with the
23 Bol Park path cross bike.

24 Mr. Corrao: On the Bol Park path update, I just wanted to give the group an update that we're
25 looking at constructing that cross bike on Thursday or Friday of this week. There were some
26 initial delays in timing just because our contractor had a really packed schedule leading up to the
27 installation. The gates will be removed from that location and concrete, teardrop-shaped median
28 islands will be installed, that you've seen, with the bollards in addition to a new crosswalk and
29 signage posted under the stop signs, that says "path traffic does not stop." That'll go in Thursday
30 or Friday of this week. That's really the only update. I just wanted to let you know to expect it.

31 Mr. Goldstein: Just to clarify, you're removing both sets of gates or only one set of gates on
32 there?

33 Mr. Corrao: Both sets of gates, on both sides. We tailored the design from El Camino Park to fit
34 in better with the logs at the path crossing, because the neighborhood really likes the rustic look
35 of the logs. It does constrain the space a little bit because they're quite high. We made the

1 teardrop almost as narrow as you can, about 2 feet wide and 6 feet long. It'll be a rolled concrete
2 island with a center bollard.

3 Mr. Goldstein: Will Eric be able to get his tricycle (crosstalk).

4 Vice Chair Nordman: Two feet wide is the center?

5 Mr. Corrao: The center piece. The clearance is approximately 4 feet on each side.

6 Vice Chair Nordman: For people with trailers, that 4 feet is tight. Usually it's 5 feet minimum,
7 but it is doable at 4 feet.

8 Mr. Mello: The island will be mountable as well. You'll have another 6-8 inches of the island.

9 Mr. Corrao: We wanted to address concerns that we heard loud and clear from the
10 neighborhood, that cyclists would continue at too high of a rate of speed through the crossing.
11 That (crosstalk).

12 Mr. Goldstein: As long as you can get through it.

13 Mr. Corrao: The other update was that we removed the—there was a coyote bush that I went
14 into the field, that Robert mentioned to me. It's right in the visibility triangle of cyclists as you're
15 approaching in the southbound direction, as you approach the intersection. That concern is that
16 cyclists, particularly at night or on an overcast day, wouldn't be able to see vehicles in the
17 intersection. That's been ...

18 Chair Neff: Vice versa (inaudible).

19 Mr. Corrao: Vice versa, yeah.

20 Mr. Robinson: I'd like to add a comment. Art, we have a little advantage as PABAC that we get
21 notices about the public meetings generally speaking. I've noticed—I've been attending them for
22 years—they have improved some. Sometimes residents don't know that there's a community
23 meeting. There was quite a bit of discussion in the Barron Park area about bicycle safety and
24 pedestrian safety in particular, since the roads are so narrow.

25 Mr. Liberman: We had meetings—I can just respond to that—that Jaime held, which were about
26 other bike routes in Barron Park. There were no meetings or discussions about removing the
27 chicanes. There was no public discussion about that. I'm very closely connected, and I was at
28 one point on the Board. I was president of the Barron Park Association at the time. I know of
29 the kinds of discussions that were held. It would have been nice to have held discussions on that
30 topic with the community. I had mentioned to Josh and I also mentioned it to Chris a meeting
31 that several of us held that those kinds of discussions on that particular topic were not held. We
32 do realize that there are other meetings that have been held on bicycle issues, and it was greatly
33 appreciated.

34 Mr. Robinson: Eric here, one of my colleagues, has written quite a paper on the dangers, the
35 deaths that have occurred from the chicanes that will be removed. An example of existing, fairly

1 new, mountable bollards are in the north El Camino Park. There's been no complaints.
2 Everybody seems to be real pleased with the way those turned out.

3 Mr. Goldstein: I'm hearing some contradictory information. Chris, you just reported that there
4 were community concerns about this. I'm hearing from Art that there wasn't a community
5 meeting. Can I get some clarification on that?

6 Mr. Corrao: There wasn't a community meeting. There was a meeting with Art and two other
7 neighbors with the Director and Josh and myself. They were concerned. There wasn't a
8 community meeting on this crossing. This was a spot improvement.

9 Mr. Mello: This started a little before Chris got here. This is a rather small project that was
10 associated with a much larger resurfacing project in Barron Park. We elected to hold more
11 focused outreach, and we invited Art and some of his neighbors out to the site to explain the
12 reasoning behind the design (crosstalk).

13 Mr. Goldstein: I even saw a column by Doug Moran about this.

14 Mr. Mello: Yeah. There was certainly quite a bit of community chatter and emails and phone
15 calls. I think the community was sufficiently notified that this was going to move forward.

16 Mr. Goldstein: My confusion has been addressed. Thank you.

17 Mr. de la Beaujardiere: I just wonder about the bollard. What's the material of the bollard? Is it
18 metal? Is there any danger of a bicyclist missing it somehow and running on the curb, crashing
19 into the bollard?

20 Mr. Corrao: The new bollard's a metal, single bollard. It has handles that will be turned parallel
21 to the path. It has really high visibility, reflective tape on it. It will be much, much safer than the
22 current obstruction. It's still a bollard. You could potentially hit it, but we still need some way
23 to restrict (inaudible).

24 Chair Neff: Thanks. We can go back to "a," the Churchill Avenue meeting.

25 Mr. Corrao: On Churchill Avenue, the update is that this is for the extension of the shared-use
26 path that runs along the Caltrain railroad in front of the PAUSD property and then ends at
27 Castilleja. There's the Stanford Perimeter Trail, so there's a gap between those two trails. This
28 project would extend that path along the frontage of the school property and connection across El
29 Camino to the Stanford Perimeter Trail. There's been some concern, as I reported at the last
30 meeting with the landscaping subcommittee of the School District, that has concerns about the
31 plan and the loss of green space. Josh and Cash from the City Manager's Office and myself went
32 and spoke to the School District last week to sort of present what the plan is, how far we are on
33 the design process, the significant City investment in this project and the significant benefits of
34 completing two existing paths. It seemed like the landscaping subcommittee is concerned about
35 the loss of green space. We decided to regroup. We'll be meeting again either later this week or
36 next week, and we issued a memo to them giving more details about the project. That memo sort
37 of outlined the potential benefits to students and talked about some very minor modifications that
38 could be made to potentially improve the aesthetics of the project along Churchill Avenue.

1 There's the unimproved dirt strip between the sidewalk and Churchill. We talked about maybe
2 putting some landscaping into that dirt strip, which is not currently in the project. We're trying to
3 work with this committee so that we can get the easement we need to build this project. Really
4 any delay in the design phase—a week or so of delay doesn't compute to a week or so of delay in
5 the construction phase. It's much longer. We're trying to stay on schedule.

6 Mr. Goldstein: As I understand it, one of the concerns or issues with these people is that they
7 had invested some energy in landscaping this within the last year or two. I don't know if there
8 was money involved, but there certainly was time and effort. I guess they in some sense were
9 told that this was a good project for them to do, and they did the project. Somehow they heard
10 that the City's coming through and putting a bike path through their little garden. Am I right
11 about that being the ...

12 Mr. Corrao: I think that was mentioned at one point. The concerns that we heard at the meeting
13 were not really regarding the landscape in that sense. We've offered to replace in kind the
14 landscaping that's been installed and plant additional trees with the project. We're hearing some
15 misguided concerns about sustainability and having too much asphalt and global warming and
16 things that we've addressed with other staff doing assessments of this project. There's quite a
17 number of greenhouse gas emission reductions associated with building a bike facility and with
18 also removal of the turf. There's a large area of irrigated turf that will be removed. The one
19 thing interestingly that the group really does like is the right-hand turn lane that will be installed
20 at El Camino, which removes quite a bit of landscaped area as well. We're working through
21 these issues.

22 Mr. Goldstein: Thank you very much.

23 Chair Neff: Thanks. I'm looking at the list. Let's skip "c" for a moment and go onto "d," which
24 is the Embarcadero Road/El Camino Real intersection. As you know, we talked about this at
25 least two months ago. I think we gave a recommendation that we like both, but we thought we
26 preferred the version with the bike lane, not with the shared-use path. That was in the staff
27 report that went to the Planning and Transportation. Actually Planning and Transportation—you
28 can correct me where I'm wrong because all I know is what I read in the *Weekly*. They actually
29 like the plan with the two bike lanes on both sides, with the mixed-use paths on both sides and
30 without the bike lane in the middle and the protected intersection design.

31 Mr. Corrao: That's correct.

32 Chair Neff: I was wondering if we wanted to reconsider PABAC's position and maybe soften it
33 to we support either one of these or leave it. I don't know. If you'd like me to write a letter—
34 anyway, this is going to Council in ...

35 Mr. Mello: September 19th.

36 Chair Neff: ... September 19th, in two weeks, for them to look at the path as well.

37 Mr. Robinson: I, for one, want to see the drawing again, because it was very confusing when we
38 discussed it.

1 Mr. Goldstein: It was confusing, I remember. Part of our recommendation had to do with
2 feasibility and political issues. I cannot remember if it—I don't know what Planning and
3 Transportation Committee approved or recommended is superior to what we feel or is it actually
4 in contradiction to our concerns. I just don't know that. It would be good to know so that we can
5 go on record as either supporting that or saying, "Wait a second, guys. You didn't listen to our
6 thoughtful input."

7 Mr. Mello: I can give a one-sentence description of each alternative. Let me make sure I get the
8 numbers right. Alternative 1, which is what PTC voted for, is basically a European model where
9 the bikeways are raised and separated from the traffic. They're one-way bikeways one either side
10 of the road separate from the sidewalk and separate from the roadway, but elevated. At the
11 intersection of El Camino, it would be a Dutch-style protected intersection. Alternative 2 is a
12 shared-use path model, which would have cyclists travel in two ways on the north side all the
13 way to the pedestrian crossing at Paly, and then they would cross there, and then they would ride
14 two-way into Stanford. It'd be a two-way path that crosses El Camino at the Paly signal. There's
15 also a westbound bike lane for people who don't want to ride on the shared-use path. They
16 would be able to ride in road westbound from the Paly crossing into Stanford. That one includes
17 right turn-lanes for Town and Country and El Camino Real. PTC felt that the benefits from the
18 right turn-lanes did not outweigh the benefits of better bicycle and pedestrian accommodations
19 for families and young and old cyclists that you would achieve with the separated facilities.

20 Mr. Goldstein: You cannot answer this question, I don't believe. How likely is it that Caltrans
21 will approve that kind of modification to that (inaudible) intersection.

22 Mr. Mello: Design Information Bulletin 89, which came out late in 2015, they're separated
23 bikeway guidelines signed by their design engineer. It includes protected intersections. There's
24 a discussion about protected intersections in there. This might likely be the first protected
25 intersection on a state highway, but the door is open.

26 Mr. Goldstein: I was actually more concerned about ...

27 Mr. Mello: Level of service?

28 Mr. Goldstein: Yeah. Thank you for that.

29 Mr. Mello: Stanford also submitted comments that were highly supportive of the protected
30 intersection concept. They didn't vote one way or the other, but the tone of their comments
31 leaned more towards the protected intersection.

32 Mr. Goldstein: I remember our Safe Routes to School staff were highly supportive of that
33 alternative as well.

34 Male: Just as a reminder, how do they handle right-turning traffic through bicycles?

35 Mr. Mello: The concept behind the Dutch protected intersection is there's actually one car length
36 of storage. You turn 90 degrees, and the pedestrians and cyclists are crossing. The signal timing
37 is done in a way that you separate those movements as much as possible. That would have to be
38 worked out through this. It could be a leading bike/ped phase. It could be a lagging bike/ped

1 phase. It could be separated entirely. The main point is you're not conflicting immediately when
2 you turn. There's actually a car length of storage like at a roundabout.

3 Chair Neff: Do you think you could find the drawing and put it on the screen?

4 Mr. Corrao: I believe it's posted on the City's website.

5 Mr. de la Beaujardiere: Can you clarify—I don't remember what it means—a protected
6 intersection? Also, are we only talking about that intersection there? I remember we looked at
7 pathways in the underpass, under the tracks. Is that part of that too? Was that approved?

8 Mr. Mello: Coming from Bryant, there would be a one-way cycle track that led you to the
9 underpass. Through the underpass, we were recommending using little medallions that would
10 have bicyclists on the left and pedestrians on the right.

11 Mr. de la Beaujardiere: On the sidewalk?

12 Mr. Mello: On the sidewalk. We're not going to rebuild the sidewalk through the underpass.
13 Immediately coming out of the underpass, you'd be separated again into a one-way cycle track
14 and sidewalks that were separate. Going the other direction, it would be similar except we would
15 try to get all the way to Bryant Street. There's a chance, if the Castilleja project moves forward,
16 that we could actually have them construct one block of the one-way cycle track on their
17 property and preserve the trees, but still get that connection all the way to Bryant. Without that,
18 it doesn't work as well because you'd end at Emerson, and then you would have to either ride on
19 the sidewalk for a block or go out of way travel.

20 Chair Neff: Chris, you can find it through the Planning and Transportation Committee agendas.

21 Mr. Corrao: Do you remember when that ...

22 Male: It was two months.

23 Mr. Mello: If you're on the staff Wi-Fi you can get to our server actually.

24 Mr. Corrao: Do you know what folder this is in?

25 Mr. Mello: Yeah.

26 Mr. Goldstein: I can make a comment. Now with this discussion, I ...

27 Mr. Mello: Transportation and engineering, capital improvement projects program,
28 Embarcadero and El Camino Real. Then just sort and pick the latest. Concept plan 1 and 2 will
29 have the (inaudible). This is the PowerPoint. That one right there, one and two.

30 Chair Neff: That's the protected intersection version with the ...

31 Male: Can you clarify what protected intersection means?

32 Mr. Robinson: Can you zoom up on the El Camino?

1 Mr. Mello: There's actually a video that's really helpful on Vimeo, Chris, if you want to try to
2 upload that by Nick Falbo. You can leave that up while you're—actually you can't. There's a
3 video that explains it better. I might have to jump out to go to Council any minute. Basically,
4 this is essentially a circulatory bikeway. These are the crosswalks. When you get to the
5 intersection, you would have a signal. You can actually go the other way too if you want.
6 Bicyclists have this little island here that protects them from turning vehicles. They get out in
7 the road quicker than cars turning right. You're actually highly visible when you're right here. If
8 you're sitting here on a bike, both of these cars will be able to see you. I can't explain it as well
9 as the video.

10 Mr. Corrao: I'll find it. It's on the (inaudible) you said?

11 Mr. Mello: It's on Vimeo.

12 Mr. Robinson: While you're looking for that, my opinion is that certainly our residents and our
13 visitors who work in our community will be quite—not exactly amused. They will be really
14 affected by the attention given to bicyclists to safely cross. Just a warning. I think it's the right
15 thing to do though.

16 Mr. Goldstein: While we're doing that, can I make ...

17 Vice Chair Nordman: (crosstalk) the distances for pedestrians too.

18 Chair Neff: Paul had another comment.

19 Mr. Goldstein: ... a comment? I have now been sufficiently reminded of our discussion and the
20 like. I believe that this proposal is very forward-thinking and will provide safe crossing for
21 bicycles. My concern the last time was that that intersection now has such a poor level of service
22 for automobile traffic that this would further delay that. That was the import of my—(inaudible)
23 question to Josh. I live in that neighborhood, and I know how hard it is to get through that
24 intersection. I do think that there's going to be a lot of pushback from Council, from the driving
25 public and the like. That said, as a member of this Committee who's interest is in advising us to
26 do things that are best for bicyclists, I'm fully comfortable with this going ahead. I do think this
27 is a good plan for bicyclists. I do think it will be subject to a withering political attack. As a
28 bicyclist, I don't see any reason to have concerns about it. I think it is better for commuters and
29 school children and others who are using what is now a very hazardous—a very challenging
30 intersection.

31 Chair Neff: I think I led the charge to recommend the other one before. I think really what it is,
32 is that I'm comfortable as a vehicular cyclist who's out in traffic with that one giving me a way
33 through an intersection where I wouldn't get a right hook. I'm a little nervous about this, but I
34 think if—we can see the design, but it still remains that if you're coming up to the intersection
35 and you're on a bicycle, then you're going to have to make sure that the cars see you. If they're
36 already turning right, you have to negotiate with that. I think all-in-all—maybe I still need to
37 watch the video—the benefit for people who are less confident about being out in the middle of
38 the street, in the middle of Embarcadero, left of the right turn-lane, it's a big benefit to those
39 people. If they're nervous at the corner, they can wait at the corner. If there's a leading green,
40 it'll be advantageous. I think we should consider voting in support of the first option.

1 Mr. Zauman: Just one question about whether the use of the cycle track would be mandatory.

2 Chair Neff: Of course not.

3 Mr. Mello: No, separated (crosstalk). Separated bikeways are not considered (crosstalk).

4 Mr. Zauman: It's definitely considered separated?

5 Mr. Mello: Yes.

6 Mr. Corrao: I'll go ahead and show the video. [Video shown.]

7 Mr. Mello: He's actually my former colleague with Alta. Since this video came out, two have
8 been built in the United States, one in Salt Lake City and one in Davis. Alta has actually
9 developed design guidelines for protected intersections, which were used in coming up with this
10 concept.

11 Mr. Goldstein: Question. Anything like that intersection?

12 Mr. Mello: The one in Davis is fairly large. It's a four-lane, divided boulevard intersecting kind
13 of a main street from a new development. It's not busy yet because the new development is just
14 being built.

15 Chair Neff: Bill. Two Bills.

16 Mr. Zauman: What's the probability of you having to stop at the intersection if you're riding a
17 bike compared to, say, the probability of a car stopping depending on the signal phasing?

18 Mr. Mello: We haven't gotten to the point of looking at the signal phasing yet. This is just a
19 high-level concept.

20 Mr. Zauman: The problem is that if the signal phasing is such that bikes get a very small fraction
21 of it in terms of when they get through there, the result is that every intersection becomes a stop,
22 which increases the amount of energy it takes to get around town. That might be ...

23 Mr. Mello: Under this concept, you'd still be permitted to ride in the travel lane if you wanted to.
24 You're not required to use the separated bikeway or the protected intersection.

25 Mr. Courington: I think these kinds of intersections are really cool. I question whether they're
26 right for this intersection. There's no north/south bicycle traffic at all on that. Most of the traffic
27 is on the north side in two directions. The bicycle traffic is very asymmetric here. Whereas, this
28 model seems really nice for a kind of downtown intersection where everybody's going in all
29 directions. I'm not sure it applies. We haven't talked about the other one. I don't recall it as
30 much. I thought it was more biased towards the two-way traffic on the north side of the
31 (crosstalk).

32 Mr. Mello: Just a point of clarification. There is the Stanford Perimeter Trail on the west side,
33 which runs north/south. That would become part of this intersection functionally.

1 Mr. Arthur: I think also if you make that intersection safer for cyclists you'll get more people
2 there. Right now cyclists want to use Churchill because ...

3 Mr. Joye: There's a ton of cyclists who use (crosstalk).

4 Mr. Arthur: Embarcadero is a disaster for a cycle right now.

5 Mr. Joye: No, but they want to go to Town and Country.

6 Mr. Goldstein: There's a ton of cyclists there now.

7 Mr. Joye: A huge number.

8 Mr. Arthur: If you make it safer, I think you'll get way more traffic on that. This is a
9 chicken/egg thing. I think it needs to get safer, and then you can see more. I'm sorry. You guys
10 recommended this approach.

11 Mr. Mello: We did not recommend one or the other.

12 Mr. Arthur: You did not.

13 Chair Neff: Planning and Transportation recommended this approach to Council.

14 Mr. Goldstein: Our Committee recommended the other approach.

15 Mr. Arthur: I like both. I thought both were radical improvements.

16 Chair Neff: Actually I think that's what we said, but that got translated into—I think the motion
17 was that we preferred the other one, and that's what got translated into the staff report to
18 Planning and Transportation.

19 Mr. Robinson: It'll come before the Council on the 19th, right, two weeks?

20 Chair Neff: Yes.

21 Mr. Goldstein: Can I make a motion?

22 Chair Neff: Yeah.

23 **MOTION**

24 Mr. Goldstein: This Committee recommends improvements to the Embarcadero/El Camino
25 intersection to facilitate bicycle and pedestrian traffic in this highly used intersection. Whereas,
26 both alternatives represent improvements, in our view this protected intersection would be a
27 dramatic improvement for cyclists of all abilities, especially younger cyclists and novice cyclists,
28 and pedestrians.

29 Mr. Robinson: Just a question then. If we approve your idea, then somebody needs to make that
30 clear to Council.

1 Mr. Goldstein: It would be a letter that I would share with them.

2 Chair Neff: I could write a letter.

3 Mr. Mello: We can also do an at-places memo. The report's already been transmitted, but we
4 can do an at-places memo and attach a letter to it. If that makes sense. They would get that
5 before the meeting.

6 Chair Neff: That was a motion.

7 Mr. Robinson: That's a motion.

8 Chair Neff: Is there a second?

9 Mr. Robinson: I second the motion.

10 Chair Neff: Any other comments?

11 Mr. de la Beaujardiere: Just to clarify. What you're saying is you like both options, but you
12 think that the option that we saw here, this protected one that the PTC who also liked—your
13 motion is saying we also like this option as being ...

14 Mr. Goldstein: Essentially that's what I said. I say it's particularly valuable for novice cyclists
15 and younger cyclists.

16 Mr. de la Beaujardiere: More so than the other.

17 Mr. Mello: Just to put a finer point on it. It's officially called Concept Plan Alternative 1.

18 Mr. Goldstein: It's not "B." I thought it was "B." Thank you.

19 Mr. Zauman: What was the other alternative?

20 Chair Neff: Can you find it?

21 Mr. Corrao: I think I closed it already, but I can go back to it.

22 Mr. Mello: It's the next page.

23 Chair Neff: It's the next page.

24 Mr. Mello: There it is. This is a two-way cycle track. It crosses at the Paly pedestrian crossing,
25 and it goes under the tunnel. It becomes a two-way connection to Bryant Street. There's a bike
26 lane that begins right here. It has right turn-lanes, which are new.

27 Male: The alternate one has facilities on (crosstalk).

28 Mr. Mello: One-way.

1 Mr. Goldstein: One-way facilities on it. This has two-way facilities on it.

2 Male: If you go on the north side, you're only—if you're on the top, you're only supposed to be
3 going to the left.

4 Mr. Mello: Yes.

5 Mr. Goldstein: You'd be a vacant cyclist. For those of you who have actually ridden this, that
6 crosswalk there on the right, that light can be a very long wait to get to the other side of the
7 street. Just so you know. That was (crosstalk).

8 Chair Neff: Can I call it cyclists of all ages and abilities?

9 Mr. Goldstein: That's better.

10 Chair Neff: Thank you.

11 Mr. Goldstein: Those of us who are comfortable.

12 Chair Neff: We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? It was unanimous. I will
13 write a letter this week.

14 Mr. Robinson: It'll be attached in that secret way that you know is secret.

15 Chair Neff: Back to Middlefield. The update on the Middlefield two-way cycle track.

16 Mr. Corrao: The Middlefield update was really just a quick update. As you all know, the two-
17 way cycle track has been under construction on Middlefield at the California Avenue offset
18 intersection. We're still waiting on the bollards to install. There's been some confusion on the
19 part of the community with respect to the striping. Being that it's a change, there's no longer the
20 dashed center line. The striping has been confusing for folks. We anticipate having that open
21 very soon. We'll all be out there, our entire staff, helping students learn how to use the new bike
22 facility. We've been in close contact with the school. That is something that we're going to have
23 wrapped up pretty soon.

24 Male: This week, next week?

25 Mr. Corrao: I believe this week.

26 Mr. Mello: Apparently we hired the three stooges to (crosstalk) it. They ordered the bollards
27 way too late. Today, they installed a thermoplastic (inaudible) earmarking 180 degrees in the
28 wrong direction. Originally we were going to open it tomorrow or Thursday. It's looking like it
29 might be Friday or early next week. We're not going to open it until it's completely safe and
30 everything is ...

31 Male: It's blocked off right now?

32 Mr. Mello: It's blocked off right now.

1 Mr. Goldstein: Thermoplastic no less.

2 Mr. Mello: The plans were very clear as to which way it should face.

3 Chair Neff: Is that what happened to the sharrows on Laguna too or are those in the right place?

4 Mr. Mello: Those were actually installed a little bit too far to the right. A marking was
5 misinterpreted by the contractor. I think it's the same contractor.

6 Male: Chris, has there been any feedback from Jordan people as to how this delay has affected
7 things?

8 Mr. Corrao: They're understandably not thrilled. We were hoping to have this open at the start
9 of the school year. We've been communicating with them. I know ...

10 Male: No issues per se?

11 Mr. Mello: They're still using the sidewalk like they were before. There was no bike lane there
12 before. The students were using the sidewalk before the cycle track was constructed, and they're
13 still using it now. The sidewalk is actually 5 feet wider than it was last year.

14 Mr. Zauman: Are there any provisions for things like sharrows just for commuters who are
15 going straight, so they don't get stuck in a mob of students making turns or getting a little bit
16 stuck close to the curb when they're trying to cross an intersection?

17 Mr. Mello: If I was riding on Middlefield, I wouldn't enter the cycle track at all.

18 Mr. Zauman: I know, but it looks like it's a bike lane. If you're going for the first time, you
19 might not realize what you're getting into.

20 Mr. Mello: We left an opening with a (inaudible) at the North California—at the exit going—if
21 you're traveling north.

22 Chair Neff: You can escape.

23 Mr. Mello: There's an escape hatch before you turn right onto North California.

24 Chair Neff: My experience around schools is that if you're there when school is open ...

25 Male: Better get off your bike.

26 Chair Neff: ... that's going to be a busy place.

27 Male: You don't want to be near them.

28 Mr. Robinson: "D."

29 Mr. Corrao: Or "e."

1 Male: We did "d."

2 Mr. Robinson: "E."

3 Chair Neff: We're at "e," yes, the park and Page Mill, which is there on the ...

4 Mr. Corrao: This is something we wanted to get your feedback on, that my colleague Jarrett
5 Mullen has been working on, that's an improvement on Park at Page Mill, that's associated with
6 the redevelopment project. One of the alternatives being considered is signaling this
7 intersection. Another concept is to do a mini roundabout. One of the things that we don't like
8 about this option is that you have to drop the bike lane and it also makes this a little bit trickier
9 for pedestrians because your crosswalks are moved back a little bit further from the intersection.
10 There are benefits to traffic circles as well. This is something we just wanted to get PABAC's
11 feedback on. This is for a project that's already been entitled. This isn't something going to
12 Council for approval or anything like that.

13 Mr. Mello: Just one of the other benefits is the bike lane would no longer be between a through-
14 lane and right turn-lane heading southbound.

15 Mr. Goldstein: You were just (inaudible).

16 Mr. Mello: You would have to merge into the travel lane right before you enter the roundabout.

17 Chair Neff: There would be one lane for all the cars. You wouldn't have to merge into it right
18 before the roundabout. Ken.

19 Mr. Joye: Is there any institutional knowledge about why that right turn-lane from Park
20 Boulevard onto Page Mill Road was put into place? I don't know how long that's been there. I
21 think it's as long as I've lived in town. What was the motivation for having that right turn-lane?

22 Mr. Mello: I'll tell you that we've been dealing with mitigation measures that were approved
23 sometimes over a decade ago in this area in particular. Earlier this year ...

24 Mr. Joye: I guess my point is ...

25 Mr. Mello: Earlier this year, this developer went to implement a left turn-lane here. You guys
26 all know about this. That was a mitigation that was approved almost ten years ago. We put a
27 stop to that and instead added parking. It actually didn't work geometrically either. There's a lot
28 of entitled developments around here that have kind of automobile-centric mitigation measures
29 that are from CEQA. I imagine the right turn-lane was probably related to one of the
30 developments that occurred over there.

31 Mr. Joye: Do we know how much traffic there is coming—like there's four ways that traffic
32 could come. What's the heaviest flow of traffic at this intersection?

33 Mr. Robinson: Right turn lanes (crosstalk).

34 Mr. Zauman: (crosstalk) the Expressway.

1 Mr. Joye: There is a sense—is there any data behind that? It seems to me that if you have a
2 roundabout here and if people are trying to make the right turn to go onto Oregon Expressway,
3 they're going to have to wait for those turning left, which is a huge change at this intersection.
4 I'm biased because I live on Park Boulevard. I go through this intersection all the time. I frankly
5 don't see this as an improvement for me personally. I don't attach any more weight to it than you
6 should.

7 Male: Are you speaking as a cyclist or a driver?

8 Mr. Joye: Both.

9 Mr. Robinson: I asked Chris separately in an email prior to this that we've got to have data,
10 turning movements. This is completely wrong in my view. The green-painted lane was actually
11 kind of a Jaime invention. It really improved safety, I think. The right-turning cars, when they
12 do it right, they're making their right turn onto the Expressway. If that was a stop-controlled
13 intersection, it would screw up that queue that's going onto Oregon Expressway. I think an even
14 flow of traffic in all cases is going to be better, bicycles and cars. However, we don't have any
15 data, Ken. I underscore that whoever is designing this has got to have a data log.

16 Mr. Mello: Just to clarify. This would be in lieu of a traffic signal.

17 Mr. Robinson: I understand.

18 Mr. Mello: The existing condition is not going to stay. It would either be a traffic signal or it
19 would be something else like a roundabout. In regard to data, a high right-turn volume would
20 not affect the operation of a roundabout, because they would probably just dominate that
21 quadrant of the roundabout. Once in a while, when somebody came to turn left, they would have
22 to yield.

23 Mr. Joye: You're saying a right-turning vehicle does not have to yield to someone who's turning
24 left, who's already in the roundabout?

25 Mr. Mello: No, no, no. This volume would be free flow until a pedestrian crossed here or if a
26 vehicle was coming this way. The volume coming this way is so low that very seldom would
27 somebody have to ...

28 Mr. Joye: You say that, but again I live on this street. I go through it all the time. There is not a
29 low volume of left-turning vehicles. Left-turning vehicles now have to wait for all the traffic to
30 clear in order to get onto Oregon Expressway. Sometimes there's a very long line of vehicles.
31 There are new developments here and going to be more new developments with left-turn
32 vehicles.

33 Chair Neff: Paul.

34 Mr. Goldstein: I looked at this and thought, "What is my role here as an advisor to staff?" I
35 basically concur that I really need to suggest that you guys collect data. I understand a modern
36 roundabout concept such as the ones that are developed at Stanford. If that was the kind of thing
37 you were proposing, I would understand it. I don't understand how this would work. If you will

1 trust engineering judgment, I don't have a sense of whether this would be an improvement or not
2 an improvement on the existing conditions. As you guys recognizing the existing conditions,
3 there will be more traffic because there's so much development going in there. All I can do as
4 advisor to staff is to say please make sure that you collect a lot of data on movements including
5 future projections and make sure that a design like this will function for all kinds of movement.
6 I'm sort of agnostic about it.

7 Mr. Mello: Just a couple of points. This is almost identical to what was just opened at Galvez
8 and Campus. It is a modern roundabout. It's almost identical (crosstalk).

9 Mr. Goldstein: This is Galvez and Campus?

10 Mr. Mello: No. This looks just like the one that was opened at Campus and Galvez.

11 Mr. Goldstein: I know. Galvez and Campus has a huge amount of real estate connected to it.
12 Does this have that much?

13 Mr. Mello: This is a well-designed modern roundabout. The deflection isn't as great as you
14 could probably fit if we designed it from scratch. This is not like Stanford and Park ...

15 Mr. Goldstein: This is not like Homer and Addison?

16 Mr. Mello: No, it's not like that at all.

17 Mr. Goldstein: This is a modern roundabout?

18 Mr. Mello: Yes. Secondly, of course we're going to collect data. We already have the data.
19 The next step is to model it. There's a program called Visom that will actually model the
20 operations of roundabouts. We're looking for your input as cyclists, and we're looking for your
21 input as to how this relates to the bike boulevard. I don't think we want to go down the road of
22 designing a bike boulevard for traffic operations. That's kind of opposite of where we're ...

23 Mr. Goldstein: Let me just continue. I was under a different impression. I didn't get the scale
24 on this. If this is a modern roundabout, other ones that have been designed at Stanford, then
25 check the volumes and the like. I have no concerns about how it would function for bicyclists.
26 If the car volumes are correct, I have no concerns about how it would function for automobiles,
27 because (crosstalk) modern roundabout.

28 Chair Neff: Bruce is next.

29 Mr. Arthur: I have one big concern. I have noticed the afternoon traffic coming from left to
30 right on Park backs up a lot. To some extent, the virtues of the existing structure are the cars
31 kind of see it. You get on the left side of it, and you go straight through. I'm slightly concerned
32 in this design, if that backup goes through the roundabout, now all the bikes will be held up
33 behind it. There's not a way to get through. That seems to be every afternoon that that gets
34 pretty heavy. I don't know if adding more stuff will change that. My hunch is once the traffic
35 starts to back up in the roundabout, I'm not sure what happens.

1 Mr. Goldstein: It's backing up because they can't get on Oregon.

2 Mr. Arthur: Yeah, they can't get on Oregon. That's exactly why.

3 Mr. Zauman: That was pretty much my comments, that the traffic backs up and you have to
4 make sure it doesn't go into there. The right turn-lane provides a little bit for the over flow.

5 Mr. Arthur: Yeah.

6 Mr. Zauman: You're going to have a right turn-lane with the roundabout too.

7 Mr. Mello: The Galvez/Campus one actually (crosstalk) bypasses (crosstalk). That was my first
8 reaction when I saw this, do we need a bypass lane (crosstalk).

9 Mr. Zauman: I would look at it around 4:00 to 6:00 which is kind of the peak times when traffic
10 is getting onto the Expressway.

11 Chair Neff: Let's focus on bicycle things. Both of you and then I have ...

12 Vice Chair Nordman: I much prefer a roundabout to a stop light, having dealt with tons of stuff.
13 It's really a bummer to have to continuously wait. I think this can allow sort of freer flow. It
14 also will slow traffic down because of them having to do the sort of job. Slowing traffic down
15 would be better than having a street light where people are racing to get to it.

16 Chair Neff: Cedric.

17 Mr. de la Beaujardiere: I also would not like to have a stop light. I'm concerned about this
18 design. We know that all the bicyclists are going straight. Pretty much no cyclist is turning
19 right. The majority of traffic that's going left to right or southbound on Park is going to be
20 making that right turn. I feel like it's kind of expressly building in the conflict of all the
21 bicyclists getting right hooked by the majority of the cars. That's my concern there. I just don't
22 really see the clean way there for the cars to be like, "Should I be giving this bike the right-of-
23 way?" I like the current design. It's a little hairy that there's traffic on both sides. At least if
24 they're a competent driver and they've gone over to the right early instead of late, which I also do
25 see a lot, at least they're over. They do a pretty good job generally of not cutting off the cyclists.
26 The right-turners are all on my right, and they're going right. I don't have to deal with them.
27 That's my concern with this one. If there is a bypass model that you can work out, I think that'd
28 be great or put (crosstalk) ...

29 Chair Neff: Bypass for the right ...

30 Mr. de la Beaujardiere: ... and have the cars in the traffic lane, so that you're in front of the car.
31 SOL car, you've got to go slow; there's a bike here going through.

32 Chair Neff: My first thought looking at that is I know how fast the cars go through there now. I
33 don't want to have to merge into that car traffic. I have a hard time imagining the cars slowing
34 down enough that I would be comfortable making that merge. That may be completely wrong.
35 Certainly when I go through the ones at Stanford, there's enough gaps in traffic it's easy to make

1 the merges that go into one lane going into those roundabouts at Stanford. My experience is the
2 cars look like they're doing 35 down Park Boulevard right now. I'm happy to be in the bike lane,
3 and they can go 35, and it's okay. That's the thing that I'm having trouble getting over for this.
4 As Cedric points out, the way that all the bikes are going through straight and at least 70 percent
5 of the cars are probably turning right coming off Park, if you're coming from the left side here.
6 Maybe there's a way to keep the existing right-turn-only movement on that side, but it makes it
7 asymmetric. I don't know if that violates the rules of modern roundabouts or not. Maybe there's
8 some way that you can separate out that flow so that through the roundabout is maybe a slower
9 flow.

10 Mr. Mello: Just a couple of reactions to that. The way it's designed is there's no physical way
11 possible. This is kind of poorly shown here. We actually have told them they need to correct
12 this. It would be just like the one that's at Galvez and Campus. You would have to merge into
13 the travel lane. There'd be no way for a car to pass you, because this space would not be wide
14 enough for a bike and a car. Exactly what you said would be your preference is what would
15 happen here. Everybody would be moving slowly. This is extremely tight. This is a pretty tight
16 maneuver here. It's not some of the other circles where you could just cruise through by shifting
17 over a little bit. This is a very tightly designed roundabout.

18 Chair Neff: Can you point out what the two circles are?

19 Mr. Mello: This is a mountable truck apron, and this would be a landscaped, kind of higher area
20 here. You can't drive on this comfortably. You're making a fairly tight maneuver. Even though
21 there'd be a lot of cars turning, a right hook would not physically be possible unless you were
22 riding on the sidewalk or out of the travel (crosstalk).

23 Mr. Goldstein: You keep comparing it to Galvez, but Galvez does have ...

24 Chair Neff: Sorry. My other point was ...

25 Mr. Mello: There may be room to actually keep the right turn-lane and have a bypass lane like
26 what Galvez has. Right-turning vehicles would not even enter the roundabout. They would just
27 have their own—then you'd still have that conflict point where right-turners are crossing the bike
28 lane.

29 Male: What do pedestrians do in that case?

30 Mr. Mello: They have a yield.

31 Male: You have a giant bulbout there that the pedestrians are going to be able to use.

32 Mr. Mello: The channelized right turn-lane could have a raised crosswalk. It would typically
33 just have an unsignalized crosswalk. The distance you're crossing is only like 12 feet, so it's
34 fairly easy to ...

35 Male: I look at that, and I see where there are curb cuts, like right above Chris' hand. I don't
36 understand how that curb cut (crosstalk).

1 Mr. Mello: Have you seen the one at Galvez and Campus yet?

2 Male: Nope, I haven't.

3 Mr. Mello: You should go take a look at it. It's got a bypass lane that will look just like this.

4 Male: That's where the gas station is?

5 Mr. Mello: No, no. On Campus.

6 Male: It's by the Arillaga—that doesn't (crosstalk).

7 Mr. Arthur: I am concerned that if we're adding a lot of housing and other buildings, there's
8 going to be more traffic going left. Right now I think we ride this, and we see most of the traffic
9 is cars going right. As they continue to add stuff in the upper-right of this, you're going to have
10 more cars cutting left to get in there too. Is a roundabout actually helpful for that? Right now
11 we're all worried about the right hook. As they add volume, there's going to be people coming
12 north that are going to be moving left across. They're going to be very eager because there's not
13 a lot of gaps. I've seen people being ridiculously aggressive about that already, and we're adding
14 more of that.

15 Chair Neff: I see. You're worried about a left hook from someone making a left turn coming
16 this way as you're going (crosstalk).

17 Mr. Arthur: I've seen people do ridiculous things. The backup is bad, so they're going to be
18 desperate to get in. They accelerate very quickly at that sometimes. I'd like the roundabout to
19 deal with that.

20 Vice Chair Nordman: (crosstalk) cars and not the bikes.

21 Mr. Robinson: They're trying to cut into the queue to get on the Expressway.

22 Mr. Arthur: Exactly.

23 Mr. Robinson: Rob has a question.

24 Chair Neff: Wait, wait. You're not next.

25 Mr. Joye: I would be remiss if I didn't make one comment for my wife, who was concerned
26 about the herd mentality of pedestrians coming from the AOL Building to Sheridan to go to
27 Caltrain. She pointed out, I think, correctly that expecting someone to cross Park 30 or 40 feet
28 from that circle and then go 30 or 40 feet east before they can continue on to the train station
29 may be wishful thinking. That's something you should try to imagine.

30 Mr. Robinson: What's the yellow? That's the next project.

31 Mr. Joye: That's proposed 2747 Park Boulevard.

32 Mr. Robinson: It's not proposed. It's going to happen. What is the yellow?

1 Mr. Joye: That's their drawing.

2 Chair Neff: That's their sidewalk.

3 Mr. Robinson: That's their sidewalk. There will be no left turns out of Sheridan, I think. That's
4 been in the bike boulevard plan a long time. That's why there's a bulbout on the left, so cars can't
5 turn left out of ...

6 Chair Neff: Up on the upper left here?

7 Mr. Robinson: Yes, correct. It would be a prohibited, no left, for cars coming out of Sheridan.

8 Male: From the train station, you could go all the way around the far side.

9 Chair Neff: Cedric.

10 Mr. de la Beaujardiere: If you have the roundabout, I'd say you have the bike traffic merge in
11 with the car traffic early and often, so you're not kind of last minute trying to get in with all those
12 cars.

13 Male: Where's the driveway for the building at the lower edge of that illustration?

14 Mr. Robinson: You mean the building that exists?

15 Male: Yeah.

16 Mr. Robinson: It's set back to the left.

17 Male: You can merge before that driveway?

18 Mr. Goldstein: You probably need to merge about where you are now.

19 Mr. Robinson: I think you can see the pavement. No, you can't. The good news I heard tonight
20 is you have data. Let's see that simulation. The good news is that Galvez has a right-turn
21 bypass. We can go see that.

22 Chair Neff: Everyone's assignment before next month is to go over to Stanford and ride around
23 Galvez and Campus if you ...

24 Mr. Goldstein: I will caution everybody that the Galvez circle has been under construction now
25 for maybe two or three months. The pavement is very rough, and the markings are difficult. It
26 doesn't have the feel of a completed roundabout as the other ones do on Campus.

27 Chair Neff: That one's smaller than the other ones on Campus. The other ones are huge.

28 Mr. Goldstein: It is pretty big. That's why I asked Josh about the real estate. I thought it was
29 pretty big, especially since it has that dedicated right-hand turn. There's basically two lanes of
30 traffic coming in or four lanes of traffic coming into the four sides. It's pretty big.

1 Chair Neff: I think we're done with this.

2 Mr. de la Beaujardiere: One more thing.

3 Chair Neff: One more thing.

4 Mr. de la Beaujardiere: I'm sorry. I'm also kind of concerned about the pedestrian movements.
5 It seems like they're kind of—the pedestrian crossings are all kind of far away from the
6 roundabout. You're kind of already through the intersection. I guess the question is are the cars
7 going to expect pedestrians to be there and is kind of the safest configuration for pedestrians as
8 well. Is there anything like flashing lights or anything like that to (inaudible) cars and say watch
9 out or even, God forbid, speed humps to just slow that traffic down a bit?

10 Male: You've got the circle that sort of basically slows everything down. They can't go
11 (inaudible).

12 Chair Neff: Cedric, I think one thing about this design—someone can correct me when I'm
13 wrong—is you actually want to move the crossings back away from where the traffic is looking
14 at the traffic, so the traffic looks at the pedestrians and decides what to do. Then, it can go past
15 that and look at the traffic. Also, there's only one lane of traffic. I think there are islands
16 everywhere. You can get halfway across and make sure—you've a protected space before you
17 cross the second half. I think these are considered pedestrian-friendly. It takes you out of the
18 way so far that you've decided you're going to go catty-corner across the intersection anyway.

19 Mr. de la Beaujardiere: I can see the logic of separating from the roundabout.

20 Chair Neff: I guess there is a little bit of a "walking away from the corner" penalty if you're
21 (crosstalk).

22 Male: That's true. Roundabouts (inaudible).

23 Mr. Goldstein: Thank you for bringing this to our (crosstalk).

24 Mr. Corrao: It's my pleasure. I see merits to both. Being out there, I went and took a look. My
25 personal take is that I kind of feel like in this area over time the land use patterns could evolve
26 into more of a Downtown feel. I think that's something we should take into consideration too,
27 what's more appropriate. Part of the reason I brought this here is I wanted to get a sense of when
28 this group feels like traffic circles are appropriate and when it would be preferred to have signal
29 equipment. It's really helpful to hear all these comments. Obviously we'll bring anything back.

30 Mr. Robinson: I've got one more question again. How does this relate to Fehr & Peers' existing
31 contract to finish up Park/Wilkie? They were given a quarter million dollars, I believe, in May.
32 This is right on their responsibility. I'm confused. Who's in charge?

33 Mr. Corrao: The Fehr & Peers bike boulevard contract is one of the projects that I'm managing.
34 This is separate. This is tied to a development project. These funds are not related to the Fehr &
35 Peers contract.

1 Mr. Robinson: Somehow they have to meld.

2 Mr. Mello: Fehr & Peers today does assume that there would be a traffic signal there?

3 Mr. Robinson: A signal?

4 Chair Neff: There's pretty much nothing they have to do for that, I think.

5 Mr. Mello: Not if there's a traffic signal.

6 Mr. de la Beaujardiere. I'm sorry. I have to say one more thing. Why not just keep things as
7 they are? I think the way it is now works pretty well. You could argue that northbound Park is
8 sort of hosed because they just kind of get queued up, and they wait forever. Theoretically you
9 could have a traffic signal that is green pretty much all the time except for some times when
10 there's traffic queuing up trying to go north and turning left. Then, you would get like a stop
11 signal to kind of give them a break. If there was a traffic signal where like 75 percent of the time
12 it was green for the cyclist coming through, I'd be okay with the traffic light. I just don't want a
13 traffic light where half the time it's red and having to stop again. Otherwise, I guess my
14 question, why not keep things as they are? What are you trying to solve?

15 Mr. Mello: If we don't do anything, the intersection is going to become unsafe and unfunctional
16 with the projections for traffic based on the development that's been approved out there.

17 Mr. Liberman: I have a question. Have you presented these ideas to the people in the AOL
18 Building or to the people in that new construction that's partially rented, the people who are
19 going to be primarily affected by this to get some reaction to it?

20 Mr. Joye: Those are not the people primarily affected. They're important, but my neighbor is
21 primarily affected.

22 Mr. Liberman: Exactly. To the Park Boulevard neighborhood. It's more than just this
23 community.

24 Mr. Mello: The traffic signal was part of an environmental document that was approved by City
25 Council.

26 Male: A few years ago.

27 Mr. Mello: This is a brand new concept that is an alternative to what was approved as part of the
28 environmental document.

29 Mr. Corrao: We're not voting on that, just to be clear. We're not voting on that tonight.

30 Mr. Liberman: I'm just advocating. (crosstalk) community input is helpful in general, rather
31 than just trying to present something and saying, "We've already presented this and this is part of
32 an environmental input statement that was submitted as part of a development proposal, so you're
33 going to have to swallow it whether or not you like it or not."

1 Mr. Corrao: We'll absolutely reach out when we have an idea of what those alternatives could
2 be. I think we're so early that it's too early just yet.

3 Mr. Goldstein: If I may, what is the next step? Thank you very much for bringing it to us at this
4 extremely early stage conceptually. I think the sense of the Committee is that we would prefer
5 something other than a traffic signal as bicyclists. I think the sense of the Committee is that
6 modern roundabouts do work well for bicycles and that we would like some more data about
7 current and projected volumes to make sure that this particular design is going to work.
8 Certainly if it backs up because of problems on the—that's a major consideration that you're
9 going to have to take into account. What's your next steps on this?

10 Mr. Corrao: I would transmit this feedback to Jarrett Mullen, who's working on this project. I'm
11 not 100 percent certain what his timeline is on this project. I would report back, and I can let you
12 know at a subsequent meeting or by email.

13 Mr. Mello: Just to put a fine point on the public involvement. We could require the developer to
14 go back and do some outreach to the surrounding neighborhood. The environmental document
15 will have to be modified, which is a public process. This is just the very early stages of
16 investigation of what some of the alternatives to a traffic signal could be. We can certainly
17 encourage the developer to go back and do some focused outreach on the abutting property
18 owners.

19 Mr. Joye: The developer in this case is 2747?

20 Mr. Mello: No, I think it's the one ...

21 Mr. Robinson: The existing one, I think.

22 Mr. Joye: The Park (crosstalk) 195 Page Mill.

23 Mr. Robinson: 195, yeah.

24 Mr. de la Beaujardiere: The one in the upper right?

25 Mr. Mello: We'll clarify that. Most of developments have all triggered this cumulative impact to
26 that intersection.

27 Chair Neff: Thanks. I added 5f, the Park/Stanford roundabout. From this intersection, if you go
28 through California Avenue and keep going on Park, there's a new roundabout there right at Peers
29 Park and Stanford Avenue, instead of stop signs. Does anyone else ...

30 Male: I've ridden but not driven.

31 Chair Neff: We have six people who have ...

32 Mr. Robinson: Not driven.

33 Chair Neff: Do you want my comment first or last?

1 Male: Go right ahead.

2 Chair Neff: My comment was that I thought the merge space from the bike lane to the car lane
3 was really late. It was like all of a sudden the bike lane's ending and I should merge. Maybe it
4 wasn't fairly long. Maybe I'm just not used to going through there.

5 Mr. Robinson: I go through there eight times a week. I've never had a driver ...

6 Chair Neff: Had to merge.

7 Mr. Robinson: ... to share. I never had to merge.

8 Mr. Goldstein: You're too fast, Robert.

9 Chair Neff: Yeah, that's what I realized.

10 Mr. Robinson: I've had to yield to cyclists.

11 Chair Neff: The thing is there's not much time between when the paint says you should be
12 merging to looking behind and making sure you miss the traffic island in front if you're going at
13 14 miles an hour. When you look at something like—my recommendation is you look at that
14 and say Meadow at Ross where we're planning on doing the traffic circles, start that merge. I
15 don't know how you decide how far back.

16 Mr. Corrao: I just want to mention before (inaudible) comments on this. This is something Josh
17 and I have been in the field looking at a lot recently. One of the things that we've noticed with
18 the design of this traffic circle is it's pretty easy still for a motorist to sail through. We're looking
19 at installing a deflection island. There's one that's scheduled to occur with the bike boulevard,
20 but we may go ahead and just move that forward faster. It seems like it would be really helpful.
21 That would force ...

22 Mr. Mello: (crosstalk) southbound. There's already one going northbound. There's no island
23 going southbound.

24 Mr. Courington: I just didn't feel like there was much deflection for automobiles at that circle.

25 Mr. Corrao: Again on the opposite side of the intersection, so that would be the ...

26 Chair Neff: Stanford?

27 Mr. Corrao: ... southwest side as well.

28 Chair Neff: And Stanford Avenue?

29 Mr. Corrao: Yes. From Stanford making a right onto Park but on Park. Just to tighten up ...

30 Mr. Robinson: (crosstalk) at the circle.

1 Mr. Goldstein: I haven't actually ridden through that, but I want to support Robert's comment.
2 In my experience with the roundabouts at Stanford and even there, the marking for the merge is
3 sort of late for anybody who is a vehicular cyclist and is moving along pretty quick. I will
4 generally merge before the line turns dotted. The other day I happened to be in a car, and the
5 driver was not particularly familiar with roundabouts and the like. I noticed that the bicyclist in
6 front of us did not merge to the center. I could see that it was actually very confusing. It was
7 very confusing to know whether he was supposed to pass the bicyclist or what he was supposed
8 to do. You have to be moving pretty slow to get into the roundabout anyway. I take your
9 comments about deflection. It's much better if the bicyclist is taking that lane, and it's very clear
10 that he or she is in front of you and you're going to go through that in turn. When the bicyclist is
11 sort of pushed to the right, it is more confusing especially for a driver who is not used to these
12 things.

13 Mr. Courington: I rode through that intersection three times, I think, so far. I love it. I love that
14 the road is smooth. Thank you. It is wonderful to ride through. I love that I don't have to stop.
15 I like the fact that you put the flags up on the yield sign to alert people that this intersection is
16 different. It's a nice transition to sort of let people know this is different now. I did not worry
17 about the size of the merge, maybe because I'm just comfortable riding in the middle of it
18 already, because I already do it. I loved it, absolutely loved it. Also, you're right. There's very
19 little auto traffic down there.

20 Mr. Mello: Talk to the lady that lives there and it's a superhighway. Collisions happening all
21 day long. People with strollers diving out of the road. I'm not exaggerating.

22 Mr. Goldstein: That's a known fact. The street in front of your house is the busiest street in the
23 City.

24 Mr. Courington: I love that intersection. I'm very happy.

25 Mr. Goldstein: It's true in my case.

26 Mr. Corrao: We are putting landscaping in within the next—I can't give you a date (crosstalk).

27 Mr. Courington: (crosstalk) I might even have to use my brakes going left.

28 Mr. Corrao: It is still under construction, so it (inaudible).

29 Mr. Courington: We're about an hour behind, so I don't know if we want to triage some of the
30 remaining items or stay late or what.

31 Chair Neff: Goodness. We have the bike share presentation, and it's 40 minutes for that.

32 Mr. Corrao: Actually that bike share presentation can be about 10 minutes. I just wanted to
33 leave time for Q&A.

34 Mr. Goldstein: What's time sensitive?

1 Mr. Corrao: Can I make a suggestion? There really isn't much of an update on the Friendship
2 Bridge closure. We're just looking to figure out the best way to transmit when it's open and
3 closed. That's not time sensitive. The new roadway markings around town additionally we
4 could discuss at the next meeting. Bicycle safety education ties in well with the bike share
5 presentation. I think that I could do that presentation in about 10 minutes. We could still be ...

6 Chair Neff: Actually the 101 bridge meeting is—I can do that pretty quickly. Why don't I just
7 do that? I'll try to be fast.

8 Mr. Goldstein: The grant funding thing, there's nothing going to surprise me tomorrow night at
9 the meeting?

10 Mr. Corrao: No, it's minimal.

11 Mr. Mello: Unless we got one of the awards. I'll be pleased.

12 Mr. Corrao: There's minimal updates on grant funding. We'll find out in the next week if we get
13 the MTC letter of interest.

14 Chair Neff: Josh, you weren't here. Paul was saying that he would like, as a member of the
15 VTA (crosstalk) have already talked about that.

16 **6. US 101 BRIDGE DESIGN MEETING REPORT**

17 Chair Neff: Eric and I met—about a week and a half ago, we came down and talked to the—is
18 he a contractor?

19 Vice Chair Nordman: The designer.

20 Chair Neff: The designer who's with the firm that's doing the design and build contract for the
21 101 overcrossing at Adobe Creek. He asked us specifically at the touchdown on the east side if
22 we wanted there to be chicanes there. We said no. He said okay. That was the main specific
23 feedback we had. We talked a lot about the bridge in general. There are a lot of specific issues
24 on the west side. The way the plans come down across the bridge over Adobe Creek is a
25 problem because there are utility vaults right there, vaults underneath. You can't kind of build
26 right across the top of them. That's something he's working on. He's looking at the possibility
27 of—there are a lot of options he's working through. He seems to have good experience. The
28 plan is for a 12-foot wide walkway. Right now he's sort of working on this, the basic plan. At
29 some point, he's going to come back to the City Council and say, "Here's the basic plan, and
30 here's how much it costs, and here are these things that you could possibly add on which would
31 make it cost more."

32 Mr. Goldstein: Who was this?

33 Chair Neff: This was—I don't remember.

34 Male: Is it Biggs Cardosa?

1 Chair Neff: Yeah, Biggs Cardosa is the contractor. This individual is not named either of those
2 names. His previous experience. His firm and he worked on the San Tomas Creek Trail with the
3 County and with the Water District. I think the other main thing he said is that working with the
4 Water District goes up and down. Sometimes it's easy and sometimes it's hard depending on if
5 they've had a project with someone else who's given them a hard time lately. Right now, they
6 have had a hard time with the Levi Stadium people who promised one thing and didn't deliver.
7 They've had problems with ...

8 Vice Chair Nordman: That was primarily it.

9 Chair Neff: ... the San Tomas Creek, where they've told people that they could go ahead and
10 pave their roadways, and then they go back and they use their heavy equipment, and they break
11 up the pavement with their equipment. The Water District has been told, "You should repair
12 that." They say, "We didn't plan on spending money to repair your pavement." The plan is still
13 to build the trail by the creek that goes from the bridge to Meadow. The exact surface is
14 probably unlikely to be pavement there. It's likely to be some kind of ...

15 Vice Chair Nordman: Some kind of gravel or ...

16 Mr. Courington: Decomposed granite?

17 Mr. Goldstein: DG, decomposed granite.

18 Chair Neff: We suggested decomposed granite would be good, but it wasn't a slam dunk that the
19 Water District would be happy with that. Whatever it is, they would want to be able to drive
20 their stuff on it with impunity and not worry about destroying the surface of the bikeway. I don't
21 know if DG is ...

22 Mr. Goldstein: Can you drive on DG?

23 Vice Chair Nordman: I think they have very heavy equipment, particularly the things that dig
24 out the canal. I think some of those might have tractor treads. I'm not sure. I think they just
25 don't want pavement that's going to get damaged.

26 Mr. Mello: You can drive on DG, but it would still get torn up by tracks.

27 Chair Neff: It's all more complicated than it looked when we looked at the plans.

28 Vice Chair Nordman: The primary one is not unlike what we had looked at in the sense of the
29 big "U." He also has an alternate one that had sort of a total 90-degree, sharp alternate. I think
30 not very good, and it wasn't going to be good for Google either, who owns that property.

31 Chair Neff: I think that's—anyway he's working hard on the design. We'll see where it comes
32 out.

33 Mr. Goldstein: Is there a tentative schedule at this point?

1 Chair Neff: We didn't hear it. He was just looking for some input from us on some specific
2 aspects. I think he wants to come back to City Council for the ideas for add-ons. I think
3 (inaudible) is what he was looking for.

4 **7. BIKE SHARE STAFF PRESENTATION**

5 Chair Neff: We're ready for the bike share.

6 Mr. Corrao: I will try to channel my inner New Yorker tonight and make this very fast. We
7 have the bike share presentation and Q&A in a short period of time. Bear with me. As I have
8 mentioned at previous meetings, the City is going to be launching a second integration of its bike
9 share program. To give you a little bit of background on bike share. Palo Alto and Redwood
10 City and Mountain View all participated in the Bay Area Bike Share pilot program. Palo Alto's
11 had a five-station system with 37 bikes. There's a large-scale Bay Area Bike Share expansion
12 that's under way. Bay Area's had 700 bikes since the program launched, and it's rapidly scaling
13 up to 7,000 bikes. That started in 2015. Those bikes will be in San Francisco, Oakland,
14 Berkeley, San Jose and Emeryville. As you all know, the Peninsula communities that
15 participated in the pilot were not invited to participate in the system based on the ridership. They
16 were given the ability to buy into the system. To give you a little bit of overview on the
17 performance. Our bike share system had 0.17 trips per bike per day. We believe that despite—
18 you may hear some chatter online from some community members that bike share may not work
19 in Palo Alto. We don't find that to be the case at all. The following reasons are more likely
20 culprits. There's a very small service area. Thirty-seven bikes and five stations for a city the size
21 of Palo Alto, which is approximately 27 square miles, a population of 66,000, a daytime
22 population of 15,000, is completely inadequate. Also, a dock-style system which only offers
23 point-to-point trips really doesn't function well in suburban areas. Lastly, the ability to expand
24 with private partners, with the large corporate entities here, is very limited with the dock-style
25 system. That's because you really have no other destinations to reach. You need another dock.
26 It would be extremely costly to cover the City with docks. This is the existing bike share map.
27 There are only five stations. Unless you're riding around downtown Palo Alto or the Cal. Ave.
28 business district, it's not extremely useful. After a study session that Council held in April—
29 when I started in May actually—we started working with our neighboring communities to
30 consider a subregional system using Social Bicycles. The direction from Council was to pursue
31 a smart bike system. This is a system where you don't have to use a dock, but you can leave a
32 bike at either a station or outside a station area. We met many times with Redwood City, San
33 Mateo, Mountain View. We're discussing using a different operator, purchasing the equipment
34 from Social Bicycles and then having a company called Bikes Make Life Better run the system.
35 San Mateo went ahead and did that. Between the time of that launch and now, Motivate made an
36 unsolicited offer to the City of Palo Alto because of a title sponsor that will be supporting the
37 system that's based in Palo Alto. They have offered to fully operate a bike share system at no
38 cost to the City of up to 350 bicycles. At the time, that offer was not made to neighboring
39 communities; it was only made to Palo Alto. We took advantage of the recently formed
40 Manager's Mobility Partnership. This is a group of City Managers and Stanford University and
41 Joint Venture Silicon Valley. You have Menlo Park, Mountain View, Redwood City and Palo
42 Alto all represented. Basically met to discuss bike share. Each city is intent on bike share.
43 Negotiate with Motivate sort of as a unified block. We were able to convince Motivate to
44 operate Social Bicycles as part of Bay Area Bike Share. It's, we feel like, a really big win for the

1 Peninsula. In the new proposal, Palo Alto would be responsible still for purchasing the capital
2 equipment. The total cost is \$1,160,803. Motivate would operate for the life of the contract up to
3 350 bikes. Any additional bikes over 350 bikes, the City would pay \$100 per bicycle per month.
4 For Peninsula communities, what we've been able to negotiate is either free operations or all
5 sponsorship assets to offset operational cost. These aren't choices they can make; these are
6 choices that Motivate will be making. They're still negotiating with the title sponsor. Their goal
7 is to have free operations to all neighboring communities. However, if they can't convince the
8 title sponsor to pay for all operations up and down the Peninsula, they have at least committed to
9 giving away all sponsorship assets. That's like the bike basket, the skirt guard, the station-based
10 advertising. That is more than enough to offset the operational costs of the system. They will be
11 announcing the sponsor this week, so we'll know who the overall Bay Area Bike Share program
12 sponsor is. It apparently has a presence in Palo Alto, but not necessarily based here. We don't
13 know either.

14 Mr. Mello: It is an older company.

15 Mr. Corrao: An older company you might not expect. That's what we've heard.

16 Mr. Joye: It's kind of a mystery.

17 Mr. Corrao: It's a mystery. To give you a little bit of ...

18 Mr. Goldstein: AT&T.

19 Mr. Corrao: ... an overview on SoBi equipment and why we feel it's better for Palo Alto. This is
20 a picture of the Social Bicycles rack in Santa Monica. Their system is called Breeze. The station
21 equipment is essentially a glorified bike rack. It has a base plate and blades that you lock the
22 bikes to. On that blade sign, you have a map of the City. Usually there's some bicycle safety
23 information on there, how to use the system, etc. This system can be assembled and
24 disassembled within a few hours. Each station is just set on the ground. It doesn't have to be
25 drilled in. There's no utility connections; there's no trenching. It's much less intrusive when
26 you're placing this in front of a business versus a large dock. The way this system works. This
27 is an image of the Portland system that launched recently. You have an app here, and the green
28 areas are hubs. This is actually a hub. If you look at this map, you'll see that a hub is actually
29 this entire intersection. What's great about this is—in other bike share systems, when you get to
30 a hub or a rack and they're all filled up, you need to keep riding until you can find an available
31 hub. In this situation, you could lock the bike to any available bicycle rack, and you won't be
32 penalized. If you do, though, park out of a hub area entirely, you're charged \$3. If you return it,
33 which is any of these blue dots, to a hub, you get credit of \$1. That helps rebalance the system.
34 We can tinker with those incentives. Here's an image of a SoBi bike in West Hollywood, where
35 I used to work. As you can see, the locking mechanism is on the bike itself. All access and
36 usability of this is all on-bike. That's why there's no need for any connections on the station
37 itself. You can use either your app or a membership card if you don't have a smart phone. You
38 can reserve bikes 10 minutes ahead of time. You can buy rides for your friends. It's a very
39 convenient system.

1 Mr. Mello: The coolest thing is—I used the one in Phoenix when I was there—the grid system.
2 I rode to a coffee shop, locked it up out in front of the coffee shop, and it stayed reserved under
3 my name. I was able to go in, buy a coffee and then unlock it when I came out, and then ride it
4 back to a hub. You can't do that with the (crosstalk) station systems.

5 Mr. Courington: Do you have a pin to unlock it?

6 Mr. Mello: Yeah, you get a pin.

7 Mr. Corrao: You do, yeah. In contrast to our 37-bike system that we currently we have, we're
8 proposing a 350-bike first phase of the system that would launch in June of 2017. This is a map
9 that shows the potential full build-out. This isn't a recent map. This was included in the Council
10 bike share staff report, the study session that I mentioned from last May. It was created by Toole
11 Design Group. We would do a thorough public outreach process to determine where the best
12 station locations would be. It would have a map where residents and business owners could pin
13 desired station and hub locations. We've applied, speaking of grants, for grant funding through
14 the MTC for a second phase of this program. That funding is available in 2018. We applied for
15 \$1 million. That could double the fleet. That would pay for 350 additional bikes. In that case,
16 we would be on the hook for operational costs, which would be \$420,000 a year. However, in
17 the world of bike share that's still an exceptional deal. The other really amazing thing about this
18 type of bike share system is that, because it's smart bikes, there's enormous interest and
19 opportunity to work with private entities to grow the system. We've been in touch with
20 Facebook. We've been working with Stanford, both the University and the Research Park, the
21 Medical Center, even Google. They all have expressed some interest of hosting stations, so that
22 could mean purchasing the equipment and paying for operations. That would be completely
23 compatible with the City system, You would, as a user, have no idea that that company paid for
24 that equipment. Also for future development as a potential offset for transportation demand
25 management, this could be a tool that's in the City's toolkit to reduce traffic impacts. Our
26 timeline—I'm running a little bit late to your question. Our timeline is we go to Council
27 October 4th. We would then negotiate with the vendor for a couple of months before bringing a
28 contract back to Council, and then issue a purchase order for the equipment with an eye on
29 launching in June. Of course, we would have a big launch party, which is what you do when you
30 launch a robust bike share system. In 2018, if we do get the grant award, as soon as we get the
31 E-76 from MTC, we could double the size of the system. That is just a cost outline. That's the
32 last slide. That's pretty much it. We're very excited about this. We're excited that we've been
33 able to work a deal for the whole Peninsula. It's pretty exciting.

34 Mr. Courington: That's San Mateo to Mountain View?

35 Mr. Corrao: Yes.

36 Chair Neff: The other cities would invest their own funds to get themselves off the ground?

37 Mr. Corrao: Yes. We would include in our contract a "me too" clause, which guarantees them
38 the same pricing and all of the deals that we've been able to negotiate. When they do their
39 contract, they would just be buying the bikes, and then they could reference our "me too" clause
40 in our contract.

1 Mr. Goldstein: What is the proposed pricing model for a user of the system?

2 Mr. Corrao: Because this is now Bay Area Bike Share, the pricing would be consistent with the
3 pricing set by MTC for the Bay Area. We would not have the ability to change the fares. It
4 would be the same as it is currently, which is \$9 for a day. There's a 3-day pass available or an
5 annual pass.

6 Mr. Goldstein: A monthly pass or an annual pass.

7 Mr. Corrao: Exactly. One minor detail I forgot to note on the hub, one thing that's kind of
8 interesting. I mentioned that there's a \$3 fee for leaving a bike out of hub. Some communities
9 have determined that they wanted their entire downtown to be a hub. That's kind of an
10 interesting thing. We could, if we wanted to, determine that University Avenue's the hub.
11 You're never penalized if you leave a bike at the station area.

12 Mr. Robinson: You mean if you tie it to a tree, it's still a hub.

13 Mr. Corrao: As long as it doesn't conflict with City policy.

14 Mr. Robinsons: A lock would prohibit some trees.

15 Chair Neff: You're not allowed to use the trees.

16 Mr. Zauman: Just one comment about the pricing. A friend of mine from out of town saw the
17 current bike share stations. He assumed that \$8 was \$8 per ride. This was just from reading it.
18 If someone reads it once, they're going to jump to a conclusion. They're not going to parse the
19 thing and try to figure that out. It's probably worth taking whatever signs you have describing
20 the pricing, run it past 10 or 20 people who haven't seen it before, and see what they think it
21 actually says.

22 Mr. Corrao: That's a good point.

23 Mr. Zauman: You may find that's something that may make them make the wrong interpretation
24 of what the pricing actually is.

25 Mr. Mello: One of the things that will be different under our bike share 2.0 is there will be a title
26 sponsor whose name will be all over the equipment and associated with the system. If the
27 system doesn't operate well and people aren't happy, it's going to reflect negatively on that
28 sponsor. There's going to be another party that's watching Motivate to make sure the system is
29 operated efficiently and in a customer-friendly manner. That doesn't happen today. There's no
30 title sponsor.

31 Mr. Zauman: I think there's a (inaudible) ours is a little too high if you're just using it for like a
32 3-minute bike ride.

33 Mr. Corrao: The pricing right now may even be \$9, but it's for a day. You get a certain fixed
34 amount of time that you can use incrementally. It's incremental up until—is it 30 minutes or 60
35 minutes?

1 Mr. Mello: I think you get 30 minutes per ride.

2 Chair Neff: The per day pricing works pretty well if you're a tourist.

3 Mr. Zauman: And you're not just making one trip.

4 Vice Chair Nordman: Social Bikes is much better than the existing ones. I think you want to
5 sort of not try to spread out for the entire City. The residential areas, I think you will not get
6 much use. I think people are using them, as Paul had said previously, to go to Philz, get coffee.
7 It's mainly the workers who would be using these bikes as opposed to people who at home use
8 their own bikes.

9 Mr. Courington: I'm not sure if I remember this correctly. Didn't Jaime have a surprisingly
10 difficult time in getting people to allocate space for stations? Do you think that's ...

11 Mr. Robinson: The five that we have?

12 Mr. Courington: Yeah.

13 Mr. Goldstein: These stations are less intrusive. Yes, it was a big deal.

14 Chair Neff: I think the main thing is we didn't we get any cooperation with private—the Research
15 Park or the hospital or Stanford.

16 Mr. Corrao: That is one of the appeals that this station has. It's so compact and light. You can
17 even do a mini station that's half the length. You don't have to have this blade sign either. In
18 some constrained areas, you can do a small grouping of bikes versus a docking station where it's
19 much heavier equipment and it's more visually intrusive to a business. It's almost like a bus
20 shelter, in a sense.

21 Chair Neff: Paul.

22 Mr. Goldstein: This is probably advanced thinking. Has there been consideration of
23 encouraging employers to offer as a benefit to their employees annual passes to the bike share
24 program?

25 Mr. Corrao: We have been discussing that, and it will be in our contract discussions with
26 Motivate. That will be something that we'll discuss with them.

27 Mr. Mello: Corporate memberships are one of the most effective (crosstalk) funding streams for
28 (crosstalk).

29 Mr. Goldstein: That's what I would say, because those are your target audience really. People
30 come by train; they don't have a bike in town.

31 Mr. Mello: Another thing I can see is us conditioning development approval on them installing a
32 bike share station as one of their TDM measures.

33 Chair Neff: Cedric.

1 Mr. de la Beaujardiere: The pricing seems a little high to me. I did the Paris one, and it was 8
2 Euros for a week. I just checked it right now. A 7-day ticket for 8 Euros. A 1-day ticket is 1
3 Euro 70, so it's about \$2 a day. I don't know if there's any way to get that price down. For us, it
4 was extremely affordable, especially compared to—you might want to look at what's the cost of
5 like a transit ticket. A transit ticket's going to cost you maybe four ...

6 Chair Neff: \$2.

7 Mr. de la Beaujardiere: \$2. (crosstalk) maybe getting a transfer or something. I'm not sure how
8 much the transfer is. Or comparable, say, to get into the City or out of the City. That's like \$9.

9 Mr. Goldstein: It's set by MTC.

10 Mr. Courington: You don't want to go up against MTC (crosstalk) what these guys do. That's a
11 huge organization setting the prices.

12 Mr. de la Beaujardiere: I think the price could be an issue in terms of getting usage. If it's too
13 high, it's going to fail, people aren't going to use it. It should be—I don't know. Maybe talk to
14 MTC to talk about what is their thinking here.

15 Mr. Corrao: What we could definitely do is talk to Motivate about—some cities have done some
16 sort of founding membership, which is intended to be part of the promotion of the system before
17 launch and usually gives residents or employees the ability to get a discounted rate on annual
18 memberships. We don't have the ability to change the fare structure. Actually the bike share
19 company has researched to death what fare will give them the highest ridership. Even though it
20 does seem high to me as well—it's almost as high as the Chicago system—they have researched
21 that number down to maximize their ability to provide good customer service with their
22 anticipated ridership. Unfortunately we don't have a ton of wiggle room, but I'll definitely push
23 for in the negotiations some way to get a better deal.

24 Mr. de la Beaujardiere: That would be good. You said these are smart bikes. They'll collect
25 data about where they're picked up, where they're ridden and stuff. You said there's an app too.
26 The app presumably would collect data, like where the person is when they're ordering the bike.
27 I think that data over time could be used in tailoring where you put the system, if you're getting a
28 lot of demand from over here. Someone said maybe residences aren't really great, but I would
29 say hotels would probably be a great target.

30 Mr. Corrao: That's a good point.

31 Mr. de la Beaujardiere: The Paris one, I was staying at my aunt's place. Walk down the street,
32 pick up a bike.

33 Mr. Corrao: (crosstalk) is that what it's called?

34 Mr. de la Beaujardiere: Velib, yeah. I'm not 100 percent sure that just saying don't put it at all in
35 the residential, because you do have visitors from out of town or whatever. I think there's
36 potentially some opportunity there.

1 Mr. Corrao: The beauty of this system is you can take a bike, and you could take it to a
2 residential area. If you can park it somewhere, you'd be okay. That's a great point about data.
3 One of the questions I want for this group too is—I apologize for interrupting. I'm using this as a
4 dry run for Council. I'm also looking for comments on what's missing in this PowerPoint, not
5 just comments on bike share. Data was a good point. One of the slides I forgot to add is that
6 there's a dashboard given to the City on the data. It's anonymous data, but it shows all the trips.
7 It shows the routes people are taking. It could be incredibly useful for PABAC and for the City.
8 I'll make a note to take a look at that slide.

9 Mr. Robinson: A title sponsor will get advertisement. These little blades, do they have to be on
10 public right-of-way? They can't be on private property or could they be on private property?

11 Mr. Corrao: They can also be on private property. They work better.

12 Mr. Robinson: A business could say, "Use my sidewalk." Is that what you're saying?

13 Mr. Corrao: Yes. We anticipate having ours on the sidewalk. This is just Santa Monica's. The
14 City could put them on the sidewalk and public right-of-way and plans to. For private property
15 like hotels, we would need to have some sort of agreement with the property owner.

16 Male: Where I work, they have Social Bikes directly in front of the building.

17 Male: Where do you work?

18 Male: In Menlo Park.

19 Mr. Goldstein: If I were a City Council Member, I would look at what the cost is to the City.
20 This is such a better deal than the previous one. The previous one was free, but (inaudible) MTC
21 paid for it all. I personally have my own doubts about whether this is going to work. If anything
22 is going to work, this seems one hell of a lot more viable than what we (crosstalk).

23 Chair Neff: In places like Santa Monica, what sort of usage are they getting up to per bike?

24 Mr. Corrao: Up to 3 trips per bike per day, 2-3. That's what Portland is getting also. Our target
25 is 1 trip per bike per day.

26 Chair Neff: I saw New York City is up to 6.

27 Mr. de la Beaujardiere: The previous one is 0.17?

28 Mr. Corrao: 0.17. We're starting from a pretty low bar.

29 Mr. de la Beaujardiere: I think this has a much more chance of success. Just like you said, the
30 five stations and I don't know how many bikes, I don't remember. Having just a more distributed
31 system is much more usable.

32 Mr. Corrao: I think for a lot of people that take Caltrain and don't bring their bikes because of
33 the bike crowding, it could be helpful. I know I plan on using it.

1 Mr. Robinson: They don't have a chain. They're a really interesting construction. They have a
2 drive shaft. It's all totally enclosed.

3 Chair Neff: Do you have any word on what the usage is so far in San Mateo or is it still too early
4 to ask?

5 Mr. Corrao: I don't know their trips per bike per day, but I believe it's pretty low. They have a
6 pretty small system also. They're kind of doing a bare bones approach. They're not doing many
7 hubs or stations. They just really ordered the bicycles. They're even having a staff person doing
8 half of the rebalancing. I've been in close contact with them. We really want them to get on
9 board and buy into this system so that they're not on a separate network with SoBi bicycles.
10 We're meeting tomorrow in this room, from all the cities all the staff members. Hopefully we'll
11 all get the green light. If San Mateo could buy in, it'd be great.

12 **8. GRANT FUNDING UPDATES**

13 **9. ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

14 **a. Bicycle Safety Education**

15 **b. Friendship Bridge Closure Information**

16 **c. New Roadway Markings Around Town**

17 Chair Neff: Let me tell you about the new roadway markings around town. North California has
18 wide bike lanes on both sides of the street now. It's very nice ...

19 Mr. Courington: I rode that the other day.

20 Chair Neff: ... especially the ones that are no longer substandard. Los Robles has bike lanes all
21 the way up to Laguna from El Camino, which is (crosstalk). Before, that was sort of a narrow
22 and a wide, but it's nicer. The north side is nicer. Park looks good. Finally, Bike Palo Alto is
23 coming up on ...

24 Mr. Robinson: On the 2nd of October.

25 Chair Neff: ... the 2nd of October. If you want a yellow sign to put on the back of your bicycle,
26 talk to this man.

27 Mr. Robinson: The Mayor has a part in this particular one.

28 Chair Neff: There's going to be a bike fest in front of City Hall.

29 Mr. Robinsons: A bike fest right over there on Bryant side of the campus.

30 Chair Neff: It's a new feature for Bike Palo Alto. Semi-related to that, the Midtown Residents
31 Association has their ice cream social coming up two Sundays from now on the 17th. I'm going
32 to be there. I'm going to be doing some publicity for Bike Palo Alto, but I also have a map of the
33 City and asking people for their input on the bike network and how we're doing. I'll write that
34 up. I saw my notes from what I wrote up last year, and I realized I didn't follow up very well.

1 One of the comments was we needed bike racks in Hoover Park. I don't think I did anything
2 about that.

3 Male: I think the Friendship Bridge, which is the bridge that connects up to East Palo Alto along
4 the Baylands. The last couple of works, there's a sign that says closed September 1st for this
5 levee reconstruction thing, 2 years.

6 Male: It's closed for 2 years.

7 Male: Then they put up a sign that sort of said closed intermittently. Evidently you can contact
8 the San Francisquito Creek thing, and they will put you on an email list. You can sign up for an
9 email list, which I did. That's sort of the Bay Trail connection as it exists.

10 Chair Neff: Can that be put on something like the City website?

11 Mr. Corrao: Yeah. We could put that on our website.

12 Chair Neff: Along with the one that tells us when the underpass is closed. If we can keep up
13 (inaudible).

14 Mr. Corrao: Also, Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition, I've been communicating with them so that
15 they can get it out through their social media, since our social media is not very robust.

16 Mr. Zauman: Will this be set up so you can use a Clipper card just to pay for it?

17 Mr. Corrao: Bike share?

18 Mr. Zauman: Yep.

19 Mr. Corrao: Yes.

20 Male: That's great.

21 Mr. Courington: Half price for seniors?

22 Chair Neff: My Clipper card is free because my work pays for it.

23 Mr. Courington: I don't have to work. I think I've gotten the better deal.

24 **10. ADJOURNMENT**

25 Chair Neff: Seeing no other material, the meeting is adjourned.

26