



Palo Alto Pedestrian and  
Bicycle Advisory Committee

Tuesday, April 4, 2017 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
3. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES
4. SRTS UPDATE
5. STAFF UPDATES:
  - a. EXISTING TRAFFIC CIRCLES & INFLUENCE ON BIKE BLVD PROJECT
  - b. SHARED USE PATH SIGNAGE & BOL PARK PATH PLAN
6. CHARLESTON/ARASTRADERO PRESENTATION (65% PLANS) 7:00
  - a. 65% Plans Part 1
  - b. 65% Plans Part 2
7. STANDING ITEMS:
  - a. BIKE SHARE UPDATE
  - b. GRANT FUNDING UPDATE
  - c. VTA BPAC UPDATE
8. ANNOUNCEMENTS
9. ADJOURNMENT 8:00



# PABAC

Palo Alto Pedestrian and  
Bicycle Advisory Committee

Tuesday, March 7, 2017

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), Cedric de la Beaujardiere, Bill Courington, Paul Goldstein, Ken Joye, Rob Robinson, Jane Rothstein, Richard Swent, Bill Zauman

Members Absent: Bruce Arthur, Ann Crichton, Steve Rock

Staff Present: Chris Corrao, Cherie Walkowiak

Guest: None.

**1. CALL TO ORDER** at 6:02 p.m.

**2. AGENDA CHANGES**

Chair Neff announced Item Number 8 would follow Item Number 5.

**3. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES**

**MOTION**

Motion by Mr. Goldstein, second by Vice Chair Nordman, to approve the minutes of the February 7, 2017 meeting as presented. Motion passed unanimously with Mr. Joye abstaining.

**4. SRTS UPDATE**

Ms. Walkowiak reported the Police Department was providing a monthly collision report, which Traffic Division staff analyzed to determine whether engineering solutions could be implemented to prevent collisions. In October, November, and December, several right-hook and left-turn collisions were reported. She would obtain and provide a summary of the data. Schools were organizing encouragement events. She continued to organize Bike to Work Day. A Getting to High School event was being planned for eighth graders at JLS, Terman and Jordan Middle Schools. City staff was scheduled to present Safe Routes for toddlers at preschools. Several schools were holding bike mobiles. Staff would focus on strategies to implement goals

1 for SRTS in year one. Because Penny Ellson would be leaving SRTS committee at the end of  
2 the school year, the PTA had divided her tasks and recruited a few people to replace her.

3 Mr. Goldstein had communicated concerns about SRTS education encompassing encouragement  
4 projects to VTA staff, who assured him it would.

5 Mr. Corrao noted the collision report would be useful because the California Highway Patrol  
6 usually updated information every one or two years.

7 Mr. Zauman requested collision data be provided to Committee Members monthly.

8 **VTA BPAC Update**

9 Mr. Goldstein reported BPAC members discussed the suggested change of VERBS funding to  
10 Measure B funding. With this change, SRTS programs would have fewer restrictions on their  
11 ability to do non-infrastructure projects. BPAC members also heard an extended presentation  
12 regarding Next Network. VTA staff was well aware of concerns raised by Palo Alto residents.  
13 There was definite interest in reducing the distance between bus stops for the limited buses, but  
14 the problem was finding logical locations for bus stops. The agenda for the March meeting  
15 included finalizing VERBS criteria and an annual report of County development projects.

16 **5. STAFF UPDATES**

17 **A. Caltrain Bike Parking Management Plan**

18 Mr. Corrao had been participating in the Caltrain Bike Parking Management Plan group.  
19 Onboard and online surveys of Caltrain riders showed 17 percent of Caltrain riders arrived by  
20 bicycle. Of that 17 percent, 93 percent carried their bikes onboard, 6 percent parked at the  
21 station, and 1 percent used a bike share program. Caltrain staff received 1,600 responses to  
22 surveys. 24 percent of onboard respondents with bicycles would take the train if there was an  
23 extensive bike share program. That could be important information in planning the bike share  
24 program for Palo Alto. People favored lockers or valet service in theory but not in practice.  
25 Caltrain staff would complete the survey in the summer and make a recommendation to the  
26 Board to improve bike parking at Caltrain stations.

27 In response to questions from PABAC members, Mr. Corrao was not sure how a person walking  
28 to and driving away from a Caltrain station was counted in the survey. Caltrain staff discussed at  
29 length the pros and cons of different types of technology for bike parking. Caltrain staff felt bike  
30 ridership would increase if bicyclists could be assured of not being bumped. There was no  
31 discussion of subsidies for last-mile transit. Caltrain staff mentioned smart capabilities, but the  
32 obstacle was cost. Train riders could reserve key lockers now, but there were waiting lists at  
33 some stations. Caltrain staff did discuss methods for increasing the efficiency of providing  
34 lockers and asked if cities with downtown stations would be interested in cosponsoring bike  
35 stations in downtown areas, to which Mr. Corrao informed them Palo Alto would be interested.

36 Committee Members discussed the previous valet bike parking at the Caltrain station in Palo  
37 Alto and attempting to find out the pros and cons of that operation to consider for a future  
38 operation.

- 1 **8. STANDING ITEMS**
- 2 **a. Bike Share Update**
- 3 **b. Grant Funding Update**
- 4 **c. VTA BPAC Update**

5 Mr. Corrao advised that VTA requested staff submit a new application with a waiver for TFCA  
6 funding because the proposed bike share program had changed. The amount of a potential grant  
7 could be approximately \$160,000. The City Council did not discuss or vote on the bike share  
8 program the previous evening. The bike share proposal was one of the most affordable offered  
9 to municipalities.

10 Committee Members discussed potential users of a bike share program and community benefits  
11 provided by a bike share program. New bike share companies were dropping off bikes in cities  
12 and not having stations or obtaining City permits.

## 13 **6. AMBLUR WAYFINDING DISCUSSION**

14 Chair Neff noted Appendix A of the Bike Plan offered general guidance for signage and  
15 requested feedback on ideas for wayfinding signage.

16 Committee Members debated including common neighborhood names on signs because the Bike  
17 Plan suggested it. However, neighborhood names did not have any meaning for commuters.  
18 The need for wayfinding signage was small because the majority of cyclists were locals who  
19 knew the locations of neighborhoods and destinations. Most people used some type of GPS  
20 device for navigation. More signage would mean more clutter. A few well-placed signs could  
21 be helpful. Signs could list major destinations at the top, nearby destinations in the middle, and  
22 parks or neighborhoods at the bottom if there was space for them. Destinations should be  
23 appropriate to the direction of travel along a route. Signs should be more refined in directing  
24 cyclists to Caltrain stations. Signs should illuminate crosstown routes and connections riders  
25 may not have considered. Emphasis should be placed on destinations further away rather than  
26 bigger destinations. Listed destinations should be reasonably accessible by a good bicycle  
27 connection. Signs should indicate the best routes to destinations and could include directions to  
28 important roads and bikeways. Signs could list restrooms, directions from one Bike Boulevard  
29 to another, routes to cross barriers. Follow-up signage would be needed along the route to a  
30 destination. Directional signage should lead to the stated destination. Signs could direct cyclists  
31 between Caltrain stations.

32 Signage did not need to be placed at every intersection. Bike boulevard markings at every major  
33 intersection helped a cyclist find his way.

34 Because of limited space on signs, Caltrans abbreviations would be used whenever possible.

35 Mr. Corrao advised that he would be meeting with his transportation counterparts from Menlo  
36 Park and Mountain View to discuss wayfinding among the three cities. Wayfinding signage may  
37 be needed in other parts of the city to direct people to bike boulevards.

38 Committee Members discussed the pros and cons of reflective pavement markings installed in  
39 Mountain View. The Committee reached consensus that the markings were not useful because

1 they became less noticeable with wear and tear, were paved over, and were generally too small.  
2 A sign along with a pavement marking might be more noticeable.

3 **MOTION**

4 Motion by Vice Chair Nordman, second by Mr. Robinson, for wayfinding signs to focus on  
5 major destinations such as adjacent communities and important commercial areas and to avoid  
6 neighborhood names, unless otherwise designated in the Comprehensive Plan. Motion passed  
7 unanimously.

8 Committee Members also suggested signs list community centers, libraries, bike shops, staffed  
9 bike stations, but not list destinations that did not show up on a bike route map.

10 Chair Neff mentioned a possible route from the intersection of Moreno and Ross to the Bay with  
11 destinations of Ohlone school, the Bay Trail, Ramos Park, and Middlefield Road or Midtown  
12 Shopping Center. Directions from Oregon Avenue to the overpass might direct cyclists to go to  
13 Greer, over and then up.

14 Mr. Zauman suggested a subcommittee would be more efficient than the full Committee  
15 discussing each point.

16 Chair Neff appointed [no one stated his name, Robert, Cedric, Bill???] to a subcommittee to draft  
17 plans for wayfinding signage.

18 Mr. Joye recalled a proposal for renaming schools, which could affect signage.

19 **7. ADDITIONAL BIKE/PED WAYFINDING SIGNAGE CITYWIDE**

20 Committee Members suggested routes of Cowper to Mitchell Park via Charleston; Channing and  
21 St. Francis to the 101 bike bridge; Melville to (inaudible) between the library and Town and  
22 Country; the Caltrain path to Downtown via Churchill; to Greer Park by turning off Bryant onto  
23 El Dorado with a jog to Colorado or Midtown Shopping Center; the California Avenue Caltrain  
24 station to Stanford Research Park; from Menlo Park across the bridge at the Guild; and signs on  
25 the other side of the Homer tunnel directing people to the right to the shopping center and left to  
26 Town and Country.

27 **Future Agenda Items**

28 Chair Neff announced an update on the Charleston/Arastradero project was scheduled for April.  
29 Committee Members suggested agenda items of an update of the projects in the Council  
30 Infrastructure Funding Plan; the monthly collision report; the St. Francis wayfinding signage  
31 project; an update regarding Bike to Work Day; and the proposed roundabout or traffic signal at  
32 the entrance to eastbound Oregon Expressway.

33 **9. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

34 None.

1 **10. ADJOURNMENT – 7:58 p.m.**

2