REVISED
Tuesday, June 2, 2020 at 6:15 P.M.
Join Meeting Via Zoom
Join Online: https://zoom.us/j/91620498131; Dial-in: 669-900-6833
Meeting ID: 916 2049 8131

Note: This meeting contains presentations. We highly encourage you to join online.

1. CALL TO ORDER 6:15 PM

2. HOUSEKEEPING: 6:17 PM
   a. How to mute/unmute and raise/lower hand in Zoom
   b. Attendance in Zoom

3. AGENDA CHANGES 6:30 PM

4. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES FROM MARCH (LAST MEETING) 6:32 PM

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS: 6:34 PM
   a. Reminder no meeting in July

6. SRPGO PRESENTATION – JAMIE JARVIS: 6:35 PM
   a. Stanford Research Park Transportation homepage available here

7. STAFF UPDATES: 7:05 PM
   a. Safe Routes to School
   b. Caltrans Maintenance Request Webpage 7:10 PM
   c. Adobe Bridge and Lefkowitz Undercrossing Project Status 7:11 PM
   d. Newell Bridge Project Status 7:15 PM

8. DISCUSSION ITEMS: 7:20 PM
   a. Budget Status – FY 2021 Proposed Operating and Capital Budget Wrap Up Staff Report May 26, 2020 7:40 PM
   b. Shared Streets Feedback

9. STANDING ITEMS: 7:50 PM
   a. VTA BPAC Update

7. EXTENDED COMMUNITY ADVIORY PANEL (XCAP) PRESENTATION – NADIA NAIK: 7:05 PM
   a. Renderings, Plans, and Animations
   b. Churchill, Meadow and Charleston Grade Separation Traffic Analysis by Hexagon

8. ADJOURNMENT 8:30 PM
Tuesday, March 3, 2020
6:15 P.M.

EL PALO ALTO WEST ROOM
MITCHELL PARK COMMUNITY CENTER
3700 Middlefield Road, Palo Alto, CA

Members Present: Ken Joye (Chair), Art Liberman (Vice Chair), Bill Courington, Cedric de la Beaujardiere, Kathy Durham, Penny Ellson, Paul Goldstein, Owen Longstreth, Robert Neff, Eric Nordman, Rob Robinson, Steve Rock, Jane Rothstein, Richard Swent, Alan Wachtel

Members Absent: Ann Crichton, David Hirsch, Bill Zaumen

Staff Present: Sylvia Star-Lack, Joanna Chan

Guest: Nicole Zoeller Boelens, Arnout Boelens, Ken Kershner

1. CALL TO ORDER at 6:15 p.m.

2. AGENDA CHANGES

None

3. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES

MOTION

Motion by Chair Joye, seconded by Mr. Nordman, to approve the minutes of the February 4, 2020 meeting as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Joye announced he and John Cordes of Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition are planning an infrastructure ride, tentatively scheduled for April 11 at 9:00 a.m. Mr. Robinson volunteered to serve as a host. In reply to Mr. Goldstein's question, Chair Joye informed the ride would focus on facilities and programs, but he would provide additional information at a later time and is open to suggestions.
5. STAFF UPDATES:
   
a. Safe Routes to School

Ms. Chan reported the site assessment at Palo Verde is complete. Staff hosted a family engagement fair on February 22 and a table at the screening of Motherload on Sunday.

b. Bike and Scooter Share Pilot Program

Ms. Chan advised that the Council approved a revised Bike and Scooter Share Pilot Program the prior day. Staff is working with the City Attorney’s Office to finalize guidelines for City Manager’s approval. Staff anticipates a three-week application period. The pilot program deployment could begin in June.

Vice Chair Liberman noted according to the webpage, a person under 18 years of age is not required to wear a helmet while operating a motorized scooter. The webpage should be updated, and the guidelines should contain a requirement for people under the age of 18 to wear a helmet.

Mr. Nordman did not believe the trip data would be useful without identifiable beginning and ending points for each trip, such as street names or coordinates.

c. Hanover/Page Mill Project Status

Ms. Chan related that the project has been delayed because of the legal issue with Measure B. The County recently began designing the intersection. Staff has contacted the County to determine if the County would like to present the project to PABAC or if staff may present the project to PABAC.

Mr. Neff advised that an island in the middle of Page Mill Road has been shifted to create space for a left turn-lane. Ms. Chan agreed to look into the work.

Mr. Goldstein indicated the sensors on Hanover appear to have been restored. Mr. Swent explained that the sensors are required to detect any legal traffic.

d. Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons

Ms. Chan reported all beacons along El Camino should be active. The timing of each beacon is tied to the timing of the closest traffic signal in an effort to coordinate traffic flow along El Camino. Caltrans has not provided the exact timing for each beacon.

In answer to Mr. Goldstein's question about the educational handout, Mr. Swent explained that a motorist should stop when the beacon is solid red, even if a pedestrian is not in the crosswalk. Mr. Goldstein suggested removing "for pedestrian" in item 2 of the handout. He interpreted "stop for pedestrian" as allowing a motorist to proceed if a pedestrian is not present in the crosswalk.

In response to Mr. Swent's inquiry, Mr. Neff indicated the crosswalks have pedestrian countdown timers. Mr. Swent asked if the signal changed to flashing red when the timer reached zero, to which no one responded.
Mr. Neff felt pedestrians would ignore the beacons when El Camino traffic is light. A wait of 80-90 seconds for pedestrians would be normal during times of heavy traffic. He suggested staff approach Caltrans with hours of the day when the beacons' timing could favor pedestrians and ask Caltrans if they have studied pedestrian compliance with beacons.

Mr. de la Beaujardiere expressed concern that, until motorists become familiar with the beacons, they could interpret no signal as the beacon not functioning. Motorists would more readily interpret a green signal as go. Perhaps for the first month, the beacon could rest on flashing yellow.

Ms. Ellson expressed concern that students may not have the patience to wait for the beacon to stop traffic.

Vice Chair Liberman questioned whether the beacons comply with ADA requirements for visually impaired people. Ms. Chan advised that Caltrans has not answered the question.

e. Bol Park Path Project Status

Ms. Chan related that the Public Works Department will probably lead the project. Staff is exploring funding sources and will obtain cost estimates.

In answer to Chair Joye's question, Ms. Chan indicated staff has not developed a plan for the project.

In reply to Mr. Goldstein's queries, Ms. Star-Lack reported the project could include widening the path, treating bridge surfaces to increase smoothness, and lighting. Staff originally anticipated funding the project with monies from the Stanford University General Use Permit (GUP).

In response to Vice Chair Liberman's inquiry, Ms. Star-Lack did not know if the project would include the section of the path between Matadero and Hanover. The lower Bol Park Path is not located on City property, but it should be upgraded as well. Vice Chair Liberman noted that section of the path is heavily used and has some sharp corners.

Mr. de la Beaujardiere shared the origins of the project and indicated a survey of community opinions was conducted at some point. He supported separation of bikes and pedestrians on the path. Neighbors' preference for a pastoral feel should be considered in any design.

Mr. Neff remarked that the trail at Cooley Landing is a good example of improvements needed for the Bol Park Path.

6. STANDING ITEMS:

a. VTA BPAC Update

Mr. Neff advised that the VTA BPAC did not meet in February. VTA staff has requested feedback regarding an update of the County's bike map.
In response to Vice Chair Liberman's question, Mr. Neff explained that Google no longer crowdsources data for maps. Determining the appropriate Google personnel to discuss additions or changes to maps is difficult. Mr. Swent noted the VTA has color-coded routes on the map to reflect the level of experience required. The VTA map contains more information than a Google map.

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS:
   a. Neighborhood Traffic Safety Bicycle Boulevard Phase 1 Report

In answer to Mr. Robinson's question, Ms. Ellson indicated the Council approved installation of two-way stop signs at the Ross/East Meadow traffic circle.

Ms. Chan reported Phase 1 of the project included nine segments, but only five were implemented. Feedback received during the February 24 Council meeting addressed reducing stress levels of bikeways, the effectiveness of the Bryant Street bike boulevard, the use of diverters, additional landscaping, proceeding with the Bike Plan, more community engagement, and confusion related to two-way stops in roundabouts. The Council approved Items 1-7 of the staff recommendation as written. The Council directed the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) to review the East Meadow roundabout after installation of the stop signs, staff to consider the full range of options for bicycle infrastructure, and the Parks and Recreation Commission to review landscaping in roundabouts.

Mr. Swent noted many people refer to bulb-outs when they mean chokers.

In reply to Mr. Arthur's inquiries, Ms. Star-Lack advised that some of the feedback suggested the Ross Road bike boulevard should be more like the Bryant Street bike boulevard. Diverters include street closures. Ms. Durham clarified that comments recommended that Council allow staff to consider and use diverters.

In response to Mr. Nordman's query, Ms. Chan explained that one bike accident occurred prior to the improvements and three after the improvements.

PABAC members discussed their interpretations of language directing installation of stop signs and PTC review regarding the East Meadow traffic circle. Mr. Wachtel advised that he foresees liability issues and operational problems with the stop signs. He wondered about the rationale for reassigning the stop signs on Louis. Ms. Durham noted the rationale for installing the stop signs was the number of collisions, and the collisions were caused by motorists not yielding. She expressed concern about the stop signs creating dangerous situations. Mr. Rock believed the concern should be safety rather than liability. If yield signs are removed, there will be uncontrolled intersections, which are dangerous. Mr. Rock suggested that PABAC should strongly recommend stop signs not to be installed until traffic flow is understood. He recalled road closures for bicycle boulevards were originally suggested by the community. The table of collisions is misleading. Mr. Robinson did not believe any of the changes should be made until PABAC and the PTC reviewed the as-built environment and the language of the motion. Mr. Swent explained the reasons yield signs are needed on Ross Road. He concurred with the use of temporary improvements prior to construction of permanent improvements. When designing the project, the consultant did not listen to community input. Mr. Goldstein remarked that PABAC,
the PTC, and the City/School Traffic Safety Committee should be used more effectively. Ms. Ellson suggested staff explore yield signs with alternative designs before installing the stop signs.

Mr. Nordman noted a positive outcome of the project is increased bicycle and pedestrian traffic.

Mr. de la Beaujardiere was pleased with the Council's reaffirmation of the importance of bicycling and reinstatement of the use of diverters. Perhaps staff could grind down the pavement lip in one of the roundabouts because it is dangerous for bicyclists. In updating the Bike Plan, PABAC may want to review bicycle facilities on Amarillo and Moreno.

In reply to Vice Chair Liberman's query, Ms. Star-Lack indicated the Council directed staff to proceed with the modifications, not a trial program.

Ms. Star-Lack requested PABAC members submit written comments to staff. She clarified that the City’s consultant wrote the staff report and recommendations.

MOTION

Motion by Mr. Robinson, seconded by Mr. de la Beaujardiere, to express PABAC's belief that the bike boulevard evaluation staff report would have been significantly improved with input from PABAC, the City/School Traffic Safety Committee, and the Planning and Transportation Commission. PABAC urges staff to use advisory bodies available to them in the future before proceeding with staff reports to the Council.

Ms. Durham wanted a clear statement in the motion indicating PABAC has concerns that converting a traffic circle into a two-way stop also has liability. Mr. Wachtel added that the issue is not that PABAC was not consulted, but that the recommendation is contrary to the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). PABAC’s concern is the way in which the decision regarding the two-way stop was made.

Mr. Wachtel believed PABAC's concerns are not only process but also substantive features of the Council's adopted motion, particularly the stop signs at Ross and Meadow.

AMENDED MOTION

Motion by Mr. Robinson, seconded by Mr. de la Beaujardiere to advise staff of PABAC's belief that the bike boulevard evaluation staff report would have been significantly improved with input from PABAC, the City/School Traffic Safety Committee, and the Planning and Transportation Commission. In particular, PABAC is concerned that some of the recommendations in the staff report do not conform to MUTCD standards and could cause operational, safety, and liability issues. One example is the two-way stop proposed at Ross Road and East Meadow. PABAC urges staff to use advisory bodies available to them in the future before proceeding with staff reports to the Council.
SUBSTITUTE MOTION

Motion by Mr. Rock, seconded by Mr. de la Beaujardiere to advise staff of PABAC's belief that the bike boulevard evaluation staff report would have been significantly improved with input from PABAC, the City/School Traffic Safety Committee, and the Planning and Transportation Commission. In particular, PABAC is concerned that some of the recommendations in the staff report do not conform to mandatory MUTCD standards and could be dangerous. One example is the two-way stop proposed at Ross Road and East Meadow. PABAC urges staff to use advisory bodies available to them in the future before proceeding with staff reports to the Council.

Substitute motion failed.

Amended motion passed.

Chair Joye requested staff to notify PABAC members if the project is presented to the PTC prior to PABAC's next meeting.

In answer to Mr. Robinson's question, Ms. Star-Lack advised that staff does not usually share PABAC's motion with the Council because PABAC is advisory to staff.

MOTION

Motion by Mr. Swent, seconded by Mr. Goldstein, to direct the Chair to send a letter to the Council informing the Council of PABAC's motion regarding the Neighborhood Traffic Safety Bicycle Boulevard Report. Motion passed.

Ms. Chan reported that staff, at the Council's direction will install the stated devices by June 2020, hopefully, and subsequently present items to the PTC and PABAC for review. Ms. Star-Lack added that staff will determine whether the PABAC review can occur prior to the PTC review.

b. Neighborhood Traffic Safety Bicycle Boulevard Phase 2 Plans

Mr. Nordman expressed confusion as to the purpose of the community engagement. Phase 2 has many issues that are likely to raise some of the concerns raised in the Ross Road improvements. He suggested modification of Phase 2 plans to address those concerns and then presentation of the modified plans for community engagement. Raised intersections and bulb-outs at low-traffic intersections could be removed. Example of issues are the cement ovals, widening the gutter path on Park Road, forcing bicyclists to take the lane, and placing the "bump" signs.

Mr. Neff believed Phase 2 plans should be discarded because they follow the same philosophy that raised concerns about Ross Road improvements.

Chair Joye requested PABAC members to review the Phase 2 plans and prepare comments for the next meeting.

8. ADJOURNMENT at 8:02 p.m.