

Baumb, Nelly

From: pennyellson12@gmail.com
Sent: Sunday, May 2, 2021 12:14 AM
To: Council, City
Subject: Item #10: Alma/Churchill Concept Plans

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

Honorable City council Members,

I am writing re: Item #10 on your Monday, May 3 agenda.

Please support Option 2. This option maximizes waiting space on the northwest corner of the intersection for people who walk and bike. It is where students tend to be unsafely crowded between the expressway and train tracks during school commute times. This project will also prevent autos from stopping on the tracks, a dangerous behavior I have observed more than once.

Option 2 will improve the safety of this very dangerous crossing for the many people of all ages who walk, bike, and drive there daily for school and work commutes.

Sincerely,

Penny Ellson



Virus-free. www.avg.com

Baumb, Nelly

From: Arnout Boelens <a.m.p.boelens@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 2, 2021 11:49 AM
To: Council, City
Subject: Alma/Churchill Safety Improvement Project

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

Dear City Council members,

We are writing to encourage you to choose option 2 for the Alma/Churchill Safety Improvement Project. This option maximizes the waiting space at the railroad crossing and reduces the distance to cross Alma. Therefore, it is the safest option for all the bicyclists and pedestrians crossing Alma at this busy intersection. Since the goal of this project is to make this crossing safer and to eliminate safety hazards, it makes sense to pick the option that increases road safety most.

Kind regards,

Nicole, Arnout, & Ava Zoeller Boelens

Baumb, Nelly

From: John VanHorne <jvhiii@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 2, 2021 12:03 PM
To: Council, City
Subject: Improvements to the Alma and Churchill Intersection

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

Councilmembers,

Even though I occasionally use the right turn lane from southbound Alma to westbound Churchill, I support Alternative 2 for proposed improvements to that intersection. A small delay in traffic is worth it considering the safety improvements for pedestrians and bicyclists. However, I have a specific question about the plan. The last page of the packet has a drawing of the school bus turning movement. On it, bus paths when making certain turns appear to be shaded. The path from eastbound Churchill to southbound Alma overlaps the bicycle lane directly east of the railroad tracks. I'm concerned that this will pose a danger to bicyclists should a bus be turning at the same time that there is bicycle traffic. Perhaps staff could clarify if this is the case and propose modifications or mitigations so that bicycle traffic could be completely separated from the bus path.

Thank you,
John Van Horne

Baumb, Nelly

From: William Courington <billcour@sonic.net>
Sent: Friday, April 30, 2021 11:07 AM
To: Council, City
Subject: Churchill/Alma: I support Alternative 2

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

More gathering space for pedestrians, shorter walk across Alma, wider lanes for cars.

Bill Courington, Byron St.

Baumb, Nelly

From: Robert Neff <robert@neffs.net>
Sent: Thursday, April 29, 2021 11:41 PM
To: Council, City
Subject: Support option 2 for Churchill/Alma project

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

Dear Palo Alto City Council,

RE: Alma Street and Churchill Avenue Railroad Crossing Safety Project

I strongly encourage you to pass the staff recommendation, option 2, for the Churchill/Alma Safety Improvement Project. Option 2 maximizes the waiting space for bicyclists and pedestrians on the NW corner of the intersection, allowing the most space possible to alleviate the pedestrian and bicyclist crowding between Alma and the train tracks, and also shortening the crossing distance across Alma. This will be even more important when train frequency increases with electrification.

In earlier presentations, staff and consultants have reported that pedestrians and bicyclists overcrowd that corner between Alma and the tracks after Paly lets out. Unfortunately the written staff report has no details on this point, either in the present, or in the future, with more crossing interruptions due to CalTrain electrification. Without assurances that the smaller space in option 1 would be sufficient in the long term, and with the added benefit of a shorter crossing distance, I think council should follow the lead of the Planning and Transportation Committee, and support option 2.

There is a small difference in some auto traffic delay in Option 2, and that is extensively covered in the report. As a result, the reader may become focused on details of the auto traffic analysis, without comprehending the importance of the safety improvement for bicyclists and pedestrians crossing from Paly. I encourage you to keep both these aspects in mind during deliberations.

Thank you for your service to our city.

--
-- Robert Neff
Emerson Street, near Loma Verde.