



**Palo Alto Pedestrian and  
Bicycle Advisory Committee**

**Tuesday, November 3, 2020 at 6:15 P.M.**

**Join Meeting Via Zoom**

**Join Online: <https://zoom.us/j/96927215326>; Dial-in: 669-900-6833**

**Meeting ID: 969 2721 5326**

**PART I: TDA 3 – BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PLAN UPDATE**

- |   |         |
|---|---------|
| 1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL/CONFIRM QUORUM                                     | 6:15 PM |
| <i>A quorum of this Committee shall be a majority of its membership (10).</i> |         |
| 2. AGENDA CHANGES   | 6:18 PM |
| 3. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES   | 6:20 PM |
| 4. PUBLIC COMMENTS  | 6:22 PM |
| 5. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS  |         |
| a. Discuss the Potential Framework of the City's Bike/Ped Plan Update         | 6:25 PM |
| b. Continue in a December Special Meeting                                     | 7:25 PM |
| 6. ADJOURNMENT  | 7:30 PM |

**PART II: OTHER ITEMS**

- |   |         |
|---|---------|
| 1. AGENDA CHANGES                                     | 7:32 PM |
| 2. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES                         | 7:34 PM |
| 3. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS                  |         |
| a. Election of a Chair and Vice Chair in January 2021 | 7:36 PM |
| 4. STAFF UPDATES                                      |         |
| a. Caltrans El Camino Real Project Schedule Update    | 7:39 PM |
| 5. DISCUSSION ITEMS                                   |         |
| a. 2021 Virtual and In-Person Meeting Time            | 7:42 PM |
| 6. STANDING ITEMS                                     |         |
| a. VTA BPAC Update                                    | 7:47 PM |
| 7. ADJOURNMENT  | 8:00 PM |



Palo Alto Pedestrian and  
Bicycle Advisory Committee

Tuesday, October 6, 2020

6:15 P.M.

**VIRTUAL MEETING**

Palo Alto, CA

Members Present: Chair Ken Joye, Vice Chair Art Liberman, Bruce Arthur, Arnout Boelens, Nicole Zoeller Boelens, Cedric de la Beaujardiere, Kathy Durham, Paul Goldstein, Rob Neff, Eric Nordman, Rob Robinson, Steve Rock, Jane Rothstein, Alan Wachtel, Bill Zaumen

Members Absent: Bill Courington, Penny Ellson, Owen Longstreth, Richard Swent

Staff: Joanna Chan, Sylvia Star-Lack

Guests: Matt Bryant

**PART I: TDA 3 – BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PLAN UPDATE**

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL/CONFIRM QUORUM – 6:16 p.m.

Joanna Chan confirmed that a quorum is present.

2. AGENDA CHANGES

None

3. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES

None

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

1 5. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS  
2 a. Vote: TDA 3 Funds for Updating the City's Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan

3 Ms. Chan reported funding, including the estimated amount of funds to be received in fiscal  
4 year 2021, will total approximately \$325,000.

5 In response to questions, Ms. Chan advised that staff has not developed a budget for the  
6 Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (Plan) update. Depending on the number of active transportation  
7 elements added to the Plan, the cost could exceed the estimated available amount of TDA 3  
8 funds. The cost of updating the Plan in 2012 was around \$80,000. At a minimum, the full Plan  
9 will be reviewed and revised in the upcoming update. Staff will likely begin preparing a  
10 framework for the update in the Spring and issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a consultant  
11 in Summer 2021. Work on the update will extend into 2022. PABAC does not have to allocate  
12 funding in the current meeting. A resolution allocating TDA 3 funding needs to be presented to  
13 the Council and submitted to VTA in April or May 2021. Not all funds have to be used at the  
14 current time. Sylvia Star-Lack indicated Sunnyvale recently adopted a Bike Plan, Pedestrian  
15 Plan, and Safe Routes to School Plan, which were prepared at a cost of \$415,000. Chair Joye  
16 clarified that PABAC would be voting to approve the allocation of TDA 3 funds to be used to  
17 update the Plan, and not approve the expenditure of funds right now.

18 Mr. Goldstein, Mr. Rock, and Mr. Neff expressed surprise regarding the anticipated cost of the  
19 update. Mr. Goldstein wanted to review a budget or some high-level scope prior to voting to  
20 allocate TDA 3 funds. Mr. Robinson encouraged staff to obtain data prior to preparing the  
21 scope of work for a contractor. Mr. Rock proposed not utilizing the 2012 contractor because  
22 some of the projects in the 2012 Plan were not well done. Mr. Neff suggested the 2012  
23 contractor may have reduced its bid in anticipation of obtaining contracts for individual  
24 projects.

25 **Motion** by Mr. Goldstein, second by Mr. Rock, to defer a vote to allocate TDA 3 funds for  
26 updating the City of Palo Alto Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan until staff brings a scope of work to  
27 PABAC.

28 Mr. Robinson preferred not to include Safe Routes to School components in the Plan. Mr. Neff  
29 noted the issue before PABAC is whether TDA 3 funds may be expended for the Plan update.  
30 The expenditure of funds will be presented in the future. Ms. Durham concurred with Mr. Neff.  
31 Mr. Nordman requested a future discussion of Plan components including the impacts of  
32 individual components on the cost and timeline of the update. Mr. Goldstein clarified that he  
33 could support allocating \$50,000 or a similar amount to begin the update.

34 Ms. Star-Lack clarified that staff presented the item to begin the allocation and update process.  
35 The next step would be a discussion of the components of the Plan so that staff could begin  
36 preparing a budget and framework for the update.

37 **Motion passed** 11-3, Liberman, Nordman, Durham no

1 6. ADJOURNMENT

2 **Motion** by Vice Chair Liberman, second by Chair Joye, to adjourn the meeting. Without  
3 objection, Chair Joye adjourned the meeting at 6:57 p.m.

4 **PART II – OTHER ITEMS**

5 Chair Joye called the meeting to order at 6:57 p.m.

6 1. AGENDA CHANGES

7 None

8 2. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES

9 **Motion** by Mr. Goldstein, seconded by Mr. Nordman, to approve the minutes of the September  
10 1, 2020 meeting, as presented.

11 **Motion passed** 10-0 with 2 abstaining

12 3. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

13 None

14 4. STAFF UPDATES:

15 a. Safe Routes to School

16 Ms. Chan reported Safe Routes to School staff has developed a parent survey to learn about  
17 families' plans to use active transportation to and from school. Palo Alto Unified School District  
18 (PAUSD) will distribute the survey, and staff will share survey results when they are available.  
19 Five of 12 elementary schools have scheduled Walk and Roll events. Middle and high schools  
20 will plan events later in the fall when students can return to campus. Nicole and Arnout  
21 Boelens hosted a trial family bike ride, in which three families participated.

22 Ms. Boelens advised that the ride was fun and an opportunity to understand the needs of  
23 families and to get a feeling for future rides. Notice was sent to young families primarily.

24 Chair Joye suggested that PABAC members would like to receive notice of future family rides.

25 b. City Safety Statistics

26 Ms. Chan shared a chart of pedestrian and bicycle collisions in Palo Alto from January 2019 to  
27 June 2020 and the top five corridors for injury collisions.

28 In reply to inquiries, Ms. Chan indicated the collision chart is based on accidents reported to the  
29 Palo Alto Police Department. Collisions on the top five corridors comprise about half of total  
30 collisions. The exact location of each collision is not available for this report. Ms. Star-Lack

1 explained that the police department's reporting process requires an officer to manually redact  
2 confidential information from computer-generated reports, and current budget constraints  
3 have eliminated staffing to handle that function. In the next 12 months, the police department  
4 will convert to a new records management system. A Vision Zero component for the Plan could  
5 include analysis of collision data.

6 Mr. Rock wanted to understand the number of collisions in comparison to the total number of  
7 bicyclists and pedestrians traveling each of the five corridors. Mr. Boelens suggested  
8 comparisons of collisions to miles traveled and to previous years. Vice Chair Liberman wanted  
9 to see the data for intersections. Ms. Durham noted data is missing from the chart. Mr. Neff  
10 advised that collision data reported to Caltrans is available to the public through the Statewide  
11 Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) database. Mr. Wachtel remarked that police  
12 reports are often inaccurate in reporting cause of collision and possible violations.

13 c. El Camino Real/Page Mill Rd. Bike Access

14 Ms. Chan provided a concept drawing for improvements at the El Camino Real and Page Mill  
15 Road intersection and requested PABAC members submit comments to Mr. Rius. This is not a  
16 City project, but the City is participating in the review process as a stakeholder. Staff will  
17 request the project include a receiving westbound bike lane.

18 In answer to a query, Ms. Chan noted parking along the eastbound receiving lane is not  
19 allowed.

20 Mr. Boelens suggested the improvements should provide a protected intersection. Mr. Rock  
21 remarked that bicyclists should avoid this intersection because of the traffic volume and  
22 suggested funding for this project should be reallocated to other projects. Mr. Wachtel  
23 commented that few bicyclists use the underpass; however, bicyclists travel eastbound on Page  
24 Mill and cross El Camino en route to Park Boulevard. The eastbound receiving lane will  
25 accommodate those bicyclists. Mr. de la Beaujardiere suggested a right-turn-only lane from El  
26 Camino to eastbound Page Mill would increase safety and eliminate cut-through traffic to Park.  
27 Mr. Zaumen believed bike lanes for crossing El Camino would benefit motorists by removing  
28 bicyclists from travel lanes. Mr. Neff noted the bike lane appears to extend to the underpass,  
29 which is an improvement over the existing condition. Mr. Bryant suggested the bike lanes  
30 should be more dominant because the number of bicyclists will increase with the increase in  
31 housing and a HAWK signal should be installed on Page Mill at Ash Street.

32 5. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

33 a. Appointment of VTA BPAC Representative 2020-2022

34 Ms. Chan reported that staff received a letter from VTA requesting the appointment of a  
35 representative to the VTA BPAC for 2020-2022. The appointment would be retroactive to July  
36 1, 2020.

37 Mr. Neff advised that he is willing to continue serving as the City's representative.

1 **Motion** by Mr. Goldstein, seconded by Chair Joye, to appoint Robert Neff as the City's  
2 representative to the VTA BPAC.

3 **Motion passed** 12-0

- 4 b. 2021 Virtual and In-Person Meeting Time
- 5 c. Potential Joint PABAC and MV B/PAC Meeting in 2021

6 Chair Joye announced these items are continued to the November meeting.

- 7 d. XCAP Churchill Alternative Potential Recommendation from PABAC

8 Chair Joye indicated the XCAP has recommended closure of Churchill Avenue and discussed  
9 options for bike and pedestrian crossings. Seale Avenue would be a good location for a  
10 crossing.

11 Mr. de la Beaujardiere noted one alternative proposed a bike/pedestrian crossing near Kellogg.  
12 Seale Avenue would be a better location for a crossing. There were two options for a crossing  
13 at Churchill, and he preferred Option 2 because it crossed both Alma and the tracks with no  
14 sharp turns.

15 Mr. Robinson remarked that a great deal of time and funding has been spent on analyzing the  
16 Churchill intersection. A crossing at Seale was desirable, but it would affect the dog park and  
17 the tennis courts.

18 Mr. Zaumen believed the issue with closing Churchill was traffic creating a bottleneck at  
19 Embarcadero and people going through a tunnel in a pandemic.

20 **Motion** made by Mr. Neff, seconded by Mr. de la Beaujardiere, to have the Chair send a letter  
21 to the XCAP supporting Option 2 of the Churchill closure alternative and recommending the  
22 XCAP consider closing access to Alma from both sides of Churchill so as to provide flexibility of  
23 design.

24 Mr. Robinson noted public comment has expressed concerns that the Option 2 bicycle and  
25 pedestrian path would be too narrow.

26 Vice Chair Liberman indicated closing access to Alma from Churchill was not part of the  
27 proposal and would create confusion and raise objections. He suggested the Chair bifurcate  
28 the motion or the maker eliminate the recommendation.

29 **Amended Motion** made by Mr. Neff, seconded by Mr. de la Beaujardiere, to have the Chair  
30 send a letter to the XCAP supporting Option 2 of the Churchill closure alternative.

31 Mr. Wachtel expressed concern about the tunnel being in the middle of the roadway.

32 **Amended Motion passed** 7-2 with 2 abstaining

1 6. STANDING ITEMS:

2 a. VTA BPAC Update

3 Mr. Neff reported in September BPAC reviewed station access studies for Blossom Hill and  
4 Tamien and a plan for a bicycle/pedestrian path along Manila Avenue near Moffett Field. In  
5 October, BPAC will consider proposals for funding bicycle and pedestrian projects and  
6 transitioning from Level of Service to Vehicle Miles Traveled.

7 In response to Mr. Bryant's inquiry regarding the proposal to add a bike lane to El Camino Real,  
8 Chair Joye indicated there has not been any activity. Ms. Star-Lack added that the City has  
9 received a construction grant for pedestrian safety on El Camino, but the project may not  
10 include bicycle safety improvements.

11 In reply to Mr. Neff's question, Ms. Chan advised that she will be meeting with Caltrans for an  
12 update on the El Camino Real project in Palo Alto and will report on her meeting in the future.  
13 Mr. Neff wanted to remove parking and install bicycle facilities or evaluate parking demand on  
14 El Camino Real.

15 7. ADJOURNMENT at 8:07 p.m.



Palo Alto Pedestrian and  
Bicycle Advisory Committee

## ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

### 1. Safe Routes to School

- i. Added our first High School Student Liaison to the Partnership: Gunn Sophomore Joaquin Min Antonio.
- ii. Holding a TSR Orientation in late October for new TSRs and as a refresher for experienced TSRs.
- iii. Reaching out to secondary schools to host physically distanced bike repair events prior to the holidays.
- iv. Held a well-received presentation to the [City School Liaison Committee](#).
- v. Main topic of this month's City School Transportation Safety Committee discussion:
  - a. *Voluntary Transfer Program (VTP) students are experiencing COVID-related increases in absenteeism, challenges in accommodating bus-related physical distancing guidelines, and have fewer opportunities to engage in physical activity to boost their academic performance and serve as a prophylactic against C-19 transmission. Can the SRTS Partnership support healthier school commutes to mitigate these challenges and if so, how?*
- vi. Held [Walk 'N' Chalk Welcome Week](#) at 6 Elementary Schools. Will also support [Ruby Bridges Walk 'N' Roll events](#) on Nov. 18.
- vii. [PAUSD Reopening Guidelines](#): Inclusive active transportation information added but modified updates re: grammar and sentence structure have been sent to PAUSD for greater clarity. Spotty compliance with inclusive communications.
- viii. Working with Emergency Preparedness Manager to assess and support transportation circulation plans that support physical distancing at exits/entrances, Park and Walk activities, sidewalk extensions and bike racks.
- ix. [6th Grade: Middle School Bike Safety Ed.](#): Completed or scheduled for completion at all schools but Fletcher.
- x. Considering converting this year's Bike Rodeo's into [Pedal Parks/Playgrounds/Pathways](#).
- xi. Developed [digital downloads](#) to support missed K-2 Pedestrian Education last spring and encouraged TSRs to share in their newsletters.
- xii. Developed a [PAUSD Parent Survey](#). Results are being generated.

### 2. Uplift Local

We've launched [a new website](#) to connect the community to local businesses open during our public health emergency and offering discounts and more, seeking to welcome the community

back as business activities are allowed this holiday season! The new site also features [events, resources, and contests](#) planned as we get closer to Halloween and will evolve as more holiday events are added. Check out this new website and the amenities offered by visiting [Upliftlocal.org](http://Upliftlocal.org) today! Also new is an online community survey to gain your Uplift Local experience and input. For our community check-in meetings to ask questions or share thoughts directly with City staff, go [here](#) for upcoming meeting details.



**Office Memorandum**  
 Office of Transportation  
 City of Palo Alto

Date: October 23, 2020

To: Palo Alto Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

From: Joanna Chan, Senior Transportation Planner

Subject: City of Palo Alto Bicycle + Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update

**BACKGROUND**

The City of Palo Alto Bicycle + Pedestrian Transportation Plan 2012 (BPTP 2012) aimed to guide public and private investment in non-motorized transportation facilities and related programs. However, with the BPTP 2012 standing for almost a decade, it is time to re-evaluate the Plan’s relevance and comprehensiveness.

Since the BPTP 2012, there has been incredible change in the economy, infrastructure, and technology that impact travel behavior. It is staff’s desire and recommendation to reassess the vision set forth in the BPTP 2012. An update to the Plan could take into consideration other important transportation challenges today including, Safe Routes to School, Safe Routes for Older Adults, Vision Zero, and Complete Streets. A high-level draft schedule of the BPTP Update is presented in Table 1 below. Specific tasks and expected implementation timeline will be defined in a Scope of Work as part of the Request for Proposals process in the summer of 2021.

**Table 1: BPTP Update Draft Schedule**

	<b>Estimated Timeframe</b>	<b>Project Milestone</b>
Part 1	November, 2020	Discuss Framework
	December, 2020 *	Discuss Framework
	January, 2021	Discuss/Finalize Framework
Part 2	February, 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finalize Framework</li> <li>Vote by PABAC to Allocate TDA Article 3 Funds</li> </ul>
	March, 2021	Staff Report Preparation
	April, 2021	Vote by Council to Allocate TDA Article 3 Funds and the BPTP Update Framework
	May to June, 2021	Resolution to VTA
	July to August, 2021	Request for Proposals

Part 3	Fall 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notice of Award</li> <li>• BPTP Update Development</li> </ul>
--------	-----------	--

\* Contingent on a special PABAC meeting

Increasingly, communities now include additional transportation planning elements to develop more robust bicycle and pedestrian plans to broaden access to active modes by more diverse groups of people. Examples are Vision Zero plans, Safe Routes to School plans, and Safe Routes for Older Adults plans. This plan update is also an opportunity to incorporate into the BPTP relevant initiatives within the City, such as the Sustainability/Climate Action Plan, and the Green Stormwater Infrastructure Plan. Table 2 below provides the cost estimate for a basic update of the BPTP 2012, as well as brief descriptions, rough cost estimates, and sample plans of other transportation planning elements that could be included in the BPTP Update. The actual cost of this plan update will be determined as part of the Request for Proposals bid process.

**Table 2: Other Transportation Planning Elements**

Planning Element	Description	Estimated Cost	Sample Plan
Basic Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-evaluation of projects</li> <li>• Update data analysis</li> <li>• Community engagement</li> </ul>	\$200,000 - \$250,000	<a href="#">Palo Alto Bicycle + Pedestrian Transportation Plan 2012</a>
Basic Update with Project Prioritization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop project prioritization steps</li> <li>• List of projects</li> </ul>	\$25,000 - \$50,000	
Safe Routes to School Plan (SRTS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formalize current city practices to promote transit use, walking and bicycling to school</li> <li>• Walking and bicycling audits</li> <li>• Develop a prioritized project list</li> <li>• Community engagement</li> </ul>	\$40,000 - \$60,000	<a href="#">Sunnyvale Active Transportation Plan 2020 – Chapter 6: Safe Routes to School Plan</a>
Safe Routes for Older Adults (SRFOA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide information about transit use, walking and bicycling safety for older adults</li> <li>• Develop programs and opportunities that encourage transit use, walking, and bicycling for older adults</li> </ul>	\$40,000 - \$60,000	<a href="#">Berkeley SafeTREC Safe Routes for Older Adults Plan 2018</a>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Walking and bicycling audits</li> <li>Community engagement</li> </ul>		
Vision Zero	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment of the city’s current safety conditions</li> <li>Propose policies, programs, and/or projects to eliminate serious and fatal injury collisions</li> <li>Community engagement</li> </ul>	\$50,000 - \$150,000	<a href="#">San Jose Vision Zero Action Plan 2020</a>
Complete Streets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide best practices in street design standards that enable safe access for all users</li> <li>Design options for a small selection of locations</li> <li>Include a chapter that highlights the city’s green stormwater infrastructure approaches and designs</li> <li>Community engagement</li> </ul>	\$80,000 - \$120,000	<a href="#">San Jose Complete Streets Design Standards &amp; Guidelines 2018</a>  <a href="#">Palo Alto Green Stormwater Infrastructure Plan 2019</a>

*Note: The cost of each planning element is highly dependent on specificity, level of analysis, and types of outreach conducted. Particularly for a Vision Zero Plan, which is a data driven approach, the wide cost range will be determined by the level of existing conditions analysis, contributing factors identification, and development/identification of specific countermeasures.*

**TDA ARTICLE 3 FUNDS FOR THE BPTP UPDATE**

As authorized by state law, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) adopted a resolution requiring local agencies seeking funds for bicycle and pedestrian projects under the Transportation Development Act (referred to as “TDA Article 3 funds”) to have a Bicycle Advisory Committee to review and prioritize TDA Article 3 funded bicycle and pedestrian projects and to participate in the development and review of comprehensive bicycle plans.

TDA Article 3 funds may be banked for up to four years plus one year to program funds. If banked funds are not partly programmed by the end of the 5<sup>th</sup> year, these funds will be redistributed to the countywide TDA Article 3 pool for the following fiscal year. The City of Palo Alto last allocated TDA Article 3 funds in fiscal year 2016-2017 for designing bicycle boulevards. The upcoming fiscal year 2021-2022 will be the 5<sup>th</sup> year since the City last allocated TDA Article 3 funds. Therefore, the City must request and program TDA Article 3 funds by the end of fiscal year 2021-2022. Table 3 below summarizes the amount and status of the City’s TDA Article 3 funds since last expended.

**Table 3: City of Palo Alto TDA Article 3 Funds Status**

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Guarantee Amount (Includes Banked Funds from Prior Years)</b>	<b>City Action</b>
2017 – 2018	\$60,285	Banked (Exp: End of 2021/2022)
2018 – 2019	\$115,702	Banked (Exp: End of 2022/2023)
2019 – 2020	\$194,206	Banked (Exp: End of 2023/2024)
2020 – 2021	\$264,604	Banked (Exp: End of 2024/2025)
2021 – 2022 *	\$329,604	TBD

\* *Estimated guarantee amount*

***PABAC’s Role***

The Palo Alto Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PABAC) has been a long-standing citizen advisory committee. Members have valuable knowledge of walking and bicycling challenges in the city and have been critical in reviewing and shaping pedestrian and bicycle projects and programs, including the BPTP 2012.

There are three main parts to updating the Plan, each requiring an active role from PABAC members. The following sections provide an overview of actions and questions for PABAC members

- Part 1: PABAC members to discuss and advise on a Framework for the BPTP Update.

While it is crucial to re-examine the BPTP 2012, staff seek guidance on a framework for developing a new plan. The objective of the Framework is to provide structure for re-evaluating the BPTP 2012 and to develop strategies for other transportation planning challenges, such as increasing safety improvements for all ages and abilities. Analyses and technical details will be considered during part 3.

Questions for PABAC:

1. What chapters do you like/dislike about the BPTP 2012 and why?
2. Which appendices in the BPTP 2012 were useful and should be updated? Which appendices could be removed?
3. With reference to the BPTP 2012 table of contents, what additional contents within the scope of the BPTP 2012 could improve the BPTP Update?
4. What additional contents including other transportation planning elements described in Table 2 could advance the BPTP Update into a more holistic active transportation planning document?

- Part 2: PABAC members to vote on allocating TDA Article 3 funds for updating the BPTP 2012.

At PABAC's discretion, a passing vote is necessary to confirm PABAC members' support in allocating TDA Article 3 funds in part or in full to the BPTP Update. In order to provide sufficient time to initiate and process the staff report to City Council, PABAC must conduct a vote to allocate TDA Article 3 funds at the February 2021 meeting.

The Framework in part 1 and the resulting vote to allocate TDA Article 3 funds in part 2 will be presented to City Council in anticipation of a written submission with a resolution to the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) officially requesting and allocating TDA Article 3 funds for the BPTP Update. Once VTA confirms the City's request, the City will solicit proposals from consultants.

- Part 3: PABAC members to discuss and advise on the detail development of the BPTP Update.

### **NEXT STEPS**

It is essential for PABAC members to deliberate and advise on a final Framework, as well as to conduct a vote to allocate TDA Article 3 funds at the February 2021 meeting. Therefore, in upcoming meetings, PABAC members should be prepared to discuss actions and questions stated in part 1 above. Conversations between now and the February 2021 meeting will be focused on crafting an outline for the BPTP Update. Analyses and technical details will be considered during part 3.

For your reference, links to additional reading materials are provided below.

### **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES**

Active Transportation Plan 2020, Draft Plan

City of Sunnyvale

Link:

<https://sunnyvale.ca.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?t=41192.68&BlobID=27131>

Bicycle Transportation Plan Update 2015, Final Plan

City of Mountain View

Link:

<https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=18294>

Safe Routes to School Plan 2017, Final Plan

City of Stockton

Link:

[http://www.stocktongov.com/files/Stockton\\_SRTS\\_Plan\\_December\\_2017.pdf](http://www.stocktongov.com/files/Stockton_SRTS_Plan_December_2017.pdf)

Transportation Master Plan 2020, Draft Plan  
City of Menlo Park

Link:

<https://www.menlopark.org/DocumentCenter/View/25974/Draft-Transportation-Master-Plan->

Vision Zero Action Strategy 2019, Final Plan  
City of San Francisco

Link:

[https://www.visionzerosf.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/VZAS\\_040419\\_web.pdf](https://www.visionzerosf.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/VZAS_040419_web.pdf)

Vision Zero Plan 2019, Final Plan  
City of Sunnyvale

Link:

<https://sunnyvale.ca.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=26613>