



**Palo Alto Pedestrian and
Bicycle Advisory Committee**

Tuesday, March 2, 2021 at 6:15 P.M.

Join Meeting Via Zoom

Join Online: <https://cityofpaloalto.zoom.us/j/99657574509>; Dial-in: 669-900-6833

Meeting ID: 996 5757 4509

PART I: TDA 3 – BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PLAN UPDATE

No items are scheduled for this meeting. Written comments submitted by email to Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org before 12:00pm on February 22, 2021 are attached with the agenda packet.

PART II: OTHER ITEMS

- | | |
|--|---------|
| 1. CALL TO ORDER | 6:15 PM |
| 2. AGENDA CHANGES | 6:16 PM |
| 3. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES | 6:18 PM |
| 4. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS | 6:20 PM |
| 5. DISCUSSION ITEMS | |
| a. VTA Bicycle Superhighway Discussion | 6:22 PM |
| <i>Note: Discussion will be facilitated by VTA staff. A presentation on the item for the VTA BPAC meeting on December 9, 2020 can be found here:</i> | |
| VTA BPAC Meeting on December 9, 2020 | |
| b. Churchill Avenue Enhanced Bikeway Project Status | 7:10 PM |
| c. Ross Rd./E. Meadow Dr. Traffic Control Motion | 7:35 PM |
| d. Joint PABAC and MV BPAC Meeting on June 30, 2021 | 7:45 PM |
| 6. STAFF UPDATES – NONE | |
| 7. STANDING ITEMS | |
| a. VTA BPAC Update | 7:55 PM |
| 8. ADJOURNMENT | 8:00 PM |



Palo Alto Pedestrian and
Bicycle Advisory Committee

Tuesday, February 2, 2021

6:15 P.M.

VIRTUAL MEETING

Palo Alto, CA

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

Members Absent: Bruce Arthur, Arnout Boelens, Nicole Zoeller Boelens

Staff Present: Sylvia Star-Lack, Joanna Chan

Guests: Matthew Lefkowitz, Kerry Yarkin

PART I: TDA 3 – BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PLAN UPDATE

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL/CONFIRM QUORUM

Chair Joye called the meeting to order at 6:16 p.m. Joanna Chan called roll and announced a quorum is present.

2. AGENDA CHANGES

None

3. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES

Motion by Mr. Goldstein, seconded by Mr. Nordman, to approve the minutes of the January 5, 2020 meeting, as amended. Motion passed 13-0.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

5. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Confirmation of the final Framework topic headings

Ms. Chan requested comments regarding the topic headings rather than the potential content.

1 Mr. Goldstein suggested adding Stanford University and neighboring jurisdictions to the list of
2 plans, programs and facilities on page 27, changing high-injury network to high-injury locations,
3 adding the projected numbers of users as a criteria, and adding evaluation of the structure of
4 PABAC to Item 6.4. Heading number 5 should be Needs Assessment Criteria and Metrics.
5 Community support should be a criteria. Item 6.3.2 should read expand bicycling and walking
6 for all user types.

7 Vice Chair Liberman noted a disconnect between Section 5, 6 and 7. The community
8 engagement items seem perfunctory. The Plan, when complete, should be updated routinely and
9 periodically. In reply to his query, Ms. Chan advised that she included the 2012 existing
10 conditions map as a based map to show progress.

11 Ms. Ellson advised that Safe Routes to School is doing much of the work for the nine elements
12 of Vision Zero and should be elevated to a successful model within the Plan. Chapters 2 and 6
13 can point to Safe Routes to School as the working model. This chapter could highlight the six
14 E's of Safe Routes to School, the synergies provided through a partnership, and the dependence
15 on a partnership that mobilizes political action, supports changes, and recruits volunteers. Rail
16 grade separation needs to be included in the Framework. In answer to Ms. Ellson's questions,
17 Ms. Chan explained that the Framework is an outline, much like a table of contents, and future
18 discussions will address detail content for Safe Routes to School. Vision Zero is a principle that
19 guides the development of the Plan.

20 Mr. Zaumen proposed an analysis of near misses in Section 2.2.

21 Mr. Neff concurred with an evaluation of PABAC's structure.

22 Mr. Nordman felt Section 4.6 could include a review of collision details.

23 Ms. Durham remarked that the purpose of the Framework and a vision for active transportation
24 are not apparent in the Framework. Driver engagement is not mentioned in the Framework. The
25 fifth bullet under Section 1.1 could read “engage” the public. The discussion of Safe Routes to
26 School should emphasize the partnership as key to its success. Ms. Chan referred to the content
27 for Item 1.1 and indicated driver engagement can be included in Item 6.3.2. Ms. Star-Lack
28 suggested expanding driver engagement in Item 1.2 because it is a key piece of the Vision Zero
29 approach.

30 Mr. Rock believed the Plan has to deal with the integration of electric and human-powered
31 modes of transportation.

32 Motion by Mr. Neff, seconded by Mr. Goldstein, to accept the proposed final Framework and to
33 recommend staff to send it to City Council for consideration. Motion passed 14-0 with 1
34 abstention.

35 **b. Vote: Use of TDA 3 funds for the BPTP Update**

36 Ms. Chan reported TDA 3 funding will total approximately \$325,000, including the estimated
37 fiscal year 2021 funding. Staff anticipates presenting the Framework and a funding resolution to
38 the Council in April 2021 and releasing a Request for Proposals (RFP) in the summer.

1 In answer to inquiries, Ms. Chan advised that staff has not obtained an estimate. Some of the
2 funding has to be used in order to retain all the funds.

3 Motion by Mr. Goldstein, seconded by Ms. Durham, to authorize the use of \$200,000 in TDA 3
4 funds for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update.

5 In reply to Vice Chair Liberman's queries, Ms. Chan indicated she could seek PABAC's input on
6 the RFP if there is sufficient time. Staff and PABAC can further discuss the potential content
7 prior to drafting the RFP. The Council will not review and approve the RFP.

8 Mr. Neff remarked that work on the Plan will begin when the consultant is hired. The consultant
9 will advise staff and PABAC about drafting the Plan, and PABAC can determine the important
10 aspects of the Plan. In reply to his question, Ms. Chan indicated the cost will probably exceed
11 \$200,000.

12 In response to Mr. Goldstein's inquiry, Ms. Chan explained that applications for funding are
13 submitted annually. If PABAC authorizes \$200,000 and the cost is higher, staff will have to find
14 an alternate funding source. Ms. Star-Lack added that the City could potentially hold any
15 unspent funds.

16 Amended motion by Mr. Goldstein, seconded by Ms. Durham, to release the full amount of TDA
17 3 funds to be used for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update. Amended motion
18 passed 15-0.

19 **6. ADJOURNMENT** – 7:33 p.m.

20 **PART II: OTHER ITEMS**

21 **1. AGENDA CHANGES**

22 Mr. Goldstein requested a brief discussion of the roundabout at Ross Road and East Meadow.
23 Chair Joye indicated a discussion would be held following Staff Updates.

24 **2. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES**

25 Motion by Mr. Neff, seconded by Mr. Goldstein, to approve the minutes of the January 5, 2020
26 meeting. Motion passed 11-0.

27 **3. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

28 **a. Acknowledgement of Lefkowitz Undercrossing**

29 Matthew Lefkowitz sought PABAC's assistance in retaining the name Benjamin Lefkowitz for
30 the undercrossing.

1 **4. STAFF UPDATES**

2 **a. Alma/Churchill Section 130 Project Status**

3 Ruchika Aggarwal, City of Palo Alto Project Engineer, introduced Jason Mansfield and Jonathon
4 Centofranchi of BKF Engineers and Marie Mai of Callander Associates. The project is funded
5 through the Section 130 program, which eliminates hazards at at-grade rail crossings. The City
6 has partnered with Caltrans, Caltrain, and the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) for
7 this project. The scope of the project addresses safety concerns at the Alma and Churchill
8 intersection. Possible design elements include traffic signal modifications, sidewalk realignment
9 and widening, drainage improvements, signing, and striping. Technical constraints for the
10 project are rights-of-way, existing utilities, visibility, and intersection capacity.

11 Ms. Mai noted pre-COVID-19 traffic on westbound Churchill often spills into the northbound
12 left turn-lane on Alma, and thru-traffic is prohibited during the morning school commute.
13 Pedestrians are frequently caught at the median between the train tracks and vehicle traffic on
14 Alma Street. The team has developed two concepts for the intersection. At a January 21, 2021
15 community meeting, the community expressed concern that eliminating the left-turn pocket
16 would increase traffic congestion.

17 In response to questions, Ms. Aggarwal indicated that improvements should be constructed
18 quickly while the timeline for grade separation improvements is unknown. The connection to
19 the Embarcadero bike path is not part of the project scope. The limited scope of the project
20 constrains staff's ability to address all issues. A scramble signal phase is not an option at this
21 intersection due to train preemption.

22 **b. VERBS Grant Project Status**

23 Ms. Chan advised that the Council approved the draft community engagement plan for the
24 project on January 25, 2021. Once on-board, the City's on-call consultant will develop concept
25 plan alternatives and conduct the first phase of outreach.

26 In reply to Mr. Goldstein's questions, Ms. Star-Lack related that the Council added stop signs to
27 the roundabout and directed staff to return the item to the Planning and Transportation
28 Commission (PTC). Ripon Bhatia added that the Council directed staff to evaluate the
29 improvements six months after implementation and to return to the PTC. The evaluation is
30 scheduled for May, and the PTC review hopefully will occur in June or July.

31 Motion by Mr. Goldstein, seconded by Mr. Nordman, in the judgment of PABAC the current
32 signage configuration for the roundabout at Ross Road and East Meadow Drive is confusing and
33 does not conform with the California Manual for Uniform Traffic Control Devices, and PABAC
34 is concerned that it may constitute a hazardous condition and requests that PTC examine the
35 issue.

36 Mr. Nordman remarked that people in the roundabout appear to have the right-of-way when in
37 fact they do not. This condition causes confusion and the potential for collisions.

38 Mr. Wachtel supported the spirit of the motion; however, it should contain more details and
39 suggest improvements.

1 Mr. Swent noted stop signs are placed before the crosswalk because there is no room for them
2 after the crosswalk. This impedes the drivers' and bicyclists' views.

3 Subsidiary motion by Ms. Durham, seconded by Mr. de la Beaujardiere, to continue this
4 discussion to the next PABAC meeting. Motion passed.

5 **5. DISCUSSION ITEMS – NONE**

6 **6. STANDING ITEMS:**

7 **a. VTA BPAC Update**

8 Mr. Neff announced his election to Chair of the VTA BPAC. Grants using Measure B funding
9 are available. He requested staff provide information regarding use of the Clean Air grant. In
10 March, PABAC can consider a discussion on the VTA bicycle superhighway.

11 **7. ADJOURNMENT** at 8:32 p.m.



Public Comment Instructions For City of Palo Alto Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan Update

Members of the Public may provide public comments on the City of Palo Alto Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan Update as follows:

1. **Written public comments** (including visuals such as presentations, photos, etc) may be submitted by email to Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org. Please follow these instructions:
 - A. Please email your written comments **by 12:00 pm (noon) on the Monday the week before (eight days before)** the upcoming Palo Alto Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee (PABAC) meeting, unless otherwise indicated. Details of upcoming PABAC meetings are available on the City's [PABAC webpage](#).
 - Written public comments will be attached to the upcoming PABAC meeting agenda packet.
 - Written comments submitted after 12:00pm (noon) on the Monday before the upcoming PABAC meeting will be attached to the following PABAC meeting agenda packet.
 - B. Please **lead your email subject line with "BPTP Update"**.
 - C. When providing comments with reference to the current [City of Palo Alto Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan 2012](#), please be as specific as possible by indicating the chapter number, section heading number, and/or page number.
2. **Spoken public comments using a computer** will be accepted through the teleconference meeting. To address the Committee, click on the URL in the agenda packet for Zoom. Please follow these instructions:
 - A. You may download the Zoom client or connect to the meeting in-browser.
 - If using your browser, make sure you are using a current, up-to-date browser: Chrome 30+, Firefox 27+, Microsoft Edge 12+, Safari 7+. Certain functionality may be disabled in older browsers including Internet Explorer.
 - B. You may be asked to enter an email address and name. We request (but do not require) that you identify yourself by name as this will be visible online and will be used to notify you that it is your turn to speak.
 - C. When you wish to speak, click on "raise hand." Staff will activate and unmute speakers in turn. Speakers will be notified shortly before they are called to speak.
 - D. When called, please limit your remarks to the time limit allotted by the Chair.



3. **Spoken public comments using a smart phone app** will be accepted through the teleconference meeting. To address the Committee, download the Zoom application onto your smart phone from the Apple App Store or Google Play Store and enter the Meeting ID in the agenda. Please follow the instructions B-D above.

4. **Spoken public comments using a phone (cell or land line) without an app** will be accepted through the teleconference meeting. Use the telephone number listed in the agenda. When you wish to speak, press *9 on your phone to “raise hand.” You will be asked to provide your first and last name before addressing the Committee. When called, press *6 on your phone to unmute. Please limit your remarks to the time limit allotted by the Chair.

Public Comments for City of Palo Alto Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan Update

This Packet Includes:

A compilation of written comments on the City of Palo Alto Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan Update submitted by email to Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org.



From: [Transportation](#)
To: [Chan, Joanna](#)
Subject: FW: BPTP Update
Date: Thursday, February 4, 2021 5:44:44 PM

JC,
Forwarding.

From: pennyellson12@gmail.com <pennyellson12@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 4, 2021 5:34 PM
To: Transportation <Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: BPTP Update

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

From: pennyellson12@gmail.com <pennyellson12@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 4, 2021 5:13 PM
To: 'Star-Lack, Sylvia' <Sylvia.Star-Lack@CityofPaloAlto.org>; 'Chan, Joanna' <Joanna.Chan@CityofPaloAlto.org>; 'Mesterhazy, Rosie' <Rosie.Mesterhazy@cityofpaloalto.org>; 'Ken Joye' <kmjoye@gmail.com>
Cc: robert@neffs.net; 'Paul B Goldstein' <marmot@stanford.edu>
Subject: Comments on the BPTP Final Topic Headings & Potential Content

Hi Joanna, Sylvia, Rosie, & Ken,

Overall comments on the Topic Headings Framework and Potential Content:

A). It's not clear to me from reading the framework how staff intends to integrate principles of Vision Zero. Consider the **Nine Elements of a Strong Vision Zero Commitment:**

- Political Commitment
- Multi-Disciplinary Leadership (a taskforce or leadership committee that includes, at minimum, high ranking staff, electeds, police, transportation, public health staff)
- Action Plan
- Equity Commitment with measurable benchmarks
- Cooperation & Collaboration among relevant gov agencies and community stakeholders to set shared goals and focus on coordination and accountability
- Systems-Based Approach focusing on built environment, systems, and policies that influence behavior—as well as adopting messaging that emphasizes that collision losses are preventable.
- Data-Driven—Requires a commitment to gather analyze, use, and share reliable

data to understand traffic safety issues and prioritize resources based on evidence of the greatest needs and impact.

- Community Engagement
- Transparency, including regular public updates on the Action Plan and performance measures to City Council

It strikes me that the Safe Routes to School PTA, PAUSD, CoPA Partnership and City School Transportation Committee already are operating under most of these principles. If it is our goal to integrate principles of Vision Zero in this BPTP, PABAC will need to be reorganized to support that. If committee reorg is part of this planning process as Paul and Robert suggested at the last meeting, I hope this will be part of that discussion.

I think Safe Routes to School (SRTS) needs to be elevated in this document because the program's outstanding local success demonstrates that a multi-pronged approach works. In **Chapters 1, 2 and 6** SRTS can highlighted in a substantive way as a working Palo Alto model for how we might reorganize to support principles of Vision Zero more broadly through something like Safe Routes for All, for instance. SRTS can provide a working model to set the stage and garner support for such change.

These chapters could highlight the SRTS 6Es and the synergies of partnership. SRTS success depends on a partnership that mobilizes political action to support change and recruits volunteers to organize and support education and encouragement events and activities that are the catalysts for behavior change. If we are serious about making a commitment to principles of Vision Zero, then I think we need to look at the elements of the SRTS partnership model that may be transferable. I agree this chapter should lay out SRTS' best practices and strategies, but I hope it will also help people understand how this approach works, and the SRTS story shows that. We do not have to adopt Vision Zero in its entirety to implement its principles. We have a model that works. We've shown that we can adapt these principles to a create unique program that suits Palo Alto's needs.

B). There is no mention of XCAP (rail grade separations) anywhere in the framework. I hope future grade separations and related road closures and multi-modal traffic circulation/operations changes (including those that will be necessary during the long construction period) will be considered systemically in this plan.

Specific Comments:

- Executive Summary
- Present the big picture. **I think this should read like a story with a compelling arc** that the elected layman or member of the public who picks this plan up can easily understand--a story about where we have been, what we have accomplished and where

we want to go and why . A list of accomplishments will only be meaningful and compelling in the context of that story. This story does relate to Comp Plan Goals regarding community health and safety, traffic congestion reduction, and environmental sustainability, but it can be written as a story that engages and excites community members and electeds about this plan, its vision, and its possibilities. It can motivate them to support and choose active transportation more often. This section, as Nicole said so eloquently, should invite them in.

1.1 Introduction Purpose

- I agree that the audience should include staff (**including, specifically, police**) and members of the public. — **Please consider adding elected policy makers.**
- Intents:
 - To guide City staff and key decision-makers on providing safe, **comfortable, and sustainable, active options that make transportation accessible to everyone, wherever they want to go, whether or not they can drive or want to drive.**
 - please consider adding this: **To reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions, reduce traffic congestion, and to support community health and safety.**
 - To assemble of menu of prioritized projects, facilities and programs , taking into consideration priorities, available funds **and other community resources.**
 -

1.4 Please consider adding a bullet to this section that considers PABAC reorg based on my comments above in section A. I also agree with the comments made by Robert Neff and Paul Goldstein on this subject.

2.2 Overview of Safe Routes to School—Please see my comments above.

4. I am more interested in collision rates, in addition to raw collision counts. At locations where there are high injury/fatality collision rates, I'd like to see more specific crash data (that is available in SWIRTS and police reports) that helps us understand the causes of those collisions.

A thought: PAPD often comes to the CSTSC with school route collision reports, but we don't have an organized system for capturing and tracking the details of those reports. Perhaps we should.

5. **Can you add a few words to help us understand what is meant by "Accessibility"?** This can mean different things to different people. For me, It means, "A transportation system that is accessible to everyone of every age and ability (whether or not they can drive) and that integrates a land use plan that is designed to keep everyday trips as short as possible, enabling more frequent use of active transportation." In addition to providing safe, comfortable, multi-modal streets, we need to connect people to nearby stores, schools, libraries and other

frequent destinations. So many stores have closed during Covid, I find myself driving out of town more for things I can't buy online. The beauty of Palo Alto's design is the way our neighborhoods connect to public schools, shopping centers, libraries, community facilities. Robert Neff once pointed out to me that proximity relates to accessibility in this way. I think he is right. Can we integrate proximity into our "accessibility" concept?

6.3.2 Under Safe Routes for Everyone, can we consider e-bike vehicle subsidies to include e-bikes and other small EVs, not just e-cars (CoPA Utilities current program)?

Can we discuss better bike parking requirements (and connectivity of bike parking) for multi-family housing and retail?

Thank you for considering my comments.

Penny

"Today is only one day in all the days that will ever be. But what will happen in all the other days that ever come can depend on what you do today." –Ernest Hemingway



Virus-free. www.avg.com

From: [Transportation](#)
To: [Chan, Joanna](#)
Subject: FW: BPTP Update
Date: Tuesday, February 9, 2021 1:07:17 PM

JC,
Forwarding.

From: Art Liberman <art_liberman@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 9, 2021 1:01 PM
To: Transportation <Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: BPTP Update

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

I presented comments about the BPTP update Framework at the February 2 PABAC meeting. I would like to emphasize one point that I made at that meeting.

This has to do with Community Engagement. There was no information in the content section of the update to elaborate what staff intended to include in this section - how, who and when the community would be solicited for their ideas and support, what suggestions they might have for new routes or improvements to routes. So it might be thought that Community Engagement was included as a required element and as an essential element of the BPTP update.

I don't think that was the case, but I feel that Transportation staff must understand that even vigorous community engagement - notifying the community of proposed plans and asking them for feedback - is not enough. I feel that Transportation must go further and include how they intend to elicit **Community Support** for the projects proposed by this plan.

Decisions on plans require involvement of the Community at an early stage. The community (actually plural - communities - residents in the neighborhoods, school parents and students, commuting groups) should be solicited for ideas for new routes and for suggestions about existing routes that would make them safer and would encourage more people to use them. This would be one way to insure the projects have **Community Support**.

I noted at the Feb 2 meeting, in the suggested content for the BPTP, there was a disconnect between Section 5 (Needs Assessment) and Section 7 (Implementation). Specifically, in Section 7, Community Engagement is not listed! as one of the criteria for making decisions, I feel this is a serious omission. Inadequate Community Engagement and consequent lack of Community Support before deciding on the plans for the Ross Road and associated roadway modifications a few years ago led to significant community backlash when the project was being constructed and

afterward, and created a drop of support by residents for future bicycle infrastructure projects in Palo Alto that the City is still dealing with. This omission needs to be corrected with the BPTP update.

Respectfully,

Arthur Liberman