



**Palo Alto Pedestrian and
Bicycle Advisory Committee**

Tuesday, April 6, 2021 at 6:15 P.M.

Join Meeting Via Zoom

Join Online: <https://cityofpaloalto.zoom.us/j/97811643326>; Dial-in: 669-900-6833

Meeting ID: 978 1164 3326

PART I: TDA 3 – BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PLAN UPDATE

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL/CONFIRM QUORUM 6:15 PM
A quorum of this Committee shall be a majority of its membership (10).
2. AGENDA CHANGES 6:18 PM
3. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES 6:20 PM
4. PUBLIC COMMENTS 6:22 PM
Note: No written comments were submitted by email to Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org between 12:00pm on February 22, 2021 and 12:00pm on March 29, 2021.
5. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS
 - a. Staff Update on FY 21/22 TDA 3 Funds 6:28 PM
 - b. Announcement: Submit comments by email on the potential content document by 12:00pm on April 26, 2021 6:35 PM
6. ADJOURNMENT 6:45 PM

PART II: OTHER ITEMS

1. AGENDA CHANGES 6:45 PM
2. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES 6:47 PM
3. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS 6:50 PM
4. STAFF UPDATES – NONE
5. DISCUSSION ITEMS
 - a. South Palo Alto Bikeways Special PABAC Workshop Timeframe 6:55 PM
 - b. Draft Outline of the Joint MV BPAC and PA PABAC Meeting 7:05 PM
 - c. Carryover Ross Rd./Meadow. Dr Motion (Maximum 10-mins) 7:15 PM
6. STANDING ITEMS
 - a. Grant Update 7:25 PM
 - b. CSTSC Update 7:40 PM

c. VTA BPAC Update

7:50 PM

7. ADJOURNMENT

8:00 PM



Palo Alto Pedestrian and
Bicycle Advisory Committee

Tuesday, March 2, 2021

6:15 P.M.

VIRTUAL MEETING

Palo Alto, CA

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

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Sylvia Star-Lack, Joanna Chan, Shahla Yazdy, Ripon Bhatia, Rafael Rius

Guests: Lola Torney, Matt Bryant, Joel Gartland

PART I: TDA 3 – BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PLAN UPDATE

No items are scheduled for this meeting.

PART II: OTHER ITEMS

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Joye called the meeting to order at 6:20 p.m.

2. AGENDA CHANGES

None.

3. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES

Motion by Mr. Goldstein, seconded by Ms. Ellson, to approve the minutes of the February 2, 2021 meeting. Motion passed 17-0.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Robinson requested an agenda item regarding the counters that were removed when their batteries expired.

1 **5. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS**
2 **a. VTA Bicycle Superhighway Discussion**

3 Lola Torney, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Transportation Planner,
4 presented the Bicycle Superhighway Implementation Plan (Plan). The 2018 Countywide Bicycle
5 Plan introduced the bicycle superhighway, which is a network of high-quality, low-stress, on-
6 street bikeways and trails. The Plan will position member agencies to pursue grant funding and
7 provides a map of the existing and proposed network, design assumptions, planning-level cost
8 estimates by route, vehicle-miles-traveled (VMT) reductions by route, operations and
9 maintenance guidance, funding opportunities, and policy language. She highlighted planning
10 efforts for bike facilities on El Camino Real. Modeling indicates construction of the full network
11 by 2040 could result in a reduction of 71,680 VMT per workday. Approximately \$416 million is
12 needed to implement the entire network. Next steps include VTA finalizing the Plan and Palo
13 Alto finalizing the Peninsula Bikeways Study.

14 Mr. Nordman indicated separating bikeways from motor vehicles is a great idea but may be too
15 ambitious. The key to a successful network is not having stops every two blocks.

16 Mr. Wachtel noted that any kind of separation, side path, or barrier separation will create
17 geometric conflicts at every business driveway and intersection, particularly along El Camino
18 Real. Signalized intersections may require separate bicycle phases. El Camino Real may offer a
19 continuous route, but it may not be very safe. Bicycle boulevards are a much better idea.

20 Mr. de la Beaujardiere advised that the proposed routes, other than El Camino, are good for
21 confident bicycle commuters but not for younger, less experienced bicyclists. No east-west
22 superhighways are shown in Palo Alto, but several potential routes could be good east-west
23 superhighways in Palo Alto.

24 Mr. Goldstein stated long-distance routes are helpful for tourists and long-distance cyclists
25 traveling through the area. The map of routes in Palo Alto looks good. Signage is the important
26 component at intersections. Superhighways should not be restricted to separated facilities. He
27 proposed adding Channing as a connector from Bryant Boulevard to the Bay Trail and
28 Middlefield Road as a potential corridor.

29 Mr. Neff noted the Peninsula Bikeway Study has become a signed route from Downtown
30 Mountain View to Redwood City. Efficient connections across arterials are good. Routes
31 through signalized intersections that do not conflict with the thru route for bicycles would be
32 advantageous. Permissive left turns are a problem for bicyclists in the bike lane. Two-way stops
33 on non-signalized streets are bad if they oppose a bicyclists direction of travel, but four-way
34 stops are okay.

35 Ms. Boelens commented that superhighways should connect to existing bike networks, local
36 destinations, and transit; offer direct routes and shortcuts that compete with driving; eliminate
37 stop signs; have short signal cycles; prioritize bicycle traffic over car traffic; accommodate
38 speeds up to 25 mph; and be constructed atop speed bumps.

39 Mr. Zaumen favored wind breaks along superhighways but not a large number of stops.

1 Mr. Arthur indicated the number of driveways along a superhighway should be minimal and
2 signalized intersections should be well marked for bicyclists and should work all the time.
3 Middlefield and Park-Wilkie are good connections to Palo Alto. Mr. Arthur also urged the VTA
4 to consider Foothill Expwy as a bicycle superhighway.

5 In response to Ms. Ellson's questions, Ms. Torney advised that Palo Alto's bike boulevards were
6 considered in proposing superhighways, but the primary factor was the potential for separated
7 bikeways over long distances. Bicyclists may deviate to the bike boulevard rather than travel on
8 El Camino Real. The intent is to provide bicyclists with options. The routes are intended to be
9 transformational projects to show how VMT could be reduced by having high-quality, separated
10 facilities.

11 Ms. Ellson stated the superhighway should not be a priority, and other projects have higher
12 priority, especially for funding. East-west crossings and grade separations will be far more
13 important for Palo Alto.

14 Mr. Rock wanted to see separate bicycle phases for signalized intersections and proposed the use
15 of alarms to signal traffic in driveways.

16 Ms. Durham remarked that existing conditions on El Camino Real are not suitable for a
17 superhighway.

18 Mr. Joye liked the focus on VMT. High-volume train stations should be considered in planning
19 superhighways. Barricades that allow bicycles but not vehicles to pass have been a factor in Palo
20 Alto's successful bike boulevards.

21 Ms. Star-Lack remarked that a superhighway is intended for adult bicyclists commuting long
22 distances. There could be intermediate steps to implementing a superhighway on El Camino
23 Real.

24 **b. Churchill Avenue Enhanced Bikeway Project Status**

25 Shahla Yazdy reported the project will connect the Caltrain pathway with the Stanford Perimeter
26 Trail. The project began in March 2014, was placed on hold in the summer of 2018, and
27 restarted in November 2019 to complete the project design. Improvements on Churchill Avenue
28 include high-visibility crosswalks at Castilleja, new lighting and curb improvements at Castilleja,
29 a raised crosswalk at Madrono, restriping and repaving on Churchill, and landscaping and tree
30 planting along the school frontage. Intersection safety improvements at El Camino Real include
31 removing the pork chop island, adding a right-turn-only storage lane on westbound Churchill to
32 northbound El Camino Real, enhanced bicycle and pedestrian crosswalks at all three crossings of
33 intersections, and an improved signalized intersection. Caltrans will have to review and approve
34 changes to the intersection with El Camino Real. The proposed design provides 5-foot
35 sidewalks, 5.5 and 6-foot planting strips, a 7.5-foot parking lane, 10-foot travel lanes, 4 and 5-
36 foot bike lanes, and an 8-foot bike path with a 2-foot shoulder along Churchill Avenue. Next
37 steps are to finalize and confirm design and easement details with PAUSD, conduct community
38 outreach, submit plans to Caltrans for an encroachment permit, complete 100% design, and seek
39 bids for construction in early 2022.

1 In reply to inquiries, Ms. Yazdy explained that the bike lane is intended for experienced
2 bicyclists while the two-way bike path is intended for younger and inexperienced bicyclists. The
3 final design will consider placing the path atop a speed bump as well as signage and other
4 improvements that increase awareness of the bike path. The travel lanes on El Camino Real
5 have been reduced to the minimum width allowed. A leading pedestrian phase will be
6 implemented at the El Camino Real intersection.

7 Mr. Rock did not find the improvements at Castilleja and Churchill beneficial. There has to be a
8 way for bicyclists traveling from the railroad to move into the bike turn lane. The westbound
9 bike lane seems redundant. The eastbound bike lane is not easily accessible for bicyclists on El
10 Camino Real. Ms. Star-Lack noted the diagrams do not show intersection thru-markings for the
11 eastbound bike lane at El Camino Real.

12 Mr. Zaumen stated that using the on-street bike lane instead of the path was safer at the
13 intersection, while risk of being hit from behind when in the bike lane is very low. Signage
14 could be useful in directing westbound bicyclists to the bike lane from the driveway. Turning
15 left onto El Camino Real is easier from the bike lane than from the trail.

16 Mr. Goldstein noted that turning from westbound Churchill onto southbound Castilleja is
17 challenging. Adding bulbouts to the intersection of Churchill and Castilleja will not be helpful
18 because the street is narrow. A 4-foot bike lane may be substandard.

19 Mr. Neff appreciated the increased distance between the bike crossing and the corner of El
20 Camino Real and Churchill as it increases safety.

21 **c. Ross Rd./E. Meadow Dr. Traffic Control Motion**

22 Mr. Nordman proposed four options for the Ross Road and East Meadow Drive intersection: a
23 standard roundabout, a traffic circle with a stop sign on East Meadow Drive, a traffic circle with
24 stop signs on both East Meadow Drive and Ross Road, and a traffic circle with speed humps on
25 East Meadow Drive.

26 Mr. Wachtel advised that the lack of traffic control appears to give traffic entering the
27 intersection from Ross the right-of-way. Normally, traffic within the roundabout has the right-
28 of-way. The geometry of the intersection indicates traffic within the roundabout has the right-of-
29 way. Thus, traffic within the roundabout and traffic entering the roundabout from Ross Road
30 believe they have the right-of-way. The California Manual for Uniform Traffic Control Devices
31 (MUTCD) prohibits a combination of stop and yield signs. Ideally, the stop signs should be
32 removed and the intersection returned to a roundabout configuration with larger yield signs, yield
33 pavement markings in both words and symbols, and wider splitter islands. If the splitter islands
34 cannot be made wider, a wider envelope could be striped around them. If the stop signs cannot
35 be removed, he proposed yield pavement markings at the Ross Road approach and wider splitter
36 islands at all approaches.

37 Mr. Joye recalled that he on behalf of PABAC sent a letter to the Council in March 2020
38 regarding this topic. He did not believe the Council acted on or responded to the letter.

1 Ripon Bhatia reported that Council directed staff to remove the splitter islands from between the
2 crosswalk and the traffic circle because Green Waste and emergency vehicles cannot maneuver
3 around them. The intersection will function as a traffic circle with a two-way stop sign.

4 Rafael Rius noted that the City has very limited right-of-way on all four approaches. The islands
5 were maximized for typical motor vehicle traffic. The Council directed removal of the islands
6 based on comments from Green Waste, the Fire Department, and the community survey.

7 Mr. Goldstein clarified that the intent of the motion was to provide a written statement for the
8 record that PABAC as an advisory committee believes the current configuration is confusing and
9 unsafe; the original intent, a traffic circle, is better than the existing condition; and enhancements
10 to signage and to slow entering traffic would make the intersection better and safer. If the
11 intersection were a traffic circle, it should have only yield signs. The original problems resulted
12 from insufficient signage and insufficient leading signage warning drivers of the upcoming
13 traffic circle.

14 Mr. Swent believed the motion needs additional language indicating why the intersection is
15 confusing and why PABAC believes it is unsafe. Removing the splitter islands makes it even
16 less of a traffic circle. It appears there was never sufficient space for a traffic circle. Perhaps it
17 should be removed and replaced with a four-way stop.

18 Mr. Rius reported all-yield approaches are commonly used in roundabouts, and there is specific
19 guidance for the design of roundabouts. The space is not large enough for a roundabout, and the
20 existing condition is called a neighborhood traffic circle or a mini roundabout, which has options
21 for all-way stop, two-way stop, or four yields depending on design. The terms roundabout and
22 traffic circle have been confused.

23 Mr. Nordman attempted to draft a motion, which was not seconded, to send a letter to the
24 Council suggesting staff investigate installing a "yield to traffic in circle" sign such that it is
25 visible to motorists going on Ross Road in an effort to eliminate the ambiguity of who has the
26 right-of-way.

27 Mr. Rock agreed with the attempted draft motion as a way to improve a bad situation. The yield
28 sign needs to be installed on Ross Road. The ultimate solution may be returning to a four-way
29 stop.

30 Mr. Wachtel remarked that it seems there was never sufficient right-of-way at this intersection to
31 design a proper roundabout. Mr. Bhatia and Mr. Rius seem to be much more knowledgeable
32 about this than the consultant. These tweaks will not work because the intersection will not
33 function as a roundabout. In which case, removing the splitter islands so that the intersection
34 functions as a conventional neighborhood traffic circle may be the best solution. As a
35 neighborhood traffic circle, stop signs on Meadow and yield signs on Ross are prohibited.

36 Mr. Bhatia advised that yield signage will be installed on side streets, and mixing stop and yield
37 signs are not authorized under the California MUTCD.

1 Mr. Rius interpreted the draft motion as investigating the installation of a warning sign for
2 motorists to yield to traffic in the circle because a stop sign on Meadow and a yield sign on Ross
3 are prohibited.

4 Mr. Bhatia suggested the sign could be a warning sign alerting motorists to the traffic circle. The
5 MUTCD does not contain a sign that states "yield to traffic in circle."

6 Ms. Durham indicated the lack of clear direction for right-of-way will be a dangerous situation
7 for bicyclists commuting to schools.

8 **Motion** by Mr. Neff, seconded by Mr. de la Beaujardiere, to send a letter to the Council stating
9 that the current configuration of the Ross Road/East Meadow Drive intersection is confusing and
10 unsafe and would be made safer with the addition of a four-way stop sign. Mr. Neff's motion
11 was left open as it was neither accepted nor rejected by PABAC members.

12 Mr. Rock proposed the letter to not suggest corrective actions for the traffic circle but state that
13 the intersection is confusing and unsafe and should be redesigned by staff. Staff has heard the
14 discussion and is aware of PABAC's concerns.

15 In answer to Ms. Ellson's question, Mr. Rius explained that the bulbouts with ramps to the bike
16 lane or travel lane will remain. The boxes opposite the bulbouts will be removed.

17 Chair Joye announced to take the discussion offline and encouraged interested PABAC members
18 to meet and discuss potential motion language to be further considered at another meeting.

19 **d. Joint PABAC and MV BPAC Meeting on June 30, 2021**

20 Ms. Chan reported Mountain View staff on behalf of Mountain View's BPAC inquired about
21 interest in a joint meeting on June 30th, 6:30-8:30 p.m. The joint meeting will be subject to the
22 Brown Act; therefore, a quorum of PABAC members need to be present at the meeting. A
23 survey of PABAC members indicates the top three topics of interest for the joint meeting are the
24 Park Boulevard/Wilkie Bridge/Miller Avenue bikeway, the Bay Trail, and a tie between
25 bicycle/pedestrian access along the San Antonio Corridor and bicycle/pedestrian access to the
26 San Antonio station and San Antonio/Alma/Central Interchange. Two respondents suggested
27 topics of wayfinding between Palo Alto and Mountain View and a route between Fayette and
28 Latham through the shopping center. Ms. Chan counted 14 members interested in attending a
29 joint meeting on June 30th.

30 **6. STAFF UPDATES – NONE**

31 **7. STANDING ITEMS:**

32 **a. VTA BPAC Update**

33 Mr. Neff advised that the VTA BPAC discussed long-term transportation projects and efforts to
34 improve bus times by reducing the frequency of stops on some routes. At the meeting, he
35 inquired about adding a few stops to the 522 service, and staff informed him that an additional
36 route with more stops than the 522 service and fewer stops than the 22 service could serve more
37 people.

1 **8. ADJOURNMENT** at 8:35 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.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update Final Framework with Potential Content

i. Letter from the Mayor or City Manager (tentative)

ii. Executive Summary

- Accomplishments and progress since the BPTP 2012
- Include links to quickly access sections of interest

1. Introduction

1.1. Purpose

- Audiences: For City staff and members of the public alike
- Intents:
 - To guide City staff on providing safe, accessible, and enjoyable transportation options for everyone
 - To assemble a menu of projects, facilities, and programs taking into consideration priorities and available funds
 - To engage the public on how this plan fits into city goals, including support for behavior change with more bicycle and pedestrian projects, facilities, and programs, as well as education for driver awareness

1.2. Principles

- Complete streets
- Systemic safety
- Vision zero
- Sustainability

1.3. Goals, Performance Measures, and Policies

- Describe goals and how to measure success of the Plan Update
- Introduce existing policies and needed policy changes for a successful Plan Update (refer to policy recommendations in chapter 6.4)
- Consider Bicycle Friendly Community criteria
- Potential goals for consideration:
 - Accessible
 - Equity
 - Integration of all modes and users
 - Inviting
 - Health
 - Safety
 - Sustainability

1.4. Palo Alto Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee (PABAC)

- Describe PABAC's role as an advisory committee to staff, including involvement in the Plan Update development

2. Plans, Programs, and Facilities

2.1. Relevant Plans (include links to each document)

- City of Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan 2030

Note: City of Palo Alto Sustainability and Climate Action Plan is anticipated for Council in mid-2021, which may influence content of the Plan Update.

- City of Palo Alto Green Stormwater Infrastructure Plan 2019
 - City of Palo Alto Complete Streets Policy 2015
 - City of Palo Alto Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan 2012
 - City of Palo Alto Sustainability and Climate Action Plan (in development)
 - City of Palo Alto Expanded Community Advisory Panel Final Recommendations Report (in development)
 - City of Palo Alto California Avenue District Public Art Master Plan (in development)
 - Peninsula Bikeway Study (in development)
 - Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Countywide Bicycle Plan 2018
 - Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Bicycle Technical Guidelines 2012
 - Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Bicycle Superhighway Feasibility Study (in development)
 - Caltrans District 4 Bike Plan 2018
 - Caltrans District 4 Pedestrian Plan (in development)
 - Caltrans District 4 Bike Highway (in development)
- 2.2. Supporting Programs
- Safe Routes to School
 - Include route map with crossing guard positions
 - Include best practices, strategies like parent engagement, a 5-year work plan, and a 10-year vision

2.3. Supporting Facilities

- Bicycle parking
- Wayfinding

3. Community Engagement for the Plan Update

3.1. Purpose

3.2. Process

- Include the schedule, potential stakeholders, and different forms of outreach strategies

3.3. Outcome

4. Safety Analysis

4.1. Bicycle and Pedestrian Volumes

- Annual bicycle and pedestrian counts
- Annual bicycle and pedestrian counts on key bicycling and walking routes
- Annual bicycle and pedestrian counts on key school commute routes

4.2. High Injury Network

- Corridors and intersections (signalized and unsignalized)

4.3. Bicycle Collision Trends

- Killed, severely injured, visibly injured, not injured (near misses)
- Location types, street types, and time of day
- Common causes (wrong side riding, left/right hooks, dooring, signals and signs, others)
- Age and gender

Note: City of Palo Alto Sustainability and Climate Action Plan is anticipated for Council in mid-2021, which may influence content of the Plan Update.

4.4. Pedestrian Collision Trends

- Killed, severely injured, visibly injured, not injured (near misses)
- Location types, street types, and time of day
- Common causes (mid-block crossing, left/right hooks, signals and signs, others)
- Age and gender

4.5. Other Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Factors

- Aging infrastructure
- Lighting

5. Needs Assessment Criteria and Metrics

- Categorized by projects, facilities, and programs
- Describe how each criteria will be measured and scored
- Potential criteria for consideration:
 - Accessibility
 - Community engagement
 - Community support
 - Connectivity to transit and destinations
 - Consistency with relevant plans and volumes
 - Cost
 - Equity including vulnerable populations and geographic inequities
 - Gap closure including across barrier connections
 - Bicycle level of stress
 - Pedestrian level of stress
 - Projected number of users
 - Safety (refer to analysis in chapter 4)
 - Sustainability including GHG reductions

Criteria	Metric	Points
PROJECTS:		
FACILITIES:		
PROGRAMS:		

6. Recommendations

6.1. Projects

6.1.1. List of Bicycle Projects Recommendations

- Evaluate existing conditions and propose bicycle projects, including Safe Routes to School bicycle projects

6.1.2. List of Pedestrian Projects Recommendations

- Evaluate existing conditions and propose pedestrian projects, including Safe Routes to School pedestrian projects

Note: City of Palo Alto Sustainability and Climate Action Plan is anticipated for Council in mid-2021, which may influence content of the Plan Update.

6.2. Facilities

6.2.1. List of Bicycle Facilities Recommendations

- Evaluate existing conditions and propose bicycle facilities, including Safe Routes to School bicycle facilities

6.2.2. List of Pedestrian Facilities Recommendations

- Evaluate existing conditions and propose pedestrian facilities, including Safe Routes to School pedestrian facilities

6.3. Programs

6.3.1. List of Safe Routes to School Program Recommendations

- Evaluate the existing Safe Routes to School program and propose programmatic recommendations

6.3.2. List of New Program Recommendations

- Evaluate the existing citywide context and propose new programmatic recommendations that support and expand bicycling and walking for all user types
 - First Last Mile Connections
 - Micromobility
 - Safe Routes for Everyone

6.4. Policies

- Evaluate the existing role and structure of the Palo Alto Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee (PABAC), and propose changes that furthers efficiency
- Evaluate existing policies and propose policy changes that support and expand bicycling and walking to all user types
 - Electric vehicle subsidies to include electric bicycles
- Evaluate existing policies on safety data collection and propose policy changes to improve the process

Project Name	Criteria	Points
PROJECTS:		
FACILITIES:		
PROGRAMS:		

7. Implementation

7.1. Methodology

- Describe how recommended projects, facilities, and programs are ranked and prioritized
 - Ranked by high, medium, and low

Note: City of Palo Alto Sustainability and Climate Action Plan is anticipated for Council in mid-2021, which may influence content of the Plan Update.

- Prioritized by availability of funds, cost, and readiness
 - Availability of funds: Consider funding sources
 - Cost: Consider project cost estimates
 - Readiness: Consider project phase (feasibility, planning, design, engineering, construction) and implementation timeline

7.2. List of Ranked and Prioritized Projects

8. Appendices (potentially be web-based)

8.1. Appendix A: City of Palo Alto Reference Maps

- Mapping layers:
 - Roadway Pavement Conditions
 - Transit Routes
 - Across Barrier Connections
 - Parks and Open Spaces
 - Employment Districts and Business Districts
 - Shopping Centers and Neighborhood Commercial Centers
 - Community Facilities
 - Schools

8.2. Appendix B: City of Palo Alto Bicycle Network Progress Map, Existing Conditions, and Network Gaps

- Mapping layers:
 - Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan 2012 Existing Conditions
 - Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan 2012 Proposed Projects and Facilities
 - Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan 2012 Completed Projects and Facilities = Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update Existing Conditions
 - Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update Network Gaps

8.3. Appendix C: City of Palo Alto Pedestrian Network Progress Map, Existing Conditions, and Network Gaps

- Mapping layers:
 - Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan 2012 Existing Conditions
 - Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan 2012 Completed Projects and Facilities = Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update Existing Conditions
 - Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update Network Gaps

8.4. Appendix D: City of Palo Alto Safe Routes to School Network Progress Map, Existing Conditions, and Network Gaps

- Mapping layers:
 - Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan 2012 Adopted School Commute Network
 - Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan 2012 Safe Routes to School Existing Conditions
 - Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan 2012 Safe Routes to School Proposed Projects and Facilities

Note: City of Palo Alto Sustainability and Climate Action Plan is anticipated for Council in mid-2021, which may influence content of the Plan Update.

- Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan 2012 Safe Routes to School Completed Projects and Facilities = Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update Safe Routes to School Existing Conditions
 - Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update Safe Routes to School Network Gaps
 - Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update Adopted School Commute Network
- 8.5. Appendix E: City of Palo Alto Bicycle and Pedestrian Volumes Map
- 8.6. Appendix F: City of Palo Alto High Injury Network Map
- 8.7. Appendix G: List of Design Manuals

Note: City of Palo Alto Sustainability and Climate Action Plan is anticipated for Council in mid-2021, which may influence content of the Plan Update.