PART I: TDA 3 – BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PLAN UPDATE

No items are scheduled for this meeting. No written comments were submitted by email to Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org between 12:00pm on May 24, 2021 and 12:00pm on July 26, 2021.

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
   a. Regular June PABAC Meeting
   b. Special Joint Meeting with MV BPAC
4. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS 6:23 PM
5. STAFF UPDATES 6:25 PM
   a. Staffing Update
   b. South Palo Alto Bikeways
   c. PABAC 311 Submissions
   d. Peninsula Bikeway Study
6. DISCUSSION ITEMS 7:00 PM
   a. Comments from attendees about joint meeting with MV B/PAC
   b. Off-road access to Foothills Park, Gate D
7. STANDING ITEMS 7:55 PM
   a. Grant Update – NONE
   b. CSTSC Update – NONE
   c. VTA BPAC Update
8. ADJOURNMENT 8:00 PM
Tuesday, June 1, 2021
6:15 P.M.

VIRTUAL MEETING
Palo Alto, CA

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

Members Absent: Arnout Boelens, Nicole Zoeller Boelens

Staff Present: Joanna Chan, Sylvia Star-Lack

Guests: Steve Davis

PART I: TDA 3 – BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PLAN UPDATE

No meeting scheduled.

PART II: OTHER ITEMS

1. CALL TO ORDER – 6:16 p.m.

2. AGENDA CHANGES

Chair Joye announced a report from the subcommittee reviewing work items will be added to the agenda as Item 6c.

3. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES

Motion by Mr. Goldstein, seconded by Vice Chair Liberman, to approve the minutes of the May 4, 2021 meeting as presented. Motion passed 14-0 with 2 abstaining.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Goldstein requested a standing agenda item listing future agenda topics with tentative dates. He also requested staff investigate the possibility of delaying the repaving of Addison Avenue until the entire substandard bike route along Addison can be designed and included in the repaving project as one.
Ms. Ellson thanked Mr. Neff for organizing events for Bike to Wherever Day and staff, especially Ms. Chan, for supporting the event. The Council has fully funded Phase III of the Charleston/Arastradero project.

5. STAFF UPDATES – NONE

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS
   a. South Palo Alto Bikeways Presentation and Discussion

Joanna Chan shared the objectives and requirements of the grant funding the project, public engagement opportunities, project segments, and charts for middle school and high school bike counts. Earlier start times for Jane Lathrop Stanford Middle School (JLS) and Gunn High School beginning in September 2021 could result in even higher rates of biking and walking to schools.

Steve Davis, Fehr & Peers, reported the Fabian Way segment includes two vehicle travel lanes in each direction, a westbound bike lane, and an eastbound shared bike and parking lane. Because of crossing distances, traffic volumes and speeds, and the current lane configurations, riding and walking on or crossing Fabian Way is a challenge. Two potential options for reconfiguring Fabian Way have been identified, and potential improvements could include eliminating on-street parking to add buffers and eliminate dooring risks while maintaining existing travel lanes or reducing the number of vehicle travel lanes to introduce protected bike lanes while maintaining existing parking in the eastbound direction. Improvements on Fabian Way would be coordinated with the Charleston/Arastradero project.

Mr. Rock indicated that having the bicycle lane to the right of the parking lane seems to reduce bicyclists' visibility of motorists. In addition, large vehicles and RVs park along the street. These vehicles may not fit within the parking lane in Option 2.

Mr. Neff remarked that the parking-protected bike lane will result in less on-street parking. Drop-off at the high school needs to be considered. The road diet makes a left turn easy and safe for bicyclists. For bicyclists wanting to turn left from Fabian onto East Meadow, a design with a center turn-lane is the best option.

Mr. Robinson wanted to know the types of road users, their numbers, and their use of Fabian before discussing improvements for Fabian Way. Ms. Ellson reported Fabian has become a school commute route because of housing built around the JCC Campus. Parents will not allow their children to commute to school via Fabian Way because of safety concerns.

Mr. Goldstein remarked that a parking-protected bike lane is a new treatment in this situation, and other treatments have been used successfully. New treatments were implemented on Ross Road without success. A parking-protected bike lane seems to add unnecessary barriers and confusion without providing much benefit.

Mr. Rock noted that the intersection of Fabian and Charleston is extremely busy during rush hour. The number of lanes turning left from Fabian and right onto Fabian should be the same.
Vice Chair Liberman did not like protected bike lanes and rarely used them. A parking-protected bike lane may not be necessary if existing on-street parking is not fully utilized.

Ms. Durham stated reducing the crossing distance could provide safety benefits for pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists.

In response to questions, Ms. Chan advised that driveways have not yet been counted. Some traffic counts were conducted during the pandemic, but if necessary, a full traffic study will be completed in the following phase. Mr. Davis stated parking along the Kehillah Jewish High School side of Fabian Way would be eliminated in Option 2. Driveways with lower traffic volumes typically have 40-60 feet of free space from the edge of the driveway to ensure clear sightlines. Each driveway will be reviewed independently during the design phase. Ms. Chan stated the Adobe Creek Reach Trail will open with the Highway 101 Pedestrian/Bike Bridge in the summer. These improvements will not extend into Bayshore. Sylvia Star-Lack noted bicyclists leaving the Oshman Family Jewish Community Center (JCC) may want to turn left onto East Meadow. Staff will explore different ways for bicyclists to exit the protected bike lane so that bicyclists of all skill levels are comfortable.

Mr. Davis continued the presentation with the segment of East Meadow Drive between East Meadow Circle and Fabian Way, which includes one vehicle travel lane in each direction, one bike lane in each direction, and a shared bike and parking lane in the westbound direction. Option 1 provides buffered bike lanes in each direction and eliminates parking. Option 2 is essentially maintaining the existing conditions. East Meadow Drive between Alma Street and East Meadow Circle has a parking lane, bike lane, and a vehicle travel lane in both directions with no physical barriers between any of the uses. Rolled curbs and cars parked in or overlapping the bike lane and sidewalks are significant challenges for pedestrians and bicyclists. The goal for this segment is to minimize the threat of vehicles parking in the bike lane and on the sidewalk. Option 1 has buffered bike lanes in each direction with parking along one side only. Option 2 provides a parking-protected bike lane in one direction. The parking-protected bike lane may be located on either the westbound or eastbound side based on where the community feels the greatest need is and based on geometric constraints. The segment of East Meadow adjacent to Fairmeadow Elementary provides angled parking in the eastbound direction, a bike lane in each direction, and some extra space between the bike lane and parking. Option 1 widens the bike lane into the extra space. Option 2 includes parking adjacent to the drop-off loop at Fairmeadow Elementary.

Mr. Rock did not perceive any difficulties with the improvements due to few cars parking along East Meadow. In normal situations, vehicles turn left from westbound Meadow into Fairmeadow Elementary, which delays traffic, and park in the bike lane. Left turns into the school should be prohibited to improve safety.

Mr. Courington questioned whether back-in angle parking could be implemented on Meadow.

Mr. Nordman preferred Option 2, the road diet, for Fabian Way. Protected bike lanes are a concern because of sightlines. Pylon barriers are less expensive than concrete barriers. Implementing protected bike lanes on East Meadow is more difficulty due to the number of driveways.
Mr. Swent supported a hybrid of Options 1 and 2, i.e., a road diet and buffered bike lanes, for Fabian Way. The roundabout will be a challenge for bicyclists if there is a protected bike lane on E. Meadow.

Mr. Arthur preferred locating a buffered bike lane on Fabian because there are fewer driveways. Square curbs would do a lot to standardize traffic, cars, and parking. Aligning parked vehicles would provide a huge advantage.

Mr. Neff concurred with Mr. Swent that a road diet, plastic buffers, and no parking is probably the best option. Residents who are located across from JLS but have East Meadow addresses are very uncomfortable with the idea of removing parking in front of their homes. From Waverley to Alma, a buffered, separated bike lane is a good alternative. On East Meadow, plans to construct a left turn pocket at the trail entrance needs to be considered.

Mr. de la Beaujardiere preferred bollards to a raised curb. Option 1 for East Meadow between Alma and East Meadow Circle does not eliminate the risk of bicyclists being doored.

Mr. Davis concluded the presentation with the Waverley Multi-use Path. Existing conditions and high demand during school peak periods have led to falls and collisions for bicyclists. In some portions of the path, the usable width is less than 5 feet for both directions of travel. Options for barriers include bollards or delineators, concrete curbs, and bike bollards. Option 1 widens the path into the adjacent grassy strip at pinch points where feasible and replaces the fence with a different type of barrier. Option 2 widens the path towards either side where feasible and again replaces the fence.

Mr. Swent supported removing the fence and Option 2.

Mr. Rock suggested widening the path into the grassy strip to provide a wider path and passing areas.

Ms. Durham encouraged the design team to consider the path as three segments. The segment at Charleston is constrained during school commute times by the large number of cars accessing Hoover. Parking towards Hoover is constrained such that widening the path toward the roadway may be easier. The segment at JLS may be the easiest to modify. People may object to removing the fence.

Mr. Neff liked the fence separating the path from vehicle traffic. Whatever barrier is used, it needs to prevent motorists from backing onto the path. Widening the entire path would be best.

Ms. Star-Lack noted that the path is located on PAUSD property and must maintain at minimum a 20-foot fire lane. Parents prefer a fence or a continuous barrier.

Ms. Ellson commented that PAUSD may not agree to removing the fence when its risk management team reviews the design. In response to her question, Ms. Star-Lack offered options of mounting bollards on concrete curbs or installing a lower and artistic fence.

Mr. Wachtel was uncomfortable with the project. The main problem appears to be roadways that are too narrow to accommodate parking, bike lanes, and traffic lanes. All proposals include
some level of parking removal and lane configuration. Inexpensive, flexible, easy-to-modify, and expedient options have not been offered because the grant requires a bikeway with physical protection. The separated bikeways are neither protected nor bike lanes. Drawbacks of separated facilities include a bicyclist's inability to avoid debris and surface hazards, to pass other users, to turn left, and to reach midblock destinations across the roadway without a break in the barrier. At every driveway and intersection, separated facilities create geometric conflicts unless mixing zones or separate traffic phases are provided. Recognized guidelines are inadequate and should not be relied on to solve problems after the fact. Buffered bike lanes do not prevent lateral movements, but they can create turning conflicts. Buffers are best used to keep bicyclists out of the door zone. The experiment on Arastradero should be observed closely before it is repeated.

b. PABAC Email List Protocol

Mr. Goldstein reported the subcommittee does not believe there is a grave problem. The guidelines are guidelines; there will be no enforcement.

Mr. Arthur questioned the prohibition against using the list to advocate for or against issues or policies. An email thoughtfully advocating for or against a topic is valuable for informing decisions. Mr. Goldstein noted that PABAC is not subject to the Brown Act; therefore, staff is not required to publish PABAC emails for public consumption. An email providing additional information or suggesting ways to structure a discussion may be sent to the Chair for inclusion in the agenda packet. The PABAC email list is not the appropriate place for advocacy.

Mr. Rock did not believe the email list has been used inappropriately and did not see a need for guidelines.

Mr. Wachtel commented that PABAC's meetings, agendas, and minutes are available to the public. It is not appropriate to conduct extensive policy discussions via the email list. Comments should be reserved for the public meeting.

Mr. de la Beaujardiere indicated that the proposed guidelines align with practices.

Mr. Nordman suggested changing "protocol" to "guidelines" in the title.

Ms. Ellson advised that the guidelines will be helpful for new members.

Ms. Durham proposed including the fact that PABAC is advisory to staff and revising "other communication platforms" to "for those interested, the following resources are available." Walk/Bike Palo Alto does not have a distribution list yet.

Motion by Ms. Ellson, seconded by Mr. Goldstein, to adopt the proposed guidelines with revisions to change "protocol" to "guidelines" in Heading 1 and add beneath Heading 1 "PABAC is an advisory committee; advocacy is not part of this Committee's charter." Motion passed 15-1.
c. Review of Past Work

Mr. Swent advised that two items remain outstanding: the bollards on Louis/Moreno and the Stanford/Park traffic circle. In February 2019, PABAC approved a recommendation for the City to place adequate reflective material on all bollards on Louis/Moreno/Amarillo. In September 2019, staff talked about moving the existing bollards, and at least one bollard was moved. Since 2019, the intersection has been reconfigured, stop signs moved, and streets restriped, but adequate reflective material has not been applied to all bollards. PABAC began discussing the Stanford/Park traffic circle in April 2017, and staff provided an update in August 2017. In January 2018, staff offered four alternatives for review and discussion. The minutes do not indicate which alternative PABAC preferred. In January 2020, staff new to the City advised PABAC that the project was included in Phase II of bicycle boulevard work, which was placed on hold. Multiple requests for monthly collision data and for review of downtown pedestrian safety have not been addressed. A number of items need staff updates. With funding of Phase III of the Charleston/Arastradero project, PABAC needs to ensure the project is coordinated with the Caltrans repaving of El Camino.

Chair Joye reported he and Vice Chair Liberman will work with staff to place items on upcoming agendas. A joint meeting with the Mountain View BPAC is scheduled for June 30, 2021.

7. STANDING ITEMS:
   a. Grant Update

   None

   b. CSTSC Update

   None

   c. VTA BPAC Update

   Mr. Neff reported that the BPAC committee reviewed planning projects and recommended some for grant funding. BPAC conducted a Complete Streets checklist review of projects submitted to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for the quick strike program. BPAC also recommended the VTA Board of Directors to adopt the Bicycle Superhighway Implementation Plan. The City may want to consider a project to fill the gap in the Bay Trail at Embarcadero and West Bayshore or support a route on the off-street path.

   Ms. Star-Lack noted a development application has been submitted for the property at the corner of Embarcadero and East Bayshore. In a prior development application, staff required a bike path across the property to the multi-use path leading to Geng Road. The property was rezoned, but the development proposal was abandoned. The current development application proposes a smaller project, and staff is again attempting to require a bike path across the property. PABAC members may wish to submit comments to the Council regarding the project and bike path.

   Ms. Chan stated the project will likely be listed by its address, 1700 Embarcadero Road.
Mr. de la Beaujardiere announced the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition is hosting a virtual bike ride on June 3, 2021. Several years ago, PABAC identified many improvements for Park Boulevard, such as wayfinding signage. Perhaps the subcommittee can investigate and resurrect that piece of unfinished business. The Council may be scheduled to review the North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan (NVCAP) on June 8, 2021. The Council’s selection of an option for the NVCAP or direction to staff could impact Park Boulevard.

7. **ADJOURNMENT** at 8:19 p.m.
SPECIAL JOINT MEETING OF THE
MOUNTAIN VIEW BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
AND
PALO ALTO PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, June 30, 2021
6:30 P.M.
Virtual Meeting

1. CALL TO ORDER – 6:30 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL/ESTABLISH QUORUM

2.1 Mountain View Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (MV B/PAC)

Members Present: Chair Lada Adamic, Vice Chair Valerie Fenwick, Terry Barton, James Kuzsmaul, Kalyanaraman Shankari

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Ria Hutabarat Lo, Brandon Whyte

2.2 Palo Alto Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee (PABAC)

Members Present: Chair Ken Joye, Vice Chair Art Liberman, Bruce Arthur, Bill Courington, Cedric de la Beaujardiere, Penny Ellson, Robert Neff, Eric Nordman, Steve Rock, Alan Wachtel, Bill Zaumen

Members Absent: Arnout Boelens, Nicole Zoeller Boelens, Kathy Durham, Paul Goldstein, Rob Robinson, Jane Rosten, Richard Swent

Staff Present: Sylvia Star-Lack, Joanna Chan

3. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

Mr. England directed comments to Mr. Whyte and Ms. Lo.

4. MINUTES APPROVAL

4.1 MV B/PAC Meeting Minutes for May 26, 2021

Motion by Vice Chair Fenwick, seconded by Mr. Kuzsmaul, to approve the minutes of the May 26, 2021 meeting as presented. Motion passed 5-0.
4.2 PABAC Meeting Minutes for June 1, 2021

None

5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

6. NEW BUSINESS

6.1 Orientation to Mountain View B/PAC and Palo Alto PABAC

Mr. Whyte provided an introduction to tonight’s agenda. Ms. Lo and Ms. Chan summarized the roles and responsibilities of Mountain View B/PAC and Palo Alto PABAC.

6.2 Pedestrian and Bicycle Issues that Cross City Borders

Mr. Whyte presented on cross city borders issues.

Mr. Kuzsmaul asked about the process and timeline of Caltrans’ El Camino Real project. Specifically, who needs to approve the parking removal in Mountain View and how bus stops will be redesigned. Mr. Whyte shared that Caltrans will provide design plans within the next month, which staff will review and comment with regards to the bus stops. Ms. Lo mentioned that Mountain View Council has already approved half of the parking removal and will need to consider approving the other half.

Chair Joye stated that the presentation showed no parallel alternate route to El Camino Real, and asked staff whether there is a reasonable parallel alternate route for San Antonio Road. Mr. Whyte explained that the understanding isn’t to have a parallel alternate route for San Antonio Road, but to develop San Antonio Road into a bicycle and pedestrian friendly corridor. Ms. Starr-Lack added that Palo Alto Council has asked for a corridor study along San Antonio Road.

Vice Chair Liberman questioned the types of protected bikeways that Mountain View has envisioned for El Camino Real, as well as consideration for noise level on El Camino Real. Mr. Whyte clarified that it will be a raised curb on El Camino Real. Ms. Starr-Lack added that there may be removal of two to three parking spots to accommodate the El Camino Real plans.

Ms. Shankari questioned whether there will be a connection between Cesano Ct to Del Medio Ave without needing to travel along El Camino Real. Ms. Starr-Lack and Ms. Lo mentioned that there is a private property which was conditioned to close the gap between Cesano Ct and Del Medio Ave.

Mr. Wachtel expressed that El Camino Real has multiple conflicts and should be carefully addressed.

Ms. Ellson, Mr. Zaumen, and Mr. Rock noted El Camino Real as a dangerous bicycle route, and that there are multiple safer parallel routes.
Mr. Neff asked whether there are plans to upgrade the Caltrain overpass at San Antonio Road. Ms. Lo mentioned that the Caltrain Business Plan proposes a double track at the Caltrain overpass, but details are not available at this time.

Public speaker Greg believed the El Camino plan is ambitious. San Antonio is a very poor north/south connector and a barrier between Palo Alto and Mountain View. Bicyclists crossing El Camino Real have to watch for right hooks. The bike lane ends abruptly at California Street. San Antonio is dangerous for bicyclists, and the Central Expressway Caltrain overpass makes no provision for bicyclists and pedestrians. There is no wayfinding signage for the tunnel at the San Antonio station. The bike lane on West Middlefield through Mountain View is beautiful, but it ends at the intersection with Old Middlefield Road.

Mr. Arthur noted overlap between the Park Boulevard and Ellen Fletcher routes and suggested descriptions clearly indicate the Park Boulevard or Ellen Fletcher route. Figure 2 should be updated to reflect the jurisdictions. He referred to a letter to the Mountain View Council regarding Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects.

In reply to Vice Chair Liberman's questions, Mr. Whyte advised that the Class IV protected bikeway project on California Street is in the very early stages and that details have not been developed.

Chair Joye expressed interest in improvements to the intersection of Charleston and San Antonio and encouraged Mountain View staff to recognize the issues of crossing El Camino versus traveling along El Camino. In answer to his question, Mr. Barton indicated Google has proposed expanding the North Bayshore networks and making them safer, but the Bay Trail is excluded from the North Bayshore zone. Improvements to the connection to the new overcrossing have been discussed, but plans have not been drafted.

Ms. Shankari and Mr. Barton discussed Fayette as a route to El Camino, and Ms. Shankari read comments made in the chat feature.

Vice Chair Fenwick supported the proposal to remove parking along El Camino, expressed concern regarding curb cuts and driveways, appreciated efforts to make El Camino safer, wanted more improvements on San Antonio, and suggested improvements include signage.

Mr. Kuzsmaul supported removing street parking on El Camino for a protected bike lane, proposed minimizing bus and bike conflicts at bus stops along El Camino, preferred buses stop in the travel lane, suggested extending the curb at driveways as far as possible to create a tight turning radius for vehicles, supported extreme measures to improve San Antonio where needed, and noted the West Middlefield bike lanes are not so good because they are time and day limited.

Ms. Ellson concurred with comments regarding crossing El Camino and San Antonio Road. There is an unusually long wait to cross Nita, and motorists try to beat the signal or cross against the signal. Wayfinding signage to the San Antonio station, bike parking at the station, and bike connectivity to the station need improvements. San Antonio needs better bike facilities, but improvements in the Palo Alto segments of the corridor may not be feasible due to rights-of-way and redevelopment. A bike lane that connects to Latham and Church should be added when the remainder of the San Antonio Shopping Center property is redeveloped.
Mr. de la Beaujardiere supported removing parking along El Camino Real to install semi-protected bike lanes. The potential for right hooks at driveways is high, but the potential for bicyclists being doored or rear-ended is greater. Turning left from Monroe onto El Camino Real is difficult because there is no traffic signal. Regarding bus/bike conflicts, he suggested bus stop islands. In response to Mr. de la Beaujardiere's inquiry, Mr. Whyte reported Caltrans is preparing improvements for San Antonio Road over Highway 101, including sidewalks and either protected bike lanes or a multiuse path, but the project is ten years away.

Ms. Shankari supported removing parking on El Camino for bike lanes. El Camino is a route and a destination because of the businesses along El Camino. There is not always a connection from a parallel route to El Camino.

Mr. Barton indicated any improvements to El Camino Real would be good and encouraged staff to seek the City of Los Altos' approval for improvements, especially around San Antonio Road.

Mr. Neff supported a study to determine whether parking can be removed and believed the study area should extend from Adobe Creek to Arastradero. With respect to San Antonio Road, removing parking, making space on the road for bicycles, or building an off-street bike path are the only options. Bus stop islands are a good way to reduce bus/bike conflicts.

Mr. Wachtel remarked that staff needs to understand the causes of bike/car collisions on El Camino and San Antonio and determine whether proposed improvements address those causes. The protected bikeways are in actuality separated bikeways or cycle tracks and may cause significant increases in exposure to collisions at driveways and intersections.

Mr. Nordman agreed with removing parking on El Camino and disagreed with the comment to extend the curb as far as possible at driveways. He preferred merging into the bike lane when safe and turning from as far right as possible.

Chair Adamic supported removing parking and agreed that El Camino is a destination. A bike lane on El Camino would increase safety and encourage bicycling.

Mr. Rock supported eliminating parking on El Camino. Being able to access businesses on El Camino by bicycle is important, and El Camino does not have to be a through bicycle route.

Vice Chair Liberman expressed concern about Mountain View's community outreach plan for separated bike lanes and supported removing parking from El Camino.

Mr. de la Beaujardiere suggested staff consider a bus, taxi, and bike lane in the center of streets. Mr. Whyte related that staff would explore the concept, but it is not considered a best practice.

Mr. Courington encouraged Mountain View to establish criteria for the success of the project.
6.3 Santa Clara Valley Transportation Agency (VTA) Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Update

Chair Adamic reported the June meeting was canceled. In May, the VTA BPAC received updates regarding the Safe and Seamless Mobility Quick-Strike Program, planning projects funded with Measure B 2021 monies, and the Bicycle Superhighway.

Mr. Neff added that the VTA Board adopted the Bicycle Superhighway in June.

In answer to Mr. Barton's question, Ms. Star-Lack advised that the County would have traffic counts conducted before and after the road diet project on Junipero Serra Boulevard/Foothill Expressway.

Mr. Kuzsmaul assumed BPAC would obtain Mountain View B/PAC's input on a business plan.

7. COMMITTEE/STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS, UPDATES, REQUESTS, AND COMMITTEE REPORTS

7.1 Mountain View Staff Comments

Ms. Lo announced the City of Mountain View hired Mr. Whyte as an Active Transportation Planner. Attendance for Bike to Wherever Week was low this year. The City Council approved the AccessMV Final Report and an extension of Castro StrEATS to January 3, 2022. The City of Mountain View was awarded a grant for the Stierlin Quick Strikes.

Mr. Whyte presented the AskMV report for May and June 2021.

Mr. Skinner indicated that the City of Mountain View received a Measure B innovative transit grant to expand shuttle hours for two years beginning September 2021.

7.2 Palo Alto Staff Comments

Ms. Chan reported the South Palo Alto Bikeways Project will be presented to the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) on July 14 and the City Council on August 9.

Ms. Star-Lack noted that outdoor dining was extended through September 2021, the City recertified as a gold level Bicycle Friendly Community, and staff hosted an adaptive cycling program for special needs students.

7.3 Mountain View B/PAC Comments

Vice Chair Fenwick shared an incident with a personal delivery device that occurred at the intersection of Shoreline and Villa.

Mr. Barton requested Mountain View and Palo Alto avoid using wood in bridge decks.

Chair Adamic proposed joint bike rides and walks with PABAC in the future. Ms. Ellson concurred and volunteered to assist with arranging such events.
7.4 Palo Alto PABAC Comments

None

8. SET DATE AND TIME FOR NEXT MEETING

Wednesday, August 25, 2021 B/PAC Meeting at 6:30 p.m.

9. CALENDAR

Wednesday, September 29, 2021 B/PAC Meeting at 6:30 p.m.
Wednesday, October 27, 2021 B/PAC Meeting at 6:30 p.m.
Wednesday, November 24, 2021 B/PAC Meeting at 6:30 p.m.

10. ADJOURNMENT approximately at 8:30 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.