



**Palo Alto Pedestrian and
Bicycle Advisory Committee**

Tuesday, September 7, 2021 at 6:15 P.M.

Join Meeting Via Zoom

Join Online: <https://cityofpaloalto.zoom.us/j/97624505881>; Dial-in: 669-900-6833

Meeting ID: 976 2450 5881

PART I: TDA 3 – BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PLAN UPDATE

No items are scheduled for this meeting. Written comments submitted by email to Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org between 12:00pm on May 24, 2021 and 12:00pm on July 26, 2021 are attached with the agenda packet.

No written comments were submitted by email to Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org between 12:00pm on July 27, 2021 and 12:00pm on August 31, 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 |
| 4. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS | 6:23 PM |
| 5. STAFF UPDATES | 6:25 PM |
| a. South Palo Alto Bikeways | |
| b. Charleston-Arastradero Road Project Kick-off | |
| c. PAPD Records System in Transition | |
| 6. DISCUSSION ITEMS | |
| a. Sub-committee proposal: signal inventory | 6:40 PM |
| 7. STANDING ITEMS | 6:50 PM |
| a. Grant Update – NONE | |
| b. CSTSC Update | |
| c. VTA BPAC Update | |
| 8. ADJOURNMENT | 7:00 PM |



Palo Alto Pedestrian and
Bicycle Advisory Committee

Tuesday, August 3, 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, Bill Courington, Cedric de la Beaujardiere, Kathy Durham, Penny Ellson, Paul Goldstein, Robert Neff, Eric Nordman, Rob Robinson, Jane Rosten, Alan Wachtel, Bill Zaumen

Members Absent: Steve Rock, Richard Swent

Staff Present: Sylvia Star-Lack, Shrupath Patel

Guests: Diana

PART I: TDA 3 – BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PLAN UPDATE

No items

PART II: OTHER ITEMS

1. CALL TO ORDER – 6:20 p.m.

2. AGENDA CHANGES

None

3. APPROVAL OF ACTION MINUTES

a. Regular June PABAC Meeting Minutes

b. Special Joint Meeting with MV B/PAC

Vice Chair Liberman corrected Fabian Way to Alma on page 3, line 17 of the June 1, 2021 minutes.

Mr. Goldstein requested staff attach a copy of the adopted email guidelines to the June 1, 2021 minutes and post them to the website. He agreed with Sylvia Star-Lack's suggestion to email the guidelines to PABAC members because members of the public who view the guidelines online will not understand their purpose.

1 Mr. Zaumen clarified his comments on page 2, lines 32-33 of the June 30 minutes as alternative
2 routes are approximately the same length as El Camino, but the different number of stops along
3 each route may make a difference in travel time.

4 Ms. Rosten requested the June 30, 2021 minutes reflect her presence at the meeting.

5 Motion by Mr. Goldstein, second by Ms. Ellson, to approve the minutes of the June 1, 2021
6 meeting as amended and the minutes of the June 30, 2021 meeting as amended. Motion passed
7 14-0.

8 **4. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

9 Mr. Goldstein reported complaints about recent improvements on Foothill Expressway around El
10 Monte and San Antonio Road have led the County to propose three alternatives that will improve
11 the hazardous situation for bicyclists.

12 **5. STAFF UPDATES**

13 **a. Staffing Update**

14 Ms. Star-Lack advised that Joanna Chan has left the City for a position at Tesla. While the
15 human resources department prepares a recruitment for the position, she hopes to fill the position
16 temporarily.

17 In response to questions, Ms. Star-Lack indicated it's a full-time senior transportation planner
18 position. The job advertisement will be posted to the City website. Any questions typically
19 addressed to Ms. Chan should be addressed to Ms. Star-Lack. The primary reason for turnover
20 in the position appears to be the amount of work.

21 **b. South Palo Alto Bikeways**

22 Ms. Star-Lack announced the Council will review the project on August 9, 2021. The updated
23 staff recommendation reflects resident feedback and Planning and Transportation Commission
24 (PTC) direction regarding retention of the two parking lanes on East Meadow east of Middlefield
25 Road. PABAC members may provide comment during the meeting or in an email to the
26 Council.

27 **c. PABAC 311 Submissions**

28 Ms. Star-Lack reminded members to submit 311 requests regarding medium-term and longer-
29 term projects by choosing the "traffic congestion or traffic safety concern" item in the "streets
30 and roadways" menu and beginning the description with "PABAC." In this manner, the
31 submissions are included in a database of items for future prioritization and in the Bike Plan
32 Update, if appropriate.

33 In response to questions, Ms. Star-Lack explained that staff is discussing criteria for prioritizing
34 the items, and the items can be made public. The database captures all items, whether they are
35 low or high priority. The best method to get action is to submit a 311 request because staff and
36 budgets have been reduced drastically. As part of the Bike Plan Update, an interactive map or a

1 survey will be used to obtain input. An interactive map could be preloaded with 311
2 submissions so that the public does not have to repeat them.

3 Ms. Durham believed prophylactic treatments on school routes should be completed without the
4 need for a 311 submission. Ms. Ellson agreed and stated that making improvements based on
5 only 311 submissions is unwise. The City has always made improvements to school routes
6 before the beginning of school.

7 **d. Peninsula Bikeway Study**

8 Ms. Star-Lack reported in 2016 city managers from Redwood City, Menlo Park, Palo Alto, and
9 Mountain View formed the City Managers Mobility Partnership to address transportation
10 challenges and worked to advance the concept of a Peninsula bikeway using existing local
11 bikeways, streets, established bike routes, and wayfinding. The Partnership designed an interim
12 route that provides a low-stress bike connection between Redwood City and Mountain View. A
13 study of a long-term, high-quality bikeway suitable for bicyclists of all ages and abilities was
14 conducted in 2019 and funded with \$25,000 from each city. The study provides
15 recommendations for addressing safety and wayfinding issues throughout the interim route and
16 was provided as an informational report to the Council in May 2021. The Partnership, which has
17 not met in several years, is scheduled to meet in August 2021 to discuss the future focus of the
18 group. Staff is not currently working on the study's recommendations. The public may evaluate
19 and prioritize study recommendations as part of the Bike Plan Update.

20 In response to a question, Ms. Star-Lack related that the *Palo Alto Weekly* article discusses the
21 study's findings, which are based on criteria determined by the consultant.

22 **6. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

23 **a. Comments from attendees about joint meeting with MV B/PAC**

24 Vice Chair Liberman advised that neither Chair Joye nor he reviewed the staff memo during the
25 agenda meeting. In his opinion, the memo was directed by and oriented to Mountain View. The
26 meeting seemed to be oriented to Mountain View's priorities and controlled by Mountain View.
27 The Mountain View Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (B/PAC) appears to focus on
28 grants and large projects and programs rather than obtaining community feedback on specific
29 designs. The request for PABAC to take a position on parking along El Camino Real was
30 puzzling given that PABAC's feedback regarding East Meadow was not solicited.

31 Mr. Zaumen noted that a Mountain View B/PAC member alleged a high number of accidents on
32 El Camino Real involving bicyclists being hit from behind. Mr. Wachtel has previously stated
33 bicyclists being hit from behind is rare. The causes and factors of these accidents may affect the
34 type of data that Palo Alto collects.

35 Ms. Star-Lack agreed that this type of accident is rare, but surprisingly they occur along El
36 Camino. A State grant funded Palo Alto's and Redwood City's work to address collisions on El
37 Camino. The data needs to be reviewed. The meeting was driven by Mountain View because
38 their work plan includes meeting with neighboring B/PACs regarding mutual concerns. Staff
39 attempted to list all potential topics for discussion on the second page of the agenda to comply
40 with Brown Act requirements. Mountain View wrote the memo based on their active projects.

1 Prior to the meeting, she deleted language in the memo seeking PABAC's position on parking
2 along El Camino, but the published memo contained the language. After the meeting, she
3 learned that Los Altos owns El Camino to the Palo Alto curbside; therefore, Palo Alto has no
4 control or influence over parking on El Camino Real near Cesano Court.

5 In response to questions, Ms. Star-Lack indicated staff will follow-up with the Police
6 Department regarding software that redacts personal information from reports so that City staff,
7 but not PABAC or the public, can review accident reports.

8 Mr. Wachtel explained that the reasons for crashes must be known to implement
9 countermeasures. Without the proper data, improvements may not help or may worsen the
10 situation. More than 25 years ago, a member of PABAC obtained and analyzed redacted
11 accident reports for a two-year period. The analysis led the Council to stop designating
12 sidewalks as bikeways. Data from accident reports is valuable and informative and rarely
13 provided for decision-making.

14 Mr. de la Beaujardiere found the joint meeting enjoyable and valuable and hoped to participate in
15 joint meetings with other B/PACs.

16 Mr. Goldstein wanted to analyze accident reports in order to provide accurate information for the
17 Bike Plan Update.

18 Ms. Rosten appreciated the spirit of the joint meeting.

19 Mr. Boelens noted that the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) database
20 provides the public with useful accident information. Data about bicyclist exposure is difficult to
21 find. The State is working on highway exposure data for pedestrians.

22 Ms. Ellson suggested a request for public records may be a way to obtain redacted accident
23 reports. Reports of injury collisions over the past five years could supplement SWITRS data and
24 provide more information as to the specific causes.

25 Mr. Boelens suggested excluding months covered by the pandemic because the pandemic may
26 skew data.

27 Ms. Star-Lack requested an opportunity to discuss the issues with the Police Department prior to
28 anyone submitting a public records request. The Police Department may not release accident
29 reports in response to a request. In addition, the Bike Plan Update includes a collision analysis.

30 Mr. Wachtel suggested accident reports covering two years will provide sufficient data. The
31 previous data analysis included a comparison of data with bicycle counts to establish crash
32 locations and the rate of occurrence.

33 Ms. Durham urged PABAC members and staff to carefully evaluate bicycle facilities along El
34 Camino Real, especially for bicyclists who do not travel El Camino now. Completing the Park
35 Boulevard Bike Boulevard is more important.

1 Chair Joye encouraged PABAC members to attend Mountain View B/PAC meetings. Mountain
2 View is attempting to identify intersections that resemble collision locations in an effort to utilize
3 one fix in multiple locations. Following the meeting, he communicated additional thoughts to
4 Mountain View staff and encouraged PABAC members to share with Mountain View staff
5 comments not captured in the meeting minutes.

6 **b. Off-Road Access to Foothills Park, Gate D**

7 Chair Joye noted that Mr. Goldstein requested this item and wrote the Parks and Recreation
8 Commission advocating for changes at the boundary between Foothills Park and Arastradero
9 Preserve.

10 Mr. Goldstein reported the Bay to Ridge Trail crosses Foothills Park, but until recently only Palo
11 Alto residents were allowed access to Foothills Park by City ordinance. After some negotiations,
12 Gate D was opened to pedestrians with no residency restriction. The idea was pedestrians would
13 traverse Foothills Park and continue on the Bay to Ridge Trail. The residency restriction for
14 Foothills Park has since been lifted. Gate D is signed for no bicycles beyond the gate. However,
15 a paved road and a trail, both of which allow bicycle travel, extend from Gate D into Foothills
16 Park. The signed prohibition is not enforced, and bicyclists may walk their bikes through Gate D
17 and ride the paved roads in Foothills Park. The signage and ordinance are confusing and do not
18 welcome bicyclists. Perhaps, transportation staff will work with parks staff to change the
19 ordinance and signage.

20 Mr. Nordman clarified that the prohibition is rarely enforced and agreed with Mr. Goldstein's
21 comments.

22 Motion by Mr. Goldstein, second by Mr. de la Beaujardiere, to endorse changing the signage on
23 Gate D of Foothills Park to read "Bicycles on Paved Roads Only in Foothills Park."

24 Vice Chair Liberman suggested amending the motion to include language on the sign of "No
25 Bicycle Riding on Trails in Foothills Park" to emphasize that riding mountain bikes on Foothills
26 Park trails is not allowed. He shared his observations of electric mountain bikes being ridden in
27 Foothills Park.

28 Mr. Goldstein clarified that bicycles are not allowed on fire roads in Foothills Park. The
29 regulation and signage refer to paved roads only rather than trails. He expressed no interest in
30 changing that aspect of the ordinance.

31 Mr. Wachtel supported Mr. Goldstein's proposed language for signage. Signage at Foothills
32 Park is not entirely consistent with the ordinance. Bicycling from Arastradero Preserve to
33 Foothills Park and from Foothills Park to Arastradero Preserve is prohibited. There is no reason
34 for the prohibition of biking from Foothills Park to Arastradero Preserve. The ordinance lists
35 entrances to Foothills Park, but entry is also possible at Alexis Drive. At Alexis Drive, signage
36 prohibits bicycles but not pedestrians. Mr. Goldstein indicated the entry at Alexis Drive is an
37 unpaved fire road.

1 Ms. Ellson suggested signage at Gate D remind bicyclists to yield to pedestrians. Inexperienced
2 bicyclists may not be aware of the rules of the road for multiuse paths in Foothills Park. Mr.
3 Goldstein reiterated that bicycles are allowed on paved roads only.

4 Mr. Neff suggested bicycles should be allowed on fire roads in the future. Many bicyclists are
5 not aware of the rules of the road for shared-use paths.

6 Vice Chair Liberman related that the Gate D roadway is one way and leads from the interpretive
7 center to Vista Hill and expressed concern that people will travel the wrong way.

8 Amended motion by Mr. Goldstein, second by Mr. de la Beaujardiere, to endorse changing the
9 signage on Gate D of Foothills Park to read "Bicycles on Paved Roads Only in Foothills Park" to
10 promote bicycle riding. Motion passed 13-0 with 1 abstention.

- 11 **7. STANDING ITEMS:**
12 **a. Grant Update** – None
13 **b. CSTSC Update** – None
14 **c. VTA BPAC Update**

15 Mr. Neff advised that the VTA BPAC discussed the 2016 Measure B Highway Interchanges
16 Program category prioritization and project selection process. BPAC moved to recommend a
17 higher priority for pedestrian and bicycle issues in the criteria. BPAC also reviewed ratings for
18 routes for the Central Bikeway Project. The routes were rated on equity, project compatibility,
19 community's desire for the project, sustainable mobility, access, safety, and joy. All the routes
20 had advantages and disadvantages. The most direct route that traversed larger streets in East San
21 Jose and portions of El Camino Real received better scores.

22 Ms. Rosten announced the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition's Summit is scheduled for August
23 13, 2021.

24 Chair Joye noted the local chapter of Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition has planned a bike ride for
25 August 7, 2021.

26 **7. ADJOURNMENT** at 7:42 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: [Ken Joye](#)
To: [Transportation](#)
Subject: BPTP Update
Date: Monday, July 12, 2021 4:04:38 PM

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

When the BPTP is updated, among the things which should be considered is the priority of gaps in the Bay Trail within Palo Alto's borders.

Currently, there is a gap between {Geng Rd & Embarcadero Rd} and either the end of Faber Pl or across from the junction of {East Bayshore Rd & the bike/ped bridge over Hwy-101}.

That is, one may enter Palo Alto from either Mountain View or East Palo Alto and ride on the Bay Trail until one approaches Embarcadero Rd. Then, one is forced to leave the Class I bicycle facility and traverse city streets, potentially passing through the challenging intersection of East Bayshore and Embarcadero Roads. Correspondingly, a user of the bike/ped bridge over Hwy-101 heading toward the Dumbarton Bridge is forced to traverse city streets before accessing the Bay Trail at the end of Geng Rd.

thank you for considering this gap to be closed,
Ken Joye
chair, PABAC

end of Geng Rd: <<https://www.google.com/maps/@37.45376379191601,-122.1212770248129,19z>>
end of Faber Pl: <<https://www.google.com/maps/@37.44934758370776,-122.11558001292595,19z>>
junction of East Bayshore Rd & the bike/ped bridge over Hwy-101:
<<https://www.google.com/maps/@37.44759934053839,-122.11878257042824,19z>>