

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Questions February 22, 2023

6.1 Active Transportation Plan (ATP) Update

Question: How will e-scooter and e-bike use be a part of different phases of the update, e.g., will there be separate counts, will there be separate considerations for traffic (e.g. speed) rules, etc.?

Answer: E-scooter and e-bike policies will be considered as part of the ATP update. Mode-specific vehicle counts will occur as required for the ATP; several are budgeted. E-bikes would not be counted separately from human-powered bicycles. Scooters may be counted independently depending on the method of data collection.

Question: Will the ATP update address use of pedestrian and bike infrastructure by autonomous vehicles such as delivery robots?

Answer: Yes.

Question: How will trails such as the Stevens Creek Trail be treated in the study leading up to the update (e.g. would they qualify for observation counts, will scoring criteria in development be applicable to them?)

Answer: Yes. We have a budget to collect data on the trails, and they will be part of all aspects of the ATP.

Question: What is a good resource to read up on green streets? What is an example of a recent implementation of a green street in Mountain View?

Answer: Resources for Green Streets include:

- Stormwater infrastructure as part of street design that reduces pollution and runoff
 - US EPA Green Streets Handbook https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2021-04/documents/green_streets_design_manual_feb_2021_web_res_small_508.pdf
 - NACTO Urban Street Stormwater Guide <https://nacto.org/publication/urban-street-stormwater-guide/>
- Species specialization and biodiversity in general, plus resources on local and endemic species and potential companion plantings and design ideas
 - Doug Tallamy. Nature's Best Hope. 2020 (or some of his other books)
 - Robin Wall Kimmerer. Braiding Sweetgrass
 - <https://bloomcalifornia.org>
 - <https://calscape.org/>
- Urban forests and shade trees
 - City of Mountain View, Community Tree Master Plan <https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=17520>
 - City of Palo Alto, Urban Forest Master Plan <https://ufmptoolkit.net/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/UFMP-CityOfPaloAlto.pdf>

Recent implementation in Mountain View:

- Charleston Road, Mountain View (shade trees, native species)
- Pioneer Memorial Park, Mountain View (native species near Library)
- Tantau Road, Cupertino (shade trees, native species)
- Lowes on Wolfe Road, Sunnyvale (permeable paving in part of the parking lot)

Recent implementation in other Bay Area communities:

- Chilco Street, Menlo Park (green infrastructure)
- Mariposa Ave and Castilleja Ave near Peers Park, Palo Alto (green infrastructure and native plants)
- Main Street Driveway next to Calabazas Creek, Cupertino (green infrastructure)

Question: Will there be an assessment of the earlier bike/ped plans in terms of how much progress had been made on their priorities?

Answer: Yes, a full existing conditions report will be completed.

Question: For code recommendations, is there any chance of reviewing fire code, or is that not city-level purview?

Answer: Fire code is part of the review and within the purview of the ATP to make recommendations.

Question: Do you expect mixed-use vs. side-by-side bike/ped trail & other facility guidelines to emerge out of this process?

Answer: The possibility of separating pedestrians from bicycles on our trail system is under consideration for the project. All relevant trail policies can be considered for review.

Question: Do you expect shopping center (e.g. San Antonio shopping center) design guidelines with respect to bikes (including and beyond bike parking) to emerge out of this process?

Answer: Development policies relevant to active transportation are part of this review process; this certainly includes bike parking and other accommodations.

Question: How will past funding success and anticipated future funding opportunities (which may be more visible to staff than to community) influence the plan?

Answer: The plan is based on the last five years of Capital Improvement Program funding to active transportation projects. This includes all projects that resurfaced the roadway and also provided an active transportation improvement. As well as projects that were solely active transportation in nature. Summing up those projects, we then project a similar number of projects to be

completed for the first five years of the ATP. This will be more thoroughly explained in the scenario planning portion of the ATP (see attached ATP scope). Note that grants are not included in this evaluation. Any projects completed via a grant in the last five years will not be assumed to be awarded again in the first five years of the plan. Based on this amount of work, we will provide more detailed recommendations for a project, and possibly context-sensitive data will be collected for a given project if the project is expected to be completed within the first five years of the ATP. In this way, the ATP will act to ensure realistic concepts can be delivered by a given project and be reviewed by the community during the ATP process.

Question: What does the abbreviation MUD stand for in the Workplan from NN Engineering? (and if the expansion of the abbreviation doesn't make it obvious what MUD is, please expand)

Answer: Metta Urban Design is the name of the sub-consultant addressing the Green Streets aspects of the plan. For more information, please see this link: <http://www.mettaurbandesign.com/home.html>

Question: In the plan scope, under Task 6.4 regarding “Policy and Code Recommendations,” on what basis will policy recommendations be considered? Based on input from the various sources of engagement?

Answer: Policy and code recommendations will be considered based on input from the community, BPAC, staff, the consultant, and general best practices.

Question: The attached document from NN Engineering is just to provide context, yeah? We are only considering the vision statement at the meeting?

Answer: Yes, the attached document (the project scope) is to provide context. We are considering the vision statement and providing the BPAC with an update of the planning process thus far and for the future.

6.2 Bernardo Avenue Undercrossing Project

Question: The Packet mentions the ability to connect with 280 N Bernardo was considered for the western alignment. Was the possibility of connection with Mary Manor Estates considered for the eastern alignment? Did any of the surrounding property owners indicate any desire for a connection?

[

Answer: Community members did not specifically request a connection to Mary Manor. However, this connection was considered by the project team. County staff recommends against creating a pedestrian connection to the south side of the expressway due to a lack of existing or future connecting sidewalk along the south side of the expressway.

Question: Are the relative costs known, and should they be a part of our decision process?

Answer: Detailed cost estimates will be developed in the project’s design phase. The project team anticipates that the east and west alignments will have comparable costs. The western alignment

will require more utility relocations, while the eastern alignment has a longer total length. Using the triangular county property for the eastern alignment may improve constructability.

Question: There is art included in both alternatives, where does the funding for the art come from? Will having art in the project reduce the bike and ped facilities?

Answer: Public art would be part of the total project cost. Both cities have a public art policy or master plan that allows a portion of qualifying capital improvement project budgets to be devoted to art. The art would be reviewed by the Visual Arts Committee and will not reduce the pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Ideally, public art—which could include whimsical and functional elements such as art seating, murals, decorative lighting, or water features—will enhance the pedestrian experience.

Question: What are "Elephant Prints" ? (both alternatives)

Answer: Elephant prints refer to green dashed bike lanes through the intersection, more commonly called green conflict pavement markings.

Question: How do the alignment changes proposed on Evelyn in Western Alternative work with Sunnyvale planned upgrade of the bike facilities on Evelyn? That is, with Sunnyvale's changes, is realignment on Evelyn happening regardless of the Bernardo undercrossing changes? (this may be easier to explain in the meeting)

Answer: This will be addressed in the meeting.

Question: On page 5 of the memo, Attachments 5 and 6 are referenced, on Legistar the attachments are numbered 3 and 4, but contain headings saying 5/6 in the headings of the pdf. Is this expected?

Answer: Page 5 should refer to Attachments 3 and 4.

Question: For the Western alignment, what was the reason for preserving a dedicated right-turn lane from Evelyn to Bernardo, given that space seems to be constrained?

Answer: There are a few reasons for leaving the existing dedicated right turn in place:

1. The right turn volumes are significant. Traffic volumes have increased with the new residential development, recently constructed along Evelyn Avenue west of the intersection. The development has access along Evelyn Avenue.
2. Eastbound Evelyn Avenue has two thru lanes west of the intersection—the right thru transitions into the dedicated right turn lane. Eastbound Evelyn has only one receiving lane on the east side of the intersection. So, if the right turn lane were eliminated, the two lanes of eastbound Evelyn Avenue traffic would need to merge into one lane before the intersection. The single-thru lane would include thru and turning vehicles leading up to the intersection.

- All traffic exiting the development, including traffic that wants to turn right at the intersection, would need to merge into the single-thru lane before turning right.

It should be noted that this concept does include removing the pork chop island and tightening up the curve to slow vehicles down.

Question: How finalized are the planned surface-level intersection modifications? Namely, what is driving the preservation of having right-turning vehicles cross the bike lanes at all the intersections in both alternatives?

Answer: Surface-level intersection modifications will be finalized in the project’s design phase.

6.3 Vision Zero Action Plan/Local Road Safety Plan

Question: Is there a list of past Neighborhood Traffic Management petitions?

Answer: Yes, the list is presented below.

DATE	Location	From	To	Qualified
2022	Church Street	Hope St	Bush St	YES
2022	Central Ave	Moffett Blvd	East End	YES
2022	Wyandotte St	Rengstorff Ave	Independence Ave	Part of CIP
2021	Latham St	Ortega Ave	Escuela Ave	YES
2021	Blackfield Way	Marich Way	Judson Drive	NO
2021	Centre St	Calderon Avenue	East End	NO
2021	Whisman Station Dr	Beverly Street	Pacific Drive	NO
2021	Pettis Avenue	Latham Street	California Street	NO
2020	Pilgrim Avenue	El Monte Rd	Blackfield Way	NO
2019	Villa St	Shoreline Blvd	Escuela Ave	NO
2019	Winston Pl	Leong Dr	Emily Dr	NO
2019	Leong Dr	Winston Pl	Walker Dr	NO
2019	Emily Dr	Evandale Ave	Wake Forest Dr	NO
2019	Fordham Way	Meadow Ln	Barbara Ave	NO
2019	Barbara Ave	Meadow Ln	Fordham Way	NO
2019	Meadow Ln	Marilyn Dr	Barbara Ave	NO
2019	Marilyn Dr	Springer Rd	Meadow Ln	NO
2019	Cypress Point Dr	Moffett	End of the street	NO
2018	Levin Ave	Grant Rd	Brower	NO
2018	Mercy St	Franklin St	Shoreline Blvd	NO
2018	Alison Ave	Hans Ave	Barbara Ave	NO
2018	Fair Oaks St	Stanford Ave	Leland Ave	NO
2018	Marilyn Dr	Miramonte Ave	Satake Ct	NO
2017	San Rafael Ave			NO
2016	Victory Ave			NO

2016	California St			NO
2016	Gretel Ln	Cuesta Dr	Hans Ave	YES
2016	Easy St	Central Expy	SR 85 On-Ramp	YES
2016	Sylvan Ave	El Camino Real	Moorpark Way	YES
2015	Jardin Dr	Alicia Way	Clark Ave	YES
2015	Gabriel Ave			NO
2015	Gladys Ave	Easy St	N Whisman Rd	YES
2015	Plymouth St	Rengstorff Ave	Sierra Vista Ave	YES
2015	Linda Vista Ave	Middlefield Rd	Terra Bella Ave	YES
2014	Cuesta Dr	Miramonte Ave	Springer Rd	YES
2014	April Lane	East of Grant Rd	East of Grant Rd	NO
2014	Jane Lane	Fay Way	Fay Way	NO
2014	Flynn Ave	Tyrella Ave	Whisman Rd	NO
2014	Ehrhorn Ave	El Camino Real	Church St	NO
2013	Palo Alto Ave	California St	Dana St	NO
2013	Sonia Way	Castro St	Lane Ave	NO
2013	Boranda Ave	El Camino Real	Hans Ave	NO
2013	Brookdale Ave	Barbara Ave	Marilyn Dr	NO
2013	Rose Ave	Miramonte Ave	Springer Rd	YES
2013	Levin Ave	Diericx Dr	Grant Rd	NO
2012	Bush St	Church St	Mercy St	NO
2012	Continental Circle	Dale Ave	The Americana	NO
2011	Orangetree Lane	Rose Ave	Lincoln Dr	YES

Question: Were any of the segments or intersections part of a Neighborhood Traffic Management attempt?

Answer: Yes. Segments or intersections include:

- Latham St
- Pettis Ave
- Leong Dr.
- California St
- Sylvan Ave
- Plymouth St
- Cuesta Dr
- Flynn Ave

Question: Regarding Prioritization Criteria, section (3), several classes of key destinations were listed, but scoring only shows SR2S. Does this mean only schools were included in the final weight, and other key destinations were not?

Answer: In the scoring, schools were given higher priority. The total score near schools was given two points, and all other destinations were given one point.

Question: Sections such as Miramonte from Castro to El Camino Real are not included in the prioritization list because they already have planned improvements, correct?

Answer: Yes.

Question: Prioritized Key Segments. h. Sierra Avenue. It should be Sierra Vista, yes?

Answer: Yes.

Question: The discussion prompts reference the project list in particular; is staff also seeking input regarding the strategies in the Attachment?

Answer: Yes. BPAC members are welcome to suggest other strategies that address the emphasis area and the attachment.

Question: The killed and severe injury (KSI) data seems to only go through 2019. How is the city incorporating the more recent bike/ped fatalities into this plan?

Answer: This is a living document. In the upcoming years, staff will update the action plan, including the crash analysis time period. The current analysis encompasses 2014 to 2019, the latest year for which full crash data is available via the [Transportation Injury Mapping System](#).

Question: To understand better how intersections are ranked, would it be possible to get the breakdown of points allocated to Independence and Middlefield, i.e. history of injury, routes to school, etc. Similarly, how did Moffett and Central Ave rank (I see it is a high motor vehicle crash intersection, which makes me wonder what is going on with pedestrians, but it doesn't seem to make it on the list, maybe because motor vehicle crashes aren't counted in the scoring?)

Answer: Score breakdown: Independence and Middlefield

1. Severity: 3
2. Equity: 2
3. School and Key Destination: 3

Here is a little bit of the rationale for Equity and Destinations:

- Equity: It received points for vulnerable users (there was a bike crash, a ped crash, and it is high-stress for both those modes according to Access MV analysis), but it did not receive points for being in a low-income area
- Destinations: It received points for being on a school route and for being close to a park

A signal improvement at Moffett and Central Ave addressed the crash type. We did not include intersections with relevant completed safety improvements, so Moffett & Central wasn't prioritized.

Question: The crosswalk across Cuesta at Bonita, I think I recall that there were improvements such as a pedestrian crossing beacon, planned. Not seeing it mentioned in the doc, is it too small (doc deals only with high injury segments or intersections) or it is already planned, so not included?

Answer: Yes. The prioritized key segments and intersections are based on the High Injury Network (HIN), key intersections with high crashes, and systemic analysis.