

Kim Lunt

From: David Stillman
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2022 9:13 AM
To: Kim Lunt
Subject: Fwd: Safe Intersection alternatives to avoid no-turn-on-read requirement 24-7



David Stillman

Transportation Manager
Public Works
DavidS@cupertino.org
(408) 777-3249



Begin forwarded message:

From: Liang Chao <LiangChao@cupertino.org>
Date: November 14, 2022 at 2:13:09 PM PST
To: City of Cupertino Bike and Ped Commission <Bikepedcommission@cupertino.org>
Subject: Fwd: Safe Intersection alternatives to avoid no-turn-on-read requirement 24-7

For your consideration.



Liang Chao

Vice Mayor
City Council
LiangChao@cupertino.org
408-777-3192



From: Matt Morley <MattM@cupertino.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2022 7:21 AM
To: Liang Chao; Pamela Wu
Subject: RE: Safe Intersection alternatives to avoid no-turn-on-read requirement 24-7

Thank you for the additional insights, Vice Mayor.



Matt Morley

Director of Public Works
Public Works
MattM@cupertino.org
(408)777-3282



From: Liang Chao <LiangChao@cupertino.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2022 12:03 AM
To: Matt Morley <MattM@cupertino.org>; Pamela Wu <PamelaW@cupertino.org>
Subject: Safe Intersection alternatives to avoid no-turn-on-read requirement 24-7

Matt,

Thanks for the explanation below (in blue).
But the reality is that there are other methods to design safe intersections without using a bike box, which is barely visible.

For example, below is one design that I have seen in San Jose.
The bikes are better protected with bollards and a wider corner.

Such intersections do not need no-turn-on-red at all.

I think Stelling and McClellan intersection should be wide enough for this configuration, right?



Below is a design in Fremont. This is a low-cost design that could make an intersection immediately safer.

Fremont has is an early adoptor of the Vision Zero plan, around 2015.



The current intersection design at McClellan & Stelling and McClellan & Bubb have these flaws:

1. the bike box is barely visible, Many bicyclists do not know what it is for or do not feel comfortable waiting in that box, being exposed.
2. The No-turn-on-red signal is not very visible at night since it is right next to the red light. The flare from the red light makes the no-turn-on-red sign barely visible, I notice that other no-turn-on-red signs are on top of the red lights, rather than right next to it.
3. The vehicles are not allowed to turn right on red. When the light turns green, right-turn cars have to wait for pedestrians to pass first and then turn right. As a result, the cars going straight are blocked too by the waiting right-turn cars. This creates unnecessary congestion.
4. When the intersection is not busy, vehicles are waiting in idle when no one is insight. More greenhouse emissions are generated by these idling cars when no one is insight.
- 5.

Please consider improvements to the safe intersection designs.

Of course, this is just a suggestion from one Councilmember for your consideration.

But I have heard quite a few residents expressing concerns on the ineffective bike safety designs of our intersections.

=====

Response from Matt in blue below.

1. Alternatives to avoid no-turn-on-read requirement 24-7 due to bicycle boxes - use bollards as protection.

Bike boxes prioritize and provide a safe means for bicyclists to change direction. The roadways where bike boxes are installed are not wide enough to provide for the bike box and a controlled right turn. Where there is sufficient room, bike boxes have been located to allow right turns on red. MUTCD requires no right turn on red where the right turn movement would conflict with the bike box. BPC has indicated that, for the time being, they accept the trade-off of restricting right turns on red where we have bike boxes (specifically Bubb/McClellan).

For reference, here is the intersection at McClellan (horizontal) and Stelling (vertical)



Here is the intersection at McClellan (horizontal) and Bubb (vertical)





Liang Chao

Vice Mayor

City Council

LiangChao@cupertino.org

408-777-3192

