



**FINAL MINUTES  
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
BICYCLE PEDESTRIAN COMMISSION**

**January 18, 2023**

**Final Minutes**

The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:**

Present: Jack Carter (VC), Gerhard Eschelbeck, Ilango Ganga (C), Grace John, Erik Lindskog

Absent:

Staff: David Stillman, Staff Liaison

Others Present: None

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**1. December 21, 2022 Bicycle Pedestrian Commission Minutes**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Eschelbeck moved, seconded by Vice Chair Carter to approve the minutes as presented.

**MOTION PASSED:** 4-0, John Absent

**POSTPONEMENTS**

No Postponements

**ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

Jennifer Shearin, public speaker remarked that at the last meeting there was a discussion on safety procedures, but this information was already available and tailored for schools. Instructions were given to each parent, student, and other stakeholders.

Chair Ganga commented on the comprehensive item regarding bicycle safety that went last month. The Commission emphasized partnership with schools.

Seema Lindskog, public speaker reiterated what Ms. Shearin said. There was a lot of education at the schools about safety and she was concerned the Bicycle Pedestrian Commission was not aware of that.

## WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None

## OLD BUSINESS

### 2. Future Agenda Items

Carmen Road Bridge

Education on How to Use Two-Stage Left Turn Boxes

Path between Lincoln Elementary and Monta Vista High School

The Impact of Semi-Rural Designation on Bike and Ped Projects/Priorities

Reassess the Intersection at Bubb Road/McClellan Road

Stevens Creek Boulevard, Phases 1-3

Vision Zero (Workplan Item)

Lead Pedestrian Walk Interval (LPI) (start the pedestrian green before vehicles)

Lawson Middle School Bike Path

Input from Seniors on the Bicycle Pedestrian Improvements

Bollinger Road Safety Corridor Project

AB 43 – Summary and how Commission can support implementation (to what extent we can reduce speed limits)

Bicycle Licensing (to prevent bike theft)

Bicycle Facilities (Workplan Item)

Land Donation from Richard Lowenthal (Carter)

Review Progress toward BPC Objectives (Six months to annually)

BPC Input at the VTA BPAC Meeting Regarding Adult Bicycle Education (Lindskog/Ganga)

League of American Bicyclists Application – Due 2/2023

Review Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements and Provide Input from the Public

Pedestrian Safety around Shopping Centers

Update from Safe Routes to School (SR2S)

Examine Pedestrian Walkways for Safety

Memorial Park Specific Plan (Feb)

FY 23/24 CIP (Feb)

Nomination and Selection of the new Chair and Vice Chair of the BPC (Feb)

Nomination of a City Representative of the VTA BPAC (Feb)

Pedestrian Focused Area in Cupertino related to the VTA Plan for Pedestrian Safety

Seema Lindskog, public speaker inquired about the Stevens Creek Boulevard Study project. She thought the Bicycle Pedestrian Commission needed to be involved.

Chair Ganga understood there was a priority one project on Stevens Creek Boulevard, and it was a continued agenda item. David Stillman, Transportation Manager believed Ms. Lindskog was referring to the Stevens Creek Boulevard Corridor project. There was representation from the City of Cupertino.

### **3. Bicycle Facilities Improvements (Dullu)**

David Stillman, Transportation Manager gave a presentation on bicycle facility improvements to the Bicycle Pedestrian Commission (Commission.)

Commissioner Eschelbeck wanted to know about the footprint for the bike racks and how many were able to be installed in any one location. Mr. Stillman replied there was information about the exact space requirements for each bike rack. Between the recommended types, the difference was not much. The wave option was able to hold a higher density of bikes.

Seema Lindskog, public speaker thought this was an opportunity to do a public/private partnership. There were artistic bike racks that enhanced the beauty of the City of Cupertino. Companies or stores were possibly able to sponsor these.

Jennifer Shearin, public speaker sent a letter to the Commission about proposed locations throughout the City. Feedback was not included and that was disconcerting. Bike racks needed to be placed in useful spaces, especially where they were not subject to theft.

Joel, public speaker repeated what Ms. Shearin's comments were. If the bike rack was too far away, he did not use it. There was more protection when it was placed in a high traffic area.

Commissioner Lindskog thought it was good to put bike racks right in front of the entrance to a store, not long distances away. Of the three bike racks shown, none had closed loops. The 'U' rack left an option open for artistic design, such as the City of Oakland's design.

Commissioner Eschelbeck wondered if the Commission needed to recommend specific places or guidelines on criteria of the type of location, such as where to put them, and some measurements.

Vice Chair Carter commented from his personal standpoint and said he would not park his bike too far away from a building. Other cities put bike racks really close to the building but in Cupertino, the public right-of-way was a long way from the building. He did not park his bike on De Anza Boulevard or Stevens Creek Boulevard because he wanted his bike where it could be seen by others.

Chair Ganga agreed with many of the comments. Bike racks needed to be closer to buildings. When this item last came to the Commission, the recommendation was three-fold. This item was part of the City Work Program, which meant there was a budget and the Commission directed staff to come up with recommendations on where to put bicycle facilities. The Commission was also interested in having bike racks in shopping facilities where the City did not own property, in which case the City needed to partner with business owners. The third recommendation was to require future building projects to have bike facilities installed. Mr. Stillman replied that his presentation indicated locations where the City was able to install bike facilities on the public right-of-way while staying as close to a business as possible. He put the responsibility on Commissioners to develop a list of shopping centers or other private

properties that Commissioners were interested in having bike facilities installed on. He did not have the means to contact all businesses. More specific direction was required from the Commission to move forward.

Chair Ganga referenced Commissioner Eschelbeck's comment about recommending guidelines instead of specific locations. Mr. Stillman replied that it depended on the guidelines. Within the public right-of-way, staff did as good a job as they were able. If the guidelines related to the type of business, that narrowed the number of developers to a manageable number. The City had no leverage to require the installation of facilities on private properties. Commissioner Eschelbeck did not think this needed to be forced. He suggested advertising that the City was interested in installing bike racks and maybe some would volunteer. Mr. Stillman remarked that the more property owners heard from community members, the more weight it carried.

Vice Chair Carter said if the only alternative was to put a bike rack in a poor location, then it was a waste of money. Second, he understood the Chamber of Commerce had a list of businesses that were interested in having bike racks. Having criterion made sense, and if the business owner agreed, then a bike rack could be installed.

Commissioner Lindskog understood the City of San Jose had a website where business owners could request a bike rack. He agreed to partnering with organizations like the Chamber. He also suggested putting out a notice, so businesses were able to apply.

Vice Chair Carter wondered if there was a list of businesses that were interested and why not start there. Mr. Stillman understood this Work Program Item did not involve staff canvassing various property owners. If the Commissioners wanted to be involved in the communication with businesses, the City was happy to facilitate that process.

Commissioner Lindskog suggested the answer could be as simple as the City offering to pay for part of the cost of the bike rack, or the installation of the rack. This saved money and incentivized property owners. Mr. Stillman was not sure about this suggestion because that could look like a gift of public funds that directly benefited a property owner. Commissioner Eschelbeck thought for those that were interested, the incentive was the City paid for the rack and the installation; that made it so the gift idea was not applicable. Chair Ganga suggested a grant program where people applied, and the City approved. A program needed to be created to encourage business owners to install the bike rack. Mr. Stillman commented that if business wanted to install a bike rack, they would not look for a City grant to do that.

Chair Ganga circled back and again recommended conversations with the Chamber of Commerce. Commissioner Lindskog suggested reaching out to the Rotary Club as well.

Commissioner Eschelbeck iterated there was a two-phase approach: one part was bike racks on City property, for which there was a list of recommendations from Mr. Stillman, the second was to have a program where businesses were able to opt in for bike racks on their property. Both seemed to be the best of both worlds, and both needed to be pursued.

Vice Chair Carter indicated a need for some criteria. Chair Ganga asked to identify a few locations that met the criteria. Mr. Stillman suggested taking another look at the list he recommended and eliminating some of the more questionable sites. Commissioner Lindskog said the problem was more with private property; he did not have a problem parking his bike on public property.

**MOTION:** Vice Chair Carter moved, seconded by Commissioner Lindskog to recommend the following guidelines for the installation of bike racks:

1. Bike racks should be where the public right of way begins but no further than 30 to 35 feet away from the front door of the business
2. Bike racks should be visible from the front door of a business
3. Bike racks should be installed on popular locations around the City of Cupertino

**MOTION PASSED:** 4-0, John absent

Commissioner John joined the meeting at 8:34 p.m.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **4. Pedestrian Safety Aspects, Education and Enforcement (Ganga)**

Chair Ganga gave a presentation on pedestrian safety aspects, education, and enforcement.

Vice Chair Carter thought that having guidelines related to pedestrians not being engaged in telecommunication on the sidewalk eliminated over 90% of solo walkers and runners. If rules were made, knowing they were going to be broken, that did not make sense. Chair Ganga replied that these were safety guidelines provided by different departments based on statistics. Vice Chair Carter replied that if there were guidelines that did not make sense, then people were not going to take them seriously.

Hervé Marcy, public speaker commented that fatalities needed to be eradicated for pedestrians. Regarding the collision data, the key was to determine who was at fault because that made the focus of the safety campaign on the driver, not the pedestrian.

Joel, public speaker lived in Cupertino in 37 years and walked near De Anza Boulevard and Stevens Creek Boulevard. A person needed to be aware when walking in that area and a lot more police enforcement was good.

Jennifer Shearin, public speaker thought the presentation put the onus on the pedestrian instead of the driver. Pedestrians were not a danger to vehicles, but the opposite was true. Infrastructure that allowed pedestrians to be separate from vehicles was the best. Enforcement did not work.

Seema Lindskog, public speaker said actual collisions and near misses were not included in that data. Better data collection was needed. In a pedestrian versus vehicle collision, the pedestrian was the loser. She requested speed reduction and better enforcement.

Chair Ganga said the data came from the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) website, which was used by various cities, as it showed known collisions. He wanted the broader picture on how to eliminate collisions. The SWITRS data showed who was at fault, the time of the incident, etc.

Vice Chair Carter mentioned other conflicts, such as the Local Road Safety Program (LRSP) and Vision Zero. Those programs addressed a lot of infrastructure and road changes. He keyed in on all the rules for pedestrians, such as looking both ways before crossing the street. There was an issue with the cars, speeds, etc. but people still needed to practice common sense.

Commissioner Lindskog agreed there was a bicycle problem, but there was even more of a pedestrian infrastructure problem, which included facilities improvements. Crossing Bollinger Road was not a pleasant experience. What had the biggest effect was to lower speeds of vehicles and to make more and better crosswalks.

Chair Ganga agreed with all the points raised. There were guidelines for the driver, for enforcement, for pedestrians, etc., which included comprehensive facilities improvements. He recalled the LRSP and Vision Zero addressed speed and they were part of a comprehensive framework that looked at pedestrian safety, as pedestrian injuries were increasing. He did not want the statistics to go up. Vice Chair Carter remarked that if a list of safety measures was going to be recommended, it should be short.

Commissioner Eschelbeck commented that typically there were separate infrastructures for pedestrians and bicyclists and there were different safety constraints for both. He suggested a sharing of the bike and ped facilities. He noticed many sidewalks were not used by pedestrians; why not use less frequently used pedestrian paths as a shared path for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Commissioner John agreed with Vice Chair Carter and suggested having simple rules and having visuals throughout the City. She cited simple things pedestrians could do, such as not wear all dark colors at night. David Stillman, Transportation Manager commented that the City was under certain guidelines set by the State of California, regarding setting speed limits. There were some changes to speed limit laws that allowed for reductions in school and commercial areas. Those rules were not yet enacted into law yet. Regarding getting additional information to the public, there were a variety of social media outlets that he was able to utilize. Sharing facilities was something to be investigated but he suggested looking at wider sidewalks for that option.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Eschelbeck moved, seconded by Commissioner John to recommend the following improvements with regard to bicycle and pedestrian safety:

1. Identify opportunities to reduce the speed limits on streets in the City of Cupertino
2. Have visible guidelines on various locations, such as signage in prominent locations including various media channels
3. Explore possibilities to share bicycle and pedestrian facilities where right-of-way is limited
4. Partner with stakeholders, such as traffic safety or other traffic safety programs

**MOTION PASSED:** 5-0

### **STAFF AND COMMISSION REPORTS**

David Stillman, Transportation Manager said in-person meetings will resume in March. The pedestrian scramble was to be implemented on Bubb and McClellan Road beginning January 23. He thanked Commissioner's Eschelbeck and Lindskog for all their work on the Bicycle Pedestrian Commission (Commission.)

Vice Chair Carter gave an update on the Safe Routes to School Meeting; there was no Mayor's meeting.

Chair Ganga asked for an update on Vision Zero. Mr. Stillman said there was none at this time.

Chair Ganga planned on covering the Mayor's Meeting and Safe Routs to School meeting in February.

Commission Lindskog said there was no VTA BPAC meeting update for January because it conflicted with the Commission meeting in January.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 9:59 p.m.

### **SUBMITTED BY:**

*David Stillman*

---

David Stillman, Staff Liaison

Note: Any attachments can be found on the Cupertino Website  
<https://www.cupertino.org/our-city/agendas-minutes>