

BPC 8-20-2025

Item No.3
Active
Transportation
Plan

Written
Communications

From: [Ishan Khosla](#)
To: [City of Cupertino Bike and Ped Commission](#); [David Stillman](#); [City of Cupertino Planning Commission](#); [Piu Ghosh \(she/her\)](#)
Subject: Changes to ATP Prioritization for Students
Date: Friday, August 15, 2025 10:47:40 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

My name is Ishan Khosla, and I am a junior at Cupertino High School. As someone who relies on biking to get to school, the library, and around town every day, I appreciate all of the work going into Cupertino's new Active Transportation Plan. That being said, I would like to share a few suggestions for how the draft prioritization can be improved with regard to our student population.

Students are one of the most vulnerable groups when it comes to transportation, and should be prioritized accordingly. The current draft limits consideration of school proximity to only a quarter mile, which is much less than the average commute for students of all ages in Cupertino. In fact, typical commute distances are a 1/2 mile for elementary schoolers, 1 mile for middle schoolers, and over 1 mile for high schoolers. The 1/4 scope severely limits the efficacy of the ATP by failing to account for the majority of students who would benefit from the projects outlined in the plan.

Instead, I suggest that the weighting points for all modes for the "School Proximity" criteria are changed to the following:

- 20 points if within 1/4 mile of a school
- 15 points if within 1/2 mile of school
- 5 points if on a school commute path > 1/2 mile from school

This will ensure that more Cupertino students are represented accurately and fairly in the ATP and help prioritize projects accordingly. I appreciate your consideration and ongoing efforts towards the ATP.

Thank you, Ishan Khosla

From: [J Shearin](#)
To: [City of Cupertino Bike and Ped Commission](#); [David Stillman](#); [City of Cupertino Planning Commission](#); [Piu Ghosh \(she/her\)](#)
Subject: ATP Prioritization Rubric (BPC 8/20 and Planning Commission 9/9)
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 5:32:35 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Bicycle Pedestrian Commissioners, Planning Commissioner, and Staff:

I'm a cyclist and resident of Cupertino, who not only walks and uses my bike daily for transportation to shops, destinations, and church, but also had her children do the same to all their schools. I recently reviewed the proposed scoring rubric for the Active Transportation Plan (ATP) projects, and saw that some key changes could improve it significantly for our city's residents. **I ask that you make the suggested changes in your recommendations on this topic.**

The most heavily weighted goals for the ATP should be *Safety* and *Access*. These have the greatest effect on our residents, and are the least subjective.

The weighting for *School Proximity* (within *Access*), *Sustainability*, *Balance*, and *Fairness* all should be modified. *Access* should include consideration for our seniors, and *Sustainability* should include proximity to trails and biking networks. Here are specifics on this:

1. ***Access/School proximity* weighting should include points for commute paths to school**, as the vast majority of students in Cupertino must commute more than ¼ mile to their schools and we need to prioritize our most vulnerable residents. Making the weighting only right at the school—instead of considering their commute—is not logical. **School Proximity should be weighted instead to:**
20 pts if within ¼ mile of a school
15 pts if within ½ mile of school
5 pts if on a school commute path > ½ mile from school
2. ***Access* should also include weighting for proximity to senior and low-income housing/facilities.** This also prioritizes our more vulnerable residents, many of whom walk or use mobility devices such as four wheel scooters. Adding these points also considers equity, as many lower income residents do not drive but instead walk, bike, or use public transit. **Proximity to senior housing (like Westport), the senior center, and low income housing units should be weighted as:**
10 pts if within ½ mile of designated senior housing, the senior center, or single residential locations with >10 low income housing units
3. ***Sustainability* should also include proximity to other low-stress active transportation facilities** such as trails and protected bike lanes. This encourages a network of safe pedestrian facilities to the borders of Cupertino, and will result in a higher usage of facilities, as shown by numerous studies. **A modest weighting for proximity to trails (for all), and other protected bike lanes (for Bicycle Network) including neighboring cities could be:**

5 pts if within ¼ mile of a trail or protected bike lanes

4. **Balance weighting should be reduced to 5pts or eliminated altogether**, as it directly opposes Cupertino's recently approved Vision Zero plan regarding parking as well as CA Senate Bill 743, which mandates that projects are only assessed on Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), not Level of Service (car throughput).

- *Cupertino's Vision Zero Plan* says "Prioritize multimodal safety and quality of service **over** motor vehicle level of service and on-street parking." By adding weight to level-of-service (car "throughput") and to on street parking, the ATP would be prioritizing the exact opposite of the Vision Zero Plan's requirement.
- CA Senate Bill 743 is also clear that all projects must be assessed using **Vehicle Miles Traveled, and not Vehicle Level of Service**. This category negatively penalizes projects that have lane losses out of a fear that this may cause cars to be slower—a clear stand-in for an LOS metric.
- Last, many [studies](#) show that removal of a lane has not been shown to **increase traffic congestion**, including here in Cupertino for DeAnza's buffered bike lanes. Instead, there is a well-documented phenomenon of induced demand, whereby when more lanes and space are allocated to cars, more people drive and cause more traffic.

5. **Fairness (public comment count) is not an objective measure**. It should be eliminated altogether or reduced to a minimal 5 points. Public input should encourage where to consider projects, but subjective comments should not influence how high of a priority a project is. It's just too easy to "game" the system with loads of positive or negative comments. We should be data driven, about where projects are needed based on accidents, access, demand, equity, and sustainability.

With these changes, the ATP will rightfully prioritize projects that further safety and access; prioritize our youngest and oldest residents; and make rankings based on data, and not on subjectivity or stand-ins for measurements which have been banned by the state legislature. This will result in the best plan for all residents. I encourage you to make these changes in your recommendations.

Thank you for your work on behalf of Cupertino.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Shearin

From: [Evan Lojewski](#)
To: [City of Cupertino Bike and Ped Commission](#); [David Stillman](#); [City of Cupertino Planning Commission](#); [Piu Ghosh \(she/her\)](#)
Subject: Comments - Cupertino Active Transportation Plan, Phase 2 Kickoff
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 10:15:19 PM
Attachments: [publickey - evan@lojewski.xyz - 0x51A23DD9.asc](#)
[signature.asc](#)

Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission,

I am a resident of Cupertino who daily commutes to work and stores. I saw that the Bicycle + Pedestrian Commission was discussing the ATP, including "Feedback on the Draft Project Prioritization Criteria" (per the posted agenda).

I have a few comments that I hope the commission will consider based on the presentation and proposed prioritization criteria

- Safety
 - The proposed criteria indicate a +20 score if the improvement is on a roadway with high injuries.
 - Please also include in this if an improvement will provide a route that means user no longer **have** to go on a high injury route. For example, opening up access between neighborhoods that are currently blocked (for example: opening a sound wall to allow pedestrians and/or bicycles to traverse between two roads that are otherwise blocked. In other words, does this allow a HIN to be bypassed by a user.
- Access
 - I now regularly bike by a couple of schools, and with school starting, I also am seeing kids bike as well. Please ensure that the rating criteria covers students that are not immediately next to a school and are commuting from a further distance. (My commute is ~3.5 miles, and I never need to leave Cupertino city limits, I see students on the trail and road covering 1-2 miles of my commute.)
- Balance
 - I don't believe that a HIN should be negated for the sake of balance. If there are many accidents in an area, this should be addressed. We should not ignore it because it will inconvenience people. Improvements should be considered (such as separated bike lanes and walkways) even if it may require taking space away from parking or removing a lane. (Ideally projects would be done to improve access for everyone (such as by using roundabouts instead of traffic lights - which would improve car throughput, or adding over street crossings - again, improving car throughput, or even adding alternative crossing locations like the Mary Ave bridge).
 - If alternatives cannot be done that improve things for **everyone**, then safety should still be prioritized - the city has Vision Zero. If, for example, Steven Creek has a lot of injuries, then things should still be addressed there.
- Sustainability
 - Please prioritize items that encourage people to walk and bike. In other words, does the project / impact location connect the user to other trails or ATP projects (for example, connecting to the Regnart Creek Trail, buffered or separated bike lanes, connecting to the library, parks, or other future projects like the potential East Channel Trail that Sunnyvale is studying (starting at Ortega Park)
 - The better connected a network, the more likely it is to encourage its use.

Thanks you for considering my comments,
Evan Lojewski

From: [Jian He](#)
To: [City of Cupertino Bike and Ped Commission](#); [David Stillman](#); [City of Cupertino Planning Commission](#); [Piu Ghosh \(she/her\)](#)
Subject: Strong Recommendations for the Active Transportation Plan Prioritization
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 10:52:10 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Cupertino Bicycle Pedestrian Commission and Planning Commission,

This is Jian He, a Cupertino resident for more than 20 years. I am writing to you today to strongly urge you to adopt a project prioritization weighting scheme for the new Active Transportation Plan (ATP) that is centered on safety and access. The decisions you make now will determine what gets built for the next 10 years, and it is crucial that this plan serves all Cupertino residents, **especially our most vulnerable**.

The draft prioritization framework is a good start, but it can be improved significantly to align with our city's stated goals and best practices. I have specific recommendations to ensure the final plan prioritizes projects that will have the greatest positive impact.

Prioritize Safety and Access

The most heavily weighted categories in the ATP prioritization should be **Safety** and **Access**. These are the least subjective metrics and have the most profound effect on residents' quality of life. An effective ATP must prioritize the safety of all road users, particularly pedestrians and cyclists, and ensure that our active transportation network is accessible to everyone.

Adjust Specific Weighting Categories

I urge you to modify the weightings for several categories to create a more effective and equitable ATP.

- **Access:** This category should be expanded to include proximity to senior and low-income housing and facilities. Prioritizing projects that serve our senior population and those with limited transportation options is a matter of equity and responsible urban planning. Furthermore, the **School Proximity** sub-category should award points for commuter paths to schools. The vast majority of

students live more than a quarter-mile from school, and we must prioritize safe routes for our most vulnerable residents.

- **Sustainability:** This category should also include points for a project's proximity to existing low-stress active transportation facilities, such as trails and protected bike lanes. This approach encourages the development of a cohesive and connected network of safe pedestrian and bicycle facilities, which is more likely to be used and provides greater value to the community.
- **Balance:** The weighting for **Balance** should be significantly reduced to 5 points or eliminated entirely. This category, which often considers factors like parking loss, directly conflicts with Cupertino's approved **Vision Zero** plan and California Senate Bill 743. SB 743 mandates that project impacts be assessed on Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), not on Level of Service (traffic throughput). Placing a high priority on balancing competing interests can lead to the rejection of essential safety projects.
- **Fairness:** The weighting for **Fairness**, which appears to be tied to public comment count, should be reduced to 5 points or eliminated. While public input is vital for identifying project locations, a quantitative count of subjective public comments is not an objective measure of a project's priority or effectiveness. Prioritization should be based on data-driven metrics like safety and access, not on the loudest voices or the number of complaints.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I trust that you will create a prioritization scheme that truly serves the needs of all Cupertino residents and moves our city toward a safer, more accessible, and more sustainable future.

--

Blessings,
Jian

"...all things work together for good..." --- **Romans 8:28**