



City of Sunnyvale

Meeting Minutes - Final Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission

Thursday, April 17, 2025

6:30 PM

Online and Redwood Conference Room,
City Hall, 456 W. Olive Ave., Sunnyvale,
CA 94086

Public Participation

6:30 P.M. BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMISSION MEETING

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Beagle called the meeting to order at 6:40 p.m.

SALUTE TO THE FLAG

Chair Beagle led the salute to the flag.

ROLL CALL

- Present** 6 - Chair Bryce Beagle
Vice Chair Arwen Davé
Commissioner Alex Bonne
Commissioner Geeta Gollakota
Commissioner Leia Mehlman
Commissioner Jonathan Wilson
- Absent** 1 - Commissioner Dan Hafeman

Commissioner Hafeman's absence is excused.

Council Liaison Le (present)

STUDY SESSION

A [25-0546](#) East Channel Trail Study

Kevin Chen, Senior Traffic Engineer with the City of Sunnyvale and Jeffrey Knowles from Alta Planning + Design, gave a presentation. Highlighting the following:

- Project Overview

- Virtual Site Visit
- Community Engagement
- Alternative Analysis
- Next Steps

Commissioner Mehlman asked about the following:

- Expressed concern that Tasman Drive may present a larger issue than freeway overcrossings due to the lack of bicycle infrastructure and limited pedestrian infrastructure.
- Questioned how the project will address challenges posed by the location of the light rail tracks.
- Emphasized the importance of establishing a north-south trail to connect northern and southern Sunnyvale.
- Noted that completing such a trail would benefit dog walkers and others seeking access to parks like Fair Oaks Park, especially given the restrictions within mobile home parks.
- Acknowledged the project is in the early stage but indicated strong interest in seeing how these concerns will be addressed.

Commissioner Bonne asked about the following:

- Asked whether the survey responses track population densities of the zip codes.
- Inquired if one zip code has been more responsive than another so far.

Mr. Knowles responded.

Commissioner Wilson asked about the following:

- Noted that stormwater flows in San Tomas Aquino Creek can be substantial, sometimes making underpasses impassable during or after storms.
- Asked whether the trail design accounts for elevated water levels following storm events.
- Inquired if there is a maximum distance being considered for surface-level detours when trail users must exit the trail to navigate around city streets.

Mr. Knowles responded.

Commissioner Gollakota asked about the following:

- Mentioned issues with the existing bike infrastructure along the corridor, as well as concerns for runners.
- Asked for more information about the risks mentioned in the presentation related to

the overhead power lines.

Mr. Knowles responded.

Vice Chair Davé asked about the following:

- Asked what the main constraint is for moving the project forward and whether funding is the primary barrier.

Mr. Chen and Angela Obeso, Interim Transportation & Traffic Manager, responded.

Chair Beagle asked about the following:

- Raised the idea of piecemeal construction and questioned what percentage of the trail might be reasonably usable in its current state, noting that some areas are simply behind fences.
- Asked whether the City has considered opening portions of the trail in their current gravel condition, provided they are safe and permitted for public use.
- Inquired if the City of Cupertino is planning any continuation of the trail south of Homestead Road, or if the project ends there and is limited to Sunnyvale's jurisdiction.
- Asked how other cities manage concerns related to homeless encampments along trails, and whether such concerns typically require significant intervention or tend to be minimal with occasional action.

Mr. Chen and Mr. Knowles responded.

Commissioner Wilson asked about the following:

- Noted that the San Tomas Aquino Creek Trail has experienced settling, leading to pavement cracking and the need for repairs.
- Mentioned that the trail's elevated design contributes to unique drainage issues.
- Asked whether the East Channel Trail is expected to have substantial maintenance requirements, especially given that much of the area appears already flattened and well maintained.

Mr. Knowles responded.

Commissioner Gollakota asked about the following:

- Asked whether the East Channel Trail is envisioned to be usable at all times of the day.
- Inquired about the inclusion of lighting or other considerations to support use

during darker hours.

Mr. Chen responded.

Chair Beagle asked about the following:

- Sought clarification on the term “daytime use,” asking whether it implies the trail would be closed at night or simply not designed for nighttime use.

Mr. Chen and Mr. Knowles responded.

Commissioner Wilson asked about the following:

- Sought clarification on whether “daytime use” implies the trail would remain accessible at night but simply would not have lighting installed.

Mr. Chen and Mr. Knowles responded.

Public Comment opened at 7:24 p.m.

Sharlene Liu, member of the public, commented on the following:

- Highlighted that the East Channel Trail is part of the Santa Clara County VTA Bicycle Superhighway Implementation Plan, which aims to serve cyclists countywide, not just within Sunnyvale.
- Emphasized the importance of designing the trail to accommodate regional commuter use, including people who do not live within 500 feet of the trail or in Sunnyvale at all.
- Noted the distance to the nearest existing superhighways—Stevens Creek Trail to the west and San Tomas Aquino Trail to the east—underscoring the need for a well-developed East Channel Trail in this corridor.
- Mentioned that superhighway standards call for physical separation from motor vehicles and low-stress environments, and encouraged the City to strive for those features.
- Urged more outreach to community members outside of the 500-foot radius, since the trail will attract regional users.
- Requested specific trail features:
 - Paved surface for smoother and faster cycling.
 - Separated grade crossings wherever possible.
 - Avoidance of trail barriers such as bollards and chicanes, noting they are prohibited by the highway design manual.

Public Comment closed at 7:28 p.m.

Commissioner Mehlman commented on the following:

- Expressed support for the removal of the pedestrian overcrossing with zigzag gates as part of the trail project.
- Described the overcrossing as useless and inconvenient.
- Noted the lack of wayfinding signage, making it difficult to locate.

Commissioner Gollakota commented on the following:

- Agreed with the public commenter that the trail surface should be more suitable for both runners and bicyclists.
- Expressed a desire for improved surface conditions to enhance usability.
- Suggested ensuring that the trail edges are reinforced to prevent disintegration and erosion, especially during rainy months.
- Noted that erosion can reduce the trail width over time and hoped this concern would be addressed in collaboration with Valley Water.

Commissioner Wilson commented on the following:

- Acknowledged a point raised by a public commenter and posed a question about the expected usership of trails like San Tomas Aquinos, Guadalupe, or Regnart for long-distance commutes versus short daytime walks.
- Observed that trails like San Tomas Aquinos, which pass by offices, often see peak usage from people walking during lunch breaks.
- Suggested that if the goal is to build a cost-effective bicycle network, the marginal utility of a separated and potentially expensive trail—due to needed overpasses—should be compared to cheaper surface routes.
- Proposed that trade-offs might include building stairs instead of ramps for overcrossings if long-distance cycling demand is low.
- Expressed interest in understanding projected usage levels for the East Channel Trail compared to other, less costly bike infrastructure.

Mr. Knowles responded.

Commissioner Bonne commented on the following:

- Asked whether usage data from other trails—such as Guadalupe Creek, San Tomas Aquino Creek, and Stevens Creek—will be surveyed to understand day versus night use and to serve as comparables for the East Channel Trail.
- Expressed support for compacted gravel or unpaved trail surfaces, citing benefits like water permeability, cost-effectiveness, and potential for adequate cycling speed

with proper tires. Encouraged staff not to dismiss this option, even if occasional re-rolling or sanding is required.

- Shared personal experience as a long-distance commuter from Sunnyvale to Fremont using the San Tomas Aquino Creek Trail, noting that the proposed East Channel Trail would help simplify and improve such a commute by eliminating a portion of the current routing challenges.
- Emphasized that the trail would be attractive to a wide range of users.

Chair Beagle commented on the following:

- Expressed agreement with Commissioner Bonne that gravel paths are perfectly acceptable for cycling and can be a suitable end goal. Stated that pavement should not be a prerequisite for opening a path; emphasized the priority to open the trail first, with paving as a potential improvement later.
- Highlighted the significance of the reported 14,000 people living within 500 feet of the trail, calling it an impressive and marketable figure that the City and consulting agencies should leverage to support the project.
- Emphasized the importance of allowing nighttime access to the trail, even without dedicated lighting. Shared personal reliance on biking as a primary mode of transportation, including during winter months when it gets dark early. Mentioned bike-mounted lighting as a personal solution and suggested low-level lighting (e.g., strip lighting or undercrossing lighting) as a beneficial but nonessential feature.
- Commented on the irony and frustration of a car dealership obstructing the optimal trail alignment. Urged the City to actively pursue the best routing option, whether through land acquisition or other means, stressing the importance of minimizing deviations for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Requested that connections between the trail and the nearest Caltrain stations, likely Evelyn Avenue, be thoroughly examined. Emphasized the critical importance of these interfaces for people who rely on both bikes and Caltrain for commuting, noting how discouraging it is to travel on unsafe or unpleasant streets like El Camino just to reach a bike-friendly route.

Commissioner Mehlman commented on the following:

- Agreed with the importance of using a porous trail surface but raised concerns about accessibility for individuals using adaptive mobility devices, such as wheelchairs. Emphasized the need to consult with members of the differently abled community to determine appropriate surface types that remain usable and safe, noting that hard-packed surfaces can degrade into uneven terrain with rivulets that are challenging or impassable for some users.
- Shared personal experience of regularly commuting via the San Tomas Aquino

and Guadalupe River Trails to attend ukulele lessons in Japantown, highlighting the everyday practicality and relevance of trail connectivity.

- Advocated for prioritizing trail segments in the northern part of Sunnyvale, particularly those that would connect to the Bay Trail and provide a crossing over Highway 101. Noted that current options, such as the Borregas Avenue Bike Bridge, are limited and that alternative routes like Fair Oaks Avenue or Persian Drive are inconvenient.
- Stressed that while central segments may be easier to implement, the northern section lacks critical infrastructure and should receive focused attention in planning efforts. Expressed a continued intent to advocate for improvements in North Sunnyvale.

Vice Chair Davé commented on the following:

- Emphasized that three of the largest employers in the area are located in northern Sunnyvale, reinforcing the importance of creating a safe and accessible route for commuters traveling to that part of the city.
- Shared a personal experience of sustaining a concussion while commuting to work, highlighting the risks of sharing the road with vehicles and underscoring the need for protected and dedicated infrastructure for people biking or walking.

Council Liaison Le asked about and commented on the following:

- Inquired about the division of responsibility between Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) and the City of Sunnyvale regarding community outreach, particularly referencing VTA's interest in engaging with residents in District 6, including mobile home park communities in the northern area.
- Asked whether feedback gathered by VTA would also be integrated into the City's outreach efforts or if VTA is solely responsible for that portion.
- Requested clarification on the distribution of trail ambassadors throughout the city, specifically asking if there is representation north of the Caltrain tracks in Districts 5 and 6.
- Commented on the importance of ADA accessibility for individuals who are visually impaired, suggesting that consideration be given to the use of canes—not just wheeled mobility devices—as surface types can significantly affect navigation for cane users.

Mr. Chen and Mr. Knowles responded.

B [25-0552](#) Review Complete Streets Checklist for TDA Article 3 Funding
Lillian Tsang, Principal Transportation Engineer, gave a presentation. Highlighting

the following:

- Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Funding for FY 2025/26
- Project Recommendations

Commissioner Mehlman asked about the following:

- Questioned the ADA compliance of proposed crosswalk upgrades at locations such as Washington and Sunset Avenues, and California Avenue and Frances Street, particularly regarding the checklist language that curb extensions are recommended "where feasible."
- Expressed concern that the phrase "where feasible" sounds uncertain, and asked how ADA compliance can be guaranteed if there's no assurance that ADA-compliant curb extensions will be installed.
- Sought clarification on whether all other elements of the crosswalk designs would still meet ADA standards, and confirmed understanding that the curb extensions are the only aspect with potential variability.

Ms. Tsang responded.

Commissioner Bonne asked about the following:

- Asked for clarification on whether the commissioners were expected to rank project priorities during the meeting.
- Inquired about the total cost for all five proposed projects, in relation to the available funding.

Ms. Tsang responded.

Commissioner Mehlman asked about the following:

- Asked whether, for the Homestead Road bike lanes, the slurry seal was already covered under the City's existing budget and routine maintenance.

Ms. Tsang responded.

Public Comment opened at 7:53 p.m.

No speakers.

Public Comment closed at 7:53 p.m.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Chair Beagle made an announcement regarding Board and Commission recruitment.

Vice Chair Davé gave a presentation highlighting the following:

- Shared observations from a recent business trip to Switzerland and Italy, focusing on transportation infrastructure and its potential applicability to Sunnyvale.
- Noted that university campuses had well-designed mixed-use infrastructure, including narrow streets, clear separation between pedestrians and vehicles, and accommodations for alternative transportation.
- Observed that areas outside campuses were less organized, with pedestrians, streetcars, and vehicles sharing space—emphasized this lack of separation as a practice not to emulate.
- Highlighted open railway crossings with minimal barriers and cautioned against similar designs in Sunnyvale, emphasizing the importance of safety through separation.
- Described narrow and older streets where sidewalks were often obstructed by parked vehicles, garbage bins, and dining setups—recommended against such configurations despite their traffic-calming benefits.
- Reviewed different street sweeper designs:
 - Noted that one model used in Europe would be too wide for U.S. bike lanes.
 - Endorsed another model with extendable brushes that could cover nearly a full lane width.
- Mentioned an exhibit of Leonardo da Vinci’s urban planning concepts, including a bridge design that completely separated pedestrian and cart traffic.
- Shared examples of beautifully designed boulevards in parks, featuring distinct paths for pedestrians and cyclists, trolley tracks, and vehicle lanes.

Public Comment opened at 7:59 p.m.

Amar Shah, member of the public, commented on the following:

- Identified safety concerns on Bernardo Avenue between El Camino Real and Ayala Drive:
 - Noted the absence of bike lanes despite significant bicycle and pedestrian activity.
 - Described mid-block pedestrian crossings and unsafe driver behavior, including speeding and reckless passing.
 - Suggested the City conduct a study for improvements, similar to the one being done for Hollenbeck Avenue.
- Raised concerns about a recent Department of Public Safety post on Nextdoor

reporting a driver caught speeding at 96 mph in Sunnyvale who was cited and released.

- Questioned why such reckless driving did not result in impoundment of the vehicle.
- Proposed advocating for stricter policies from the Department of Public Safety, including automatic impoundment for excessive speeding.

Ms. Obeso responded.

Public Comment closed at 8:03 p.m.

CONSENT CALENDAR

- 1.A** [25-0545](#) Approve the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission Meeting Minutes of March 20, 2025.

Approve the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission Meeting Minutes of March 20, 2025 as submitted.

Public Comment opened at 8:03 p.m.

No speakers.

Public Comment closed at 8:04 p.m.

Commissioner Mehlman moved and Commissioner Wilson seconded the motion to approve item 1.A.

The motion carried with the following vote:

- Yes 6 -** Chair Beagle
 Vice Chair Davé
 Commissioner Bonne
 Commissioner Gollakota
 Commissioner Mehlman
 Commissioner Wilson

No 0

- Absent 1 -** Commissioner Hafeman

PUBLIC HEARINGS/GENERAL BUSINESS

2 [25-0553](#) Select the Design Concepts for 2025 Utility Bill Insert

Commissioner Mehlman asked about the following:

- Noted that the new insert for Class III and IIIB bikeways includes "Bike Route" and "Bikes May Use Full Lane" signage, but many local roads still display "Share the Road" signs.
- Suggested including "Share the Road" signs in the example as a point of discussion, although expressed personal dislike for them due to lack of clear instruction.
- Asked whether the replacement of "Share the Road" signs with "Bikes May Use Full Lane" signs occurs during slurry seal projects or if a specific study is required.

Ms. Tsang responded.

Commissioner Bonne asked about the following:

- Commented on the proposed design for Class III and IIIB bikeways insert.
- Stated that the general public is less concerned with bikeway classifications and more interested in understanding how to interact with bicycles on roadways.
- Emphasized that the key message should be that bicycles are legally entitled to use the road, not only where signs are present, citing the California Vehicle Code.
- Suggested minimizing use of jargon like "Class III" or "Class IIIB," and instead using simple illustrations that show what to expect and how drivers should behave around bicycles.
- Noted this approach could also save space on the informational materials.

Ms. Tsang responded.

Commissioner Gollakota asked about the following:

- Explained that the reason for requesting an insert on Class IIIB bikeways was based on personal experience.
- Noted that many motorists appear frustrated when they see bicyclists riding in the middle of the road.
- Felt this frustration stems from a lack of understanding that bicyclists have the right-of-way on certain roads and should be respected.
- Acknowledged uncertainty about how many people would actually read the Utility Bill Insert, but clarified that the intent was to promote awareness and understanding.

Vice Chair Davé asked about the following:

- Suggested that a clearer, more engaging title could improve understanding of the

Class IIIB bikeway insert.

- Proposed a title such as "What to do when a bike's in front of you" to directly convey the intended message.
- Asked for input on what kind of title others would recommend or like to see used.

Commissioner Bonne responded.

Commissioner Wilson asked about the following:

- Clarified a question to Commissioner Bonne regarding the term "single lane," noting that a Class IIIB bikeway would require a center separation, implying two way roadway, one lane in each direction.
- Expressed appreciation for the complexity shown in the photo, stating it helps illustrate the infrastructure challenges.
- Noted the edge line in the photo may be confusing, as it resembles a bike lane, especially when paired with sharrows, and speculated it might be intended to direct traffic over a speed hump.
- Suggested that the broken line in the illustration above should be continuous to better emphasize that vehicles should not pass bicycles.
- Pointed out potential confusion in distinguishing Class III vs. IIIB in the image, stating that both center illustrations seem to represent Class IIIB behavior (one correct, one incorrect), rather than contrasting Class III and IIIB.
- Recommended adding clearer labels to reinforce that the examples pertain specifically to Class IIIB bikeways.
- Suggested replacing vague terms like "overtaking violations" with clearer language such as "you cannot pass," to avoid jargon and improve public understanding.
- Overall supported the use of visuals like thumbs up/down but emphasized the importance of clarity in messaging.

Commissioner Bonne responded.

Vice Chair Davé asked about the following:

- Suggested using "How to Share the Road", which is currently placed in the middle of the insert, as the bold header at the top to make the message clearer and more prominent.

Commissioner Mehlman asked about the following:

- Noted that the information conveyed in the current insert regarding Class IIIB bikeways appears redundant, as similar content is already covered in Corrected Attachment 1 (25-0533), such as:

- Solid double yellow lines
- Dashed green lines
- Bicycle use of full lanes
- Overtaking violations
- Suggested that instead of introducing a new insert, the City could consider adding the “Bike Route” and “Bike May Use Full Lane” signage to the existing Corrected Attachment 1 to reduce duplication.
- Mentioned that the original intent of the request also related to speed limits on these streets, which does not appear to be clearly conveyed in the current insert.
- Concluded that the new insert may not offer additional clarity beyond what is already provided.

Chair Beagle asked about the following:

- Sought clarification on the first insert's statement regarding "No Right Turn on Red".
 - Asked whether the restriction is due to the presence of a bicycle in front of the car or because right turns on red are categorically prohibited at intersections with bike boxes.
 - Suggested the language could be clarified to reduce potential confusion, as it initially read like a situational restriction rather than a standard rule tied to bike box presence.
- Inquired whether the dimensions or aspect ratio of the inserts are fixed, or if there's flexibility in formatting.

Ms. Tsang responded.

Commissioner Wilson asked about the following:

- Regarding Insert Page 1:
 - Agreed with Chair Beagle’s comment that the “No Right Turn on Red” statement needs clarification to indicate it only applies at intersections with a bike box, typically accompanied by signage.
 - Suggested edits for clarity and structure:
 - Recommended re-titling the insert from “How it Works” to “How to Turn Left Using a Bike Box” to better reflect the two-stage left-turn process being described.
 - Noted that “How it Works” is vague and doesn’t clearly convey the instructional nature of the content.
- Regarding Insert Page 2 (Class III vs. Class IIIB bikeway):
 - Suggested moving the explanatory block of text about Class III vs. IIIB from the top of the page to the bottom, to avoid distracting from the main message.

- Proposed reordering content to highlight the primary takeaway, first - using the title "How to Share the Road", followed by side-by-side visuals of appropriate and inappropriate behaviors.
- Recommended placing the Class III vs. IIIB explanation as a supplemental note at the bottom, to avoid diluting the key message of road-sharing behavior.

Public Comment opened at 8:25 p.m.

No speakers.

Public Comment closed at 8:26 p.m.

Commissioner Mehlman commented on the following:

- Felt the Class III / IIIB bikeway insert may not be necessary, as it conveys the same core message as Corrected Attachment 1, 25-0533 (i.e., overtaking violations and bicycles may use the full lane). Suggested updating Corrected Attachment 1, 25-0533 instead to include relevant signage such as "Bike Route" and "Bike May Use Full Lane."
- Wished members of the public had stayed to provide feedback, as their impressions would help determine whether the messaging is effective. Proposed creating a future outreach tool such as a simple survey that shows graphics and asks people what they think they mean. Noted that commissioners may have more cycling knowledge than the general public, so public input is important.
- Supported the two-stage left turn / bike box insert, as it may help cyclists who encounter that infrastructure and are unsure how to use it. Asked whether this type of bike box currently exists in the city.

Vice Chair Davé commented on the following:

- Liked the bike box insert and appreciated that it explained something unfamiliar. Mentioned being someone who previously did not know how to use bike boxes but now understands them better after reviewing the insert.
- Suggested a small improvement to the graphic: recommended curving the blue arrow to better show the intended movement, similar to how the car's movement is shown. Felt the current straight arrow made the message less clear without reading the text.
- Regarding the two inserts that convey similar messages about not passing bicycles, acknowledged that the original version has been in circulation but still observes drivers passing unsafely. Suggested trying the new version as it might be more effective or resonate with a different audience.

Commissioner Wilson commented on the following:

- Expressed skepticism that road markings alone can prevent drivers from passing cyclists, stating that many drivers will pass regardless, even in areas with double yellow lines.
- Shared observations from cycling in places like Woodside, where drivers often pass cyclists on narrow mountain roads.
- Supported the idea of trying a new approach, noting that the updated graphic highlights neighborhood environments where slower speeds and more considerate driving are expected.
- Felt this new context better aligns with the intended message compared to the older version, which could be interpreted as applying to larger, faster roads like El Camino Real.
- Acknowledged that the updated graphic emphasizes a more specific setting - Class IIIB, low-speed neighborhood streets which might justify keeping it as a distinct insert.

Chair Beagle commented on the following:

- Suggested adding a short URL below the QR code on the first insert to accommodate users without smartphones, noting the current design is not very accessible.
- Recommended clarifying the rationale behind bike boxes to make them less intimidating and confusing for the average road user.
- Proposed explaining that bike boxes offer an alternative to traditional left turns, which require cyclists to merge across traffic lanes - a maneuver that can be uncomfortable or unsafe for some.
- Emphasized that the two-stage turn facilitated by bike boxes allows cyclists to proceed straight across an intersection and then make another straight movement, avoiding the need to merge across vehicle lanes.

Commissioner Mehlman commented on the following:

- Suggested using a more casual and engaging title such as “What are those green boxes, and how do I use them?” instead of the more formal “Two-stage left turn boxes.”
- Felt a humorous or conversational tone might be more effective in capturing attention and making the concept more approachable to the public.

Commissioner Wilson commented on the following:

- Noted that the green thumbs-up section under “How it works” does mention that

confident riders can still merge across lanes.

- Agreed with Chair Beagle that the first sentence should do a better job explaining why the bike box is useful - specifically that it allows riders to avoid merging across traffic lanes, offering a safer and more comfortable alternative.
- Suggested revising the first sentence to add context that explains the rationale behind using a two-stage left turn, even if it makes the description a bit longer.

Chair Beagle commented on the following:

- The phrase “when light turns green, look in all directions before riding forward to complete the turn” could be clarified to specify that it refers to a green light to go straight, not a green arrow for a left turn. Shared a personal experience of confusion when using a bike box for the first time and noted that the timing of when to proceed can be unclear.
- Expressed agreement with other Commissioners' concerns about the design being too cluttered and confusing.
- Felt the previous “no passing” design was more effective.
- Commented that the speed bump in the current diagram is almost invisible and the curve in the road is unnecessary. While the real-world image helps convey that it's a neighborhood, it adds visual noise and takes up too much space for the limited information it conveys.
- Suggested removing jargon like “Class III/IIIB,” emphasizing that the public just needs to understand whether a bike lane is present and how to use it. Supported simplifying the message for people unfamiliar with cycling terminology.
- Recommended changing the orientation of the utility bill inserts from portrait to landscape, suggesting the top half be placed beside the bottom half. Noted this as a minor preference.

Commissioner Mehlman commented on the following:

- Clarified that the Class IIIB graphic shows a street without a bike lane and is intended to illustrate how bikes can use the full lane. Emphasized the importance of simple, clear graphics that accurately convey key concepts.
- Noted the absence of a double yellow line in the curvy road diagram, which may lead to confusion.
- Agreed that the new insert with a real-world picture is confusing and redundant, as a simpler graphic elsewhere already conveys the same message more effectively.
- Suggested a revised title for the insert, such as “Bikes and Roadway Use,” to clearly communicate that bicyclists have the right to use the full lane. Proposed more relatable, plain-language phrases like “Bikes belong on the road” or “Bikes are vehicles too.”

- Recommended that each insert include a title that clearly reflects the concept being illustrated.
- Supported the inclusion of the two-stage left turn box, noting that initial encounters with it can be confusing. Recommended keeping the instructions simple and suggested positioning them near the “stay courteous and obey posted signs” reminder.
- Suggested that vehicle restrictions (e.g., no right turn on red) might be clarified in the design, if applicable.
- Noted that many inserts may go unread, so the visuals must be strong and eye-catching enough to grab attention quickly.
- Raised a question about duplicate “Crossing Roads Safely” inserts and asked whether that was an error.
- Found the 3-foot safety distance insert confusing, as it appears to imply a 3-foot following distance rather than a passing distance. Recommended moving the 3-foot reference to the middle of the illustration and using a more accurate title like “Follow at a Safe Distance, Pass at 3 Feet.”
- Emphasized designing visuals that are intuitive enough for a kindergartener to understand, stating that visuals should clearly convey the intended message even without accompanying text.
- Expressed preference for the inserts on the two-stage left turn, overtaking violations, and “bicycles may use full lane,” recommending a title that communicates appropriate behavior for both drivers and cyclists.

Commissioner Wilson commented on the following:

- Suggested revising the center text on page one to replace “Stay courteous and obey posted signs” with a clearer directive, such as: “Where you see the green box, right turns are not permitted.” Believed this would better clarify expected motorist behavior and reinforce the traffic rule in the context of the diagram.
- Commented on the “May Use Full Lane” language in the Class IIIB insert, expressing concern that the phrase may not be immediately understood by the public. Suggested replacing it with a more direct message like “Do Not Pass” if that is the intended takeaway.
- Emphasized that if the goal is to prevent motorists from attempting to pass cyclists, the graphic and text should be explicit about that. Noted that “May Use Full Lane” can be misinterpreted as conditional or temporary rather than an indication of right-of-way.
- Found value in the real-world photo used in the Class IIIB insert, as it reinforces that cyclists may be in the lane even when a double yellow line is present. Appreciated that the photo conveys a scenario where passing is not allowed due to

both lane markings and cyclist positioning.

- Confirmed support for including these clarifications and visual examples in the materials.

Ms. Tsang responded.

Chair Beagle commented on the following:

- Expressed a personal preference for emphasizing that the laws governing passing are the same for both bicycles and cars.
- Clarified that, legally, if a driver cannot pass a car in a given situation, such as over a double yellow line, they also cannot pass a bicycle.
- Noted a common misconception among drivers who believe they can pass cyclists simply because bicycles are slower or smaller.
- Stressed the importance of reinforcing that the legal requirement is the same regardless of vehicle type: no passing over a double yellow line, whether the vehicle ahead is a bike or a car.

Commissioner Wilson commented on the following:

- Suggested that "Do Not Pass" is clearer messaging and could be effectively explained by stating that "May Use Full Lane" means the bicyclist has the right to the entire lane, and therefore, drivers should not pass.
- Noted that on winding roads with double yellow lines, "Do Not Pass" signage is already used to reinforce the restriction, even when two lanes are visible, so the same logic should apply to bicycles.
- Emphasized that "Use the full lane" should imply the lane is not a shared space; no vehicle, including bicycles, should be passed within it.
- Clarified that "Do Not Pass" communicates that the driver must remain within their lane and not cross over to pass.
- Recommended using clearer language to guide driver behavior, noting that the concept of lane use and passing needs to be more explicitly communicated to avoid misinterpretation.

Commissioner Gollakota commented on the following:

- Suggested adding clear, separate instructions for both bicyclists and drivers in each educational insert to reduce confusion.
- Proposed phrasing such as:
 - For bicyclists: "You have the full right to use the lane in a Class IIIB route."
 - For drivers: "When you see a bicycle occupying the full road, know that a bicycle is equivalent to a vehicle, and all the same rules apply."

- Recommended describing expected cyclist behavior in scenarios like two-stage left turn boxes (e.g., wait for the light and then proceed straight).
- Stated that when bike-specific rectangular markings are present, vehicle drivers should yield and not make a right turn.
- Believed that dual instruction, one for cyclists and one for drivers, would make expectations more clear, especially for those who might read both sides.
- Asked fellow commissioners whether to move forward with the Class IIIB insert and the one illustrating the 3-foot passing distance, or to consider alternative options.

Ms. Tsang and Chair Beagle responded.

Commissioner Mehlman commented on the following:

- Suggested using the title "You shall not pass" to clearly convey that drivers should not pass cyclists in certain conditions.
- Emphasized the goal is to educate drivers, not cyclists, on when not to overtake bicycles, particularly in single-lane scenarios.
- Criticized the current Class IIIB bikeway insert for being too confusing, cluttered, and ineffective in communicating its message.
- Noted the images used do not clearly support the text and described the bottom image in particular as overly busy and unclear.
- Expressed support for a clean layout with informational images on one side and simple, step-by-step text on the other.
- Urged the group to simplify messaging: if there's a yellow line (single or double), drivers should not pass a bike and should follow behind. If there's no line and it's safe, then passing is allowed.
- Stressed the core message should be that bicycles belong on the road with or without sharrows, and their right to use the lane should be respected.
- Recommended abandoning the Class IIIB bikeway concept entirely and focusing on one or two clearer, more effective concepts, potentially revisiting the idea with public input in the future.

Chair Beagle commented on the following:

- Agreed with the importance of simplicity, citing the AB 413 insert on pedestrian crossing as a strong example due to its clean design, concise language, and easy-to-understand diagrams.
- Emphasized the need to avoid overcrowding the insert with too much content.
- Suggested that the commission should first decide on which concepts to pursue before refining the content further.
- Noted that the commission's role is to provide guidance to a designer, not to

dictate exact design details.

- Encouraged the group to avoid getting lost in minutiae and instead focus on the essential messages and overarching ideas while maintaining a minimalistic approach.

Commissioner Wilson commented on the following:

- Expressed agreement with the goal of creating a pamphlet that is easy to understand.
- Acknowledged the challenge of working with several overlapping concepts that require varying levels of effort to refine effectively.
- Suggested that abandoning the Class IIIB concept might be a reasonable decision if it proves too difficult to make clear.
- Recommended that the commission aim to include two concepts to encourage a more rigorous communication process and avoid overly simplistic or weak messaging.
- Emphasized the importance of evaluating how much interaction can realistically occur with the designer, since effective revisions will require meaningful back-and-forth.
- Proposed that if limited feedback with the designer is possible, the commission may need to prioritize the clearest concept, even if it's not the preferred one, citing the 3-foot passing law as potentially more straightforward than Class IIIB.

Chair Beagle commented on the following:

- Expressed full agreement with Commissioner Wilson's perspective.
- Emphasized the importance of prioritizing concepts that can be conveyed clearly and concisely.
- Supported giving preference to the content the commission would ideally like to see, but acknowledged that if it cannot be executed effectively, it's better to go with existing options that are already working well.

Vice Chair Davé commented on the following:

- Emphasized that just because the commission cannot design a clear pamphlet doesn't mean it's impossible to do so.
- Requested clarification on the process, specifically asking whether this meeting was the final opportunity to review the inserts and make a decision.

Ms. Tsang responded.

Commissioner Wilson commented on the following:

- Suggested focusing the primary communication on "Do not pass" for the Class IIIB insert.
- Recommended removing the purple text from the bottom image and highlighting the sharrow in the middle of the road with a circle or highlighter.
- Proposed moving the supplemental text to the bottom and switching places with the image, with the title reading "Do not pass when you see the sharrow."
- Clarified that the meaning of "may use full lane" should be communicated as "don't harass cyclists," indicating it's illegal to make them get out of the way.
- Emphasized that the key message is that drivers should follow cyclists at 5 mph until they can safely pass or turn, regardless of whether it's a Class III or IIIB situation.
- Expressed approval for this concept if it were presented.

Chair Beagle commented on the following:

- Agreed that focusing on the passing behavior would be a good design.
- Acknowledged that the previous guidance included understanding the differences between bike lane classifications, but suggested it might be best to drop that information for simplicity.
- Proposed keeping the definitions at the top, but making them smaller and moving them to the bottom to make them secondary to the primary message about passing behavior.
- Agreed that this would make the definitions less prominent, but still present for reference, without distracting from the main focus.

Commissioner Mehlman commented on the following:

- Expressed that if the specific Class IIIB concept was chosen, they wouldn't support it because it conveys information already present on another form that is simpler and more understandable without the excessive images.
- Suggested updating a different form to communicate the "You Shall Not Pass" message more succinctly.
- Preferred focusing on the 2-stage left turn bike bicycle box as educational tools for cyclists.
- Wanted the opposite side to feature educational content for drivers, but did not support the Class IIIB concept.

Chair Beagle responded.

Motion 1: Commissioner Mehlman moved and Commissioner Wilson seconded the motion to select the two-stage bike turn concept for cyclists (Page 1), with minor

revisions to clarify vehicle behavior, specifically stating that drivers may not turn right on red when the four green boxes are present, and to provide step-by-step instructions for bicyclists. Re-titling the insert may be included as part of these revisions.

The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes 6 - Chair Beagle
Vice Chair Davé
Commissioner Bonne
Commissioner Gollakota
Commissioner Mehlman
Commissioner Wilson

No 0

Absent 1 - Commissioner Hafeman

Motion 2: Commissioner Bonne moved and Commissioner Wilson seconded the motion to select "What is a Class III/IIIB Bikeway?" (Page 2), with the recommendations of the Commission as noted by staff.

The motion carried with the following vote:

Yes 5 - Chair Beagle
Vice Chair Davé
Commissioner Bonne
Commissioner Gollakota
Commissioner Wilson

No 1 - Commissioner Mehlman

Absent 1 - Commissioner Hafeman

3 [25-0547](#) Report and Discussion of Recent Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Meeting

Commissioner Mehlman gave the April meeting summary report regarding the following topics:

- Foothill Feasibility Study kicked off, focusing on improving cyclist accommodations.
- Mention of a pedestrian fatality in Mountain View; limited details available.
- Boulder, CO highlighted for freeway-adjacent bike/pedestrian paths.
- County Active Transportation Plan (ATP) advanced to next review stage.

- BPAC amendments to the County ATP included:
 - Facilities on both sides of expressways and municipal roads.
 - Update bike accommodation guidelines by early 2026.
 - Regular 5-year ATP review cycle.
 - Protection of existing infrastructure when new facilities are added.
- Caltrans awarded \$695,000 for freeway interchange bike/pedestrian study.
- Five interchanges will be selected; 280/Foothill suggested due to safety concerns.
- Grant expires in 2027.
- Slip lanes identified as a major safety hazard for cyclists and pedestrians.
- Concerns raised about high-speed vehicle conflicts and limited visibility near slip lanes.

Commissioner Wilson asked about the following:

- Whether the underpass mentioned on Trimble referred to the Guadalupe Trail underpass beneath Trimble Road.

Commissioner Mehlman responded.

Commissioner Gollakota asked about the following:

- A clarification on what a slip lane is.

Commissioner Mehlman responded.

Public Comment opened at 9:32 p.m.

No speakers.

Public Comment closed at 9:33 p.m.

STANDING ITEM: CONSIDERATION OF POTENTIAL STUDY ISSUES

NON-AGENDA ITEMS AND COMMENTS

-Commissioner Comments

Commissioner Mehlman commented on the following:

- Reminded everyone that the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition will host the 2025 El Camino Real bike ride on May 17.
- Stated the ride will start in City of Santa Clara and end in City of Menlo Park, covering approximately 17 miles.
- Mentioned the route map has not been released yet.

- Noted that volunteers are still needed for roles such as ride leaders and sweepers.
- Encouraged those interested in volunteering or participating to visit the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition website or find the event on Eventbrite.
- Clarified that tickets are free for both participants and volunteers.
- Added that it's not necessary to ride the entire route and that participants may join or leave at any point, including those with children.

Commissioner Gollakota commented on the following:

- Announced that the Sunnyvale Education Foundation, which funds 10 schools within the Sunnyvale School District, is celebrating its 10th anniversary this year.
- Mentioned the upcoming student showcase on May 6 at 5:30 PM.
- Explained that the event will highlight programs funded by the Foundation, including culinary arts, Danza folk, band programs, and STEM initiatives.
- Stated that the showcase provides a way for the community to see the impact of donations.
- Encouraged community members to purchase tickets on Eventbrite and attend to see students perform and display their talents.

Vice Chair Davé commented on the following:

- Mentioned a recommendation from Italy regarding a movement called Piazze Aperte, which translates to "open squares initiative."
- Referenced an article about the initiative on citiestoday.com.
- Explained that the initiative focuses on quick builds to test how improved pedestrian access to city centers can work.

-Staff Comments

Ms. Tsang commented on the following:

- Announced the activation of a new HAWK signal near San Miguel Elementary School at the intersection of San Miguel and Duane Avenues. This is part of the Safe Routes to School improvements.
- Shared that on May 15, the City will be hosting an energizer station at Plaza del Sol from 7 to 10 a.m. as part of the Bike to Work/Wherever Day event.

INFORMATION ONLY REPORTS/ITEMS

- [25-0548](#) BPAC 2025 Annual Work Plan
- [25-0554](#) Active Items List April 2025
- [25-0549](#) 2025 Deferred Study Issues

[25-0550](#) 2026 Proposed Study Issues

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Beagle adjourned the meeting at 9:39 p.m.