



City of Sunnyvale

Excerpt Meeting Minutes - Draft

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission

Thursday, May 15, 2025

6:30 PM

Online and Council Chambers, City Hall,
456 W. Olive Ave., Sunnyvale, CA 94086

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

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Beagle called the meeting to order at 6:34 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present 7 - Chair Bryce Beagle
Vice Chair Arwen Davé
Commissioner Alex Bonne
Commissioner Geeta Gollakota
Commissioner Dan Hafeman
Commissioner Leia Mehlman
Commissioner Jonathan Wilson

Commissioner Gollakota arrived at 6:35 p.m.

Council Liaison Le (present)

PUBLIC HEARINGS/GENERAL BUSINESS

- 2** [25-0057](#) Recommend to City Council to approve the concept plan (Alternative 2) to implement the improvements in two phases, find that the action is exempt from CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15301(c) and Public Resources Code Section 21080.25(b)(1), and recommend that the City Council direct staff to include the concept plan as an unfunded project in the FY 2025/26 Budget pending future identification of funding.

Commissioner Mehlman recused themselves from this item, as they are a resident along the roadway.

Thinh Le, Transportation Engineer, and Adam Dankberg from Kimley-Horn gave a presentation. Highlighting the following:

- Project Overview
- Existing Temporary Condition
- Project Timeline
- Existing Geometric Conditions
- Traffic Analysis
- Collision Analysis (Jan 2018 - Dec 2022)
- Design Alternatives
- Alternative 1: Multi-Use Path
- Alternative 2: Sidewalk and Buffered Bike Lane
- Summary of Engagement Rounds 1 & 2
- Online Survey Findings
- Coordination with Department of Public Safety (DPS) Emergency Access
- Traffic Congestion – AM Peak Period Eastbound between Vienna Drive and Lawrence Expressway
- Mobile Home Delivery
- Midblock Crossings
- Cost Estimates
- Recommendation to City Council

Commissioner Hafeman asked about the following:

- Whether the queuing issue was analyzed in relation to Eastbound traffic making left or right turns onto Lawrence Expressway.
- Why two left-turn lanes could not be preserved while reducing the straight-through lanes to one and whether this adjustment would mitigate queuing issues.
- Whether the existing single Eastbound lane has been observed to create queuing issues.
- If the single lane between Fair Oaks Avenue and Vienna Drive had impacted traffic volume compared to previous conditions.
- Concerns about the phased approach to bike lane installation, questioning what would happen if phase one resulted in the bike lane ending abruptly, leaving cyclists without a safe continuation.
- Whether the specified 5 to 8 foot bike lane width excluded the buffer zone.
- If the width measurement accounted for the concrete drain pan and whether it could be specified as a one-foot drain pan instead of two feet.

Mr. Le, Lillian Tsang, Principal Transportation Engineer, Angela Obeso, Interim

Transportation and Traffic Manager, and Mr. Dankberg responded.

Commissioner Bonne asked about the following:

- Whether the daily traffic levels were analyzed over 24 or 12 hours, and if the study used single-day data or multi-day averages.
- What is the peak number of cars per hour on average over 24 hours.
- Whether both road halves in the measured section were single-vehicle or double-vehicle lanes.
- How does the traffic volume compare to other streets and whether the numbers are considered moderate, high, or low by traffic planners.
- What the quantitative meaning of "not significant impact to traffic flow" is.
- When including the bike lane and buffer, what is the combined width in Alternative 1?
- How many trees would be impacted in Alternative 1 and whether combination of elements of Alternatives 1 and 2 was considered.
- Why Alternative 1 does not allow for the same variance in width as Alternative 2, and whether restricting variance is due to potential overlap between bikes and pedestrians.
- The current speed limit in the area and expected vehicle speeds under both options.
- Whether speed limits would be reevaluated if either option is adopted.
- Which option would result in drivers being more likely to adhere to the speed limit.
- Whether a non-90-degree curb was considered for emergency vehicle passing in Alternative 1, and whether a sufficiently slanted curb could allow cars to slow down and partially use the sidewalk if necessary

Mr. Dankberg, Mr. Le, Ms. Tsang, and Ms. Obeso responded.

Commissioner Wilson asked about the following:

- Whether the current queuing situation involves vehicles turning right onto Lawrence Expressway from the second lane present east of Vienna Drive.
- Whether the removal of the second lane will force vehicles to queue in the only travel lane, potentially reducing the number of cars able to turn right onto Lawrence Expressway.

Mr. Le responded.

Vice Chair Davé asked about the following:

- Whether emergency vehicles and trailer home moving vehicles, given their higher

clearance, could traverse a curb that regular cars would try to avoid.

- Whether there is a curb height that could discourage regular cars while still allowing larger vehicles to get through.

Ms. Obeso responded.

Commissioner Gollakota asked about the following:

- Whether emergency vehicles could use the curb to access the bike lane in an emergency situation.
- Whether regular vehicular traffic could also use the curb to make way for emergency vehicles.
- Whether a curb design with a slight dip from the road, making it more difficult for regular cars to traverse but still accessible for emergency vehicles, would be feasible.
- What the expected shared width would be for pedestrians and bicycles if Alternative 2 is adopted.

Ms. Obeso and Ms. Tsang responded.

Chair Beagle asked about the following:

- Clarification on staff's recommendation, confirming the three alternatives: separated bike paths, buffered bike lanes, and the no-build option.
- Confirmation that the project consists of two phases: west of Vienna Drive and east of Vienna Drive.
- Whether the plan is to implement buffered bike lanes across both phases, starting with phase one.
- Whether the previous single-phase buffered alternative was replaced with a two-phase buffered alternative.
- Whether any consideration was given to a two-phase implementation of Alternative 1.
- Whether Alternative 1 could be applied west of Vienna Drive and Alternative 2 east of Vienna Drive, given concerns about mobile home deliveries and traffic east of Vienna Drive.
- Whether the two-phase approach was analyzed before being proposed.
- Concerns about emergency response times and whether the Department of Public Safety (DPS) is basing concerns on data analysis or general perception.
- The trade-off between response time and overall corridor safety, noting fewer collisions would reduce the need for emergency responses.
- Location of the nearest fire station in relation to the mobile home parks.

- Whether Alternative 3 (no-build option) would maintain the current temporary bike lanes or result in their removal.
- Whether shifting travel lanes to one side of the light rail tracks while placing separated bike lanes on the other side was considered.
- Whether this configuration would accommodate mobile home deliveries while leaving emergency access unobstructed.
- Continuation of Commissioner Bonne's question regarding expected speed limits for each alternative.
- Whether speed limit planning could be made an explicit design objective, ensuring the final design meets targeted speed limits.
- How phase two of the project would be ensured or reevaluated after phase one is implemented.
- Whether travel lanes in Alternative 2 would be narrowed to 11 feet like Alternative 1, or if they would remain wider.
- Whether intersection turn radii were designed to accommodate mobile homes.
- Whether excessive turn radii could be adjusted for safety.
- Whether mountable curbs or temporary barriers could be used to allow flexible turn radii when necessary for mobile home deliveries while maintaining safety in normal conditions.

Ms. Obeso, Ms. Tsang, and Mr. Dankberg responded.

Commissioner Gollakota asked about the following:

- Where the traffic on Tasman Drive originates from during peak times, specifically whether it comes from mobile home parks, Vienna Drive, Fair Oaks Avenue, or Lawrence Expressway.
- Whether communities with only one entry and exit point could have an additional outlet, or if the single-access design is a safety feature.
- Whether barriers exist on either side of Tasman Drive that restrict vehicle movement, similar to those found on Frances Street along El Camino Real.
- Whether such barriers could be adjusted as a simpler fix if traffic conditions worsen and access to Lawrence Expressway or Fair Oaks Avenue becomes more difficult.

Mr. Le, Mr. Dankberg, and Ms. Obeso responded.

Commissioner Wilson asked about the following:

- Whether the study provided any data on current bicycle volumes on Tasman Drive.

- Whether a comparison was available against a similar eastbound bicycle infrastructure corridor.
- Whether a comparable road, such as Arques Avenue, has higher bicycle usage.
- Whether there is a ballpark estimate for bicycle volumes on Tasman Drive compared to Arques Avenue.
- Whether 30 bicycles per day is considered a low volume in relation to other comparable streets.

Mr. Le, Mr. Dankberg, and Ms. Tsang responded.

Commissioner Hafeman asked about the following:

- Whether phase two would be canceled if traffic conditions are deemed unacceptable.
- Whether the queuing problem between Fair Oaks Avenue and Vienna Drive will improve by reducing the lane count, allowing phase two to proceed safely.
- Concerns about implementing only part of the bike lane in phase one, potentially creating a serious safety issue.
- Whether phase one could instead involve closing both lanes completely while allowing sidewalk construction to proceed.
- The risk that phase one is implemented but phase two is never completed due to public opposition or future council decisions.
- Concerns about bike lane continuity and the negative impact of an incomplete bike network.
- The potential advantage of testing a full lane closure in phase one to determine feasibility early rather than later.
- Suggesting phase one as an experiment by closing both lanes first before committing to further changes.

Ms. Tsang responded.

Public Comment opened at 7:56 p.m.

Victor Garza, member of the public, commented on the following:

- Strongly opposed all alternatives in the Tasman Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvement Study that would change Tasman Drive.
- Stated that Tasman Drive is a major arterial corridor with a raised median and light rail in the center, not a quiet residential street.
- Expressed concern that reducing Tasman from four lanes to one lane in each direction would cause severe congestion, delays, and dangerous traffic conditions.

- Explained that he resides in Casa de Amigos Mobile Home Park and relies on Tasman Drive as his primary access point for entering and exiting his home.
- Emphasized that the proposed changes would directly impact 1,700 homes and 4,000 cars from Casa de Amigos and Plaza del Rey Mobile Home Parks.
- Warned that the plan would create major traffic backups for thousands of residents and workers in the area, worsening daily commutes.
- Stressed that there are no alternative entry and exit points for these mobile home parks other than Tasman Drive.
- Raised concerns that the lane reduction would severely disrupt emergency services, including fire, ambulance, and evacuation routes, potentially putting lives at risk.
- Noted that 613 additional mobile home residents and nearby apartment and condominium dwellers would also be negatively affected, as they rely on Tasman Drive for highway access.
- Argued that additional restrictions on right turns would further choke traffic flow and increase congestion.
- Opposed the notion that bike lanes must be added directly to Tasman Drive, citing his 25 years of experience in Casa de Amigos, where pedestrians and cyclists already travel safely within the park's 15 mph speed limit and minimal traffic.

Elena Feinsmith, member of the public, gave a presentation and commented on the following:

- Has been a resident of Casa de Amigos since 1996, before the introduction of the light rail.
- Representing Sunnyvale Safe Streets, highlighted concerns about safety issues on Tasman Drive.
- Recommended implementing Alternative 1 from Fair Oaks Avenue to Vienna Drive and replanting trees that were previously removed, with phase two from Vienna Drive to Lawrence Expressway being evaluated after phase one.
- Encouraged preserving the existing lane closure and considering a temporary closure between Fair Oaks Avenue and Vienna Drive on the north side until permanent construction is completed.
- Stated that there are no permanent, continuous sidewalks or bikeways on Tasman Drive, which traps children, disabled residents, and car-less individuals in their neighborhoods.
- Noted that some Casa de Amigos residents attempt to leave but find conditions too dangerous due to the lack of safe routes.
- Shared photos of teenagers biking on Tasman Drive in heavy traffic moving between 40 and 60 mph.

- Highlighted the challenges of pedestrians walking back from grocery stores and navigating a blind curve, which poses a serious safety risk.
- Stated that speeding is frequent on Tasman Drive and cited multiple accidents, including one from the prior week, as evidence of the need for traffic calming measures.
- Emphasized the importance of improving safety for children and the community, expressing appreciation for the efforts made to address the issue.

Daniel Karpelevitch, member of the public, continued the presentation and commented on the following:

- Emphasized the urgent need for improvements on the west side of Tasman Drive.
- Stated that survey responses indicate strong community support for the project, with most respondents living nearby and wanting one of the proposed alternatives.
- Noted that many residents would use Tasman Drive more if the project were implemented.
- Supported staff's recommendation to phase the project, addressing the west side first before the east side.
- Highlighted the benefits of phasing, including lower costs and faster implementation of phase one compared to completing the entire project at once.
- Identified the west side from Fair Oaks Avenue to Vienna Drive as the most dangerous segment in need of immediate attention.
- Stated that phase one has near universal support, while opposition to the project is mainly related to phase two rather than phase one.
- Suggested using lessons from phase one to refine the approach for phase two and potentially improve alternatives.
- Proposed deferring new restrictions on right turns until phase two.
- Addressed concerns about emergency vehicle access, clarifying that response times to mobile home parks would not be affected by phase one, as the fire station serving those parks is located east of the project area.
- Explained that phase one would not impact mobile home deliveries, allowing additional time to analyze phase two before proceeding.
- Stated that phasing provides flexibility by allowing different priorities to be addressed separately for the west and east sides of Tasman Drive.

Hans Bernhardt, member of the public, continued the presentation and commented on the following:

- Is a Sunnyvale resident who frequently bikes on Tasman Drive to travel to the East Bay.
- Compared Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 for phase one of the project.

- Described Alternative 1 as safe and Alternative 2 as dangerous.
- Stated that Alternative 1 provides flexibility for two-directional biking on both sides and is safer for children by keeping them separated from fast-moving traffic.
- Argued that Alternative 2 places children near large, fast-moving vehicles, increasing the risk of head-on collisions and unsafe mid-block crossings.
- Stated that Alternative 1 is more convenient for cycling, making trips to grocery stores and other destinations easier.
- Warned that Alternative 2's layout encourages cyclists to take risky mid-block crossings rather than using the designated path.
- Cited a past fatal accident involving a pedestrian attempting a mid-block crossing.
- Expressed concern that Alternative 2 would increase bicycle and vehicle head-on collisions due to cyclists traveling in the wrong direction on bike lanes.
- Concluded that having designated bike lanes in both directions on both sides would be a safer option.

Ari Feinsmith, member of the public, concluded the presentation and commented on the following:

- Introduced himself as a lifelong resident of Casa de Amigos and a transportation industry professional.
- Advocated for phase one Alternative 1 as the best solution for the West side, ensuring safe and convenient access for bicyclists and pedestrians.
- Shared personal experiences growing up on Tasman Drive without safe walking and biking options, emphasizing the importance of providing these for future generations.
- Highlighted benefits of phase one, including eliminating mid-block crossings and promoting active transportation through separated bikeways.
- Noted minimal tree impact and proposed replanting trees removed from Tasman Drive as part of the project.
- Recommended evaluating phase two after phase one is completed to account for potential changes in traffic patterns and public sentiment.
- Urged immediate safety improvements, supporting a temporary north-side lane closure to address hazardous conditions without altering the existing intersection.
- Concluded by endorsing Alternative 1 for phase one, supporting tree replanting, and maintaining lane closures until permanent construction is completed.
- Encouraged advocates for safe bike lanes to join Sunnyvale Safe Streets in their mission to improve local infrastructure.

Pat Carpio, member of the public, commented on the following:

- Is a resident of northern Sunnyvale living in a mobile home.

- Expressed excitement about biking but avoids cycling in her neighborhood due to unsafe traffic patterns.
- Prefers biking along Bay Trails for recreation on weekends.
- Raised concerns about students crossing Tasman Drive to reach schools and the lack of safe transportation options for those living in mobile home parks.
- Stated that many students do not have cars and need safe biking and walking infrastructure.
- Advocated for Alternative 1, citing its greener, safer, and more inviting design that promotes future-oriented urban planning.
- Recounted a firsthand experience of walking with a fellow trustee who was startled by the unsafe conditions students face when traveling to school or accessing public transit.
- Highlighted how inconvenient and unsafe access points force people to take unnecessary risks.
- Emphasized that not everyone has a vehicle, and biking and walking should be accessible, safe transportation choices.
- Urged decision-makers to select Alternative 1, enhance greenery, and create an enjoyable environment for pedestrians and cyclists.

Kathy Meagher, member of the public, commented on the following:

- Is a volunteer with Sunnyvale Urban Forest Advocates (SUFA), stating that SUFA is not committing to supporting either of the two design proposals at this time.
- Expressed concerns over the potential loss of 12 to 66 mature trees along Tasman Drive and the possibility that they may not be replaced on site.
- Stated that removing mature trees eliminates important health and environmental benefits they provide.
- Warned that Alternative 1 could result in little to no shade along Tasman Drive, exacerbating the urban heat island effect as Sunnyvale experiences more frequent hot days.
- Suggested that reduced shade could discourage bicyclists and pedestrians from using the new infrastructure as anticipated.
- Urged the city to preserve as many trees as possible and ensure that any removed trees are replaced on site.

Jason Feinsmith, member of the public, gave a presentation and commented on the following:

- Is a resident of Casa de Amigos for 29 years and a supporter of Sunnyvale Safe Streets.
- Advocated for implementing Alternative 1 in phase one, then evaluating phase two

after it becomes operational.

- Emphasized that phase one addresses concerns raised by opposition while significantly improving safety, tree preservation, and biking infrastructure.
- Stated that completing phase one will eliminate the need for additional right-turn-on-red restrictions at intersections like Vienna Drive.
- Highlighted that keeping two lanes on the east side will preserve emergency response times, as the area is served by Fire Station 6.
- Expressed skepticism about phase two, describing it as less compelling compared to phase one.
- Shared that he spoke with Judy Pavlick, a leader of the opposition committee, and found an opportunity for compromise by focusing on bike and pedestrian lanes on the west side in phase one.
- Clarified that Alternative 1 in phase one is beneficial for tree preservation, as trees at risk are being removed independently of the project.
- Stated that with this project, there is an opportunity to replant code-compliant trees along Tasman Drive.
- Noted that traffic conditions under phase one would remain unchanged at Vienna Drive and Lawrence Expressway while improving at Fair Oaks Avenue due to stoplight timing adjustments.
- Concluded that the plan for phase one represents a significant opportunity for safety improvements and compromise.

Denise Gallardo, member of the public, commented on the following:

- Stated that the community has already made significant sacrifices with the introduction of VTA as an alternate mode of transportation.
- Explained that Tasman Drive is classified as a commercial collector with a 40 mph speed limit, which would need rezoning or other measures to be lowered.
- Referenced cities that have removed bike lanes due to issues such as false safety perceptions for bicyclists and pedestrians.
- Raised concerns that pedestrians may step into traffic without realizing the risks posed by passing cars.
- Stated that multipath use by pedestrians and bicyclists could slow traffic and potentially push cyclists into vehicle lanes.
- Expressed concerns about the dangers of right-hand turn lanes where bike paths are present.
- Highlighted maintenance challenges, stating that debris accumulates in bike lanes and they are difficult to sweep properly.
- Warned that deflecting traffic from Tasman Drive could push congestion into nearby neighborhoods.

- Noted that approximately 4,000 cars belong to residents of mobile home parks in the affected section.
- Questioned the validity of the survey results, noting that only 324 responses were collected out of 4,000 residents.
- Shared that Station 6, the nearest fire station, responded to 41 incidents within a seven-day period at Casa de Amigos and Plaza Del Rey mobile home parks.
- Stated that she personally spoke with seven firefighters and one police sergeant, all of whom opposed the proposed changes.
- Urged that tax dollars not be wasted on the project.

Leia Mehlman, member of the public, commented on the following:

- Identified herself as the author of the study issue that initiated the Tasman Drive project and a resident of Casa de Amigos since 2006.
- Expressed a personal desire for safe walking and biking infrastructure, particularly now that a supermarket is available in the area.
- Stressed the need for a connected and usable bicycle and pedestrian network due to anticipated changes from the Moffett Park Specific Plan.
- Cited the death of a pedestrian on Tasman Drive as evidence of the urgent need for sidewalks.
- Clarified that mobile home parks have multiple entrances and exits, with deliveries conducted through Persian Drive for Casa de Amigos and another entrance further down Vienna Drive for Plaza Del Rey.
- Acknowledged concerns about DPS response times but indicated support for a phased project implementation.
- Supported contiguous sidewalks on both sides of the street up to Vienna Drive to ensure safe pedestrian travel, particularly for schoolchildren.
- Advocated for bike lanes, emphasizing the benefits of alternative transit beyond bicycles, including scooters and hoverboards.
- Noted that mobile home residents are not permitted to walk dogs inside the parks, forcing them to cross the light rail tracks or travel to Vienna Drive, which is inconvenient.
- Expressed commitment to seeing the project completed in some form.

Kevin Jackson, member of the public, commented on the following:

- Acknowledged that residents along Tasman Drive would have strong opinions about the proposed changes, given its role as a significant cross-jurisdictional corridor connecting multiple destinations.
- Stressed the importance of making Tasman Drive accessible to travelers using all modes of transportation.

- Emphasized that the study aims to improve safety for environmentally friendly and healthier transportation options, encouraging more people to use them.
- Warned against settling for minimal improvements, urging planners to consider future growth and evolving transportation needs.
- Highlighted the increasing popularity of e-bikes and similar devices, which will lead to higher traffic in bike lanes and a greater speed disparity among users.
- Recommended designing bike facilities that allow safe passing, similar to how motorists navigate traffic.
- Clarified that BPAC's role is advisory, providing recommendations to the city council rather than making final decisions.
- Stated that BPAC's real-world experience in sharing the road with motor vehicle traffic offers a unique and valuable perspective.
- Urged BPAC to advocate for high-quality bike and pedestrian infrastructure that serves future users, rather than settling for bare-minimum solutions.
- Encouraged BPAC to present a unified position to help influence the final outcome effectively.

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

- Supported implementing Alternative 1 in phase one on the west side, with phase two on the east side being evaluated later.
- Emphasized that the City's ultimate goal should be to build a connected network that serves all residents.
- Shared that canvassing in the study area revealed strong enthusiasm for improved walking and biking facilities due to the current lack of infrastructure.
- Acknowledged concerns about change but argued that a phased approach allows residents to gradually adjust without major disruptions.
- Suggested that DPS could use phase one as an opportunity to test emergency response adjustments, including evaluating how fire trucks navigate the new design.
- Proposed the use of wide curb cuts to accommodate emergency vehicle access.
- Stated that Alternative 1 is safer than Alternative 2, especially in the Northwest quadrant, where two-way bikeways are necessary for residents returning from Grocery Outlet.
- Highlighted that Alternative 1 aligns with Caltrans Design Information Bulletin 94, which recommends multi-use paths for roads with a 40 mph speed limit, whereas Alternative 2 does not.
- Pointed out that cyclists from outside the study area will likely be major users of the completed route, and the project must consider their needs.
- Urged decision-makers to recognize the broader transportation benefits of Alternative 1.

Judy Pavlick, member of the public, commented on the following:

- Raised concerns about the movement of mobile homes, stating that they are transported north from Fair Oaks Avenue to the mobile home parks rather than from Lawrence Expressway to Tasman Drive.
- Spoke with Triple B Hauling and Glen at Alliance Mobile Home Park, who identified mobile home transportation as a major issue.
- Explained that mobile homes are 15 feet wide and 66 feet long, transported on trucks with eight-axle carriers.
- Expressed concerns that under Alternative 1, the 11-foot lanes would result in mobile homes hanging over the railroad tracks and bike paths.
- Stated that Alternative 1 would require reducing the width of bicycle and pedestrian pathways to accommodate mobile home transportation.
- Noted that mobile home movers must apply for a permit and must complete transport by 4 p.m. each day.
- Explained that mobile home haulers refuse to move homes during nighttime hours due to safety concerns.
- Suggested that Alternatives 1 and 2 need to be reevaluated to determine whether size adjustments could resolve transportation conflicts.
- Stated that Alternative 1 may not be feasible at all due to the dimensions of mobile homes.
- Shared that the owner of Alliance Mobile Home Park is strongly opposed to the proposed changes, citing significant impacts on his business.

Doug Kunz, member of the public, commented on the following:

- Is a member of the Sustainability Commission speaking in a personal capacity.
- Stated that on-road transportation is the largest contributor to Sunnyvale's greenhouse gas emissions.
- Emphasized the need for the City to provide safe and convenient biking and walking routes to reduce fossil fuel-powered auto use.
- Urged the Council to close the gap in the safe walking and biking network along Tasman Drive.
- Expressed support for both Alternatives 1 and 2, stating that they represent major improvements over current conditions.
- Applauded staff's phased approach, which prioritizes bike and pedestrian safety between Fair Oaks Avenue and Vienna Drive while allowing time to address community concerns about the east side.
- Found arguments in favor of a multi-use path persuasive and supported Alternative 1.

- Stressed that action is necessary, as maintaining the status quo would leave residents without safe walking and biking access to light rail and local businesses.
- Concluded that while he supports Alternative 1, he also views Alternative 2 as a meaningful improvement.

Tim Oey, member of the public, commented on the following:

- Is the Chair of the Santa Clara County Roads Commission, speaking in a personal capacity as a professional bicycle instructor who bikes Tasman Drive periodically.
- Strongly recommended Alternative 1, supporting multi-use paths on both sides of Tasman Drive for phase one.
- Expressed openness to Alternative 2 for phase two or postponing the decision to allow DPS easier access to Plaza Del Rey and Casa de Amigos.
- Stated that Fire Station 6, located just east of the mobile home parks near Lawrence Expressway, has multiple access routes, including highway 237, Persian Drive, and highway 101.
- Shared personal experience biking on multi-use paths in Helsinki and other European cities, as well as some American cities, noting their effectiveness.
- Emphasized that Alternative 1 minimizes the need for bicyclists to cross streets unnecessarily, particularly for trips to and from Grocery Outlet at Fair Oaks Avenue and Tasman Drive.
- Highlighted that separating bicyclists from motor vehicles using curbs significantly enhances safety, especially for children.
- Advocated for prioritizing safety to prevent crashes rather than simply improving emergency response times.
- Called for greater efforts to reduce vehicle miles traveled and mitigate climate change, noting that transportation contributes 50% of greenhouse gas emissions.
- Argued that every street in Sunnyvale should be a complete street, designed for safe travel by all modes of transportation.

Tim Kerr, member of the public, commented on the following:

- Opposed both Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, citing concerns that not enough consideration has been given to potential problems the changes could create.
- Highlighted three major upcoming developments within a mile of the project area: the Kiely project, the Relative project near the stadium, and a high-density residential project at Sandia Avenue and Lawrence Expressway.
- Warned that increased traffic from these developments would worsen existing congestion, particularly during morning and evening commutes.
- Expressed concern that reducing Tasman Drive to one lane would exacerbate traffic backups as new residents move into the area.

- Stated that both alternatives would create a "mess" and should be reconsidered, arguing that the road should be left as it is.
- Questioned whether accommodating bicyclists was worth inconveniencing 4,000 cars.
- Opposed the removal of right-turn-on-red options, arguing it would create excessive delays for drivers leaving Plaza Del Rey and Casa de Amigos, particularly in emergency situations.
- Suggested that residents could be stuck for 20 minutes or more waiting for the light rail, congestion, and signals to clear.
- Recommended that Sunnyvale abandon the proposed changes and allocate funding to other projects instead.

Stephen Meier, member of the public, commented on the following:

- Expressed support for Alternative 1 but focused his remarks on the Department of Public Safety's (DPS) position regarding response times.
- Criticized DPS for prioritizing minimal response time increases over broader safety improvements.
- Shared past concerns about DPS opposing traffic calming measures, stating that Chief Ngo initially resisted changes but later acknowledged there was no issue.
- Accused DPS of obstructing safety improvements repeatedly without clear explanations for their position.
- Called on DPS to shift focus toward proactive safety measures rather than maintaining response times at the expense of prevention.

Deb, member of the public, commented on the following:

- Expressed frustration that bike and walking lanes previously existed before the City installed VTA tracks in the center of Tasman Drive, removing those lanes.
- Opposed further lane reductions, arguing they would be another mistake.
- Stated that many residents rely on driving because they transport children to school and work, rather than using bicycles.
- Clarified that school buses pick up children on Vienna Drive each morning, as schools are not close to the area.
- Corrected a previous statement, clarifying that Plaza Del Rey has only two entrances and exits—one on Vienna Drive near Lawrence Expressway and another on Vienna Court, which requires traveling on Tasman Drive to access Fair Oaks Avenue or Lawrence Expressway.
- Urged decision-makers to reconsider the project and return to the drawing board.
- Criticized the project team for placing cones on the wrong side of the street and not listening to resident concerns.
- Stated that an incident and fatality occurred on the Casa de Amigos side due to a

pedestrian crossing where there was no sidewalk.

- Emphasized that pedestrians should only cross where safe and argued that the blind turn area should have received safety measures instead.
- Called for the project team to listen to residents before making final decisions affecting their roadway.

Public Comment closed at 8:47 p.m.

Chair Beagle called for a recess at 8:47 p.m. Chair Beagle reconvened the meeting at 8:59 p.m.

Commissioner Hafeman commented on the following:

- Initially had concerns about phasing but now understands the reasoning behind it.
- Acknowledged the public's input and private conversations that helped clarify the approach.
- Stated that the selected phasing strategy is the right decision.
- No longer objects to the phased implementation.
- Expressed uncertainty about choosing between Alternative 1 and Alternative 2.
- Indicated that further comments would be shared as discussions continue.

Vice Chair Davé commented on the following:

- Shared a personal experience of being clipped by a car while cycling in a painted bike lane in a 15 mph zone, resulting in a concussion and a temporary loss of memory.
- Expressed skepticism about the safety of painted bike lanes.
- Stated a preference for Alternative 1 as the safer option.
- Agreed with concerns raised by an audience member, emphasizing that if adults are not safe on the road, children are even more vulnerable.
- Urged decision-makers to prioritize safety considerations in their evaluation of the project.

Commissioner Bonne commented on the following:

- Supported the view that painted bike lanes do not provide adequate safety, particularly on roads with high speed limits.
- Shared a personal anecdote about being passed dangerously close by a large delivery truck while biking on an inadequate, debris-filled bike lane along Kifer Road.
- Applauded the concept of raising bike and pedestrian paths for increased safety in Alternative 1.

- Advocated for urban transportation design centered around human-powered vehicles rather than cars, given increasing population density and limited land availability.
- Argued that expanding road space for vehicles is unsustainable, and instead, streets should prioritize higher-density transportation modes.
- Compared the footprint and mass of cars versus bicycles, suggesting that bicycles allow for more efficient use of street space.
- Encouraged taking additional space away from vehicle lanes while preserving trees, noting that shaded streets enhance pedestrian comfort.
- Highlighted the cooling benefits of trees in urban environments, stressing their importance as temperatures rise.
- Urged planners to preserve as many trees as possible and to choose Alternative 1 for its separated bike and pedestrian paths.

Commissioner Gollakota commented on the following:

- Raised concerns about the high income disparity in Sunnyvale, noting that mobile home parks provide an affordable homeownership option for those unable to buy traditional homes.
- Observed that many mobile home park residents also rent their homes.
- Inquired whether the City has data on the age demographics of mobile home park residents, particularly whether the community skews toward senior citizens or has a more diverse mix.
- Expressed that affordability forces many residents to commute long distances, with bicycles being a viable option for nearby destinations but cars being necessary for farther commutes.
- Shared concerns about mobility-challenged individuals, including a friend who uses a wheelchair, and emphasized that alternative transportation options may not be accessible to everyone.
- Suggested that the City explore opening certain closed pathways near Tasman Drive and Lawrence Expressway to improve mobility options, specifically referencing a previously closed opening on Persian Drive.
- Proposed evaluating whether emergency vehicles, garbage trucks, and large vehicles could use alternative routes to avoid congestion and improve accessibility.
- Acknowledged that mobile home parks have existing exit options and are not entirely isolated.
- Expressed support for preserving trees and ensuring access to Grocery Outlet for residents who rely on biking or public transit.
- Agreed that Tasman Drive feels narrow and unsafe for bicyclists and pedestrians, stressing that elevating pedestrian paths could improve safety but might increase

risks for bicyclists.

- Ultimately supported Alternative 1 as an option that meets mobility needs while maintaining safety and accessibility.

Ms. Obeso responded.

Commissioner Wilson commented on the following:

- Questioned the potential tree impacts between phase one and phase two, seeking clarification on how many trees would be removed in each segment.
- Asked whether the public's perception that tree removal in phase one is minimal was accurate or if the impact is evenly distributed between both phases.
- Raised concerns about the necessity of a bidirectional shared-use path on the south side of Tasman Drive, suggesting that most residents seem primarily concerned with access to grocery stores.
- Asked why a hybrid option of a sidewalk and bike lane (rather than a shared-use path) on the south side was not explored.
- Inquired whether uniformity on both sides influenced the design decision.
- Considered the cost differential between Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, noting that Alternative 1 costs approximately \$4 million more.
- Suggested that a buffered bike lane and sidewalk already provide a significant safety improvement and questioned whether the additional investment in a shared-use path is justified.
- Proposed that the \$4 million might be better spent on additional bike lanes elsewhere in the city, such as on Hollenbeck Avenue.
- Acknowledged that bidirectionality on the north side could improve pedestrian safety, citing a past fatality where a pedestrian was forced to cross at an unsafe location due to the absence of a continuous sidewalk.
- Concluded that while bidirectionality may save lives, the higher cost for bike safety improvements may need further evaluation.

Mr. Le and Mr. Dankberg responded.

Chair Beagle commented on the following:

- Asked City staff to clarify whether sidewalks and bike lanes existed prior to the installation of light rail on Tasman Drive and whether any infrastructure was removed.
- Sought clarification on whether bike lanes were formally designated or merely shoulders used unofficially for cycling.
- Requested a breakdown of survey results specific to mobile home park residents

and their sentiment toward the proposed alternatives.

- Asked for the total number of survey respondents who lived in mobile home parks.
- Inquired about a detailed cost breakdown for each phase of the project, including Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, and whether a mixed approach was considered (Alternative 1 for phase one, Alternative 2 for phase two).
- Expressed concerns about future cost increases if phase two is delayed by five or more years and requested a comparison of immediate versus long-term costs.
- Reminded City staff and contractors about City's Land Use and Transportation (LUTE) Policy LT-3.6, which prioritizes pedestrians, cyclists, and transit users over single-occupant vehicles in transportation planning.
- Criticized the emphasis on traffic congestion in decision-making, arguing that it may be receiving disproportionate weight over other considerations such as pedestrian and cyclist safety.
- Stated that while state laws must be followed, traffic concerns should not overshadow safety priorities outlined in City policy.
- Suggested that future decision-making should better align with policy LUTE Policy LT-3.6 rather than focusing excessively on vehicle traffic impacts.
- Strongly supported staff's recommendation to implement the project in two phases, emphasizing the importance of making progress rather than delaying improvements in pursuit of perfection.
- Expressed appreciation for the public's input and endorsed a phased approach that begins with Alternative 1 in phase one (separated bike paths) and Alternative 2 in phase two (buffered bike lanes).
- Acknowledged concerns from residents about the impact of 4,000 vehicles from mobile home parks on traffic but noted that staff does not foresee significant congestion increases, at least for phase one.
- Argued that providing safe biking and pedestrian infrastructure may reduce residents' reliance on cars over time, potentially lowering the number of vehicles used daily.
- Stressed the importance of ensuring phase two is not overlooked or indefinitely postponed, recommending that the council establish a structured plan to revisit and implement the second phase.
- Suggested incorporating temporary bike lanes on the north side of the tracks, complementing existing south-side bike lanes, before permanent phase one construction begins.
- Advocated for preserving and adding trees as part of the final project design.
- Summarized preferred recommendations:
 - Alternative 1 in phase one: separated bike paths.
 - Alternative 2 in phase two: buffered bike lanes.

- Temporary bike lanes on the north side west of Vienna Drive before permanent phase one construction.
- Tree preservation and replanting.

Ms. Obeso and Mr. Dankberg responded.

Commissioner Hafeman commented on the following:

- Expressed understanding of the rationale for bi-directional bike and pedestrian paths west of Vienna Drive, noting that alternative buffered bike lanes could lead to cyclists riding in the wrong direction due to long detours.
- Raised concerns about the potential loss of trees and the lack of clarity on the number of trees impacted in phase one.
- Highlighted emergency vehicle accessibility as a critical issue, questioning whether emergency responders from Fire Station 6 would face obstacles under the proposed design.
- Stressed that cars typically move to the right to allow emergency vehicles through, but the presence of raised paths could make this difficult, potentially forcing vehicles onto pedestrian spaces.
- Considered whether buffered bike lanes could still allow cars to shift temporarily for emergency access but noted that pedestrians might be easier to manage than cyclists in such situations.
- Expressed discomfort with accepting emergency vehicle complications as a necessary tradeoff for improved bike and pedestrian safety.
- Suggested that emergency access concerns might be why buffered bike lanes were ultimately favored as the preferred choice.
- Called for further discussion and a solution that ensures emergency response operations are not compromised.
- Maintained that while bike and pedestrian safety is a priority, it should not come at the cost of efficient emergency response services.

Mr. Le responded.

Vice Chair Davé commented on the following:

- Requested clarification on the rationale behind recommending buffered bike lanes for phase two.
- Asked staff to provide a timeline update on the study progress.
- Confirmed that the BPAC would not review the project again before it is presented to the City Council.

Chair Beagle and Mr. Le responded.

Commissioner Wilson commented on the following:

- Continued discussions regarding the potential impact of tree removal, requesting clarification on maneuverability constraints when implementing a shared-use path.
- Asked whether shared-use paths provide limited flexibility to avoid trees compared to other configurations.
- Confirmed that the 12-foot width standard applied consistently in city projects, leaving little room for adjustments around tree roots.
- Questioned whether minor modifications could help preserve certain large trees but acknowledged that overall flexibility is limited.
- Raised concerns about the speed limit on Tasman Drive west of Vienna Drive, noting its curvy layout and potential implications for traffic flow.
- Highlighted that staff's speed analysis showed minimal travel time differences when reducing lanes but questioned whether a buffered bike lane might trigger a speed reassessment.
- Suggested that a speed limit reduction from 40 mph to 30 mph could lead to cascading traffic impacts beyond just travel time delays.
- Asked whether a 10 mph speed reduction could result in more substantial delays than currently estimated.
- Noted that while the analysis suggests minimal travel time differences, there remains uncertainty regarding future speed adjustments under the buffered bike lane recommendation.
- Recognized that if a speed limit reduction becomes necessary, the full extent of traffic impacts remains an open question that may need further evaluation.

Mr. Dankberg and Ms. Tsang responded.

Commissioner Bonne commented on the following:

- Re-examined the math regarding vehicle counts, noting that Casa de Amigos has 915 homes, suggesting an estimated two to three cars per household, totaling fewer than 3,000 cars.
- Stated that Tasman Drive accommodates 4,000 to 5,000 cars over a 24-hour period, with peak traffic at less than 700 cars per hour.
- Concluded that there is no significant mass exodus of residents, and traffic flow would not be severely impacted by either alternative.
- Highlighted the City's goal of creating induced demand for biking and walking while depressing demand for vehicles to reduce congestion.
- Argued that encouraging more citizens to shift from driving to biking or walking

benefits everyone, including drivers who remain reliant on their vehicles.

- Supported Alternative 1 as a solution that would promote a more balanced, sustainable transportation system.

Commissioner Hafeman moved and Commissioner Gollakota seconded the motion to recommend the following:

- Phase One: Implementation of mixed-use paths.
- Phase Two: The final design will either include mixed-use paths or buffered bike lanes.
- Temporary Bike Lane: Before construction begins, the north-side lane should be closed to create a temporary bike lane, complementing the already closed south-side lane.
- Lane Closures: One lane on each side of the corridor will be temporarily closed for bicycle use.
- Closure Boundaries: The temporary closure will span the area between Vienna Drive and Fair Oaks Avenue.

Commissioner Hafeman spoke to their motion, emphasizing the importance of the mixed-use path and explaining that there are no cross streets in the area. He stressed the need to ensure that children on bicycles and older residents using electric bikes or other mobility devices can safely commute to the grocery store without having to take long detours to Vienna Drive before returning. For him, this was the primary reason why the mixed-use paths were crucial.

Regarding the potential impact on trees, he acknowledged that while some members of the public stated that trees would not be significantly affected on the west side, the study did not confirm this. However, he suspected that most of the tree-related concerns would likely arise in phase two rather than phase one.

He also addressed concerns about emergency vehicle access, noting that the fire station is located to the east. Based on this, he believed that most emergency vehicles, including police cars, would likely approach from the Lawrence Expressway side. Consequently, the likelihood of emergency vehicles needing to use the mixed-use path would be minimal. He suggested that, if necessary, the path could be sloped to allow emergency vehicles to access it more easily.

Commissioner Wilson's asked about the following:

- Asked staff for clarification on how funding constraints might affect the project timeline.

- Noted that Sunnyvale has historically faced challenges in securing construction funding.
- Pointed out that the project is currently listed as an unfunded item in the 2025–2026 budget.
- Questioned whether the cost difference between Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 would significantly impact the timeline for beginning construction.
- Sought staff's opinion on whether recommending Alternative 1 might delay the start of initial construction due to the higher cost associated with that option.

Ms. Obeso responded.

Chair Beagle commented on the following:

- Expressed strong support for the proposal, particularly Alternative 1 in phase one.
- Highlighted that this project presents a rare opportunity to implement protected bike lanes or separated bike paths since there are no driveways in the area, which is a common limitation in other projects.
- Emphasized the importance of access to grocery stores, light rail stations, nearby restaurants, and future bike infrastructure, including the East Channel Trail.
- Stressed that connections to existing and future biking facilities are critical, especially on the west side of the project area.
- Considered the west side to be the most important part of the project.
- Expressed a preference for prioritizing quality in implementation, supporting a "do it right" approach rather than rushing the process.

The motion carried with the following vote:

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

No 0

Recused 1 - Commissioner Mehlman