

Melissa Lee

From: Ken Kratz <kskratz@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, November 8, 2021 9:41 PM
To: Mayor and Council
Subject: Formalization of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, Item 6c, Agenda 11-9-21

Categories: Blue Category

Mayor and City Council
City of Santa Clara
1500 Warburton Avenue
Santa Clara, Ca. 95050

re: Formalization of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, Item 6c, Agenda 11-9-21

Dear Mayor and City Council:

I was a BPAC member for many years and I have two recommendations regarding the formalization of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC):

- Approve the BPAC's formalization recommendations, listed below, rather than Staff's.
- Expand the membership of the committee to ten (10) members: one voting representative from each City district (6 members), three who work but do not live in the City (3 members), and one (1) non-voting chairperson elected by the BPAC (may be a city council member but could be another person who shows leadership qualities).

In regard to my first recommendation, BPAC formalization recommendations made by the BPAC members are sensible:

1. Member Eligibility - BPAC members to be at least 18 years of age, live or work in the City, and do not have to be a qualified elector of the City.
2. Applications and Appointments - the BPAC to review membership applications, interview applicants, vote for applicants, and make recommendations to Council
3. BPAC Chair - the BPAC to elect their own Chair instead of the Chair being a Councilmember
4. Meetings - the BPAC to have a minimum of 8 meetings, 12 preferred, each year

The BPAC's recommendations two and three above (BPAC review of membership applications and election of chairperson) are sensible because the City needs bicycle and pedestrian advocates, not necessarily political appointees, and those serving on the committee are best qualified to make recommendations on membership and chairperson.

POST MEETING MATERIAL

The BPAC's recommendation four above (more meetings) is sensible because BPAC meetings are usually four to six hours long and, unfortunately, the Staff provides a huge amount of materials within days of the meeting for committee member review; this is too much work to thoroughly review in the time allotted. More meetings with shorter agendas would help. From what I have observed, the city is experiencing an upsurge in cycling and pedestrian activity, especially during the pandemic; therefore, it makes sense that more time should be spent by Staff, not less, in meeting the needs of those activities.

In regard to my second recommendation (that the City expand the committee to ten members to include one representative from each district, three people who work but do not live in the city, and one non-voting chairperson), this request is sensible because the Committee will then be representative of all areas of the city and because cycling and pedestrian activities are primarily local/district activities. If the City has problems finding residents in those districts to fill vacancies on the BPAC, other candidates may apply.

Having a representative from each district will provide more in-depth investigations into what that particular area of the city may need in the way of projects and programs to best meet the needs of citizens and the public in those districts. For example, I live in district four and I am working on the BPAC subcommittee on roundabouts. I have discovered some locations in my district, where I have lived for years and watched local traffic including cyclists and pedestrians, where roundabouts will help me and my fellow district residents as well as the public to go to the nearby stores, parks and schools.

As part of my subcommittee duties, I have looked at a few locations for roundabouts in other districts but there is no way I can survey the whole city and anticipate where those citizens in those other districts may like to walk or cycle to local destinations. The BPAC needs representatives from each district do this level of detailed investigation.

Also, in regard to my second recommendation (again, expand the committee to ten members to include one representative from each district, three people who work but do not live in the city, and one non-voting chairperson), this request is sensible because the Committee needs a lot of members to fully staff the BPAC subcommittees.

BPAC subcommittees include Way-finding, Bicycle Story, Collision History, Bike to Shop Day, Roundabouts, and Website subcommittees. The work performed by the subcommittees relieves City Staff of much of this work. Those subcommittees are staffed by committee members and may include volunteer citizens. They are performing research and investigative work for the benefit of the Committee and ultimately the public and City's residents. I anticipate the need for more subcommittees, along with the accompanying need for more members involvement, as bicycling and pedestrian activities increase in our city.

Also in regard to my second recommendation (one non-voting chairperson), the chairperson of the BPAC committee should be a non-voting member since a council member taking that chairperson position would essentially have two opportunities to vote on a BPAC proposal: once at the BPAC meeting and once at the City Council meeting.

Please consider adopting my and BPAC's recommendations to formalize the BPAC rather than Staff's recommendations.

Sincerely,

Ken Kratz
BPAC Subcommittee member
past BPAC member

Melissa Lee

From: danieliz1@yahoo.com
Sent: Saturday, November 6, 2021 8:02 PM
To: Mayor and Council
Cc: Teresa O'Neill; Hosam Haggag
Subject: Comment on Item 6C - meeting of 9Nov2021

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Categories: Blue Category

Dear City Council Members

I was at the Governance & Ethics meeting early this year, and I'd thought we'd made major headway from staff recommendations, but from this item, it looks like you're recommending everything that staff did. (Staff is not perfect, and the ones who attend BPAC meetings don't live in Santa Clara or ride bikes for transportation. I.e. it is not a good idea to assume that everything they say and do is in the best interests of the cycling & walking communities, or even Santa Clarans in general.) Let me take this item by item.

Item 1 is fine.

Item 3 makes no sense. We had 19 applicants for the last election! We are also now taking care of both bicycling and pedestrian issues, so there is plenty of work to go around. We need the people, and there is more than ample interest in the community. So, it makes zero sense to reduce the size of the committee.

Item 5 is also a mistake. Since the Governance & Ethics meeting, I have attended two commission selection meetings. The first was for the redistricting commission, was conducted under the auspices of the city clerk and was as fair as fair can be. (And I say that as one who applied and did not get selected.) However, ping pong balls make sense for a commission that is only formed, activated, and disbanded every ten years. For every other committee & commission, the existing members of that group know best what they do, what a member needs to know, and what sort of new member would best complement the existing group. The other selection meeting I attended was the HLC. It was horrible. I won't repeat what I emailed you (mayorandcouncil) on October 6th at 4:41pm, but if you don't still have it, I'm happy to re-send.

Item 7 was discussed at the Governance & Ethics meeting. When a councilmember is chair and a voting member of a committee or commission, he/she has too much power -- controlling the meeting, voting in the committee/commission meeting, and voting again at council on our recommendations. When that councilmember is a member of the cycling/walking community and truly has our interests at hearts, such as Teresa O'Neill, it is not so much of an issue (and I, for one, would be more than happy to have her on the committee as a member of the public and then vote her in to be chair), but when that is not the case, instead of making things better for the community, we are spending a great deal of time battling the chair along with a staff often unwilling to help us in our goals as well. Like every other committee and commission, we should be allowed to select our own chair. And while a

council representative is encouraged to attend meetings, as a liaison with council, that person should not have a vote or be considered a committee member.

Item 9 is a bit unclear since I believe that they have brought you both what we committee members want along with what they want.

Sincerely, Diane Harrison (currently a BPAC member) 3283 Benton St. Santa Clara, CA 95051 (land of the Ohlone and Muwekma Ohlone people) 408-246-8149 dianeliz1@yahoo.com