

Cespedes, Christopher

From: Cespedes, Christopher
Sent: Tuesday, November 8, 2022 8:51 AM
To: Cespedes, Christopher
Subject: RE: Comments for 10/19 Transportation Commission meeting: State Street (Granger to Packard) active transportation safety improvements

Hello, commissioners. I'm too dispirited to be eloquent or even politic so I'll try to go with just questions:

1. How does it meet project goals (A2Zero, A2Moving Together all-ages designation) to *widen the parking lane* and narrow the bike lane?



2. Why are one-way protected bike lanes not feasible? What reasons prompted the team to decide on paint infrastructure instead? Were there any outlier voices?

3. What analysis has been done on average car speeds on State Street today and projected change with the new design?

4. What changes did the team consider to improve the safety of cyclists turning left off southbound State? Why did the team choose to make no changes?



5. What changes did the team consider to connect State Street and Packard bike lanes at the southwest corner? Why did the team ultimately decide to stay with the current discontinuous path for bikes, which results in cars pinning bikes to the curb? Why were options like those outlined in [Don't give up at the intersection](#) infeasible?

[Detailed analysis here on the cyclist experience](#) today and under the new plan. (TLDR: this will not provide the all-ages route the City has publicly declared our intention and there is no alternative street that could do so.)

Thanks for your time.
XXXXXXXXXXXX