



BBF ENTRANCE ROAD FEASIBILITY STUDY
COMMENT SHEET

MEETING DATE: 02/12/20 PAGE 1 of
MEETING TIME: 6:30-8:00pm
MEETING LOCATION: 22221 McCLELLAN ROAD, EEC

COMMENT NUMBER	DWG.NO.	COMMENT TYPE	COMMENT
1	Alt C	E	Uphill bike lane on the wrong side of the road is confusing and dangerous. Opposed to Option C.
2	Alt D	E	Road is much too wide. Opposed to Alternative D.
3	Alt C	E	Lose fewer trees take out more of the golf course. Best Option.
4	Alt B	E	Best Plan: Easier Construction. Fewer tree removal. Option B.
5	Alt B	E	Ok to lose some trees to make path better and lose less golf course.
6	Alt B	E	Lose fewer trees and take out more of the golf course.
7	Alt B	E	Why do we need this?
8	Alt B	E	Will people opt to use the ped path?
9	Alt B	E	2 nd best option.
10	Alt B	E	Option B! This one please. =)
11	-	E	Please minimal impact to the golf course hole #3.
12	-	E	I think a bike/ped separated path from oncoming traffic is best.
13	-	E	Please keep the stone wall. Bikes separate from walkers.
14	-	E	How does alternative B deal with bike traffic having to cross oncoming bikes at top/bottom of the slope?
15	-	E	Bikes obey traffic rules so riding on street is appropriate to max extent possible therefore Option A appears best followed by C.
16	-	E	If it is deemed necessary for such a project, then we need to preserve trees and minimize cost. Therefore, Alternative B seems to be the best compromise.
17	-	E	Do not install bike curbs like on McClellan.
18	-	E	Reconsider relocating entrance to BBF on Stevens Creek Blvd. (2x)
19	-	E	Install tall fence to protect homes and vehicles from golf balls.
20	-	E	Masterplan conceptual designed a meandering path. Was this considered?
21	-	E	Keep bikes on the road. Separate pedestrians from the roadway. (2x)

COMMENT TYPE: A – Aesthetics
C – Costs
M – Maintenance
S – Safety
T – Traffic
E – Environment

ACTION CODES: A – Originator agrees and will comply/take action
B – Originator disagrees for reasons noted; discussion may be required
C – Answer provided; no action needed



BBF ENTRANCE ROAD FEASIBILITY STUDY
COMMENT SHEET

MEETING DATE: 02/12/20
MEETING TIME: 6:30-8:00pm
MEETING LOCATION: 22221 McCLELLAN ROAD, EEC

COMMENT NUMBER	DWG.NO.	COMMENT TYPE	COMMENT
22	-	E	No on Option D. No to traffic signalized option.
23	-	S	What are the collision statistics? Any reported accidents?
24	-	T	Traffic calming at McClellan/Byrne similar to San Fernando/Byrne.
25	-	C	Do not widen road. Install ADA path only.
26	-	S	Bike path should be a gradual not undulating path uphill.
27	-	-	Provide a more valid explanation that this project needs to be done.
28	-	-	Keep it simple
29	-	T	There is no need for any special bicycle treatment in my opinion. I can envisage two types of bicycle usage: A. Kiddie bikes with parents – these can use the pedestrian walkway B. Adults on bikes – I foresee very little usage of this access by adult bicyclists. It will be quite rare. Bicyclists will commonly use the Stevens Creek Trail, but access to Byrne will not be an important element. In the rare case an adult wants to use this access, they can walk their bike on the pathway, or choose to ride uphill or downhill and share lanes with cars. The cars wouldn't be obstructed in the uphill direction, only for the reason that the cars going uphill will be already traveling at a very slow speed. In the rare case a car has to follow a bike uphill, it will not impact the traffic flow significantly, as there is already a stop sign at the top of hill – this is not a through route. Going downhill, an adult bike will already be traveling at the same speed as a car.
30	-	T	We don't need more than two lanes for autos.
31	-	T	We don't need signaling!
32	-	T	The design should provide the widest reasonable two-lane bike/ped pathway. If the widest is 14', then please use that. If wider is possible, even better.
33	-	T	The most dangerous section has not been addressed. It is for cars exiting the parking lot making a restricted view left hand turn. This is at the bottom of a hill and downhill bikers can NOT see the cars. The cars can also not see to the left until they are on Fernando. This is the

COMMENT TYPE: A – Aesthetics
C – Costs
M – Maintenance
S – Safety
T – Traffic
E – Environment

ACTION CODES: A – Originator agrees and will comply/take action
B – Originator disagrees for reasons noted; discussion may be required
C – Answer provided; no action needed



BBF ENTRANCE ROAD FEASIBILITY STUDY
COMMENT SHEET

MEETING DATE: 02/12/20
MEETING TIME: 6:30-8:00pm
MEETING LOCATION: 22221 McCLELLAN ROAD, EEC

COMMENT NUMBER	DWG.NO.	COMMENT TYPE	COMMENT
			double blind intersection. None of the alternates appear to address this.
34	-	T	Why does the ADA path need to be 10 foot wide?
35	-	T	One fat lane is safer than two. If forces the cars to be careful. If forces the drivers to move over or have a head on collision. If you widen the road for 2 lanes there will be more accidents. Widening the road will increase the speed of drivers. This is bad for bikers too. It makes it faster and less safe. So Alternate A is the closest to this.
36		E	Don't connect BBF to Stevens Creek. There are too much bird habitat and Env. Sensitive Areas that one has to go through. Heard from 2 different attendees.

COMMENT TYPE: A – Aesthetics
C – Costs
M – Maintenance
S – Safety
T – Traffic
E – Environment

ACTION CODES: A – Originator agrees and will comply/take action
B – Originator disagrees for reasons noted; discussion may be required
C – Answer provided; no action needed