

Answers to WBC 2026 Walking and Biking Survey by Candidate John Tang

Cupertino has made progress on safe walking and biking in the past ten years, though we fall short on our Vision Zero goals. What do you consider the most important bike or ped project the city should work on to improve safety for our residents? Why? Please be specific as to the location and improvements you would encourage.	I strongly applaud the city’s Vision Zero Action Plan. Traffic collisions are preventable when we implement proper road design, modern intersection treatments, and targeted engineering controls. Based on Cupertino’s High Injury Network data, our immediate focus must be on our highest-risk corridors and intersections—specifically De Anza Boulevard at Homestead Road and Stevens Creek Boulevard at Bandley Drive. For these high-volume corridors, we should prioritize physical separation, such as protected bike lanes and protected intersection designs, to prevent severe collisions. Public statements and actions: <i>John has made public statements in support of all types of improvements for walking and biking, including safer intersections and separated bike lanes. With strong co-candidates on the slate of Cupertino Together, we are confident he will be supportive of project with help our residents move about the city actively, safely and easily.</i>
With the study on Bollinger Road to address the multiple resident deaths and myriad of safety issues on that street cancelled (despite posing no cost to the city), how would you respond to residents that are concerned about safety while using that street?	Canceling this study was a major misstep. Public safety is a core municipal responsibility, and it encompasses traffic, pedestrian, and bicycle safety alongside traditional emergency services. We must listen to residents who navigate this corridor daily. I support reversing this decision and directing staff to move forward with the study so we can evaluate empirical traffic data and implement long-overdue safety interventions on Bollinger Road.
The city's 2024 Vision Zero Plan commits the city to have zero residents killed or seriously injured (KSI) on our roads by 2040. However, the criteria used to rank projects in the new 2026 Active Transportation Plan (ATP) makes projects on streets with the highest KSIs to be ranked low enough to likely to never be built. Without these projects, Vision Zero goals cannot be met. How would you resolve this dilemma?	As an engineer, I believe policy decisions must be grounded in objective data. A project prioritization model that buries high-injury corridors undermines our commitment to Vision Zero. I will work to recalibrate the ATP scoring system to ensure Killed or Seriously Injured (KSI) collision metrics carry significant weight. Prioritizing funding where severe collisions actually occur is essential to achieving our 2040 Vision Zero goals.
The new Active Transportation Plan (ATP) has many highly ranked projects which include "Bike Boulevards", which means adding only signage and sharrows to streets. Sharrows and signage have been shown to have no effect on safety, and in large studies to actually decrease safety and increase accidents. In 2024, CalTrans stated sharrows should be "a last resort”, and "are not a dedicated bike facility". How would you remedy this issue in the ATP, or do you think Cupertino should continue to plan for more sharrows on our streets?	Infrastructure improvements must match the speed and volume of the roadway. Caltrans guidelines rightly state that sharrows are not dedicated bicycle facilities and should serve as a last resort. While basic sharrows or signed neighborhood routes may be acceptable on low-speed, low-stress residential streets, they are entirely inadequate for high-speed arterials like Stevens Creek or De Anza. On major corridors, we must commit to physical, grade-separated, or buffered infrastructure.
Do you think the Bike Ped Commission's duties should be folded into the Planning Commission's mission, or become a subentity of the Planning Commission (like a committee), or a remain independent? Do you think that the Planning Commission should be a second reviewer on all Bike/Ped projects? Why or why not?	The Bicycle Pedestrian Commission should remain an independent body. Land-use decisions under the Planning Commission require a different focus than specialized active transportation planning. Making the Planning Commission a secondary reviewer for every bike/ped project would add unnecessary administrative delay and duplicate review cycles, given that projects already receive final review and approval from the City Council.
The data on the newly installed separated buffered bike lanes on DeAnza Boulevard shows that they reduced accidents by half compared to prior years, and decreased travel time for cars. This is one example of how separated lanes improve safety for all residents and do not reduce car throughput. Other studies and data show they do not harm emergency response time. How have you supported separated bike lane projects in Cupertino, and how will you in the future to gain these benefits for residents?	The safety improvements on De Anza Boulevard demonstrate that well-engineered, separated bike lanes increase safety for all road users while preserving traffic flow. As a long-time resident, civil engineer, and parent whose children walked and biked to local public schools, I fully support expanding protected multimodal infrastructure. Safe routes to school are essential—our children deserve to travel to school safely, and delivering safe infrastructure is a fundamental duty of local government.
Eighty percent of the cost of bike/ped projects in Cupertino have been paid by county, state, and local grants, though often anti-active transportation advocates cite "cost" as the reason not to improve our streets. How would you change this narrative?	We change the narrative by emphasizing fiscal transparency and long-term return on investment. The fact that up to 80% of project costs are covered by outside grant funds is a major asset for Cupertino taxpayers. Building broad consensus requires meeting residents where they are, presenting clear cost-benefit analyses, and showing how external funding preserves local tax dollars while delivering essential safety upgrades for our community.
How have you personally advocated for improved walking or biking in Cupertino or the surrounding areas? Examples could include specific Safe Routes to School work (not just attending meetings), supporting new infrastructure through signing a petition, or advocating for improvements by speaking as a resident at a City Council or at a Bicycle Pedestrian Commission meeting.	My career has centered on public infrastructure engineering, community leadership, and youth mentorship. As a local Cubmaster and former Chamber President, I have support safe, family-friendly public infrastructure. Moving forward—both as a candidate and as a resident—I am committed to actively championing safe routes to school and modernizing our city’s active transportation network.
The City's 2024 Vision Zero Plan states the city should "Prioritize multimodal safety and quality of service over...on-street parking." All improvement projects are different, but can you give an example of a past or future project with the removal of on-street parking which you support?	Trade-offs between street parking and safety must be evaluated on a project-by-project basis using objective safety data, business access needs, and traffic volumes. Where high-injury corridor data shows that reallocating curb space saves lives—especially near schools or high-density transit corridors—I support prioritizing physical safety improvements over underutilized on-street parking.