

Answers to WBC 2026 Walking and Biking Survey by Candidate Mark Fantozzi

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.	While Cupertino has made important investments in bike lanes, trails, and Safe Routes to School, I believe the city's highest-priority pedestrian and bicycle safety project should be improving the corridor around Stevens Creek Boulevard and De Anza Boulevard, particularly the intersections serving schools, transit riders, cyclists, and shoppers. This area experiences some of the highest volumes of pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicle traffic in Cupertino, creating numerous conflict points. To better protect residents and advance our Vision Zero goals, I would support a comprehensive safety project that includes: • Protected bike lanes separated from vehicle traffic on key approaches. • Protected intersections with dedicated bicycle signal phases to reduce conflicts with turning vehicles. • Shorter pedestrian crossings through curb extensions and pedestrian refuge islands. • High-visibility crosswalks and improved lighting to increase visibility during evening hours. • Leading pedestrian intervals (LPIs) that give pedestrians a head start before vehicles receive a green light. • Better connections between the corridor, nearby neighborhoods, schools, transit stops, and the regional bicycle network. • I prioritize this location because it serves residents of all ages, including students, seniors, commuters, and families. Investing in proven safety improvements here would reduce the likelihood of severe collisions while encouraging more people to walk and bike for everyday trips. By focusing on high-injury and high-activity corridors, Cupertino can make meaningful progress toward achieving its Vision Zero objectives and creating safer streets for everyone. Public statements and actions: <i>We have no record of Mark's involvement in any advocacy, for or against, regarding walking and biking in Cupertino. He is running as a single candidate not associated with any slate.</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?	I understand the frustration of residents who supported the Bollinger Road study. When a corridor has experienced multiple fatalities and persistent safety concerns, the appropriate response is not to stop examining the problem but to better understand it and identify solutions. I would support restarting the evaluation process and prioritizing near-term safety improvements while longer-term plans are developed. We should use available data, traffic engineering expertise, and community input to determine the most effective interventions, whether that means safer crossings, traffic calming, protected bike facilities, improved lighting, or intersection redesigns. Residents deserve to know that their concerns are being heard and acted upon. My commitment would be to maintain transparency, regularly communicate progress, and ensure Bollinger Road remains a priority until meaningful safety improvements are delivered.
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?	Vision Zero is more than an aspirational statement. If Cupertino has committed to eliminating traffic fatalities and serious injuries by 2040, then our planning, funding, and project ranking systems must reflect that commitment. If the criteria in the 2026 Active Transportation Plan result in projects on streets with the highest concentrations of fatalities and serious injuries being ranked too low to be implemented, then there is a clear disconnect between our stated goals and our decision-making process. I would support revisiting the project scoring methodology to ensure that demonstrated safety risk and crash history receive greater weight in project prioritization. At the same time, I recognize that project selection should consider multiple factors, including equity, connectivity, feasibility, cost, and community support. The solution is not to ignore those considerations, but to ensure that corridors with the greatest safety risks are treated as a priority rather than competing on equal footing with projects that primarily provide convenience or recreation benefits. I would advocate for a "Vision Zero Priority Network" that guarantees focused investment on streets with the highest rates of fatal and severe crashes. Projects on these corridors should receive expedited review, dedicated funding strategies, and regular public progress reporting. If necessary, the city should pursue a phased approach, implementing lower-cost improvements such as signal timing changes, speed management measures, upgraded crossings, and quick-build safety treatments while pursuing larger capital projects. Ultimately, success should be measured not by the number of plans we adopt, but by reductions in fatalities and serious injuries. If our current rankings do not support achieving our Vision Zero goals, then the rankings should be adjusted. The purpose of the Active Transportation Plan should be to help deliver Vision Zero, not unintentionally prevent it.
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?	I support using data, engineering best practices, and measurable safety outcomes to guide transportation investments. Based on current guidance and research, sharrows can play a role in helping cyclists navigate low-speed, low-volume neighborhood streets, but they should not be relied upon as a primary safety treatment on corridors where people are expected to ride alongside significant vehicle traffic. If the Active Transportation Plan relies heavily on bike boulevards consisting primarily of signage and sharrows, I would review whether those projects are being ranked appropriately and whether they meaningfully advance the city's Vision Zero goals. Where safety improvements are needed, the city should prioritize infrastructure that provides greater protection and comfort for riders, such as protected bike lanes, separated bikeways, traffic-calming measures, safer intersections, and enhanced crossing treatments. I do not believe success should be measured by the number of miles of bicycle facilities shown on a map. Success should be measured by whether more residents, including children, seniors, and less confident riders, can travel safely and comfortably without fear of serious injury. For streets identified as high-priority bicycle routes, I would seek to replace or supplement sharrow-only projects with facilities that better align with current best practices and state guidance. Where physical separation is not immediately feasible, the city should explore phased approaches that combine traffic calming, speed reduction, intersection improvements, and quick-build safety treatments while working toward more permanent infrastructure. Ultimately, the Active Transportation Plan should prioritize projects that demonstrably improve safety, increase ridership, and help achieve our Vision Zero commitments. If evidence shows that certain treatments are not delivering those outcomes, we should be willing to adjust the plan and invest in solutions that do.
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?	I believe the Bike/Ped Commission should remain an independent commission. Safe walking, biking, and active transportation issues deserve focused attention from commissioners who can develop expertise in these areas and provide detailed recommendations to the City Council. At the same time, I believe the Planning Commission has an important role to play when projects affect the city's broader transportation network, development patterns, circulation plans, or public infrastructure. Many land use and development decisions have significant impacts on pedestrian and bicycle connectivity, so coordination between the two commissions is essential. Rather than folding the Bike/Ped Commission into the Planning Commission or making it a subordinate committee, I would favor a model where the Bike/Ped Commission serves as the primary subject-matter reviewer for bicycle and pedestrian projects, while the Planning Commission provides a second review for projects with substantial planning, development, or transportation system implications. This approach preserves the Bike/Ped Commission's independent voice while ensuring projects are evaluated through both a mobility and a citywide planning lens. It also helps identify potential conflicts, improve project design, and build broader community consensus before recommendations move to the City Council. Ultimately, I view the two commissions as complementary rather than duplicative. The goal should be better coordination, not consolidation. Maintaining an independent Bike/Ped Commission while encouraging Planning Commission review of significant projects would provide stronger oversight and lead to better outcomes for residents.
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?	I have not been actively involved in the De Anza project, but as a transportation professional I appreciate the importance of evaluating projects based on objective performance data. The reported safety improvements demonstrate why it is important to test, measure, and learn from completed projects rather than rely solely on assumptions or perceptions. In the future, I will apply my transportation engineering background to identify locations where separated bicycle facilities can improve safety and network connectivity while maintaining efficient operations for all road users. I support a data-driven approach that measures outcomes, engages the community, and prioritizes projects that deliver demonstrable benefits. If separated bike lanes continue to show positive results in Cupertino, they should remain an important tool in our transportation toolkit. We are looking for a candidate who can take a stance on these issues, instead of being noncommittal.
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?	I would shift the narrative toward transparent safety engineering principles and proactive community engagement. Cost concerns are legitimate, and residents deserve clear explanations of how grants offset capital expenses and how projects are prioritized using measurable criteria such as conflict point reduction, sight distance improvements, and emergency access reliability. My support for bicycle transportation is rooted in system wide risk reduction, but project selection must also reflect the needs of larger populations and higher risk corridors. To change the narrative, I would expand outreach—meeting residents where they are, explaining funding sources, sharing safety data, and listening to concerns about emergency response, traffic flow, and neighborhood impacts. When people understand both the engineering basis and the community benefits, we can build trust and demonstrate that bike and pedestrian improvements are practical, cost effective components of a broader mobility strategy that serves the entire city.
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 most direct involvement was serving on the Cupertino Bicycle Commission approximately 20 years ago, during the early discussions and planning efforts that helped shape Cupertino's Safe Routes to School vision. At that time, I supported efforts to improve safety and accessibility for students walking and biking to school, and I was encouraged to see the city begin developing a more comprehensive approach to active transportation. Since then, my professional responsibilities have focused on managing large transportation projects throughout the Bay Area, which has limited my direct participation in local advocacy activities. However, that work has given me extensive experience in transportation planning, traffic operations, safety analysis, project delivery, and stakeholder engagement. I have worked on projects that balance the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, and motorists, and I bring that perspective to local transportation issues. I believe my transportation engineering and project management background allows me to contribute in a different but valuable way. I understand how transportation projects move from concept to implementation, how safety improvements are evaluated, and how to develop practical solutions that can achieve community goals. Going forward, I look forward to being more actively engaged in Cupertino's transportation discussions and applying both my previous Bicycle Commission experience and my decades of professional transportation experience to support safer walking and bicycling facilities throughout the city.
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?	I support the goal of improving safety for all road users, but I do not believe there is a one-size-fits-all approach to every street. While there are situations where removing on-street parking is appropriate and necessary to achieve significant safety improvements, there are also corridors where parking plays an important role in supporting local businesses, providing accessibility for seniors and people with mobility limitations, and maintaining the economic vitality of commercial districts. As a transportation professional, I believe every project should be evaluated on its specific merits and constraints. If data show that on-street parking is creating a substantial safety risk that cannot be adequately addressed through other design measures, then I would support its removal. For example, I could support removing a limited amount of parking near a high-risk intersection, school crossing, or commercial driveway if doing so would improve sight distance, shorten pedestrian crossings, or create a safer bicycle facility with a demonstrated safety benefit. However, I would not support removing parking simply because it is viewed as a lower priority in principle. In many commercial areas, parking is an important community asset, particularly where private parking supplies are limited. The city should carefully evaluate impacts on businesses and seek solutions that improve safety while preserving access whenever possible. My approach would be to first consider alternatives such as intersection redesign, signal improvements, traffic calming, loading zone management, curb-use optimization, or targeted parking removal at specific conflict points before eliminating significant amounts of on-street parking along an entire corridor. Ultimately, I see this as a balance rather than an absolute choice. We should strive to improve multimodal safety, but we should also recognize the role that convenient access and parking can play in supporting local businesses and community destinations. The best projects are those that advance safety while minimizing unnecessary impacts on economic activity and neighborhood accessibility.