Outlook

FW: Item 5.2 Resolution Establishing Speed Limits

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Mon 8/25/2025 7:41 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: Ryan Globus [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2025 6:57 AM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Item 5.2 Resolution Establishing Speed Limits

[**External Email**. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. Learn more]

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

Mayor and City Councilmembers,

Please support the resolution to reduce speed limits on various streets. Last year I was hit by a car while riding my bike, and the only reason I am alive today is that the car wasn't going much faster. Reducing speed limits will save lives.

Please consider adding Park Ave to your list of streets to reduce speed limits, now or in the future. Right now it's 30 in many stretches (and cars go 35-40+), but it should be 20 or 25. There are a lot of people walking/biking to Diridon, senior apartments, small businesses, homes, etc. The current speed limit is too fast and dangerous for Park Ave.

Thanks,
Ryan Globus
D6 Resident

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Outlook

FW: Public comment regarding "Item 5.2 Resolution Establishing Speed Limits"

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Mon 8/25/2025 2:01 PM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: Ian Emmons <[redacted]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2025 1:33 PM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Public comment regarding "Item 5.2 Resolution Establishing Speed Limits"

[**External Email**. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. Learn more]

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

I live on 11th street and as a local resident I fully support lowering the speed limit. Even a 5 mile change makes a huge difference. Hopefully this will help prevent some of the speed related accidents that regularly occur in front of my house.
Thanks again for your support.

-Ian Emmons
[redacted]

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Outlook

FW: public comment on Item 5.2 - Resolution Establishing Speed Limits

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 7:11 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: Deanna Chevas [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2025 7:21 PM
To: District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: public comment on Item 5.2 - Resolution Establishing Speed Limits

[**External Email**. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. Learn more]

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

Hello City of San Jose Council Clerk,

Please include my comment on item 5.2 at the Aug 26, 2025 meeting of the city council.

I am a resident of district 6 who bikes for transportation and very much supports lowering speed limits on any and all surface streets.

Since we know that people generally do not comply with posted speed limits I hope you will add traffic calming elements as well to encourage drivers to slow down.

Thank you for your efforts to keep our residents and visitors safe.

Best,
Deanna Chevas

about.me/DChevas

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Outlook

FW: Support for staff recommendation Item 5.2 "Resolution Establishing Speed Limits." Council 8/26

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 7:13 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: Jordan Moldow [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 12:18 AM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>; Ristow, John <John.Ristow@sanjoseca.gov>; Cruz, Lam <lam.cruz@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Support for staff recommendation Item 5.2 "Resolution Establishing Speed Limits." Council 8/26

[**External Email**. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. Learn more]

I support all the proposed speed limit reductions, and encourage Council to adopt the staff recommendation. Thank you to DOT for bringing these recommendations forwards.

This is one (of many) critical piece of the Vision Zero Action Plan. Safe streets advocates gave strong feedback throughout the Vision Zero Action Plan drafting process, that AB 43 speed limit reductions needed to be aggressively utilized. I am thrilled to see that begin to be realized today. I hope this is but the first of many such adjustments.

The Vision Zero Action Plan adopted the Safe Systems Approach, which emphasizes the role that physical infrastructure designs plays in driver behavior. As we all know too well, speed limit signs are not physical infrastructure, and drivers routinely violate them. So then why is it still worthwhile to lower the speed limits?

- Speed kills. Whether the vehicle was illegally speeding is irrelevant: getting hit at 40mph will do the same amount of damage regardless of the posted limit. By lowering speed limits, we close the gap between "speeding" and "fatal speeds".
- The speed camera pilot can only issue fines for going 11mph over the speed limit, which is a huge amount of wiggle room. With a 5mph decrease in the speed limit, we'll be able to enforce at 6mph above the old speed limit.
- Speed limits convey values. The less excessive the speed limit, the more we convey that pedestrians and cyclists have a right to be present on the road and the right to get around safely.
- If speed limits decrease but speeds stay the same, it is a strong signal that physical infrastructure changes are needed to slow the actual speeds. Future redesigns will have a design speed that matches the lower limit.
- On a one-lane road or a crowded two-lane road, you just need a single driver to willingly obey the speed limit, and then every car behind them will be forced to also obey the speed limit.
- Studies show that decreasing limits by 5mph will not likely lead to actual speeds decreasing by 5mph, but they will lead to some decrease. Every decrease in speed helps, and lowering the limits is a quick win.

This action should occur before activation of the speed cameras, so it is important to improve today's staff recommendation as-is. However, I would like to see some additional work in the near future:

- For segment A10. Monterey Road – Bernal Road to Blossom Hill Road (District 2), lower the speed limit to 45mph, utilizing CVC 22358.7. All of the other segments in today's action are already 45mph or lower today, and being decreased to 40mph or lower. Segment A10 is faster than all of these by a huge margin. The speeds on all segments of Monterey are excessive, and it is an extremely uncomfortable place to bike and walk. Lowering its limit to 45mph will bring it closer to that of segment A11. Monterey Rd – Capitol Ex to Tully Rd (CD 7), which will be 40mph after this action.
- There are still many segments (including entire corridors) of safety corridors that haven't been slowed down yet. Let's use AB 43 to its maximum potential for our Vision Zero corridors.
- Please also utilize CVC 22358.7 for non- safety corridors with "high concentrations of bicyclists or pedestrians".

Thanks,
Jordan Moldow (speaking on his own behalf)
Chair of the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (for identification purposes only)
District 3, 95112, Japantown

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Outlook

FW: 5.2 August 26 city council agenda

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 8:36 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: Ruth Callahan [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 8:33 AM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: 5.2 August 26 city council agenda

[**External Email**. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. Learn more]

Please be advised the speed reduction on Camden/ Hillsdale is unnecessary and will increase traffic congestion and fuel road rage.
The city is reducing the limit by 20 miles an hour which is outrageous to the continuity of our communities.
Camden/ Hillsdale/ Branham are major arteries and not retail or pedestrian trails.
This city's vice mayor and her ilk of anti-car, anti-transportation, and forced petty tyrannies to alter ever aspect of our daily lives down to the minutiae of unnecessarily increasing time and aggregation in the execution of traversing major arteries in the city is a targeted maco-aggression.
The blight of orange bollards on Hillsdale and restriction of the residents being able to turn into their residential block wasn't enough?
The reduction of parking and loss of right hand turns on Cherry and Branham was dangerous and ineffective. Was that not enough?
The bollards on Pearl and Branham
restricts lane changes into the left hand turn access and cause danger to drivers. Was that not enough?
This change is a targeted maco-aggression against commuters and families.
It will be unenforceable and ignored.
Who's going to police it? Speed cameras? Fat chance! The ACLU and your radical left communities will sue?
Wait until your East Side residents complain about the marginalization of their communities.
Furthermore, SJC ' s magnificent 7 traffic enforcement team are not present enough to handle the expected wholesale ignoring of a 20 mph section of a road on the cities major arteries.
Vice Mayor Foley and the radical left marxist agenda of Campos, Ortiz, Candelles continue to be detrimental in our political representation and civil liberties protections.
The City Management is flawed and failing and this is what your focused on. Tragic but predictable with a radicalized markist staff hell bent on making our lives miserable.
Your SJPD can't even enforce parking and code laws. This will be a joke .

Ruth A Callahan

[redacted]

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Outlook

FW: Letter of Support for Item 5.2 Resolution Establishing Speed Limits

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 10:22 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: Jay Newman <[redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 10:21 AM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Letter of Support for Item 5.2 Resolution Establishing Speed Limits

[**External Email**. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. Learn more]

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

City Council of San Jose,

This letter is in support of Item 5.2 Resolution Establishing Speed Limits within designated Safe Corridors in the City of San Jose. This 5 mile per hour reduction is the maximum speed limits on streets such as Blossom Hill, Monterey, Quimby, Stevens Creek, Tully, and Camden is long overdue and important in encouraging active transportation, increasing safety and improving the environment of adjacent neighborhoods and businesses. I bike regularly on many of these streets both for transportation and recreation and cannot overestimate how important lower speed limits would increase both the enjoyment and safety of this mode of transportation.

I sincerely hope this measure passes to make this city a better place to walk, bike and live.

Sincerely,

Jay Newman
[redacted]

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.