

AGENDA

The next meeting of the
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BPAC)
will be as follows.

Date: Thursday, March 26, 2015
7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
Place: San Mateo City Hall
330 West 20th Avenue,
San Mateo, California
Conference Room C

PLEASE CALL ELLEN BARTON (599-1420) IF YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND.

- | | | | |
|-----|--|---|------------|
| 1. | Call To Order | Action
(Horsley) | |
| 3. | Public Comment On Items Not On The Agenda | Presentations are
limited to 3 minutes
per speaker. | |
| 4. | Minutes of the February 26, 2015 Meeting | Action
(Horsley) | Pages 3-5 |
| 5. | Highway 101/ Woodside Road Interchange Project
Presentation | Information
(Krupka) | |
| 6. | Transportation Development Act Article 3
FY 15/16 project scoring and ranking and
recommendation of a final project list for the
C/CAG Board of Directors for funding | Action
(Horsley) | Pages 6-10 |
| 9. | Member Communications | Information
(Horsley) | |
| 10. | Adjournment | Action
(Horsley) | |

NOTE: All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Committee. Actions recommended by staff are subject to change by the Committee.

Other enclosures/Correspondence

- None.

If you have any questions regarding the C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda, please contact Ellen Barton at (650) 599-1420.

NOTE: Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services in attending and participating in this meeting should contact the C/CAG Administrator at 650 599-1406, five working days prior to the meeting date.

The following BPAC meeting will be held on Thursday May 28th, 2015.

**City/County Association of Governments
of San Mateo County (C/CAG)**

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
Meeting Minutes
February 26, 2015**

Members present:

Marge Colapietro	Eric Reed
Don Horsley	Laurence May
Karyl Matsumoto	Karen Ervin
Andrew Boone	Julia Dzierwa
Frank Markowitz	Daina Lujan
Jeffrey Tong	Matthew Self
Meredith Schneider	

Members absent:

Matt Grocott	Ken Ibarra
--------------	------------

Public Attendees:

Emma Shlaes, Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition
Ken Chin, City of San Mateo
Bill Huber, resident of San Mateo County
Al Meckler, South San Francisco resident
Cecily Harris, San Mateo County Parks Department
Lawrence Henriquez, City of South San Francisco
Cassandra Woo, City of South San Francisco
Diana Shu, San Mateo County Public Works
Mario Ung, City of San Mateo
Andrew Poster, Town of Atherton Public Works
Fernando Bravo, Mark Thomas Company
Kirsten Pringle, San Mateo County Office of Sustainability
Shirley Chan, City of Daly City
Dong Nguyen, Town of Woodside
Grace Le, City of San Carlos
Kaveh Farouhi, City of San Carlos

Staff Attending:

Ellen Barton, C/CAG
Tom Madalena, C/CAG

1. Call to Order

Chair pro-tem Markowitz called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.
New members of the committee introduced themselves.

2. Public Comment On Items Not On the Agenda

Bill Huber, a resident of San Mateo County, presented information on Highway 1 sight-distance limitations in an area south of Pacifica that create concerns for cycling safety. He suggested installation of a cyclist-activated warning light at strategic locations and requested the topic be added to a future BPAC agenda.

3. Nomination and Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

Ellen Barton gave a short summary of the duties of the Chair and Vice-Chair. There were no public comments on this agenda item. Chair Markowitz invited nominations from the floor, noting that nominations do not require a second. Member Dzierwa nominated Don Horsley as Chair. There were no other nominations.

Motion: Member Dzierwa nominated Member Horsley. Elected unanimously.

Chair Horsley called for nominations for Vice Chair. Frank Markowitz nominated Marge Colapietro for Vice Chair. There were no other nominations.

Motion: Member Markowitz nominated Member Colapietro. Elected unanimously.

4. Minutes of the August 28, 2014 Meeting

Motion: Vice Chair Colapietro moved/member Lujan seconded approval of the August 28, 2014 minutes. Motion carried unanimously.

5. Transportation Development Act Article 3 (TDA3) FY 15/16 Project Applicant Presentations

Review and evaluation of TDA3 project applications is a main responsibility of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee. BPAC members received printed copies of the fourteen (14) grant proposals, with score sheets, prior to the meeting. Presentations made during the meeting are an opportunity to ensure clear understanding of the projects. BPAC members had opportunities to ask clarifying questions of the presenters in order to assist with scoring. Presentations were limited to 10 minutes each, including time for questions. BPAC members were reminded they will have the opportunity to view project sites on a site tour later in the month. Scoring of the projects will take place at the April meeting.

Presentations were made on the following projects:

- Cecily Harris, Crystal Springs Regional Trail, County of San Mateo Parks Department
- Diana Shu, Sand Hill Road/280 Interchange, County of San Mateo Public Works
- Lawrence Henriquez, Hickey and Linden projects, City of South San Francisco
- Andrew Poster, Complete Streets and Oakwood Avenue projects, Town of Atherton
- Kirsten Pringle, Bicycle Education, County of San Mateo Office of Sustainability

- Kaveh Farouhi, Highway 101 Overcrossing, City of San Carlos
- Shirley Chan, Westmoor Avenue Project, Daly City
- Dong Ngyuen, Multi-use Pathway, Town of Woodside
- Mario Ung, San Mateo Drive, City of San Mateo

Member Ervin briefly described the Pacifica Rockaway Beach Trail project.

Clarification was made to ensure consistent understanding of the point award for percentage of match provided: a dollar-for-dollar 100% match is eligible for award of full points and adjustment should be made on the score sheet. There is no requirement for match for capital projects.

By a show of hands, the Committee members chose Saturday, March 21 as the date for the tour of project sites.

6. Review and approval of the BPAC Meeting Calendar for 2015

Motion: Member Lujan moved/member Colapietro seconded approval of the BPAC Meeting Calendar for 2015. Motion carried unanimously.

7. Member Communications

Ellen Barton announced that the C/CAG Board policy stipulates that attendance at 75% of committee meetings is required. An attendance report is provided to the Board at the end of each year for review and possible action.

8. Adjournment

Chair Horsley adjourned the meeting at 9:35 pm.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: March 26, 2015

To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

From: Ellen Barton

Subject: Transportation Development Act Article 3 FY 15/16 project scoring and ranking and recommendation of a final project list for the C/CAG Board of Directors for funding

(For further information or questions contact Ellen Barton at 599-1420)

RECOMMENDATION

That the BPAC score and rank the Transportation Development Act Article 3 FY 15/16 proposed projects and recommend a final project list for the C/CAG Board of Directors approval for funding.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is an estimated \$1,500,000 available for the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Program Call for Projects for the FY 15/16 cycle.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

- TDA Article 3 funds are derived from the following sources:
 - Local Transportation Funds (LTF), derived from a ¼ cent of the general sales tax collected statewide
 - State Transit Assistance fund (STA), derived from the statewide sales tax on gasoline and diesel fuel.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

At this meeting the BPAC will be providing the scores for each of the project applications submitted for the Transportation Development Act Article 3 Program. BPAC members will have an opportunity to discuss each project as we tally the scores together for the final project ranking and recommendation of funding for the C/CAG Board of Directors.

C/CAG issued a call for projects for the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Program on October 10, 2014. The TDA Article 3 Program call for projects included both the capital and planning project components. A total of \$1,300,000 is available for all project types including capital projects and \$200,000 is available for planning and/or bicycle education projects. The initial application deadline was Monday January 12, 2015. The deadline was extended to Tuesday, February 17, 2015 at 5:00 pm . Staff received 13 applications for capital projects and 1 application for a bicycle education project. The total amount requested for all of the proposed TDA Article 3 Program projects is \$3,199,800. There is an estimated total of

\$1,500,000 available for the current TDA Article 3 Program funding cycle.

Jurisdictions are limited to receive a maximum allocation of \$400,000 through this TDA funding cycle. This \$400,000 maximum includes both capital and planning projects. The maximum amount a jurisdiction may receive for a planning project is \$100,000, and planning projects require a dollar-for-dollar match.

Staff recommendation for the BPAC is to score, rank, and recommend a final project list for the C/CAG Board of Directors approval. BPAC members are to score and rank the project proposals before the meeting and bring their scores with them to the meeting. At the meeting the members will present their scores and the BPAC will determine if the projects merit funding.

ATTACHMENTS

- TDA Article 3 FY 15/16 Project Applications List
- TDA Article 3 FY 15/16 Scoring Sheet

TDA Article 3 Fiscal Year 2015/2016 Project Applications

Jurisdiction	Capital Project Description	Amount Requested	Project Type
Town of Atherton	City wide Class III Bike Paths (Various Streets in Atherton)	\$50,000	Capital
Town of Atherton	Middlefield Road and Oak Grove Avenue Complete Street Improvements	\$124,200	Capital
City of Daly City	Westmoor Avenue to Guadalupe Parkway Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements	\$277,000	Capital
City of East Palo Alto	Garden Street Safe Routes to School Improvements	\$332,550	Capital
Town of Hillsborough	Eucalyptus Trail Project	\$400,000	Capital
City of San Carlos	Highway 101 Pedestrian/Bicycle Overcrossing	\$400,000	Capital
City of Pacifica	Rockaway Beach to Pacifica State Beach Class I Multipurpose Trail Rehabilitation	\$250,000	Capital
City of San Mateo	San Mateo Drive Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvement Project Peninsula to Baldwin	\$400,000	Capital
City of South San Francisco	Hickey Boulevard and Junipero Serra Boulevard Pedestrian Improvements	\$100,000	Capital
City of South San Francisco	Linden Avenue Complete Streets Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Improvements	\$400,000	Capital
Town of Woodside	Woodside School Multi-use Pathway	\$195,000	Capital
County of San Mateo - Parks	Complete the Gap Crystal Springs Regional Trail	\$100,000	Capital
County of San Mateo - Public Works	Bicycle Lane Improvements/Additions Sand Hill Road near I-280	\$150,000	Capital
County of San Mateo - Sustainability	Bicycle Routes and Rules	\$21,050	Bicycle Education
Total Amount Requested		\$3,199,800	

C/CAG OF SAN MATEO COUNTY
TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ARTICLE 3
PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE PROGRAM

FISCAL YEAR 2015/2016
PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

Applicant Agency:	Rater Name:
I. Project Title:	Project type: (check one) <input type="checkbox"/> Capital <input type="checkbox"/> Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Educ.

II. Project Screening: (Note: a "No" answer in this section will disqualify project)		
a. Eligible jurisdiction: City, County of San Mateo, or joint powers agency in San Mateo County	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
b. Meets applicable Caltrans standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes or NA	<input type="checkbox"/> No
c. CEQA approval, if applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes or NA	<input type="checkbox"/> No
d. BAC established or in progress	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No

	Scale	Maximum Points <small>(shaded areas: Capital Projects only)</small>	Points Assigned
III. Clear and Complete Proposal			
a. Degree to which proposal is clear and complete	0 = Incomplete description, missing documentation 1-5 = Clear project description 5-10 = Clear and complete scope and documentation	10	
<i>Subtotal:</i>		<i>Max. 10</i>	

IV. State of Readiness For Capital Projects only: (Note: if Exempt or Not Applicable, eligible for full points)			
a. Right-of-Way degree to which R.O.W. is secured	0 = R.O.W. not certified, not started 1-3 = R.O.W. partially secured 4 = R.O.W. certification complete	4	
b. Permits obtained degree to which permits are in place	0 = No agreements or permits in place 1-2 = Some permits in place 3 = All permits and agreements complete	3	
c. Design status: degree to which design is complete	0 = Design not started 1 - 2 = Design in progress 3 = Design complete	3	
<i>Subtotal:</i>		<i>Max. 10</i>	

V. Community Support For all projects types:			
a. Meets BAC requirements	0 = No BAC 2 = BAC established or in process	2	
b. Project approved by BAC or other group(s)	0 = No support 1 - 5 = Support from other groups 6 - 10 = Support from BAC <u>and</u> group(s)	10	
c. Local Cash Match <small>(Note: Planning and Education projects must show dollar-for-dollar match to be eligible)</small>	0 = 0% match 6 = 30% match 2 = 10% match 8 = 40% match 4 = 20% match 10 = 50% match	10	
<i>Subtotal:</i>		<i>Max. 22</i>	

	Scale	Maximum Points Capital	Max Points Plan/Ed	Points Assigned
.VI. Meets Program Objectives				
<p><i>For All Projects:</i></p> <p>a. Project Need: Degree to which problems, need, and issues are described, urgent and documented</p>	<p>0 = No need demonstrated 1-5 = Moderate description of need or problem 6-10 = Documented need, data cited 11-20 = Effective/proven strategy</p>	20		
<p><i>For Plan or Education Projects only:</i></p> <p>b. Score reflects how many and how well the following items are addressed:</p> <p>___ Previous preparation ___ Accomplishments to date ___ Scope detail ___ Budget and tasks ___ Schedule ___ Researched methods ___ Commitment of staff ___ Defined deliverables ___ Outreach methods ___ Partnerships ___ Data collection/evaluation</p>	<p>0 = No detailed scope 1-5 = Addresses scope, budget, tasks</p> <p>Add up to 3 points for each item addressed in list at left using the following scale:</p> <p>1 point = briefly addressed 2 points = adequately addressed 3 points = addressed well, in detail</p>		38	
<p>c. <i>For Capital Projects Only (c – h):</i> Safety: degree of reduction in injury risk</p>	<p>0 = no documentation of risk reduction 1 – 4 = Moderate collision risk reduction 5 – 8 = Documented crash risk reduction 9 – 13 = Severe injury crash history, effective strategy</p>	13		
<p>d. High use activity centers</p>	<p>0 = no activity centers in proximity 2 - 3 = moderate number of activity centers accessed, or trips served 4 -5 = high number of activity centers and trips served</p>	5		
<p>e. Pedestrian facility</p>	<p>0 = does not provide pedestrian facility 5 = provides a pedestrian facility</p>	5		
<p>f. Transportation purpose</p>	<p>0 = facility serves recreational uses exclusively 1 – 2 = serves mainly recreational uses 3 - 4 = serves both transportation and recreation purposes 5 = serves mainly transportation trips</p>	5		
<p>g. Connection to network</p>	<p>0 = does not connect to network 1 -2 = connects to local network 3 = connects to regional network</p>	3		
<p>h. Consistent with plans</p>	<p>0 = not included in local or regional plans 1-3 = included in some local plans 4-6 = priority in some local plans 7 = included in CBPP regional plan</p>	7		
<i>Subtotal:</i>		<i>max 58</i>	<i>max 58</i>	
Total Score: <i>(Maximum total points: 100)</i>				