

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

AGENDA

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BPAC)

Date: Thursday, January 26, 2017
7:00 p.m.

Place: San Mateo City Hall
Conference Room C
330 West 20th Avenue
San Mateo, CA 94403

- | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. | Call To Order | Action
(Colapietro) | |
| 2. | Public Comment On Items Not On The Agenda | Limited to 3 minutes
per speaker. | |
| 3. | Meeting Minutes of August 25, 2016 | Action
(Colapietro) | Pages 1-3 |
| 4. | Meeting Summary of October 27, 2016 | Information
(Yu) | Pages 4-5 |
| 5. | Form a BPAC Complete Street Checklist Review
Working Group | Action
(Yu) | Pages 6-16 |
| 6. | Project applicant presentations for the Bicycle and
Pedestrian Improvement Program under the
OneBayArea Grant 2 (OBAG2) Program | Information
(Yu) | Pages 17-18 |
| 7. | Member Communications | Information
(Colapietro) | |
| 8. | Adjournment | Action
(Colapietro) | |

If you have any questions regarding the C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda, please contact Eliza Yu at (650) 599-1453 or eyu@smcgov.org.

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

The next BPAC meeting will be held on Thursday, February 23, 2017.

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

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

Meeting Minutes

August 25, 2016

Members Present:

Marge Colapietro	Marina Fraser
Karyl Matsumoto	Karen Ervin
Jeffrey Tong	Rob Lawson
Ken Ibarra	Ann Schneider

Members absent:

Eric Reed	Daina Lujan
Gary Pollard	Don Horsley
Matthew Self	

Public Attendees:

Trieu Tran, City of San Mateo
Michael Dietz, City of Redwood City

Staff Attending:

Eliza Yu, C/CAG
Tom Madalena, C/CAG
Jean Higaki, C/CAG

1. Call to Order

Chair Colapietro called the meeting to order at 7:09 pm.

2. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda

There were no public comments.

3. Minutes of the May 26, 2016 Meeting

Chair Colapietro asked Member Matsumoto if she was referring to the C/CAG BPAC or City of South San Francisco's BPAC under Member Communications. Member Matsumoto replied that she was referring to the City of South San Francisco's BPAC.

Motion: Vice Chair Fraser moved/Member Ibarra seconded approval of the May 26, 2016 minutes. The motion carried unanimously.

4. Receive a Presentation on the San Mateo County Safe Routes to School Program for School Year 2015-2016 (Information)

Theresa Vallez-Kelly, Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Coordinator for San Mateo County, presented an overview and accomplishments the San Mateo County SRTS has achieved with San Mateo County's Office of Education this school year. Vallez-Kelly reported that \$349,000 were allocated to 17 grantees. The BPAC received the presentation.

5. Recommendation on modifying the field tours for bicycle and pedestrian grant programs

Tom Madalena presented this item on the field tours for bicycle and pedestrian grant programs. In the past, C/CAG staff typically sets aside a Saturday and organizes a field tour for the BPAC members to meet with project sponsors and view selected project sites. C/CAG staff would like to modify this process and presented two options for the BPAC to consider: (1) Conduct 1-2 Saturday field tours where at least 50% of the BPAC can attend or the field tours will be canceled; (2) Allow project sponsors to expand their presentation to the BPAC and encourage the inclusion of a video tour to be submitted with the application in lieu of field tours.

Member Ibarra asked if C/CAG staff had to eliminate any projects when planning field tours. Madalena replied that typically small projects are taken out then C/CAG Staff selects which tours can fit in an 8-10 hour day. Member Tong voiced that he does not like the idea of small projects being taken out. Trieu Tran, staff from City of San Mateo, spoke in favor of Option 1 saying that it would be a more fair option so that C/CAG staff does not have to hand select projects for the field tours. Vice-Chair Fraser suggested modifying Option 2 to (1) incorporate videos for BPAC members to view prior to project sponsor presentations at their leisure; (2) require each video to be no longer than 5 minutes long.

Motion: In lieu of field tours, the BPAC will expand project sponsor presentations with the inclusion of optional videos (no more than 5 minutes each) to be included in the application process, as stated in Modified Option 2. Member Ervin moved/Member Schneider seconded approval of Modified Option 2. Motion carried unanimously.

6. Receive the revision to the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Framework (Information)

Jean Higaki presented an update to the OBAG 2 Framework. Though the framework was approved at the May 2016 C/CAG Board of Directors Meeting, the federal Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act provided additional STP/CMAQ funds which resulted in an additional \$2.69M for the San Mateo County share. As a result, the BPIP allocation amount has increased from \$5,421,000 to \$5,926,000. The revised OBAG 2 framework was adopted at the August 2016 C/CAG Board of Directors Meeting.

7. Receive the Board approved definition of "proximate access" as it relates to Priority Development Areas in the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Program (Information)

Jean Higaki presented the Board approved definition of proximate access. At the May 2016 BPAC meeting, Higaki brought the "proximate access" definition to the BPAC for consideration and a motion was made to raise the ½ mile radius of a PDA boundary to 1 mile. At the June 2016 Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (CMP TAC) meeting and the Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee meeting, the CMP TAC and the CMEQ recommended approval of the definition as modified by the BPAC. At the August 2016 C/CAG Board of Directors Meeting, the C/CAG Board approved and adopted the modified definition of proximate access recommended by the BPAC, CMP TAC and CMEQ.

8. Review and recommend approval of the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program (BPIP) Call for Projects

On July, 27, 2016, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) adopted revisions to the project selection requirements that now require the Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) to adopt a specific scoring methodology for selecting projects within Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or Transit Priority Areas (TPAs) that rewards jurisdictions "with the most effective housing anti-displacement policies". Two options were presented for consideration to address the anti-displacement scoring requirement:

Project is located in a PDA or TPA that has affordable housing preservations strategies and/ or community

stabilization policies.

Option 1: (1-2 policies = 2 pts, 3-6 policies = 3 pts, 7-9 policies = 4 pts, 10-14 policies = 5pts)

Option 2: (1-2 policies = 4 pts, 3-6 policies = 6 pts, 7-9 policies = 8 pts, 10-14 policies = 10 pts) and drop Local Support from 10 pts to 5 pts

Member Lawson requested clarification on how anti-displacement ties in with PDA scoring. Jean Higaki explained that the anti-displacement requirement was developed in response to displacement perceived as a result of directing funding towards PDAs via regional scoring requirements.

Motion: Member Tong moved/Member Schneider seconded approval of Option 1. Motion carried unanimously.

9. Recommendation on the Proposed Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Bicycle and Pedestrian Program schedule for FY 16/17

Tom Madalena reported that the amount of available TDA Article 3 funds for this call is approximately \$1,100,000 and recommends deferring the TDA Article 3 call for projects to Fall of 2017 as to not overlap with the OBAG 2 and Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle 3 Call for Projects that have been released concurrently. If the TDA Article 3 Call for Projects can be deferred to this time, the funds will be rolled over to the following fiscal year and the detailed schedule will be brought to the BPAC by Spring of 2017.

Member Ibarra asked if C/CAG were to do the Call this fiscal year, when would the Call occur. Madalena responded that the Call would be released in October, at the same time as OBAG 2.

Motion: Member Ibarra moved/Member Ervin seconded approval to defer TDA Article 3 Call for Projects to Fall 2017. Motion carried unanimously.

10. Review and approval of the 2017 BPAC Meeting Calendar

Eliza Yu presented the 2017 BPAC Meeting Calendar to the BPAC with the recommendation on having a standing meeting each month with the exception of November and December. This is due BPAC's role to review, score and recommend BPIP projects for OBAG2 which will begin early next year.

Vice-Chair Fraser and Member Schneider initially expressed concern that there are too many scheduled meetings. Tom Madalena replied that we would like to have the BPAC meetings on every committee member's calendar as a placeholder but generally plan to have no more than 5-6 meetings a year.

Motion: Member Ervin moved/Member Schneider seconded approval of the 2017 BPAC Meeting Calendar dates. Motion carried unanimously.

11. Member Communications

Member Schneider shared about her experience attending the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition Conference and would like to organize a meeting with school districts on a regional bike sharing program. Member Matsumoto suggested for Member Schneider to bring this idea to South San Francisco's BPAC.

12. Adjournment

Chair Colapietro called for a motion to adjourn at 9:09 pm.

Motion: Member Lawson moved/Member Matsumoto seconded approval of the motion to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously.

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

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
Meeting Summary
October 27, 2016**

Members Present:

Marge Colapietro	Marina Fraser
Daina Lujan	Karen Ervin
Matthew Self	Ann Schneider

Members absent:

Eric Reed	Karyl Matsumoto
Gary Pollard	Don Horsley
Matthew Self	Jeffrey Tong
Ken Ibarra	

Public Attendees:

Gwen Buckley, San Mateo County
Emma Shales, Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition
Casey Langenberger, Resident of Redwood City

Staff Attending:

Eliza Yu, C/CAG
Tom Madalena, C/CAG
Jean Higaki, C/CAG
Sandy Wong, C/CAG

*No BPAC meeting occurred due to the lack of a quorum. The following is a brief summary of what occurred.

- **Public Workshop for the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG2) Program**

Jean Higaki presented a general overview of the OBAG2 Program by providing background information, call for projects details, who/what projects are eligible for funding, and how projects get selected. The purpose of the public workshop is for members of the public to submit their project ideas by either contacting their city/town directly or by filling out an OBAG2 project idea form at the BPAC meeting that we can then forward to the respective jurisdiction on their behalf. Questions from the BPAC and public included how congestion is being measured, if any submitted project ideas from the public have been implemented, what funding sources are being used for local street maintenance, if a safe routes to school project could apply and how competitive is the call.

- **Presentation on San Mateo County's Health Systems Collisions Report**

Jessica Garner from San Mateo County presented on San Mateo County's Health Collisions Report, or "Get Healthy San Mateo County" (GHSMC). The mission of GHSMC is to support policy change to prevent diseases and ensure everyone has equitable opportunities to live a long and healthy life. GHSMC aims to improve places and build healthy, equitable communities through policy, planning, community implementation funding, research, capacity building, and communication.

- **Presentation on Draft San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan (SMCTP) 2040**

Bill Loudon from DKS Associates presented on the Draft SMCTP 2040. The SMCTP 2040 is a comprehensive, long-range transportation strategy document that will provide a coordinated planning framework for San Mateo County. The SMCTP 2040's vision is to "provide an economically, environmentally, and socially sustainable transportation system that offers practical travel choices, enhances public health through changes in the built environment, and fosters inter-jurisdictional cooperation." Public outreach meetings were held from September 27-29 and the draft SMCTP 2040 document has been posted for public review on the C/CAG website at: <http://ccag.ca.gov/smctp2040/>.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: January 26, 2017
To: C/CAG Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
From: Eliza Yu
Subject: Form a BPAC Complete Street Checklist Review Working Group
(For further information, please contact Eliza Yu at eyu@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the BPAC form a Complete Streets Checklist working group.

FISCAL IMPACT

None

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Not applicable

BACKGROUND

Since 2006, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) has incorporated complete streets concepts to ensure that bicyclists and pedestrians are considered at the earliest conception or design phase of each new project. This has led to the development of the Complete Streets checklist (per Resolution 3765) where all project sponsors are required to complete this checklist in order to apply for regional funds such as the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG2) Program. Complete Streets elements include but are not limited to: bike lanes, sidewalks, bike racks, transit stops, pedestrian signals, street trees, curb ramps and bulb outs.

Resolution 3765's policy states that projects funded all or in part with regional funds (such as federal, State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), bridge tolls) shall consider the accommodation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities. These recommendations shall not replace locally adopted policies regarding transportation planning, design, and construction. These recommendations are intended to facilitate the accommodation of pedestrians, which include wheelchair users, and bicyclist needs into all projects where bicycle and pedestrian travel is consistent with current, adopted regional and local plans. In the absence of such plans, federal, state, and local standards and guidelines should be used to determine appropriate accommodations.

The Complete Streets Project Checklist is intended to evaluate bicycle and pedestrian facility needs and to identify its accommodation associated with regionally funded roadway and transit projects consistent with applicable plans and/or standards. The form is intended for use on projects at their earliest conception or design phase. The Complete Streets Project Checklist website provides the BPAC the opportunity to review projects and to provide input to the project sponsors to ensure that routine accommodation is considered at the earliest stages of project development.

C/CAG Staff recommends that the BPAC forms a Complete Streets Checklist Review Working Group of ideally 3-4 members to review the complete streets checklists for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program (BPIP), Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program, and Local Streets and Roads (LSR) Program on behalf of the BPAC between February and April. These members will go on MTC's Complete Streets Project Checklist website at <http://completestreets.mtc.ca.gov/> and review the complete streets checklists in San Mateo County that were submitted by the BPIP, TLC and LSR project sponsors prior to project selection. Questions and/or comments on the complete streets checklists can be directed to the project sponsors who have listed their point of contact and their contact information for each individual checklist.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Complete Streets Checklist Routine Accommodation Guidance



COMPLETE STREETS CHECKLIST GUIDANCE

<http://completestreets.mtc.ca.gov>

Basic Information

- Project sponsors are responsible for completing checklists and are encouraged to submit completed checklists early in the project conception process. Checklists can only be completed online via the Complete Streets web application: <http://completestreets.mtc.ca.gov/>.
- First-time users will need to create a user account under *Sponsor login*. Contact MTC if your agency is not listed under the *Sponsor* dropdown menu or if you have other questions.
- The checklist should not take long to complete, but you may save your progress and finish the checklist later using the blue *Save* button. Simply log in again when you are ready to finish.
- All projects must complete questions 1-4. Projects requesting funds for Project Specifications and Estimates (PS&E), Preliminary Engineering (PE), Construction (CON) must also answer questions 5-10.
- Checklists are only publicly visible online *after* MTC or a CMA admin user approval. If there are time constraints with your project, please contact MTC staff to expedite review.

Projects

Each checklist must be linked to a project. If your project already exists in the database, you may select it from the Projects page or use the dropdown selector when creating the checklist. If your project is not in the database, it must be created. Projects will cover a program of capital improvements and may be titled something like “Citywide curb ramp enhancements”. When creating a project:

- **Sponsors** – Select the name of the sponsoring agency from the pull down list. This is the name of the agency that will be implementing the project. If you don’t see your agency listed please contact MTC staff to add your agency.
- **Name** - Add the title of the project. In some cases projects will cover a program of capital improvements such as “Citywide curb ramp enhancements”. In other cases, a project will cover only one location.
- **Description** – Add a short, detailed description of the type of project and the scope of work.

Checklists

Each distinct project location requires a completed checklist. If a project has four locations (e.g. intersections or segments), four checklists are required. Checklists should provide details about the location of the proposed improvements. When creating your checklist:

1. **Name** – Add the title of the project. If there are multiple locations for the project, it may be helpful to add a location descriptor for each checklist.
2. **Description** – Add a short description of the type of project and scope of work.
3. **Project Status** – Select one of two options: *In Progress* or *Submitted*. *In Progress* allows projects to be saved and edited. *Submitted* indicates the checklist is complete and is awaiting approval.
4. **Project** – Select your project from the dropdown list.
5. **Location** – This is the city or county where the project is located. If you do not see your city or county on this list, please contact MTC staff. This may be different from your contact address.
6. **Contact Name, phone, e-mail, address** – Provide the information for the lead contact. This information will be displayed along with the project checklist.

Project Information

Name -

Description -

Status -

Project -

City -

Contact Name, Email, Phone, Address -

I. Existing Conditions

1 PROJECT AREA

a. What bicycle and pedestrian accommodations are currently included on the facility or on facilities it intersects or crosses? Please check all that apply.

Examples include:

- Class I bicycle paths
- Class II bicycle lanes
- Class III bicycle routes
- Class IV bikeways
- Bicycle boxes
- Raised separated bikeways
- Bicycle Boulevards
- Bicycle parking
- Sidewalks on one side or both sides of street
- Marked crosswalks
- Protected intersection
- Painted conflict zones
- Narrow unpaved path
- Pedestrian-actuated traffic signals or routine pedestrian cycle
- Bulb-outs
- Bicycle actuated traffic signals or routine bicyclist cycle
- High visibility crosswalks
- Pedestrian-level lighting
- ADA-compliant ramps
- Traffic signal push buttons
- Refuge islands on roadways

b. If there are no existing pedestrian or bicycle facilities, how far from the proposed project are the closest parallel bikeways and walkways?

c. Please describe the overall context of the project area:

d. Please indicate needed pedestrian, bicycle, or transit improvements in the project area that staff or the public have identified.

e. What existing challenges could the proposed project improve for bicycle, pedestrian, or transit travel in the vicinity of the proposed project?

- Transit shelter
- Wide curb lanes
- Right turn only lanes
- Transit vehicle stops
- Pedestrian countdown signals
- Way-finding or directional signage

Additional space is given for other facilities and for applicants to provide detail on items checked above.

- 0-1/4 mile
- 1/4 mile to 1/2 mile
- 1/2 mile to 1 mile
- 1+ mile

Examples include: # of lanes and lane designations, lane widths, and posted and observed speeds.

Examples include:

- Improved lighting
- Sidewalks
- Improved intersections
- Mid-block crossings
- Accommodations for the elderly or disabled or school age children
- Transit shelters
- ADA facilities
- Widened curb lanes
- Bicycle parking
- Traffic signals responsive to bicycles
- Shorter vehicular traffic signal cycles
- Longer pedestrian signal crossing times
- Addressing choke points or gaps in pedestrian or bicycle network
- RR crossings
- Bike racks on busses
- Widened or better-lit under crossings
- Removed slip lanes
- Right turn only lanes

Examples of existing challenges include:

- traffic signals that are unresponsive to bicycles;
- Unresponsive signals to bicycles

- Lack of bicycle parking
- Freeway on-off ramps
- Narrow curb lanes
- Choke points
- RR crossings
- No bike racks on buses
- Wide roadway crossings
- Long signal cycles which require pedestrians to wait long periods of time
- Short signal crossing times
- Narrow undercrossings, overcrossings
- Slip lanes
- Sidewalk obstruction or missing sidewalk
- Pedestrian-level lighting
- Lack of ADA compliant facilities
- Lack of Transit vehicle stops

2 A DEMAND

What trip generators (existing and future) are in the vicinity of the proposed project that might attract walking or bicycling customers, employees, students, visitors or others?

Examples of generators include:

- Educational institutions
- Transit stations
- Senior centers
- High-density land uses
- Downtowns
- Shopping areas
- Medical centers
- Major public venues
- Government buildings
- Parks

3 A COLLISIONS

Have you considered collisions involving bicyclists and pedestrians along the route of the facility?

[yes or no]

If so, please provide the number of collisions and describe the outcomes of each:

Possible data sources include: SWITRS (specify queries); local police data; history of complaints from pedestrians and cyclists; anecdotal reports; etc.

If so, what resources have you consulted?

MTC's Safety Toolbox is one example of collision countermeasures.

II. Plans, Policies and Process

④ PLANS

- a. Do any adopted plans call for the development of bicycle or pedestrian facilities on, crossing or adjacent to the proposed facility/project?

Is the proposed project consistent with these plans?

Please check all plans in which bicycle or pedestrian facilities are identified for the project or its corridor, such as:

- City, town, or countywide bicycle and/or pedestrian plans
- ADA transition plan
- General plan
- Specific plan
- Regional transportation plan
- Sales tax expenditure plan
- Station area access plan
- Neighborhood plans
- Park or trails plans
- Short range transit plans
- San Francisco Bay Trail plan

Additional space is given for other facilities and for applicants to provide detail on selected items. For each plan cited, please provide adoption date and URL or staff contact.

⑤ POLICIES, DESIGN STANDARDS & GUIDELINES

- a. Do any local, statewide or federal policies call for incorporating bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities into this project?

If so have the policies been followed?

In addition to locally-adopted policies, examples include:

- Caltrans Deputy Directive 64
- Caltrans Highway Design Manual (Chapter 1000)
- ACR 211
- MUTCD 2003
- MUTCD California supplement
- Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG)
- MTC Pedestrian Districts Study

Please also see guidance for question #4, above, for examples of plans which may contain applicable policies.

b. If this project includes a bicycle and/or pedestrian facility, which applicable design standards or guidelines have been followed?

Examples of design standards and guidelines include:

- American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) guides:
 - *Green Book*
 - *Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities*
 - *Guide for the Planning, Design, and Operation of Pedestrian Facilities*
- Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines
- Caltrans *Design Information Bulletin 89*
- Caltrans *Highway Design Manual*
- Caltrans *California MUTCD*
- Caltrans *Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities in California*
- FHWA *MUTCD*
- ITE *Designing Urban Walkable Thoroughfares*
- NACTO *Urban Bikeway Design Guide*

6A REVIEW

What comments have been made regarding bicycle and pedestrian accommodations at BPAC, stakeholder, or public meetings at which the proposed project has been discussed?

Although this checklist may be completed prior to BPAC, stakeholder or public review of the proposed project, some projects may have been presented to reviewing bodies and/or the public at this stage. For these projects, please summarize comments received that seek to influence project design with respect to accommodating bicyclist and pedestrian travel.

How have you responded to comments received?

Project sponsors should describe how the comments from question #6a were considered in the design of the project.

III. The Project

7 PROJECT SCOPE

What accommodations, if any, are included for bicyclists and pedestrians in the proposed project design?

Have you considered including the following?

- Class I bicycle paths
- Class II bicycle lanes
- Class III bicycle routes
- Class IV bikeways
- Bicycle boxes
- Raised separated bikeways
- Bicycle Boulevards

- Bicycle parking
- Sidewalks on one side or both sides of street
- Widened sidewalks
- Marked crosswalks
- Protected intersection
- Painted conflict zones
- Narrow unpaved path
- Pedestrian-actuated traffic signals or routine pedestrian cycle
- Bulb-outs
- Bicycle actuated traffic signals or routine bicyclist cycle
- High visibility crosswalks
- Pedestrian-level lighting
- ADA-compliant ramps
- Traffic signal push buttons
- Refuge islands on roadways
- Transit shelters
- Wide curb lanes
- Right turn only lanes
- Transit vehicle stops
- Pedestrian countdown signals
- Way-finding or directional signage

Other facilities may include facilities for disabled persons as required by US DOT, as of 11-29-06: Curb ramps, including truncated domes; accessible signal actuation; adequate sidewalk width; acceptable slope and cross-slope (particularly for driveway ramps over sidewalks, overcrossings and trails); and adequate green signal crossing time.

③ HINDERING BICYCLISTS/PEDESTRIANS

- a. Will the proposed project remove an existing bicycle or pedestrian facility or block or hinder bicycle or pedestrian movement?

If yes, please describe situation in detail.

[yes or no]

Examples of projects that could inadvertently worsen conditions for bicyclists and/or pedestrians include: removal of existing roadway shoulder; narrowing of existing curb lane; creating large corner radii; right turn slip lanes; multiple right or left turn lanes; roadway widening, which increases pedestrian crossing distance; increasing green time for one direction of traffic, which increases delay for pedestrians waiting to cross; crosswalk removal; redirecting bicyclists or pedestrians to routes that

- b. If the proposed project incorporates neither bicycle nor pedestrian facilities, or if the proposed project would hinder bicycle or pedestrian travel, list reasons why the project cannot be re-designed to accommodate these facilities.

Was a road diet or car parking removal considered?

What would be the cost of the added bicycle and/or pedestrian facility?

If the proposed project incorporates bicycle or pedestrian improvements, what proportion is the bicycle and/or pedestrian facility of the total project cost?

If right-of-way challenges are the reason for the hindrance, please explain the analysis that led to this conclusion.

require significant out-of-direction travel; and elimination of an existing bicycle and/or pedestrian facility.

The Federal Highway Administration recommends including up to 20 percent of the project cost to address non-motorized access improvements; MTC encourages local agencies to adopt their own percentages. Therefore, please provide estimated cost of planned bicycle and/or pedestrian improvements as a percent of total project cost if none are proposed for the project. Has your jurisdiction adopted a threshold? If so, please provide percent and attach adopted threshold policy.

If lack of adequate right-of-way precludes the accommodation of bicyclists and/or pedestrians, please describe limitations. Please make distinction between absence of right-of-way and trade-offs between various transportation modes and/or parking. For instance, does existing curb/gutter/sidewalk prevent striping of a new bicycle lane (If so, please attach intersection LOS data and existing travel lane configuration and widths)? Would curb extensions (to shorten street crossing distance for pedestrians) require eliminating on-street parking spaces?

9 CONSTRUCTION PERIOD

How will access for bicyclists and pedestrians be maintained during project construction?

Specify or attach applicable policies and construction permit conditions.

10 ONGOING MAINTENANCE

What agency will be responsible for ongoing maintenance of the facility?

No guidance

How will ongoing maintenance be budgeted?

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: January 26, 2017
To: C/CAG Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
From: Eliza Yu
Subject: Project applicant presentations for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program under the OneBayArea Grant 2 (OBAG2) Program

(For further information, please contact Eliza Yu at eyu@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the BPAC receive the project applicant presentations for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program under the OneBayArea Grant 2 (OBAG2) Program.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is approximately \$5,900,000 available for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program. These funds are available from FY 2017/2018 through FY 2021/2022.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

The Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funds and Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds are made available through the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG2) Program.

BACKGROUND

C/CAG issued a Call for Projects for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program (BPIP) on September 12, 2016. Applications were due by 5:00 p.m. on Friday November 18, 2016. The total amount requested for all of the projects is \$6,841,000. There is a total of approximately \$5,900,000 available for the FY 2017/2018 through FY 2021/2022 BPIP funding cycle. Staff received ten applications for this current BPIP funding cycle, however only nine applications are being considered. The City of Millbrae had submitted a BPIP project entitled "Millbrae Ave Bike/Ped Overcrossing Project" that requested OBAG2 funds for its Preliminary Engineering phase only. Under CMAQ and MTC's Resolution 4202, design only projects are ineligible to receive OBAG2 funds. This project was removed from our BPIP projects list as a result.

Project applicants are to present their projects to the BPAC at the January 26th meeting. Each jurisdiction will have a total of 10 minutes to present their project(s) including time for questions and answers, although this is subject to change at the discretion of the BPAC Chair. The link to the video tours was sent to the BPAC on December 14, 2016. The BPAC is expected to view the video tours prior to the project applicant presentations. BPAC members should complete their overall scores for each of the BPIP applications prior to the February 23rd BPAC meeting. The table below details the project list and order of the project sponsor presentations.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program (BPIP) Applications		
Jurisdiction	Project Name	Requested Amount
Redwood City	101 Woodside Class I Bikeway Project	\$948,000
Belmont	Ralston Ave Corridor Project	\$1,000,000
San Bruno	Huntington Transit Corridor Project	\$914,000
Pacifica	Citywide Curb Ramp Project	\$400,000
Pacifica	Palmetto Ave Sidewalk Project	\$330,000
Burlingame	Hoover School Area Sidewalk Improvements	\$700,000
Woodside	Woodside Pathway Project	\$664,000
Brisbane	Crocker Trail Commuter Connectivity Upgrades	\$885,000
San Carlos	Holly Street Interchange Bike/Ped Overcrossing Project	\$1,000,000
Total:		\$6,841,000