

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, September 24, 2020

Time: 7:00 PM

On March 17, 2020, the Governor issued Executive Order N-29-20 suspending certain provisions of the Ralph M. Brown Act in order to allow for local legislative bodies to conduct their meetings telephonically or by other electronic means. Pursuant to the Shelter-in-Place Orders issued by the San Mateo County Health Officer and the Governor, and the CDC's social distancing guidelines, which discourage large public gatherings, C/CAG meetings will be conducted via remote conferencing. Members of the public may observe or participate in the meeting remotely via one of the options below.

Join Zoom Meeting:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85770613434?pwd=OTBBaXR0aitDbmlORnBtc0ptQ2RnZz09>

Meeting ID: 857 7061 3434

Passcode: 041279

Join by Phone: 669-900-6833

Meeting ID: 857 7061 3434

Passcode: 041279

Persons who wish to address the C/CAG BPAC on an item to be considered at this meeting, or on items not on this agenda, are asked to submit written comments to mhiatt@smcgov.org. Spoken public comments will also be accepted during the meeting through Zoom. Please see instructions for written and spoken public comments at the end of this agenda.

1.	Call to Order	Action (Robinson)	No materials
2.	Review of Meeting Procedures	Information (Hiatt)	No materials
3.	Public comment on items not on the agenda	Limited to 2 minutes per speaker.	No materials

4.	Approval of the Minutes of the July 30, 2020 committee meeting	Action (Robinson)	Page 1-6
5.	Receive a presentation on Quick Build Projects	Information (Hiatt)	Page 7
6.	Receive a presentation and provide input on the San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (CBPP) Update	Information (Hiatt)	Page 8-9
7.	Nomination and appointment of a Committee member to serve on the evaluation panel of the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) Bicycle and Pedestrian Call for Projects	Action (Hiatt)	Page 10
8.	Member Communications	Information (Robinson)	No materials
9.	Adjourn	Information (Robinson)	No materials

The next BPAC meeting is scheduled for October 22, 2020.

PUBLIC NOTICING: All notices of C/CAG regular BPAC meetings, standing committee meetings, and special meetings will be posted at the San Mateo County Transit District Office, 1250 San Carlos Ave., San Carlos, CA, and on C/CAG's website at: <http://www.ccag.ca.gov>.

PUBLIC RECORDS: Public records that relate to any item on the open session agenda for a regular Board meeting, standing committee meeting, or special meeting are available for public inspection. Those public records that are distributed less than 72 hours prior to a regular meeting are available for public inspection at the same time they are distributed to all members, or a majority of the members, of the Committee. The Board has designated the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), located at 555 County Center, 5th Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063, for the purpose of making public records available for inspection. Such public records are also available on C/CAG's website at: <http://www.ccag.ca.gov>. Please note that C/CAG's office is temporarily closed to the public; please contact Mikaela Hiatt at (650) 599-1453 to arrange for inspection of public records.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION DURING VIDEOCONFERENCE MEETINGS: Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services to participate in this meeting should contact Mikaela Hiatt at (650) 599-1453, five working days prior to the meeting date.

Written comments should be emailed in advance of the meeting. Please read the following instructions carefully:

1. Your written comment should be emailed to mhiatt@smcgov.org.
2. Your email should include the specific agenda item on which you are commenting or note that your comment concerns an item that is not on the agenda.

3. Members of the public are limited to one comment per agenda item.
4. The length of the emailed comment should be commensurate with the three minutes customarily allowed for verbal comments, which is approximately 250-300 words.
5. If your emailed comment is received at least 2 hours prior to the meeting, it will be provided to the C/CAG BPAC members, made publicly available on the C/CAG website along with the agenda, and read aloud by C/CAG staff during the meeting. We cannot guarantee that emails received less than 2 hours before the meeting will be read during the meeting, but such emails will be included in the administrative record of the meeting.

Spoken comments will be accepted during the meeting through Zoom. Please read the following instructions carefully:

1. The C/CAG BPAC meeting may be accessed through Zoom at the online location indicated at the top of this agenda.
2. You may download the Zoom client or connect to the meeting using an internet browser. If using your browser, make sure you are using a current, up-to-date browser: Chrome 30+, Firefox 27+, Microsoft Edge 12+, Safari 7+. Certain functionality may be disabled in older browsers including Internet Explorer.
3. You will be asked to enter an email address and name. We request that you identify yourself by your name as this will be visible online and will be used to notify you that it is your turn to speak.
4. When C/CAG Staff or Chair call for the item on which you wish to speak, click on "raise hand." Staff will activate and unmute speakers in turn. Speakers will be notified shortly before they are called on to speak.
5. When called, please limit your remarks to the time allotted.

If you have any questions about this agenda, please contact C/CAG staff:

Programs Specialist: Mikaela Hiatt (650) 599-1453 mhiatt@smcgov.org

City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG)
Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
Meeting Minutes
July 30, 2020

1. Call to Order

Chair Robinson called the meeting to order at 6:07 PM.

Name	Agency	Jan 2020	Mar 2020 (Cancelled)	May 2020	July 2020
Matthew Self	Public (County of San Mateo)	X		X	X
Malcolm Robinson – Chair	Public (San Bruno)	X		X	X
Janet Borgens	Redwood City	N/A*		X	
Ann Schneider – Vice Chair	Millbrae	X		X	X
Marina Fraser	Public (Half Moon Bay)				X
Don Horsley	County of San Mateo	X			
Emily Beach	Burlingame	X		X	X
Karyl Matsumoto	South San Francisco	X		X	X
Ann Wengert	Portola Valley	X			X
Justin Yuen	Public (South San Francisco)	N/A*		X	X
Karen Cunningham	Brisbane	X		X	X
Alan Uy	Public (Daly City)	X		X	X
Brian Levenson	Public (Redwood City)	X		X	X

*Members appointed to position at May 2020 Board Meeting

Members Present: Matthew Self, Malcolm Robinson, Ann Schneider, Marina Fraser, Emily Beach, Karyl Matsumoto, Ann Wengert, Karen Cunningham, Alan Uy, Brian Levenson, Justin Yuen

Members Absent: Don Horsley, Janet Borgens

Staff Attending: Mikaela Hiatt, Sandy Wong, Kaki Cheung – C/CAG

Others in Attendance: Drew – Public; Patrick Gilster – Toole Design Group

2. Review of Meeting Procedures

Mikaela Hiatt reviewed procedures related to how the meeting would be conducted via Zoom.

Member Beach commented that the phone number for the Zoom call in was listed differently on the online posting and on the agenda packet. Staff said they would incorporate the correction in future meetings.

3. Public Comment on items not on the agenda

None.

4. Approval of Meeting Minutes of May 25, 2020

Approved with no comment.

Motion: Member Self motioned to approve/Vice Chair Schneider seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

5. Receive presentation and provide input on the San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (CBPP) Update (Information)

Patrick Gilster presented to the Committee on the status of San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Update. The presentation included information on a report capturing existing conditions of the bicycle and pedestrian network in the County, program recommendations, and draft project prioritization criteria. Mr. Gilster also described next steps of the plan.

Public Member Drew asked if the Agency was considering public input related to for network barriers and level of traffic stress. Mikaela Hiatt expressed that input will be captured during the public outreach phase.

Vice Chair Schneider asked, in the facilities inventory, whether paved trails and dirt trails were noted differently. Patrick Gilster said that those differences were recorded.

Member Self commented that freeways should not be indicated as routes on the Level of Traffic Stress map. Member Self asked a question about the difference between Level of Traffic Stress 2 and 3. Patrick Gilster explained that the difference came from vehicle speed and the level of separation between the bicycle facility and the auto travel.

Chair Robinson asked why the area below Half Moon Bay on the Equity Focus Area map was highlighted as an equity focus area. Patrick Gilster responded that the data was aggregated by census tract, thus explaining why the area looked especially large. Member Fraser responded that the Moonridge community south of Half Moon Bay is a low-income community with little to no bicycle access to key destinations.

Vice Chair Schneider mentioned that the Equity Focus Areas' data would be helpful to view as a pie chart as well.

Member Self commented that the school access prioritization category should show different distance for children walking to school and children riding to school. Member Self also commented that routes identified in Safe Routes to School plans should be considered.

Vice Chair Schneider commented that equity should be weighted in the prioritization process cautiously.

Member Levenson commented that he felt that key destinations may be less relevant than other criteria.

Chair Robinson commented that access to school should focus on the most dangerous arterials rather than proximity to school solely.

Member Wengert asked for clarity on the public input category of the prioritization process. Patrick Gilster explained that this category's weight would come from outreach phase of engagement.

Member Matsumoto expressed that the definition of key destinations could be interpreted as areas where those dependent on transit, bicycling, and walking need to access.

Public Member Drew suggested that network connectivity should be added as a criterion to project prioritization process. Further, on the subject of micromobility as part of the program recommendation, Drew recommended that clarification should be made between shared use versus personally use. Chair Robinson echoed this sentiment.

Vice Chair Schneider suggested signage be included as a program as well. Member Matsumoto echoed this comment. Member Self also asked if there has been progress on the numbering system for the county. Mikaela Hiatt responded that MTC was working on developing a regional wayfinding system.

Member Yuen asked if C/CAG has considered a countywide safety plan for the cities who may not have capacity to implement such a plan. Mikaela Hiatt responded that the development of a high injury network program could eventually lead into an effort like this.

Public Member Drew suggested that language in the document should be broad to incorporate active modes of transportation beyond just bicycles and pedestrians.

6. Review the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 grant reallocation history and discuss the need for any program modifications and make recommendations for policy changes (Information)

Mikaela Hiatt gave background information on the TDA Article 3 Call for Projects. Mikaela provided information on the amount of reallocation requests for TDA Article 3 projects previously awarded. Since FY 11-12, 10 of the past 36 awarded projects requested reallocation for reasons such as difficulty in the contract bidding process.

Mikaela began the discussion with the question of “should the number of reallocation requests be limited by project?”

Member Matsumoto shared that she supported a limitation on project reallocation requests. She further commented that a yearly update on project status would be beneficial, and that project readiness should be ranked highly on the TDA Article 3 scoring criteria.

Mikaela Hiatt sought further input from the Committee on two additional questions, related to expansion of eligible project types and whether or not to place more emphasis on project readiness.

Vice Chair Schneider asked what the protocol is for handling project reallocation requests and brought up a historical project when the project sponsor requested funding to be moved to another project in the same city. Member Matsumoto asked for clarification on that project. Vice Chair Schneider elaborated, and Member Matsumoto responded that the project was no longer possible in the initial project site and thus was granted the reallocation request.

Chair Robinson expressed that unforeseen circumstances should not restrict a project sponsor from reallocation. However, should the scope of the allocated project change, then the funding should return to the overall TDA Article 3 funding pot.

Member Beach expressed that she supported a heavier weighting of project readiness. She also commented that she does not support reallocation for projects that entirely change scope.

Member Fraser commented that project reallocation should be awarded to projects that have not changed scope.

Mikaela Hiatt recapped what had been discussed in the committee so far, summarizing that reallocation requests should ultimately not be limited due to unforeseen circumstances such as COVID-19 Shelter-in-Place orders. However, should a project sponsor request reallocation with dramatic changes to the scope, the committee should not approve that request. If the changes to the scope are minor, then the committee may review the request and decide whether or not to approve the request. TDA Article 3 fund recipients should also give project updates yearly.

Member Wengert commented that project readiness should have a higher ranking than other categories in the future.

Member Levenson commented that he is in support of limiting reallocation requests within reason and is also in support of holding projects to a higher project readiness status.

Member Beach commented that she would be in support of project status updates given to the committee yearly. She also commented if there are delays in the project, there should be notice given to the committee.

Mikaela Hiatt summarized the comments on project readiness, stating that the committee is in support of weighting project readiness higher.

Member Uy expressed his support for opening up the eligible project types, specifically incorporating quick build projects, in order to stretch the available funds further.

Vice Chair Schneider asked if quick build projects would interfere with the goal to create permanent network in the county. Mikaela Hiatt responded that quick build projects could be a temporary method to complete the network and quickly address safety concerns. The quick build projects can eventually become permanent facilities.

Chair Robinson commented that he was not sure that bicycle parking should be incorporated, but the main focus should be on completing the network throughout San Mateo County.

Vice Chair Schneider commented that quick build projects for pedestrians could be valuable.

Mikaela Hiatt summarized the comments from the committee, stating that there is interest in expanding the funds to items such as quick build projects. Mikaela commented that she will find a representative to share information on quick build projects at the next meeting.

7. Member Communications

Mikaela Hiatt shared that C/CAG recently released a Call for Projects through TFCA funding for quick build projects. The Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition will be hosting their Annual Bike Summit the following week. Additionally, that the County would like to notify the committee that there would be a closure of Mirada Road's pedestrian bridge for rehabilitation.

Chair Robinson commented the committee should focus on improving the area around Highway 1 as the area is dangerous. The Chair also shared that he recently attended the County of San Mateo BPAC meeting to lobby for facilities and encouraged those who can attend the meetings to join for information.

Mikaela Hiatt shared that there are currently vacancies on the County of San Mateo Office of Sustainability's BPAC.

8. Adjourn

Chair Robinson called for a motion to adjourn at 8:04 PM.

Motion: Member Self motioned to approve/Chair Robinson seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: September 24, 2020
To: C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
From: Mikaela Hiatt, Transportation Programs Specialist
Subject: Receive a presentation on Quick Build Projects

(For further information, contact Mikaela Hiatt at mhiatt@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) receive a presentation on Quick Build Projects.

FISCAL IMPACT

This presentation has no fiscal impact.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

N/A

BACKGROUND

Quick build projects aim to accelerate the implementation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Utilizing durable, low cost materials such as paint, signage and flex posts, quick build projects require only minor construction activities. Quick build projects are temporary and typically last from one to five years. Many of them are used to show the effectiveness of the improvements. Once citizens and officials see the benefits of changes, these changes can eventually turn into permanent solutions. This project type allows for flexibility in the design and rapid implementation, ensuring that the improvements are adjustable and can accommodate the community needs.

In response to COVID-19, quick build project is also a monetarily efficient way to implement projects, as many jurisdictions are experiencing fiscal constraints during the pandemic. Turning to quick build projects can provide more safe places to accommodate the increased number of cyclists and pedestrians during shelter in place.

The Committee will receive more information on quick build projects in the region from Vignesh Swaminathan, a consultant with Crossroad Labs.

ATTACHMENTS

None.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: September 24, 2020

To: C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

From: Mikaela Hiatt, Transportation Programs Specialist

Subject: Receive a presentation and provide input on the San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (CBPP) Update

(For further information, contact Mikaela Hiatt at mhiatt@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee receive a presentation on the update of San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (CBPP) and provide input.

FISCAL IMPACT

This presentation has no fiscal impact. The cost to update the CBPP is \$196,492.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

- C/CAG Local Transportation Funds
- Measure A Transportation Sales Tax (San Mateo County Transportation Authority)

BACKGROUND

The San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (CBPP) is currently undergoing an update. C/CAG has retained Toole Design Group as the consultant to lead the project. At the July 30th meeting, the consultant presented to the Committee on the draft Existing Conditions Report, countywide programs, and a draft prioritization framework. The Committee provided valuable feedback.

With input from the Technical Advisory Group, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee, and the C/CAG Technical Advisory Committee on the Existing Conditions Report, the consultant has developed the Countywide Backbone Network and Pedestrian Focus Areas. In addition, Toole Design drafted a Design Toolkit and Cost Estimates document, which includes best practices for bicycle and pedestrian facilities implementation locally and nationally.

Based on previous feedback on the prioritization framework, an initial set of criteria and weighting was crafted to evaluate planned projects to help identify which ones may be most likely to do well in competitive funding programs.

At the September 24th meeting, Toole Design Group will present the project's current status and solicit feedback. Staff requests that the BPAC provides input on the Countywide Backbone Network, Pedestrian Focus Areas, and the Project Prioritization Process by October 1, 2020.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Countywide Backbone Network and Pedestrian Focus Areas (*available online at <https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/bicycle-and-pedestrian-advisory-committee/>*)

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: September 24, 2020

To: C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

From: Mikaela Hiatt, Transportation Programs Specialist

Subject: Nomination and appointment of a Committee member to serve on the evaluation panel of the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) Bicycle and Pedestrian Call for Projects

(For further information, contact Mikaela Hiatt at mhiatt@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee nominate and appoint a Committee member to serve on the evaluation panel of the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) Measure A Bicycle and Pedestrian Program call for projects.

FISCAL IMPACT

This item has no fiscal impact.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

The San Mateo County Transportation Authority is making available a total of \$8.1M for projects that encourage walking and bicycling. The funding comes from the Measure A and Measure W sales tax programs.

BACKGROUND

The San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) has requested a member of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee to serve on the evaluation panel for the recently released Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Call for Projects. Panelists will participate in a meeting to review and score the applications received by the September 21, 2020 deadline. The application review period will take place during October 2020, and final recommendations will be brought to the SMCTA Board thereafter. The total time commitment will vary depending on the number of applications received. It is expected that application scoring meeting will last three to four hours.

ATTACHMENTS

None.