

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.