

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

STORMWATER (NPDES) COMMITTEE AGENDA 2:30 PM, Thursday, January 21, 2021

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 by Zoom: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87244762290?pwd=TDVvNzhkcTZjN2dpdjlWMMW1WekevQT09>
Join by Phone: +1 669 900 6833 Meeting ID: 872 4476 2290 Password: 642583

Persons who wish to address the C/CAG Stormwater Committee on an item to be considered at this meeting, or on items not on this agenda, are asked to submit written comments to rbogert@smcgov.org. Oral 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. Public comment on items not on the Agenda (presentations limited to three minutes). | Breault | No materials |
| 2. Stormwater Issues from Dec and Jan C/CAG Board meetings: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Receive presentation on Draft Sustainable Streets Master Plan• Geosyntec and Craftwater funding agreements• American Rivers/Corona Environmental and WaterNow Alliance agreements• Azalea Mitch appointment to Stormwater Committee for City of San Mateo• Receive Urban Rain Design Task Order for green infrastructure outreach help | Fabry | No materials |
| 3. ACTION – Review and approve November 19, 2020 Stormwater Committee minutes | Fabry | Pages 1-5 |
| 4. INFORMATION – Announcements on stormwater issues <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Funding opportunities• Regional Project scopes• California Resilience Challenge Grant• MRP Reissuance• Other | Fabry | No materials |
| 5. ACTION – Review planned response to public comment and recommend the C/CAG Board of Directors adopt the San Mateo Countywide Sustainable Streets Master Plan. | Fabry | Pages 6-19 |
| 6. Regional Board Report | Mumley | No Materials |
| 7. Executive Director's Report | Wong | No Materials |
| 8. Member Reports | All | No Materials |
| 9. Adjourn | | |

PUBLIC NOTICING: All notices of C/CAG regular Board 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 Mima Guilles at (650) 599-1406 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 Mima Guilles at (650) 599-1406, 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 rbogert@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 two 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 Committee members and made publicly available on the C/CAG website along with the agenda. We cannot guarantee that emails received less than 2 hours before the meeting will be able to be posted or provided to Committee members prior to the meeting, but such emails will be included in the administrative record of the meeting.

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

1. The Stormwater Committee 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 the Committee Chair/Vice-Chair call for the item on which you wish to speak, click on "raise hand." C/CAG 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:

Program Manager: Matthew Fabry (mfabry@smcgov.org or 650-599-1419)
Administrative Assistant: Mima Guilles (650) 599-1406

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: January 21, 2021
To: Stormwater Committee
From: Matthew Fabry, Program Manager
Subject: Review and approve November 19, 2020 Stormwater Committee meeting minutes.

(For further information or questions contact Matthew Fabry at mfabry@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee review and approve November 19, 2020 Stormwater Committee meeting minutes, as drafted.

DISCUSSION

N/A.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Draft November 19, 2020 Minutes

STORMWATER COMMITTEE
Regular Meeting
Thursday, November 19, 2020
2:30 p.m.

Draft Meeting Minutes

The Stormwater Committee met remotely via Zoom, per C/CAG's shelter-in-place policy and consistent with state and county directives to manage COVID-19. Attendance at the meeting is shown on the attached roster (note – member Sean Rose entered the Zoom meeting at 2:56 p.m. and left at 3:45 p.m. and so was not present for the vote on Item 3 or Items 5 and 6). In addition to the Committee members, also in attendance were Matt Fabry (C/CAG Program Manager), Reid Bogert (C/CAG staff), Sean Charpentier (C/CAG Staff), Sandy Wong (C/CAG Executive Director), Susan Wright and Kim Springer (County of San Mateo), Jennifer Lee (City of Burlingame), Matthew Zucca (City of San Mateo), Raymund Donguines (City of Pacifica), Kelly Carrol (CGS on behalf of the Town of Colma), Nick Zigler (CSG on behalf of City of Half Moon Bay), Janet Clements (Corona Environmental), Kelly Havens (Geosyntec Consulting), Thom Epps and Brad Wardynksi (Crafwater Engineering), Caroline Koch (WaterNow Alliance), Makena Wong (San Mateo County Flood and Sea Level Rise Resiliency District). Chair Breault called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

1. Public comment: None

2. Stormwater Issues from C/CAG Board Meetings: November – San Francisco Estuary Institute presentation on the Health of the Bay and the Annual Stormwater Program update presentation.

3. ACTION – Approval of the draft minutes from the October 15, 2020, Stormwater Committee meeting. Motion: member Machida; second: member Underwood. Approved (14:0:1).

4. INFORMATION – The following items were covered in announcements:

- Funding Opportunities – Matt Fabry noted an upcoming solicitation from the California Coastal Conservancy with a focus on San Francisco Bay resiliency efforts – proposals are due in January.
- Other – Fabry mentioned Executive Director of the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA), Geoff Brosseau, is retiring from the position and will be replaced by Karen Cowen, the previous Assistant Executive Director. Fabry also stated that the Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association (BASMAA) continues to move toward dissolving as a non-profit organization by the end of the calendar year, while the current Board of Directors seeks alternative structures for continued engagement and coordination at the regional level. Fabry gave recognition to Mr. Brosseau for his contributions to the stormwater community in the Bay Area and statewide over the many years of his tenure as Executive Director of CASQA and BASMAA.

5. INFORMATION – Matt Fabry presented the staff reports for Items 5 and 6 simultaneously regarding the following related topics: Item 5 - Review and recommend the C/CAG Board of Directors to approve entering into agreements with Craftwater Engineering, Inc. to identify and to identify and conceptualize regional stormwater capture opportunities at an amount not to exceed \$89,250, and Geosyntec Consultants, Inc. to develop a business case and framework for countywide collaboration on regional stormwater management in an amount not to exceed \$110,750; and Item 6: Review and recommend

the C/CAG Board of Directors approve entering into agreements with American Rivers and Corona Environmental Consultants and WaterNow Alliance for pro-bono services to evaluate opportunities for a stormwater credit trading marketplace and summarize stormwater funding and financing opportunities for stormwater capture opportunities.

Fabry presented the background of developing a multi-scale approach to planning and implementing green infrastructure in San Mateo County, including parcel-scale, street-scale and regional-scale multi-benefit projects. The emphasis of this approach based on modeling results from the Reasonable Assurance Analysis is that there are significant cost-savings of working collaboratively across jurisdictions rather than attempting a jurisdiction-based approach to achieving pollutant load reductions via green infrastructure mandated in the Municipal Regional Permit. To support a collaborative countywide approach, C/CAG sought a \$3 million State grant to fund regional project designs through CEQA for three projects in Redwood City, Belmont and San Bruno and to identify and advance additional conceptual designs for newly identified regional stormwater capture projects, the bulk of which is being contracted directly by the cities to conduct designs. The Stormwater Committee previously recommended the remaining \$200,000 be used to develop a business case for collaboration on regional stormwater management in coordination with the Flood and Sea Level Rise Resiliency District and also identify the next round of regional projects and develop new project concepts, leveraging an additional \$100,000 from the Office of Sustainability under an EPA Water Quality Improvement Fund grant for the same purpose. C/CAG staff worked with the Office of Sustainability to issue a joint RFP for consultant services and received five proposals for the work to develop a business case, identify new opportunities and develop five additional project concepts. After holding three interviews, Geosyntec Consultants and Craftwater Engineering, Inc., were identified as having strengths in each of these categories, respectively, and the selection panel (including members from C/CAG, Office of Sustainability and the Flood and Sea Level Rise Resiliency District), determined that creating two integrated scopes and engaging both consultants would result in the best project outcomes. Fabry summarized the proposed integrated approach, which will include identifying collaborative resiliency and water quality project drivers, which will tie into a project identification and prioritization process. The outputs from the prioritization process will also feed into the framework for proposed regional collaboration. In parallel to this effort, Fabry has been involved with a green infrastructure funding academy to identify opportunities to develop supplemental funding and financing mechanisms. Corona Environmental/American Rivers and WaterNow Alliance were engaged through this work to provide pro-bono services to explore developing a credit trading market place for stormwater management (including private and public entities) and public funding and financing options to advance green infrastructure (regional and parcel scale projects), respectively.

Fabry recommended approval of bringing the funding agreements with Craftwater Engineering and Geosyntec Consultants to the C/CAG Board at its December 10, 2020 meeting and to recommend the C/CAG Board enter into agreements for pro-bono services with Corona Environmental/American Rivers and WaterNow Alliance.

Motion: member Ovadia; second: member Murtuza. Approved (14:0:0).

6. INFORMATION – Per the summary of Item 5 above, Matt Fabry presented the staff reports to both Items 5 and 6 simultaneously, and the Committee approved both items unanimously.

7. INFORMATION - Received presentation on the draft Sustainable Streets Master Plan. Matt Fabry presented a summary of the Master Plan and final project deliverables, including the draft Master Plan

and prioritized sustainable streets opportunities, project concepts, catalogue of typical details, model policies, web-based mapping and tracking tool, and associated appendices and additional technical resources for advancing sustainable streets projects in San Mateo County. Fabry provided a timeline for finalizing the project, including a virtual open house scheduled for December 8, a public comment period through December, an introductory presentation to the C/CAG Board at its December 10 meeting and a proposed adoption at the February 11 C/CAG Board meeting.

8. INFORMATION – Received update on the MRP 3.0 reissuance process. Matt Fabry revisited the updated schedule for the reissuance process, based on recent communications with Regional Water Board Staff, with an anticipated administrative draft released by sometime in late November or early December, a tentative order in April of 2021, adoption of the tentative order in October 2021 and an effective date of July 1, 2022. This timeline better matches the planning, budgeting and procurement process for the countywide program. Fabry also summarized recent proposed changes to the permit requirements, emphasizing the anticipated green infrastructure requirements (including new non-regulated green infrastructure requirements) and new control measure implementation requirements for remaining moderate-PCBs areas primarily in old industrial landuse areas. Reid Bogert provided a summary of new proposed trash requirements, including a now mandatory 90% load reduction requirement by year two of the new permit (July 1, 2023) and the final 100% reduction compliance deadline by July 1, 2025), interim credits for creek and shoreline credits and phased out source controls for existing controls with the ability to achieve credit on new source controls in remaining moderate and high or very high trash generating areas. There is also a proposed “practicability” report for evaluating the feasibility of achieving full-trash capture in remaining trash generating areas, with the goal of proposing additional actions to address areas for which conventional full-trash capture is not feasible.

9. Regional Board Report: None.

10. Executive Director’s Report: None.

11. Member Reports: None.

Chair Breault adjourned the meeting at 3:45 p.m.

2020-21 Stormwater Committee Attendance														
Agency	Representative	Position	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June
Atherton	Robert Ovadia	Public Works Director	X	X		X	X							
Belmont	Peter Brown	Public Works Director	X	X		O	X							
Brisbane	Randy Breault	Public Works Director/City Engineer	X			X	X							
Burlingame	Syed Murtuza	Public Works Director	X	X	C	X	X							
Colma	Brad Donohue	Director of Public Works and Planning	X	X	A	X	O							
Daly City	Richard Chiu	Public Works Director	X	X	N	X	X							
East Palo Alto	Kamal Fallaha	City Engineer			C									
Foster City	Norm Dorais	Public Works Director	X	X	E	X	X							
Half Moon Bay	Maziar Bozorginia	City Engineer	X	X	L	X	O							
Hillsborough	Paul Willis	Public Works Director	X	O	E	X	X							
Menlo Park	Nikki Nagaya	Public Works Director	X		D	X								
Millbrae	Andrew Yang	Senior Engineer	X	X		X	X							
Pacifica	Lisa Petersen	Public Works Director/City Engineer	O			X	X							
Portola Valley	Howard Young	Public Works Director		X		X	X							
Redwood City	Saber Sarwary	Supervising Civil Engineer	X			X	X							
San Bruno	Jimmy Tan	City Engineer	X	X		X	X							
San Carlos	Steven Machida	Public Works Director	X	X		X	X							
San Mateo	Brad Underwood	Public Works Director	X	X		X	X							
South San Francisco	Eunejune Kim	Public Works Director												
Woodside	Sean Rose	Public Works Director	X			X	X							
San Mateo County	Jim Porter	Public Works Director	X	O		X	X							
Regional Water Quality Control Board	Tom Mumley	Assistant Executive Officer												

"X" - Committee Member Attended

"O" - Other Jurisdictional Representative Attended

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: January 21, 2021
To: Stormwater Committee
From: Matthew Fabry, Program Manager
Subject: Review planned response to public comment and recommend the C/CAG Board of Directors adopt the San Mateo Countywide Sustainable Streets Master Plan.

(For further information or questions contact Matthew Fabry at mfabry@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Stormwater Committee review C/CAG staff's planned response to public comments and recommend the C/CAG Board of Directors adopt the San Mateo Countywide Sustainable Streets Master Plan.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

In May 2018, C/CAG was awarded a \$986,300 Climate Adaptation Planning grant by Caltrans to develop a Countywide Sustainable Streets Master Plan (Master Plan) that prioritizes street segments throughout the county for integrating green stormwater infrastructure with planned transportation investments as an approach for adapting the transportation network to a changing climate. Sustainable Streets are broadly defined as integrating Complete Streets with Green Streets, combining improvements focused on supporting active transportation and transit with green infrastructure that captures, cleans, and retains stormwater runoff.

The project started in November 2018 and is nearing completion. The project included the following primary tasks:

- Community Engagement
- Climate Adaptation Risk Analysis on Local Transportation Network
- High-Resolution Data Analysis and Fine-Scale Drainage Delineation
- Prioritization of Sustainable Streets Opportunities and Development of Master Plan
- Project Concepts & Model Policies
- Web-based Sustainable Streets Project Implementation Mapping and Tracking Tool

The Master Plan evaluates precipitation-based climate change impacts on runoff from the roadway network and prioritize opportunities for integrating green stormwater infrastructure with planned transportation investments to help adapt the roadway network to protect downstream infrastructure and waterways. The Master Plan prioritizes specific roadway segments for integration of green infrastructure in five-, 10-, and 20-year time horizons and will include 11 project concepts. The work products will directly support C/CAG member agencies' Green Infrastructure Planning efforts required under the Municipal Regional Permit.

The project is in its final phase. An internal draft Master Plan (including initial version of web-based green infrastructure tracking tool) was circulated for review and comment by C/CAG member agency

staff and members of the project Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) in late 2020, with the draft Master Plan presented to both the Stormwater and Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committees in November. C/CAG staff and the consultant team revised the internal draft based on that feedback to create a public review draft and public-facing version of the tracking tool, both of which were released the first week of December for a public comment period that lasted through January 6, 2021.

C/CAG created a virtual “Engagement Hub” for the Master Plan that summarized the Master Plan project and allowed the public to provide direct comments/feedback (www.sustainablestreetsmc.org). In addition, C/CAG developed a dedicated Master Plan page on the flowstobay.org website where the Master Plan documents were posted with a link to the tracking tool, along with an online “flipbook” version of the Master Plan that could be viewed directly on the site (www.flowstobay.org/ssmp). C/CAG hosted a virtual “open house” via Zoom on December 8, which was attended by approximately 100 people. The recording of the open house was also posted on the flowstobay.org site and has since been viewed over 75 times. C/CAG staff presented the draft Master Plan to the C/CAG Board of Directors at their December 10, 2020 meeting.

During the public comment period, C/CAG received comments from 60 individuals, either directly via email or through the Engagement Hub. In addition, C/CAG received some member agency comments that were not able to be provided in time for inclusion in the public draft.

The public comments are summarized by category in the Table 1, and actual comments are included as attachments to this report. It is notable that the majority (33) requested more information be included in the Master Plan regarding use of native plants.

Table 1 – Categorization of Public Comments

Category ID	Comment Category	# of Comments	Summarized Response
P1	Requests to prioritize native plants	33	Add text on using native planting to Master Plan and point to other resources (GI Design Guide).
P2	Requests for general project elements (wildlife-friendly street lighting, use of specific BMPs, bike/ped tools, etc.)	9	Add text where relevant to Master Plan and point to other related C/CAG efforts (bicycle planning, green infrastructure, etc.)
P3	Site specific recommendations	6	C/CAG will refer these comments to the relevant municipalities where the project ideas are located as well as share them with C/CAG staff working on current bicycle planning efforts.
P4	Traffic/congestion concerns	4	C/CAG will share these comments and general concerns with C/CAG planning staff and member municipalities.
P5	Requests to expand on specific topics	5	Add text to highlight the requested topics more prominently.
P6	Request to include additional projects from other planning efforts (City of San Mateo)	1	C/CAG will review this suggestion with the City of San Mateo and discuss inclusion of additional projects.
P7	General approval/disapproval	9	Does not require edits.

The additional member agency comments are summarized and categorized in Table 2.

Table 2 – Additional Member Agency Comments

Category ID	Comment Category	# of Comments	Summarized Response
A1	Editorial comments (grammar, rephrasing, etc.)	16	Accept edits where applicable.
A2	Figure and photograph updates (color palette, clarity, labels)	6	Update figures.
A3	Provide additional information on GI (limitations, feasibility, technical considerations)	8	Provide a response and additional text where warranted.
A4	Careful phrasing to ensure plan doesn't lead to additional mandated requirements	2	Rephrase text as necessary.
A5	Clarification on included references	2	Provide a response and additional text where warranted.
A6	Comments or questions on prioritization methodology, results, scores	10	Add additional text to allow for easier interpretation of scores. Include explanation on methodology.
A7	Technical comments on the climate modeling methodology	1	Does not require edit. Respond to comment.
A8	Comments on potential funding sources	5	Add caveats to use of specific funding sources for certain typologies only.

Overall, none of the public or member agency comments require significant changes to the draft Master Plan. Where possible, C/CAG will revise the Master Plan to address the comments or refer to other relevant documents, as appropriate (e.g., regarding the numerous native plant comments, C/CAG will revise the text to emphasize the importance of and benefit from use of native plants in green infrastructure facilities and sustainable streets, and reference existing C/CAG guidance documents including the Green Infrastructure Design Guide and C.3 Regulated Projects Technical Guidance Manual where planting guidance has already been developed). For comments specific to particular projects or requests for particular additional projects within a jurisdiction, C/CAG will be referring the comments to member agency staff for their information/action.

Staff and the consultant team will provide a presentation to the Committee on the planned response to comments, including showing the updated web-based Green Infrastructure Tracking Tool. Staff recommends that the Committee take action to recommend the C/CAG Board of Directors adopt the Master Plan as final at their meeting in February, based on the planned approach to addressing comments received on the draft plan.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Table of categorized public comments
2. Additional public comments (unable to fit in Attachment 1)

Draft Sustainable Streets Master Plan - Public Comment Table	
Comment Category	Category ID
Requests to prioritize native plants	P1
Requests for general project elements (wildlife-friendly street lighting, use of specific BMPs, etc.)	P2
Site specific recommendations	P3
Traffic/congestion concerns	P4
Requests to expand on specific topics	P5
Request to include additional projects from other planning efforts (City of San Mateo)	P6
General approval/ disapproval	P7
Comment	Category
Thank you for working to improve our streets. Please promote California native plants - like juncus and sages - so that we also support our native insects and birds.	P1
As a long time resident of the Bay Area I would love to see more California Native plants used as they are hardier during low water/drought years, more disease resistant and requires less maintenance, attracts more native birds, butterflies and other pollinators and less water than non native plants. Once established additional water may not be needed at all.	P1
From California Nativescapes: Please add the need for California Natives as a street trees & landscaping for the Countywide Sustainable Streets Master Plan. California Natives are under represented as street trees, but they are the trees that belong here. City's that have worked with their big old growth trees are magnificent, and their trees are statues monuments in those cities (Palo Alto, Los Altos, Menlo Park, etc.). There are many small trees that are very suitable as street trees. Likewise California Natives as a showcase in other landscape areas, will help show true sustainability by planting the plants that belong here.	P1
Are you going to put in CA native plants? You can use Calscape.org to search for plants and nurseries that at native to san mateo county. Thanks!	P1
I am requesting that you prioritize planting native California plants as part of the Plan. Thank you.	P1
I am pleased to learn that San Mateo County is undertaking a countywide Sustainable Streets masterplan. I live in the Menlo Oaks neighborhood, an unincorporated area of San Mateo County, where we are lucky to have many mature oaks and redwoods. Those mature oaks and redwoods set this neighborhood apart from many neighborhoods and make it a desirable place to live. I recently read in a Sierra Club publication that U.S. metropolitan areas account for 85 percent of our population and more than 90 percent of American jobs and economic output. I also recently read Nature's Best Hope , a book by Douglas Tallamy, and what I understood from it is that we no longer have the open space left in the U.S. to rescue the diminishing population of birds and insects that are so vital for our ecological health. The solution that he proposes is that we all take responsibility for nourishing birds and insects by planting native plants and trees in our yards. The same logic would apply to Sustainable Streets. Planting native trees, shrubs, plants, and flowers will help restore bird and insect populations and thereby nurture us. Conversely, planting non-native street trees and non-native plants and grasses will do little to sustain bird and insect populations. I hope the Sustainable Street Plan will consider benefits to wildlife while planning for benefits to the humans living in the County.	P1
Please consider emphasizing the importance of using california native plants in this plan. Plants that are indigenous to the area, when selected and installed correctly, will provide myriad benefits. Not only are California indigenous plants low water use, many of them are easy care (to the skilled gardener) and offer essential habitat to butterflies and birds. Providing plants from the local area allows folks who live and work there to feel a sense of connection and identity with their surroundings. As climate change and other environmental catastrophes worsen, we owe it to our earth to create as many habitat friendly, low water use, pesticide free landscape areas as we can. You can help specify and guide this in the plan and thus have the potential to do great good.	P1
I love the concepts of sustainable streets and just want to urge you to use northern CA native plants as much as possible in the plantings. They are very resilient & if well chosen will require little water. A real plus. They are good for the native bird and insect species, too. And so are good for the environment, as well.	P1
Comments for plants for San Mateo Sustainable/Native plant evaluation. Sources for information to optimize plantings for butterflies include www.callscape.org where you can sort by Zip code (94402) for native plants and then sort by the number of butterfly species each plant attracts. Best include Ribes ((gooseberries), Prunus (Native Cherries, etc.), Willow, Ceanothus, Lupine, Frangula (coffeeberry) and Manzanita. Many of these native plants can be ordered from San Bruno Mountain Watch (Mission Blue) nursery. Other sources include Xerces Society and a web link is below: https://xerces.org/sites/default/files/2018-05/17-045_02_XercesSoc_Pollinator-Plants_California_web-4page.pdf and www.pollinator.org Pollinator Partnership. A non-profit San Francisco based 501(c)3 organization-- the largest in the world dedicated exclusively to the protection and promotion of pollinators and their ecosystems.	P1
I have in the last 3 years begun using more native California plants in my garden. The results have been increased sightings of butterflies and many more birds. I would strongly encourage you to consider more sustainable sidewalk and hiway/freeway plantings incorporating native California plants.	P1
I support urban streets with priority toward trees for shade and traffic slowing in addition to making the street more pedestrian friendly. Please allocate enough room for trees, removing concrete if needed. Also make selection of Native trees a priority. Urban biodiversity is a hot button topic because it is a time sensitive, crucial part of saving nature and the planet.	P1
I encourage & support San Mateo County becoming more sustainable & using native plantings for your green streets. Adding contiguous plantings of native plants is critical to sustaining insect and bird life, as these plants support the insect fauna that birds need to live. Non-native trees/shrubs generally do not support insects in the same numbers, leading to less food for birds and of course that means fewer birds.	P1

How wonderful to have sustainable streets. Please also consider making them sustainable for our local fauna by mandating the use of truly local plants. We will be rewarded with bird songs all year long! Thank you for your consideration.	P1
Please use native plants	P1
I see that native plant advocates are organizing to ask San Mateo to adopt a "natives only" policy for the General Plan. It appears their argument will be that birds are best served by native plants. Therefore, I am writing to tell you about a few of the many studies that disprove their belief. 1. John M. Marzluff, Welcome to Subirdia, Yale University Press, 2014. Marzluff is an academic ornithologist at University of Washington in Seattle. His book reports on decades of research about birds that find: "The forests of Seattle and its suburbs now embrace 141 species of trees, including 30 native species and ornamentals from North and South America, Europe, Asia, and Africa...They provide a diverse menu of foods and nesting and roosting sites for birds." His research around the world is consistent with his findings in Seattle. 2. Linda Chalker-Scott, "Nonnative, Noninvasive Woody Species Can Enhance Urban Landscape Biodiversity," Arboriculture & Urban Forestry, 2015, 41(4): 173-186 Chalker-Scott is also an academic scientist at University of Washington. Her meta-analysis of 120 studies from 30 countries that quantified the biodiversity of birds, insects, mammals, reptiles, and other plants in woody plants and trees in urban landscapes concluded: "The published research overwhelmingly identifies diversity, structure, and function as the most important vegetation characteristics for enhancing community biodiversity...In fact, sometimes landscapes require the inclusion of exotic trees and control of natives to maintain diversity." 3. Clare Aslan and Marcel Rejmanek, "Avian use of introduced plants: Ornithologist records illuminate interspecific associations and research needs," Ecological Applications, 20(4), 2010. This study done at UC Davis sent over 1,000 questionnaires to bird watchers who were members of birding societies, asking them to report their observations of interactions of birds with plants. Most responses were from California. "Interact" is defined as the full range of bird behavior: eat, nest, perch, glean, etc. Respondents to the survey reported that 47% of observations of feeding by 139 bird species were of seeds or fruits of non-native plants. Thirty-five percent of all "habitat interactions" were with non-native plants and 26% of all nesting activity was in non-native plants. The needs of wildlife, including birds, are best served by a diverse mix of plant species that prolongs the blooming season. Such diversity is achieved with a mix of native and non-native plants. The most important thing that San Mateo can do for wildlife and the safety of the people of San Mateo is to ban all pesticides, including herbicides.	P1
I would like to recommend strongly the use of California native plants and trees usage in the Sustainable Streets Master Plan. Native plants are highly suited to the climate and ecology and support native bird, bee, insect and animal life, whereas non-natives do not support local organisms, and represent food deserts for native insects, bees, birds, butterflies, etc. Please emphasize use of California native plants and trees in your projects.	P1
Hello! I would like to ask that local CA native plants are used when possible. Thank you!	P1
For the San Mateo plan, I recommend using Native plants wherever you can as they are necessary for birds and we all need more of them.	P1
Please use local native plants in Sustainable Streets SMC projects. Local native plants feed moths and butterflies via caterpillars. Most exotics can't provide the forage due to chemicals in the leaves that make them impenetrable. A study showed that 96% of the food birds feed to their nestlings are caterpillars. It's critical that the Master Plan adds local native plants almost exclusively now rather than try to correct an error after landscaping commitments have been made.	P1
I urge you to encourage or require the use of local native plants. Because California is a biodiversity hotspot, meaning we are blessed with an abundance of native plant and wildlife species, many of which we humans have brought to the brink of extinction. No other state has greater biodiversity. This is our natural heritage. By converting and degrading naturally occurring grasslands, woodlands and all our various habitat types, we've destroyed habitat for bees, butterflies and birds; their populations have declined precipitously in recent decades. This is a message of hope that you can include in the San Mateo Countywide Sustainable Streets Master Plan a requirement for planting local native plants--to support bees, butterflies and birds. The word "local" is important; plants from other parts of the state are not indigenous.	P1
I am writing to urge that plants native to this part of California be used in "sustainable streets" landscaping as the default option, and that the use of non-natives be avoided. We are fortunate to have a large variety of attractive, drought tolerant and pest resistant natives to choose from. In addition to these virtues, native plants and trees are essential for the survival of our bird population, which is visibly and audibly declining. I was astonished to learn that to raise a clutch of chickadees, the parents must provide about 9,000 caterpillars from the time the baby birds hatch until they fledge (Audubon). Native plants and trees are hosts to the insects and caterpillars chickadees and other birds require. Native insects, on the other hand, are less likely to use non-natives. The "Sixth Great Extinction" is not an abstraction to me. I do not remember the last time I saw a caterpillar, or a garter snake, or a toad. There is less and less birdsong; I see few butterflies, beetles, or other once-common creatures while I work in my (pesticide free) garden. The reasons for these declines are various--but I do see that most public landscaping is non-native and that non-native invasives such as jubata grass, French broom, ivy and iceplant are multiplying rapidly in open spaces. It is no wonder that bugs, birds and other creatures are finding fewer places to live and much less to eat. One way to help the wildlife that is left is to use native plants as much as possible in public spaces. Please.	P1
Hi. I continue to read through the draft Sustainable Streets Master Plan and am impressed and so pleased with what I've seen so far. One thing struck me in reading through it and viewing other parts of the website - I saw a lot about green streets and green infrastructure and I know this can have lots of different meanings (environmentally sustainable, energy efficient, water-wise, etc.) One thing it means to me is plant life suitable to the climate and environment and ecology, but I didn't see much guidance about recommended plant/tree usage in the Plan. I would hope there could be some guidance added that encourages use of appropriate California native plants/trees rather than non-natives. Native plants are highly suited to the climate and ecology and support native bird, bee, insect and animal life. Often non-natives do not provide this and are devoid of characteristics to support the native ecology. They are food deserts for native insects, bees, birds, butterflies, etc. I would hope these new Sustainable Street projects could and would support California native plants and trees which, in turn, support the native ecology. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.	P1
Hi, I live in San Carlos and am committed to native plants. They make so much more sense on every level than using non-native plants. They are adapted to our weather, allowing for much less maintenance than non-natives that are not used to our wet winters and dry summers. The health of our communities, both insects, birds and mammals (including humans) will benefit from the use of native plants. Thanks Brenda Porter	P1
PLEASE use only California Native plants in the landscaping. There are multiple reasons for this and it would sent a good example for the community. Thank you - member of the California Native Plant Society.	P1

<p>I am writing here to comment on the San Mateo Countywide Sustainable Streets Master Plan. I am a longtime resident of Menlo Park and am very happy to see the plans that have developed so far. I appreciate your outreach efforts to the public, and your review of all of the public comments. I laud your efforts to develop this master plan, based on principles of sustainability.</p> <p>The master plan states, "Green infrastructure uses plants and soils to mimic natural watershed processes, capture and treat stormwater, and create healthier environments." (Source: https://www.flowstobay.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/DRAFT-PLAN-San-Mateo-County-SSMP-12.07.2020.pdf, -pages 8 and 34.) To that end, I ask that you explicitly state that only native plants will be used for the green infrastructure. The use of non-native plants is not a sustainable practice, and in the long run creates a host of new problems.</p> <p>Native plants are ecologically adapted to where they are naturally found. They are part of an entire ecosystem of fauna and flora, thousands of species that have co-evolved, and provide checks and balances on all members within that ecosystem. By introducing a handful of non-native plant species, the entire ecosystem is disrupted-the balance is thrown off, and cannot be restored. Non-native plants, i.e. plants that historically did not evolve here, lack the controls to keep them in check. They do not interact or perform nearly as successfully with the local fauna and flora. The use of non-native plants displaces native plants, and the consequences to all of the rest of the ecosystem can be lethal. The populations of animals and other plant species that are dependent on our local plants decline and in many instances disappear completely. Over time, non-native spread and become a nuisance to landscaping and agriculture, often requiring more measures (often usage of pesticides) to control.</p> <p>There are native plants (trees, grasses, et al.) that can achieve all of the goals of the Master Plan. With planning, native plants can be grown and made available for this program when they will be needed. Please add language to the Master Plan to include the exclusive usage of native plants.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of the issues raised above.</p>	P1
<p>I am proud to live and have worked (recently retired teacher) in San Mateo County with their efforts for a sustainable living environment. We need bike paths everywhere to lower the need for cars. Make El Camino safe for riders. It's a hub to easy access to trains, other cities and work. I rode my bike from San Mateo to San Jose on El Camino and it was scary, especially through Redwood City. More bike lanes promote exercise, zero emissions and good overall health.</p> <p>I would also like to have more NATIVE California plants used in the green belt areas. Having Natives promote:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Better adaptation to their surroundings 2. Less water needed once established 3. Less maintenance 4. Reduced pesticides due to resistance to pests with many species 5. Creation of habitats for wildlife, which include pollinators, with is good for our entire world. <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	P1
<p>As a 5th generation Californian who has lived in San Mateo County for almost 30 years (including 25 years in the City of San Mateo), I know this place and want to do what I can to make sure Sustainable Streets honors what is special about it. To that end, I formally request that wherever it is practicable the landscaping in the Sustainable Streets program use native plants. They are attractive. Many varieties are highly fire resistant. Also, they are so well adapted to the specific local conditions that they require little or no irrigation. Furthermore, their inclusion will begin to re-establish critical habitat for other endemic species and help to prevent further extinctions of local native flora</p>	P1
<p>The plans look good and it would be great if the plants used in the projects could be local California native plants wherever possible.</p>	P1
<p>I am a long time resident of San Mateo. First, I want to sincerely thank you for working on sustainable streets. I am a SMC BPAC member, a cyclist, a native plant enthusiast, an Edgewood Park docent, and a California Native Plant Society member.</p> <p>I would like to ask you to only use local CA native plants in your sustainable streets plan. The more I learn about the benefits of planting CA native plants over non-local plants, the more incredulous it seems that anyone would choose a non-native. And here is a short summary:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- According to a nine-year case study conducted by the City of Santa Monica, native plants typically use about 83 percent less water, produce about 56 percent less green waste and require nearly 70 percent less maintenance. 2- Adult song birds eat seed, but baby song birds do not. They need caterpillars. And the moths and butterflies that create the caterpillars are incredibly species specific, meaning that they will only eat and lay eggs on plants that they have evolved with. You may think that just any old plant will work. But they will not use plants they are not adapted to. This is a major reason why the song bird population has declined in the US by more than 40% since 1970. 3- CA native plants have evolved with fire. And they are more fire resistant than non-natives. There is a landscape designer, Greg Rubin, who has demonstrated this: https://youtu.be/K2BSGjqT_Sk <p>And here is the longer story with more detail: Street and park trees can be helpful for maintaining populations of songbirds and pollinators, generally an order of magnitude more so if they are locally native species. By the way, relict or naturalized native vegetation in urban areas, such as along creek lines can be much more effective for the same purposes if freed from destructive shading and crowding by naturalized woody weeds or by insensitive deliberate plantings (hedges or even large trees) that muscle out the natives or leave them in the shade. Willows growing in full sun are a cornucopia of life for breeding birds (supporting many more caterpillars) and for pollinators (flowering far more freely and effectively for insects when growing in the sun (many fewer insects come to shaded out flower resources).</p> <p>Locally native trees support far more caterpillars, essential food for all breeding songbirds. In San Francisco, out of about 400 recorded species of moths and butterflies, the coast live oak supports caterpillars of 39 species -- far more than any other tree. More songbirds make for a better quality of life. Where there are native oaks</p>	

<p>Even several butterflies require oaks for their caterpillars, especially the mournful duskywing, one of the more commonly seen butterflies in settled areas, especially where more native oaks either remain or have been planted. Non-native oaks in some cases have some value, but far less.</p> <p>Even one (better a group) California buckeye planted in a favorable location can host a colony of echo blue butterflies, while drawing more or less every species of butterfly to its flowers. Notably, a spectacular oak feeder (its caterpillars) is the California Sister, which is a high-flying species much more likely to feed on buckeye tree flowers than any other; a few buckeyes to complement heritage oaks creates far better habitat for it to thrive. Where willows are present, the buckeye provides nectar for adult butterflies whose caterpillar stage is nourished by the willows, such as Western Tiger Swallowtail or Lorquin's Admiral. More of such beauties about makes for a better quality of human life.</p> <p>An interesting contrast is between our native bigleaf maple and the common and admittedly beautiful Japanese maple. The bigleaf maple has flowers which attract insects, even supporting many bumblebees and some butterflies; and its leaves support many caterpillars, notably a favorite for our largest and most spectacular moth, the Polyphemus moth. Whereas the Japanese maple supports no insects and thus is of very little value to birds and no value to pollinators.</p> <p>The whole world is becoming "homogenized" in its built landscape appearance, with many of the same exotic (and often worthless to songbirds and pollinators) plants used over large areas, so that landscapes often provide rather little in the way of "sense of place". Every part of the the world has its unique spectrum of native plants, and, when used in landscaping, those locally native plants reinforce the sense of "there" there!</p> <p>Once upon a time, California was famous for its wonderful wildflower displays; but looking at our "built" landscaping, which typically comes out as if they had never existed, one might never know -- a pity. It was our annual wildflowers, imported to Europe, that began the very custom of planting for "annual color". They are still capable of delivering "seasonal color" (with strong bonus benefits for pollinators), especially here, but tragically rarely thought of in planning urban and suburban landscapes.</p> <p>Thank you so much!!</p>	<p>P1</p>
<p>I've just learned of the opportunity to offer comments on the county's Master Plan for Sustainable Streets project. I am a native of San Mateo and recently retired as a Deputy Agriculture Commissioner with 29 years of service in the counties of San Mateo and Alameda, having managed Plant/Pest Quarantine and Invasive Species programs during my tenure. I have a B.S. in Botany and Plant Ecology as well a extensive coursework/experience in Horticulture and Landscape Design and have a particular interest in native plant design. I offer this background to you to explain my intense interest in the plan and to speak as a professional with direct knowledge of plant ecology and design.</p> <p>I would like to encourage the county to use native plants whenever possible in the landscape design portion of the work. This will not only save water, maintenance time/costs, and disease incidence in plantings, but will also provide a significant benefit for wildlife, which I read is one of the goals of the program. I imagine that you are aware that recent studies have definitively shown that native plants support local (and migratory) birds, native reptiles, amphibians and pollinators, as native plants support the insect life needed for birds and other animals and are excellent sources of pollen and nectar for bees, butterflies, moths, hummingbirds and other animals that utilize these food sources. There are many accomplished Designers and Landscape Architects with knowledge of appropriate native plants for use in our area.</p> <p>It is of course understood that in some of the smaller projects, native trees might not be able to be used in which case consideration should be given to trees that provide the best food sources for birds. For plants other than trees, the native plant choices are very broad and material is readily available in the nursery industry.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on this program. It will be wonderful to see each of these projects completed and I hope that with careful use of native plants we can increase continuity of habitat for wildlife as we become increasingly urbanized.</p>	<p>P1</p>
<p>I am very happy that you are doing this work! Delighted! Great work, and I wish we had the funding to all of the projects next year! I do have a few suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Please use local California native plants. Pollinators are dependent on finding food and habitat on the local plants they have evolved with over hundreds of thousands of years. And in particular, use "keystone" California plants that provide habitat for the majority of our wildlife .(Oak trees are an example.) 2- Could you incentivize home owners to use permeable driveways and water capture systems so that less water runs into our storm drains in residential areas? 3- Could you prioritize street lighting that does not cause light pollution in the sky? These lights light the streets better, at a lower cost. 	<p>P1/P2</p>
<p>Hello, I hope 2021 brings back Nature</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Plant native plants, encourage native wildlife - Use bio swales - Instead of developing along the Bay, work on a living shoreline to buffer this important area from the impacts of climate change - When installing lighting use international dark skies recommended lighting which is better for people and wildlife 	<p>P1/P2</p>

Master Plan.

The Yerba Buena Chapter of the California Native Plant Society is a non-profit organization with over 600 members in San Francisco and Northern San Mateo County. Our parent organization has over 10,000 members statewide. The mission of CNPS is to conserve California native plants and their natural habitats, and increase understanding, appreciation, and horticultural use of native plants. Our vision includes a future where Californians can experience thriving biological diversity, even in human-altered landscapes.

OVERALL

We commend your master plan for addressing climate change and for green infrastructure recommendations that include rain gardens, stormwater curb extensions, green roofs and street trees. However, we're concerned that your master plan, by failing to recommend local native plants for your infrastructure proposals, overlooks the ongoing biodiversity crisis that the UN Global Assessment says is on par with the climate change crisis. Promoting native plants in urban areas can help these landscapes support wildlife populations and is a key component of conservation for Bay Area species. Exotic plants can only do this in a very limited capacity.

As the San Francisco Estuary Institute points out in its urban planning document, Making Nature's Cities[1], many studies have found greater biodiversity in urban greenspaces with greater abundance and richness of native plants (Goddard et al. 2010, Aronson et al. 2017, Threlfall et al. 2017). Native plants have complex and interdependent relationships with other organisms, developed through deep shared evolutionary histories (e.g. Ehrlich and Raven 1964). Many insects have strongly specialized relationships with host plants or specialized diets resulting from adaptations to tolerate plant chemical defenses (e.g. high tannin content in oak leaves, Stone et al. 2009). The presence of specialized insects can form the basis of food webs that cascade upwards, enhancing biodiversity of other wildlife. As a result, non-native plants are often poor substitutes for native plants, and exotic-dominated urban habitats tend to support less native wildlife (Goddard et al. 2010, Aronson et al. 2017).

Native plants are the foundation of the food web and must be considered in any planning document. In fact, according to extensive research[2] done by entomologist Doug Tallamy, insect-eating birds whose young depend on a high-calorie, high-protein diet — namely caterpillars and spiders — struggle to feed their young in landscapes with even a small proportion of nonnative plants.

APPENDIX ITEMS

1) Appendix F Sustainable Street Model Policy

The examples use the word "Green" but that can mean invasive or exotics which can harm or have no connection to the unique San Francisco Peninsula. All too often exotic nonnative plants are pest free, which usually means those plants were treated with herbicides (neonicotinoids) at the nursery. Those plants from another country contribute to the biodiversity there but often will not attract local, specialist pollinators including the butterflies and bees here. Instead "Green" should be replaced with "local native" which are plants that will contribute to local biodiversity and are likely to thrive in the local soil and rainfall. We recommend that a primary objective of this project includes use of native plants in all revegetation and landscaping.

2) Appendix G Tech Suitability and Co-benefit Maps

The climate change impact maps show impacts throughout the peninsula along the Bay and Ocean. Living Shorelines[3] are encouraged to prevent the negative impacts of sea level rise and storm surge from climate change. Oyster reefs, resilient native wetland and marsh plants should be considered whenever feasible to protect the shore and provide habitat for wildlife and beautiful shoreline areas for people to enjoy.[4] Native plants have a beneficial role to perform in filtering and cleansing runoff, and can help protect vulnerable communities through changing climate conditions.

Finally, we raise the following additional issues related to Sustainable Streetscape Projects:

(A) Please use the International Dark Skies Association as a resource[5]. Use the minimal amount of lighting required, motion detectors where appropriate, and shielding directed to the specific areas where light is needed. This will save natural resources and minimize negative impacts of artificial night light[6] on humans, insects, birds, plants and other wildlife.

(B) What measures will prevent trash and runoff from polluting the watersheds, Bay and Pacific Ocean? If the bioswales and bulbouts are filled with trash then the plants will not be performing the intended ecosystem services. If degraded in this way, people will complain and the project will be seen as a failure. Also, can this Master Plan simultaneously communicate information on pollution prevention through transportation choices, purchasing choices, and eliminating trash and minimizing recycling and promoting neighborhood to shoreline cleanups within the community?

(C) A maintenance component is recommended to ensure that the planted areas are kept up through weeding and trash removal.

IN SUMMARY:

We recommend a firm commitment to use native plants for vegetation. At the very least, we request an analysis of the environmental effects of any use of non-native plants.

The chapter would be happy to help with choosing appropriate native plants for upcoming projects. We have created a document[7] that includes native plant landscaping recommendation for San Francisco County that may be a useful reference for Northern San Mateo County.

[1] <https://www.sfei.org/projects/making-natures-city>

[2] <https://nationalzoo.si.edu/news/new-smithsonian-study-links-declines-suburban-backyard-birds-presence-nonnative-plants>

[3] http://www.sfbaylivingshorelines.org/Library/SFBayLivingShorelinesProjDes_052412.pdf

[4] <https://www.sfestuary.org/estuary-news-giant-marsh-living-shoreline/>[4]

[5] <https://www.darksky.org/our-work/lighting/>

[6] <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-018-00665-7>

[7] http://cnps-yerbabuena.org/wp-content/uploads/Low-Impact-Design_rev1.doc.pdf

P1/P2

Please include bicycle paths for all options.

Please include rain water collection in planting beds wherever possible.

Thank you

P2

I strongly commend your Sustainable Streets efforts. I live on Carmelita Drive in San Carlos, with 85' of frontage on Pulgas Creek, so I have a strong interest in stormwater management. However, I would like to see more recognition in your planning on the habitat value of landscaping. I'm frankly tired of nice-looking landscapes - without an insect or bird to be seen! A more holistic approach would be a win-win for the environment. California native plants (appropriate to the micro-climate) co-evolved with our native insect and bird species. Such natives would be ideal for habitat planting and should be considered. Many California monocots are particularly useful in seasonal wet areas. On somewhat higher ground, on my own property I have planted Toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*) and Redbud trees (*Cercis occidentalis*) and have had much success in attracting the birds and the bees. I'm sure that the Santa Clara Valley chapter of the California Native Plant Society can connect you with professional resources. Good luck on your program!!

P1

Please consider this on N Humboldt Street between Poplar and Peninsula.

P3

The ride on RALSTON Ave in Belmont from Alameda de las Puelgas to the bike path leading to CANDADA Rd is perilous. The shoulders are narrow and the cars are whizzing by at 50 mph. A protected bike lane is desperately needed.

P3

Ralston Avenue needs protected bicycle lanes; part of Ralston (downtown) has a full lane shared with cars; part a narrow bike lane that is too bumpy for road bikes, and the western part above Alameda has no lane and no shoulder with cars going 40+ mph, making access to the bike bridge/Canada Road treacherous. Any way you can create safe protected bike lanes for us?

P3

Great project, I would like to see a solution as well for Alameda de las Pulgas from Belmont border to crystal spring. Many schools along the way that could benefit from such bike lanes.

P3

The concept for Santa Cruz Avenue surprised me. I didn't see any bicycle lanes. Is that an oversight? Middle school kids bike down Santa Cruz to Hillview Middle School and high school kids bike up Santa Cruz to Menlo- Atherton HS. Telling the kids something about parallel bike routes is just useless as the will want to go through downtown after school (and often before) to buy an ice cream or a coffee or other things. With so many children biking through this street I can't understand why there is ample outdoor sitting space but no bike lane planned. What are our priorities here? Safety for the kids? Or additional tables for the businesses?

P3

San Mateo County seems to have a predominance of North/South bike lanes and trails i.e. bay trail, Canada Rd, Alameda de las Pulgas etc... San Mateo County lacks East/West bike lanes and Trails. Major through-fares like Ralston, Woodside, Whipple, Crystal Springs are narrow and inconsistent. Further N/S routes tend to be flatter. E/W routes are hilly. We can't change the hills, but as an avid cyclist, I know that when going up hill, a bike lane is critical. Another example: I have followed the CalTrain route. It is easy to bike from station to station. Biking from most stations E/W to the community is typically a challenge. In reviewing the plan, there still seems to be a trend to have more N/S routes or more improvement in N/S routes. In the priority score for projects, underserved directions, should receive more points to help make them a priority.

P3

I understand your proposals. However, I will not support ANY plan which will increase traffic congestion along El Camino Real.

P4

these are great concepts--Bravo! I would like to see the data from emergency responder tests of how many seconds are lost when we install curbs and other hardscape. I have witnessed several incidents where fire engines --getting ever larger-- cannot traverse around traffic calming. LA is dealing with this as well.

As a reminder, the most common cause of death in the US is heart disease; and if emergency personnel cannot get to someone who is suffering sudden cardiac arrest, 30 seconds can mean life or death. Please rely on actual data to demonstrate we are not burdening our 1st responders and causing more deaths than lives saved.

P4

I do not agree with encouraging bicyclists to be using SM parks. I am extremely against adding in a bike lane as bicyclists cause accidents, and largely do not follow traffic or helmet laws. I like the idea of following Burlingame's more sustainable rain gutters.	P4
I really don't understand how you seem to think that cutting lanes of traffic in half will not make already bad traffic even worse. Also, where will people park? Fix public transportation FIRST! Then start building less car friendly places. Building these without the proper public transportation infrastructure is why places like Uber and Lyft are able to step in and actually MAKE TRAFFIC WORSE to the point that anyone who CAN will pay someone else to do the driving, which means that even more cars are driving even more miles. My coworker used public transportation and it would take her two hours to go a distance that takes 20 min to drive. And that was if she left at 6am, before the rush. This is just not tenable for most people. Make public transportation convenient and pleasant and a LOT more people would use it. Acting like we aren't a car based society won't make things better, it will only make things worse. Fix public transportation first!	P4
Excellent work, and very useful. Identification and design of feasible and effective Green Infrastructure retrofit projects involves, as a primary step, locating low points in the existing street drainage (generally these are catch basin locations), investigating the extent and characteristics of the catchment draining to each point, and then determining if a selected catch basin location is amenable to retrofit with appropriately sized bioretention (that is, if one or more flat green spaces at the required elevation can be integrated with the street, gutter, sidewalk, utilities, and other infrastructure at that location). The discussion of the Drainage Management Area Assessment Tool (Section 6.1) captures this design process and is a significant advance in facilitating the process; however, the SSMP as a whole could be strengthened by introducing this information earlier and featuring it more prominently.	P5
Looking at the map, it seems that for city of San Mateo, it's high density of population should incorporate more green route, and there's almost none. How can we increase more?	P5
This looks like good ideas. Its also looks like good ideas for SMC to help county small businesses. Contact independently owned nursery owners, lighting companies, concrete companies, painters and what ever else would be needed to carry this project out, NOT the larger companies that are state and national wide. KEEP IT IN THE COUNTY!!	P5
I love it. We need more green designation bike lanes, not city wide but county. We also need bike lanes street swept w the machines like city streets. The information was on track with the previous sustainable meetings in 1917-1918.	P5
I liked the renderings and about the City of Burlingame safe streets and parking. I would like to be able to look at those facts and schedules at a slower pace. Thank you.	P7
I don't have time to read all of the phraseology and jargon in this report and likely this is the case with many others. Separate bike lanes are the only way for widespread adaptation. If an 8 year old or 80 year old feels safe, others will, and we can enjoy the benefit of our climate. Currently, the Bay Area is largely a transportation dystopia whereby tech feels that they can solve the world's problems, all while locals don't feel safe on a bike due to awful infrastructure. Glad this project is going on, but the very way it's presented is only going to gain marginal support instead of widespread adoption. Again, keep it simple and recognize the time that others have to devote to engaging in the project. Also, be an advocate for the many unspoken who would benefit from separated bike paths and don't prioritize angry folks who prioritize car infrastructure at all costs. Thank you.	P7
Very supportive! Can we get more of these for San Mateo please?!	P7
I like the separation between the sidewalk and parking so that we capture pollutants in rain water. It mitigates any flood risk as well. We need to improve our roads and current infrastructure as well so that what we currently have is usable for the future. Please continue to think about adding more greenery to locations.	P7
Thank you for sharing the plan ideas. I am looking forward to seeing San Mateo County streets more bike and pedestrian friendly.	P7
I love it! I'm a big supporter and hope to see more improvements like this soon. I'm glad my tax dollars are being used to make the community better, safer and more accessible.	P7
I have great reservations about these plans.	P7
It's about time !!! This is great news. We are logging behind European, Asian, and Middle Eastern countries !!! what a shame. Thanks to the people behind this movement !!!	P7
I am interested in getting involved with this amazing effort ... I have a 40 Year background in sustainability and can provide help!	P7
the San Mateo City Council and the Public Works Department on consolidating Master Plans and determining project priorities. 50-60 percent of the city's Public Works budget is spent on Paving (see screenshot and minute 17 of the Council report). The explanation given for this is that if you repave a road while it's still "good" it costs a lot less than if you wait and then have to repave a road from "poor" quality up to "good." The costs rise exponentially the longer you wait because the condition of the road just keeps getting worse and worse. But this approach to budgeting does not seem sustainable from an environmental perspective or from a fiscal perspective. Rather than repaving to maintain the status quo of asphalt roads, funds could instead be spent on transforming the streets into places that can absorb stormwater runoff. Or if the Paving budget was reduced down to 40 percent, shaving off \$7M, then the city could fund all of the quick-build projects identified in the Bike Master Plan. I am asking that in the County Sustainable Streets Plan, the county create incentives for cities to redistribute funds to more sustainable options and disincentives to have a majority of the infrastructure budget go to Paving. Thank you very much!	P5/P6

Public Comment – Draft Sustainable Streets Master Plan
Time Stamp – Wed 12/16/2020 9:46 PM
Category – P5/P6

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the San Mateo Countywide Draft Sustainable Streets Master Plan document. Here are my recommendations. I am sending them via email since I am including some embedded hyperlinks and I am not sure how the Community Engagement Hub would handle those.

Include Projects and Principles from City Plans

In Appendix C, Recommended Sustainable Street Planned Project Opportunities, the Countywide Plan is missing projects listed in the [City of San Mateo City Council approved 2015 Sustainable Streets Plan](#). There may also be projects from the [2012 Citywide Pedestrian Master Plan](#). I see there are many from the [2020 City Bicycle Master Plan](#) listed.

Quick-build Section in Plan

There should be a list of projects that can be tackled right away using [quick-build](#) features. In the Plan, Appendix C, Recommended Sustainable Street Planned Project Opportunities, opportunities for quick-build should be identified, perhaps in a separate list.

Focus on Regional Connectivity

Specifically, the County should prioritize projects that are under Caltrans jurisdiction. As the County, you can help create a thoughtful approach to these projects that cross jurisdictions.

Make ECR from 2nd-9th Avenues a Sustainable Street

In particular, I want to advocate that the County help get the corridor along El Camino Real between 2nd-9th Avenues to become a Sustainable Street as soon as possible.

It meets all the requirements to be a top priority — it's an area with a high risk for collision and there is great potential to improve safety, it is the backbone of connectivity for the county, it is a connection for transit with Caltrain and many bus routes, it can help improve equity for our community, and it can help with access to schools, parks, and essential services like grocery stores.

Please see pages 50-51 (4-4 - 4-5), pages 109-115 (B-11 - B-17) and pages 257 - 261 (F-21 - F-25) of the [City of San Mateo City 2015 Sustainable Streets Plan](#). There is a great detail in this plan, but it was also mentioned in the 2020 San Mateo Bicycle Master Plan (p. 44) in less detail.

In the 2015 City of San Mateo Sustainable Streets Plan, it says on p. 109/515 "El Camino Real is the one clearly identifiable corridor for high numbers of pedestrian collisions, and to a lesser degree, bicycle collisions." For that plan, they were looking at data from 2007-2011. At a [November 2020 City Council Meeting](#), during a report on traffic management looking at data from 2017-2019, they also identified El Camino Real as a hotspot for collisions, with a collision resulting in an injury involving a pedestrian or bicyclist occurring once every 50 days.

See page 50/515 for more details for this corridor along El Camino Real between 2nd-9th Avenues planned in the 2015 Sustainable Streets Plan. The plan states, "A road diet would transform El Camino Real between 2nd Avenue and 9th Avenue by reducing the number of travel lanes from six to four, with left-turn lanes at key intersections. The new configuration would include two travel lanes in each

direction and a new landscaped median. This would extend the configuration that is currently present north of 2nd Avenue all the way to 9th Avenue. It would transform El Camino Real from a perceived and real barrier to an inviting downtown gateway that connects Central Park with the public library and other destinations in the area." The aspects about the landscaped median have some green infrastructure components to it as well. This should not fall off the radar of the County Sustainable Streets Plan, especially since El Camino Real is the backbone of connectivity for the county.

In Appendix F of the city plan, Chapter 5, F-21 - F-25 (p. 257/515 - 261/515) Sustainable Streets Level of Service and Multimodal Analysis October 2014, you will see more details for the improvements to El Camino Real between 2nd-9th Avenues, which is located in the heart of downtown San Mateo. These changes and the ones detailed in earlier sections should be implemented in the long-run, and in the short run, San Mateo County should work with Caltrans on a **quick-build solution** to take action on one of the recommendations -- "the signals should default to a pedestrian crossing phase on every cycle." This can be done through software reprogramming.

In October 2020, Caltrans announced that they would be using Lead Pedestrian Interval signals at several locations along El Camino Real, so there is precedent for taking this kind of action recently.

[Caltrans Highlights Efforts to Reduce Pedestrian Injury and Death](#)

[Pedestrian Safety Measures Locations](#)

The county should advocate and work with Caltrans to make this corridor of El Camino Real safer right now. Given the history of collisions along this corridor (on p. 114 of the City Sustainable Streets Plan, "Roughly 39% of collisions involving pedestrians occurred at intersections, with notable clusters along S.R. 82/El Camino Real at 3rd and 5th Avenues..."), we cannot wait for the next round to be identified in September 2021. We have already been waiting too long for action on other plans that have not yet been implemented. Please take steps with Caltrans to see that this quick-build solution is implemented right away.

Green Infrastructure and Complete Street Features for New Projects and New Developments

With new projects and new developments, the county should require that green infrastructure and complete street features be included to create low impact development and safe areas for pedestrians and bicyclists. And the county should incentivize cities to also adopt this requirement as the county did with the county disposable food items. And work with Caltrans to incorporate these features for the corridors that are under their jurisdiction.

Streets should have the following features:

- wide sidewalks
- pedestrian-scale lighting
- bike lanes
- traffic calming infrastructure (a focus should be on getting quick-build done first, then permanent later) such as wider medians, speed humps, narrower traffic lanes and curb extensions
- rain gardens with native plants and trees on sidewalks or medians, biofiltration planters, bioretention swales
- [stream daylighting](#)
- [permeable surfaces](#)

- Street furniture with shade trees, shelter and attractive lighting and informational signage
- Bicycle parking

One area that is quite interesting and could help with poor water quality at the Marina Lagoon for example is stream daylighting. This is something the County should investigate and try to implement where possible. The City has four main creeks that convey water towards the bay and/or the lagoon; San Mateo Creek, Leslie Creek, Borel Creek, and Laurel Creek. Any creek maintenance requires permits and approval from various regulatory agencies such as California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Also, the City offsets some of the costs by participating in a collaborative, countywide effort, the San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program (SMCWPPP). This is why it is so important that the County take the lead with trying to identify stream daylighting opportunities and include it in the Countywide Sustainable Streets Plan.

Sustainable Streets Fee

I also recommend that the County adopt, and encourage cities to adopt, a fee for developers, called a Sustainable Streets Fee that would fund a wider array of projects, with a focus on those that support the goals of the Plan by improving conditions for all modes.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the plan should:

- Include projects from the 2015 City of San Mateo Sustainable Streets Plan and other City of San Mateo Plans on Ped and Bike safety where missing
- Put an emphasis on identifying quick-build projects
- Focus on cross-jurisdictional areas such as working with Caltrans on ECR improvements
- Advocate for immediate improvements via quick build for ECR along 2nd-9th Avenues
- Create requirements for new projects and new development that can be also adopted by cities
- Create a sustainable streets fee

Thank you for all your work so far on this document. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.

Links: City of San Mateo 2015 Sustainable Streets

Plan: <https://www.cityofsanmateo.org/DocumentCenter/View/44849/1--SanMateoSustainableStreetsFullFINAL---Copy>

2012 Citywide Pedestrian Master Plan: <https://www.cityofsanmateo.org/2218/Pedestrian-Master-Plan>

2020 City Bicycle Master Plan: <https://www.cityofsanmateo.org/3944/Bicycle-Master-Plan-2020>

Calbike Quick-build Guide: <https://www.calbike.org/calbike-releases-quick-build-guide/>

November 2020 City Council

Meeting: <https://sanmateo.primegov.com/Portal/Meeting?compiledMeetingDocumentFileId=11233>

Caltrans Highlights Efforts to Reduce Pedestrian Injury and Death: <https://dot.ca.gov/caltrans-near-me/district-4/d4-news/2020-10-12-caltrans-highlights-efforts-to-reduce-pedestrian-injury-and-death>

Pedestrian Safety Measures Locations: <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/safety-programs/ped-bike/ped-monitor-locations-round-1>

Stream daylighting: https://roanoke.com/opinion/commentary/younos-stream-daylighting-the-21st-century-green-water-infrastructure/article_97f5d3b8-0a44-5340-b67e-c3fe49f9525f.html

Permeable surfaces: [https://www.nola-com.cdn.ampproject.org/c/s/www.nola.com/news/politics/article_0f047728-9bbb-11ea-91ea-5f1f267d28bf.amp.html](https://www.nola.com.cdn.ampproject.org/c/s/www.nola.com/news/politics/article_0f047728-9bbb-11ea-91ea-5f1f267d28bf.amp.html)