

City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG)
Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
Meeting Minutes
March 25, 2021

1. Call to Order

Chair Robinson called the meeting to order at 7:02 PM.

Name	Agency	Jan 2021	Feb* 2021	March 2021
<u>Public</u>				
Malcolm Robinson – Chair	San Bruno	X	X	X
Matthew Self	County of San Mateo	X		X
Marina Fraser	Half Moon Bay	X	X	X
Justin Yuen	South San Francisco	X	X	X
Alan Uy	Daly City	X	X	X
Brian Levenson	Redwood City			X
Vacant Seat				
<u>Elected</u>				
Ann Schneider – Vice Chair	Millbrae	X	X	X
Don Horsley	County of San Mateo		X	X
Emily Beach	Burlingame	X	X	X
Mary Bier	Pacifica	X	X	X
Patrick Sullivan	Foster City	X	X	X
Vacant Seat				
Vacant Seat				
Vacant Seat				

*This meeting was a special meeting and not originally on the BPAC 2021 Meeting Calendar.

A list of the members in attendance at the March 25, 2021 meeting can be found above.

Staff Attending: Mikaela Hiatt, Kaki Cheung, Jeff Lacap, Sean Charpentier, Sandy Wong – C/CAG

Others in Attendance: Hae Won Ritchie – San Bruno; Bill Giang and Andrew Yang – Millbrae; Shirley Chan – Daly City; Malahat Owrang – Redwood City; Lisha Mai and Andrew Wong – Burlingame; Sue-Ellen Atkinson – San Mateo; Christina Fernandez – South San Francisco, Jeffrey Chou – Public Member

2. Review of Meeting Procedures

C/CAG staff Mikaela Hiatt reviewed procedures related to how the meeting would be conducted via Zoom.

3. Public Comment on items not on the agenda

No public comment.

4. Approval of Meeting Minutes of February 24, 2021

No additional comment.

Motion: Vice Chair Schneider motioned to approve. Member Bier seconded the motion. Roll call was taken. All in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.

5. Receive information and provide input on the cost benefit analysis of the draft San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (CBPP) Update (Information)

C/CAG Staff, Mikaela Hiatt, presented to the Committee an update on the CBPP and information on the cost benefit analysis. The cost benefit analysis is the final step in the prioritization process for the bicycle project list for the CBPP, and breaks the projects up into high, medium, and low benefit and cost buckets. The cost buckets are separated into thirds and the benefits buckets align with the previously reviewed and approved prioritization rankings. Mikaela explained that the intent of the project team was to bring the Final Plan recommendations to the BPAC at a special meeting in April.

Vice Chair Schneider requested that the meeting be held later in the month to accommodate more members timelines and asked if the City of Millbrae's comments had been incorporated into the Plan. C/CAG staff Mikaela Hiatt responded that staff would send out a Doodle Poll to determine the best meeting time and that the project team was working to incorporate the Millbrae comments as appropriate.

Vice Chair Schneider explained to the Committee the recommendations in the Millbrae letter, communicating that it would help create safer facilities along the hillside.

Chair Robinson asked about the difference between bayside and coast side projects. C/CAG staff Mikael Hiatt explained that the bayside and coast side projects are ranked utilizing the same factors. This approach is consistent with previous analysis completed for the Pedestrian Focus areas and Equity Focus Areas. Mikaela explained that the goal of the separation is to create a more equal distribution of project rankings.

Chair Robinson asked what projects fall into the various cost buckets. C/CAG staff Mikaela Hiatt explained that because the projects are broken out on a cost per mile basis,

the cost buckets tend to align with their given facility type (i.e. Class II recommendations are lower cost than Class I recommendations).

Member Bier asked if there was an opportunity for a one on one with C/CAG staff as she is new to the Committee. Mikaela Hiatt responded that she could set up a one on one.

6. Review and provide input on the Complete Streets Checklists submitted by project sponsors as part of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Safe and Seamless Mobility Quick Strike Program and receive an update on the Program (Action)

C/CAG staff, Sean Charpentier presented to the Committee the list of complete streets checklists for the Quick Strike project list, including 6 projects equaling a total of \$4.6 million in Tier 1. Sean explained that because MTC is recommending funding of the San Mateo Delaware Street project through the regional Active Transportation Program , there are two additional projects that could be added to Tier 1 of the list of county recommendations to MTC for funding. These two projects are the Burlingame Safe Routes Pedestrian improvements and the Millbrae Park Boulevard Safety project. Sean stated that staff is also recommending convening a special meeting if additional review of Quick Strike project checklist is necessary.

C/CAG staff requested the Committee review and approve the Complete Streets Checklists for the MTC Quick Strike Program recommendations.

Member Fraser expressed her excitement for the additional project recommendations given the Active Transportation Program funds for San Mateo, but asked for clarification on the action requested at an April Special Meeting. C/CAG staff Sean Charpentier explained that a special meeting in April is only necessary if MTC recommended additional projects on the award list and review of additional Complete Streets Checklists are required.

Member Sullivan asked about the method of selecting projects for the Quick Strike item in Attachment 1. C/CAG staff Sean Charpentier explained the county selection process and that MTC was the final decision maker. The County target of \$4 million was not a guarantee, but staff would advocate for them.

Member Self asked if it would be possible to find the balance between moving with haste and reviewing the project through due process. Sean responded that there will be an upcoming discussion about the TDA 3 process to find that balance, but the Quick Strike program was exceptionally fast and the timeline was set by MTC. Although the process had been fast paced, C/CAG staff, Committees and local jurisdiction staff worked together quickly to secure additional funding.

Member Bier asked about the process of funding the Delaware Street project. Sean commented that C/CAG should know if Delaware Street is recommended for Quick Strike or ATP funding by mid-April.

Vice Chair Schneider expressed appreciation for the recommendation and seconded Member Self's previous question and comment.

Member Horsley commented that while Quick Build projects are good ideas, they should be implemented in locations where it makes sense.

Member Sullivan asked what the total recommended project mileage is. Sean commented that these are located on Page 10 and 11.

Motion: Member Fraser motioned to approve. Vice Chair Schneider seconded the motion. Roll call was taken. All in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.

7. Review and discuss proposed changes to the evaluation framework of Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 funding program (Information)

C/CAG staff, Mikaela Hiatt, gave a brief overview on the TDA Article 3 funding program, giving an update on timeline and expected funding amount. She also presented discussion questions to the Committee on upcoming TDA Article 3 guidelines.

C/CAG staff opened a Zoom poll to ask if the Committee would like to include Quick Build projects in the upcoming TDA call for projects.

Member Uy asked if Quick Build projects would be evaluated on the same rubric as other capital projects. Mikaela Hiatt responded that the rubric for Quick Build projects would be based on the former capital project rubric and also bring in elements of the quick build scoring from the recent Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) and Active Transportation Program calls for projects.

Vice Chair Schneider, Member Horsley, Member Beach, and Member Self expressed support for including the projects as eligible.

Member Sullivan asked what the total cost of a quick build project typically is. Mikaela Hiatt responded that typical quick build projects will cost around \$500,000, depending on length.

Member Self expressed concern for creating a separate quick build project funding category, and suggested emphasizing which projects would be implemented the fastest instead. Chair Robinson asked if there should be an additional score in the rubric. Member Uy asked if this was already included. Mikaela Hiatt responded that project readiness was included and quick build projects would be scored accordingly.

C/CAG staff asked the Committee if they would like to open up the Non-Infrastructure eligible projects list to include more than just Planning projects.

Member Horsley, Vice Chair Schneider, Member Self and Member Beach commented that given the limited amount of funding, they did not feel TDA Article 3 Call should expand to include non-infrastructure projects beyond planning. Member Bier, Member Sullivan, Chair Robinson, and Member Yuen concurred.

C/CAG staff asked the Committee if the total funding amount available for a single project award should increase from the current \$400,000 limit.

Member Sullivan commented that it would need to be a special case to go beyond the limit, but asked if the Committee still had the ability to recommend a higher funding amount after applications are received. C/CAG Executive Director Sandy Wong commented that once the Committee sets the guidelines and limitations, it is not advisable to go beyond this funding limit as it would not be fair to other applicants.

Member Beach commented that she did not feel the limit should be raised past \$400,000. Member Bier, Member Self, and Chair Robinson concurred with Member Beach.

Chair Robinson asked what amount of the Federal Infrastructure bill if there was funding coming through that. C/CAG staff Kaki Cheung commented that \$900 million would be coming to California and the California Transportation Commission would decide allocation formula.

C/CAG staff asked if the Committee wanted to include history of project funding in the scoring.

Chair Robinson asked if that information could be shared with the Committee. Mikaela Hiatt responded that if the Committee requested this of staff, then staff could provide this information.

Member Fraser commented that she did not feel this should be a consideration as project readiness and quality of project should determines funding award.

Member Beach commented that there is merit to including this as a criterion for consideration.

Vice Chair Schneider commented that it is important to include this and to evaluate history of project funding through other grants.

Member Horsley commented that he felt that the Committee has been doing a good job of evaluating the projects based on merit. History of project funding can be an additional consideration.

Vice Chair Schneider, Member Fraser, and Member Horsley commented that they felt site visits were beneficial in the evaluation process.

Member Self commented that the projects should be scored on their merit first, but then could add history of project funding as a criterion.

Vice Chair Schneider commented that the committee should also evaluate how many projects funded are bicycle versus pedestrian.

Member Sullivan asked if safety has been a criterion included and if there is an education element for bicycle and pedestrian safety. Mikaela Hiatt commented that safety has been an evaluating factor. Safety education could be included through a non-infrastructure program, if the Committee elected to expand the Non-Infrastructure eligibility list.

Member Beach asked if the Committee could also consider adding extra point for Vision Zero communities. Vice Chair Schneider commented that given the difficulty of creating a Vision Zero plan, it may exclude some cities.

C/CAG staff asked if the Committee would like to include Equity as a criteria in the scoring rubric.

Vice Chair Schneider, Member Horsley, and Member Sullivan commented that it should be included as a criterion.

Member Bier commented that she felt equity should be included and asked how it would be incorporated into TDA Article 3. Mikaela Hiatt responded that it would be modelled after the SMCTA Measure A and W call for projects.

Chair Robinson asked how the Equity Focus Areas in the County decided in the San Mateo County. Mikaela Hiatt said the criteria were income, race, housing and transportation cost burden, and vehicle ownership.

8. Member Communications

Member Fraser commented that several members were up for reappointment. Mikaela Hiatt commented that the Call for Applicants for vacant public and elected seat positions would soon be released and will go for Board approval at the May Board meeting.

Member Fraser commented that the Express Lanes 101 project's equity component included a bicycle and pedestrian element and encouraged members to learn more. Member Beach commented that Committee members could learn more by going to the website at:

https://www.smcta.com/Projects/Current_Projects/SM_101_Express_Lanes_Policy_and_Governance/San_Mateo_101_Express_Lanes_Equity_Study.html.

C/CAG staff Kaki Cheung shared that Congresswoman Speier was asking cities and community members to submit ideas for community projects. Staff would share further information via email.

9. Adjourn

Chair Robinson called the meeting adjourned at 8:47 PM.