

**City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG)**  
**Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**March 24, 2022**

**1. Call to Order**

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

<b>Name</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Jan 2022</b>	<b>Mar 2022</b>
<b><u>Public</u></b>			
Malcolm Robinson - Chair	San Bruno	X	X
Alan Uy	Daly City	X	X
Angela Hey	Portola Valley	X	X
Brian Levenson	Daly City	X	X
Justin Yuen	South San Francisco	X	X
Marina Fraser	Half Moon Bay		X
Matthew Self	County of San Mateo	X	X
<b><u>Elected</u></b>			
Ann Schneider – Vice Chair	Millbrae	X	X
Emily Beach	Burlingame	X	X
Flor Nicolas	South San Francisco	X	X
Mary Bier	Pacifica	X	X
Patrick Sullivan	Foster City	X	
John Goodwin*	Colma		X
Debbie Ruddock*	Half Moon Bay		X
Vacant Seat			

\*Appointed at February 2022 C/CAG Board meeting.

The BPAC members in attendance at the March 24 meeting is listed above.

Others attending the meeting were: Roland Yip – City of Daly City, Brae Hunter – County of San Mateo, Robert Ovadia – Town of Atherton, Ray Razavi – City of Half Moon Bay, Kevin Luikens, Drew, and others not noted.

Staff attending: Kaki Cheung, Sean Charpentier, Audrey Shiramizu, Eva Gaye, Jeff Lacap, Van Dominic Ocampo – C/CAG.

## **2. Review of Meeting Procedures**

C/CAG Program Director Kaki Cheung reviewed procedures related to how the meeting would be conducted via Zoom.

## **3. Public Comment on items not on the agenda**

None.

## **4. Approval of the Minutes from the January 27, 2022 Committee meeting**

Chair Robinson noted that not all of his comments from the January 2022 meeting were recorded in the minutes. In January, Chair Robinson commented on the BPAC Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 FY 2022/23 scoring process and expressed concerns of inequity. Specifically, that cities with more funding have additional resources and time to develop applications, while cities with less funding and resources may struggle to prepare the application packet. The Chair was not comfortable with approving the minutes as-is. Vice Chair Schneider asked that future minutes include more details. While some members of the committee agreed, Member Hey noted that minutes do not need to capture every detail.

*Motion: Vice Chair Schneider motioned for staff to bring the amended January 2022 minutes for approval to the next BPAC meeting. Member Self seconded the motion. Roll call was taken. All members in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.*

## **5. Review and recommend the highest ranked Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 FY 2022/23 Bicycle and Pedestrian project proposals to the C/CAG Board for funding allocation**

C/CAG staff Audrey Shiramizu provided an overview of the TDA Article 3 FY 2022/23 funding cycle, and the Committee scoring process. She then presented the BPAC's average scores, and staff's recommendation for funding approval. The available funding amount was \$300,000 for planning projects, and \$1,950,000 for capital projects, for a total of \$2,250,000. Twelve jurisdictions submitted project proposals, which included 11 capital project proposals and one planning project proposal.

The BPAC discussed and reviewed the average scores. Vice Chair Schneider noted difficulties with reviewing the application materials when they were not combined into one pdf document. She noted some discrepancies when it comes to scoring equity, project readiness, and funding history between the applicants' scores and staff's scores. Staff noted that the funding history scores were updated after reviewing the agency records and confirming with project applicant. The Vice Chair asked how staff determined scoring criteria. C/CAG Program Director Kaki Cheung responded that criteria were developed and approved by the BPAC. Staff also verified the equity focus areas in the C/CAG Comprehensive Bike and Pedestrian Plan when awarding equity points.

Chair Robinson noted that the rankings do not necessarily relate to the value of the projects. The Chair recommended scheduling a future meeting to discuss the process, grading, ranking, and re-starting site visits for future cycles. Site visits were not scheduled this cycle due to the pandemic. Member Fraser agreed that site visits for previous grant cycles were invaluable to the scoring process.

Member Self echoed that the focus should be on the projects and not on the application process, and that there needs to be a balance between disbursing money competitively versus pro rata. Member Self noted there are at least two aspects to equity in this cycle's scoring: 1) focus on disadvantaged communities and 2) focus on funding history and ensuring money is spread around different cities. Member Self noted this was the first year the BPAC added funding history criteria and that may be revisited in the next cycle. Member Self also agreed on re-starting the site visits.

C/CAG Executive Director Sean Charpentier noted that staff use the term "geographic distribution" as a separate definition from equity, which C/CAG defines as serving disadvantaged communities.

To standardize the application process in the future, Member Bier suggested parameters on documentation and application length.

Member Hey suggested that BPAC members could visit site projects on their own in the future. Member Hey also asked how staff distributed the call for projects. C/CAG Program Director Kaki Cheung responded that staff distributed to Public Works directors, planning staff, and the C/CAG TAC. Member Hey recommended adding local BPACs as part of the distribution groups in the future.

Vice Chair Schneider recommended a future meeting on federal funding processes, how funding is distributed, and local matches. The Vice Chair also noted that in previous years, site visits were only organized for select applicants. Vice Chair recommended that in the future, site visits should be organized for all prospective projects.

Chair Robinson asked how Measure W is distributed. Executive Director Sean Charpentier responded that it is a competitive process. Member Self noted that the previous Measure A evaluation panel comprised of a mixed panel of SamTrans/County staff. Member Beach confirmed that the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) oversees Measure A and W. Member Beach suggested reviewing the TA's scoring process as reference. Executive Director Sean Charpentier also noted that the TA is planning an Active Transportation Projects call for projects for \$16M this year (timing TBD).

Member Beach suggested the equity scoring and criteria could be clarified. Member Beach recommended that staff score quantitative criteria and BPAC can score the qualitative criteria. For project support, Member Beach suggested more emphasis on

quality, not quantity, of support letters. Member Beach also suggested having discussions about discrepancies or application questions prior to revealing average scores.

Vice Chair Schneider motioned to vote for each highest ranked TDA Article 3 project proposal individually. The motion did not receive a second.

*Motion: Member Nicolas motioned to approve staff's recommendation of recommending all the highest ranked TDA Article 3 project proposals to the C/CAG Board for funding allocation. Member Ruddock seconded. Roll call was taken. One member voted no; all other members in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.*

## **6. Review and recommend approval of the proposed process for the One Bay Area Grant Cycle 3 (OBAG 3) County & Local Program**

C/CAG staff Jeff Lacap provided an update on the OBAG guidelines that MTC approved and the tentative timeline. Jeff then presented C/CAG staff's proposed process and proposed framework for the evaluation panel for the OBAG 3 County and Local Program. The County has a \$37M funding target. The final amount is subject to project competitiveness and may be disbursed differently amongst the Bay Area counties.

C/CAG's process includes two evaluation panel options:

- Option 1: A hybrid panel comprised of partner agencies within the county, a few BPAC members, and C/CAG staff.
- Option 2: The C/CAG BPAC would serve as the main evaluation panel.

For both options, the BPAC must review all applicants' Complete Streets checklists and review the final project recommendations following evaluation. C/CAG staff will complete the initial project screening.

The process, scoring, and criteria is set by MTC. County Transportation Agencies, like C/CAG, may add criteria. C/CAG is proposing to add six criteria.

Staff presented this process to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) in March. The TAC recommended approval of the proposed process and included in their motion support for Option 1, hybrid panel. Staff will present at the next Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee. The final process will go to the C/CAG Board for approval. MTC will need to approve C/CAG's final OBAG 3 process.

The Chair and Vice Chair noted the importance of BPAC involvement in scoring because of the BPAC's knowledge and familiarity with countywide bike and pedestrian plans. The Chair suggested that BPAC score the qualitative criteria and staff focus on quantitative criteria. The Vice Chair preferred the BPAC to review the initial list of applications and expressed concern of staff and/or a smaller group ranking projects. The Vice Chair also

requested that the BPAC is provided with an opportunity to offer input after the evaluation panel selects the recommended project proposals.

*Motion: Member Beach motioned to approve the proposed process for the OBAG 3 County & Local Program with support for option 1 (hybrid evaluation panel). Member Ruddock seconded. Roll call was taken. One member voted no; all other members in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.*

Chair Robinson, Vice Chair Schneider, and Members Self, Uy, and Bier, expressed interest on being on the hybrid panel. Staff will determine the number of BPAC members to serve on the panel and will discuss panel selection at the next meeting.

## **7. Review and recommend approval of requests for reallocation of Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 FY 2019/20 funds**

7.1: City of Daly City

7.2: County of San Mateo

7.3: City of Redwood City

7.4 City of Half Moon Bay

Roland Yip from the City of Daly City presented a project update. Roland described the reason for an extension, which was due to staff shortage during the pandemic and the resulting hiring freeze.

Member Fraser responded that each of the four cities deserve the extension due to the special circumstances of the pandemic.

Vice Chair Schneider noted that the BPAC should be careful of granting too many extensions in the future, because when applicants originally applied, they were selected partly due to having a project that is ready to proceed. Member Fraser agreed, but noted the extenuating circumstances due to the pandemic.

*Motion: Member Fraser motioned to approve all four requests for reallocation of TDA Article 3 FY 2019/20 funds. Member Bier seconded. Roll call was taken. All members in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.*

## **8. Member Communications**

C/CAG Executive Director Sean Charpentier made three announcements:

- C/CAG is now fully staffed with two new staff: Audrey Shiramizu and Eva Gaye.
- In March, the C/CAG Board elected Davina Hurt as new Board Chair and Ricardo Ortiz as new Board Vice Chair.
- The BPAC has one vacancy for an Elected Official. The cities currently not represented by an Elected Official or community member on the BPAC are: Atherton, Belmont, Brisbane, East Palo Alto, Hillsborough, Menlo Park, Redwood

City, San Carlos, San Mateo, and Woodside. C/CAG asked the BPAC to reach out to their elected officials and interested parties for recruitment.

Vice Chair Schneider asked if BPAC/cities can brainstorm with staff about potential projects for OBAG 3 applications. Executive Director Sean Charpentier responded that staff is available as needed and may host office hours after the OBAG 3 Call for Projects opens.

Program Director Kaki Cheung welcomed new BPAC Elected Official Members John Goodwin (Colma) and Deborah Ruddock (Half Moon Bay) to their first BPAC meeting.

## **9. Adjournment**

Chair Robinson adjourned the meeting at 9:11 PM.