

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park • Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside

AGENDA

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BPAC)

Date: Thursday, July 28, 2022

Time: 7:00 PM

On September 16, 2021, the Governor signed AB 361, which amended certain provisions of the Ralph M. Brown Act in order to allow for local legislative bodies to conduct their meetings remotely via telephonically or by other electronic means under specified circumstances. Thus, pursuant to Government Code section 54953(e), the C/CAG Board and Committee meetings will be conducted via remote conferencing. Members of the public may observe or participate in the meeting remotely via one of the options below.

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87362024773?pwd=ZXN1eFlyY3p4MHMvVWROeUJlId1VPUT09>

Meeting ID: 873 6202 4773

Passcode: 894749

Join by Phone: 669 900 6833

Meeting ID: 873 6202 4773

Passcode: 894749

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

1.	Call to Order	Action (Schneider)	No materials
2.	Review of Meeting Procedures	Information (Shiramizu)	No materials
3.	Public comment on items not on the agenda	Limited to 2 minutes per speaker.	No materials
4.	Approval of the Minutes from the May 26, 2022 Meeting	Action (Schneider)	Page 4-10

5.	Receive an update on the San Mateo County Safe Routes to School Program and Annual Report for FY 2020-2021	Information (Gaye)	Page 11-12
6.	Nomination and appointment of two Committee members to serve on the evaluation panel of the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) Cycle 6 Pedestrian and Bicycle Program Call for Projects	Action (Shiramizu)	Page 13-14
7.	Receive an update on the San Mateo County Shared Micromobility Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan	Information (Wever)	Page 15-18
8.	Receive an update on the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 3 County & Local Program and receive the MTC Complete Streets Checklists submitted by project sponsors	Information (Lacap)	Page 19-21
9.	Member Communications	Information (Schneider)	No materials
10.	Adjournment	Information (Schneider)	No materials

The next regularly scheduled BPAC meeting will be on September 22, 2022.

Note- A Special August BPAC meeting is being scheduled.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Transportation Program Specialist: Audrey Shiramizu (ashiramizu@smcgov.org)

City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG)
Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
Meeting Minutes
May 26, 2022

1. Call to Order

Chair Robinson called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

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

*Appointed at May 2022 C/CAG Board meeting.

The BPAC members in attendance at the May 26 meeting is listed above.

Others attending the meeting were: Nicolette Chan – City of San Mateo, Sue-Ellen Atkinson – City of San Mateo, Sergio Ruiz - Caltrans District 4, Drew, and others not noted.

Staff attending: Sean Charpentier, Audrey Shiramizu, Eva Gaye, Jeff Lacap, Kim Wever – C/CAG.

2. Review of Meeting Procedures

C/CAG Transportation Program Specialist Audrey Shiramizu 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 Amended Minutes from the January 27, 2022 meeting

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

5. Approval of the Minutes from the March 24, 2022 Meeting

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

6. Receive update on the One Bay Area Grant Cycle 3 Program and appoint three Committee members to serve on the evaluation panel

C/CAG Transportation Systems Coordinator Jeff Lacap provided an update on the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 3 Program call for projects and C/CAG's proposed evaluation process.

Staff noted two major updates to the Guideline Summary:

- An additional \$900,000 in Measure M funding would be added to the call for eligible Safe Routes to School (SRTS) projects. Staff noted that at the May 19 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting, members expressed concern that SRTS projects are typically less than \$500,000 and the amount of administrative work may hinder proposals. Staff will review additional options.
- Funding distribution for Large/Small Projects: 65% towards Large Projects (more than \$1M) and 35% towards Small Projects (less than \$1M). This is a total of \$12M for Large Projects and \$11M for Small projects.

Staff noted that at the May 23, 2022 Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) meeting, Committee members recommended changing the evaluation panel from:

3 BPAC Members, 2 CMEQ Members, and 4 Others to
3 BPAC Members, 3 CMEQ Members, and 3 Others.

C/CAG staff will bring this proposed modification to the C/CAG Board for approval.

Chair Robinson asked how the SRTS amount was identified. C/CAG staff Jeff Lacap noted that C/CAG partners with the San Mateo County Office of Education (COE) to manage SRTS.

Member Beach asked staff to clarify the \$2M set aside for C/CAG Countywide Planning, Programming, and Administrative Support in the Guidelines. C/CAG staff Jeff Lacap noted that the MTC provided a base set-aside per each County Transportation Agency (CTA) to administer countywide initiatives. C/CAG needed to augment the base by \$2M to administer and manage future endeavors for the next four years. C/CAG Executive Director Sean Charpentier added that this fee is for C/CAG to implement Plan Bay Area. This will not go into effect until after the OBAG 3 Call for Projects but does impact how C/CAG implements and supports the projects awarded.

Vice Chair Schneider asked how many countywide projects were included in Plan Bay Area 2050. C/CAG staff Jeff Lacap noted that C/CAG can share the list of projects submitted for Plan Bay Area 2050.

Vice Chair Schneider asked if the May 24 Application Workshop was recorded. C/CAG staff Jeff Lacap answered that it was not, but that staff will send the slides to the committee.

Member Self asked if C/CAG anticipates receiving many applications under the “Local Streets and Roads Preservation” category. C/CAG staff Jeff Lacap noted that staff does not have an estimated number of applications.

Vice Chair Schneider noted that the Call for Projects does not address communities divided by train tracks or large canals. C/CAG staff Jeff Lacap noted that the MTC categories are set, but that interested communities should add this to their narrative.

Vice Chair Schneider asked how the Equity Focus Areas (EFA) and the MTC Equity Priority Communities (EPC) will be used. C/CAG staff Jeff Lacap noted that equity areas were tailored to San Mateo County to provide more coverage of the County EFAs.

Vice Chair Schneider asked how cities that cannot afford Vision Zero plans will be impacted if Vision Zero plans are required. C/CAG staff Jeff Lacap responded that there is a new requirement for applicants to have a local roadway safety plan (LRSP). There are approximately 10 cities in the County that do not have a plan. C/CAG has set aside \$300,000 to ensure those cities are compliant with an LRSP.

C/CAG staff Jeff Lacap noted the three CMEQ evaluation panel volunteers:

- Councilmember Rick Bonilla – San Mateo County
- Councilmember Diana Reddy – Redwood City
- Councilmember Patrick Sullivan - Foster City

No public members of the CMEQ Committee volunteered to join the panel.

Committee members asked about the expectations of the evaluation panel. C/CAG staff noted that the panel will only meet once and it will be virtual. The panel should expect to review and evaluate (at their convenience) in July. The actual number of hours spent will depend on the number of applications received.

Four committee members volunteered to serve on the panel:

- Member Bier
- Member Self
- Vice Chair Schneider
- Member Uy

Members voted on the nominations using a Google Form. The top three votes were:

- Member Self
- Member Uy
- Member Bier

Motion: Chair Robinson motioned to appoint the top three votes to serve on the evaluation panel. Vice Chair Schneider seconded. Roll call was taken. All members in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.

7. Review and recommend approval of a request for reallocation of Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 FY 2019/20 funds for the City of San Mateo's Transit-Oriented Development Pedestrian Access Plan

Nicolette Chan from the City of San Mateo presented a project update. The City of San Mateo requested an extension to February 2023 because many of the City's community meetings were postponed or met less frequently due to the pandemic. By extending the schedule, the City can conduct more focus groups and meetings to collect more community feedback.

Motion: Vice Chair Schneider motioned to approve the request for reallocation of TDA Article 3 FY 2019/20 funds. Member Self seconded. Roll call was taken. All members in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.

8. Receive a presentation on the Caltrans Bay Area Bike Highway Study

Sergio Ruiz from Caltrans District 4 presented on the Caltrans Bay Area Bike Highway Study. The study will be released in June 2022.

Chair Robinson asked if this study diverts funding from safety improvements on existing highways. Sergio responded that the answer is complicated. Because there are many

resources for different efforts, it is possible. However, he noted that there is not enough funding in general for all improvements needed, especially regionally.

Member Hey suggested looking at Bogota, Colombia, for exemplary raised paths. She also recommended looking at private lands to provide continuous paths. Sergio responded that the study looked at Bogota as an international best practice.

Vice Chair Schneider noted that the San Bruno 380 interchange is impacted by airport noise and that removing the median may impact noise absorption.

Member Fraser emphasized the importance of rails to trails conservancy.

Chair Robinson asked if there is a mandate to require covered bike parking. Sergio confirmed no, but that the study does recommend this.

Member Schneider asked how the study impacts retail on El Camino Real (ECR). Sergio responded that Caltrans defers parking to the local jurisdictions and that there have been parking studies along ECR.

Chair Robinson asked if a purpose of this study is mode shift. Sergio responded that increasing bike mode share is a major state goal. Related goals for this study are enabling longer distance bike trips and continuous high-quality networks.

Chair Robinson asked if electric bike chargers are planned. Sergio confirmed that chargers and facilities like mobility hubs are being considered.

9. Receive an update on the San Mateo County Shared Micromobility Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan

C/CAG Transportation Program Specialist Kim Wever presented on the initial feasibility findings for the San Mateo County Shared Micromobility Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan.

Member Ruddock asked how the study proposes selecting micromobility vendors. C/CAG staff Kim Wever responded that recommendations will be in the next findings. The project team is surveying the public to guide those recommendations.

Member Self noted that the bike share program in Slovenia is three euros per year for a membership, enabling many people to use the system. He noted that price matters and if the system is affordable, people will use the systems.

Member Hey asked if the study looked at different types of parking/docking. C/CAG staff Kim Wever noted that the study will make recommendations on docked versus dockless systems and parking. The project team is also looking into vendors that use geofencing.

Member Hey reiterated the importance of having one interchangeable payment system, like Clipper, to use between multimodal systems and jurisdictions. Member Hey also recommended working with local bike shops for bike rentals. C/CAG staff Kim Wever noted the project team is working with a community member from a Pacifica bike shop.

Vice Chair Schneider noted that the City of Burlingame approached the City of Millbrae for a joint Request for Proposals for an electric bike system that is also senior-friendly. Vice Chair Schneider asked if the study is considering using Lime. C/CAG staff Kim Wever noted that the project's ad hoc group prefers a seamless, countywide program. The project team is conducting interviews to support existing efforts. The project outcomes will include safety recommendations.

Member Beach commented that Caltrain leading micromobility could free up space on the rail corridor and provide consistency for users.

Member Bier suggested public-private partnerships to allow cities to work with local bike shops.

Drew, a member of the public, asked to include skateboards as micromobility in the study. Drew also suggested C/CAG present at an upcoming Caltrain Bicycle and Active Transportation Advisory Committee (BATAC) and/or Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC). C/CAG staff Kim Wever confirmed she will be presenting to Caltrain in July.

Chair Robinson asked if helmets are required. C/CAG staff Kim Wever anticipates providing helmets as a recommendation.

10. Nominations and Elections of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson

C/CAG Transportation Program Specialist Audrey Shiramizu explained the process of nominating and electing a new Chair and Vice Chairperson, including that the Chair and Vice Chairperson may be reappointed to their positions.

C/CAG Executive Director Sean Charpentier confirmed that as of 2010, there are no term limits for elected officials to serve as a committee member nor to hold the Chair/Vice Chair positions.

Chair Robinson nominated Member Fraser to serve as Chair. Member Fraser thanked Chair Robinson for the nomination but declined.

Member Bier nominated Vice Chair Schneider to serve as Chair. Chair Robinson seconded the nomination. Vice Chair Schneider accepted the nomination.

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

Chair Robinson and Vice Chair Schneider nominated Member Self to serve as Vice Chair. Member Self accepted the nomination. Member Beach nominated Member Uy to serve as Vice Chair. Member Uy thanked member Beach for the nomination but declined.

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

11. Member Communications

Vice Chair Schneider asked if Chair Robinson could report on the Caltrans District 4 Bike/Pedestrian Committee. Chair Robinson agreed to provide an update at a future meeting.

Vice Chair Schneider also requested an update on Safe Routes to School.

Vice Chair Schneider announced that the City of Millbrae may be hosting the next Silicon Valley Bike Summit in August at the new Millbrae Recreation Center. The date is TBD.

Member Fraser thanked Chair Robinson for his leadership and knowledge as Chair.

Member Beach thanked Chair Robinson for his leadership as Chair.

C/CAG Executive Director Sean Charpentier made three announcements:

- Thanked Chair Robinson and Vice Chair Schneider for their leadership.
- The BPAC is now fully appointed.
- Staff is recruiting for an elected member for the C/CAG Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee. C/CAG will send a notice to the Committee, and asked Committee members to share with councilmembers, supervisors, and others that may be interested.

12. Adjournment

Chair Robinson adjourned the meeting at 8:56 PM.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: July 28, 2022

To: C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

From: Eva Gaye, Transportation Program Specialist

Subject: Receive an update on the San Mateo County Safe Routes to School Program and Annual Report for FY 2020-2021

(For further information, contact Eva Gaye at egaye@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) receives an update on the San Mateo County Safe Routes to School Program, including a Program Annual Report for FY 2020-2021.

FISCAL IMPACT

None.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

The San Mateo County Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Program is funded using a combination of federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) funds from the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Program, and local Measure M funding, which is the \$10 fee levied on registered vehicles in San Mateo County.

BACKGROUND

Since 2010, the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) has contracted with San Mateo County Office of Education (SMCOE) to administer the Safe Routes to School Program. Program activities include ongoing outreach on biking and walking activities, bike and pedestrian rodeos, walk, and roll to school days and more. As part of SMCOE's reporting requirements to C/CAG, SMCOE prepares an annual report summarizing activities conducted within the fiscal year and outlining the projected goals for the following year. At the July Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee meeting, Theresa Vallez-Kelly, Program Coordinator, and Vanessa Castro, Program Specialist of the Safe Routes to School Program will present the FY 2020-2021 annual report, and outline some of the program accomplishments in FY 2021-2022. One of the major tasks completed from FY2021-2022 is the development of a Program Strategic Plan and a youth based high injury network.

ATTACHMENT

1. FY 2020-2021 Safe Routes to School Annual Report (*will be available online at:*
https://ccag.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/SRTS_Annual_Report_2020-2021.pdf)

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: July 28, 2022

To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

From: Audrey Shiramizu, Transportation Program Specialist

Subject: Nomination and appointment of two Committee members to serve on the evaluation panel of the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) Cycle 6 Pedestrian and Bicycle Program Call for Projects

(For further information, contact Audrey Shiramizu at ashiramizu@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee nominates and appoints two Committee members to serve on the evaluation panel of the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) Cycle 6 Measure A and Measure W Pedestrian and Bicycle Program Call for Projects.

FISCAL IMPACT

This item has no fiscal impact.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

The TA is making available a total of \$17.7M for projects that encourage walking and bicycling. The funding comes from the Measure A and Measure W sales tax programs. To support active transportation near schools, C/CAG is planning to infuse an additional \$200,000 of Measure M (\$10 vehicle registration fee) money to this call for project process. This funding action is pending C/CAG Board's approval at the September meeting.

BACKGROUND

The San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) has requested two Committee members to serve on the evaluation panel for the TA's Cycle Pedestrian and Bicycle Program Call for Projects. The Call for Projects will be issued on August 4, 2022. The evaluation committee will participate in a meeting to review and score the applications received by the September 23, 2022 deadline. The application review period will take place during October 2022, and final recommendations will be brought to the TA Board in November/December 2022. The total time commitment will vary depending on the number of applications received. It is expected that the application scoring meeting will last three to four hours.

ATTACHMENT

1. TA Cycle 6 Pedestrian and Bicycle Program Call for Projects - Guidelines (*will be available online at <https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/bicycle-and-pedestrian-advisory-committee/>*)

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: July 28, 2022
To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
From: Kim Wever, Transportation Program Specialist
Subject: Receive an update on the San Mateo County Shared Micromobility Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan
(For further information, contact Kim Wever at kwever@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee receives an update on the San Mateo County Shared Micromobility Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan.

FISCAL IMPACT

The cost to develop the Study is \$99,994.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Federal Surface Transportation Program and local Congestion Relief Plan funds.

BACKGROUND

Micromobility refers to services such as bikeshare and scooter-share, where users are able to check out various small and light-weight vehicles for short term use through a self-service rental portal. It has been envisioned as one of the tools to address first and last mile challenges, bridging the transportation gap between home and transit stations, and from transit stations to places of employment. Other benefits of micromobility includes reducing short distance vehicle trips and increasing transportation access. Micromobility was also one of the recommended programs in the Board adopted 2021 C/CAG Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.

On September 2021, C/CAG released a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the San Mateo County Shared Micromobility Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan. In December 2021, Board approved a consultant contract with Alta Planning + Design to prepare the Study.

The key deliverables for the Study include the following:

1. Evaluate the feasibility of a micromobility program
2. Define program benefits, establish County specific goals and performance measures
3. Perform case studies research, and summarize findings and recommendations
4. Assess market demand and identify potential pilot locations throughout the County; and

5. Develop program guidelines and sample micromobility permit application, and draft ordinance template with fee examples.

The initial analysis results showed that a bikeshare and/or scooter-share program is feasible in San Mateo County. Findings were presented to the Ad Hoc advisory group, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), the Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee, and the C/CAG Board of Directors at their April and May meetings.

Since the last presentation to the Committee, the project team has:

- Developed the draft program goals and performance measures.
- Conducted individual interviews with six local jurisdictions (Cities of Burlingame, Millbrae, Redwood City, San Mateo, South San Francisco, and County of San Mateo) and six partner agencies (Caltrain, Commute.org, Joint Venture, SamTrans, San Mateo County Transportation Authority, and Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition) to engage their interest and participation in a multi-jurisdictional program.
- Researched best practices and identified peer systems that are the most applicable to a future system in the County.
- Proposed program recommendations.

Draft Program Recommendations

The project team is recommending a multi-jurisdictional shared micromobility program in the County. The analysis found that it is most effective for one single organization to lead the program, with an option that allows individual jurisdictions to opt in to participate. In addition, the consultant proposed five test locations to pilot the program, based on the following characteristic: proximity to transit, barriers, and equity priority focus areas, and potential market demand. It is recommended that the program manager begins with one pilot location and expand when there's sufficient ridership, additional funding, available infrastructure, and projected demand. The five potential pilot location areas are the following:

1. Redwood City and North Fair Oaks
2. Daly City, Pacifica, South San Francisco, and San Bruno
3. Daly City and Broadmoor
4. South San Francisco Grand Avenue Library, and unincorporated San Mateo County
5. Millbrae and Burlingame

The Draft Program Recommendations (Web Attachment 1) memo includes key considerations for how such a program should be governed and structured. The memo also identifies the roles and responsibilities of the program manager/lead, and cost implications for various program types of sizes. The table shown below is excerpted from the Draft Program Recommendations memo, which summarizes key characteristics of each program type and the approximate annual operating costs. A list of funding opportunities is also presented in the memo for considerations.

Table 1: Overview of program costs by scenario

Scenario	Key Facts	Approximate Annual Operating Costs
Scenario 1: No Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No associated capital costs No associated operating costs Leads to duplication of effort among jurisdiction, small impact on reducing single-occupant vehicle (SOV) trips 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unknown (would include redundant staff efforts in local jurisdictions)
Scenario 2: Regional Program Oversight and Contract Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimal capital costs (about \$2,500 per parking location/docking station; \$125,000 for 50 mobility hubs) One FTE of resources to manage contract and program oversight (\$150,000) Potential for modest revenues through permit fees (\$20 to \$100 per vehicle per year; \$20,000 to \$50,000 or \$0.10 per trip) to offset costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$100,000 - \$150,000 per year
Scenario 3: Subsidized System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimal capital costs (about \$2,500 per parking location/docking station) One FTE of resources to manage contract and program oversight Subsidies of \$100,000 annually to the vendor to cover costs associated with operations and maintenance of the program¹ Potential for modest revenues through permit fees (\$20 to \$100 per vehicle per year; \$20,000 to \$50,000 or \$0.10 per trip) to offset costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$200,000 - \$250,000 per year
Scenario 4: Fully Publicly Owned System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major capital investment (\$2,500 per vehicle and \$2,500 per parking location/docking station, 50 locations) One FTE of resources to manage contract and program oversight plus operating fee with vendor (about \$200 per vehicle per month) 25 percent cost recovery from user fees. Potential for additional revenue from advertising, sponsorships, and local operating support not counted. Replacement of 20% of the fleet per year due to state-of-good repair (e.g., end of life replacement, theft, vandalism). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$650,000 annually in operating (\$1,200,000 operating costs - \$550,000 revenue from user fees)² \$250,000 in annual state-of-good repair costs \$1.6 million in start-up capital costs

¹ Based on an assumed trip per vehicle per day of 1.0 and the operating subsidy paid by the program managing public entity.

² Operating costs and revenues are estimated based on revenues for peer systems. This figure assumes one trip per vehicle per day for a system of 500 vehicles with average user revenues of \$3.00. The operating cost figure assumes \$200 per vehicle per month.

Next Steps

At the July meeting, the Committee will receive a presentation focusing on the proposed program recommendations and have an opportunity to provide input. The recommendations will also be presented to the Ad Hoc advisory group, the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), the Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee, and the C/CAG Board of Directors. The feedback received will help finalized the Implementation Plan (including Program Guidelines and Regulatory Framework), which will be brought back the Committees and Board for consideration in Fall 2022.

WEB ATTACHMENTS

1. Draft Program Recommendations (*will be available online at <https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/bicycle-and-pedestrian-advisory-committee/>*)
2. Powerpoint Presentation (*will be available online at <https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/bicycle-and-pedestrian-advisory-committee/>*)

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: July 28, 2022

To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

From: Jeff Lacap, Transportation Systems Coordinator

Subject: Receive an update on the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 3 County & Local Program and receive the MTC Complete Streets Checklists submitted by project sponsors

(For further information or questions contact Jeff Lacap at jlacap@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee receive an update on the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 3 County & Local Program and receive the MTC Complete Streets Checklists submitted by project sponsors.

FISCAL IMPACT

Other than staff time, there is not any direct fiscal impact to C/CAG at this time. Upon C/CAG and MTC approval, the OBAG 3 County & Local Program funds will be allocated to project sponsors directly.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Federal funds are allocated by MTC via the OBAG 3 County & Local Program, including Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds and Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds.

BACKGROUND

The One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) program is the policy and programming framework for investing federal Surface Transportation Program (STP), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ), and other fund programs throughout the San Francisco Bay Area. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) established the OBAG program in 2013 to strengthen the connection between transportation investments and regional goals for focused growth in Priority Development Areas (PDAs), places near public transit that are planned for new homes, jobs, and community amenities.

On January 26, 2022, MTC adopted Resolution 4505 outlining and approving the OBAG Cycle 3 (OBAG 3) Grant Program. A total of \$750 million will be available in the region, with a 50/50 funding split between the Regional and County & Local Programs. This funding will be available over a four-year horizon, from FY 2022-23 through FY 2025-26. The OBAG 3 policy considerations includes focusing investments in PDAs and incorporating recent policy initiatives

such as regional safety/vision zero policies and other strategies from Plan Bay Area 2050, and addresses federal programming requirements. MTC will directly administer the Regional Program and C/CAG, as the County Transportation Agency (CTA) for San Mateo County, will assist MTC in administering the County & Local Program.

On May 11, 2022, C/CAG staff released the call for projects; applications were due on Friday, July 1, 2022, at 12pm. To date, staff has held applicant workshops to provide guidance on the application process. Additionally, public workshops have been held to solicit project ideas from members of the public.

By the due date of July 1, 2022, C/CAG received 29 capital project applications from a total of 18 jurisdictions and 3 partner agencies, totaling \$88.3 million; 270% of the \$32.6 million available county target. The average funding request is \$3 million. C/CAG staff determined that all projects were eligible, and no projects were removed from consideration. The applications C/CAG received for the OBAG 3 Call for Projects are broken down by project sponsor in the table below.

Project Sponsor	Applications Submitted	% of Total Applications	Amount of Funding Requested	% of Total Funding Request
Atherton	1	3%	\$ 3,115,024	4%
BART	2	7%	\$ 9,249,219	10%
Belmont	1	3%	\$ 1,000,000	1%
Burlingame	2	7%	\$ 5,900,000	7%
Colma	1	3%	\$ 4,640,000	5%
County of San Mateo	1	3%	\$ 3,806,790	4%
Daly City	1	3%	\$ 4,550,000	5%
East Palo Alto	1	3%	\$ 2,010,000	2%
Foster City	2	7%	\$ 1,704,000	2%
Half Moon Bay	1	3%	\$ 5,000,000	6%
Hillsborough	1	3%	\$ 1,000,000	1%
Menlo Park	2	7%	\$ 7,000,000	8%
Millbrae	1	3%	\$ 880,000	1%
Pacifica	2	7%	\$ 4,141,600	5%
Redwood City	3	10%	\$ 11,254,300	13%
SamTrans	1	3%	\$ 5,000,000	6%
San Carlos	2	7%	\$ 6,100,000	7%
San Mateo	1	3%	\$ 5,000,000	6%
SMCTA	1	3%	\$ 3,375,000	4%
South San Francisco	1	3%	\$ 3,127,385	4%
Woodside	1	3%	\$ 536,000	1%
Total	29	100%	\$ 88,389,318	100%

To ensure a prioritized project nomination list is submitted to MTC by September 30, 2022, the evaluation panel will review and score applications in July, followed by a review of the prioritized list by the C/CAG Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee, Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee, and Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee in August. Then, the C/CAG Board of Directors will review and consider the project list at their September 8, 2022 meeting.

MTC Complete Streets Checklist

Agencies applying for regional transportation funds use the MTC Complete Streets Checklist to make sure that the needs of people who bike and walk are considered at the earliest stages of project development.

As part of the MTC guidelines, C/CAG must make each project's Complete Streets Checklist available for review by the appropriate Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee prior to MTC Commission approval of projects and fund programming. C/CAG staff has designated the July 28th C/CAG Committee meeting as the venue to receive on the MTC Complete Streets Checklists. To provide additional time to examine the Checklists, C/CAG staff proposes to return to the Committee at a special meeting in August to confirm that the Committee has reviewed the checklists and comments have been provided. At the same meeting, staff will present the draft prioritized OBAG 3 project nomination list.

ATTACHMENT

1. MTC Complete Streets Checklists from projects nominated for the MTC OBAG 3 County & Local Program (*will be available online at <https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/bicycle-and-pedestrian-advisory-committee/>*)