

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

SPECIAL BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BPAC)

Date: Tuesday, August 23, 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=ZXN1eFlyY3p4MHMvVWROeUJId1VPUT09>

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. | By motion, find that, as a result of the continuing COVID-19 pandemic state of emergency declared by Governor Newsom, meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees. | Action
(Charpentier) | Page 4-8 |

4.	Public comment on items not on the agenda	Limited to 2 minutes per speaker.	No materials
5.	Approval of the Minutes from the July 28, 2022 Meeting	Action (Schneider)	Page 9-13
6.	Review and confirm receipt of Committee comments and project sponsor responses to the MTC Complete Streets checklists for the One Bay Area Grant Cycle 3 (OBAG 3) County & Local Program	Action (Gaye)	Page 14-18
7.	Review and recommend approval of the draft nomination list of projects for the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 3 County & Local Program and \$200,000 in Measure M Safe Routes to School funding to be incorporated into the SMCTA Bicycle and Pedestrian Call for Projects	Action (Lacap)	Page 19-23
8.	Member Communications	Information (Schneider)	No materials
9.	Adjournment	Information (Schneider)	No materials

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

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)

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: August 23, 2022

To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

From: Sean Charpentier, Executive Director

Subject: By motion, find that, as a result of the continuing COVID-19 pandemic state of emergency declared by Governor Newsom, meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees.

(For further information contact Sean Charpentier at scharpentier@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee finds, by motion, that, as a result of the continuing COVID-19 pandemic state of emergency declared by Governor Newsom, meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Not applicable

BACKGROUND

On June 11, 2021, Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-08-21, which rescinded his prior Executive Order N-29-20 and set a date of October 1, 2021 for public agencies to transition back to public meetings held in full compliance with the Brown Act. The original Executive Order provided that all provisions of the Brown Act that required the physical presence of members or other personnel as a condition of participation or as a quorum for a public meeting were waived for public health reasons. If these waivers fully sunset on October 1, 2021, legislative bodies subject to the Brown Act would have to contend with a sudden return to full compliance with in-person meeting requirements as they existed prior to March 2020, including the requirement for full physical public access to all teleconference locations from which board members were participating.

On September 16, 2021, the Governor signed AB 361, a bill that formalizes and modifies the teleconference procedures implemented by California public agencies in response to the Governor's Executive Orders addressing Brown Act compliance during the COVID-19 emergency. AB 361 allows a local agency legislative body to continue to use teleconferencing

under the same basic rules as provided in the Executive Orders when certain circumstances occur or when certain findings have been made and adopted by the legislative body.

AB 361 provides that Brown Act legislative bodies must return to in-person meetings on October 1, 2021, unless they choose to continue with fully teleconferenced meetings because a specific declaration of a state or local health emergency is appropriately made. AB 361 allows legislative bodies to continue to conduct virtual meetings as long as there is a gubernatorially-proclaimed public emergency in combination with (1) local health official recommendations for social distancing or (2) adopted findings that meeting in person would present an imminent risk to health or safety. AB 361 is effective immediately as urgency legislation and will sunset on January 1, 2024.

AB 361 also requires that, if the state of emergency remains active for more than 30 days, the legislative body must make findings by majority vote every 30 days to continue using the bill's exemption to the Brown Act teleconferencing rules. Specifically, the legislative body must find that the need for teleconferencing persists due to risks posed by the ongoing state of emergency. Effectively, this means that local agencies must either agendaize a Brown Act meeting once every thirty days to make these findings, or, **if a local agency has not made such findings within the prior 30 days, the local agency must re-adopt the initial findings if it wishes to conduct a remote meeting.**

Cities throughout San Mateo County and San Mateo County have made the findings required to continue remote meetings. On July 14, 2022, the C/CAG Board of Directors approved Resolution 22-59, which made the findings necessary for remote meetings for both the Board of Directors and its standing Committees, including the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee.

Unfortunately, August 23, 2022 is 40 days after the C/CAG Board of Directors approved Resolution 22-59. See Attachment 1. There is no August C/CAG Board of Directors meeting.

The September C/CAG Board meeting will include a resolution similar to 22-59 that would make the findings necessary to continue with remote meetings for both the C/CAG Board and standing C/CAG Committees for another 30 days.

DISCUSSION

The County's high vaccination rate, successfully implemented local health measures (such as indoor masking), and best practices by the public (such as voluntary social distancing) have proven effective, in combination, at controlling the local spread of COVID-19.

However, the California Department of Public Health and the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention have cautioned that the Delta variant of COVID-19, currently the dominant strain in the country, is more transmissible than prior variants of the virus, that it may cause more severe illness, and that even fully vaccinated individuals can spread the virus to others, resulting in rapid and alarming rates of COVID-19 cases and hospitalizations (<<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/variants/delta-variant.html>>).

Reducing the circumstances under which people come into close contact remains a vital component of the County's COVID-19 response strategy. While local agency public meetings are an essential government function, the last 18 months have demonstrated that conducting such meetings virtually is feasible.

Public meetings pose high risks for COVID-19 spread for several reasons. These meetings bring together people from throughout a geographic region, increasing the opportunity for COVID-19 transmission. Further, the open nature of public meetings makes it difficult to enforce compliance with vaccination, physical distancing, masking, cough and sneeze etiquette, or other safety measures. Moreover, some of the safety measures used by private businesses to control these risks may be less effective for public agencies.

These factors combine to make in-person public meetings imminently risky to health and safety.

Given that the BPAC meeting is occurring 40 days after the approval of C/CAG Resolution 22-59, staff recommend that in order to continue to have remote meetings, the Committee finds, by motion, that conducting in-person meetings at the present time would present an imminent risk to the health and safety of attendees. Staff do not anticipate a need to agendaize a similar item at future BPAC meetings, because future BPAC meetings should occur within 30 days of the C/CAG Board of Directors approval of a resolution making the necessary findings.

ATTACHMENT

1. Resolution 22-59

RESOLUTION 22-59

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY FINDING THAT, AS A RESULT OF THE CONTINUING COVID-19 PANDEMIC STATE OF EMERGENCY, MEETING IN PERSON FOR MEETINGS OF THE C/CAG BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND ALL OTHER C/CAG LEGISLATIVE BODIES WOULD PRESENT IMMINENT RISKS TO THE HEALTH OR SAFETY OF ATTENDEES, AND THAT THE STATE OF EMERGENCY CONTINUES TO DIRECTLY IMPACT THE ABILITY OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND C/CAG LEGISLATIVE BODIES TO MEET SAFELY IN PERSON.

RESOLVED, by the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG); that,

WHEREAS, on March 4, 2020, pursuant to California Government Code section 8550, *et seq.*, Governor Newsom proclaimed a state of emergency related to the COVID-19 novel coronavirus, and subsequently, the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors declared a local emergency related to COVID-19, and the proclamation by the Governor and declaration by the Board of Supervisors remain in effect; and

WHEREAS, on March 17, 2020, Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-29-20, which suspended certain provisions in the California Open Meeting law, Government Code section 54950 *et seq.* (the “Brown Act”), related to teleconferencing by local agency legislative bodies, provided certain requirements were met and followed; and

WHEREAS, on June 11, 2021, the Governor issued Executive Order N-08-21, which extended provisions of Executive Order N-29-20 that waive otherwise-applicable Brown Act requirements related to remote/teleconference meetings by local agency legislative bodies through September 30, 2021; and

WHEREAS, on September 16, 2021, Governor Newsom signed AB 361 into law, and AB 361 provides that a local agency legislative body subject to the Brown Act may continue to meet without complying with the otherwise-applicable requirements in the Brown Act related to remote/teleconference meetings by local agency legislative bodies, provided that a state of emergency has been declared and the legislative body determines that meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees, and provided that the legislative body makes such findings at least every thirty (30) days during the term of the declared emergency; and

WHEREAS, the C/CAG Board of Directors concludes that there is a continuing threat of COVID-19 to the community, and that Board meetings have characteristics that give rise to risks to health and safety of meeting participants (such as the increased mixing associated with bringing together people from across the community, the need to enable those who are immunocompromised or unvaccinated to be able to safely continue to participate fully in public governmental meetings, and the challenges with fully ascertaining and ensuring compliance with vaccination and other safety recommendations at such meetings); and

WHEREAS, the C/CAG Board of Directors has an important governmental interest in protecting the health and safety of those who participate in its meetings; and

WHEREAS, on October 14, 2021, the C/CAG Board of Directors approved Resolution 21-79

making the findings necessary to continue holding remote meetings of the C/CAG Board of Directors and all other C/CAG legislative bodies; and

WHEREAS, at subsequent meetings, the C/CAG Board of Directors adopted resolutions making the findings necessary to continue remote meetings for both the C/CAG Board of Directors and all other C/CAG legislative bodies; and

WHEREAS, in the interest of public health and safety, as affected by the emergency caused by the spread of COVID-19, the C/CAG Board of Directors deems it necessary to find that meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees, and that the COVID-19 state of emergency continues to directly impact the ability of members of the Board of Directors and all other C/CAG legislative bodies to meet safely in person, and thus intends to continue to invoke the provisions of AB 361 related to teleconferencing;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY DETERMINED AND ORDERED that

1. The recitals set forth above are true and correct.
2. The C/CAG Board of Directors has reconsidered the circumstances of the state of emergency caused by the spread of COVID-19.
3. The C/CAG Board of Directors finds that the state of emergency caused by the spread of COVID-19 continues to directly impact the ability of members of the Board of Directors and all other C/CAG legislative bodies to meet safely in person.
4. The C/CAG Board of Directors further finds that holding meetings of the C/CAG Board Directors and all other C/CAG legislative bodies in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees.
5. Staff is directed to take such other necessary or appropriate actions to implement the intent and purposes of this resolution.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED, THIS 14TH DAY OF JULY 2022.



Davina Hurt, Chair

**City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG)
Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
Meeting Minutes
July 28, 2022**

1. Call to Order

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

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

*Appointed at May 2022 C/CAG Board meeting.

The BPAC members in attendance at the July 28 meeting is listed above.

Others attending the meeting were: Theresa Vallez-Kelly - San Mateo County Office of Education, Vanessa Castro - San Mateo County Office of Education, Peter Skinner - San Mateo County Transit District, Drew, and others in attendance.

Staff attending: Kaki Cheung, 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.

Chair Schneider also asked C/CAG staff to introduce themselves to the new Committee member.

3. Public comment on items not on the agenda

None.

4. Approval of the Minutes from the May 26, 2022 Meeting

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

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

Theresa Vallez-Kelly and Vanessa Castro from the San Mateo County Office of Education (COE) presented the FY 2020-2021 San Mateo County Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Program Annual Report and the youth-based High Injury Network (HIN) .

Member Sullivan asked if a breakdown of the ages and locations of students were factored into the study. Member Sullivan also asked how the variation in traffic and resulting travel behavior since the pandemic were incorporated. COE and C/CAG staff noted they will follow up with the project consultant, Alta, for additional information.

For the High Injury Network (HIN), Chair Schneider asked if areas with a greater percentage of children biking to school have higher chances of accidents compared to areas where more people walk or drive. C/CAG Program Director Kaki Cheung responded that the HIN report focuses on hot spots where collisions already took place.

Member Hey asked for the number of children killed and/or injured on their way to school, and how many car trips are saved. C/CAG Program Director Kaki Cheung noted that the fact sheets in the HIN reports accidents of severe injuries. Member Hey noted that the fact sheets show the number of people who are injured, but not if they biked or drove.

Chair Schneider suggested the committee to review the report and potentially bring this item back to a future meeting. Member Hey suggested sending written comments or questions to C/CAG for follow-up.

C/CAG staff noted they will share the HIN report with the committee.

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

C/CAG Transportation Program Specialist Audrey Shiramizu provided information on the San Mateo County Transportation Authority's (TA) upcoming Cycle 6 Pedestrian and Bicycle Program Call for Projects. Through this program, the TA is making available approximately \$17.7M for projects that encourage walking and bicycling. The funding

comes from Measure A and W sales tax programs.

The Call for Projects will be issued on August 4 and applications will close on September 23.

The TA has requested two BPAC members to serve on the evaluation panel. If selected, evaluation panel members will review and score through October. The time commitment will depend on the number of received applications. The final project recommendations will be brought to the TA Board in November/December 2022.

Peter Skinner, Director of Grants and Fund Management for the San Mateo County Transit District, noted that the commitment is not an insignificant amount of time. Mr. Skinner estimated at least 10 hours to review and score the applications, in addition to a kick-off meeting and a follow up review meeting.

Chair Schneider asked how many applications were received in the past. Mr. Skinner noted at least 20. He shared that the District divided the applications among the evaluation panel to score. He also confirmed that the TA offers this grant every two years. The next cycle will be in 2024.

Chair Schneider asked the Committee for nominations to serve on the evaluation panel. C/CAG staff Audrey Shiramizu noted that Member Robinson, who was unable to attend the meeting, volunteered to be on the panel. Member Uy also volunteered. Vice Chair Self volunteered as an alternate panel member.

Motion: Member Fraser motioned to appoint Member Uy and Member Robinson to serve on the evaluation panel. Member Sullivan seconded. Roll call was taken. All members in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.

Motion: Member Nicolas motioned to appoint Vice Chair Self to serve as an alternate on the evaluation panel. Member Fraser seconded. Roll call was taken. All members in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.

7. 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 Study's draft program recommendations.

Member Sullivan asked for clarification on the pilot program locations. C/CAG Staff Kim Wever noted that the team will select one of the five locations for the first pilot. The potential locations were shown in the presentation, with the recommended areas in red.

Member Sullivan asked if the providers will be a private entity or county/city-run. C/CAG Staff Kim Wever noted that the program recommends a private vendor as the operator (e.g. Bird, Lyft, etc.) and a countywide agency as the Program Manager (e.g. C/CAG, SamTrans, Commute.org, etc.).

Member Sullivan applauded seeing photos of users with helmets in the presentation. He asked if the cities or providers would be responsible for enforcing safety rules, and subsequent liabilities. C/CAG Staff Kim Wever confirmed that safety is a key component for the study. Further detail will be developed in the guidelines. The consultant also recommended a governance committee to decide the rules and regulations. Member Sullivan noted this is an opportunity to have the selected vendor sell helmets and gloves and provide bike support like pumping air in tires.

Member Fraser noted pre-pandemic, a few cities had Lime Bikes, and subsequently pulled them in favor of scooters. Member Fraser suggested reaching out to those cities for lessons learned, including identifying barriers and costs and how they handled safety. C/CAG Staff Kim Wever responded that the team reached out to these cities. The major issue was vehicle parking. The team is recommending geographic boundaries for parking. The team also discussed helmets and safety education with the Silicon Valley Bike Coalition.

Member Hey noted that Portola Valley public libraries provides two bikes for public use. Members Fraser and Bier also noted their cities have free bikes at their libraries. C/CAG Staff Kim Wever noted that the study's survey indicated demand for bikes, and that these could be good options for those that are lower-income and/or unbanked.

Member Yuen asked for the duration of the pilot program and the evaluation metrics. C/CAG Staff Kim Wever noted the pilot will last one year. She also noted that the ad hoc advisory group developed metrics and that C/CAG will share with the committee. She also noted that if the committee has comments on the metrics, to send to her by August 5.

Member Bier asked how the team will choose the pilot program locations and how to encourage participation within her city, especially to encourage coastwide economic development. C/CAG Staff Kim Wever welcomed the committee to provide that feedback today.

Member Sullivan suggested a policy or disclosure for bikes that travel faster speeds (20-30 MPH) to stay in their lanes. Chair Schneider asked if there is a maximum speed limit for bikes in the bike lane.

Member Yuen asked if BART was included as a partnering agency. C/CAG Staff Kim Wever noted that BART is part of the ad hoc advisory group. BART does not plan to play a Program Manager role.

Chair Schneider noted that the Cities of Millbrae and Burlingame recently received a micromobility grant and how that would impact the study. C/CAG Staff Kim noted that the team is working with the cities. She noted the City of Burlingame expressed interest as a lead agency. Chair Schneider commented that the City of Millbrae would likely share the same criteria as the City of Burlingame.

Member Sullivan asked if the team established safety policies for electric skateboards and

rollerblading. C/CAG Staff Kim Wever responded that based on the study's surveys, electric bikes are the most popular mode, and that policies are leaning towards e-bikes.

C/CAG staff will return to the September BPAC meeting to share the full plan.

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

C/CAG Transportation Systems Coordinator Jeff Lacap provided an update on the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 3 Program call for projects and information on the MTC Complete Streets Checklists. C/CAG received 29 OBAG Cycle 3 applications from 18 member agencies and three partner agencies.

C/CAG Staff Jeff Lacap noted that at the upcoming Special August BPAC meeting, the committee will receive the prioritized project list and C/CAG will confirm that the committee has reviewed the Complete Streets checklist. Staff will present the prioritized list to the C/CAG Board in September, ahead of the September deadline to MTC.

Chair Schneider asked staff to clarify the purpose of the checklist and the committee's role in reviewing. C/CAG Staff Jeff Lacap noted that MTC requires all project applicants to fill out the checklist as part of their applications. As part of the OBAG 3 process, C/CAG is also required to make the checklists available for the committee to review. C/CAG staff have completed initial review of the 29 checklists and requests the committee to review, focusing on project description and the safety and comfort section. C/CAG staff will re-share the checklists' link to the committee. The committee must send their comments to C/CAG staff by August 11.

9. Member Communications

Chair Schneider noted that the Silicon Valley Bike Coalition's Annual Bike Summit will be held in person in Millbrae on August 18.

10. Adjournment

Chair Schneider adjourned the meeting at 8:31 PM.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: August 23, 2022

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

From: Eva Gaye, Transportation Program Specialist

Subject: Review and confirm receipt of Committee comments and project sponsor responses to the MTC Complete Streets checklists for the One Bay Area Grant Cycle 3 (OBAG 3) County & Local Program

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

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) reviews and confirms receipt of comments and project sponsor responses to the MTC Complete Streets Checklist for the One Bay Area Grant Cycle 3 (OBAG 3) Program.

FISCAL IMPACT

Other than staff time, there are no direct fiscal impacts to C/CAG at this time.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Funding for the One Bay Area Grant Cycle 3 Program is comprised of Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) and Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds. This funding is administered by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC).

BACKGROUND

One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 3 County & Local Program

As part of the One Bay Area Grant Cycle 3 (OBAG 3) funding program administered by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), project that are seeking federal funding are required to adhere to MTC's Complete Streets Policy (Resolution 4493). The policy promotes the development of transportation facilities that accommodate all modes. In accordance with the Policy, project sponsors seeking federal funding or endorsement for all transportation projects (with a total project cost of \$250,000 or more) are required to complete a Complete Streets Checklist. The checklist is then reviewed and approved by the local agency or County Transportation Agency (CTA) Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC).

With the recent call for projects under the OBAG 3 program, project sponsors submitted a total of 27 Complete Streets Checklists. At the July 28, 2022 Committee meeting, staff provided the checklists as an information item. Members of the Committee were instructed by staff to submit comments on the checklists by August 11, 2022. Upon receiving comments from the committee,

project sponsors are tasked to address Committee's comments. Attachment 1 is a compiled list of responses received thus far. Staff will forward any additional answers to questions and comments upon receipt.

RECOMMENDATION

C/CAG staff requests that the Committee reviews and confirms receipt of Committee comments and project sponsor responses to the Complete Streets Checklists for the One Bay Area Grant Cycle 3 (OBAG 3) County & Local Program.

Attachment

1. MTC Complete Streets Checklists – Comment and Response Table (as of August 18, 2022)

Project Sponsor	Project Title	Commenter	Comment	Response
San Carlos	Safe Routes to School Improvement Project	John Goodwin	Vague answer to Question #2 In regard to question #7, is their Transportation and Circulation Commission the equivalent of a BPAC?	Yes
San Carlos	Holly Street/US-101 Pedestrian and Bicyclist Overcrossing	John Goodwin	In regard to #7, is their Transportation and Circulation Commission the equivalent of a BPAC?	Yes
San Carlos	Holly Street/US-101 Pedestrian and Bicyclist Overcrossing	John Goodwin	Their response to #6 appears to be "no" but the "yes" and "no" boxes are missing.	Response to #6 is no.
San Carlos	Holly Street/US-101 Pedestrian and Bicyclist Overcrossing	John Goodwin	In regard to Question #6 Is project Homekey permanent? roject Homekey permanent? I thought it was a temporary measure. There is low income housing on the left side of the main road into Redwood Shores further on. This is a very valuable improvement for the biking infrastructure as Holly Street is one of the most tricky ways from El Camino to the other side of 101 on a bike. It will help many in Redwood Shores get to San Carlos station or dining areas more safely. It is also a way for Redwood City residents to get to the Bay Trail paths and levees that lead from Redwood Shores to Foster City and beyond by cycling on Industrial to Holly Street.	Based on the Homekey website, applications were due May 2, 2022 and funds must be fully expended by June 30, 2026.
Pacifica	Sharp Park Priority Development Area Pedestrian Improvement Project	John Goodwin	#4 a and #4 b appear to contradict each other, "Samtrans buses travel down Palmetto Ave" and then "There is no transit along the affected streets"	Samtrans buses travel along Palmetto Avenue. The affected streets are Paloma Avenue, Carmel Avenue, and Santa Maria Avenue. Samtrans buses do not travel along the affected streets. No work is envisioned on Palmetto Avenue.
South San Francisco	School Street Spruce Avenue and Hillside Boulevard Safety and Access Improvement Project	John Goodwin	vague answer to Question #2	It appears the full response may have been inadvertently truncated, the full response to the question is: The Project will provide safety improvements at the four uncontrolled crosswalks by installing a traffic signal, new crosswalks, lighting and advanced yield markings, ADA-compliant curb ramps, mark all crosswalks for visibility; reduce crossing distances by installing bulb-outs; install continental crosswalk striping, advanced stop bars, and yellow curbs; lighting and bike racks. Additionally, a raised intersection and drainage improvements on School Street will be installed to address flooding issues which prohibit safe pedestrian access to the school during rain events.

Half Moon Bay	Kelly Avenue Complete Street Project	John Goodwin	vague answer to Question #2	This project will be adhering to NACTO's All Ages and Abilities design Principles. Per the guidelines provided in the last page of the complete streets checklist, the City will be including design of a conventional bicycle lane along Kelly Avenue due to the existing speed limit of 25 mph, an ADT of 1,500 - 3,000 for a single lane in each direction, with a fairly low average curbside activity throughout the corridor.
Half Moon Bay	Kelly Avenue Complete Street Project	John Goodwin	Marked "yes" to #7 but their staff hadn't yet presented it to the city's BPAC.	City Staff has presented to the proposed project and grant application to the City's BPAC on July 7, 2022, and no comments were provided during the meeting.
San Mateo County	Bay Road Complete Street Rehabilitation Project	John Goodwin	In regard to #7, is their City Transportation Advisory Committee their equivalent to a BPAC?	Yes
Menlo Park	Middle Avenue Caltrain Pedestrian and Bicycle Undercrossing	John Goodwin	vague answer to #2	Thanks for the opportunity to clarify. The new proposed undercrossing is located within the MTC adopted priority active transportation corridor along El Camino Real.
Menlo Park	Middle Avenue Caltrain Pedestrian and Bicycle Undercrossing	John Goodwin	In regard to #4c, its not clear to me if the applicant is inferring that Menlo Park is itself a MTC Mobility Hub or is there one within the project area?	There is an MTC Mobility Hub at the Menlo Park Caltrain station. The project would enhance access to this mobility hub for people walking and bicycling to to this mobility hub from several parts of the City.
Menlo Park	Middle Avenue Caltrain Pedestrian and Bicycle Undercrossing	John Goodwin	In regard to #7, is their City Transportation Advisory Committee their equivalent to a BPAC?	Yes, the City Complete Streets Commission is equivalent to a BPAC.
Menlo Park	El Camino Real Pedestrian Crossing Improvements	John Goodwin	vague answer to #2	Thanks for the opportunity to clarify. The pedestrian crossing upgrades along El Camino Real are within the MTC adopted priority active transportation corridor along El Camino Real.
Menlo Park	El Camino Real Pedestrian Crossing Improvements	Angela Hey	#3B-This is a bit unclear - earlier they said people need more time to cross the street, then they say they will reduce the time to cross, then they say there will be islands in the middle which would probably enable slower people to cross. So it seems that the crossing time will be slower not quicker.	The crossing improvements do two things: (1) create a shorter path of travel for people walking, which should reduce crossing time for many pedestrians. This is because people will not have to wait as long for the correct combination of signals to cross the street. (2) adding improved medians and other safety features for people who need more time to cross. With an aging population and a desire to better accommodate individuals with disabilities, we are seeking to design our crossings in such a way that people of all ages and abilities can cross at whatever their speed of travel while making the crossing shorter for everyone.
Menlo Park	El Camino Real Pedestrian Crossing Improvements	Angela Hey	#4A-SAMTrans bus route 286 is being cancelled	Thank you for the update on this route. Our answer should state that access to the SamTrans ECR route (the agency's busiest route) and the 296 route are enhanced by this project.
Redwood City	Roosevelt Avenue Traffic Calming Project	John Goodwin	In regard to Question #7, is their Transportation Advisory Committee the equivalent of a BPAC?	Yes

San Mateo County Transit District	SamTrans - Express Bus Mobility Hub	John Goodwin	vague answer to Question #2	The project is located entirely within the MTC regional Active Transportation Network and the C/CAG Countywide Bikeway Backbone Network. The proposed two-way Class IV Separated Bikeway was selected for this segment of the roadway in an effort to provide a comfortable facility consistent with the NACTO recommendations, which considers the existing operational uses and observed bicycling level of stress. Separated bike lanes provide a buffer and physical vertical elements that minimize interactions between bicyclist and other modes of travel, creating a very comfortable and compatible route for users of all ages and abilities.
Redwood City	101Woodside UPRR Bikeway Project	John Goodwin	vague answers to Questions#2 and #3a	#2, the proposed facility is a Class 1 path which separates people walking and biking from vehicular traffic which is safer and more appealing to a wide range of ages and abilities. #3a because the proposed facility is entirely new and separate from an existing roadway it can't be part of a high-injury network. However, it will provide an alternative route to Broadway and Woodside which ARE part of our high-injury network due to the number and severity of bicycle and pedestrian-involved collisions.
Redwood City	Broadway Bicycle and Pedestrian Vision Zero Project	John Goodwin	In regard to Question #7 is their City Transportation Advisory Committee the equivalent to a BPAC?	Yes

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: August 23, 2022

To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

From: Jeff Lacap, Transportation Systems Coordinator

Subject: Review and recommend approval of the draft nomination list of projects for the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 3 County & Local Program and \$200,000 in Measure M Safe Routes to School funding to be incorporated into the SMCTA Bicycle and Pedestrian Call for Projects

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

RECOMMENDATION

Review and recommend approval of the draft nomination list of projects for the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 3 County & Local Program and \$200,000 in Measure M Safe Routes to School funding to be incorporated into the SMCTA Bicycle and Pedestrian Call for Projects.

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

MTC allocates federal funds through the OBAG 3 County & Local Program, including Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds and Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds. As part of the OBAG 3 process, C/CAG Board authorized an infusion of \$900,000 in Measure M funds to pay for Safe Routes to School eligible projects.

BACKGROUND*OBAG 3 County & Local Program*

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, 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. In addition to the evaluation criteria prescribed by MTC, CTAs may include other local criteria into their prioritization processes but must be approved by both MTC staff and the C/CAG Board of Directors. General highlights of the adopted OBAG 3 program guidelines and jurisdictional eligibility requirements can be found in Attachment 1.

MTC will have a larger role in the County & Local Program's call for projects and final project selection, per federal programming requirements that do not allow for formula distribution. Similar to the process used for last year's MTC Safe and Seamless Mobility Quick-Strike Program, MTC will adopt guidance and nomination targets. The Commission will then select projects based on initial county screening and prioritization received by the nine counties in the Bay Area, in addition to incorporating other regional considerations. The CTA ranking and prioritization will account for 75% of the regional ranking. Project nomination lists are due to MTC by September 30, 2022.

C/CAG staff presented a preview of the OBAG 3 County & Local Program to the November 18th, 2021 C/CAG Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (CMP TAC) and January 31st, 2022 C/CAG Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee meetings.

The process and guidelines for the OBAG 3 County & Local Program was recommended for approval by the C/CAG CMP TAC, CMEQ, and Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) at their respective March 2022 meetings. The C/CAG Board of Directors approved the process and guidelines at their April 14th, 2022 meeting.

On May 11, 2022, C/CAG staff released the call for projects. 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. Project applications were due on Friday, July 1, 2022, at 12pm.

Project Evaluation

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. The total funding request was 270% of the \$32.6 million available county nomination target. The average funding request is \$3 million. C/CAG staff determined that all projects were eligible, and no projects were removed from consideration. Upon the initial staff screening, staff forwarded the project applications to the nine member evaluation panel comprised of representatives from the C/CAG CMEQ and BPAC Committee, Commute.org, Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition, and local city staff. To streamline the review process, the panel reviewed the following areas in the application: Project Description,

Project Justification, and Community Support/Engagement. Staff reviewed and screened the remaining categories for all the applications.

Attachment 2 shows the initial ranking of projects (Option 1). Based on the rankings, the top eight projects are recommended for funding, leaving a balance of \$384,825. Staff recommends funding the Sharp Park Priority Development Area Pedestrian Improvement project from the City of Pacifica using the remaining balance. This would allow some level of geographic distribution of funding, and not one jurisdiction receives funding for more than one project. With the additional infusion of the \$900,000 in Measure M, the Sharp Park project would be close to being fully funded.

Staff recommend Option 2, the top eight highest ranked projects would also get funded, but the US 101/Peninsula Avenue Interchange Improvements project from the City of San Mateo will only get partial funding. Because of the current project schedule and a fairly large funding gap for the construction phase, staff believes that the construction funding for the project would be competitive at the regional level when the project is further developed. The project sponsor has indicated that additional funding is necessary for the PS&E phase, and that the project must receive federal funds so that the NEPA clearance can be completed. Therefore, staff recommends allocating \$1,000,000 to advance the project's PS&E phase. Similar to the reasons described in Option 1, the remaining grant balance can be directed to fund the Adelante Selby Spanish Immersion School Safe Route to Schools Project in the Town of Atherton and the Sharp Park Priority Development Area Pedestrian Improvement Project in the City of Pacifica.

Staff had proposed a target of 65% (up to \$21.2m) large projects and 35% (up to \$11.4m) small projects (\$1m or less). The staff recommendation does not meet this target for the following reasons. There were far fewer smaller applications submitted than anticipated. Only 5 out of the 29 projects were "small" projects requesting a total of \$3.9 million. The "small" projects received lower scores. The scoring process did not take size into account. The relatively low scores could be an indicator of low regional competitiveness. Furthermore, if the size targets were applied, the small projects would be recommended for funding simply because of their size. This would raise concerns with the MTC and FHWA about a specific "suballocation," which is prohibited under MTC's and FHWA's guidelines.

Staff met the evaluation panel to discuss project ranking on August 12, 2022. The evaluation panel was supportive of staff's recommendation to proceed with Option 2 as it provides funding for a larger number of projects and accomplishes the goal of geographic distribution.

At the May C/CAG Technical Advisory Committee meeting, the committee had comments regarding the \$900,000 set-aside in Measure M funds and that Safe Routes to School project costs, by design, are smaller than \$500,000 (the minimum grant amount for OBAG 3). Staff wanted to recognize the concern and find solutions to help fund these smaller, but important projects. In response, staff proposes to direct \$200,000 of Measure M Safe Routes to School funds to the current San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) Call for Projects for pedestrian and bicycle projects.

Recommendation

The C/CAG Technical Advisory Committee recommended approval of the draft nomination list of projects under Option 2 at their August 18th, 2022 meeting. The Committee also recommended approval of \$200,000 in Measure M Safe Routes to School funding to be incorporated into the SMCTA Call for Projects for pedestrian and bicycle projects

The recommendation from this Committee along with the Technical Advisory Committee and Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee will be forwarded to the C/CAG Board at their September 15th, 2022 meeting for a final recommendation before being forwarded to MTC.

MTC staff will develop a draft program of recommended projects for Commission adoption in late 2022. MTC staff will coordinate with CTA staff to provide comments and feedback on the draft program of projects and may refine the recommended program of projects accordingly. The MTC Commission will consider the recommended OBAG 3 County & Local Program projects in January 2023.

C/CAG staff requests that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee recommends approval of the draft nomination list of projects under Option 2 for the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 3 County & Local Program. Staff also requests that the Committee recommends approval of \$200,000 in Measure M Safe Routes to School funding to be incorporated into the SMCTA Call for Projects for pedestrian and bicycle projects.

ATTACHMENTS

1. April 14, 2022 C/CAG Board Staff Report – Item 7.3: Review and approval of the proposed C/CAG Guidelines and process for the MTC One Bay Area Grant Cycle 3 (OBAG 3) County & Local Program (*Can be viewed at: <https://ccag.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/041422-CCAG-Board-Agenda-Revised.pdf>*)
2. Draft project nomination list for the One Bay Area Grant 3 (OBAG 3) County & Local Program (Option 1 and 2)

Item 7, Attachment 2

OBAG 3 Draft Prioritized List Recommendation

Application ID	Sponsor Name	Project Name	OBAG3 Funds Requested	Option 1 (Baseline)		Option 2 (Staff Recommendation)		Project Description, Project Need, Community Support/Engagement	Alignment with Regional Policies, Project Readiness, Local Match	Total Score	Safe Routes to School (within 1/2 Mile)
				OBAG 3 Recommended Funding Allocations	Measure M Recommended Funding Allocations	OBAG 3 Recommended Funding Allocations	Measure M Recommended Funding Allocations				
12	San Mateo County	Bay Road Complete Street Rehabilitation Project	\$ 3,806,790	\$ 3,806,790		\$ 3,806,790		58	58	115.6	Yes
9	City of South San Francisco	School Street/Spruce Avenue and Hillside Boulevard Safety and Access Improvement Project	\$ 3,127,385	\$ 3,127,385		\$ 3,127,385		54	60	113.9	Yes
16	City of Redwood City	Roosevelt Avenue Traffic Calming Project	\$ 3,400,000	\$ 3,400,000		\$ 3,400,000		58	53	111.2	Yes
19	City of San Mateo	US 101/Peninsula Avenue Interchange Improvements Project	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000		\$ 1,000,000		57	54	111.2	Yes
20	San Mateo County Transportation Authority	19th Avenue/Fashion Island Boulevard Complete Street Class IV Bikeway	\$ 3,375,000	\$ 3,375,000		\$ 3,375,000		57	53	109.6	Yes
25	Town of Colma	El Camino Real Complete Street Project from Mission Road to City of South San Francisco (Segment B)	\$ 4,640,000	\$ 4,640,000		\$ 4,640,000		54	52	105.6	Yes
13	City of Menlo Park	Middle Avenue Caltrain Pedestrian and Bicycle Undercrossing	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000		\$ 5,000,000		53	52	105.0	No
24	City of Burlingame	Rollins Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Project	\$ 3,900,000	\$ 3,900,000		\$ 3,900,000		53	51	104.3	Yes
23	City of Redwood City	101/Woodside UPRR Bikeway Project	\$ 4,800,000					52	52	104.3	Yes
26	City of Redwood City	Broadway Bicycle and Pedestrian Vision Zero Project	\$ 3,054,300					55	48	103.1	Yes
1	City of Burlingame	California Drive Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Project	\$ 2,000,000					49	52	101.3	Yes
17	Town of Atherton	Adelante Selby Spanish Immersion School Safe Route to Schools Project	\$ 3,115,024			\$ 3,115,024		52	49	100.8	Yes
15	City of Menlo Park	El Camino Real Pedestrian Crossing Improvements	\$ 2,000,000					49	51	100.3	Yes
18	San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans)	Express Bus Mobility Hub	\$ 5,000,000					52	48	99.6	Yes
8	BART	Next Generation Fare Gates Project at Northern San Mateo County BART Stations	\$ 4,457,455					47	52	99.1	No
5	City of Pacifica	Sharp Park Priority Development Area Pedestrian Improvement	\$ 2,360,000	\$ 384,825	\$ 900,000	\$ 1,269,801	\$ 900,000	50	49	98.8	Yes
7	BART	Next Generation Fare Gates Project at Central San Mateo County	\$ 4,791,764					47	51	97.9	No
10	City of Half Moon Bay	Kelly Avenue Complete Street Project	\$ 5,000,000					54	43	96.9	Yes
28	City of Millbrae	Micro-Mobility Hub Phase 2 and Electric Vehicle Shuttle Program servicing riders to and from Multi-Modal BART/Caltrain/HSR Station, Affordable Housing, Job Centers and Schools	\$ 880,000					48	47	95.0	Yes
27	City of Daly City	Bayshore and Woodrow Wilson Safe Routes to School Project	\$ 4,550,000					45	45	89.9	Yes
3	City of San Carlos	Holly Street/US-101 Pedestrian and Bicyclist Overcrossing	\$ 5,000,000					46	41	87.3	No
11	East Palo Alto	Runnymede Street between Pulgas Avenue and the Bay Trail within the City of East Palo Alto.	\$ 2,010,000					41	41	82.0	Yes
6	Town of Woodside	The Glens Path - Pedestrian Safety Improvements - Phase 3	\$ 536,000					42	38	80.0	No
4	City of Pacifica	Rosita Road from Adobe Drive to Oddstad Boulevard, Pacifica, CA	\$ 1,781,600					40	38	77.8	Yes
21	City of Belmont	City of Belmont Pedestrian and Bike Improvements	\$ 1,000,000					35	42	77.3	Yes
14	City of Foster City	Street Rehabilitation - Edgewater (FY 24-25)	\$ 1,200,000					33	43	75.8	Yes
22	City of Foster City	Foster City Safe Routes to School Improvements	\$ 504,000					36	36	72.1	Yes
2	City of San Carlos	Safe Routes to School Improvement Project	\$ 1,100,000					40	29	68.6	Yes
29	Town of Hillsborough	Hillsborough Street Resurfacing Project	\$ 1,000,000					36	31	67.2	Yes
			\$ 88,389,318	\$ 32,634,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 32,634,000	\$ 900,000				