



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

Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee

Date: Monday August 29, 2022
Time: 3:00 p.m.

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), C/CAG 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/88589170098?pwd=ajNNWndSRlUvM3F0bHNjQVVHb0p0aUo0Q0R0>

Meeting ID: 885 8917 0098
Passcode: 136584

Join by Phone: +1-669-900-6833
Meeting ID: 885 8917 0098
Passcode: 136584

Persons who wish to address the C/CAG CMEQ Committee on an item to be considered at this meeting, or on items not on this agenda, are asked to submit written comments to jlacap@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. Brief Overview of Teleconference Meeting Procedures | Information (Lacap) | No Materials |
| 2. 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) | Pages 1-5 |
| 3. Public comment on items not on the agenda | Presentations are limited to 3 mins | No Materials |
| 4. Issues from the July 2022 C/CAG Board meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval of Reso 22-60 executing an agreement with SAMCEDA for a \$75,000 10% local march for the Pre-PID scope of the Dumbarton Corridor project • Approval of Reso 22-67 executing an MOU with SMCTA for the US 101/SR 92 Interchange Director Connector Project | Information (Lacap) | No Materials |
| 5. Approval of minutes of June 27, 2022 meeting | Action (O’Neill) | Pages 6-8 |
| 6. Receive an update on the San Mateo County Shared Micromobility Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan | Information (Wever) | Pages 9-12 |



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

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)	Pages 13-17
8. Executive Director Report	Information (Charpentier)	No Materials
9. Member comments and announcements	Information (O'Neill)	No Materials
10. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date: September 26, 2022	Action (O'Neill)	No Materials

PUBLIC NOTICING: All notices of C/CAG regular Board meetings, standing committee meetings, and special meetings will be posted at the San Mateo County Court Yard, 555 County Center, Redwood City, 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 Board meeting are available for public inspection at the same time they are distributed to all members, or a majority of the members, of the Board. The Board has designated the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), located at 555 County Center, 5th Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063, for the purpose of making public records available for inspection. Such public records are also available on C/CAG's website at: <http://www.ccag.ca.gov>. Please note that C/CAG's office is temporarily closed to the public; please contact Mima Guilles at (650) 599-1406 to arrange for inspection of public records.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION DURING VIDEOCONFERENCE MEETINGS: Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services to participate in this meeting should contact Mima Guilles at (650) 599-1406, five working days prior to the meeting date.

Written comments should be emailed in advance of the meeting. Please read the following instructions carefully:

1. Your written comment should be emailed to jlacap@smcgov.org.
2. Your email should include the specific agenda item on which you are commenting or note that your comment concerns an item that is not on the agenda.
3. Members of the public are limited to one comment per agenda item.
4. The length of the emailed comment should be commensurate with the two minutes customarily allowed for verbal comments, which is approximately 250-300 words.
5. If your emailed comment is received at least 2 hours prior to the meeting, it will be provided to the C/CAG CMEQ Committee members, made publicly available on the C/CAG website along with the agenda. We cannot guarantee that emails received less than 2 hours before the meeting will be 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 Board 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 CMEQ 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: Jeff Lacap, jlacap@smcgov.org

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: August 29, 2022

To: Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee

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 Congestion Management and Environmental Quality 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 Technical Advisory Committee.

Unfortunately, August 29, 2022 is 46 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 CMEQ meeting is occurring 46 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 CMEQ meetings, because future CMEQ 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 COMMITTEE ON CONGESTION
MANAGEMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY (CMEQ)**

**MINUTES
MEETING OF June 27, 2022**

The meeting was called to order by Vice-Chair Alba at 3:00 p.m. via Zoom Videoconference. Roll call for attendance was taken. Attendance sheet is attached.

1. Brief Overview of Teleconference Meeting Procedures

Jeff Lacap, C/CAG Staff, provided an overview of the teleconference meeting procedures.

2. Public comment on items not on the agenda

None.

3. Issues from the June 2022 C/CAG Board meeting. (Information)

Jeff Lacap, C/CAG Staff, noted the agenda listed the status of items recently addressed by the C/CAG Board, and offered to respond to any questions.

4. Approval of minutes of the May 23, 2022 meeting. (Action)

Motion – To approve the minutes of the May 23, 2022 CMEQ meeting, Penrose/Reddy. Beach, Bonilla, Reddy, Sullivan, Papan, Penrose, Salazar, Alba. Members Holober and Roberts abstained. Motion Passes 8-0-2

5. Receive a presentation on Countywide Stormwater Program updates

Reid Bogert, C/CAG Staff, presented on the Countywide Stormwater Program and addressed committee member's questions.

Member Roberts requested more information regarding the change in total maximum daily load (TMDL) for Pescadero. In which Reid responded that the original revised tentative order in the permit required additional monitoring and best management practices for certain culverts that were going to feed into the Pescadero watershed. The revised permit established increased requirements that were above the TMDL. As a result, staff modified the permit language to be consistent with the TMDL language which will not require additional monitoring.

Member Sullivan requested for information on the Bayside Ocean Mercury content. Reid offered to share resources with the Committee. He added that there are some reports on monitoring the latest data of PCB mercury on the Bay margins which indicates a direct connection for runoffs of the tributary.

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

Jeff Lacap, C/CAG Staff, presented an update on the One Bay Area Grant Cycle 3 Program and requested that the Committee appoint three members to serve on the evaluation panel. The Committee motioned to appoint members Sullivan, Reddy, and Bonilla to the OBAG 3 Evaluation Panel.

Motion- To appoint members Sullivan, Reddy, and Bonilla to the OBAG 3 Evaluation Panel, Beach/Penrose. Beach, Reddy, Holober, McCune, Sullivan, Penrose, Salazar, Roberts, Alba. Members Papan and Bonilla were not present at the time of voting. Motion passes 9-0.

7. Executive Director Report (Information)

Sean Charpentier, C/CAG Executive Director, thanked the three Committee members for volunteering to serve on the OBAG 3 Evaluation Panel.

9. Member comments and announcements (Information)

There were no member comments or announcements.

10. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date

The meeting adjourned at 3:47 p.m. The next regular meeting was scheduled for August 29, 2022

2022 C/CAG Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee Attendance Report

Name	Representing	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul (No Mtg.)	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec (No Mtg.)
Emily Beach (Burlingame City Council Member)	Elected Official	X	X	X	X		X						
Rick Bonilla (San Mateo City Council Member)	Elected Official		X	X	X	X	X						
Julia Mates (Belmont City Council Member)	Elected Official		X		N/A	N/A	N/A						
Mike O'Neill (Pacifica City Council Member)	Elected Official	X	X	X	X	X							
Diana Reddy (Redwood City Council Member)	Elected Official	X	X	X	X	X	X						
Dick Brown (Woodside Town Council Member)	Elected Official	X	X	X	X	X							
Reuben Holofer (Millbrae City Council Member)	Elected Official	X	X	X	X		X						
Tom McCune (Belmont City Council Member)	Elected Official	X			X	X	X						
Patrick Sullivan (Foster City Council Member)	Elected Official	X		X	X		X						
Gina Papan (MTC Commissioner)	Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)		X	X	X	X	X						
Lennie Roberts	Environmental Community		X	X	X	X	X						
Juan Salazar	Business Community		X	X		X	X						
Peter Ratto	San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans)	X	X	X	X	X	X						
Jessica Alba	Public Member	X		X	X	X	X						
<i>Vacant</i>	<i>Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain)</i>												
Deborah Penrose	Agencies with Transportation Interests		X	X	X	X	X						

Staff and Guests in attendance for the June 27, 2022 Meeting
 Sean Charpentier, Eva Gaye, Jeff Lacap, and Reid Bogert, - C/CAG Staff

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: August 29, 2022

To: Congestion Management and Environmental Quality 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 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. The proposed pilot duration is 1-2 years with one-year options to extend. The team also proposed the preferred vehicle type to be e-bicycles with the option for individual jurisdictions to include manual bicycles and/or e-scooters. 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 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 August meeting, the Committee will receive a presentation focusing on the proposed program recommendations and have an opportunity to provide input. The Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), the Ad Hoc Advisory Group (AHAG) and the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed the proposed recommendations and provided feedback at their July and August meetings. The BPAC, AHAG, and TAC commented that they recommend a minimum of three jurisdictions to participate in the pilot phase and to require users to wear helmets. Other comments received include, starting the pilot program with one vendor for a seamless user experience, including budgets to evaluate the program performance at the end of a pilot, and partnering with libraries' bike share program to serve areas with less demand. Lastly, there was more support for e-bikes rather than scooters. Staff will present the recommendations to the C/CAG Board of Directors in September. The feedback received will help to inform 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/congestion-management-and-environmental-quality-committee/>*)
2. Powerpoint Presentation (*will be available online at <https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/congestion-management-and-environmental-quality-committee/>*)

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: August 29, 2022

To: Congestion Management and Environmental Quality 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 and Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee recommended approval of the draft Staff Recommended nomination list of projects under Option 2 at their August 18th, 2022 and August 23rd, 2022 meeting, respectively. Both committees 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 Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory 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 CMEQ Committee recommends approval of the draft Staff Recommended 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)

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				