

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*

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) AGENDA

Date: Thursday, September 15, 2022

Time: 1:15 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), 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/87923846411?pwd=dIMyY3dLV2QwLzFmR0FhVDg3R1o1QT09>

Meeting ID: 879 2384 6411

Passcode: 389315

Join by Phone: 669-900-6833

Meeting ID: 879 2384 6411

Passcode: 389315

Persons who wish to address the C/CAG TAC on an item to be considered at this meeting, or on items not on this agenda, are asked to submit written comments to kcheung1@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 Procedure	Cheung	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	Page 3-7
3. Public comment on items not on the agenda (limited to 2 minutes)	Stillman	No materials
4. Issues from the last C/CAG Board meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none">N/A	Cheung	No materials
5. Approval of minutes from the August 18, 2022 Meeting (Action)	Cheung	Page 8-12
6. Receive an update on the San Mateo County Shared Micromobility Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan (Information)	Wever	Page 13-16
7. Discuss Committee Membership Composition and Guidelines (Information)	Charpentier	Page 17-21
8. Regional Project and Funding Information	Lacap	Page 22-28

9. Executive Director Report	Charpentier	No materials
10. Member Reports	All	

The next regularly scheduled meeting is on October 20, 2022.

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 TAC 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 TAC meeting are available for public inspection at the same time they are distributed to all members, or a majority of the members, of the TAC. The TAC 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 Kaki Cheung at (650) 363-4105 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 Kaki Cheung at (650) 363-4105, 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 kcheung1@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 TAC members and 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 made publicly available on the C/CAG website prior to 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 TAC 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 Co-Chairs 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:

Program Director: Kaki Cheung (650) 363-4105 kcheung1@smcgov.org

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: September 15, 2022

To: Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

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 Technical 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 Technical Advisory Committee.

Unfortunately, September 15, 2022 is 61 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 TAC meeting is occurring 61 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 TAC meetings, because future TAC 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

**CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (CMP)
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)
August 18, 2022
MINUTES**

No.	Member	Agency	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jul	Aug
1	Ann Stillman (Co-Chair)	San Mateo County Engineering	x	x	x	x	x		x
2	Joseph Hurley (Co-Chair)	SMCTA / PCJPB / Caltrain	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
3	Robert Ovadia	Atherton Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
4	Peter Brown	Belmont Engineering	x	x	x	x		x	
5	Randy Breault	Brisbane Engineering	x	x		x	x	x	
6	Syed Murtuza	Burlingame Engineering	x	x	x		x	x	x
7	Sean Charpentier	C/CAG	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
8	Brad Donohue	Colma Engineering	x			x	x	x	x
9	Richard Chiu	Daly City Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x	
10	Tatum Mothershead	Daly City Planning	x	x	x		x	x	x
11	Louis Sun	Foster City Engineering	x	x	x	x		x	x
12	Paul Willis	Hillsborough Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
13	Maz Bozorginia	Half Moon Bay Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
14	Nikki Nagaya	Menlo Park Engineering			x	x	x	x	x
15	Andrew Yang	Millbrae Engineering		x	x	x	x	x	x
16	Lisa Petersen	Pacifica Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
17	Jessica Manzi	Redwood City Engineering	x	x	x	x	x		
18	Matthew Lee	San Bruno Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
19	Steven Machida	San Carlos Engineering	x		x	x	x	x	
20	Azalea Mitch	San Mateo Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
21	Eunejune Kim	South San Francisco Engineering	x	x	x			x	x
22	Billy Gross	South San Francisco Planning	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
23	Sean Rose	Woodside Engineering	x		x	x		x	x
24	James Choe	MTC	x	x	x	x		x	x

The two hundred eightieth(280th) meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee took place on August 18, 2022 at 1:16 p.m.

TAC members attending are listed on the Roster and Attendance table on the preceding page. Others attending the meeting were: Jeffrey Lacap, Kaki Cheung, Audrey Shiramizu, Eva Gaye, Kim Wever – C/CAG; Grace Le – City of San Carlos; Jared Barrilleaux – City of Belmont; Matthew Ruble – City of South San Francisco; Pamela Herhold – BART; and others not noted.

1. Brief Overview of Teleconference Meeting Procedures

C/CAG staff Kaki Cheung described how the Committee Meeting would run virtually.

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)

C/CAG Executive Director Sean Charpentier explained that AB 361 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. 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 TAC committee. Given that the TAC meeting is occurring 35 days after the approval of C/CAG Resolution 22-59, staff recommends that in order to continue to have remote meetings, the TAC find, by motion, that conducting in-person meetings at the present time would present an imminent risk to the health and safety of attendees.

Motion – To approve by motion, that conducting meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees, Gross/Bozorginia. Roll Call was taken. All members in attendance voted to approve. Motion passed 19-0.

3. Public comment on items not on the agenda

There were no public comments regarding items not on the agenda.

4. Issues from the August 2022 C/CAG Board meetings (Information)

C/CAG staff Kaki Cheung stated that since there was no August C/CAG Board meeting, there were not any items of interest to highlight at this meeting.

5. Approval of minutes from the July 21, 2022 Meeting (Action)

Motion – To approve the minutes of the July 21, 2022 TAC meeting, Gross/Nagaya. Roll Call was taken. Stillman abstained. All other members in attendance voted to approve. Motion passed 18-0-1.

6. Receive an update on the San Mateo County Shared Micromobility Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan (Information)

C/CAG staff Kim Wever presented an update on the San Mateo County Shared Micromobility Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan. Kim updated the Committee on the proposed recommendations including forming a governance committee and implementing a multi-jurisdictional pilot phase. Committee had the opportunity to provide feedback. The 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 stating a preference for e-bikes over scooters.

7. Review and recommend approval of the draft nomination list of projects for the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 3 County & Local Program (Action)

C/CAG staff Jeff Lacap presented two nomination options for the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 3 County & Local Program:

- Option 1 (Baseline) would nominate the top eight projects for full OBAG 3 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.
- Option 2 (Staff Recommendation) would nominate the top seven highest ranked projects for full funding and the eighth, 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 seeking construction funding for the project would be more competitive at the regional level as the project gets 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 to obtain NEPA clearance. Therefore, staff recommends allocating \$1,000,000 to advance the project's PS&E phase. Similar to 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 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.

At the May Committee, 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) pedestrian and bicycle Call for Projects process.

Member Kao understood the reasoning for not nominating the targeted number of smaller projects, and felt that the guidelines were changed after the applications were submitted.

C/CAG staff Jeff Lacap responded 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 grant size into account. The relatively low scores could be an indicator of low regional competitiveness.

BART Assistant General Manager, Pamela Herhold provided information to support recommending BART’s Next Generation Fare Gates Project.

Member Murtuza requested a debrief of project scores. C/CAG staff Jeff Lacap responded that staff is available to have discussions with jurisdictions if requested.

Member Nagaya asked about next steps. C/CAG staff Jeff Lacap stated that the prioritized nomination list submitted by C/CAG will account for 75% of the regional scores. C/CAG is only submitting the projects list under option 2. MTC will score the projects and reach out to C/CAG this winter before it goes to MTC Commission approval.

Member Rose asked if the infrastructure bill could backfill OBAG funding. C/CAG staff Jeff Lacap will keep the Committee updated but MTC has not provided additional updates about the infrastructure bill yet.

Member Rose asked if the TA’s Call for Projects will consider giving preferences to those projects that did not get nominated for OBAG funds. Co-Chair Hurley stated that the TA has its own criteria and process.

Member Rose asked if staff and the evaluation panel considered partially funding projects. C/CAG staff Jeff Lacap stated the goal was to recommend fully funding the top ranked projects and partially fund projects with the residual balance.

Member Ovadia asked if there is a chance to edit the application before it goes to MTC. C/CAG staff Jeff Lacap believed it is okay to edit since the guidelines did not prohibit enhancing the applications.

Motion – To recommend approval of the Option 2 nomination list of projects for the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 3 County & Local Program, and recommend 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, Murtuza/Gross. Roll Call was taken. Choe abstained. All other members in attendance voted to approve. Motion passed 17-0-1.

8. Regional Project and Funding Information

C/CAG staff Jeff Lacap highlighted the following items from his staff report: Inactive Projects list; MTC annual obligation plan; SMCTA 2022 Cycle 6 Pedestrian and Bicycle Program Call for Projects; USDOT Safe Streets and Roads for All and other funding opportunities; and Local Technical Assistance Trainings.

8. Executive Director Report (Information)

C/CAG Executive Director Sean Charpentier congratulated Co-Chair Hurley on his retirement and thanked him for his professionalism and commitment. He also shared that staff will be

bringing a discussion item about possibly rotating the Chair and Vice Chair position and adding a BART seat.

9. Member Reports (Information)

Member Choe announced that MTC is accepting letter of interests for parking management grant program.

Co-Chair Hurley thanked C/CAG Executive Director Sean Charpentier for the kind words and wished the Committee and the County all the success.

10. Adjournment

Co-Chair Stillman adjourned the meeting at 2:31p.m.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: September 15, 2022

To: Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee

From: Kim Wever, Transportation Program Specialist

Subject: Receive an update on the San Mateo County Shared Micromobility Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan
(For further information, contact Kim Wever at kwever@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

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

FISCAL IMPACT

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

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Federal Surface Transportation Program and local Congestion Relief Plan funds.

BACKGROUND

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

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

The key deliverables for the Study include the following:

1. Evaluate the feasibility of a micromobility program
2. Define program benefits, establish County specific goals and performance measures
3. Perform case studies research, and summarize findings and recommendations
4. Assess market demand and identify potential pilot locations throughout the County; and
5. Develop program guidelines and sample micromobility permit application, and draft ordinance template with fee examples.

The initial analysis results showed that a bikeshare and/or scooter-share program is feasible in San Mateo County. The project team is recommending a multi-jurisdictional shared micromobility program in the County. Analysis found that it is most effective and efficient 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 one to two years with possible one-year extension. The consultant recommended making e-bicycles as the primary shared vehicle in the program. Local jurisdictions can choose to include manual bicycles and/or e-scooters in their programs. In addition, the consultant proposed five locations to pilot the program in the first phase, based on the following characteristics: proximity to transit, barriers, and equity priority focus areas, and potential market demand. The Ad Hoc advisory group, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and the Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee provided comments on the proposed recommendations at their July and August meetings.

Draft Program Guidelines

Using technical findings and the proposed recommendations developed for this study as a basis, in addition to incorporating stakeholder input, the project team has developed Draft Program Guidelines (Attachment 2). The memo includes an overview of the existing micromobility regulatory framework in California, and more specifically San Mateo County. The memo then continues with an inventory of recommended program guidelines and performance standards, covering topics such as:

- Types of vehicles permitted
- Where customers can ride and park vehicles
- Rider safety (vehicle speed, minimum age to ride, and use of helmets)
- Insurance and indemnification
- Fleet size and distribution
- Contract length
- Vehicle maintenance and inspection
- Customer service and complaint resolution
- Data sharing
- Equity programming
- Enforcement
- Program fees
- User fees
- Subsidies and revenue sharing

The Guidelines will be used to develop procurement materials for a single vendor to operate the micromobility program in the County.

Next steps

At the September meeting, the Committee will receive a presentation focusing on the proposed program guidelines and have an opportunity to provide input. The feedback received will help finalized the Implementation Plan, which will be brought back to the Committees and Board for consideration in Fall 2022.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Executive Summary of Draft Program Guidelines
2. Draft Program Guidelines (*will be available online at <https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/congestion-management-program-technical-advisory-committee/>*)

Executive Summary

The following memorandum provides detailed program recommendations and guidelines for implementing a regional shared micromobility pilot in San Mateo County. The guidelines build off the technical findings and recommendations developed for this study as well as stakeholder input gained through meetings and presentations with potential partners. This report is divided into the following sections:

- **Existing Micromobility Regulatory Framework:** A review of state and local micromobility regulations that could impact the implementation of a program in San Mateo County
- **Recommended Program Guidelines and Requirements:** Outline of technical requirements and guidelines to be incorporated into a future request for proposals (RFP). This information is supplanted by examples of current practice across the Bay Area and elsewhere
- **Program Roll-out and Expansion:** Discussion of how a future micromobility pilot program could be expanded over time.
- **Mitigating Risk:** Discussion of strategies to mitigate program risk.

Existing Micromobility Regulatory Framework

Today only the City of San Mateo and Redwood City have established micromobility ordinances in the county. Millbrae and Burlingame have program requirements identified through an RFP which is has yet to be awarded at the time of writing. After reviewing these existing documents, the only major point of conflict between these established regulations is that while all communities permit bikeshare (including e-bikes), scooters are presently only permitted in Redwood City. Other differences between regulations, such as minimum insurance requirements, could be easily reconciled through a new regional program.

Recommended Program Guidelines and Requirements

The wider study envisions that a regional micromobility program be established as a pilot, implemented through an RFP to select a vendor who would own and run a local program. This report outlines an inventory of recommended program guidelines and performance standard, which is summarized in **Table 1**. Discussion around each topic includes an overview of options, their pros and cons, examples from other jurisdictions, and specific recommendations for the pilot micromobility program in San Mateo County.

Table 1: Summary of Program Guidelines

Topic	Description
Types of Vehicles Permitted	Recommended minimum technical requirements for micromobility vehicles, including for pedal-assist e-bikes and e-scooters.
Rider Regulations	Outlines rules for where micromobility vehicles are permitted to be operated based on existing state and local regulations.
Vehicle Parking Regulations	Parking regulations with which vendor and riders must comply. Modeled closely on existing standards outlined in area micromobility ordinances
Speed Limits	Sets maximum electrically-assisted speed for devices to 15 mph for scooters and 20 mph for bicycles
Age Restrictions	Outlines state age restrictions for scooters and e-bicycles.
Fleet Size	Recommends initial fleet size of 500 vehicles, with specific minimum limits set systemwide and per operating jurisdiction.

Topic	Description
Insurance and Indemnification Requirements	Sample insurance and indemnification requirements taken from other local micromobility programs.
Data Sharing and Frequency	Describes when and how data is to be shared with the program manager, participating jurisdictions and the public. Includes language requiring adoption of existing data standards.
Contract Length	Recommends a one-year pilot contract with renewal options.
Vehicle Maintenance and Inspection Requirements	List of maintenance and inspection requirements to ensure system is in proper working order.
Rebalancing Requirements	Defines rebalancing for the purpose of the RFP and outlines the types of information on rebalancing a respondent should provide in their proposal.
Geographic Coverage	Proposes vehicle distribution requirements based on jurisdiction boundaries and MTC Equity Priority Communities.
Customer Service and Complaint Resolution Standards	Defines standards for customer service, including issue response time and complaint resolution.
Equity Programming	User-equity focused RFP requirements aimed at reducing barriers to use.
Enforcement Requirements	Defines enforcement mechanism, including recommended operator security deposit, hourly impound fee, and mechanism to suspend operations.
Program Fees	Outlines recommended vendor fee structure and pricing.
User Fees	Information on area micromobility prices and how an RFP can consider proposed pricing in the total contract value proposition
Subsidy and Revenue Sharing	Information on how operating subsidies and revenue sharing could be incorporated into the program.

Program Rollout and Expansion

This section discusses the impact of a jurisdiction entering or leaving the program during the duration of the pilot and how that may affect the overall pilot system. The study team envisions that the pilot would run for one-year, with participating jurisdictions committing to stay within that program through the duration of the pilot.

The pilot is an opportunity for the county to refine its micromobility management approach. At the end of the pilot period, the study team envisions the county would make recommendations for and adopt a revised program management structure that incorporates lessons learned from the pilot.

Risk Mitigation

Any micromobility program faces risks. While it is impossible to eliminate all risk, there are strategies to help mitigate or lesson risk exposure for the program manager, participating jurisdictions, and the public. Some key topics discussed in this report include: liability risk, reducing the likelihood of operator exit, and financial risks associated with the program.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: September 15, 2022

To: Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee

From: Sean Charpentier, Executive Director

Subject: Discuss Committee Membership Composition and Guidelines

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

RECOMMENDATION

That the Technical Advisory Committee discusses the composition of Committee membership and any revisions to the Committee guidelines.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact related to this item.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Not applicable.

BACKGROUND

In 1998, C/CAG Bylaws established the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee. The Committee is comprised of engineers and planners who provide technical expertise and professional recommendations to the C/CAG Board regarding transportation and air quality issues. There are currently a total of 25 positions, including 23 engineers and 2 planners from the C/CAG member agencies as well as representatives from regional and state transportation agencies. Traditionally, the County of San Mateo's Public Works Director and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority representative take turn chairing the meetings. The Committee guidelines were last updated on November 24, 2009.

Given that a significant amount of time has lapsed since the last Committee guideline update, staff would like to discuss with the Committee on the following items:

1. The Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) has recently expressed interest in participating on the Committee. Does the Committee wish to expand its membership to include representation from BART?
2. What are the Committee's thoughts on making the chairmanship opportunity available to all members?

The Committee will have an opportunity to review the guidelines and provide input at the meeting. Staff will return to the Committee at a future meeting with draft revisions to the guidelines for approval.

ATTACHMENT

1. Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (CMP TAC) Guidelines
2. 2022 Committee Roster

Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (CMP TAC) Guidelines

11/24/09

Mission

The CMP TAC is a staff committee composed of engineers and planners who provide technical expertise and professional recommendations to the CMEQ Committee and C/CAG Board regarding transportation and air quality issues, the Congestion Management Program, and the Countywide Transportation Plan.

Membership

The CMP TAC was originally established to include representatives from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) (1), the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) (1), San Francisco International Airport (SFIA) (1), the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) (1 with 1 alternate), the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) (2), San Mateo County Government (3), the Central County Cities (2), the North County Cities (2), the South County Cities (2), the Cities at large (1), and Caltrans (3). A total of 19 members.

The composition of the Technical Advisory Committee includes up to twelve city engineers and planners, one county engineer, one county planner, one representative each from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, CalTrans, SamTrans, the Transportation Authority, the Joint Powers Board, and the Congestion Management Program.

There are currently a total of 25 positions including 15 engineers and 4 planners from the local jurisdictions in addition to representatives from Caltrans, SamTrans, Peninsula Corridor JPB, SMCTA, MTC, and C/CAG.

- 25 members on average
- The CMP TAC is currently composed of 24 members made up of engineers representing SMCTA, Peninsula Corridor JPB (Caltrain), Caltrans, MTC, C/CAG, and the cities and County
- 16 jurisdictions (15 cities and the County) are represented
- Burlingame, San Mateo, Daly City, and the County have 2 representatives each (engineer and planner)
- 5 cities NOT represented: Hillsborough, San Bruno, Portola Valley, Half Moon Bay, and East Palo Alto
- The total number of members fluctuates with the highest of 27 in 2005 and lowest of 20 in 2000 with 20. The current number of members is 24.

Term Limits

- There are no term limits for the CMP TAC. Members can remain on the TAC indefinitely or until the member voluntarily relieve him/or herself of the membership.

Selection Process

- To fill the vacant engineering positions, staff solicits individuals from C/CAG member agencies who have expressed interest in being on the TAC and requested that a letter of interest be submitted to C/CAG for considerations. Staff would focus on the cities' Public Works Directors/City Engineers that are not currently represented on the Committee. For backfilling a vacant "Planner" position, staff will contact the Planning Directors.
- Interested individuals are then asked to submit a letter of interest and request from the City Manager. Based on the number of vacancies and responses received, the C/CAG Executive Director makes the recommendation for the appointment of new member(s) to backfill the vacancies. If there is more interest than positions available, the Director has the discretion to expand the number of members to maintain a representational and diverse committee.

2009 TAC Roster and Attendance	
Member	Agency
Jim Porter (Co-Chair)	San Mateo County Engineering
Joseph Hurley (Co-Chair)	SMCTA
Duncan Jones	Atherton Engineering
Karen Borrmann	Belmont Engineering
Randy Breault	Brisbane Engineering
Syed Murtuza	Burlingame Engineering
Bill Meeker	Burlingame Planning
Sandy Wong	C/CAG
Gene Gonzalo	Caltrans
Rick Mao	Colma Engineering
Robert Ovadia	Daly City Engineering
Tatum Mothershead	Daly City Planning
Ray Towne	Foster City Engineering
Chip Taylor	Menlo Park Engineering
Ron Popp	Millbrae Engineering
Van Ocampo	Pacifica Engineering
April Chan	Peninsula Corridor JPB
Peter Vorametsanti	Redwood City Engineering
Robert Weil	San Carlos Engineering
Larry Patterson	San Mateo Engineering
Bob Beyer	San Mateo Planning
Steve Monowitz	San Mateo County Planning
Dennis Chuck	So. San Francisco Engineering
Kenneth Folan	MTC
<i>Staff Support</i>	
John Hoang	C/CAG

Current Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee Roster – 2022

Agency	Representative
San Mateo County Engineering	Ann Stillman (Co-Chair)
SMCTA / PCJPB / Caltrain	Heba El-Guindy (pending)
Atherton Engineering	Robert Ovardia
Belmont Engineering	Peter Brown
Brisbane Engineering	Randy Breault
Burlingame Engineering	Syed Murtuza
C/CAG	Sean Charpentier
Colma Engineering	Brad Donohue
Daly City Engineering	Richard Chiu
Daly City Planning	Tatum Mothershead
Foster City Engineering	Louis Sun
Hillsborough Engineering	Paul Willis
Half Moon Bay Engineering	Maziar Bozorginia
Menlo Park Engineering	Nikki Nagaya
Millbrae Engineering	Jane Kao
Pacifica Engineering	Lisa Petersen
Redwood City Engineering	Jessica Manzi
San Bruno Engineering	Matthew Lee
San Carlos Engineering	Steven Machida
San Mateo Engineering	Azalea Mitch
South San Francisco Engineering	Eunejune Kim
South San Francisco Planning	Billy Gross
Woodside Engineering	Sean Rose
MTC	James Choe
Caltrans	Nidal Tuqan (pending)

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: September 15, 2022

To: Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee

From: Jeff Lacap, Transportation Systems Coordinator

Subject: Regional Project and Funding Information
(For further information, contact Jeff Lacap at jlacap@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Technical Advisory Committee receives information on regional project and funding related items.

FISCAL IMPACT

None.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

N/A

BACKGROUND

C/CAG staff routinely attends meetings hosted by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and receives information distributed from MTC pertaining to federal funding, project delivery, and other regional policies that may affect local agencies. Attached to this report includes relevant information from MTC.

FHWA Policy for Inactive Projects

Caltrans requires administering agencies to submit invoices at least once every 6 months from the time of obligation (E-76 authorization). The current inactive list is attached (Attachment 1). Project sponsors are requested to visit the Caltrans site regularly for updated project status at: <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/local-assistance/projects/inactive-projects>

Please continue to send in your invoices in a timely matter to Caltrans or let them know of any unanticipated delays to your project. Obligated funds should be able to be spent and invoiced for reimbursement within 6 months. Projects not ready to be encumbered or awarded within 6 months should not be obligated.

Pavement Management Program (PMP) Certification

The current PMP certification status listing is attached (Attachment 2). Jurisdictions without a current PMP certification are not eligible to receive regional funds for local streets rehabilitation and will have

projects removed from MTC's obligation plans until their PMP certification is in good standing. Contact Sui Tan at stan@bayareametro.gov if you need to update your certification.

Miscellaneous MTC/CTC/Caltrans Federal Aid Announcements

SMCTA 2022 Cycle 6 Pedestrian and Bicycle Program Call for Projects

The Call for Projects for the Cycle 6 San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) Pedestrian and Bicycle Program is currently underway and project applications are due on September 23, 2022.

More information can be found here: <https://www.smcta.com/2022-cycle-6-pedestrian-and-bicycle-program-call-projects>

USDOT Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A)

This program appropriates \$5 billion over the next five years to fund regional, local, and Tribal initiatives to prevent roadway deaths and serious injuries, with up to \$1 billion available in 2022. Eligible applicants include MPOs, counties, cities, towns, transit agencies, other special districts that are subdivisions of a State, federally recognized Tribal governments, and multi-jurisdictional groups comprised of the previously listed entities. Applications are due to USDOT on Thursday, September 15, 2022.

More information can be found here: <https://www.transportation.gov/grants/SS4A>

USDOT Reconnecting Communities Pilot Program – Planning Grants and Capital Construction Grants

The Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) established the new Reconnecting Communities Pilot (RCP) discretionary grant program, funded with \$1 billion over the next 5 years.

It is the first-ever program to help reconnect communities that were previously cut off from economic opportunities by transportation infrastructure. Funding supports planning grants and capital construction grants, as well as technical assistance, to restore community connectivity through the removal, retrofit, mitigation, or replacement of eligible transportation infrastructure facilities.

Applications are due to USDOT through Thursday, October 13, 2022.

More information can be found here: <https://www.transportation.gov/grants/reconnecting-communities>

USDOT Notice of Funding Opportunities 2022

In order to provide stakeholders with more visibility into upcoming funding opportunities, US Department of Transportation (USDOT) has published a list of anticipated dates for Notice of Funding Opportunities (NOFOs) for key Bipartisan Infrastructure Law programs. The NOFO list is not comprehensive and will be *updated periodically* with new programs and dates.

Full details can be found here: <https://www.transportation.gov/bipartisan-infrastructure-law/upcoming-notice-funding-opportunity-announcements-2022>

Lapsed Project End Dates

Please review the Caltrans Project End Date (PED) lookahead report attached (Attachment 3) and work with Caltrans Local Assistance to take appropriate action.

Any work done on projects past the PED is not eligible for reimbursement. PEDs should be extended prior to the expiration of the current PED. If a PED is extended after its lapse, then the work done during the lapsed period is not reimbursable. PEDs must be extended through an E-76 modification. Please plan on the E-76 approval process to take at least 4 weeks.

Caltrans Division of Local Assistance (DLA), Office of Project Implementation provides guidance and support to local agencies in managing the Federal-aid projects. The Project End Date (PED), analogous to the previously used Agreement End Date (AED), is the date that an agency estimates to identify the end of a project phase's Period of Performance (end of Federally participating work). It is defined as the date after which no additional federally participating costs may be incurred for an authorized phase of work.

The look ahead report attached lists projects with (i) expired PED, (ii) PED to expire within the next three months, (iii) PED to expire within the next 6 months and (iv) PED to expire in more than 6 months but with lapses in the past. The purpose of this list is to alert local agencies of expired or expiring PEDs, so they can initiate PED extension requests where necessary and/or contact DLAEs for further assistance. Projects with final invoices submitted do not require a PED extension.

Local Technical Assistance Trainings

These programs provide subsidized, practical training for transportation professionals in California's cities, counties, and regional transportation agencies.

- Federal Aid Series – Various Dates. Register here:
<https://californialtap.org/index.cfm?pid=1077>

ATTACHMENTS

1. Caltrans Inactive Project List for San Mateo County as of September 2, 2022
2. MTC's PMP Certification Status of Agencies within San Mateo County as of September 8, 2022
3. Caltrans Lapsed Project End Dates Lookahead Report

Updated on 09/02/20: 4th quarter inactive projects

> \$50,000 unexpended balance

Project Number	Status	Agency Action Required	State Project No	Project Prefix	District	County	Agency	Project Description	Latest Date	Earliest Authorization Date	Latest Payment Date	Last Action Date	Months of No Activity	Program Codes	Total Cost Amount	Obligations Amount	Expenditure Amount	Unexpended Balance
5438011	Inactive	Project is inactive. Funds at risk. Invoice immediately. Provide status to DLAE/ submit inactive justification form.	0400021118L1	HPLUL	04	SM	East Palo Alto	BAY ROAD: CLARKE/ILLINOIS TO COOLEY LANDING (BAY TRAIL) ROAD WIDEN, RESURFACE, STREETScape, BIKE LANE	07/02/2021	04/04/2012	7/2/2021	7/2/2021	11	HY10	\$14,156,908.00	\$9,747,135.64	\$5,502,448.47	\$4,244,687.17
5171023	Inactive	Project is inactive. Funds at risk. Invoice immediately.	0418000443L	CML	04	SM	Burlingame	ALONG BROADWAY CORRIDOR REMOVE AND REPLACE OLD STREET LIGHTING WITH NEW PEDESTRIAN LIGHT FIXTURES AND POLES.	11/22/2021	6/24/2020	11/22/2021	11/22/2021	7	Z003	\$865,106.00	\$720,000.00	\$1,327.95	\$718,672.05
5935087	Inactive	Invoice under review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.	0422000053L	STPL	04	SM	San Mateo County	VARIOUS LOCATIONS NEAR GARDEN VILLAGE ELEMENTARY AND BEN FRANKLIN INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS SAN MATEO COUNTY: ON SOUTH PARK PLAZA DR: INSTALL A RAISED MIDBLOCK CROSSWALK, CONNECTING BOTH SCHOOLS, WITH ADA CURB EXTENSIONS AND RAMPS, PEDESTRIAN-ACTIVATED RAPID RECTANGULAR FLASHING BEACONS (RRFB), SPEED REDUCTION STRIPING, AND EDGE LINES; ON 87TH ST AT THE CORNERS OF S. PARK PLAZA AND WASHINGTON ST: INSTALL ADA CURB EXTENSIONS AND RAMPS; ON 87TH ST FROM SOUTHGATE AVE TO SULLIVAN AVE: INSTALL SPEED REDUCING EDGE LINES (TC)	11/01/2021	11/1/2021		11/1/2021	7	Z230	\$210,000.00	\$210,000.00	\$0.00	\$210,000.00
5267023	Inactive	Project is inactive. Funds at risk. Invoice immediately.	0418000359L	STPL	04	SM	San Carlos	CEDAR STREET BETWEEN SAN CARLOS AVENUE AND CITY OF BELMONT; AND BRITTAN AVENUE BETWEEN ELM STREET AND THE ALLEYWAY SOUTH OF EL CAMINO REAL AC OVERLAY AND INSTALL ADA RAMPS	12/28/2021	1/16/2020	12/28/2021	4/8/2022	6	Z230	\$602,896.56	\$524,537.20	\$349,107.95	\$175,429.25

< \$50,000 unexpended balance

Project Number	Status	Agency Action Required	State Project No	Project Prefix	District	County	Agency	Project Description	Latest Date	Earliest Authorization Date	Latest Payment Date	Last Action Date	Months of No Activity	Program Codes	Total Cost Amount	Obligations Amount	Expenditure Amount	Unexpended Balance
5935079	Inactive	Project is inactive. Funds at risk. Invoice immediately.	0418000322L	BPMP	04	SM	San Mateo County	CLOVERDALE ROAD OVER BUTANO CREEK, NORTH OF BUTANO PARK ROAD (BR NO 35C0041) SCOUR COUNTERMEASURES AND TREAT DECK WITH METHACRYLATE (TC)	11/22/2021	11/7/2018	11/22/2021	11/22/2021	7	Z233	\$150,000.00	\$150,000.00	\$104,072.57	\$45,927.43
5029035	Inactive	Project is inactive. Funds at risk. Invoice immediately.	0416000282L	CML	04	SM	Redwood City	MIDDLEFIELD ROAD BETWEEN MAIN STREET AND WOODSIDE ROAD BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS: SIDEWALK WIDENING, CORNER BULB OUT, CROSSWALKS, BUS STOP, BENCHES, PED LIGHTS, STREET LIGHTS, BIKE LANES, SIGNS, STRIPING	10/12/2021	2/27/2018	10/12/2021	10/12/2021	8	Z003	\$7,286,350.00	\$1,752,000.00	\$1,711,999.99	\$40,000.01
5438018	Inactive	Project is inactive. Funds at risk. Invoice immediately.	0420000013L	STPL	04	SM	East Palo Alto	WEST BAYSHORE RD, SCOFIELD ST, RUNNYMEDE ST., PULGAS AVE, O. CONNOR ST (NON-PARTICIPATING), NEWBRIDGE ST, COOLEY AVE ROADWAY REHABILITATION, INCLUDING: BASE REPAIR, CRACK SEAL AC OVERLAY, GRINDING, ADJUST UTILITY FRAMES, REPLACE PAVEMENT MARKINGS AND TRAFFIC SIGNAL DETECTION	06/21/2021	3/5/2020	6/21/2021	6/21/2021	12	Z230	\$1,358,724.00	\$416,000.00	\$376,817.83	\$39,182.17
5029024	Inactive	Project is inactive. Funds at risk. Invoice immediately.	0400021045L-N	BPMP	04	SM	Redwood City	BRIDGE PARKWAY OVER MARINE WORLD LAGOON, PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE	08/02/2017	4/13/2011	8/2/2017	8/2/2017	58	Q120	\$75,000.00	\$66,398.00	\$39,121.06	\$27,276.94
5029025	Inactive	Project is inactive. Funds at risk. Invoice immediately.	0400021046L-N	BPMP	04	SM	Redwood City	BRIDGE PARKWAY(RIGHT) OVER MARINE WORLD LAGOON, EAST OF MARINE WORLD PARKWAY, PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE	08/02/2017	4/13/2011	8/2/2017	8/2/2017	58	Q120	\$75,000.00	\$66,398.00	\$39,121.06	\$27,276.94
5333014	Inactive	Project is inactive. Funds at risk. Invoice immediately.	0412000122L	BHLS	04	SM	Woodside	KINGS MOUNTAIN RD OVER WEST UNION CREEK; 0.05 MI EAST OF TRIPP RD, BRIDGE REHABILITATION	07/07/2020	3/16/2012	7/7/2020	7/7/2020	23	L1CE	\$135,090.00	\$119,595.00	\$98,399.16	\$21,195.84
5438015	Inactive	Project is inactive. Funds at risk. Invoice immediately.	0414000191L	HPLUL	04	SM	East Palo Alto	UNIVERSITY OVERCROSSING US 101 BIKE PED PATH	10/25/2019	11/27/2013	10/25/2019	10/25/2019	32	HY20	\$950,000.00	\$760,000.00	\$739,979.07	\$20,020.93
5029032	Inactive	Project is inactive. Funds at risk. Invoice immediately.	0414000103L	BPMP	04	SM	Redwood City	MAIN ST, VETERANS BLVD, AND MAPLE ST OVER REDWOOD CREEK BRIDGE PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE	08/28/2019	3/21/2014	8/28/2019	8/28/2019	34	M240	\$26,250.00	\$23,239.00	\$4,519.81	\$18,719.19
5333013	Inactive	Project is inactive. Funds at risk. Invoice immediately.	0412000121L	BHLS	04	SM	Woodside	MOUNTAIN HOME RD OVER BEAR CREEK; 0.3 MI SOUTH OF SR 84, BRIDGE REHABILITATION	07/07/2020	3/16/2012	7/7/2020	7/7/2020	23	L1CE	\$107,428.00	\$95,106.00	\$93,266.37	\$1,839.63

\$1,000 or less unexp. Balance

Project Number	Status	Agency Action Required	State Project No	Project Prefix	District	County	Agency	Project Description	Latest Date	Earliest Authorization Date	Latest Payment Date	Last Action Date	Months of No Activity	Program Codes	Total Cost Amount	Obligations Amount	Expenditure Amount	Unexpended Balance
6204125	Inactive	Project is inactive. Proceed to next phase/ closeout project.	0413000206L	FERPL	04	SM	Caltrans	ON US101 FROM 0.3 MILES NORTH OF SAN ANTONIO ROAD (SCL -PM 50.6) TO 0.3 MILES SOUTH OF GRAND AVENUE INTERCHANGE (SM-PM 21.8) US 101: INSTALL HOV/HOT LANE	07/02/2019	5/16/2017	7/2/2019	7/2/2019	35	RPS0	\$20,999,258.82	\$9,547,698.97	\$9,547,074.22	\$624.75
6204113	Inactive	Project is inactive. Proceed to next phase/ closeout project.	0400000684L	CML	04	SM	Caltrans	ON STATE ROUTE: 101. US 101 BROADWAY INTERCHANGE IN BURLINGAME RECONSTRUCT INTERCHANGE INCLUDE BIKE/PED FACILITY	01/24/2020	1/30/2014	1/24/2020	2/24/2022	29	M400	\$50,043,250.63	\$3,559,977.49	\$3,559,977.49	\$0.00
5268020	Inactive	Project is inactive. Proceed to next phase/ closeout project.	0415000290L	STPL	04	SM	Belmont	BELMONT VILLAGE, SPECIFIC IMPLEMENTATION PLAN	04/25/2018	4/9/2015	4/25/2018	4/25/2018	50	M23E	\$550,000.00	\$440,000.00	\$440,000.00	\$0.00
6204111	Inactive	Project is inactive. Proceed to next phase/ closeout project.	0400000743L	HPLULCML	04	SM	Caltrans	STATE ROUTE 1 SAN PEDRO BRIDGE, BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	05/26/2017	11/1/2013	5/26/2017	5/26/2017	61	HY10	\$10,166,000.00	\$3,390,749.00	\$3,390,749.00	\$0.00
6419007	Inactive	Project is inactive. Proceed to next phase/ closeout project.	044A9208L	CML	04	SM	City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County	ARTERIAL ALONG ECR TO SR101 FR I280 HOLLY ST , IMPLEMENT ITS ELEMENTS	02/17/2011	1/27/2009	2/17/2011	2/17/2011	136	L400	\$415,000.00	\$367,000.00	\$367,000.00	\$0.00
5935044	Inactive	Project is inactive. Proceed to next phase/ closeout project.	04924729L	CML	04	SM	San Mateo County	MIRADA SURF BIKE/PED TRAIL, BIKE/PED CLASS 1 TRAIL	06/24/2010	2/5/2009	6/24/2010	6/17/2013	144	L400	\$184,604.00	\$163,429.29	\$163,429.29	\$0.00

PMP Certification September 8, 2022	Expired
	Expiring within 60 days
	Certified (including Pending & Extension)

* "Last Major Inspection" is the basis for certification and is indicative of the date the field inspection was completed.

County	Jurisdiction	Last Major Inspection*	Certification Expiration Date	P-TAP Cycle	Status
San Mateo	Atherton	6/30/2020	7/1/2022	23	Certified with Pending
San Mateo	Belmont	11/1/2021	12/1/2023	22	Certified with Pending
San Mateo	Brisbane	8/4/2020	9/1/2022	23	Certified with Pending
San Mateo	Burlingame	8/15/2020	9/1/2022	23	Certified with Pending
San Mateo	Colma	6/13/2019	7/1/2022	23	Certified with Pending
San Mateo	Daly City	10/1/2019	11/1/2022	23	Certified with Pending
San Mateo	East Palo Alto	8/15/2020	9/1/2022	21	Certified
San Mateo	Foster City	8/7/2021	9/1/2022	21	Certified
San Mateo	Half Moon Bay	11/1/2021	12/1/2023	22	Certified
San Mateo	Hillsborough	8/15/2020	9/1/2022	23	Certified with Pending
San Mateo	Menlo Park	12/31/2020	1/1/2023	23	Certified with Pending
San Mateo	Millbrae	9/26/2020	10/1/2022	23	Certified with Pending
San Mateo	Pacifica	8/28/2020	9/1/2022	23	Certified with Pending
San Mateo	Portola Valley	2/28/2021	3/1/2023	21	Certified
San Mateo	Redwood City	12/1/2021	12/21/2023	22	Certified
San Mateo	San Bruno	8/3/2019	9/1/2021	22	Certified with Pending
San Mateo	San Carlos	10/7/2019	11/1/2022	23	Certified with Pending
San Mateo	San Mateo County	7/31/2019	8/1/2022	23	Certified with Pending
San Mateo	San Mateo	9/3/2020	10/1/2022	21	Certified
San Mateo	South San Francisco	2/23/2020	3/1/2023	20	Certified with Extension
San Mateo	Woodside	8/19/2020	9/1/2022	21	Certified

(*) Indicates One-Year Extension. Note: PTAP awardees are ineligible for a one-year extension during the cycle awarded.

(^) Indicates previous P-TAP awardee, but hasn't fulfilled requirement; must submit certification prior to updating to current P-TAP award status.

Note: Updated report is posted monthly to:

http://mtc.ca.gov/sites/default/files/PMP_Certification_Status_Listing.xlsx

Project End Date Reporting

Last Updated: 9/1/2022

*** Submit PED extension requests at least one month prior to expiration to account for processing times and reduce nonparticipating gaps ***

Project Number xxxx(xxx)	Prefix	Responsible Agency	Agency's Portfolio with Lapses (%)	PE Auth "Other" (NI/Studies)	PE Auth	RW Auth	CON Auth	Monitoring Class	Approved PED (* Legacy)	PED Expires (Months)	PED by Expiration (Based on current PED)	Current SEQ #	Current FADS SEQ Status	Pending PED Change	Lapse Occurrences	Lapse Action by SEQ # (WR) or (NP)	FHWA Approves Waiver Request	Nonparticipating PED Lapses (Adjusted for Waiver Approvals)	AMS Adv ID (* Multi Adv IDs)	AMS Adv Acct Codes	FMIS Status
5438(018)	STPL	East Palo Alto	33.3%				03/05/20		08/31/21 *	-13	● PED Expired	1	Approv		1			SEQ# 1(8/31/2021 to Present)	042000013		ACTIVE
5177(040)	CML	South San Francisco	50.0%		01/04/19				02/01/22 *	-8	● PED Expired	2	Pend FHWA	12/31/26	1			SEQ# 1(2/1/2022 to SEQ# 2 Approval)	0419000112		ACTIVE
5029(035)	CML	Redwood City	25.0%						07/31/22 *	-2	● PED Expired	1	Approv		1			SEQ# 1(7/31/2022 to Present)	0416000282		ACTIVE
5438(011)	HPLUL	East Palo Alto	33.3%		04/04/12		03/02/18		09/30/22 *	1	◆ PED 0 to < 3 mos	6	Approv						0400021118	2W	ACTIVE
5438(015)	HPLUL	East Palo Alto	33.3%		11/27/13				10/30/22 *	2	◆ PED 0 to < 3 mos	4	Approv						0414000191	2W	ACTIVE
5935(064)	BPMP	San Mateo County	33.3%		08/10/18				10/31/22 *	2	◆ PED 0 to < 3 mos	1	Approv						0413000030		ACTIVE
5268(021)	CML	Belmont	33.3%				12/23/20		11/01/22	2	◆ PED 0 to < 3 mos	1	Approv						0419000270		ACTIVE
5177(041)	HSIPL	South San Francisco	50.0%				12/12/19		11/25/22	2	◆ PED 0 to < 3 mos	2	Approv						0419000138		ACTIVE
5177(039)	BPMP	South San Francisco	50.0%		11/19/19				12/30/22 *	4	◆ PED 3 to < 6 mos	1	Approv						0418000191		ACTIVE
5196(040)	ATPL	Daly City	0.0%		04/17/17		07/02/20		12/31/22 *	4	◆ PED 3 to < 6 mos	2	Approv						0417000097		ACTIVE
5177(033)	CML	South San Francisco	50.0%		01/31/14		01/09/17		03/31/23	7	◆ PED 6+ mos	4	Approv		1	3-WR	Yes (Partial)	SEQ# 3(09/01/2020 to 1/14/2021)w	0414000209	2W	ACTIVE
5196(042)	STPL	Daly City	0.0%				01/02/20		05/09/23	8	◆ PED 6+ mos	3	Approv						0419000152		ACTIVE
5357(010)	BRLS	Half Moon Bay	0.0%		02/27/18				06/30/23 *	10	◆ PED 6+ mos	2	Approv						0417000486		ACTIVE
5267(023)	STPL	San Carlos	100.0%				01/16/20		12/18/23	15	◆ PED 6+ mos	3	Approv		1			SEQ# 1(12/18/2021 to 12/21/2021)	0418000359		ACTIVE
5333(017)	BRLS	Woodside	0.0%		07/28/17		01/31/20		12/30/23	16	◆ PED 6+ mos	5	Approv						0417000338		ACTIVE
5333(012)	BRLS	Woodside	0.0%		03/16/12		03/26/21		12/30/23	16	◆ PED 6+ mos	4	Approv						0412000119	2W	ACTIVE
5935(075)	ATPLNI	San Mateo County	33.3%				06/15/17		01/01/24	16	◆ PED 6+ mos	2	Approv						0417000250	2W	ACTIVE
5029(032)	BPMP	Redwood City	25.0%		03/21/14				03/21/24 *	18	◆ PED 6+ mos	2	Approv						0414000103	2W	ACTIVE
5268(022)	STPL	Belmont	33.3%				03/04/22		05/01/24	20	◆ PED 6+ mos	1	Approv						0421000026		ACTIVE
5177(043)	HSIPL	South San Francisco	50.0%				11/15/21		06/01/24	21	◆ PED 6+ mos	2	Approv						0420000025		ACTIVE
5935(087)	STPL	San Mateo County	33.3%		11/01/21		08/29/22		06/30/24	22	◆ PED 6+ mos	2	Approv						0422000053		ACTIVE
5171(023)	CML	Burlingame	0.0%				06/24/20		07/01/24	22	◆ PED 6+ mos	2	Approv						0418000443		ACTIVE

Project End Date Reporting

Last Updated: 9/1/2022

*** Submit PED extension requests at least one month prior to expiration to account for processing times and reduce nonparticipating gaps ***

Project Number xxxx(xxx)	Prefix	Responsible Agency	Agency's Portfolio with Lapses (%)	PE Auth "Other" (NI/Studies)	PE Auth	RW Auth	CON Auth	Monitoring Class	Approved PED (* Legacy)	PED Expires (Months)	PED by Expiration (Based on current PED)	Current SEQ #	Current FADS SEQ Status	Pending PED Change	Lapse Occurrences	Lapse Action by SEQ # (WR) or (NP)	FHWA Approves Waiver Request	Nonparticipating PED Lapses (Adjusted for Waiver Approvals)	AMS Adv ID (* Multi Adv IDs)	AMS Adv Acct Codes	FMIS Status
5102(049)	BRLS	San Mateo	50.0%		06/09/18				07/28/24	23	◆ PED 6+ mos	2	Approv		1			SEQ# 1(8/6/2020 to 5/6/2021)	0417000373		ACTIVE
5102(051)	STPL	San Mateo	50.0%				03/07/22		10/31/24	26	◆ PED 6+ mos	1	Approv						0420000363		ACTIVE
5226(023)	CML	San Bruno	100.0%		11/16/18				01/01/25	28	◆ PED 6+ mos	2	Approv		1			SEQ# 1(11/1/2020 to 3/18/2021)	0419000066		ACTIVE
6419(027)	CMLNI	City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo Countv	0.0%				10/18/17		03/31/25 *	31	◆ PED 6+ mos	2	Approv						0418000108		ACTIVE
5333(013)	BHLS	Woodside	0.0%		03/16/12				NA *		■ No PED Established	3	Approv						0412000121	2W	ACTIVE
5333(014)	BHLS	Woodside	0.0%		03/16/12				NA *		■ No PED Established	3	Approv						0412000122	2W	ACTIVE
5029(024)	BPMP	Redwood City	25.0%		04/13/11				NA *		■ No PED Established	1	Approv						0400021045	2W	ACTIVE
5029(025)	BPMP	Redwood City	25.0%		04/13/11				NA *		■ No PED Established	1	Approv						0400021046	2W	ACTIVE
5935(044)	CML	San Mateo County	33.3%				02/05/09	"Fin" Invoice	NA-Zero \$ *		■ No PED Established	3	Approv						0400001511		ACTIVE
5268(020)	STPL	Belmont	NA		04/09/15			Acct Final	12/01/18 *	-46	■ NA-Closing	1	Approv		1			SEQ# 1(12/1/2018 to Present)	0415000290	7D	ACTIVE
5177(037)	ATPL	South San Francisco	NA		04/20/17		02/27/19	Acct Final	02/28/22 *	-7	■ NA-Closing	4	Pend FHWA	No change	2			SEQ# 4 (SEQ# 4 Approval to Present) SEQ# 3(2/28/2022 to SEQ# 4 Approval)	0417000117	7D	ACTIVE
5935(079)	BHLO	San Mateo County	NA		11/07/18			Vouchered	07/01/22 *	-3	■ NA-Closing	4	Pend HQ	No change	2			SEQ# 4 (SEQ# 4 Approval to Present) SEQ# 3(7/1/2022 to Next FMIS Appv)	0418000322	9A	ACTIVE
5935(081)	STPL	San Mateo County	NA		11/30/18		12/16/20	Acct Final	09/01/23	12	■ NA-Closing	3	Approv		1			SEQ# 1(10/31/2020 to 12/16/2020)	0419000108	7D	ACTIVE
6419(007)	CML	City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo Countv	NA		01/27/09			Acct Final	NA-Zero \$ *		■ NA-Closing	2	Approv						0400001169	7D	ACTIVE
5299(013)	STPL	Millbrae	NA	02/06/15				Acct Final	NA-Zero \$ *		■ NA-Closing	1	Approv						0415000126	7D	ACTIVE