

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

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

AGENDA

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BPAC)

Date: Thursday, September 22, 2022

Time: 7:00 PM

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

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87362024773?pwd=ZXN1eFlyY3p4MHMvVWROeUJId1VPUT09>

Meeting ID: 873 6202 4773

Passcode: 894749

Join by Phone: 669 900 6833

Meeting ID: 873 6202 4773

Passcode: 894749

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

1.	Call to Order	Action (Schneider)	No materials
2.	Review of Meeting Procedures	Information (Shiramizu)	No materials
3.	Public comment on items not on the agenda	Limited to 2 minutes per speaker.	No materials
4.	Approval of the Minutes from the August 23, 2022 Meeting	Action (Schneider)	Page 4-9

5.	Receive an update on the San Mateo County Shared Micromobility Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan	Information (Wever)	Page 10-14
6.	Member Communications	Information (Schneider)	No materials
7.	Adjournment	Information (Schneider)	No materials

The next regularly scheduled BPAC meeting will be on October 27, 2022.

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

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

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION DURING VIDEOCONFERENCE MEETINGS: Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services to participate in this meeting should contact Audrey Shiramizu at ashiramizu@smcgov.org, five working days prior to the meeting date.

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

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

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

1. The C/CAG BPAC meeting may be accessed through Zoom at the online location indicated at the top of

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

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

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

City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG)

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

Meeting Minutes

August 23, 2022 – Special Meeting

1. Call to Order

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

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

*Appointed at May 2022 C/CAG Board meeting.

The BPAC members in attendance at the August 23 meeting is listed above.

Others attending the meeting were: Angel Torres – City of South San Francisco, Robert Ovadia – Town of Atherton, Sam Bautista – City of Pacifica, and others in attendance.

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

2. Review of Meeting Procedures

C/CAG Transportation Program Specialist Audrey Shiramizu reviewed procedures related to how the meeting would be conducted via Zoom.

3. 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.

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 BPAC. Given that the BPAC meeting is occurring 40 days after the approval of C/CAG Resolution 22-59, staff recommends that in order to continue to have remote meetings, the BPAC 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: Member Fraser motioned to approve. Member Nicolas seconded the motion. Roll call was taken. All members in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.

4. Public comment on items not on the agenda

None.

5. Approval of the Minutes from the July 28, 2022 Meeting

Motion: Member Sullivan motioned to approve. Member Hey seconded the motion. Roll call was taken. Member Robinson abstained. All other members in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.

6. Review and confirm receipt of committee comments and project sponsor responses to the MTC Complete Streets Checklist for One Bay Area Grant 3 (OBAG 3) County & Local Program

C/CAG Transportation Program Specialist Eva Gaye presented on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Complete Streets Checklist for the One Bay Area Grant 3 (OBAG 3) grant cycle.

Member Sullivan asked if scooters and skateboards were included in the Checklist. C/CAG Staff Eva Gaye responded that scooters and skateboards are included in the MTC Checklist.

Member Robinson echoed the importance of safely integrating micromobility, especially electrified devices, with pedestrians, bicyclists, and automobiles.

Chair Schneider and Member Sullivan asked if the committee should do more on helmet safety and enforcement. C/CAG Program Director Kaki Cheung noted that California state law does not require those over the age of 18 to wear a helmet. She noted that the Safe Routes to School Program encourages safety and helmet use and has distributed helmets. The local jurisdictions are typically responsible for local ordinances and

enforcing helmet requirements.

Chair Schneider suggested bringing back bike rodeos and other safety awareness campaigns in the future.

Member Espinoza-Garnica noted that under the City Manager, the City of Redwood City has a youth outreach group that has led bike outreach events in the past.

Member Sullivan suggested sponsoring an organization to provide helmets in each city. Member Robinson added that the San Bruno Fire Department provides helmets to children annually.

C/CAG Staff Jeff Lacap noted that the Countywide Safe Routes to School Program has provided flashlights and helmets in the past.

Member Goodwin motioned to confirm receipt of committee comments and project sponsor responses to the MTC Complete Streets Checklist for One Bay Area Grant 3 (OBAG 3) County & Local Program. Member Robinson seconded the motion. Roll call was taken. All members in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.

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

C/CAG Transportation Systems Coordinator Jeff Lacap presented two options of the draft nomination list of projects for the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 3 County & Local Program.

- Option 1 – Baseline
 - Top eight highest ranked projects for full OBAG 3 funding
 - Balance of \$384,825 from OBAG 3 plus \$900,000 Measure M recommended to City of Pacifica
- Option 2 - Staff Recommendation
 - Top seven highest ranked projects for full OBAG 3 funding; 1 project partially funded
 - Balance of OBAG 3 and Measure M funds recommended to the Town of Atherton and City of Pacifica

Chair Schneider asked staff to clarify the additional \$200,000 for Safe Routes to School. C/CAG Staff Jeff Lacap responded that \$900,000 from Measure M was already added prior to July 31. Today's agenda item recommends adding an additional \$200,000 from Measure M to the San Mateo County Transportation Authority's (SMCTA)'s Bicycle and Pedestrian Call for Projects Cycle 6.

Chair Schneider asked if any of the smaller projects were chosen. C/CAG Staff Jeff Lacap responded smaller projects ranked lower than other proposals.

Member Robinson asked why the scoring criteria does not seem to award smaller jurisdictions, like Belmont (for this and other grants). C/CAG Executive Director Sean Charpentier responded that the recommendation does include funding for two small towns: Colma and Atherton. Chair Schneider noted that Belmont recently received earmarks from three assemblymembers.

Member Robinson also noted that the scoring system tends to reward cities with more businesses and higher revenues.

Member Sullivan asked if all evaluators using the same methodology. C/CAG Staff Jeff Lacap responded that all evaluators were asked to score the same three categories.

Member Sullivan asked if the committee could view the raw data from each evaluator to compare differences in scoring between the three scoring groups (BPAC, Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ), and others). C/CAG Executive Director Sean Charpentier responded that the scores were not compared as three different groups. Chair Schneider and Member Sullivan noted that seeing this breakdown could be a point of reference for future evaluations.

Member Self, who participated as an evaluator for the BPAC, noted two items that impacted the outcome and skew towards larger projects. First, he noted some evaluators score based on the proposal (e.g., writing quality, level of detail, completeness, etc.) whereas others score the project (e.g., overall benefit of the project). MTC's scoring guidelines benefit proposals that are well-written, and typically cities that are bigger and have more funding and staff capacity can dedicate more time to writing. Second, he noted that there was not a cost benefit aspect in the scoring, only the overall impact. Therefore, larger projects scored better because they have a larger impact. Larger projects were typically submitted by larger cities with more funding and staff capacity. Member Self noted the guidelines were from MTC and the evaluation committee worked within the framework that was given.

Chair Schneider noted that C/CAG has two MTC representatives. The Chair recommended the committee review the OBAG 3 process and make recommendations to MTC.

Member Beach asked staff to clarify if the scoring evaluations were driven by MTC. C/CAG Staff Jeff Lacap confirmed that the scoring was driven by MTC. Member Beach agreed that the committee should provide feedback to MTC.

Member Beach asked why certain projects scored higher than others but were not recommended for funding. C/CAG Staff Jeff Lacap responded that some jurisdictions have received funding for another project already. Member Beach asked why the San Mateo County Transit District/SamTrans project, "Express Bus Mobility Hub", was not nominated. C/CAG Executive Director Sean Charpentier responded that the residual amount of funding available would have only partially funded the project, and that staff wanted to fully fund another project. Staff also considered the importance of geographic

distribution.

Member Hey noted that selecting Option 2 has a big impact on the City of San Mateo's "US 101/Peninsula Avenue interchange improvements project", from \$5,000,000 to \$1,000,000. Member Hey asked staff to clarify the impact to that project. C/CAG Staff Jeff Lacap and Executive Director Sean Charpentier responded that the \$5,000,000 was originally for construction, but the project has not cleared the environmental stage yet, and therefore, may not be as competitive for funding. The \$1,000,000 allows the City to move forward with planning and design. Staff confirmed that they reached out to the City about this recommendation after tallying the total scores.

Chair Schneider asked how the Town of Atherton's project is considered an equity priority community (EPC). C/CAG Staff Jeff Lacap noted that the school borders the North Fair Oaks EPC. Robert Ovadia, Public Works Director at the Town of Atherton, added that the project adds pedestrian improvements and widened bike lanes to a school that mostly serves the underserved communities.

Member Beach noted that she likes Option 2 because it includes the City of Pacifica, providing some geographic distribution. She also likes that Option 2 includes the Town of Atherton project. She agreed that the US 101/Peninsula Avenue project is not as competitive and that it is important to nominate projects that are closer to construction.

Motion: Member Beach motioned to approve the Option 2 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. Member Robinson seconded the motion. Roll call was taken. All members in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.

Chair Schneider thanked the BPAC members on the evaluation panel for their time and review. The Chair noted there is work to do in terms of equity on these grant cycles.

C/CAG Executive Director Sean Charpentier thanked the evaluation panel and the BPAC for their time. He noted that C/CAG views this application list as a priority projects list, and that in the last quick strike cycle, C/CAG was able to fund almost all projects within nine months. He noted that C/CAG will continue to work with the cities to implement these projects.

8. Member Communications

Chair Schneider noted that on August 18, the City of Millbrae hosted the Silicon Valley Bike Coalition's first bike summit outside Santa Clara County at their new Recreation Center.

C/CAG Executive Director Sean Charpentier noted that the California Transportation Commission (CTC) is recruiting members for an equity advisory committee. Staff will send information to the committee.

Member Hey noted there is discussion on electric bikes and other micromobility devices. She suggested looking at micromobility devices and how to bring them to communities equitably and safely.

9. Adjournment

Chair Schneider adjourned the meeting at 8:27 PM.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: September 22, 2022

To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

From: Kim Wever, Transportation Program Specialist

Subject: Receive an update on the San Mateo County Shared Micromobility Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan

(For further information, contact Kim Wever at kwever@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

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

FISCAL IMPACT

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

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Federal Surface Transportation Program and local Congestion Relief Plan funds.

BACKGROUND

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

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

The key deliverables for the Study include the following:

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

template with fee examples.

The initial analysis results showed that a bikeshare and/or scooter-share program is feasible in San Mateo County. 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 Memo (*will be available online at <https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/bicycle-and-pedestrian-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.