



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

AGENDA

Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee

Date: Monday September 26, 2022

Time: 3:00 p.m.

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

Join Zoom Meeting:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88589170098?pwd=ajNNWndSRlUvM3F0bHNjQVVHoi90QT09>

Meeting ID: 885 8917 0098

Passcode: 136584

Join by Phone: +1-669-900-6833

Meeting ID: 885 8917 0098

Passcode: 136584

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

1. Brief Overview of Teleconference Meeting Procedures	Information (Lacap)	No Materials
2. Public comment on items not on the agenda	Presentations are limited to 3 mins	No Materials
3. Issues from the September 2022 C/CAG Board meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval of Resolution 22-81 authorizing the C/CAG Chair to sign a Letter of Interest nominating 10 projects requesting \$32.6 million for the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) One Bay Area Grant 3 (OBAG 3) County & Local Program • Update on the Construction of San Mateo 101 Express Lanes Project 	Information (Lacap)	No Materials
4. Approval of minutes of August 29, 2022 meeting	Action (O'Neill)	Pages 1-4
5. Receive an update on the San Mateo County Shared Micromobility Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan	Information (Wever)	Pages 5-9



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

- | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--------------|
| 6. Executive Director Report | Information (Charpentier) | No Materials |
| 7. Member comments and announcements | Information (O'Neill) | No Materials |
| 8. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date:
October 31, 2022 | Action (O'Neill) | No Materials |

PUBLIC NOTICING: All notices of C/CAG regular Board meetings, standing committee meetings, and special meetings will be posted at the San Mateo County Court Yard, 555 County Center, Redwood City, CA, and on C/CAG's website at: <http://www.ccag.ca.gov>.

PUBLIC RECORDS: Public records that relate to any item on the open session agenda for a regular Board meeting, standing committee meeting, or special meeting are available for public inspection. Those public records that are distributed less than 72 hours prior to a regular Board meeting are available for public inspection at the same time they are distributed to all members, or a majority of the members, of the Board. The Board has designated the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), located at 555 County Center, 5th Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063, for the purpose of making public records available for inspection. Such public records are also available on C/CAG's website at: <http://www.ccag.ca.gov>. Please note that C/CAG's office is temporarily closed to the public; please contact Mima Guilles at (650) 599-1406 to arrange for inspection of public records.

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

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

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

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

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

If you have any questions about this agenda, please contact C/CAG staff: Jeff Lacap, jlacap@smcgov.org

**CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS COMMITTEE ON CONGESTION
MANAGEMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY (CMEQ)**

**MINUTES
MEETING OF August 29, 2022**

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

1. Brief Overview of Teleconference Meeting Procedures

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

2. Public comment on items not on the agenda

None.

3. Motion for COVID-19 Pandemic State of Emergency

Sean Charpentier, C/CAG Director requested that the committee find by motion that as a result of the continued COVID-19 Pandemic state of emergency, meeting in person would present imminent risks.

Motion- To 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. Penrose/Bonilla, Beach, Bonilla, Reddy, Brown, Holober, McCune, Sullivan, Papan, Penrose, Roberts, Alba. Motion Passes 11-0.

4. Issues from the July 22 2022 C/CAG Board meeting. (Information)

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

5. Approval of minutes of the June 27, 2022 meeting. (Action)

Motion – To approve the minutes of the June 27, 2022 CMEQ meeting, Penrose/Sullivan. Beach, Bonilla, Reddy, Brown, Holober, McCune, Sullivan, Papan, Penrose, Roberts, and Alba. Motion Passes 11-0.

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

Kim Wever, C/CAG Staff, presented the draft program recommendations for the San Mateo County Shared Micromobility Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan and addressed committee members' questions and comments.

Member Sullivan inquired about the 500 bikes that are available to participating cities, he questioned whether scooters are included and if they would be rentable. He also asked is there is a correlation between the population and the number of bikes each jurisdiction would receive. Kim responded to Member Sullivan's question and stated that the pilot program includes 500 vehicles, each jurisdiction

that is part of the pilot program can select whether they want electric bicycles or scooters. In addition, the 500 vehicles will be divided between the participating jurisdictions.

Member Reddy noted that the electric bikes are a huge investment. She asked will it be a liability for the participating jurisdiction if the electric bicycles are stolen? Member Reddy also expressed her concern that East Palo Alto and Menlo Park were not included in the pilot program considering that residents in these jurisdictions are met with transportation challenges. Kim noted that the electric bikes will not be city owned therefore it would be up to the vendor as the operator to manage theft and or damage of electric bicycles. She additionally added that East Palo Alto and Menlo Park are part of Phase 2 since they did not score as high for proximity to mass transportation as Phase 1 pilot areas.

Member Brown asked if we surveyed potential users. Will the program lead to less cars on the roadway? Kim noted that they had conducted a public survey but had not analyzed the results of the survey. She indicated that the feasibility study did indicate that there is demand in San Mateo County for Micromobility options.

Commissioner Papan emphasized the need to track the pilot program and involving law enforcement. She also asked how we incorporate cities and corporations that have already started their own programs. Kim stated the next step is developing program guidelines, which will be guided by current ordinances and best practices.

Member Beach commented that bicycles and scooters serve different needs, for example scooters provide equity to those that cannot ride a bicycle.

Member Sullivan commented that safety is very important like helmet usage and headlight requirements, and he suggested having sponsors for free helmets with logo stickers.

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

Jeff Lacap, C/CAG Staff, presented on the draft nomination list of projects for the One Bay Area Grant Cycle 3 Program and requested that the Committee recommend approval of the draft nomination list along with the \$200,000 Measure M Safe Routes to School funding to be incorporated into the SMCTA Bicycle and Pedestrian Call for Projects.

Commissioner Papan expressed the need to equitably distribute funds across San Mateo County cities for jurisdictions that did not receive funding or put forth competitive projects. She also expressed additional concerns regarding the Next Generation Faregates project submitted by BART and BART's participation in the county. Executive Director Charpentier responded to Commissioner Papan's comments and indicated that BART would like to have a more active role in the county and proposed to C/CAG to receive a seat on the C/CAG Technical Advisory Committee.

Member Holober expressed concerns regarding the large and small projects. He expressed that part of the reason why jurisdictions submitted projects that were less than \$1 million is because some project sponsors thought that by requesting less money, they would have a greater chance of being funded in the small category. Executive Director Charpentier indicated that the evaluation criteria provided by MTC prohibits sub-allocation of projects. In addition, these smaller projects generally received lower scores and would have a challenge competing at a regional level. He also indicated that C/CAG is embarking on an equity study that would examine C/CAG funding methods for small cities.

Member Bonilla expressed support for partially funding the City of San Mateo's US 101/Peninsula Avenue Interchange Improvements project.

Member Reddy highlighted her experience as an OBAG 3 Panelist. She indicated that she assessed the safety need of the project first and then assessed the equity need. She concluded her comments by stating that some applicants did a great job demonstrating the safety need of a project while others had challenges.

Motion to approve draft nomination list of projects under Option 2 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. Reddy/Bonilla. Beach, Bonilla, Reddy, Brown, Holober, McCune, Sullivan, Papan, Penrose, Roberts, and Alba. Motion passes 11-0.

7. Executive Director Report (Information)

Sean Charpentier, C/CAG Executive Director provided the following updates:

- C/CAG requested \$760,000 to begin the planning work for a buffered bike lane between Millbrae and El Camino Real.
- CTC is currently seeking applicants for an equity panel. Applications are due September 2, 2022

Director Charpentier concluded by thanking the committee for their work on OBAG 3.

9. Member comments and announcements (Information)

Commissioner Papan stated that MTC will be discussing the Transit Oriented Communities Policy at their next meeting.

10. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date

The meeting adjourned at 4:44 p.m. The next regular meeting was scheduled for September 26, 2022

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

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

Staff and Guests in attendance for the August 29, 2022 Meeting

Sean Charpentier, Kaki Cheung, Eva Gaye, Jeff Lacap, and Kim Wever, - C/CAG

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: September 26, 2022

To: Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee

From: Kim Wever, Transportation Program Specialist

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

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

RECOMMENDATION

That the Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) 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.