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

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
Meeting Minutes
October 27, 2022

1. Call to Order

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

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

*Appointed at May 2022 C/CAG Board meeting.

The BPAC members in attendance at the October 27 meeting is listed above.

Staff attending: Eva Gaye, Kim Springer, Kim Wever, Kaki Cheung, Sean Charpentier – C/CAG.

2. Review of Meeting Procedures

C/CAG Program Director Kaki Cheung reviewed procedures related to how the meeting would be conducted via Zoom.

3. **Public comment on items not on the agenda**

   None.

4. **Approval of the Minutes from September 22, 2022 Meeting**

   Member Robinson and Chair Schneider noted two changes to the minutes.

   Member Robinson noted that on Item 5, he described the difference between mountain bikes and normal or road bikes is suspension travel and tire type.

   Chair Schneider noted that on Item 5, regarding the discussion of a joint partnership to develop consistent bike and pedestrian signage, it is advisable to include the City of Menlo Park as one of the partnership cities.

   There were no public comments on the minutes.

   Motion: Member Robinson motioned to approve minutes as amended. Member Fraser seconded the motion. Roll call was taken. All other members in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.

5. **Review and recommend Board approval of the San Mateo County Shared Micromobility Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan**

   C/CAG Transportation Program Specialist Kim Wever presented an update on the Micromobility Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan, including program recommendations and the draft plan.

   Member Robinson asked about safety and if local police will be brought into the process. C/CAG Staff Kim Wever noted that in the program guidelines, vendors will be encouraged to provide education and training events. Staff also would consider bringing the police into the governance committee to keep them involved.

   Member Sullivan asked how many bikes will be included for the pilot and if scooters will be included. Staff Kim Wever noted that a maximum of 500 bikes will be included within the 2-3 pilot program's jurisdictions. Staff also noted that the plan currently recommends electric bikes (e-bikes). However, the jurisdictions will have discretion if they would like to include scooters. The program guidelines included guidance on scooters, including speeds.

   Member Sullivan asked if vehicles will be available for people with disabilities or limited mobility. Staff Kim Wever noted that the program guidelines request operators to propose alternatives and/or ADA options.

   Member Sullivan noted concern about safety and bike lanes. Member Sullivan asked if the project team reviewed where designated bike lanes were located when determining pilot locations to ensure success. Staff Kim Wever noted that the consultant reviewed proximity to barriers as a criterion for determining pilot locations.

   Member Sullivan asked if the bikes are subject to weather impacts. Staff Kim Wever

responded that they have not received input on this from vendors yet.

Member Sullivan asked about funding for helmets. He noted that certain jurisdictions require people to wear helmets when on bikes or e-scooters. Staff Kim Wever noted that in the Millbrae/Burlingame program, some operators suggested giving credit or discounts to riders who submit photos of themselves wearing helmets via a phone application. The project team is considering this.

Member Sullivan noted it is critical to find the right vendor with the right software to collect data and provide accountability. Staff Kim Wever agreed and noted that Redwood City did a separate Request for Proposal (RFP) for software, and commute.org has an RFP for collecting transportation demand management (TDM) data. Staff noted the potential to collaborate with these programs for data collection.

Chair Schneider noted she is fine with the recommended pilot locations. The Chair also noted that in places like Daly City, low visibility due to fog is an issue that should be considered. She also noted impacts from wind gusts in northern cities.

Chair Schneider noted that the governance committee includes "other key stakeholders" and asked if the plan could specifically list these stakeholders. The Chair recommended including cities that have real-world experience like Redwood City, Millbrae, and Burlingame. She also suggested other representatives to get broader perspectives, like Commute.org and C/CAG CMEQ (Congestion Management and Environmental Quality). She suggested BART and Caltrain as main transit providers in the area. Staff Kim Wever noted they could list stakeholders in the plan. She noted including Millbrae and Burlingame, Commute.org, and transit agencies. She noted that BART and Caltrain were on the ad-hoc advisory committee for the plan and expects they will be involved. Kim commented that the actual governance committee will likely be made up of the participating jurisdictions.

Chair Schneider noted that allowing cites to choose whether to have e-scooters makes it harder to compare data points. She also noted that some cities receive development block grants while other smaller cities do not have access to that money.

Chair Schneider asked if the $50,000 to evaluate the program could be done by the new C/CAG staff person and sent out for peer review to be more cost efficient. Staff Kim Wever noted that the $50,000 is just an estimate at this time.

Member Yuen asked who is responsible for the capital and operating costs and if costs would be shared amongst participating jurisdictions. Staff Kim Wever noted that as Program Manager, C/CAG will try to secure funding. However, if cost proposals are higher than expected, C/CAG will work with participating jurisdictions on cost sharing. One option may be like the C/CAG StreetLight subscription, in which costs are divided amongst participating jurisdictions based on population size. She also noted that many developers are also interested in the program, and may contribute funds. Funding sustainability will be evaluated throughout the pilot.

Staff Kim Wever noted that committee members who have other questions to follow up with her by November 7.

Motion: Member Robinson motioned to recommend Board approval of the San Mateo County Shared Micromobility Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan. Member Nicolas seconded the motion. Roll call was taken. All members in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.

6. **Review the evaluation processes for the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Grant and the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 3 and make recommendations for staff to consider in future grant evaluation processes**

C/CAG Program Director Kaki Cheung congratulated the committee on a successful and productive year, including the committee's involvement in the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Grant and the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 3 evaluation processes. With the committee's help, C/CAG allocated nearly $36M in funding. Program Director Kaki Cheung opened this item as an opportunity to review the evaluation processes and provide feedback for staff to consider for future grant cycles.

Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Grant

Member Robinson participated on the evaluation committee for the San Mateo County Transportation Authority's (TA) Cycle 6 Pedestrian and Bicycle Program Call for Projects this fall. Member Robinson suggested elements from the TA's Call for Projects, including implementing a 100-point grading system (instead of +100 points), and allocating more points for equity and more equity related scoring categories. He suggested scoring projects differently if they are already partially funded. He noted that equity should help the most people that need help. Program Director Kaki Cheung noted that the most recent TDA Article 3 cycle incorporated points for equity.

Member Hey noted that it is hard for places like Portola Valley to apply and be awarded funding. Member Hey noted that hundreds of bikes travel through Portola Valley and that bike infrastructure could be improved. Member Hey noted that however, based on income alone, Portola Valley does not qualify. In comparison, the Town's budget reflects a different perspective.

Chair Schneider noted that as a former resident of Mountain View, Portola Valley is the town that many people travel through. However, the Chair noted that Portola Valley's recent proposals were not awarded. She suggested returning to site in-person site visits for all voting members, as opposed to just videos of the project.

Vice Chair Self noted that the application videos were not useful and that he learned more from his own in-person visits or Google Maps. The Vice Chair suggested simplifying the application process to not require videos.

Chair Schneider noted that one of the criteria weighed an entity who received one grant in the last 10 years the same as an entity who received five grants in the last 10 years. The

Chair noted that the criteria did not give points to communities who have never received a grant, nor did the criteria take points from communities who received a grant every cycle. Chair Schneider encouraged staff to bring this topic to future committee meetings, especially post-covid.

Member Robinson did eight site visits for the TA's Call for Projects and wish it was more compartmentalized geography-wise. Program Director Kaki Cheung clarified that that was a TA-led process, and not C/CAG.

Chair Schneider noted it is useful to review scoring practices from other agencies like the TA.

Chair Schneider noted that for the "State of Readiness" scoring category, wealthier and larger cities with more staff likely have projects sitting on the shelf whereas smaller cities most likely do not have projects ready. The Chair asked staff to consider incorporating this into the equity scoring.

Chair Schneider noted "Network Connectivity" was difficult to score due to subjectivity. The Chair suggested splitting the category between commuter or recreational connectivity.

Vice Chair Self noted that the TA's evaluation panel had an excel spreadsheet with each project and dropdown scores. The Vice Chair suggested replicating this. The Vice Chair also noted that the TA's application made applicants provide more information for categories like network connectivity, making evaluating easier. For example, if a question asked if the project is a priority in a countywide plan, the applicants had to attach and identify which page the project is listed in the plan.

Chair Schneider asked if the TA's Call for Projects had a page limitation. Vice Chair Self noted this was still a problem for TA and some applicants included attachments with hundreds of pages. The Vice Chair noted that applicants should just note what page evaluators should refer to if attaching a document. Chair Schneider suggested including tips or hints for applicants as they are filling in the application.

Chair Schneider recalled a previous cycle reviewing 27 applications for 17 hours due to long attachments.

Member Hey noted requiring projects to be listed as a priority in a plan is not fair for a smaller town like Portola Valley because the town does not have the resources to write a bike plan. Member Hey noted it is important for an agency to state the importance of a project and that it does not necessarily need to be listed in another plan.

Program Director Kaki Cheung noted that the application asked applicants to refer to the C/CAG Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and that applicants did not need to have their own bike plans. Program Director Kaki Cheung noted that TDA Article 3 also includes planning funds; the Town of Colma received planning funds in the recent cycle.

Member Hey noted that for smaller towns, lack of staff resources and time is the bigger

issue. Chair Schneider noted that the County has several small cities that are under resourced, and this may become a geographic equity issue.

Member Robinson noted part of the barrier is bureaucracy. Member Robinson noted that in 2014, San Bruno required a committee to receive funding to develop a bike plan. Member Robinson questioned the usefulness of developing a committee, and that funding should be more focused on how beneficial the project is and if the project area has previously received funding.

Member Sullivan appreciated the discussion as an elected official. Member Sullivan noted that social equity and infrastructure is critical. He noted that surrounding cities in the county are understaffed – could be in the Public Works, Planning, Parks and Recreation, or in committees. Member Sullivan suggested thinking "outside the box" to simplify the application process and make it easier for more cities to apply.

Chair Schneider noted that the one-time Millbrae received a grant, the County had a program with extra funding that cities could avail themselves. The Chair suggested staff to review that process.

One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 3

Program Director Kaki Cheung provided a recap of MTC's OBAG Cycle 3, including a summary of the applications and the evaluation committee. The committee answered four discussion questions on the process.

Member Ruddock asked Vice Chair Self to share feedback following his comments on criteria at a previous BPAC meeting. Vice Chair Self noted that the OBAG scoring rubric was too focused on application quality as opposed to project quality. For example, the rubric asked, "does the application clearly state project benefits?" as opposed to "is the benefit to the community large or small?". Vice Chair Self noted that this may lead evaluators to score clarity over project benefit. The Vice Chair acknowledged this is MTC's rubric but would like the opportunity to provide direct feedback to MTC.

Chair Schneider asked how C/CAG could transmit feedback to MTC. C/CAG Executive Director Sean Charpentier noted that the committee could submit a letter and recommended submitting after MTC releases the prioritization results. He noted that quality of application does matter and that there should not be a significant difference between a quality application and a quality project. Vice Chair Self noted that there could be a difference. For other rubrics, the Vice Chair noted there are points given for clear and complete applications. He noted the importance of ensuring that evaluators look beyond application clarity and if the actual proposed project is useful.

Chair Schneider requested staff to revisit this item in January 2023 after MTC releases results.

Executive Director Sean Charpentier suggested articulating to future evaluators that it is not just the quality of the application but how much the project fills a need. He noted

C/CAG staff should make this clear in program guidelines and committee should note this as they review guidelines.

Member Robinson recommended creating a sub-committee to dissect the process and to include members that have evaluated and/or have experience with application processes.

Member Sullivan appreciated Vice Chair Self's comment. He agreed on creating a sub-committee to provide feedback to MTC on the rubric and making the process more equitable for all cities.

Member Beach asked if staff could coach or mentor cities with less resources during the application process, especially cities that may not have received meaningful funding in the past. This support may include helping cities strategize or meeting in advance on how to improve the application prior to applying.

Chair Schneider noted that the County of San Mateo provided support on grant applications in the past. The Chair also noted that this approach does require more time and that C/CAG staff did provide office hours throughout the OBAG process for applicants.

Executive Director Sean Charpentier noted the suggestion. He commented that for this OBAG process, staff gave applicants more time to apply, offered office hours, and were available any time throughout the six weeks for support. He noted that only some applicants took advantage of the resources. Staff also reviewed applications and reached out to applicants with clarifying questions. He noted that staff will consider this suggestion and may provide a pre-assistance or mandatory workshop in the future.

Member Robinson noted that for the TA's Call for Projects, Patrick Gilster at the TA suggested hiring a countywide consultant to support applicants in the future.

Chair Schneider supported the idea of a sub-committee and drafting a letter to MTC with suggestions to help member cities score better for future cycles. Chair Schneider also suggested the committee review the balance of small and larger cities and they have been funded. Chair Schneider conducted a straw poll of the committee on starting a sub-committee. The committee supported the idea.

Executive Director Sean Charpentier recommended calling the committee an ad hoc committee. He confirmed that the committee could motion to recommend developing this ad hoc committee at this meeting. He noted that if the ad hoc committee is approved, to leave membership open to committee member Mary Bier, who participated in the OBAG process but was unable to attend tonight's meeting.

Motion: Member Ruddock motioned to develop an ad hoc committee to discuss the OBAG 3 process and provide a written letter to MTC. Member Robinson seconded the motion. Roll call was taken. All members in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.

Members Matthew Self, Patrick Sullivan, Malcom Robinson, and Ann Schneider

volunteered for the ad hoc committee. Chair Schneider noted she will reach out to Mary Bier if she is interested in joining.

7. **Receive a presentation on C/CAG's Equity Assessment and Framework Development project and draft Equity definition**

C/CAG Transportation Systems Coordinator Kim Springer presented an overview of the C/CAG Equity Assessment and Framework Development project. Staff requested feedback from the committee on the draft equity definition (in agenda packet).

Member Robinson suggested reviewing the equity focus areas at a future committee meeting. Staff will provide more information on the equity areas that were developed for the C/CAG Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan at a future meeting.

8. **Member Communications**

The committee mentioned Doctor Elaine Salinger and research on transportation safety and police enforcement. This included information on heat maps of incident locations, bicycle incident reporting and video evidence, safety tactics, and reviewing Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) data.

Vice Chair Self thanked the committee for participation on the recent grant processes.

C/CAG Executive Director Sean Charpentier noted that this committee will return to in-person meetings in March 2023. The committee were able to meet online due to the Governor's existing state of emergency. The state of emergency will expire at the end of February 2023. He noted that staff will work to provide zoom for public participation.

9. **Adjournment**

Chair Schneider adjourned the meeting at 9:00 PM.