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, July 27, 2023 **Time:** 7:00 p.m. **Location:** 455 County Center 1st Floor, Room 101 Redwood City, CA, 94063	**Join by Zoom Meeting:** https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87362024773?pwd=ZXN1eFlyY3p4MHMvVWROeUJId1VPUT09 **Zoom Meeting ID:** 873 6202 4773 **Password:** 894749 **Join by Phone:** (669) 900-6833

HYBRID MEETING - IN-PERSON AND BY VIDEOCONFERENCE

This meeting of the C/CAG BPAC will be held in person and by teleconference pursuant to Government Code Section 54953(e). Members of the public will be able to participate in the meeting remotely via the Zoom platform or in person at the location above. For information regarding how to participate in the meeting, either in person or remotely, please refer to the instructions at the end of the agenda.

_____

1.	Call to Order	Action (Schneider)	No materials
2.	Public comment on items not on the agenda	Limited to 2 minutes per speaker.	No materials
3.	Approval of the Minutes from the March 23, 2023 Meeting	Action (Schneider)	Page 4-10
4.	Receive a presentation on the New Online Incident Reporting System from the County Sheriff's Office	Information (Shiramizu)	Page 11
5.	Review and Discuss the Fiscal Year 2023/2024 Cycle Transportation Development Act Article 3 Program Draft Call for Projects, Schedule, and Possible Changes to Scoring Sheet	Possible Action (Shiramizu)	Page 12-22

6.	Nominations and Elections of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson	Action (Shiramizu)	Page 23
7.	Member Communications	Information (Schneider)	No materials
8.	Adjournment	Information (Schneider)	No materials

The next regularly scheduled BPAC meeting will be on September 28, 2023.

PUBLIC NOTICING: All notices of C/CAG regular BPAC 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 BPAC 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 BPAC 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.

ADA REQUESTS: Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services to participate in this meeting should contact Audrey Shiramizu at ashiramizu@smcgov.org by 10:00 a.m. prior to the meeting date.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION DURING HYBRID MEETINGS: During hybrid meetings of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, members of the public may address the Committee as follows:

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 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 BPAC 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 in person and through Zoom. Public comments will be taken first by speakers in person, followed by via Zoom. Please read the following instructions carefully:

*In-person participation:
1. If you wish to speak to the C/CAG BPAC, please fill out a speaker's slip placed by the entrance of the meeting room. If you have anything that you wish distributed to the Committee and included in the official record, please hand it to the C/CAG staff who will distribute the information to the Committee members and staff.

*Remote participation:
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 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. If calling in via phone, press *9 to raise your hand and when called upon press *6 to unmute.
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
March 23, 2023

1. **Call to Order**

   Chair Schneider called the meeting to order at 7:00PM. The Chair welcomed the committee back to the first in-person meeting since the pandemic. C/CAG staff present at the meeting introduced themselves.

Name	Agency	Jan 2023	Mar 2023
Public			
Matthew Self – Vice Chair	County of San Mateo	X	X
Malcolm Robinson	San Bruno	X	
Alan Uy	Daly City	X	X
Angela Hey	Portola Valley	X	X
Brian Levenson	Redwood City		
Justin Yuen	South San Francisco	X	X
Marina Fraser	Half Moon Bay	X	
Elected			
Ann Schneider – Chair	Millbrae	X	X
Emily Beach	Burlingame	X	
Flor Nicolas	South San Francisco	X	
Mary Bier	Pacifica	X	X
Patrick Sullivan	Foster City	X	X
John Goodwin	Colma		X
Debbie Ruddock	Half Moon Bay		
Lissette Espinoza-Garnica	Redwood City	X	X

   C/CAG Staff present: Audrey Shiramizu, Kaki Cheung, Sean Charpentier, Jeff Lacap, Eva Gaye, Kim Springer.

   Guests: Bryan Redmond (Metropolitan Transportation Commission), Anthony Montes (Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition).

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

   None.

3. **Approval of the Minutes from the January 26, 2023 Meeting**

   There were no public comments on the minutes. Chair Schneider noted that she liked the narrative in the minutes.

   Motion: Member Espinoza-Garnica motioned to approve minutes. Member Sullivan seconded the motion. All members in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.

4. **Review and recommended approval to amend the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Program Funds to reflect a reallocation of $1,000,000 for City of Pacifica's Sharp Park Priority Development Area Pedestrian Improvement Project**

   C/CAG Staff Eva Gaye presented on staff's recommendation to reallocate $1,000,000 in available OBAG 2 funds to the City of Pacifica for the Sharp Park Priority Development Area Pedestrian Improvement Project.

   Member Hey asked where the project is located. C/CAG staff Eva Gaye responded that the project is located along Paloma and Carmel Avenues.

   Member Uy asked why this project was recommended. Staff responded that C/CAG submitted 11 projects to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and that seven were not recommended for funding. This project was selected to provide more geographic distribution as other projects funded by MTC are located on the bayside. C/CAG Executive Director (ED) Sean Charpentier noted that this project was the next highest scoring project that was not funded nor on MTC's contingency list.

   Vice Chair Self asked if the Atherton/Adelante project was selected instead of the Pacifica project, would the Pacifica project be moved to the contingency list. C/CAG Executive Director responded that MTC would not update the contingency list. He also noted that the funding available could fully fund the Pacifica project. Vice Chair Self noted that the scoring committee submitted a prioritized list to MTC and asked why coast side and bayside priorities were not initially part of the scoring criteria. C/CAG ED noted that it was a competitive process and that the Pacifica project scored right below projects that were fully funded or put on the contingency list. Chair Schneider noted that MTC may have created the score sheet and C/CAG ED noted that MTC may have also been held to Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) orders to not distribute through a formulaic distribution.

   Member Sullivan asked if the project was selected based on the completion of the project more than the scoring. The C/CAG ED noted that the project was selected because C/CAG would be able to fully fund the project while the Atherton project could still remain on the MTC contingency list for funding.

   Chair Schneider noted there is a smaller group within the BPAC planning to review MTC's scoring process and draft a letter to MTC on the BPAC's behalf.

Member Sullivan asked if the value of the project has a score. C/CAG ED responded that to be eligible on this list, a project needed a 20% local match or if located in an MTC Equity Priority Community or a C/CAG Equity Focus Area, an 11.47% match (the minimum federal local match). Member Sullivan noted it is critical for applicants and evaluators to know this to have a better chance of funding.

Member Bier noted that this project is an important part of the City's General Plan update and that the pedestrian improvements opens more accessibility to the coast side.

Chair Schneider note that the smaller BPAC group drafting a letter to MTC should consider a criterion on cut-through traffic impacts.

A member of the public, Anthony Montes, asked if there is sea wall reinforcement in the Precise Plan. Member Bier responded yes and the City is working on funding. Anthony Montes also noted that modal filters, or dead ends for cars but not for people, are helpful for cut through streets.

Vice Chair Self asked about San Carlos's plan for this project and if the highway overcrossing project is happening. C/CAG ED replied that C/CAG does not know at this time. The two projects are bundled at this time.

Motion: Member Goodwin motioned to approve. Member Bier seconded the motion. All members in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.

Staff noted this recommendation is going to the C/CAG Board for approval on April 9.

5. **Receive a presentation on bicycle and pedestrian safety from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission on the Bay Area Vision Zero (BayVIZ) System and from the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition on safety education, engagement, and programs**

BAYVIZ

Bryan Redmond, Assistant Program Coordinator for Vision Zero Program at MTC, presented on MTC's Bay Area Vision Zero System (BAYVIZ), a tool for analyzing safety at the regional, county, and local level.

Member Hey asked how recent the data and how it is collected and inputted. Bryan noted that data is from UC Berkeley Transportation Injury Mapping System (TIMS) and that staff is aware it is not completely accurate and may not include every relevant crash. Chair Schneider asked if San Mateo County had additional data sources, how could the County work with the Department of Transportation to get the data accepted. Bryan noted that he can process and handle data that the County wants to submit into the BAYVIZ system but is not aware of the process for getting data into another source like DOT. Chair Schneider asked staff if they can compile local data sources and send to DOT. C/CAG ED noted that there are staff limitations and that it may lead to inconsistencies

and/or duplicative data. Members Hey and Sullivan noted data from fire truck and ambulance services. Member Hey asked if there is a way to crowd-source data. C/CAG Program Director Kaki Cheung noted that C/CAG is not aware of a tool at this time. Chair Schneider noted that more recent data is needed for grants. C/CAG ED noted that grants typically require standard data that is not crowd sourced nor subject to variation.

Member Sullivan suggested Committee members check with their own cities on how emergency services data is collected. Chair Schneider asked if C/CAG staff meet with transportation staff at every city. C/CAG ED replied that staff is engaged through the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Public Works departments. Staff noted that MTC BAYVIZ will also present at an upcoming TAC meeting. C/CAG ED noted that BAYVIZ is a helpful tool for cities' active transportation planning and prioritizing street improvements. Vice Chair Self noted that this tool takes existing data and disseminates the data; and there is still a question about how to get more data inputted. Member Sullivan noted that incidents related to scooters and e-bikes are not always reported. Member Uy noted that San Francisco works with hospitals to get public health data.

Member Hey noted her concern about the accuracy of the data. Chair Schneider suggested members to report back on their cities' data collection at a future meeting.

Chair Schneider asked MTC if BAYVIZ uses MTC's Equity Priority Communities (EPCs). MTC confirmed. Chair Schneider asked if MTC can input C/CAG's Equity Focus Areas (EFAs). MTC responded they will consider adding EFAs if staff sends the GIS layers.

C/CAG staff Eva Gaye noted that C/CAG completed a high-injury network (HIN) analysis last year using TIMS and Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) data. She noted that many of the jurisdictions used the HIN for OBAG 3 grant applications.

Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition

Anthony Montes, Community Organizer at the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition (SVBC), presented on SVBC's mission, programs, safety education, and engagement.

For the upcoming Bike Summit on August 24, Chair Schneider asked about e-bike safety and if e-bikes should be allowed on trails. Anthony noted that SVBC has a contract with Peninsula Clean Energy for an e-bike ride at the summit and that safety may be added.

Member Hey commented that El Camino Real (ECR) is a dangerous corridor for bicyclists due to numerous car exits and that it is misguided to make ECR a bike lane. Anthony acknowledged Member Hey's comment. Member Hey suggested bike lanes down the middle of ECR, like in Bogota, Colombia. Anthony responded that that is a design idea in the Caltrans bike highway study led by Sergio Ruiz at Caltrans.

Chair Schneider noted each city has localized issues. For example, Millbrae needs trees to buffer noise and focus is needed on both commuter and recreational bike routes.

Member Yuen asked where the pop-up facility on ECR in South San Francisco is located and for how long. Anthony noted that at the South San Francisco City Council meeting the night before, Council did not approve a resolution to receive funding for the pop-up due to concerns about the location and needing more design. City staff is vetting the design and location before approval. Member Yuen noted that there are existing class 2 bike lanes terminating at Westborough and would be good to extend those lanes south to the BART stations. Anthony noted that a big issue with bike lanes on ECR is lack of continuity that forces riders to weave between parking and bike lanes. Member Yuen asked if Caltrans is interested in making this pop-up permanent. Anthony responded that it is a demonstration project but that SVBC desires to make it permanent.

C/CAG ED noted that Sergio Ruiz at Caltrans previously presented the bike study at BPAC, which extends from Colma to Redwood City and would vastly improve bike facilities on ECR.

Member Bier thanked Anthony for the presentation and asked if SVBC has a youth component. Anthony replied there is no structure in place but there are volunteers from high schools and college. Member Bier noted she works at the Daly City Youth Health Center and offered connecting SVBC. Anthony noted SVBC intends to do more programming for Safe Routes to School.

Member Goodwin asked if SVBC could visit to Colma's Veteran's Village, a 62-unit complex with active veterans interested in biking. Anthony noted he is happy to connect and that SVBC supported a redesign in that area.

Member Sullivan noted the prevalence of e-scooters and the need to engage younger people. He noted Foster City plans to open a new a 12-mile loop on the levy/Bay Trail in the next four months. The $195M project will go through Redwood Shores and Belmont.

Member Espinoza-Garnica asked how SVBC does outreach. Anthony noted that he goes to community groups to understand who serves them. He does not try to take away from the existing community-based organizations (CBOs) and instead finds alignments through listening sessions.

Chair Schneider noted the opportunity to host the first community e-bike ride and if SVBC could provide a cost. Chair also asked about SVBC's capacity to host a bike training for older people. Anthony will follow-up with the chair and noted that SVBC recently hosted cycling classes for professionals.

Chair Schneider noted that Millbrae has a tentative bike rodeo planned on October 8.

Member Hey asked about SVBC's data sources. Anthony noted SVBC uses TIMS data.

Member Sullivan recommended collaborating with the East Palo Alto's Boys and Girls Club for volunteer opportunities.

Member Uy asked about other priorities aside from ECR. Anthony responded that SVBC is prioritizing growing their team, building capacity, and training volunteers to organize

on their own to tackle ECR and to have cities build out their bike plans and networks. Member Uy thanked Anthony for being present in Daly City, despite a limited staff team.

Chair Schneider noted she can help connect north county advocates to Anthony. Anthony also noted he will connect with the Town of Colma as well.

6. **Receive C/CAG's Draft 2 Year Workplan**

C/CAG Executive Director Sean Charpentier presented on C/CAG's draft two-year workplan. He noted that the team is understaffed, and elements may stretch to year three. C/CAG ED focused on elements most relevant to the BPAC.

For item 35, Planned Buffered Bike Lane on El Camino Real in San Bruno/Millbrae, Chair Schneider commented that Millbrae is working with Caltrans to shrink lanes on ECR and add more trees. The Chair asked how the City's project can coordinate with C/CAG. C/CAG ED noted this is a planning effort bringing different stakeholders together. C/CAG will want to move into actionable design in alignment with San Bruno and Millbrae.

C/CAG ED noted C/CAG is releasing a Call for Projects for Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 for fiscal year 2023/2024. Chair Schneider asked about the schedule. C/CAG Program Director Kaki Cheung noted that for the previous TDA Article 3 cycle, the process started fall 2021 and the Committee began ranking projects in January 2022.

For item 33, Dumbarton Corridor Feasibility Study and Plan, Vice Chair Self commented that the corridor is an excellent route for bike lanes but heard that it was not feasible because a train would be coming. With no train coming, the Vice Chair would like to see how to get a bike lane on the corridor. C/CAG ED noted C/CAG is not looking at rail right-of-way or rail connection and is looking at connecting the corridor to the express lanes on US-101. C/CAG will be looking at bike connections as part of this. Chair Schneider noted that the best bike commuter route would be if BART/Caltrain gave right-of-way to this area.

Member Sullivan emphasized the importance of safety and did not see helmet safety or helmet vendors with their own liability in the micromobility plan. Chair Schneider suggested discussing helmet legislation at a future meeting.

Member Hey asked if C/CAG can change the e-bike strategic plan to include e-bikes and e-scooters. C/CAG ED noted that the plan and the micromobility program implementation is focused on e-bikes because they provide opportunity for the longest trips and mode shift. Member Sullivan noted that e-scooter riders will still be using the e-bike lanes and which needs to be accounted for. Chair Schneider requested every city to have the same rules. C/CAG ED noted that the first phase of the micromobility implementation will focus on governance, rules, pilots, and best practices to guide the request for proposal (RFP) process for how vendors should manage software and liability. Member Sullivan asked if the micromobility plan looked at existing bike/scooter share programs, like at the Marriott Hotel. Chair Schneider added that may compliment

the Millbrae/Burlingame micromobility program. C/CAG Program Director Kaki Cheung noted C/CAG will be looking at lessons learned from the Millbrae/Burlingame program. Chair Schneider noted that Millbrae is focusing on e-bikes and not e-scooters.

Member Espinoza-Garnica noted that the City of Redwood City is focusing on building a relationship with young residents that live downtown to lead bike rodeos prior to asking them to wear helmets. This is because many young people, especially people of color, are already scrutinized on bikes and are not trusting to authorities.

Member Sullivan asked if there will be bilingual communication for implementation. C/CAG ED replied yes. Chair Schneider suggested trilingual communications. C/CAG ED also noted there is an equity program in the micromobility plan that will subsidize rides. Chair Schneider asked if there were lessons learned from the Peninsula Clean Energy e-bike subsidy/rebate program, which was well-subscribed and spread geographically throughout the county. C/CAG ED noted C/CAG will look to the PCE program for partnerships and lessons learned.

C/CAG ED noted that staff brought the work plan to the Board in January and will include it as an attachment to the budget.

7. **Member Communication**

Chair Schneider noted the City of Millbrae is hosting a commemoration on April 4 for the airplane that left San Francisco International Airport and crashed on the way to Hawaii, which led to the creation of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). The Chair also noted the City had a groundbreaking for Longfellow and the new Harriet Tubman Way and art piece at Millbrae train station.

Chair Schneider adjourned the meeting at 9:02pm.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date:　　　　July 27, 2023

To:　　　　Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

From:　　　Audrey Shiramizu, Transportation Programs Specialist

Subject:　　Receive a presentation on the new online incident reporting system from the County Sheriff's Office

(For further information, contact Audrey Shiramizu at ashiramizu@smcgov.org)

_____

RECOMMENDATION

Receive a presentation on the new online incident reporting system from the County Sheriff's Office.

FISCAL IMPACT

None.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

None.

BACKGROUND

At the March 24, 2023 meeting, Committee members expressed interests in learning about transportation data sources, and ways that members of the public can report bicycle incidents. Started on May 1, 2023, bicyclists can now use the San Mateo County Sheriff's Office's online crime portal to report vehicles operating in an unlawful manner. This includes vehicles not obeying Vehicle Code 21760(c) of the California Vehicle Code, also known as the "three-foot rule." The rule prohibits drivers of a motor vehicle from passing a bicycle in the same direction on a highway at a distance of less than 3 feet between the vehicle and the bicycle. The rule also notes that if a 3 feet of clearance is not available, the driver must slow down and pass only when it is safe to do. The driver may not cross a double yellow center line, even to provide required clearance. At this time, members of the public may only submit reports for violations in the Sheriff's Office contracted jurisdictions: Millbrae, San Carlos, Woodside, Portola Valley, and Half Moon Bay.

At the July meeting, Captain Mark Myers from the San Mateo County Sheriff's Office will present on the updated reporting system, explain how one can submit a report, and report on the types of incidents that have been submitted since May 1.

ATTACHMENT

1. Presentation (will be available online at https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/bicycle-and-pedestrian-advisory-committee/)

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: July 27, 2023

To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

From: Audrey Shiramizu, Transportation Programs Specialist

Subject: Review and Discuss the Fiscal Year 2023/2024 Cycle Transportation
               Development Act Article 3 Program Draft Call for Projects, Schedule, and
               Possible Changes to Scoring Sheet

(For further information, contact Audrey Shiramizu at ashiramizu@smcgov.org)
_____

RECOMMENDATION

Review and discuss the fiscal year 2023/2024 Cycle Transportation Development Act Article 3
Program Draft Call for Projects, schedule, and possible changes to scoring sheet.

FISCAL IMPACT

It is expected that approximately $2,590,706 will be available for the FY 2023/2024 Cycle of the
Transportation Development Act Article 3 (TDA Art. 3) Program.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

TDA Art. 3 funds are derived from the following sources:

-   Local Transportation Funds (LFT), derived from a ¼ cent of the general sales tax
    collected statewide
-   State Transit Assistance Fund (STA), derived from the statewide sales tax on gasoline
    and diesel fuel.

BACKGROUND

TDA Article 3 funds are made available through State funds and are distributed by the
Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to C/CAG on a formula basis. As the program
administrator for San Mateo County, C/CAG issues a call for project nominations for eligible
bicycle and/or pedestrian projects within the county. Eligible applicants include the 20 cities, the
County, and any joint powers agencies in San Mateo. Approximately $2,590,706 is available for
the FY 2023/24 Cycle.

A draft Call for Projects Schedule is included in Table 1. For this cycle, staff added a community
engagement meeting and opportunities for jurisdictions to meet with staff to ask questions about
the grant during the Call for Projects. Staff also wants to highlight that the Committee will be
expected to submit their project scoring sheets by February 26, 2024.

Of the $2,590,706 available for this grant cycle, an amount of $300,000 will be available to fund planning projects. The remaining $2,290,706 is set aside for capital projects. The maximum grant amount for the planning project and capital projects is $100,000 and $400,000, respectively. Project sponsors are required to provide a minimum of 10% local funding match for both project types.

Table 1: Proposed TDA Article FY 2023/24 Call for Projects Schedule

Activity	Date*
BPAC Recommends Board Approval of the Call for Projects and Overall Schedule	July 27, 2023
C/CAG Board Approval of Call for Projects and Schedule	September 14, 2023
Release Call for Projects	September 18, 2023
Community Outreach Meeting (virtual)	Week of Sept. 18, 2023
Application Workshop	September 25, 2023
Preliminary Discussions on Application Concepts (optional office hours)	Sept. 26-Oct. 10, 2023
Applications Due	November 13, 2023
C/CAG Completes Staff-only Scoring	December 1, 2023
C/CAG Distributes Applications and Score Sheets to BPAC	December 4, 2023
BPAC Scoring/Evaluation Period	Dec. 4, 2023 – Feb. 26, 2024
Project Sponsor Presentation to BPAC – 1st meeting	January 25, 2024
Project Sponsor Presentation to BPAC – 2nd meeting (if needed)	February 22, 2024
BPAC Scoring Sheets due to C/CAG Staff	February 26, 2024
Project Scoring BPAC Meeting/Board Recommendations	March 28, 2024
C/CAG Board Approval	May 9, 2024

Dates may be adjusted as needed

At the October 27, 2022 BPAC Meeting, staff sought Committee's input on the FY 2021/22 TDA Article 3 grant process. The Committee provided feedback and suggestions, which are summarized into categories, as demonstrated in Table 2. With this feedback and discussions, C/CAG staff modified the TDA Article FY 2023/24 scoring sheet (Attachment 1). Staff have also documented responses to the Committee's feedback in Table 2.

Table 2: TDA Article 3 FY 21/22 Feedback and Staff Response

BPAC Feedback on TDA Article 3 (FY 21/22)	Staff Recommendation/Response
Scoring and Evaluation	
Allocate more points towards the equity criteria for capital projects	See Attachment 1, "VI. Meets Project Objectives", item g, "Equity" and "VII. Funding and Local Match, item a". Staff revised the scoring sheet and clarified the "Equity" criterion. There are now points available for projects that will clearly serve an underserved community, even though the project is not located in a C/CAG Equity Focus Area (EFA) or MTC Equity Priority Community (EPC). Staff also revised the scoring sheet by reducing the minimum match required for projects located within EFAs/EPCs. Staff proposes to score the equity criterion for all applications.
Consider awarding points to applicants that have not won an award in 10 years	See Attachment 1, "VII. Funding and Local Match, item b." Attachment 2 of this staff report contains information related to the TDA Article 3 project funding history from 2012-2022. Staff revised the scoring sheet to give project applicants one point if the applicant has previously applied for TDA Article 3 funding for the same project in the past 10 years, but were not awarded with funding for that project.

Review other agencies' scoring practices (e.g., TA's Cycle 6 Ped/Bike Program)	Staff reviewed the San Mateo Transportation Authority's scoring sheet for their Ped/Bike Program, and incorporated new elements for the upcoming cycle.
Reevaluate "State of Readiness" scoring criterion to ensure a level playing field for jurisdictions, regardless of size or economic conditions	This criterion is in line with other agencies' "Readiness" categories. C/CAG places emphasis on construction-ready projects.
Reevaluate "Network Connectivity" scoring criterion to make it less subjective; consider differentiating commuter and recreational trip purposes	See Attachment 1, "VI. Meets Project Objectives", item d, "Closes gap in and/or extends the Countywide pedestrian and bicycle network". Staff revised the title of this criterion to "Closes gap in and/or extends the Countywide pedestrian and bicycle network." Staff also added descriptions to the scoring ranges to provide additional clarity. Staff proposes to score this criterion for all applications.
An applicant's project should not have to be listed as a priority project in a jurisdiction's plan. Some smaller jurisdictions do not have bike plans that list priority projects.	See Attachment 1, "VI. Meets Project Objectives", item f, "Consistent with plans". Staff notes that a proposed project should be consistent with local, county, and/or regional plans, which also shows that the project has undergone public engagement process. Staff revised the scoring sheet by clarifying that a project can be consistent with a local *or* regional plan, including C/CAG's Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian plan, Caltrans' District 4 Bike Plan, or MTC's Active Transportation Plan. Staff proposes to score this criterion for all applications.

Consider project quality vs. quality of proposal	See Attachment 1, "VI. Meets Program Objectives", item b. Staff notes that both project quality and quality of the written proposal are important for evaluation. To better capture project quality, staff added a new criterion to reward projects with a large positive impact.
Application	
Remove requirement of applicants to submit videos	Staff proposes removing this requirement, noting that applicants can still submit videos at their discretion.
Request applicants to list relevant page numbers/sections if including attachments, to reduce the number of pages for evaluators	Staff proposes requesting applicants to list reference page numbers for the ease of review, in addition to conveying the importance of brevity. Furthermore, staff proposes limiting the total application package to 50 pages, not including letters of support. Staff will advise that applicants should include excerpts of relevant plans/attachments, and not the full attachments unless absolutely necessary.
Address resource availabilities of the applicants	Staff acknowledges that applicant/city staff time is constrained and want to make the application process as seamless and efficient as possible. Staff plans to hold office hours and offer preliminary feedback on project concepts.
General	
Schedule in-person site visits	Staff cannot arrange site visits due to staff time constraints and limitations. Staff encourages members of the committee to visit sites on their own and/or use online tools such as Google maps to support their review.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Committee reviews and discusses the Fiscal Year 2023/24 Cycle Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Program Call for Projects, schedule, and possible changes to Scoring Sheet.

If the Committee does not have any additional comments on the Call for Projects, schedule, and proposed changes to the Scoring Sheet, at its discretion, the committee can recommend C/CAG Board's approval of the FY 2023/24 TDA Article 3 Call for Projects process.

If the Committee requires further discussion, a special August meeting may need to be scheduled to accommodate the Call for Projects schedule.

ATTACHMENT

1. TDA Article 3 FY 2023/24 Draft Scoring Sheet
2. TDA Article 3 Application History (2012-2022) *(will be available online at https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/bicycle-and-pedestrian-advisory-committee/)*

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ARTICLE 3 PEDESTRIAN AND
BICYCLE PROGRAM CALL FOR PROJECTS FISCAL YEAR 2023/24
SCORING SHEET

Revised: July 21, 2023   Note: Gray shaded cells to be scored by staff

I. Project Name and Funding Request		
a. Applicant Agency: b. Partnering Agency (if applicable):	Rater Name:	
I. Project Title:	Project type: *(check one)* ☐ Capital/Quick Build ☐ Planning	

II. Project Screening:		
a. Eligible jurisdiction: City, County of San Mateo, or joint powers agency in San Mateo County	☐ Yes	☐ No
b. Meets applicable Caltrans standards	☐ Yes	☐ No
c. CEQA approval, if applicable (Date of Approval:_____)	☐ Yes or N/A	☐ No
d. BPAC or equivalent established as a standing committee	☐ Yes	☐ No
e. Project adheres to the MTC qualifications	☐ Yes	☐ No

Note: Rater may assign points within the prescribed range	Scale	Maximum Points	Points Assigned
III. Project Description			
a. Degree to which proposal is clear and complete	0 = Incomplete description, missing documentation 1-3 = Clear project description 4-5 = Clear and complete scope and documentation	5	
		Subtotal (Max. 5):	

For Capital Projects Only (a – d):

IV. State of Readiness *For Capital Projects only: (Note: if Exempt or Not Applicable = eligible for full points)*			
a. Right-of-Way degree to which R.O.W. is secured	0 = R.O.W. not certified, not started 2 = R.O.W. certification complete or not required	2	
b. Permits obtained degree to which permits are in place	0 = No agreements or permits in place 1-2 = Some permits in place 3 = All permits and agreements complete	3	
c. Design Status degree to which design is complete	0 = Design not started 1 = Design in progress 35% Complete 2 = Design in progress 65% Complete 3 = Design in progress 95% Complete 5 = Design 100% complete or is a Quick Build Project (ready to advertise)	5	
d. Schedule degree to which project can be completed before funds expire	0 = No Major milestones and construction dates included 1-4 = Project completes PS&E only 4-7 = Project completes PS&E and construction can be complete within 2-3 years 7-10 = Project completes construction	10	

	within 1-2 years		
		5	
		Subtotal (Max. 20):	

V. Community Support	*For all projects types:*		
a. Project supported by BPAC or other group(s)	0 = No documented support 1 - 3 = Support from local BPAC (or BPAC equivalent as described in the application instructions) only 4 - 8 = Support from BPAC <u>and other</u> group(s)	8	
c. Public Outreach	0 = No documented outreach 1 = Some outreach conducted and documented 2 = Significant outreach conducted and documented	2	
		Subtotal (Max. 10):	

	Scale	Max Points	Points Assigned
.VI. Meets Program Objectives			
For All Projects: a. Project Need: Degree to which problems, need, and issues are described, and documented	0 = No need demonstrated 1-5 = Moderate description of need or problem 6-10 = Documented and apparent need, data cited	10	
b. Project Impact/Benefit: Degree to which the project provides a benefit to the community	0 = No impact or benefit clearly demonstrated 1-3 = Benefit or impact is somewhat explained 4-5 = Benefit or impact is clearly and convincingly explained	5	
For Planning Projects Only: (score reflects how well the following items are addressed)			
Vision/Mission Statement	1-3 = briefly addressed, unclear vision and goals 4-6 = adequately addressed, somewhat clear vision and goals 7-10 = addressed well, detailed vision and goals	10	
Budget and Tasks	1-2 = budget briefly addressed with little back up 3-4 = budget and tasks reasonable and adequately addressed with back up 5 = budget and tasks addressed well, in detail	5	
Schedule	1-3 = project completed within 3 years 4-6 = project completed within 2 years 7-10 = project completed within 1 year	10	
Proposed Outreach Methods During Planning	1-2 = briefly addressed and not overall engaging 3-4 = adequately addressed and engages many groups	5	

	5 = addressed well, in detail with very thorough engagement		
Data collection/evaluation	1-2 = briefly addressed 3-4 = adequately addressed 5 = addressed well, in detail	5	
Specific Improvements	1-2 point = not very specific improvements 3-4 points = some specific interest improvements addressed 5 points = detailed specific improvements and align with goals	5	
Multi-Modal/Complete Streets Concepts	1-2 = briefly addressed, vague concepts 3-4 = adequately addressed, clear concepts 5 = Detailed concepts and addressed multiple mode	5	
Consistency with local, regional, and statewide programs, goals, and plans	1-2 = briefly addressed and partially aligned 3-4 = adequately addressed and aligned 5 = addressed plan consistency in a comprehensive and detailed manner	5	
Equity	0 = plan does not serve a community of concern, disadvantaged community, or equity focus area 1-2 = the planning area does not cover an Equity Focus Area nor an MTC Equity Priority Community, but the application clearly explains how the plan serves a community of concern, disadvantaged community, low income, seniors, students, and/or other vulnerable populations 3-4 = the planning area is in an Equity Focus Area with a score of 8-10 5 = the planning area is in an Equity Focus Area with a score of 8-10 and in an MTC Equity Priority Community or CalEnviroscreen high risk census tract (top 25%)	5	
For Capital Projects Only (c – g):			
c. Safety: degree of reduction in injury risk	0 = minimal safety improvement 1-5 = moderate reduction of risks of severe crashes/injuries 6-10 = significant reduction of risks of severe crashes/injuries	10	
d. Closes gap in and/or extends the Countywide pedestrian and bicycle network	0 = does not fill a gap in the Countywide Backbone Network (CBN) or Pedestrian Focus Area (PFA), does not extend the pedestrian or bicycle network (is an isolated project), and does not upgrade an existing facility 1-3 = upgrades an existing bicycle or pedestrian facility but does not fill a gap or extend the CBN or PFA 4-6 = upgrades an existing bicycle or pedestrian facility located in the CBN or PFA but does not fill a	8	

	gap or extend the pedestrian or bicycle network. 7-8 = located on a designated key corridor in the CBN or PFA and meets either of the following: • Project closes a gap between two or more existing bicycle or pedestrian facilities OR • Extends an existing bicycle or pedestrian facility.		
e. Transportation purpose	0-2 = serves primarily recreation 3-4 = serves primarily transportation 5 = serves transportation and recreation	5	
f. Consistent with plans	0=not included in local or regional plans 1 = included in local or regional plans 2 = Identified as a priority in local or regional plans 3 = included in Caltrans' District 4 Bike Plan or MTC's Active Transportation plans **Bicycle only projects:** 4 = along the Countywide Backbone Network (CBN) 5 = along the CBN as a Medium Priority 6 = along the CBN as a High Priority **Pedestrian only projects:** 6 = within a Pedestrian Focus Area (PFA) **Bike and Ped projects:** 7 = along the CBN and in a PFA	7	
g. Equity	0 = does not serve a community of concern, disadvantaged community, or equity focus area 1-2 = the project is not located in an Equity Focus Area nor an MTC Equity Priority Community, but clearly explains how the project serves a community of concern, disadvantaged community, low income, seniors, students, and/or other vulnerable populations 3-4 = the project is in an Equity Focus Area with a score of 8-10 5 = the project is in an Equity Focus Area with a score of 8-10 and in an MTC Equity Priority Community or CalEnviroscreen high risk census tract (top 25%)	5	
		Subtotal *(Max. 70 for Planning* *Max. 50 for Capital)*	

VII. Funding and Local Match	

a. Local Cash Match *(min. 10% local dollar requirement)*	0 = 0% match 6 = 30% match 2 = 10% match 8 = 40% match 4 = 20% match 10 = 50% match OR 10 = Only a 10% match is required when the project is located mostly within an MTC EPC or C/CAG EFA, with an equity a score of 8-10	10	
b. Project Funding History	0 = the applicant has received funding in the past 10 years 1 = the applicant has applied for funding for this same project in the past 10 years, but was not awarded with a grant 5 = the applicant has not received funding in the past 10 years	5	
		Subtotal (Max. 15):	
		Total Score: *(Maximum total points: 100)*	

NOTE:
- Gray cells are to be filled by staff
- Please note that under "VI. Meets Program Objectives", depending on the nature of the project (Planning or Capital), some criteria may or may not apply.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: July 27, 2023

To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

From: Audrey Shiramizu, Transportation Program Specialist

Subject: Nominations and Elections of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
               Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson

(For further information or questions, contact Audrey Shiramizu at ashiramizu@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee nominates and elects a Chairperson and
Vice-Chairperson.

FISCAL IMPACT

None.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

N/A.

BACKGROUND

Each year, the Committee elects a Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson to lead the Committee for
a one-year term. There is not a term limit for each office.

Nomination of officers is conducted at the regular Committee meeting. At the May 26, 2022
meeting, member Ann Schneider and member Matthew Self were nominated and elected as the
Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson, respectively. Both candidates are eligible to continue serving
in their respective roles, if re-elected. The Committee can also accept additional nominees from
the floor.

Election of the Chairperson shall precede election of the Vice-Chairperson. The voting shall be
public, and a roll call vote will be taken at each nominated position.

ATTACHMENTS

None.