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 28, 2023	**Join by Zoom Meeting:** https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87362024773?pwd=ZXN1eFlyY3p4MHMvVWROeUJId1VPUT09	
Time:	7:00 p.m.		
Location:	San Mateo County Transit District Office 1250 San Carlos Ave 2nd Fl. Auditorium San Carlos, CA	**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 (Self)	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 July 27, 2023 Meeting	Action (Self)	Pages 4-11
4.	Review and confirm receipt of the MTC Complete Streets checklist for the City of Pacifica's Manor Drive Overcrossing Project for the 2024 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)	Action (Gaye)	Pages 12-22

5.	Update on C/CAG Equity Assessment and Framework Development Project and review of proposed actions for comment	Information (Springer)	Pages 23-48
6.	Member Communications	Information (Self)	No materials
7.	Adjournment	Information (Self)	No materials

The next regularly scheduled BPAC meeting will be on October 26, 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
July 27, 2023

1. Call to Order

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

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

*Appointed at May 2023 C/CAG Board meeting.

C/CAG Staff present: Audrey Shiramizu, Sean Charpentier, Eva Gaye, Kim Wever.

Guests: Captain Mark Myers (San Mateo County Sheriff's Office), Ebo Biratu

2. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

None.

3. Approval of the Minutes from the March 23, 2023 Meeting

There were no public comments on the minutes.

Motion: Member Espinoza-Garnica motioned to approve minutes. Member Bier seconded the motion. Member Swire abstained from the vote. All other members in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.

4. **Receive a presentation on the New Online Incident Reporting System from the County Sheriff's Office**

Captain Mark Myers from the San Mateo County Sheriff's Office presented on the County Sheriff's Office new online incident reporting system. As of May 1, 2023, bicyclists can now use the online crime portal to report vehicles operating in an unlawful manner. This includes obeying the "three-foot rule", which 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.

Member Espinoza-Garnica asked if the portal is only to report violations of the three-foot rule. Captain Myers noted that users can report violations of the three-foot rule or other bike-related complaints. He added that it is difficult to ticket and cite all potential violators because it is hard to see drivers violate the three-foot rule. This violation is an infraction and not a misdemeanor. Member Espinoza-Garnica suggested listing on the website what other bicycle complaints can be reported, like speeding. Captain Myers replied that collisions have also been reported. He noted that this new feature is in a testing phase, and data and metrics will be collected. The Sheriff's Office will work with Public Works and municipalities to widen roadways for bicyclists.

Member Espinoza-Garnica asked if the Sheriff's Office provides bicycle education and if information is available in multiple languages. Captain Myers noted the Office provides pamphlets, junior bicycle rodeos, and safety equipment to bicyclists, and trains all deputies on safety and rules of the roadway. The information is provided in English.

Member Swire asked Captain Myers to confirm that they cannot cite someone for an infraction without police presence. Captain Myers confirmed that that is state law and that felonies can occur outside police presence. Member Swire asked if video evidence of a bike being clipped was sufficient. Captain Myers replied no.

Member Beach thanked Captain Myers for the presentation. She noted it will be interesting to see if other cities implement this reporting. She asked about the tone of the letter that the Sheriff's Office sends to violators. Captain Myers confirmed the letters are educational and not antagonistic.

Member Beach liked the idea of using heat maps to identify where more enforcement or infrastructure is needed. She asked about privacy for people submitting reports. Captain Myers noted that recipients of the warning letters do not know who reported.

Member Uy asked how the five cities were selected and what metrics will be evaluated. Captain Myers replied that the five cities that can report are where the Sheriff's Office provides contract law enforcement. He noted that metrics are sporadic at this time. He noted the Sheriff's Office will be looking at hot spots for simple improvements like increasing shoulder widths.

Chair Schneider asked if other cities outside of the Sheriff's Office contract can buy the same reporting software. Captain Myers replied that the Sheriff's Office have their own online reporting system and other cities would have to modify.

Member Hey asked if all deputies are trained for this new system. Captain Myers replied that crime police and traffic police are trained the same.

Chair Schneider noted that for grants that BPAC scores, projects receive points if they track number of incidents with people, bicyclists, and scooters. The Chair asked about data for allowing or disallowing e-bikes in certain areas and how to set rules if problem areas are unknown. Captain Myers noted a grand jury report came out requesting all cities to enforce the three-foot rule. Chair Schneider asked how to encourage more standard data collection and the California Highway Patrol (CHP's) role. Captain Myers noted that all data collection goes to the CHP.

Member Bier thanked Captain Myers for his presentation and noted the City of Pacifica is working on road safety. She appreciated the presentation and noted the importance of education. Member Nicolas agreed.

Member Espinoza-Garnica asked if the County has a mobile application to enter requests like curb or sidewalk violations. Captain Myers noted that users can report parking complaints. Member Espinoza-Garnica asked if this can reach other departments, i.e., reporting weeds or homeless encampments. Captain Myers did not think the County has an application at this time except for this crime reporting portal.

Chair Schneider noted the BPAC could discuss in the future ideal data to have and to share with the Sheriff's Office. C/CAG Executive Director Sean Charpentier asked if the warning letters are added to Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS), the statewide collision data used for bike planning. Captain Myers replied no.

Captain Myers noted that the Sheriff's Office is still testing this new system and have received 12 reports. Member Uy asked if there is a way for cities to access this data when applying for projects. Captain Myers said he could work with the respective cities if they ask for data. Chair Schneider suggested standardizing bike safety signage like the images in Captain Myers' presentation.

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**

C/CAG Staff Audrey Shiramizu presented on the upcoming FY 2023/2024 Cycle Transportation Development Act Article 3 (TDA 3) grant program. Staff provided a program background, proposed updates to the evaluation score sheet, a draft Call for Projects schedule, and a summary of TDA funding from the last 10 years.

Chair Schneider asked if C/CAG received funding from One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) 3 to

manage bicycle and pedestrian programs and if that could go towards planning site visits.

Member Beach noted that TDA 3 is the most important item for this BPAC and that is a huge opportunity to have impact on where money flows. Member Beach noted that the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) have had similar discussions about spreading grant funding equitably, including geographically to larger and smaller cities. She noted the TA had separate buckets for coastal and small cities. She suggested setting categories for big, medium, and small cities. She liked that the updated scoring sheet has a lower match threshold for equity areas. She noted that the TA uses the MTC Equity Priority Communities and the SamTrans equity zones. For the Community Support scoring category, she noted that some cities have a standard support letter and will submit dozens of letters, while other cities will have fewer but more meaningful letters. She recommended the committee agree on how to score quality of support letters. Member Beach also appreciated the summary of the TDA award history. She noted that some cities may not have ever won TDA, TA, or OBAG funding at all. For section III-a "Project Description", she noted that the scale and range seemed fair to evaluate the project. Member Beach wrapped by noting that she plans to resign from the BPAC due to limited bandwidth. She noted that her resignation is not a reflection of the committee.

Member Yuen asked for more information on the optional office hour. C/CAG Executive Director noted it is an optional opportunity for applicants to check with staff on project eligibility and criteria.

Member Bier stated she was glad an extra equity point may be added for projects that do not fall in a designated equity area but that still serve an underserved area.

Chair Schneider noted concern with scoring how well written an application is and that an office hour will not help. C/CAG Executive Director noted that this is an important and collaborative BPAC process. Staff can work on timing with the BPAC if more review is needed.

Member Fraser noted this is her ninth year on the committee and this scoring sheet is light years away from previous cycles. She noted that visiting the sites is critical to understand projects and see the locations on the ground. She asked if staff cannot schedule site visits, then all members should visit the sites on their own. Member Bier liked the lower local match requirements for equity zones. She noted that SamTrans has rural community and coast side equity zones. She noted it would be nice to have another discussion on TDA with Members Robinson and Self. Chair Schneider noted that Member Self cannot attend the September meeting. Member Fraser thanked Member Beach for her time on BPAC.

Member Hey noted that the application and score sheet should specify what well-written means. She suggested that application writing should stick to facts and not be flowery.

Chair Schneider suggested scheduling a special follow-up meeting. Member Espinoza-Garnica asked if that meeting would be the final meeting to vote, and if so, suggested voting on the scoring sheet today. She noted that other members may be missing at the next meeting. Members missing today should not be treated more significantly than members present at today's meeting. Chair Schneider replied that if another meeting is scheduled, staff could send a revised scoring sheet and missing members could attend and review. The committee was divided on scheduling a special meeting and chose to continue today's discussion before deciding how to move forward.

Chair Schneider noted that the 10-year TDA summary table and scoring sheet does not necessarily indicate geographical equity. The Chair also noted that equity is not just a plot on a map but should consider a resourced community versus an under resourced community. She suggested reconsidering the points given between a city that received one grant in five years versus a city that received one grant in ten years. C/CAG Executive Director noted staff have not seen a direct correlation. He noted some smaller cities have been awarded well, hillside communities have not been as successful. While South San Francisco has been successful, they have also applied the most. He noted that jurisdictions that have never won do receive a point and that if a jurisdiction continuously applies, they receive a point. He also noted that C/CAG is shifting from "geographic equity" to "geographic distribution".

Member Swire asked if previously submitted projects were not great or awarded in a previous cycle, why would they receive a point. He also noted that some cities do not manage grants well and that the committee should reward cities that do manage well. He also noted that projects with the most impact should win and that application writing should not matter. He noted the ultimate metric should be if a project saves lives and gets more people biking. C/CAG Executive Director noted that projects in half a mile of a dense area serves more people, but in a rural area, a project may serve less people. He noted it is a challenge to determine which matters more. Member Swire noted that if the projects benefit more people, it seems like a better use of funds. C/CAG Executive Director note the County has a wide use of land uses - urban, rural, suburban – and that at some level they all need some investment.

Member Hey noted that it is hard to get grants in Portola Valley because the Town never hears about the grants. Chair Schneider noted that when she scores Portola Valley projects, she tends to score them higher. Chair Schneider suggested just giving the money directly to the cities instead of having the committee decide. She noted that she is hesitant to apply for funding again if her city will not end up being awarded.

Member Uy suggested that the office hours may help those jurisdictions that need support.

Chair Schneider asked the committee again on support for reconsidering the difference between an agency who receives one grant in ten years versus one grant in five years. Member Bier asked the Chair for a solution. Chair Schneider suggested slicing the historical summary table further and separating the planning grants awards from capital awards. She

noted that lumping 10-years of data in one table is hiding things. C/CAG Executive Director responded that there are diminishing returns to slicing data and doing so can prove any point. Chair Schneider the City has applied to grants across the board and has received nothing. C/CAG Executive Director replied that since joining C/CAG, the City of Millbrae has applied for four grants and that C/CAG has recommended funding for three of them.

Member Espinoza-Garnica noted that the rubric does not seem to be as heavily weighted by the quality of writing and likes how it is currently stated. They also noted removal of requirements like videos is reasonable. For site visits, they suggested reaching out to city/town staff to guide site visits. Chair Schneider replied that is too much city staff work. Member Bier noted that site visits are important and asks staff to help arrange for the committee. Member Swire asked if the visits need to be curated. Chair Schneider noted they typically were. Member Swire suggested adding visit times into the application. Some committee members noted they have done site visits independently. C/CAG Executive Director noted staff will look into this after applications are received.

Member Swire asked if can score project description and clarity. Chair Schneider noted staff will score the grey boxes. The Chair and other committee members agreed that "clear and complete" for Project Description is acceptable.

Member Hey noted that for scoring, Public Outreach is more important than BPAC support and letters. Member Bier agreed that the Public Outreach points is too low. Member Yuen noted that BPAC support should be a separate set number of points from support from other local groups. C/CAG Executive Director suggested moving points from BPAC support to Public Outreach.

Member Hey noted that Section V in the score sheet is missing item b.

Member Hey noted that Portola Valley does not have multimodal streets. Member Swire note multimodal is more of a holistic view. C/CAG Executive Director noted projects should be multimodal within the context of its own jurisdiction and type (e.g., urban versus rural). Chair Schneider suggested adding examples to the application for different land types.

Chair Schneider asked if the Metropolitan Transportation Commission received the C/CAG Equity Focus Area GIS layer. Staff Audrey Shiramizu replied yes.

Member Swire asked if projects not located in an equity zone receives less points. C/CAG Executive Director noted that the project will not receive the same amount of points as a project that is wholly in an equity area, but if the project connects or clearly serves an equity area, the project will receive a point.

Chair Schneider noted that some cities still have safety data gaps.

Chair Schneider noted that for local match funds, only four cities received Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds and that smaller cities do not and therefore do not have funds for matches. She noted that this local match change does not impact a lower resourced city that is not in a designated equity zone. Member Espinoza-Garnica replied that that is fair because this system prioritizes equity areas. Otherwise, those equity areas would be continuously underspent. C/CAG Executive Director asked how one could identify a lower resourced city. Member Hey suggested looking at the town budget. C/CAG Executive Director noted other than demographics, how else can one determine if an area is disadvantaged.

Member Swire noted that local match is important because it can drive the number of projects that are done. He suggested 10 may be too few points and increasing the scale would increase the number of projects funded.

C/CAG Executive Director noted that staff will look into site visits and will reach out to the members that could not attend today's meeting.

Motion: Member Espinoza-Garnica motioned to approve the scoring sheet with the amendment to revisit the scoring range and a small typo in Section V. Community Support. Member Goodwin seconded the motion. Chair Schneider voted no. All other members in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.

6. **Nominations and Elections of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson**

Chair Schneider noted Vice Chair Self noted via email that he is interested in the Chair position. Chair Schneider nominated Vice Chair Self as Chair.

Member Espinoza-Garnica asked the responsibilities for Chair and Vice Chair. Chair Schneider noted that staff sets the agenda and the primary responsibility is running the meeting. C/CAG Executive Director noted that staff has met with Chairs and Vice Chairs to discuss potential issues. He noted the primary role is to facilitate the meeting and that staff do take agenda suggestions. He also noted that there are statutory requirements for the BPAC, which dictates much of the agenda and deadlines. Member Swire asked if the C/CAG Board has input on the agenda. C/CAG Executive Director said the Board can suggest items. Member Hey asked if other members can send agenda items to staff. C/CAG Executive Director replied yes.

Motion: Chair Schneider motioned to approve Vice Chair Self as Chair. Member Bier seconded the motion. All in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.

Member Bier nominated Member Uy as Vice Chair. Member Uy accepted the nomination.

Motion: Member Bier motioned to approve Member Uy as Vice Chair. Member Schneider seconded the motion. All members in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.

The committee thanked Member Schneider for her service.

7. **Member Communications**

Chair Schneider announced the City of Millbrae's annual bike rodeo. She noted concern about kids riding without helmet and suggested discussing helmets at a future meeting.

Chair Schneider announced the Grand Jury Report on Bike Safety was released and suggested the BPAC to review.

Member Swire asked if C/CAG is involved with the proposed widening of lanes on I-380. C/CAG Executive Director responded that C/CAG is a co-sponsor of the project.

Member Hey noted that the Silicon Valley Bike Coalition (SVBC) Annual Bike Summit is on August 24. C/CAG Executive Director noted that staff nominated the County's Midcoast Multimodal Trail as Project of the Year.

C/CAG Executive Director noted that in the civil grand jury report, C/CAG is mentioned but is not named as a respondent. He noted staff are open to helping staff respond if needed.

C/CAG Executive Director noted that staff are now looking for two elected officials to sit on BPAC and to reach out to potential candidates.

C/CAG Executive Director thanked Member Schneider for facilitating the BPAC.

Chair Schneider adjourned the meeting at 9:40pm.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: September 28, 2023

To: C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

From: Eva Gaye, Transportation Program Specialist

Subject: Review and confirm receipt of the MTC Complete Streets checklist for the City of
               Pacifica's Manor Drive Overcrossing Project for the 2024 State Transportation
               Improvement Program (STIP)

               (For more information, please contact Eva Gaye at egaye@smcgov.org.)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) review and confirm
receipt of the MTC Complete Streets checklist for the City of Pacifica's Manor Drive
Overcrossing Project for the 2024 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

FISCAL IMPACT

Other than staff time, there are no direct fiscal impacts to C/CAG at this time.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Funding for the 2024 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) will primarily come
from the state excise tax on gasoline as well as federal funding sources.

BACKGROUND

State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is the biennial five-year investment plan
for state transportation funds. The STIP is a adopted every two years by the California
Transportation Commission (CTC) to program certain portions of the gas tax for transportation
projects. The Program is developed in coordination with the Metropolitan Transportation
Commission (MTC). For the 2024 STIP Cycle, San Mateo County is projected to receive
approximately $37 million of STIP funds for eligible transportation projects. The STIP covers
fiscal years (FYs) 2024/25 through 2028/29. New funding is generally available in the outer two
fiscal years (FY 2027/28 and FY 2028/29) to program new projects. On July 20, 2023, C/CAG
staff issued a call for projects to the San Mateo County Public Works Directors via e-mail, for
potential STIP projects to consider with a due date of August 4, 2023. In addition, staff has also
been working with partner transportation agencies such as Caltrans and the San Mateo County
Transportation Authority (SMCTA) in identifying top regional projects that supports the

historical policy of directing STIP funds towards major highway improvement projects of regional significance, per the San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan. This allows major projects to leverage regional and state funding programs.

At the September 14, 2023 C/CAG Board meeting, Staff provided the proposed 2024 STIP project list for approval (*see attachment 1*). The C/CAG Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee recommended approval of the draft list at their September 14th meeting. The Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) will receive the revised draft 2024 STIP at their September 21st meeting for review and recommendation. The proposed draft 2024 STIP will be presented to the C/CAG Board in October again for final approval, before the MTC's anticipated project submittal deadline.

MTC Complete Streets Policy

Adopted in 2022, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) Complete Streets Policy (Resolution 4493) promotes the development of transportation facilities that accommodate all modes (walking, biking, rolling, and taking transit). In accordance with the Policy, project sponsors applying for regional discretionary transportation funding or endorsement from MTC with a total project cost of $250,000 or more are required to complete a Complete Streets Checklist. The checklists are then reviewed by the County Transportation Agency (CTA) Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), and any comments from the C/CAG BPAC will be incorporated as part of the submittal to MTC. This Policy only applies to projects that have not previously received STIP funds.

Of the final four proposed projects that will be considered for 2024 STIP funding, only the City of Pacifica's Manor Drive Overcrossing Project *(see attachment 2 for Complete Street Checklist and project info*) will need to adhere to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) Complete Streets Policy (Resolution 4493). The Manor Overcrossing Project is a new project, and it has not previously received STIP programming.

In advance of the C/CAG BPAC meeting this month, the Committee was instructed to submit comments on the checklist **by noon, on Thursday, September 28[th.]** Staff will forward responses to the questions upon receipt. The Project Sponsor also plans to attend the Committee meeting and will be available to address additional comments and questions.

RECOMMENDATION

C/CAG staff requests that the Committee review and confirm receipt of the MTC Complete Streets checklist for the City of Pacifica's Manor Drive Overcrossing Project for the 2024 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

Attachment

1. Summary of Draft 2024 STIP Project List
2. MTC Complete Streets Checklist: City of Pacifica - Highway 1/Manor Drive Overcrossing Improvement Project

2024 STIP Program - San Mateo County

	Lead Agency	PPNO	Project	Project Totals by Fiscal Year ($1,000's)							Project Totals by Component ($1,000's)					
				Prior Info Only	23-24	24-25	25-26	26-27	27-28	28-29	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Sup	Con Sup
Projects	SM C/CAG	668D	SR 92/US 101 Short Term Area Improvements	5,628	1,685								2,411	3,217		1,685
	Redwood City	692K	Woodside Interchange Improvements	8,000							8,000					
	South San Francisco	702D	Produce Interchange - Improvements	5,000										5,000		
	Daly/Bris/Colma	658G	ITS Improvements in San Mateo Northern Cities - (Daly City, Brisbane, and Colma)	9,312								9,312				
	SM C/CAG	658M	US 101 Managed Lane Project North of I-380			5,477	1,700		29,888			29,888		5,477	1,700	
	Caltrans	658D	US 101 Express Lanes Project - Whipple to I-380		2,320							2,320				
	Pacifica	NEW	Highway 1/Manor Drive Overcrossing Improvement Project						5,000			5,000				
Admin	SM C/CAG	2140A	Planning, programming, and monitoring (CMA)	236	236	308	308	309	309							

2024 STIP

Available capacity for 2024 STIP: $37,208

The 2024 STIP Fund Estimate identifies net new capacity only in the two years added to the STIP, FY 2027-28 and FY 2028-29.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Complete Streets Checklist

Implementation of MTC's Complete Streets Policy, Resolution 4493, Adopted 3/25/22

Background

Since 2006, MTC's Complete Streets (CS) Policy has promoted the development of transportation facilities that can be used by all modes. In March 2022, MTC updated its CS policy (Resolution 4493) with the goal of ensuring that people biking, walking, rolling, and taking transit are safely accommodated within the transportation network. This policy works to advance Plan Bay Area 2050 objectives of achieving mode shift, safety, equity, and vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emission reductions, as well as state & local compliance with applicable CS-related laws, policies, and practices, specifically the California Complete Street Act of 2008 (Gov. Code Sections 65040.2 and 65302) and applicable local policies such as the CS resolutions adopted before January 16, 2016 (as part of MTC's OBAG 2 requirements.)

Requirements

MTC's CS Policy requires that all projects (with a total project cost of $250,000 or more) applying for regional discretionary transportation funding – or requesting regional endorsement or approval through MTC – must submit a Complete Streets Checklist (Checklist) to MTC.

Please note that Projects claiming exceptions to CS Policy must complete the Exceptions section on the Checklist and provide a Department Director-level signature.

Additional information and guidance for completing this Checklist can be found at the MTC Administrative Guidance: Complete Streets Policy Guidance for public agency staff implementing MTC Resolution 4493 at
https://mtc.ca.gov/planning/transportation/complete-streets

This form may be downloaded at https://mtc.ca.gov/planning/transportation/complete-streets.

Submittal

Completed Checklists ***must be emailed*** to completestreets@bayareametro.gov.

PROJECT INFORMATION
Project Name/Title: Manor Drive Overcrossing Project
Project Area/Location(s): Manor Drive, Palmetto Avenue, and Oceana Boulevard, City of Pacifica, California See Attachment for Project Location Map

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: (300-word limit)

Please indicate project phase: Construction

The Manor Drive Overcrossing spans over Highway 1 and provides the lone connection between Pacifica's northwestern and northeastern communities, as well as their respective access to Highway 1. It experiences congestion to Level of Service (LOS) E and F during peak hour traffic. Built in the 1950's, the overcrossing is antiquated and therefore does not meet current design and seismic standards. It presents serious safety concerns to motorists, pedestrians (especially school children) and bicyclist as evidenced by the high volume of accident occurrences.

Pacifica's Manor Drive Overcrossing Improvement Project and Milagra On-Ramp study will alleviate traffic congestion by widening the overcrossing structure, increasing the curb return radii and installing traffic signals at the intersections to better facilitate traffic. It will study a freeway on-ramp at Milagra Drive to allow local traffic to access to northbound Highway 1 without needing to go through the Oceana Blvd/Manor Drive intersection, thereby reducing traffic volume at the intersection. The proposed project will also widen the sidewalk and upgrade the crosswalk and ADA ramps to increase the safety and mobility for non-motorized users such as children traveling to and from school, beach goers and patrons of near-by commercial establishments.

CONTACT INFORMATION		
Contact Name & Title: Roland Yip, P.E., Deputy Director of Public Works, City Engineer	**Contact Email:** ryip@pacifica.gov	**Contact Phone:** (650)738-3771
Agency: City of Pacifica		

Topic	CS Policy Consideration	YES	NO	Required Description
1. Bicycle, Pedestrian and Transit Planning	Does Project implement relevant Plans, or other locally adopted recommendations? Plan examples include: • City/County General + Area Plans • Bicycle, Pedestrian & Transit Plan • Community-Based Transportation Plan • ADA Transition Plan • Station Access Plan • Short-Range Transit Plan	☒	☐	The project will implement recommendation from the City of Pacifica's Bicycle & Pedestrians Master Plan and the General Plan. It will also implement right-of-way improvements.

Topic	CS Policy Consideration	YES	NO	Required Description
	• Vision Zero/Systematic Safety Plan			
2. Active Transportation Network	Does the project area contain segments of the regional Active Transportation (AT) Network? [See AT Network map on the MTC Complete Streets webpage.]	☒	☐	
3. Safety and Comfort	A. Is the Project on a known High Injury Network (HIN) or has a local traffic safety analysis found a high incidence of bicyclist/ pedestrian-involved crashes within the project area?	☒	☐	Manor Drive and Palmetto Avenue are both on the City of Pacifica's Local Roadway Safety Plan and included in the High Injury Network.
	B. Does the project seek to improve bicyclist and/or pedestrian conditions? If the project includes a bikeway, was a Level of Traffic Stress (LTS), or similar user experience analyses conducted?	☒	☐	The new curb ramps and driveways will provide ADA compliant paths of travel and the Class II Bike Lanes and Class III and IIIB Bike Boulevard pavement markings will enhance the streets by promoting biking and other micro-mobility modes of transportation.
4. Transit Coordination	A. Are there existing public transit facilities (stop or station) in the project area?	☒	☐	SamTrans buses travel down Palmetto Avenue, and Oceana Boulevard.
	B. Have all potentially affected transit agencies had the opportunity to review this project?	☒	☐	The City met with SamTrans in 2019 to confirm bus routes, types, and sizes in the project area, and requested relocation of some bus stops.
	C. Is there a MTC Mobility Hub within the project area?	☐	☒	

Topic	CS Policy Consideration	YES	NO	Required Description
5. **Design**	Does the project meet professional design standards or guidelines appropriate for bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities?	☒	☐	ADA Curb Ramps will be installed per Caltrans Design Standards and Class II, III, and IIIB Bike Boulevard pavement markings will be installed per CA MUTCD standards.
6. **Equity**	Will Project improve active transportation in an Equity Priority Community?		☒	
7. **BPAC Review**	Has a local (city or county) Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission (BPAC) reviewed this checklist (or for OBAG 3, this project)?	☐	☒	

Statement of Compliance	YES
The proposed Project complies with California Complete Street Act of 2008 (*Gov. Code Sections 65040.2 and 65302, MTC Complete Streets Policy (Reso. 4493*), **and locally adopted Complete Streets resolutions** (*adopted as OBAG 2 (Reso. 4202) requirement, Resolution 4202*).	☒

If no, complete Statement of Exception and obtain necessary signature.

Statement of Exception	YES		Provide Documentation or Explanation
1. The affected roadway is legally prohibited for use by bicyclists and/or pedestrians.	☐		If yes, please cite language and agency citing prohibited use.
2. The costs of providing Complete Streets improvements are excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use (defined as more than 20 percent for Complete Streets elements of the total project cost).	☐		If claimed, the agency must include proportionate alternatives and still provide safe accommodation of people biking, walking and rolling.
3. There is a documented Alternative Plan to implement Complete Streets and/or on a nearby parallel route.	☐		Describe Alternative Plan/Project
4. Conditions exist in which policy requirements may not be able to be met, such as fire and safety specifications, spatial conflicts on the roadway with transit or environmental concerns, defined as abutting conservation land or severe topological constraints.	☐	☐	Describe condition(s) that prohibit implementation of CS policy requirements

SIGNATURES / NOTIFICATIONS

TRANSIT

The project sponsor shall communicate and coordinate with all transit agencies with operations affected by the proposed project. If a project includes a transit stop/station, or is located along a transit route, the Checklist must include written documentation (e.g. email) with the affected transit agency(ies) to confirm transit agency coordination and acknowledgement of the project. A CS Checklist Transit Agency Contact List is available for reference.

DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR-LEVEL SIGNATURE FOR EXCEPTIONS

Exceptions must be signed by a Department Director-level agency representative, or their designee, and not the Project Manager. Insert electronic signature or sign below:

Full Name: Roland Yip, P.E.

Title: Deputy Director of Public Works, City Engineer

Date: September 12, 2023

Signature: *Roland Yip*

All Ages and Abilities and Guidelines

1. All Ages and Abilities

Designing for All Ages & Abilities, Contextual Guidance for High-Comfort Bicycle Facilities, National Association of Transportation Officials, December 2017

Projects on the AT Network shall incorporate design principles based on designing for "All Ages and Abilities," contextual guidance provided by the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO), and consistent with state and national best practices. A facility that serves "all ages and abilities" is one that effectively serves the mobility needs of children, older adults, and people with disabilities and in doing so, works for everyone else. The all ages and abilities approach also strives to serve all users, regardless of age, ability, ethnicity, race, sex, income, or disability, by embodying national and international best practices related to traffic calming, speed reduction, and **roadway design to increase user safety and comfort. This approach also includes the** use of traffic calming elements or facilities separated from motor vehicle traffic, both of which can offer a greater feeling of safety and appeal to a wider spectrum of the public.

Design best practices for safe street crossings, pedestrian facilities, and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility at transit stops, and bicycle/micromobility facilities on the AT Network should be incorporated throughout the entirety of the project. The Proposed Public Rights-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG) by the U.S. Access Board should also be referenced during design. (See table on next page for guidelines)

2. Design Guidance

Examples of applicable design guidance documents include (but are not limited to): American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) – *A Policy on Geometric Design of Highway and Streets, Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, Guide for the Planning, Design, and Operation of Pedestrian Facilities; Public Right-of-Way Accessibility Guide (PROWAG); Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD); Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG)*; National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) – *Urban Bikeway Design Guide*.

Contextual Guidance for Selecting All Ages & Abilities Bikeways

Roadway Context				All Ages & Abilities Bicycle Facility
Target Motor Vehicle Speed*	Target Max. Motor Vehicle Volume (ADT)	Motor Vehicle Lanes	Key Operational Considerations	
Any		Any	*Any of the following:* high curbside activity, frequent buses, motor vehicle congestion, or turning conflicts‡	**Protected Bicycle Lane**
< 10 mph	Less relevant	No centerline, or single lane one-way	Pedestrians share the roadway	**Shared Street**
≤ 20 mph	≤ 1,000 – 2,000		< 50 motor vehicles per hour in the peak direction at peak hour	**Bicycle Boulevard**
	≤ 500 – 1,500			
≤ 25 mph	≤ 1,500 – 3,000	Single lane each direction, or single lane one-way	Low curbside activity, or low congestion pressure	**Conventional or Buffered Bicycle Lane, or Protected Bicycle Lane**
	≤ 3,000 – 6,000			**Buffered or Protected Bicycle Lane**
	Greater than 6,000			**Protected Bicycle Lane**
	Any	Multiple lanes per direction		
Greater than 26 mph†	≤ 6,000	Single lane each direction	Low curbside activity, or low congestion pressure	**Protected Bicycle Lane, or Reduce Speed**
		Multiple lanes per direction		**Protected Bicycle Lane, or Reduce to Single Lane & Reduce Speed**
	Greater than 6,000	Any	Any	**Protected Bicycle Lane, or Bicycle Path**
High-speed limited access roadways, natural corridors, or geographic edge conditions with limited conflicts		Any	High pedestrian volume	**Bike Path with Separate Walkway or Protected Bicycle Lane**
			Low pedestrian volume	**Shared-Use Path or Protected Bicycle Lane**

*While posted or 85th percentile motor vehicle speed are commonly used design speed targets, 95th percentile speed captures high-end speeding, which causes greater stress to bicyclists and more frequent passing events. Setting target speed based on this threshold results in a higher level of bicycling comfort for the full range of riders.

† Setting 25 mph as a motor vehicle speed threshold for providing protected bikeways is consistent with many cities' traffic safety and Vision Zero policies. However, some cities use a 30 mph posted speed as a threshold for protected bikeways, consistent with providing Level of Traffic Stress level 2 (LTS 2) that can effectively reduce stress and accommodate more types of riders.[18]

‡ Operational factors that lead to bikeway conflicts are reasons to provide protected bike lanes regardless of motor vehicle speed and volume.

Figure 1 Designing for All Ages & Abilities, NACTO https://nacto.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NACTO_Designing-for-All-Ages-Abilities.pdf

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: September 28, 2023

To: C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

From: Kim Springer, Transportation Systems Coordinator

Subject: Update on C/CAG Equity Assessment and Framework Development Project
               and review of proposed actions for comment

               (For further information, contact Kim Springer at kspringer@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

Receive an update on C/CAG Equity Assessment and Framework Development Project, and review proposed actions for comment.

FISCAL IMPACT

The existing Mariposa Planning Solutions agreement for this project is $200,000.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

The project is funded with both General Funds and Surface Transportation Program Planning Grant funds.

BACKGROUND

On April 24, 2022, the C/CAG Board of Directors adopted Resolution 22-16, authorizing the C/CAG Executive Director to execute an agreement with Mariposa Planning Solutions (Consultant) for the C/CAG Equity Assessment and Framework Development Project (Project).

C/CAG's role on equity in San Mateo County is unique. C/CAG is not a "safety net" agency in San Mateo County, yet C/CAG programs millions of dollars of funding for a wide variety of projects and programs. Through the scope of this Project, the Consultant developed an equity definition specific to C/CAG's influence, drafted a historical perspective of injustices and disparities, and completed an analysis of existing demographic conditions and equity focus area mapping. Next, the consultant developed an "equity connections" document that ties challenges and opportunities for C/CAG to reduce disparities, in addition to conducting an internal review of all C/CAG programs. Through this process, a Draft C/CAG Equity Framework Structure, Procedural Steps, & Action Plan has been developed. This Action Plan is included as an attachment to this staff report for BPAC members to review prior to the meeting.

Throughout the project, the Consultant and staff held multiple rounds of Working Group meetings with Community Based Organizations and Agency Partners. Community Based Organizations for this project include Youth Leadership Institute, Samaritan House, Nuestra Casa, El Concilio of San Mateo County, Youth United for Community Action (YUCA), and the Housing Leadership Council. Peninsula Conflict Resolution Center has supported coordination of some of these meetings. The Agency Partners engaged include SamTrans, County of San

Mateo Equity Office, County Office of Sustainability, Peninsula Clean Energy, and Commute.org. In addition, the C/CAG Board established an Ad Hoc Equity Committee at its March meeting, with participation from six members.

The BPAC Committee has received two prior presentations on the Project, October 27, 2022 and January 26, 2023. At the October 27, 2022 meeting, staff provided an overview of the Project and shared a draft equity definition for information and discussion. At the January 26, 2023 meeting, there was discussion about mapping work completed by the Project consultant. Since that time, for Project purposes, C/CAG staff have decided to keep the Equity Focus Areas (EFAs) the same as approved by the BPAC Committee through the 2021 San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. The mapping of EFAs will be revisited in coordination with other agencies, such as SamTrans, and will be brought to the Committee for comment at that time.

The goal of this presentation is to provide an opportunity for members to comment on proposed future equity actions by C/CAG. For this meeting, staff is specifically requesting feedback on the Draft C/CAG Equity Framework Structure, Procedural Steps, & Action Plan document. The Action Plan has 36 separate actions.   See Attachment 1. The Action Plan items that are anticipated to be implemented in the next 9 months are highlighted in yellow. Looking at the attachment, the Actions document is structured by Category of actions, Goals, Outcomes, and Actions as follows:

Category

- **Goal**
  - **Outcomes**
    - **Action**
      - **Performance Indicators:** Criteria used to evaluate progress or completion of Action.
      - **Reporting:** Describes the reporting process, who reports progress and to whom.
      - **Implementation Timeline:** Staff's estimate of when the Action will be implemented based on Fiscal Year or TBD if further study is required.
      - **Fiscal Impact:** Identifies the level of effort or estimated costs *if* additional budget will be required and represents a rough estimate. There are some activities that will require assistance from outside consultants. All these activities will require C/CAG staff time, which has opportunity costs. To the extent possible, C/CAG will attempt to leverage outside funding sources for discrete activities. C/CAG staff's time will be higher as these activities are initiated, and decrease over time as these activities become normal operating practices. For example, the first annual report will probably take a considerable amount of time and effort. However, subsequent ones will require less time.
      - **Implementation Status:** Identifies the status of completion, with the qualification that even after "completion," many of these activities will continuously improve. The following are the categories of completion:
        - Completed

> - o Ongoing
> - o In Progress – Estimated Completion Date
> - o Not Initiated

Also attached is a summary of stakeholder meetings, showing a list of the Board, Board Equity Ad Hoc, C/CAG Committees, staff, and agency and community working group meetings held and still planned, through this project process. A total of 30 meetings have been held, including 11 public Brown Act agendized meetings.

After receiving feedback from the C/CAG Board and C/CAG committees in September, Mariposa Planning Solutions will prepare a draft final report, which will include an executive summary, the main body of the report, and appendices with final memo documents, meeting notes, and other documents relevant to the project. The draft final report will be shared widely and presented to the C/CAG Board at the October 12, 2023 meeting for comment. Final adoption is tentatively scheduled for November 9, 2023.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Draft C/CAG Equity Framework Structure, Procedural Steps, & Action Plan (Please review prior to meeting)

2. Summary of Stakeholder Meetings

8/31/2023

Draft C/CAG Equity Framework Structure, Procedural Steps, & Action Plan

Purpose: Develop an equity framework to convey a shared understanding among C/CAG staff, Board, Committees, Equity Framework Agency Partner, Community Working Group members, and other stakeholders that guides C/CAG on what and how the agency will achieve its equity goals.

Outcomes: Establish a structure for the framework and key components needed to advance equity. Identify strategies, actions, and a timeline for implementation - what it means to achieve equity in the context of C/CAG's mission and roles in San Mateo County and how the agency will measure progress.

Process:

- Project team shares draft framework and action plan structure, including goals, outcomes, and actions, and accompanying staff internal review summary with C/CAG staff working group for initial input.
- Project team incorporates feedback for a second C/CAG staff working group discussion focused on refinement of goals and outcomes and the creation of proposed actions/strategies.
- Project team incorporates staff working group input & shares with remainder of C/CAG staff for all-staff meeting discussion.
- Project team incorporates all-staff meeting input & shares with staff working group for discussion.
- Project team incorporates staff input & shares with C/CAG Board subcommittee and Agency and CBO Partners for discussion.
- Project team incorporates Board Subcommittee and Agency & CBO Partner input and shares with the full Board for discussion.

1

Equity Framework Final Report Elements

- Executive Summary
- San Mateo County Community Context
  - History of racist and discriminatory actions in SMC
  - Equity Focus Areas (EFA's) in San Mateo County - location of high concentrations of historically and currently underserved and impacted populations
  - Existing conditions and disparities
- Agency Context
  - C/CAG's mission and role in the county
  - Equity connections between C/CAG's program areas and equity
  - Where C/CAG has been and where it currently is on its equity journey
    - Strengths
    - Gaps
- C/CAG's Equity Commitments & Approach
  - C/CAG's Equity Definition
  - Board and staff equity commitment statement
  - Intended Equity Goals and Outcomes
  - C/CAG's procedural approach for projects, programs, plans, and funding calls
  - Action Plan
- Appendices
  - External review summary
  - Summary of CBO & Agency Partner input

2

Procedural Steps for Projects, Programs, and Plans

Set the project direction/scope:
- Establish intended equity goals, outcomes, and performance measures.
- Use an equity lens to identify and integrate potential equity-focused concepts & alternatives.

Assess for optimal outcomes:
- Identify who, what, where, when to focus on to avoid further harm and address historic & existing inequities.
- Identify benefits & burdens of each alternative.
- Select strategies that advance equity and avoid/minimize burdens.

Maintain transparency and accountability and conduct inclusive and meaningful outreach and engagement throughout the planning process.
- Develop a community engagement plan centered around Equity Focus Area geographies and demographics potentially affected (benefited or impacted)
- When feasible, partner with Equity Focus Area-serving Community Based Organizations (CBOs) and community leaders at each step of the process, including co-creation of direction/scope.
- Communicate purpose, scope, and implementation timeline throughout the process, and inform process participants and EFA stakeholders of the final decision/product(s) and how input received was incorporated.
- Create opportunities for ongoing feedback, evaluation, reporting, and iteration as applicable.

Action Plan Structure:

Category
- **Goal**
  - **Outcomes**
    - **Action**
      - **Performance Indicators:** Criteria used to evaluate progress or completion of Action.
      - **Reporting:** Describes the reporting process, who reports progress and to whom.
      - **Implementation Timeline:** Staff's estimate of when the Action will be implemented based on Fiscal Year or TBD if further study is required.
      - **Fiscal Impact:** Identifies the level of effort or estimated costs *if* additional budget will be required and represents a rough estimate. There are some activities that will require assistance from outside consultants. All these activities will require C/CAG staff time, which has opportunity costs. To the extent possible, C/CAG will attempt to leverage outside funding sources for discrete activities. C/CAG time required will be higher as these activities are initiated and decrease over time as these activities become normal operating practices for C/CAG. For example, the first annual report will probably take a considerable amount of time and effort. However, subsequent ones will require less time.
      - **Implementation Status:** Identifies the status of completion, with the qualification that even after the "completion" many of these activities will continuously improve. The following are the categories of completion:
        - Completed
        - Ongoing
        - In Progress – Estimated Completion Date
        - Not Initiated

Action Plan Goals and Outcomes:

Category 1: Internal Equity (Organization and Administration)

- **Goal 1: Create and maintain internal reporting, feedback, coordination, and collaboration structures for C/CAG equity advancement efforts.**
  - o Outcome 1: The Equity Framework and Action Plan's intent and commitments are in a constant state of implementation, with learning and adaptation along the way.
- **Goal 2: Continually strengthen and maintain internal organizational understanding, resources, and capacity to advance equity.**
  - o Outcome 1: An increasing number of staff, Board, and Committee members are representative of EFA demographics and/or geographies.
  - o Outcome 2: Staff, Board, and Committee members have a greater depth of credentials and/or lived experience relevant in equity advancement work.
- **Goal 3: Promote economic justice and shared prosperity through programs.**
  - o Outcome 1: C/CAG contributes to increased opportunities for Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE).[1]

Category 2: C/CAG Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs

- **Goal 4: Infuse a pro-equity approach within all relevant projects, plans, and programs.**
  - o Outcome 1: Equity is integrated in the design of projects, programs, and other actions and initiatives.
  - o Outcome 2: All applicable planning efforts, projects, and programs include an analysis of equity needs, impacts, and benefits.

---

[1] "DBEs are for-profit small business concerns where socially and economically disadvantaged individuals own at least a 51% interest and also control management and daily business operations. African Americans, Hispanics, Native Americans, Asian-Pacific and Subcontinent Asian Americans, and women are presumed to be socially and economically disadvantaged. Other individuals can also qualify as socially and economically disadvantaged on a case-by-case basis". https://www.transportation.gov/partners/small-business/dbe-program

5

- Outcome 3: Equity analyses/assessments are shared with the public, including C/CAG Committees/Board.

- **Goal 5: Advance equity through the call for projects structure and other funding opportunities for EFA geographies and demographics**
  - Outcome 1: C/CAG staff, Board, and Committees have a clear understanding of the degree to which grant funded programs and projects are advancing equity.
  - Outcome 2: Grant funding trends towards equitable outcomes due in part to changes in C/CAG's approach.
- **Goal 6: Use data and mapping to help ensure C/CAG's equity goals are tracked and achieved.**
  - Outcome 1: C/CAG staff leverage data, mapping, and analytical tools that are augmented and refined over time.

Category 3: EFA Community Engagement, Empowerment, & Accountability

- **Goal 7: Build and maintain trust, transparency, and lasting relationships with EFA CBO's and leaders and the populations they serve.**
  - Outcome 1: C/CAG staff have an organized and centralized repository of CBO and community leader contacts to share relevant information with, obtain input from, and partner with when opportunities arise.
  - Outcome 2: Decision makers, EFA stakeholders, and the broader community are kept informed of progress towards meeting Equity Framework goals.
  - Outcome 3: EFA-serving CBOs are resourced to support C/CAG in reaching historically and currently impacted, underserved, and hard-to-reach populations and to provide valuable input and perspective.

Category 4: Countywide Leadership, Coalition Building, and Advocacy

- **Goal 8: Provide countywide equity leadership.**
  - Outcome 1: C/CAG serves and is increasingly seen as a leader in equity advancement efforts in San Mateo County.

6

31

Category 1: Internal Equity (Organization and Administration)

- **Goal 1: Create and maintain internal reporting, feedback, coordination, and collaboration structures for C/CAG equity advancement efforts.**
    - o **Outcome 1: The Equity Framework and Action Plan's intent and commitments are in a constant state of implementation, with learning and adaptation along the way.**

Actions	Performance Indicators (Internal & community-level, as applicable)	Reporting	Implementation Timeline	Fiscal Impact & Implementation Status
1. Establish an Equity Lead among C/CAG staff to help track, coordinate, and implement the Framework and Action Plan.	Equity Lead established	Annual Report The equity lead staff person reports to the Executive Director, shares progress, and helps facilitate action at periodic all-staff meetings.	FY 2023-24	Fiscal Impact: *Staffing* Status:
2. Provide an annual evaluation of Equity Framework progress, including lessons	Percent of Equity Framework Actions by Status compared to	Annual report shared with Committees and Board of Directors (BOD) and posted	FY 2023-24	Fiscal Impact: *Staffing*

learned and proposed changes and next steps.	Implementation Timeline.	on C/CAG's Equity Framework webpage, including updates to community equity indicators over time.		Status:
3. Convene and support the C/CAG Board of Directors (BOD) Equity Framework Ad Hoc Committee as needed on an ongoing basis to incubate ideas and assist with Framework and Action Plan implementation.		Ad Hoc Committee provides progress updates to the Board and Action reported in annual report	Ongoing as needed	Fiscal Impact: *Staffing* Status:

- **Goal 2: Continually strengthen and maintain internal organizational understanding, resources, and capacity to advance equity.**
    - **Outcome 1: An increasing number of staff, Board, and Committee members are representative of EFA demographics and/or geographies.**
    - **Outcome 2: Staff, Board, and Committee members have a greater depth of credentials and/or lived experience relevant in equity advancement work.**

Actions	Performance Indicators	Reporting	Implementation Timeline	Fiscal Impact & Implementation Status
4. Consider adding Equity focused seats to the CMEQ and RMCP Committees	Discussion on Board addition of Equity Seats completed, and Seat added if requested by Board	Staff report and Annual Report	FY 2023-24 & FY 2024-2025	Fiscal Impact: *Staffing* Status:
5. Incorporate equity criteria in recruitment and selection of new candidates for open public member seats.	Equity criteria integrated into recruitment document and recruitment staff report to Board	Staff reports to Board via staff report and in Committee/BOD Annual Report	FY 2023-24 Upon recruitments	Fiscal Impact: *Staffing* Status:

9

6. Conduct outreach to equity-focused CBO's to fill vacant public member seats for applicable committees (Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ) & the Resource Management and Climate Protection Committee (RMCP)).	Use CBO distribution list for recruitments.	Staff reports and Annual report	FY 2023-24 Ongoing	Fiscal Impact: *Staffing* Status:
7. Explore developing a stipend policy for public members on C/CAG committees to increase the quantity and diversity of applicants for open committee seats.	Discussion and exploration completed	Annual Report	Conduct study on best practices for stipends for public members. TBD	Fiscal Impact: *Staffing & Stipend costs* Status:
8. Work with the County on all C/CAG HR actions to identify opportunities to leverage their equity-oriented Human Resources Action Plan, staffing, and other HR resources.	Ongoing opportunity discussions with County HR	Provide updates, if any, to C/CAG Board	FY 2023-24	Fiscal Impact: *Staffing* Status:
9. To extent possible, Incorporate equity expertise in or as desired and qualifications in job descriptions for all relevant planning, policy, and programmatic positions.	Percent of recruitments in which equity expertise was included as a desired skill	Executive Director reports to C/CAG Board on new hires and includes	FY2023-24	Fiscal Impact: *Staffing* Status:

		information on equity credentials, if any/		
10. Ensure that the Equity Framework is included in all onboarding materials for C/CAG Staff, Board members, new staff, and Committee members.	Number of C/CAG, Board members, new staff, and Committee members provided Equity Framework in onboarding	Percent reported in annual Equity Report	FY 2023-24	Fiscal Impact: *Staffing* Status:
11. All staff participate in at least one equity-focused training or professional development activity every two years, including County of San Mateo equity trainings available to C/CAG staff.	% of staff participating in equity-focused trainings/professional development activities	Staff report learnings from trainings at all-staff meetings and % reported in annual Equity Report	FY 2023-24 & FY 2024-25	Fiscal Impact: Estimated *$10,000 -$25,000 per year for equity training/professional development* Status:
12. Seek additional resources to help implement the Framework and Action Plan, including funding, and provide staff and leadership with needed support.	Annual evidence of ongoing Equity Framework resource development	Provide update in annual Equity Report to C/CAG Board	FY 2023-24 & Ongoing	Fiscal Impact: *Staffing* Status:

13. Board of Directors (BOD) is provided an annual presentation from an expert in the field on emerging equity themes relevant to C/CAG's activities.	Annual presentation completed	Annual Report	FY 2024-25	Fiscal Impact: Estimated costs of $5,000-$10,000 and *Staffing* Status:

- **Goal 3: Promote economic justice and shared prosperity through programs.**
  - Outcome 1: C/CAG contributes to increased opportunities for Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE).[2]

Actions	Performance Indicators	Reporting	Implementation Timeline	Fiscal Impact & Implementation Status
14. Explore C/CAG's needs and goals around inclusive procurement and identify next steps and potential tools to achieve those goals.	Assessment of needs, goals, and interventions completed. % of contracts that include DBE requirements	Update in annual Equity Report	TBD	Fiscal Impact: Estimated *Consultant costs of $75,000* Status:
15. Join a procurement platform so DBE businesses can sign up to receive notification of C/CAG procurement opportunities.	Identification and joining 1-2 most applicable platforms. Addition of question in RFP asking how proposer (especially DBE's) heard about procurement.	Report outcomes in Annual Report, based on question in RFPs.	FY 2024-25	Fiscal Impact: *Staffing a potential cost to join platform.* Status:

---

[2] "DBEs are for-profit small business concerns where socially and economically disadvantaged individuals own at least a 51% interest and also control management and daily business operations. African Americans, Hispanics, Native Americans, Asian-Pacific and Subcontinent Asian Americans, and women are presumed to be socially and economically disadvantaged. Other individuals can also qualify as socially and economically disadvantaged on a case-by-case basis". https://www.transportation.gov/partners/small-business/dbe-program

13

Category 2: C/CAG Plans, Projects, Policies, and Programs

- **Goal 4: Infuse a pro-equity approach within all relevant projects, plans, and programs.**
  - o **Outcome 1: Equity is integrated in the design of projects, programs, and other actions and initiatives.**
  - o **Outcome 2: All applicable planning efforts, projects, and programs include an analysis of equity needs, impacts, and benefits.**
  - o **Outcome 3: Equity analyses/assessments are shared with the public, including C/CAG Committees/Board.**

Actions	Performance Indicators	Reporting	Implementation Timeline	Fiscal Impact & Implementation Status
16. Center equity and climate resiliency in C/CAG's upcoming strategic planning.	Comprehensive inclusion in Strategic Plan RFP & document	Report to C/CAG Board in annual Equity Report	FY 2023-24 Upon launch of Strategic Planning	Fiscal Impact: *Staffing* Status:
17. Use an Equity Evaluation Tool (EET) to assist staff and decision makers in considering a range of equity considerations at the earliest stages of project, plan, program, and funding call design.	Percent of projects, plans, programs, and funding calls for which staff used the EET.	EET use details presented in staff reports to BOD, for discussion and iteration	FY 2023-24	Fiscal Impact: *Staffing* Status:
18. Include an appropriately- scaled equity analysis, assessing benefits and burdens of proposed	Percent of projects, plans, programs, and planning efforts for which an equity	Staff reports and Annual Report.	FY 2023-24	Fiscal Impact: *Staffing* Status:

Actions	Performance Indicators	Reporting	Implementation Timeline	Fiscal Impact & Implementation Status
actions, in all projects, programs, and planning efforts.	analysis was completed			
19. Provide committees and Board with a new Equity Section within staff reports to share benefits, burdens, recommendations, at the project, plan, program, and funding approval stage.	Section added to relevant staff reports and presented to committees and Board	All Staff reports	FY2023-24	Fiscal Impact: *Staffing* Status:

15

- **Goal 5: Advance equity through the call for projects structure and other funding opportunities for EFA geographies and demographics**
  - o **Outcome 1: C/CAG staff, Board, and Committees have a clear understanding of the degree to which grant funded programs and projects are advancing equity.**
  - o **Outcome 2: Grant funding trends towards equitable outcomes due in part to changes in C/CAG's approach.**

Actions	Performance Indicators	Reporting	Implementation Timeline	Fiscal Impact & Implementation Status
20. Establish equity reporting metrics relevant to C/CAG grant programs to evaluate and report on the percentage of funds benefiting EFA geographies and/or demographics	Equity reporting metrics for C/CAG grants established	Staff reports and Annual Report	FY2023-24	Fiscal Impact: *Staffing* Status:
21. Periodically, evaluate C/CAG grantmaking spending and consider changes to call for project selection criteria, including the number of points that are allocated for equity outcomes, equitable engagement, and the required local match for projects located in EFA's.	Grantmaking spending evaluated periodically % of call for project funding allocated within EFAs	Staff reports and Annual Reports	FY 2023-24	Fiscal Impact: *Staffing* Status:
22. To extent feasible, leverage outside funding to assist EFA's with technical assistance for applicable State and Regional funding applications.	Number of EFA's benefitting from C/CAG technical assistance	Reported in annual Equity Report	FY 2023-24 & Ongoing	Fiscal Impact: *Staffing* Status:

- **Goal 6: Use data and mapping to help ensure C/CAG's equity goals are tracked and achieved.**
  - o **Outcome 1: C/CAG staff leverage data, mapping, and analytical tools that are augmented and refined over time.**

Actions	Performance Indicators	Reporting	Implementation Timeline	Fiscal Impact & Implementation Status
23. Establish and update an online equity dashboard, storyboard, and/or other data reporting and visualization strategies to share progress on data and performance measures relevant to C/CAG's Equity Framework, program areas, and activities.	Establishment of dashboard	Annual Report	FY 2024-25	Fiscal Impact: Estimated *$20,000 to establish online visual* Status:
24. Update Equity Focus Area mapping by each applicable C/CAG program area in 2025, and every five (5) years thereafter based on available data, changing demographics and community conditions, EFA input, and other considerations	Completion of five-year update	Annual Report	TBD Every five years in alignment with census data updates.	Fiscal Impact: *Estimated $200,000 to update mapping.* Status:
25. Work with other county-level agencies to coordinate on mapping and data use, including opportunities to create unified Equity Focus Area maps.	Completion of unified maps with other participating agencies	Report any updates to C/CAG Board, Committees	TBD	Fiscal Impact: *Staffing* Status:

17

<u>Category 3: EFA Community Engagement, Empowerment, & Accountability</u>

- **Goal 7: Build and maintain trust, transparency, and lasting relationships with EFA CBO's and leaders and the populations they serve.**
    - o **Outcome 1: C/CAG staff have an organized and centralized repository of CBO and community leader contacts to share relevant information with, obtain input from, and partner with when opportunities arise.**
    - o **Outcome 2: Decision makers, EFA stakeholders, and the broader community are kept informed of progress towards meeting Equity Framework goals.**
    - o **Outcome 3: EFA-serving CBOs are resourced to support C/CAG in reaching historically and currently impacted, underserved, and hard-to-reach populations and to provide valuable input and perspective.**

Actions	Performance Indicators	Reporting	Implementation Timeline	Fiscal Impact & Implementation Status
26. Design public participation plans for relevant C/CAG plans and projects; emphasize and sufficiently fund outreach to areas of greatest need and utilize equitable public participation best practices. Use multiple communication and engagement strategies that are most appropriate for target audiences.	Qualitative evaluation of EFA participation in C/CAG projects, programs, plans, and policies	Report to Board via Equity Section in Staff reports and Annual Report	FY 2023-24	Fiscal Impact: *Staffing* Status:
27. Incorporate adequate budget to support participation and input from EFA-serving CBO's and community leaders in C/CAG projects, grant proposals, and planning efforts.	% of total outreach dollars budgeted for CBO engagement	Staff reports and Annual Report	FY 2023-24	Fiscal Impact: *Estimated at $30,000 per major project. (grant applications would*

18

Actions	Performance Indicators	Reporting	Implementation Timeline	Fiscal Impact & Implementation Status
Obtain feedback on the methodology and funding amount from CBO's.				*include funding for CBO participation)* Status:
28. Establish and maintain a database of Equity Focus Area (EFA) contacts that C/CAG staff can use for communications and community engagement purposes.	Establishment and annual update	Report Establishment and updates in the annual Equity Report	FY 2023-24	Fiscal Impact: *Estimated $5k-$10k each year* Status:
29. Use C/CAG's EFA database to inform equity-focused CBOs of nonprofit funding opportunities within calls for projects, opportunities to serve on C/CAG Committees, and other opportunities to improve equitable public participation. (Obtain feedback on the methodology and funding amount from CBO's)	Percent of EFA CBOs in the C/CAG database engaged in projects, programs, plans, and policies. Awareness of C/CAG's programs and opportunities to engage, or actual engagement via Annual CBO survey	Annual Report	FY 2023-24 & Ongoing	Fiscal Impact: *Staffing* Status

Actions	Performance Indicators	Reporting	Implementation Timeline	Fiscal Impact & Implementation Status
30. Complete a study on improving language accessibility in C/CAG materials and website with plan for necessary updates.	Completion of study and plan	Report to C/CAG Board on completion of study and plan	TBD	Fiscal Impact: *Estimated $30,000 for consultant review* Status:
31. Provide an Equity Framework overview and update at a relevant public meeting each year to report on gaps, progress, lessons learned, and adjustments towards meeting Equity Framework performance measures.	Equity Framework overview and update completed publicly, annually	Annual Report times to budget process, with follow up public meeting.	FY2023-25	Fiscal Impact: *Staffing* Status:

Category 4: Countywide Leadership, Coalition Building, and Advocacy

Goal 8: Provide countywide equity leadership.

Outcome 1: C/CAG serves and is increasingly seen as a leader in equity advancement efforts in San Mateo County.

Actions	Performance Indicators	Reporting	Implementation Timeline	Fiscal Impact & Implementation Status
32. Ensure inclusion of equity in annual Legislative Priorities, and actively support legislation that helps advance and does not run counter to C/CAG's Equity Framework.	Inclusion of Equity Section in Legislative Priorities document.	Annual Report	FY 2023-24	Fiscal Impact: *Staffing* Status:
33. Help SMC cities and the County meet equity standards in new state/federal requirements, including gaining HCD Pro Housing Designation Housing Supportive Community status by sharing equity best practices and other strategies.	Percent of cities + County that hold HCD Pro Housing designation	Reported annually in C/CAG Equity Report	FY 2024-25	Fiscal Impact: *Staffing* Status:
34. Encourage regional and state standards that support C/CAG Equity Framework Goals in grants funding guidelines.	Percent of external sources of funding include equity as a criterion	Reported annually in C/CAG Equity Report	FY 2023-24	Fiscal Impact: *Staffing* Status:

35. Send C/CAG's Equity Framework and Action Plan to all elected officials in San Mateo County, with annual updates on progress towards meeting commitments and actions.	Upon comp	Reported annually in C/CAG Equity Report	FY 2023-24	Fiscal Impact: *Staffing* Status:
36. Support the next generation of equity focused planners and engineers by exploring options for funding relevant external scholarship opportunities for students in our local region, etc.	Partner established and funding a C/CAG scholarship annually	Reported to C/CAG Board when established and reported annually in C/CAG Equity Report. Post info on C/CAG website.	FY 2024-25	Fiscal Impact: *Estimated at $5,000 to $10,000 and Staffing* Status:

Summary of Stakeholder Meetings

Future dates are listed in green:

Body	Dates
C/CAG Board- 4 Public Meetings	April 14, 2022 - Contract October 13, 2022 February 9, 2023 March 9, 2023 September 14, 2023 October 12, 2023 November 9, 2023
C/CAG Board Ad-Hoc Committee- 2 meetings	May 4, 2023 August 2, 2023 TBD
Staff – C/CAG- 9 meetings	September 27, 2022 December 14, 2022 February 22, 2023 March 14, 2023 April 26, 2023 May 8, 2023 May 15, 2023 June 6, 2023 August 23, 2023
BPAC Committee- 1 Public Meeting	October 27, 2022 January 26, 2023 September 28, 2023
CMEQ Committee- 1 Public meeting	November 28, 2022 September 25, 2023
CMP TAC	September 21, 2023
RMCP Committee- I Public Meeting	October 19, 2022 September 20, 2023
Agency Partners- 4 Meetings	August 30, 2022 November 30, 2022 March 20, 2023 July 21, 2023
Community Partners- 4 Meetings	September 9, 2022 November 30, 2022 March 20, 2023 July 27, 2023