

**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
<u>Public</u>				
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
<u>Elected</u>				
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.