

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, January 22, 2026	Join by Zoom Meeting: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87362024773?pwd=ZXN1eFlyY3p4MHMvVWR0eUJId1VPUT09
Time: 6:00 p.m.	Zoom Meeting ID: 873 6202 4773
Location: Burlingame Community Center 850 Burlingame Avenue Burlingame, CA, 94070	Password: 894749
Teleconference Location (Alternate Public Access): 3049 Page Street Redwood City, CA 94063	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. Members of the public will be able to participate in the meeting remotely via the Zoom platform or in person at the location above. The Board welcomes comments, including criticism, about the policies, procedures, programs, or services of the agency, or of the acts or omissions of the Board and committees. Speakers shall not disrupt, disturb, or otherwise impede the orderly conduct of a Board meeting. 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 (Thayer)	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 October 23, 2025 Meetings.	Action (Thayer)	Pages 1-5
4.	Review and Discuss the Fiscal Year 2026-2028 Transportation Development Act Article 3 Program	Action (Shiramizu)	Pages 6-9

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

Draft Call for Projects and Schedule.

5.	Receive an update on Cycle 4 of the MTC One Bay Area Grant (OBAG 4) County & Local Program.	Information (Lacap)	Pages 10-15
6.	Review and confirm receipt of MTC Complete Streets Checklist from SamTrans for the Redwood City/El Camino Real Bus Boarding Islands Project.	Action (Shiramizu)	Pages 16-29
7.	Receive a presentation on the County Transportation Plan Update.	Information (Lacap)	Pages 30-32
8.	Member Communications	Information (Thayer)	No materials
9.	Adjournment.	Information (Thayer)	No materials

The next regularly scheduled BPAC meeting will be on March 26, 2026.

Upcoming BPAC items/discussion topics:

- a. San Bruno-Millbrae El Camino Real Multimodal Improvement Corridor Study
- b. TDA 3 grant applications review
- c. OBAG 4 grant
- d. E-bike policy white paper
- e. County Transportation Plan updates
- f. Complete Streets Checklists Review
- g. County Sheriff's Office Update on Online Incident Reporting System

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

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

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.

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

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

October 23, 2025

1. Call to Order

Chair Swire called the meeting to order at 6:01 PM.

Name	Agency	Jan 2025	Mar 2025	May 2025	July 2025	Sep 2025	Oct 2025
<u>Public</u>							
Matthew Self	County of San Mateo	X				X	X
Malcolm Robinson	San Bruno		X	X			X
Alan Uy – Vice Chair	Daly City		X	X	X		
Angela Hey	Portola Valley	X		X	X	X	X
Justin Yuen	South San Francisco	X	X		X		
Mike Swire - Chair	San Mateo	X		X	X	X	X
Jean Yang	Redwood City			X*	X	X	X
<u>Elected</u>							
Flor Nicolas	South San Francisco		X [†]	X	X [†]	X [†]	X
Mary Bier	Pacifica	X	X	X		X	
Patrick Sullivan	Foster City	X	X		X	X	X
Desiree Thayer	Burlingame	X [†]	X	X	X	X	X
Stephen Rainaldi	Millbrae		X*	X	X	X	X [†]
Isabella Chu	Redwood City			X [†] *	X [†]		X [†]
Paul Nagengast	Half Moon Bay			X*	X		X
Greg Wright	Pacifica			X*	X	X [†]	X [†]

[†] Attended meeting online via Assembly Bill 2449.

*First meeting.

Noted: Member Rainaldi and Member Wright attended the meeting online via Assembly Bill 2449. Member Chu attended the meeting as a Teleconference member.

C/CAG Staff present: Audrey Shiramizu, Kaki Cheung, Jeff Lacap, Sophia Palacio, Eva Gaye (online).

Guest(s): Sue-Ellen Atkinson (San Mateo County Transportation Authority), Amy Linehan (San

Mateo County Transportation Authority), and others in attendance.

2. Public comment on items not on the agenda

Public Member John Langbein noted that the County of San Mateo is working on changes for the I-280 and Alpine Road Interchange, and Alpine Road is a major cycling route on Portola Valley Loop. John commented that the existing configuration is more favorable than proposed designs. Chair Swire thanked John for his participation.

Public Member James Cowing noted that the Redwood Shores Cycling Meetup hosted their annual event in September and had 300 cyclists through various jurisdictions. He commented that it was successful and noted the upcoming Bike to the Future event in Silicon Valley. He also noted that e-bikes are becoming a safety hazard. C/CAG Executive Director Sean Charpentier responded that an e-bike strategy and jurisdiction approach concepts are being discussed by San Mateo County. He also noted that C/CAG received \$400,000 from the Safe Streets For All (SS4A) grant to begin implementing the Countywide Vision Zero Local Roadway Safety Plan (LRSP), including a White Paper focused on e-bike policy.

3. Ratify comments for the MTC Complete Streets Checklists from the City of San Carlos and San Mateo County for State Transportation Improvement Program projects, and from SamTrans for the Countywide Transit Signal Priority – Network Optimization Working Group Program.

C/CAG Staff Member Audrey Shiramizu noted that due to a lack of quorum at the September meeting, the committee was unable to vote to confirm the receipt of comments for the MTC Complete Streets Checklists. Committee members were asked to review a comment summary and to submit additional comments by October 10th.

C/CAG Executive Director noted that the comments were submitted to MTC, and C/CAG Staff Member Jeff Lacap noted that additional comments may be emailed to the project sponsors.

Motion: Member Self motioned to ratify comments for the MTC Complete Streets Checklists from the City of San Carlos and San Mateo County for State Transportation Improvement Program projects, and from SamTrans for the Countywide Transit Signal Priority – Network Optimization Working Group Program. Member Robinson seconded the motion. All members in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.

4. Approval of the minutes from the July 24, 2025 and September 25, 2025 Meetings.

Motion: Member Robinson motioned to approve the July 24, 2025 minutes. Member Sullivan seconded the motion. All members in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.

Motion: Member Self motioned to approve the September 25, 2025 minutes. Member

Robinson seconded the motion. Members Nicholas and Nagengast abstained. All other members in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.

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

Member Rainaldi nominated Member Thayer as Chair. Member Nicholas seconded the nomination. Member Thayer accepted the nomination.

Motion: Chair Swire motioned to approve Member Thayer as Chair. Member Nicholas seconded the motion. All in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.

Chair Swire nominated Chair Swire as Vice Chair. Member Robinson seconded the nomination.

Motion: Chair Swire motioned to approve Chair Swire as Vice Chair and Chair Swire. Member Robinson seconded the motion. All in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.

6. Review and approval of the 2026 Committee Meeting Calendar.

C/CAG Staff Member Audrey Shiramizu presented the proposed 2026 Committee meeting calendar. Staff proposed keeping a similar schedule and time to the 2025 Calendar.

Motion: Member Rainaldi motioned to approve the calendar. Member Wright seconded the motion. All members in attendance voted to approve. The motion passed.

7. Receive a presentation from the San Mateo County Transportation Authority on the US 101 San Mateo County Crossing Improvement Plan.

Sue-Ellen Atkinson and Amy Linehan from the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) presented on the San Mateo County Transportation Authority's US 101 San Mateo County Crossings Improvement Implementation Plan and updates since the 2024 presentation.

Member Wright noted his strong support and appreciation for the Plan and the team's work. He asked if other municipalities could use the Plan's content and strategies to implement within their own jurisdiction's plans. Sue-Ellen noted that she is happy to help with implementation and to reach out.

Member Robinson asked for clarification of the decision to not use the full length of El Camino Real as a North-South corridor. Sue-Ellen clarified that the Plan does run throughout the County, but it is not a direct line and focuses on connectivity across US-101.

Member Robinson asked if the TA would consider technical assistance for projects. Sue- Ellen noted that the TA provided technical assistance and any jurisdiction can apply for technical assistance and the Highway Program funding for higher cost projects.

Member Robinson noted that none of the projects cross US-101 and there is a lack of connectivity across the freeway. C/CAG Executive Director Sean Charpentier noted that the C/CAG Board just approved \$12.5 million in funding of State Transportation Improvement Program funds for the Holly Street Crossing.

Member Chu asked for the definition of a bicycle facility. Sue-Ellen noted that some projects contain Class III bicycle routes while others have shared bike/vehicle facilities. Member Chu noted the data-driven approach and empiric data use for facility implementation and asked for clarification on these strategies. Sue-Ellen noted that Active 101 is looking to support what cities have already identified and is based on community-driven input.

Member Wright asked if the project will be ADA compliant. Sue-Ellen noted that ADA compliance is required for projects that touch sidewalks or curb.

Member Thayer asked for the definition of fully separated bike facilities and if that differs near transit stops. Sue-Ellen noted that she would review and return with an answer.

Chair Swire commented at the lack of US-101 crossings and asked if there is funding associated with the Plan. Sue-Ellen noted that there is no funding attributed and only technical assistance. She also noted that the TA plans to provide bonus points in an upcoming Call for Projects for priority projects in this Plan.

8. Receive an update on the Transportation Development Act Article 3 Call for Projects.

C/CAG Staff Member Audrey Shiramizu reviewed the previous committee suggestions and ideas for the upcoming Transportation Development Act Article 3 (TDA 3) Call for Projects. The update noted that there will be two separate Calls for Projects, one for TDA 3 and one for One Bay Area Grant 4 (OBAG 4). Audrey reviewed the Call for Projects schedule and noted that the Call for Projects packet will be brought to the C/CAG Board in February 2026. Audrey also noted that the TDA 3 Call for Projects will encompass three years to combine more funds for more projects, and the OBAG 4 Call for Projects will happen later in 2026.

Member Robinson asked if the applications will be online and if all members can review the applications. C/CAG Executive Director noted that all members can review applications. Audrey noted that the applications will be online.

Member Nagengast asked if there is a cap for project application funds. Audrey noted that staff is finalizing the cap amounts.

C/CAG Deputy Director Kaki Cheung clarified that there will be no changes in the TDA 3 Call for Projects application and review processes, and that the Committee will remain as the evaluation panel.

9. Member Communications

Member Self noted the lack of local and public objections for the County meeting for I-280 options.

Member Robinson noted his trip to the Eastern Alps and their advanced public transportation.

C/CAG Executive Director Sean Charpentier noted that the County is pursuing technical support to the Local Roadway and Safety Plan (LRSP) to ensure all jurisdictions are eligible to apply for Safe Streets for All funding.

Member Chu noted that Europe has many approaches that San Mateo County could adopt.

Chair Swire noted Governor Newsom's new bills signed including red light camera issues addressed and revisions to speed limit laws. He also noted that jurisdictions should collaborate on education and strategies for e-bike safety, emphasizing youth. Member Chu noted that the automobile industry spends half of their funds advertising dangerous and aggressive driving. She noted her support for Chair Swire's push for infrastructure as a solution for safety measures.

10. Adjournment

Chair Swire adjourned the meeting at 7:35 PM.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: January 22, 2026
 To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
 From: Audrey Shiramizu, Senior Transportation Programs Specialist
 Subject: Review and Discuss the Fiscal Year 2026-2028 Transportation Development Act Article 3 Program Draft Call for Projects and Schedule.

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

RECOMMENDATION

That the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee review and discuss the fiscal year 2026-2028 Transportation Development Act Article 3 Program Draft Call for Projects and Schedule.

FISCAL IMPACT

It is expected that approximately \$4.7 million will be available for the FY 2026-2028 Cycle of the Transportation Development Act Article 3 (TDA Art. 3) Program.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

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

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

BACKGROUND

Transportation Development Act Article 3 (TDA 3) funds are made available by the state and allocated by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to C/CAG on a formula basis. As the program administrator for San Mateo County, C/CAG issues a call for project nominations for eligible bicycle and/or pedestrian projects within the county. Eligible applicants include the 20 cities, the County, and any joint powers agencies in San Mateo. Approximately \$4.7 million will be available for the FY 2026-2028 Cycle.

Of the \$4.7M available for this grant cycle, an amount of \$800,000 is allocated for planning projects, with the remaining \$3.9M reserved for capital projects. Should either category be undersubscribed, any uncommitted funds may be reallocated to the other program category. The maximum grant awards are \$200,000 for planning projects and \$750,000 for capital projects. Project sponsors are required to provide a minimum local match of 10% for both project types.

Draft Call for Projects Schedule

A draft Call for Projects Schedule is included in Table 1. Please note that the Committee will need to submit their project scoring sheets by June 30, 2026.

Table 1: Proposed TDA Article FY 2026-2028 Call for Projects Schedule

Activity	Date*
BPAC Recommends Board Approval of the Call for Projects and Overall Schedule	January 22, 2026
C/CAG Board Approval of Call for Projects and Schedule	February 12, 2026
Release Call for Projects	February 16, 2026
Application Workshop	February 24, 2026
Community Outreach Meeting	February 26, 2026
Preliminary Discussions on Application Concepts (optional office hours)	Feb. 24-March 10, 2026
Applications Due	April 16, 2026
C/CAG Conducts Completeness and Technical Evaluation	May 1, 2026
C/CAG Distributes Applications and Score Sheets to BPAC	May 4, 2026
BPAC Scoring/Evaluation Period	May 4, 2026 – June 30, 2026
Project Sponsor Presentation to BPAC	May 28, 2026
BPAC Scoring Sheets due to C/CAG Staff	June 30, 2026
Committee Deliberation and makes Board Recommendations	July 23, 2026
C/CAG Board Approval	September 10, 2026

**Dates may be adjusted as needed*

Key elements of the schedule include C/CAG's completeness review and technical evaluation to verify project eligibility, consistency with TDA requirements, and readiness for implementation prior to distribution to BPAC for scoring. Timely submission of project scores is essential to support staff review and compilation. Accordingly, late score submittals will not be accepted. At the July meeting, Committee members' scores will be compiled by staff to develop a ranked list of projects for Committee deliberation and recommendation to the C/CAG Board.

Evaluation Criteria

C/CAG staff will convene a panel, consisting of C/CAG staff and this Committee, to review and evaluate applications.

Table 2 shows the evaluation criteria and weights that will be used by the panel to evaluate projects. Based on the evaluation of all eligible TDA 3 applications and funding availability, C/CAG staff and this Committee will recommend a project funding list to the C/CAG Board for approval.

Table 2: TDA Article FY 2026-2028 Evaluation Criteria

Planning Projects	Capital Projects
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Description – 5% of score • Community Support – 7% of score • Meets Program Objectives – 73% of score • Funding and Local Match – 15% of score <p>Total Percentage: 100%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Description – 5% of score • State of Readiness – 20% of score • Community Support – 7% of score • Meets Program Objectives – 53% of score • Funding and Local Match – 15% of score <p>Total Percentage: 100%</p>

Changes from prior cycles:

There were minimal changes from the scoring criteria from previous cycles.

Staff made one modification to the scoring sheet from the previous cycle. The change is under section VII. Funding and Local Match.

Staff heard from this Committee and other committees that applying for grants can be difficult for smaller jurisdictions and may discourage some from applying. To promote broad countywide participation, staff propose giving points to jurisdictions that do not contain a Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Priority Development Area (PDA) or are not located within or adjacent to a Transit-Oriented Community (TOC). This is intended to encourage high-quality bicycle and pedestrian investments in jurisdictions that have historically had fewer opportunities to access regional active transportation funding, while maintaining the program’s core emphasis on safety, network connectivity, equity, and readiness.

Staff propose reducing the number of points given to applicants that have not received funding in the past 10 years from 5 points to 3 points and allocating those remaining 2 points to applicants from jurisdictions without an MTC PDA or TOC.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Committee review the Fiscal Year 2026–2028 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Program Call for Projects, schedule, and proposed scoring updates, and provide any feedback. Following Committee input, staff will finalize the materials and forward the Call for Projects process to the C/CAG Board for consideration and approval.

EQUITY IMPACTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

In recent years, C/CAG has worked to prioritize equity and incentivize the development of more TDA 3 projects in underserved areas. For example, for the FY2024-2025 cycle, staff updated the scoring criteria to include more points for projects located within C/CAG Equity Focus Areas (EFA) or MTC Equity Priority Communities (EPCs). Additionally, maximum points were awarded if a project was located mostly in an EFA or EPC and provided the minimum local match.

In FY2024-2025, C/CAG distributed the Call for Projects to C/CAG’s new Community Based Organization (CBO) list. C/CAG also hosted three Community Workshop meetings on Zoom open to members of the public. C/CAG invited CBOs and interested members of the public to attend to learn more about the TDA Article 3 program, project eligibility, and to encourage public members to advocate for local projects that they would like to see built or improved within their communities.

These equity-based scoring criteria and outreach practices will continue to be applied in the FY 2026–2028 cycle to support equitable investment.

ATTACHMENTS

The following attachment is available on the C/CAG BPAC website (*See “Additional Agenda Materials” for the relevant BPAC Meeting*) at: <https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/bicycle-and-pedestrian-advisory-committee/>

1. TDA Article 3 FY 2026-2028 Draft Call for Projects Letter and Application Instructions

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: January 22, 2026

To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

From: Jeff Lacap, Program Director

Subject: Receive an update on Cycle 4 of the MTC One Bay Area Grant (OBAG 4) County & Local Program.

(For further information, contact Jeff Lacap at jlacap@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee receive an update on Cycle 4 of the MTC One Bay Area Grant (OBAG 4) County & Local Program.

FISCAL IMPACT

This item is presented to the Committee for informational purposes only and has no fiscal impact.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

N/A

BACKGROUND

MTC One Bay Area Grant

The One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) program provides the policy and funding framework for investing federal Surface Transportation Block Grant (STP), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ), and related funds across the Bay Area. Established by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) in 2012, the program leverages these federal dollars to advance regional priorities, particularly the integrated transportation and land use goals outlined in Plan Bay Area, the region's combined Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). The current cycle of the OBAG program (OBAG 3) establishes policy and programming framework for investing a total of \$766 million across federal fiscal years (FYs) 2023 through 2026.

In the current funding cycle, the OBAG 3 funding is evenly split between the following programs:

- *County & Local Program:* Each County Transportation Agency (CTA) manages its share of funds through a competitive call for projects process. This allows local jurisdictions to apply for a wide range of transportation projects.
- *Regional Program:* MTC uses the other half of the funds for Bay Area-wide initiatives that are better managed at the regional level, including more specialized calls for projects.

Overall, about two-thirds of the OBAG 3 investments benefit specific cities and counties directly, while the remaining one-third supports initiatives that serve the region as a whole.

OBAG 4 County & Local Program

The OBAG 4 framework is expected to be brought to the MTC Commission for adoption in early 2026, with a call for projects anticipated in spring 2026 and final project approval in spring 2027. C/CAG and other CTAs have been meeting with MTC and providing input on the framework.

MTC has outlined draft principles below to guide the next round of OBAG funding (FY 2027–2030). The goal is to continue supporting both local and regional priorities, with a stronger emphasis on safety, sustainability, and coordination across jurisdictions.

- *County & Local Program*
 - Provide a flexible funding source to deliver local priority projects that support Bay Area objectives, with an emphasis on local road safety, complete streets, and state of good repair.
 - Incentivize local partner agencies to advance Plan Bay Area policies and goals through effective sponsor requirements.

- *Regional Program*
 - Implement effective regional initiatives and services, with an emphasis on inclusive communities, sustainability, and an optimized experience for all travelers.
 - Advance local agency progress toward regional goals through coordinated planning and technical assistance.
 - Address multi-jurisdictional challenges and improve key corridors with regional leadership and strategic support.

Similar to OBAG 3, MTC will continue their larger role in the County & Local Program’s call for projects and final project selection. This is due to federal programming requirements, which do not allow for formula distribution. MTC will adopt guidance and nomination targets for the counties, and the Commission will then select projects based on initial county screening and prioritization, in addition to incorporating other regional considerations.

Additionally, many of the project sponsor requirements established under OBAG 3 will continue to apply under OBAG 4, including the requirement to maintain an up-to-date Local Roadway Safety Plan and to demonstrate compliance with state housing laws, such as having a Certified Housing Element. There will be a continued focus on investments within Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and Transit Oriented Communities (TOCs), maintaining the existing OBAG requirement that at least 80% of funds be programmed to PDA and TOC- supportive projects.

Key OBAG 4 Considerations

While many elements of OBAG 4 will build on the existing OBAG 3 framework, MTC is proposing several notable changes related to funding capacity and safety priorities.

Program Capacity

In the current cycle, OBAG 3 (FY 2023–2026) programs approximately \$766 million regionwide. The upcoming OBAG 4 (FY 2027–2030) is expected to provide a comparable funding level, at approximately \$800 million. However, it is important to note that available discretionary funding for local projects is projected to decrease due to new transit operations commitments and the expiration of one-time funding sources provided under OBAG 3.

Transit Priority Policy for Roadways (TPPR)

MTC is developing a new policy to ensure that roadway projects consider transit priority features, such as dedicated lanes, signal priority, or other design elements that improve transit speed, reliability, and efficiency. TPPR will be implemented through the existing Complete Streets Policy Checklist, with adoption anticipated in late 2025. This policy is intended to standardize transit priority requirements across jurisdictions and strengthen coordination between local agencies and transit operators. This policy is expected to influence how local roadway and active transportation projects are designed and evaluated under OBAG 4. As a reminder, under the MTC Complete Streets Policy, the Committee is responsible for reviewing Complete Streets checklists submitted by project sponsors.

OBAG 4 Schedule

A more detailed tentative schedule is summarized in Table 1 below:

Table 1: OBAG 4 County & Local Program – Proposed San Mateo County Timeline

C/CAG Action	Tentative Dates	MTC Action
- Present proposed OBAG 4 Framework and Process to C/CAG CMP TAC, CMEQ, and BPAC Committees for review and recommendation	March 2026	- MTC Commission approval of OBAG 3 Program Guidelines and Nomination Targets
- C/CAG Board approval of OBAG 4 Framework and Process	April 2026	- MTC Staff to review and approve of CTA proposed OBAG 4 Process
- OBAG 4 County & Local Program Call for Projects Issued to Local Jurisdictions and Agencies	May 2026	
- Call for Projects Application Period (approximately 45 days)	May – June 2026	
- OBAG 4 screening, scoring, and development of project nominations for MTC - BPAC review of MTC Complete Streets Checklists for OBAG 4 nominated projects	July – August 2026	
- Present recommendations to C/CAG Committees (CMP TAC, CMEQ, and BPAC)	August 2026	
- Project nomination list approved by the C/CAG Board	September 2026	
- OBAG 4 prioritized nominations due to MTC	September 30, 2026	
MTC’s Project Evaluation Process	October – December 2026	- MTC’s evaluation of OBAG 4 project nomination lists from CTAs - CMAQ emissions benefits and cost effectiveness analysis - MTC & CTA discussions of preliminary staff recommendation
- Project sponsors to submit project information into the TIP	January 2027	- MTC Commission approval of County & Local program of projects

OBAG 4 Next Steps and Committee Discussion

C/CAG staff is actively participating in the development of the OBAG 4 County & Local Program. The call for projects is anticipated in spring 2026, following MTC adoption of final guidance and county-level funding targets. Staff will return to the Committee with detailed funding criteria and project evaluation methodology once the OBAG 4 framework is finalized.

Beginning in late 2025, staff has engaged Public Works Directors in the county through the C/CAG Technical Advisory Committee to gather feedback on the following elements under consideration for inclusion in the OBAG 4 framework:

- **Grant Size Threshold:** To address rising construction costs and administrative burden associated with federal funding, staff propose increasing the minimum grant request from \$250K to \$1M. Staff also propose lowering the maximum grant request from \$5 million to \$4 million to expand the number of projects eligible for funding.
- **Alignment with Green Infrastructure:** To align the OBAG 4 call for projects with current C/CAG priorities, staff proposes including criteria in the guidelines to recognize projects that demonstrate an upfront commitment to integrate green infrastructure with transportation improvements. Initial ideas include awarding additional points to projects that are referenced in a city's Green Infrastructure Plan or C/CAG's Sustainable Streets Master Plan.
- **OBAG 4 Evaluation Panel and Structure:** Due to the compressed schedule and timeline of the OBAG 4 County and Local Program, staff is considering modifications to the evaluation panel composition and review process to improve efficiency while maintaining balanced representation.

For OBAG 4, staff is proposing to reduce the total number of C/CAG CMEQ and BPAC Committee representatives from six to four, resulting in a seven-member panel. For reference, the OBAG 3 panel consisted of nine members, including representation from C/CAG Committees, Commute.org, Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition and local city staff.

In addition, staff is exploring a streamlined evaluation approach modeled after the Active Transportation Program. Under this approach, each panel member would review a subset of the applications, followed by a consensus meeting of the entire panel to discuss applications and determine a final ranking. Panel members are responsible for submitting scores within the established timeline. The BPAC will be responsible for reviewing the MTC Complete Streets checklists required for project applications.

EQUITY IMPACTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

The OBAG program supports equity in San Mateo County by directing funding toward projects that improve access to safe, reliable, and sustainable transportation options for all communities, including historically underserved and disadvantaged populations. Through the county program, local jurisdictions can prioritize investments in a broad range of transportation projects.

ATTACHMENT

None.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: January 22, 2026
 To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
 From: Audrey Shiramizu, Senior Transportation Program Specialist
 Subject: Review and confirm receipt of MTC Complete Streets Checklist from SamTrans for the Redwood City/El Camino Real Bus Boarding Islands Project.

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

RECOMMENDATION

That the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee review and confirm receipt of MTC Complete Streets Checklist from SamTrans for the Redwood City/El Camino Real Bus Boarding Islands Project.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no direct fiscal impact to C/CAG at this time.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Established by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), the FY 2025-26 Transit Performance Initiative (TPI) Investment Program is a competitive capital grant program funded by an anticipated \$8 to 9 million in state FY 2025-26 Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) population-based funds.

BACKGROUND

Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Complete Streets Policy

In 2022, MTC adopted Resolution 4493, which formed its Complete Streets Policy (Policy). The goal of MTC's Policy is to promote the development of transportation facilities that accommodate all modes (walking, biking, rolling, driving, and taking transit). Project sponsors applying for regional discretionary transportation funding, or seeking endorsement from MTC, with a total project cost of \$250,000 or more, are required to submit a Complete Streets Checklist. The checklists are then reviewed by the County Transportation Agency's (CTA) Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC). C/CAG is San Mateo County's CTA, and comments from the C/CAG BPAC will be considered and incorporated as part of the submittal to MTC.

Project Description

The Redwood City/El Camino Real Bus Boarding Islands Project would fund the construction of fourteen concrete bus boarding islands along El Camino Real in Redwood City and unincorporated North Fair Oaks. This project would supplement Caltrans's Redwood City Bike Safety Project, which will install separated bike lanes and pedestrian improvements on the corridor, as well as an existing grant of \$1.4M awarded from the BusAID program Round 1, which funds pre-construction activities. The fourteen bus boarding islands to be constructed by the Project will be located at the following bus stops:

1. El Camino Real & Whipple Ave (Stop ID# 344079),
2. El Camino Real & Whipple Ave (344080),
3. El Camino Real & Brewster Ave (344070),
4. El Camino Real & Brewster Ave (344069),
5. El Camino Real & Jefferson Ave (344084),
6. El Camino Real & Jefferson Ave (344085),
7. El Camino Real & Maple St (relocated),
8. El Camino Real & Lincoln Ave (344086),
9. El Camino Real & Oak Ave (344090),
10. El Camino Real & Pine (relocated),
11. El Camino Real & Center St (344075),
12. El Camino Real & Center Street (relocated),
13. El Camino Real & Oakwood Drive (344091),
14. El Camino Real & Dumbarton (344900)

The Project meets eligibility under the TPI Guidelines by updating the transit stop designs at all locations to include bus boarding islands and relocating stops from near side to far side. This would reduce bus delays, improve rider experience, take advantage of existing Transit Signal Priority, and increase average speeds on SamTrans' highest ridership bus route, called Route ECR.

The Project will be delivered as a component of the existing Caltrans Redwood City Bike Safety Project, which is currently in Project Approvals and Environmental Document (PA&ED). The project will establish Class IV separated bike facilities along the route from Brewster Avenue to Selby Lane. It will also allow bus boarding islands to be incorporated into this bikeway project, which will lead to faster and more reliable bus service and fewer potential conflicts with bicyclists. Additionally, this Project will enhance rider experience by incorporating shelters and pedestrian access improvements consistent with Redwood City's El Camino Real Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Study (2019), SamTrans' El Camino Real Bus Speed and Reliability Study (2022), Bus Stop Improvement Plan (2024), and the Grand Boulevard Initiative (GBI) Action Plan (2026). These improvements will attract new riders, improve service for existing riders, enhance safety for people walking to and from bus stops, and reduce stress for bus operators related to maneuvering buses in and out of traffic and 'leapfrogging' bicyclists.

SamTrans has completed the MTC Complete Streets Checklist for the project, which is included as Attachment 1.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Committee reviews and confirms receipt of MTC Complete Streets Checklist from SamTrans for the Redwood City/El Camino Real Bus Boarding Islands Project.

EQUITY IMPACTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

The MTC Transit Performance Initiative (TPI) Investment Program Call for Projects aims to fund relatively low-cost and/or quick to implement capital improvements that improve operations on high-frequency bus corridors or at connections between high-frequency/high ridership transit services. These improvements benefit all road users and particularly those that are transit-reliant, increasing access to jobs, education, and services.

The Redwood City/El Camino Real Bus Boarding Islands Project will directly benefit four census tracts identified as MTC Equity Priority Communities (EPCs).

ATTACHMENTS

1. MTC Complete Streets Checklist from SamTrans for the Redwood City/El Camino Real Bus Boarding Islands Project.
2. Project Map.

MTC 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 in the public right of way (with a total project cost of \$250,000 or more) applying for regional discretionary transportation funding – or requesting regional endorsement or approval through MTC – submit a Complete Streets Checklist (Checklist) to MTC.

Project sponsors shall coordinate with their respective County Transportation Agency (CTA) or local Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) (or equivalent) to review the CS Checklist. Checklists must be reviewed by the local or county BPAC (or equivalent) prior to MTC's review of the Checklist. If a project includes a transit stop/station or is located along a transit route, the checklist should include an email confirmation from the transit agency(ies) to confirm transit agency coordination and acknowledgement of the project.

Please note that projects claiming exceptions to the CS Policy must complete the Exceptions section on the Checklist, including the BPAC review, and provide a Department Director-level signature. Please fill out Contact Information and Project Information and then move to Statement of Exception, which is the last section.

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>

Contact Information

1. Contact Name*

Perry Chavez

2. Email Address*

chavezp@samtrans.com

2. Contact Phone Number

chavezp@samtrans.com

4. Project Sponsor*

SamTrans (San Mateo County Transit District)

5. If "Other" was selected above, please provide your jurisdiction name here.

N/A

6. County*

San Mateo

7. Counties (if "Regional" was selected above, please list all counties impacted here)

N/A

8. Is your project seeking regional discretionary funds or an endorsement?*

- Regional discretionary funding
- Endorsement

9. If your project is seeking regional discretionary funding, please choose which funding program. If you are unsure, please email completestreets@bayareametro.gov.

- Active Transportation Program (ATP)
- Carbon Reduction Program (CRP)
- Local Transportation Climate Adaptation Program (LTCAP)
- One Bay Area Grant Program (OBAG)
- Regional Measure 2 (RM2)
- Regional Measure 3 (RM3)
- Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)
- Senate Bill 1 (SB1) Competitive Programs - (SCCP, TCEP, LPP-C)

- STA Revenue-Based Exchange
- Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3
- Priority Conservation Area (PCA)
- Bus Accelerated Infrastructure Delivery (BusAID)
- Other

Transit Performance Initiative Investment Program

Project Information

10. Project Name/Title*

Redwood City/El Camino Real Bus Boarding Islands Project

11. Project Location*

Along El Camino Real, from Whipple Avenue to Dumbarton Avenue in Redwood City and the unincorporated area of North Fair Oaks.

12. Project Area Map (Attach if applicable)

Please save the file "Project Name_YourJurisdictionName_Map." Add the name of the file being uploaded below. Then [Click Here](#) to upload your file.

13. Project Description (200 character limit).

*Please include scope of project, project extents, length of segment(s), street names, transit stop/stations, etc.**

The Project would fund the construction of fourteen concrete bus boarding islands along El Camino Real from Whipple Avenue to Dumbarton Avenue in Redwood City and unincorporated North Fair Oaks. These stops serve SamTrans Route ECR.

14. Please choose the project phase(s).*

- Planning (PLN)
- Environmental (ENV)
- Preliminary Engineering (PE)
- Design Engineering (PSE)
- Right-of-Way Acquisition (ROW)
- Construction (CON)
- Operating and Maintenance (O&M)

15. Please check all the modes that the project includes:*

- Bicycle
- Pedestrian
- Roadway Transit (bus, light rail, streetcar)
- Non-Roadway Transit (heavy rail, ferries, etc.)
- Driver/Automobile

16. Do you think your project qualifies for a Statement of Exception? *

- Yes
- No

Topic: Bicycle, Pedestrian and Transit Planning

The Complete Streets Policy states that projects that are funded all or in part with regional discretionary funding or receiving MTC endorsements must implement CS as recommended in recently adopted local or countywide plans, such as bicycle, pedestrian, active transportation, Vision Zero, or other systemic safety plan, Community Based Transportation Plans, or transit plan.

17. Please check all of the relevant plans that this project helps to implement.*

- City/County General + Specific Area Plans
- Bicycle, Pedestrian and/or Active Transportation Plan(s)
- Community-Based Transportation Plan
- ADA Transition Plan
- Station Access Plan
- Transit Plan
- Safety-Related Plans
- Safe Routes to School Plan
- Other:

N/A

18. Please provide details on the Plan recommendation(s) affecting the project area, if any, with Plan adoption date.

If the project is inconsistent with adopted plans, please provide explanation.

The Project advances the El Camino Real Bus Speed and Reliability Study, which recommended installing bus bulbs or boarding islands in Redwood City. The SamTrans

Board adopted the study on December 7, 2022. The project also advances recommendations from the 2021 C/CAG San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and Redwood City's 2022 bicycle and pedestrian plan to install a Class IV separated bicycle facility on El Camino Real between San Carlos and Menlo Park.

Topic: Active Transportation Network

19. Does the project area contain segments of the regional Active Transportation (AT) Network? [See MTC's AT Network map [here](#)]*

- Yes
- No

20. If yes, describe how the project adheres to the National Association of City Transportation Official's (NATCO's) "[Designing for All Ages & Abilities Contextual Guidance for High-Comfort Bicycle Facilities](#)" and/or the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board's "[Accessibility Guidelines for Pedestrian Facilities in the Public Right-of-Way](#)."

Background: MTC's Complete Streets Policy states, "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. The Proposed Public Rights-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG) (adopted July 2024,) by the U.S. Access Board should also be referenced during design."

The Project supports Caltrans' plan to implement a protected bicycle lane, consistent with the all-ages-and-abilities bicycle facility recommended for a roadway with El Camino Real's speed, ADT, and lane context. This Project is currently in the design phase and is requesting funding for construction, based on prior planning efforts that determined feasibility and assessed alternatives. The bus boarding islands comply with the standards set by these documents and by the City of Redwood City and the county.

21. Is there a [MTC Mobility Hub](#) (map) within the project area?*

- Yes
- No

22. If yes, please describe outreach to mobility providers, and the project's Hub-supportive elements. Please view the [Mobility Hubs Playbook Play 1](#).

The Project will support mobility hubs by coordinating the implementation of a separated bikeway on El Camino Real with the installation of bus boarding islands, facilitating multimodal transfers and travel along El Camino Real in Redwood City.

A. Topic: Safety and Comfort

23. Is the project on a known High Injury Network (HIN) or has a local traffic safety analysis found a high incidence of killed or severely injured bicyclist/pedestrian-involved crashes within the project area?*

Yes

No

24. Please summarize the traffic safety conditions and describe the project's traffic safety countermeasures. The [Bay Area Vision Zero System](#) may be a helpful resource.

Redwood City's 2022 Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan and Vision Zero Action plan shows a high number of bicycle and pedestrian collisions along El Camino Real. The Project would support Caltrans' efforts to install an all-ages, all-abilities bicycle facility along El Camino Real.

Topic: Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Transit Facility Design

Please check all the infrastructure elements that will be included in this phase of the Project:

- Sidewalk Gap Closure
- Sidewalk Widening
- New Crosswalk
- Updated Crosswalk/Crosswalk Enhancements
- Pedestrian Safety Island(s)
- Curb Extensions
- Class 1 Multi-Use Trail or Path
- Class 2 Bike Lane or Buffered Bike Lane
- Class 3 Bicycle Boulevard / Slow Street
- Class 3 Bike Route - Sharrow
- Class 4 Separated Bikeway
- Speed Hump/Table/Cushion/Raised Sidewalk
- Daylighting/Corner Parking Restrictions
- Speed Limit Reduction

- New Traffic Signal or Control Device
- Upgrade to Existing Traffic Signal or Other Control Device
- Transit Signal Priority
- Transit Queue Jump Lanes
- Transit-Supportive Lanes (transit lanes, HOV lanes, bus-on-shoulder lanes)
- Transit-Stop Design (transit bulbs, boarding islands, etc.)
- Transit-Supportive Stop Placement/Spacing
- Other:

Topic: Equity

Will the project help to improve active transportation or transit in an [Equity Priority Community \(EPC\)](#)?*

- Yes
- No

Please list census tracts that are designated as EPCs and affected by this project.

Affected EPCs (Geo ID):

06081610203

06081610601

06081610900

06081610800

Topic: Resilience

Will the Project integrate green infrastructure?

- Yes
- No
- N/A

Compliance and Exemption with Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee (or Equivalent) Review

Topic: Transit Coordination

25. Please describe the transit routes, stations, etc., and include information about transit-supportive design elements included in the project.*

The corridor includes several SamTrans routes: 79, 278, 397 OWL, and Route ECR. Route 79 is a school route with a limited school-focused schedule. Route 278 operates on hourly headways for stops with destinations including the Redwood City Transit Center and Canada College. 397 OWL operates on 60-minute headways during late-night and early-morning hours. Notably, Route ECR is the only service that operates during peak hours, serving all bus stops along the corridor with headways of 12 to 15 minutes. The Project would fund the construction of fourteen concrete bus boarding islands along El Camino Real in Redwood City and unincorporated North Fair Oaks.

26. If yes, list transit facilities (stop, station, and route) and all affected agencies.

SamTrans: 79, 278, 397 OWL, Route ECR

27. Have all potentially affected transit agencies had the opportunity to review this project? If yes, please save the email from transit operator(s) below.

- Yes
- No

Topic: Transit Agency Review

Please upload the email documentation from the transit operator(s). Please save the files as "Project Name_YourJurisdictionName_TransitEmail" Add the name of the file being uploaded below. Then [Click Here](#) to upload your file.

Statement of Compliance

The proposed projects status of compliance with MTC Complete Streets Policy (Resolution 4493).

Is this project in compliance with MTC Complete Street's Policy (Resolution 4493)?*

- Yes
- No

Topic: Bicycle Advisory and Pedestrian Committee/Commission Review

Has a local Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee/Commission (BPAC) reviewed this Checklist?*

Yes

No

The Checklist is being submitted to send to the BPAC for review.

Please provide the meeting date(s).

January 22, 2026

Please provide a summary of meeting comments.

N/A

Topic: Transit Agency Review

1. The affected roadway is legally prohibited for use by bicyclists and/or pedestrians.

Yes

No

If yes, please cite language and agency citing prohibited use.

N/A

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).

Yes

No

If claimed, the agency must include proportionate alternatives and still provide safe accommodation of people biking, walking and rolling. Please share how that will be executed.

The expense associated with implementing all elements of complete streets is prohibitive for a single agency to undertake. Consequently, this Project collaborates with the Caltrans El Camino Real SHOPP Project to establish bicycle facilities along the route from Brewster to Selby Lane, thereby actualizing the complete streets vision for El Camino Real within Redwood City. The bus boarding islands within this Project will include shelters and pedestrian access enhancements. This grant will enable SamTrans to leverage Caltrans's planning and environmental processes and to supplement Caltrans's project budget to include bus boarding islands.

3. There is a documented Alternative Plan to implement Complete Streets and/or on a nearby parallel route.

- Yes
- No

If Yes, describe alternative Plan/Project.

N/A

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.

- Yes
- No

Describe condition(s) that prohibit implementation of CS policy requirements.

N/A

Name of department director or equivalent for exceptions.

N/A

Department Director-Level Signature for Exceptions

Exceptions must be signed by a Department Director--level agency representative, or their designee. Please include name, title and copy of their approval of this exception in email or letter format below.

Director Approval File Upload

Please save the file with the project name and the jurisdiction submitting checklist. Add the name of the file being uploaded below. Then [Click Here](#) to upload your file.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: January 22, 2026

To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

From: Jeff Lacap, Program Director

Subject: Receive a presentation on the San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan update
(For further information, contact Jeff Lacap at jlacap@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee receive a presentation on the San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP).

FISCAL IMPACT

This presentation is information only, and has no fiscal impact associated with this action. The cost to update the CTP is \$399,992.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Per Resolution 24-59, C/CAG entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) to collectively participate in funding the cost to complete the upcoming update of the CTP in San Mateo County. The total cost of this effort to be split 50/50 between C/CAG and SMCTA. C/CAG share of funding will come from the C/CAG Congestion Relief Fund.

BACKGROUND

COUNTYWIDE TRANSPORTATION PLANS

A Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) establishes a long-range vision and goals for the transportation system, as well as recommends transportation project priorities and strategies that will achieve the vision and goals over time. This presentation provides the Committee with an overview of the Countywide Transportation Plan update process, key regional planning context, and early outreach efforts. It is intended to inform future policy discussions related to project prioritization and active transportation.

The CTP is a primary input into the preparation of the San Francisco Bay Area's Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS, also referred to as "Plan Bay Area") prepared by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). As such, CTPs play a critical role in informing regional transportation and land use planning efforts.

PLAN BAY AREA

In 2021, MTC adopted the third iteration of Plan Bay Area, Plan Bay Area 2050, which connects the elements of housing, the economy, transportation, and the environment through 35 strategies that aim to make the Bay Area more equitable for all residents and more resilient in the face of

unexpected challenges. In the short-term, the Plan’s implementation plan identifies more than 80 specific actions for MTC, ABAG, and partner organizations to take over the next five years to make headway on each of the 35 strategies and achieving Plan Bay Area goals and objectives.

Currently, MTC is developing Plan Bay Area 2050+, a limited and focused update to Plan Bay Area 2050. It is an opportunity to refine select plan strategies to integrate the lessons of the last three years since the adoption of Plan Bay Area. Additionally, this approach will enable continued progress implementing the strategies of Plan Bay Area 2050.

MTC has developed a set of guidelines to provide context for coordinated transportation and land use planning in the San Francisco Bay Area by developing a common planning framework between CTPs and the RTP/SCS, reflective of state and regional climate and equity goals.

The next major update of Plan Bay Area is expected to begin in 2026 and be adopted in 2029. As stated in the CTP guidelines from MTC, MTC recommends that CTPs should be completed by 2026 to inform the next major update to Plan Bay Area.

SAN MATEO COUNTYWIDE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

As one of responsibilities as the County Transportation Agency (CTA), C/CAG prepares the CTP for San Mateo County. The last iteration of the CTP, the San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan 2040 (SMCTP 2040), was adopted by the C/CAG Board on February 9, 2017. Since that time, the county’s population and employment have increased substantially, several major transportation projects and planning efforts have been completed, and a rapid change in commute patterns brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, MTC has issued updated guidelines on how CTPs should be updated and many policies regarding equity and climate have changed at the local, regional, state, and federal levels. This CTP update is a collaboration between C/CAG and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA).

Beginning in November 2025, C/CAG and SMCTA staff have been presenting to various transportation related committees in the first phase of outreach. Leveraging almost 5 years’ worth of recent public engagement through other transportation planning efforts in the county, staff have been using this valuable data to help shape and validate the draft vision and goals for the CTP, particularly as they relate to changing travel patterns and user experiences across the County. To date, staff has presented to 30 committees throughout the county. Staff will return to the Committee in Summer 2026 to discuss and seek input on the transportation project list required for inclusion in the CTP.

EQUITY IMPACTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

The San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan is a countywide plan that advances equity by ensuring all residents in San Mateo County have access to safe and reliable modes of transportation by recommending transportation project priorities and strategies that will achieve the vision and goals over time.

ATTACHMENT

The following attachment is available on the C/CAG BPAC website (*See “Additional Agenda Materials” for the relevant BPAC Meeting*) at: <https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/bicycle-and-pedestrian-advisory-committee/>

1. San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan Update Presentation