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

Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee

AGENDA

Date: Monday, November 30, 2026 **Time:** 3:00 p.m. **Location:** San Mateo City Hall Conference Room C 300 W. 20TH Ave San Mateo, CA 94403	**Join by Zoom Webinar:** https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89128902788?pwd=n1dEL5hm2W3U4ERq1RndyVqMFRcijn.1 **Join By Phone:** +1 669 900 6833 **Zoom Webinar ID:** 891 2890 2788 **Passcode:** 183740

***** IN-PERSON MEETING WITH REMOTE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AVAILABLE*****

This meeting of the C/CAG Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee 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. The Committee 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/Roll Call	Action (Papan)	No Materials
2.	Public comment on items not on the agenda.	Presentations are limited to 2 mins.	No Materials
3.	Issues from the October 8th and November 12th, 2026 C/CAG Board meetings. o Approved funding package consisting of $24,111,142 in OBAG Cycle 4 County & Local Program nominations for eight projects, $782,319 in Community Action Resource and Empowerment Technical Assistance (CARE TA) funding for two projects, and $2,131,430 in Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Fund for seven eligible projects. o Received a presentation on the San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan update. o Receive a presentation from One Shoreline on Board Member recruitment.	Information (Lacap)	No Materials

4.	Approval of minutes of September 28, 2026 CMEQ Meeting.	Action (Papan)	Pages 1-4
5.	Review and approval of the 2027 CMEQ meeting calendar.	Action (Lacap)	Page 5
6.	Review and recommend approval of the Lifeline Transportation Program (LTP) Cycle 8 Guidelines, including the implementation of a two-pathway funding approach consisting of a pilot streamlined renewal process and a competitive call for projects.	Action (Gaye)	Pages 6-12
7.	Receive a presentation and provide feedback on the C/CAG E-Bike Ordinance Templates and Guidance.	Information (Gaye)	Pages 13-16
8.	Executive Director Report	Information (Cheung)	No Materials
9.	Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date January 25, 2027	Papan	No Materials

Future Potential Topics:

1. Results from project sponsor survey regarding C/CAG Call for Projects

---

PUBLIC NOTICING: All notices of C/CAG regular Board 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 Board 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 Board meeting are available for public inspection at the same time they are distributed to all members, or a majority of the members, of the Board. The Board 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 Jeff Lacap at (650)-599-1455 to arrange for inspection of public records.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION DURING VIDEOCONFERENCE MEETINGS

ADA REQUESTS: Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services to participate in this meeting should contact Jeff Lacap at jlacap@smcgov.org five working days prior to the meeting date.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: 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 jlacap@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 CMEQ Committee members, made publicly available on the C/CAG website along with the agenda. Emails received less than 2 hours before the meeting will be provided to the C/CAG CMEQ members and included in the administrative record of the meeting as soon as practicable.

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:

If you wish to speak to the C/CAG CMEQ, 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:

1. The C/CAG CMEQ 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. 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: Program Director, Jeff Lacap, jlacap@smcgov.org

ITEM 4

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS COMMITTEE ON CONGESTION MANAGEMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY (CMEQ)

MINUTES
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 28, 2026

The meeting was called to order by Chair Papan at 3:00 p.m. at San Mateo City Hall. Roll call for attendance was taken. Attendance sheet is attached.

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Meeting called to order at 3:00 pm by Chair Papan. Quorum was met.

2. Public comment on items not on the agenda

No public comment.

3. Issues from September 11, 2026 C/CAG Board meeting. (Information)

Jeff Lacap, C/CAG Program Director, noted that the C/CAG Board received updates on the following items:

- Receive a presentation from Bay Area Housing Finance Authority (BAHFA) on its exploration of a potential housing revenue measure.
- Receive a presentation on the Peninsula Shuttle Program Optimization and Funding Strategy.

4. Approval of minutes of February 23rd, April 27th and August 31st 2026 CMEQ Meetings (Action)

Motion to approve minutes of February 23rd, April 27th and August 31st 2026 CMEQ Meetings. Hedges/Brown. Papan, Brown, Miles Holland, Manalo, McCune, Dinan, Carter and Hedges. 8-0

5. Review and recommend approval of the proposed funding package, consisting of $24,111,142 in One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 4 County & Local Program nominations for eight projects, $782,319 in Community Action Resource and Empowerment Technical Assistance (CARE TA) funding for two projects, and $2,131,430 in Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) 40% Fund for seven eligible projects. (Action)

Jeff Lacap, C/CAG Program Director, presented on the OBAG 4 County and Local Program Nominations for eight projects, $782,319 in Community Action Resource and Empowerment Technical Assistance (CARE TA) funding for two projects, and $2,131,430 in Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) 40% Fund for seven eligible projects.

Chair Papan expressed concern regarding staff's scoring of the Millbrae Aviador Bridge Replacement Project and emphasized the need for a consistent and standardized approach to evaluating project deliverability across all applications. C/CAG Interim Executive Director Kaki Cheung explained that the scoring process included both an independent review of certain

evaluation criteria and an internal staff assessment. She noted that project risks and the ability to meet the proposed delivery timeline were key considerations, consistent with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) guidelines for delivering federal-aid projects.
She explained that, based on the submitted application materials, staff determined the project was unlikely to meet the schedule proposed in Millbrae's application. While acknowledging the project's significant need and merit, she emphasized staff's concerns about its ability to be delivered within the OBAG 4 timeframe.

Kaki also noted that staff had offered office hours to provide applicants with guidance during the application process. Jeff Lacap added that the project is not located within an Equity Priority Community, which was another consideration in the evaluation.

Chair Papan expressed concern regarding the potential closure of BART stations in San Mateo County and inquired whether OBAG 4 funds would be reallocated to other projects if station closures occur. Member Herhold clarified that BART has adopted an alternative service plan that would be implemented should the regional funding measure fail.

Member Miles Holland requested clarification regarding projects funded through the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) and CARE TA programs. Holland also requested that staff survey jurisdictions to inquire why they did not apply for the call for projects. Jeff clarified that all projects received their full funding allocations. Kaki shared that staff had kept the Public Works Directors aware of the call for projects.

Member Dinan inquired whether East Palo Alto had applied for OBAG 4. Jeff clarified that East Palo Alto had withdrawn its application due to eligibility issues.

Member Hedges suggested that staff provide technical assistance to jurisdictions who wish to apply for grant funding.

Chair Papan shared that it is important to ensure that elected representatives are also aware of call for projects.

Public Comment
Mike Swire stated that many cities report funding shortfalls yet do not apply for available grants, treating them as discretionary, while routinely spending millions on paving. He suggested that future prioritization criteria consider a city's ability to deliver projects.
Motion to review and recommend approval of the proposed funding package, consisting of $24,111,142 in One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 4 County & Local Program nominations for eight projects, $782,319 in Community Action Resource and Empowerment Technical Assistance (CARE TA) funding for two projects, and $2,131,430 in Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) 40% Fund for seven eligible projects and recommendation to survey jurisdictions to ascertain why they are not submitting grant proposals. Hedges/Manalo. Brown, Miles-Holland, Manalo, McCune, Dinan, Carter and Hedges. 7-0-1 Chair Papan Abstained. Motion Passes.

6. Receive a presentation on the C/CAG Countywide E-bike whitepaper and strategy. (Information)

Jeff Lacap, C/CAG Program Director, provided an overview of the C/CAG Countywide E-bike whitepaper and strategy. Jeff introduced Angelica Rocha, from Fehr and Peers to provide a detailed overview of the E-Bike strategy.

Member Brown inquired how law enforcement agencies anticipate enforcing e-bike regulations on roadways, particularly regarding compliance with stop signs. Angelica responded that enforcement challenges are largely due to limited training and staffing capacity. She noted that some school districts require students to complete bicycle safety training and become familiar with the rules of the road before being permitted to ride e-bikes to school.

Chair Papan inquired about the enforcement measures currently available to address e-bike violations.

Member Dinan inquired whether the report would include recommendations for bicycle infrastructure improvements. Angelica confirmed that infrastructure recommendations are included in the design guidance component of the report, which will outline best practices for designing bicycle facilities, including considerations for accommodating e-bikes and determining appropriate design approaches. She further explained that C/CAG will continue to provide technical assistance to jurisdictions pursuing bicycle infrastructure projects and support efforts to secure grant funding for infrastructure improvements.

Public Comment

Mike Swire, C/CAG BPAC Member, inquired about efforts to educate parents on the differences between e-bikes and e-motos to discourage the purchase of inappropriate vehicles for youths. He encouraged cities to review their sidewalk riding regulations, emphasizing that young riders should not be forced onto roadways with traffic traveling at speeds of 45 to 50 miles per hour when safe alternatives are unavailable. He further stressed the importance of providing safe bicycling options for young people to avoid discouraging teenagers from riding bicycles and encouraging greater reliance on automobiles.

7. Executive Director Report (Information)

Kaki Cheung, C/CAG Interim Executive Director, noted the following:

Recruitment is underway for an elected official to fill the seat vacated by Member Jimenez.

8. Member comments and announcements (Information)

No member comments

9. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date

The meeting adjourned at 4:23 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for October 26, 2026 at San Mateo City Hall, Conference Room C.

Name	Representing	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May (No Mtg)	Jun (No Mtg)	Jul (No Mtg)	Aug	Sept	Oct (No Mtg)	Nov	Dec (No
Dick Brown (Woodside Town Council Member)	Elected Official	X	X	X						X			
Tom McCune (Belmont City Council Member)	Elected Official	X	X	X					X	X			
Mark Dinan (East Palo Alto Council Member)	Elected Official	X	X							X			
Stacy Jimenez (Foster City Council Member)	Elected Official	X	X		X								
Stacy Miles Holland (Atherton Council Member)	Elected Official	X	X	R	X					X			
Juslyn Manalo (Daly City Council Member)	Elected Official	AB 2449		R	R					AB 2449			
Pranita Venkatesh (San Carlos Council Member)	Elected Official	X	X	X	X				X				
Bob Nguyen (Millbrae Council Member)	Elected Official			X					X				
Christopher Sturken (Council Member)	Elected Official				Brown Act								
Gina Papan (MTC Commissioner)	Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)	X	X	X	X				X	X			
Mollie Carter	Environmental Community	X	X	X	X				X	X			
Richard Hedges	Public Member	X	Brown Act	Brow n Act	X				X	X			
Vacant	Business Community												
Deborah Penrose	Agencies with Transportation Interests	AB 2449			X								
Peter Ratto	San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans)	X	X	X	X				X	X			
Pamela Herhold	Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)	X		X	X					X			
Casey Fromson	Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain)	X		X					X				

R - Remote attendance **Blank**- Absent
Brown Act - Remote attendance via Publicly Accessible Teleconference Location
X - In person attendance **AB 2449** – Remote attendance via AB 2449

In-Person: Eva Gaye, Jeff Lacap
Online: Kaki Cheung, Angelica Rocha (Fehr & Peers), Tanisha Werner (Redwood City, C/CAG TAC), Stephen Rainaldi, Mike Swire

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: November 30, 2026

To: C/CAG Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee

From: Jeff Lacap, C/CAG Program Director

Subject: Review and approval of the 2027 CMEQ meeting calendar.
Jeff Lacap at jlacap@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee review and approve the regular meeting calendar for 2027.

FISCAL IMPACT

None

SOURCE OF FUNDS

N/A

BACKGROUND

The proposed meeting calendar for 2027 is as follows:

C/CAG Congestion Management & Environmental Quality Committee	
Mondays 3:00 p.m.	
January 25, 2027	August 30, 2027
February 22, 2027	September 27, 2027
March 29, 2027	October 25, 2027
April 26, 2027	November 29, 2027
May 24, 2027 (Memorial Day on 5/31)	
June 28, 2027	

All meetings are scheduled for the last Monday of the month, except May 24, which avoids the Memorial Day holiday. Consistent with the Committee's practice in prior years, staff recommend no meetings in July or December.

Meetings begin at 3:00 p.m. and are currently in Conference Room C, San Mateo City Hall, with occasional alternative locations to be announced.

EQUITY CONSIDERATIONS

This item is necessary for the administration/operation of C/CAG and the CMEQ Committee.

ATTACHMENTS

None.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: November 28, 2026

To: Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee

From: Eva Gaye, Transportation Program Specialist

Subject: Review and recommend approval of the Lifeline Transportation Program (LTP) Cycle 8 Guidelines, including the implementation of a two-pathway funding approach consisting of a Pilot Streamlined Renewal Process and a Competitive Call for Projects.

(For further information or questions, contact Eva Gaye at egaye@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee review and recommend approval of the Lifeline Transportation Program (LTP) Cycle 8 Guidelines, including the implementation of a two-pathway funding approach consisting of a Pilot Streamlined Renewal Process and a Competitive Call for Projects.

FISCAL IMPACT

The October 2026 State Transit Assistance (STA) estimate provides approximately $4.9 million in Population-Based STA funding for the first two years of Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 8. C/CAG staff propose extending the Lifeline Transportation Program's funding cycle from two to three years, with a single Call for Projects covering the full three-year period. The three-year funding proposal assumes that SamTrans and C/CAG will maintain the existing split of 37% for paratransit and 63% for Lifeline. Staff is working with Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) staff to estimate third-year funding and will add the estimated Lifeline share to the available funding pool once it is determined. Separately, $1.2 million in Community Action Resource and Empowerment – Participatory Budgeting and Implementation (CARE-PBI) funding is available for eligible capital projects in San Mateo County. The two sources combined are expected to provide over $6.1 million for the coordinated Call for Projects.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

The State Transit Assistance (STA) Program funds are derived from a sales tax on diesel fuel. Program funding is split between a Revenue Based Program, which is distributed to transit operators by MTC, and the Population-Based Program, which is distributed to the Bay Area based on the 19% share of the state's population.

The MTC Community Action Resource and Empowerment (CARE) Participatory Budgeting and Implementation (PBI) Program is funded through the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) program, including federal transportation funds and associated fund exchanges, as well as State Transit Assistance (STA) funds.

BACKGROUND

State Transit Assistance (STA) County Block Grant Program

In February 2018, MTC Resolution 4321 established a new State Transit Assistance (STA) County Block Grant Program policy, whereby the nine Bay Area County Transportation Agencies (CTAs), also known as Congestion Management Agencies, would determine how to invest the Population-Based STA funds in public transit services and lifeline transportation services. Under the STA Block Grant Program, C/CAG would be solely responsible for determining the distribution policy among STA-eligible transit operators and allocating funds dedicated to benefiting Equity Priority Communities (EPCs) each fiscal year.

As the County Transportation Agency (CTA), C/CAG coordinates with STA-eligible transit operators and develops the STA Population-Based distribution strategy. Beginning in Fiscal Year 2018-2019, C/CAG and SamTrans staff have coordinated and developed an annual STA Population-Based distribution policy. In past cycles, under the STA Block Grant Program, the split averaged 37% for paratransit and 63% for the Lifeline program. C/CAG will continue with this split for the FY 26/27 cycle and allocate its share towards the Lifeline Transportation Program. The distribution policy for the FY26/27 State Transit Assistance (STA) Population-Based funds was approved by the TAC at the April 16th meeting and the CMEQ Committee at its April 27th meeting, followed by C/CAG Board adoption at the May 14th meeting.

In August 2026, staff presented the proposed framework for Cycle 8 of the Lifeline Transportation Program to the Committee. The framework provided the foundation for developing the Cycle 8 Guidelines and considering how to balance the continuation of established SamTrans operation projects with opportunities to fund competitive transportation projects.

Staff proposes a three-year funding cycle for Cycle 8. C/CAG has traditionally used two-year cycles. A single call covering three years would streamline the application process, reduce how often local agencies need to prepare and submit applications, and increase the amount of Lifeline funding available through the call.

Lifeline Transportation Program

The purpose of the Lifeline Transportation Program is to fund transportation projects identified in, or derived from, Community-Based Transportation Plans (CBTPs) and other local planning efforts serving disadvantaged communities. MTC's Equity Priority Communities are areas with high concentrations of low-income and minority households and/or other populations that face transportation or economic barriers, such as people with disabilities, seniors, and cost-burdened renters.

San Mateo County currently has six CBTPs: Bayshore, East Palo Alto, North Central San Mateo, San Bruno/South San Francisco, Daly City, and Southeast San Mateo County. These plans identify transportation needs and solutions intended to benefit Equity Priority Communities. Projects identified in CBTPs will continue to receive priority consideration in Cycle 8.

Community Action Resource and Empowerment (CARE) Program – Participatory Budgeting and Implementation (CARE-PBI)

The Community Action Resource and Empowerment – Participatory Budgeting and Implementation (CARE-PBI) Program supports implementation-ready capital transportation improvements identified through Community-Based Transportation Plans (CBTPs) or other qualifying community-driven planning efforts. CARE-PBI funds may be used only for eligible implementation projects which adhere to MTC eligibility,

readiness, and implementation requirements. CARE-PBI will be included in the coordinated competitive call but will retain separate eligibility, application documentation, funding restrictions, and approval procedures.

Pilot Streamlined Renewal Process

The proposed Cycle 8 Guidelines establish two pathways for Lifeline funding: a Pilot Streamlined Renewal Process and a Competitive Call for Projects, based on the three-year estimate, the pilot would reserve $782,000 in State Transit Assistance (STA) funding for two established SamTrans operating projects, SamCoast and Route 117.

The two identified SamTrans services have an established history of Lifeline support and are proposed for streamlined consideration based on their continuing operating function, consistent service scope, and demonstrated performance. Participation in the pilot renewal process would not guarantee continued funding or establish an ongoing funding entitlement. Both SamTrans projects would remain subject to C/CAG staff review, applicable committee consideration, funding availability, and final approval by the C/CAG Board. Projects with significant changes in scope, performance concerns, or do not qualify for streamlined renewal will be directed to participate in the competitive Call for Projects.

The decision to limit the streamlined renewal process to these two SamTrans services also takes into consideration the financial implications of increased shuttle operating costs, as examined through the San Mateo County Transportation Authority's Peninsula Shuttle Program Optimization and Funding Strategy Study. Expanding the streamlined process to other jurisdictions with a history of Lifeline funding for shuttle operations at this time could result in funding commitments that may not align with future transportation priorities or service recommendations identified through the study.
Accordingly, other jurisdictions, including those with previously funded shuttle services, will remain eligible to apply through the competitive Call for Projects. This approach preserves funding flexibility and allows C/CAG to evaluate shuttle projects based on current operating costs, demonstrated transportation needs, project performance, and available resources.

Competitive Call for Projects

Based on the two year estimate, approximately $4.1 million in Lifeline STA funding would be made available through the competitive Call for Projects to support operating and capital projects that address the mobility needs of low-income and underserved communities throughout San Mateo County. A separate $1.2 million of CARE-PBI funding would support eligible implementation-ready capital improvements. Both programs would share a call for project process, selection panel, and applicable capital evaluation framework, while maintaining funding-source-specific eligibility, application requirements, rankings within their respective pools, and final approval procedures. CARE-PBI applicants must submit both the C/CAG Lifeline and MTC CARE-PBI applications so that projects meeting both programs' eligibility requirements can compete for funding from both sources.

Eligible lifeline projects may include new or expanded transit operations, shuttle services, transit pass programs, mobility initiatives, active transportation improvements, transit infrastructure, and other eligible capital improvements. For countywide mobility assistance and pass programs, applicants would identify the specific transportation need, how expenditures would be restricted and verified, and expected eligible users and trips. They would also demonstrate access and benefits for residents of Equity Priority Communities (EPCs).

The proposed Cycle 8 guidelines establishes 100 point evaluation criteria that prioritizes demonstrated transportation needs, benefits to low-income communities, consistency with Community-Based Transportation Plans (CBTPs) and other relevant planning efforts, project readiness, organizational capacity, cost-

effectiveness, and measurable outcomes.

Projects identified through CBTPs would receive priority consideration in the competitive evaluation process, supporting the program's emphasis on community-identified transportation needs and investments that provide meaningful mobility benefits to underserved populations. CARE-PBI capital applications would also need to satisfy CARE-PBI-specific community prioritization, readiness, and implementation requirements.

Cycle 8 Funding Availability

The proposed allocation below distinguishes the Lifeline pilot streamlined renewal process, the competitive operating and capital funding categories, and the separate CARE-PBI capital pool. The proposed 70% operating and 30% capital split of competitive Lifeline funding is intended to balance continuing mobility-service needs with capital investment opportunities. Subject to eligibility, program restrictions, and applicable approvals, C/CAG may consider reallocating uncommitted funds between eligible Lifeline competitive categories if a category is undersubscribed; CARE-PBI funds would remain subject to their separate capital-only restrictions.

The proposed Cycle 8 funding structure below reflects two years of Lifeline STA estimates and the separate CARE-PBI capital allocation. The fund estimate is expected to increase once the amount for the third year is determined.

Funding Component	Current Funding Estimate
Pilot Streamlined Renewal Process – (*SamTrans Operations only)*	$782,000
Competitive Call – Operations Projects (70%)	Approximately $2.9 million
Competitive Call – Capital Projects (30%)	Approximately $1.2 million
Total Lifeline STA Funding	**Approximately $4.9 million**
CARE-PBI – Eligible Capital Improvements	$1.2 million
Total Combined Program Funding	Approximately $6.1 million

Next Steps

Staff presented the guidelines to the CMP TAC at their November 19th meeting; the committee recommended approval and had no comments. Following CMEQ's review and recommended approval of the proposed Cycle 8 Guidelines, staff will present the guidelines to the C/CAG Board for final review and approval on December 10, 2026. Staff expect to present a refined three-year Lifeline funding estimate and updated funding table when the guidelines come to the Board for approval.

Subject to Board approval, staff anticipates releasing the Cycle 8 Call for Projects on Friday, December 11, 2026. The proposed schedule for the Cycle 8 funding process is outlined below.

Event	Date
Call for Projects Issued	**December 11, 2026**
Applicant Workshop	Tuesday, December 15, 2026
Applicant Office Hours	January 6th and 7th, 2027
Public Workshop	December 16, 2026 and January 5, 2027
Applications Due	Friday, January 22, 2027
Selection Panel Reviews Applications	January 27- February 15, 2027
C/CAG Committees Consider Recommendation	March 18th and 29th, 2027
C/CAG Board Considers Recommendations	April 8, 2027

EQUITY IMPACTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

The Lifeline Transportation Program directly funds projects that are identified in Equity Priority Communities (EPCs) across the county. EPCs are areas with high concentrations of low-income and minority households and/or other populations that face transportation or economic barriers, such as people with disabilities, seniors, and cost-burdened renters. The proposed Cycle 8 Guidelines are intended to direct available resources toward transportation improvements that address the needs of these communities.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Proposed Scoring Criteria

The following attachment is available on the C/CAG TAC website (*See "Additional Agenda Materials" for the relevant meeting*) at: https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/congestion-management-program-technical-advisory-committee/

2. Draft Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 8 and CARE PBI Guidelines

Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 8 Scoring Rubric

Application criterion	Scoring components	Maximum
1. Project Need, Goals and Objectives	Documented transportation need: Clearly establishes a service gap or mobility barrier using data and supporting evidence. Goals and project response: Explains how proposed activities address the need and improve access to essential destinations. Program and policy alignment: Demonstrates consistency with Lifeline objectives and relevant regional plans and policies.	25
2. Community-Identified Priority	Documented community priority: Shows that affected low-income residents helped identify or prioritize the need. Current community support: Provides meaningful, current evidence of community endorsement. Benefit to intended communities: Clearly identify beneficiaries and demonstrates a direct benefit to low-income residents. CBTP priority: Demonstrates a direct connection to a priority identified in a San Mateo County CBTP.	15
3. Implementation Plan and Project Management Capacity	Implementation plan: Provides a realistic scope, schedule, milestones, and responsible parties. Readiness and delivery risk: Addresses approvals, procurement, agreements, clearances, and other dependencies. Organizational capacity: Demonstrates relevant experience, administrative and financial capacity, and satisfactory prior performance where applicable.	25
4. Coordination and Program Outreach	Coordination and partnerships: Identifies relevant partners, their responsibilities, and how the project complements existing services. Outreach approach: Presents practical methods to reach intended beneficiaries and address language, disability, technology, and other access barriers. Ongoing community involvement: Provides opportunities for feedback during implementation and explains how feedback will inform adjustments.	15
5. Cost-Effectiveness and	Cost-effectiveness: Demonstrates reasonable costs relative to anticipated benefits and explains why the approach is	10

Performance Indicators	appropriate. Performance and evaluation: Establishes measurable outcomes, targets, data collection methods, and corrective actions if targets are not achieved.	
6. Project Budget and Sustainability	Budget and funding commitments: Provides a complete, reasonable budget, identifies funding sources, and documents required match and commitments. Sustainability: Explains how operations will continue or capital assets will be maintained after the grant period.	10
Total		**100**

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: November 28, 2026

To: Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee

From: Eva Gaye, Transportation Program Specialist

Subject: Receive a presentation and provide feedback on the C/CAG E-Bike Ordinance Template and Guidance.

(For further information or questions contact Eva Gaye at egaye@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee receive a presentation and provide feedback on the C/CAG E-Bike ordinance templates and guidance.

FISCAL IMPACT

None; this is an informational item.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

The Countywide E-Bike Strategy is part of C/CAG's $441,471 federally funded Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Supplemental Planning Project.

BACKGROUND

The City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) received a Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) grant in August 2024 from the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) to implement the San Mateo Countywide Supplemental Planning Project. This funding builds upon the completed Countywide Local Roadway Safety Plan (LRSP) and supports the next phase of coordinated, data-driven safety improvements across the county.

As part of this effort, C/CAG is developing a Countywide E-Bike Strategy to promote consistent e-bike policies and practices across jurisdictions. As e-bike usage continues to increase in San Mateo County, the strategy seeks to establish a coordinated framework that addresses emerging safety concerns while preserving the mobility, accessibility, and environmental benefits of e-bikes. The strategy includes guidance on facility design, speed management, signage, enforcement, education, interagency coordination, and performance monitoring.

C/CAG's delivery of the Countywide E-Bike Strategy is organized around five key areas to support local implementation:

- **Stakeholder Facilitation:** Engage stakeholders in a shared countywide conversation on e-bike safety and policy.
- **Analysis and Monitoring:** Support jurisdictions in understanding safety trends, identifying data gaps, and evaluating collision patterns.
- **Grants and Funding:** Identify funding opportunities and assist member agencies in pursuing resources for implementation.
- **Technical Assistance:** Provide practical tools, resources, and design guidance that jurisdictions can adapt to local conditions.
- **Policy Support:** Help jurisdictions understand their regulatory authority, navigate applicable state legislation, and establish consistent local e-bike policies through model ordinance language and decision-making tools.

As part of the policy support component, C/CAG has developed an E-Bike ordinance templates and guidance (Document B), one of a series of companion guidance documents in the Countywide E-Bike Strategy to assist jurisdictions in adopting or updating local e-bike regulations. The template is intended to provide a consistent countywide approach while allowing individual jurisdictions to address local safety concerns and operating conditions.

Overview of Document B: E-Bike Ordinance Templates and Guidance

The E-Bike Ordinance Templates and Guidance (Document B) provides model regulatory language and implementation guidance to help jurisdictions establish clear, consistent, and enforceable rules for the safe operation of bicycles and e-bikes. The template builds upon existing California Vehicle Code requirements and identifies areas where local governments have authority to establish additional regulations.

The model ordinance emphasizes balancing safety with accessibility, recognizing the importance of e-bikes as a transportation option for students, commuters, older adults, and residents who may have limited access to a vehicle. It also prioritizes education, proportional enforcement, and coordination across jurisdictions to improve public understanding and compliance.

The model ordinance is organized into eight sections addressing the following key areas:

1. **Findings and Purpose:** States the safety need, identifies the state laws the ordinance builds on, and establishes its intent to supplement, not conflict with, the California Vehicle Code.
2. **Definitions:** Aligns local terminology with state law, including definitions of e-bike classifications and distinctions between legal e-bikes and other motorized devices.
3. **General Operating Rules:** Confirms that riders have the rights and duties of vehicle drivers on the roadway, and that safe-operation standards also apply on sidewalks and shared use paths.

4. **Standards of Safe Operation:** Clarifies expectations for safe e-bike operation, including compliance with traffic controls, reasonable speeds, proper direction of travel, passenger restrictions, and prohibitions on reckless riding.
5. **Minimum Age Requirements:** Provides optional ordinance language implementing Assembly Bill 2595, which authorizes San Mateo County jurisdictions to prohibit children under 12 from operating Class 1 and Class 2 e-bikes through a state pilot program that runs until January 1, 2031. Enforcement begins with a 60-day warning period, followed by a $25 fine. Participating jurisdictions must meet specified public education, enforcement, data collection, and reporting requirements.
6. **Location-Specific Rules:** Establishes location-specific operating rules intended to reduce conflicts between e-bike riders and pedestrians. These include restrictions on sidewalk riding, pedestrian right-of-way requirements, sidewalk speed limits, and posted speed limits on shared use paths.
7. **Temporary and Special Events Rules:** Allows jurisdictions to establish temporary operating restrictions during special events, construction activities, or other conditions where additional safety measures may be necessary.
8. **Enforcement, Penalties, and Monitoring:** Establishes an education-first approach to enforcement, including warnings, graduated penalties, opportunities to complete bicycle safety education in lieu of fines, and consideration of an individual's ability to pay. It also encourages jurisdictions to track e-bike-related collisions, citations, warnings, complaints, and education participation to evaluate safety outcomes and inform future policy decisions.

Collectively, these provisions are intended to create a consistent regulatory framework that improves safety, supports responsible e-bike use, and provides jurisdictions with practical tools for implementation.

The guidance also incorporates recent changes to state legislation, including Assembly Bill 2346, which establishes sidewalk speed limits and authorizes local speed regulations on bicycle and shared use paths, and Assembly Bill 2595, which establishes the San Mateo Electric Bicycle Safety Pilot Program, as referenced above.

Local Implementation Considerations

The model ordinance is intended to serve as a resource for local jurisdictions rather than a mandatory countywide regulation. C/CAG recommends a consistent approach to adoption to minimize confusion among riders traveling between neighboring jurisdictions. However, each jurisdiction retains responsibility for reviewing the proposed language with legal counsel and determining whether and how to adopt the provisions.

Document B is one component of the broader Countywide E-Bike Strategy and is intended to complement its companion documents: E-Bike Safety and Operations Guidance (Document A), the E-Bike Policy Decision Matrix for Local Agencies (Document C), Design and Operations Guidance (Document D), the Enforcement and Education Guidebook (Document E), and Data, Evaluation, and Community Safety Outcomes (Document F). Additional documents are expected

to be released in early 2027. C/CAG prioritized the release of the draft ordinance template to ensure jurisdictions are able to utilize it as a model ordinance prior to end of 2026.

Staff will present an overview of the ordinance template, highlight key policy provisions, and seek feedback from the Committee on the proposed framework and potential implementation considerations.

Equity Impacts and Considerations

The Countywide E-Bike Strategy aims to reduce e-bike-related injuries and fatalities, including in disadvantaged and historically underserved communities across San Mateo County. The model ordinance in Document B supports this objective by promoting clear and consistent safety expectations while recognizing the role of e-bikes as an affordable and accessible transportation option.

The emphasis on education-first enforcement, alternatives to monetary penalties, and ability-to-pay considerations is intended to reduce potential disproportionate impacts on lower-income riders and families. Additionally, coordinated data collection and community engagement can help jurisdictions identify safety needs, monitor outcomes, and ensure that implementation efforts support equitable access to safe e-bike transportation.

ATTACHMENT

The following attachment is available on the C/CAG TAC website (*See "Additional Agenda Materials" for the relevant meeting*) at: https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/congestion-management-program-technical-advisory-committee/

1. Draft E-Bike Ordinance Templates and Guidance (Document B)