



**REGULAR MEETING of the
San Mateo County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (SMCBPAC)
Thursday, October 15, 2020
7:00 P.M.**

*****BY VIDEOCONFERENCE ONLY*****

Pursuant to the Shelter in Place Orders issued by the San Mateo County Health Officer and the Governor, the Governor's Executive Order N-29-20, and the CDC's social distancing guidelines which discourage large public gatherings, the regular meeting location of the SMCBPAC is no longer open for public meetings.

Public Participation

- * Written public comments may be emailed to jslavit@smcgov.org and 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 or is on the consent agenda.
- * Spoken public comments will also be accepted during the meeting through Zoom.
- * Please see instructions for written and spoken public comments at the end of this agenda

1. WELCOME

2. ROLL CALL

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

This item is reserved for persons wishing to address the Committee on any SMCBPAC-related matters that are as follows: 1) Not otherwise on this meeting agenda; 2) Staff Report on the Special Meeting Agenda; or 3) Committee Members' Reports on the Special Meeting Agenda. Public comments on matters not listed above shall be heard at the time the matter is called.

Speakers are customarily limited to two minutes, but an extension can be provided to you at the discretion of the Committee Chair.

4. ACTION TO SET AGENDA

This item is to set the final regular agenda.

REGULAR AGENDA

- 5. Review and Approve August 20, 2020 Meeting Minutes** (Action)
- 6. BPAC Member Announcements and Discussion** (Information)
- 7. Presentation on the Unincorporated San Mateo County Active Transportation Plan** (Information)
- 8. Kings Mountain Road Discussion** (Information)
- 9. Crystal Springs Trail Gap Discussion** (Information)
- 10. County Updates** (Information)
- 11. Adjournment**

Instructions for Public Comment During Videoconference Meetings

During videoconference meetings of the SMCBPAC, members of the public may address the SMCBPAC members as follows:

*Written Comments:

Written public comments may be emailed in advance of the meeting. Please read the following instructions carefully:

1. Your written comment should be emailed to jslavit@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 or is on the consent 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 24 hours in advance of the meeting, it will be provided to the SMCBPAC members and made publicly available on the SMCPAC website along with the agenda. We cannot guarantee that e-mails received less than 24 hours in advance of the meeting will be read during the meeting but such e-mails will still be included in the administrative record of the meeting.

*Spoken Comments:

Spoken public comments will be accepted during the meeting through Zoom. Please read the following instructions carefully:

1. The October 15, 2020 SMCBPAC meeting may be accessed through Zoom online at <https://smcgov.zoom.us/j/95413512038>

The meeting ID is: 954 1351 2038. The October 15, 2020 SMCBPAC meeting may also be accessed via telephone by dialing US: +1 669 900 6833 (Local). Enter the meeting ID: 954 1351 203, then press #.
2. You may download the Zoom client or connect to the meeting using an internet browser. If using your browser, make sure you are using a current, up-to-date browser: Chrome 30+, Firefox 27+, Microsoft Edge 12+, Safari 7+. Certain functionality may be disabled in older browsers including Internet Explorer.
3. You will be asked to enter an email address and name. We request that you identify yourself by name as this will be visible online and will be used to notify you that it is your turn to speak.
4. When the SMCBPAC Chair calls on the item you wish to speak, click on “raise hand.” The SMCBPAC Chair will activate and unmute speakers in turn. Speakers will be notified shortly before they are called to speak.
5. When called, please limit your remarks to the time limit allotted.

Public records that relate to any item on the open session agenda for the Committee meeting are available for public inspection. Those records that are distributed less than 24 hours prior to the 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 SMCBPAC’s website has been designated for the purpose of making those public records available for inspection. The website is located at: <http://www.smcsustainability.org/livable-communities/active-transportation/>.

Meetings are accessible to people with disabilities. Individuals who need special assistance or a disability-related modification or accommodation (including auxiliary aids or services) to participate in this meeting, or who have a disability and wish to request an alternative format for the agenda, meeting notice, agenda packet or other writings that may be distributed at the meeting, should contact Joel Slavit, Senior Sustainability Specialist at least 24 hours before the meeting at jslavit@smcgov.org. Notification in advance of the meeting will enable the County to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting and the materials related to it.



San Mateo County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (SMCBPAC)

MEETING MINUTES

*****BY VIDEOCONFERENCE*****

Thursday, August 20, 2020

7:00 P.M.

1. WELCOME

Chair Doherty called the meeting to order at 7:04 P.M. It was noted that BPAC members and staff would be connecting to this meeting either by video or audio. Chair Doherty then stated the process for public comment, noted the challenges of holding a BPAC meeting online and thanked everyone for their patience during this time.

2. ROLL CALL

Members Present:

Susan Doherty
John Langbein
Elaine Salinger
Frederick Zyda

Members Absent:

William Kelly

County Staff: Joel Slavitt, Julia Malmo-Laycock, Harry Yip

Joel Slavitt conducted a roll call. A quorum was present.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Before the public comment period proceeded, Joel Slavitt briefly explained procedural logistics for receiving public comment for virtual Zoom meetings

No public comments were received.

4. ACTION TO SET AGENDA

Chair Doherty introduced the item and asked if there were any requested additions or omissions from the agenda.

Motion: Chair Doherty moved to approve/Member Langbein seconded. The motion carried 4-0.

REGULAR AGENDA

5. Review and Approve June 18, 2020 Meeting Minutes

Motion: Chair Doherty moved to approve/Member Salinger seconded. The motion carried 4-0.

6. BPAC Member Announcements and Discussion

Chair Doherty asked if members had any announcements or discussion. Seeing none, Chair Doherty moved to the next item.

7. Presentation on the C/CAG Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Update Transportation Plan

Mr. Slavik introduced Mikaela Hiatt, transportation program specialist from the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG), who proceeded to provide a PowerPoint presentation on the C/CAG Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Update (CBBP).

Ms. Hiatt spoke to work accomplished on the CBBP since September 2019 and asked for feedback on work in progress. Ms. Hiatt stated that C/CAG is using the same consultant that the County is for its active transportation plan. She noted that the C/CAG has completed the first phase of work, which included a review of plans and policies from other agencies within the county and surveys and interviews with staff from those jurisdictions. She also noted that C/CAG has completed work on developing the CBBP vision, goals and objectives to help guide the plan and an inventory of all existing and planned pedestrian and bicycle facilities throughout the County in tandem with city and county staff. Ms. Hiatt stated that C/CAG is currently working on finalizing their existing conditions report, which can be found on their BPAC's web page at: https://ccag.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Item-5_A2_CCAG-CBPP-Existing-Conditions_DRAFT-07232020.pdf. She also stated that they are finalizing their program recommendations and developing project prioritization criteria to be used for grant processes, which is under internal review and will be presented to the public during their outreach phase soon.

Ms. Hiatt stated that C/CAG, working with its technical advisory group (TAG), BPAC, consultant and internal staff, have proposed the following vision statement, "C/CAG and partnering agencies will strive to provide a safe, accessible and comprehensive network of bicycle and pedestrian facilities for a diverse population in San Mateo County." She stated that C/CAG and partnering agencies will strive to provide facilities that aim to increase mobility, provide equitable levels of access to affordable and reliable transportation options, reduce air pollution, and promote a healthy lifestyle by connecting people to their destinations. She said that this reflects the goals that C/CAG hopes to achieve, which have been updated from their prior plan and include the themes of: 1) establishing a connected network, 2) promoting riding and walking for transportation and recreation, 3) improving safety, 4) advancing complete streets, 5) developing, prioritizing and funding projects equitably, and 6) collaborating with local and regional agencies and providing technical support where necessary.

Ms. Hiatt stated that the existing conditions report includes information on demographics for the County, existing facility inventories, network gaps and barriers, collision assessments, equity focus areas

and a level of traffic stress analysis. She highlighted the existing facility inventory as well as two new elements, the equity focus areas and level of traffic stress analysis that weren't included in the prior Plan. Ms. Hiatt said that a countywide map has been developed showing existing bicycle facilities in the County and that the appendix of the existing conditions report includes a bikeway map for each jurisdiction, updated with input from the Plan TAG, the BPAC and city and county staff. She asked the County BPAC to let her know if any further updates are needed to their maps. Ms. Hiatt stated that she will be coming back to BPAC's throughout the County to share C/CAG's proposed bikeway networks in future outreach and that there will be another opportunity to provide comment.

Ms. Hiatt spoke to C/CAG's level of traffic stress (LTS) analysis. She stated that it is a measure of how comfortable a roadway is for the average bicyclist. Referring to the slide she noted that the LTS ratings range from a level of 1, which indicates a low LTS, to 4, which indicates a high level of stress, and that variables considered include presence of existing bikeways, traffic speed and volume. The LTS analysis will help inform the Plan recommendations. Ms. Hiatt stated that the report shows roadways with relatively higher stress levels.

Ms. Hiatt mentioned that equity focus areas layer disadvantaged communities from CalEnviroScreen with Communities of Concern from MTC that qualify for state and regional grant programs but that due to the high cost of living in the county, there are other underrepresented areas. As such, additional layers have been added to account for the underrepresentation, including median household income, race and ethnicity, the housing and transportation affordability index and vehicle ownership. Ms. Hiatt showed a map of the County's equity focus areas that captured a significantly larger area when compared to the state and regional definitions in identifying disadvantaged communities.

Ms. Hiatt noted that C/CAG is looking to expand existing programs, including the County Safe Routes to School program and their stormwater program, which promotes green infrastructure stormwater opportunities in conjunction with active transportation. Ms. Hiatt noted that new programs they are recommending include: local jurisdiction training and a grant support program to aid local agencies; a micro-mobility strategy to create uniform recommendations such as uniform payment, collaboration across jurisdictional boundaries and feasibility studies; and developing a high injury network (HIN) and systemic safety program to identify where the highest concentrations of collisions are occurring.

Member Salinger asked for further explanation on the stormwater program. Ms. Hiatt noted that it is an area of responsibility for C/CAG, that a sustainable streets plan is in the process of being developed and that it's important to collaborate with that process to match up streets proposed for green infrastructure opportunities with active transportation facilities. Member Langbein asked about the development of the HIN and systemic safety. He mentioned that the intersection of Woodside Road and US 101 probably has few bike crashes because everyone avoids it, but he said that it's a barrier and that there is a trade-off between a HIN and barriers. Ms. Hiatt pointed out that the CBBP is also developing a network barriers and gap analysis to address this concern. Chair Doherty asked how the BPAC could help C/CAG. Ms. Hiatt noted that they could help with the gap analysis. Ms. Hiatt mentioned that they are looking inward doing analysis but after that's completed they will conduct a round of public outreach to all the BPAC's in the next month or so and can comment at that time. For next steps, Ms. Hiatt noted that C/CAG will be finalizing the project prioritization criteria and their existing conditions report, their network gap analysis, move on to their public outreach phase and prioritize their bicycle and pedestrian projects list. She said a draft Plan should be released around January. Ms. Hiatt provided her contact info by phone: (650) 599-1453 and e-mail: mhiatt@smcgov.org. and asked if there were further questions.

Member Langbein asked how many projects were completed from C/CAG's last Plan and how much change there will be between the old and new plans. Ms. Hiatt mentioned that it will be good for C/CAG to look back and see how much change has occurred since C/CAG's last Plan was prepared. She noted that this plan is meant to serve as an update to the last Plan rather than a complete re-work. While she noted there will be new projects recommended in the current Plan, probably the biggest change will be with the development of new programs. Chair Doherty thanked Ms. Hiatt for the presentation and welcomed working closer with C/CAG.

8. Update on the Santa Cruz Avenue/Alameda de las Pulgas Improvements Study

Chair Doherty introduced Harry Yip, from the County Department of Public Works, and that he would be providing a PowerPoint presentation on the Santa Cruz Avenue/Alameda de las Pulgas Improvements Study.

Mr. Yip noted that he presented this item to the BPAC in February 2020 but that not all BPAC members were present, so a lot of the information would be the same as that presentation with an update in the process. Mr. Yip provided context on the project location and that the purpose of the project is to improve safety for all users of the roadway. Mr. Yip then provided the history of the project including the formation of a task force comprised of residents, roadway users and local agency staff in 2017 and an initial survey on wants and needs, with results showing people wanted safety improvements and a slower flow of traffic. He said that the County has made some improvements since then, including a lowering of the speed limit and temporary lane closures to slow traffic. The north leg of Santa Cruz Avenue was also part of the study area initially but because of limited right of way, not many changes could be made as it's a narrow two lane road with no parking.

Mr. Yip proceeded to describe the existing conditions and proposed improvements as outlined in the PowerPoint presentation for the Alameda de Las Pulgas, Santa Cruz and Y intersection segments of the study area. He noted that the proposed roadway layouts were developed in conjunction with the study task force. For the Alameda de las Pulgas segment, he noted there would be some modest delay to motor vehicle traffic through the proposed reduction in motor vehicle travel lanes from four to two through lanes but that the safety improvements (e.g. reduction in travel lanes and lane widths, dedicated bicycle facilities and wider sidewalks) can over-ride some of the impacts.

Mr. Yip then noted that the Santa Cruz segment was a little more complicated with three alternatives: A, B and C. He noted that Alternative A resulted in the least amount of change, with no reduction in the number of travel lanes and Alternative B, had the greatest amount of change (reducing the number of through lanes from four to two) and Alternative C being a hybrid of Alternatives A and B, where only one through lane was removed in the south bound direction. He stated that Alternative B had a negative impact on vehicular traffic. He stated that Alternative C fewer bike buffers but retained other bicycle and pedestrian improvements and the impact on delay was minimal, one minute in each direction. Member Salinger noted that slowing traffic with a delay of one minute doesn't seem like much for the tradeoff of having more people on bikes and reducing traffic. Mr. Yip stated that Alternative C is the chosen alternative based on the greatest amount of overall community support. Member Salinger asked for more information about the people who participated in the survey. Member Langbein said there was a substantial amount of cyclist input into the survey. Mr. Yip stated there was good overall representation from the different modes (pedestrians, bicyclists and automobile users). Member Salinger found the decision disappointing.

Mr. Yip then described the Y intersection , which is where the north leg of Santa Cruz Avenue and the Alameda de las Pulgas meet and that it's a skewed intersection with very long crosswalks, and like Santa Cruz Avenue, many alternatives were developed. He described Alternative A being similar to Alternative A for the Santa Cruz segment, with two through travel lanes but with bike lanes through the intersection and bike lane improvements on the Alameda segment and median and other islands to help pedestrians and bicyclists. It had minimal impact on travel times. He noted that Alternative B, like the Santa Cruz approach, was the most aggressive with a much longer island channelizing northbound traffic and a reduction of vehicular lanes on Santa Cruz Avenue to one lane. Alternative C, the preferred alternative from the community and task force, resulted in shrinking the intersection as much as possible to reduce crosswalk lengths and increase visibility of users at the intersection with lots of islands for pedestrians to stop with a substantial amount of bicycle improvements.

Mr. Yip then addressed options considered for the right turn signal at the Y intersection, leading toward downtown Menlo Park. He said that currently a right turn on red isn't allowed but previously it was, which made it difficult for bicyclists and residents to leave their homes. Based on public input, the no right-turn on red is proposed to remain.

Mr. Yip noted that the County reconvened the task force and is in the process of wrapping up the final report with plans to take the report to the Board for adoption in October and to recommend a project for funding purposes as the design and construction phases aren't funded.

Member Salinger found the proposed lane reduction on the Santa Cruz segments peculiar and wanted to know more about how this came about, as she preferred to see one lane in each direction. Mr. Yip said that traffic backs up to Sand Hill Road and would require the County to do mitigation on Menlo Park's roadways and signals. He said that prior to Covid-19, the Santa Cruz/Sand Hill intersection was one of the most impacted intersections in Menlo Park. Member Langbein agreed and said it was a compromise but that it made more sense based on the modeling projections with one lane going south and two going north. He did note that the modeling projections don't account for mode shift. He said the key thing to consider is the width of the travel lane, which the BPAC will talk about later. Chair Doherty thanked Mr. Yip for the presentation.

9. Consideration to Prepare and Submit a Comment Letter on the Santa Cruz Avenue/Alameda de las Pulgas Improvements Draft Report

Chair Doherty mentioned that this item is an action item to state the BPAC's support, or not, for the project. She also noted that members Langbein and Kelly spearheaded most of the work on this and have prepared a nice draft. Chair Doherty asked Mr. Slavit how best to proceed with this item and if she should lead the discussion. Mr. Slavit mentioned that she could but that it would be good for Member Langbein and Mr. Yip to speak as well. Mr. Slavit noted that staff took the draft letter prepared by Members Langbein and Kelly and made a recommended revision regarding the recommended travel lane width but left the original language in "strike out font" and that it would be good to have discussion about it. Chair Doherty asked Member Langbein to explain to the Committee why the BPAC should support his position. Member Langbein noted that during the last survey, the task force submitted a letter to the Department of Public Works regarding the Santa Cruz Avenue segment stating that Alternative B was preferred but that they could live with Alternative C. He said the letter summarized what Mr. Yip presented. He noted that one of the items that he wasn't in agreement with the Department of Public Works on is the feature about 10 feet wide motor vehicle lanes. Member

Langbein noted that the draft report called out 10 feet wide lanes except for right turn lanes. He said 10 feet wide lanes slow traffic more. He noted that the plan is conceptual, and that details will be ironed out later. He also said we need to grow the bike lanes wider to avoid the door zone and that the obvious place to do it would be the 11 feet wide right turn lanes or take the space away from the sidewalks. He said he was confused about the need for lanes greater than 10 feet wide. Chair Doherty said former Public Works Deputy Director Joe Lococo told her that studies have showed that narrower travel lanes slow down traffic. Member Langbein said that's the point.

Chair Doherty asked Mr. Yip to respond. Mr. Yip said that the plans show 10 feet wide lanes and said he would talk with Khoa Vo, the Deputy Director of Public Works. Member Langbein and Mr. Yip discussed the width of the center turn lane, but Mr. Yip pointed out they won't know the actual widths until a land survey is conducted. Member Langbein said the area for parking and the bike lane need to be at least 14 feet wide otherwise you can have a dooring problem with bicyclists. Member Salinger said she has heard of the need for wider bike paths, especially now with more e-bikes on the road, where there is a need for space for slower moving, muscle powered bikes and another for e-bikes. She said the good news is that this project will reduce car traffic but it's important that over time there will be more cyclists and e-bikes and we need wider bike lanes that are safe. Chair Doherty said ideally we would have a lane for everybody but given the constraints with this project, we're fortunate to get one bike lane.

Mr. Slavitt asked Chair Doherty if he could follow up on the concern regarding whether 10 feet wide lanes were called out in the report and read the following excerpt from Section 8.2 of the report, which Mr. Vo shared with him, "The Caltrans highway design manual was used as a basis of design. The proposed concepts assume a minimum vehicle lane width of 10 feet for the travel lanes and 11 feet for the center two-way left turn lane to reduce the overall geometric cross section. The concepts assume a minimum bicycle lane width of five feet, not including a striped buffer. Horizontal curve radii were based on design speed and did not account for super elevation, as no vertical information was known about the existing roadway. The current widths of the sidewalks along the study corridor are estimates and will need to be confirmed and/or revised during the final design based on field survey." He said that language referring to proposed concepts and estimates that need to be confirmed is key in regard to what is happening with the design. Member Langbein noted that this is all conceptual and if they can't live with 10 feet wide travel lanes then it's not worth having a bike lane. Member Langbein suggested that the language state that the BPAC support the conceptual design that includes a ten foot wide travel lane. Chair Doherty said she liked that and asked if that was ok with Mr. Yip. Mr. Yip welcomed the BPAC's recommendations and said they are important to the Public Works Department. Chair Doherty thanked Mr. Yip for all his good effort and work on the project.

Chair Doherty asked for a motion on the letter with the original wording adding the comment that the design of the travel lanes being 10 feet wide is conceptual and that the 11 foot turn lane could be reduced if the combination of parking, plus bike lane is about 14 feet wide. Chair Doherty asked if the BPAC should edit the letter now. Mr. Slavitt said yes and that he could make the change. Mr. Slavitt shared his screen with the draft letter and revised the section in question with feedback from BPAC members and Mr. Yip as follows, "To encourage motorists to drive more slowly and closer to the posted 25 mph speed limit, the traffic lanes are recommended to be 10 feet wide, which we believe to be wide enough to accommodate fire engines. We encourage the combination of parking and bike lanes to be a minimum of 14 feet throughout the study area."

Chair Doherty asked if police and fire were involved in the discussion about lane width. Member Langbein said that they were. Chair Doherty asked for a motion to approve the letter.

Motion: Member Langbein moved to approve the letter as revised in the meeting/Chair Doherty seconded. The motion carried with a 4-0.

10. Crystal Springs Trail Gap Funding Discussion

Chair Doherty introduced the item. She noted the potential for a public-private partnership for the Crystal Springs Trail gap, based on discussion with Parks Director Nicholas Calderon at the BPAC's July meeting. Chair Doherty asked Member Salinger to share any comments she had in regard to the potential for a public-private partnership.

Member Salinger said she didn't believe that the SFPUC would support a southern extension of the Sawyer Camp Trail to Canada Road via a protected bike lane but noted that Julia Malmo-Laycock said the SFPUC was on board, so she organized a group of bicyclists to speak at the SFPUC's meetings, which occur every two weeks. She said that the SFPUC added this to one of their agendas and she and several other bicyclists met with Tim Ramirez, the SFPUC's Natural Resources Division Manager, on August 4th. During the course of the meeting she saw that the SFPUC is open to the concept of providing land for a two way protected bike lane. Member Salinger said that while it would be great to open up the SFPUC fire roads, which could result in a scenic bikeway away from cars, she realized it's more important to get something built and that it would likely be cheaper and easier to build a facility along Lower Skyline. She said that she and her colleagues came up with a couple of scenarios and after the meeting, they came up with another plan. She noted that one of her fellow bicyclists, Andrew Hsu, met with Parks Director Nicholas Calderon, who said they are short staffed. She said that Parks would maintain the protected bikeway. Chair Doherty said the Parks Department was strapped for resources and not able to take the project on at this time.

Member Langbein asked what the concept was for a separated bike lane, and if it was physically separated from Skyline or within the Caltrans right of way. Member Salinger said their first plan would have it along the west side of the Lower Skyline shoulder with the caveat that a portion of the road may need to be moved to the east to accommodate enough land for the two way bike lane. Member Salinger said she didn't see anything that looked like protected habitat. Member Langbein asked why not add five feet on either side of the road and add a bike lane, which would be cheaper. He said he preferred a bike lane over a protected bike lane because there are bicyclists traveling at different speeds and they need to be able to pass each other. Chair Doherty said they already have a separate bike path on the Sawyer Camp Trail, and it would be good to continue that. Chair Langbein said that they should think about doing this in two phases with the bike lanes being the cheapest first and then adding the separated bike lanes later. Member Salinger asked if one is heading north on Lower Skyline, how you cross traffic to get to the Sawyer Camp Trail? She said if you look at the number of people that drive to bike on the trail, if you give them a safer place to ride, more people will use it to commute and fewer people will drive to where they are biking.

Member Salinger said with the bike lane option you still need to cross at the light where Canada Road meets State Route 92 and they must cross the merging lane from State Route 92. Member Langbein acknowledged the concerns about those points. Member Salinger said she has a PowerPoint, prepared by Sonia Elks, that shows bicyclists crossing at the light on State Route 92, at the intersection of Lower

Skyline, and they stay on the west side of Lower Skyline until meeting up with the Sawyer Camp Trail and if bicyclists want to ride on Lower Skyline, they can.

Chair Doherty thanked member Salinger for her work, that this need to go into a project mode and asked what is needed to keep this moving forward. Member Langbein also asked how much of this is on Caltrans right of way because if it is, then Caltrans should maintain it. Member Salinger said when Mr. Hsu met with Parks Director Nicholas Calderon, that the Parks Department couldn't consider working on this for 18-24 months because they are backed up with ongoing projects. Member Salinger said they are now thinking they need to build support for this with Caltrans. She also heard that there is grant money available and the deadlines are in September and that she has asked for feedback on this from Mr. Slavitt and Ms. Malmo-Laycock. She also reached out to Ms. Hiatt, who said that C/CAG can offer help with grant writing. She said she didn't think she needed anything from the BPAC now other than to get direction to do this.

Member Langbein and Member Salinger discussed which Caltrans staff members to reach out to and they agreed that Sergio Ruiz and Greg Curry were two key people to contact. Member Langbein noted that Caltrans District 4 prepared a bike plan two years ago and as far as he could tell, this segment is not in their plan. He said this should be included in the County's bike plan. She doubted that the area next to Lower Skyline was protected habitat. Chair Doherty asked Mr. Slavitt if member Salinger can have another member of the BPAC work with Member Salinger on this offline. Mr. Slavitt said yes and referenced the work that Member's Langbein and Kelly took preparing the letter of support the BPAC acted on earlier in the evening. He said since there are currently five members on the BPAC, they can work on this together as that would represent less than a quorum of the BPAC. However, they should not hold discussions with other BPAC members about this outside of BPAC meetings to ensure compliance with the Brown Act.

Chair Doherty asked if anyone else was in favor with this approach. Member Zyda said he supported the approach. She also asked if Mr. Slavitt or Ms. Malmo-Laycock could help with resources. Mr. Slavitt said staff could help as needed. Chair Doherty asked if staff could also help with funding applying for grants. Mr. Slavitt said the Transportation Authority (TA) has a grant program but that it takes time to put together an application. He said if the County were to consider an infrastructure application for this project for the TA's grant program, a well vetted scope, schedule and budget would be needed with concurrence of the affected property owners and that more work would be needed. He noted the extensive work effort that went into the Santa Cruz/Alameda de las Pulgas developing the project scope. He said staff can stay apprised of upcoming funding opportunities. He also noted that the TA's program is oriented toward commuters that can include school children commuting to school or bicyclists commuting to transit to get to work. He said as the project scope is further developed that staff can look for more funding opportunities as they become available. Chair Doherty asked to keep the group posted.

Member Salinger said she wanted to reach out to Mr. Slavitt, Mr. Hiatt and the bicyclists she has been working with to put together a plan to speak with Caltrans and was concerned about postponing work given the progress that has been made. Mr. Slavitt said he would be more than happy to work with her. Ms. Hiatt and the other bicyclists further separately offline. Member Langbein asked if an individual could prepare the grant application. Chair Doherty asked if the BPAC could be the agency that submits the application. Mr. Slavitt said that the TA's guidelines require the project sponsor to be a public agency but that the public agency could partner with other entities like the BPAC or other non-profits. Chair Doherty thanked Member Salinger for her work.

11. Election of a Vice Chair for the Remainder of Calendar Year 2020

Chair Doherty introduced this action item and requested that Mr. Slavit go over the process to elect a vice chair. Mr. Slavit noted at the July BPAC meeting, he mentioned that four BPAC member terms expired and two members didn't reapply. He said that Chair Dianna Butcher, who was the vice chair, didn't reapply and the vice chair position has become available through the end of the calendar year. Mr. Slavit stated that after the BPAC discusses the position, any member can nominate another member and if the nominated member accepts, a motion can be made, seconded and a roll call vote can be conducted. Chair Doherty asked if any member could be nominated. Mr. Slavit said yes. He noted that Member Langbein and Salinger were alternates. However, Member Salinger's term expired, and she expressed an interest to be appointed as a regular voting member. Member Langbein also expressed an interest, due to a second vacancy created by the departure of former Member Natalie Gore, who chose not to re-apply for her expired term. Since Member Salinger and Langbein were appointed by the Board to serve as regular voting members, all of the members, outside of Chair Doherty who serves as the chair, are eligible to serve as vice chair. Chair Doherty asked for nominations. Ms. Malmo-Laycock also noted that the role of the vice chair is to step in when the chair isn't available. After discussion took place regarding the position among the members, Member Zyda offered to serve as vice chair.

Motion: Chair Doherty nominated Member Zyda to serve as the vice chair/member Langbein seconded. The motion carried 4-0.

12. County Updates

Mr. Slavit congratulated Member Kelly for being reappointed, as well as Members Langbein and Salinger who were appointed as regular members as well, as the Board acted on this at its August 4, 2020 meeting. He noted that the County is in the process of filling 2 vacancies as both Diana Butcher and Natalie Gore decided not to seek new terms after their positions expired on June 30, 2020. A notice was posted to fill the vacancies, which closed on August 14, 2020.

Ms. Malmo-Laycock provided an update on the County's unincorporated Active Transportation Plan. She said the County received an administrative draft of the plan and that the Plan technical advisory committee (TAC), comprised of staff from County departments and Caltrans, SamTrans and C/CAG, will be providing comment on it at their August 24th meeting. She anticipated a public review draft of the Plan becoming available in early October, which will be discussed at the BPAC's October meeting. She said the public review timeline would be between four and six weeks with virtual outreach and asked that BPAC members share the draft Plan with their networks to help get the word out. She also said the final draft Plan will be sent to the Board for their approval.

Mr. Slavit then noted that the bicycle and pedestrian bridge at the southern end of the Mirada Road, which is part of the Coastal Trail in Miramar, was closed on July 27, 2020. He stated that construction was anticipated to begin after necessary permits are obtained and after the rainy season concludes next Spring. He said in the meantime, the County was working with Caltrans to provide a detour for

pedestrians and bicycles between Miramar Drive and Medio Avenue, on the other side of Medio Creek, to allow for continuous trail access. He said that County Public Works staff were working with Caltrans on the logistics to obtain an encroachment permit for the detour on the west side of State Route 1 and to work out any safety considerations.

Mr. Slavitt also mentioned, coincidentally, that Caltrans was also proposing a high visibility ladder style crosswalk at the intersection of State Route 1 and Miramar Drive. The proposed crosswalk improvement may also include flashing beacons to assist with pedestrian movement. He said that Caltrans would be hosting a public meeting, via a WebEx webinar on August 26, 2020 from 4:00 to 5:30 PM and that a link to a flyer with conceptual crossing information was forwarded to the BPAC and members on the BPAC interest list yesterday.

Mr. Slavitt also noted that there were two transit related public comment opportunities, with contact information that he e-mailed separately to the BPAC on August 12, 2020. The first was in regard to Caltrain's Draft Equity Policy Framework to advance equity and improve access for all. He stated that the comment period for that project closes tomorrow on August 21, 2020 and that the e-mail address to submit comments is equity@Caltrain.com. Mr. Slavitt noted that the other opportunity is in regard to the California High Speed Rail environmental document for the segment between San Francisco and San Jose. He said that the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) is taking public comment through September 9, 2020.

13. Adjournment

Motion: Chair Doherty motioned to adjourn, member Zyda seconded. The motion carried 4-0.

The meeting adjourned at 8:54 P.M.