



**SPECIAL MEETING of the  
San Mateo County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (SMCBPAC)  
Tuesday, November 17, 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](mailto: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 October 15, 2020 Meeting Minutes** (Action)
- 6. BPAC Member Announcements and Discussion** (Information)
- 7. Kings Mountain Road Discussion** (Information)
- 8. Draft Unincorporated San Mateo County Active Transportation Plan Update** (Information)
- 9. Draft 2021 BPAC Work Plan** (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](mailto: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 November 17, 2020 SMCBPAC meeting may be accessed through Zoom online at <https://smcgov.zoom.us/j/94538871153>  
The meeting ID is: 945 3887 1153. The November 17, 2020 SMCBPAC meeting may also be accessed via telephone by dialing US: +1 669 900 6833 (Local). Enter the meeting ID: 945 3887 1153, 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](mailto: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, October 15, 2020**

**7:00 P.M.**

### 1. WELCOME

Chair Doherty called the meeting to order at 7:00 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 comments and 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  
William Kelly  
John Langbein  
Elaine Salinger  
William Kelly  
Frederick Zyda

**Members Absent:**

None

**County Staff:** Joel Slavit, Matthew Petrofsky, Khoa Vo

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

### 3. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Before the public comment period proceeded, Mr. Slavit briefly explained procedural logistics for receiving public comment for virtual Zoom meetings.

No public comments were received.

#### **4. ACTION TO SET AGENDA**

Chair Doherty requested a motion to set the agenda.

*Motion: Member Kelly moved to approve/Chair Doherty seconded. The motion carried 5-0.*

#### **REGULAR AGENDA**

##### **5. Review and Approve August 20, 2020 Meeting Minutes**

Chair Doherty requested a motion to adopt the August Meeting Minutes.

*Motion: Member Kelly moved to approve/Member Zyda seconded. The motion carried 5-0.*

##### **6. BPAC Member Announcements and Discussion**

Chair Doherty asked if members had any announcements or discussion. Member Langbein mentioned a letter from Bob Page, member of the public, that was transmitted to the BPAC regarding poor pavement quality on a two block stretch of the Alameda de Las Pulgas in the West Menlo Park business district. He said it was a minor concern but there is a seam in the northbound direction. Mr. Vo, Deputy Director from the County Public Works Department, acknowledged receipt of Mr. Page's letter and he said there is a gap between the edge of pavement and the lip of the gutter, and that the Department would consider patching in this area. Chair Doherty asked Mr. Vo to keep the BPAC posted on this matter.

##### **7. Presentation on the Unincorporated Draft San Mateo County Active Transportation Plan**

Joel Slavit introduced Brooke Dubose, Principle from Toole Design's Oakland office. Ms. Dubose spoke to a PowerPoint presentation. Ms. Dubose said she would provide updates on the draft Plan, walk the BPAC through what is on the website, answer questions and talk about next steps. Ms. Dubose mentioned the schedule and the activities conducted throughout it. She noted work started spring 2019 and that the County was a few months away from wrapping up the Plan. Brooke noted the three phases of the Plan, which included: 1) data collection and initial outreach during the spring and summer of 2019, 2) project and program recommendations from the fall of 2019 through the summer of 2020, and 3) developing the implementation strategy and the draft plan from the past summer to the present. She noted that the Plan will serve as a roadmap for implementation.

Ms. Dubose spoke to community outreach efforts, mentioning initial in-person activity during the first phase of work and the switch to virtual engagement when the pandemic hit during the second phase. She said that County staff conducted extensive outreach. She noted analysis was conducted looking at collision data for safety countermeasures, gap analysis for gaps in the existing bikeway network and through looking at areas of greatest demand, which is critical as agencies have limited funding. She stated this work guided the project and program recommendations.

Ms. Dubose then proceeded to walk through and explain the Draft Plan chapters. She noted that Chapter 1 provides an overview and defines the Plan purpose and Chapter 2 focuses on the goals and objectives with corresponding metrics. She stated that Chapter 3 focuses on the bicycle recommendations and includes facilities that cross jurisdictional boundaries. It includes guidance on the type of facilities recommended based on vehicle volumes and speeds. She mentioned important trade-offs that need to be considered when determining appropriate bicycle facilities and that there are

competing needs for street space. Ms. Dubose stated that Chapter 4 focuses on the pedestrian element of the plan and contains recommendations for 11 key pedestrian destinations that are good prototypes for other areas in the County and that there is a design toolkit that can be used to help identify different types of improvements in the appendices. She said Chapter 5 contains a series of support programs and policies that focus on four key areas including: 1) Planning, design and management, 2) Education and encouragement, 3) Funding and implementation, and 4) Additional policies and practices to be initiated. Ms. Dubose then stated that Chapter 6, Implementation and Funding, is a critical part of the Plan. She noted that projects are prioritized, although once a project is ranked that it's just the beginning of moving toward implementation and there are a lot of different ways projects can be implemented. She noted this chapter also contains cost estimates for projects and funding sources.

Ms. Dubose mentioned that the prioritization criteria in the Plan needs to align with both community values and funding criteria. Projects were ranked high, medium and low, with the intent that high rated projects would be the first to move out of the gate. She noted though that priorities can shift over time and conditions can change and that the project rankings were just a first step moving toward implementing projects.

Member Kelly asked when does an idea become a project. If there is a crying need but not a plan to develop it is it a project or just a problem? Ms. Dubose said there will always be needs and this Plan may or may not have identified them. If there is a need for a project that's not in the Plan, it provides guidance for staff on how to address it. Mr. Kelly asked if we were starting with a blank slate in identifying projects. Ms. Dubose said we leveraged a number of different data points, including looking at C/CAG's Plan recommendations that had yet to be implemented as well as other Plans such as the Caltrans District 4 Bicycle Plan and the Connect the Coastside Plan as well as analysis conducted in this Plan.

Member Kelly stated concern that the Dumbarton Corridor was not mentioned as a project. He asked if that was because the project isn't well defined at this point. Mr. Slavitt noted that the focus for bikeways in the Plan is the on-street network. He noted that further work needs to be done on the Dumbarton Corridor and that it is called out in the Plan with other regional planning priorities and efforts. Mr. Slavitt said the Dumbarton Corridor is controlled by SamTrans and that as part of a future transit project, SamTrans is also considering a pedestrian/bicycle path and the County will be part of that conversation. Mr. Kelly said that if the Plan could only focus on a few priorities, we need to know where our efforts are best rewarded and that the draft Plan doesn't make it clear that this is a high priority project. Ms. Dubose asked Mr. Slavitt which agency would be the implementing this project. Mr. Slavitt mentioned that the implementation of the shared use path has yet to be determined. He said that SamTrans is the owner, but it could be privately funded and many of the details still need to be flushed out. Ms. Dubose stated that this type of project tends to be in a different category, similar to other large complex projects such as overcrossings and we can look at beefing up the discussion and profile of this project. Member Kelly said he understood the level of complexity, size of the project and that the Office of Sustainability may not be the lead on it, but it is a transformative, high yield project for the chronically underserved communities of North Fair Oaks and Bell Haven and he encourages the Plan to be more vocal about that. He said it is a home run project and he encouraged staff and the consultant to think about that. All of the BPAC members unanimously agreed.

Member Salinger said she noticed that in Appendix D, the area along Skyline received the highest number of comments, yet this area was rated low even though it is a major north/south corridor for cyclists and wanted to know why. Mr. Slavit stated that the Crystal Springs Gap, along with other key corridors such as Dumbarton and the California Coastal Trail are identified in a separate section as regional high priority projects. He said that the Crystal Springs Trail Gap is on the County's radar and that we can go back and beef up the language to make it clear that these projects are high priorities for the County. He also noted that when the criteria were developed, we wanted to reflect community values, but we also needed to be cognizant of criteria used in various transportation funding programs. In today's environment, many programs are focused on serving low income, transit dependent populations, based on equity and people who may not have another travel option available. As part of that, many funding programs focus on serving people and providing transportation connections where they live, which is a reason why it may have been scored lower based on the criteria. Mr. Slavit noted though that the Plan is a draft and we are currently taking comment on it.

Ms. Dubose mentioned that a data driven approach was used for the Plan prioritization criteria and projects which serve underserved communities, are located in higher density areas, and have higher collision trends, sway how a project is ranked. She stated that a number of other metrics such as community and political support as well as project feasibility are also important and part of another lens that the County will need to consider as it moves forward with the implementation of projects. She also noted that community support a project may have received is somewhat subjective and dependent on who is responding to the Plan material and may not be representative of all community members. She said we can look to better explain the implementation process in the Plan considering these other factors. Member Salinger said that if something is ranked lowest, even when things change, she asked if it still may not be implemented given its ranking. Ms. Dubose said there are a number of different ways to sort and filter the project list. She gave a hypothetical example of a potential funding opportunity becoming available only for certain types of projects in which a lower ranked project might be a better fit and that the prioritization criteria should just be used as an initial indicator of which projects are most likely to fulfill the Plan goals.

Member Langbein said he had a number of specific comments and asked if it was possible to get together with Ms. Dubose, Ms. Malmo Laycock or Mr. Slavit to further discuss. Mr. Slavit said that he and Ms. Malmo-Laycock would be available to have a conversation with him and that he was open to having individual conversations with any of the BPAC members.

Ms. Dubose finished the presentation by noting the upcoming virtual engagement outreach opportunities.

Public member Drew spoke to the prioritization criteria and noted that C/CAG is doing something similar with its Plan. He spoke to the potential for developing two different project lists, one that aligns well with grant program criteria and another for projects that have demonstrated high community support as a way to increase visibility for these other projects without negating projects that align well with funding program criteria. Ms. Dubose mentioned we do have like and dislikes for projects available.

Member Langbein requested that policy language be included to address bike lanes in door zones when roads are repaved, that reconsideration of lane widths be considered to widen bike lanes. He also mentioned that a policy is needed regarding parking in bike lanes and how to implement the provision of parking and bike lanes, noting that on-street parking isn't an automatic right.

## **8. Kings Mountain Road Discussion**

Chair Doherty introduced this item, providing background describing a tragic bicycle fatality on Kings Mountain Road and noted a substantial amount of correspondence received expressing concern over the fatality with suggestions to improve existing conditions. She noted one particular correspondence from Amir Michael, member of the public, regarding reckless activity that had been taking place in a relatively flat area of the road from car enthusiasts putting bicyclists at risk. Mr. Michael shared his personal experience with the BPAC and referred to a photo from his correspondence showing skid marks left on the pavement from motorists testing the performance limits of their cars. Mr. Michael requested improvements be made to prevent future tragedies including improved signage and adding double yellow lane striping. Public member Andrew Hsu noted that he had seen an increase in cyclists using Kings Mountain Road and reiterated the need for safety improvements as outlined in his correspondence.

Chair Doherty asked Mr. Vo what the best practices were for a solution on roads like Kings Mountain Road. Mr. Vo said that he had read the public correspondence received, mentioned their validity and that staff will be looking into the suggestions. He said a staff member from the Public Works Department drove on Kings Mountain Road and took videos. He noted areas between Huddart Park and Skyline, where the center lane line is dashed, and said enhancements could be made. He also mentioned the County's paving schedule and that work is scheduled on Kings Mountain Road in either Fiscal Year 2021 or 2022, but it could be affected by the State budget. He said staff would specifically look into enhancements that could improve visibility and safety. He said some of the enhancements, such as shoulder widening, which involve more structural work and are more costly, may take longer to implement. He reiterated center lane striping and signage could probably happen sooner and that the County would look into funding options to make it possible.

Chair Doherty asked if Mr. Vo could report back at the BPAC's next meeting. Mr. Vo said he could potentially report back sooner. Bill Kelly mentioned it also sounds like there is a law enforcement issue with reckless driving. He asked what the BPAC might be able to do to raise attention to the expressed concerns. He mentioned it's both a design and enforcement issue. Mr. Vo noted that he will try and get the improvements done as soon as possible. Chair Doherty noted that the possibility to raise private funding was mentioned in some of the public correspondence received.

Public member Ken Nishimura spoke and reiterated similar concerns shared by Mr. Hsu recommending safety improvements, specifically for signage for drivers not to pass on blind corners, extending the existing yellow double lane striping, and the installation of turnouts and road widening where possible, and referenced improvements made on Mt Diablo Road. Mr. Kelly asked if there was anything the BPAC wanted to do now to escalate the issue. Member Langbein referred two types of drivers: 1) the hot rodders that ignore all safety rules, and 2) tourists that aren't familiar with windy roads and are



impatient waiting to pass bicyclists. He said signage would be appropriate for the tourists but wouldn't work for the hot rodders and enforcement or speed humps would be needed for them. Mr. Vo said that speed humps wouldn't be appropriate on Kings Mountain Road as that wouldn't be safe. Member Kelly asked that law enforcement attend the meeting and be prepared to discuss strategies they might be able to take. Mr. Slavit said he would look into inviting a CHP contact to speak at the next BPAC meeting. Chair Doherty asked the public members who spoke if they might be willing to reach out to local newspapers to draw attention to the issue and thanked them for sharing their experiences with the BPAC.

## **9. Crystal Springs Trail Gap Update**

Member Elaine Salinger provided an update on this discussion item. She noted that Mr. Hsu has been very active with her for work on this path. She noted this is shown as a low priority in the draft Active Transportation Plan and that it is used as a commute corridor, it's dangerous, there have been accidents and it should be a high priority because there is a lot of interest in it. She said it is only 2.6 miles. She also mentioned that she and a group of her colleagues have a proposal to install a two-way protected bikeway adjacent to Lower Skyline Boulevard and State Route 92 to connect the north end of Canada Road with the south end of the Sawyer Camp Trail. She said it should be less expensive and easier to implement than using the SFPUC fire roads and it was proposed after a lot of the planning work was done in the draft Active Transportation Plan and it is not currently in it. She said the only proposal in the Plan for this area was to widen shoulders. She said widening Lower Skyline is a great idea because it would accommodate vehicular cyclists to ride on the road, however there are lot of families that have to drive to Canada Road because there is no safe way to get there.

Chair Doherty asked what she might need from the BPAC. Member Salinger said she needed support for the project. She reiterated her disappointment that it is listed a low priority project in the Draft Active Transportation Plan. She mentioned that the last people she spoke to with were Mr. Slavit and Ms. Malmo-Laycock and was informed that the County currently doesn't have funding for the project and the highest priority, rightfully so, are the communities where people don't have other transportation options. She said she didn't want to take away from this priority so there is a need to try and find private funding. She said she will seek to provide an on-line petition to raise awareness, particularly with the Board of Supervisors. Chair Doherty mentioned this was part of what the grand jury considered. Member Salinger noted that the grand jury report said this project should happen. Chair Doherty said we should elevate this in the Active Transportation Plan, mention the grand jury report and that resources need to be put into this project, and perhaps private funding could be raised from donations. Member Salinger said she was informed the next step would be to do a feasibility study, which she was informed could cost between \$200,000 and \$300,000. She said it was helpful knowing the potential cost in terms of seeking donations and she will pursue obtaining private funding.

Member Langbein agreed this project needs to be promoted more than it currently is in the draft Active Transportation Plan. He said it is a popular route and the grand jury singled this corridor out for improvements. He understands the County's position is that it currently doesn't have the resources to proceed. Nonetheless it says it needs to be in the bike plan with a reasonably high priority. Chair Doherty noted, in terms of equity, that people use the existing facilities for recreation from all areas of the County.

Drew mentioned that the Active Transportation Plan could have a special section in the main body that addresses a few special projects like this one. He noted the City of San Mateo did this with their Plan for projects that are great things to do but cost a lot of money, like overcrossings. They were projects that the City would like to implement but many other projects could happen for the same cost. The City provided a page for each of these unique projects in their Plan. He said the Crystal Springs Gap could be a fit for this and the County could note the challenges associated with the project, but that there is a lot of support for it and it could be grouped together with other projects and highlighted in the Plan. He also noted it's a major corridor in the C/CAG Plan too.

Mr. Hsu said he wanted to amplify Member Salinger's concerns about this corridor. He said it will not only be used for recreational cyclists, but it is also a major choke point for a growing class of extreme commuters traveling between San Francisco and Mountain View to their destination at a certain high tech company. It is a popular route for these commuters, however there are concerns about this missing gap. He said the two-way bike path could be a solution in bridging the existing gap and making this a more extensive bikeway in the Bay Area. He noted he is working closely with Member Salinger to try and make progress. Chair Doherty asked Mr. Slavitt to make sure this is called out as a priority in the Active Transportation Plan. Mr. Slavitt said he could do that and look into the City of San Mateo's Plan to see how they addressed special "vision" projects.

#### **10. County Updates**

Mr. Slavitt mentioned the status of the recruitment to fill the two open BPAC alternate member positions and said that interviews for prospective candidates would be occurring in early November and that there was a possibility that the two new alternate members could be on board for the BPAC's December meeting.

Mr. Slavitt also reiterated informational items that were previously sent to the BPAC and its interest list via e-mail. He mentioned that the Safe Routes to School Partnership was hosting a Zoom webinar on October 22<sup>nd</sup> at 1:00pm EST about Dropping Enforcement from the 6 E's framework, which would include small group discussion after a brief presentation. He noted that registration is limited to the 1<sup>st</sup> 300 participants.

Mr. Slavitt then noted that the Town of Colma was currently seeking comment on their preferred design concept for the Colma El Camino Real Bike and Pedestrian Improvement Plan. He said that you can learn more and provide feedback on it at: [ColmaElCamino.org](http://ColmaElCamino.org) and that he was informed that the public comment period would be extended through the end of the month.

On a final note Mr. Slavitt mentioned that the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition will be holding an online forum on their Bicycle Network Priority Tool on Monday, October 19<sup>th</sup> that starts at 6:00PM. He noted that the link to both this forum and the Colma Plan were previously sent out with the Agenda Packet.

#### **11. Adjournment**

Chair Doherty requested a motion to adjourn.

*Motion: Member Langbein moved to approve/Member Kelly seconded. The motion carried 5-0.*

The meeting was adjourned at 8:44 PM.