



**REGULAR MEETING of the  
San Mateo County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (SMCBPAC)  
Thursday, February 16, 2023  
7:00 P.M.**

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

On March 17, 2020, the Governor issued Executive Order N-29-20 suspending certain provisions of the Ralph M. Brown Act in order to allow for local bodies to conduct their meetings telephonically or by other means. On June 11, 2021, the Governor issued Executive Order N-08-21 extending the suspension of those provisions to September 2021. On September 16, 2021, the Governor signed AB361, that allows local bodies to continue to conduct meetings through teleconferencing when it has determined by majority vote that as a result of a proclaimed state of emergency, meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees. No physical location will be available for the SMCBPAC meeting.

Public Participation

- \* Written public comments may be emailed to [vcastro1@smcgov.org](mailto:vcastro1@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. TELECONFERENCE MEETING REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE BROWN ACT (Action)**

#### **4. 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 Regular Meeting Agenda; or 3) Committee Members' Reports on the Regular 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.

#### **5. ACTION TO SET AGENDA**

This item is to set the final regular agenda.

#### **REGULAR AGENDA**

**6. Review and Approve December 15, 2022 Meeting Minutes** (Action)

**7. BPAC Member Announcements and Discussion** (Information)

**8. Bay to Sea Trail Feasibility Study** (Information)

**9. BPAC Member Process and Roles** (Information)

**10. Unincorporated County Bicycle and Pedestrian Collision Report**  
(Information)

**11. Draft BPAC 2023 Work Plan** (Action)

**12. 2023 BPAC Neighborhood Responsibilities** (Action)

**13. Future BPAC In-Person Meeting Location** (Action)

**14. County Updates** (Information)

**15. 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 [vcastro1@smcgov.org](mailto:vcastro1@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 SMCBPAC 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 February 16, 2023 SMCBPAC meeting may be accessed through Zoom online at: <https://smcgov.zoom.us/j/98215054624>.

The meeting ID is: 982 1505 4624. The February 16, 2023 SMCBPAC meeting may also be accessed via telephone by dialing US: +1 (669) 900-6833 (Local). Enter the meeting ID: 982 1505 4624, 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 Vanessa Castro, Sustainability Specialist – Active Transportation, at least 24 hours before the meeting at [vcastro1@smcgov.org](mailto:vcastro1@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, December 15, 2022

7:00 P.M.

#### 1. WELCOME

Chair Zyda called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm.

#### 2. ROLL CALL

##### Members Present:

Fred Zyda  
Elaine Salinger  
Bill Kelly  
John Langbein  
Annie Tsai

##### Members Absent:

Cristina Aquino  
Susan Doherty

**County Staff:** Joel Slavitt, Vanessa Castro, Khoa Vo

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

#### 3. TELECONFERENCE MEETING REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE BROWN ACT (Action)

Chair Zyda provided background on the new teleconference meeting requirements under the Brown Act and that the BPAC would need to pass a motion, due to the continuing COVID-19 pandemic state of emergency, if it desired to continue its meeting remotely via teleconference, as meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees

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

#### 4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Before the public comment period proceeded, Mr. Slavitt briefly explained procedural logistics for receiving public comment for virtual Zoom meetings. No public comments were shared at this time.

## **5. ACTION TO SET AGENDA**

Chair Zyda introduced this item to set the final regular agenda.

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

## **REGULAR AGENDA**

### **6. Review and Approve October 20, 2022, Meeting Minutes (Action)**

Member Langbein recommended a slight change to page four of the meeting minutes, stating that a comment pertaining to the agenda item for the Local Road Safety Plan, with regard to the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS), should read that the Plan incorporates “ the only available source of data”.

*Motion: Chair Zyda moved to approve with Member Langbein’s proposed changes. Member Langbein seconded. The motion carried 5-0.*

### **7. BPAC Member Announcements and Discussion (Information)**

Member Langbein shared that the County recently released its 90 percent plans for the Santa Cruz/ Alameda del las Pulgas Improvement Project and noted concerns regarding transition zones at the “Y” intersection and bike lane widths. Member Langbein said he would send comment to the County before the plans are finalized. Member Kelly suggested that the BPAC prepare a letter if the plans need to be adjusted for this project. Member Langbein recommended agendaing this item for the February 2023 BPAC meeting. Mr. Vo, Deputy Public Works Director, said that the plans will be finalized and taken to the Board of Supervisors for approval and adoption and that comment should be received before the end of January 2023.

Mr. Vo said the Department welcomed public comment, however, there would be no guarantee comments could be incorporated. Mr. Vo stated that the bike lanes can’t be made wider without impacting the rest of the roadway, and that any changes to the plans need to be within the constraints of the existing right of way. Member Langbein clarified that his comments regarding bike lanes referred mostly to the painted lines, not necessarily expanding the public right of way. In response to Member Langbein’s clarification, Mr. Vo stated that transition zones with the dashed green stripping are intended to help drivers and cyclists recognize the conflict zones and serve as a reminder to traverse the area with caution to increase safety for all roadway users.

Member Kelly shared that he witnessed what appeared to be a serious collision involving a truck and cyclist on November 7<sup>th</sup> near Sand Hill and Whiskey Hill Roads. He said he expected to see an article about the collision in local newspapers but couldn’t find coverage of it. Member Kelly suggested adding a standing agenda item to report on bicycle and pedestrian fatalities and serious injuries in the County during the proceeding period. He said he was concerned about the reliability of the data that is available, and this incident underscored how little people know what is happening throughout the County. Member Kelly inquired whether it is within the capacity of the County to provide this information at every BPAC meeting. Mr. Slavit stated that he would reach out to law enforcement about this. Member Kelly added that it could be a step forward if there were a standing process to provide this data at BPAC on an ongoing basis.

Member Langbein stated that the Town of Atherton's BPAC has a standing item in which their Police Department provides maps of where they cited pedestrians and cyclists, noting that in most instances, people were issued warnings as opposed to citations as an educational measure.

Member Salinger noted that she and Craig Davis, member of the public, met with George Dale, member of the public, who was trying to connect with Sheriff-Elect Corpus to bring her up to speed with various community groups that want to see the Sheriff's department respond differently and improve the lines of communication.

Bruce Dughi, member of the public, added that the Alameda County BPAC has a collision report at every meeting as a standing agenda item.

## **8. Coastal Trail Study (Information)**

Mr. Slavitt introduced Rachael Faye and Bryana Whitney from the Peninsula Open Space Trust (POST), and Liz Westbrook from the Zander Design consultant team. This was an informational presentation on the Southern San Mateo County Coastal Trail Study to raise awareness of the study, inform the BPAC of progress, and share opportunities for input and participation.

Member Kelly inquired whether the trail is intended to be a purely recreational trail, or if it will be more functional for bike travel. Ms. Westbrook replied that the trail is recreational, where it may be a natural surface trail, but that in some places it may also be a Class I bikeway. Ms. Westbrook also noted that the Town of Pescadero is interested in incorporating Safe Routes to School on Pescadero Creek Road.

Member Tsai asked Ms. Westbrook to speak to her experience improving road crossings. Ms. Westbrook stated that the first step is to consider site distance to determine if the crossing location is feasible. She said some improvements might be more informal, such as signage indicating a pedestrian crossing. She said that design can also include elements such as striping, and rectangular rapid flashing beacons, and that all of these could occur on State Route 1 and would need to be approved by Caltrans. She said that other segments, such as Pescadero Creek Road, would require higher levels of design and engineering, but the study wasn't ready to approach this yet.

Member Salinger asked if there was any collision data available along State Route 1, and if so, if that could be incorporated into the study. Ms. Westbrook shared that a fatality occurred along the corridor during the preparation of Study and that within the Study area there have been 10 bicycle and pedestrian involved collisions within a 5-year period. She said there have been some proposed pedestrian under-crossings at the San Gregorio intersection. She said the goal has been to capture as much data as they have access to, with safety in mind. She noted that there were no reported crashes on Pescadero Creek Road, but there were likely many near misses. She added that the Study incorporates community stories and qualitative data.

Member Langbein noted that it seemed like the plans involve putting much of the trail in Caltrans alignment and asked if people realize how close they will be to vehicular traffic.

Ms. Westbrook replied that the highest response from the study survey indicated a preference to include vegetation as a barrier. She also shared that they are exploring solutions for areas in which this level of separation is not possible, such as building metal or concrete barriers at certain pinch points. She said that POST's goal is to have the trail be off the road as much as possible.

In response to Ms. Westbrook's answer, Member Langbein asked what this Study was going to do to ease the stress along different pinch points? He said that riding off road may work for some people, but for those who want to ride on the road, the bridges along State Route 1 can be dangerous. Ms. Westbrook said that any time Caltrans works on a bridge, they must add pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and Caltrans has San Gregorio and Pescadero Creek Bridges on their work plan, and that POST was actively working with Caltrans to help shape that work.

Ms. Faye noted that there are several gaps in the coastal trail that are constrained by terrain or private property. As a result, they were prompted to look at the feasibility of using Caltrans right of way and how to make the user experience pleasant.

Member Tsai noted that there are a lot of people who park along the highway. From her perspective, the question of safe parking is related to safe crossing, and she wanted to see that included in the conversation. Ms. Westbrook replied that parking is not part of the study scope, but segment 7 of the study area allows for a parking concept design.

Bruce Dughi said that he was glad to hear under-crossings were being considered.

#### **9. Caltrans District 4 Bike Highway Study (Information)**

Mr. Slavitt introduced Greg Currey, Senior Transportation Planner and Bicycle and Pedestrian Branch Chief from Caltrans District 4. Mr. Currey provided an informational presentation on the Caltrans Bay Area Bike Highway Study regarding the study background, purpose, results, and next steps.

Member Kelly inquired about the opportunities identified in the Study, specifically recalling the opportunity to connect San Bruno to Redwood City by building a bike highway parallel to State Route 82 or one that runs parallel to the Caltrain tracks. He asked if Caltrans would only consider State Route 82, since it is within the Caltrans right of way, or if it objectively was considered the most feasible alternative. Mr. Currey responded that the Study's focus was primarily along Caltrans right of way and that the Study did not examine adjacent corridors. However, he noted that if a good opportunity were to arise in a parallel corridor, Caltrans would provide its support.

Member Salinger observed that Caltrans has control of a two-mile stretch of roadway parallel to Highway 280 along Lower Skyline Boulevard that could open a major thoroughfare for bicycling. She said that it has the potential to be a more cost-effective option for faster and safer commuting for cyclists from San Bruno to Redwood City. Mr. Currey responded that Caltrans would be updating its project list in 2023, and that if this was not already on the list, it could be a good candidate.

Member Tsai shared her enthusiasm to see El Camino Real being considered for the Bike Highway. She said that if there is an equity lens on bike usage, completing this project in a high-density area where people are primarily using bikes out of necessity would be advised, and hoped to see Caltrans prioritize those segments first. Member Langbein posed that it is good to have plans and funding but believes there are land use issues in the area that need to be addressed. He said El Camino Real is largely comprised of on-street parking and travel lanes, and a bike highway would come with significant tradeoffs. He expressed concern with convincing the public, including elected officials, that building bicycle facilities in this area is beneficial, since parking is at a premium along El Camino Real. He said that Caltrans should carefully navigate this issue. Mr. Currey agreed with Member Langbein and shared that there has been a shift at Caltrans, and that the agency is moving towards a safe system approach. He said past approaches have historically been reactive, and Caltrans was beginning to identify corridors



based on roadway conditions to proactively make safety improvements. He said that Caltrans is willing to make some politically challenging decisions.

Ms. Westbrook noted that State Route 1 was considered but not prioritized. She said POST is mostly focusing on recreational riding, and regularly sees long distance cyclists along State Route 1. She asked if the Caltrans Study could leverage some of the bike highway momentum to set up a braided system of recreation and commuter ridership. Mr. Currey stated that he does not view this Study as being only applicable to bike highway corridors. Caltrans is gradually moving towards understanding that spot improvements are not enough and there is greater interest in connecting the bike network. He said Caltrans is adding more tools to support bike and pedestrian projects, such as the [Bikeway Facility Selection Guidance](#).

Ms. Westbrook asked if there are ways that Caltrans can document near misses. Mr. Currey shared that there is currently no official way to document this data, as there are no Caltrans-owned resources to document this, but they do make use of the data on the SafeTrec Street Story database, which documents recorded near misses.

#### **10. Follow-up on Local Roadway Safety Plan Data Collection Sources (Information)**

Mr. Slavitt introduced speakers Craig Davis, founder of CyclistVideoEvidence.com and Khoa Vo, San Mateo County Department of Public Works Deputy Director as speakers for this item. Mr. Davis made a presentation titled “Accurately Documenting and Analyzing Cyclists Threat” and Mr. Vo provided his response to the presentation.

Following the presentation, Mr. Vo stated acknowledged the relevance of near misses and that future updates on the County’s Local Road Safety Plan (LRSP) could consider including such informal data. He noted that the County isn’t able to provide preferential treatment to contract with a specific vendor to obtain data and would need to go through a formal procurement process.

Member Kelly stated that he didn’t agree with the proposal to encourage all cyclists to ride with a camera and said such a policy could discourage people from riding and become a barrier to access. Mr. Davis noted that other jurisdictions around the world, where cycling is more common, have stronger policies that protect bicyclists. Member Kelly said the issue of riding with cameras had been discussed at BPAC on numerous occasions and isn’t likely to be resolved at this level.

Member Langbein referred to a disclosure shared on the Transportation Injury Mapping System (TIMS) website stating the data and information accessed through its website was for informational purposes only and not meant to be a reliable source of data. Member Langbein questioned why projects still justify using the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS). He commented on the conversation about riding with cameras and said many cyclists can easily afford cameras but also noted that there is a large population that can’t afford a camera or a computer to upload their near-miss encounters. He said if user-uploaded websites don’t include this population, it’s likely that this data set would miss key roadway segments, particularly those in areas of high equity concern.

Member Salinger asked Mr. Vo, that if SWITRS data is unreliable and unusable, then what is the resolution? Mr. Vo replied that the general public can bring concerns regarding data from SWITRS to the State, which has its own way to validate or add new data sets. He encouraged members of the public to reach out to the State and offer feedback on ways to update, revise or add additional information. He also said that agencies such as the County, must use formal standardized data from sources, such as

SWITRS, which is relevant when seeking grant funds. He said when a data source is standardized, public agencies can make greater use of it.

Member Salinger agreed with Mr. Vo but expressed concern for something to be done to support the collection of near miss data. She said she would like to add this as a future agenda item and would like to strategize on who to contact at the State to begin a conversation for Caltrans to stop relying on SWITRS. Member Langbein stated that the BPAC can form a sub-committee, or the County can raise the point to the State, but that local agencies should lean on the State to come up with a serious way of conducting studies to have meaningful statistics and data detailing near-misses.

Member Kelly commented that he appreciated Mr. Vo's comments and ability to defend the County's stance, but his thought was that the BPAC should take their concerns to the public. He said that many people who ride know someone who has suffered near misses or collisions with drivers and believed that they may need to consider other channels to be productive.

Bruce Dughi shared that he rides for transportation purposes and doesn't leave home without a \$20 camera, and that his daughters also ride with cameras. Mr. Dughi said he had participated as an Active Transportation Program grant reader and noted that readers often look for innovation and would look at near miss data favorably. He shared that one of his daughters had a collision with a car and the police didn't want to take a report unless property damage was recorded. He also shared that Mr. Davis met with Caltrans Active Transportation Program leaders, and they agreed to allow near-miss data. Mr. Vo stated that near miss data can be included in grant applications but that it needs to be specifically called out and clarified as supplemental data.

Steve Lubin, member of the public, shared comment via e-mail expressing concern that the County doesn't use full and reliable data sources to track traffic incidents involving bicycles. Rob Waring, member of the public, shared that he had reported incidents to local law enforcement and they didn't seem supportive of tracking near misses. He said that a legislative change could mandate Caltrans to gather this data in a way that includes near misses to improve data collection. He suggested individuals raise these concerns with local elected officials. He also noted that camera use is a question of cultural practice and comfort level and that in England, cameras are commonly used, including by bicyclists. Member Langbein stated that it has proven challenging to use cameras in public to cite for speeding and this innovation has not led to any significant changes.

Mr. Davis added that Cyclist Video Evidence is unique because the videos uploaded focus on specific incidents, as opposed to surveillance video, speed cameras, license plate readers, or traffic light cameras, which are always on and capture all activity in the area.

#### **11. Draft BPAC 2023 Work Plan (Information)**

Mr. Slavik provided an overview of the 2023 work plan as an informational item and said it would come back to the BPAC at its February 2023 meeting as an action item.

Member Langbein recommended that the County's annual road resurfacing program and information about ongoing street resurfacing projects be consolidated as a single line item. Member Salinger said she wanted to add that BPAC needs to strategize ways to encourage the State to accept non-standardized data with solutions and action.

Member Kelly asked if BPAC members could collectively write Op-eds, signing as BPAC members, to raise awareness of alternative data sources to the general public. Mr. Slavitt noted that the BPAC can make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors, but said he would check with County counsel to confirm if this was within the BPAC's authorized role.

Member Salinger shared that she co-leads SMC Citizens Climate Lobby, and members are trained to lobby legislators. She said that she knows of effective and respectful techniques and could help get legislation from elected officials and would be happy to help organize, if allowed.

## **12. Election of Committee Chair and Vice-Chair for Calendar Year 2023 (Action)**

Member Kelly nominated Member Salinger for Committee Chair.

*Motion: Member Kelly moved to elect Member Salinger as Committee Chair. Chair Zyda seconded. The motion carried 5-0.*

Member Kelly nominated Member Langbein as Vice-Chair.

*Motion: Member Kelly moved to elect Member Langbein as Vice-Chair. Chair Zyda seconded. The motion carried 5-0.*

## **13. County Updates (Information)**

Mr. Slavitt provided information on County updates.

He shared that two unincorporated County projects received funding from the San Mateo County Transportation Authority's recent Call for Projects from their Bicycle and Pedestrian Program. He said the County was awarded \$4 million for the construction of the Santa Cruz/Alameda de las Pulgas Complete Streets Project and \$890,000 to fund a project initiation document (PID) for the Alpine Road Corridor Improvement Project.

Mr. Slavitt also shared that per the County Executive Office's October 2022 Memo, the BPAC will begin reconvening in-person starting with its April 2023 meeting. He said that the BPAC's prior in-person meeting location, at the San Mateo Martin Luther King Center, now closes before 9:00 pm, and if the BPAC continued to meet there, meetings would need to end at 8:30pm. Mr. Slavitt asked if BPAC members were open to meet from 6:30 P.M. to 8:30 P.M. to accommodate the Martin Luther King Center hours of operation, or if they would prefer to move to a different location.

Member Langbein recalled that the BPAC used to meet at the San Mateo City Hall and ask if that space is available for BPAC use. Mr. Slavitt noted that staff would look into it. Member Kelly shared that he was in favor of meeting at a location that had a two-hour limit for meetings. Member Salinger said she supported an earlier meeting time.

Member Kelly asked Mr. Slavitt to send a short list of meeting location options to the BPAC prior to the next meeting.

Member Langbein stated that the Martin Luther King Center requires attendees to

drive to the meeting location, and parking is difficult in the area. Member Salinger shared that in her neighborhood there is a community center called Highlands Recreation Center that could be a central location for future BPAC meetings, but that it may have a charge associated with its meeting space use.

Member Tsai noted that there are County facilities located on Tower Road in San Mateo that could be available for use.

Mr. Slavitt added that there is space available at the County's facilities in Redwood City and asked that BPAC members follow up with him via e-mail with further thoughts on the subject or suggestions for meeting locations.

#### **14. Adjournment**

Chair Zyda introduced this item.

*Member Kelly moved to approve, and Member Langbein seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0.*

The meeting adjourned at 9:41 pm.