



**REGULAR MEETING of the
San Mateo County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (SMCBPAC)
Thursday, August 17, 2023
7:00 P.M.**

455 County Center, Conference Room 101
Redwood City, CA 94063

***** HYBRID MEETING – IN-PERSON AND BY VIDEOCONFERENCE *****

This meeting of the SMCBPAC will be held in Room 101 at 455 County Center, Redwood City, CA 94063. Members of the public will be able to participate in the meeting remotely via the Zoom platform or in person at Room 101 at 455 County Center, Redwood City, CA 94063. For information regarding how to participate in the meeting, either in person or remotely, please refer to the instructions at the end of the agenda.

Public Participation:

The August 17, 2023, SMCBPAC meeting may be accessed through Zoom online at <https://smcgov.zoom.us/j/98215054624>. The webinar ID is: 982 1505 4624. The August 17, 2023, SMCBPAC meeting may also be accessed via telephone by dialing (669) 900-6833. Enter the webinar ID: Webinar ID: 982 1505 4624, then press #. Members of the public can also attend this meeting physically in Room 101 at 455 County Center, Redwood City, CA 94063.

*Written public comments may be emailed to vcastro1@smcgov.org and such written comments should indicate the specific agenda item on which you are commenting.

*Spoken public comments will be accepted during the meeting in person or remotely through Zoom at the option of the speaker. Public comments via Zoom will be taken first, followed by speakers in person.

***Please see instructions for written and spoken public comments at the end of this agenda.**

ADA Requests

Individuals who require special assistance or a disability related modification or accommodation to participate in this meeting, or who have a disability and wish to request an alternative format for the meeting, should contact Vanessa Castro, Sustainability Specialist – Active Transportation, as early as possible but no later than 24 hours before the meeting at vcastro1@smcgov.org. Notification in advance of the meeting will enable the County to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting, the materials related to it, and your ability to comment

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 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.

4. **ACTION TO SET AGENDA**

This item is to set the final regular agenda.

REGULAR AGENDA

5. **Review and Approve June 15, 2023 Meeting Minutes** (Action)
6. **BPAC Member Announcements and Discussion** (Information)
7. **Coleman and Ringwood Avenues Transportation Study** (Information)
8. **Pilot Cyclist Camera Program** (Action)
9. **Proposal to Lower Speed Limit on County Roads Near Schools**
(Information)
10. **County Updates** (Information)
11. **Adjournment**

***Instructions for Public Comment During Hybrid Meetings**

During hybrid meetings of the SMCBPAC, members of the public may address the Members of the SMCBPAC 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.
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 Members of the SMCBPAC and made publicly available on the agenda website under the specific item to which your comment pertains. If emailed comments are received less than 24 hours before the meeting, the SMCBPAC staff will make every effort to either (i) provide such emailed comments to the SMCBPAC and make such emails publicly available on the agenda website prior to the meeting, or (ii) read such emails during the meeting. Whether such emailed comments are forwarded and posted, or are read during the meeting, they will still be included in the administrative record.

***Spoken Comments**

In person Participation:

1. If you wish to speak to the SMCPAC please fill out a speaker's slip. If you have anything that you wish distributed to the SMCBPAC and included in the official record, please hand it to SMCBPAC staff who will distribute the information to the SMCBPAC members.

Via Teleconference (Zoom):

1. The August 17, 2023, SMCBPAC meeting may be accessed through Zoom online at <https://smcgov.zoom.us/j/98215054624>. The webinar ID is: 982 1505 4624. The August 17, 2023, SMCBPAC meeting may also be accessed via telephone by dialing (669) 900-6833. Enter the webinar ID: Webinar ID: 982 1505 4624, then press #. Members of the public can also attend this meeting physically in Room 101 at 455 County Center, Redwood City, CA 94063.
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 or SMCBPAC staff calls for the item on which you wish to speak, click on "raise hand." Speakers will be notified shortly before they are called to speak.

***Additional Information:**

For any questions or concerns regarding Zoom, including troubleshooting, privacy, or security settings, please contact Zoom directly.

Public records that relate to any item on the open session agenda for a regular SMCBPAC meeting are available for public inspection. Those records that are distributed less than 72 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 SMCBPAC.



San Mateo County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (SMCBPAC)

Meeting Minutes Thursday, June 15, 2023 7:00 P.M.

455 County Center, Conference Room 101
Redwood City, CA 94063

***** HYBRID MEETING – IN-PERSON AND BY VIDEOCONFERENCE *****

1. WELCOME

Chair Salinger called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

2. ROLL CALL

Members Present:

Elaine Salinger
John Langbein
Cristina Aquino
Fred Zyda

Members Absent:

Annie Tsai
Susan Doherty

County Staff Present: Joel Slavit, Vanessa Castro, Cassandra Matter, Captain Mark Myers, Paul Sheng, Juda Tolmasoff

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

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mike Swire, member of the public, commented on high vehicular speeds near schools and noted he would like to help schools located in Unincorporated San Mateo County. Mr. Swire asked the BPAC for its support for the County to adopt an ordinance in support of slower speeds near schools.

4. ACTION TO SET AGENDA

Chair Salinger introduced the item.

Motion: Vice Chair Langbein moved to approve, Member Zyda seconded. The motion carried 4-0

REGULAR AGENDA

5. Review and Approve April 20, 2023 Meeting Minutes (Action)

Chair Salinger introduced the item.

Motion: Vice Chair Langbein moved to approve, Chair Salinger seconded. The motion carried 4-0.

6. BPAC Member Announcements and Discussion (Information)

Vice Chair Langbein provided an update on the PG&E closure of the Ralston Trail. He shared that after attempting to work with PG&E for many months, he wasn't successful reaching out to reopen the trail for cyclist use. Vice Chair Langbein also shared that at an Atherton BPAC meeting he attended, there was discussion about Class II bike lanes with buffers and Class IV protected bikeways on El Camino Real. He also spoke to the County Department of Public Work's Alameda De Las Pulgas/Santa Cruz Improvement Project. He shared that he had been working with West Menlo Park residents and thought that the project plans could be improved to reduce speeding. Vice Chair Langbein recommended reducing the travel lane width to 10 ft. He also shared that he was scheduling a meeting with County Executive Officer Mike Callagy, Public Works Director Ann Stillman, and Public Works Deputy Director Krzysztof Lisaj to discuss further.

Chair Salinger added that the Ralston Trail closure negatively impacted bike connectivity and stated that she would like the BPAC to address improving Sheep Camp Trail, as it is heavily eroded. Vice Chair Langbein noted that the trail is maintained by San Mateo County Parks. Chair Salinger stated that it could be an inexpensive improvement by adding a bike trail between Cañada Road and the Camp Sawyer Trail extension. She added that she had been in contact with Greg Currey from Caltrans to ask about upcoming opportunities to work on this trail.

7. Sheriff's Office New Online Incident Reporting System (Information)

Captain Myers, with the San Mateo County Sheriff's Department, shared information about their Online Incident Reporting System for bicycle complaints and brief updates regarding road closures along State Route 84.

Chair Salinger stated that she would not share the press release until the incident reporting system could allow video uploading and the ability to share violations with other law enforcement agencies could be incorporated.

Captain Myers noted that San Mateo County is the only law enforcement agency offering this service and he couldn't commit to providing a timeline for other agencies' ability to incorporate the system. Chair Salinger asked if the Sheriff's Department plans to update the press release once they are added and inquired about the status of working with other law enforcement agencies to encourage them to adopt a similar process. Captain Myers stated that he would make an announcement at an upcoming County-wide police chiefs meeting.

Giuliano Carlini, member of the public, shared that he was in favor of the reporting system and had encouraged the City of Belmont to incorporate a similar initiative. Bruce Dughi, member of the public, also shared that he supported the new system. Mr. Dughi stated that Alameda County also has an

incident reporting system that does not require video or photographs. He added that educational measures should not require photo or video evidence. He also said three-foot letters are issued in Alameda County.

Chair Salinger asked Mr. Dughi to clarify whether the California Highway Patrol or Alameda County Sheriff's Department issue warning letters. Mr. Dughi responded that it was California Highway Patrol. Chair Salinger noted that in most of the unincorporated San Mateo County, the California Highway Patrol is responsible for traffic enforcement, and the California Highway Patrol does not send 3-foot violation warning letters. She added that she would like to agendize discussion for this item again and for people to share the same comments with California Highway Patrol representation present.

Matt Turner, member of the public, shared that he rides with a camera and a screenshot of the violation provides enough evidence for law enforcement. Mr. Turner encouraged San Mateo County to adopt Alameda County's policies regarding 3-foot violations. Mr. Swire shared his support for moving in the direction of Alameda County to remove the photo evidence requirement.

8. Pilot Cyclist Camera Program (Information)

Chair Salinger introduced this item with Mr. Craig Davis, founder of CyclistVideoEvidence.org, who presented on a proposed pilot cyclist camera program to document near-miss data for cyclists.

Mr. Slavik asked Mr. Davis to clarify what he was requesting from the County with regards to this item and if he could speak to similar pilots supported by other local agencies. Mr. Davis responded that Mr. Dughi and Mr. Turner have both been working with the California Highway Patrol to create a 3-foot violation warning letter template. Additionally, Mr. Davis shared that he had led grassroots efforts across California, working on numerous proposals with several jurisdictions. Mr. Davis stated that the San Mateo County proposal could be a 20,000-hour program that provides 10 cameras and miscellaneous accessories, such as a bicycle mount, a secure digital (SD) card, and an SD Card reader to 10 pilot participants. He estimated the approximate cost of the pilot to be \$22,000. Mr. Slavik noted that there are general considerations that would need to be addressed if participation were to be requested from the County, such as privacy and civil liberty concerns. He also shared that staff capacity to implement a pilot would also be a concern. Mr. Davis stated that his pilot helps cyclists work with law enforcement to report bicycle safety incidents. Chair Salinger commented about privacy concerns and shared that the program is incident-based and would not be considered surveillance.

Mr. Slavik asked how Cyclist Video Evidence would ensure that cameras are used appropriately. Mr. Davis responded that if funding the cameras is an issue for the County, Cyclist Video Evidence could fund them. Vice Chair Langbein asked to see an itemized breakdown of the proposed \$22,000 budget. Mr. Davis shared that this was addressed in the proposal.

Member of the public, Steve Lubin, shared that he found CyclistVideoEvidence.com to be a valuable program that would incorporate technology and cyclist safety initiatives. Mr. Carlini shared that he was in support of this pilot. He noted that the program is education-based and not punitive. Regarding the concern about privacy, Mr. Carlini noted that if the evidence captured is in the public right of way, video evidence is legal. Mr. Swire said he also supported the effort. He also agreed that that privacy concerns should not be an issue and added that the removal of traffic cameras across the County has negatively impacted driver behavior. He suggested extending the pilot to drivers as well and to provide an opportunity for them to submit video evidence as well. Mr. Dughi also shared his support of the pilot and noted that Mr. Davis and his program assists cyclists to effectively navigate the legal system. He also

shared his view that privacy concerns with cameras in public domain are not an issue. Mr. Turner spoke in support of the pilot program and said he had participated in the program in Alameda County.

Vice Chair Langbein commented that including vehicles could be a good opportunity to expand the pilot. Chair Salinger shared that she would like to discuss next steps and proposed that the BPAC write a letter of support for the pilot. Mr. Slavik clarified that County staff would need to work out concerns associated with the pilot prior to County participation. Vice Chair Langbein asked Mr. Slavik if there are technical issues regarding the procurement process. Mr. Slavik stated if the County were to participate in a pilot program with a vendor, that the request would need to go through an open and fair procurement process. Mr. Davis responded that the County should consider the San Mateo County Community College District's sole source procurement guidelines. Paul Sheng, County Counsel, noted that the County has an administrative memo that guides sole source procurement and documents recent changes. He shared that the County was moving toward a model in which the County Executive Officer must approve the sole source provider.

9. North Fair Oaks Bicycle and Pedestrian Railroad Crossing and Community Connections Study Update (Information)

Mr. Slavik, Senior Sustainability Specialist with the San Mateo County Office of Sustainability, presented an update on the North Fair Oaks Bicycle and Pedestrian Railroad Crossing and Community Connections Study, focusing on the recently completed round of community engagement and the rail crossing options.

Vice Chair Langbein raised his concern about the height requirements for the proposed bridge crossings and noted that other areas of the rail corridor have lower bridges. He asked why the proposed Study bridge crossings had to be so much higher. Mr. Slavik responded that Caltrain isn't rebuilding existing bridge crossings and that the bridge crossing options in the Study are proposed and not existing. He also noted that the County was informed that there are higher vertical clearance requirements in the Study area due to the number of tracks in a relatively constrained area where Electrification infrastructure was being erected. He also shared that the high voltage electrification wires could not be located outside of the Caltrain corridor above County road right of way. Mr. Slavik noted that a separate study would be required, likely outside the timeframe of the current Study, to determine if it might be feasible to lower the height of the wires, but that would be dependent on Caltrain's decision to permit a bridge crossing. He noted that the current Study is just the first step in the process, should the County decide to move forward with a potential new rail crossing.

Chair Salinger asked if a shuttle bus for the residents was considered as an option. Vice Chair Langbein inquired about the cost for a grade-separated crossing for automobiles and how it compares to a grade-separated pedestrian and bicycle crossing. Mr. Slavik referenced the estimated cost of a proposed grade-separated road crossing cost over the Caltrain tracks from approximately 5 years ago at over \$300 million. In response to Chair Salinger's question, Mr. Slavik shared that the most efficient transportation system provides a variety of different travel options for all users. He said the Study is in an equity priority area of the County, where not everyone has access to a car.

Mr. Lubin shared that he has participated in different architectural projects in the region, and he found that the large grade change made the overcrossing unattractive. Mr. Lubin noted that Redwood City was exploring options to change the grade of the railroad and asked if Caltrain was exploring similar solutions. Mr. Slavik agreed that a separated at-grade bicycle and pedestrian crossing would be much more convenient for the community, but it would be significantly more expensive to raise the railroad tracks.

Member Zyda stated that there were not any great solutions, and he was in support of the tunnel undercrossing, due to its shorter crossing distance. Additionally, Member Zyda noted that he previously lived in the Study area and shared that the tracks present a big problem to residents. He said there is a clear need for a new railroad crossing and from his perspective, he would be willing to accept an imperfect solution because it's better than having nothing done.

10. County Updates (Information)

Joel Slavit and Vanessa Castro provided County Updates.

Mr. Slavit shared that he was in discussion with the County Executive Office about the recruitment to fill the vacancy for Bill Kelly's prior position. Chair Salinger asked if there was an interest in prioritizing the Coastside in the recruitment efforts. Mr. Slavit responded that members of the BPAC are welcome to reach out to any interested parties. Vice Chair Langbein asked if the vacancy is in Supervisor Mueller's District. Mr. Slavit responded that up to two BPAC members can reside in any one Supervisorial District. He said that District 4, Supervisor Slocum's District, was currently at-capacity.

Mr. Slavit also shared that he was in contact with Caltrans regarding a bicycle and pedestrian improvement project on El Camino Real adjacent to North Fair Oaks and informed the BPAC that a community meeting would be held late June and that he would send meeting information, when released, to the BPAC.

Ms. Castro shared that the Coleman and Ringwood Study Survey was open from May 26th until June 16th. She said the survey provided respondents the opportunity to opine on proposed alternatives for four key focus areas along the Study corridors. She noted that the alternatives were developed with community input received during the first phase of outreach, from technical and community advisory committees, and the Study workshop held on May 4th. Ms. Castro stated that the goal was to move toward a community-preferred alternative.

Ms. Castro also provided an update on the Bay to Sea Trail Feasibility Study. She said the Study team completed the physical constraints analysis, the first round of community engagement, and in the most recent coalition meeting, route planning considered both short and long-term options and long term goals. Chair Salinger asked when the next round of community engagement would begin. Ms. Castro shared that she would reach out to the Study lead and respond.

Ms. Castro provided an update on the Coastal Trail Feasibility Study and shared that the Study was nearly complete. As a reminder, she noted that the Study was a project of POST in partnership with Caltrans, and the goal was to coordinate with several other public agency partners to connect the California Coastal Trail.

11. Adjournment

Chair Salinger introduced the item.

Motion: Chair Salinger moved to approve, and Vice Chair Langbein seconded. The motion carried 4-0.

The meeting adjourned at 8:48.