



**SPECIAL VIRTUAL MEETING of the
San Mateo County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (SMCBPAC)
Thursday, May 21, 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 jmalmolaycock@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 February 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. Discussion on Lower Skyline (State Route 35) between Bunker Hill Road and State Route 92** (Information)
- 9. County Updates** (Information)
- 10. 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 jmalmolaycock@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 by at least 10 am on the day 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 after 10 am on the day of the meeting will be read during the meeting but such emails 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 May 21, 2020 SMCBPAC meeting may be accessed through Zoom online at <https://smcgov.zoom.us/j/92864072174>
The meeting ID is: 928 6407 2174. The May 21, 2020 SMCBPAC meeting may also be accessed via telephone by dialing US: +1 669 900 6833 (Local). Enter the meeting ID: 928 6407 2174, 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 Special 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 and Julia Malmo-Laycock, Resource Conservation Specialist II by 10 am the day of the meeting at jmalmolaycock@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

Martin Luther King Center Conference Room

City of San Mateo, California

Thursday, February 20, 2020

7:00pm

1. WELCOME

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

2. ROLL CALL

Members Present:

William Kelly (presided as Chair due to absences)

Frederick Zyda

John Langbein (alternate)

Members Absent:

Dianna Butcher

Susan Doherty

Natalie Gore

Elaine Salinger (alternate)

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

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

3. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

No public comments were received.

4. ACTION TO SET AGENDA

Chair Kelly requested a motion to set the agenda.

Motion: Alternate Member Langbein moved to approve/Member Zyda seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

REGULAR AGENDA

5. **Review and Approve December 19, 2019 Meeting Minutes**

Chair Kelly requested approval to adopt the December 19, 2019 Meeting Minutes.

The minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

6. BPAC Member Announcements and Discussion

Chair Kelly asked for any announcements from BPAC members, seeing none the Chair moved on to Item 7.

7. Presentation on the Alameda de las Pulgas /Santa Cruz Avenue Improvement Project

Harry Yip, traffic engineer from the County Department of Public Works, presented the Alameda de las Pulgas (ADLP)/Santa Cruz Avenue Safety Improvements Project. Mr. Yip stated that in early 2017, a Task Force was created to address the needs of different users in the Corridor from Sand Hill Road, in the south, on Santa Cruz Avenue to the ADLP heading north toward Atherton.

Chair Kelly asked the other BPAC members if they could visualize the location. He noted there is a lot of dense traffic coming from many different locations heading north on Santa Cruz Avenue to the Y intersection where Santa Cruz Avenue veers toward downtown Menlo Park and the ADLP continues north. He noted that it's been a very difficult space that the BPAC has talked about previously.

Mr. Yip stated that in 2018 a questionnaire was distributed to the community to gather basic information on wants and needs in the corridor. Based on feedback received, seven different proposals were initially developed, traffic analysis was conducted and the proposals were further refined. In January 2019, a community meeting was held, with roughly 150 people in attendance, to receive input from local residents, and cyclists and motorists that travel through the corridor. Different alternatives were presented for each part of the corridor: the Santa Cruz segment, the Y intersection, and the ADLP segment. Mr. Yip noted that a public survey was released and that Public Works was in the process of gathering feedback. He noted that the Task Force will meet again to review responses from the public survey and that a final report will be developed and presented to the County Board of Supervisors this summer.

Mr. Yip noted that the results from the 2018 questionnaire showed that most respondents wanted safety improvements on the corridor and that most were willing to reduce a travel lane for improved safety. He then gave an overview on the project location and then spoke specifically about the proposals for the ADLP segment between Avy and Santa Cruz Avenues. This segment is a four lane road, with two 11-foot wide lanes in each direction with sharrows, on-street parking (9.5 feet wide) and relatively narrow sidewalks (approx. 4-feet wide). The proposal calls for two 10-foot wide through lanes with an 11 foot wide center left turn lane, 5-foot wide bikes lanes with 2-foot buffers, narrower on-street parking space (7.5 feet wide) and wider sidewalks.

Mr. Yip then described the existing Santa Cruz segment, which consists of five travel lanes, two each in the north and south bound directions with an 11-foot wide center left turn lane, 8-foot wide parking on one side of the street only and sharrows on both sides. He noted three different proposals for this segment:

- Alternative A has the least amount of proposed change. It maintains the existing travel lanes in their current configuration with the existing sharrows and adds high visibility crosswalks, bulb-outs and a flashing beacon at Liberty Park Avenue.

- Alternative B reduces the number of travel lanes from five to three, with two 10-foot wide through lanes, an 11 foot wide center left turn lane, adds a six-foot wide buffered bike lanes on each side, maintains the existing parking lane on one side, has wider sidewalks and includes the high visibility crosswalks, bulb-outs and flashing beacon from Alternative A.
- Alternative C represents a compromise between Alternatives A and B as it is a four lane roadway, with two northbound travel lanes, a center left turn lane and one southbound travel lane. Bike lanes are provided but with a buffer on one side only that is narrower than the proposal in Alternative B. The existing parking lane as well as the high visibility crosswalks, bulb-outs and flashing beacon are also maintained.

Chair Kelly asked about the traffic analysis. Mr. Yip stated that, from the modeling, the projected impact from Alternative B will likely increase vehicle travel time by one minute during the commute peak in each direction. Chair Kelly asked what assumptions were made in driver behavior as a result of this. Mr. Yip stated that there isn't a similar parallel route in the vicinity and it is unlikely that this would cause cut-through traffic in the neighborhood. Chair Kelly noted that he knows people use this route instead of Interstate 280. Mr. Yip stated that while the traffic modeling didn't cover this, it's possible people who use this route now may prefer to stay on Interstate 280. Chair Kelly also asked whether the modeling assumed a change in mode shift from this project and Mr. Yip stated the modeling software doesn't account for that so the traffic impact represents a worst case scenario. Mr. Yip stated that the delay for both Alternatives B and C would be the same in the southbound direction. The delay for Alternative C in the northbound direction would be the same as the existing condition.

Chair Kelly asked if the delay was primarily from the evening peak. Alternate Member Langbein noted there is congestion during the southbound peak as well.

Mr. Yip described the Y intersection alternatives next and noted that although they are labeled Alternative A, B and C, they are not tied to the same Alternatives listed for the Santa Cruz Avenue segment. Mr. Yip stated that the existing Y intersection of Santa Cruz Avenue and the ADLP at Campo Bello Lane is a wide skewed intersection with crosswalks on three sides only.

- Alternative A adds bulb-outs and traffic islands that reduce pedestrian crossing lengths and adds green bike lanes. Chair Kelly asked how bicyclists coming from Santa Cruz Avenue would get through the Y to continue on the ADLP. Mr. Yip stated there are green dashed bike lanes that the bicyclists would follow.
- Alternative B adds a long traffic island in the northbound direction of Santa Cruz Avenue to separate bicyclists and motorists that are continuing to the ADLP from those that are turning right to continue north on Santa Cruz Avenue. This reduces conflicts through the intersection from last minute direction changes. It also precludes traffic from Campo Bello Lane from continuing through the intersection on Santa Cruz Avenue to get to downtown Menlo Park. The long traffic island is an option and depending on feedback, it could be removed. Chair Kelly asked if there are other ways for those on Campo Bello Lane to go to downtown Menlo Park and Mr. Yip mentioned there were other options. Mr. Yip also stated there is only one lane in the

southbound direction on Santa Cruz Avenue with a bike lane on the side. Alternative B has crosswalks on all sides of this intersection.

- Alternative C reduces the distances that pedestrians cross and an island has been added at the Y intersection to channelize traffic and reduce potential conflicts. This option further improves visibility at the intersection.
- In addition, there are 3 options for right turns on northbound Santa Cruz Avenue at the Y intersection for those heading to downtown Menlo Park. The first option maintains the existing condition and doesn't allow for right turns on a red light. The second option provides for an extended green light time for turns and the third option allows for turns on a red light after a complete stop.

Mr. Yip shared the link to the current survey and said public comments are due February 23rd. He also noted that the Task Force would reconvene to review the survey results in March and that a final report on the proposed plans will be prepared and be scheduled for Board adoption in June.

Alternate Member Langbein mentioned there had been discussion about squaring off the Y intersection at the Task Force and asked Mr. Yip about this option. Mr. Yip stated that would result in the creation of two intersections at the Y and there are challenges with constrained right of way, costs and additional travel time delay through this area.

Chair Kelly asked if there were any other questions and then moved on to the next item.

8. Consideration to Prepare and Submit a Comment letter regarding the Alameda de las Pulgas/ Santa Cruz Avenue Improvement Project

Chair Kelly mentioned that he and Alternate Member Langbein drafted the BPAC comment letter to the Department of Public Works on the proposed ADLP/Santa Cruz Avenue safety improvements, which can be shared with the Task Force and that there is a desire for it to be followed later by another letter to the Board of Supervisors. Chair Kelly stated that the letter recommends Alternative B for the Santa Cruz segment, which is the more aggressive road diet alternative because it is safer and it's feasible to implement. Chair Kelly states that we shouldn't have right turns on red at the Y intersection as that puts pedestrians and bicyclists at risk.

Alternate Member Langbein mentioned there was a fallback given that Alternative B is fairly aggressive at the Y intersection. He continued, stating that Alternative C would be ok if more space were provided for the northbound bike lane due to dooring concerns. For bicyclists, Alternative A has a nice separated bike lane feature for about 50 feet on northbound Santa Cruz Avenue turning right at the Y intersection and Alternative C has a nice bike lane on southbound ADLP heading into the Y to the left of the right turn lane toward Campo Bello Lane. He also mentioned that Alternative C is preferred for pedestrians, Alternative A doesn't work for pedestrians because you lose a crosswalk and Alternative C is better.

Chair Kelly recommended a motion to approve and send the proposed letter.

Motion: Commissioner Zyda approved/Chair Kelly seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

9. Presentation on the Unincorporated San Mateo County Active Transportation Plan

Sara Rauwolf, project manager from Toole Design, provided an update via PowerPoint on the Unincorporated San Mateo County Active Transportation Plan. Per previous feedback, four main plan goals were developed, which are safety, equity, access and flexibility (in regard to changing mobility and land use changes). Ms. Rauwolf noted that the Plan kicked off in the spring of 2019 and since then outreach was conducted with the community to find out what it's like to walk and bike in the County along with an analysis of existing conditions, which was presented to the BPAC in August. Since August the focus has been on developing draft recommendations for a draft bicycle network, draft pedestrian focus areas and draft policies and programs.

Ms. Rauwolf noted we are currently looking for input to the draft recommendations. Later this summer we will come back to discuss Plan implementation and present the Final Draft. Sarah then proceeded to describe work conducted for the current phase of outreach and stated that it focused on going to places and events where people go. She also noted that walking and bicycling tours were conducted. The outreach, in conjunction with demand and gap analysis helped determine the areas that needed to be further studied for inclusion in the network.

Ms. Rauwolf stated that draft recommendations for policies and programs have been prepared to support infrastructure improvements and provided an overview list. There may be a few that we won't focus on more than others. Chair Kelly asked for clarification regarding a bike parking ordinance and wayfinding. Ms. Malmo-Laycock mentioned there are rules for providing bike parking in certain zoning districts on private property now and this could be expanded to all zoning districts. Ms. Rauwolf also mentioned a design toolkit is being developed with best practices on short and long term bicycle parking that can be referenced in a proposed bike parking ordinance. Ms. Rauwolf stated that wayfinding is a way of directing people to destinations via signage.

Alternate Member Langbein asked about the design toolkit and whether NACTO guidelines would be included. Sara mentioned the toolkit is a compilation of best practice recommendations. She noted the FHWA just updated their bicycle planning guide and other organizations are in the process of developing updates.

Member Zyda asked what the acronym SRTS means. Ms. Rauwolf noted that it stands for Safe Routes to School, which the County Office of Education runs. The Plan recommends coordination efforts take place to ensure good communication between the COE, the Office of Sustainability and the Department of Public Works. Chair Kelly asked about TSM and what it means. Mr. Slavit noted that it stands for Transportation Systems Management. When new development is proposed it often needs to mitigate traffic impacts. TSM, similar to transportation demand management (TDM) is a way of providing a more efficient means of transporting people through non-SOV trips and active transportation improvements can help do this. Ms. Malmo Laycock stated the County has a TSM policy from 1995 that is old and in need of updating. Alternate Member Langbein asked about coordination among the different school districts within and outside the unincorporated area. Ms. Rauwolf stated that is something we want to ensure takes place.

Ms. Rauwolf point out that FHWA has a guide for best practices that accounts for motor vehicle speed and traffic volume in the recommendations that are made for bikeway facility types. There are different recommendations between urban and rural areas. She talked about different types of facilities in urban

areas ranging from sharrows to protected bikeways and shared use paths. In rural areas recommendations can range from shared lanes to striped shoulders and rumble strips. Alternate member Langbein mentioned a concern with rumble strips and stated you don't want to ride on them for long stretches and that certain types of rumble strips are better than others for safety. Ms. Rauwolf mentioned there are specifications that call for spacing between the strips to allow bicycles to move in and out.

Ms. Rauwolf pointed out that we have draft bicycle recommendations that we are soliciting input on. Ms. Malmo Laycock brought up slides that showed the bike recommendation maps. BPAC staff also received hard copies of the maps. Ms. Rauwolf noted that updated online interactive bikeway maps should be available next week. Chair Kelly asked when the next meeting would be for the BPAC to provide input to the online maps. Mr. Slavik mentioned that the next regular BPAC meeting is in April. Chair Kelly asked if there was sufficient time to wait until the April meeting as the bikeway maps were distributed late. Ms. Malmo Laycock mentioned we could hold another meeting to discuss the bikeway map recommendations for the Plan.

Chair Kelly asked about the Dumbarton Corridor. Ms. Malmo Laycock mentioned that work on Dumbarton is still conceptual. Mr. Kelly said Dumbarton should be mentioned in the Plan. Mr. Slavik mentioned that there is a current proposal being led by SamTrans and its partners referred to as Dumbarton Forward and the project will soon be undergoing the environmental phase of work. Ms. Malmo Laycock mentioned that we will be referencing study efforts underway where it is too early to know what to propose on our bikeway map. Alternate Member Langbein asked what is planned on the El Camino Real south of Redwood City. Ms. Malmo Laycock mentioned that a protected bike lane is proposed. She also mentioned a protected bike lane is proposed in an unincorporated pocket north of Colma and that Colma is also considering protected bike lanes on El Camino Real.

Alternate Member Langbein also mentioned a concern that the Caltrain Corridor separates neighborhoods in North Fair Oaks and asked about bike/pedestrian crossings of it. Ms. Malmo Laycock mentioned that is a need mentioned in the 2011 North Fair Oaks Plan. Alternate Member Langbein also asked how the Alameda de las Pulgas/Santa Cruz Avenue project will be shown in the Plan. Ms. Malmo Laycock said we'll incorporate the project recommendations in the Plan. Ms. Rauwolf noted that we are proposing to incorporate Caltrans District 4 Bike Plan recommendations into our Plan for SR 1. Chair Kelly also asked about Coleman Avenue in an unincorporated pocket of Menlo Park. Ms. Rauwolf mentioned a bike lane is proposed on Coleman Avenue.

Alternate Member Langbein mentioned that Class III facilities have minimal impact. Chair Kelly stated it's the least we can do. Ms. Rauwolf mentioned these areas are often constrained by right of way. In urban areas we most always call for bike boulevards, which also include traffic calming improvements. Chair Kelly expressed a desire to hold another meeting to further discuss the bike plan recommendations after the online interactive maps are available and it would also provide an opportunity for input with greater attendance from the rest of the BPAC. Ms. Rauwolf mentioned that for purposes of maintaining the project schedule, a March meeting would be preferable over the regularly scheduled April meeting because the planned outreach would be wrapping up in March. Chair Kelly noted that individual BPAC members should provide comments for their assigned neighborhood areas. Ms. Rauwolf asked BPAC members to help get the word out on planned upcoming outreach events. Alternate Member Langbein requested that the initial online interactive survey map be made

available to BPAC members so they can see if input from that is reflected in the most recent bikeway map recommendations.

Ms. Rauwolf mentioned there are numerous opportunities for pedestrian improvements throughout the County and the approach has been to identify 10, soon to be 11 with North Fair Oaks, specific locations for detailed pedestrian recommendations. These locations were selected from input received in the first phase of outreach and from the gap and demand analysis. Site visits were conducted for these areas and we want to get feedback on the types of pedestrian facilities that people would like to see for these areas. Ms. Rauwolf mentioned that specific recommendations will be provided for these 11 sites supplemented with five different classifications reflective of the different types of environments in the County, incorporating best practices and community desires with regard to the types of facilities people want to see. Chair Kelly asked if we should focus on identifying needs or specific solutions. Ms. Malmo Laycock mentioned that we are looking at proposing specific improvement recommendations. Chair Kelly mentioned it would be good to know what the specific improvement recommendations are for the next BPAC meeting.

Member Zyda mentioned there are rounded curbs in North Fair Oaks and people park on the sidewalks. Fair Oaks Avenue as it turns into 9th near the train tracks is an example of where this occurs. Member Zyda also mentioned there are many areas in North Fair Oaks that lack curb cuts.

Ms. Rauwolf proceeded to talk about next steps and referenced the series of pop up events, workshops and public meetings that have been planned as part of the current phase of outreach. Ms. Malmo Laycock encouraged BPAC members to inform us of other good outreach venues.

Ms. Rauwolf, mentioned after the current outreach phase ends we will prioritize bicycle project recommendations and we be identifying and weighting prioritization categories to assess projects, separating them into high, medium and low for implementation priority. We will also create separate lists for projects on the bayside and Coastside for geographic equity.

Chair Kelly asked what the potential prioritization category of comfort meant. Ms. Rauwolf referred to the bicycle facility selection slide pertaining to vehicle speed and volume to gauge comfort level. Chair Kelly and Alternate Member Langbein mentioned that prioritization criteria should include connectivity and cost. Alternate Member Langbein noted there is a need to provide connectivity between unincorporated county pockets and adjacent jurisdictions and that a project could consist of a relatively short segment but have high value as it could overcome a barrier and fill a gap. Ms. Rauwolf mentioned that connectivity is assessed as part of the comfort level criteria and she will check and see how cost has been treated in other plans they have prepared.

Alternate Member Langbein noted that a number of bikeways are on State facilities and asked if we are reflecting the Caltrans district 4 Bike Plan. Ms. Rauwolf confirmed that we are incorporating recommendations from that Plan and other agency plans. We will note that further study is needed for prospective bikeways in ongoing planning efforts not yet finalized. Ms. Malmo Laycock noted that the Office of Sustainability submitted a grant proposal to conduct a feasibility study for a separated bike path along State Route 1, where we have proposed a Class I facility south of Half Moon Bay.

Ms. Rauwolf wrapped up her presentation by stating after we complete outreach on the draft bikeway recommendations and prioritize them we will develop financial and implementation strategies that will

be incorporated into the Draft Plan. There will be a subsequent presentation to the BPAC when the Draft Plan is released.

10. County Updates

Mr. Slavitt provided a status update on the schedule & funding for the Parallel Trail on the Coastside and stated that it is at the 100 percent final design phase with plans under review County and Caltrans staff. The construction contract is anticipated to be advertised this summer, pending final permit approvals. The anticipated completion date of construction is spring 2021. The current cost estimate is \$5.5 million and recent allocations from a \$400,000 TDA Article 3 grant and a \$529,000 infusion of Measure K funds, fully fund the current estimate. Alternate Member Langbein asked where the rest of the money is coming from and Mr. Slavitt mentioned he had that information and would send it out in a subsequent e-mail to the BPAC.

Mr. Slavitt also provided information on the Caltrans District 4 Pedestrian Plan and said the comment period for submitting input on Caltrans' street story maps closed on January 21st. Caltrans will be seeking input from their partner agencies within the next few months and will be holding a public webinar this spring. Office of Sustainability staff will keep the BPAC apprised of future opportunities for input. BPAC staff are also welcome to sign up for future updates by sending an e-mail to Greg Currey at Gregory.Currey@dot.ca.gov. Chair Kelly requested that Greg's contact information along with all the information regarding County updates be sent to the BPAC via a separate e-mail given that many members were not able to attend this meeting. Chair Kelly also suggested that future BPAC meetings not be scheduled during President's week as that may have been a reason why other BPAC members weren't able to attend tonight's meeting.

11. Adjournment

Chair Kelly made a motion to adjourn.

Motion: Carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:54pm.