# C/CAG

**CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY**

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

# AGENDA

The next meeting of the

**BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BPAC)**

will be as follows.

**Date:** Thursday, June 28, 2007
**7:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.**

**Place:** San Mateo City Hall
330 West 20th Avenue
San Mateo, California
Conference Room C (across from Council Chambers)

PLEASE CALL TOM MADALENA (599-1460) IF YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Call To Order. | Action (Alfano) | | 7:30 p.m. (5 mins) |
| 2. | Public Comment On Items Not On The Agenda. | Presentations are limited to 3 mins per speaker. | | 7:35 p.m. (5 mins) |
| 3. | Minutes of March 22, 2007 Meeting. | Action (Alfano) | Pages 1-2 | 7:40 p.m. (5 mins) |
| 4. | Discussion on Funding Criteria for the Measure A Half Cent Sales Tax Bicycle and Pedestrian Program | Potential Action (Hurley) | | 7:45 p.m. (20 mins) |
| 5. | Discussion on Bicycle Route Network and Facilities | Discussion (Madalena) | Pages 3-7 | 8:05 p.m. (15 mins) |
| 6. | Review and Recommendation on Improvements to the TDA Article 3 Process | Action (Hoang) | Pages 8-14 | 8:20 p.m. (20 mins) |
| 7. | Recommendation on the Approval of the Request for Proposals (RFP) for a San Mateo County Bicycle Transportation Map | Action (Shu) | Pages 15-32 | 8:40 p.m. (20 mins) |
| 8. | Member Communications | Information (Alfano) | | 9:00 p.m. (5 mins) |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9. | Communications (for information only) | | Pages 33-35 |
| 10. | Adjournment | Action<br>(Alfano) | 9:05 p.m.<br>(5 mins) |

**NOTE: All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Committee. Actions recommended by staff are subject to change by the Committee.**

Other enclosures/Correspondence

- None.

If you have any questions regarding the C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda, please contact Richard Napier at 650-599-1420 or Tom Madalena at 599-1460.

*NOTE: Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services in attending and participating in this meeting should contact Nancy Blair at 650 599-1406, five working days prior to the meeting date.*

**The following BPAC meeting will be held on Thursday July 26th, 2007.**

# Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
# Meeting Minutes
# March 22, 2007

## 1. Call to Order.

Chair Alfano called the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) meeting to order at 7:08 p.m. After waiting for a quorum, a quorum was achieved.

Members Attending:
Michael Barnes, Cathy Baylock, Maureen Brooks, Robert Cronin, Karyl Matsumoto, Matt Grocott, Mike Harding, Marc Hershman, Judi Mosqueda, Julie Lancelle, Naomi Patridge, Mark Meadows and Cory Roay.

Staff/Guests Attending:
Sandy Wong, John Hoang, Tom Madalena, Steve Carlson, Dennis Chuck, Mo Sharma, Robert Ovadia, Al Meckler, Vivian Ma and Caryl Gay

## 2. Public Comment On Items Not On The Agenda.

None.

## 3. Minutes of the March 1, 2007 Meeting.

*Motion: Member Baylock moved/member Brooks seconded approval of the March 1, 2007 minutes. Motion carried.*

## 4. TDA Article 3 FY08 Candidate Project Scoring and Ranking

Project #11 (Half Moon Bay) was amended to acknowledge 50% completion, so therefore it will receive 2 additional points.

Member Mosqueda stated that the BPAC should look into developing a Pedestrian Plan.

Project #16 (San Mateo County Parks) was revised to reflect a score of 0 for item 2d because it is a design project.

Project #20 (South San Francisco – Bay Trail) has not been designed yet so the score is 0 for item 4d. Special attention should be paid to the grading so that the waves in the pavement do not appear.

It was requested to have an agenda item discussion on Master Plans (versus capital projects) being included in applications.

Member Patridge moved and member Barnes seconded to fund the first five projects which would include fully funding the Brisbane and Half Moon Bay projects with partial funding for the sixth project (Burlingame).

Yes – 3
No – 11

Motion did not carry.

Member Hershman moved and member Grocott seconded to fund the Brisbane Project at $550,000 which would allow fully funding the eleven top scoring projects.

Yes – 13
No – 1

Motion carried.

## 5. Member Communications

Chair Alfano commended member Hershman for his attendance and value input provided to the BPAC. Member Baylock mention that the Peninsula Avenue overpass to Coyote Point is being rebuilt and the BPAC confirmed that bicyclists would prefer to travel in the direction of traffic.

## 6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 pm.

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** June 28, 2007

**To:** Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

**From:** Tom Madalena

**Subject:** Discussion on Bicycle Route Network and Facilities

(For further information contact Tom Madalena at 599-1460)

---

## RECOMMENDATION

That the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee review the attached correspondence and newsletter and be prepared to discuss the bicycle route network and facilities.

## FISCAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact to C/CAG.

## SOURCE OF FUNDS

None.

## BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Staff received correspondence from a BPAC member requesting that the BPAC discuss ideas for fundamental goals that could be achieved through future TDA Artice 3 applications. Being that the BPAC is currently reviewing the TDA Article 3 process this discussion could help define and encourage potential future projects as well as help jurisdictions achieve the desired goals.

## ATTACHMENTS

- Email from Robert Cronin
- Tech Transfer Newsletter - Bicycle Detection and Signalization

**From:** "Robert Cronin" <shawms@bigvalley.net>
**To:** "Tom Madalena " <tmadalena@co.sanmateo.ca.us>
**Date:** 4/6/2007 1:58 PM
**Subject:** BPAC agenda item

Hi Tom,
I would like to suggest that the next BPAC meeting include an agenda item to discuss ways to encourage TDA applicants to consider basic issues of access and useability for cyclists and pedestrians before they apply for funds for something grander, but less essential. As an example, I would like to see cities make all their traffic-actuated signals responsive to bikes, so that bikes don't have to run red lights. Another example would be to encourage cities and the county to close gaps in their bike-lane and bike-route networks. I am sure that committee members will have more ideas for fundamental goals that should be achieved, and rules or incentives to point the applicants in the right direction.
Robert Cronin

Dial Broadband has arrived Nationwide! Up to 5 times faster than traditional dialup connections from $13.33/month! See the demo for yourself at <a href="http://www.BigValley.net">www.BigValley.net</a>

From *Tech Transfer* Newsletter, Spring 2007
This document is found at www.techtransfer.berkeley.edu/newsletter/07-2/bike_detection.php

# Bicycle Detection and Signalization

By Alyssa Sherman, Tech Transfer Program

Detection of bicyclists at signalized intersections can improve efficiency, decrease delay to bicyclists, and discourage red light running by cyclists without causing inordinate delays to motorists. Many California cities have already implemented bicycle detection devices. Bicycle detection at intersections can be accomplished using several technologies; the most widely used are loop detectors and video detectors.

At intersections with extremely large volumes of bicycle traffic, dedicated bicycle signal heads are another possibility. The city of Davis, California has installed the first bike signals in the country.

## Loop Detectors

Well placed loop detectors with pavement markings are currently the most reliable technology for bicycle detection. Standard loop detectors will detect bicyclists, but the sensitivity must be adjusted so that bicyclists are detected, and the loops must be placed in a location where a bicyclist's movements can be registered. Detection using loop detectors does not depend on the presence of conductive metals as commonly thought. Instead, most in-pavement loop detectors commonly used today are inductive loops, which are triggered by a break in the magnetic field. Therefore, it does not necessarily require a heavy metal frame to be detected by these mechanisms. Previous research by Dr. Ken Courage at the University of Florida has indicated that non-ferrous metals and composites can work equally well. The Caltrans Type D loop configurations are generally considered an effective means for detection of small vehicles like motorcycles and bicycles. In California, cities including Bakersfield, Santa Cruz, Davis, and Palo Alto have adjusted loop detectors to detect bicycles.

In its Online Safety Toolbox, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) mentions that loop detectors are ineffective if cyclists don't know where to position themselves, and inconsistency in placement or presence of stencils could confuse cyclists. However, these problems may be avoided by adhering to federal and state requirements for pavement markings accompanying bicycle-sensitive loop detectors, found in Chapter 9 of the MUTCD and Part 9 of the California Supplement.

To cut down on bicyclist confusion, many cities that use loop detectors for bicycle detection—including Bakersfield, Santa Cruz, and Palo Alto—have provided online tip sheets for bicyclists that describe "how to turn red lights green." For a model of loop detector-bicycle interaction, consult Design Considerations for Detecting

Bicycles with Inductive Loop Detectors (See resources section in the sidebar for reference information).

## Video Detectors

Video detection can pick up a bicycle's presence at an intersection over a larger area. A video detection setup consists of a video detector usually mounted on a 4' riser pole or a mainline pole, and a computer with video image processing capability. In this system, installation is done above ground, minimizing lane closures. Existing video detectors have a flexible detector layout allowing for reprogramming of detection zones in a matter of minutes.

A recent paper describing research performed in Santa Clara County concluded that the video detection process had difficulties in detecting bicycles in darkness and resulted in occasional false calls due to vehicle shadows appearing on the bicycle lane, but that newer cameras might have corrected the problems. *(Adaptive Signal Timing for Bicycles)*. See the resources section at the end of this article for reference information. The city of Walnut Creek, California, is currently testing video detection, citing the ease of maintenance and flexibility of the cameras as positive aspects of the system.

## Bicycle Signal Heads

The City of Davis, home to UC Davis, has gained national preeminence in bikeway planning and design. In a city with a population of 64,000 residents, there are an estimated 60,000 bicycles. The city estimates that 17 percent of all journeys to work take place on bicycle. According to the City of Davis Comprehensive Bicycle Plan:

> "The city of Davis has been using a traffic control device for a number of years known as a "bicycle signal head." These are similar to a standard traffic signal, except that it uses red, yellow and green bike icons rather than red, yellow and green "balls." Bicycle signal heads are commonly used around the world in such places as the Netherlands, England, Germany, and China. The city of Davis began using this type of traffic signal to help expedite the safe movement of bicycles through the city's more heavily used intersections (one intersection where these are in use has had counts of more than 1,000 bicycles per hour). The city of Davis is the first city in the country to utilize this innovative traffic control device, and the city was the driving force in getting the California Vehicle Code changed in order for its use to be allowed on public streets. These new traffic signals have performed admirably since the city began using them on a trial basis in 1990. Bicycle circulation was enhanced and safety has been improved atlocations where these have been installed."

More information on the potential advantages and disadvantages of bicycle signal heads is also available in the MTC's Safety Toolbox.

*Thank you to Timothy Bustos, Sr., Program Manager for Tech Transfer and former Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator for the city of Davis, for his comments and edits.*

## More Information

Every method of detection and signalization has its advantages and disadvantages. Consult these resources for more information on the topic and to learn from the experiences of others.

**The Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety Toolbox**

Fact sheets and resources for further information on the topic.

**TRB Reports**

TRB reports are also available from the UC Berkeley Institute of Transportation Studies Library. Information explaining how to order is available on page 13.

**Adaptive Signal Timing for Bicycles**

Akbarzadeh, Masoud; Prasad, Ananth; Chung, Nora; Pham, Thien Tich. Transportation Research Board
Annual Meeting 2007, Paper #07-0121, 11 pages.

Santa Clara County research project presenting different methods of bicycle detection and discussion of bicycle speed.

**Design Considerations for Detecting Bicycles with Inductive Loop Detectors**

Kidarsa, Richard; Pande, Tarkesh; Vanjari, Srinivas; Krogmeier, James; Bullock, Darcy.
Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board No. 1978, 2006, 7 pages.

Develops model of loop detector/bicycle interaction.

**The Use of Bicycle Signal Heads at Signalized Intersections**

Pelz, David; Bustos, Tim; Flecker, Jonathan. Institute of Transportation Engineers, 1998. Compendium of Technical Papers. Washington, DC. 5 pages.

Discusses implementation of first bicycle signal heads in the US in Davis, CA.

---

© 2007 Regents of the University of California

Tech Transfer Newsletter www.techtransfer.berkeley.edu/newsletter/07-2/bike_detection.php

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** June 28, 2007

**To:** Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

**From:** John Hoang

**Subject:** Review and Recommendation on Improvements to the TDA Article 3 Process

(For further information contact John Hoang at 363-4105)

---

## RECOMMENDATION

That the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee review the project application and scoring process from the recently completed TDA Art3 FY 2007/08 cycle and recommend improvements to be considered for implementation in the next funding cycle.

## FISCAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact to C/CAG.

## SOURCE OF FUNDS

TDA Article 3 funds are derived from the following sources:

- Local Transportation Funds (LTF), which is derived from a ¼ cent of the general sales tax collected statewide
- State Transit Assistance fund (STA), which is derived from the statewide sales tax on gasoline and diesel fuel.

## BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

In March 2007, the BPAC completed the project evaluation and selection process that resulted in the recommendation of eleven (11) projects receiving approximately $1.7M in TDA Art.3 funds (FY2007/08). The C/CAG Board subsequently approved the project list and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is currently in its approval process.

In an effort to assure that the best projects are selected for funding each TDA Art. 3 Cycle, it is recommended that the BPAC review the recent evaluation and scoring process and identify areas for improvements and refinements to be considered in the next funding cycle.

## ATTACHMENTS

FY 2007/08 Application and Scoring Criteria

# C/CAG BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMMITTEE
# TDA ARTICLE 3 FISCAL YEAR 2007/08 PROGRAM
# APPLICATION

---

AGENCY:

FUNDS REQUESTED: $

PROJECT DESCRIPTION / OBJECTIVE:

---

I. PROJECT SCREENING

a. CALTRANS Standards

Explain how the project meets CALTRANS Standards.

b. CEQA approval? Yes ☐ No ☐

Date of approval

*Note: CEQA document must be submitted with the application.*

II. STATE OF READINESS

a. Make sure that the project proposal is complete and contains all required documentation. The more complete the application will result in a higher project score.

b. Right-of-Way certification required? Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☐

If required, Right-of-way Cert. completed? Yes ☐ No ☐

Comments:

c. Permits/Agreements approved? Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☐
List all permits and/or agreements approved/obtained to date:

| Document | Date approved/ obtained |
|---|---|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

Comments:

d. Comment on the status of design of the project, and indicate the percentage of design completed.

III. COMMUNITY SUPPORT

a. Listed as "priority project" in the C/CAG Comprehensive Bicycle Route Plan or a recommended pedestrian plan. Yes ☐ No ☐

Plan:
Page:

b. Local approval by bicycle/pedestrian (BPAC) organization?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Other organized groups with demonstrated knowledge of bicycle and pedestrian needs? *(examples: clubs, school committees, citizen coalition, combined citizens/public BPAC, etc)*

Yes ☐ No ☐

Comment on level of support. Attach approval documentation and show composition of relevant committee. *(examples: letters, meeting minutes, etc)*

c. Funds requested: $

Local match to be provided: $

Local match percentage = $\frac{\text{Local match provided}}{\text{Funds requested}}$

= = %

## IV. MEETS PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

a. Does the project eliminate or mitigate the effects from an identified problem?
Yes ☐ No ☐

Explain:

b. Bicycle and Pedestrian:

1. Does the project provide access to bicycle facilities in high use activity centers?
Yes ☐ No ☐

2. Does the project provide access to pedestrian facilities in high use activity centers?
Yes ☐ No ☐

Explain:

c. Is commute use improved by the project? Yes ☐ No ☐

Explain:

d. What is the relationship of the project to more significant bicycle or pedestrian routes? Explain:

e. The project is consistent with or included in the following:
*(Attach copy of documentation for item Nos. 1, 2, 3, & 4 as appropriate)*

1. County or City facilities plan: Yes ☐ No ☐
2. Circulation element of general plan: Yes ☐ No ☐
3. C/CAG Comprehensive Bicycle Route Plan: Yes ☐ No ☐
4. Pedestrian Plan equal to "e.3" above: Yes ☐ No ☐

Plan:

Page:

f. Comment on the level of local support:

## V. SAFETY

How is safety improved because of the project? Explain:

## VI. OTHER ITEM

*(These Items are for information ONLY and will not be "scored" but may be used as a tiebreaker)*

a. Can the project be partially funded? Yes ☐ No ☐

- If "Yes", how much? Explain:

b. Can the project be divided into phases? Yes ☐ No ☐

- If "Yes", describe the different phases and cost associated with each phase.

---

## VII. PROJECT CONTACT INFORMATION

Primary Contact Person:

Telephone Number:

Email address:

Secondary Contact Person:

Telephone Number:

Email address:

# C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
# TDA Article 3 Scoring Sheet

| AGENCY: | RATER: |
|---|---|
| PROJECT: | |

| I. PROJECT SCREENING | |
|---|---|
| a. Meets applicable CALTRANS standards | Yes ☐ No ☐ (No disqualifies project) |
| b. CEQA approval | Yes ☐ No ☐ (No disqualifies project) |

| | Scale | Max Points | Points Assigned |
|---|---|---|---|
| **II. STATE OF READINESS** | | | |
| a. Clear and complete proposal | 0 or 3 (A zero score disqualifies project.) | 3 | |
| b. Right-of-Way Certification | 0 – No<br>4 – Yes (Completed or Not Needed) | 4 | |
| c. Permits/Agreements obtained | 0 – No<br>4 - Yes | 4 | |
| d. Project design completed | 0 – No<br>4 - Yes | 4 | |
| | Subtotal | 15 | |
| **III. COMMUNITY SUPPORT** | | | |
| a. Is a "priority project" on the C/CAG adopted Comprehensive bicycle Route Plan or an equal Pedestrian Plan. | 0 – None<br>5 – Local Project<br>10 – C/CAG Project | 10 | |
| b. Local BPAC approval<br>AND/OR<br>Support from other organizations | 0 – No Support<br>3<br>5 – General Support<br>7<br>10 – Strong Support | 10 | |
| c. Cost Sharing (Local Match as % of total requested funds) | 0 – 0% match<br>2 – 10% match<br>4 – 20% match<br>6 – 30% match<br>8 – 40% match<br>10 – 50% match | 10 | |
| | Subtotal | 30 | |

| IV. MEETS PROGRAM OBJECTIVES | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Eliminates or mitigates an identified problem area on a route that would otherwise provide relatively safe and direct bicycle or pedestrian travel. | 0 to 10 | 10 | |
| b. Bicycle and Pedestrian<br>1. Does the project provide access to or bicycle parking in high use activity centers? (Bicycle only)<br>OR<br>2. Does the project provide access to recognized pedestrian facilities in high use activity centers? (Pedestrian only) | 0 – No<br>5 - Yes | 5 | |
| c. Does the project provide for the improvement of bicycle or pedestrian commute use? | 0 to 5 | 5 | |
| d. Does the project provide connection to and continuity of more significant routes? | 0 to 5 | 5 | |
| e. Is the project included in a County or city facilities plan or circulation element of a general plan? OR Is it consistent with the C/CAG Comprehensive Bicycle Route Plan or an equal Pedestrian Plan? | 0 to 5 | 5 | |
| f. Is there demonstrated local support? | 0 – None<br>2 – Little<br>3 – Moderate<br>5 - Strong | 5 | |
| | Subtotal | 35 | |
| **V. SAFETY** | | | |
| Improves Safety | 0 – None<br>5 – Little<br>10 – Moderate<br>15 – Substantial<br>20 - Significant | 20 | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **TOTAL SCORE** | 100 | |

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** June 28, 2007

**To:** Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

**From:** Diana Shu, Transportation Systems Coordinator

**Subject:** Recommendation on the Approval of the Request for Proposals (RFP) for a San Mateo County Bicycle Transportation Map

(For further information contact Diana Shu at 599-1414)

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee approve the Request for Proposals (RFP) for a San Mateo County Bicycle Transportation Map

**FISCAL IMPACT**

To be determined.

**SOURCE OF FUNDS**

Partial funding for this project has been included in the FY 07-08 Budget.

**BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

Per the Committee's recommendation, staff has been working with members of the map subcommittee as well as individual board members in order to prepare a draft RFP for review and discussion. These discussions identified four core areas for the bicycle map:

The four core areas and their respective priorities are:

1. A foldable paper map similar to the existing map produced in the 1998 for San Mateo County.
2. A method to maintain and update the bicycle route data
3. A method to up load the data onto a known bicycle website or onto the C/CAG website.
4. To use the information gathered for the map in the proposed updates to the Comprehensive Bicycle Plan

Due to limited funding for this project, staff recommends focusing this RFP on producing a paper map. Subcommittee members agreed that this approach was reasonable.

At the June 19, 2007 subcommittee meeting in San Carlos, subcommittee members determined that they would prefer to have a bicycle transportation map that provides both user routes as well as routes officially recognized by the local jurisdictions. It is the

subcommittee's hope that this map will serve as an instrument for bicyclists as well as to assist local jurisdictions identify gaps and barriers in existing bicycle routes when considering future plans for bicycle projects.

In order to provide this information for this map project, subcommittee members and other interested parties have volunteered to review the existing bicycle route layer to identify the route's current classification and to field verify the accuracy of the data previously captured in the database. The subcommittee plans to submit its findings in parallel with the RFP solicitation so that the data will be collected by August 1, 2007 in time to award the RFP to the successful candidate.

The purpose of this RFP is to:

1. Determine what mapping options are available with the route information that is currently available.
2. Determine the costs of producing a bicycle map.
3. Select a qualified consultant based on the quality and experience of previous work.
4. Produce a bicycle transportation map.

**ATTACHMENTS**

- Request for Proposals for a San Mateo County Bicycle Transportation Map

# C/CAG

**CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**
**OF SAN MATEO COUNTY**

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park*
*Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

# REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) FOR A SAN MATEO COUNTY BICYCLE TRANSPORTATION MAP

Requested by
C/CAG
City/ County Association of Governments
of
San Mateo County

Submittal Date:

August 31, 2007 by 5:00 p.m.

To

Diana Shu

C/CAG of San Mateo County
555 County Center, 5th Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063
dshu@co.sanmateo.ca.us
650-599-1414

# REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) FOR A SAN MATEO COUNTY BICYCLE TRANSPORTATION MAP

## GENERAL

The City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) of San Mateo County is seeking proposals for professional cartographic services to update the San Mateo County Bicycle Transportation Map. The current map was produced in 1998.

The main goal of this project is to produce a foldable paper map of San Mateo County bicycle facilities (routes, paths, lanes, bike ways) that clearly delineates bicycle facilities in the county and its relationship to other features (schools, train stations, etc.). C/CAG will provide the bicycle facility information to the successful candidate. This map is intended to be a bicycle transportation map that identifies both official bicycle facilities as well as user defined bicycle facilities.

C/CAG and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) will be evaluating these proposals. Depending on the funding requirements, all or a portion of the listed deliverables, as described below, will be selected for the final project.

Interested parties should submit information regarding their firm's qualifications for this project including information about sub consultants or sub contractors, if any, and samples of relevant work. C/CAG is particularly interested in samples related to San Mateo County. Additional information regarding the scope of services, schedules, fees, and future capabilities as listed in the Appendix A are also required.

Successful candidates will be selected on the basis of the quality of their work and past experience.

## SCOPE OF WORK

### Paper Map

Develop a general map similar to the enclosed Bicycle Transportation Map of the San Francisco Peninsula San Mateo County (existing map), standard foldable map, with current bicycle facility information and associated features as described below.

**Base Map with GIS Layers**
C/CAG currently has San Mateo County Bicycle Facilities identified in a data file that can be exported upon request. A partial data set can be made available in Oracle Object Model, Arc View Shapefile, Microsoft ACCESS, or other commonly used GIS data formats. The successful consultant will be given the full data set for use on this project.

Please note that while the data is currently stored in Geomedia, this project does not need to use Geomedia, other cartographic applications may be used. C/CAG welcomes all applications. Having Geomedia or the ability to use data exported from Geomedia will only help facilitate the data transfer. Therefore, the consultant should identify the type of application to be used for this project in the proposal.

The consultant shall provide a base map with layers that clearly and legibly identifies:

1. All roads, road names, major routes, highways
2. Schools
3. Public buildings
4. Hospitals
5. BART and/or Train stations
6. Public Parks, state parks and wildlife refuges
7. Existing bike facilities and trails
8. Legends and other information listed on the existing map with updated information as required. Symbols shall conform to those used on the existing map. Other symbols may be used if they enhance the legibility of the map. Include also notes (eg: difficult intersection, best route, etc.) shown on existing map.
9. Bike facility gradients using chevrons (pointing uphill) to illustrate the direction and relative steepness of grade.

Optional, preferred but not required layers, which identifies:

10. Bike facilities at 2000 feet beyond the borders of the county limits
11. Identify dirt roads
12. Public restrooms
13. Distances between intersections of major arterials (in miles)
14. Bicycle shops

Consultant shall provide a sample of the base map for San Mateo County with as many of the above requested features as possible that is best suited for this project with the proposal.

**Paper Map**
A 40" x 28" (or C/CAG approved size) paper map which can be folded into a 4"x 9" easy to carry size is required. Color and paper type shall conform to those on the existing map enclosed in this proposal. Other colors and paper will be considered. Please provide samples.

Note: if there is a substantial cost differential for number of colors, line types, etc. please provide a breakdown and sample, if possible. C/CAG is interested in a bicycle transportation map that clearly delineates bicycle facilities from roadways while at the same time allow roadways to be shown as key landmarks for the traveling bicyclist.

**Quantity of Map**
Estimated costs for printing maps should include line item costs for:

- Initial setup
- Printing for bulk quantities of 5,000, 10,000 and 20,000 copies
- Printing for 10, 100, 500 copies
- Shipping for above quantities

**Distribute Map**
C/CAG may wish to have these maps distributed to certain public facilities such as local bike shops, libraries, and civic centers. Please provide estimated costs for shipping or delivering set quantities to these types of facilities. C/CAG staff will provide addresses after the project has been awarded.

**Deliverables**
**75% Draft Set** – provide 10 color copies of bicycle transportation map, as defined above for review and comment and one softcopy of the modified bicycle facility information in a format compatible with Geomedia version 6.00.34.92 (see Footnote About Geomedia), or approved equal.

**90% Check Set** – provide 5 color copies of bicycle transportation map, as required for backcheck, and one softcopy of the modified bicycle facility information in a format compatible with Geomedia version 6.00.34.92, or approved equal.

**100% Proof set** – provide 2 color copies of bicycle transportation map, for review prior to final printing and one softcopy of the modified bicycle facility information in a format compatible with Geomedia version 6.00.34.92, or approved equal.

**Final set** – provide color hardcopies, in quantities requested, and one softcopy of the final bicycle facilities information in a format compatible with Geomedia version 6.00.34.92, or approved equal.

**Footnote about Geomedia**
Our current version of Geomedia allows us to connect to spatial data created in the following formats:

- Access
- MGE Segment Manager (MGSM)
- ARC/INFO
- ArcView shapefile
- ODBC Tabular
- CAD – AutoCAD and MicroStation®/IGDS
- Oracle® Object Model
- FRAMME™
- SQL Server
- MapInfo
- SmartStore Server
- Modular GIS Environment (MGE)
- Text File Server
- MGE Data Manager (MGDM)

As noted above, those responding to the RFP should contact Diana Shu if further clarification is needed about the bicycle facility data on Geomedia. This project does not need to use Geomedia, other cartographic applications may be used. C/CAG welcomes all reasonable proposals.

C/CAG is also interested in obtaining rights to the completed map. C/CAG would like to retain the right to publish, and reproduce, the completed map. This proposal shall state whether or not this is possible and to what extent. C/CAG recognizes that this may be an issue for some consultants but would like to understand if arrangements can be made or which options are available. Selection of the consultant will not be based on the ability to obtain these rights.

**Future Phases of This Project**

C/CAG is considering future phases of the bicycle map project. Those phases include the following:

A. Bicycle Facility Map Data Maintenance Application
   a. Develop a Geomedia (or similar graphical interface) workflow for bicycle facility information that can be easily maintained by C/CAG staff or other designated support staff.

B. Online Bicycle Facilities
   b. Upload bicycle facility data onto the Metropolitan Transportation Commission online bicycle facility site 511.org
   c. Provide updated information to MTC as required by C/CAG Staff

C. Proposed Bicycle Facility Paper Map
   d. Develop area specific general maps with current and proposed bicycle facility information on standard 8.5" x 11" paper to be inserted into the revised San Mateo Comprehensive Bicycle General Plan. C/CAG will provide the consultant with the proposed bicycle facility information.

In your proposal, please describe how your final bicycle facilities dataset will benefit or impact, if any, the next phases of this project.

**Phase A**
**Bicycle Facility Map**
**Data Maintenance Application**

Develop a Geomedia, or other approved application, workflow for bicycle facility information that can be easily maintained by C/CAG staff or designated technical support staff.

**Workflow or software application user interface**
Develop a process by which C/CAG staff or designated technical staff can update bicycle facilities as required when new bicycle facilities are identified or developed.

This process may be any one or more of the following:

1. An instruction manual guiding the user through Geomedia, or other approved application, on how to enter new bicycle facilities, or to delete selected old bicycle facilities. Please specify application to be used.
2. Develop a workflow, simplified user interface or electronic data editing form in Geomedia, or other approved application, that will allow the user to update bicycle trails. Please identify the software application to be used.

**Possible Deliverables**

**Instruction manual** -for updating bicycle facilities on current electronic file; include one hard and one soft copy of draft set and one final set.

**Workflow, or electronic data editing form** - associated with updating facilities on the bicycle map database (optional).

## Phase B
## Online Bicycle Facilities

### Part I – MTC 511.org

Upload bicycle facility data onto the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) online bicycle map site 511.org and provide updated information to MTC as required by C/CAG staff.

### Online interactive mapping

Coordinate with MTC staff on the 511.org website support to upload the C/CAG bicycle facility information on an as needed basis. Provide data that is compatible with current MTC 511.org website requirements. For this proposal, **assume** that all bicycle facilities are Class III only and no more than one upload per year. Future updates, may include more accurate classifications as provided by C/CAG or BPAC staff.

Work with C/CAG staff to maintain bicycle facility information on an annual basis that can be easily uploaded onto the MTC 511.org website.

### Possible Deliverables

**Allow the public to access bicycle facility information on existing website for bicyclists** – provide data to MTC 511.org website and provide softcopy of same data to C/CAG staff.

**Maintain data on 511.org** – update on annual basis assuming that the data format and or upload requirements remains unchanged from its current MTC configuration.

### Part II – Acrobat (.pdf) Open Access Version on C/CAG Website

C/CAG staff may also wish to post an Acrobat (.pdf) open access version, or other static version of this map on the C/CAG website for users to download all or a portion of the map for their use. Consultant may submit a separate estimate of the cost of providing C/CAG with an Acrobat (.pdf) or other application version of this map and associated license fees, if any along with this proposal. Consultant should provide samples of this work if similar work has been done.

### Possible Deliverables

Acrobat (.pdf) version – provide final version of map in Acrobat (.pdf) open access version or other static format for C/CAG staff to post on C/CAG website for general distribution.

## Phase C
## Proposed Bicycle Facility Paper Map

Using the base map and layers developed for the paper map, develop another set of paper maps with existing and proposed bicycle facility information. The output of this set of maps will be by city and will need to be printed onto standard 8.5" x 11" size sheets to be inserted into the revised San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle General Plan document which will be prepared by others.

Currently, the raw data for the proposed facilities are available on paper format. Only a portion of this data is in an electronic format. The information may be described in a text file, on paper maps, or in Geomedia. For the purposes of this proposal, assume that the information will be provided on a marked up copy of the current bicycle map. C/CAG staff will provide this data.

**Possible Deliverables**

**Proof set** – provide 10 color copies of proposed bicycle facilities, by city, on 8.5" x 11" sheets to C/CAG and/or BPAC committee for review prior to final printing and one softcopy in Geomedia version 6.00.34.92, or approved equal.

**Final set** – provide 5 color hardcopies, one softcopy in a reproducible file and, one softcopy in Geomedia version 6.00.34.92, or approved equal.

## Proposals

Proposals shall include the following information at minimum:

1) Please provide a description of scope of services as stated in above request.
    a. Tasks to be performed and who will do the work: prime or sub consultant.
    b. Include information on software applications, if any, used for this project and its compatibility with Geomedia version 6.00.34.92
    c. Description of deliverables, proposed delivery schedule, and cost estimate on the form provided in Appendix A of this proposal

2) Describe the level of experience on relevant projects
    a. Provide one or two samples of relevant work if available.
    b. Provide contact information
    c. Attach schedule of fees

Provide four (4) hard copies, one set of samples, and one electronic version of your proposal by August 31st, 2007 by 5:00 p.m. to my attention:

Diana Shu
C/CAG of San Mateo County
555 County Center, 5th Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063
650-599-1414
dshu@co.sanmateo.ca.us

**Attachments**

San Mateo County Bicycle Transportation Map
Appendix A Schedule and Cost Estimates
Appendix B Sample Standard Contract Form

## Appendix A
## Schedule and Cost Estimates

| No. | Deliverable | Schedule in Weeks | Cost to Produce |
|---|---|---|---|
| **1.0** | **Paper Map** | | |
| 1.1 | Base map with required GIS layers as defined in items 1 to 8 on pg 3 | | |
| | Bike facility gradients using chevrons to illustrate the direction and relative steepness of grade. (item 9 on pg 3) | | |
| 1.2 | Optional GIS layers: | | |
| | Bike facilities at 2000 feet beyond the borders of the county limits | | |
| | Identify dirt roads | | |
| | Public restrooms | | |
| | Distances between intersections of major arterials (in miles) | | |
| | Bicycle shops | | |
| | **Paper Map** | | |
| | Initial setup cost for paper map | | |
| | Printing and shipping for bulk quantities: | | |
| | Quantity = 5,000 | | |
| | Quantity = 10,000 | | |
| | Quantity = 20,000 | | |
| | Printing and shipping for limited quantities | | |
| | Quantity = 10 | | |
| | Quantity = 100 | | |
| | Quantity = 500 | | |
| | | | |
| 1.3 | 75% draft set | | |
| 1.4 | 90% check set | | |
| 1.5 | 100% proof set | | |
| 1.6 | Final Set with 1 copy | | |
| 1.7 | Estimated "Not to exceed amount" to complete project (w/o prints) | | |
| 1.8 | Rights to publish and reproduce | Yes/No/Maybe | |

## Appendix A (continued)

| No. | Future Phases: Benefit or Impact |
|---|---|
| 2.0 | **Phase A: Bicycle Facility Map Data Maintenance Application** |
| | |
| 3.0 | **Phase B: Online Bicycle Facilities** |
| | |
| 4.0 | **Phase C: Proposed Bicycle Facility Paper Map** |
| | |

ATTACHMENT B
SAMPLE

AGREEMENT BETWEEN
*CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS AND* _____

This Agreement entered this ___ Day of _____, 2007, by and between the CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS, a joint powers agency formed for the purpose of preparation, adoption and monitoring of a variety of county-wide state-mandated plans, hereinafter called "C/CAG" and _____, hereinafter called "Contractor."

W I T N E S S E T H

WHEREAS, C/CAG is a joint powers agency formed for the purpose of preparation, adoption and monitoring of a variety of county-wide state-mandated plans; and,

WHEREAS, C/CAG is prepared to award funding for developing a Bicycle Facility Map for San Mateo County; and

WHEREAS, C/CAG has determined that Contractor has the requisite qualifications to perform this work.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY AGREED by the parties as follows:

1. Services to be provided by Contractor. In consideration of the payments hereinafter set forth, Consultant agrees to perform the services described in Exhibit A.

2. Payments. In consideration of Contractor providing the assistance and services authorized by C/CAG staff, C/CAG shall reimburse Consultant based on acceptance of deliverables and fee schedules set forth in Exhibit A up to a maximum amount of _____.

3. Relationship of the Parties. It is understood that this is an Agreement by and between Independent Contractor(s) and is not intended to, and shall not be construed to, create the relationship of agent, servant, employee, partnership, joint venture or association, or any other relationship whatsoever other than that of Independent Contractor.

4. Non-Assignability. Contractor shall not assign this Agreement or any portion thereof to a third party without the prior written consent of C/CAG, and any attempted assignment without such prior written consent in violation of this Section automatically shall terminate this Agreement.

5. Contract Term. This Agreement shall be in effect as of _____ and shall terminate on _____; provided, however, the C/CAG Chairperson may terminate this Agreement at any time for any reason by providing 30 days' notice to Contractor. Termination to be effective on the date specified in the notice. In the event of

termination under this paragraph, Contractor shall be paid for all approved deliverables provided by the date of termination.

6. Hold Harmless/ Indemnity: Contractor shall indemnify and save harmless C/CAG from all claims, suits or actions resulting from the performance by Contractor of its duties under this Agreement. C/CAG shall indemnify and save harmless Contractor from all claims, suits or actions resulting from the performance by C/CAG of its duties under this Agreement.

The duty of the parties to indemnify and save harmless as set forth herein, shall include the duty to defend as set forth in Section 2778 of the California Civil Code.

7. Insurance: Contractor or its subcontractors performing the services on behalf of Contractor shall not commence work under this Agreement until all Insurance required under this section has been obtained and such insurance has been approved by the C/CAG Staff. Contractor shall furnish the C/CAG Staff with Certificates of Insurance evidencing the required coverage and there shall be a specific contractual liability endorsement extending the Contractor's coverage to include the contractual liability assumed by the Contractor pursuant to this Agreement. These Certificates shall specify or be endorsed to provide that thirty (30) days notice must be given, in writing, to C/CAG of any pending change in the limits of liability or of non-renewal, cancellation, or modification of the policy.

Workers' Compensation and Employer Liability Insurance: Contractor shall have in effect, during the entire life of this Agreement, Workers' Compensation and Employer Liability Insurance providing full statutory coverage.

Liability Insurance: Contractor shall take out and maintain during the life of this Agreement such Bodily Injury Liability and Property Damage Liability Insurance as shall protect the Alliance, its employees, officers and agents while performing work covered by this Agreement from any and all claims for damages for bodily injury, including accidental death, as well as any and all operations under this Agreement, whether such operations be by the Contractor or by any sub-contractor or by anyone directly or indirectly employed by either of them. Such insurance shall be combined single limit bodily injury and property damage for each occurrence and shall be not less than $1,000,000 unless another amount is specified below and shows approval by C/CAG Staff.

Required insurance shall include:

| | Required Amount | Approval by C/CAG Staff if under $ 1,000,000 |
|---|---|---|
| a. Comprehensive General Liability | $ 1,000,000 | _____ |
| b. Workers' Compensation | $ Statutory | _____ |

C/CAG and its officers, agents, employees and servants shall be named as additional insured on any such policies of insurance, which shall also contain a provision that the insurance afforded thereby to C/CAG, its officers, agents, employees and servants shall be primary insurance to the full limits of liability of the policy, and that if C/CAG, or its officers and employees have other insurance against a loss covered by such a policy, such other insurance shall be excess insurance only.

In the event of the breach of any provision of this section, or in the event any notice is received which indicates any required insurance coverage will be diminished or canceled, the C/CAG Chairperson, at his/her option, may, notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement to the contrary, immediately declare a material breach of this Agreement and suspend all further work pursuant to this Agreement.

8. Non-discrimination. The Contractor and its subcontractors performing the services on behalf of the Contractor shall not discriminate or permit discrimination against any person or group of persons on the basis or race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, pregnancy, childbirth or related conditions, medical condition, mental or physical disability or veteran's status, or in any manner prohibited by federal, state or local laws.

9. Accessibility of Services to Disabled Persons. The Contractor, not C/CAG, shall be responsible for compliance with all applicable requirements regarding services to disabled persons, including any requirements of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

10. Substitutions: If particular people are identified in this Agreement are providing services under this Agreement, the Contractor will not assign others to work in their place without written permission from C/CAG. Any substitution shall be with a person of commensurate experience and knowledge.

11. Sole Property of C/CAG: Any system, product, or documents developed, produced or provided under this Agreement shall become the sole property of C/CAG. C/CAG shall retain the right to publish, reproduce, and edit all data associated with the development of this bicycle map.

12. Agreement Renewal. This Agreement may be renewed for an additional two (2) years upon approval by the C/CAG Board and Contractor.

13. Access to Records. C/CAG, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access to any books, documents, papers, and records of the Contractor which are directly pertinent to this Agreement for the purpose of making audit, examination, excerpts, and transcriptions.

    The Contractor shall maintain all required records for three years after C/CAG makes final payments and all other pending matters are closed.

14. Merger Clause. This Agreement, including Exhibit A attached hereto and incorporated

herein by reference, constitutes the sole agreement of the parties hereto with regard to the matters covered in this Agreement, and correctly states the rights, duties and obligations of each party as of the document's date. Any prior agreement, promises, negotiations or representations between the parties not expressly stated in this document are not binding. All subsequent modifications shall be in writing and signed by the C/CAG Chairperson. In the event of a conflict between the terms, conditions or specifications set forth herein and those in Exhibit A attached hereto, the terms, conditions or specifications set forth herein shall prevail.

15. Governing Law. This Agreement shall be governed by the laws of the State of California and any suit or action initiated by either party shall be brought in the County of San Mateo, California.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have affixed their hands on the day and year first above written.

## Contractor

By _____ _____
Date

Contractor Legal Counsel

By _____

## City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG)

By_____
Deborah C. Gordon, C/CAG Chair Date

C/CAG Legal Counsel

By_____
Miruni Soosaipillai, C/CAG Counsel

**From:** "pat giorni" <hogorni@yahoo.com>
**To:** "Sandy Wong" <slwong@co.sanmateo.ca.us>
**Date:** 4/15/2007 6:02 PM
**Subject:** ...Hillsdale Blvd/101 Pedestrian/Bicycle overcrossing Project

Dear Sandy,

I am sending you the letter that I wrote to the San Mateo City Council and cc'ed to their Planning Commission and Department of Public Works, as well as Julian Carroll of Caltrans, regarding the proposed Hillsdale/101 pedestrian/bicycle bridge project, of which I think the entire membership of the C/CAG BPAC should be aware.I did not post this sooner because because I did not want for it to be seen as an influence in any respect while BPAC was judging pedestrian and bicycle funding applications.

However, in future I would urge BPAC to fund feasible projects, not feasibility studies. So little of the transportation tax dollar ever makes its way to bicycle and pedestrian protection in the first place. It is a criminal expenditure to drop these precious dollars into the giant maw of the bureaucracy that has grown around consultancy and feasibility studies. Let a municipality bring forward a completed project proposal with its i's dotted and its t's crossed if it is indeed serious about effecting change and improvement and safety in the pedestrian and bicycle realm.

On April 11, I gave comment before the San Mateo Public Works Commission, and I will forward that presentation to you, whereby what had seemed a slam dunk for approval was sent back to the Department of Public Works for further study and evaluation. Although I know that you do not get involved in an advisory capacity in municipal business, I would suggest that you avail yourself of the approved minutes of that public hearing, just to see the sudden, lively questions that the Commissioners posed once they realized that, good as it sounds, the proposed bridge might not prove of maximum benifit to their city.

Thank you for your consideration.

Pat Giorni,
1445 Balboa Avenue
Burlingame, 94010
650-347-8418

---

February 24, 2007

Dear Mayor Matthews, and Council members;

The City of San Mateo has applied for and received funding to study the feasibility of constructing a pedestrian/bicycle over-crossing, to meet current ADA requirements, at Hillsdale Boulevard/101 in order to provide a greater margin of safety. Three options were developed and discussed in public meetings of the San Mateo Bikeways Committee on 7/13/06, 11/9/06, 12/19/06and 2/20/07. The current option requires acquisition of, or an easement through an undeveloped, privately held parcel to construct a separate ped/bike bridge which would eliminate all at-grade freeway ramp crossings.

Although I have not as yet seen the Draft Study of this project since staff has been slow and reluctant to release it, I have attended the Bikeways meetings to keep abreast of what meager information that has been so far provided. It is my opinion that this entire exercise has been a monumental waste of time and resources to provide what will be an impractical, inconvenient, highly under-used and extremely expensive "quick fix." It would be preferable to see the safety and accessibility issues on the existing 101 overpass addressed and corrected. I am not unaware that this would involve Caltrans cooperation; and I refer you to "Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities in California", July 2005, Deputy Directive (DD-64)pages i-iv; page II-7; page III-6. It has become long past time for jurisdictional boundaries of defined responsibility to be broached so that cooperation between local and state agencies can provide the best and safest facilities for all access and accommodation on our public thoroughfares.

Therefore, one viable alternative would be the installation of traffic signals at the entrance and exit ramps to the existing overpass with conveniently located activation switches/buttons for pedestrian and cyclist use. Traffic studies will bear out that this arrangement will not adversely affect vehicular Level of Service since traffic will be halted only on the occasional as-needed basis. It will not force a change of east-west flow for the pedestrian or cyclist who would be otherwise forced to negotiate dangerous intersections, thus leading to a greater level of safety. Since the estimated cost of traffic signal installation is about $250,000 per pole, this proposal could save at least $3 Million of an estimated $5 million price tag. All sidewalks, with appropriately placed curb-cuts, should be widened to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists, or bicycle lanes should be added to the entire length of the project.It should also be noted that this proposal does address ADA compliance without the necessity of acquiring more land in order to engineer the maximum 2 percent grade,

as the existing overpass already fulfills this requirement.

OR:

A second alternative would be the construction of an isolated, protected pathway down the center of the existing overpass allowing the pedestrian/cyclist to use existing traffic lit intersections to gain access. This solution mimics what has already been done on the 3rd Avenue/101 overpass. Although only San Mateo traffic engineers have shown themselves to be unhappy with this configuration the protected pathway is the preferred means that most pedestrians and cyclists employ at that location. The only real drawback to the 3rd Avenue pathway is that it is too narrow. The remedy is to construct the pathway be at least 10 feet wide which could be easily accomplished by removing existing sidewalks and using that recovered footage to construct the pathway.

Thank you for your consideration.

Patricia Giorni
1445 Balboa ave.
Burlingame
347-8418

---

Do You Yahoo!?
Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around
http://mail.yahoo.com