



**MEETING MINUTES of the
San Mateo County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (SMCBPAC)
Thursday, June 18, 2026
6:00 P.M.**

500 County Center, Manzanita Hall, first floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

1. WELCOME

Chair Michael Barnes called the meeting to order at 6:02 PM.

2. ROLL CALL

Present:

Michael Barnes
Fred Zyda
John Langbein
Mark Lee
Elaine Salinger
Susan Doherty (Zoom)

Absent:

Cristina Aquino

County Staff: Krzysztof Lisaj, Gina Luiz, and Paul Sheng (County Attorney's Office)

Additional attendees: Jae Riddle (Senior Transportation Planner – Mark Thomas), Melissa Pacheco (member of the public), and Josie Domet (Journalist – Coastside News)

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

4. ACTION TO SET AGENDA

Motion: Vice Chair Mark Lee moved to set the agenda/Member John Langbein seconded. The motion carried 6-0.

REGULAR AGENDA

5. Review and Approve April 16, 2026 Regular Meeting Minutes ([Action](#))

Motion: Member Langbein moved to approve/Member Elaine Salinger seconded. The motion carried 6-0.

6. One Bay Area Grant Cycle 4 Application Presentation ([Action](#))

Jae Riddle, Senior Transportation Planner – Mark Thomas, presented on the One Bay Area Grant Cycle 4 Application for the Guadalupe Canyon Parkway Class IV Project (Project).

Member Salinger asked for clarification on whether the shared bicycle lane intersects with the John F. Kennedy Elementary School (School) on Guadalupe Canyon Parkway. She stated that there is a sidewalk where cyclists are expected to share a lane. Ms. Riddle responded that youth under the age of 12 are allowed to ride their bicycles along the sidewalk. She continued by stating elementary-age children are not riding that corridor alone. Krzysztof Lisaj added that the proposed bicycle lane area is past the School.

Member Langbein asked about the road grade in the area. Ms. Riddle stated she will provide that information to the SMCBPAC committee. Mr. Lisaj noted that the bicycle path is 8-foot wide, which is wider than the standard bicycle path. Member Langbein asked why there is an 11-foot travel lane instead of a 10-foot travel lane. Ms. Riddle responded that it has to do with the speed limit, and 11-foot-wide lanes are the minimum they were able to recommend. Ms. Riddle provided the road grade information and said if you are traveling in the eastbound direction the road grade varies between 5% and 7%. Member Langbein stated that when you mix e-bikes and regular bicycles passing motions will increase and create conflict. Mr. Lisaj asked if the concern was the protected line or the delineators. Member Langbein responded that both are concerns and the protected bike lane needs to be able to safely accommodate passing motions.

Vice Chair Lee asked if the only parking lanes are in the U-turn segment near the School. Ms. Riddle confirmed those are the only parking lanes. Vice Chair Lee asked about the lineal footage of the area, and Ms. Riddle said the lineal footage is approximately 200-500 feet.

Chair Barnes noted he can easily go 35 MPH downhill from the San Bruno Mountain State Park (Park) entrance when traveling from the east. He said once you reach the crest of Guadalupe Canyon Parkway there is debris on the roadway from eucalyptus trees, and cyclists avoid the area due to the debris. Chair Barnes stated that at the summit there is a gate on the south side of the roadway. As you go toward Daly City and up Guadalupe Canyon Parkway to the Park entrance there is an automated gate. When descending from the top of Radio Road, Chair Barnes said he lifts his bicycle over the guardrail to Guadalupe Canyon Parkway as a safer alternative. His suggested solution is a cyclist and pedestrian entrance, and he understands that this would require State cooperation.

Chair Barnes asked whether they plan to install a stop sign across from Price Street on Guadalupe Canyon Parkway. Ms. Riddle said the project does not include new stop sign locations. Chair Barnes said as you are leaving Daly City and traveling west Price Street becomes Guadalupe Canyon Parkway. There is a stop sign on Orange Court and when you reach the School and are heading uphill. Chair Barnes said people come around the sweeping turn and there is limited visibility. He said when the area reduces to a one sharrow lane it becomes scary. He suggested the following safety enhancements: installing a stop sign on east bound Guadalupe Canyon Parkway across from Price Street, consider two travel lanes, or reducing the 9-foot buffer and lowering the speed limit.

Chair Barnes said the rumble strips that were installed from Bayshore Boulevard in Brisbane to Guadalupe Canyon Parkway are effective. He asked if the rumble strips will be eliminated as the roadway is repaired. Ms. Riddle said she will check with her colleagues on the design. She said there are tall delineators to provide a visual distinction of where not to go and the wheel bumps move vehicles out of the cycling path.

Chair Barnes said if you are traveling uphill from Carter Street and heading west there is a “Bike Land Ends” sign and the lane narrows to 3-feet. He asked if the 8-foot bicycle lane proposed in Segment 2 is the entire length of Bayshore Boulevard to the School. Ms. Riddle said there was discussion about possibly widening the roadway. She will check with the designers on whether the widening was added to the contingency costs.

Member Salinger asked Ms. Riddle if there are plans to remove the eucalyptus trees. Ms. Riddle said that decision would be made by the property owners. Mr. Lisaj said tree removal is not included in this Project, and they could ask if there is an opportunity for tree trimming.

The SMCBPAC committee voted on the letter of support for the Project. Member Barnes noted there is a typo in the letter where it states Bayshore Parkway, but it should state Bayshore Boulevard. Ms. Riddle said they will revise the letter.

Vice Chair Lee asked who the author of the letter was and Mr. Lisaj responded that the letter was developed by Mark Thomas with input from Public Works.

Mr. Lisaj said once the grant is approved there will be an opportunity for comment once the Project is in the design phase.

Motion: Member Fred Zyda moved to approve the letter of support/Member Salinger seconded. The motion carried 5-0, and Member Langbein abstained.

7. Brown Act 2026 Updates ([Information](#))

Paul Sheng, County Attorney’s Office, presented on the Recent Changes to the Brown Act and SB707.

Vice Chair Lee asked what is permitted under the Brown Act with regards to sub-committees and ad-hoc committees. Paul Sheng responded if there is not a quorum and the sub-committee and/or ad-hoc committee is formed for a specific purpose and that information is brought back to the SMCBPAC committee for discussion then it is allowed. There must be proper notice on the agenda of the formation of the sub-committee and/or ad-hoc committee.

Member Salinger asked if it is a violation of the Brown Act if two SMCBPAC committee members are working on a project and inform the Chair of updates outside of a regular meeting. Mr. Sheng responded that if there is a quorum then it is a violation of the Brown Act. Mr. Sheng offered to return to a future meeting for an in-depth presentation of the Brown Act.

Chair Barnes asked if the Board of Supervisors has authorized a committee to meet fully remote and Mr. Sheng responded no. Mr. Lisaj added there is a larger County effort to look at all the Boards and Commissions to determine if they can move to fully remote participation. He said he will ask staff and provide the SMCBPAC committee with a response. Chair Barnes asked what findings need to be made by the Board of Supervisors to authorize full remote participation. Mr. Sheng said he will ask and provide a response to the SMCBPAC committee.

Chair Barnes asked if the Board of Supervisors eventually authorizes full remote participation will all committee members have to participate remotely or will they have an option of attending in-person? Mr. Sheng said committee members always have the option to report in-person. Chair Barnes also asked if all committee members must be located in San Mateo County to ensure a

quorum. Mr. Sheng said that is dependent on the type of meeting, for example, a teleconference meeting. He said he will verify if committee members must be present in San Mateo County for a fully remote meeting. Chair Barnes asked how often the Board of Supervisors must reauthorize remote meetings and Mr. Sheng said he was unsure and will provide a response to the SMCBPAC committee once he has the answer.

8. BPAC Members Terms Expiring ([Information](#))

Mr. Lisaj presented the process for appointment, recruitment of BPAC members, and expiring terms.

Member Salinger stated attendance should be a factor for reappointment. Chair Barnes noted the attendance requirement was addressed during the SMCBPAC committee's bylaws discussion. Mr. Lisaj added that recommendations for reappointment are based on the bylaws and attendance. Member Zyda noted that SMCBPAC committee member attendance is public record. Chair Barnes said the bylaws will be part of the package that will go to the Board of Supervisors.

9. BPAC Roles with other BPACs (C/CAG) ([Information](#))

Mr. Lisaj presented on the SMCBPAC roles with other BPACs including definitions, regional network connectivity, review of regional plans, sharing data and best practices, and advocacy on regional policies.

Vice Chair Lee announced he was recently appointed to City of San Mateo Sustainability and Infrastructure Commission. He said he would like to coordinate local and County efforts and goals.

Member Salinger asked when there is a vacancy if there is a way to prioritize candidates serving on the San Mateo County Transportation Authority or C/CAG. Mr. Lisaj said there is no official guidance during the recruitment process, however there are things they look for in a candidate, and they can add that as part of the recruitment process.

Member Langbein stated that people may advocate as an individual to another BPAC. Mr. Lisaj confirmed people may attend any meeting as an individual, however you cannot attend as a SMCBPAC committee member unless it has been approved by the SMCBPAC committee.

Member Susan Doherty asked to add the Bay to Sea Trail as a project to follow. Chair Barnes agreed and said that is a great example of regional cooperation. Mr. Lisaj said there is a contact they can reach out to for any updates they may want to share with the SMCBPAC committee.

Mr. Lisaj also said that this is an opportunity for a SMCBPAC sub-committee to identify other BPACs and see if there is opportunity for coordination. He will follow up with Mr. Sheng to ask what the process is and ask for a presentation on subcommittee formation.

Chair Barnes asked if there are coastal BPAC committees in Pacifica, Half Moon Bay, and/or Pescadero. Mr. Lisaj said there is the Pescadero Municipal Advisory Council in Pescadero, and Pacifica and Half Moon Bay likely have BPACs. Mr. Lisaj noted the Metropolitan Transportation Commission guidelines for Complete Streets require a BPAC to obtain funding. All 20 jurisdictions likely have a BPAC to be eligible for funding.

Chair Barnes stated the Coleman Avenue Project in Menlo Park is a great example of community engagement. He said they should contact the City of Menlo Park BPAC for their feedback. He also

said they should reach out to the Daly City BPAC for their thoughts on the Guadalupe Canyon Parkway Class IV Project. Chair Barnes acknowledged that Vice Chair Lee asked for e-bikes to be agendized.

Member Salinger proposed expanding the list of project priorities to include a bicycle path on the north and south path of Interstate 280 to help reduce traffic congestion and pollution. She also supported that they advocate for a crossing on State Route 92 (SR 92) for active transportation at upper Skyline Boulevard. Chair Barnes asked if Member Salinger was referring to the connection between Skyline Boulevard and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC). Member Salinger confirmed and stated people will want to continue the path that goes along the Southern Skyline Ridge Trail to San Bruno. Member Langbein said the section north of SR 92 is managed by the SFPUC and access is limited. Member Salinger stated she went on a docent tour and there is discussion about making the trail more accessible. Member Barnes and Member Langbein said the project may already be in the workplan, and they can discuss the workplan at a future meeting. Mr. Lisaj confirmed Public Works will present the workplan at the December SMCBPAC meeting.

10. BPAC Member Announcements and Discussion (Information)

Member Salinger met with Supervisor Mueller and Anya Chernykh, Legislative Aide, and they planning to walk part of the gap between the Sawyer Camp Trail and Cañada Road in July or August.

11. County Updates (Information)

Mr. Lisaj reviewed the April 16, 2026 BPAC meeting minutes and a SMCBPAC committee member noted there were references to Sustainability on the Active Transportation section of the Public Works website. Mr. Lisaj said that upon review there are not references to Sustainability and asked if the SMCBPAC committee member(s) would email him any information that requires updating.

Mr. Lisaj reported said there are continuing efforts to replace the Sustainability Specialists. Unfortunately, they did not receive any applications for the work-out-of-class opportunity. Moving forward, Public Works will use an existing hiring list to fill the vacancy. He will share the job description with the SMCBPAC committee.

12. Adjournment

Motion: Vice Chair Lee moved to adjourn/ Member Salinger seconded. The motion carried 6-0.

The meeting adjourned at 7:58 PM