



BAY AREA VISION ZERO WORKING GROUP

Bringing together Bay Area cities, counties, and other public agency staff to share wins, challenges, and work together regionally in support of Vision Zero.

Wednesday, May 27, 2026 | 1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Zoom Link: [Join Meeting](#) | Meeting ID: 816 8688 0897 | Passcode: 120752

AGENDA [NOTES]

1. Opening

1:30 p.m.

[Shruti introduced Fabian Gallardo, who recently joined MTC as the Principal Program Coordinator for Safety/Vision Zero, Access and Mobility Programs.]

2. Presentations

- a. MTC Updates: SS4A Quick-Builds and Survey, ATP Cycle 8 1:35 p.m.
Brian Xi, MTC Vision Zero Data Analyst
Fabian Gallardo, MTC Principal Program Coordinator
Karl Anderson, MTC Senior Transportation Planner

[SEE [SLIDES](#) – Karl gave an update on the 2027 Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle 8 Call for Projects, with applications due on June 22, 2026. Approximately \$310M is available statewide, and \$53M is available for MTC’s regional component.

Brian and Fabian gave an update on MTC’s SS4A grant. MTC has launched a [survey](#) until July 1 to identify potential project partners to delivery quick-build safety projects as part of its grant. For additional details about the program (including eligible project materials, funding amounts, example scopes, etc.), please refer to the above slides. This survey will help MTC deliver its grant in a timely manner.

As part of the [AT-VZ Project](#), the next event is a Best Practices Workshop in San Mateo County on June 23, 2026 from 10:00am-2:00pm. Registration details to be shared via email.

Q&A:

- Did Caltrans Division of Local Assistance (DLA) also confirm Brian’s explained approach with CA Division of FHWA? Which contact? Curious if Richmond Parkway is eligible, among others?
 - o Caltrans DLA Environmental has confirmed the quick-build materials MTC shared in the slides. To deliver the grant in a timely manner, MTC has shared survey considerations they will evaluate holistically, including Caltrans right-of-way and potential unusual circumstances under National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

Program Coordinator: Brian Xi | bx@bayareametro.gov

Assistant Director: Shruti Hari | shari@bayareametro.gov

Webpage: [MTC Vision Zero](#)

- review. However, MTC encourages local partners to submit any potential project location, as they will evaluate all responses and collaborate with local partners.
- For quick build projects, can the design scope be such that the installed quick build elements be intended to be left in place for multiple years, vs. needing to be removed like a quick-build demonstration project?
 - o While quick build materials are intended to be temporary and adjustable, MTC will defer to local jurisdictions on leaving these elements in place, especially if they have positive community feedback and safety benefits.
 - What is the timeline of this grant?
 - o MTC has five years (until 2030) to execute this grant; MTC anticipates selecting project partners for quick-builds this fall before proceeding to active work.
 - Is the intent for each jurisdiction to submit their own quick build improvement application? Or for MTC to submit a combined application for all jurisdictions who are interested in implementing quick build improvements?
 - o Each jurisdiction should submit their own application with the survey; MTC encourages jurisdictions to coordinate with each other where possible, especially if the project location crosses multiple jurisdictions or could benefit from multijurisdictional collaboration.
 - How are you going to select the projects you will fund?
 - o MTC's survey considerations are shared in the slides. In general, MTC seeks to select quick-build projects that can be delivered on time, within the next 2-3 years.
 - How heavily is the disadvantaged community benefit weighted in applications?
 - o MTC will consider disadvantaged community benefits in applications.
 - Will there be a call for projects or is the survey essentially serving as the CFP?
 - o At this stage, this survey will likely be the primary opportunity to put forward projects to keep the program timeline on track.
 - How much money did you receive in total from SS4A?
 - o MTC received a \$10M federal SS4A grant award, with \$2M in local match.
 - Approximately when will we know if a project is awarded?
 - o After the survey closes in July, MTC will review survey responses through July, schedule follow ups as necessary, and aim to respond by August/September.
 - You said that MTC will be collecting data for before/after studies?
 - o MTC will be collecting data on pre-implementation assessment and at least a six-month evaluation period post-implementation of quick-builds. MTC is finalizing the program delivery method and should have an update mid-summer on whether MTC or local partners will be collecting data.
 - For the quick build project location, does it have to be on the federal aid roadway network since the funds are federal funds?
 - o No; project locations can be on locally-owned roads, preferably ones that aren't state routes and do not have unusual circumstances with regards to NEPA. However, MTC will consider all submitted project locations and work with respondents to create successful projects.]

a. City of Oakland Speed Cameras Update
Jasmine Pomar, OakDOT Chief of Staff

1:55 p.m.

[SEE SLIDES AND [WEBPAGE](#) – Jasmine presented an update on the City of Oakland’s Speed Safety Cameras Pilot Program. The program launched in January 2026 with a 60-day warning period, and citations started in March 2026. The City placed cameras along its high-injury network (HIN) while covering each District.

Q&A:

- Can OakDOT share any insight into why a jurisdiction might consider using engineering surveys for speed (instead of StreetLight data or Replica or other planning data uses)?
 - o OakDOT did not have access to datasets like the above when selecting camera locations.
- Did Oakland analyze whether there was any correlation between location of the warning/citation, and the address/neighborhood where the vehicle is registered? Curious how commuters and visitors/tourists might factor into the overall share of speeding incidents.
 - o AB 645, the legislation for this program, contains strict privacy guardrails; OakDOT has zip code information from warnings/citations but not specific addresses.
- How are vehicles with altered, incorrect, hidden, fake, or no license plates addressed in the data you presented?
 - o OakDOT is aware of these issues and has been working with other departments to address this.
- Have you ever had drivers contest the citations? Or is someone else driving another person’s car and receives a citation?
 - o There are lots of citation contests. OakDOT has a process for investigating them. In terms of liability around someone else driving a vehicle, that was programmed out by the legislation. These are non-moving violations that cite the registered owner, similar to a parking ticket. OakDOT does not need to prove who was driving the car. In fact, the cameras are required to be positioned in a way that cannot see the driver’s face.
- What do you spend the revenue on? And does the revenue cover staff hours related to implementing/maintaining this program?
 - o The revenue is cost recovering. The program is estimated to be costing about \$2.5M a year. After the program pays for itself, the legislation requires that OakDOT spend the rest of the money on traffic calming infrastructure designed to slow vehicles. DOT has to keep control over all the funds, which is fairly unique to this state’s legislation.
- You mentioned the cameras turn on if a vehicle measures 11 mph over the posted speed limit. How was this number selected?
 - o While AB 645 provided the number, many VZWG members are interested in revisiting that figure in the future – for instance, addressing the percentage by which each posted speed limit is exceeded instead of a flat number.
- Have there been reported complaints of speeding on nearby streets where no speed cameras were placed due to cut-through traffic? Has any identifying info taken from the speed cameras been used to build cases on any criminal investigations, say in addition to the Flock camera system?
 - o OakDOT has not heard anything about this; they know that spillover is something residents always worry about when doing infrastructure projects. It’s challenging to

study, but OakDOT has started studying that for streetscape projects and having conversations with partners.

- How much is a citation?
 - o Tickets start at \$50 (for those without income-based fine reduction) and go all the way up to \$500 for anyone going above 100mph regardless of speed limit.
- How well do the cameras work in dark conditions? Did the City choose street light specs for camera effectiveness?
 - o Quite well – the speed detection element is RADAR/LIDAR, so the accuracy of speed detection is not relative to light conditions. To the best of their knowledge, OakDOT has not had to work with their vendor on street lighting.]

b. City of Santa Rosa Traffic Calming and Road Diet Projects 2:20 p.m.
Alexander Ocegüera, Santa Rosa Active Transportation Planner

[SEE SLIDES – Alexander presented on a couple of traffic calming and road diet projects that the City of Santa Rosa completed. Many traffic calming projects targeted elementary schools and railroad crossings, while many road diet projects were incorporated as part of the City’s pavement maintenance program. The City is using an SS4A grant to improve intersection safety as well.

Q&A:

- How much outreach are you doing for the road diets implemented with the pavement program? Did you get/need Council approval for the concepts?
 - o The City of Santa Rosa doesn’t need council approval for the concepts. The City did a road diet on Steele Lane where there was quite a bit of outreach done where they had multiple mailers and surveys put out to residents. After that Pilot Study, the council has trusted the City’s judgement on implementing multi-modal corridors so now their approach is to not do as much outreach and install their multi-modal concepts and inform residents as calls come in about the projects. The City is lucky to have a Council that is supportive of the projects that they have been implementing.
- How are you addressing street sweeping for the protected bike lanes?
 - o The City has its own in-house bike lane street sweeper that can go down to five feet. They also have a local trash collection contractor called Recology that was willing to purchase a bike lane street sweeper. The City did have to add a rate increase to the contract so they could purchase the bike lane street sweeper.
- How are you deciding between the bigger green bollards and the skinner white ones in the separated bike lanes?
 - o Bigger K71’s are implemented on roadways where the City has done a resurfacing/pavement maintenance project or where they don’t plan to resurface the street for at least 7+ years. The smaller skinnier white delineators are meant to be in areas where the installation would be more temporary in nature before the City is able to allocate funds to have the road resurfaced and have a more permanent solution in the buffer area. In the future, the City hopes to harden the vertical separation area with concrete or an asphalt berm.

- Can you expand a bit more on the internal process to move forward with projects outside of paving work? This seems to be a barrier for many jurisdictions that will only do bike/ped enhancements as part of paving projects. Prioritization, staff capacity/resources, funding, etc.?
 - o The focus from the Director of Public Works is on safety so enhancements to the roadway are a priority. The City talks internally about projects and their Safe Routes to School walking audits help inform the projects they work on. They focus on locations where there have been collisions, are on their HIN, are connections to their bicycle network, or are part of their Safe Routes to School walking audits.]
- c. 2026 Legislative Update 2:45 p.m.
Jadie Moar, MTC Legislative Analyst

[Jadie provided some legislative updates; on the state side, many e-bike bills have been introduced this year to regulate e-motos and the growing prevalence of higher-speed, high-powered devices that do not fit into any device category in the California Vehicle Code.

[AB 1837](#) – González. Indefinitely extend the existing authorization for parking enforcement for vehicles stopped in bus lanes with forward facing cameras on buses, and potentially expand it for additional violations. This is currently under a pilot program that ends in 2027, hence its introduction this year. This bill passed Committee and has been ordered to the Senate.

[SB 1167](#) – Blakespear. Clarifies that e-bikes are devices that do not exceed 20 mph (throttle) or 28 mph (pedal assist) and have motors of 750 watts or less. Devices exceeding these thresholds are not considered e-bikes and shall be regulated according to their speed, power, and safety risks. This bill passed Committee and has been ordered to the Assembly.

On the federal side, the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee released the BUILD America 2050 Act, which is the \$580B, 5-year reauthorization of federal surface transportation programs. Among other details, the Act includes codification of the Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) program, with more focus on implementation funding.]

3. Closing

- a. Meeting notes and slides will be shared after the meeting