



TA Board of Directors
Meeting of June 5, 2025

Correspondence as of May 30, 2025

Subject

1. FW_ Video on the failure of .. this time for sure, just one more lane (or one more interchange)
2. Funding Request Letter from City of Burlingame
3. Foster City Council joins San Mateo in voicing concern over 101_92 Direct Connector Project

From: [Public Comment](#)
To: [Board \(@smcta.com\)](#)
Subject: FW: Video on the failure of .. this time for sure, just one more lane (or one more interchange)
Date: Tuesday, May 27, 2025 7:33:17 AM

From: Giuliano <giuliano@carlini.com>
Sent: Monday, May 26, 2025 3:04 PM
To: Giuliano <giuliano@carlini.com>
Subject: Video on the failure of .. this time for sure, just one more lane (or one more interchange)

ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders.

Hi all,

An email blast to a few councils and boards. Please forward as public comments to them.

This video on the futility of adding capacity in the hope it will reduce congestion is worth a watch: <https://youtu.be/CHZwOAlect4>.

I'm sure some of you will find reasons to believe it somehow does not apply to us. While some of it discusses the US it also discusses other countries, and for some reason some folks think that means it's not relevant. A lot of the discussion is about urban areas, and we are suburban. And so some will ignore it. Even though the concepts are still 100% applicable. Some of it discusses freeways and mostly we deal with local streets. But, again, the concepts still apply. And y'all have been impacted by, and have a lot of influence on dumb freeway expansions recently completed, and in the works.

Adding car capacity only increases congestion. Every time. I'd love to hear of ANY study to the contrary or project that was not true of. For example the 101 express lane south of 380 was billed primarily as congestion relief. Data now shows it created more congestion.

And yet the 101 Express Lane north of 380 continues to include as the primary alternative being pushed, adding a lane. This failed south of 380, why do we continue to consider it north of 380?

And Caltrans is pushing hard on adding a new half interchange between 101/92. It will

absolutely fail to relieve congestion. But they want to spend \$10M over the next year for a study. That \$10M should be spent doing things that will actually relieve congestion. As should the \$300M that building that half interchange would cost.

Hope y'all like the video. Reach out if you'd like to just chat. Perhaps you'd like a bibliography of studies and evidence that adding car capacity fails to relieve congestion. Always. Perhaps something else. Whatever, just reach out.

Thanks,

giuliano

--

Drive a bike a bit more often and cars a bit less. You'll be healthier and happier, and so will our world.



The City of Burlingame

OFFICE OF THE
CITY MANAGER

CITY HALL — 501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CALIFORNIA 94010-3997

TEL: (650) 558-7204

May 20, 2025

Ms. April Chan
Executive Director
San Mateo County Transportation Authority
1250 San Carlos Avenue
San Carlos, CA 94070-1306

Re: Request for \$7.65 Million (50%) in Measure A Grade Separation Program Funding for 65% Redesign for the Broadway Burlingame Grade Separation Project

Dear Ms. Chan:

The City of Burlingame is currently seeking funding to support the 65% redesign phase and early work packages for the Broadway Burlingame Grade Separation Project, with an additional funding request anticipated in spring 2026 to complete the 100% design documents. As the project sponsor, the City respectfully requests that the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) consider programming and allocating \$7.65 million (50%) from Measure A Grade Separation Funds to support the total \$15.3 million required for the 65% redesign of the project. Additionally, the City acknowledges that Caltrain will contribute \$3.83 million (25%) toward the redesign effort. The Burlingame City Council approved a \$3.83 million (25%) local match contribution for this effort at its regular meeting on May 19, 2025.

We thank the TA and its staff for their continued support and collaboration in advancing this important project. We look forward to strengthening our partnership with both the TA and Caltrain as we move the Broadway Grade Separation Project forward. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Syed Murtuza, Director of Public Works at (650) 558-7230.

Thank you for your consideration and support.

Sincerely,

Lisa K. Goldman
City Manager

C: City Council
Syed Murtuza, PW Director
Michelle Bouchard, Executive Director of Caltrain
PCJPB Board

From: [Mike Swire](#)
To: [cacsecretary \[@smcta.com\]](#); [Board \(@smcta.com\)](#); [Mima Crume](#)
Subject: Foster City Council joins San Mateo in voicing concern over 101/92 Direct Connector Project
Date: Tuesday, May 27, 2025 12:00:30 PM
Attachments: [20250527 SMDJ article on FC and 10192.pdf](#)

ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from email senders.

Dear SMCTA and C/CAG Board and Commission Members,

Attached please find a SM Daily Journal article on the Foster City Council's concerns with the 101/92 Direct Connector project. Three of the five councilmembers have opposed the project and others have expressed concerns.

Now that the cities of SM and FC have weighed in on this project, I hope that the TA and CAC Boards will revisit whether this highway widening is the best use of taxpayer money at this time. We can still save almost \$10M of taxpayer money by halting the EIR phase.

Sincerely,

Mike Swire
San Mateo, CA

https://www.smdailyjournal.com/news/local/foster-city-unsure-of-92-101-project/article_b05c6abd-df7d-4a0a-a8cb-361492f8de62.html

FEATURED

Foster City unsure of 92/101 project

Council joins San Mateo in voicing concern over a new connecting express lane

By Alyse DiNapoli, Daily Journal staff

May 27, 2025



The Foster City Council joined San Mateo in expressing skepticism over a controversial project that would add a connecting lane between State Route 92 and Highway 101.

Last month, the San Mateo City Council penned a letter to various agencies and representatives — including the San Mateo County Transportation Authority and Caltrans — asking them to "seriously reconsider" the currently proposed project,

noting particular concern with eminent domain, equity impacts from toll lanes, environmental effects and the lack of communication with residents. During a Foster City meeting May 19, councilmembers voiced concern as well, though no official action was taken to sign on to San Mateo's letter.

The 92/101 connector lane project has been a discussion topic for years, with transit agencies such as the Transportation Authority stating it could reduce congestion and improve safety by using a new ramp connector to get from one freeway to another. The lane would be similar to the current Highway 101 express lanes, which employ a demand pricing model, though high-occupancy vehicles would be exempt or receive a discount.

However, Foster City councilmembers Phoebe Venkat and Suzy Niederhofer said there should be more focus on providing transit connections for congestion relief, rather than building an additional highway lane.

"I really think that if we're going to make real progress, it needs to be a long-term project that we focus on that shows it will definitely impact [congestion], and that we have data that show that," Venkat said. "What I'm hearing a lot is around wanting more options for transit, like the cross-Bay transit options. That will really help a lot with the traffic coming from East Bay to the Peninsula to the southern Peninsula."

Agency officials are contemplating a few options. One would add a direct connection from westbound State Route 92 to both directions of the Highway 101 express lanes, which could mitigate morning congestion; a connection from the Highway 101 express lanes to eastbound State Route 92 to alleviate evening traffic; or a reversible lane that could serve both morning and evening demands.

While the project is still in the early stages, it originally involved acquiring more than 30 parcels of private property via eminent domain, which stipulates that owners may have to sell their land under certain circumstances, provided it will be used for public use.

However, the TA said the current proposal options wouldn't take any houses or parks, but could involve taking portions of property. The two areas in question are in San Mateo, on the southwest side of Highway 101, in the Fiesta Gardens

neighborhood south of State Route 92, and on the northeast side of Highway 101, in the Shoreview neighborhood north of State Route 92.

Foster City Mayor Stacy Jimenez said that while she has some concerns over the project, she would be supportive of it if there is a clear indication it could improve emergency access routes.

"We know that it's very difficult for us to get into or out of Foster City, so if this project has the potential to aid in emergency situations then I am all in," Jimenez said.

Funding for the entire project is uncertain. The initial \$200 million estimate is several years old, and the price tag will likely be higher. Updated cost estimates will be released with the draft environmental impact report, which is expected to be circulated for public comment and feedback in the fall of 2026.

alyse@smdailyjournal.com

(650) 344-5200 ext. 102



Alyse DiNapoli, Daily Journal staff

Daily Journal staff

[Learn more about your privacy options](#)