



TA Board of Directors  
Meeting of July 10, 2025

Correspondence as of June 13, 2025

# Subject

1. Public Comment: 1) Concerns and 2) Foster City Council reaction to 101/92 presentation by TA
2. Public Comment: Goal of 101/92 is to increase capacity of 101 and 92

**From:** [Public Comment](#)  
**To:** [Board \(@smcta.com\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 1) Concerns and 2) Foster City Council reaction to 101/92 presentation by TA  
**Date:** Monday, June 9, 2025 7:32:12 AM

---

**From:** Giuliano <giuliano@carlini.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 7, 2025 1:20 AM  
**To:** Public Comment <publiccomment@smcta.com>  
**Subject:** 1) Concerns and 2) Foster City Council reaction to 101/92 presentation by TA

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

Hi all,

Concerns

I went to the last TA meeting, 5 June 2025, planning only to thank my fellow CAC members Jeff Londer and Peter Ohtaki for the service. I needed to leave early as my Aikido Nidan test was later that evening. I was not expecting to speak on any item as I had already said my piece at the CAC meeting, and felt no need to repeat any of it for the public at large as part of the TA meeting.

I was quite surprised when staff had a significantly different view of the Foster City Council's reaction to the 101/92 connector presentation than I had, based on my attendance at their May 19th meeting. And so I quickly filled out a speaker card and made my comments.

Now, I'm a bit concerned based on the recent changes to the rules of procedure for the CAC, and the drafts leading up to it. I'm concerned that when I speak out opposed to projects which the TA sponsors, whether at CAC and TA meetings or during advocacy outside of these meetings, that this may result in my eventual removal from the CAC; possibly based on claimed violations of the Rules of Procedure, possibly on pretextual reasons. I believe completely in the Rules of Procedures principles, and do my utmost to follow them.

The CAC is the advisory body that is tasked to give the TA the community's frank opinions. The CAC ensures the TA is fairly apprised of the broad range of the community's opinion. Those who agree have no need to advocate. Their desires are

being met. You want me/others who disagree (after reasonable consideration) to feel comfortable advocating. You want me to be part of the process, and engaging with the process. You do not want a "rubber stamp". Indeed, the statutes setting up the CAC demand no less.

I hope y'all can give full throated support when I oppose to TA decisions, even though we disagree. Otherwise, the CAC becomes nothing but a rubber stamp, and useless to you in gauging what the community wants.

RE: my statement above "after reasonable consideration". I can understand frustration with folks who are doctrinaire and who are closed minded. I am not. I decide on projects based based on the data, science/engineering, Measure A goals, Measure W Core Principles, and TA and state policy. Show me how I'm wrong, how the data, science/engineering, etc support a project and I'll change my opinion on that project.

Foster City Council reaction to 101/92 presentation by TA

Foster city council May 19 meeting

video: <https://fostercity.new.swagit.com/videos/343233>.

Council member comments and questions. I generally capture below the opposition and concerns. Other than they mayor, there were very few equivocal comments. What did occur was mostly the polite preludes and epilogs folks generally give. Only the mayor expressed whole hearted support for modeling and the EIR.

Initially there was start of meeting formalities, followed by TA staff presentation.

- 24:30 Sullivan: Financing question.
- 26:15 Venkat:
  - "I could not find any studies that showed that projects like this help long term." ... paraphrasing: are there any.  
Director Manzi: modeling and analysis but no studies. the hope is " [NB: when it is well understood that adding capacity to any part of the system increases capacity and then demand.]
  - "I don't see a transit component in this plan"  
"I would think we'd want to focus on transit ... can be really helpful in

relieving congestion"

Paraphrasing: can transit be added? Response: no, because it is a highway project. [NB:

According to the text of Measure W, highway projects may use funds on transit, just not exclusively on transit. If I recall correctly, Measure A is silent on this.]

○ 31:13: even if no takings, won't pollution impact residents.

- \* 33:50 Niederhofer:  
Focus should be on regional transit working together to reduce congestion ... "and solving the real problem".
- 35:10 Kiesel: Was this project part of RM3 scope? Response: no, no specific projects were scoped.  
40:15: We are going to be drafting long term project EIR when we don't have data from near term project +
- 43:15 Jimenez: Eminent domain questions
- 44:30 Sullivan: We have been patching 101 for 20 years ... "We are have trying to get people off the freeways".  
Project has to address public transportation.
- 47:00 Public comments. 57:20 Public comments done
- 57:40 Niederhofer: "We need to solve the issue of the bridge with some kind of commute transit that goes to transit ... We really need to look at that."
- 58:05 Venkat: "If we are going to make real progress, it needs to be long term projects ... [that have impact]... and that we have data that will show that"  
No one in Foster City or outside that asking for this ... what I'm hearing is options for transit ... That's where we need to head to for the future.
- 59:19 Sullivan: 50% of our traffic is moms and dads taking their kids back and forth to school. Most of the people driving on 101 are going less than 30 miles. The failure we've had is to get CalTrain, BART, SamTrans to get together and develop a seamless thing.

How are we connecting transportation, how are we taking care of the environment.

We can come up with some kind of public transportation or ebikes or scooters

We gotta get people out of their cars.

- 1:00:35 Kiesel: I'm not sure we can cancel this project or give the nod to go ahead with it. [NB: While they may not be able to make the decision, they are being asked for their input]]

All we are doing is moving congestion from 101 to 92. Wherever you put the neck of the bottle, that's where the jam will start.

92/101 interchange has been a problem since 1968 when I first started driving on it. Sitting here talking about it means it hasn't been solved.

- :04:00 Jimenez: Concern is primarily for Foster City residents. Concerns about emergencies. If it might help congestion, I'm all in. It's too early to say
- 1:09:20 Item concluded. Informational only. Nothing else we can do.

Thanks much,

giuliano

--

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

**From:** [Public Comment](#)  
**To:** [Board \(@smcta.com\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Goal of 101/92 is to increase capacity of 101 and 92.  
**Date:** Monday, June 9, 2025 7:31:31 AM

---

**From:** Giuliano <giuliano@carlini.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 7, 2025 9:18 PM  
**To:** Public Comment <publiccomment@smcta.com>  
**Cc:** Jessica Manzi <Manzij@samtrans.com>  
**Subject:** Goal of 101/92 is to increase capacity of 101 and 92.

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

Hi all,

Summary:

I just realized that despite mixed messaging, that TA staff has clearly been making statements whose logical conclusion is that these projects are adding capacity to 101 and 92. And, what does every single study say happens after a capacity increase? That it will induce demand. That more cars will use the new capacity. That congestion will return. Only now with more cars. Congestion is now worse.

This project is a boondoggle that is doomed to fail. Kill it now before we waste a further \$7M on it.

Details:

For at least a year now, something has been gnawing at me. Last night, after watching the staff presentation at the Foster City Council May 19th meeting I figured it out.

Staff is contradicting itself. They say that neither the short term work on the 101/92 interchange nor the construction of the 101/92 connector increases capacity on 101 or 92. They have directly told me this in earlier meetings. And they repeated this claim at the Foster City Council meeting. They say that since neither is having any lanes added to them, therefore there is no addition of capacity. The thing is, capacity is not defined as highway width.

So, what is the definition of capacity? Every source I've checked defines highway

capacity as something close to "The capacity of a roadway facility is the maximum reasonable hourly rate at which vehicles can be expected to transverse a point or a uniform section of lane ..." (from the FHWA, Federal Highway Administration, emphasis mine). The capacity is the number of vehicles that can traverse the highway per hour. If ANYTHING changes that rate, it has changed the highway's capacity, even if that change was not directly to the highway.

In response to a question by Council member Venkat about induced demand, at 27:20 staff says that the interchange does add capacity, though not to 101 or 92. And that the hope is this will decrease congestion and increase flow on 101 and 92. Well, increased flow means the traffic is moving faster and that therefore more cars are traversing 101 and 92 at any given unit of time. In other words, we have increased the capacity of 101 and 92 even though they have not themselves have not been changed.

Please refer to the video: <https://fostercity.new.swagit.com/videos/343233>. This is not an exact quote, I'm not a stenographer, but it is pretty close. It is accurate with respect to meaning (emphasis is mine):

... one of the unique elements of this project is that it's providing additional capacity for that specific segment 101 and 92 but it's not changing the capacity of 92 on one side or 101 on the other, because those facilities aren't changing, you still have the same volume of traffic that is going to go through the facility, but there is more space for that existing volume to use and so the hope is that you shift some of the cars that are doing all of that merging and creating all of that congestion on 101 and 92 to this Direct Connector so that those flow more freely, and you don't have that backup, even folks that aren't using the interchange direct itself that it clears up some of that congestion that you experience on 92 or 101.

This project is a boondoggle that is doomed to fail. Kill it now before we waste a further \$7M on it.

giuliano

--

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

On Sat, Jun 7, 2025, at 1:20 AM, Giuliano wrote:

Hi all,

## Concerns

I went to the last TA meeting, 5 June 2025, planning only to thank my fellow CAC members Jeff Londer and Peter Ohtaki for the service. I needed to leave early as my Aikido Nidan test was later that evening. I was not expecting to speak on any item as I had already said my piece at the CAC meeting, and felt no need to repeat any of it for the public at large as part of the TA meeting.

I was quite surprised when staff had a significantly different view of the Foster City Council's reaction to the 101/92 connector presentation than I had, based on my attendance at their May 19th meeting. And so I quickly filled out a speaker card and made my comments.

Now, I'm a bit concerned based on the recent changes to the rules of procedure for the CAC, and the drafts leading up to it. I'm concerned that when I speak out opposed to projects which the TA sponsors, whether at CAC and TA meetings or during advocacy outside of these meetings, that this may result in my eventual removal from the CAC; possibly based on claimed violations of the Rules of Procedure, possibly on pretextual reasons. I believe completely in the Rules of Procedures principles, and do my utmost to follow them.

The CAC is the advisory body that is tasked to give the TA the community's frank opinions. The CAC ensures the TA is fairly apprised of the broad range of the community's opinion. Those who agree have no need to advocate. Their desires are being met. You want me/others who disagree (after reasonable consideration) to feel comfortable advocating. You want me to be part of the process, and engaging with the process. You do not want a "rubber stamp". Indeed, the statutes setting up the CAC demand no less.

I hope y'all can give full throated support when I oppose to TA decisions, even though we disagree. Otherwise, the CAC becomes nothing but a rubber stamp, and useless to you in gauging what the community wants.

RE: my statement above "after reasonable consideration". I can understand frustration with folks who are doctrinaire and who are closed minded. I am



not. I decide on projects based based on the data, science/engineering, Measure A goals, Measure W Core Principles, and TA and state policy. Show me how I'm wrong, how the data, science/engineering, etc support a project and I'll change my opinion on that project.

Foster City Council reaction to 101/92 presentation by TA

Foster city council May 19 meeting

video: <https://fostercity.new.swagit.com/videos/343233>.

Council member comments and questions. I generally capture below the opposition and concerns. Other than they mayor, there were very few equivocal comments. What did occur was mostly the polite preludes and epilogs folks generally give. Only the mayor expressed whole hearted support for modeling and the EIR.

Initially there was start of meeting formalities, followed by TA staff presentation.

- 24:30 Sullivan: Financing question.
- 26:15 Venkat:
  - "I could not find any studies that showed that projects like this help long term." ... paraphrasing: are there any.  
Director Manzi: modeling and analysis but no studies. the hope is " [NB: when it is well understood that adding capacity to any part of the system increases capacity and then demand.]
  - "I don't see a transit component in this plan"  
"I would think we'd want to focus on transit ... can be really helpful in relieving congestion"  
Paraphrasing: can transit be added? Response: no, because it is a highway project. [NB:  
According to the text of Measure W, highway projects may use funds on transit, just not exclusively on transit. If I recall correctly, Measure A is silent on this.]
  - 31:13: even if no takings, won't pollution impact residents.

- \* 33:50 Niederhofer:  
Focus should be on regional transit working together to reduce congestion ... "and solving the real problem".
- 35:10 Kiesel: Was this project part of RM3 scope? Response: no, no specific projects were scoped.  
40:15: We are going to be drafting long term project EIR when we don't have data from near term project +
- 43:15 Jimenez: Eminent domain questions
- 44:30 Sullivan: We have been patching 101 for 20 years ... "We are have trying to get people off the freeways".  
Project has to address public transportation.
- 47:00 Public comments. 57:20 Public comments done
- 57:40 Niederhofer: "We need to solve the issue of the bridge with some kind of commute transit that goes to transit ... We really need to look at that."
- 58:05 Venkat: "If we are going to make real progress, it needs to be long term projects ... [that have impact]... and that we have data that will show that"  
No one in Foster City or outside that asking for this ... what I'm hearing is options for transit ... That's where we need to head to for the future.
- 59:19 Sullivan: 50% of our traffic is moms and dads taking their kids back and forth to school. Most of the people driving on 101 are going less than 30 miles. The failure we've had is to get CalTrain, BART, SamTrans to get together and develop a seamless thing.  
  
How are we connecting transportation, how are we taking care of the environment.  
  
We can come up with some kind of public transportation or ebikes or scooters  
  
We gotta get people out of their cars.
- 1:00:35 Kiesel: I'm not sure we can cancel this project or give the nod to go ahead with it. [NB: While they may not be able to make the

decision, they are being asked for their input]]

All we are doing is moving congestion from 101 to 92. Wherever you put the neck of the bottle, that's where the jam will start.

92/101 interchange has been a problem since 1968 when I first started driving on it. Sitting here talking about it means it hasn't been solved.

- :04:00 Jimenez: Concern is primarily for Foster City residents. Concerns about emergencies. If it might help congestion, I'm all in. It's too early to say

- 1:09:20 Item concluded. Informational only. Nothing else we can do. Thanks much,

giuliano

--

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