

Report of the TA Community Advisory Committee Meeting of November 4, 2025

Committee Actions - All items approved unanimously

Consent Calendar - no discussion

- **4a) Approval of Minutes of the CAC Meeting of July 8, 2025**
- **4b) Approval of Minutes of the CAC Meeting of September 2, 2025**
- **4c) Approval of the 2026 Community Advisory Committee Meeting Calendar**
- **4d) (TA Board Item 5.b.) Accept Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for the Period Ending June 30, 2025**
- **4e) (TA Board Item 5.d) Accept Quarterly Investment Report**

- **5) (TA Board Item 10.a.) Programming and Allocating \$6,715,000 for the 2025 Cycle 3 Transportation Demand Management Call for Projects**
 - Karen Kuklin asked why the East Palo Alto (EPA) project was not funded. Staff said the EPA project received the lowest score in the planning category.
 - Sandra Lang asked whether the electric bicycle (e-bike) awards address safety and financial success of previous allocations, showing concern for the legal risk of e-bikes to municipalities. Staff said Burlingame and Millbrae applied to continue e-bike share programs. Staff noted the cities submit thorough and positive quarterly program reports. Cities can discontinue these programs if there are safety concerns.
 - Chair Barbara Arietta asked about the ineligible coastal project. Staff said Pacifica's corridor project was ineligible under the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program; they have reached out and have offered technical assistance, which will help qualify them for upcoming bicycle-pedestrian (bike/ped) calls for projects in June 2026.
 - Nheeda Enriquez asked about the "need" criteria, especially for San Carlos projects. Staff said "need" is qualitative and quantitative. Citywide projects can do better on this metric.
 - Giuliano Carlini asked why spot improvements were allowed but not corridor improvements. Staff said the TDM program requirements dictate eligibility. He said this isn't required by Measures A & W. Staff said where possible, corridor projects are eligible for bike/ped funding; they try to differentiate eligibility between different buckets. Spot treatments don't compete well in the bike/ped category (e.g., pedestrian improvements near transit stops). He said crosswalks

can be important to corridors and that he is concerned that past TA funding has been scattered and doesn't form connected routes that don't encourage mode shift away from solo drivers. He urged the TA Board to do this better to encourage mode shift as many projects don't work together holistically. Mr. Carlini said that e-bikes concerns are overblown; e-bikes are safe (but e-motorcycles are not). Kids are remarkably responsible, and adoption of e-bikes should be encouraged among kids. This is important to foster autonomy, which is less present than previous generations.

- Vice Chair Mike Swire noted the Millbrae/Burlingame e-bike share program 18+ age requirement. He asked if criteria addresses whether applicants have reneged on past projects and if it is put into consideration. Staff said is yet to be an issue for concern for the TA's programs. He said the TA is not the only granting authority and should speak with City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (CCAG) and look at other sources of info instead of waiting for it to happen to the TA.
 - Ms. Lang said e-bike share programs shouldn't go into State regulatory issues. She said there are educational components that need to be addressed, but that might be outside the grant evaluation criteria.
-
- **7) (TA Board Item 11.a.) Accept Statements of Revenues and Expenditures for the Periods Ending July 31, 2025; August 31, 2025; and September 30, 2025**
 - Mr. Hedges liked the new report formatting.

 - **8) (TA Board Item 11.b.) Program and Allocate \$10,000,000 in Original Measure A Funds to the San Mateo County Transit District for Fiscal Years 2026 and 2027 Member Agency Contributions to Caltrain**
 - Gus Mattammal asked whether Senate Bill (SB 63) would fund operating or capital projects. Staff said SB 63 funds would go towards Caltrain operating uses, but the return to source county money could be used for capital projects.

Other Items

- **3) Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda** – None.

- **6) (Board Item 10.b.) 101 Corridor Connect: Draft North County and Mid County Multimodal Strategies**

- Chair Arietta asked about the used social media platforms. Staff said LinkedIn, Facebook, and X were used, in conjunction to City partners websites. Facebook was cost-effective and geo-targeted. She asked about NextDoor, where Staff said was used in the past but not for this project. She noted NextDoor's popularity and its importance for future consideration.
- Chris Kao asked if lighting, tree canopy, and land use could be in scope (e.g., for pedestrians). Staff said projects include these design elements at the discretion of the project sponsor. Projects need to focus on multi-modal solutions in this program. He asked whether the funding amounts include costs for these elements. Staff said that this is from the cities' estimates (i.e., ask them for more details).
- Ms. Lang asked about the corridor prioritization methodology. Staff said they used large maps at public outreach events and online, who then pointed out areas of concern/improvement. She asked whether any corridors were left out due to the scale of the effort and the process. Staff said the public focused on areas of improvement, based on their experience.
- John Fox asked whether respondents were able to discuss their frequent (non-car) trips and modalities; they have more experience than those who drive every day. Staff said respondents were able to share their personal experiences through maps and conversations with staff.
- Ms. Enriquez asked about next steps and funding. Staff said this will be covered when they address South County. These projects could get bonus points in funding conversations.
- Vice Chair Swire asked whether the US 101 Express Lane North of Interstate 380 (I-380) project was included. Staff said that it was ranked at the 15th spot in North County. He asked whether these projects were related to Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) mitigation projects that might be identified during the US 101 Express Lane North of I-380 project. Staff said this effort is not related to VMT mitigation efforts and the project has not determined what VMT mitigations may or may not be required; various VMT mitigation projects may be possible.
- Mr. Carlini said that the project list was a bottoms up effort instead of a coordinated structure. E.g., El Camino Real (ECR) is in scope in some cities but not others, and some cities like Burlingame and San Mateo are resistant to proposals for El Camino Real. This will not facilitate travel across municipal borders corridorwide, especially on bikes. He said that biking through parts of Burlingame on ECR is horrific. He asked how the 101 Express Lane project was

“multi-modal.” Staff said that driving is mode of transportation and is included as part of a multi-modal effort and that there is no funding associated with this program (and thus doesn’t come from only one funding bucket). He asked how the project costs compared to the 101 Managed Lanes project. Staff agreed that the 101 project would be significantly larger than the other projects. He said that favoring cars with a disproportionate share of funding is concerning. He said that buses are important for mode share. Bus rapid transit will drive real change, more so than signal priority. Without looking at the length of ECR, this won’t happen. He said that our culture hates buses and cycling, but we need to make these modes possible to shift behavior. He also said not to mix bikes & pedestrians on the same pathway; this is not safe given the difference in speed. Finally, he said that pedestrian bulb-outs are dangerous as they require people on bikes to merge with traffic; he advocated instead for protected intersections.

- Mr. Kuo asked about the definition of “connectivity.” Staff said connectivity scoring is based on proximity to priority development areas. The weighting is based on respondent desire and safety, not geography.
- Mr. Fox asked about “transit reliability.” Staff said this refers to transit being on schedule and helping you get to where you need to go. It is not about infrastructure failure.
- Ms. Enriquez was happy to see the Holly Street projects on the list, given recent safety incidents. She praised the one-pagers on each of the many projects.
- Mr. Carlini would like to see a fantastic north/south bike corridor but worries that doing El Camino Real and Old County Road/Delaware Street will compromise quality. Staff said that they bundled multiple ECR projects from various municipalities and initiatives. They may not all move forward, however. He said that migrating between multiple north/south corridors is not practical for people who bike. He asked why Ralston in Belmont had no projects. Staff said that there is no project proposed by Belmont for Ralston. He said that the City of Belmont is hostile to creating bike infrastructure on Ralston and thus he looks for the TA to lead the way on a system of connectivity. He asked how respondents could indicate their preferred routing (instead of simply smaller pain points). Staff said that they didn’t offer that option. He said that mode shift will only happen if 100 percent of their route is safe. He also said that sometimes the public’s requests (e.g., stop lights) might make things less safe; he urged consultation with experts. Staff said engineering staff identified all projects and that TA would facilitate third-party best practice review and offer technical assistance. He encouraged the TA to ensure that best practices are

considered in selecting projects. Staff said it would be difficult to place such requirements on the broader project review process.

- Ms. Lang asked whether Amphlett in San Mateo was considered. Staff said that this list is based on how high projects sit in the City's master plan (assuming the City has identified it as a project).
- Vice Chair Swire asked whether auto safety was an option for respondents' concern. Staff said this was an option. He said that this effort might prioritize certain projects in existing funding processes, later asking about current process problems. There are no problems with the current processes; they do often offer bonus points in various evaluations. This process provides a County view.
- Mr. Hedges said that protected bike lanes on El Camino Real in San Mateo could require loss of a travel lane and decimate local businesses. He thought a compromise was possible. He said that the 19th Avenue/Fashion Island bike lane proposal at Norfolk had a bulb-out that will compromise bike safety.

- **9) (TA Board Item 12.a.) - Legislative Update**

- Mr. Kuo asked staff to define cap and trade. Staff said this is a policy tool which intends to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, setting a cap on emissions and letting groups trade emissions. The money is used to fund positive projects.
- Chair Arietta asked whether the \$1 billion fixed amount for high-speed rail would be similar to current levels. Staff will investigate this.
- Vice Chair Swire asked about the safety of the \$500,000 allocation for the 19th Avenue/Fashion Island project, given recent federal developments.

- **10) Report of the Chair**

- "For the past few months, I have been giving updates reporting on a new ballot measure called Senate Bill (SB) 63 and its journey to secure approval to be put on the 2026 California ballot.

On September 13, 2025, the California Legislature passed legislation authorizing that ballot measure to create a 14-year, sub-regional sales tax in five Bay Area counties to generate revenue to support Bay Area public transportation systems.

Exactly one month later, on October 13, 2025, Governor Gavin Newsom signed the bill.

The bill, SB 63, introduced by State Senators Scott Wiener and Jesse Arreguín, will allow voters to decide on the revenue measure on the November 2026 ballot.

SB 63 has garnered much support from a broad base of transportation agencies because of its vital ability to provide funding to support several Bay Area transit operations.

The emergence of this new ballot measure follows Caltrain's launch last year of its new high performance electric trains in September 2024. The new electrified trains have offered a better experience for Caltrain riders by providing faster and more frequent service that has generated strong support for the agency.

Caltrain is currently reporting its best ridership numbers since 2020 and has seen 11 straight months of ridership grow to 9.1 million passengers over Fiscal Year (FY) 2025, up from 6.2 million in FY 2024, with over 75 percent ridership growth from July 2024 to July 2025.

A January poll of Santa Clara, San Mateo, and San Francisco counties highlighted voter's overwhelming approval of Caltrain with 82 percent of respondents reporting a favorable view of the transit agency. Riders of Caltrain reported an even stronger approval of the agency with 91 percent of frequent riders reporting a favorable view.

As previously reported, the passage of this legislation comes as Bay Area transit agencies face looming fiscal cliffs that threaten service. Caltrain projects an average annual deficit of about \$75 million beginning in fiscal year 2027.

Without new funding, the agency would face difficult decisions, including drastic service reductions, station closures, and cuts to service frequency. With the passage of SB 63, Caltrain would receive an average of about \$75 million annually resulting in Caltrain's operating deficit being fully funded and Caltrain maintaining its half hourly service."

- Ms. Lang commented on the importance of Caltrain success and SB 63. The benefits need to be highlighted to the community.

- Mr. Mattammal said the fiscal cliffs are due to non-trivial and likely permanent changes in ridership patterns. He said that SB 63 asks the public to cover these operating deficits despite operations being greater than the community demand. He said that the system needs to evolve based on the community's needs.
 - Chair Arietta said that people need to get out of cars and onto transit and having a funded Caltrain is a plus. She said that demand will increase with education.
 - Mr. Guiliani said that Caltrain needs to encourage new ridership, with current work from home trends, to help mode shift. He said Caltrain will go away without funding. He said Europe has much better trains which should be modeled after.
 - Staff discouraged further discussion on efficacy of SB 63 as it wasn't agendaized.
- **11) Report from Staff** – No discussion.
 - **12) Member Comments/Requests**
 - Mr. Mattammal said he likes international trains and suggested the consideration of similar automation.
 - Mr. Kao asked that the Dumbarton Corridor transit study be included on a future CAC agenda. Staff said Board hasn't granted the CAC the ability to add agenda items, aside from the two one-hour discussions on topics raised by the CAC. Staff stated Committee members can address this at the next CAC meeting. Staff said items must be on the Board agenda for them to be on the CAC agenda.
 - Ms. Lang recommended the Chair can make a report to address new items. Staff reiterated the two one-hour discussion process, in which CAC members can pick two items.
 - Vice Chair Swire commented on the level of service (LOS) analysis presented at the recent C/CAG Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ) meeting. He said the State identified LOS as an outdated metric compared to VMT. The report said, "Results show that the general-purpose lane travel times along US 101 have increased between 2023 and 2025, particularly southbound during the AM peak. In contrast, the Express Lanes continue to provide substantial benefits, offering at least 20 percent shorter travel times for single occupancy vehicles compared to the general-purpose lanes." He said that congestion is increasing in the general-purpose lanes over the past two years.

- Chair Arietta said that she recently did a long trip on the US 101 where she traveled more quickly in the general-purpose lane than the Express Lane.
- Mr. Carlini said that Caltrain is great aside from the shrieking doors and the bike lane layout. He loves the quicker travel times. He highlighted the size of the detailed financial data in the packet, noting about his prior requests for detailed performance metrics on Measure A & W goals - e.g., congestion on 101, safety, VMT, GHG emissions. He said congestion heat maps aren't useful for analysis over time. He asked when it was possible to see this data in the goals. He said that if you don't measure something, you can't make it better. He asked about the measurement of projects success if there is no data and analysis. He said staff has previously mentioned that congestion data is not hard to provide and asked about next steps. Staff said it is up to the Board to direct staff to collect additional data. He said that he has passed along this desire to the Board multiple times. He would like to formally ask them.

- **13) Date/Time of Next Regular Meeting: Tuesday, December 2, 2025, 4:30 pm**

Video - https://samtrans.granicus.com/player/clip/1420?view_id=2&redirect=true