

Report of the TA Community Advisory Committee Meeting of December 2, 2025

Committee Actions

Consent Calendar

- **4a) Approval of Minutes of the CAC Meeting of November 4, 2025 - *approved unanimously***
- **4b) (TA Board Item 6.b.) Acceptance of Capital Projects Quarterly Status Report for Fiscal Year 2026 Q1 - *approved unanimously***
 - Giuliano Carlini asked Staff to verify the Woodside project pre-construction phase cost of \$35 million. Staff confirmed this cost, clarifying that \$20 million was for property acquisition. He asked that project summaries be included with the project goals and whether goals were accomplished at project completion. He continues to ask about whether the Express Lane project achieved its stated congestion relief goal.
- **4c) (TA Board Item 6.c.) Accept US 101 Express Lanes Quarterly Update on Variable Rate Bonds and Express Lanes Performance Approval of Minutes of the CAC Meeting of September 2, 2025 - *approved unanimously***
 - Mr. Carlini said the heat maps suggest increased congestion and slower speeds in the general purpose lanes. He said that it would be great to see if Measure A & W goals were accomplished. He said that there is substantial financial data and recommended Board request staff to answer whether Measures' objectives were met. He said that 47 percent of Express Lane users select High Occupancy Vehicles (HOV-3+) on their FasTrak. He asked if there are ways to confirm the occupancy in the car. Staff said the Joint Powers Authority (JPA) allocated money for an occupancy detection pilot, requiring collaboration with regional partners. Mr. Carlini asked for something simpler to address this quicker. Staff said it was uncertain whether this would be beneficial information. Mr. Carlini said the scale of the problem is important.
 - Karen Kuklin said that not all HOV-3 drivers are cheating, stating the drivers might forget to change the settings each time and the transponder is out of reach for many drivers.
 - Rich Hedges said cameras might be useful for enforcement in the future and are not intrusive. He also said that City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County's (C/CAG) Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee previously discussed at a meeting a recent survey that suggests the Express Lanes are 20 percent faster than the general purpose lanes (10 miles per hour faster, per Mike Swire).

- Vice Chair Swire said that in the CMEQ meeting the congestion report indicated that travel times in the US 101 general purpose lanes increased between 2023 (the year of the US 101 widening) and 2025 (although Mr. Hedges pointed out the impact of the return to work after COVID).
- **4d) (TA Board Item 6.d.) Adopting the Mid County Multimodal Strategy - The CAC voted 1-6 against a motion to reject the strategy. The CAC then voted 6-1 in favor of a motion to adopt the strategy.**
 - Mr. Carlini said the strategy includes \$2.5 billion in car projects and \$90 million for recreational projects (less than 5 percent). Transportation projects in South San Francisco (SSF) were \$90 million. Other projects were only \$20 million. He said that this is supposed to be a multi-modal strategy and yet 85 percent is for car-focused projects. He encouraged staff to make it a multi-modal strategy.
 - Vice Chair Swire asked for clarification on what the item does/not do. Staff said it simply prioritizes already identified projects from local jurisdictions without allocating funds. If not approved, the TA would not prioritize assisting municipalities with the outlined projects. This will also help with eligibility for funds from Senate Bill (SB) 1 grant programs. South County will be considered early next year.
- **4e) (TA Board Item 6.e) Adopting the North County Multimodal Strategy - Same vote as 4d above**
- **8) (TA Board Item 12.a.) 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 - Approved unanimously, no discussion**
- **11a) Report of the Chair - Selection of Two Topics for Discussion at Future CAC Meetings - Approved unanimously**
 - Mike Swire: highway widening and induced demand
 - Giuliano Carlini: encouraging mode shift

Other Items

- **3) Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda - No public comment**
- **5) (TA Board Item 11.a.) Brand Refresh Update**
 - Sandra Lang asked whether the community can respond to the stated strategy and its focus points. Staff said that the website accommodates feedback but will primarily be used to guide staff action.
 - Chris Kao worried about the process. He said that the primary audience is San Mateo County (SMC) residents, but much of the TA's funding comes from sales tax from non-residents. He said that 40 percent of workers in the County are from elsewhere and they should be included as they use transport within SMC.

- Mr. Hedges said the 40 percent figure was accurate but non-resident employees were also getting benefits of the taxes.
 - Mr. Swire said that there is public confusion about the differing roles of the various transportation bodies in San Mateo County. Staff said that discreet brands cater to different customers; the TA needs more brand recognition compared to competing brands. He said that there is concern there are too many regional transportation agencies. He said that sustainability should be an important goal/priority given that 50 percent of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions come from the transportation sector.
 - Mr. Carlini said that most residents are unaware of the purpose of the TA and thus a brand refresh is important. Staff said that the improved branding facilitates other strategies that communicate value to the public.
 - Ms. Lang asked whether updated photos would be included. Staff verified that photos will be updated.
- **6) (Board Item 11.b.) 2025 Highway Program Call for Projects Draft Recommendations**
 - Mr. Hedges asked why need was considered less important than effectiveness. Staff clarified it as projected effectiveness. Need is more important earlier in the process. He asked whether readiness was still important, which staff confirmed as a pre-requisite.
 - Ms. Lang asked whether supplemental roadways are in rural and coastal areas. Staff said local roadways are eligible throughout the San Mateo County, and the focus is on existing roadways, not new roads.
 - Nheeda Enriquez asked at what point these criteria factor into the process. Staff said that early screens include some but not all criteria. Later phases include more criteria.
 - Mr. Swire asked why the sustainability criteria was migrated to the effectiveness criteria. Staff said sustainability is still considered, just in a different criteria. Staff also explained that non-auto projects are eligible, to varying degrees, for highway money through Measures A & W.
 - Mr. Hedges asked whether a project could receive funding for bike and pedestrian elements from different Measures. Staff said it was theoretically possible depending on the project. He said that Holly Street and other projects are needed to improve safety for pedestrians.
 - Mr. Carlini endorsed the two funding considerations for Fashion Island and Half Moon Bay. He prefers Class VI over Class II bike lanes in the Old Bayshore project. He questioned whether \$24 million is worth it as this is not a major corridor for people who bike. He thought that freeway overpass and El Camino bike/pedestrian projects would be more cost-efficient where people want to bike. He said that the Moss Beach Class II bike lane might be too narrow to encourage mode shift. He said that alternative designs might be more bike friendly than the proposed.
 - Ms. Kuklin said that Old Bayshore the safety improvements will be valuable in an area with high development. She asked whether the plans aligned with One

Shoreline's plans. Staff said that the plans are in alignment. She worried on the excessiveness of the San Carlos project.

- Mr. Kao asked about the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) project's conditional status. Staff said that a funding agreement will require certain requirements to be met first. He supports both considerations.
- Mr. Hedges asked whether Burlingame has bike lanes on the Bay Trail. Staff said that there are bike lanes but they cannot accommodate widening for a variety of users. He thinks that prioritization of other projects would be more cost-effective.
- Ms. Lang asked whether the Bayshore project is flood safe.
- Gus Mattammal asked if there was a downside to the funding considerations. Staff said that the money could be prioritized.
- Mr. Kao asked whether any projects didn't get funding. Staff said that all 17 submissions received funding. He asked for scoring details, but staff said that the presentation includes the total scores only but will provide the details on request.
- Mr. Carlini said that development on Bayshore will create a need for safe non-car options. He said that the current Bay Trail width is not comfortable for multiple users simultaneously.
- Mr. Kao expressed concern about the cloverleaf conversions being successful given concerns with similar projects at Willow. Staff said that Caltrans has endorsed the design. Mr. Swire pointed out that one of the goals of these conversions is safety.
- Mr. Swire praised the project quality compared to previous cycles given the focus on non-car options while still addressing drivers as project focused less on widening/Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)-inducing projects. Given recent fatalities of people on foot and bike, he said that some people bike on Old Bayshore en route to San Francisco (SF). He asked whether the Old Bayshore project has full support of the City of San Carlos. He said that the City Council recently rejected a safety project in front of local schools after taking safety grant money. Staff said that the project has city and hotel support. Burlingame staff said that they completed a feasibility study and Council is aware of the project; there is positive feedback.
- Mr. Hedges showed concern with other projects that require parking removal to install bike lanes. He said that we need to acknowledge the impact on local businesses. Bike lanes on the inside of parking is a good idea.

- **7) (TA Board Item 11.c.) - Grand Boulevard Initiative (GBI) Action Plan**
 - Mr. Mattammal said that this project was discussed for a long time but has produced a lot of meetings and earned media for elected officials but few results. Staff said that brand recognition and a narrower focus should improve results this time.
 - Mr. Hedges said that cities hadn't bought into the program in the past. He said that every city will have a different concern, especially those with businesses along the corridor. Lane removal will sometimes be possible. State legislation would be helpful in making this happen; he recommends engaging our state legislators. Staff said that Caltrans' changing attitude will be helpful. He said that loss of sales tax is an issue for cities.
 - Ms. Kuklin commented on cities providing input for their situation. She said that cities want to help increase tax bases.
 - Mr. Carlini said that cities should be able to contribute given local needs, but that ECR is owned by California and cities shouldn't thwart progress. Palo Alto tried to shut down bike lanes on El Camino Real (ECR), but Caltrans held firm on the bike lanes. He said that active transportation increases tax revenue through incremental transactions. He said that quick builds could accelerate implementation and encourage trial. Staff said that the TA can facilitate quick build projects and paving projects are an opportunity for more rapid action. He endorsed bus rapid transit, which can make commute times competitive with driving. He endorsed Class IV bike lanes as Class II bike lanes don't make most people comfortable. He said that many of our streets are extremely wide and will accommodate multiple uses. He promoted protected intersections instead of bulb outs, which aren't safe for people on bikes. He also promoted roundabouts over traffic lights.
 - Mr. Swire asked whether this aligned with paving plans. Staff said yes. He asked whether San Mateo would get protected bike lanes with upcoming repaving plans. Staff wasn't sure. He said that parochial local decision making often gets in the way of regional benefits. He encouraged the TA to leverage its power of the purse to facilitate cross-border bike lanes and bus rapid transit.
 - Mr. Hedges encouraged transit signal priority on El Camino. Staff said this hasn't been very effective but will be testing this soon.
 - Mr. Carlini discouraged parallel routes to El Camino for bike lanes as they discourage usage.
- **9) (TA Board Item 12.a.) - Legislative Update - No discussion**
- **10) (TA Board Item 13.b.) – Draft Legislative Program for 2026**
 - Mr. Swire asked whether there will be advocacy for VMT mitigation. Staff said that the program is broad enough.

- **11) Report of the Chair**

- “This report is on the “best” of roads and the “worst” of roads in San Mateo County only.

Pavement Condition Index (PCI)

On November 12, 2025, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) released its periodic “pavement report card” on the Bay Area’s 44,000 lane miles of local streets and roads. This report, known as the region’s “Pavement Condition Index (PCI), stated that the Bay Area’s score in 2024 was 67 out of 100 points for the 10th consecutive year.

Bay Area PCI Score A score of 67 is squarely in the “fair” range, with the typical Bay Area roadway showing serious wear and likely requiring rehabilitation soon. The good news is that the cities, towns, and counties are continuing to “hold the line.”

“Excellent” PCI: 90-100 points

According to the MTC report, PCI scores of 90 or higher are considered “excellent.” There are streets that show little or no distress. No jurisdiction in San Mateo County (SMC) is currently in this category.

“Very Good” PCI: 80-89 points

Pavement with a PCI score in the 80 to 89 range is considered “very good” and shows only slight or moderate distress. There is only one jurisdiction in this category. Hillsborough has currently received the highest PCI score in San Mateo County, with a score of 81, which puts it in the “very good” tier.

“Good” PCI: 70-79 points

The “good” category ranges from 70 to 79. Several San Mateo County cities and towns, including San Mateo County, itself, fall within this category. Those jurisdictions in the “good” tier and their current PCI scores are as follows: Colma (78), Daly City (78), Foster City (77), Atherton (76), Burlingame (76), Menlo Park (76), Portola Valley (76), South San Francisco (76), San Mateo County (74), Woodside (74), Brisbane (72), and San Mateo (72).

“Fair” PCI: 60-69 points

Jurisdictions, with PCI scores of 60 to 69, fall within the “fair range” and may need repairs to prevent rapid deterioration. These include the following: Belmont (68), Redwood City (68), Half Moon Bay, (64), San Bruno (62), and East Palo Alto (60).

“At Risk” PCI: 50-59 points

Roadways, with PCI scores of 50 to 59, are considered “at risk.” The cities in this category are San Carlos (59), Millbrae (52), and Pacifica (50). The jurisdiction currently found to have the lowest PCI score in this county is Pacifica, which puts it in the “at risk” category, with its score of 50.

“Poor” PCI: 25-49 points

Roadways with PCI scores of 25 to 49 are considered “poor.” These roads require major rehabilitation or reconstruction. There are no SMC jurisdictions currently in this category.

“Failed” PCI: below 25 points

These are the roads that have completely failed. There are no SMC jurisdictions currently in this category.”

- **13) Member Comments/Requests**

- Mr. Hedges expressed support for the planned conversion of an office building to housing in San Mateo. He said that this is a model for the future.
- Mr. Kao said that he spoke with TA staff on highway onramp metering. Metering lamps are now throughout the County. He said that previous metering has decreased travel times, and the lights can shift backup onto local roads – a positive for efficiency.
- Mr. Carlini said that he continues to want to see additional data on congestion on US 101. He said that imperfect slates of projects shouldn’t be accepted.

- **14) Date/Time of Next Regular Meeting: Tuesday, January 6, 2026, 4:30 pm**

Video - https://samtrans.granicus.com/player/clip/1433?view_id=2&redirect=true