



TA Community Advisory Committee

Meeting of January 6, 2026

Correspondence as of December 12, 2025

Subject

1. BART OKs \$12M in improvements to SM County Stations
2. An interesting article on gas tax alternative and the science behind it.

From: [Mike Swire](#)
To: [cacsecretary \[@smcta.com\]](mailto:cacsecretary [@smcta.com])
Subject: BART OKs \$12M in improvements to SM County Stations
Date: Friday, December 5, 2025 9:45:03 AM
Attachments: [BART OKs \\$12M for improvements to stations in San Mateo County Local News smdailyjournal.com.pdf](#)

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

https://www.smdailyjournal.com/news/local/bart-oks-12m-for-improvements-to-stations-in-san-mateo-county/article_552df322-41ff-474c-a968-62d915720c4a.html

FEATURED

BART OKs \$12M for improvements to stations in San Mateo County

Recent allocation for station upgrades could help mend agency and county tensions

By Alyse DiNapoli, Daily Journal staff
Dec 5, 2025



WARNING:
This product
contains nicotine.
Nicotine is an
addictive chemical.

read

BART approved \$12 million to update San Mateo County stations, including lighting and roof upgrades, in a move that may help improve relations between the county and the transit agency.

“[The county] was very frequently saying they feel that their stations weren’t getting enough TLC, especially compared to other stations and especially in the urban core, and we wanted to say that we really do need to spend more time at these stations and freshen them up, so this is long overdue work that probably should have already taken place,” BART spokesperson Alicia Trost said.

Some county leaders have criticized the transit agency for neglecting its stations, attributing it in part to the fact that the county doesn’t have any members on the agency’s Board of Directors.

While the lack of San Mateo County-based board members means less input on important decisions, it was part of a 2003 deal that allows county taxpayers to contribute significantly less to the system than the member counties of San Francisco, Alameda and Contra Costa. Still, the relationship has remained fraught at times, and was further exacerbated this year as discussions over a 2026 sales tax ballot measure were in the works. Senate Bill 63, which passed in October, is a multicounty measure meant in large part to shore up the gaping deficits of several major transit agencies, including BART and Caltrain. Some county-based transit leaders, including Metropolitan Transportation Commissioner Gina Papan and Jackie Speier, SamTrans board member and San Mateo County supervisor, have been adamant that BART should be held accountable not only for its fiscal management but also improved maintenance at county stations.

“Especially leading up to SB 63, obviously we’ve been having all kinds of conversions with the county, showing them how committed we are to the county, how important BART is to the county and how important the county is to BART,” Trost said.

Papan said she was glad to see BART’s commitment to the county stations.

“It’s great to see that they’re finally focused on increasing ridership throughout the system, which means that throughout the system, particularly in San Mateo County, you have to keep the stations maintained,” Papan said.

Much of the \$12 million will go toward new LED lighting, roof upgrades, cleaning and dated bus shelter removals at Colma, South San Francisco, San Bruno and Millbrae stations. LED lighting at the latter station is already in the works and should be completed by the end of the month, Trost said.

“The [LED lighting] is a dramatic improvement,” Trost said. “Everywhere, including the parking lot, is so much brighter, and it just looks much better.”

The work will begin early next year and be completed by the end of the year, according to the press release.

alyse@smdailyjournal.com

(650) 344-5200 ext. 102



MORE INFORMATION



Transit-focused sales tax measure advances

Alyse DiNapoli, Daily Journal staff

Daily Journal staff

Learn more about your privacy options

From: [Giuliano](#)
To: [cacsecretary \[@smcta.com\]](mailto:cacsecretary [@smcta.com]); [Public Comment](#); CityCouncil@belmont.gov
Subject: An interesting article on gas tax alternative and the science behind it.
Date: Wednesday, December 10, 2025 12:00:47 PM

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

<https://cleantechnica.com/2025/12/06/how-outdated-engineering-models-distort-todays-ev-road-charges-debate/>

My take aways, some old, some new. One was so startling to me that I need to explore it further. Note: these are take aways from the article. Some that I have followed up on before, and that I believe are correct. Others, well, the are what the article claims, and the claims need further checking:

- Something that has been long known, but not well known: **The gas tax is a small part of the funds used to build and maintain our roads.** Drivers are heavily subsidized by the general population, in particular those who do not drive or drive very little. When folks whine about it being unfair that they have to pay for bike lanes, the fact they subsidize cars by 100 fold should be very upsetting.
- That said, as we inevitably shift to EVs, even **that small part of the funding is going away.** How do we replace it?
- One proposal: a **fee based on vehicle weight.**
- **The "science" that weight is a significant factor, that road damage follows the 4th power law, is wrong.** For me this was the shocker. Like a dolt I'd heard of this relation, and just believed it, and had not followed up on whether it is true. I now need to follow up and see which is correct, the article or the original claim.
- **Cars and light trucks, including every EV, cause no additional road impacts to modern roads compared to lighter cars.** including even the largest stupid Cybertruck ("Cyber", really???? 6000-7000 pounds), F150 (7000 pounds), and Hummer (9000 pounds).
- **Heavy trucks bear the vast majority of the responsibility for road damage.** Think semis and heavy utility vehicles. Even among them, varying designs significantly affect road damage. For example, a loaded semi with single axle trailer does far more damage than one with dual axles.
- Also long know and proven: **weight and speed are huge factors in the lethality of vehicles.** And design, both vehicle and roadway. Deaths and injuries are part of the social costs of driving vehicles, beyond the costs of building and maintaining roads. All social costs need to be accounted for. A 3 ton F150 with a massive vertical front profile traveling 50mph on a 25mph street in front of a school (Hello Ralston Ave at Ralston Middle School) has a [90% chance](#) of killing a pedestrian or cyclist. For a 1.5 ton car traveling 25 mph it's 10%.
- We should **replace the gas tax with one based primarily on distance traveled, and not include weight** as a factor. This is much too simplistic. We need a formula that includes distance traveled, a non linear weight factor (so that light vehicles are not subjected to this factor, while very heavy vehicles are), vehicle emissions (yes, gas vehicles will be around a good while, and pollution harms us and needs to be paid for), injury/lethality rates (yes a 3.5 ton vehicle with a 5 foot tall vertical front profile should be charged more than a 1.5 ton vehicle with a lower profile), and possible other factors.

Most importantly: all road building and repair funds should come from this fee. Why should those who drive less (or not at all) pay for those who do?

giuliano

--

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

Reach out if you'd like to learn to cycle more safely ([LCI #7105](#)).

<https://bikesiliconvalley.org>

<https://www.peopleforbikes.org/news/your-bike-advocacy-playbook>