

Report of the SMCTA Community Advisory Committee Meeting of June 2, 2026

Video - https://samtrans.granicus.com/player/clip/1500?view_id=2&redirect=true

Committee Actions

- **Consent Calendar - *approved unanimously***
 - **4a) Approval of Minutes of the CAC Meeting of May 5, 2026**
 - **4b) SMCTA Board Item – 5.b. Accept Quarterly Financial Report Fiscal Year 2026 Quarter 3 Results and Financial Outlook**
 - **4c) SMCTA Board Item – 5.c. Accept Capital Projects Quarterly Status Report for Fiscal Year 2026 Quarter 3**
 - Vice Chair Swire asked when the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) would be released for the 101 Express Lanes North of 380 project. Staff said roughly December or January; the SMCTA is finalizing documents with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).
 - **4d) SMCTA Board Item – 5.d. Accept US 101 Express Lanes Quarterly Update on Variable Rate Bonds and Express Lanes Performance**
 - Giuliano Carlini said that the recent changes to the Express Lane performance presentation do not improve clarity. He can no longer see detail on peak volumes and speeds. He wants real performance data, with similar detail to the hundreds of pages of financial data that the CAC receives. He said that a March report said that congestion was improving, but between calendar year 2024 Quarter 3 (CY24Q3) and CY26Q3 tolls have increased 14-45 percent. He said that if tolls are increasing, congestion is increasing. He asked for an explanation of this disconnect. He asked how many San Mateo County residents are eligible for the Go Card program. He estimated 20-30 percent of the population. Staff will look into an updated figure. He said that if only 1.5 percent of eligible residents are taking the Go Card, usage should be increased. He recommended sending the application to all County residents, or a subset as a pilot, to increase usage. He said that 86 percent of Go Card users are taking the transit benefit.
 - Nheeda Enriquez said that the data suggests more trips but less revenue; she asked why this is the case and whether it is due to changes in carpooling or noncompliance. Staff said that there are upcoming San Mateo Express Lanes Joint Powers Authority (SMEL-JPA) Board of

Directors (Board) discussions on improvements in detection technology to address this issue. She asked for a two-year view to understand longer trends.

- Rich Hedges said that drivers may not comply if enforcement is limited. He said monitoring should be improved.
- **4e) SMCTA Board Item – 5.e. Programming and Allocating a Total of \$5,575,120 in Measure A Funds to the San Mateo County Transit District for its Paratransit Program and the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance for Commute.org’s Operations and Transportation Demand Management Monitoring Program**
- **4f) SMCTA Board Item – 5.f. Establishing the Appropriations Limit Applicable to the San Mateo County Transportation Authority During Fiscal Year 2027**
 - Sandra Lang asked if this is setting an annual limit for sales tax allocations. Staff said yes. This is set annually before the fiscal year begins.
- **4g) SMCTA Board Item – 5.g. Programming and Allocating a Total of \$2,461,000 in Measure A Caltrain Category Funds to the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board to be Used as Matching Funds for Three Grants Awarded through the Regional Transit Connections and Transportation Demand Management Programs, and to Fund Two Additional Local Projects**
- **4h) SMCTA Board Item – 5.h. Programming and Allocating \$1,235,193 in Measure W Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Funds for the Fiscal Years 2027 and 2028 Safe Routes to School Program**
- **5) SMCTA Board Item – 10.a. Adopting a Budget in the Amount of \$204,361,520 for Fiscal Year 2027 - *approved unanimously***
 - Mr. Hedges asked if the SMCTA was planning on advertising on Instagram and Facebook. Staff said yes.
 - Mr. Carlini praised the program but asked what is the call to action. Staff said this is a name ID lift campaign with no call to action. The goal is to let people know what the SMCTA does and the project it has completed. Staff said they will survey before and after the campaign to measure the impact on name recognition. He said that many residents may not engage with the information without a call to action. Staff said campaigns can help residents understand what SMCTA’s role is; an updated SMCTA website will be rereleased soon.
 - Ms. Lang said that marketing is critical to SMCTA’s success. She asked who would do the work. Staff said that most work will be done in house. She asked for more information on the project’s performance.

- John Fox asked whether the next step is to raise awareness of transit options. He said that many people are not aware of bus routes and thus do not ride. Staff said that the transit agencies are working to increase awareness; some of these awareness programs are funded through the SMCTA.
 - Mr. Swire asked what the benefit is of raising the SMCTA's brand awareness. Staff said that the SMCTA cannot attempt to influence a revenue measure's reauthorization. He asked whether other SMCTA-like agencies have had success with similar campaigns. Staff said that they have done similar work for transit agencies.
 - Ms. Enriquez asked whether additional investment will increase marketing channels. Staff said that billboards are expensive and require more funding. More funding would increase advertising volume.
 - Christopher Kao said that most residents are interested in what transit has done for them and whether tax dollars are used effectively. He suggested emphasizing how certain projects reduce driving and congestion.
 - Chair Barbara Arietta said that promoting SMCTA accomplishments will improve SMCTA brand recognition.
 - Mr. Carlini asked about funding buckets for bicycle (bike)/pedestrian (ped) in old versus new Measure A. Staff said that the original Measure A was not structured in the same way as New Measure A; in many cases it specified specific projects. New Measure A allocates three percent for bike/ped.
 - Ms. Lang asked whether there would be in-person engagement as part of the branding campaign. Staff said that this may occur and that the SMCTA holds regular meetings.
 - Mr. Carlini said that he would like a clearer view of what modes the budget enables, given flexibility in funding categories.
 - Mr. Kao asked how the SMCTA uses the \$8 million remaining balance. Staff said that the Board can determine allocation for this balance, potentially in future years.
- **7) SMCTA Board Item – 11.b. Programming and Allocating a Total of \$20,520,000 in Measure A Caltrain Category Funds to the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board for the San Mateo County At-Grade Crossings Enhancements Project Phase 1 - *approved unanimously***
 - Chair Arietta said that the Broadway intersection was the most dangerous in the State with 10-11 crashes in the last year.
 - Ms. Enriquez asked whether there was a prioritization for the enhanced projects. Staff said that the projects are prioritized but the list as presented is not

prioritized. She said that a 7–10-year timeline is a long time. Staff said that they aim to complete projects as quickly as possible but must be conservative and balance train downtime.

- Mr. Kao asked for more detail on specific “advanced” improvements. Staff mentioned pedestrian gate separation, lighting, pavement markings, advance signal pre-emption, traffic signal movement modifications, quad gates, and site-specific traffic signals.
 - Vice Chair Swire recommended some attention to safety for people on bikes crossing the tracks. He referenced an incident in which a child on a bike had a wheel stuck in the tracks, fell, and required dental work. Staff said that they will review usage videos for all modes, including bikes. Staff said signage and channelization can improve safety.
 - Mr. Fox asked whether these improvements were already implemented in some places. Staff said that they are implemented as part of ongoing projects at the project location.
 - Ms. Lang said that the recent Broadway safety improvements were beneficial.
 - Mr. Hedges asked if quad gates were in scope given the cost. Staff said that quad gates are in scope. He said that quad gates can improve safety without closing crossings.
 - Mr. Carlini said that there are various treatments for making crossings safe for people on bikes. He said that several crossings like Middlefield Road in North Fair Oaks need improvement. He said that North Fair Oaks deserves similar investment as wealthier communities.
- **8) SMCTA Board Item – 11.c. Programming and Allocating \$21,600,000 in Measure A Grade Separation Category Funds; Programming up to \$234,600,000 in Measure A Caltrain and Grade Separation Categories; and Programming up to \$87,000,000 in Measure W Local Safety, Pothole and Congestion Relief Improvements (Grade Separation) Category Funds for the Broadway Grade Separation Project - *approved unanimously***
 - Mr. Hedges said that there is an opportunity to secure funding on top of the \$3 million recently obtained by Congressman Mullin.
 - Vice Chair Swire asked whether the updated design will change safety for people on foot and bike. Staff said that there is no longer a station planned at Burlingame. Staff said that there are still bike/ped crossings at Cadillac and Sanchez, but the Carmelita crossing is gone without the station.

- Karen Kuklin said that the design schedule is very long. Staff said that the original environmental analysis will need to be revalidated and that permitting will also be required.
- Mr. Kao asked about funding complexity for the project. Staff said that it is complex because for Measure W grade separation funding comes from the Local Streets and Roads category. Staff also said that the Measure A Caltrain source involves Caltrain category funds purchasing Caltrain property, with proceeds from the sale are used for eligible project expenses
- Mr. Carlini said that he would like bike/ped under crossings will be available in the future, including Class I or IV infrastructure and pedestrian sidewalks. Staff said that the non-Broadway crossings would be for bikes and pedestrians only.

Other Items

- **3) Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda - none**
- **6) SMCTA Board Item – 11.a. Community-Based Organization (CBO) Bench Pilot Program**
 - Ms. Enriquez supported the concept but said that the one-year pilot might not be sufficient to gauge effectiveness given how long these projects take. Staff said that regular meetings with bench organizations will provide improvements in the short term but ideally the pilot will continue beyond one year.
 - Mr. Fox asked for more detail on the suggested process. Staff said that the program will help project sponsors identify and access qualified vendors/partners from the bench.
 - Vice Chair Swire asked what the benefits are of the program to project sponsors. Staff said that the Program allows sponsors to use SMCTA technical assistance funding to engage the CBOs for outreach or other purposes.
 - Chair Arietta said that this is an ongoing need. Staff said that the Board is interested in additional technical support for municipalities.
 - Mr. Hedges said that this is akin to community organizing. Staff said that the project scope will vary widely depending on project sponsor's needs. He said that the SMCTA was effective in outreach regarding the 101/92 Direct Connector project.
 - Mr. Carlini asked how the SMCTA will measure effectiveness in reaching priority communities. Staff said that they have researched similar programs in other cities and the metrics will vary by project. He said that the metrics will be important in evaluating project performance. He asked how the seven CBOs

were chosen. Staff said that the CBOs responded to a request for applications and provide diverse coverage across the County.

- Ms. Lang asked who sponsors these projects. Staff said that sponsors are largely cities and these are SMCTA projects.
 - Vice Chair Swire asked whether the list of CBOs is final. Staff said this is a final list for the pilot.
 - Mr. Kao said that a one-year pilot may not be enough time to yield results. He said that many projects are included in old master plans already approved by cities and that there may be less outreach when an SMCTA project begins. Staff said that this is a challenge, but many projects still require outreach.
- **9) SMCTA Board Item – 12.a. Legislative Update**
 - *No comments*
 - **10) Report of the Chair**
 - Electric bicycles (E-bikes) Impact on San Mateo County
 - The e-bike experience over the past few years in San Mateo County has sparked a public health and safety crisis. While precise countywide totals for all minor collisions aren't entirely published, a major spike in severe high/speed collisions-notably those involving illegal, modified e-bikes and electric motorcycles (e-motorcycles/e-motos) ridden by youths has driven a wave of new safety regulations.
 - Recent Incident and Fatalities
 - High-Profile Fatalities: Tragic accidents have deeply impacted the community, including a four year old Burlingame boy who died in a chain reaction e-bike crash and a 16-year-old Menlo-Atherton High student who collided with a car.
 - E-Motorcycle vs e-Bikes: A 16-year-old student from Montara tragically died after crashing an unclassified, off-highway electric motorcycle into a box truck at speeds over 50 miles per hour (mph) on Highway 1 in Half Moon Bay.
 - Hospitalization Spikes: Trauma centers across California note that e-bike injuries result in hospitalization much more frequently than conventional bicycles, often yielding severe orthopedic and neurological damage.
 - What Is Being Done About the Safety of E-Bike Use In San Mateo County?
 - San Mateo County and its cities are tackling the surge in e-bike use with a mix of safety education, localized pilot programs and

coordinated legislative efforts to crack down on reckless riding and illegally modified high speed bikes.

- Individual Cities - Because city-by-city rules vary, municipalities are focusing heavily on public awareness and clarifying the law for youth.
 - San Mateo and Millbrae: Police and Sheriff's departments are leading educational campaigns that emphasize helmet laws, restrict Class 3 e-bikes to riders 16 and older, and enforce bans on e-bikes (and traditional bikes) in most downtown sidewalk areas.
 - Half Moon Bay: The city has published specific visual comparisons between legal e-bikes and e-motos. They explicitly mandate that unauthorized motor vehicles are prohibited from public roads, requiring riders to be 16 plus and possess a license.
- General Enforcement: Across most of the county, cities are issuing citations for sidewalk violations and unsafe riding, while working to educate parents on keeping e-bikes to designated bike lanes and roads.
- Legislative and Safety Response
 - Board of Supervisors:
 - The San Mateo County Board of Supervisors is currently developing a unified countywide e-bike safety ordinance. The legislation is spearheaded by Supervisors Jackie Speier and Ray Mueller.
 - The Proposed Ordinance: The pending county legislation would create consistent "E-Conveyance" rules across unincorporated areas. It explicitly bans riders on sidewalks (with potential exceptions for young minors), prohibits unsafe maneuvers (like "wheelies") and standardizes rules for helmets, lights, and reflectors.
 - Penalties and Impoundment: The proposed rules implement progressive fines ranging from \$100 to \$500 for repeat offenses, Youth diversion programs, and safety courses are being built into the framework to help educate rather than strictly penalize young riders.

- State Action
 - Assembly Bill (AB) 2595: Assembly Woman Diane Papan (D-San Mateo) is tackling the crisis at the state level to give local communities better tools for enforcement. She introduced AB 2595. - (E-Bike Pilot Program) which authorizes San Mateo County and its cities to prohibit children under 12 from operating Class 1 and Class 2 e-bikes. It requires a 60-day waiting period, followed by a \$25 fine or safety training and makes parents jointly responsible for minor violations.
 - AB 1557 (Power Loophole) is designed to close loopholes that allow high-speed, moped-like vehicles to be marketed and sold as regular e-bikes. It clarifies the definition of an e-bike, capping maximum peak motor power at 750 watts, ensuring dangerous machines are taken off bike paths and forcing them to adhere to appropriate vehicle and licensing laws.
- SMCTA's Potential Contribution
 - While the SMCTA primarily focuses on funding and planning large scale-transit, highway and bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure, it can directly impact the crisis through the following:
 - 1) Infrastructure Modifications: It can allocate "complete streets" and protected, physical separation for bike and micromobility lanes to keep fast moving e-bikes solely away from pedestrians.
 - 2) Safe Route To School Programs: The SMCTA can fund and expand educational programming at the local school district level, encouraging safe riding habits and proper device classification.
 - 3) Data Collection: The SMCTA can facilitate and fund studies(similar to recent Mineta Institute Reports) to assess rider behavior and collision zones to help cities enforce the law.
- Report Finding: The surge in youth injuries and a few tragic fatalities has triggered a major countywide response within San Mateo County. With the increase of e-bikes in our communities, we are seeing more injuries. People are getting hurt and hurt badly. Getting law enforcement agencies to have consistent regulations and laws to enforce will be necessary in addressing the safety issue countywide.
- *The Deputy District Secretary adjourned the meeting due to the lack of quorum under the Brown Act.*

- **11) Report From Staff**
 - *The Deputy District Secretary adjourned the meeting due to the lack of quorum under the Brown Act.*

- **12) Member Comments / Requests**
 - *The Deputy District Secretary adjourned the meeting due to the lack of quorum under the Brown Act.*

- **13) Date/Time of Next Regular Meeting: Tuesday, June 7, 2026, 4:30 pm**