Item #4.
8/6/2026

Report of the TA Community Advisory Committee
Meeting of August 4, 2026

Video - Part 1 (https://samtrans.granicus.com/player/clip/1517?view_id=2&redirect=true
Part 2 (https://samtrans.granicus.com/player/clip/1518?view_id=2&redirect=true)

Committee Actions

- **Consent Calendar -** *approved unanimously with no discussion*
  - **4a) Approval of Minutes of the CAC Meeting of June 2, 2026**
  - **4b) SMCTA Board Item – 5.b. Accept Quarterly Reports for On-Call Contracts for Fiscal Year 2026 Quarter 4**

- **7) SMCTA Board Item – 12.a. Accept Quarterly Investment Report 1** - *approved unanimously*
  - Sandra Lang asked what makes up the County Pool. Staff said that the County Pool is open to agencies within the County, following the same regulations as the SMCTA.
  - Vice Chair Mike Swire said at the end of the year almost a billion dollars in cash was to be expected. Staff said annual expenditures are roughly $45-53 million. Staff said even though the bank balance is large, most money was programmed and allocated to projects. Project sponsors are responsible for moving projects forward, spending funds, and asking for reimbursement in a timely fashion. Roughly two-thirds of the $1 billion are allocated at this point. The remainder is waiting for larger projects like grade separations and United States (U.S.) 101/ State Route (SR) 84, which will not happen for some time. He urged the SMCTA to accelerate spending to avoid inflation. Staff said larger projects progress slowly, resulting in interest balances that can grow significantly. Other agencies don't see similarly large balances as they bond early against the measure to deliver projects sooner; this means that towards the middle of the measure fewer projects are delivered.
  - Christopher Kao asked how interest income is spent. He asked what percent of interest is used for projects and how this compares to other funding agencies. Interest earnings pay largely for staff time, technical assistance, City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) support, and planning/oversight.

- Ms. Lang asked who manages these balances. Staff stated a joint powers authority hires a private manager, with the involvement of the State of California.

Other Items

- **3) Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda -** *none*

- **5) SMCTA Board Item – 11.a. Peninsula Shuttle Program Optimization and Funding Strategy Update**
    - Giuliano Carlini asked whether the SMCTA would ask corporations to contribute to the local match. Staff said some current shuttles obtain private funding, largely from smaller employers. He suggested planning for the expected growth in bioscience employees to avoid a large increase in cars on the road and urged coordination with cities to address this future need. Staff said cities can require shuttles as part of their transportation demand management programs. He said some cities seem reluctant to do so.
    - Vice Chair Swire asked whether historical rider performance is incorporated into reapplications from current providers. Staff said recent performance is considered. For new applicants, consultants estimate future demand based on a variety of criteria. He asked what the rough average subsidy per shuttle route was. Staff could not provide an estimate but stated, historically, some shuttles have exceeded $1 million. He said that the shuttle program is expensive and some are shorter routes; thus, he opined whether bike lane installation would be more cost effective for shorter routes. He said that in the longer term this could be a less expensive one-time expense. Staff said a diverse user base is served, with multiple transit options.
    - Nheeda Enriquez asked how criteria weighing is determined. Staff said stakeholders provided input, which was in line with previous shuttle evaluations.
    - John Fox asked how the shuttle cost inflation compares to that seen by other transit methods. This info could help stem future increases. Staff said transit operating costs are increasing across all transportation agencies. One of the largest challenges is finding shuttle drivers in a competitive labor market. He said many cost drivers are beyond the SMCTA's control, and businesses should assist with the cost increases given their use of the shuttles. Staff said that Commute.org (which operates most shuttles) has been successful in soliciting local matches. Shuttles can't serve a single employer.

- Ms. Lang asked about community demographics. Staff said the recommendation includes quantitative metrics and a narrative component.
- Karen Kuklin asked what match was most popular among workshop attendees. Staff said zero percent match was most popular, followed closely by 10 percent.
- Mr. Kao asked about the difference between a shuttle and differ. Staff said shuttles are smaller, meet train or other connections, and focus on stops serving employers and community destinations. He said that "key community destinations" needed to be defined better in the Local Mobility Option goal. He asked whether certain destinations are more aligned with shuttle use. Staff are unaware what places are best served by shuttles. He asked whether there are different age demographics for shuttle versus bus riders. Staff haven't investigated it. He said this would be useful in determining key destinations.
- Chair Barbara Arietta asked whether shuttles existed between community college campuses. Staff said the intercampus shuttles are operated by the San Mateo Community College District. She heard of the need for intercampus shuttles.
- Vice Chair Swire asked whether "Equitable Access" included all transit-reliant populations. Staff said transit reliance is a criteria for an equity priority area. He said that not all equity priority areas are car-sparse. He also said that there are transit-reliant populations outside of equity priority areas. He said that 30 percent of the population cannot drive, including kids, the disabled, and other groups.
- Rich Hedges said that he rides the shuttles. They are funded through Measure A. He asked whether Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) and Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain) are funding shuttles that serve their stations. He asked whether the SMCTA funds Genentech's shuttles. Staff said the SMCTA doesn't fund their shuttles.

- **6) SMCTA Board Item – 11.b. 101 Corridor Connect Mini-Grant Program Update**
  - Vice Chair Swire urged the SMCTA to ensure that City of Belmont and San Carlos work together on Old County Road, despite applying separately. He said the transitions are important, but projects need to align holistically across borders. He said that there is currently no alignment between jurisdictions on Old County Road. He also noted the lack of protected bike lanes when he bikes in San Mateo County.
  - Mr. Kuo asked what solutions are in scope for these projects. Staff said it is early in the process and that initial designs will be high level. He asked key metrics for success. Staff said 101 Corridor Connect focuses on multimodal

corridor safety and access. Staff is working on performance metrics for these projects as part of a larger performance metrics initiative.

- Ms. Enriquez asked why the City of Belmont and San Carlos are not applying together to take advantage of economies of scale and cost reduction. Staff said that San Carlos was worried about the effects to project progress. She said that the SMCTA should work with the cities to ensure alignment and coordination. Staff said future funding for this route could depend on how well cities work together in previous phases.
- Mr. Carlini said that the SMCTA continues to solicit proposals instead of driving a coherent, safe, and connected network of bike infrastructure. He said we do this for cars but not bikes. He said that a hodgepodge of unconnected bike projects will not be effective. He said that Old County Road is one of the few semi-continuous routes that span much of the length of the Peninsula. He said that coordinated strategy in planning routes should be prioritized and projects don't get serious conceptual input from the public early in the process. He said that the Grand Boulevard Initiative requires two car lanes, regardless of whether the public wants this. He asked whether the SMCTA will require these projects to use high quality (Class I & IV) bike lanes. He urged the SMCTA only to fund high quality bike lanes. He said that the City of Belmont's Downtown Area Plan only requires Class III bike routes (i.e., sharrows). He said that 12-27 percent of bike crashes happen in door zone bike lanes. He said that buffered bike lanes require the same amount of space as Class IV (protected) bike lanes. He asked whether the additional $4.35 million should be spent on these additional projects; he said only if the project is used for truly safe bike infrastructure.
- Mr. Kuo supports Option 2. Staff said that this exercise intends to make the process more transparent, earlier in the process.

- **8) SMCTA Board Item – 13.a. Legislative Update**
  - Mr. Swire asked whether any local projects were threatened by recent cuts to federal funding for bike and other safety projects. Staff said there are no new in San Mateo County, although liberal leaning states will continue to struggle to get federal funding.

- **9) Report of the Chair**
  - Caltrain Update
    - Officials report that the Bay Area transit agencies (including the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board/Caltrain, San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District/BART, and the San Francisco Municipal Transportation

Agency/Muni) have successfully secured a spot on the November ballot for a regional funding measure.

- The Connect Bay Area Measure, authorized by the Connect Bay Area Act (Senate Bill 63), was recently certified for the election after advocates submitted over 305,000 valid signatures.
- The November 2026 ballot measure aims to bridge the staggering fiscal shortfall (the "transit fiscal cliff") threatening major operators.
- Here are the key details of the initiative:
  - The Revenue: A 14-year regional transportation sales tax will generate roughly $980 million annually. The tax is set at a half percent in Alameda, Contra Costa, San Mateo, and Santa Clara counties and one percent in San Francisco.
  - Agency Impact: Approximately 63 percent of the funding is dedicated to transit operations for Caltrain, BART, Muni and Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit) to prevent service cuts, station closures and frequency reductions.
  - Caltrain's Specific Needs: Caltrain currently faces an annual structural deficit of roughly $75 million. Without this regional funding, the agency has warned it may be forced to reduce train service to once an hour, eliminate all weekend service and end weekday service by 9:00 pm. Page 1 of 2 Item #9. 8/4/2026
  - Near-term Bridges: To avert immediate, catastrophic service cuts while the measure goes to voters, Governor Newsom and state officials approved a $590 million state loan package for Bay Area transit agencies in early 2026.

- How Does Caltrain Measure "RR" Funds Intersect With the Bay Area Connect Regional Measure?
  - Caltrain Measure "RR" funds do not replace and are not replaced by the November 2026 Connect Bay Area Regional Measure; instead, they function as a necessary baseline. While Measure "RR" keeps the trains running at a basic operations level, the Connect Bay Area Regional Measure is designed to layer on top to close Caltrain's structural deficit and fund its expanded electrified service vision.
  - It would explicitly allocate an estimated $70 million to $75 million annually specifically to Caltrain.

- **10) Report From Staff**

Vice Chair Swire asked for the status of a bike/pedestrian bridge on Hillsdale Boulevard in San Mateo. Staff said in the 101 Corridor Connect, there is a recommendation for a technical assessment of previous work and analysis of whether other current projects on Hillsdale Boulvevard will be compatible and synergistic.

- **11) Member Comments / Requests**
  - Ms. Lang remarked on the importance of the transit revenue measure.
  - Mr. Carlini congratulated the City of Burlingame and Millbrae for the available bike share program which will encourage mode shift and help with connections to other transit modes. He urged the SMCTA to be a leader on safe streets, especially to areas with previous fatalities. The SMCTA needs to lead and drive change. He hopes that the SMCTA will put pressure on municipalities to do the right thing.
  - Chair Arietta hopes that more become aware of the benefits of Caltrain service levels in order to avoid cutbacks.
  - Vice Chair Swire encouraged members to look at Connect Bay Area measure supporters and was surprised on the number of electeds in the County who do not support the measure. He suggested that the CAC present to the SMCTA Board similar to the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) and San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) CACs. He expressed concerns of Board members not having enough time to read the CAC report prior to the meeting. He also mentioned having a subscription list to the CAC (and Board) to receive reminders and agendas via email. Staff said the new website will include this functionality.
  - Mr. Kuo thanked SMCTA staff (Peter Skinner, Patrick Gilster, Jessica Manzi), CAC Member Mike Swire, and others for attending a recent infrastructure bike ride in East Palo Alto. They discussed how projects are connected and involve multiple municipal authorities/jurisdictions. He recommended other cities to do these rides. He said that Senate Bill (SB) 79 took effect on July 1, promoting denser housing near major transit stops. Numerous SB 79 projects are moving forward in the area. He also mentioned the upcoming celebration of SamTrans' 50th Anniversary on September 26.
  - Ms. Enriquez recently visited the New York City Transit Museum; it is a positive reminder of the work that we do here.

- **13) Date/Time of Next Regular Meeting: Tuesday, September 1, 2026, 4:30 pm**