



SamTrans Board of Directors
Meeting April 1, 2026

Correspondence as of March 31, 2026

Subject

1. RE: Follow-up: Route 294 Naming & Service Policy Framework consistency – *Staff response*
2. Re: Follow-up: Route 294 Naming & Service Policy Framework consistency
3. Re: SAMTRANS Board Meeting - April 1, 2026
4. FCX
5. Supporting SamTrans' AI Strategy & Implementation

From: [SamTrans BOD Public Support](#)
To: max.mautner@gmail.com
Cc: [Board \(@samtrans.com\)](mailto:board@samtrans.com)
Subject: RE: Follow-up: Route 294 Naming & Service Policy Framework consistency
Date: Friday, March 27, 2026 11:11:54 AM

To Max Mautner,

Thank you for taking the time to share your thoughtful and detailed feedback, and for your continued engagement with SamTrans service planning.

We appreciate the perspective you've outlined regarding Route 294 and the opportunity to improve clarity in how routes are named and communicated. Your point around making routes easier to understand, particularly for riders who may not be familiar with the system is well taken, and aligns with broader goals around accessibility and usability.

At the same time, Route 294 serves multiple communities along the corridor, and any naming updates would need to consider the full range of riders who rely on the service. While a destination-based name like "HMB" may provide clarity for some, it could also create confusion for riders traveling to or from other areas along the route. Maintaining consistency across the network is also an important factor in how routes are identified and understood systemwide.

Your feedback is valuable from a Customer Experience standpoint, particularly as we continue to evaluate how we communicate service information and improve awareness of routes serving Equity Priority Areas. We will share your input with the appropriate teams for further review as part of ongoing discussions around service planning, communication and rider outreach.

Thank you again for your engagement and for helping us improve the rider experience.

Your SamTrans BOD Public Support Team

From: Max Mautner <max.mautner@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2026 4:51:35 AM (UTC+00:00) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Board (@samtrans.com) <board@samtrans.com>
Subject: Follow-up: Route 294 Naming & Service Policy Framework consistency

You don't often get email from max.mautner@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Hello Board Members and Executive Director Chan,

I recently wrote to this board recommending that Route 294 be renamed "HMB" — following the same approach used for the CSM, SKY, and EPX routes to communicate destinations clearly. I received a response from your Public Support Team explaining that lettered designations are reserved for Express and Limited Stop routes based on the established Service Policy Framework (SPF).

After reading the SPF carefully, I'd respectfully note that this is a staff convention — not what the SPF actually requires.

Chapter 5 states that "SamTrans should adopt simple and clear route naming conventions." That principle is not scoped to Express routes. It is a board-adopted guiding principle that applies across all service.

The SPF's Guiding Principle #1 also calls for routes that are "simple and easy to understand." A number does not tell anyone where a bus goes. "HMB" does.

There is also an equity dimension worth noting: the 2025 SPF update explicitly identifies Half Moon Bay as an Equity Priority Area. Community routes serving EPAs are described as lifeline services warranting prioritized outreach. Route 294 is exactly that route — and it remains largely invisible to the residents it is meant to serve. I regularly speak with San Mateo County residents on both the coast and the bay side who express shock that the route exists.

Finally, when a Community route like 294 underperforms, the SPF calls for activating additional marketing for the route. A descriptive route name on every bus stop pole is low cost, persistent, evergreen marketing.

My ask is narrow:

Please direct staff to evaluate whether the current naming convention for Route 294 is consistent with the SPF's own Route Communication Guidelines — and whether it should be updated accordingly.

Thank you for your time and continued service to San Mateo County.

Max Mautner
San Mateo resident and SamTrans rider

From: [Max Mautner](#)
To: [SamTrans BOD Public Support](#)
Cc: [Board \(@samtrans.com\)](#)
Subject: Re: Follow-up: Route 294 Naming & Service Policy Framework consistency
Date: Friday, March 27, 2026 1:19:52 PM

You don't often get email from max.mautner@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Thank you for the thoughtful response.

On the concern that renaming "294" to "HMB" might confuse riders at intermediate stops:

ECR has many intermediate stops, CSM serves destinations beyond the college, and SKY covers multiple points along Skyline Boulevard. Destination-based naming is standard practice precisely because it anchors a route in people's minds—riders consult schedules and maps for intermediate stops. Riders don't expect a route name to list every stop—they just need enough to know it is worth looking up, something that "294" does not currently facilitate.

I'd also emphasize that a route rename is among the lowest-cost improvements a transit agency can make. There is no new service to design, no capital expenditure, no schedule change—just updated signage and materials that would already be refreshed on SamTrans' normal cycle. The return on that investment is permanent, passive awareness-building at every bus stop pole along the corridor.

That awareness is worth more right now than in ordinary times.

This SamTrans board is asking the public to fund the agency beyond 2026 with the Connect Bay Area ballot measure. Voters and riders who don't know Route 294 exists are not going to advocate for the agency's future.

Riders who cannot find the service won't vote to fund it.

I appreciate that this is being shared with the appropriate teams. I'd welcome knowing which team will be reviewing it and whether there is a timeline, so I can follow up appropriately.

Thank you again.

Max Mautner

On Fri, Mar 27, 2026 at 11:11 AM SamTrans BOD Public Support
<SamTransBODPublicSupport@samtrans.com> wrote:

To Max Mautner,

Thank you for taking the time to share your thoughtful and detailed feedback, and for your continued engagement with SamTrans service planning.

We appreciate the perspective you've outlined regarding Route 294 and the opportunity to improve clarity in how routes are named and communicated. Your point around making routes easier to understand, particularly for riders who may not be familiar with the system is well taken, and aligns with broader goals around accessibility and usability.

At the same time, Route 294 serves multiple communities along the corridor, and any naming updates would need to consider the full range of riders who rely on the service. While a destination-based name like "HMB" may provide clarity for some, it could also create confusion for riders traveling to or from other areas along the route. Maintaining consistency across the network is also an important factor in how routes are identified and understood systemwide.

Your feedback is valuable from a Customer Experience standpoint, particularly as we continue to evaluate how we communicate service information and improve awareness of routes serving Equity Priority Areas. We will share your input with the appropriate teams for further review as part of ongoing discussions around service planning, communication and rider outreach.

Thank you again for your engagement and for helping us improve the rider experience.

Your SamTrans BOD Public Support Team

From: Max Mautner <max.mautner@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2026 4:51:35 AM (UTC+00:00) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Board (@samtrans.com) <board@samtrans.com>
Subject: Follow-up: Route 294 Naming & Service Policy Framework consistency

You don't often get email from max.mautner@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Hello Board Members and Executive Director Chan,

I recently wrote to this board recommending that Route 294 be renamed "HMB" — following the same approach used for the CSM, SKY, and EPX routes to communicate destinations clearly. I received a response from your Public Support Team explaining that lettered designations are reserved for Express and Limited Stop routes based on the established Service Policy Framework (SPF).

After reading the SPF carefully, I'd respectfully note that this is a staff convention — not what the SPF actually requires.

Chapter 5 states that "SamTrans should adopt simple and clear route naming conventions." That principle is not scoped to Express routes. It is a board-adopted guiding principle that applies across all service.

The SPF's Guiding Principle #1 also calls for routes that are "simple and easy to understand." A number does not tell anyone where a bus goes. "HMB" does.

There is also an equity dimension worth noting: the 2025 SPF update explicitly identifies Half Moon Bay as an Equity Priority Area. Community routes serving EPAs are described as lifeline services warranting prioritized outreach. Route 294 is exactly that route — and it remains largely invisible to the residents it is meant to serve. I regularly speak with San Mateo County residents on both the coast and the bay side who express shock that the route exists.

Finally, when a Community route like 294 underperforms, the SPF calls for activating additional marketing for the route. A descriptive route name on every bus stop pole is low cost, persistent, evergreen marketing.

My ask is narrow:

Please direct staff to evaluate whether the current naming convention for Route 294 is consistent with the SPF's own Route Communication Guidelines — and whether it should be updated accordingly.

Thank you for your time and continued service to San Mateo County.

Max Mautner

San Mateo resident and SamTrans rider

From: [Adam Matye](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: Re: SAMTRANS Board Meeting - April 1, 2026
Date: Monday, March 30, 2026 11:40:36 AM

[You don't often get email from amatye@ostrowcompany.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

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

Dear SAMTRANS Board,

As a homeowner along the recently designated CSM bus line, I have been advocating for the past year for the CSM line to be removed in our Baywood-Aragon residential neighborhood.

There is no need for this line to run given the lack of ridership observed. Please consider removing the CSM line entirely and/or rerouting onto El Camino Real to Highway 92 in order provide residents with more peace and quiet to enjoy our neighborhood without the constant noise of buses running up and down our streets.

Thank you for your review of this bus line and its schedule as a homeowner on this route that would like to see it changed.

Best Regards,

Adam Matye
531 Parrott Drive
San Mateo, CA 94402

From: [Wen-Chin Chen](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: FCX
Date: Monday, March 30, 2026 3:28:37 PM

You don't often get email from wen2368@hotmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Hi,

I have been taking FCX 5 days a week for work. Thank you for conducting a survey earlier. I really appreciate that you post the survey on the stops which can grab people's attention. And the sign is in multiple languages. That is great. But, when I asked some passengers at the stops to fill out the surveys, they tried to scan the QR code on the sign and could not. I hope they will work next time.

I wonder if the result of the survey is out. I was told that you were going to present it to the board in the April meeting and I did not see it posted to the agenda. Please post the survey result to the website so that people can be better informed.

Thank you.

Wen

From: [Jayme Miller](#)
To: [Board \(@samtrans.com\)](mailto:Board (@samtrans.com))
Subject: Supporting SamTrans' AI Strategy & Implementation
Date: Tuesday, March 31, 2026 11:00:21 AM

You don't often get email from jmiller@polimorphic.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Hello,

I came across SamTrans' FY2026 capital plan and saw the investment in developing an AI strategy and identifying use cases across the agency.

At Polimorphic, we work with public agencies to define and implement AI strategies. Our focus is on high-impact use cases like:

- Customer service automation (call centers, multilingual chat)
- Workforce efficiency and reduced administrative burden
- Real-time rider communications and service alerts
- AI-assisted internal operations (case management, CRM workflows)

We've recently supported agencies like BART and multiple counties in building conservative ROI models tied to avoided hires, reduced wait times, and improved service equity.

Given SamTrans' goals around modernization and operational efficiency, I'd welcome the opportunity to share:

- A practical framework for prioritizing AI use cases in transit
- What's working (and not working) across peer agencies
- How to move from strategy → pilot → deployment within a single fiscal cycle

Would you be open to a 20–30 minute conversation in the next couple of weeks?

Regards,

Jayme Miller, MBA
Director
714-824-1772