



SamTrans Board of Directors
Meeting July 8, 2026

Correspondence as of June 5, 2026

Subject

1. SamTrans Local Investment Plan 95
2. RE: El Camino Transit Signal Priority – *Staff response*
3. Thoughts on items
4. SamTrans Local Investment Plan 96
5. SamTrans Local Investment Plan 97

From: [Kira Arnold](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: SamTrans Local Investment Plan
Date: Wednesday, June 3, 2026 3:04:35 PM

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

SamTrans Board Members ,

The Connect Bay Area ballot measure is critically important for San Mateo County. Without it, Caltrain and BART service would be cut drastically – leading to crippling increases in traffic congestion, and adding grave risk to projects that improve and extend Caltrain and BART.

In addition to the funds dedicated to Caltrain and BART, the Connect Bay Area ballot measure would provide \$50 million annually in “return to source” local funding – which has the potential to provide much needed improvements in San Mateo County.

I urge the SamTrans Board to invest funding from San Mateo County's local investment plan into priorities that serve people who depend on transit, increase ridership, improve the cost-effectiveness of the transit system to serve more people per dollar, make progress on climate, and improve affordability for residents at a time of skyrocketing gas prices.

More specifically, please use new funding to advance:

- More frequent SamTrans service that serves more areas and improves paratransit by improving the fixed route service.
- Funding transit priority investments to make buses faster and more reliable, more cost-effective, and to move more people for the money.

At a time when federal funding for transit is getting eviscerated and affordability is a priority for many residents, San Mateo County need to focus funding on proven strategies that make accessing transit convenient, increase ridership, and bolster affordable transportation options.

Thank you.

Kira Arnold
kiraarnold@gmail.com
783 Roble Avenue, Apt 3
Menlo Park, California 94025

From: [SamTrans BOD Public Support](#)
To: 818011@seq.org
Cc: [Board \(@samtrans.com\)](mailto:Board (@samtrans.com))
Subject: RE: El Camino Transit Signal Priority
Date: Wednesday, June 3, 2026 3:29:19 PM

To Ben Mangiafico,

Thank you for taking the time to share your recent experience riding Route ECR and for your continued advocacy regarding transit signal priority (TSP) along El Camino Real. We appreciate the detailed observations you provided, particularly regarding the delays and bus bunching you experienced between Ralston Avenue and the Redwood City Transit Center.

We understand how frustrating it is to encounter a significant service gap on one of SamTrans' most frequent routes, especially during peak commute periods. Your comments reinforce concerns that staff have also been evaluating related to reliability, headway management, and the current performance of the TSP system along the corridor.

Our Planning and Bus Operations teams have recently completed an assessment of the existing TSP system on El Camino Real. While TSP is currently active at many intersections, the assessment found that the existing system is not consistently delivering the level of travel time savings or reliability improvements originally intended. Staff identified several contributing factors, including limitations in the current TSP technology and policies, operational conditions, and the challenges of monitoring performance in real time.

In response, SamTrans is actively working on several initiatives to improve performance along the ECR corridor, including:

- Evaluating next-generation cloud-based TSP technology that would provide improved monitoring and responsiveness compared to the current hardware-based system.
- Participating in a pilot project in partnership with regional agencies to test enhanced TSP technology at intersections in San Mateo County.
- Continuing to assess operational strategies that can help reduce bus bunching and improve service reliability.
- Exploring future corridor-wide improvements, such as through the Grand Boulevard Initiative effort.

Your observations regarding the intersections at Harbor Street and James Street are helpful and have been shared with the appropriate staff for additional review as part of this ongoing work.

We appreciate your engagement and your thoughtful feedback as both a rider and CAC representative. Input like yours helps us better understand the day-to-day customer experience and informs future improvements. Please note that SamTrans Planning staff will be

presenting to the CAC at the August 26th meeting on the Grand Boulevard Initiative and TSP related efforts, which will be an opportunity for the CAC to learn more about these initiatives.

Thank you again for reaching out.

Your SamTrans BOD Public Support Team

From: Benjamin Mangiafico <818011@seq.org>
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2026 11:55:11 PM (UTC+00:00) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Board (@samtrans.com) <board@samtrans.com>
Subject: El Camino Transit Signal Priority

You don't often get email from 818011@seq.org. [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,

My name is Ben, and I am a high schooler and vice chair of the CAC, speaking as an individual.

I'm writing you this email because of a frustrating first hand experience I had today that validated years of complaints I've heard and expressed about Transit Signal Priority (TSP) along El Camino.

I recently completed my trip from Ralston Avenue to the Redwood City Transit Center on route ECR, bus 820. This bus was over half an hour late, and, as a result was bunching with another southbound bus, greatly increasing the effective headway of the route. It should go without saying that having a 45 minute service gap on SamTrans's flagship route at the start of rush hour when it is supposed to run every 15 minutes is unacceptable.

However, thankfully, there appears to be some low-hanging fruit. Two different times, my bus missed the green light by only a couple of seconds, in spite of the fact that El Camino supposedly has TSP that extends green lights for late buses (the two

intersections in question were with Harbor Street and James Street). I would strongly recommend looking into whether TSP is actually active, if it can be made more aggressive, or if it only needs fixing on this one bus or these two intersections. I and others have been asking about better TSP for years only to be rebuffed that it's already active, and I think my experience today disproves that it is active to its full potential.

Thanks so much,
Ben Mangiafico

This is a student email account managed by the Sequoia Union High School District. The contents of this email are governed by the laws of the State of California and the board policies of the school district.

For abuse, misuse, or objectionable content concerns, please contact abuse@seq.org.

From: [Giuliano](#)
To: [cacsecretary \[@smcta.com\]](mailto:cacsecretary [@smcta.com]); [Public Comment](#)
Subject: Thoughts on items
Date: Wednesday, June 3, 2026 3:46:11 PM

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

Hi all,

The CAC lost quorum at last night's meeting. I enclose here my thoughts on the items we could not hear or discuss.

- Item 10. Report of the Chair

Barbara, thank you for this fantastic report, focusing on an important topic of great concern throughout the county!

We need to make roads safe. Kids and adults ride on sidewalks only because roads are not safe.

According to studies like the Mineta Study, Injuries and ER visits are rising at half the rate of increased e-bike usage. **The issue is two fold. First, roads are not safe and cars do not drive safely.** These are responsible for the vast majority of crashes, injuries, and deaths. This is the "low hanging fruit". **This is where the smallest and easiest changes will result in the biggest impact.** 2) **Secondly,** makers and sellers lie about what is an e-bike. This must be fixed. **SB1167 is the only bill tackling the real problem: it will treat marketing illegal e-moto as e-bikes as false advertising, subjecting manufacturers, sellers, and other violators to sanctions.**

RE: the Burlingame crash that killed Ayden Fang.

This was not a “chain reaction e-bike crash”. This was a car crash where the e-bike rider was an additional victim. The car driven by the 16 year old first cut off the e-bike causing that crash, then the driver panicked, drove onto the sidewalk killing Ayden. I really appreciate your concern, and I think you understand the issue. But your wording could easily be misunderstood to assign primary responsibility to the e-bike rider.

RE: What is being done

In addition to what you noted::

- **The Belmont PD also hosted an e-bike presentation.**
- **The Silicon Valley Bike Coalition regularly offers e-bike classes. They should be regularly consulted when municipalities host an e-bike event.**
- **Walk Bike Roll California (WalkBikeRollCA.org) is leading efforts to integrate cycling education into the K-12 curriculum. They should be regularly brought in when K-12 ebike education is discussed.**
- **9 (Board 12a) Legislative Update**

While this was covered in session, we were directed to address questions about specific bills to the cacecretary email. So here it is ;->

SB 1167: Why do we not take a position on this, or at least watch it? It is the only bill that deals with the cause of this issue. It is not the kids at fault. It is not the parents at fault. **The cause is the lies made by manufacturers, retailers, and others in the sales process.** It is the only bill supported by cyclists from local organizations like the SVBC to state wide groups like CalBike.

- **10. Chair's Report**

Barbara, thank you for this fantastic report, focusing on an important topic of great concern throughout the county! Some pedantic comments follow.

We need to make roads safe. Kids and adults ride on sidewalks only because roads are not safe.

According to studies like the Mineta Study, Injuries and ER visits are rising at half the rate of increased e-bike usage. The issue is two fold. Roads are not safe and cars. This is the primary issue. Secondly, makers and sellers lie about what is an e-bike. **SB1167 is the only bill tackling the real problem: it will treat marketing illegal e-moto as e-bikes as false advertising, subjecting manufacturers, sellers, and other violators to sanctions.**

RE: the crash that killed Ayden Fang in Burlingame.

This was not a “chain reaction e-bike crash”. This was a car crash where the e-bike rider was an additional victim. The car driven by the 16 year old first cut off the e-bike causing that crash, then the driver panicked, drove onto the sidewalk killing Ayden.

RE: What is being done

In addition to the actions you list, further info and actions:

- **The Belmont PD also hosted an e-bike presentation.**
- **The Silicon Valley Bike Coalition regularly offers e-bike classes**
- **Walk Bike Roll California (WalkBikeRollCA.org) is leading efforts to integrate cycling education into the K-12 curriculum.**

- **11. Staff Report**

Thanks to Executive Director Chan for sending a letter to US DOT in support of Belmont's Alameda de las Pulgas Multimodal and Safety project phase. This project is a major improvement over prior versions, adding protected bike lanes on both sides of Alameda through the entire project scope, from the San Carlos border to El Verano Avenue. While this project has some flaws, those can be corrected before implementation starts.

- **12. Member Comments**

- Summer will be here soon. Summer equinox and Fathers' day on June 21!
- The CAC often asks questions which the staff is unable to answer. We are told that staff will look into it and provide the answer later. This happens only rarely. I've reached out to Executive Officer Skinner. He tells me this is not an issue he can address, that direction to do this can only come from the board. This is deeply

surprising to me. How can the CAC function without answers to fundamental question. But, so be it: **Can the board direct staff to implement a process where when they state that answers will be provided later, that they can then do so?**

- I'm impressed by the financial tracking, accountability, and transparency surrounding TA project finances. And befuddled by the lack of the same for project outcomes.

Where claims are made about performance outcomes, sponsors must be held to account. Metrics must be described, and means to measure metrics before and after the project must be described and executed.

When projects fail to meet their objectives, the financial impact is far larger than even large financial errors. The entire project's allocation has been squandered. Near \$2B+ has been planned for various 101 projects to reduce congestion, VMT, GHG. The data we have so far are showing that the completed 101 projects have failed to deliver these objectives. That is \$2B+ that has and will be wasted, that could have been allocated to other projects that would more likely have met their goals.

We often see project proposals before the CAC stating lofty and persuasive goals. Safety. VMT reduction. Climate change reduction. Pollution reduction. Active Transport improvement. Mode shift. Etc. These claims can sometimes seem performative rather than sincere. Any claim can be made, if the sponsor knows it will not actually need to even try to achieve them.

For example, from the June 4 Agenda Packet's Executive Director's Report, various projects are described.

For the Moss Beach project, what safety and congestion metrics will be tracked?

For the Peninsula Shuttle Strategy, what metrics will it use to determine first/last mile connectivity improvements?|

For the Ravenswood/ECR project, what metrics will be used to determine pedestrian usage and safety?

Thank you,

giuliano

--

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

From: [Jennifer Kwong](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: SamTrans Local Investment Plan
Date: Wednesday, June 3, 2026 4:08:27 PM

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

SamTrans Board Members ,

The Connect Bay Area ballot measure is critically important for San Mateo County. Without it, Caltrain and BART service would be cut drastically – leading to crippling increases in traffic congestion, and adding grave risk to projects that improve and extend Caltrain and BART.

In addition to the funds dedicated to Caltrain and BART, the Connect Bay Area ballot measure would provide \$50 million annually in “return to source” local funding – which has the potential to provide much needed improvements in San Mateo County.

I urge the SamTrans Board to invest funding from San Mateo County's local investment plan into priorities that serve people who depend on transit, increase ridership, improve the cost-effectiveness of the transit system to serve more people per dollar, make progress on climate, and improve affordability for residents at a time of skyrocketing gas prices.

More specifically, please use new funding to advance:

- More frequent SamTrans service that serves more areas and improves paratransit by improving the fixed route service.
- Funding transit priority investments to make buses faster and more reliable, more cost-effective, and to move more people for the money.

At a time when federal funding for transit is getting eviscerated and affordability is a priority for many residents, San Mateo County need to focus funding on proven strategies that make accessing transit convenient, increase ridership, and bolster affordable transportation options.

Thank you.

Jennifer Kwong
jennnfer@gmail.com
535 Arastradero Road, Apt. 308
Palo Alto, California 94306

From: natashah@mac.com
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: SamTrans Local Investment Plan
Date: Wednesday, June 3, 2026 4:46:13 PM

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

SamTrans Board Members ,

The Connect Bay Area ballot measure is critically important for San Mateo County. Without it, Caltrain and BART service would be cut drastically – leading to crippling increases in traffic congestion, and adding grave risk to projects that improve and extend Caltrain and BART.

In addition to the funds dedicated to Caltrain and BART, the Connect Bay Area ballot measure would provide \$50 million annually in “return to source” local funding – which has the potential to provide much needed improvements in San Mateo County.

I urge the SamTrans Board to invest funding from San Mateo County's local investment plan into priorities that serve people who depend on transit, increase ridership, improve the cost-effectiveness of the transit system to serve more people per dollar, make progress on climate, and improve affordability for residents at a time of skyrocketing gas prices.

More specifically, please use new funding to advance:

- More frequent SamTrans service that serves more areas and improves paratransit by improving the fixed route service.
- Funding transit priority investments to make buses faster and more reliable, more cost-effective, and to move more people for the money.

At a time when federal funding for transit is getting eviscerated and affordability is a priority for many residents, San Mateo County need to focus funding on proven strategies that make accessing transit convenient, increase ridership, and bolster affordable transportation options.

Thank you.

natashah@mac.com
440 Davis Ct Apt1619
San Francisco, California 94111