



SamTrans Board of Directors Meeting

November 4, 2026

Correspondence as of October 9, 2026

Subject

1. Letter of Support: Grant Proposal for the City of San Mateo Complete Streets Implementation Standards Plan
2. Letter of Support: Support for the City of South San Francisco Safe Routes to Transit & Bay Trail Cycle 2 Applications
3. Subject: Notice of Exempt Surplus Land – F Street Property, San Carlos
4. Against Dumbarton Asphalt



BOARD OF DIRECTORS 2026

MARIE CHUANG, CHAIR
BROOKS ESSER, VICE CHAIR
DAVID J. CANEPA
MARINA FRASER
JEFF GEE
RICO E. MEDINA
JOSH POWELL
PETER RATTO
JACKIE SPEIER

APRIL CHAN
GENERAL MANAGER/CEO

October 5, 2026

California Department of Transportation
Division of Transportation Planning
1120 N Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Grant Proposal for the City of San Mateo Complete Streets Implementation Standards Plan

To Whom It May Concern,

On behalf of the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans), I am writing to express support for the City of San Mateo's grant application to the Caltrans Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant (STPG) program for the proposed San Mateo Complete Streets Implementation Standards Plan.

The Complete Streets Plan identifies ten priority corridors and needed multimodal improvements in San Mateo. This next phase will establish standards for each corridor through dimensioned concepts for sidewalks, bikeways, transit facilities and travel lanes. SamTrans operates bus service on several of these corridors. We look forward to collaborating with the City and other agencies on the Grand Boulevard Initiative along El Camino Real. We also welcome the opportunity to consult with the City on any design changes along the 3rd Ave/J Hart Clinton Dr, Norfolk St, Alameda de las Pulgas, and Hillsdale Blvd corridors, which carry multiple key SamTrans bus routes.

Street design directly affects bus reliability and safe access to stops by foot and bicycle, and decisions about boarding areas, travel-lane widths and the interface between bikeways and bus stops will shape transit operations for years. We appreciate the City's commitment to work with SamTrans and incorporate transit-supportive elements into its standards, using SamTrans' Bus Stop Design Guidelines. The guidelines identify features that make stops safe, accessible and efficient, and they provide guidance that agencies can implement as corridors change. Incorporating them into standards for City capital projects and private development will help deliver transit-supportive design as improvements move forward.

SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
166 N. Rollins Road, Millbrae, CA 94030
(650) 508-6200

October 5, 2026

Page 2 of 2

We look forward to participating as a technical partner as the City develops these standards. Thank you for your consideration of this project. Please contact Government and Community Affairs Officer Michaela Wright Petrik at petrikm@samtrans.com if you have questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,



April Chan
General Manager & CEO

CC: San Mateo County Transit District Board of Directors



BOARD OF DIRECTORS 2026

JULIA MATES, CHAIR
MARK NAGALES, VICE CHAIR
NOELIA CORZO
ANDERS FUNG
RICO E. MEDINA
RAY MUELLER
CARLOS ROMERO

APRIL CHAN
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

October 5, 2026

Metropolitan Transportation Commission
375 Beale Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94105-2066

RE: Support for the City of South San Francisco Safe Routes to Transit & Bay Trail Cycle 2 Applications

Dear MTC Review Committees,

On behalf of the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA), I am pleased to support the City of South San Francisco's applications for Regional Measure 3 Safe Routes to Transit and Bay Trail Cycle 2 funding for the Centennial Way Trail Gap Closure Project and the East Grand Avenue Corridor Project.

As the countywide transportation sales tax authority and a long-standing partner in delivering multimodal improvements in San Mateo County, SMCTA supports investments that improve safety and expand access for people walking, biking, rolling and taking transit. Through its Pedestrian and Bicycle Program and Active 101 plan, SMCTA works with local jurisdictions to close critical gaps in active transportation networks, improve access across and along U.S. 101, and enhance first- and last-mile connections to transit. These projects are also located in the Caltrans Reconnecting Communities Highways to Boulevards Connect4SSF study area and work to fix historical barriers to access across US 101 in San Mateo County.

Together, these projects would address major gaps in South San Francisco's active transportation network and improve connections between neighborhoods, regional transit, major employment centers and the San Francisco Bay Trail. Both projects advance regional goals by improving safety for people walking and bicycling, strengthening first- and last-mile access to transit, and creating a more connected active transportation network.

The Centennial Way Trail Gap Closure Project will advance design of a transformative active transportation connection between the Centennial Way Trail and the Bay Trail. The proposed 1.27-mile separated, all-ages-and-abilities route would overcome the significant barrier created by U.S. 101 and connect the 2.15-mile Centennial Way Trail to more than 7 miles of continuous off-

SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
166 N. Rollins Road
Millbrae, CA 94030 (650) 508-6200

street Bay Trail. The project would expand safe walking and bicycling access between San Bruno BART, the waterfront, and major East of 101 employment centers.

The project would also complement the South Linden Avenue and Scott Street Grade Separation Project being advanced by SMCTA in partnership with the cities of South San Francisco and San Bruno. The grade separation project includes a planned Class I shared-use connection beneath the railroad corridor. By coordinating these investments, the Centennial Way Trail Gap Closure Project can build upon the new railroad crossing to create a more complete regional walking and bicycling connection between Centennial Way, San Bruno BART, U.S. 101, and the Bay Trail.

The East Grand Avenue Corridor Project would create a continuous low-stress walking and bicycling connection among the South San Francisco Caltrain Station, major East of 101 employment centers and the Bay Trail. Separated bicycle facilities, pedestrian improvements, and safer intersections would close gaps in the existing network and make walking and bicycling more practical first- and last-mile options for residents and workers. SMCTA identified the East Grand Avenue corridor as a priority project in its 101 Corridor Connect North County Multimodal Strategy, which aims to deliver active transportation, public transit, and highway and local road improvements along the Highway 101 corridor.

SMCTA supports the City of South San Francisco's applications and urges MTC to fund both projects through the Safe Routes to Transit and Bay Trail Program. Thank you for your consideration of this request. Please contact Patrick Gilster, Director of Planning and Fund Management, at gilsterp@samtrans.com with any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "April Chan", with a stylized flourish at the end.

April Chan
Executive Director

CC: San Mateo County Transportation Authority Board of Directors

From: [HCD](#)
Subject: Subject: Notice of Exempt Surplus Land – F Street Property, San Carlos
Date: Wednesday, October 7, 2026 9:28:18 AM
Attachments: [SLA F Street.pdf](#)

You don't often get email from hcd@smchousing.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,

On behalf of the County of San Mateo Department of Housing, I am providing notice of an SLA Exemption Request for the F Street property in San Carlos, California.

On 10/6/26, the public notice was posted on the County Department of Housing website: <https://www.smcgov.org/housing/doh-public-notice>

The property qualifies as exempt surplus land under Government Code section 54221(f)(1)(A). Pursuant to Government Code section 54221(b)(4), the County has provided public notice of the exemption. The public notice, along with evidence that it will remain available for the required 30-day notice period on the County Department of Housing website, has been uploaded as part of the exemption request.

A copy of the public notice is attached for your convenience. Please contact the County at HCD@smchousing.org if any additional information is needed.

Sincerely,

County of San Mateo
Department of Housing
HCD@smchousing.org





Main Office - Department of Housing (DOH)
264 Harbor Blvd., Building A, Belmont, CA 94002-4017

Housing & Community Development (HCD)
Tel: (650) 802-5050

Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo (HACSM)
Tel: (650) 802-3300

Board of Supervisors:

Jackie Speier
Noelia Corzo
Ray Mueller
Lisa Gauthier
David Canepa

Director:
Raymond Hodges

HACSM Executive Director:
Debbie McIntyre

Declaration of Exempt Surplus Land

In accordance with California Government Code section 54221(b)(4) of the Surplus Land Act, the County of San Mateo ("County") is hereby notifying all interested parties that the following County-owned property has been determined to be "exempt surplus land" pursuant to California Government Code sections 54221(f)(1)(A) and 25539.4 because the property is to be disposed of at less than fair market value for use as housing affordable to persons and families of low or moderate income.

"F" Street Property, located at the southeast corner of "F" Street and El Camino Real, San Carlos, California, APN 045-320-100, the "Property"

The Property consists of a single parcel of approximately **0.15 acres** of land area located at the southeast corner of "F" Street and El Camino Real in the City of San Carlos, County of San Mateo, State of California, and identified as Assessor's Parcel Number **045-320-100**. The Property was previously owned by Mid-Peninsula Water District, a county water district. By Resolution No. **2018-14**, adopted **May 24, 2018**, Mid-Peninsula Water District declared the Property to be "surplus property" within the meaning of California Government Code section 54220 et seq., and thereafter followed the procedures required pursuant to the Surplus Land Act. The County subsequently pursued acquisition of the Property from Mid-Peninsula Water District for affordable housing purposes.

The County's Department of Housing previously expressed interest in acquiring the Property for the production of affordable housing in San Mateo County, and the Property was evaluated for potential development of a multifamily residential project. County staff also engaged in preliminary discussions regarding potential development of the site with approximately **15 multifamily units** targeting households with mental health issues.

The County proposes to dispose of the Property via a long-term ground lease with an affordable housing developer at a below-market rate. The affordable housing developer will develop, own, and operate an affordable housing project on the Property. One hundred percent (100%) of the Property shall be used for development of the housing project.

The Developer will enter into and record against its leasehold interest an affordable housing regulatory agreement restricting tenancy at the Property to eligible homeless households earning at or below thirty percent (30%) of Area Median Income ("AMI"). The affordability restrictions will remain in effect for a period coinciding with the term of the Affordable Housing Agreement, anticipated to be an initial term of fifty-five (55) years, with a County option to extend the term for an additional forty-four (44) years.

These affordability restrictions shall be included as covenants and conditions of a regulatory agreement with a term of at least fifty-five (55) years from the date a Certificate of Occupancy is issued for the project, which will be recorded in the office of the County Recorder, and shall be binding upon the Developer's successors in interest.

Findings: This Property is “exempt surplus land” under the Surplus Land Act pursuant to Government Code sections 54221(f)(1)(A) and 25539.4 because: at least eighty percent (80%) of the Property shall be used for the development of housing; at least forty percent (40%) of the total number of housing units developed on the Property will be affordable to households whose incomes are equal to or less than seventy-five percent (75%) of the maximum income of lower-income households, and at least half of those affordable units will be affordable to very low-income households; and these affordability restrictions shall be included as covenants and conditions in a regulatory agreement recorded in the office of the County Recorder, which shall be binding upon the successors in interest of the housing sponsor, and which shall require such affordability restrictions to remain in place for the longest feasible time, but not less than thirty (30) years, pursuant to a method prescribed by the County.

Based on the written findings detailed above, the County hereby determines that the Property is not needed by the County and is declared “exempt surplus land” in accordance with California Government Code sections 54221(f)(1)(A) and 25539.4 of the Surplus Land Act. This declaration will be effective thirty (30) days from the date of this notice.

In accordance with Government Code section 54221(b)(4), the County may publish this notice online or in a newspaper and provide a copy of it to the entities listed in Government Code section 54222(a). Any interested party has thirty (30) days from the date of this notice to submit public comments to the County.

Comments may be submitted to:

Department of Housing
HCD@smchousing.org

Against Dumbarton Asphalt

by Geoff Smith

We should not give up on the plan to rebuild rail.

SamTrans [planned out a full rebuild of the Dumbarton rail corridor](#) from Redwood City through EPA and Newark to Fremont and Union City from 2017 to 2021. SamTrans's own documents, in trying to advocate for the busway instead of the rail project, [still admit the demand for rail justifies the costs](#).

The only issue is that the agreement relied on outside investment, namely Facebook, to help fund the project. Due to both the drop in commuting from the pandemic and other distractions in technology proposals, the agreement fell apart. In other words: the money is there. (At \$3b, you could individually tax Mark Zuckerberg, a resident of Menlo Park, and he would still have \$255b.) The problem was relying on a partnership. San Mateo County is now one of the richest counties in America. We don't lack the funds. What we lack is leaders with the political imagination to take it.



ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COSTS
\$3 Billion (Subject to change)

Multimodal benefits are not exclusive to the busway.

The rail rebuild already surveyed that it would be possible to build at least two lanes of rail and a bicycle/pedestrian path beside it. The amenities and connections could even be built before the rail line is fully operational.

We should not accept greenwashing asphalt.

SamTrans claims we will provide “zero-emission” service to an equity priority area with the busway. But we’ve seen this claim before. The EPX line was advertised as SamTrans’s first all-electric route. But as battery electric buses (BEBs) still do not have full service range, and often require 20% or more buses to provide comparable service, the EPX has often operated traditional diesel and diesel-hybrid buses to make up for it. Moreover, now when they say zero emission, they mean hydrogen electric buses. SamTrans proceeded with the largest order of them so far and found, as I warned, they’re even less reliable than battery buses. But most critically, [95% of hydrogen comes from the fossil fuel industry](#), and only makes buses at best twice as energy efficient as diesel buses, compared to the three times or more of battery or trolley buses. It is an “open secret” that California only labels hydrogen as green [due to corporate lobbying](#) from Chevron. If diesel is going to run down this corridor for a temporary period, make it a train.

As you can see on [SamTrans’s service map](#), no route directly abuts the rail corridor for the majority of its length. The 270 only runs hourly and not on Sundays. The 276 is the closest, but does not cross the rail corridor. The main benefactor could be EPX, a low-ridership route, and what time it may save could likely be lost due to the traffic on Middlefield. While some new service may come with the busway, there is no discussion of the long-wanted Redwood City to Fremont/Union City service.

Our leaders prioritize ribbon cutting over service.

SamTrans’s main issue is a lack of interest in expanding service. As we’re seeing with [Caltrain’s weekend ridership doubling due to electrification guaranteeing half-hourly service](#), **ridership follows reliable, frequent service**. Yet, despite a similar population size to San Francisco ([743k to 826k residents](#)) but a richer tax base ([\\$160k to \\$140k](#) median household income), SamTrans operates ¼ as many buses as Muni (315 to 1275 vehicles). So SamTrans’s lack of imagination acts as a tax break to the suburbs, [and locks us into driving and constant pollution](#). Despite the fact [transportation is 41% or more of San Mateo County’s carbon emissions](#), we’ve seen no leadership in growing SamTrans service to at least Muni’s level per capita, if not higher, to meaningfully address climate change. What we have seen is [SamTrans approving \\$600m+ in widening Highway 101](#), which invited more car use, prevented multiple cities in the Peninsula from installing [separated bicycle/pedestrian crossings](#), and [led to another tragic fatality in San Carlos](#).

People act like suburban transit is pointless, when [many suburbs](#) around the world provide much better service than here. [49 \(and growing\) smaller French cities even have free bus service](#). (Notably, fares only account for 3.6% of SamTrans’s budget.)

Asphalt is toxic, hot, and a waste of money.

The main reason this is being pushed forward is because asphalt fits within the meager budget covered before. But in practice, due to all the more frequent maintenance, asphalt often costs just as much or more than concrete. And every cent spent on asphalt is wasted delaying rebuilding the rail line.

The key ingredient to asphalt is [bitumen](#), a **product of the petrochemical industry, aka Big Oil**. [Bitumen is carcinogenic](#), aka a cancer risk. And purchasing more of it funds the industry we are supposed to be winding down.

Asphalt is also a major contributor to the [Urban Heat Island](#) (UHI) effect, which is worsening with climate change. Just this summer, with the consecutive heat waves in Europe, [34,000 or more people died from extreme heat](#), likely exacerbated by the UHI effect. East Palo Alto (EPA) already [has some of the least canopy in San Mateo County](#), which will only be made more inhospitable by more asphalt.

EPA is an equity priority area, and it deserves better. But both EPA and San Mateo County as a whole deserve better than what SamTrans is offering.

This is a broad coalition.

While I can't speak for them currently, in the past, I have explained the situation and gotten support for rail from Lissette Espinoza Garnica (former Redwood City councilmember), Antonio Lopez (former mayor of East Palo Alto), and many community members. Please join us.

Ask yourself what your city should look like...



OR



tinyurl.com/2dxv5ybu

