

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Warren Slocum](#); [Don Horsley](#); [Carole Groom](#); [David Canepa](#); [Dave Pine](#)  
**Cc:** [CMO BoardFeedback](#)  
**Subject:** Say No to the underperforming Active Transportation Plan  
**Date:** Monday, February 8, 2021 9:44:00 PM

---

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.**

---

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Let's start with a little background information:

**Transportation = movement of people and goods**

**Active Transportation = distributes benefits and burdens most equitably**

**Complete Streets = transportation policy that requires streets to be planned, designed, operated, and maintained to enable safe, convenient and comfortable travel and access for users of all ages and abilities regardless of their mode of transportation.**

**Cost of Driving = \$9,000-10,000 per year and \$0.60 per mile**

Transportation Equity is:

- **not about disabled people** who need to drive, but the ones that can't drive
- **not about disabled people** who don't want to walk/bike, but the ones that still want to
- **not about elderly people** who don't want to walk/bike, but the ones that still want to
- **not about low-income families** with cars. It's about low-income families without cars.
- **not about house owners**, but about cost-burdened renters
- **not about affluent households** that don't want a car, but households who can't afford one
- **not (as much) about affluent communities** unless they have kids, disabled and elderly
- **not about people riding bicycles** today, it's about the 60% "Interested but Concerned" not riding yet
- **not about recreational cycling** (technically that doesn't count as 'Transportation')
- **not about residential street parking** (also not part of transportation, plus it's also only about cars)

... and about People of Color with the added burden of biased enforcement in mind ( often a typical and dangerous side-effect of 'Vision Zero').

**in summary:**

**Low-income, zero-vehicle households, single parent households, cost-burdened renters, seniors age 75+, persons with disabilities, people relying on walking/bicycling/transit, children on their ways to schools and parks.**

The goal of Transportation Equity must be to provide everybody the healthiest, safest and best transportation option possible, which is Active Transportation.

The safest option for pedestrians are sidewalks and the only safe option for cyclists are bike lanes.

Bike Lanes are called Class 2 or Class 4 bike facilities.

This also fits with surveys staff was doing.

All surveys came back with check marks:

- More Bike Lanes
- More separation from vehicle traffic

Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition also did surveys coming back with the same findings.

Separation from traffic with class 2 bike lanes are minimum requirement.

However what doesn't work are 'Sharrows' or 'bike routes'. They are neither safe, nor desirable, nor All-Ages-All-Abiliites, nor 8-80s, nor Complete Streets, nor Safe-Routes-To-School, nor Vision Zero. In reality these "bike routes" or "bike boulevards" are currently the most dangerous thing transportation engineers can do.

They still put kids at the mercy of speeding cars and so they should really just be a few feet here or there, but not for miles.

For example in and around Redwood City, transportation engineers call Jefferson Avenue, Alameda de Las Pulgas or Whipple Avenue "Bike Routes/Boulevards".

No parents in their right mind would put a 8 year old child or their 80 year old grandma onto Whipple or Alameda de las Pulgas and yet your staff is doing exactly that.  
The county calls Kings Mountain Rd. a bike route/boulevard and a 69 year old person just died there last year - so it definitely isn't all-ages-all-abilities.  
County staff is proposing 102 miles of 'shared bike routes' with cars. This is not safe or modern traffic engineering and certainly not in sync with San Mateo's 'Climate Emergency'.

During the outreach sessions, staff already made clear that most of those Class IV bike lanes require working together with other jurisdictions and are therefore highly unlikely to happen (e.g. El Camino, Woodside Rd, Bay Rd, ...)

Currently it looks like the county spent \$200,000 on consulting to come up with only 16 miles of useful bike lanes.

The County also called out North Fair Oaks as their Equity Focus Area and promised to spent special attention here.

There are at least 5-10 public, charter and private schools around here and yet the team has not put any bicycle lanes around those schools.

If staff was serious about Transportation Equity, Bike Lanes around schools are a minimum expectation, leadership should have.

5-6 foot Bike Lanes are currently the best compromise to set up a fast bicycle network within a Equity Focus Area and around those schools.

Most streets around here currently feature 4 lanes for cars (2 for driving, 2 for residential parking).

When we asked the engineers why they propose expensive "bike boulevards" over cheaper and more useful bike lanes, they threw the Board of Supervisors under the bus.

They said it's for 'political reasons', they assume you - the politicians - lack the political backbone required to replace one of those 4 car lanes with 2 bike lanes.

That is the only reason: lack of political backbone. Is that true?

If the Board of Supervisors cares about health and happiness of its residents ...

If the Board of Supervisors cares about their own "Climate Crisis" ...

If the Board of Supervisors cares about Safe-Routes-To-School ...

... this is the time to show it and send this plan back to the drawing board.

Staff did a lot of outreach, they just didn't listen with Empathy and Equity.

And here is what Toole Design thinks: <https://tooledesign.com/theNewEs/>

best regards,  
Gerd Stieler

From: [REDACTED]  
To: [CMO BoardFeedback](#)  
Subject: Comment on Agenda Item 4 - 2021 Supervisorial District Lines Advisory Commission  
Date: Monday, February 8, 2021 6:21:44 PM

---

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.**

---

Dear Honorable Board of Supervisors,

I write to provide input on the proposed Supervisorial District Lines Advisory Commission, Agenda Item 4. Thank you for the attention you are giving to this important issue. Redistricting is a once-in-a-decade opportunity to ensure that San Mateo's system of representation is fair and that district maps respect communities of interest, so that communities have equitable access to the democratic process. Having robust community outreach, engagement, and input will be essential to creating fair maps that respect community preferences. Additionally, it is important to create a commission that reflects the diversity of the County and that will be trusted by the public to act fairly. To that end, we recommend modifying the proposed commission structure and appointment process to incorporate best practices for local redistricting.

First, commissioners should not be appointed directly by the Board of Supervisors. Setting up an independent selection process helps prevent political influence, as well as the appearance of political influence, in the process. One alternative way to select the commissioners is to create an independent panel that will choose the commissioners directly. Another option is to have an independent panel select a qualified pool of applicants, use random selection to seat half of the commissioners, and then the seated commissioners select the remaining commissioners from the pool. This allows the randomly-selected commissioners to balance for geography, skills, racial and ethnic diversity, and other factors.

Second, there should be a public application process for all commission seats. Holding an open application for all seats will create more opportunities to create a diverse commission, including people who are not well-connected to Supervisors.

Finally, we commend your current proposal to make sure the commission includes individuals associated with civil rights, civic engagement, and community groups, including those active in language minority communities. You may also want to identify a goal of creating a commission with diversity of economic class, gender, race and ethnicity, and geography.

Every part of the redistricting process should be open to the public and should reach communities of diverse racial, ethnic, linguistic, and socioeconomic backgrounds. Setting a tone of public access and community participation should start now, with the commission design and the commission selection. I urge you to incorporate the above suggestions. If you have any questions, I am happy to be a resource and to continue to engage on how to create an equitable and accessible redistricting process in San Mateo.

Sincerely,  
Julia Marks

--

**Julia Marks** (she/her)  
*Program Manager & Staff Attorney, Voting Rights*

---

**Asian Americans Advancing Justice – Asian Law Caucus**

