










C/CAG Board and Committee Comments Provided on the Draft Strategic Plan

This document is a compilation of all comments on the draft Strategic Plan framework provided by C/CAG’s Board of Directors and select Standing Committees at their April-May meetings; it also includes feedback received during the public comment period in August.

- **Board of Directors** – April 11 and May 9, 2024
- **Resource Management and Climate Protection Committee (RMCP)** – May 15, 2024
- **Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)** – May 16, 2024
- **Stormwater Committee** – May 16, 2024
- **Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ)** – May 20, 2024
- **Finance Committee** – May 22, 2024
- **Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC)** – May 23, 2024
- **Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)** – May 23, 2024
- **Public Comment Period** – August 12 to September 6, 2024
 - **A total of 25 people accessed the document online, and four people submitted comments through other means.**

Comments are categorized by the Strategic Plan section, and each one is color coded to indicate the group/venue in which the comment was provided.

Key:

	Board of Directors
	Resource Management and Climate Protection Committee (RMCP)
	Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
	Stormwater Committee
	Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ)
	Finance Committee
	Airport Land Use Committee
	Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
	Public Comment Period

List of Comments and Changes

Updated 9/19/24

Major Challenges and Opportunities Facing San Mateo County:

Comment	Changes
● 1. Another key factor when it comes to mode shift is to provide options to the community. Redwood City is supportive of a regional or sub-regional shuttle or shared micromobility program.	Noted that one opportunity to increase mode shift is the forthcoming implementation of a micro-mobility (bikeshare/scooter share) pilot program in key areas of San Mateo County.
● 2. Not certain how you got this number: feels like a change from the past when SMC was a commuter suburb. Having higher % work in SMC means we need a more robust mass transit option, better micro mobility and BPAC options.	Data source added.
● 3. Driving my own car or motorcycle is easy, while our mass transit is not wide ranging and takes too much time. Micro mobility has arrived in Europe and is coming to SMC fast. Are we ready?? NO!	Implementation of a micro-mobility (bikeshare/scooter share) pilot program in key areas of San Mateo County is included as a short-term objective under Goal 1.
● 4. Make and keep it safe around SFO. Stop San Bruno from building 10 story buildings at the end of 26R & 26L.	No change was made.
● 5. I'll send Audrey the letter I wrote to SMC TA.	Letter received.
● 6. SMC is controlled by the well-heeled living in the hills. How can we get them engaged in others' plight?	No change was made.
● 7. We need more Foster City solutions on the Bayside, and Hwy 1 is in serious jeopardy already and needs to be moved in spots.	No change was made.
● 8. We are killing the human race. That's why we live in the hills on the ocean side with our natural AC. Buildings need insulation and lower cost heat/AC solutions. Infrastructure	No change was made.

	requires hardening as well.	
●	9. We are all in this together and need to gain support from the hills of SMC.	No change was made.

Mission Statement:

	Comment	Changes
●	10. "Congestion relief" is missing.	The phrasing "robust multi-modal transportation network" assumes inclusion of congestion relief strategies.
●	11. "Energy efficiency" is missing, should that be in the mission? Is that what C/CAG does?	This is included in "environmentally sustainable."
●	12. "Implement and maintain a robust multi-modal transportation network" makes it sound like we run the transit system.	C/CAG does implement and maintain some parts of the transportation system.
●	13. "Land use" is missing.	Land use is the responsibility of local jurisdictions. C/CAG only touches on land use in a limited way via the 21-Elements work and airport land use compatibility. "Environmentally sustainable" includes the balanced land use that C/CAG supports.
●	14. "Planning" is missing.	This is reflected in each goal area throughout the document.
●	15. "Promote climate resilience" is a broad phrase. Can we get more specific?	Added "environmentally sustainable."
●	16. C/CAG's mission is to work collaboratively with local jurisdictions. Be stronger about this.	This was added.
●	17. Keep "multi-modal."	No change was made.
●	18. Make it more positive, include characteristics that distinguish C/CAG from other regional groups. Mention how many cities we have around the table that are willing to work together towards common goals. The magic	Added this to the mission statement and added "innovative" to the vision statement in recognition of C/CAG's role in bringing innovative ideas to the region.

	of C/CAG is that we have been respectful and responsible, understanding that we must get where we're going together. We figure out how to make things work together. The language should reflect that.	
●	19. Transportation and climate resiliency are our focus areas, and those are there. Other concepts like jurisdictions and shared goals are good too.	Agreed.
●	20. Doesn't say anything about equitable distribution whereas the vision does.	Equity as an overarching priority is reflected throughout the document.
●	21. Consider "an accessible, robust, multi-modal transportation system."	Most of this language was added.
●	22. Make equity a central part of the mission.	This was added.
●	23. Emphasize accessibility.	This was added.
●	24. The mission and vision are inspirational and comprehensive.	Agreed.
●	25. Keep it short, fun, and fanciful if possible.	Every effort was made to keep the statements brief while making sure the language captures everything C/CAG does.
●	26. The specificity of the mission seems somewhat discordant with the breadth of the vision. Can the mission fly even higher?	Vision statements are intended to be broader and more aspirational than mission statements, which are meant to convey an organization's basic reason for being.
●	27. We all want a healthy community. Can the mission reflect this?	This will be reflected in the strategic plan narrative.
●	28. Nothing about stormwater or housing; feels too specific to transportation and climate resilience.	Stormwater is part of C/CAG's environmental quality and climate resilience work, and housing is outside C/CAG's purview, except for the 21-Elements work. The updated vision includes "environmentally sustainable, climate resilient future" which includes stormwater.
●	29. What about affordability?	C/CAG supports affordable housing through its 21-Elements support.

● 30. Mission overlooks stormwater work and feels heavily transportation focused.	Stormwater is part of C/CAG’s environmental quality and climate resilience work.
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Vision Statement:

Comment	Changes
● 31. Say “clean energy leaders” rather than “energy efficiency.”	“Clean energy” was added.
● 32. We don't need the comma after "outcomes."	Removed comma.
● 33. I like the vision better than the mission because it is more expansive.	Vision statements are intended to be broader and more aspirational than mission statements, which are meant to convey an organization’s basic reason for being.
● 34. Vision overlooks stormwater work; feels heavily transportation focused.	Stormwater is part of C/CAG’s environmental quality and climate resilience work and is described in Goal 2.
● 35. One person asked why "balanced land use" is there. Another person recommended keeping the language in.	“Balanced land use” reflects the local jurisdictions’ authority of land use and their role in identifying what is the appropriate balance of land uses for each jurisdiction. C/CAG supports the Countywide TDM policy and the 21-Elements effort that assist cities to achieve their balanced land use goals.
● 36. How far should C/CAG go in determining what land use looks like?	C/CAG only addresses land use through the 21-Elements work and airport land use compatibility. Land use is the responsibility of local jurisdictions.
● 37. Don't like "balanced land use" because "land use" implies something beyond C/CAG's purview.	See #26.

Core Values:

Comment	Changes
● 38. Frame equity more positively and forward looking.	The language was modified to reflect this.
● 39. Not enough representation of the environment. "Sustainability" isn't broad	“Environment” was mentioned more frequently in the proposed changes above.

	enough.	
●	40. Equity is missing inclusivity.	C/CAG’s Equity Assessment, Framework, and Action Plan describe this in more detail. The strategic plan will include links to these documents.
●	41. Speak to the forward-looking aspects of equity, not just the past.	The language was changed.
●	42. “Meeting the needs of the present” seems to need another noun like present communities or residents.	The language was changed.
●	43. Aspirations like these are great, however SMC has proved to be more self absorbed within the elected leaders and the wealthy. Getting real buy in will take some doing.	No change was made.

Goal 1: Transportation:

	Comment	Changes
●	44. Right now, only one performance measure has a specific number value. Identify clear targets for the timeframes.	Staff will develop more specific targets for each performance measure.
●	45. "Strengthening the implementation of the countywide CMP TDM policy" feels ambiguous. Get more detailed and actionable.	Staff will develop more specific targets for each performance measure.
●	46. Provide a target for each performance measure.	Staff will develop more specific targets for each performance measure.
●	47. In operations, clarify what is a regulatory mandate.	This will be explained in the strategic plan narrative.
●	48. Add an objective on legislative coordination and advocacy to get more funding for the county.	This is covered in Goal 5.
●	49. Consider a performance measure on how much money we get for the county as a whole from outside sources (either measured against percentage of regional funds or compared to other Bay Area counties).	Staff will develop more specific targets for each performance measure.
●	50. For mode share, is this all trips or just commute trips?	C/CAG measures both.
●	51. Be more specific and bolder on the safety performance measure (i.e., eliminate traffic deaths).	Staff will develop more specific targets for each performance measure.
●	52. Add a performance measure related to shuttles.	Shuttles typically require a performance metric when they apply for funding. The performance metrics might differ based on whether it is a commuter, community, or Lifeline Shuttle.
●	53. Where and how are we including seniors in the Equity Focus Areas? There should be more programming and support for senior	The Equity Focus Areas are those with many low-income households, people of color, households without access to a vehicle, and

	mobility given that seniors are 20% of the population.	households burdened by housing and transportation costs, compared to other areas in San Mateo County.
●	54. There are so many objectives. How will C/CAG prioritize so we can actually move the needle on some of these?	It is an ambitious plan and the different time frames reflect the priorities. Much of C/CAG's work is statutorily required or mandated.
●	55. Senior citizens aren't reflected.	Many of C/CAG's programs benefit seniors, including the shuttles and investment in pedestrian facilities.
●	56. These objectives seem focused on the built environment. Where are the behavior change strategies?	C/CAG focuses on building infrastructure with the hope that in time it will lead to behavior change. Vision Zero and Safe Routes to School work does include behavior change elements.
●	57. Cities' ability to implement these changes (e.g., mode shift, shuttles) depends on whether they have the resources to do so.	Increasing funding is a key component of the strategic plan.
●	58. Not all cities have Equity Focus Areas, but we still need funding.	Agreed. Staff have consistently noted that investment to meet our mobility goals is required throughout the County.
●	59. Encourage multi-benefit projects (i.e., whenever we do a transportation project, put in green stormwater infrastructure).	This is covered in Goal 2.
●	60. How much money won't go to active transportation if we invest in freeways? Many of the objectives are not aligned with mode shift and equity goals.	These are ongoing funding and policy decisions. It is not accurate to assume investments are fully fungible across all modes.
●	61. Safety should be the #1 goal.	Added this into the mission statement.
●	62. If we want to reduce driving and get people out of their cars, say this.	This is "mode shift."
●	63. Explore "no right turn on red light" policies in high injury areas.	This is an issue each jurisdiction can consider and/or it can be discussed as part of the C/CAG Vision Zero Advisory Committee.
●	64. The performance measures should align better with the mission statement.	The final set of performance measures and their related targets will be aligned with the

	mission statement.
● 65. Climate resilience is not the same thing as climate change prevention.	The mission statement was adjusted.
● 66. If we want to focus on equity, don't just measure grant allocations, prevent doing harm in the first place by protecting the environment and safety of vulnerable communities. Include air quality, injury prevention, and climate justice as components of equity.	C/CAG just approved the first Countywide Vision Zero Policy. Also, many of these criteria are part of the environmental assessment of all projects.
● 67. Can we look at other county/city examples for how to achieve equitable outcomes better?	C/CAG's Equity Assessment, Framework, and Action Plan describe this in more detail, including case studies.
● 68. Enforcement is an equity issue. Explore alternatives to law enforcement for traffic stops.	This is an issue each jurisdiction can consider.
● 69. Include noise pollution in equity maps.	Noise is a CEQA issue that is analyzed as part of the environmental review process.
● 70. Move towards electric buses.	SamTrans is working on this.
● 71. Add technical assistance – support and stay up to date on modeling and VMT analysis topics. Local agencies do not have staff that are expert in this topic.	The language was added.
● 72. We need a regional agency that is responsible for operation of TDM programs that does not fall under SamTrans responsibilities; thinking about a sub-regional shuttle program that support 2-3 adjacent jurisdictions.	This is an issue for further consideration.
● 73. Please ensure that new technologies deployed are interoperable with San Mateo County Transit District's plan for a centralized cloud-based TSP system.	Language on coordinating with transit and shuttle providers was added.
● 74. Please coordinate with El Camino Real	C/CAG staff will coordinate with SamTrans on this.

	Corridor Manager on implementation to ensure bike lanes are integrated with transit priority improvements.	
●	75. More Measure A and Measure W dollars should be allocated to pedestrian and bicycle safety.	C/CAG does not control Measure A and Measure W spending. The Strategic Plan emphasizes the need to invest in pedestrian and bicycle safety across the county.
●	76. Clarify roles and responsibilities of regional and local agencies (e.g., C/CAG vs. SMCTD roles).	Language was added to reflect the importance of working in partnership with other agencies.
●	77. Is there an opportunity for C/CAG to support further coordination with Caltrans on SHOPP projects (e.g., augmenting Caltrans SHOPP project with local jurisdiction needs) or is this more of a role for the TA?	No change was made; C/CAG staff can explore this further.
●	78. Continue to support education around various transportation resources and coordination with MTC on the TIP.	Language was added.
●	79. Strategic planning and coordination for larger, federal grants for regional investments (what was being planned for the LRSP and applying for SS4A grant).	Language was added.
●	80. Regional data gathering and analysis (e.g., could C/CAG support annual bike/ped counts or consider another big data subscription?).	Language was added.
●	81. SMC needs a Class 1 Bike/Ped network to allow greater personal transport, micro mobility needs to be incorporated, and mass transit needs to become an option rather than by necessity.	No change was made as this comment already aligns with the Strategic Plan objectives.
●	82. Automated vehicle plan: can't get beyond the first line of the Exec Summary. Sacramento needs to be engaged and made to focus on user rather than corporate needs.	No change was made.

● 83. Express lanes project is not popular... lost opportunity.	No change was made.
● 84. 2050 for Vision Zero generates zero interest. Get 'er done sooner!	No change was made.

Goal 2: Stormwater Management:

Comment	Changes
● 85. On objective 2.4, mention that BAWSCA is C/CAG's partner.	Added this.
● 86. Mid-peninsula unincorporated areas don't have a stormwater master plan. Would this fit into objective 2.9?	Stormwater master plans are up to the jurisdiction (i.e., cities and/or the County in unincorporated areas). C/CAG supports local green infrastructure projects and regional OneWatershed Projects.
● 87. Add a performance measure about the percentage of jurisdictions with stormwater plans?	Added this.
● 88. The last two performance measures don't feel like performance measures.	Staff will develop more specific targets for each performance measure.
● 89. Are we tracking local jurisdictions' work on stormwater?	C/CAG is already doing this.
● 90. Stormwater is a small piece of C/CAG's work. Can we call it "climate adaptation and green infrastructure" or something like that?	Added "green infrastructure" to the goal statement. Kept the focus on stormwater management, however, as this is a specific priority of C/CAG's that is tied to regulations and funding.
● 91. All of our agencies are underfunded for stormwater management. Can we look for economies of scale to increase funding for all of us? Can there be a performance measure on this?	This is covered in Goal 5. Role clarity is needed, but the strategic plan is not normally the document to address this issue.
● 92. There's a lack of role clarity between C/CAG and One Shoreline. Should there be coordination of funding initiatives with One	There is significant coordination and collaboration with OneShoreline.

	Shoreline?	
●	93. The Coastside has needs around bluff erosion and loss of open space. Can we lift this up?	C/CAG doesn't have a material role in that work and prefers not to step on other agencies' toes.
●	94. Add something about the integration of plans to approach issues more comprehensively.	Better coordinating/integrating plans across jurisdictions could be a topic of further discussion at C/CAG.
●	95. Make the performance measures specific targets.	Staff will develop more specific targets for each performance measure.
●	96. Clarify what "stormwater plans" refers to in the performance measure.	This measure was deleted. Also see response #61.
●	97. If this plan includes El Camino Real or Dumbarton Rail Corridor, please flag this effort for SamTrans Major Corridors Manager to ensure master plan is integrated with other major corridors planning efforts. Additionally, please make sure to coordinate with SamTrans on any streets that may affect our bus routes or stops.	This is embedded in the core value of collaboration.
●	98. Did not see any specific equity related performance measure or objectives. Is there an opportunity to either reference the Action Plan or be more specific (e.g., Implement X projects in EPCs)?	Language was added, and equity is part of C/CAG's overall strategy.
●	99. This is an issue for a home in the hills as well as neighborhoods built over concealed creeks: let the natural flow of water paths grow, and use them for Class 1 trails when dry.	No change was made.

Goal 3: Energy, Environment, and Climate:

Comment	Changes
● 100. Should we create a specific objective to forge a partnership with Peninsula Clean Energy (PCE)?	Although a partnership may be useful, it is not clear what the tangible benefit would be to add this as an objective in the strategic

	plan.
● 101. Add charging infrastructure.	Added this as an objective.
● 102. Add green hydrogen.	Added this as an objective.
● 103. It's not clear whether we're aiming for climate mitigation, adaptation, or both. "Resilience" is more all-encompassing.	The word "resilience" covers both mitigation and adaptation.
● 104. What about "using less resources"?	Conceptually, this is included in "environmentally sustainable, climate resilient future."
● 105. There are no action words in the goal statement (e.g., lower GHG emissions).	The objectives are action oriented. There was no consensus among Board and Committee members that the tone needed more urgency.
● 106. There's not enough urgency in our language.	The revised language has attempted to convey more action.
● 107. Would this be a place to weave in resource management and conservation?	The Board discussed whether to include parks and open space, but C/CAG doesn't have much of a role in that work and prefers not to step on other agencies' toes.
● 108. "Energy costs" resonate more than "climate change" in some communities.	Board and Committee members are encouraged to frame the work in whatever ways make most sense with their constituents/communities.
● 109. How do we involve the most impacted communities in these discussions? We want them front and center.	C/CAG staff will define the action steps in their biannual work plan and project plans, creating specific opportunities for communities to get involved.
● 110. Consider "enhance environmental quality and community resilience to climate change throughout San Mateo County."	Added this.
● 111. Can the carbon sequestration performance measure be more specific and robust?	Staff will develop more specific targets for each performance measure. Children are not specifically addressed since they are not an explicit part of C/CAG's mission or purview

	(though much of C/CAG’s work does benefit children).
● 112. Kids ages 0-8 are particularly sensitive to environmental factors. We need to include them in any climate action planning we do. I'm not sure where that would fit in here, but I think we should address it.	CEQA identifies “sensitive receptors” as part of the process for the environmental review for any projects.
● 113. Siting of cellular towers and concerns around children's/community health came up too.	Local jurisdictions don't control cell tower siting, but C/CAG can ask its lobbyist about this because it seems like a common issue to advocate around.
● 114. Please make sure to coordinate with SamTrans on any streets that may affect our bus routes or stops, or Major Corridors Manager if El Camino Real.	Noted.
● 115. Did not see any specific equity related performance measures or objectives.	Equity is part of C/CAG's overall strategy and is embedded in all we do.
● 116. Suggest augmenting the "tree canopy" objective with more specific examples. Could it be seeking funding to develop an Urban Forest Management Plan? Tree / vegetation inventory using LIDAR or other tools? Another opportunity to call out co-related issues in equity priority communities - urban heat island and can't plant large stature street trees due to no/minimal parkway and limited maintenance budget for jurisdiction.	C/CAG staff will follow up on this.

Goal 4: Land Use and Airport Compatibility:

Comment	Changes
● 117. Some thought that housing element certification shouldn’t be a performance measure because it’s out of C/CAG’s control.	Staff recommend keeping this as it is a baseline threshold for most discretionary forms of transportation funding.
● 118. There was uncertainty from about the "airport" land use focus.	C/CAG has certain mandates related to airport land use compatibility.

119. A Committee member asked whether C/CAG does any other type of land use, for example open space?	C/CAG only works on land use through the 21-Elements work and airport land use compatibility.
120. Should we include conservation and natural land use (e.g., preserving habitat, carbon sinks, etc.) that we'll need to be carbon neutral.	The County controls land use, so it's not clear what role C/CAG would have.
121. Add carbon sequestration.	"Completion and implementation of a Countywide Carbon Neutrality Plan" was added as a performance measure in Goal 3.
122. Committee members were unclear about what the 21-Elements work and HCD's pro housing designation are.	C/CAG supports local jurisdictions' work on Housing Elements.
123. Increasing housing puts pressure on the airports, making it harder for them to operate safely.	HCD's pro housing designation does not make it easier to build housing where it is restricted.
124. Separate out land use and airport land use compatibility, as the two are different. This committee doesn't touch the land use/housing work.	Labeled the objectives that are specific to airport land use compatibility.
125. Objective 4.4: How will the timing of HCD's guidance on noise and housing impact the ALUCP updates? Will we consider certain types of exemptions sooner?	This is uncertain. At an appropriate time, C/CAG will communicate with HCD regarding its concern about housing in the 70-decibel noise level.
126. Change the photo on the slide so it's not a Surfair plane because that will bother some viewers.	The consultant team will change the image for future presentations.
127. Did not see any specific equity related performance measures or objectives, beyond childcare call out.	The ALUCP is statutorily required to evaluate airport safety, noise, and land use concerns.
128. Could this include data analysis/public health lens on impact of airport on EPCs? Noise? Childhood asthma?	The ALUCP is statutorily required to evaluate airport safety, noise, and land use concerns.
129. Have you ever been in a plane that	No change was made. Note that new

aborted a landing, and had to take evasive maneuvers? I have, and it scares everyone on board, including the crew. Stop building high towers, we are asking for a lot of trouble...	development with the ALUCP must meet FAA requirements as well as the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan criteria.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Goal 5: Finance and Administration:

Comment	Changes
● 130. Add a performance measure about C/CAG's ability to receive federal funding.	Added.
● 131. Suggest objective to update/refine website to make information more readily accessible to the public and local agencies. Specifically, I find it difficult to find archived information on things like past call for projects - or navigating the content of these subpages - Funding C/CAG. A Dashboard for this page with how much money is available, how much is local, what other jurisdictions have been successful in getting, etc. would be great!	Language added.

Other Comments Not Specific to a Framework Element:

Comment	Changes
● 132. The Board should be the writers/framers of the mission and vision. Consider working with a subcommittee to address Board feedback.	The Board was given an additional opportunity to frame the mission and vision statements at their May meeting.
● 133. Check that data (both qualitative and quantitative measures) are available for each performance measure.	Staff will develop more specific targets for each performance measure. For some measures, studies still need to be done in order to collect realistic data.
● 134. Specify how and when the strategic plan gets updated. What is the schedule/interval the Board should expect an update on the progress? How do we course correct over	This will be addressed in the strategic plan narrative. It is expected that the Board will revisit the strategic plan every two years to review progress and make changes. C/CAG

	time? Be clear about this in the plan.	staff prepare a two-year work plan to inform the budget. Once the strategic plan is adopted, staff will probably use it in place of the work plan.
●	135. Outside influences can change our course. How do we specify performance measures when we don't control most of what impacts our work? The plan should make clear the need for flexibility, but we must remain strong in our mission and goals even while being flexible.	This will be addressed in the strategic plan narrative.
●	136. Where does "quality of life" get reflected in these goals, objectives, and performance measures? Since it's such a broad concept, we'd need to make it actionable in the plan.	Added "quality of life for all" to the vision statement. Will address this in the strategic plan narrative too.
●	137. The plan feels high level. We want to be able to tell our communities how we can tap into this and be part of it.	A strategic plan is high-level by nature. C/CAG staff will define the action steps in their work plan and project plans, creating specific opportunities for communities to get involved.
●	138. Want to see a focus on seniors.	See comment #44.
●	139. Equity has to be defined in the context of San Mateo County.	C/CAG's Equity Focus Areas were developed in the context of San Mateo County.
●	140. We have more committees than staff may be able to reasonably support. Should we consolidate the committees?	"Review C/CAG standing committee structure for efficiencies" was added as a specific objective under Goal 5. Streamlining the committees and/or introducing term limits is under consideration. Many of the committees are necessary and provide forums for developing thought leadership and countywide collaboration.
●	141. We spend a lot of time in meetings and aspirational actions. We need to think like a business, with quarterly reviews and get things done.	No change was made.