



Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park • Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside

March 23, 2026

The Honorable Lori Wilson
Chair, Assembly Transportation Committee
Swing Space, Suite 8110
Sacramento, CA 95814
Transmitted via Electronic Mail

RE: AB 1557 (Papan): E-Bike Motor Peak Power Restriction - SUPPORT

Dear Chair Wilson:

On behalf of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County, I write in **SUPPORT of AB 1557 (Papan)** as amended on March 16, which closes a loophole in existing law that allows for electric bicycle (e-bike) motors to be manufactured above the statutory maximum of 750 watts (750W), sets a reduced maximum speed of 16 miles per hour for Class 1 and 2 e-bikes, and establishes manufacturing and sales requirements.

E-bicycles were first recognized by the U.S. Congress in 2002, when H.R. 727 was passed. The bill classified low-speed e-bikes as consumer products subject to the Consumer Product Safety Act and removed them from the federal definition of a "motor vehicle." California followed Congress's lead and passed AB 1096 (2015) and AB 1271 (2024), which established the current framework for regulating e-bikes in California. California law identifies three classes and outlines specific requirements for each, including top speed, method of assistance, minimum age, and motor power.

While the limit is 750W, there is no specific language indicating whether it applies to peak power or continuous power, leaving it to the manufacturers' interpretation. Some manufacturers have taken advantage of the unclear regulations by selling e-bikes advertised as 750W but with higher output and that can exceed established limits. This puts consumers at risk and has even sadly led to multiple tragic accidents in California. Also, generally reducing the speed capabilities of e-bikes while establishing these wattage standards will help keep

San Mateo County streets safe for all users.

For these reasons, we respectfully request that you vote "AYE" on this bill when it is heard in the Assembly Transportation Committee. Thank you for your consideration, and please contact Sean Charpentier, C/CAG Executive Director at scharpentier@smcgov.org if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Adam Rak', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Adam Rak, Chair

City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

CC: The Honorable Diane Papan, California State Assembly
Members and Consultants, Assembly Transportation Committee



Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park • Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside

March 17, 2026

The Honorable Matt Haney
Chair, Assembly Committee on Housing and Community Development
Swing Space, Suite 5740
Sacramento, CA 95814
Transmitted via Electronic Mail

RE: AB 2002 (Solache) Regional Early Action Planning - SUPPORT

Dear Chair Haney:

On behalf of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County, I write in **SUPPORT of AB 2002 (Solache)**, which codifies the Regional Early Action Planning grant program (REAP 1.0) to solidify its proven model of delivering tangible results in expediting housing development.

California remains in a severe housing crisis, with millions of units needed to meet current and future demand. The RHNA program is the backbone of the state's approach, ensuring every region plans for its share of the state's housing need. Regional governments develop a RHNA distribution methodology, balancing complex statutory factors related to housing need, jobs, transportation, equity, and environmental constraints.

Recognizing this gap, the legislature created REAP 1.0 (2019–2023) as a one-time investment to support RHNA implementation and local planning. REAP 1.0 proved highly effective: regions produced more accurate methodologies, provided extensive assistance to cities and counties, aligned planning work across jurisdictions, and delivered zoning and infrastructure readiness that enabled significant future housing capacity. Unfortunately, REAP 1.0 was administered through the statutory framework of the Local Government Planning Support Grants Program, but it was not codified as a standalone or ongoing program. When the one-time budget appropriation expired, the program ended, leaving no permanent funding source to support RHNA administration.

There was also a follow-up program, REAP 2.0, which built upon the success of REAP 1.0 and expanded the programs' focus by integrating housing and climate goals and allowing for broader planning and implementation investments.

The next RHNA cycle will be the most expensive and complex in California history. Recent legislative changes require regions to analyze two new income categories, interview households with special housing needs, undergo expanded HCD review, and meet more rigorous equity, environmental, and data standards. These requirements strengthen the system but dramatically increase compliance costs. Without a dedicated funding source, regions cannot meet these requirements, and cities and counties will risk losing access to the planning assistance they relied on during REAP 1.0. AB 2002 codifies the REAP 1.0 framework to solidify its impact for the 7th Cycle of RHNA and beyond.

For these reasons, we support AB 2002 (Solache) and urge your "AYE" vote when it is heard in your committee. Please contact Sean Charpentier, C/CAG Executive Director, at scharpentier@smcgov.org if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Adam Rak', written in a cursive style.

Adam Rak, Chair

City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

CC: Assembly Member Solache
San Mateo County Legislative Delegation



Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park • Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside

March 17, 2026

The Honorable Lori Wilson
Chair, Assembly Transportation Committee
Swing Space, Suite 8110
Sacramento, CA 95814
Transmitted via Electronic Mail

RE: AB 2346 (Wilson): Electric Bicycles Safety – SUPPORT

Dear Chair Wilson:

On behalf of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County, I write in **SUPPORT** of your bill, **AB 2346 (Wilson)**, which puts forward various changes to ensure the sale of safe & legal e-bikes, as well as protect the safety of e-bike riders and others sharing the roadway, sidewalks, & bike paths.

As e-bikes grow in popularity, local governments are faced with new safety challenges on their streets and roads. In San Mateo County and across the state, there has been a rise in severe e-bike injuries, including the recent tragic death of a 16-year-old in Half Moon Bay.

According to a recent Legislative report by the Mineta Transportation Institute, data from Rady Children's Hospital of Orange County shows a 334% increase in traumatic e-bike accidents among children since 2022, underscoring the growing safety risks associated with e-bike use, particularly among youth.¹

AB 2346 puts forward various changes recommended by the Mineta Transportation Institute. Specifically, the bill:

- Requires all e-bikes being sold in California to be equipped with speedometers and integrated lights, beginning January 1, 2029.
- Requires that manufacturers and retailers selling e-bikes in California

¹ <https://transweb.sjsu.edu/research/2423-Electric-Bicycle-Safety-Data-Policy>

- provide consumers with a summary of e-bike laws.
- Allows local jurisdictions to impose various speed limits on a bicycle path or multi-use trail with appropriate signage.
 - Sets a statewide speed limit of 5 mph when riding on a sidewalk and 15 mph on a Class IV bikeway.
 - Sets a clear statewide speed limit of 15 mph for any minor under 15 years old, regardless of the device or where they are riding.

AB 2346 sets clearer statewide safety requirements to make our communities safer, while also empowering local governments to set local rules as appropriate. For these reasons, we support AB 2346 (Wilson) and urge your “AYE” vote when it is heard in your committee. Please contact Sean Charpentier, C/CAG Executive Director, at scharpentier@smcgov.org if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Adam Rak', written in a cursive style.

Adam Rak, Chair
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

CC: Members and Consultants, Assembly Transportation Committee
San Mateo County Legislative Delegation



Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park • Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside

March 17, 2026

The Honorable Scott Wiener
California State Senate
1021 O Street, Room 8620
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: SB 908 (Wiener) SB 79 Clean Up – Comments

Dear Senator Wiener:

The City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) represents all 21 jurisdictions in San Mateo County and advocates for those who live, work, and play in San Mateo County. Supporting feasible and achievable compact development along major transit routes is an important goal to help us achieve our mobility goals. C/CAG believes that amendments to SB 79 are necessary to achieve its goals, maintain the work our cities have done to build more housing while preserving existing standards, and continue to support the growth of our transit systems. As such, C/CAG has the following comments on SB 908 as you consider implementing amendments.

First, cities need more time to adjust and adequate time to update their plans, if necessary. We support the League of California Cities' request for a time extension for the implementation of SB 79 so that it complies with the initiation of the next RHNA cycle, a timeline that was provided for unincorporated county areas. Additional time will give cities the ability to potentially adjust their local plans to comply with SB 79. The current July 2026 effective date does not give cities any time to budget for planning changes, much less to analyze and implement them.

Second, the inclusion of future bus rapid transit stations that have yet to be constructed could jeopardize the planning and support for bus rapid transit expansions. Current law applies SB 79 to bus rapid transit projects that are included in the long-range Regional Transportation Plan (MTC's Plan Bay Area), regardless of if the project has funding committed, has been fully environmentally cleared, or has begun construction. The inclusion of bus rapid transit projects in SB 79 could make it more difficult for the advancement of bus rapid transit projects because of significant concerns about upzoning around stations. These

concerns about potential statutory increases in density can dominate the planning conversation and create counterproductive opposition. There already are examples of communities in California opposing transit extensions because of concerns about SB 79. For this reason, we believe SB 79 should exclude bus rapid transit stations as a Tier 2 project area.

Third, there needs to be more outreach and analysis on the definition of ferry service. The inclusion of ferries based on frequencies would allow residential development on any commercial zoned land within ½ mile of a qualifying ferry station. There might be commercial uses within the ½ mile zone that are incompatible with residential uses. Some ferry stations are in areas that house a disproportionate amount of a city's commercial land use base. Furthermore, there are commercial uses that might be incompatible with residential uses. C/CAG has serious concerns about the potential of SB 79 to have a negative impact on cities' careful planning efforts to ensure fiscal sustainability, employment generation, and appropriate separation of incompatible uses.

Fourth, the potential impact on and displacement of small businesses is a concern. Small businesses provide necessary jobs, services, and goods for our cities. Furthermore, thriving ground floor retail is necessary for the creation of walkable downtown. Ground floor retail improves the quality of life for the residents and creates support for the higher densities. SB 908 should include language that clarifies that SB 79 does not preclude cities from requiring ground floor retail in its high-density mixed-use developments.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on SB 908. The C/CAG Board of Directors will continue to review and comment on this legislation as it moves through the legislative cycle.

Please contact Sean Charpentier, C/CAG Executive Director, at scharpentier@smcgov.org if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Adam Rak', written in a cursive style.

Adam Rak, Chair

City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

Cc: San Mateo County Legislative Delegation
Senator Jesse Arreguín, Chair, Senate Housing Committee
Senator Maria Elena Durazo, Chair, Senate Local Government Committee