



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

April 28, 2026

The Honorable Buffy Wicks
Chair, Assembly Appropriations Committee
1021 O Street, Suite 8140
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: AB 2296 (Papan) Regional Housing Needs Allocation Process – SUPPORT

Dear Chair Wicks:

On behalf of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County, I write in **SUPPORT** of **AB 2296 (Papan)**, which makes significant improvements to the housing element development and review process by starting the Regional Housing Needs Determination and Allocation processes earlier and by requiring the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to provide specific feedback and analysis to local agencies during the process.

Local governments have faced significant challenges with HCD in achieving timely certification of their housing elements. These include inconsistent feedback, unclear guidance, and changing requirements. As a result, many jurisdictions have been forced to submit numerous drafts and miss the compliance deadline. These delays with HCD lead to cities being penalized through no fault of their own. By bolstering clarity in the housing review process, local jurisdictions will be able to develop housing plans on time that comply with California's complex laws, thus readying themselves for much-needed housing production.

For these reasons, we respectfully request support for AB 2296 (Papan). 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 that reads "Michael Salazar".

Michael Salazar, Chair
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

Cc: The Honorable Diane Papan, California State Assembly



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

April 23, 2026

The Honorable Buffy Wicks
Chair, Assembly Appropriations Committee
1021 O Street, Suite 8140
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: AB 2051 (Wicks) Coastal Resilience Permitting Working Group – SUPPORT

Dear Chair Wicks:

On behalf of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County, I write in **SUPPORT** of **AB 2051 (Wicks)**, which would establish a structured, collaborative process to improve coastal resilience permitting through administrative reform, interagency coordination, and proposed future legislative action by requiring the California Natural Resources Agency and CalEPA to convene a Coastal Resilience Permitting Working Group, including relevant agencies and commissions. The bill would task the Working Group with developing a Coastal Resilience Permitting Roadmap, as well as establish coastal and Bay advisory groups composed of state agencies, local governments, special districts, and coastal interest groups to advise the roadmap process and recommend permitting strategies.

California faces an urgent and escalating need to deliver coastal adaptation and flood resilience projects in response to sea level rise, storm surge, and king tide flooding. The Ocean Protection Council estimates sea levels could rise as much as 3.1 feet by 2100 under likely scenarios, with extreme cases exceeding 6 feet. In the San Francisco Bay Area alone, regional agencies estimate approximately \$110 billion will be needed by 2050 to protect communities, ecosystems, and critical infrastructure.

Despite this urgency, California's current coastal permitting system presents substantial barriers to timely and cost-effective project delivery. These barriers reduce the effectiveness of public funding, increase costs for publicly funded and private projects alike, and slow the delivery of urgently needed resilience improvements. Without targeted reforms, permitting bottlenecks threaten California's ability to implement climate adaptation at the scale and pace required.

AB 2051 takes a targeted, expert-driven approach to identify actionable reforms to help accelerate coastal adaptation and flood resilience projects. For these reasons, we

support AB 2051 (Wicks) 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 cursive script that reads "Michael Salazar".

Michael Salazar, Chair
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

Cc: The Honorable Buffy Wicks, California State Assembly



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

April 22, 2026

The Honorable Buffy Wicks
Chair, Assembly Appropriations Committee
Swing Space, Suite 8140
Sacramento, CA 95814
Transmitted via Electronic Mail

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

Dear Chair Wicks:

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 10 mph when riding on a sidewalk.
- Sets a clear statewide speed limit of 15 mph for any minor under 15 years old, on any e-bike.

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 cursive script that reads "Michael Salazar".

Michael Salazar, Chair
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

CC: Members and Consultants, Assembly Appropriations 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

April 22, 2026

The Honorable Buffy Wicks
Chair, Assembly Appropriations Committee
Swing Space, Suite 8140
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: AB 2595 (Papan) San Mateo County Age Limit for Electric Bicycle Use – SUPPORT

Dear Chair Wicks:

On behalf of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), I write in **SUPPORT** of bill AB 2595 (Papan), which will establish the San Mateo Electric Bicycle Safety Pilot Program and permit San Mateo County and the cities within it to adopt local ordinances or resolutions prohibiting a person under 12 years of age from operating a class 1 or 2 electric bicycle.

If successfully enacted, AB 2595 would give our local jurisdictions the ability to work through their local processes to potentially implement local rules prohibiting the use of Class I and II e-bikes if certain conditions are met. This bill does not establish a mandate that cities implement this rule and mirrors existing laws in San Diego and Marin Counties.

San Mateo has seen a rise in e-bikes on our streets, roads, and trails, many of them operated by youth who do not yet have a common understanding of the rules of the road, the power the bikes possess, or the ability to adequately control heavier Class II e-bikes. We have seen a rise in recent e-bike accidents, including the death of a minor in the City of Half Moon Bay earlier this year. These incidents not only injure the rider, but often other pedestrians are put in danger.

It is imperative that the Legislature give local agencies the tools to ensure e-bikes are safely operated in our communities and by riders who can safely operate them. Age restrictions for e-bikes can be a successful tool for local agencies to educate parents and children alike on the laws governing e-bikes and deter parents from purchasing e-bikes for younger riders who cannot operate them in a safe manner.

For these reasons, we support AB 2595 (Papan) 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 that reads "Michael Salazar". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, prominent 'M' and 'S'.

Michael Salazar, Chair
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

CC: Assembly Member Diane Papan
Members and Consultants, Assembly Appropriations Committee

April 21, 2026

Sean Charpentier, Executive Director
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County
555 County Center, 5th Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

Mr. Charpentier:

Re: Airport Land Use Compatibility Compliance – San Mateo County Housing Element Rezoning Program

We are in receipt of your letter of April 21, 2026, regarding the consistency of Phase I of the County's Housing Element Rezoning Program with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the San Carlos and San Francisco International Airports (ALUCP). Phase I of the rezoning program, adopted by the Board of Supervisors on this date, implements higher-density multifamily residential zoning for various parcels in the unincorporated Broadmoor, unincorporated Colma, and unincorporated Harbor Industrial areas.

As previously discussed with C/CAG, the Planning and Building Department (Department) acknowledges that we should have submitted the proposed amendments to the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) for review of consistency with the ALUCP prior to adoption, as required by law.

To rectify this oversight, the Department will immediately assess any amendments to the adopted Rezoning Program required to achieve consistency with the ALUCP, and prepare a submittal of the Rezoning Program to the ALUC for review of consistency. The Department intends to effect submittal as rapidly as possible, for consideration at either the May 28, 2026 ALUC hearing, or the subsequent hearing on June 25, 2026.

In the interim, the Department understands that any project applications that may be received after the effective date of the amendments (30 days after adoption, May 21, 2026) that would therefore be subject to the newly adopted regulations must and will be submitted to the ALUC for project-level review of consistency with the ALUCP, until a comprehensive determination of consistency and any necessary amendments have been made.

We appreciate your collaboration and guidance on this process, and look forward to working with C/CAG and the ALUC throughout the review and consistency determination.

Sincerely,



Steve Monowitz

Director, County of San Mateo Planning and Building Department



C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

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

4/21/26

Steve Monowitz
Director Of Planning and Building
Dept. of Planning and Building
455 County Center
Redwood City, CA 94063

Re: Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Compliance

We understand that the Board of Supervisors adopted a zoning ordinance to implement its housing element rezoning program on April 22, 2026. As you are aware, the C/CAG Board of Directors acts as the Airport Land Use Commission (“ALUC”) for San Mateo County. We write to confirm the ALUC’s role in review and consistency determinations for San Mateo County’s general plan and zoning ordinances.

As the ALUC, C/CAG is vested with certain powers under State law (Public Utilities Code § 21670 *et seq.*). Pursuant to that authority, the ALUC has adopted land use compatibility plans (“ALUCP”) for the three airports within San Mateo County: the [Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of the San Carlos Airport](#) (2015, [amended](#) in 2022 and 2025); the [Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Francisco International Airport](#) (2012); and the [Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of the Half Moon Bay Airport](#) (2014). ALUCPs are designed to encourage compatible land uses in the vicinity surrounding an airport by providing for the “orderly growth of each public airport and the area surrounding the airport” while safeguarding “the welfare of the inhabitants within the vicinity of the airport and the public in general.” *See e.g.*, San Carlos ALUCP at p. 1-1, citing Pub. Util. Code § 21675(a).

State law requires that, once an airport land use commission has adopted or amended an ALUCP, local agencies amend their general plans and any applicable specific plans, as necessary, in order to be consistent with the ALUCP. Gov. Code § 65302.3. Alternatively, local agencies have the option of taking the special steps necessary to overrule all or part of the ALUCP. Gov. Code § 65302.3(c). Subsequently, prior to amendment of general plans or specific plans, or approval of zoning ordinances or building regulations, the local agency must first refer the proposed action to the ALUC for a determination of consistency with the applicable ALUCP. Pub. Util. Code § 21676(b). A local agency can overrule a determination of inconsistency by following the process provided in State law and making specific findings. *See* Pub. Util. Code § 21676(b). If a local agency fails to take either action (i.e., achieve consistency with the ALUCP or overrule an inconsistency determination), then the local agency is required to submit all land use development actions involving property within the airport influence area to the ALUC for review. Pub. Util. Code § 21676.5(a). *See also* the [California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook](#) at p. 5-1. If a local agency has amended its general plan for consistency, or properly overruled the ALUCP, it is only required to refer legislative actions (general plan amendments or adoption or approval of a zoning ordinance) for ALUC review. Pub. Util. Code § 21676(b).

The subject zoning ordinance has not been referred to the ALUC for review for consistency with the relevant ALUCPs. We understand that the County intends to expeditiously submit the ordinance to the ALUC for review. In the interim, all land use development actions, defined in State law as all “actions, regulations, and permits,” located within the airport influence area must be referred to the ALUC for review. The ALUC is required to conduct this project-by-project review until the ALUC has found the relevant legislative documents to be compatible with the applicable ALUCP, or, if necessary, until the Board of Supervisors overrides a determination of incompatibility following the process provided in State law (Pub. Util. Code § 21676(a)).

If you have any questions, please contact Matt Petrofsky, Senior C/CAG Program Specialist at mpetrofsky@smcgov.org.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sean Charpentier". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Sean Charpentier, C/CAG Executive Director



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

April 16, 2026

The Honorable Lori D. Wilson
Chair, Assembly Transportation Committee
Swing Space, Suite 8110
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: AB 2595 (Papan) San Mateo County Age Limit for Electric Bicycle Use – SUPPORT

Dear Chair Wilson:

On behalf of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), I write in **SUPPORT** of bill AB 2595 (Papan), which will establish the San Mateo Electric Bicycle Safety Pilot Program and permit San Mateo County and the cities within it to adopt local ordinances or resolutions prohibiting a person under 12 years of age from operating a class 1 or 2 electric bicycle.

If successfully enacted, AB 2595 would give our local jurisdictions the ability to work through their local processes to potentially implement local rules prohibiting the use of Class I and II e-bikes if certain conditions are met. This bill does not establish a mandate that cities implement this rule and mirrors existing laws in San Diego and Marin Counties.

San Mateo has seen a rise in e-bikes on our streets, roads, and trails, many of them operated by youth who do not yet have a common understanding of the rules of the road, the power the bikes possess, or have the ability to adequately control them. These activities endanger the rider as well as pedestrians.

It is imperative that the Legislature give local agencies the tools to ensure e-bikes are safely operated in our communities and by riders who can safely operate them. Age restrictions for e-bikes can be a successful tool for local agencies to educate parents and children alike on the laws governing e-bikes and deter parents from purchasing e-bikes for younger riders who cannot operate them in a safe manner.

Further, AB 2595 provides an important opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of locally implemented safety measures and inform future statewide policy discussions. It also complements ongoing efforts to improve education to support safe micromobility use.

For these reasons, we support AB 2595 (Papan) 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 that reads "Michael Salazar". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Michael Salazar, Chair

City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

Cs: Assembly Member Diane Papan
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

April 13, 2026

The Honorable Josh Becker
Chair, Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee
1021 O Street, Suite 3220
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: SB 1167 (Blakespear) E-MOTOS – SUPPORT

Dear Chair Becker:

On behalf of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County, I write in **SUPPORT** of **SB 1167 (Blakespear)** as amended on March 16, which will clearly define what an electric bicycle (e-bike) is and thereby prevent motor vehicles that are faster, more powerful and more dangerous from being sold or marketed as e-bikes. This bill would also improve product labeling and data collection, and it would add safety equipment requirements.

California defines an e-bike as a bicycle with operable pedals and an electric motor with a power of no more than 750 watts. They are limited to 20 mph (Class 1 and Class 2) or 28 mph (Class 3). Users must follow the same rules of the road as traditional cyclists, are exempt from license plate requirements, and do not need a driver's license.

The three-class system can be confusing for consumers, media, healthcare providers, and even law enforcement. Unscrupulous businesses have taken advantage of this confusion and are selling powerful motor vehicles as "e-bikes." Some have motor power up to 5,000 watts and go over 50 mph.

SB 1167 will increase community safety by better regulating motor vehicles that look like e-bikes. It clarifies that any device with an engine power greater than 750 watts is not an e-bike, and specifies that devices that meet the definition of electric motorcycles, electric mopeds, and other motor vehicles are not e-bikes.

Additionally, manufacturers and sellers will be required to disclose if a device is not an e-bike, including advising them that it is a motor vehicle requiring registration and a license to operate. Failure to do so would be a misleading statement under the Business and Professions Code restriction on false advertising.

For these reasons, we respectfully request that you vote "AYE" on this bill when it is

heard in your 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 that reads "Michael Salazar". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized initial "M".

Michael Salazar, Chair

City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

Cc: The Honorable Catherine Blakespear, California State Senate



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

April 13, 2026

The Honorable Matt Haney
Chair, Assembly Housing and Community Development Committee
1020 N Street, Room 156
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: AB 2296 (Papan) Regional Housing Needs Allocation Process – SUPPORT

Dear Chair Haney:

On behalf of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County, I write in **SUPPORT** of **AB 2296 (Papan)**, which makes significant improvements to the housing element development and review process by starting the Regional Housing Needs Determination and Allocation processes earlier and by requiring the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to provide specific feedback and analysis to local agencies during the process.

Local governments have faced significant challenges with HCD in achieving timely certification of their housing elements. These include inconsistent feedback, unclear guidance, and changing requirements. As a result, many jurisdictions have been forced to submit numerous drafts and miss the compliance deadline. These delays with HCD lead to cities being penalized through no fault of their own. By bolstering clarity in the housing review process, local jurisdictions will be able to develop housing plans on time that comply with California's complex laws, thus readying themselves for much-needed housing production.

For these reasons, we respectfully request your signature on AB 2296 (Papan). 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 that reads 'Michael Salazar'. The signature is fluid and cursive, written in a professional style.

Michael Salazar, Chair
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

Cc: The Honorable Diane Papan, California State Assembly



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

April 13, 2026

The Honorable Diane Papan
Chair, Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee
1020 N Street, Room 160
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: AB 2051 (Wicks) Coastal Resilience Permitting Working Group – SUPPORT

Dear Chair Papan:

On behalf of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County, I write in **SUPPORT** of **AB 2051 (Wicks)**, which would establish a structured, collaborative process to improve coastal resilience permitting through administrative reform, interagency coordination, and proposed future legislative action by requiring the California Natural Resources Agency and CalEPA to convene a Coastal Resilience Permitting Working Group, including relevant agencies and commissions. The bill would task the Working Group with developing a Coastal Resilience Permitting Roadmap, as well as establish coastal and Bay advisory groups composed of state agencies, local governments, special districts, and coastal interest groups to advise the roadmap process and recommend permitting strategies.

California faces an urgent and escalating need to deliver coastal adaptation and flood resilience projects in response to sea level rise, storm surge, and king tide flooding. The Ocean Protection Council estimates sea levels could rise as much as 3.1 feet by 2100 under likely scenarios, with extreme cases exceeding 6 feet. The impacts of this will affect a wide array of built and natural assets utilized by all Californians. In the wider San Francisco Bay Area, regional agencies estimate approximately \$110 billion will be needed by 2050 to protect communities, ecosystems, and critical infrastructure. San Mateo County, widely considered one of the most vulnerable to sea level rise in the Nation, is expected to bear an outsized portion of those costs and impacts. Over 100,000 people in San Mateo County live in areas projected to be directly affected by 3 feet of sea level rise (one of only six such counties in the country, and the only such county on the West Coast). The economic value of the properties in those areas at risk, which includes almost 33,000 residential and commercial parcels, exceeds that of any other county in the Bay Area.

Despite this urgent need, California's current coastal permitting system presents substantial barriers to timely and cost-effective project delivery. These barriers reduce

the effectiveness of public funding, increase costs for publicly funded and private projects alike, and slow the delivery of urgently needed resilience improvements. Without targeted reforms, permitting bottlenecks threaten California's ability to implement climate adaptation at the scale and pace required.

AB 2051 takes a targeted, expert-driven approach to identify actionable reforms to help accelerate coastal adaptation and flood resilience projects. For these reasons, we support AB 2051 (Wicks) 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 that reads "Michael Salazar". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Michael" written in a larger, more prominent script than the last name "Salazar".

Michael Salazar, Chair
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

Cc: The Honorable Buffy Wicks, California State Assembly



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

April 13, 2026

The Honorable Matt Haney
Chair, Assembly Housing and Community Development Committee
1020 N Street, Room 156
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: AB 2576 (Harabedian) Transit-Oriented Development – SUPPORT AND REQUEST AMENDMENTS

Dear Chair Haney:

On behalf of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), I write in **SUPPORT** of **AB 2576 (Harabedian)**, which would delay the implementation of SB 79 (Wiener) by one year, giving state, regional, and local agencies additional time to understand the law's impacts and, as desired, work to complete statutorily-permitted local alternative plans.

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. However, cities need more time to adjust and adequate time to update their plans, if necessary. Additional time will give cities the ability to potentially adjust their local plans to comply with SB 79. The current July 1, 2026 effective date does not give cities adequate time to budget for planning changes, much less to analyze and implement them.

In addition to supporting the current provisions of AB 2576, we respectfully request that the author consider two outstanding implementation issues and request the following amendments:

1. Including bus rapid transit (BRT) stations within SB 79 presents significant implementation challenges due to the flexible and evolving nature of BRT service and planning. Unlike rail or other fixed transit, BRT routes, station locations, and infrastructure are often adjusted over time, making it impractical to base long-term housing or land use planning on BRT stations. Additionally, under current law, SB 79 applies to bus rapid transit projects that are included in the long-range Regional Transportation Plan (MTC's Plan Bay Area), regardless of whether the project has funding committed, has been fully environmentally cleared, or has

begun construction. As a result, the potential to trigger SB 79 developments around potential bus rapid transit stations in the planning phase may actually ensure that these projects are never completed, having a detrimental impact on transit service. **Given these challenges, we request that AB 2576 amend SB 79 to exclude bus rapid transit stations from the Tier 2 definition.**

2. The potential impact on and displacement of small businesses remains a serious concern. Small businesses provide necessary jobs, services, and goods for our cities. Furthermore, thriving ground floor retail is necessary for the creation of walkable downtowns. Ground floor retail improves the quality of life for the residents and creates support for the higher densities. **Accordingly, we request that AB 2576 include language that clarifies that SB 79 does not preclude cities from requiring ground floor retail in their high-density mixed-use developments.**

We appreciate your consideration of these proposed amendments and welcome the opportunity to discuss them further. In its current version, AB 2576 is critical to ensuring local governments can successfully carry out the goals of SB 79. For these reasons, we support AB 2576 (Harabedian) 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,



Michael Salazar, Chair

City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

Cc: The Honorable John Harabedian, California State Assembly



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

April 10, 2026

The Honorable Ash Kalra
Chair, Assembly Judiciary Committee
Swing Space, Suite 4610
Sacramento, CA 95814
Transmitted via Electronic Mail

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

Dear Chair Kalra:

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 10 mph when riding on a sidewalk.
 - Sets a clear statewide speed limit of 15 mph for any minor 15 years old and under, on any e-bike.

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 that reads "Michael Salazar". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Michael Salazar, Chair
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

CC: Members and Consultants, Assembly Judiciary 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

April 10, 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 "Michael Salazar". The signature is fluid and cursive, written in a professional style.

Michael Salazar, Chair
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

CC: Assembly Member Solache
San Mateo County Legislative Delegation