



DRAFT MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, July 23, 2025

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Siegal called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

CAC members present at Roll: Najuwanda Daniels, Phoebe Ford, Zameel Imaduddin, Sean Kim, Jerry Levine, Austin Milford-Rosales, Rachael Ortega, and Kat Siegal (8)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Sara Barz (entered during Item 3), Venecia Margarita (entered during Item 5), and Sharon Ng (3)

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Siegal reported that the main item at the Transportation Authority Board meeting was an item related to Senate Bill (SB) 63, which would authorize a regional transit measure for the November 2026 ballot in select Bay Area counties. She added that this was also scheduled as a main agenda item for that evening under Item 5.

Chair Siegal stated that Item 7, the Downtown Travel Study, included a presentation on post-pandemic travel trends. She explained that the study provided useful context for understanding factors contributing to the fiscal crisis facing many Bay Area transit operators, including high rates of remote work and shifts in how people travel.

Chair Siegal noted that the Transportation Authority staff conducted outreach this summer for several planning efforts and that the Brotherhood Way Safety and Circulation Study included online and in-person events, culminating in a well-attended town hall at the IT Bookman Community Center. She said the project team presented potential solutions to community-identified challenges and gathered feedback on near- and long-term improvements for safety, circulation, and connectivity along the Brotherhood Way and Alemany Boulevard corridors.

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

3. Approve the Minutes of the June 25, 2025 Meeting - ACTION

4. State and Federal Legislation Update – INFORMATION

Member Levine asked if there was anything currently pending related to increased local enforcement of autonomous vehicles (AV) under Item 4 on the Consent Agenda.

Martin Reyes, Principal Transportation Planner, replied that nothing similar to last sessions bill (Senate Bill 915) authored by Senator Cortese, was currently on the docket to his knowledge.

Member Milford-Rosales asked about the agency's adopted legislative advocacy



program, which he recalled included working with the California Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to strengthen regulations on data sharing from (AV) companies. He pointed out that the issue was not included in the previous legislative update and that no related bill appeared to be introduced and asked if there had been any progress.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, stated that Transportation Authority staff had contacted the DMV on this topic. She said staff anticipated bringing an AV item to the CAC as soon as early September and asked members to share any questions in advance so that staff could prepare responses.

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

Member Milford-Rosales moved to approve the item, seconded by Member Imaduddin.

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Ford, Imaduddin, Levine, Kim, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (9)

Absent: CAC Members Margarita and Ng (2)

End of Consent Agenda

5. **Reaffirm Support for Senate Bill 63, as Amended; Adopt Principles to Guide Continued Engagement in the Development of a 2026 Regional Transportation Funding Measure; and Recommend San Francisco's Participation in the Regional Measure at a 1.0 Percent Sales Tax Rate – INFORMATION**

Martin Reyes, Principal Transportation Planner presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Ortega asked for confirmation of San Francisco's total sales tax rate if it were increased by one percent and about the outlook for San Mateo County and Santa Clara County's participation in the regional measure.

Mr. Reyes confirmed that San Francisco's total sales tax rate would be 9.625 percent if were increased by one percent. Mr. Reyes explained that participation in the regional measure by San Mateo and Santa Clara counties seemed more likely than last year based on recent positive meetings of various governing boards; however, formal decisions by the counties to opt into the measure would not be made until early August.

Member Ortega asked for more information about the third-party financial efficiency review.

Mr. Reyes responded that the issue was still being discussed and the scope of work was not fully developed yet.

Ms. Lombardo added that there were ongoing discussions about the review between the transit operators and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), which could act as the enforcing body for the review, and noted that it was unclear how much of the scope of work would be included in the legislation as opposed to being included in policy or procedural documents prepared by MTC.



Member Kim asked whether there were any discussions about the impacts of a one-percent sales tax rate increase on businesses in San Francisco.

Mr. Reyes responded that all of the funding mechanisms considered for the regional measure had pros and cons, and that the sales tax was deemed to be the most viable through MTC's Select Committee 2024 process. He added that there were discussions in the State Assembly about other funding mechanisms, and staff would keep the Committee apprised of updates.

Ms. Lombardo acknowledged that it was a difficult time to explore new taxes, and that the regional measure was intended to prevent major transit service cuts that could have deeper and more far-reaching economic consequences than a new tax.

Member Barz asked for more details on the reduction to the set-aside for regional rider-focused improvements and whether the funding level satisfied the principle included in the presentation, which stated that the measure should provide clear benefits to riders in the district through regional transit investments.

Mr. Reyes explained that there had been recommendations from transit operators and county transportation agencies to prioritize regional measure revenues for transit operations deficits, which informed the bill authors' decision to reduce the set-aside. He indicated that the current funding level satisfied the principle, noting that the \$45 million annual expenditure framework proposed by MTC offered significant benefits to riders beyond typical transit operations.

Ms. Lombardo added that the bill authors first reduced the set-aside dedicated to administration before reducing the regional rider-focused improvements set-aside, and noted that some parties had been advocating for reducing the set-aside to zero.

Member Barz asked if MTC would be the administering body for regional measure revenues and if MTC's Regional Network Management Committee would provide oversight of the revenues.

Mr. Reyes confirmed that MTC would be the administering body and noted that the legislation did not provide details on the Regional Network Management Committee's role in oversight.

Member Barz asked whether the Clipper BayPass program was eligible for funding under the regional rider-focused improvements set-aside, noting that it was a transformational program for transit.

Mr. Reyes responded that the program may not have been considered due to its still being in the pilot phase.

Ms. Lombardo added that the funding level might not be high enough to cover the full costs of BayPass and that staff would explore making the bill language flexible enough to accommodate BayPass eligibility, even if only partially funded by the measure.

Member Milford-Rosales asked who would be placing the measure on the ballot, and what the voter approval threshold would be if MTC placed the measure on the ballot.

Mr. Reyes explained that the bill authorized MTC to place the measure on the ballot, and that while there was bill language related to the formation of a district that would allow for a citizen initiative to move forward, MTC planned to introduce the measure.



He confirmed that the voter approval threshold would be two-thirds for an MTC-led measure.

Member Ford asked about the revenue generation estimate for San Francisco in the regional measure and how it compared to the sales tax generation figures included in the Downtown Travel Study Report.

Mr. Reyes explained that a half-cent sales tax generates about \$108 million annually in San Francisco and that MTC's estimate was slightly lower.

Ms. Lombardo explained that the sales tax figures included in the Downtown Travel Study Report appeared to include other sources beyond Proposition L, and that staff would look into the issue and provide more detail.

Member Margarita asked if there was a back-up plan if the regional measure did not pass.

Mr. Reyes noted that while there was no official back-up plan, the region would likely introduce the measure again if it did not pass in 2026. Mr. Reyes also indicated that the state budget approved last month included \$750 million in loans for Bay Area transit operators including SFMTA and BART that would serve as bridge funding between the time that one-time state and federal funds are exhausted and when transit operators begin receiving regional measure revenues.

Member Margarita suggested exploring taxes on larger businesses and expressed concern about tax increases on small businesses in the Bay Area.

Member Levine asked whether each county was required to meet the two-thirds voter approval threshold.

Mr. Reyes confirmed that the approval threshold would apply to the entire district and not to each county.

Chair Siegal asked for confirmation of which sales tax rates MTC included in their polling from earlier in the year and asked about plans for polling in San Francisco on the one percent rate.

Mr. Reyes responded that MTC polled both a half percent and a seven-eighths percent sales tax rate in San Francisco and that there were no plans for MTC to poll further that he was aware of.

Chair Siegal asked what the motivation behind MTC planning to place a measure on the ballot, given that polling showed support in the low 50 percent range.

Mr. Reyes indicated that while prior polling results showed less than two-thirds support, there was still time before voting began. He explained that any time a local government explores a tax measure, it is typically intended for the measure to be placed on the ballot by a government agency.

Chair Siegal expressed appreciation for San Francisco's support of the regional measure as well as concern regarding prior polling results. She also indicated support for additional polling and consideration of another funding mechanism, such as a gross receipts tax.

Member Ortega expressed concern about the size of the one percent sales tax rate increase.



Vice Chair Daniels noted that discussing the potential impacts of not addressing the transit fiscal cliff could help alleviate concerns about the size of the proposed sales tax rate increase.

During public comment, Edward Mason suggested discussing the sales tax rates in other counties.

Roland Lebrun summarized the contents of a letter released by Senators Scott Wiener and Jesse Arreguin regarding the bill earlier that morning.

6. Budget and Legislative Analyst's Economic Costs and Fiscal Impacts of Traffic Collisions in San Francisco Policy Report – INFORMATION

Fred Brousseau, Director of Policy Analysis at the Budget and Legislative Analyst Office presented the item.

Member Ortega shared a personal experience to explain why she believe so many accidents go unreported. She said she was involved in a collision at a red light in San Francisco and went to a police station to file a report. When she told officers there were no injuries, they dismissed her and refused to take a statement. She said she was frustrated that despite trying to report the incident for the sake of accurate data, the police did not document it. She said this left her without record of the crash, which could have posed a problem if she later developed injuries or faced an insurance dispute. She emphasized that turning people away when they try to report accidents undermines efforts to collect reliable data on dangerous roads. She requested that this issue be reflected in the report. She then asked about the \$243,500 settlement the City paid related to collisions involving street design and infrastructure.

Reuben Holober, Budget and Legislative Analyst at the Budget and Legislative Analyst Office, explained that the Supervisor's office had requested the information, but it was not a major focus of the report. He said the request came late in the process, after most of the work had already been completed, and they had obtained initial data from the City Attorney's Office regarding settlements and claims involving City vehicles, and later received a follow-up request related to street design incidents. He stated that there were approximately four cases over five years, totaling around \$240,000, which he described as a minor cost compared to other findings in the report, and said that the team did not spend much time investigating the issue.

Mr. Brousseau agreed that underreporting was not the focus of the report but described the statistic as shocking and important to include. He acknowledged that many people did not report incidents and emphasized that this was not unusual. He explained that data from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) showed reporting increases with injury severity, though minor crashes still have significant impacts. He stated that this was a national issue and expressed interest in exploring policy interventions to address it.

Member Barz asked for confirmation that from 2020 to 2024, the City paid \$61.4 million in settlements and judgments related to official city vehicles.

Mr. Brousseau confirmed that amount was correct.

Member Barz asked if that annual average was approximately \$12.4 million, about one-third of the streets budget per year.



Mr. Brousseau confirmed this was correct.

Member Barz asked if the city was paying legal settlements amounting to about one-third of the cost spent on street improvements, which are the primary method to enhance city safety.

Mr. Holober replied that the \$12 million did not come from the \$33 million but was instead from a separate fund.

Member Barz stated she wanted to confirm the correct ratio or comparison. She noted that the SFMTA's budget was separate from the budget for legal claims. She said she was uncertain about the source of the legal claims budget and asked where it came from.

Mr. Brousseau stated that it came from the general fund.

Member Barz stated she had reviewed the report with interest and had requested the presentation. She asked if the data could be benchmarked, explaining that while driving is a primary mode of transportation in the city, it is not the only one. She mentioned the role of Muni and transit but described driving as expensive and dangerous. She asked how driving compares to other common city activities, such as going to parks.

Mr. Brousseau asked Member Barz if she was referring to the \$2.5 billion cost in comparison to other activities and what similar costs would be.

Member Barz replied that was correct.

Mr. Brousseau said the report did not analyze trips to parks or related costs. He said there were costs associated with park visits and that costs could be linked to nearly any activity. He suggested vehicle collisions likely represent a major cost factor, particularly serious crashes, which may rival the costs of some diseases. He said framing the issue as a public health concern, comparable to other causes of injury, illness, or death was an effective way to frame it.

Member Barz said the comparison sounded fair and asked if national trends were considered. She referenced the NHTSA study and asked for a comparison using that national data.

Mr. Holober stated that the report also used national averages, which may have undercounted San Francisco due to its high cost of living. He said that on a per capita basis, San Francisco had figures below the national averages.

Vice Chair Daniels said her comment might not be popular, but based on the study, the recommendations to the Board of Supervisors should focus on improving data collection to better compare the effectiveness of Vision Zero investments with alternative safety strategies. She said she was concerned about the City's financial stewardship, especially given the growing deficit. She emphasized the importance of safety for all road users but urged the Board of Supervisors to ensure there were proper checks and balances on spending. She cautioned against overspending on initiatives that may not be backed by measurable improvements and warned against fear-based decision-making. She said that although she might be wrong, it appeared the SFMTA made citywide investments to satisfy constituents, which has now contributed to a deficit and led to a request for new taxes.



Member Kim asked if, when the data was collected, surrounding factors such as proximity to the High Injury Network, residential areas, or congestion rates were considered. He stated that collisions are typically associated with areas of high congestion.

Mr. Holober stated that they had been asked to examine congestion at a macro level and did not analyze specific neighborhoods within San Francisco. He explained that national and international studies have found a U-shaped relationship between congestion and crash rates. He said collision rates were higher when traffic flowed freely, decreased with moderate congestion, and increased again when congestion became severe.

Member Kim stated the report should also examine whether to prioritize additional traffic calming measures or focus on improving traffic flow. He expressed concern that excessive calming features could increase collisions by creating stop-and-go conditions that made drivers anxious. He urged the study to analyze the actual causes of accidents instead of relying on assumptions or general statistics.

Member Levine acknowledged the report was primarily economic and fiscal but asked if any study had been conducted on the types of vehicles involved in the crashes. He asked whether data existed on the percentage of autos compared to motorcycles, bicycles, autonomous vehicles, battery-powered devices, or other conveyances that might use bike lanes.

Mr. Brousseau stated that the information was unavailable. He said it would be valuable to obtain and analyze such data but confirmed it was not included in the data they had to work with.

Member Imaduddin agreed with Vice Chair Daniels' concern about the lack of active data reporting. He asked if there was a website or another tool available to view the data in real time, or if something similar could be developed.

Mr. Holober stated that the Open Data SF website contained an ongoing, regularly updated database, but said that it was not user-friendly and required at least basic Excel skills to interpret trends. He said SFMTA produced a report in 2023 and likely released another one after their report, suggesting they may be issuing reports every other year.

Member Margarita emphasized the need to shift investment away from top-heavy management toward direct support for city residents. She spoke from a social worker perspective, stressing that addressing factors like mental health, alcohol use, and life stressors at the time of accidents could reduce incidents. She highlighted the struggles of many San Francisco workers juggling multiple jobs with minimal rest, urging investment in mental health services rather than cuts. She urged acting promptly to relieve stress on residents, which she believed would improve safety for drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians alike.

Mr. Brousseau said they were pleased to compile the data and produce this report, which prompted several policy discussions. He explained the findings raised many questions about the causes, vehicle types involved, contributing factors, and locations of the incidents. He said this was only one way to frame the issue and expressed hope for further work on the topic.



Member Margarita added that students pursuing bachelor's, master's, or doctorate degrees could use this as a valuable research study.

Chair Siegal asked if data existed on how collisions were distributed across income levels or ethnic groups and whether certain groups disproportionately bore these costs or if the distribution was even.

Mr. Brousseau stated they did not have that information. He added others might have researched it, but it was not analyzed or included into the project. He said there was a need for more information and better understanding, raising many related questions.

Chair Siegal asked if the \$52.4 million allocated for traffic enforcement represented the annual budget for San Francisco Police Department's (SFPD) traffic enforcement.

Mr. Brousseau stated that he believed that was SFMTA parking enforcement.

Chair Siegal asked for clarity on how SFMTA traffic enforcement was related.

Mr. Brousseau explained that enforcement of speeding drivers fell under the police department budget, not the SFMTA.

Chair Siegal suggested that the Board of Supervisors consider creating alternative methods for reporting traffic collisions beyond the SFPD reports. She explained that some people might avoid reporting to the SFPD, leading to underreported incidents and inaccurate Vision Zero statistics and opined that having other reporting options could provide better data and improve estimates of the economic impact of collisions. She recommended the City explore this possibility, acknowledging legal or jurisdictional issues might need to be addressed.

Member Margarita expressed concern about the SFMTA's recent two-hour parking limits targeting low-income families living in trailers. She emphasized that these restrictions increased stress on families working multiple jobs to survive. She highlighted the inconsistency that some wealthier neighborhoods successfully oppose parking meters, while poorer communities face stricter enforcement. She urged creative thinking and avoiding policies that criminalize poverty, stressing the need for solutions that support, rather than burden, vulnerable families and future generations.

Member Barz said she had reviewed the study again and asked for confirmation that the cost distribution table showed that 50% of the costs were borne by private insurers.

Mr. Brousseau stated that it was 53%.

Member Barz stated that this was just over half and reflects one of the way everyone pays, such as through higher auto insurance premiums and healthcare costs. She asked if there was any evidence showing a correlation between these factors.

Mr. Brousseau asked if Member Barz meant if there was any quantification of the impact and said he had not seen any. He suggested there might be a logical answer by questioning who pays for the insurance.

Member Barz replied that her own insurance costs had risen. She said the most striking point from the report was a study from New York, which showed a possible correlation between traffic calming improvements and reduced Medicaid spending.



She asked if that understanding was correct.

Mr. Holober replied that the issue was raised by staff at the Department of Public Health during discussions. He said it was a study that compared New York City to surrounding counties that had not adopted Vision Zero policies. He said the study found Medicaid costs were lower in New York City, while cities without Vision Zero had higher Medicaid costs.

Member Barz asked if the study had controlled for factors such as age.

Mr. Holober explained that after implementing Vision Zero in 2014, New York City saw 77.5 fewer injuries per 100,000 person-years among Medicaid enrollees. He clarified that a "person-year" refers to the number of individuals multiplied by the number of years in the study; for example, a five-year study with 1,000 participants represents 5,000 person-years.

Mr. Brousseau said the statistic focused on injuries from traffic collisions and the associated Medicaid savings.

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that dividing accident estimates by 360 days yields about 60 accidents daily, roughly one per square mile in the city. He recalled that about ten years ago, the police department released summary reports on Vision Zero deaths. He expressed concern about whether current open data accurately accounted for factors like the size of new trucks, which can obstruct visibility due to their height and questioned the accuracy and scope of data collected on Open Data SF, emphasizing the need for coordination between City departments, including police and medical teams. He opined that public health only becomes involved when injured individuals arrived at emergency rooms, highlighting gaps in data collection.

7. Downtown Travel Study – INFORMATION

Chun Ho Chow, Transportation Modeler, presented the item per the memorandum.

Mr. Chow explained that the sales tax slide in the presentation represented the 1% local portion of the sales tax revenue in San Francisco.

Member Ortega asked about housing vacancy in downtown, noting the report focused mainly on office vacancy. She asked whether the report included data on housing occupancy downtown, given the significant decrease in transportation activity there. She explained her question was prompted by friends who, during the pandemic, moved out of expensive downtown apartments to more spacious, affordable areas like the Sunset or Oakland. She wanted to know if the report compared rental apartment occupancy downtown to other parts of the city and the Bay Area.

Mr. Chow responded that the report did not include data on housing occupancy or housing vacancy rates.

Member Ortega asked if housing data could be added for comparison, given the focus on downtown recovery. She stated that while housing may not dominate downtown, there were substantial residential areas within the defined core, including parts of South of Market and Nob Hill. She expressed interest in a comparison of housing trends, especially since neighborhoods like the Mission and Bayview, which



were more residential, did not face the same issues.

Mr. Chow replied that staff would look into providing information on housing rental and vacancy rates.

Member Ortega asked if it would be possible to include 2024 data as an addendum, explaining that a comparison of 2023, 2024, and 2025 would show how required in-office days have changed. She said the trend has shifted significantly in the last two years (e.g. many employers recently increasing days in the office) and believed the data would be useful. She asked if the report could include ongoing updates to reflect these changes.

Mr. Chow stated that the office attendance rate was reported by the SF Economist in their reports. He explained that their data came from office tap-in records in older office buildings. He referred Member Ortega to their reports for the most current attendance numbers.

Member Ortega stated that in a year or two, the CAC could request an updated report from staff to include all relevant information and assess any changes.

Ms. Lombardo stated the report provided a snapshot in time mainly based on current data. She added that staff planned to test future scenarios in the long-range countywide transportation plan by adjusting assumptions about work-from-home and office attendance rates. She noted the current assumption aligns with the MTC, estimating about a 25% work-from-home rate, but recognized this rate had changed since the assumption was made.

Member Ortega said the report described the Bay Bridge as a major funnel from I-80 to Highway 101. She asked if there had been a comparison with traffic on the San Mateo-Hayward Bridge, given its role as the next major cross-Bay route. She observed that the report suggested many drivers traveled from the East Bay to the Peninsula or South Bay using the Bay Bridge and requested data or a possible analysis comparing the two bridges.

Mr. Chow replied that the report only examined the road network within San Francisco and did not include bridges or highways outside the city.

Member Ortega noted that while the topic might fall outside the immediate scope, she wanted a better understanding of broader Bay Area traffic patterns and their impact on San Francisco. She emphasized interest in how commuters travel between the East Bay and South Bay, particularly across regional bridges like the Bay Bridge, San Mateo-Hayward Bridge, and Golden Gate Bridge. She suggested analyzing whether drivers use the Golden Gate Bridge and 19th Avenue as a continuous route to Highway 280. She requested further analysis to determine if commuters are simply passing through the city rather than stopping in it.

Ms. Lombardo stated that the MTC had data on congestion and volume for all bridges, including Golden Gate Transit. She explained that recovery varied by job patterns and said the data would be shared.

Mr. Chow stated that the Transportation Authority currently lacks similar analyses for other Bay Area bridges. He added that the higher share of through travel shown in the chart could be due to fewer overall trips on freeway segments during COVID, with the volume of through trips increasing to take up the freed-up demand on the freeway.



segment.

Member Ford asked whether the report reflected the idea that cars tended to expand to fill available space, leading to fewer cars but more driving as it became easier. She stated that increasing trips in the transportation system required more non-car mode share because cars filled all available space once fully utilized. She opined that the lack of non-car trips was tied to employment trends: fewer jobs and more people working from home. She added that economic recovery and transit revenue ultimately depended on job availability. She concluded by asking if it was fair to say the key to recovery was having more employers in downtown San Francisco with employees returning to the office, or if another factor should be considered.

Mr. Chow stated that recovery was stronger in neighborhoods than in downtown. He added that transit ridership on Muni and BART was better on weekends than on weekdays, indicating more non-work trips. He explained that non-work trip recovery was stronger than work trip recovery, suggesting that factors beyond employment or work-from-home rates, such as neighborhood activities, were driving increased transit use.

Ms. Lombardo stated there was no perfect data set. She noted that some people remained less comfortable taking transit now than before for various reasons. She said ongoing improvements may help attract some riders back or bring in new ones.

Member Kim stated that downtown trip purposes had shifted significantly since the pandemic. He explained that social, shopping, and medical trips had increased. He emphasized strong demand for non-work trips despite more jobs returning downtown, noting many tech workers likely still worked remotely several days a week. He suggested the city should seriously consider these changes rather than expecting a full return to pre-pandemic patterns. He said transportation trends now seemed to focus less on work commutes and more on other trips. He added that the Transportation Authority's data supported this, citing Mr. Chow's mention that BART experiences higher weekend demand than weekdays. He then said that, according to the report, downtown transit trips decreased while auto trips increased. He asked for an interpretation of why transit use declined, and auto use increased, beyond the known changes in work-related travel.

Mr. Chow replied that BART ridership recovery was stronger on weekends, although weekday ridership remained higher overall. He requested clarification on whether the question was about why automobile mode share increased while transit mode share decreased.

Member Kim stated that instead of asking "why," he wanted to understand how the data could be interpreted. He asked whether the increase reflected a safety issue or a change in delivery patterns. He referenced a chart showing that auto deliveries increased from 20% to 40% and asked what conclusions were drawn from the analysis.

Mr. Chow replied that it was difficult to determine why transit ridership had declined. He noted that while all trip types were dropping, transit trips were declining at a faster rate than automobile trips. He said the decrease in automobile trips was small enough to result in an overall increase in automobile mode share. He suggested this could be due to lingering discomfort with transit and/or lasting behavioral shifts from the pandemic.



Member Kim stated that during the pandemic, Muni allowed passengers to board from the back door to speed boarding, which also made it easier for fare evaders to board. He said that while current discussions focused on funding, controlling fare evaders was crucial for safety. He shared that he doesn't let his daughter ride the bus after 6 p.m. due to negative experiences. He added he has friends who avoid transit and/or driving in San Francisco because of safety concerns, citing incidents where shoppers were followed and robbed in garages. He emphasized improving public transit safety was essential to encourage ridership. He then asked about data on freeway trips, noting that auto trips on I-80 had nearly reached pre-pandemic levels and whether trip origins outside San Francisco increased.

Mr. Chow replied that the share of trips on that freeway segment cutting through San Francisco was higher than pre-pandemic.

Member Kim asked about the total number of I-80 trips compared to pre-pandemic levels.

Mr. Chow replied that Bay Bridge traffic reached about 90% of 2019 levels by the end of 2023.

Member Kim stated that based on his experience with businesses, he had difficulty attracting service providers like repair contractors to San Francisco and said he observed many people who used to visit San Francisco on weekends no longer did so, and locals who once shopped downtown now shopped in San Jose. He referenced a recent San Francisco Chronicle report highlighting slow recovery in Oakland and San Francisco, while San Jose thrives. He suggested the Transportation Authority consider that San Francisco may be losing its attractiveness and propose ways to encourage more local travelers to visit, rather than assuming inherent appeal. He also requested any available analysis data specific to District 1.

Mr. Chow explained that an upcoming report divides the city into four super districts: northwest, northeast, southwest, and southeast and that would help provide a more fine grained geographic analysis. He added that data for Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and the Northwest super district's mode share had been emailed to Member Kim as a preview earlier in the week. He then clarified that the 91% of 2019 volumes for Bay Bridge in 2024 referred to the full day, as detailed on page 37 of the report.

Member Barz asked why walking and biking were combined throughout the presentation.

Mr. Chow stated that walking and biking were combined as active modes due to the number of arrows in the graph. He explained that biking represented a small share and that separating the two made the graph difficult to read, so for presentation purposes, the modes were combined.

Member Barz asked if it was possible to separate the bike and transit mode shares, citing examples from other cities such as New York, where an increase in biking was connected to changes in transit use. She requested data on how the two modes would differ if split.

Mr. Chow stated that staff could follow up by email and provide the separated mode data, which they already had in raw form.

Member Barz expressed appreciation for Member Ford's effort to frame the data



within a broader context and offered an alternative interpretation. She suggested the decline in non-driving modes could be due to driving filling up first as the easiest option, combined with an overall drop in job numbers. She added that downtown's limited housing compared to other neighborhoods, such as her own, might also contribute to the trend. She proposed that if downtown had more diverse land use and housing, the conclusion might not solely be about needing more jobs.

Mr. Chow explained that part of the reason was likely fewer people coming into the office, especially during the post-COVID period shown in the 2023 survey. He added that people were more likely to walk from their homes to nearby shops within their neighborhoods rather than downtown itself.

Member Barz, building on the theme of land use and travel origins and destinations, asked whether vehicle availability by household changed between 2019 and 2023. She inquired if these were different people, people with more cars, or people who previously had a car but were now behaving differently.

Mr. Chow stated the report did not examine vehicle availability by household. He added the San Francisco Transportation Plan might address this topic in an upcoming report.

Chair Siegal stated that vehicle registrations increased after the pandemic and suggested this may be related. She asked if that was correct.

Ms. Lombardo replied she would need to follow-up, noting that the Transportation Authority's Proposition AA vehicle registration fee revenues had decreased and were projected to be flat in the very near term.

Chair Siegal stated the timing was likely just after the pandemic.

Member Ortega said she was interested in seeing statistics on how many people left San Francisco but remained in the Bay Area. She believed this data was relevant to the discussion about car registration. She suggested that even if the number of cars registered in San Francisco had declined, car ownership in the broader Bay Area might have increased, with those drivers still commuting into the city. She indicated this was an additional question to consider.

Chair Siegal said she understood that vehicle registrations in the city increased in the years immediately following 2020.

Member Margarita asked for clarification about the organizations behind the travel survey.

Mr. Chow stated that the survey data came from the Bay Area Travel Study, a travel survey jointly administered by the Transportation Authority, MTC, and the Valley Transportation Authority in Santa Clara County. He added the survey team was preparing for the next round of the study, conducted in 2019 and 2023 and expected to occur next year or the year after.

Member Margarita asked if it was possible to include the raw data and create a graph focusing solely on walking and biking. She inquired whether biking data included scooters, noting that scooters have become more common recently and were not previously accounted for. She asked to see the data broken down by demographics for walking, biking, and scooters, similar to the existing study. She added that people



working from home had access to food delivery services like Uber Eats, which depended on others working downtown to prepare and deliver meals. She stated that everyone was interconnected and must support each other, urging consideration of this shared humanity to maintain services for all.

Mr. Chow stated that he could provide bike data. He added that he did not recall which mode scooters were grouped into but would follow up once he found the information.

Member Margarita said she would appreciate seeing that data. She noted a larger number of people using scooters, which she said benefited the environment, and wanted to highlight their inclusion.

Chair Siegal requested the raw Muni ridership data comparing February 2020 and 2024, citing difficulty interpreting data for smaller stops in the study graphic. She observed that bus stops appeared less affected, aligning with a work-from-home trend, while light rail ridership, used more by commuters, showed a greater decline. She also requested follow-up data from SFMTA on vehicle service provided at each stop shown on the map for 2020 versus 2024. She said this would help normalize ridership changes by accounting for service reductions, line eliminations, and frequency decreases, which might explain the decline in Market Street transit use. She said the most striking takeaway from the report was that car trips had barely declined since 2020, despite ongoing discussions about revitalizing downtown, and noted that transit ridership, walking, and biking had significantly decreased, while vehicle access on Market Street had increased and bus service had been removed. She urged the Transportation Authority Board to adopt policies that supported transit and active transportation instead of car trips, and emphasized that current actions were not aligned with the goal of making Market Street more vibrant. She added that the findings pointed to a land use issue and called for creative strategies to bring people downtown without relying solely on commuting.

Mr. Chow stated he would check with SFMTA to see if they could share the raw data for the map and added that he would need to locate Muni service data to normalize it based on the service provided per stop.

During public comment, Edward Mason stated the most concerning issue was the amount of pass-through traffic congesting freeways and contributing to pollution. He urged the Transportation Authority to work with MTC to revisit and revise the regional express bus system study conducted by Elizabeth Deakin about a decade ago. He explained the study was previously abandoned due to the rise of private commuter shuttles like Google buses. He emphasized the need to address the environmental impacts of car-centric culture and suggested implementing a mechanism to tax either the culture of convenience or the pollution it causes. He cited New York City's congestion pricing as a possible model.

Other Items

8. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

Member Barz thanked staff for inviting the Legislative Analyst Office, calling the presentation very useful. She referenced the day's first presentation and requested an update on progress toward implementing seamless transit principles. She recalled



that the Transportation Authority adopted the policy five years ago, in 2020, to assist the region's goal of transforming the transit rider experience.

Member Imaduddin said he had heard about a company developing trash-picking robots, and said he found the idea exciting and suggested such robots might appear in San Francisco soon.

Chair Siegal asked if staff could provide a reliability report on the new BART fare gates. She stated that when she used the gates at two stations last week, the doors opened only partway, making them difficult to navigate. She added that others had reported slow gate operation and that, during large events, gates were sometimes left open due to long queues. She expressed concern about their reliability given the significant funding approved for the gates, which were less than a year old, and requested information on current performance metrics and steps to improve and prevent similar issues.

Member Milford-Rosales stated that he supported Chair Siegal's comments and reiterated that he had repeatedly raised concerns last fall and winter about the difficulty of bringing bikes through BART stations with the new gates. He explained that as a frequent cyclist traveling to the East Bay, it was challenging to navigate the gates, particularly when multiple cyclists or crowded trains were present. He added that during events like the East Bay Bike Party, cyclists often waited up to 20 minutes in long lines to pass through the gates.

Member Barz asked about the reliability of the disability access gate, saying that as a mother of a small child, she usually used that gate but found it frequently did not work.

Member Ford asked what accountability mechanisms were included in the contract with the vendor to hold them accountable, particularly regarding speed and latency. She identified the Clipper tap as the likely cause of queuing. She also requested efforts to recover part of the funds spent on the project.

Member Milford-Rosales opined that part of the queuing was caused because the old gates allowed bikes to pass through any gate, whereas the new gates required bikes to use only the accessible gate. He added that each station typically had only one accessible gate per set of gates. While some larger stations had two sets of gates allowing two bike exits, he commented that many smaller stations had only a single accessible gate serving bikes in both directions.

Member Ford asked whether it was customary for procurement specifications to be included in the contract. She expressed concern that the current process was ineffective and suggested a retrospective review to understand why the contract was written as it was and whether anything had been missed. She added that any typical company would conduct such a review.

Member Ortega said she expected challenges with the retrospective review because procuring custom-made parts involved liability considerations.

Member Barz stated there were two major themes in comments raised about delays: the Clipper tap process and the door processing time. She explained that Cubic was the contractor for the MTC but was unsure who the contractor for Clipper was.

Ms. Lombardo cautioned against extensive discussion since the topic was not on the



agenda but said she heard the concerns clearly. She confirmed that the Transportation Authority has contributed \$12.5 million in Prop L funds toward the approximately \$90 million. She said she would collaborate with the oversight team and provide a response.

Member Margarita said she was concerned about the current approach to addressing SFMTA's debt, which relied heavily on taxing low-income communities and small businesses. She urged reconsidering this strategy by exploring alternatives, such as taxing car owners and high earners, noting the wealth among millionaires and billionaires in San Francisco. She emphasized preserving the city's multicultural character and warned that continuing to tax vulnerable groups could push families out and change the city's future demographic. She encouraged those conducting related studies to shift their focus and reconsider who was being targeted, stressing the need for collaborative solutions rather than exclusion.

There was no public comment.

9. Public Comment

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that a fatal scooter-pedestrian collision occurred at 6th and Market, resulting in the pedestrian's death. He said the San Mateo Police Department planned to enforce laws for scooters and bicycles as motorized vehicles. He shared recent experiences of scooters and bicycles speeding past him on sidewalks, calling it as a growing safety issue. He suggested reintroducing bicycle licensing, previously required decades ago, to encourage rule compliance. He described witnessing reckless behavior by young riders on electric bikes and stressed the need for stronger enforcement and solutions to address the problem.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:44 p.m.