



DRAFT MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, September 3, 2025

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Siegal called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

CAC members present at Roll: Najuawanda Daniels, Phoebe Ford, Sean Kim, Jerry Levine, Austin Milford-Rosales, Rachael Ortega, and Kat Siegal (7)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Sara Barz (entered during Item 3), Zameel Imaduddin (entered during Item 3), Venecia Margarita (entered during Item 5), and Sharon Ng (entered during Item 7) (4)

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Siegal reported that September was Transit Month in the Bay Area, celebrating transit agencies, drivers, workers, and riders, while reminding residents and visitors of transit's importance. She stated that this year's theme was 'Adventure Starts on Transit,' featuring a ride contest, a rally, and a month-long calendar of events. She added that over the past year, the Transportation Authority focused on the financial crisis facing major operators including BART, Muni, and Caltrain, and the CAC would receive a briefing on legislative efforts for a potential regional transit measure on the November 2026 ballot under Item 10. She encouraged everyone to adventure on and by transit.

Chair Siegal reported that the Transportation Authority had launched the second round of outreach for the Inner Sunset Transportation Study, which aimed to improve transportation safety and access in the neighborhood's commercial core. She stated that a public meeting would be held at the County Fair Building Auditorium to present findings from the first round of outreach in late 2024 and eight proposed street design concepts. She added that the study team was developing a survey that would be launched before the meeting and would remain open for several weeks afterward.

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

3. Approve the Minutes of the July 23, 2025 Meeting - ACTION

4. Internal Accounting Report, Investment Report, and Debt Expenditure Report for the Quarter Ended June 30, 2025 - INFORMATION

There was no public comment.

Member Milford-Rosales moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Vice Chair Daniels.

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. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$14,340,000 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions, for Three Requests and Amend the Prop K Standard Grant Agreement for the Next Generation Sanchez Slow Street [NTIP Capital] Project (Project) and Release \$190,000 in Funds Held in Reserve for the Project's Construction, with Conditions – ACTION

Rachel Seiberg, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Kim asked if the maintenance for new flyer vehicles was based on mileage or usage.

Gary Chang, Senior Program Manager in SFMTA's Transit Division's Transit Program Delivery Section, explained that the decision to conduct maintenance for new flyer vehicles was based on the age of the vehicle. He added that the average lifespan of a hybrid diesel coach was 12 years, so the SFMTA generally chose to conduct overhauls when the vehicle had been in service for 6 to 8 years.

Member Kim mentioned that the COVID-19 pandemic impacted vehicle usage. He asked if vehicle usage was considered when deciding the appropriate time to conduct vehicle overhauls, citing that some vehicles were used less during the pandemic and therefore may not be ready for an overhaul.

Mr. Chang replied that the Federal Transit Administration guideline set a vehicle life of 12 years. However, he qualified that San Francisco's terrain was difficult given the steep hills, combined with high passenger loads, which were currently at 70-80% of pre-pandemic levels. He acknowledged that during the pandemic, there were route reductions, however routes had since resumed, with some coaches having logged 250,000 miles [over their life to date], adding that the subject coaches ran an average of 30,000 miles per year, and they required overhauls to sustain coach availability and reliability.

Member Kim followed up by asking if motor coaches rotated routes or if certain vehicles operated on specific routes.

Mr. Chang noted that the SFMTA operated 4 hybrid diesel bus yards and 2 trolley bus yards, where each bus yard serviced specific bus routes. He added that vehicles were not dedicated to specific routes, but rather that operators randomly selected a coach to provide service and therefore, in general, coaches experienced similar conditions over the 12 years of their useful lives. He also stated that construction and poor road conditions on some roads exacerbated the need for vehicle overhaul.

Member Kim asked if Lake Street was included in the Slow Streets Implementation project, because he walked Lake Street every day and believed that further Slow Streets efforts were not needed on Lake Street if there were no traffic incidents.

Casey Hildreth, Planner in SFMTA's Streets Division's Livable Streets unit, clarified that there were 19 Slow Streets corridors, with no specific plans for Lake Street outside of small design efforts. He explained that there were some corridors with a higher need,



and design efforts were mostly focused on Slow Streets corridors with traffic calming or multiple other needs. He summarized by saying there was a broad spectrum of needs between different Slow Streets.

Member Kim asked if there were any planned community outreach activities for Lake Street.

Mr. Hildreth said there were no current plans for community outreach on Lake Street since it was a stable corridor.

Member Barz asked for clarification on which Slow Streets corridors were not included in the subject request.

Mr. Hildreth responded that Page Street and Sanchez Street were not included in this request. He later clarified that Noe Street was the third corridor not included in the request. He commented that the subject request would fund design, subject to review, for 15 of the 19 Slow Streets corridors. He added that corridors were placed into one of three groups based on the level of design effort and scope anticipated to be needed.

Member Barz asked which bucket Hearst Avenue and 12th Street fit into for the aforementioned groupings.

Mr. Hildreth stated that 12th Street was included in the lowest level effort grouping, and Hearst Avenue was in the medium level of effort group, where traffic calming efforts were primarily focused. He acknowledged that this was an iterative program, partially based on requests and complaints, which dictated the work schedule. He added that the SFMTA would shift resources based on changing conditions, which included the level of engagement and complaints from the community as a signal that the SFMTA may need to pay more attention to specific corridors.

Member Barz added that she lived on Hearst Avenue and had friends on 12th Avenue, where speeding had become an issue. She expressed a desire to see the District 7 corridors in compliance with the program metrics.

Mr. Hildreth said the SFMTA was active on Hearst Avenue to install Slow Streets measures. He added that Member Barz could follow up with Mark Dreger, Senior Planner at SFMTA's Livable Streets sub-division, for further information.

Member Barz asked what the difference was between traffic signal Contracts 66 and 67 and how the SFMTA had decided where new signals were placed.

Bryant Woo, Senior Program Manager in SFMTA's Transit Division's Transit Program Delivery Section, first replied to Member Kim's question by explaining that vehicle overhauls were necessary because the weight of buses caused rubber wear even without passengers, and despite reduced service during the COVID-19 pandemic, the coaches continued to age and deteriorate. He then answered Member Barz's question about the naming of signals contracts, stating that the numbering was sequential and based on decades of contracts. He next addressed Member Barz's follow-up question regarding the origin of traffic signals, stating that the SFMTA historically installed them based on traffic volumes and collision history. He added that a document on signal warrants outlined criteria such as traffic volumes throughout the day, traffic gaps, proximity to schools, and collision history, while more subtle justifications included maintaining even signal spacing, as seen along Sunset Boulevard and the Great Highway. He further explained that busy corridors, like Fell or Oak along the Panhandle, required signals at



every block to control speeds and create gaps for crossings. He concluded by explaining that Contract 66 contained specific criteria to mitigate development impacts, citing anticipated traffic increases at 4th Street and Long Bridge Street and at 4th Street and Mission Bay Boulevard in Mission Bay.

Member Barz asked if the Cesar Chavez and Florida Street intersection was on the High Injury Network, to which Mr. Woo confirmed that it was. She also asked if the 4th Avenue and Fulton Street intersection was on the High Injury Network as well.

Mr. Woo responded that the 4th Avenue and Fulton Street intersection was located within a small gap in the High Injury Network. He added that the SFMTA chose 4th Avenue because it was roughly equidistant between the signal at 6th Avenue and the signal at Arguillo Boulevard, and because there was a Muni bus stop located at that intersection.

Member Ortega asked for clarification on the Next Generation Sanchez Slow Street [NTIP Capital] project's funding, specifically whether this action item required additional funding on top of the existing Prop K allocation.

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director of Policy and Programming, replied that this project request involved an amendment to a previously approved Neighborhood Transportation Program grant to add construction scope and updated project information and to release funds already set aside by the Board for its construction.

Member Ortega asked if Sanchez Street deserved new funding when it was already achieving its speed goals, while other streets in the network were not yet meeting their speed goals.

Mr. Hildreth replied that the SFMTA's speed and volume targets were quantifiable metrics used to consider if a street was eligible of being a Slow Street, but there were also additional goals for individual Slow Streets, and the program in general. He stated that Sanchez Street had been a leader as the next generation of Slow Streets and work could be done to utilize Sanchez Street as a test site for more advanced Slow Street opportunities in a more permanent way, while also simultaneously improving other Slow Streets.

Member Ford inquired about the New Traffic Signals Contract 66 project, specifically asking how the work being done at 10th Avenue and Lincoln Way was coordinated with the Inner Sunset Traffic Circulation Study.

Mr. Woo explained that the 10th Avenue and Lincoln Way intersection was chosen for traffic signal installation to reduce left-turn collisions due to high traffic volumes, fewer turning lanes, delays to transit, and a driveway at the San Francisco Botanical Garden. He was unsure of coordination with the aforementioned study but noted that the public was aware that a traffic signal was needed and planned, as the location was on the High Injury Network.

Member Ford also asked why it took the SFMTA 10 years to install the stoplight at 28th Avenue and Guerrero Street, noting that community members had been requesting one since 2016.

Mr. Woo said he thought that the delay was due to coordination with the park redevelopment's final design.



Member Ford asked if the \$1.1 million allocation request was in addition to the \$400,000 in developer funds for installing new traffic signals at the Marion Mint Street alleyways.

Mr. Woo confirmed that understanding was accurate..

Vice Chair Daniels asked for clarification on the process if an agency wanted to request funds that were for a different phase or a different project within the Safer and Complete Streets 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPP).

Ms. LaForte replied that the Transportation Authority Board would have to amend the 5YPP and explained that was what was being proposed as part of the current item with amendment of the 5YPP happening in tandem with the allocation request.

Vice Chair Daniels asked, given the state of the SFMTA's budget, how funds were prioritized in the midst of budget shortfalls, and whether someone oversaw how funds were prioritized by the SFMTA.

Ms. LaForte replied that when the requests came in, they were expected to be consistent with the Board-approved 5YPP and if not, they would require an amendment that would need to be approved by the Board.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director added that in addition to project-specific amendments, it was possible to consider amending a 5YPP as a whole [between regular update cycles] such as in situations with severe budget constraints that may trigger a change in priorities. She further explained that the voter-approved Expenditure Plan defined the eligible project types for each program so that while the projects within a 5YPP could be reprioritized, the funds could not be directed to another use, e.g. Safer and Complete Streets Prop L funds can only be used for eligible Safer and Complete Streets projects and not transit operations.

Member Milford-Rosales expressed his disappointment that the Slow Streets work would only focus on the existing network, citing the lack of Slow Streets in some areas of downtown. He qualified that while there had been some real improvements in safety on affected bike lanes, some of the big arterials in the South of Market (SoMa) did not feel safe or offer a comfortable experience for cyclists with noisy high-speed cars compared to Slow Streets. He asked if the SFMTA had plans to expand Slow Streets or copy the work done at the Embarcadero bike lane or Cupid's Span, since most of the streets in SoMA were large with high traffic for only a few hours a day.

Mr. Hildreth replied that there were no plans to expand the Slow Streets Program, given the status of the budget and until the SFMTA had adequately addressed issues in the current Slow Streets Program. He posited that the SFMTA might reevaluate the program in the future, though plans were focused on the streets currently identified in the network. He added that there was a lot of work going on within the SoMa neighborhood to support safer and better facilities for vulnerable users, and the SFMTA was not planning to expand the existing work until they had completed marquee projects, like the Folsom-Howard Streetscape Project. He added that there were multiple streetscape corridor projects underway, though they were not titled Slow Streets projects.

Member Margarita asked about flexibility of changing Slow Streets to areas where fatalities had occurred due to hit and runs, citing Silver Avenue which had little to no signal lights to prevent injuries and fatalities. She reiterated her interest in prevention to the group.



During public comment, Edward Mason asked if any cracks existed in vehicle frames given the conditions of Mission Street and Geary Boulevard, since suspension systems were scheduled for overhaul. He asked whether the Slow Streets program would exist without the COVID-19 pandemic and stated that the projects were driven by available funding. He cited discussions about greening but raised concerns about funding for maintenance. He referenced congestion on Church Street and the resulting impact on the J and L lines as unintended consequences of the Slow Streets program. He stated that Sanchez Street had become a gathering place, negatively affecting the neighborhood, and urged consideration of the community's boundaries and potential impacts on neighbors.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Ford, Imaduddin, Levine, Kim, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (10)

Absent: CAC Member Ng (1)

6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Authorize an Additional Construction Allotment of \$9,635,000; Approve a Contract Amendment with WMH Corporation in the Amount of \$200,000; Approve a Contract Amendment with WSP USA, Inc. in the Amount of \$665,000 for the West Side Bridges Seismic Retrofit Project – ACTION

Carl Holmes, Deputy Director for Capital Projects, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Ortega asked about agency supplemental budget cost in Attachment 2.

Mr. Holmes explained that the \$126 million total budget included the design cost and \$17 million for construction management.

Member Ortega asked why permit fees cost \$400,000 and whether the amount applied annually or covered the life of the project.

Mr. Holmes responded that the fee applied for the duration of the project. He explained that the higher fee reflected the Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board raising the Bay's risk level to Level 2, which requires additional reporting.

Member Ortega asked for further explanation of the Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board's Risk Level 1 and Risk Level 2.

Mr. Holmes responded that the West Side Bridges Project had a 2009 permit for Risk Level 1, but has since moved to Risk Level 2, requiring more diligent reporting and records ready for audit during rain events. He stated that additional staff were needed for reporting and confirmed that investigators held stormwater quality certification. He added that preparations were underway to ensure the right staff were in place to conduct reporting and in case of an audit.

Member Ortega asked if the permit was a pollution permit to ensure construction runoff would not impact the Bay.

Mr. Holmes responded that it was and explained that they protect drainage inlets to prevent hillside water from entering drains without filtration. He added that they also track the volume of water they are unable to stop.



Member Ford commented that this project was expensive for 1.5 miles of construction. She asked how many housing units had been built, how many more were planned, and emphasized that \$126 million was a substantial investment for a single project.

Member Barz stated she was concerned about the project's cost, despite finding the requests reasonable and the project and oversight well managed. She stated that Treasure Island would have 8,000 new homes and emphasized the goal of minimizing Bay Bridge usage. She requested an explanation of how the project reached its current stage, including the demolition of seven old bridges and construction of a new bridge and a multi-use path (MUP).

Mr. Holmes stated that before the project began, Treasure Island had 2,000 residents and explained that 8,000 new units were planned, which would increase the population to 20,000. He emphasized that the goal was to minimize bridge use, with 50% of travel expected by walking, biking, or transit. He added that the Transportation Authority was conducting the work on behalf of the Treasure Island Development Authority to support infrastructure improvements and that the project planned to replace the seven seismically deficient bridges. He explained that, with the population increase, the current roads were unsafe for residents and that the project aimed to provide sustainable roadways for new development. He concluded that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) was evaluating a West Span Bay Bridge path accessible to bicyclists and pedestrians.

Member Barz responded that she appreciated the need to replace unsafe bridges, but it was challenging to reconcile this project with the significant Muni deficit.

Member Kim stated that the Federal government recently withdrew the high-speed rail grant. He said he was concerned about the potential risks to the project, given its reliance on Federal funding.

Mr. Holmes responded that the risks were low because the project was already underway and the funds had been secured, but the agency was staying in close contact with federal partners.

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Ford, Imaduddin, Levine, Kim, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (10)

Absent: CAC Member Ng (1)

7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt a Resolution Authorizing the Executive Director to Execute and Submit an Allocation Request to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission for \$16,250,000 in Regional Measure 3 Bridge Toll Funds as the Implementing Agency for the Yerba Buena Island Multi-Use Pathway and Demonstrating Project Compliance with Regional Measure 3 Policies and Procedures – ACTION

Erin Slichter, Transportation Planner, and Carl Holmes, Deputy Director for Capital Projects, presented the item per the staff memorandum.



Member Ford asked for confirmation that staff was seeking to demonstrate to MTC that the interim Yerba Buena Island Multi-Use Pathway (YBI MUP) was substantially similar to the original YBI MUP concept that was described in the application for Regional Measure 3 (RM3) funds.

Carl Holmes, Deputy Director for Capital Projects, responded that while the original concept for Segment 1 of the YBI MUP was a spiral loop, because the project did not receive a Solutions for Congested Corridors Program (SCCP) grant to construct this segment, the project team developed an interim solution and would continue to look for funding to build the spiral loop original concept. He explained that the interim solution for Segment 1 was a one-way downhill segment, and segments 2, 3, and 4 would be built to accommodate two-way travel once full funding for the Segment 1 spiral loop was secured.

Member Ford asked if there was an opportunity to remove funds from the project because it had not received the SCCP grant.

Mr. Holmes clarified that the Transportation Authority received an RM3 award from MTC that was conditional on either receiving the SCCP grant or delivering the same benefits with the project despite not receiving the SCCP grant to construct the spiral loop. He explained that this item was intended to make sure that the \$16.25 million awarded to the project would be allocated for construction of Segment 4, while the project team would continue to work with MTC to secure funding to construct the Segment 1 spiral loop.

Member Ford asked if there was a risk that the Segment 1 spiral loop would never be built.

Mr. Holmes stated that the risk was not zero but affirmed that MTC had demonstrated continued interest in bringing the project to completion.

Vice Chair Daniels asked for clarification that the resolution that was the subject of this item was a requirement for MTC to release the \$16.25 million previously awarded to the project.

Mr. Holmes affirmed that this was the case and further explained that another purpose of the resolution was to demonstrate that the Transportation Authority Board was in agreement with allocating the award to the project.

Member Barz asked if there were other regional projects that could use the \$16.25 million RM3 award instead of the YBI MUP.

Ms. Lombardo responded that this award was from the Safe Routes to Transit and Bay Trail (SR2TBT) program of RM, and that the YBI MUP project was successful in receiving an award from this program because of its connection to the Bay Trail.

Ms. LaForte added that SR2TBT focused on projects with regional benefits.

Member Barz expressed concern that the project would not serve many people because Treasure Island was not currently very populated and that this could give MTC reason to spend the funds on another project. She asked for confirmation that the award would not be reassigned to another project because it came from a program that was focused on bicycle access.

Ms. Lombardo responded that the Multimodal Bay Skyway had been used as a marquis



example of what the SR2TBT project could fund and that MTC staff was very supportive of the YBI MUP as a near term interim project since it would likely be years before funding could be secured for the full Bay Skyway. Lastly, she added that the significance of the project was not just based on the number of residents on Treasure Island but also on the jobs and other opportunities that would draw visitors to the islands.

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Nay: CAC Member Ford (1)

Abstention: CAC Member Ng (1)

8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve Programming of \$1,374,000 in Senate Bill 1 Local Partnership Program Formulaic Funds to the Yerba Buena Island Multi-Use Pathway Segment 4 - Treasure Island Road Improvements Project – ACTION

Erin Slichter, Transportation Planner, and Carl Holmes, Deputy Director for Capital Projects, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Siegal asked if the construction cost of \$38 million for Segment 4 of the YBI MUP was due to the need to cut into the hillside.

Mr. Holmes responded that cutting into the hillside was part of what contributed to the construction cost and added that the transit lane from the Treasure Island ferry terminal to the Bay Bridge also contributed to the construction cost.

Member Margarita asked what 'other' funding sources were included in the funding plan shown in the item materials.

Mr. Holmes responded that, in addition to the \$2.267 million contract change order from the West Side Bridges project, Segment 4 of the YBI MUP would be funded with construction savings from the Hillcrest Road Improvement project.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked about current statistics on the number of people using the multi-use path on the east span of the Bay Bridge to bicycle to Treasure Island. He also asked for forecasts of bicyclist usage on the YBI MUP once completed. He expressed concern about allocating funds to this project given limited resources at the state and national levels.

Member Imaduddin moved to approve the item, seconded by Member Margarita.

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Nays: CAC Members Ford and Imaduddin (2)

9. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve the Conceptual Safety-Focused Autonomous Vehicle Permitting Framework Report – ACTION



Drew Cooper, Principal Transportation Modeler, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Levine stated that the framework was conceptual, that regulations were carried out by the state, and that local government had no regulatory authority, and asked what a realistic outcome from the adoption of this report would be.

Mr. Cooper responded that there were two state regulators, California Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) and California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), and that the report would serve as an advocacy tool for engaging in rulemaking processes, and for engaging with state and local elected officials.

Member Levine stated that local regulatory authority would be necessary to enact the conceptual framework.

Member Ortega stated that her partner works for the self-driving car company Zoox and that he liked the proposed framework. She asked how Zoox and Waymo compared within the proposed framework.

Mr. Cooper responded that Waymo would be considered in full deployment. He stated that performance standards within the framework would be used to inform decisions to advance a company through deployment phases but could also be used to scale back operations to earlier phases.

Member Ortega asked whether Waymo met the criteria in this framework when it expanded citywide, and whether it met them now.

Mr. Cooper stated that SFMTA did not know whether Waymo met these criteria, and that lack of knowledge was one of the motivating factors for the report.

Member Milford-Rosales stated that autonomous vehicle (AV) companies were never forthcoming about sharing incident data and asked whether any progress had been made on updating data reporting requirements.

Mr. Cooper responded that the DMV had proposed new data reporting requirements that were more expansive than the existing ones, but that the Transportation Authority submitted comments stating that the proposed requirements were not sufficient.

Member Milford-Rosales stated that remote operators may perform vehicle retrievals and that remote operators may be located in other countries. He asked whether requirements for remote operators to be licensed in California were being considered.

Mr. Cooper stated that he believed the DMV was considering DMV license requirements. He stated that the report did not consider remote operations and that this could be an area of future work.

Vice Chair Daniels asked whether Chair Melgar planned to do anything with this report, given that it was requested by the previous Chair Peskin.

Mr. Cooper responded that staff had briefed all board members and that Chair Melgar had expressed support.

Vice Chair Daniels asked what would happen with the report and what kind of advocacy was planned.

Mr. Cooper responded that the board request had been to explore potential regulatory



solutions, and the resulting product was the subject report. He explained that the Board was being asked to approve the report, which would guide staff while they continued advocacy efforts, including commenting on regulatory proposals from the DMV and CPUC and meeting with state and local elected officials.

Member Margarita asked whether this report would have any future anticipated financial impact.

Mr. Cooper stated that it was not anticipated to have a financial impact.

Ms. Lombardo stated that the financial impact statement in the Board memo was specific to the proposed Board approval action, and that there were ongoing staff costs for this type of policy work in the agency's adopted budget.

Member Barz stated that the proposed framework seems to be about real-world performance and basing permitting decisions on that performance data. She asked whether staff considered oversight of software management, referring to written public comment received for the item.

Mr. Cooper responded that the proposed framework was focused on real-world outcomes to inform permitting decisions, and that software management oversight was not considered.

Chair Siegal stated that recent legislation to empower local law enforcement had been scaled back or was not enacted and asked what role this work would play in future state legislative activity.

Ms. Lombardo stated that state lawmakers were more focused on budgetary and other issues and invited Martin Reyes, Principal Transportation Planner, Government Affairs to comment.

Mr. Reyes stated that there was a bill related to level-2 AV technology, which was different from the technology considered by the subject report. He stated that staff were monitoring proposed legislation for issues related to local control and regulation of AV technology, and engaging with law makers to share their experience and work with them on changes.

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that the program seemed to be about collecting data. He asked whether AV companies would be required to pay a fee to cover staff time to analyze data, or whether taxpayers would cover those costs.

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

Clerk Saeyang stated that a written public comment was received and posted on the website for the subject item.

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Daniels and Levine (2)

10. State and Federal Legislation Update – INFORMATION

Given the hour, Chair Siegal asked if there were any time-sensitive dates the CAC should be aware of.



Martin Reyes, Principal Transportation Planner, Government Affairs confirmed that the legislature would end its session on September 12, when all bills, including this one, must pass. He stated that the next update would be provided after the close of the legislative session and that developments were moving quickly and that most negotiations were occurring in Sacramento between elected officials. He added that key issues were being resolved there and that the bill had already undergone many changes. He said it was up to the committee to decide whether to provide input that evening, but opportunities to relay feedback to legislators were limited.

Member Milford-Rosales requested that when this item returns to the CAC next month, that it be moved up to the top of the agenda.

There was no public comment.

Other Items

11. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

There were no new items introduced.

12. Public Comment

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that in preparation for the transit funding presentation in three weeks, alternative revenue sources should be considered. He explained that one city on the East Coast proposed a \$1.50 fee on delivered packages, arguing that delivery services burden transit systems. He added that fees on data centers could also be considered due to their high electricity consumption, which stressed the current electrical system and affects consumers. He opined that these alternatives could fund transit without increasing sales or property taxes, which would further strain residents and governments. He concluded that research should be conducted on these options.

Member Ng announced that it was her last CAC meeting due to a scheduling conflict with fall classes. She expressed enjoyment in working with the group and appreciation for learning the intricacies of transportation and the backend operations she had not known before joining the CAC. She added that she hoped to see CAC members around San Francisco in the future.

Clerk Saeyang presented Member Ng with a certificate of appreciation for her service and Chair Siegal expressed appreciation for Member Ng's service on behalf of the CAC.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:51 p.m.