



DRAFT MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, September 24, 2025

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Siegal called the meeting to order at 6:09 p.m.

CAC members present at Roll: Phoebe Ford, Sean Kim, Venecia Margarita, Austin Milford-Rosales, Rachael Ortega, and Kat Siegal (6)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Sara Barz, Najuawanda Daniels, Zameel Imaduddin (entered during Item 4), Jerry Levine (4)

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Siegal reminded the CAC that September was Transit Month, featuring events, a ride contest, and a rally. She also noted that the District 2 Safety Study would launch its second round of outreach in early October, with a survey, community presentations, and pop-up events and the Inner Sunset Transportation Study now had a multilingual survey on the project website regarding recommendations to improve transportation safety and access within the commercial core of the neighborhood. She noted that more information on both studies was available on the agency website at www.sfcta.org.

There was no public comment.

3. Approve the Minutes of the September 3, 2025 Meeting - ACTION

Clerk Saeyang stated Mr. Mason, a member of the public had brought some administrative corrections to her attention in the minutes, specifically: on page 4 of the minutes, in the second-to-last paragraph of page four, need to change "28th Avenue" to "28th Street" and on page six, in the first paragraph of page six, need to change "J and L lines" to "J Line".

There was no public comment.

Member Milford-Rosales moved to approve the minutes with the corrections as read by the clerk, seconded by Member Margarita.

The minutes were approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ford, Kim, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (6)

Absent: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Imaduddin, and Levine (4)

4. State and Federal Legislation Update – INFORMATION

Amber Crabbe, Senior Public Policy Manager and Martin Reyes, Principal Transportation Planner, Government Affairs presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Ford asked what happened if the Governor took no action on a bill presented for signature.



Mr. Reyes responded that bills passed by the Legislature and not signed by the Governor by the October 12th deadline automatically became law.

Member Ford asked why the Transportation Authority expected no revenues from the potential regional measure.

Mr. Reyes explained that most revenues from the regional measure in San Francisco were expected to be dedicated to addressing the large share of operator deficits attributed to San Francisco based on ridership, which left nothing to return to the Transportation Authority.

Chief Deputy Director Maria Lombardo added that San Francisco was well-served by SFMTA and regional transit operators, and thus needed to help address a large share of operator deficits as Mr. Reyes noted. She said at the same time San Francisco generated a relatively lower amount of sales tax revenues within the potential regional measure compared to other counties' revenue generation potential. She continued by saying that this meant all the revenues generated went toward transit deficits, leaving no surplus revenues to return to the Transportation Authority.

Member Ford asked how Cap-and-Invest proceeds could be increased and how the program treated activities within and outside of California.

Ms. Crabbe replied that the proceeds were based on auctions and could not directly have been impacted by the Transportation Authority. However, she noted the program's extension to 2045 would increase revenues due to ongoing participation in the program by emitters beyond 2030 and said she would follow up on Member Ford's second question regarding the treatment of emitters' activities.

Member Milford-Rosales asked for a comparison of San Mateo County's accountability framework proposal and the framework that was included in the final version of Senate Bill (SB) 63.

Mr. Reyes explained the differences between the two accountability frameworks, noting that San Mateo County's proposal would have given them unilateral authority to withhold funding from operators.

Member Ortega asked for clarification on Cap-and-Invest funding for High Speed Rail and the funding request from the Bay Area for bookend projects.

Ms. Crabbe clarified that the Bay Area requested \$2.2 billion in total for bookend projects, while the \$1 billion would be set aside annually for High Speed Rail through 2045.

Member Ortega asked why BART's deficit was larger than other transit agencies and why it was receiving the most funding from the regional measure.

Mr. Reyes explained that BART's deficit was largely due to the shift from in-person to remote work which impacted the agency's farebox recovery. He added that Muni had a similar deficit to BART, however the amount of measure funds directed to Muni was much less due to the limited tax revenues San Francisco could direct to Muni within the measure after accounting for its contributions to other operators.

Member Margarita asked if there was any flexibility in the sales tax rate in San Francisco.

Mr. Reyes explained that the one-cent sales tax rate for San Francisco was included in SB 63 to reflect the benefits San Francisco derives from the services provided by the major



operators (SFMTA, BART, Caltrain).

Ms. Lombardo added that San Francisco was included at a higher rate than the other counties to better balance revenue generation with the need, noting that the revenues generated by a half-cent sales tax in San Francisco were about half the amount generated by a half-cent sales tax in Alameda County.

Member Margarita asked whether additional sales tax increases would occur assuming the regional measure passed.

Mr. Reyes responded that he was unaware of discussions regarding additional sales taxes.

Member Kim asked for clarification on how the measure authorized under SB 63 would be placed on the ballot and whether multiple regional measures could appear on the same ballot.

Mr. Reyes explained that there had been news reports about potential citizen initiatives and he speculated that MTC would need to monitor them when considering whether to place the regional measure on the ballot to avoid competing measures.

Member Siegal asked for clarification on how the \$200 million for low-carbon transit operations under Cap-and-Invest would be allocated and what restrictions applied.

Ms. Crabbe replied that the funding would be distributed by formula directly to transit agencies and would be flexible for use in reducing emissions primarily through transit operations.

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that sales tax should be replaced by delivery fees and expressed reluctance to use funding from SB 63 for repaving state highways. He also suggested charging an electricity tax for large industrial sites such as data centers and fees for private commuter buses.

Roland Lebrun described the various transportation sales taxes established in Santa Clara County and pointed out that hospitals in the county were facing closures and looking at sales tax to help with that. He also commented on how transit agencies would repay potential state transit loans and the Cap-and-Invest program.

5. Adopt a Motion of Support to Amend the Prop K Standard Grant Agreement for the Mission Bay School Access Plan [NTIP Planning and Capital] (Plan) to Allow \$30,000 in Funds Held in Reserve for Implementation of Plan Recommendations to be Used for Additional Planning and Outreach; Release \$30,000 from the Reserve; and Appropriate \$20,000 in Prop K Funds, with conditions, for the Plan – ACTION

David Long, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Kim asked for an explanation of the raised crosswalks.

Mr. Long explained that vehicles approached the roundabout with crosswalks across each leg. He stated that installing raised crosswalks would make pedestrians more visible to drivers and encourage vehicles to slow down when approaching the crossings.

Member Ford said she was excited about the new school because she had an elementary schooler and believed the neighborhood shared this enthusiasm. She raised concerns about how car drop-off lines would interact with pedestrian and bike drop-offs, noting that it was difficult to picture traffic flow without the school design. She also asked about



the adequacy of a 12-foot bike lane shared by parents walking with children and children riding bikes, saying it seemed too tight. She added that Mission Bay's wide roads could allow for better space allocation

Mr. Long stated that the revised design work was intended to improve safety. He explained that the goal had been to make the designs more pedestrian-friendly and responsive to the neighborhood context, particularly given the presence of many children.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked whether the school had been part of the original Mission Bay design, and if so, whether any work had to be redone. He also asked how this related to the Caltrain tunnel project, whether the two projects impacted each other, and whether the tunnel's route might affect current plans.

Sarah Bertram stated she lived in Mission Bay and was excited about the school project. She explained the school had been part of the Mission Bay Redevelopment Plan from the start and welcomed its progress. Ms. Bertram added that neighborhood organizers, including herself, had been coordinating with the school district on pick-up and drop-off plans and aligning them with the SFMTA's traffic calming efforts. She emphasized ensuring bike routes did not conflict with car traffic and agreed on the importance of adequate pedestrian width.

Roland Lebrun suggested using Google Earth or Maps with street views to clarify the project location and planned pavement treatments. He referenced Edward Mason's comment about Caltrain tracks near the school, emphasizing safety concerns for children biking to and from school. He shared that he was the original designer of the Pennsylvania Alignment which ran north of Cesar Chavez across Potrero Hill to Seventh Street, where the tracks would be 60 feet down, at the proposed station location. He highlighted the importance of following Caltrain discussions, especially CPUC funding for grade separations, as the formula depended on train volume and the number of cars crossing the tracks. He noted that combining grade separations, like King and Mission, could optimize calculations and make the project a top California priority.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ford, Imaduddin, Kim, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (7)

Absent: CAC Member(s) Barz, Daniels, and Levine (3)

6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$6,606,363 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions, and Allocate \$1,100,000 in Prop AA Funds, with Conditions, for Four Requests – ACTION

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

Member Kim expressed concern about merchants losing business during construction of the Japantown Buchanan Mall. He asked if there was a merchant impact mitigation plan in place for this project.

Jeffrey Jackson, Project Manager at San Francisco Public Works (SFPW), replied that merchant coordination was a high priority for the project because many businesses located directly within the construction area. He said in August 2025, SFPW met with the



Japantown Task Force and other community groups, where merchants raised concerns and SFPW outlined mitigation measures, including construction working hours, noise and dust control, rodent management, and secure fencing. He stated that construction would occur during a limited timeframe of 4-5 days when concrete would be poured in front of the businesses, temporarily limiting access, and that merchants were made aware of this timeframe.

Member Kim followed up by asking if SFPW construction crews would also replace the sewer line or water line as well.

Mr. Jackson clarified that SFPW had coordinated with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) and aimed to dig into the ground once rather than multiple times to minimize impacts on businesses and residents. He said during the design phase, SFPUC learned of the project and chose to add their scope to replace aging infrastructure while SFPW was already excavating.

Member Kim referenced the Geary Boulevard Sewer and Water Improvements Phase 2 project, noting merchants experienced multiple excavations by construction crews. He asked if there were funds set aside to mitigate impacts on merchants.

Mr. Jackson responded that SFPW could not give funds directly to businesses. He referred to a monthly standing meeting with about five community groups to discuss coordination and outreach. He added that these community groups were considering contacting Supervisor Mahmood's office for protective mitigation resources.

Member Kim recommended supporting businesses impacted by construction and urged efficient coordination among SFPW, SFPUC, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, and other agencies or third parties.

Mr. Jackson stated that SFPW was coordinating with outside agencies and the Japantown community. He added that, besides monthly community meetings, SFPW held regular check-ins with external departments to anticipate and prevent potential delays.

Member Kim asked whether Prop AA could be used to repair Geary sidewalks damaged by tree roots, saying the sidewalks were in poor condition.

Mr. Jackson responded that the project included some ADA curb ramp improvements, although sidewalk improvements were not part of the project's scope.

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director of Policy and Programming, replied that the Prop AA vehicle registration fee included a pedestrian safety project category and that sidewalk improvements were eligible. She added that funds were programmed in five-year increments and that the current cycle would run through Fiscal Year 2026/2027.

Member Kim followed up by asking whether there were any equity-related criteria for selecting projects for funding.

Ms. LaForte clarified that equity considerations applied to all Transportation Authority fund programs.

Member Ortega asked about the average life expectancy of a traffic signal was.

Bryant Woo, Engineer at SFMTA, said that the average life expectancy depended on the location. He stated that near the Great Highway, traffic signals typically had a shorter lifespan due to exposure to moisture, salt, and sand, with a maximum of around 40 years.



He added that traffic signals located further inland might last up to 50 years. He then clarified that controllers had a service life of approximately 10 years.

Member Ortega asked if the Traffic Signal Upgrade Contract 35 request met standard update requirements.

Mr. Woo replied that it depended on the hardware's complexity. He emphasized the urgent need to replace controllers after instances of simultaneous signal outages.

Member Ortega asked what caused the controllers to fail.

Mr. Woo clarified that the controllers were not failing, but instead had security vulnerabilities.

Member Ortega asked for confirmation that these controllers needed to be replaced regardless of their age.

Mr. Woo confirmed that this was correct.

Member Ortega expressed appreciation for the inclusion of the 29th Street, 30th Street, and San Jose Avenue signals in the Traffic Signal Upgrades Contract 35 project.

Member Milford-Rosales asked about the traffic signal controller's security vulnerabilities and whether CAC members could review a report on them.

Mr. Woo stated the security vulnerability was discovered by accident and was not a malicious attack and he wasn't able to share more information publicly.

Chair Siegal thanked SFMTA for the signal upgrades and asked if they tracked collisions before and after the improvements to determine if collisions decreased.

Mr. Woo replied that safety improvements depended on the location and that lower-traffic areas, such as 6th Avenue and Balboa Street, saw smaller gains than High Injury Network locations with many collisions. He noted the easiest and most economical improvements involved signal retiming to give pedestrians more crossing time, allow vehicles more to clear intersections, and slow traffic between signals. He stated that complex, costly improvements were implemented alongside other infrastructure upgrades, including bulb-outs and Class 4 bike facilities. He added that more complex intersections received more expensive upgrades. He cited a 20% reduction in collisions from new signal mast heads in the 1990s and he noted that such improvements were possible since they were replacing poor or outdated infrastructure, but over time, as technology and infrastructure advanced, gains became more marginal.

During public comment, Edward Mason referenced previous remarks he made about pedestrian push button security vulnerabilities. He asked whether they were vulnerable, if they were related to the controller security issue, and whether pedestrian push buttons and other SFMTA infrastructure had sufficient security.

Mr. Woo replied that the pedestrian push button security vulnerability had been made public, noting that the vendor had provided an Apple Store application for signal operators to program accessible pedestrian signals. He explained that the first weakness was making the software easily available, and the second was that agencies did not change the default password. He stressed the severity of the matter, especially for visually impaired individuals who rely on accessible audio messages or visual cues to cross the street safely.



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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ford, Imaduddin, Kim, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (7)

Absent: CAC Member(s) Barz, Daniels, and Levine (3)

7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Amend the One Bay Area Grant Cycle 2 Project List and the Prop K Standard Grant Agreement for the Bay Area Rapid Transit District's Embarcadero Station: New Northside Platform Elevator Project to Reflect a New Phased Approach to Project Delivery – ACTION

Amelia Walley, Senior Program Analyst, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Ortega asked how BART would assist passengers during the elevator construction.

Michael Gerbracht, Senior Manager of Engineering Programs at BART, said BART had paratransit services providing access to adjacent stations for passengers who need it.

Chair Siegal asked if there would be periods when no elevators were working at the station.

Mr. Gerbracht confirmed that, with only one elevator at the station, service would be unavailable during maintenance and modernization.

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ford, Imaduddin, Kim, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (7)

Absent: CAC Member(s) Barz, Daniels, and Levine (3)

8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve San Francisco's Program of Projects for the 2026 Regional Transportation Improvement Program, Totaling \$9,887,000 – ACTION

Mike Pickford, Principal Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ford, Imaduddin, Kim, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (7)

Absent: CAC Member(s) Barz, Daniels, and Levine (3)

9. Adopt a Motion of Support to Authorize Borrowing of up to \$60,000,000 under the Amended and Restated Revolving Credit Agreement with U.S. Bank National Association – ACTION



Cynthia Fong, Deputy Director for Finance and Administration, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Ortega asked what would happen when the agreement expired in 2027 or if additional funds were needed sooner.

Ms. Fong stated that the Transportation Authority could first use funds from its revolving credit agreement before considering market options. She said the agency could either increase the credit amount or issue a long-term bond. In 2017, she recounted that the Transportation Authority fully utilized its revolving credit, consulted financial advisors, considered market conditions, and issued a long-term bond to spread costs over many years. She added that the current loan must be repaid by October 29, 2027.

Member Ortega asked if the Transportation Authority would need to repay the \$125 million by October 29, 2027.

Ms. Fong stated that the Transportation Authority would be required to repay the funds, with costs depending on the interest rate and the agency's credit rating.

Member Ortega asked if the current interest rate were lower than the standard rate.

Ms. Fong stated that the revolving credit agreement rate was 3.18%, while a bond would be at 4.1% under current market conditions.

Member Ortega asked about the potential timing for requesting the remaining \$60 million on the credit line.

Ms. Fong stated that after the mid-year budget amendment process, the Transportation Authority might request up to \$60 million in additional funding. She reported that \$65 million was spent in year one and that the subject \$60 million was being allocated in year two. She said that if this trend continued, the Transportation Authority could seek additional funds as early as March 2026 or the following year.

Member Ortega asked for clarification on the term "sponsors".

Ms. Fong explained that by "sponsors" she referred to agencies that received project grants from the Transportation Authority such as SFMTA, the Transbay Joint Powers Authority, and BART.

Member Kim asked about the revolving credit, clarifying that it had a variable component and whether the Transportation Authority must still pay the 0.2% cost even if the credit were unused. He noted that the current revolving credit rate was lower than the long-term bond rate, making it beneficial to use, and confirmed that board approval was required before withdrawal.

Ms. Fong confirmed that Member Kim's understanding was correct.

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ford, Imaduddin, Kim, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (7)

Absent: CAC Member(s) Barz, Daniels, and Levine (3)



Other Items

10. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

Chair Siegal requested that the Transportation Authority provide estimates of potential revenue from package delivery fees or delivery platform taxes, either as a flat fee, percentage, or gross receipts tax. She explained that several of these options were discussed at the Muni Funding Working Group. She emphasized the need to understand both the revenue potential and any legal hurdles to implementing these options to inform future funding strategies amid ongoing deficits.

There was no public comment.

11. Public Comment

During public comment, Edward Mason noted observing numerous Waymo vehicles looping near 14th Street and South Van Ness, including a storage and battery-recharging facility between South Van Ness and Folsom Street. He said he was concerned about the high electricity consumption of these vehicles, noting it could strain future energy supply for data centers and electrification efforts. He suggested implementing a tax on heavy electricity users to offset infrastructure costs and ensure that those with high demand pay their share.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:17 p.m.