



DRAFT MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, November 19, 2025

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Siegal called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

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

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Najuwanda Daniels (entered during Item 8), Zameel Imaduddin, and Venecia Margarita (entered during Item 8) (3)

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Siegal reported that the SFMTA Board had received a presentation on a potential local transit revenue measure, including two progressive parcel tax options that could generate about \$150 million annually for Muni operations. She stated that this measure, along with a potential regional measure under Senate Bill 63, would be essential to addressing the fiscal cliff facing Muni, BART, and Caltrain, and that SFMTA was continuing to gather input on tax structure, duration, and revenue levels. She added that the presentation largely mirrored what had been shared at the recent local roundtable and that staff would agendaize an SFMTA update for a December Transportation Authority Board meeting. Chair Siegal also reported that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) was seeking a student or youth representative for its Regional Network Management Customer Advisory Group, with applications due December 5. Lastly, she stated that MTC had approved \$1.5 million in CARE Program awards, including three grants in San Francisco: \$50,000 to Leah's Pantry for a Bayview walkability and older adults plan, \$50,000 to the South of Market Community Action Network for capacity-building related to housing and transit, and \$110,000 to the Filipino-American Development Foundation for a Russ Street streetscape and monument project.

There was no public comment.

3. Nominations for 2026 Community Advisory Committee Chair and Vice Chair - ACTION

Chair Siegal called for nominations for Chair for calendar year 2026.

Member Levine and Member Kim nominated Chair Siegal who accepted the nomination.

There were no further nominations for Chair.

Chair Siegal called for nominations for Vice Chair.

Member Kim nominated Vice Chair Daniels who was not present to accept; however; Vice Chair Daniels subsequently accepted the nomination through email.

There were no further nominations for Vice Chair.



There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

4. **Approve the Minutes of the October 29, 2025 Meeting - ACTION**
5. **Approve the 2026 Community Advisory Committee Meeting Schedule – ACTION**
6. **Adopt a Motion of Support to Authorize an Additional Construction Allotment of \$1,000,000, for a Revised Additional Construction Allotment Not to Exceed \$1,896,564, for the Pier E2 Parking Lot Project - ACTION**
7. **Internal Accounting Report, Investment Report, and Debt Expenditure Report for the Three Months Ending September 30, 2025 - INFORMATION**

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

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

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Member(s) Daniels, Imaduddin, and Margarita (3)

End of Consent Agenda

8. **Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$2,000,000 and Appropriate \$650,000, with Conditions, in Prop L Funds for Three Requests - ACTION**

Erin Slichter, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Ortega asked how street trees were maintained later in life. She asked who was responsible for long-term tree maintenance, and what was done to mitigate damage to property and sidewalks caused by trees.

David Moore, project manager at the San Francisco Department of Public Works (SFPW), responded that the Urban Forest Plan of 2015 had laid out an effort to maintain San Francisco's street trees and the sidewalks around them, and that voters had approved Prop E in 2016 to direct funding to this effort. He explained that the effort had taken time to scale up; while it set a goal of maintaining all trees every 5 years, it had been nearly 8 years since the measure passed and SFPW was only just completing the first round of maintenance on all trees due to the time needed to scale up the program. He added that many trees hadn't been maintained in more than 5 years and were overgrown, and it had also taken time to coordinate work between SFPW in-house labor and contractors.

Member Ortega asked how members of the public could report concerns about trees needing maintenance in their neighborhoods.

Mr. Moore responded that these reports could be made to 311.

Member Milford-Rosales expressed concern about the safety of the proposed changes to the I-280 Southbound off-ramp, especially given the presence of transit stations and schools in the area. He stated that he had joined the CAC initially after a family was struck by a car while crossing a highway off-ramp at 4th and King streets, and noted that the City had previously made a commitment to eliminating two-lane off-ramps to address safety.



concerns.

Carl Holmes, Deputy Director for Capital Projects, responded by noting that the configuration of the I-280 off-ramp was different from that at 4th and King because cars could only turn right, whereas at 5th and King cars could go straight or turn right. At the I-280 off-ramp, pedestrians could not cross Ocean Avenue perpendicularly, so the only crossing between cars and pedestrians would be at the crosswalk crossing the off-ramp parallel to Ocean Avenue. Mr. Holmes added that signaling the intersection would make it safer for pedestrians.

Member Milford-Rosales stated that he was not excited about the design but understood the reasoning behind it.

Member Kim stated that he didn't see funds being requested for repairing sidewalks damaged by street trees. He asked how many damaged sidewalks were in the backlog.

Mr. Moore, SFPW responded that sidewalks were considered damaged when they were lifted by half an inch or more, and that about 10%, or about 12,000 trees, had caused this kind of damage to sidewalks. He detailed that, to address sidewalk damage, SFPW typically shaved the sidewalk down to make it even and spent about \$4M per year on this effort. He explained that shaving sidewalks was faster and cheaper than outright replacing them. He added that SFPW was in the process of developing a report of sidewalk damage caused by trees citywide, and that this would become available in the next year and a half.

Jon Swae, program manager at SFPW, added that staff could provide the exact number of locations in the sidewalk damage backlog as a follow-up.

Member Kim stated that as a member of the Geary Boulevard Merchants Association, he had participated in a survey of sidewalk damage but had not seen much work to repair the damage that the survey documented. He added that sidewalk shaving sometimes still left the sidewalk quite uneven. He asked that SFPW prioritize repairing sidewalks in commercial areas and areas with high foot traffic and transit access.

Mr. Moore, SFPW responded that SFPW prioritized sidewalk repair in commercial areas, near schools, and in other areas that were frequented by children and the elderly. Member Kim stated that his neighborhood had a lot of damaged sidewalks and asked that SFPW provide a plan for repairing the backlog of damaged sidewalks. Mr. Moore responded that SFPW was continuing to work to scale up efforts to repair the backlog but was facing challenges in doing so with bidding and a hiring freeze that limited staff capacity.

Member Barz asked what the volume of traffic was on the I-280 off-ramp.

Yana Waldman, Capital Projects Division, replied that staff could provide the exact numbers from the traffic study, which used data from 2015 and projected through 2040, but did not have those numbers on hand at that moment.

Member Barz stated that she had not noticed high volumes of traffic on the off-ramp when she drove on it, and acknowledged that she may not have driven on it during peak times. She expressed concern about the project's design to widen the off-ramp when it didn't appear to be highly-trafficked in the first place. She asked what alternatives were considered for the design.

Ms. Waldman responded that the Balboa Park Circulation Study had considered other



designs. She explained that the selected design added a traffic signal, which would cause cars exiting the highway to back up at the light, necessitating more 'storage' space to accommodate the waiting cars. She clarified that widening the off-ramp only added storage space and didn't increase the capacity of the highway and off-ramp.

Member Barz asked about how the need to widen the off-ramp for storage had been determined. Ms. Waldman responded that the designed signal would operate on a 90-second signal and that combined with the traffic projections through 2040, it was determined that widening the off-ramp was necessary to prevent off-bound cars from queuing back into the I-280 main line.

Mr. Holmes added that a similar issue had arisen in the Northbound Geneva Off-Ramp study, and that the design was intended to increase storage and prevent cars from queuing onto the highway.

Member Ortega asked if the increased storage was required because the highway fell under Caltrans or federal jurisdiction.

Mr. Holmes responded that Caltrans did have jurisdiction over the highway, and that the increased storage was needed to prevent queuing and potential rear-end collisions on the highway.

Member Barz stated that she was not inclined to support allocating funds to the off-ramp project as it seemed outdated relative to current transportation priorities. She said that she had seen alternative ways to slow vehicles exiting highways in other cities and expressed skepticism about a 90-second signal being the best option in this scenario. She stated that the project would use a significant amount of funds in a fiscally-constrained environment to build a bike lane that she would still not feel comfortable using given the safety concerns on Ocean Avenue.

Mr. Holmes thanked Member Barz for her comment, and expressed surprise, adding added that staff had previously received positive public feedback for the project and had tried to take in all the feedback they had received.

Member Margarita expressed surprise at other members' comments about the I-280 off-ramp project noting that the project was intended to improve safety. She voiced her support for tree planting and stated that communities benefited from having trees and wildlife, such as birds, in their neighborhoods. She added that environmental justice groups were involved with tree planting.

During public comment, Ed Mason said that SFPW had done insufficient work to identify the backlog of sidewalk damage and report on trip-and-fall incidents resulting from unaddressed tree damage. He stated that Friends of the Urban Forest only planted trees, but did not maintain sidewalks. He urged a halt to planting more trees before sufficient funding was available for maintenance. He stated that a friend of his had broken his wrist because he tripped on an uneven sidewalk that had been damaged by trees.

Griffin Lee from ConnectedSF agreed with Mr. Mason's assertion that maintenance was needed before planting additional trees. He suggested that SFPW first gain public trust by properly maintaining existing trees before planting more. He further asked why Prop L sales tax funds were allocated to SFPW for tree planting. He also suggested that SFMTA consider transferring cable car operations to a private entity.

Member Levine asked for SFPW's Tree Planting and Establishment project to be severed



from Item 8.

Member Barz asked for the Transportation Authority's I-280 Southbound Ocean Ave Off-Ramp Realignment project to be severed from Item 8.

Member Ford asked for staff to clarify why sales tax funds were proposed for tree planting.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, responded that tree planting with SFPW as a project sponsor was a program in the voter approved Prop L Expenditure Plan.

Before the vote on the tree planting request, Vice Chair Daniels stated that her district, District 10, was suffering from the effects of toxic pollution from the Navy's presence in the district. She said that she had grown up there the toxic pollution in the air was a threat to the health of her community. She noted that many of the priority tree planting sites were in District 10 and would provide some relief from the air pollution and urged other CAC members to consider this in their vote.

Before the vote on the I-280 Southbound Ramp project, Deputy Director Holmes stated that the current peak traffic volumes on the ramp were 703 vehicles per hour in the a.m. peak and 666 vehicles per hour in the p.m. peak.

Ms. Waldman added that with these traffic volumes and the 90-second traffic signal, it was projected that 18 vehicles would be queued at a time during peak hours, necessitating more storage space. She added that further details could be sent as a follow-up.

Member Milford-Rosales moved to approve allocating \$900,000 in Prop L funds for SFMTA's Cable Car Restoration project, seconded by Member Ortega.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Member Imaduddin (1)

Vice Chair Daniels moved to approve allocating \$1,100,000 in Prop L funds for SFPW's Tree Planting and Establishment project, seconded by Member Milford-Rosales.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Ford, Kim, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (8)

Absent: CAC Member Imaduddin (1)

Abstention: CAC Member Levine (1)

Member Kim moved to approve appropriating \$650,000 in Prop L funds for Transportation Authority's -280 Southbound Ocean Ave Off-Ramp Realignment - Additional Funds project, seconded by Member Margarita.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Daniels, Ford, Levine, Kim, Margarita, Ortega, and Siegal (7)

Absent: CAC Member Imaduddin (1)

Abstention: CAC Member Barz and Milford-Rosales (2)



9. Adopt a Motion of Support to Increase the Amount of Professional Services Contract with Mark Thomas & Company by \$300,000, to a Total Amount Not to Exceed \$2,204,250, for the Design Phase for the I-280 Ocean Avenue Off-Ramp Project – ACTION

Yana Waldman, Transportation Authority Capital Projects Division, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Ortega asked about the funds amended in July 2025. She asked why community outreach was not included in the original scope and why engaging the community had required an additional \$54,000, stating she did not understand the history and sought clarification.

Ms. Waldman explained that extensive community outreach had been conducted during the environmental phase. She stated that traffic analysis was part of that phase, and additional outreach had been added to the design phase due to the time elapsed and strong public interest in bike lane safety in the area, which had been discussed in prior meetings, including the June meeting.

Member Ortega asked when the environmental work was originally performed.

Ms. Waldman replied that the environmental phase work was performed between 2015 and 2019.

Member Ortega observed the environmental work had been completed before the pandemic and requested updates on its status since the pandemic.

Ms. Waldman replied that under the next agenda item, staff would provide an update on a related proposed feasibility study, and she said that staff had also conducted additional traffic analysis that incorporated refreshed numbers.

Member Ortega requested clarification on the scope of the \$300,000 contract amendment request, and the relationship of this item to the following agenda item.

Ms. Waldman clarified that the next item addressed a segment adjacent to the current project. She explained that proposed work on the adjacent segment, if deemed feasible, would allow better utilization of the portion of bike/pedestrian travel paths currently in the design phase and emphasized the need to study the adjacent segment before moving forward.

Member Ortega stated that she had initially misunderstood the project's location, thinking the next piece was on top rather than adjacent to the current project limits, which caused confusion. She asked if the \$300,000 amendment was intended to cover final bid permits for the design, incorporating all elements discussed, as the team prepared the final bid documents and asked for clarification on why this was an amendment rather than part of the original design scope, asking whether it reflected additional community feedback or other factors.

Ms. Waldman clarified that prior funding for this item had been allocated to complete 100% design plans, which were submitted in June to Caltrans and City departments for review. She clarified that the Caltrans phase following 100% design, called final design or bid documents, involved addressing comments from the 100% design package, finalizing designs, cleaning up details, preparing final specifications for advertisement, calculating bid quantities, and updating cost estimates. She stated that the project team had always



planned to return to the CAC and Board to request funds for this Caltrans phase, to prepare the project for construction.

Member Barz asked how the elements of the project fit together rather than focusing on the design of the project itself. She asked whether the amendment to the scope both advanced the project to the bid documents and funded additional outreach to refresh community engagement.

Mr. Holmes clarified that item 8 approved additional funding for the project. He stated that item 9 amended the contract with the designer to advance the design from 100% plans to bid documents. He stated that item 10 involved studying a potential multi-use path adjacent to the off-ramp, with sidewalk and off-ramp work designed to accommodate future bicyclists, reflecting collaboration with SFMTA.

Member Barz appreciated the explanation and said it fully addressed her question.

Member Margarita reminded CAC members that the CAC had previously directed staff to seek additional community input, including from bicyclists, which the project team had done, and that members were now asking why staff had sought that input.

Member Barz stated that, according to Google Maps, the off-ramp was approximately 619 feet long. She added that this measurement, may not be precise but should roughly account for current traffic volume.

Ms. Waldman stated that the shared off-ramp split from I-280, explaining that one lane led to the discussed project and another continued underneath, and clarified that the length did not apply solely to vehicles in the project's branch of the Y.

Member Barz clarified that the measurement taken represented only the length of the Y.

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Member Imaduddin (1)

10. Adopt a Motion of Support to Amend the Prop K Standard Grant Agreement for the District 7 Ocean Ave Safety & Bike Access [NTIP Capital] to Allow \$237,000 in Funds Held in Reserve for Implementation of the Ocean Ave Mobility Action Plan to be Used for the Ocean Ave Multi-Use Path Feasibility Study (Project); Release \$237,000 on Reserve; and Appropriate \$237,000 in Prop K Funds, with conditions, for the Project – ACTION

Yana Waldman, Capital Projects Division, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Vice Chair Daniels asked about the community response. She stated that while the community was excited about the project, she wanted to know if there had been any concerns regarding the potential loss of the pedestrian bridge and whether pedestrians were worried about being redirected to the multi-use pathway.

Ms. Waldman stated that during outreach, the focus was on widening the path and improving safety for bicyclists along Ocean Avenue. She explained that the removal of the



crossing referenced in the prior Ocean Avenue Mobility Action study was only a potential outcome related to relocating the wall. She stated that the feasibility study would determine whether the pedestrian bridge needed to be removed to move the wall and, if so, would assess both pedestrian and vehicular traffic impacts. She added that additional outreach would continue as part of this effort.

Member Barz responded to Vice Chair Daniels by stating that, having served on the Ocean Avenue Mobility Task Force before joining the CAC, the pedestrian bridge was widely discussed. She stated the bridge was unpopular in her neighborhood, underused, not ADA-accessible, and considered an eyesore. Member Barz added that the bridge's removal was generally viewed as a positive outcome and that the topic had been addressed in detail by the task force.

Vice Chair Daniels stated she appreciated the response but remained concerned about pedestrian safety. She stated that while the Transportation Authority focuses heavily on bicyclists, who do not contribute revenue, she wanted to ensure pedestrians are not overlooked. She added that her concern extended beyond her perspective as a driver to the safety of her niece and nephews as they walk the streets.

Member Barz asked for clarification on the multi-use path, asking for confirmation that the path would extend from Howth Street to Frida Kahlo Way.

Ms. Waldman stated that was correct.

Member Barz stated there was a small gap between the off-ramp and the bike facility crossing the highway and asked about the conditions at that location.

Ms. Waldman stated that under the previous item, the adjacent project had included a widened path initially designed as a pedestrian sidewalk, with bicycles remaining on the street due to safety concerns at the off-ramp. She explained that crossing onto the sidewalk briefly and returning to a narrow Ocean Avenue would have posed risks with buses and other vehicles. She stated that Item 10 would allow widening the path between Howth Street and Frida Kahlo Way, enabling shared use for both bicycles and pedestrians. She added that if feasible, the widened path could be used for bicycles from the off-ramp to Frida Kahlo Way, achieving the project's goal.

Member Barz asked whether the intent of using the NTIP funds for the feasibility study had been to connect the bike path from Frida Kahlo Way potentially to the southbound ramp.

Ms. Waldman stated that staff were studying the matter because it required a formal review, and that the projects were on different timelines.

Member Barz asked about the plans for bicycle traffic further east, seeking clarification on whether the route would continue eastward or would begin only at the southbound ramp.

Ms. Waldman clarified that the current work focused on assessing the feasibility of removing a large retaining wall, which had complicated efforts to widen the sidewalk. She added that this project was part of a broader effort to improve bike and pedestrian access along Ocean Avenue, as outlined in the Ocean Avenue Mobility Action Plan.

Mr. Holmes stated that the SFMTA wanted staff to show efforts beyond the off-ramp to present a more cohesive approach. He stated that, although the area was short, the study demonstrated a commitment as part of ongoing collaboration.



Member Margarita asked whether staff had a list of the community members they contacted and indicated she wanted to ensure the outreach reflected a diverse mix, including older adults and others.

Ms. Waldman responded that staff had an extensive list of participants and could provide it, explaining that she had personally attended many meetings and had spoken with numerous attendees, and that there had been a strong mix of individuals of all ages.

Member Margarita asked whether any lights were present at the location and stated that she understood Member Daniels' concern that the design appeared bike- and car-oriented rather than pedestrian-friendly. She added that the layout seemed to prioritize traffic flow for vehicles and bicycles without clearly providing signals or protections for pedestrians.

Ms. Waldman stated that because the project was still in the feasibility-study phase, the team was evaluating a multi-use path width in the range of 14-16 feet to serve both pedestrians and bicyclists, and she added that while lighting was not being designed at this stage, any future design would include lighting that meets all applicable codes.

Mr. Holmes confirmed that the feasibility study did not include traffic signal lights, but that the traffic analysis was included in the study as part of the scope of work, and that findings related to traffic signals could result from the study.

Member Margarita asked whether community input and the study's findings could result in the area requiring traffic signals.

Mr. Holmes stated that was correct.

Member Ford commented that she increasingly regretted her early votes on the Treasure Island bike lane project due to the high costs of retaining walls. She highlighted that initial mobility studies had justified a multi-use path, but expenditures had reached \$50 million, and the current retaining wall was very large. She questioned whether the wall was being rebuilt for safety or seismic reasons or primarily to satisfy bicyclist preferences, emphasizing that \$230,000 was not significant for the committee but urged consideration of whether the project justified such high per-square-foot spending in a constrained space.

Ms. Waldman replied that the feasibility could help answer that question. She explained that the retaining wall was very old and that the team would review the as-builts, its geotechnical condition, and seismic viability.

Member Milford-Rosales stated he was very excited about the potential of the project, especially as it could connect with other upcoming projects along Ocean Avenue to create a safe bike route south of Twin Peaks, which currently did not exist. He added that, like other members, he had questions about details that he did not expect this study to fully answer. He requested an update on the item before final approval so the results of the studies could be reviewed and feedback provided while it was still early in the process.

Ms. Waldman replied that one of the proposals of the work was to provide a midway report and to seek feedback.

Member Milford-Rosales stated that while biking along the Embarcadero, many bike lanes were in poor condition and sidewalks intended as multi-use paths were not suitable due



to heavy pedestrian and cyclist traffic. He highlighted the need to prevent conflicts between faster-moving cyclists and pedestrians, especially near high-traffic areas like BART stations, and urged the staff to consider solutions that would avoid creating theoretically good but practically problematic spaces.

Ms. Waldman explained that the traffic study that would accompany the feasibility study would capture all forms of movement, including pedestrians, bicycles, vehicles, and buses.

Member Ortega shared her experience working near the Embarcadero, where she frequently worried about collisions between pedestrians and cyclists despite the presence of a bike lane. She requested that the study consider not only a multimodal path but also ways to create separation between pedestrians and bicyclists, emphasizing pedestrian safety as a key concern. She noted that incorporating these options early in the study would prevent mid-project adjustments. Member Ortega stated that regarding the geological and seismic concerns of the retaining wall, if a major repair need were discovered, she would appreciate clarification on ownership and responsibility. She added that this could be addressed during the study presentation but emphasized the importance of a clear understanding when the findings would be presented later.

Member Margarita requested a list of meeting dates and contact information, explaining that community members wanted to participate but did not know where to go or whom to contact. She suggested that if the list were shared, members could distribute it to other community members as well.

Chair Siegal stated that she agreed with other members' feedback regarding accommodations for bicyclists and pedestrians. She emphasized that both groups generally do not want to share the same space, and creating conflict points would place them in opposition, but she added there is room to accommodate both safely.

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Member Imaduddin (1)

11. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve the 2025 San Francisco Congestion Management Program – ACTION

Drew Cooper, Acting Co-Deputy Director of Technology, Data & Analysis, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Ortega stated that while the report highlighted an increase in San Francisco residents within a five-minute walk of frequent Muni service—from 20% to 27%—she found the statistic concerning and not a point of pride. She emphasized that reliable transit should be comparable to other major cities, where subways and trains arrive frequently and predictably, reducing anxiety about delays. She stated that the study underscores transit inequities, particularly outside the downtown core, and stressed the importance of making transit easy and useful for all residents. She asked whether data could be broken down by specific weekdays, such as Tuesday versus Friday, to account for changes in



travel patterns since the pandemic.

Mr. Cooper stated that the information was not currently included in the report but that it was feasible and would likely be considered in future reporting. He added that the issue was probably reflected in a statistic measuring roadway travel time variability.

Member Ortega stated that she was curious whether lower-traffic days might have been dampening the overall averages and masking heavier traffic trends, explaining that her own 11 a.m. drive on Cesar Chavez had been bumper-to-bumper despite it not being a peak hour. Member Ortega added that she wondered if removing certain weekdays from the analysis would reveal different patterns, emphasizing that her comments were not a criticism but a request for deeper understanding of that specific aspect of the study.

Mr. Cooper clarified that with respect to the roadway performance data, the study had derived the results from Tuesday through Thursday, thereby excluding Mondays and Fridays; he added that the data still appeared to show greater variability than in previous years.

Member Barz stated that slide 18's finding—that only 27% of the population lived within a five-minute walk of five-minute-frequency Muni service during the weekday PM period—fell short of what many on the Transportation Authority Board aspired to achieve, even though the figure had improved from 20% in 2025. She added that this level of access did not feel like world-class transit and emphasized the desire to see bolder options and clearer trade-offs in upcoming plans. Member Barz then asked about the significant growth in micro-mobility trips from 2024 to 2025, stating that although these trips still represented a small portion of total trips, the increase was notable, and asked whether there were any hypotheses that could account for this surge.

Mr. Cooper stated he did not have a hypothesis.

Member Barz asked for clarification on slide 8. She asked if a green designation indicated that transit was more competitive with autos on that corridor and if yellow to red indicated it was less competitive.

Mr. Cooper stated that transit had generally been slower than automobiles but remained relatively more competitive on the green segments than on the red segments.

Member Barz asked about the Van Ness corridor and asked whether the Van Ness BRT vehicles were traveling at roughly the same speed as general traffic, according to the data.

Mr. Cooper confirmed that was correct.

Member Barz commented on conditions in District 7, observing a significant presence of yellow and orange and suggesting there was room for improvement. She stated that, with anticipated growth on the West Side of the city, if buses or trains take twice as long as cars, people will continue to choose driving. She emphasized that she was personally very keen to see these considerations reflected in future plans.

Member Kim asked about the maps and the time period of the data collected, asking whether it had been from 2025 or 2024.

Mr. Cooper stated that most of the data came from spring 2025. He added that some exceptions existed, such as collision data, which reflected a full year through 2024, the most recent available. He added that micromobility data also did not include data from the full year of 2025, but most key metrics were reported from April and May 2025.



Member Kim stated that changes had occurred on Gary Boulevard, noting that parts of the boulevard did not have transit lanes. He stated that a transit lane was installed in October 2023 and that construction had taken place in 2025, which may have affected the reliability of data. He stated that the available data likely reflects conditions from 2024.

Mr. Cooper replied that the data was from 2025.

Member Kim requested clarification on terminology in the main report and asked for an explanation of the Priority Production Area, as well as definitions of Infill Opportunity Zones.

Mr. Cooper stated that Infill Opportunity Zones are part of legislation that guides the rules for writing a Congestion Management Program (CMP), setting parameters on urban typology. He stated that in these areas, it is acceptable to prioritize alternative modes of transportation over automobiles, allowing certain roadway segments to fall below a specific level of performance.

Chun Ho Chow, Transportation Modeler, stated that in 2023 he discussed updating the Infill Opportunity Zone, which depended on transit stop availability. He explained that roadways within the zone with a very low level of service (F) did not require deficiency planning, while roadways outside the zone at level F would require such planning.

Member Kim asked if the area under discussion focused on improving transportation and recommending alternative modes instead of cars.

Mr. Chow stated that it reflected the current quality of transit service, was set based on existing service levels, and was defined by a specific radius around high-frequency stops served by transit.

Ms. Lombardo stated that the Infill Opportunity Zones reflected the state's effort to encourage growth in areas with existing high transit levels.

Member Kim stated that the map nearly covered all of San Francisco, and he was curious about West Side areas where challenges existed. He highlighted the District 4 shuttle study, noting its depiction of key locations and the concept of a walk shed. He emphasized the importance of first- and last-mile transit access, especially near bus stops, and pointed out that the Infill Opportunity Zones were widespread. He suggested that identifying specific problem areas would be necessary to improve service, but the current data does not clearly indicate them.

Member Kim commended the comprehensive report and appreciated the hard work. He asked whether there were recommendations for improving Muni service, suggesting that routes could be realigned either now or in the future. He referenced AC Transit's recent bus service realignment, noting its reported time savings and efficiency, and asked if similar recommendations could be developed from the report for SFMTA.

Mr. Cooper stated that the report did not provide planning or other recommendations, but its purpose was to monitor and report on conditions. However, he added that the information informs staff's planning exercises, which could generate recommendations.

Vice Chair Daniels asked about the TDM policies, requirements, and programs, specifically referencing programs for existing development and the on-street car-sharing pilot. She asked if more information was available. She added that while she appreciated these programs, they no longer exist, citing Gig, Zipcar, and Turo, and asked if they would



return.

Mr. Cooper stated he could not answer that question.

Member Ford asked about the methodology for understanding trips within San Francisco, including how walk-share trips are attributed, whether the data includes only commute trips or all trips, and what qualifies as a trip. She also asked how the Transportation Authority tracks active transit trips, such as walking, biking, and scooter use, particularly when they are not part of the rental fleet.

Mr. Cooper explained that travel behavior is measured through travel diary surveys. He said the data used in the report was collected in 2023 as part of a regional effort conducted by the Transportation Authority in partnership with MTC and the Santa Clara VTA. He described that participants were recruited using a stratified random address-based sampling method, were incentivized to join, and were asked to download an app that tracks trips from home to other locations. He added that the app prompted participants for trip purpose, mode of travel, and companions, producing a detailed dataset of travel behavior, typically covering seven days per participant.

Member Ford stated that she had taken the survey and then addressed the coverage issue, asking whether transit within a five-minute walk counted as access to any transit rather than service in multiple directions.

Mr. Cooper confirmed that this was purely a service-based metric measured at the stop level, tracking whether service occurred at a five-minute frequency, and he clarified that it was not sensitive to the direction or multiple routes of the service.

Mr. Chow added that the data was based on published service timetables and may not have reflected actual transit operations.

Member Ford asked whether the ratio of auto time to transit time accounted for waiting time based on the service levels of the transit system.

Mr. Cooper clarified that the ratio of auto time to transit time accounted for bus dwell time but did not include the time passengers would spend waiting for a bus.

Member Ford emphasized that much work remained to make transit a competitive option and that the Transportation Authority should continually explore ways to achieve this. She highlighted that people should choose transit not out of necessity but because it is the most effective way to get around.

Member Milford-Rosales asked about Muni service frequency, referencing a map and table showing coverage by the planned timetable. He explained that near his home, four routes operate within a five-minute walk, three with 10-minute frequencies, which should result in vehicles departing roughly every three minutes. He reported that in practice, the departures were not staggered, causing him to wait a full 10 minutes if he missed a bus. He asked whether the Transportation Authority tracks metrics on this and whether efforts were made to stagger routes like the 30 and 45, or if synchronized departures were intentional.

Mr. Cooper stated that Member Milford-Rosales was addressing two issues: a service design question and a scheduled versus delivered service question. He explained that metrics directly addressing the latter issue were not included, but the SFMTA produced dashboards on on-time performance, and the Transportation Authority links to these



dashboards. He offered to provide further guidance if needed.

Member Milford-Rosales asked whether the measurement of a specific stop reflected the frequency of a single line or accounted for multiple lines sharing the stop, and whether the reported frequency showed the actual operating interval or the staggered schedule interval when lines overlapped.

Mr. Chow replied that he believed that each line was considered separately but that he would follow up by email after he had confirmed how it was implemented.

Member Margarita discussed the significant increase in shared bike and scooter trips, highlighting a rise from 400,000 to 700,000 in one year and the resulting safety concerns for pedestrians. She remarked that while scooters and bikes are cost-effective and popular for commuting, the rapid growth warranted careful consideration. She recalled that in May 2013, Supervisors Avalos, Weiner, and Mar, along with community and government representatives, visited Mexico City to study its Ecobici Bicycle Share System and Metro Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) to learn about sustainable transportation practices. She suggested leveraging lessons from that trip to manage the local surge in scooters and bikes, noting that adding 300,000 new trips in one year posed safety risks similar to adding 300,000 cars. She stated there was a need to examine past studies from other cities to identify effective strategies for maximizing safety while accommodating growing micro-mobility use. She also emphasized the need to improve transit frequency on the 44 line, enhance pedestrian safety, and learn from past studies. She suggested promoting alternative transportation options such as Muni, scooters, and bicycles while limiting car usage on certain days to reduce risks. She highlighted the importance of managing bicycle and scooter use due to safety concerns and stressed the need to continue efforts to make San Francisco a beautiful and safe city for all.

Chair Siegal asked about the auto-transit speed ratio map, commenting that it was great data. She asked why the data appeared concentrated in certain areas and whether these were the only roads with both vehicle speed and transit speed data available.

Mr. Cooper confirmed that was correct.

Chair Siegal stated she was concerned about the lack of data for the southeast corner of the city and much of the Sunset District, adding that these areas often felt overlooked and likely had poor performance. She added that the outer areas of Districts 1, 4, and the western section of District 7 also had unfavorable numbers, making it difficult to engage those communities for additional transit funding next year. She also stated that this item was the most relevant venue to convey feedback to the Transportation Authority Board as they were developing a local funding measure for Muni, emphasizing that the Transportation Authority should advocate for stronger investment in transit service rather than asking residents to accept declining conditions or to feel that roadway infrastructure was being reduced without better transit alternatives. Chair Siegal urged the Transportation Authority to use this moment to insist on improved service, stating the current system could not rely on service that performed roughly 80% worse than car travel.

Member Margarita asked about current wait times for the 91L bus, recalling that she used to ride it frequently at night. She asked whether the wait was now around five minutes.

Mr. Cooper stated he did not know the answer offhand and asked if the question concerned the service headway.



Member Margarita then acknowledged it was 30 minutes.

Chair Siegal stated that overnight service was difficult to rely on and suggested that tracking data on it would be valuable.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked whether the program considered commuter buses and if they were considered rideshare. He wondered how the system tracked pass-through traffic and what was known about commuters' origins, destinations, and motivations. He questioned whether regional transit could better serve these travelers and whether current congestion levels would justify a congestion management fee, citing New York City's experience with reduced congestion. Mr. Mason also asked if traffic decreased on Spare the Air Days, noting from KCBS reporting that congestion appeared unchanged. He emphasized concern about commuter buses running below capacity, contributing to congestion, particularly on narrow neighborhood streets.

Griffin Lee highlighted that in 2023, only about 2.4% of trips to and from San Francisco involved bikes, despite ongoing safety improvement projects that included bike infrastructure. He distinguished between general safety improvements—such as crosswalk painting and pedestrian flash beacons—and bike infrastructure, noting that the majority of trips, roughly 50%, were made by driving. Mr. Lee cited the Baby Pathway Project, where District 10 had opposed adding bike infrastructure, while the SFMTA had sought to include it, and similarly referenced the Clarendon Quick-Build project, where bike infrastructure was approved. He suggested conducting studies to *estimate* potential cyclist usage before implementing new bike lanes.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Ford, Kim, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (8)

Absent: CAC Members Imaduddin and Levine (2)

12. District 4 Community Shuttle Study Update – INFORMATION

Jean Paul Velez, Principal Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Margarita stated that she remembered the former shuttle connecting Daly City BART to San Francisco State University, which had been discontinued along with the 26 Valencia. She described the difficulty students and families faced when traveling across the large campus in heavy rain while carrying backpacks, baby bags, and strollers. She said she generally supported shuttle services and believed the proposed shuttle should serve not only District 4 but the entire city.

Member Kim stated that he regarded the concept as promising, adding that if the pilot proved successful, staff should consider a routine but flexible service rather than a fixed route. He explained that District 1's multimodal study identified several "mini-districts," and he stated that District 4 similarly included areas such as Irving, Terra Bella, Judah, Stonestown, and San Francisco State University, which residents frequently traveled between. He added that connecting these mini-districts could address gaps in existing service. He conveyed excitement for District 4's progress but disappointment that District 1's study did not include a similar shuttle solution, and he hoped a successful pilot would



extend to District 1 and other districts. He emphasized that as the agency pursues next year's tax increase to support transit, it must demonstrate improvements rather than only addressing deficits, and he requested a more detailed plan early next year. He then asked whether the new service would require an additional fare or operate under existing Clipper and monthly pass pricing.

Mr. Velez replied that the standard practice had been to charge a local fare to keep the service equitable and accessible, which aligned with community recommendations. He added that during the second outreach round, some participants viewed the service as a premium option and, given funding challenges, indicated a willingness to pay slightly more. He continued that even doubling the fare would provide only a marginal contribution toward addressing the broader funding gap and said a deeper analysis would be required.

Member Kim recommended adding a small premium fee because the service was high-value and there was a need to support the transit budget. He said the service would likely be very popular, referencing proven success in Bayview, and he conveyed concern that offering it for free could lead to system misuse and ongoing repair costs. He urged consideration of ensuring the service's long-term financial sustainability.

Member Barz stated that she thought the proposal was a good idea and shared that she had positive experiences using shuttles in similar areas. Member Barz then raised two questions, asking what had been learned from the Bayview pilot or other pilots and how people would have made their trips if the shuttle had not been available.

Mr. Velez replied that, anecdotally, conversations with the SFMTA had suggested limited transit supply in the Bayview, which likely suppressed trips, and the service aimed to address that challenge. He stated that in District 4, while some trips were similarly constrained, many did not occur because residents, particularly elderly individuals, lacked car access and found transit uncompetitive. He added that another goal was to encourage mode shift, but assessing changes in mobility patterns would require a pilot to test the theory.

Member Barz asked if the hypotheses were that the proposed solution, already used elsewhere, would allow people who otherwise could not travel to take trips and that it would encourage a mode shift from single-occupancy vehicles to shuttles.

Mr. Velez stated that those were the goals.

Member Barz asked about the study's framework. She emphasized that the study was presented as an evaluation of whether a community shuttle would be beneficial and asked what it would have taken for the recommendation to focus on expanding transit rather than implementing a community shuttle, suggesting that the shuttle might not be the most appropriate solution.

Mr. Velez said the District 4 Mobility Study conducted some of the analysis and produced recommendations. He added that the ongoing West Side Network Study was also examining broader mobility questions. He suggested that the shuttle idea could be proposed and compared with other alternatives to improve mobility in the area through that process, and then folks would need to wait and see whether it became a priority or not.

Member Barz asked whether the item under discussion was a recommendation from the



District 4 Mobility Study and whether it elaborated on what that recommendation could entail, noting that evaluating alternative transit options, such as a new route or tunnel, would involve examining the west side network.

Mr. Velez confirmed that the study followed a recommendation from the District 4 Mobility Study to pilot and on-demand shuttle, and stated that he understood the West Side Network Study to be the best available vehicle at the time to assess the shuttle versus other alternatives.

Member Ford asked why the Bayview pilot ended and what challenges it faced, raising concerns about how the D4 shuttle would address similar issues. She highlighted issues with the study's design, noting it surveyed customer interest rather than actual usage, and asked how confidence in shuttle availability and the learning curve would be established, especially given wait times and return trips. She asked about the projected 300 passenger trips per week, whether riders could board the shuttle on an ad hoc basis, and how student use, such as Lowell High School students potentially requesting the shuttle for after-school trips, would be managed.

Mr. Velez stated that the Bayview Shuttle remained ongoing and had been successful, operating under a three-year grant with approximately 175 passengers per day. He explained that demand projections for District 4 were based on population density, land use context, and comparisons with similar implementations, emphasizing that these projections were hypotheses rather than exact figures. He clarified that riders would not get stranded at Stonestown if they requested service during operational hours, which ran until 10 p.m. on weekdays and 9 p.m. on weekends, with all service area origins and destinations accessible during those times. He added that the service had not yet set specific policies for student riders, including age limits, but peer studies indicated operators were capable of managing demand fluctuations.

Ms. Lombardo emphasized that the Bayview Shuttle continued operating and she indicated that long-term funding remained a significant challenge. She noted that Mr. Velez continued to gather related information and lessons learned from SFMTA. She highlighted that the Bayview shuttle had a competitive edge for certain grant sources for the pilot it served a disadvantaged community.

Chair Siegal stated that she believed the supplementary service was worthwhile and hoped it would continue serving Bayview. She asked how many trips a new route to Stonestown or more frequent service on the 18 line would generate and what the cost per passenger would be, emphasizing the high per person operating costs of the shuttle relative to fixed-route transit. She highlighted significant demand in the Sunset District for more frequent transit and urged investment in both existing and new options. She noted that combining several transit routes earlier this year, which previously operated on less than \$2.5 million annually and served 7,000 riders per day, had reduced ridership to 2,500 per day, underscoring the need to prioritize investments that deliver the most benefit per dollar. She opined that funding existed to support both types of improvements and expressed strong support for the study.

Member Margarita referred back to her earlier question regarding the west side shuttle. She highlighted that it had been eliminated due to lack of funding and asked whether there were plans to restore it.

Mr. Velez stated that he was not familiar with the service and would investigate it. He



referenced Member Kim and the Chair's comments, noting that transit operators nationwide had used similar services both to replace costly fixed routes and to build ridership before establishing fixed routes. He explained that while per-passenger costs might be higher, overall costs could be lower, making it a useful bridge solution. He added that the tool could be applied in various ways and highlighted opportunities for further assessment.

Ms. Lombardo said she believed the shuttle service referenced by Member Margarita had been run by SFSU, and Deputy Director for Planning, Rachel Hiatt confirmed that was the case.

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that since Supervisor Mar's recommendation, autonomous vehicle technology had rapidly evolved, with companies like Waymo, Zuke, Uber, and Lyft entering the market. He indicated that Waymo operates at a loss and suggested the Transportation Authority could implement a system using such companies which would bear part of the cost. He noted that technology adoption is inevitable, other regions are piloting similar initiatives, and autonomous vehicles would remain. He recommended leveraging the technology to the Transportation Authority's advantage, including subsidizing services at a lower rate than the current \$30 per trip, while ensuring companies share part of the financial responsibility.

Griffin Lee stated that while the shuttle idea sounded appealing in theory, the reality of an average \$25-\$30 per ride—compared to approximately \$4.85 per Muni passenger—made it cost-prohibitive. He added that he agreed with others on the committee that further investigation was needed to assess long-term feasibility and funding sources, emphasizing that he would not support using revenue and spoke on behalf of ConnectedSF members who shared this concern. He noted that Chair Siegal had suggested exploring alternatives, such as running another Muni route for the \$2.5 million, potentially providing more reliable and consistent service. He concluded that the high average cost per ride raised significant concerns for himself and thousands of ConnectedSF members, and that the long-term feasibility should be carefully evaluated before pursuing a study.

Other Items

13. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

Member Barz requested an update on the Transportation Authority's congestion pricing study in San Francisco and asked if it could be revisited.

Ms. Lombardo replied that the study remained on pause, so any update would serve mainly as a refresher on prior work.

Member Barz stated that a refresher would be helpful. She also asked staff to bring back the Eco-friendly Deliveries Study discussed last month as an informational item.

Chair Siegal seconded the request for a congestion pricing study refresher.

There was no public comment.

14. Public Comment

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated that he had wanted to address the unfortunate incidents at the Transportation Authority board meeting involving an abusive



public commenter. He stated that, moving forward, he was concerned about whether exceptions would continue to allow remote public comment for individuals with senior or mobility challenges, emphasizing that it would be unfortunate if he were no longer able to address the Board of Supervisors on regional matters such as the Downtown Extension and he requested that the supervisors consider this in their resolution.

Mike Swire commended the City of San Francisco for prioritizing public transit and street safety over auto traffic and praised the Transportation Authority's stance against widening highways into the city. He urged the board to consider that neighboring San Mateo County had been planning to widen Highway 101, which would increase daily car traffic into San Francisco, reduce Caltrain and BART ridership, worsen congestion and traffic violence, further strain transit finances, and elevate air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. Mr. Swire emphasized that these impacts would disproportionately affect lower-income neighborhoods such as the Mission, Portola, Bernal Heights, Bayview, Candlestick, and Visitation Valley. He encouraged the Transportation Authority to provide input on the proposed widening and inform the public of its potential health and safety consequences. He also requested that public comment be moved earlier on the agenda in future meetings.

Griffin Lee stated that, as part of the Inner Sunset Transportation Study, community groups including ConnectedSF, Sensible D7, SON-SF, and Sunset United Neighbors urged the project team to relocate the protected bike lane from 7th Avenue to 5th Avenue. He explained that Lincoln Way was a major thoroughfare, and westbound travelers typically used 7th Avenue to access Laguna Honda, Forest Hill, or West Portal, while 5th Avenue was less car-centric and still connected to Golden Gate Park, making it more suitable for a bike lane. He also emphasized that keeping the bike lane on 7th Avenue would remove the southbound center turn lane, preventing left turns onto Irving and exacerbating existing restrictions onto Judah, creating a significant traffic bottleneck. He urged the committee to consider these factors in updating the bike infrastructure as part of the study.

15. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:33 p.m.