



# DRAFT MINUTES

## **Community Advisory Committee**

Wednesday, January 28, 2026

### **1. Committee Meeting Call to Order**

Chair Siegal called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

CAC members present at Roll: Najuwanda Daniels, Zameel Imaduddin, Sean Kim, Jerry Levine, Venecia Margarita, Austin Milford-Rosales, Rachael Ortega, and Kat Siegal (10)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Sara Barz (entered during Item 9) and Phoebe Ford (entered during Item 8) (2)

### **2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION**

Chair Siegal reported that the Transportation Authority Board held its first 2026 meeting on January 27, conducted elections, and re-elected Chair Melgar and Vice Chair Sauter. She noted that the Annual Report, presented at that meeting, reflected an ambitious Transportation Authority work program that the CAC had provided input on, and that the full CAC agenda reflected this. Chair Siegal also thanked SFMTA staff for attending to present on the local revenue measure intended to complement a potential 2026 regional transit measure and support the stabilization and improvement of core transit systems as they shifted to a post-pandemic financial model.

There was no public comment.

### **3. Election of Chair and Vice Chair for 2026 - ACTION**

Chair Siegal reported that at the November 2025 CAC meeting, she was nominated for 2026 Chair and Vice Chair Daniels for 2026 Vice Chair.

Member Imaduddin moved to approve the nomination of Kat Siegal for Chair.

There was no public comment.

The nomination was approved by the following vote:

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

Nays: CAC Member(s) (0)

Absent: CAC Members Barz and Ford (2)

Member Margarita moved to approve the nomination of Najuwanda Daniels for Vice Chair.

There was no public comment.

The nomination was approved by the following vote:



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

Nays: CAC Member(s) (0)

Absent: CAC Members Barz and Ford (2)

## **Consent Agenda**

- 4. Approve the Minutes of the November 19, 2025 Meeting - ACTION**
- 5. Adopt a Motion of Support to Accept the Audit Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2025 – ACTION**
- 6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt Fiscal Year 2026/27 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Local Expenditure Criteria – ACTION**
- 7. Internal Accounting Report, Investment Report, and Debt Expenditure Report for the Six Months Ending December 31, 2025 - INFORMATION**

Member Kim asked, regarding item 6, why staff were not recommending prioritization by project type as part of the Fiscal Year 2026/27 Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Local Expenditure Criteria.

Mike Pickford, Principal Transportation Planner, replied that this item served as an opportunity to remind the CAC about the TFCA funding opportunity and that, while the Air District sets project eligibility, it requires that the Transportation Authority Board annually adopting criteria to guide staff in prioritizing applications. He explained that in prior years, the criteria ranked eligible project types—placing zero-emission non-vehicle projects first, followed by shuttle and other projects—while also aiming to encourage program diversity (including innovate project types), which created competing objectives.

Member Kim asked whether the recommended criteria would exclude funding for certain project types that were previously eligible.

Mr. Pickford clarified that the recommended criteria would not alter the types of projects the Transportation Authority was able to fund.

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

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

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

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

Nays: CAC Member(s) (0)

Absent: CAC Members Barz and Ford (2)

## **End of Consent Agenda**

- 8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$21,217,500 and Appropriate \$200,000 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions, for Ten Requests – ACTION**

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, presented the item per the



staff memorandum.

Member Milford-Rosales expressed his support for the Muni Forward Five-Minute Network Corridor work. He asked if there would be coordination of T-Third service south of the Islais Creek Bridge, considering upcoming plans to replace the bridge.

Michael Rhodes, Transportation Priority Manager at SFMTA, responded that the improvements on the T-Third that were anticipated as part of the Muni Forward work were largely signal timing and optimization of transit signal priority. He continued that the signal work was expected to be implemented quickly with minimal construction disruption and would be finished well in advance of the upcoming bridge closure.

Member Milford-Rosales noted that the bridge closure may disrupt T-Third service for a year or more and asked if the improvements discussed could still be leveraged for bus routes while the bridge was under construction.

Mr. Rhodes said that the improvements were rail-focused and used different equipment than bus transit signal priority. He said SFMTA could explore ways to optimize signal timing for buses while the bridge was under construction but that those would be separate. He stated that SFMTA expected the rail transit signal priority to provide benefits for thirty years.

Member Kim noted that Muni buses facilitate travel for people who use wheelchairs and asked if there were restrictions on where Paratransit riders could travel with respect to Muni routes.

Jonathan Cheng, Paratransit Manager at SFMTA, said there were no destination restrictions for Paratransit services as long as destinations were within the SFMTA service area.

Member Kim asked if SFMTA was able to guide users toward Muni or Paratransit to maximize cost-effectiveness.

Mr. Cheng responded that to qualify for Paratransit service, users must have a disability that prevents them from using Muni some or all the time. He said that, based on a recent survey, one-third of Paratransit riders had used Muni in the last month. He said that SFMTA had a Mobility Management team to help identify which services best met the needs of individuals and educate riders on using accessible bus features to help seniors and people with disabilities better utilize the transportation network.

Member Ford asked about the Transportation Authority's obligation to help fund the cost overruns, whether freight railroads were partnering to also help fund the cost overruns, and whether they were partnering on things like level boarding at Caltrain stations. She asked if SFCTA was funding a higher proportion of the cost overruns.

Angie Myrechuck, Project Manager at Caltrain, stated that freight carriers were funding a portion of the project.

Michelle Stewart, Director of Grants and Fund Management at Caltrain, remarked that with a project of this scale, there were many funding sources. She stated that Caltrain had approached all three member counties to fill the funding gap and that VTA and SMCTA had sought approval for their contributions from their respective Boards already.

Ms. LaForte directed members to the funding plan included in the enclosure. She noted that the other member counties were providing their contributions up front, while the



Transportation Authority was providing its contribution over time to continue to fund other systemwide state of good repair projects on an annual basis.

Member Ortega asked for confirmation that the budget for the Guadalupe River Bridge Replacement had increased from \$65 million to \$170 million. She asked what reallocation of Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) bond funds, referenced in the enclosed funding plan, meant. She echoed Member Ford's comments that freight contributions seemed low and remarked that if freight was contributing just 4% to the project, perhaps Caltrain should have track priority and/or ownership.

Ms. Myrechuck confirmed that the project had faced significant cost overruns, primarily related to increased requirements associated with environmental permitting that were not originally anticipated. She explained that Caltrain began construction in 2023 and was forced to pause and redo the environmental permitting process, which resulted in delays that also contributed to the cost increases.

Ms. Stewart explained that the reallocation of TIRCP bond funds referred to bond funds to which Caltrain had access to that were used to support other projects. With the significant funding gap for the Guadalupe River Bridge Replacement project, she continued, Caltrain revisited the list of other projects being funded with the TIRCP bond and diverted funds from other projects to this critical effort. This was done in an effort to limit the amount of additional funding Caltrain had to seek from the member counties and reflected what Caltrain could do to shoulder the cost increase itself. She noted that there were nuances regarding ownership of the bridge and said Caltrain could follow up with clarification.

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Nays: CAC Member(s) (0)

Absent: CAC Member Barz (1)

**9. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$12,500,000 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions, to the Transbay Joint Powers Authority for The Portal Project Engineering Phase Activities for Fiscal Year 2025/26 and Amend the Prop L Standard Grant Agreement for The Portal Project Engineering Phase Activities for Fiscal Year 2024/25 to Allow Retroactive Expenditures of up to \$267,209 Starting July 1, 2024 – ACTION**

Jesse Koehler, Rail Program Manager, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Ford asked whether she had correctly understood that the expected cost of The Portal had recently decreased and sought clarification on how that reduction had occurred, adding that such a change was uncommon. She also raised concerns about the magnitude of consultant costs and asked whether staff had evaluated the option of using in-house staffing rather than consultants.

Mr. Koehler responded that the reduced capital cost estimate reflected extensive interagency collaboration to refine the project scope allowed the Transbay Joint Powers



Authority (TJPA) and its partners to recommend scope changes that lowered costs, including reducing the size of the project's new underground Fourth and Townsend station reducing the length of the tunnel stub to connect to the future Pennsylvania Avenue Extension project, and other modifications. He added that savings also resulted from updated escalation assumptions as compared to the original cost estimate, explaining that when the estimate was originally submitted to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in 2023, conservative inflation assumptions were required, and that by updating those assumptions with actual, lower escalation resulted in a meaningful reduction. Mr. Koehler stated that despite these reductions, upward cost pressures could be expected to continue, but he emphasized that the project has carried a substantial contingency at this stage and that ongoing risk management, right-of-way acquisition, and early enabling work such as utility relocation were intended to help reduce risk as the project advances.

Alfonso Rodriguez, Project Director at TJPA, stated added that scope elements were refined in coordination with agency partners, including through value engineering, and that the project team was able to appropriately adjust project scope, cost estimates, and escalation assumptions. He explained that earlier escalation had been overstated due to a heated market at the time estimates were originally prepared, and he added that updating these assumptions resulted in an overall cost reduction of approximately \$680 million. Mr. Rodriguez then addressed the second question and clarified that the professional services category reflected non-construction, activities undertaken by consultants.

Mr. Koehler said that he understood Member Ford's question to be related to the specific work supported by Prop L funds during that year, explaining that the funding was largely directed to TJPA costs for program management and general engineering services.

Mr. Koehler added that \$3.1 million of the recommended amount would cover consultants conducting design work, with the remainder for program management for the project. He added that for a program of this scale and, an agency the size of TJPA, a substantial level of consultant support was necessary both to produce the designs and to manage the project.

Mr. Rodriguez explained that TJPA had a small internal staff and relied heavily on consultants to supplement agency staff resourcing. He noted that this support goes beyond cost and schedule management, providing personnel who help advance the program, and he added that a majority of the project team members come from this contract.

Member Levine noted that The Portal project would extend to the transit center with provisions for future high-speed rail, and he asked about the funding contribution that high-speed rail was making to the project.

Mr. Rodriguez reported that the California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) was currently carrying an estimated \$550 million contribution to the project in its business plan.

Mr. Koehler stated that the project's top priority was finalizing the funding plan and securing the non-federal money required for the FTA to commit its \$3.4 billion, emphasizing that the FTA would not act until all other contributions were in place. He highlighted that, although there was a long-standing pledge of \$550 million from the



CHSRA, the commitment needed to be realized, and he indicated that advocacy on this, along with other state priorities, would be critical.

Mr. Levine indicated that his questions concerned the current uncertainty of the funds, to support the CHSRA contribution.

Mr. Koehler said the funds were expected to be from state sources, highlighting a major milestone this year with the reauthorization of Cap and Trade, now called Cap and Invest, which supports both the CHSRA and the TIRCP. He added that there was a growing effort to coordinate with local partners, including the Transportation Authority, TJPA, and MTC, to engage in advocacy with the state delegation and staff to secure TIRCP funds and a high-speed rail commitment. He emphasized that while funding was not guaranteed, the strategy incorporated both these components of state funding.

Member Ortega asked about right-of-way and requested a very high-level explanation.

Mr. Koehler explained that the right-of-way program referred to property or property rights that were necessary for a project, such as acquiring land for a vent structure to ventilate the tunnel at the surface. He described how the program also involved formalizing the city's grant of a right for the tunnel to occupy land beneath public streets, like 2nd and Townsend streets, allowing TJPA to use the spatial volume under the right-of-way. He stated that the program was critical for preparing for construction and added that TJPA was advancing the first phase of the program this year.

Chair Siegal asked whether any right-of-way acquisitions might fail to occur or were essentially guaranteed, and she asked about the scope of acquisitions that could cause displacements or require complex relocations.

Mr. Koehler explained that right-of-way was critical for a program like this and that the lead agency must start early because the process takes time, was highly structured, and was subject to regulatory requirements, including provisions to address potential displacements. He emphasized that the lead agency initially seeks mutual agreements with property owners, but that eminent domain may be used as a last resort if negotiations fail, and the schedule allowed for that possibility.

Chair Siegal asked whether the right-of-way locations had already been identified.

Mr. Rodriguez reported that the program would progress this year in five tranches. He said the first tranche, including full-take parcels for off-site ventilation shafts, was underway. He explained that the first tranche would also allow for future construction of a wide, shallow tunnel to accommodate tracks approaching the Salesforce Transit Center. He indicated that property owners were aware, and the project's real estate manager was coordinating with them. Mr. Rodriguez added that tranches 2 through 5 primarily involved subterranean easements, which required appraisals and engagement with owners. He emphasized that the tranches were being scheduled according to when the property was needed and confirmed that the process for Tranche 1 had begun.

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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



Nays: CAC Member(s) (0)

Absent: CAC Member(s) (0)

**10. Adopt a Motion of Support to Amend the Octavia Improvements Study Recommendations to Add the Hayes Valley Public Life Study as an Eligible Use of Revenues from the Market and Octavia Special Revenue Fund, in the Amount of \$410,000, with Conditions – ACTION**

Rachel Hiatt, Deputy Director for Planning, and District 5 Legislative Aide, Raynell Cooper, introduced the item and SF Planning's Jeremy Shaw, Principal Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Barz stated she was very interested in the study. She added that she looked forward to seeing the concepts that would emerge and asked whether the analysis of public life was aimed at understanding the economic impact of the space on nearby businesses.

Mr. Shaw stated that the public life study used a methodology to track how people use public spaces, including pedestrian and cyclist movements and interactions with automobiles. He added that the study would provide a snapshot of activity rather than business-specific data. He noted that, depending on the scope, qualitative input from nearby businesses would likely be included to ensure that impacts on them were considered, even though gathering business data at this scale was challenging.

Member Barz stated that she was highly attentive to the needs of the small business community, emphasizing that small businesses were central to what made San Francisco special and that many businesses supported the space and the current weekend closure. She added that the primary focus should be less about concern over support and more about building trust and rapport with businesses and showing how street changes could ease their operations, which she said should remain a key consideration throughout the study.

Chair Siegal stated she supported the study and sought clarification from SFMTA regarding the remaining recommendations from the 2023 study. Chair Siegal noted that the Transportation Authority memo included a table listing all projects, the added study, and cost breakdowns, but observed that an attachment indicated bulb-outs had been deprioritized in favor of another project and asked if the recommendations had changed or might change further, noting some confusion about the current status.

SFMTA's Casey Hildreth, Project Manager, explained that after the 2023 study was completed, additional site analysis and engineering were conducted, particularly for the conceptually proposed bulb-outs at intersections uphill at Webster and Buchanan. He said the analysis showed that constructing even one bulb-out would effectively require rebuilding the entire intersection, including signals, which introduced significantly more risk and cost than anticipated during the study. Mr. Hildreth added that while the SFMTA could revisit those intersections in the future, the approach was no longer feasible as originally envisioned, and therefore those improvements were not recommended as a top priority compared with clearer priorities identified in the 2023 study. He also noted that since the study's completion, a paving project on Oak Street was moving forward that would add curb ramps, though not bulb-outs, resulting in unanticipated investment at several corners.



Chair Siegal asked whether the use of the funds remained a potential future application but was not an immediate priority.

Mr. Hildreth stated that the SFMTA aimed to monitor how the proposed public life study developed while advancing other priorities. He said the recommendations did not use all available funding, leaving some resources for emerging priorities in the coming years.

Chair Siegal appreciated the update and said it made sense. She shared that she was particularly enthusiastic about traffic calming on Octavia Street and asked whether any of the remaining recommendations had a timeline for implementation, noting that none appeared to be in progress.

Mr. Hildreth confirmed they had been awaiting the special funds before proceeding with other efforts. He explained that, separate from the public life study, the SFMTA now sought funding to advance traffic calming and ADA improvements along the Octavia Boulevard corridor. He stated the plans built on planning from about a decade ago, starting with basic streetscape upgrades, including ADA enhancements and traffic calming measures, as a first phase toward a larger vision. He added that these improvements would lay the groundwork for additional traffic calming actions informed by future studies and outreach led by the SFMTA.

Member Milford-Rosales asked whether the public study would examine potential infrastructure changes to support the street closure. He acknowledged that the effort had relied heavily on volunteers for some time, with limited capacity to continue, but highlighted strong community support and interest. He suggested exploring opportunities to develop proposals that could be submitted to SFMTA to support the closure.

Mr. Shaw sought clarification on what Member Milford-Rosales meant by infrastructure. Member Milford-Rosales suggested retractable bollards to maintaining a rotating list of neighbors responsible for moving cones, noting that they could face legal liability if they did not move them on time.

Mr. Cooper explained that the management of the space currently fell under the Shared Spaces program, which did not include funding or substantial support. He said that implementing additional staffing would require creating a new program and allocating funding, likely through SFMTA, which would be discussed later. He added that the public life study aimed to gather facts to inform decisions by the Board, other departments, and the neighborhood, but he indicated it would not directly result in the type of program described.

Member Milford-Rosales asked whether the study would make recommendations or whether it would not provide any guidance on the street closure or propose any infrastructure changes that would require staffing to implement.

Mr. Shaw stated that the study's scope was to first understand the impacts. He added that if optional Task 6 were exercised, it could explore potential (transportation) capital improvements.

Member Ortega raised concerns about traffic near the 101 exit, noting that conditions from 2023 to the present likely differed from the study's assumptions. She requested that the traffic analysis distinguish between peak commuter and non-commuter hours and clearly highlight both. She also asked whether design requirements, such as two right-turn



lanes for highway capacity discussed in previous meetings with agencies like Caltrans, might affect the results and suggested that any potential highway capacity issues at the 101 exit be included in the study.

Mr. Hildreth asked whether Member Ortega was referring to the Central Freeway off-ramp at Market Street.

Member Ortega stated that was correct and said she was concerned about potential conflicts or pushback related to the project. She emphasized the importance of ensuring the community received a neighborhood they value. She highlighted that discussions at prior meetings on other studies sometimes revealed infrastructure constraints, such as the highway, sometimes limit the feasibility of recommended street adjustments. She suggested the Transportation Authority proactively address these challenges in the study to avoid surprises and ensure ideas align with existing conditions.

Mr. Hildreth stated that the SFMTA had assessed transportation and traffic impacts in the first phase of the study. He indicated that, due to previous SFMTA work and current demand patterns, there was minimal interaction with Central Freeway traffic, as much of it was directed toward Oak and Fell streets, and vehicular connections to Hayes Street had been reduced. He explained that traffic from downtown via Hayes Street might present more noticeable impacts. He added that no unforeseen obstacles were expected and emphasized that effective policy, design, and community engagement should prevent significant issues, and he would be surprised if any occurred.

Member Imaduddin asked for clarification about the optional scope Task 6.

Mr. Shaw clarified that Task 6 was entirely optional and focused on developing concepts or alternatives to address recommendations from Task 5. He explained that the first five tasks involved analysis, while Task 6 would consider different alternatives or potential design refinements for projects already in the Market Octavia Fund, emphasizing the forward-looking aspects.

There was no public comment.

Member Imaduddin 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, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (9)

Nays: CAC Member(s) (0)

Absent: CAC Member(s) (0)

Abstention: CAC Member Kim (1)

**11. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve the 2026 State and Federal Advocacy Program – ACTION**

Amber Crabbe, Senior Public Policy Manager, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Levine said he was pleased to see autonomous vehicles prioritized at both the federal and state levels. He added that he was particularly interested in seeing a more explicit statement supporting local enforcement and control over these vehicles,



emphasizing the ability for local officers to issue citations.

Ms. Crabbe acknowledged the point and highlighted that the agency had worked closely with then-Assemblymember Ting on Assembly Bill 1777 two years ago, which had initially included the ability to issue citations. She noted that under current law, citations cannot be issued without a human driver to sign the citation. She added that the legislation had attempted to address this but ultimately did not, and the California Department of Motor Vehicles had not yet identified a solution. She emphasized that this issue remained a priority and would continue to be considered in the Transportation Authority's policy framework.

During public comment, Edward Mason raised concerns about the rapid growth of micromobility and its safety impacts. He described nearly being struck by a large electric bicycle on the sidewalk and highlighted frequent encounters with scooters and oversized bicycles riding where pedestrians were expected. He emphasized the lack of regulation and enforcement, expressing frustration over reckless behavior, including people performing wheelies on electric bicycles. He pointed to widespread violations along Market Street and at the Ferry Plaza as examples of the ongoing safety risks to the public.

Chair Siegal asked Ms. Crabbe whether she was tracking any policy related to e-bike safety.

Ms. Crabbe responded that many communities were grappling with the rapid emergence of new transportation options and noted that there are numerous bills aiming to clarify definitions to distinguish between different types of e-bikes and scooters, and considering ways to regulate them.

Member Levine 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)

Nays: CAC Member(s) (0)

Absent: CAC Member(s) (0)

**12. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the District 4 Community Shuttle Study Final Report – ACTION**

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

Member Ortega asked what the CAC was voting on, specifically whether the action was limited to accepting the study as completed or whether it required approval of additional actions.

Mr. Velez stated that the project was tasked with developing a design for a microtransit service in District 4, including the technical and operating parameters, a budget, and an implementation strategy. He explained that the report recommended moving forward with pursuing funding for a pilot to assess its impacts and the longer-term viability of the service. Funding would likely come from a combination of grants or earmarks, corporate sponsorships, as well as local funding.

Member Kim asked whether the service area and hours of operation would mirror the



outlined schedule of weekdays from 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. and weekends from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m., and whether the pilot would follow the same schedule. He then asked how many vehicles would operate during the pilot, whether there was a defined vehicle count, and whether there was a planned timeline or schedule for expanding service and transitioning into regular operations.

Mr. Velez explained that the proposed service area and service hours outlined were for the pilot. He also stated that the vehicle supply would fluctuate with demand, at full capacity during peak periods the operational design proposed five vehicles, but that number would be reduced when demand was lower. He said that a similar operating model with demand-based vehicle adjustments would likely continue, as this was a key advantage of the operational design.

Member Kim asked for clarification on how users in the study were defined, specifically whether they included individuals with an address in District 4.

Mr. Velez clarified that the definition covered not only residents but anyone within District 4 and the Stonestown Galleria Mall area. He explained that the service, as envisioned could be requested either through a smartphone app or by calling, but the trip must start and end within the proposed service area.

Member Ford stated she reviewed the packet and indicated that the study lacked an analysis of a best alternative that uses Muni. She highlighted that investing one million dollars in north-south Muni service in District 4 would provide about 62 additional buses, significantly increasing service to Stonestown. She asked why this scenario was not included, whether the calculations are correct, and why it would be a priority if Muni did not currently prioritize funding north-south buses in District 4 under its budget.

Mr. Velez explained that the report did not consider alternatives because the scope of the project was the design and implementation strategy for an on-demand shuttle. He continued to explain that the main need addressed by the study was to improve local mobility within District 4, particularly along commercial corridors and other areas of interest. He indicated that the inclusion of Stonestown and the Galleria Mall, which is located in District 7, followed best practices to connect adjacent hubs that attract additional trips, so additional markets would be served without compromising the core goal.

Member Ford asked if, in Mr. Velez's professional opinion, this represented the most important use of staff and Transportation Authority funds in 2026, noting that the \$25 per trip cost would exceed paratransit expenses. She explained that her high-resource, dense, grid-patterned neighborhood was well-suited for fixed-route service and that the absence of buses was due to funding priorities, not operational knowledge. She emphasized that incremental grant funding over many years would not meaningfully improve transportation in District 4 and concluded that pursuing the study would be a poor use of staff and CAC time.

Mr. Velez stated that he could not advise whether to prioritize this service over other alternatives because that was not studied. He offered context regarding the \$25 per trip cost. He highlighted that fare could exceed a local Uber fare, but Uber did not provide equitable service to wheelchair users or pay living wages and benefits to their drivers. He explained that it was also not adequate to compare that figure to those of fixed route transit or paratransit, the former being much lower and the latter being much higher. He



emphasized that this service was a niche solution addressing specific coverage needs and that the costs they estimated were aligned with what they saw from similar services across the country.

Member Kim expressed strong support for the project and emphasized his interest in seeing the outcome, noting that post-pandemic shifts in demand had not yet been fully analyzed by SFMTA. He highlighted that District 4 lacked sufficient transit service and suggested that a successful pilot could justify adjusting routes in the district. He described personal challenges traveling from Stonestown to SFO to pick up his college-aged child, stressing the need for better connections from Stonestown to BART. He indicated that the project could offer practical benefits, provide a cost-effective solution, and serve as a valuable basis for future analysis.

Chair Siegal stated she was concerned about recommending a pilot without identified funding for ongoing operations, noting that while the Bayview Shuttle had been popular, it continued to struggle to secure sustained funding. She referenced the Transportation Authority memo explaining that the project would be less competitive for grants and would rely on other local funding sources, which reinforced her concern. She suggested that, even if it fell outside the initial study scope, staff should consider recommending enhanced Muni service, such as increasing frequency on the 18 line, extending it to Daly City BART, or testing a new north-south route connecting areas like 19th Avenue, Sunset Boulevard, Stonestown, and the airport. She indicated she did not have questions and supported directing local funding toward a pilot for additional Muni service.

Member Barz aligned with concerns raised by another member and explained that, while District 7 could benefit from trips originating in other districts, research suggested micromobility shuttles tended to have limited usefulness and were often adopted by very specific communities rather than integrated into the main transit network, which she indicated would be more beneficial overall. She shared that the concept of a shuttle had circulated for many years. She conveyed skepticism about the long-term sustainability of funding for microtransit, supported moving forward with a pilot in response to demand, and emphasized that the most valuable outcome would be data-driven recommendations for new or modified Muni routes based on where riders actually requested trips. She added that she wanted to see those recommendations included in the study results and indicated interest in revisiting them through a midterm report, asking whether that level of follow-up would be feasible.

Mr. Velez stated that the report drew on the Transportation Authority's review of comparable services nationwide to identify best practices and key lessons, highlighting that these services primarily function as coverage solutions when fixed-route transit fails to meet mobility needs in specific areas. He explained that such services could precede fixed-route transit by building ridership and preventing car ownership for single trips that often lead to long-term auto dependence. In District 4, he said that the shuttle would address the need for more competitive transit services for those that do not use a car, but it could also gradually encourage mode shift and reduced car reliance.

To Member Barz's question, Ms. Lombardo stated that if there were a pilot, the data could be used in any number of ways (e.g. to inform refinements to the community shuttle, to Muni service, or lead to a decision to stop the pilot and take no further action).

Vice Chair Daniels asked what would happen to the item if it were not approved that evening.



Ms. Lombardo said the options included consulting with the district supervisor and then holding the item and returning it to the CAC, or taking it directly to the Board, where Chair Siegel would provide her monthly report on the CAC's discussion.

During public comment, Edward Mason shared his thoughts on the cost difference between transit and autonomous vehicle options, noting that for 100,000 riders, the expense would be \$31 per trip versus \$19 for Waymo. He highlighted that while people might resist autonomous vehicles, convenience drives cultural expectations, making it challenging to shift riders from personal autos. He observed that transit was moving toward automation. He referenced the Bayview shuttle pilot, which logged 55,000 trips in a year, and questioned the program's cost-effectiveness due to a lack of available data. He concluded by suggesting the funds might be better allocated elsewhere and wished the program success with the decision-making process.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Imaduddin, Kim, and Margarita (4)

Nays: CAC Members Ford and Levine (2)

Absent: CAC Member(s) (0)

Abstention: CAC Members Daniels, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (4)

### **13. SFMTA Local Revenue Measure Update – INFORMATION**

SFMTA's Katie Angotti from the Office of the Chief of Staff and External Affairs, and SFMTA's Anthony Burton, Revenue Strategy Manager of the Finance Division, presented the item.

Member Ortega noted concerns about the complexity of the parcel tax framework and how it might impact voter support. She also asked for clarification about how much the parcel tax would generate for SFMTA.

Ms. Angotti responded that the parcel tax would generate about \$150 million annually to help address anticipated funding shortfalls.

Member Barz asked how SFMTA would ensure that parcel tax revenues were spent responsibly and how the agency planned to increase revenues associated with efficiencies over time.

Ms. Angotti noted that oversight and accountability provisions were still being developed and acknowledged that SFMTA would need to identify cost reductions and efficiency measures that would grow over time. Mr. Burton added that Senate Bill 63 (Wiener, Arreguín) required the preparation of a study for SFMTA that would help identify potential efficiency strategies.

Member Ford asked whether a voter-led ballot initiative would be pursued for the parcel tax and whether fare changes were being considered.

Ms. Angotti noted that she was there only to discuss the structure of the proposed parcel tax and that SFMTA was exploring all revenue options to address the agency's funding shortfalls.

Vice Chair Daniels encouraged SFMTA to engage with labor representatives.



Ms. Angotti noted that SFMTA had engaged with SEIU, TWU and the San Francisco Labor Council on the parcel tax framework as part of two roundtable meetings.

Chair Siegel noted that a recent article she had seen suggested parcel tax revenue projections of \$183 million annually and asked whether the projections had changed recently.

Ms. Angotti clarified that projections had not changed and the parcel tax would potentially generate \$183 million. She explained that only \$150 million would be available to address the agency's anticipated funding shortfalls after considering costs related to exemptions, administration and service increase.

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that he had observed a potential process improvement within Muni involving employee shuttle buses that routinely operated empty, particularly at the 24th Street Mission BART station and the 22nd Street Caltrain station, and he estimated the cost to operate each bus at roughly \$350 per hour. He explained that although he had occasionally seen a single rider at different times of day, including late at night, he had otherwise consistently observed the shuttles running without passengers. He added that given reliance on sales and parcel taxes, broader fiscal constraints, and what he described as national economic decline, he believed reductions in service should be anticipated moving forward.

## **Other Items**

### **Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION**

There were no new items introduced.

There was no public comment.

#### **14. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

#### **15. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:58 p.m.