



DRAFT MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, February 25, 2026

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Siegal called the meeting to order at 6:12 p.m.

CAC members present at Roll: Sara Barz, Zameel Imaduddin, Jerry Levine, Austin Milford-Rosales, and Kat Siegal (5)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Najuwanda Daniels (entered during Item 7), Phoebe Ford, Sean Kim, Rachael Ortega, and Venecia Margarita (5)

There was no quorum at 6:12 p.m. Staff clarified that no actions could be taken and no minutes would be recorded until quorum was obtained.

Chair Siegal called Item 2 and Item 7; quorum was obtained at 6:40 p.m. during item 7.

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

[no quorum]

3. Approve the Minutes of the January 28, 2026 Meeting - ACTION

Item 7 was presented before Item 3.

There was no public comment.

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

The Minutes were approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Imaduddin, Levine, Milford-Rosales, and Siegal (6)

Absent: CAC Members Ford, Kim, Margarita, and Ortega (4)

4. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the District 2 Safety Study Final Report – ACTION

Alex Pan, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Levine thank staff for briefing him on the study, noted that the study was initiated by former Commissioner Stefani and asked whether Commissioner Sherrill had provided any input, acknowledging that District 2 staff had carried over.

Ms. Pan confirmed that her team collaborated with the same staff member from former Commissioner Stefani's office, ensuring continuity in the work.

Member Levine raised concerns about the Balboa High School area, noting feedback regarding congestion and safety challenges near the school. He asked if it would be possible to incorporate this area into the study at a future point, acknowledging that it was not included in the current scope.



Ms. Pan acknowledged that the topic had been raised in a previous community meeting and indicated that the area could be referenced as a potential future study location in the final report. She highlighted that Balboa High School might be able to look into SFMTA's school walk audit program to address transportation challenges.

Member Barz asked why neighborhood transportation studies were limited to quick-build projects.

Ms. Pan explained that the neighborhood transportation studies were not restricted to quick-build projects. She explained that in this instance, former Commissioner Stefani prioritized using the funds for initiatives that could be implemented rapidly and requested that most funds be directed toward implementation.

Member Barz commented that the report and methodology made sense and asked whether there were study areas that had been considered but not included.

Ms. Pan stated that the report included a list of locations considered but not included. She added that these were specific sites within each study area and that earlier iterations had encompassed larger areas, which were later reduced following field observations.

Member Barz asked why the study areas were reduced, questioning whether the change was driven by on-the-ground conditions or other factors.

Ms. Pan explained that the final report would include a technical appendix detailing the methodology and data used to create the study area maps. She stated that the original study areas were large, but observations had identified specific zones with the greatest challenges, leading to the exclusion of less relevant streets, such as some residential areas, from the final study.

Chair Siegal recalled a smaller quick-build project and asked whether a more comprehensive Franklin Street road diet, which reduced three lanes to two, had been paused or discontinued. She requested confirmation of its status and whether it had been considered in the current study.

Jennifer Molina, Senior Transportation Planner at SFMTA, stated that the Franklin Street project had been completed in 2022, followed by an evaluation and some signal retiming, and added that SFMTA could facilitate connecting with the Project Manager for any additional details, including information on the road diet. Chair Siegal indicated she would be interested in following up.

There was no public comment.

Member Barz acknowledged and appreciated Ms. Pan's acknowledgement at the beginning of the presentation to bring studies to the CAC before the final report. She stated that Ms. Pan's engagement with Member Levine before the meeting and Ms. Pan's thorough responses had influenced her decision to support the item.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Imaduddin, Levine, Milford-Rosales, and Siegal (6)

Absent: CAC Members Ford, Kim, Margarita, and Ortega (4)



5. Adopt a Motion of Support to Appropriate \$75,000 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions, for Federal Autonomous Vehicle Policy Development – ACTION

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

Member Levine asked whether staff were pursuing ways to preempt federal oversight of state and local governments.

Mr. Velez clarified that the bill introduced in Congress would preempt state authority.

Member Levine asked whether the Transportation Authority would oppose it.

Mr. Velez confirmed that while there was no official position on the bill, the recommended position by staff at present would be to oppose.

Member Levine emphasized that state control over California municipalities was already concerning, and he warned that federal oversight of both state and local governments would create a disastrous situation.

Member Imaduddin requested clarification on Task 3, related to the peer exchange.

Mr. Velez explained that the peer exchange was still in the planning stages, focusing initially on identifying a group of cities with extensive Autonomous Vehicle (AV) testing and deployment, including San Francisco, Phoenix, and Austin. He stated that the exchange was aimed both at informing federal AV policy and at providing guidance to emerging cities anticipating AV expansion, sharing expertise and best practices from the experiences of established adopters.

Member Milford-Rosales thanked staff for initiating the effort and commented that he found the House bill highly concerning. He emphasized that San Francisco's experience could provide valuable insight to help influence federal legislation relative to other parts of the country.

Chair Siegal thanked staff for spearheading the work and wished staff success.

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Imaduddin, Levine, Milford-Rosales, and Siegal (6)

Absent: CAC Members Ford, Kim, Margarita, and Ortega (4)

6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Appropriate \$97,000 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions, for Caltrain Governance 2026 Work Program and Ad Hoc Committee Support – ACTION

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

Member Barz requested clarification on the time-sensitive aspects and the expected outcome. She also noted that governance had been a contentious issue for many years and asked what the areas of differing views were.

Mr. Koehler said that the Caltrain Board-approved motion called for this work to advance over approximately six months, with the Ad Hoc Committee planned to meet monthly. He



emphasized that the Transportation Authority would support Director Walton as well as coordinate with City agencies to ensure San Francisco's interests were effectively represented. He characterized the Ad Hoc Committee's work as addressing the unfinished business of the 2022 Memorandum of Understanding concerning governance of Caltrain, with the aim to codify governance agreements in a consolidated set of amendments to the Joint Powers Agreement and to resolve inconsistencies. Mr. Koehler identified the managing agency function as a key area of multiple viewpoints, noting that while SamTrans has served as managing agency since Caltrain's formation, agreements in 2008 and 2022 had modified the parameters of this role. He added that future policy direction could, for example, revert to provisions from governing agreements in the 1990s or allow Caltrain to contract with one or more member agencies for certain administrative functions. He also highlighted additional considerations, including establishing Caltrain as an entity within the state pension system to ensure employee transitions from SamTrans were handled appropriately.

Member Barz recapped that the Caltrain matter was time-sensitive, with the board emphasizing that collaboration and staff support needed to begin promptly, and she compared the situation to having multiple conflicting versions of bylaws that require harmonizing.

Member Barz asked whether one of the main points of disagreement was with respect to the managing agency and determining its responsibility.

Mr. Koehler stated that one of the points of disagreement was the issue of managing agency, including the rights of the managing agency and the oversight of the board and the member agencies.

Member Barz said that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) now had a transit network management committee and asked whether the committee was involved in the Caltrain governance discussions.

Mr. Koehler said his understanding was that the MTC committee was not directly involved in these discussions, likely because network management committee had primarily focused on regional integration and agency interfaces from a customer perspective. He added that the Caltrain discussions had been more centered on the framework of agreements governing Caltrain among the three member counties.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun noted that the issue was time-sensitive because Supervisor Walton was leaving at the end of the year, and the matter had been delayed for four years.

Member Imaduddin moved to approve the item, seconded by Vice Chair Daniels.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Imaduddin, Levine, Milford-Rosales, and Siegal (6)

Absent: CAC Members Ford, Kim, Margarita, and Ortega (4)

7. SFMTA Curbside EV Charging Initiatives Update – INFORMATION

This item was called after Item 2 due to lack of quorum.

Broderick Paulo, Planner, Parking and Curb Management at SFMTA and Danny Yeung, Manager, Taxi, Access and Mobility Services at SFMTA, presented the item.



Quroum was reached at 6:40 p.m.

Member Barz asked how the SFMTA would place chargers in areas with bike lanes, transit lanes at the curb, or other fixed curb uses.

Mr. Paulo stated that safety was the SFMTA's top priority in its multimodal network. He noted that San Francisco faced high demand for curb space with competing uses, including loading zones, bus stops, parklets, vehicle storage, and transit or bikeway movement, and said that staff would coordinate with bike, transit, and paratransit teams when siting future charging stations.

Member Barz asked whether the teams within SFMTA would have identified potential conflicts from a process perspective.

Mr. Paulo confirmed that was correct and gave an example of how SFMTA could crosscheck a proposed location with the SFMTA's North Star map, included in the Biking and Rolling Plan, and if a vendor proposed a location on a street with a dedicated bike lane, SFMTA could redirect the vendor to find a nearby location that avoids conflicts with transit or bicycle infrastructure.

Member Barz asked about the draft map in the slide deck, asking for clarification on its purpose and what its future development might involve.

Mr. Yeung explained that the map was a tool designed to help SFMTA staff and potential applicants quickly identify sites that were technically infeasible, such as steep slopes or other obstacles, versus locations suitable for further evaluation. He noted that areas without obvious obstructions would allow private companies to focus on the easiest-to-implement sites rather than evaluating the entire city. Mr. Yeung stated that public outreach and confirmation of actual users would still be required, and that the tool reduced financial risk for the SFMTA while serving as a preliminary step for permit applications.

Member Barz stated that it would be helpful for CAC members to have the map clearly indicate the meaning of green, as companies were likely to focus on those areas with fewer reviews. She added that she appreciated the opportunity to provide feedback before being asked to approve the future allocation request for this work.

Chair Siegal asked about the initial site's reported 60% utilization and whether that indicated the space was occupied 60% of the time. She asked for clarification on whether vehicles were actively using the space or simply parked there without use.

Mr. Paulo clarified that vehicles must be actively charging to occupy the space, with permit holders allowed unlimited charging time and non-permit holders limited to two hours.

Chair Siegal asked how the charging system operated and whether it functioned on a monitored or honor basis for residential parking permit holders.

Mr. Paulo explained that once a vehicle was fully charged, an idling fee began, which applied only during daytime hours. He added that the fee did not apply roughly from 10 p.m. to 8 a.m., ensuring that drivers were not required to move their vehicles in the middle of the night.

Chair Siegal asked about the current landscape of electric vehicle charging and whether many parking garages in denser areas already had charging infrastructure, and whether the effort focused on locations without existing chargers, or if SFMTA-owned garages



were being used for charging at that time.

Mr. Paulo reported that SFMTA-owned lots and garages had 55 dual-port chargers generating approximately \$300,000 annually. He added that over the next three years, an additional 250 chargers would be installed in these facilities, while curbside charging would address gaps for individuals without overnight charging access.

During public comment, Edward Mason highlighted that white zones were for loading, with taxicab areas valued at \$250,000, and recommended that the SFMTA assess market rates for charging zones. He proposed modeling a revenue stream on San Jose's electric bill charges and noted that research and development costs, funded by Prop L, should ultimately be covered by users as a convenience fee. He also suggested implementing a web-based reservation system, similar to practices in other cities, to improve efficiency in curb space usage.

Roland Lebrun raised concerns about the loss of parking spaces and questioned the viability of Level 2 chargers, noting they required six to eight hours to charge a vehicle, making them suitable mainly for overnight use. He observed that current parking revenue losses could be mitigated by installing Level 3 chargers, which charged vehicles in roughly 30 minutes, and suggested the SFMTA could have leased spaces to commercial vendors such as Iona, EVgo, and Electrify America rather than directly investing in charging infrastructure. His remarks highlighted the potential of utilizing existing parking areas, including large shopping malls, for charging stations. He also noted that while charging fees could generate revenue, sales taxes reduced net returns, and he cautioned against applying additional convenience fees.

8. Geary/19th Ave Subway and Regional Connections Study Update – INFORMATION

Andrew Heidel, Principal Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Barz expressed strong enthusiasm for the project, highlighting its alignment with long-term planning goals. She shared that discussions with fellow residents reflected widespread support and that public outreach findings accurately captured community sentiment. She emphasized learning from prior megaprojects in the Bay Area and abroad, citing the Crossrail (Elizabeth line) project in England, and asked whether this project's planning incorporated lessons from other major initiatives outside the region.

Mr. Heidel described expanding the project review to include recently completed local initiatives, such as the Central Subway in San Francisco, as well as international examples, to inform lessons learned. He noted that while it was too early to finalize project delivery or construction methods, the early strategic planning phase was the appropriate time to consult project teams about which prior decisions were most impactful. He highlighted the value of these insights in avoiding future challenges or costs and cited the Crossrail as a successful long-term benchmark for inspiration in project planning and delivery.

Member Barz highlighted the Crossrail as an example, noting that its initial 1990s proposal had lacked political and public support, but a subsequent business case had demonstrated the project's net positive impact and had helped secure approval. She asked whether staff had applied a similar methodology in their planning.

Mr. Heidel explained that the staff, working with technical consultants and experienced staff from the SFMTA, drew on international examples, including Canada, to apply a



business case framework alongside the traditional environmental framework. He noted that the environmental framework guided decision-making while minimizing impacts, and he described efforts to integrate a business case approach to quantify benefits, noting the challenge of doing so at this study's relatively small scale. He indicated that this approach had remained under active consideration for future application.

Member Milford-Rosales expressed enthusiasm for the Transportation Authority's long-term planning and foresight. He asked whether requests for federal funding would be submitted before the end of 2028.

Mr. Heidel responded that they would not.

Chair Siegal acknowledged that public feedback on the project, including concerns about Central Subway costs, construction speed, disruptions, and displacement, aligned with what she heard in community discussions. She asked whether the final study would make recommendations to address these concerns or prioritize them once detailed planning begins.

Mr. Heidel indicated that the study would likely follow the latter approach and would not make specific recommendations but would capture concerns as part of a transparent process. He emphasized that the study would identify where decisions occur, and staff would highlight the issues that emerged as most important during outreach. He added that it would be essential to weigh these concerns as the project develops, noting that priorities such as cost, speed, and minimizing disruption may conflict, and underscoring that understanding these trade-offs is critical for ongoing community engagement and decision-making.

During public comment, Edward Mason reviewed the history of unrealized transit plans along the Geary corridor, from the 1930s O'Farrell Street proposal to the 1960 BART-to-Marín plan and the 1995 BART subsurface/light rail concept. He noted that the current study had overlooked the city's 20-year declining birth rate and emerging autonomous and shared vehicle services, which challenged assumptions about five-minute transit service. He expressed doubt that it would be realized, suggesting it might follow the pattern of prior uncompleted Geary corridor projects.

Other Items

Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

Member Barz asked if it would be possible to agendize a presentation from BART on service decisions and the measures being implemented to address them.

There was no public comment.

9. Public Comment

During public comment, Mr. Mason described observing Muni buses bunching on multiple routes instead of maintaining even spacing, cited a MTC report showing increased San Francisco ridership, and stated he could not determine whether that trend related to conditions on the 48 line or Mission Street. He recounted recent experiences on the J line, including an outbound train delayed between 26th and 28th streets after becoming stuck in northbound automobile traffic on Church Street, and said he had seen



similar delays at times in the afternoon. He suggested these conditions may have been an unintended consequence of Slow Streets treatments on Sanchez Street creating a slow Birch Street, which he said appeared to have been affecting J line performance and contributing to periodic bunching, and concluded that such impacts reflected the realities of living in the city.

Vice Chair Daniels stated that February was Black History Month and honored Garrett Augustus Morgan (1877-1963), the inventor who patented the three-way traffic signal.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:03 p.m.