



DRAFT MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, March 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, Sean Kim, Venecia Margarita, Austin Milford-Rosales, Rachael Ortega, and Kat Siegal (6)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Najuwanda Daniels, Phoebe Ford, Zameel Imaduddin, and Jerry Levine (4)

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Siegal recounted that CAC members had recommended approval of an appropriation in February for Transportation Authority staff to engage in autonomous vehicle (AV) policy development at the federal level, and she reported that staff had since continued engagement on the SELF DRIVE Act and related legislation, including the AV Safety Data Act. She explained that staff had participated in a National Highway Traffic Safety Administration-hosted AV Safety Forum and had met with congressional offices, including Speaker Pelosi, Senator Padilla, and Senator Schiff, to provide briefings and advocate for strong federal safety standards while preserving state and local regulatory authority. She added that staff would continue to provide updates. Chair Siegal also reported that on March 10, Mayor Lurie and Chair Melgar had convened the Street Safety Initiative Working Group to implement the Mayor's Executive Directive, and she stated that the Transportation Authority would coordinate with the Controller's Office to assess agency performance and would host an annual street safety hearing, anticipated in fall 2026.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated that, for individuals not on the Clerk's distribution list, access to the Executive Director's Report was available through a link associated with the Board meeting on the agency's website.

Consent Agenda

3. Approve the Minutes of the February 25, 2026 Meeting - ACTION

4. State and Federal Legislation Update - INFORMATION

Positions: Support: Assembly Bill (AB) 1421 (Wilson), AB 1837 (Gonzalez), and AB 2308 (Haney).

Member Milford-Rosales asked about the updated amendment to AB 1837, which had removed the provision allowing cameras to enforce parking violations in bike lanes and expressed disappointment, noting as a cyclist he felt unsafe having to swerve into the vehicle lane around double-parked vehicles.



Amber Crabbe, Senior Public Policy Manager, stated that staff's understanding was that there was no likelihood of the measure moving forward without the aforementioned provisions being eliminated.

Member Kim asked for more context about the road usage charge in AB 1421.

Ms. Crabbe stated that the state had been studying a road usage charge for more than a decade. She explained that as vehicles became more fuel-efficient, gas tax revenues declined because the tax was collected per gallon, reducing its long-term effectiveness as a transportation revenue source. She added that the state was considering a revenue measure to replace the gas tax, with the road usage charge intended as a proxy for how much a vehicle was driven. She indicated that options under consideration for a road user charge included a per-mile charge, methods of collection, and potential structuring, which would continue the ongoing work.

Member Kim asked whether the measure would be an additional tax, with the existing gasoline tax remaining in place. He asked if the additional charge would apply to all vehicles or only specific types, noting that hybrid vehicles used both fuels and that the calculation could be complicated.

Ms. Crabbe stated that the state had not yet developed an actual proposal. She elaborated that previous discussions had considered the measure as a replacement for the gas tax; it could be set higher than the gas tax; or both taxes could be retained; and exceptions could be made to treat different vehicle types differently. She concluded by emphasizing that nothing had been decided yet.

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, Kim, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (6)

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

End of Consent Agenda

5. **Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$9,800,000 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions, for Three Requests – ACTION**

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

Member Ortega asked how Caltrain's 22nd Street Station fit in with The Portal project, specifically seeking clarity on where undergrounding was planned to begin and asked about the expected life of the planned Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) access improvements at 22nd Street Station.

Jesse Koehler, Rail Program Manager, stated that The Portal project had no bearing on the 22nd Street project. He stated that the Pennsylvania Avenue Extension (PAX) project was a future, long-term project not expected to be constructed for nearly twenty years. He continued that the ADA accessibility improvements recommended in this item were a modest investment to bring the system up to standard and confirmed that the benefits would be in place for years and unaffected by the PAX Project.



Member Kim asked what the current Powell Street sidewalk conditions were and whether widening the sidewalk as part of the Powell Street Improvement project would remove roadway or parking spaces.

Maia Small, Director of Planning at SFMTA, responded that the street would not be closed, that the sidewalk would be widened to accommodate more uses, and that the sidewalk work was carefully tailored around existing utilities.

Member Kim asked whether the roadway in its current form was for cable cars only.

Ms. Small stated that Market to Ellis was for cable cars only and continued that the project area would largely look the same as it did now, with some minor adjustments to commercial and passenger loading. She stated that the project area roadway was primarily for the cable car and commercial vehicles.

Member Kim noted that there appeared to be a lane for cars from Ellis to Geary and asked whether it would be removed.

Ms. Small replied that it would be a transit lane for the cable car, paratransit, taxi, and commercial vehicles to access loading zones.

Member Barz asked to confirm that the \$16 million cost estimate of the 22nd Street Station ADA Access Improvements project would be funding scope that consisted of two ramps and some tactile surfaces, noting that it seemed high.

Mr. Koehler confirmed the cost estimate and explained that it was driven by site complexity due to an embankment adjacent to the southbound program with housing above it, as well as its position under a highway and the fact that it was an active electrified railroad.

Member Barz asked whether alternatives to the current design configuration were considered.

Mr. Koehler stated that the Transportation Authority partnered with Caltrain on a Prop K-funded alternatives study that considered a suite of options and that this was the recommended alternative. He remarked that other options, such as elevators, had large maintenance burdens.

Member Barz noted that the Mission Bay Ferry Landing project had been underway for many years and asked for clarification on whether the requested scope was included in the original scope.

Simon Betsalel, Project Manager at the Port of San Francisco, responded that the project began in 2018 and was originally advertised as a Construction Management/General Contract (CM/GC) project, which was a failed bid. He stated that Phase 1, initial remediation, was completed in 2020, at which point there were some funding questions, including a legal challenge to Regional Measure 3 (RM3), and that costs significantly escalated during the COVID-19 pandemic. In partnership with San Francisco Bay Ferry, the Port applied for and received a Clean Ports grant through the United States Environmental Protection Agency and was awarded additional funding for ferry electrification, which closed the funding gap, and the RM3 legal challenges were resolved. Phase 2A was completed in November 2025 and included the completion of remediation and removal of the former pier. The upcoming Phase 2B, the subject of the request, would include physical construction of the ferry landing on top of the water and improvements to the



plaza.

Member Barz asked how the ridership projections were devised.

Mr. Betsalel replied that San Francisco Bay Ferry (SFBF) included the estimates in its long-range expansion plan and noted that projected residential growth was a factor. He stated that he would follow up with the sources of the estimates.

Member Milford-Rosales asked to be included in the ridership estimate follow-up and stated that, as a resident of the neighborhood, the numbers seemed very optimistic.

Ms. Walley clarified that the ridership estimates were annual.

Members Barz and Milford-Rosales reiterated the request for a follow-up on the ridership information with information on assumptions.

Chair Siegal asked whether SFMTA had considered, in the Powell Street Improvement design, the inclusion of a farebox or some other fixed way to pay fares while queuing for the cable car, noting the difficulty of the handheld fareboxes for operators.

Ms. Small stated that the issue had come up and that the historic nature of the cable car infrastructure limited what SFMTA could do.

Victoria Chong, Transportation Planner at SFMTA, stated that she had not heard internally about a desire for a farebox and acknowledged that the handheld Clipper devices could be challenging. She stated that riders could also use the Muni Mobile app, a payment kiosk, or cash.

Member Ortega commented that cash was not carried by many people and emphasized the importance of electronic payment functionality.

Member Margarita also asked to be included in the Mission Bay Ferry ridership estimates follow-up. She asked whether agencies could partner with Chase Center, Oracle Park, and other large corporations that benefit from the ferry to contribute to the improvements.

During public comment, John Roberts, a resident of District 1, expressed his appreciation for the members' questions about the ferry ridership estimates and stated that they seemed high. He asked whether the estimates were based on new usage or transferred usage from existing ferry routes or other modes.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

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

6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Amend the Prop K Standard Grant Agreement for the Potrero Yard Modernization Project to Allow Use of \$1,000,000 in Prop K Funds for Milestone Payment 1 Costs Under the Infrastructure Facility Project Agreement – ACTION

Jesse Koehler, Rail Program Manager, presented the item per the staff memorandum and Bonnie Jean von Krogh, Public Affairs Manager and Chris Lazaro, Project Director, at SFMTA presented the project update.

Member Ortega asked for clarification of the proposed action before the CAC.



Mr. Koehler clarified that the action under consideration was not a new allocation but an amendment to a previous allocation [codified in a grant agreement] and that the amendment was to modify the scope of the prior allocation without creating additional funds.

Member Ortega appreciated the explanation and asked about height limitations for the Bryant Street apartment building, and asked whether future housing construction would be possible if funding could be secured.

Chris Lazaro, stated that the housing design followed building height standards and limitations due to parcel dimensions and size, which also took into consideration, cost and feasibility. He added that the building could be taller if funding allowed. He also explained that bus yard construction would proceed independently, but that simultaneous construction with housing was possible if the same contractor was compensated and directed to do both at the same time; otherwise, the housing would start after the bus yard was complete.

Member Ortega asked whether her understanding was correct that housing could be built later even if a separate housing contractor was not secured at that time.

Mr. Lazaro stated that the Lease Development Disposition Agreement allowed up to two years after the bus yard was complete to start housing construction.

Member Kim asked for clarification on the height limitations of the Potrero Yard housing, noted that the yard was large, asked why the parcel was so constrained.

Mr. Lazaro stated that the bus yard needed specific dimensions to allow proper circulation of trolley buses within the facility. He explained that any significant modification to the yard's dimensions would drastically reduce the number of buses that could be accommodated and maintained on site.

Tim Kempf, Senior Project Manager at SFMTA, explained that accommodating and maintaining approximately 246 buses daily required the current bus yard design. He stated that maintaining proper clearances through columns and allowing safe turning radii for all buses dictated the facility's design and that the remaining parcel reflected the area left over.

Member Margarita asked about the housing component, noting that the SFMTA cannot directly own the units. She stated the units targeted as affordable housing corresponded to 80 percent of the area median income (AMI) and requested the specific income amount.

Bonnie Jean von Krogh, stated that the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development published a list each year specifying affordable housing targets, which changed annually.

Mr. Lazaro stated that the 2026 numbers from the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development were not yet published. He explained that the 2025 chart was used to show that the maximum income for a family of four was \$124,700.

Ms. von Krogh stated that the housing units were targeted up to 80 percent of the AMI and explained that developers indicated some units could be as low as 30 percent AMI, creating a range of affordability levels.

Member Margarita asked whether the affordable housing would be available to families



around the project's 2030 completion or if availability would occur later.

Ms. von Krogh stated that the bus yard facility would be completed by 2030. She explained that the timeline for housing availability would depend on when housing construction would start and would take approximately two years for units to become available.

Member Barz stated that she was perplexed by a sentence in the memo indicating that SFMTA was prohibited by the city charter from funding housing design or construction. She asked why that was the case.

Ms. von Krogh stated that SFMTA was the city's transportation agency and explained that the funds the agency receives were restricted for transportation purposes.

Member Barz stated that SFMTA received various types of funds and asked why the city explicitly prohibited SFMTA from financing housing. She also asked about the background behind this prohibition.

Mr. Koehler stated that the original conception of the project involved SFMTA leading the effort. He explained that SFMTA carefully accounted for the costs of both the transit and housing components and indicated that advancing both as originally planned would require non-transportation funding from another entity. He added that sufficient housing funds were not forthcoming, which led the City and SFMTA to decide to proceed with the transit project while reducing the housing potential. He stated that the project initially preserved future potential for additional housing, but insufficient funds limited the project to only the Bryant Street housing.

Member Barz stated that she anticipated the change was due to insufficient funds to support the originally planned housing aspirations. She added that, as a transportation funding authority, SFMTA prioritized completing a seismically retrofitted bus yard that accommodates 68% more buses. She stated that she remained perplexed by the city charter limitation that prohibits SFMTA from funding or financing housing in the future and said she would like to better understand that restriction.

Ms. von Krogh stated that she would provide the committee with the relevant city charter contacts and the associated language.

Chair Siegal asked what the minimum cost of the project would be if the podium had been included to allow for additional housing development in the future.

Mr. Lazaro stated that early last year, the contractor pricing came in about 30% higher than anticipated. He explained that if the podium were added back into the project, costs would likely increase by at least 30% over the current, agreed on, design and construction cost.

Chair Siegal stated that translated to about \$200 million more.

During public comment, Edward Mason explained that the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) completed the Tamien Station Housing project and had a program underway for Curtner Station, and he stated that BART also developed housing on some parking lots. He added that empty park-and-ride lots for light rail could potentially be converted to housing. He said he provide these as examples though he was not familiar with the underlying fund sources.

Roland Lebrun stated that the east side of Tamien Station was a Caltrain parking lot, not a



VTA site, and explained that it included a daycare with dedicated parking that allowed parents to drop off their children and access Caltrain. He stated that these facilities and parking spaces were removed and clarified that the empty parking referenced by a Mr. Mason was located on the VTA site across Highway 85, which served as overflow for Caltrain after parking losses. He added that VTA planned redevelopment at the Cerone facility, where employee RV parking was eliminated to allow for permanent housing development.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

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

7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve a Two-Year Professional Services Contract with HNTB Corporation in an Amount Not to Exceed \$1,050,000 for Consulting Services for the Pennsylvania Avenue Extension Bridging Study – ACTION

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

Member Ortega asked when the project would begin construction and what the timeline would look like.

Mr. Koehler stated that staff did not currently have a construction schedule for the project due to the early stage of the project.

Member Ortega opined that the timing of the project was not decided due to a variety of factors, including The Portal project.

Mr. Koehler explained that the Rail Alignment and Benefits (RAB) Study, completed in 2018, contemplated a long-term Caltrain corridor service of up to 12 Caltrain and 4 high-speed rail trains per hour, which created significant impacts for at-grade crossings. He reported that currently, key priorities include fully funding The Portal project and advancing it to construction, while also supporting Caltrain's plans for the rail yard site. He added that as these projects proceeded, staff would be focusing on planning for forward-compatibility for the long-term vision to deliver the PAX project in the future.

Member Ortega stated that she supported bringing more trains and high-speed rail underground to eliminate grade crossings and reduce traffic and safety risks.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated that the RAB study began in 2013 and lasted five years and that he had designed the PAX project 18 months before the RAB study. He opined that HNTB, the selected contractor, previously contributed to significant project issues, including cost increases, challenges with Union Pacific, and inflated estimates on multiple rail projects. He explained that in his upcoming letter to the Board of Supervisors, he would describe potential construction methods, which he asserted could include a trench from Cesar Chavez Street to 22nd Street and over \$2 billion in cost to extend to 7th Street and connect to The Portal.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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



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

8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt San Francisco's One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 4 County Framework, Including Recommending Programming \$2,153,000 to the Transportation Authority for Congestion Management Agency Planning, \$5,843,000 to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Program, and \$48,660,000 to Projects to be Selected Through a Call for Projects – ACTION

Erin Slichter, Transportation Planner, and Ben Frazier, Safe Routes to School program manager at the SFMTA, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Siegal thanked Mr. Frazier for the in-depth presentation about the Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure (Safe Routes) Program.

Member Barz asked for confirmation that the OBAG program was managed by Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), that Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) prioritized projects for part of the funding at targets determined by MTC, that the item before the CAC recommended setting aside some of that funding for CMA Planning and for the Safe Routes Program. She further asked for confirmation that the remaining funds would be prioritized through a competitive call for projects.

Ms. Slichter affirmed that this was correct. Ms. Lombardo further clarified that MTC asked CMAs to nominate projects for 120% of the target identified for each county, from which MTC would select projects. She added that San Francisco could expect to receive less than the 120% that would be nominated but would hope to receive more than the 100% target identified.

Member Barz asked if the CMA Planning funding would be used for the SF CHAMP model. Ms. Slichter explained that funding could be used for updates to the San Francisco Transportation Plan and follow-on studies, waterfront planning, the CHAMP model, and other planning efforts identified through the annual budget process. Member Barz stated that she was supportive of Slow Streets and of kids walking and riding to school. She asked how the effectiveness of the Safe Routes Program was measured to assess progress toward more kids using active modes to get to school.

Mr. Frazier responded that progress was measured through travel tallies collected every two years since at least 2015. He stated that this data allowed staff to compare how students got to school over time and measure program effectiveness and explained, as an example, that the tally showed increased single-family driving during the pandemic, but that the 2024 tally showed increases in bicycling and carpools. He added that the Safe Routes Non-Infrastructure Program was only one factor among others that affected families' travel decisions, such as infrastructural conditions and school crossing guards. He stated that part of the Safe Routes work was to coordinate with other teams to maximize the potential for students to get to school through modes other than single-family driving.

Member Barz stated that this information would have been helpful to include in the item memo or the presentation.

Mr. Frazier stated that there was a recent SFMTA blog post about the results of the most recent student travel tally and offered to send it to Member Barz.

Member Barz expressed several concerns that were not addressed by the Safe Routes Program, including speeding on a Slow Street near her home and two elementary



schools, regulatory barriers that prevented children from walking to school alone or with another adult before the fourth grade, and the lack of bike parking at schools. She stated that these issues were significant hurdles impeding more students from getting to school by alternative modes. She said she understood that the proposed funding set-aside was for the Non-Infrastructure Program, but expressed concern that these issues were not being addressed.

Mr. Frazier responded that he was aware of the infrastructural challenges to kids taking alternative travel modes to school and explained that his role involved coordination with other teams in SFMTA to address these issues. He stated that, in the case of bike parking, SFMTA was working with a school to increase bike parking, whether on the sidewalk or in the street in SFMTA's right of way, or by simplifying the regulatory process for installing bike racks on SF School District property. He affirmed that when issues were raised through the Non-Infrastructure Program, staff worked to address them with the appropriate teams, and added that SFMTA staff held a bi-weekly meeting between SFMTA's traffic engineering and Safe Routes Program teams, along with the SF School District's transportation team, to coordinate on these issues.

Member Barz thanked Mr. Frazier for his response and urged staff to do a better job including this behind-the-scenes coordination work to remove infrastructure and policy barriers to increase the number of students using alternative modes to get to school when describing the Safe Routes Program, stating that some people had the impression that the Safe Routes Program's work was limited to a few events during the year.

Member Barz stated that she wanted data and evidence of impacts on safety and mode shift to be strongly considered in the OBAG County Program competitive call for projects. She asked whether would be possible to add this to the program requirements.

Ms. Slichter responded that the application materials would ask sponsors to provide data to back up projects' claimed safety improvements, and to provide evidence of diverse community support.

Member Kim asked for further detail on carpooling in the Safe Routes program. Mr. Frazier responded that carpooling was on the program's "Four Fun Ways," but that this mode received the least attention because it was labor-intensive. He added that the Safe Routes Program provided a carpooling toolkit and worked with schools to distribute flyers to help families use preferred routes for different modes of transportation to school.

Member Kim suggested that the SFMTA develop an app to assist families with carpool arrangements. He stated that he and other families often arranged carpools for kids' sports games, but that this was challenging to arrange over text. He stated that carpooling tools could be especially helpful for low-income families who did not have access to quality and safe transit in their neighborhoods. He further suggested that the SFMTA could work with SFUSD to reduce families' need to drive, including by coordinating staggered school start times so as not to overwhelm Muni, and by providing bus transport for school sports games. Lastly, Member Kim suggested that the SFMTA provide a tool for teens to report safety issues or concerns while riding Muni, and said that the Safe Routes Program should educate students not to use their cell phones while walking, as this presented a safety issue.

Member Margarita stated that the Safe Routes Program was planting seeds for long-term benefits. She asked whether the SFMTA could provide a list of the focus schools for this



cycle of the program.

Mr. Frazier stated that he did not have the list on hand but that he could provide it later.

Member Margarita asked how schools that were not currently on the list could be added to the list.

Mr. Frazier responded that schools that were not on the focus list could still receive Safe Routes programming. He added that the schools were prioritized with each cycle and stated that he could provide the selection methodology and would invite feedback on it.

Member Margarita said that staff should provide the list before the next cycle of the program, so that there would be time to adjust the methodology and try to get schools in need on the list.

During public comment, Edward Mason recommended that the Safe Routes Program educate students on how to comport themselves on Muni, including keeping their feet off the seats, sitting up, being respectful of others, and making priority accessible seating available to seniors and people with disabilities.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

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

Other Items

9. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

Member Milford-Rosales stated that another family was hit in a crosswalk in District 6, marking the second such incident in approximately two and a half years, and explained that the initial SFMTA response involved adjusting stoplight timing and repainting the crosswalk. He reported that a community-installed safety treatment was subsequently removed by the City and replaced with a bike lane that he indicated did not meet current design criteria. He added that since the Vision Zero plan ended, there was no clear direction, and he asked whether SFMTA, the Mayor's Office, or others had a concrete plan to address pedestrian fatalities and guide future responses.

Member Margarita stated that accidents occurred across multiple areas of District 9, including the Mission, Bernal Heights, and the Portola, and said that community involvement was needed to develop solutions to eliminate accidents. She added that SFMTA and the Mayor's Office should invest in District 9 to improve pedestrian safety. She also stated that she planned to work with community members and labor to develop a plan for renaming Cesar Chavez Street. She added that the renaming effort should be led by District 9 residents in collaboration with labor.

Member Kim stated that fare evasion prevention efforts, including new gates, were successful in reducing fare evasion and maintenance costs and were associated with improved safety. He explained that SFMTA faced challenges in preventing fare evasion due to its all-door boarding policy. He added that fare evasion remained an ongoing issue linked to safety concerns and activity shifting across neighborhoods. He stated that further discussion was needed on strategies to prevent fare evasion on Muni.



Member Barz stated that she would like Safe Routes to School staff to return for an informational item. She explained that upcoming travel survey data would provide better insight into transportation modes used at different schools and that she was interested in understanding related metrics, including those raised by Member Margarita. She added that the request was not urgent but would help clarify these data points.

There was no public comment.

10. Public Comment

During public comment, Edward Mason shared a flyer from San Jose and stated that it highlighted a recent convention and developments in off-hour and bike delivery downtown. He explained that emerging technologies, including automated delivery systems like Uber Eats, required the city to continuously update its programs rather than maintain a stationary approach. He added that reserved yellow zones for delivery trucks would streamline operations by providing designated locations for drop-offs. He concluded that the city should further integrate technology into its downtown delivery planning.

Roland Lebrun stated that he wanted to address Senate Bill 79, which he said could displace entire mobile home parks and schools, and reported that a cleanup bill Senator Wiener was expected to introduce was no longer proceeding. He added that he asked MTC to propose emergency legislation to address these issues before Senate Bill 79 would become law on July 1. He also opined that Senate Bill 707 mandated remote public participation for all meetings, indicated that the Board of Supervisors had not complied at the Transportation Authority since January 1.

11. Adjournment

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