



DRAFT MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, April 22, 2026

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Vice Chair Daniels called the meeting to order at 6:16 p.m.

CAC members present at Roll: Sara Barz, Najuwanda Daniels, Phoebe Ford, Sean Kim, Jerry Levine, and Rachael Ortega (6)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Venecia Margarita (entered during Item 3), Austin Milford-Rosales and Kat Siegal (3)

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Vice Chair Daniels shared an outreach announcement regarding the San Francisco Transportation Plan 2050+ (SFTP). She explained that the SFTP serves as the blueprint for the city's transportation system development and investment, including a 30-year constrained investment plan and a vision plan identifying projects and programs for additional funding. She reported that the Transportation Authority project team would host a virtual town hall on April 23 from 6:00 to 7:30 p.m. to collect community feedback on citywide transportation priorities, with language interpretation available in Cantonese, Filipino, and Spanish. She added that the public could register and complete a survey on the project website.

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

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

4. Adopt a Motion of Support to Exercise Contract Options for 17 Shortlisted Firms for On-call Project Management and Engineering Services in an Amount Not to Exceed \$2,700,000 for a Combined Total Contract Amount Not to Exceed \$13,400,000; and for 10 Shortlisted Firms for On-call Transportation Planning Services in an Amount Not to Exceed \$1,000,000 for a Combined Total Contract Amount Not to Exceed \$4,000,000 – ACTION

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

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

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Ford, Levine, Kim and Ortega (6)

Absent: CAC Members Milford-Rosales and Siegal (2)

Abstention: CAC Member Margarita (1)



End of Consent Agenda

5. **Approve the Minutes of the Allocate \$350,000 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions, for Two Requests - ACTION**

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

Member Levine asked, regarding the SFMTA's Curbside Electric Vehicle Charging request, who would be on the working group and how it would be assembled.

Nicole Appenzeller, Senior Clean Transportation Specialist at SFE, stated that SFE would work closely with SFMTA to establish and implement a permanent curbside program. She explained that the working group would include the Transportation Authority, SFMTA, and the SFE, as well as partners from the Department of Public Works and the Public Utilities Commission, noting that these partners supported the demonstration pilot program currently running. She added that the group would serve as the core group and would address topics including power and utility access, with additional participants as needed.

Member Levine asked whether community and advocacy organizations, including Walk San Francisco, Livable Cities, the Sierra Club, the Bicycle Coalition, and transit rider groups, would be included in the working group. He said that the Sierra Club had written a letter with suggestions and concerns regarding the program.

Ms. Appenzeller stated that stakeholder participation and inclusion in the working group remained under consideration, and that stakeholders identified in the recent letter would be incorporated into the community engagement plan consistent with program requirements.

Member Levine said that the Sierra Club and other coalition members had developed a list of conditions they considered critical for advancing the program. He asked how much consideration would be given to these organizations in the planning process.

Ms. Appenzeller said that the letter raised several valid concerns that had also been raised during the demonstration pilot process. She said that the program took into account existing and planned street uses, such as transit lanes and bikeways, and emphasized that, as a transit-first city, avoiding conflict with those uses was a primary requirement and central consideration in both the pilot and permanent program. She added that the program implementation team had reviewed the letter and would incorporate those concerns into the development of site selection criteria, community engagement, and permit terms and conditions as the permit process was developed.

Member Levine asked for clarification about the scope of the EV curbside item before the CAC.

Ms. Appenzeller stated that the current request would fund planning for a permanent curbside program, with a goal of launching the program in summer 2026. She explained that over the next few months the funding would support development of policy and permit terms and conditions, and that, once launched, the program would use a two-step permit process allowing operators to apply for an operator permit and then, if selected, for site-specific permits. She added that site proposals would be submitted for assessment and would need to meet all program criteria to proceed.

Member Levine asked whether any components, including site selection criteria or site



selections, would return to the committee for approval or whether those decisions would be made solely by SFMTA.

Ms. Appenzeller replied that development of the permit terms and conditions, as well as the application, were part of the scope of work for the requested funds and would be implemented as part of the program, once it was launched. She stated that SFMTA would be responsible for enforcing the permit terms and conditions when site selection occurred later in the year, after operators had been approved and the process advanced to site selection. She explained that each site application would be reviewed to ensure it met all site-specific criteria, and that the permit terms and conditions submitted under the scope of work would define the structure for the future assessment process.

Mr. Reyes clarified that no further Transportation Authority approvals were required for specific elements of the permit program and that SFMTA and SFE would provide monthly progress updates as a condition of receiving funds, with status updates could be shared with the CAC at key milestones.

Member Ford asked why an allocation was needed for Curbside Electric Vehicle Charging if the working group would primarily consist of City employees and why staff could not instead proceed with the work as part of their regular duties given their existing knowledge of the subject.

Ms. Appenzeller stated that if the funding was not received, SFE would not have the staff capacity to support development of the curbside program.

Elena Baranoff, Principal Mobility Analyst in the Taxi Division at SFMTA, stated that the program would proceed. She said that the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors were committed to advancing it. She explained that, even if the requested funds were not allocated, the program would still move forward, but most likely without SFE as a partner.

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, clarified that the funding would support SFE and SFMTA work to develop the program and would not support the working group. She explained that the working group consisted of a small number of meetings to formalize ongoing interdepartmental coordination related to program development.

Member Ortega asked whether the \$150,000 funding was intended to support planning, policy development, and program launch for a curbside EV charging permit program and to address interagency staffing capacity.

Ms. Baranoff replied that the funding would support SFE staff time to develop the policy framework, draft permit terms and conditions, and prepare the application, reflecting SFE staff's subject matter expertise from the pilot program. She said that the funding would also support SFMTA staff, primarily interns, to assist with application review and administrative tasks as part of the project's deliverables.

Ms. Baranoff added that the budget included in the packet identified positions that would be funded under the request.

Member Barz stated that she had previously helped set up a permit program for the City of Oakland and that, while serving on staff, she charged about half of her time to a specific project supporting that work, which was funded through a Caltrans grant. She explained that public agency timesheets often require charging time to specific project codes, similar to consultant arrangements, and said that setting up a program was the real



work.

Member Ortega said that Member Barz's explanation helped clarify the project and her understanding of public agency staff cost tracking.

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Levine, Kim, Margarita, and Ortega (6)

Absent: CAC Members Milford-Rosales and Siegal (2)

Abstention: CAC Member Ford (1)

6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve Programming Priorities for Up to \$4,548,974 in San Francisco's State Transit Assistance County Block Grant Funds, with Conditions – ACTION

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

Member Barz asked whether, if the Muni or regional transit sales tax measures were to fail in November, the recommended programming could be revisited.

Mr. Pickford stated that programming recommendations were required to be submitted to MTC by May.

Ms. LaForte stated that State Transit Assistance (STA) County Block Grant funding was a flexible source available to transit operators for operating and capital activities and was used to support programs such as paratransit and the elevator attendant program. She explained that continued use of STA funds helped offset operating costs needed to maintain current service levels. She added that BART and SFMTA shared remaining costs for the elevator attendant program not covered by STA and that similar offsets applied to paratransit within SFMTA's budget.

Member Barz said she supported and had personally benefitted from the elevator attendants, but said she was concerned about funding tradeoffs. She said that she would prefer allocating limited operating funds to additional BART service rather than elevator attendants. She said that paratransit was an essential service and noted that the recommended ferry-related funding represented approximately 10 percent of total available funds, which she said made sense. She questioned whether funding a ferry pilot would be appropriate in a scenario of severe transit cuts, such as potential BART closures and urged continued investment in transit services through the November election cycle.

Member Barz then asked why she stated the electric ferry project was one year late.

Suany Chough, Assistant Deputy Director for Planning, stated that, in 2024, when the Board initially approved STA funds for the project, staff tried to accelerate the electric ferry timeline, but that it took a long time to coordinate the required project components, including the vessel under construction, as the first of its kind in the area. She stated that the vessel was now proceeding on schedule, but that delivery had been delayed and was now expected in spring 2027. She explained that additional challenges included the lack of electric ferry charging infrastructure and ongoing efforts to secure operating funds.



Member Barz asked whether the situation could be summarized as multiple new initiatives were being undertaken and that the original timeline for completing these efforts had not ended up being accurate because lessons learned along the way extended the schedule.

Ms. Chough replied that that was correct.

Member Barz asked how confident Ms. Chough was that an electric ferry would be delivered and begin service in mid-2027.

Ms. Chough stated she was pretty confident. She said that capital infrastructure aspects of the project were fully funded and that a lot of work was underway. She added that work was still underway to finalize a 10-year funding plan and acknowledged that it was not a great time to be seeking funds for operations.

Member Ford asked how the current diesel ferry was operating in the meantime and whether it had stable ongoing funding.

Ms. Chough stated the diesel ferry was an interim service provided by the Treasure Island developer. She added it would remain in operation until permanent electric service began.

Member Ford asked when the developer's commitment would end if the ferry service did not start and noted that the project was already a year late. She asked when the developer would be released from the commitment for the other service.

Ms. Chough stated there was no official commitment for the service, but it was provided as an amenity to island residents and businesses. She stated that the developer would continue to operate the service until a permanent service was established.

Member Barz stated that if the developer was paying for the diesel ferry on an ongoing basis with no commitment to end the arrangement, she questioned why funding was being requested at that time.

Ms. Chough said the developer's service was provided at their will, was diesel-powered, and was not the preferred method of propulsion on an ongoing basis. She stated that the boat only had a 49-passenger capacity and was expected to be outgrown as the population on Treasure Island grew. She explained that because it was a private service, there was no control over its service plan and it did not take Clipper, which was inconvenient. She said the intention has always been to provide a public ferry transit service that was consistent with regional service.

Ms. LaForte added that the service also supported an equity priority community.

Member Barz stated that the memo described the proposed allocation of paratransit funds as being in line with the amount SFMTA would have received under the prior regional program. She asked what the prior regional program was and requested an explanation of it.

Mr. Pickford stated that the prior program referred to the former regional paratransit program. He explained that the STA County Block Grant program had replaced a regional paratransit program and a regional Lifeline transit program intended to support transit access for disadvantaged populations.

Member Barz noted that funding from the current block grant program had been used consistently over the past seven years to support paratransit and elevator attendant



services. She asked whether this use of funds was related to the history of the regional paratransit funding program.

Mr. Pickford replied in the affirmative.

Vice Chair Daniels asked how a 17 percent reduction in program costs for the BART Elevator Attendant Program was achieved. She stated that the presentation emphasized the importance of the project and the safety it provided and described it as essential. She expressed concern about whether, given financial issues, there were plans for BART or SFMTA to transition the program into a department function and raised concerns about attendant wages and cost of living for the elevator attendants. She also questioned whether cost savings were related to low wages.

Mr. Pickford responded that the cost savings shown reflected actual costs in BART's contract compared to an earlier cost estimate. He explained that the comparison did not align with what BART experienced in practice and represented a cost savings relative to the earlier expectation.

Rachael Axelrod, Principal Grants Officer at BART, added that the budget estimate was produced at the time when the contract with the previous elevator attendant vendor, Urban Alchemy, was ending and while BART was in the process of seeking a new vendor. She explained that during the development of the STA block grant budget, an initial estimate was submitted that was higher than the actual program costs incurred. She clarified that actual spending was in line with previous years. She added that the BART Board approved a five-year commitment to the program and that funding was also supported through a joint operating agreement with SFMTA through 2030, indicating continued program funding regardless of revenue measure outcomes.

Mili Choudhary, Senior Manager of Social Services Partnerships at BART, stated that BART conducted a competitive procurement process and that vendor-set rates determined attendant staff costs. She explained that vendor selection focused on obtaining required services at a fundable cost and that BART did not have influence over how vendors set their rates. She added that bringing the service in-house would be more expensive, would require additional staffing, and was not feasible due to financial constraints and limited internal capacity. She also stated that current unionized staff did not have this work in their job descriptions and that in-house provision would require adding more staff.

Vice Chair Daniels stated that she worked for SEIU 1021 and was familiar with labor and SFMTA classifications. She said that the SFMTA Car Cleaner job classification could stand in and attend elevators. She stated that she was comfortable with attendants being present in elevators for safety reasons based on her experience riding BART. She added that dignity and respect were reflected in one's paycheck and expressed concern about cost savings being achieved at the expense of workers.

Member Ford asked if she could make a motion to consider the paratransit funding separately from the ferry and elevator attendant funding, so that, if funding for those projects was not approved, the funds could remain within the Transportation Authority to fund transit operations more generally after the November election.

Ms. LaForte stated that the Transportation Authority owed MTC a list of projects by May 1. She explained that if no project was specified, she did not know what the impact would be or whether the funds would carry forward.



Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, suggested that one way to reflect the sentiments expressed by Member Ford would be to amend the staff recommendation to add a statement that if one or either potential transit revenue measure did not pass, the CAC would be interested in revisiting the programming. She stated that she was unsure whether that approach was allowable since the decision was up to MTC first as program administrator and then the Transportation Authority Board, but that this approach could be used to convey CAC input.

Member Barz asked what other projects, if any, had been considered or evaluated besides those presented.

Ms. LaForte stated that the Transportation Authority had funded the paratransit program and the elevator attendant program since 2018 at levels consistent with the former regional paratransit program and had not considered funding other projects this cycle. She explained that staff recommended continuing the practice of funding these programs as priorities for the use of STA funds.

Ms. LaForte continued by stating that revenues were 10 percent lower than last year and also lower than the prior year. She explained that the staff recommendation included prioritizing "make whole" funding from a prior year when revenues were lower than expected and programming commitments were not fully met in the year of revenue generation. She stated that they were making good on that prior-year commitment while funding the maximum amount possible to preserve funding levels for the elevator attendant and paratransit programs, consistent with prior practice.

Ms. Lombardo stated that both the elevator attendant and paratransit programs had a strong nexus to equity priority communities and transit service. She explained that staff had not considering defunding these programs, particularly given lower transit revenue forecasts.

There was no public comment.

Member Barz made a motion to approve the projects as recommended by staff, amended to add that if one or more of the transit measures did not pass in the fall, the CAC would be interested in revisiting programming recommendations if allowed to do so, seconded by Member Kim.

The motion to amend was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Milford-Rosales and Siegal (2)

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

The item as amended was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Milford-Rosales and Siegal (2)

- 7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Amend the Prop L Standard Grant Agreement for the Woods/Islais Creek Yard Electrification Phase I Project to Update the Project Scope, Schedule, Cost, and Funding Plan; and Change the Project Phase from Design to Construction – ACTION**



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

Member Ortega asked whether alternatives beyond diesel-hybrid buses, such as trolley buses, could be considered for the Bus & Bus Facilities grant in place of procuring electric buses. She referenced prior discussions about trolley buses in the city, and opined that their potential for transit electrification had not been fully evaluated. She suggested revisiting them in relation to electrification, overhead wiring, and fleet development. She asked if the Bus & Bus Facilities grant funding could be used for trolley buses as an alternative to diesel-hybrid buses. .

Member Barz stated that there was a state mandate to electrify the bus fleet and acknowledged that SFMTA was working to implement it, and noted that scaling back the project would reduce long-term capacity for electric buses and affect transit service growth. She stated that recent federal actions had affected SFMTA's ability to make good on the state mandate. She asked what actions had been taken to challenge the federal decision to rescind funding.

Christian Kalinowski, Project Manager at SFMTA, stated that the grant was discretionary, meaning the federal government could choose how to spend the funds. He explained that funding was redirected toward diesel vehicles instead of electric vehicles. He stated that legal counsel had challenged the decision and worked with counsel from other Bay Area municipalities, as well as counterparts in Oregon and Washington affected by the same change in federal stance. He added that because the funds had not yet been received into SFMTA's account and no contracts had been signed, there was limited ability to contest the change.

Member Barz thanked the speaker for the response and stated that the situation was extremely disappointing. She requested a summary, for the public record, of the downsides of the scaled-back approach and what it would mean for the city, noting that some of this had been referenced in prior email communication.

Mr. Kalinowski stated that the project was originally planned to construct an overhead gantry structure to charge buses from above, which would have allowed installation of electrical equipment overhead and potential solar panels to reduce charging costs. He explained that without this structure, the system would use dispenser-style chargers and require equipment to be installed in bus parking lanes, reducing parking capacity in the yard and affecting long-term operational capacity as service expanded. He added that the overhead gantry and chargers were intended as the first phase of a broader yard-wide automated charging system, and that without it the agency would instead need to rely on yard operations staff to manually plug in and unplug buses and manage charging.

Member Margarita asked how potential changes related to a proposed public buyout of PG&E would affect existing budget line items for PG&E-related work. She asked whether those costs would be reallocated, paused, or would remain the same regardless of the service provider, and whether such changes would delay project timelines. She referenced prior experience with projects changing or pausing due to shifting conditions and asked whether similar impacts would be anticipated in this case.

Ms. LaForte stated that the infrastructure funding was for initial equipment needed to connect to the electrical system and did not cover ongoing operating costs. She explained that the equipment enabled electric charging of vehicles and indicated that it would likely be required regardless of the energy service provider.



Mr. Kalinowski stated that SFMTA would fund PG&E work to install a larger power cable to the site as part of this project and explained that the upgrades were required regardless of any PG&E buyout. He stated that the site's existing capacity was approximately 273 kilowatts and added that about 1 megawatt was needed to support bus charging. He stated that the upgrade was necessary in all scenarios.

Member Margarita asked whether using an alternative provider would result in lower costs and potential savings or whether costs would remain generally consistent across providers.

Mr. Kalinowski stated that costs were not expected to change significantly and explained that the city had an existing agreement with PG&E for upgrade and electricity costs.

Mr. Mason stated that SFMTA decided to pursue a fully electric bus fleet and did not pursue hydrogen due to safety concerns. He referenced that other agencies, including SamTrans and the Valley Transportation Authority, operated both hydrogen and electric buses and suggested consideration of a similar approach. He asked whether SFMTA might reconsider hydrogen as an option and noted that doing so would require additional infrastructure investment.

Member Barz asked whether charging speed differed between plug-in chargers and pantograph systems.

Mr. Kalinowski stated that charging speed varied based on kilowatt capacity and explained that pantograph systems had a higher maximum capacity and charged faster than plug-in chargers.

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, Levine, Kim, Margarita, and Ortega (7)

Absent: CAC Members Milford-Rosales and Siegal (2)

8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve the State and Federal Legislative Update – ACTION

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

Member Levine asked why staff had a watch position on Senate Bill (SB) 1246 rather than a support position, noting that he thought industry pushback suggested it was a strong bill.

Ms. Crabbe responded that a watch position would allow for further vetting, potential engagement with emergency responders and the author's office, and monitoring of amendments that may be introduced in collaboration with industry stakeholders. She added that staff may bring a position forward at a future meeting once bill language was more developed.

Member Kim asked for information regarding the difference between electric bicycles and electric motorbikes.

Mr. Reyes responded that California law defined three classes of e-bikes with limits on assisted speeds and motor size. He explained that devices not meeting state definitions



were not considered e-bikes and were classified either as “e-motos” or as another kind of device, which may be subjected to licensing and registration or may not be street legal. He further explained that one of the primary intents of SB 1167 was to eliminate ambiguity in identification and classification of these devices.

Member Kim asked whether e-motos subjected to licensing and registration could be ridden by teenagers and shared an experience about high school students who owned e-motos that could travel between 40 to 100 miles per hour.

Mr. Reyes stated that some devices were classified as motor vehicles and that in those cases, children would generally not be permitted to operate them. He added that other kinds of e-motos were not street legal and were intended for off-road use.

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that he attended an Ingleside Community Police monthly meeting where a portion of discussion focused on the usage of e-bikes, scooters and other devices. He stated that licensing for these vehicles should be considered and could discourage unsafe behavior.

CAC Member Austin Milford-Rosales stated that he was unable to attend the CAC meeting due to illness and expressed appreciation for efforts on federal House of Representatives 4376. He expressed interested in potential amendments to SB 1246 and requested clarification on what engagement with industry would entail. He requested an email update on the bill and whether language he supported could be retained. He also stated that he was seeking information on SB 1167 regarding provisions for bike modifications and potential penalties.

Howard Wong of SaveMUNI stated that usage of electric motorized devices was growing across the globe and suggested a review of best practices to inform policymaking.

Member Margarita suggested investing in educating youth on how to operate devices and cars safely in collaboration with community-based organizations, libraries and schools. She added that she agrees with paying for licenses but stressed that it should not be punitive or hinder undocumented individuals from obtaining licenses.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Ford, Levine, Kim, Margarita, and Ortega (6)

Nays: CAC Member Daniels (1)

Absent: CAC Members Milford-Rosales and Siegal (2)

9. Adopt a Motion of Support to Amend the Adopted Fiscal Year 2025/26 Budget to Decrease Other Financing Sources by \$50,000,000 for a Total Net Decrease in Fund Balance of \$50,000,000 – ACTION

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

Member Ortega summarized that staff reported a modest increase in sales tax revenue but stated that the budget would not be adjusted due to overall climate and uncertainty, which she indicated made sense and agreed with. She stated that the decrease in a \$50 million line item was not due to lower projected sales tax revenue but due to delays in payment requests, potentially related to project schedule delays or other unknown



factors, and added that the reduction was projected from the originally approved \$110 million. She also noted an associated increase in credit on the bank loan and asked for confirmation that her understanding was correct.

Ms. Fong stated that Member Ortega's definition was close and clarified that staff was unaware of any specific projects causing delays, explaining that the issue was a timing difference in when invoices were submitted. She added that sponsors could be billing other financing sources or grants first and noted that there could be administrative factors involved, but indicated there was no specific identified project schedule issue. She stated that the situation reflected "just-in-time" financing practices, where short-term debt is only drawn when needed to avoid interest costs, and added that minimizing interest expenses allows more funding to be directed toward projects.

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that the Central Subway extension appeared in materials as a placeholder and referenced a 2014 SFMTA-commissioned study projecting a 40,000 daily ridership increase from a proposed extension using 3- and 4-car trains, which would require platform modifications. He opined that the Central Subway had been a "disaster" and added that it was draining funding from Muni, citing observations of multiple two-car trains on layover at Geneva on the T-Line.

Howard Wong referenced the 2008 Los Angeles subway ridership projections and describing project costs that increased from approximately \$700 million to \$1.6 billion and ultimately \$2 billion. He commented that the Central Subway contributed to current Muni budget deficits and referenced a \$400 million cost overrun, an annual operating cost of \$15 million for three stations, and high cost per ridership. He added that closing stations could reduce costs and referenced the potential to reallocate funding toward bus service, transit deserts, and underserved areas, including the west side and south side. He stated that transit spending decisions reflected broader "politics of transit" and called for preventing what he described as poor project decisions in favor of more equitable funding distribution.

Member Margarita said she heard the staff presentation noting cost savings and that the Transportation Authority did not need to borrow as much. She expressed concerns about the political context and ongoing discussions of cuts affecting staff salaries, including Muni bus drivers and elevator operators and then asked whether funds could still be borrowed to avoid salary reductions and layoffs, stating she was concerned about preventing layoffs and unemployment.

Ms. Fong said the Transportation Authority's budget focused on capital project costs for the projects and was not related to administration or operations of SFMTA. She added that administrative and operational matters would be addressed in the SFMTA budget.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Milford-Rosales and Siegal (2)

10. Preliminary Fiscal Year 2025/26 Budget and Work Program – INFORMATION

Lily Yu, Finance Manager, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Kim asked about the Central Subway extension, noting he received multiple



public questions about the Central Subway. He asked why it was listed in the delivery section of the work program given that planning was already completed.

Ms. Lombardo stated that under the work program delivery section, the Central Subway Extension was listed under Project Delivery Support and Oversight, explaining that potential Transportation Authority roles contemplated in the FY 2026/27 work program included working with SFMTA to explore and conduct additional planning on the project rather than delivering the capital project. She also referenced a recent Board of Supervisors hearing on the project, where Rachel Hiatt, Deputy Director for Planning, spoke.

Ms. Hiatt stated Ms. Lombardo was correct and stated she would be happy to discuss the questions after the meeting.

Member Kim referenced prior reports on major capital projects, noting cost increases and delays in the Central Subway and Van Ness projects. He recommended independent or third-party review for future large capital projects to strengthen public trust. He also noted similar concerns for the Geary-19th Avenue Subway project and urged action to address them.

Ms. Hiatt thanked Member Kim for his comments and explained that the Central Subway extension was included in the proposed work plan because Transportation Authority staff had been discussing with SFMTA colleagues how they would resume the work and define the scope of response since the aforementioned hearing. She added that SFMTA was considering a request for Prop L funding to support the work, which would involve bringing a proposed scope of work and funding request to the CAC if pursued. She stated she would share Member Kim's comments and considerations with SFMTA staff working on the topic.

Member Ortega asked about the proposal to draw down the remainder of the line of credit and requested clarification on what that would mean and what options would be available after the line of credit was fully drawn.

Ms. Fong stated that once the remaining capacity of the revolving credit agreement with U.S. Bank was drawn down, the agency would take time to plan its next steps. She explained that in 2016 the agency fully drew down a similar credit agreement and subsequently issued its first sales tax revenue bond in 2017 to provide funding to advance project delivery. She added that similar options could be considered again in the future, including issuing bonds, increasing the revolving credit agreement, or expanding its terms. She stated that the agency was closely monitoring revenue streams, coordinating with sponsors on funding needs, providing quarterly updates to the committee, and continuing ongoing discussions.

Member Ortega expressed concern about another sales tax proposition given other major measures already on the ballot this year and stated that public support next year could be limited. She referenced the sales tax measure and parcel tax measure already under consideration this year.

Ms. Fong noted that in 2017 the agency issued its first sales tax revenue bond and clarified that this action was not an increase in San Francisco's sales tax [but rather the bond was to be paid back by the existing sales tax, now superseded by Prop L].

During public comment, Howard Wong stated that Attachment 1 indicated SFMTA was



resuming work funded by previous Transportation Authority sales funds and advancing the Central Subway extension through planning and conceptual design, which he said was a bad idea. He referenced upcoming voter measures, including a regional transportation tax and a San Francisco parcel tax, and stated that voters did not intend for new taxes or existing funds to be diverted to the Central Subway extension. He stated the project had contributed to Muni budget deficits and service cuts and noted concerns about low ridership and transit redundancy in parts of the city. He stated there should be greater public outreach and input, responsible use of existing funding, and called for an independent audit of the Central Subway extension.

11. San Francisco Transportation Plan 2050+ and West Side Network Study Update – INFORMATION

Item 11 was deferred to a future CAC meeting due to time constraints.

12. Brotherhood Way Safety and Circulation Plan Update – INFORMATION

Item 12 was not presented due to time constraints.

Other Items

13. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

There were no new items introduced.

14. Public Comment

During public comment, Edward Mason discussed technology trends in transportation and referenced reports of 1.2 million self-driving rides in December 2025, representing a 500% increase over 18 months. He stated that autonomous vehicles (AV) were contributing to congestion and added that the entry of Uber and Lyft into the AV market could shift transit use decisions. He referenced automated bus operations, including systems in Austin, Texas, that move buses and reduce labor costs. He stated that deliberations should consider how rapidly advancing technology could be applied to transportation planning.

Howard Wong stated that Mr. Mason's comments were thought-provoking and noted support for emerging transit systems was changing rapidly. He said that traditional subway construction took 15 to 30 years and referenced automated surface transit systems, including trackless vehicles that follow painted lines. He cited Jacksonville, Florida as implementing automated transit, including microbuses operating without tracks and running continuously. He opined that AI-enabled mobility systems were emerging and should be considered in future transportation planning and suggested the topic for a presentation.

15. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:53 p.m.