



DRAFT MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, May 27, 2026

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Siegal called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

CAC members present at Roll: Clara Baumgarten, Najuwanda Daniels, Phoebe Ford, Jerry Levine, Austin Milford-Rosales, Rachael Ortega, and Kat Siegal (7)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Sara Barz (entered during Item 7), Sean Kim, Diana Labaro, and Venecia Margarita (entered during Consent Agenda) (4)

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Siegal reported that the May 19 Board Executive Director's Report included several updates on various state and federal legislative matters and noted that all state bills supported by the Transportation Authority advanced except Senate Bill 2276 (Soria) and Senate Bill 1411 (Stern), which died in committee. Given all the legislative activity this time of year, Chair Siegal requested that staff provide a comprehensive state and federal legislative update at the next CAC meeting if time permitted.

Chair Siegal also welcomed and acknowledged new CAC Members Clara Baumgarten and Diana Labaro.

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

3. Approve the Minutes of the April 22, 2026 Meeting - ACTION

4. Adopt a Motion of Support to Authorize an Additional Construction Allotment of \$2,000,000, for a Revised Additional Construction Allotment Not to Exceed \$3,896,564; and Approve a Contract Amendment with GHD Inc. in the Amount of \$324,000 for the Bimla Rhinehart Vista Point Pier Parking Lot Project – ACTION

5. Internal Accounting Report, Investment Report, and Debt Expenditure Report for the Nine Months Ending March 31, 2026 - INFORMATION

6. State and Federal Legislation Update - INFORMATION

Member Milford-Rosales echoed the Chair's request for a more comprehensive presentation next month on state and federal legislative matters, including the status of bills and positions supported by the Transportation Authority, due to how quickly legislative activity had moved in recent weeks, and appreciated that current bill statuses were evolving at this point in the session

During public comment, Edward Mason referenced the legislation under Item 6 regarding



electric bicycles and stated that he hoped future legislation would require licensing for electric and motorized vehicles. He explained that operating these vehicles on sidewalks and in traffic created safety concerns and said that local, regional, or statewide action should address the issue.

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

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Barz, Kim, and Labaro (3)

End of Consent Agenda

7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the Inner Sunset Transportation Study Final Report - ACTION

Item 7 was presented after Item 10.

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

Member Baumgarten asked whether the reference to competing budget items related to the current budget or a future budget discussion.

Mr. Heidel explained that the recommendations identified potential funding sources and that some projects could be combined with larger SFMTA projects, which may expand funding opportunities. He further clarified that the identified funding sources were competitive and would require agencies to apply when funding opportunities became available.

Member Ortega asked whether shared-use loading zones were considered as part of long-term parking strategies. She noted that the approach could accommodate business parking and loading activities at different times of day.

Mr. Heidel stated that the recommended parking study would address loading zone usage and he added that the study would consider curb access needs, parking demand, and changing transportation patterns.

Member Ortega asked why the parking study timeline was expected to take five years.

Mr. Heidel clarified that the five-year timeline included the timeline for potential implementation of street-level changes. He added that implementation timing would depend on available funding, staffing, and resources.

Member Barz stated that community members and merchant representatives acknowledged the robust outreach efforts and had raised concerns regarding parking, double-parking, neighborhood safety, and traffic safety. She expressed support for the near-term implementation timeline for improvements. Member Barz questioned whether the proposed Class II bike lane on 7th Avenue was appropriate given recent collisions, vehicle speeds, and traffic volumes, and suggested additional consideration of alternative traffic and bicycle circulation approaches.



Member Milford-Rosales supported coordination with mapping software companies to improve traffic routing recommendations. He asked why similar approaches were not more widely implemented and whether policies or guidance could support low-cost traffic management strategies in future traffic studies.

Mr. Heidel stated that coordination with mapping applications had reduced routing through restricted turns by updating navigation guidance with the applications. He added that current efforts focused on providing destination-specific routing information, including directing drivers to appropriate parking facilities. Mr. Heidel stated that the approach would reduce congestion in the Inner Sunset and on Martin Luther King Jr Drive.

Jean Long, Multimodal Planning Manager at SFMTA, stated that navigation company coordination was being considered to address traffic routing through neighborhood streets. She noted that while SFMTA could coordinate with navigation companies to distribute traffic more evenly, the approach was not a complete solution due to routing variables and navigation algorithms.

Chair Siegal stated that she supported stronger improvements for transit reliability and safety along the corridor, particularly on Irving Street between 7th and 9th avenues. She explained that double-parked vehicles and delivery trucks affected N Judah operations and contributed to bicycle safety concerns. She asked whether the studies could result in stronger recommendations to prevent vehicles from obstructing N Judah service.

Mr. Heidel stated that regulations and pavement markings alone were insufficient to address double parking. He explained that medium- and long-term recommendations would consider street cross-section changes, including a bulb-out at 9th and Judah and additional corridor design review along Irving Street.

Ms. Long stated that long-term recommendations included preventing double parking through corner improvements at Irving Street and 9th Avenue and extending buffers along Irving Street between 7th and 9th avenues. She explained that the improvements aimed to prevent double-parked vehicles from interfering with N Judah operations and stated that related long-term projects were being coordinated with recommendations from the Transportation Authority study. She added that the N Judah project was conducting outreach and that additional information would be available later in the year.

Chair Siegal stated that she supported further exploration of roadway buffers. She asked whether the corridor could be considered for earlier implementation of loading and curb management strategies, including designated delivery hubs, due to ongoing double parking and large delivery vehicle activity.

Mr. Heidel stated that he would coordinate with the relevant project teams and follow up regarding the issue discussed.

Member Ford asked about the timeline for the N Judah survey and when it would produce actionable outcomes that would change the street.

Ms. Long stated that the survey for the N Judah project remained open online. Ms. Long stated that she did not have the details to answer the latter question on hand and said she would follow up.

Member Barz stated that she supported the proposal. She also supported feedback requesting faster and more concrete recommendations and asked what would be



required to advance long-term parking access and public space studies into shorter-term recommendations.

Mr. Heidel explained that funding limitations affected the ability to accelerate infrastructure improvements, including protected bicycle facilities and curb modifications along Irving Street. He continued to elaborate saying that additional study also was necessary because the corridor involved competing commercial, transit, bicycle, and parking demands that required evaluating trade-offs and coordinating with multiple agencies. He added that staff considered potential changes along Irving Street following the March collision but were unable to reach a clear recommendation for implementation.

During public comment, Bob Feinbaum, President of SaveMUNI, asked whether staff evaluated or would evaluate accessibility trade-offs for seniors and disabled riders when considering stop consolidation.

Gerald Cauthen of the Bay Area Transportation Working Group asked whether survey responses reflected broad public support for the proposed changes or a more narrow sampling of the population.

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

The minutes were approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Kim and Labaro (2)

8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$22,651,000 in Prop L Funds and Allocate \$1,860,572 in Prop AA Funds, with Conditions, for Ten Requests – ACTION

Rachel Seiberg, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Ford asked if SFPW could deliver the Geary Boulevard Pavement Renovation Phase 2 project in an accelerated manner similar to how Caltrans used a series of weekend closures for the 19th Avenue Paving and Rehabilitation project to minimize the construction timeline.

Paul Barradas, Project Manager at SFPW, replied that the 19th Avenue Paving and Rehabilitation project was a straightforward paving-only project, whereas the Geary paving project included sewer work that would take longer to implement. He added that the paving portion of the project would be implemented quickly, at approximately one block per day, and that paving typically occurred at the end of the project.

Member Barz asked what SFPW and SFMTA had learned from the Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project, which included sewer work that had contributed to significant project delays - that could make project delivery on the Geary Boulevard project more likely to be successful.

Liz Brisson, Senior Planning Manager at SFMTA, clarified that the paving allocation request was the second half of the Geary Boulevard Improvement Project, which focused on the western part of the corridor between Stanyan Street and 34th Avenue. In 2021, she said the SFMTA completed a similar scope of work from Stanyan Street east to Market Street, which was also coordinated with underground work that the SFPUC completed first. Ms. Brisson also cited lessons learned from the first phase of the Geary Boulevard



project that were planned to be applied to the second phase of the Geary Boulevard project. She added that the Van Ness BRT project used one contract for all the different infrastructure work, while the Geary Boulevard project used two different contracts. She noted that most of the disruptive utility work, which was part of a separate contract, was already completed and that the remaining work primarily involved transit and safety upgrades at spot locations and did not require extensive demolition.

Member Barz asked why Paratransit operations were eligible under Prop L, even though Prop L was largely for capital expenses.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, responded that Paratransit which provided critical mobility for seniors and persons with disabilities was the exception and that had been the case since the original sales tax was approved in 1989.

Member Barz asked if the funding level for Paratransit operations had remained the same since the inception of the sales tax.

Ms. Lombardo responded that the funding level had increased over time and noted the percentage or share of overall sales tax revenues increased from the prior sales tax to Prop L [8.6% to 11.4%] and that annual revenues were closed to \$115 million currently.

Member Barz asked why the design of painted bike lanes on 7th Avenue was combined with the bicycle connection feasibility assessment for the Inner Sunset Bike Connection project.

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director of Policy and Programming, said that the two scope elements were combined, in part, to achieve economies of scale for outreach.

Mr. Heidel said that there were economies of scale and outreach benefits to combining the two scopes. He explained that the painted bike lanes on 7th Avenue could be implemented quickly, while the evaluation of lower-stress, higher-protection bicycle alternatives potentially on 5th and 6th avenues, Hugo Street, and Judah Street, was not yet developed. He added that there was an opportunity to identify additional improvements that could be implemented alongside additional bike lanes. He clarified that the two scopes were tied together to talk to community members about the two scopes together and to emphasize that while a Class II bike lane on 7th Avenue was not the ideal solution, Transportation Authority and SFMTA staff could communicate what was able to be implemented quickly and what the project team might be able to do better in the future.

Member Barz stated that while the outreach portions seemed to fit together, the solutions did not. She asked why funding proposed for the painted bike lane could not be used for a different option.

Mr. Heidel replied that advancing the 7th Avenue bike lane did not preclude additional work and was not a one-to-one tradeoff. He added that alternative routes involved tradeoffs, such as hillier topography and more turns. He stated that developing an alternative route would have required changing the recommendation from SFMTA's Biking and Rolling Plan North Star Network.

Member Barz stated that the 7th Avenue bike lane seemed to contradict NACTO Street Design Guidelines and that the scope seemed easy but not helpful.

Mr. Heidel replied that cyclists used both routes, with more cyclists using 7th Avenue,



even with the drawbacks Member Barz identified.

Matt Lasky, Project Manager at SFMTA, reiterated Mr. Heidel's comments, and added that 7th Avenue provided the most direct route to the park and that was still used by cyclists. Mr. Lasky emphasized that this work did not preclude changes to the "West Side Wiggle" option. He added that it made more sense to combine outreach, and that the 7th Avenue bike lane would be a predecessor to future work in the area.

Member Milford-Rosales expressed his support for the Mission SoMa repaving and anticipation of a smoother transit ride.

Member Ortega asked why the allocation for the Treasure Island On-Island Shuttle Start-Up Phase 1 was contingent on an amendment of the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) 5YPP.

Ms. Lombardo responded that staff had been working with agency partners such as SFMTA to develop a strategic plan that would help identify potential uses of the Prop L TDM funds. She stated that the plan had not yet been completed and that, in the interim, a provision allowed the placeholder to be used for projects that scored well under the TDM 5YPP criteria. She added that the Treasure Island On-Island Shuttle Start-Up Phase 1 project scored well against the criteria and that staff therefore recommended using a portion of the placeholder to fund the project.

Member Ortega also asked whether this was a second study before implementing shuttle service on Treasure Island.

Alex Pan, Transportation Planner, stated that the study would evaluate shuttle operations and identify vendor options for operating the shuttle.

Ms. Lombardo added that staff was conducting the work necessary to issue a Request for Proposals for a shuttle provider.

Member Baumgarten asked how the different Paratransit programs were audited for utilization and how the Transportation Authority ensured that funds were allocated to the most needed programs.

Jonathan Chang, Associate Engineer at SFMTA, stated that the \$14 million request helped fund the entire Paratransit program, which included operations and administration, shuttles, vans, the Van Gogh service, etc. He stated that administration of the Paratransit program included registering people for the program and providing some non-ADA services such as the Essential Trip Card Program. Mr. Chang added that taxis provided 50% of service, SF Access provided approximately 30-35% of service, and 15% was from group van service.

Member Margarita asked if Paratransit vouchers could be restored as part of this allocation or if vouchers were dependent on the community-based organizations (CBOs) to which they were connected to.

Mr. Chang replied that CBO vouchers were not administered through SFMTA but that SFMTA did administer a subsidized taxi program.

Member Margarita asked if the taxi program would continue as it had been or if it would be augmented beyond the status quo. She also asked whether the \$14 million allocation was only for the current fiscal year.



Mr. Chang also confirmed that the allocation was for Fiscal Year 2027 only.

During public comment, Edward Mason commented that, in the future, staff should include past performance measures, such as the percent of auto trips reduced through the Safe Routes to School program. He opined that students were late to school due to Muni delays and that attendance increased when parents drove. He added that he did not believe the Safe Routes to School program was practical in some instances, such as when young children would have to walk or bike over hills, and urged staff to balance program goals and reality.

At Member Barz's request, Chair Seigal severed the Inner Sunset Bike Connection from the other requests.

Member Milford-Rosales moved to approve all of the other requests as recommended by staff, except for the Inner Sunset Bike Connection project, seconded by Member Margarita.

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Nays: CAC Member Ford (1)

Absent: CAC Members Kim and Labaro (2)

Member Barz stated that she supported a new bike connection but not a painted bike lane on 7th Avenue and said she wanted the Board to consider using funds only for the feasibility assessment.

Member Milford-Rosales moved to amend the Inner Sunset Bike Connection request to only include the scope of work for the feasibility assessment and drop the scope to design and implement Class II bicycle facilities on 7th Avenue, seconded by Member Margarita.

The amendment was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Levine, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, and Ortega (6)

Nays: CAC Members Baumgarten and Ford (2)

Absent: CAC Members Kim and Labaro (2)

Abstention: CAC Member Siegal (1)

Member Barz moved to approve the Inner Sunset Bike Connection request, as amended, seconded by Member Margarita.

The project as amended was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Kim and Labaro (2)



9. Adopt a Motion of Support to Amend the Prop K Standard Grant Agreement for the District 2 Safety Study and Implementation [NTIP Planning and Capital] (Project) to Update the Project Scope, Schedule, Cost, and Funding Plan; and Release \$430,000 on Reserve to Implement District 2 Safety Study Near-Term Recommendations – ACTION

Rachel Seiberg, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Ford asked how the project areas were chosen and why the locations were spot locations.

Alex Pan, Transportation Planner, replied that the study focused on vulnerable road users, and the study areas focused on places where those users gathered. She added that another selection criterion of the study was geographic diversity within the district.

Member Baumgarten requested clarification on which entities were responsible for construction delivery.

Damon Curtis, Project Manager at SFMTA, stated that most improvements would be completed by SFMTA and SF Public Works crews. He explained that some traffic calming work could be contracted out depending on project design development, but he expected the improvements would be delivered by city staff.

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Daniels, Kim, and Labaro (3)

10. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the Proposed Fiscal Year 2026/27 Budget and Work Program – ACTION

Item 10 was presented before Item 7.

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

During public comment, Edward Mason recommended monitoring autonomous vehicle implementation, establishing autonomous vehicle fees, incorporating autonomous vehicle technology and reservation-based loading zones into micromobility planning, and supporting the regional express bus system.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Baumgarten, Daniels, Ford, Levine, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (8)

Absent: CAC Members Barz, Kim, and Labaro (3)



11. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$180,800 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions, to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency and Appropriate \$49,900 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions, for the Central Subway North Beach Extension Study – ACTION

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

Member Ortega referenced public comments regarding the Central Subway study, including requests for an audit of prior project spending and support for broader subway expansion planning. She stated that she wanted the study to evaluate multiple expansion options, improve transit transfer reliability, and examine opportunities for additional tunnel construction and northern expansion. She added that she was concerned about the study timeline extending to 2028 and asked whether the proposal involved both reallocating existing funds and allocating additional funding.

Mr. Heidel replied that the funding request description was correct.

Member Ortega requested that the study include additional detail regarding expansion concepts, Central Subway cost escalation, and strategies to avoid similar cost increases in future projects. She stated that she supported extending the subway to Fisherman's Wharf and expressed concerns regarding limited transit service in the area.

Member Baumgarten stated that she supported the proposed infrastructure improvements. She asked whether staff considered collaborating with other cities or reviewing comparable international studies and what would be required to expedite the study before 2028.

Ms. Brisson stated that the proposed study schedule reflected uncertainty related to the timeline for completing required project steps, including consultant procurement and technical analysis. She explained that the study would involve both in-house staff and specialized geotechnical consultants, and that the timeline was conservative to account for potential delays, although staff would aim to complete the work sooner than two years.

Member Baumgarten asked whether requests for proposals were used to procure specialized geotechnical consulting services for the study.

Ms. Brisson explained that SFMTA used as-needed consultant contracts to reduce procurement time by prequalifying firms for commonly needed services. She stated that task orders could be issued to those firms and that multiple contract holders could be invited to submit proposals for specific task orders.

Member Margarita asked about the conditions associated with the proposed Prop L funding allocations and questioned the overall cost of the Central Subway project in light of the budget situation.

Mr. Heidel explained that the funding conditions included approval of amendments to previously programmed funding and requirements for SFMTA to return with informational updates and a final report.

Jesse Koehler, Director of Strategy, stated that the approximately \$1.9 billion Central Subway cost reflected completed construction costs funded through federal, state, regional, and local sources. He stated that any future subway extension would likely



require a similar suite of funding sources and clarified that the proposed extension project did not yet have construction funding. He added that the current effort focused on planning and cost analysis to support future funding and project development decisions.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, explained that the study would provide information to support policymakers, SFMTA, and other stakeholders in prioritizing future transit investments and project advancement decisions.

Member Margarita asked whether advancing the project would guarantee implementation and whether additional requirements and approvals would need to be completed before the project could move forward.

Mr. Koehler stated that completion of the next phase of planning did not guarantee project construction but was a necessary step in considering future project advancement.

Member Ford asked whether the proposed study had sufficient political support to advance beyond planning and whether key stakeholders supported the project. She questioned whether pursuing the study was appropriate if the project lacked support to secure future funding, approvals, coordination, and implementation.

Ms. Brisson explained that the study was initiated in response to public testimony at a Board of Supervisors Land Use Committee hearing supporting extension of the Central Subway. She stated that the study would evaluate the costs and considerations of extending the line to North Beach and compare that approach with longer extension options. She added that the study was intended to assess whether a phased extension strategy could provide a more practical approach to future expansion.

Member Milford-Rosales stated that he supported transit expansion but cited concerns regarding T Third service reliability, crowding, and capacity constraints. He explained that increasing ridership through a Central Subway extension should be paired with increased service frequency and additional transit improvements. He added that future planning should consider the capacity needed to accommodate additional riders generated by the extension.

Member Margarita stated that she remained concerned about the approximately \$2 billion cost of the Central Subway project and suggested that improving existing transit service, including increasing bus service and frequency, should be considered. She expressed concern about potential impacts on SFMTA staffing during the budget crisis.

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that the proposed effort involved a study rather than construction and argued that long-term operations and maintenance costs should also be considered. He referenced the Santa Clara County light rail system as an example of a project with low ridership and questioned whether additional investment in the Central Subway extension would be justified. He added that he had reservations about spending additional funds on further studies and expansion planning.

Howard Wong stated that he opposed further investment in the Central Subway extension, citing concerns regarding project costs, cost overruns, operating expenses, ridership, and maintenance issues. He argued that transit investments should prioritize improvements throughout the city rather than concentrating resources in the northeastern portion of San Francisco. He added that existing transit infrastructure in the area should be improved and made more resilient to flooding.

Gerald Cauthen commented that future extension of the Central Subway would require



substantial federal funding and questioned the likelihood of securing such support. He argued that Central Subway ridership projections were overstated and capital and operating cost estimates were understated. He added that project costs increased significantly from original estimates and that actual ridership was substantially lower than projected.

Tom Kearney commented that the study should evaluate extensions beyond North Beach, including Phase 3 and Phase 4 concepts identified in the T Third Concept Study, as part of the analysis. He added that funding availability should not limit the scope of the study. He stated that the T line had the second-highest ridership in the Metro system and that combined ridership on the T, 30, and 45 routes exceeded that of the 38 and 38R, supporting the need for improved transit capacity through the Stockton Street corridor.

Chair Siegal asked whether expanding the scope of the study to include additional areas would require significantly more funding or primarily a change in direction.

Ms. Brisson stated that expanding the study scope would require significantly more funding due to the engineering resources needed to develop conceptual alignments and stations. She explained that the study focused on potential station costs and comparisons of two extension options connected to the existing tunnel. She added that a broader extension study would require significant public outreach with affected neighborhoods and would not be feasible within the funding allocation under consideration.

Member Baumgarten asked whether the need for the study was driven by updated cost estimates or by structural differences that previous Phase 3 conceptual studies did not address.

Ms. Brisson stated that previous studies did not specifically evaluate a single-station extension to North Beach. She explained that a 2014 concept study developed several conceptual alignments and station locations for an extension to Fisherman's Wharf and was conducted as a technical study without public outreach.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Baumgarten, Ford, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (6)

Nays: CAC Member Margarita (1)

Absent: CAC Members Daniels, Kim, Labaro, and Levine (4)

12. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the Geary/19th Ave Subway and Regional Connections Study Final Report – ACTION

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

Member Barz stated that she supported the project and believed it would be important to support implementing the Family Zoning Plan on the west side and in District 7. She asked whether the project would compete for funding with the project discussed in the previous agenda item.

Mr. Heidel stated that staff and fiscal capacity existed to continue advancing multiple major transit projects, refining cost estimates, and evaluating benefits ahead of the next San Francisco Transportation Plan update in 2027. He explained that the plan update



would provide an opportunity to prioritize investments among the major transit projects under consideration. He added that project readiness, funding competitiveness, and community and political support would be factors in that evaluation.

Mr. Heidel continued by stating that the characterization made by Member Barz was fair and explained that individual project efforts would help inform the evaluation process. He added that the San Francisco Transportation Plan would bring the projects together for a comparable evaluation.

Member Barz stated that major infrastructure projects could generate economic benefits through jobs and related economic activity and that project costs did not fully capture the value of such investments. She stated that evaluating project benefits was as important as evaluating costs and supported measuring outcomes such as the number of people served. She added that ridership represented people whose lives benefited from transit service and project benefits should not be overlooked during the evaluation process.

Member Margarita questioned the equity benefits of the project given the proposed investment and the impacts of the current budget crisis on SFMTA workers and their families. She asked whether an analysis had been conducted regarding occupational segregation and the workforce affected by job cuts, and stated that equity impacts should be examined more closely. She added that investment priorities should focus on improving pedestrian and bicycle safety and preserving existing transportation services. She stated that project benefits for workers and residents should be weighed against future benefits when evaluating the investment.

Chair Siegal stated value capture was an important consideration for any future project advancement. She supported including an alternatives analysis as a next step and suggested evaluating the benefits of significantly increasing service on the 38 and 28 routes as both an alternative and a potential incremental approach. She stated that such analysis could help assess what improvements could be achieved with existing resources and additional operational funding.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated that previous transit planning efforts incurred significant costs and cited the Central Subway extension and Link21 as examples. He explained that residents in Santa Clara County studied tunnel projects and developed alternative proposals. He suggested creating a grassroots effort in San Francisco to engage residents with relevant expertise to help inform projects such as the Central Subway and Geary/19th corridor.

Howard Wong commented that the Transportation Authority should study emerging transit technologies, including artificial intelligence, digital traffic management, automated trackless trains, microbuses, and automated train control systems. He explained that such technologies could be incorporated into existing systems and implemented more quickly than major capital projects. He added that San Francisco's transit mode share had declined despite significant investment and stated that transit funding should prioritize improvements that delivered benefits sooner. He also stated that Central Subway ridership was concentrated on the Third street segment of the T Line while several subway stations experienced lower ridership.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:



Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Baumgarten, Ford, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (6)

Nays: CAC Member Margarita (1)

Absent: CAC Members Daniels, Kim, Labaro, and Levine (4)

Other Items Minutes:

13. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

Member Milford Rosales stated that more than 100 days had passed since the Mayor's Street Safety Executive Directive and that the only visible action was high-visibility enforcement. He stated that community discussions following a fatal traffic collision indicated that processes outlined in the directive for community engagement and street safety improvements were not yet in place. He stated that he had not heard a clear Vision Zero plan and requested that a representative from the Mayor's Office attend a future meeting to discuss implementation efforts.

There was no public comment.

14. Public Comment

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that he observed a significant decline in corporate commuter bus ridership, particularly on Mondays and Fridays, which he attributed to employees working from home and a Tuesday-through-Thursday workweek pattern. He referenced a Transportation Authority survey conducted through CHAMP and stated that the program was justified in part by findings that riders would otherwise drive. He added that the buses continued operating despite reduced patronage and stated that they generated pollution and consumed fuel.

Roland Lebrun commented that the 2026 High-Speed Rail Business Plan was presented to the Senate Transportation Committee and rejected after the estimated cost between Los Angeles and San Francisco increased from \$133 billion to \$231 billion. He added that the Governor replaced the chair and vice chair of the High-Speed Rail Authority with Jason Elliott and Steve Kawa. He stated that high-speed rail appeared likely to reach the Transbay Terminal at least a decade before reaching Bakersfield.

15. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:14 p.m.