



DRAFT MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, June 24, 2026

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Siegal called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

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

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Sara Barz (entered during Item 8), Najuwanda Daniels, Diana Labaro, Venecia Margarita (entered during Item 6) (4)

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Siegal reported that signatures were submitted for two transit-related citizen initiatives for the November 2026 ballot, including a regional transit sales tax measure and the Stronger Muni for All initiative in San Francisco, both of which would provide transit funding if approved by voters. She added that the Transportation Authority project team would host a community outreach event for the Westside Network Study on June 28 at the Outer Sunset Farmers Market to share information and gather public feedback. She encouraged community members to attend and provide input.

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

3. Approve the Minutes of the May 27, 2026 Meeting - ACTION

4. Adopt a Motion of Support to Award a Three-Year Professional Services Contract with an Option to Extend for Two Additional One-Year Periods, to Crowe LLP in an Amount Not to Exceed \$340,000 for Annual Audit Services – ACTION

5. Adopt a Motion of Support to Ratify Debt, Investment, and Procurement Policies – ACTION

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

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

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Baumgarten, Ford, Kim, Levine, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (7)

Absent: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Margarita, and Labaro (4)

End of Consent Agenda



6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$3,055,000 and Appropriate \$125,000 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions, for Six Requests – ACTION

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

Member Kim asked for the Public Sidewalk and Curb Repair project, if there were 200 locations and around 1,000 locations of backlog, how many damaged areas were related to trees and how many were unrelated to trees.

Ms. Seiberg clarified that none of the locations in the list were due to tree damage.

Marianna Williams, Project Manager at San Francisco Public Works (SFPW), clarified that this request and the backlog was for non-tree related repair, and that tree-related repairs were funded separately.

Member Kim asked how many curbs had damage related to trees and inquired if Prop L funds had previously funded curbs damaged due to trees and asked why sidewalks repairs were never funded related to tree damage.

Ms. Williams replied that around 2,000 locations were damaged due to trees and she explained that the subject Prop L allocation request was specifically for non-tree related curb repair and that tree-related sidewalk repair was funded under the City's Tree Maintenance Fund.

Member Kim responded that as a small business owner, he noticed poor sidewalk conditions on high pedestrian traffic merchant corridor areas like Geary Boulevard and Clement Street due to tree damage and added that wheelchair users could not use the sidewalk due to curb damage.

Ms. Williams replied that SFPW focused curb repair work on busy corridors and less busy areas throughout the city. She added that this year alone, SFPW repaired over 113,000 square feet of sidewalk. She cited the urgency in proactively repairing curbs to mitigate claims against the City related to trips, slips, and falls. She added that SFPW had access to contractors through programs such as the Accelerated Sidewalk Abatement Program.

Member Kim commented that he previously worked with SFPW staff when they were marking severely damaged sidewalks by trees near senior centers, schools, and other centers that attracted vulnerable populations but he did not see improvements or funding requests. He urged SFPW to prioritize curb repairs near senior centers, schools, and bus stops.

Member Ford asked about the Curb Ramps Various Locations No. 19 request and stated that the allocation request came out to \$38,000 per curb ramp and \$200,000 per intersection. She asked if the prices per curb ramp and intersection were the same as last year.

Anastasia Haddad, Project Manager at SFPW, replied that every location was unique and that SFPW could not apply an average cost per curb ramp or per intersection, as some locations required drainage or other complex work involving sub-sidewalk basements, overhead catenary, etc., which therefore made some locations more expensive than others. Ms. Haddad added that she did not have data from last year's prices but said they were likely comparable, perhaps with a 3-5% increase.

Member Ford asked if SFPW made an effort to decrease prices per year and encouraged SFPW to seek to be more efficient when implementing work en masse over time.



Member Ford also asked if the work was planned to be implemented in-house or bidded out, to which Ms. Haddad replied that the project was planned to be bidded out.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, added that SFPW had previously implemented many of the simpler, less expensive curb ramps and was now implementing the more expensive work.

Member Milford-Rosales expressed his support for the Visitacion Ave Bike and Pedestrian Safety Improvements project, specifically as a way to connect schools to playgrounds, connect to Mansell Promenade, and to better connect the bike network. He asked if concrete barriers were going between the two-way cycle track and the main traffic flow.

Marian Cross, Project Manager at Recreation and Parks Department, replied that there would be concrete barrier K rails to protect bicyclists from vehicles, along with speed tables, lane narrowing, and pedestrian refuge when crossing the street.

In regard to the curb ramp project, Chair Siegel asked if SFPW considered absence of curb ramps when selecting curb ramp locations and if there was an inventory of intersections that did not have curb ramps at both crosswalks.

Ms. Haddad replied that SFPW considered locations that did not have existing curb ramps as a criteria and affirmed it had an inventory of all curb assets.

Chair Siegel followed up by asking if it was a priority for DPW to ensure that every crosswalk had a curb ramp added, to which Ms. Haddad replied yes, as ADA accessibility was a citywide priority, though there were still thousands of locations in the queue for curb ramp construction. She said that the public was able to send a request for a curb ramp through 311 or file a request through the Office of Disability and Accessibility, and the request would then be routed to SFPW.

During public comment, Edward Mason noted that curb repair was planned at the 16th and Sanchez street intersection, though damage was minor. He asked why SFPW was prioritizing this type of curb for repair while other infrastructure was falling apart.

Roland LeBrun commented on the cost of curb ramps in San Jose, which was \$7,500 to \$20,000 per curb ramp. He observed that in San Jose, curb ramps were implemented through a large capital bid and that in San Francisco, costs were much higher.

Member Margarita asked for DPW to address Edward Mason's public comment and stated that she appreciated the clarification that residents were able to call 311 or the Office of Disability and Accessibility. She asked how locations were prioritized.

Ms. Haddad replied that curb ramp requests were prioritized considering several criteria, such as the number of requests per location, how long a constituent had been waiting for repair, resources around the locations, and proximity to hospitals and other key resources. She clarified that while there was a goal to get through the entire queue of requests, SFPW had thousands of curb ramps to complete.

Member Margarita asked if the CAC could get a copy of historical requests to answer Edward Mason's question about why SFPW was fixing the curb at the intersection of 16th and Sanchez streets if it did not need to be fixed.

Ms. Haddad clarified the 16th and Sanchez streets intersection was not part of the subject curb ramp project on the agenda. She emphasized that the goal was to build out every curb ramp in the city and that constituent requests were given the highest priority.



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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

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

7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve the Fiscal Year 2026/27 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program of Projects, Totaling \$2,496,917, with Conditions – ACTION

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

Regarding the Bike Corrals at Daylit Intersections project, Member Baumgarten asked whether the goal was to eventually daylight all intersections in the city, with something in addition to paint on the curb.

Mr. Pickford said that there was a state law requiring daylighting, but that he was not aware of any SFMTA policy to do anything other than paint the curb at this time. He said that the recommended project was an early effort to provide 'hardening' at a limited number of daylight locations.

Member Baumgarten asked whether constituents could request a bicycle parking corral at a daylight location, similar to requesting standard bicycle racks.

Mr. Pickford stated that the short-term bicycle parking request process allowed requests for bicycle corrals in addition to single bicycle racks and explained that such requests would be evaluated through SFMTA's evaluation system.

Jason Hyde, Senior Transportation Planner at SFMTA added that SFMTA expected to launch a separate Community Corners website later in the summer that would allow the public to request bicycle corrals.

Member Baumgarten asked whether the plan included funding to publicize the public's ability to request bicycle corrals, including through marketing or outreach initiatives.

Mr. Hyde stated that SFMTA had not actively publicized the public's ability to request bicycle racks for some time and appreciated the comment. He explained that the subject request did not include dedicated funding for outreach but added that other funding opportunities could support those efforts.

Member Baumgarten asked whether the public could request bike share stations through a request form similar to the process for requesting bicycle parking.

Mr. Hyde stated that the public could submit potential bike share location suggestions by email and added that SFMTA welcomed public input on potential locations.

Member Baumgarten asked whether decisions regarding bike share infrastructure were made through a public-private partnership with Lyft.

Mr. Hyde confirmed that was correct.

Matt Lasky, Project Manager at SFMTA stated that bicycle share station placement was more complex because SFMTA sought citywide coverage. He added that e-bikes now had locking devices, providing opportunities for use beyond bicycle share stations.



Member Kim asked for an explanation of why Southeast San Francisco was the only area identified as a high-priority community under Assembly Bill (AB) 617 and requested additional information about the designation.

Mr. Pickford explained that AB 617 established a process to focus on communities disproportionately affected by poor air quality by supporting local planning and providing resources to improve air quality. He stated that the Bay Area Air District selected multiple planning areas throughout the region and added that Southeast San Francisco was the only selected area within San Francisco County.

Member Milford-Rosales stated his support for the Howard Streetscape Project and asked for clarification on the proposed conditional funding allocation, including why funding approval depended on SFMTA securing its funding and the likelihood of that occurring.

Mr. Pickford stated that the Howard Streetscape Project remained a high priority for the city and the Transportation Authority and that additional funding had been proposed for the project. He explained that the proposed funding condition reflected the timely use of funds requirement and would allow the funds to be redirected if project delays occurred.

Ms. Lombardo explained that Prop L sales tax policy requires projects to be fully funded or provide a usable segment as a prerequisite for allocation of funds. She added that staff was confident that the remaining funding would be secured and had included the funding condition to allow the project to move forward while the remaining funds were secured in light of timely use of funds deadlines, while preserving flexibility to redirect funds if circumstances changed.

Member Margarita asked why the funding was restricted to bicycle projects and requested an explanation of the AB 617 planning area, including the meaning of the red lines shown on the map.

Mr. Pickford explained that the Air District shifted bicycle project funding to counties because regional bicycle projects had often faced delays or not advanced, and the new approach was intended to improve project delivery. He added that he did not know how the AB 617 planning area boundaries were determined but explained that the program emphasized a community-led process to develop plans that improve local air quality.

Member Margarita asked whether the AB 617 planning area would receive additional bicycle infrastructure improvements and requested clarification on what types of investments would be made in the designated area.

Ms. Lombardo explained that the Air District specified that the regional TFCA funds under consideration in this item were only for bicycle projects, but other Air District funding opportunities may be available for other types of projects, with priority for AB 617 planning areas.

Member Margarita asked whether the AB 617 planning process would include community meetings and then asked whether the Emergency Ride Home program also covered scooters and similar mobility devices in addition to bicycles.

Mr. Pickford confirmed that the AB617 planning process involved community input and that the process was led by the Air District. He said that SFMTA was assuming management of the Emergency Ride Home program. He added that users of zero-emission transportation modes would likely be eligible for the program but clarified that he could not speak on SFMTA's behalf.



Member Margarita asked how participants would access assistance through the Emergency Ride Home program, including whether assistance would be available by calling 311.

Paul Bignardi, Transportation Planner at SFMTA stated that SFMTA was in the process of assuming management of the Emergency Ride Home program. He explained that eligible participants with qualifying emergencies pay for a taxi ride home upfront and may request reimbursement after meeting the program's eligibility requirements and verification process.

Mr. Pickford stated that SFMTA would provide additional information as it assumed management of the Emergency Ride Home program and added that staff would share information with the CAC to help publicize the program.

Member Margarita encouraged staff to consider equitable outreach strategies and community engagement to help ensure all residents could benefit from the Emergency Ride Home program.

Chair Siegal stated her support for the Howard Streetscape Project and asked whether the project's estimated \$58 million cost for seven blocks reflected the typical cost of a streetscape project or whether specific project elements made it more expensive.

Mr. Lasky explained that the Howard Streetscape Project included extensive underground utility work and above-ground improvements, including paving, landscaping, pedestrian enhancements, and signal upgrades. He added that the signal upgrades would support a two-way bikeway along the corridor.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated that electric vehicles were subject to the same \$4 TFCA charge as other vehicles and indicated that this appeared inconsistent with the program's purpose.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

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

8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Amend the Prop K Standard Grant Agreements for the Visitacion Valley & Portola Community Based Transportation Plan (Plan) Implementation [NTIP Capital] to Update the Scope, Schedule, Cost, and Funding Plan; and Release \$435,000 on Reserve to Implement Plan Recommendations – ACTION

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

Member Margarita asked whether SFMTA had any project funds beyond the allocated \$435,000 and asked for clarification on the future \$750,000 allocation request.

Ms. Seiberg confirmed that the subject \$435,000 were on reserve to implement recommendations from the plan and that there remained another \$750,000 programmed to the Visitacion Valley & Portola Community Based Transportation Plan Implementation Placeholder that SFMTA intended to request in the future to help fund other plan recommendations.



Jean Long, Transportation Planner in SFMTA's Streets Division/Planning & Project Delivery Subdivision/Planning Section, stated that plan recommendations also included costlier elements, such as pedestrian bulbouts and as a result, SFMTA was seeking additional funds through MTC's CARE grant, which funded community based transportation plan implementation.

Member Margarita expressed her appreciation for investing in the area.

Member Milford-Rosales asked about the vision for bicycle network connectivity including whether there were plans to connect the multi-use path or provide sidewalk or park space where people could walk their bikes, as the area seemed to be a near-connection between two projects. He added that some completed projects did not fully connect to the existing bike network, and implementing a few blocks of bikeway that did not connect to the existing bike network did not seem to fix the overall problem.

Ms. Long replied that the scope reflected recommendations from the subject community plan, which had included public outreach. She added that the funds were for detailed design and construction, so project engineers and planners would seek opportunities to build the bike network in the area. SFMTA planned to use the recommendations as a starting point but was not locked into the specific scope and would seek opportunities to connect to the existing bike network. She said that SFMTA planned to start with the two segments in the scope, to honor the recommendations in the community plan and they would see what other opportunities emerged during the design process if feasible with the budget.

Member Milford-Rosales stated that he would appreciate it if SFMTA committed to connecting those two bicycle facilities.

Member Margarita asked what streets the bike lanes planned to travel on.

Chair Siegel commented that the bike lane seemed to continue toward San Bruno Avenue.

Ms. Lombardo stated that Transportation Authority staff would follow up with SFMTA staff about the exact bike path.

Ms. Long added that SFMTA planned to initiate detailed design and would have public outreach, since it had been a few years since SFMTA had done outreach.

Member Margarita asked if SFMTA would provide the CAC with a list of community based organizations that they planned to reach out to within Districts 9 and 10. Ms. Long replied that SFMTA would start with District 10, since the Neighborhood funds were dedicated to District 10. She mentioned that SFMTA had already connected with Supervisor Walton's office about key stakeholders in that area to conduct outreach.

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Daniels and Labaro (2)



9. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the Laguna Honda Gondola Feasibility Study Final Report – ACTION

Ahmed Thleiji, Rail Program Principal Engineer, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Ortega asked about the cost of increasing shuttle service frequency, including whether increasing service would proportionally increase operating costs or provide cost savings. She also asked how an SFMTA-operated shuttle service would compare with the existing hospital-operated or privately operated services.

Jean Paul Velez, Principal Transportation Planner, replied that increasing shuttle frequency would require an additional shuttle and would approximately double the annual operating cost. He added that SFMTA previously operated a shuttle service and stated that staff would need to consult with SFMTA regarding its prior operation and whether the agency had considered resuming the service.

Member Ortega stated that the study did not evaluate what would be required to increase service but said the report should have recommended using any cost savings from a gondola to improve transit infrastructure and increase service frequency to the hospital. She explained that the report compared the gondola with existing shuttle service rather than an equivalent level of service and said a comparison based on matching shuttle frequency and capacity would have provided a more appropriate basis for evaluating feasibility. She added that she would have liked the report to include that analysis.

Ahmed Thleiji, Rail Program Principal Engineer, stated that a 2023 transportation demand management study examined ridership associated with future growth at the hospital and identified increasing shuttle frequency as a potential option. He explained that the current study evaluated a shuttle and a gondola rather than equivalent services and agreed that it was not an apples-to-apples comparison because of differences in capital costs and technical characteristics. He added that the earlier study specifically focused on the shuttle.

Member Ortega stated that the shuttle's operating hours appeared limited and said the report should have acknowledged how those hours affected access to the hospital. She explained that the study highlighted shortcomings in the existing shuttle service but did not address them because they were outside the study's scope for this study. She added that she respected the defined scope of the gondola technical feasibility study but said the broader transportation issues it identified warranted a more comprehensive study.

Carl Holmes, Deputy Director for Capital Projects, stated that staff encountered challenges obtaining information about the existing shuttle after discovering it was operating during the gondola feasibility study. He explained that the study originally considered a shuttle service as an alternative if the gondola was not cost-effective but shifted to evaluating the existing shuttle once it was identified. He added that the findings supported enhancing shuttle service and agreed that the study's scope and limited budget constrained further shuttle alternative analysis.

Member Kim asked whether adopting the feasibility study also meant adopting its conclusion not to recommend further study of the Laguna Honda gondola concept.

Mr. Thleiji confirmed that staff did not recommend further study of the Laguna Honda gondola concept because the estimated \$22 million cost for a one-tenth-mile alignment



was too high.

Member Kim stated that additional information before the study would have been beneficial and said he hoped the study could be used for future efforts.

Member Levine asked at what point the gondola would have been at its highest point above the ground.

Vanessa Peers, Project Manager at Kimley Horn stated that the gondola would have reached a maximum height of 55 feet above ground. She explained that the alignment needed to climb steeply to clear required pedestrian and roadway height envelopes before leveling off and then descending at a gentler grade toward the hospital.

Member Levine asked whether patients at the hospital had been interviewed to determine whether they would be willing to use a gondola, given that some might have an aversion to heights.

Mr. Thleiji stated that staff worked closely with hospital staff to determine the project's footprint but did not evaluate whether users would be willing to ride the gondola. He explained that, after determining the estimated cost and identifying other challenges, staff did not recommend studying the gondola further for the site.

Member Levine stated that a gondola could present problems if it were the only transportation option available for people who had an aversion to riding it.

Member Margarita asked about the cost and duration of completing the study.

Mr. Thleiji stated that the study cost approximately \$170,000 and took a little more than one year to complete.

Member Margarita stated that she had visited Laguna Honda multiple times during and after the shuttle's operating hours and had never seen the shuttle.

Member Baumgarten asked whether adopting the gondola feasibility study final report would commit the committee to any follow-up actions or funding allocations, or whether the action would simply recognize the study's findings.

Mr. Thleiji confirmed the latter was accurate.

Member Ford asked whether the study had been requested by Chair Melgar and whether the funding approved was limited to the study rather than shuttle service. She stated that she was disappointed the study cost approximately \$170,000 and asked whether changes to the committee's evaluation process could help avoid spending resources on similar proposals in the future. She also asked how the committee could influence future decisions beyond receiving the study findings.

Deputy Director Holmes stated that the study was initiated at Chair Melgar's request and the allocation request had been supported by the CAC. He further explained that staff evaluated the existing shuttle as an alternative to avoid concluding that no transportation improvements were possible and had sought to identify potential applications for similar gondola concepts elsewhere. He explained that staff also evaluated the existing shuttle to support potential advocacy for enhanced shuttle service so the study would produce a useful outcome.

Member Barz stated that she understood why Chair Melgar requested the study and said a gondola could have been an appropriate technical solution for improving access to the



hospital for people with mobility challenges. She added that comparable capital investments had been made for short-distance transportation projects and said she saw value in both the study and its recommendation. She asked how the existing shuttle's operating hours and service frequency had been determined.

Mr. Velez stated that he did not know the formal basis behind the shuttle's operating hours but opined that they likely reflected work hours and expected peak demand periods.

Member Barz stated that she shared concerns that the shuttle's operating hours appeared too limited for a hospital and asked why a gondola would become more feasible over a longer distance, such as six-tenths of a mile.

Deputy Director Holmes stated that he referenced a longer distance because a gondola operates over a similar distance in Portland. He explained that staff had not studied the issue but cited that example as an available point of comparison and added that a longer distance would likely be needed to improve overall cost effectiveness.

Member Barz stated that she would have liked the report to include a return-on-investment analysis comparing the gondola with enhanced shuttle service. She asked whether staff had evaluated that type of analysis to help determine when the benefits of a gondola would justify its cost.

Mr. Velez stated that projected demand for the gondola did not justify its capacity or cost. He explained that the existing shuttle could accommodate projected demand growth more affordably through expanded service and added that the gondola's cost per passenger trip would be significantly higher.

Member Margarita stated that the proposal had received careful consideration because of its cost relative to the short distance served. She added that, although she did not believe the gondola was appropriate for Laguna Honda, she believed the study could benefit future transportation planning in other parts of the city where improved access was needed for older adults and people with mobility challenges.

Member Baumgarten asked whether the study recommended any follow-up studies or actions beyond the stated findings and recommendations and whether alternatives other than a shuttle or gondola were being considered.

Mr. Thleiji stated that the study recommended enhancing the existing shuttle and implementing additional transportation demand management strategies, which could lead to additional transportation solutions if needed.

Member Baumgarten stated that transportation assistance programs, such as fare waivers for rideshare could improve access to healthcare. She suggested that a broader healthcare transportation assistance program could be considered to help residents access care.

During public comment, Edward Mason recommended that Transportation Authority include the cost and funding source of each study in future reports. He stated that the study should compare total travel time beyond the gondola trip itself and consider emerging transportation alternatives when evaluating access to Laguna Honda.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:



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

Absent: CAC Members Daniels and Labaro (2)

10. West Side Network Study Update – INFORMATION

David Long, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Kim stated that Transportation Authority outreach at the Richmond District Night Market generated strong public engagement and that he also met Transportation Authority staff during outreach to local organizations. He said that the proactive outreach was positive and asked whether the Westside Study included any specific proposals, that could be applied to other efforts.

Mr. Long stated that the outreach approach did not include any project-specific or novel elements and explained that the same approach could be applied to other projects. He added that staff was documenting lessons learned and would apply those best practices to future projects.

Member Kim stated that ideas from the study could inform the Transportation Authority's San Francisco Transportation Plan 2050+. He asked staff to explain the meaning of "fill sidewalk gaps," stating that members of the public had asked about the term.

Mr. Long explained that a proposed project would identify and fill sidewalk gaps on the west side. He stated that priority locations included the north side of Lincoln adjacent to Golden Gate Park and Lower Great Highway, where there were locations without sidewalks.

Chair Siegal stated that she was encouraged by the study's progress and early recommendations. She asked whether public feedback had identified concerns about overcrowded transit, long walking distances between routes, and requests for improved route coverage and service frequency, particularly during off-peak hours.

Mr. Long stated that public feedback consistently identified improving north-south transit routes and connectivity as a priority. He stated that improving connections to regional transit, as well as addressing transit reliability and station area concerns, were also recurring themes in the feedback.

Member Ortega stated that she supported improving transit service that was less focused on downtown and included stronger north-south connections. She explained that indirect routing, multiple transfers, and longer travel times reduced the convenience of transit for trips outside the downtown core.

Member Ford stated that she supported the comments regarding improved north-south transit service and long walking distances. She asked whether the study would address operational funding opportunities for transit improvements or whether those funding issues would be considered separately.

Mr. Long explained that the study considered proposals requiring ongoing operational funding but that fiscal cliff facing transit operators was severe and nothing within the Westside Network Study changed that reality. He stated that study would identify the operational and maintenance implications of new ideas. He added that any prioritized proposals would require additional funding and that the final report would include a



funding and implementation chapter outlining strategies to support implementation.

Member Kim stated that public outreach showed strong interest in new transit proposals, particularly improved north-south connections and a connection to Daly City BART. He added that he explained to Transportation Authority staff that the Richmond District's long avenue blocks contributed to longer walking distances, providing geographic context for public feedback.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked whether the study included traffic analysis using TomTom or heat-mapping data to identify travel patterns and trip directions. He stated that understanding where and when people traveled would be important in evaluating transportation needs.

11. State and Federal Legislation Update – INFORMATION

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

Member Milford-Rosales asked whether recent reports regarding Waymo pickups and drop-offs in bike lanes had affected discussions with state legislators or changed the status of autonomous vehicle (AV) legislation.

Ms. Crabbe stated that she had not specifically discussed the reported Waymo issue with legislators but explained that legislators recognized the need to address AV concerns while prioritizing selected issues. She added that SB 1246 focused on interference with emergency responders and that the implementation of AB 1777 on July 1 would help inform the impacts of the legislation on autonomous vehicle operations.

Member Milford-Rosales acknowledged that emergency response remained the highest AV policy priority and added that enforcement of moving violations was also a concern. He asked whether new reports on AV moving violations could support efforts to strengthen legislation addressing interference with emergency vehicles.

Ms. Crabbe stated that such evidence could be considered when developing legislation.

Member Barz asked for a brief update on the status of the Super Speeders Act.

Ms. Crabbe stated that the Super Speeders Act faced scrutiny in part because of its potential impact on the state budget and increased costs to the DMV. She added that privacy concerns were also considered during discussion of the bill.

Martin Reyes, Principal Transportation Planner, Government Affairs, further explained that the funding issue involved the Motor Vehicle Account, which supports the DMV, the California Highway Patrol, and other programs. He added that bills increasing costs to agencies supported by the Motor Vehicle Account faced significant challenges during the current legislative session because they would worsen the account's already poor financial condition.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked whether legislation was being considered to require licensing for e-bikes and similar vehicles. He stated that licensing could improve rider responsibility and help address safety concerns related to e-bikes and scooters operating on sidewalks.

Roland Lebrun stated that he learned at the California High-Speed Rail Authority Board meeting that the annual \$1 billion in Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund funding was being



contested. He added that the issue could invalidate the High-Speed Rail Business Plan and stated that he was researching the matter.

Other Items

12. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

There were no new items introduced.

13. Public Comment

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated that he supported funding for BART core capacity at the Metropolitan Transportation Commission meeting but recommended withholding further funding approval of \$750 million for the VTA BART Extension until issues identified in the Santa Clara County Civil Grand Jury report were addressed. He added that the report could affect a regional funding measure and said that he would forward his letter to the committee.

14. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:56 p.m.