San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

1455 Market Street, 22ND Floor, San Francisco, California 94103 415-522-4800 info@sfcta.org www.sfcta.org

MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, July 22, 2026

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Siegal called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

CAC members present at Roll: Clara Baumgarten, Najuawanda Daniels, Sean Kim, Jerry Levine, Venecia Margarita, Austin Milford-Rosales, Rachael Ortega, and Kat Siegal (8)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Sara Barz (entered during Item 2), Phoebe Ford (entered during Item 6), and Diana Labaro (3)

2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Siegal reported on ongoing public outreach for the Western Addition–Geary Boulevard Community Study, the Bayview Caltrain Station Location Study, and the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 4 County Program, including upcoming engagement opportunities and anticipated CAC actions this fall. She added that CAC members interested in a briefing on the Bayview Caltrain Station Location Study before the September 9 CAC meeting should contact the Clerk of the Transportation Authority. She also thanked outgoing CAC member Sara Barz for her service and contributions to the committee.

Vice Chair Daniels thanked Member Barz for her service on the CAC, appreciated her thoughtful leadership and support during committee discussions, and wished her well in her future endeavors.

Member Barz thanked the Chair, Vice Chair, and staff and stated that serving on the CAC for the past four years was a pleasure. She added that she had decided not to seek reappointment, expressed confidence in her successor, and said she was saddened to leave the committee.

Member Margarita thanked Member Barz for her service, commented that Member Barz consistently advocated for the community, and wished her well in her future endeavors.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun thanked Member Barz for her service. He also stated that he was unable to find the meeting link and information about that evening's Bayview Caltrain Station Location Study outreach on the Transportation Authority website. [The Bayview Caltrain Station Location Study Update was presented to the Bayview Hunters Point Citizen Advisory Committee as Item 5c at its July 22, 2026 meeting. The meeting agenda is available at sfplanning.org/event/bayview-hunters-point-citizen-advisory-committee-meeting-11.]

Consent Agenda

3. Approve the Minutes of the June 24, 2026 Meeting – ACTION

4. Investment Report and Debt Expenditure Report for the Quarter Ended June 30, 2026 – INFORMATION

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

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

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Ford and Labaro (2)

End of Consent Agenda

5. Community Advisory Committee Ethics Training for Public Meetings— INFORMATION

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy, introduced the item and Amber Maltbie, Legal Counsel, presented the item.

Member Milford-Rosales asked whether tenants with leases longer than one month were treated the same as property owners for purposes of the program. He added that the language appeared to treat a one-year lease as a real property interest and asked whether that interpretation was correct.

Ms. Maltbie clarified that the provision was not intended to treat fixed-term leases as real property interests and added that the wording could be clarified.

Member Kim asked how CAC members should handle potential conflicts of interest when district-specific projects affected areas where they owned businesses. He asked whether members should recuse themselves under those circumstances.

Ms. Maltbie stated that potential conflicts of interest depended on whether a decision could have a financial impact on a member's financial interest, not on the district represented. She explained that members generally should recuse themselves from voting on matters affecting property or businesses within 500 feet of their financial interest but would not be required to recuse themselves if the matter was more than1,000 feet away.

Member Kim asked whether he would be required to recuse himself from voting on transportation projects along Geary Boulevard because he owned a business there. He added that Geary Boulevard projects often covered long corridors and questioned how he could serve on the CAC if he had to recuse himself from all Geary-related projects.

Ms. Maltbie clarified that an exception could apply if a decision affected a member's financial interest in the same manner as every other business along Geary Boulevard. She explained that conflict-of-interest determinations depended on the specific vote and added that the described situation would likely qualify for an exception allowing the member to participate because the law was not intended to prevent everyone affected from voting. She noted that this was a good example of why CAC members should reach out to staff in advance to discuss a possible conflict of interest, as staff may need a little time to make a determination based on the particular situation.

There was no public comment.

6. 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 stated that he supported the Senate Bill (SB) 1246 but believed it did not go far enough because it did not provide local authorities with the ability to enforce traffic violations involving autonomous vehicles (AVs). He added that construction contractors could be valuable supporters of future legislation because AVs created challenges in construction zones by blocking construction vehicle access.

Ms. Crabbe stated that staff was developing the state and federal legislative advocacy program for the upcoming legislative session, which would provide an opportunity to consider additional issues while acknowledging that issues would remain to be addressed even if SB 1246 passed.

Member Ortega stated that she would abstain from voting because her husband worked for a self-driving company and she believed she may have a financial interest related to the matter.

Member Barz asked whether the intent of SB 1246 was to provide emergency responders with greater control over AVs that became immobilized and blocked streets during incidents. She also requested an explanation of SB 1216, the budget trailer bill.

Ms. Crabbe explained that SB 1246 was intended as an initial step to prepare for increased AV deployment, such as providing emergency responders with the ability to put the car in neutral or turn it off so they could be move if necessary. She added that Mayor David Lurie recently issued a letter to the state requesting action to help address his concerns around AV interactions with emergency responders.

Member Barz also requested an explanation of SB 1216 and potential impacts of recent Cap-and-Invest program changes on transit capital and operating programs. She asked whether SB 1216 would effectively eliminate the availability of Cap-and-Invest funding for projects such as the SFMTA Train Control Upgrade Project.

Ms. Crabbe explained that the Cap-and-Invest expenditure plan was revised by the state legislature in 2025 and that transit capital, transit operations, and affordable housing programs were assigned to Tier 3 as a lower funding priority in the revised expenditure plan. She continued by stating that in early 2026 the California Air Resources Board (CARB) changed the way Cap-and-Invest revenues were collected. Further, she said that because the CARB action would reduce the total available Cap-and-Invest revenue, less funding, if any, would likely be available for those Tier 3 programs. Ms. Crabbe said that SB 1216 would delay distribution of the bulk of the Cap-and-Invest funding until the legislature identified an alternative way to fund Tier 3.

Member Barz asked whether SB 1216 was intended to allow the legislature to reconsider distribution of the Cap-and-Invest funding.

Ms. Crabbe confirmed that was correct.

Member Margarita asked about SB 1246 and referenced a recent incident in District 9 in which she said an AV blocked an ambulance from reaching a resident experiencing a stroke. She asked whether the bill would apply retroactively.

Ms. Crabbe stated that SB 1246 was not intended to apply retroactively.

Member Baumgarten asked whether SB 1246 provided a mechanism for the public to report incidents that AV companies might not have self-reported and whether the bill's incident reporting provisions addressed that issue.

Ms. Crabbe replied saying that the bill did not address public reporting of incidents.

Member Baumgarten said it would be beneficial to provide a mechanism for the public to report AV incidents or require companies to incorporate reporting into their platforms, rather than relying on companies to self-report. She indicated support for amendments to SB 1246 to establish automatic penalties for violations rather than requiring cities and counties to file lawsuits to recover amounts owed.

Ms. Crabbe clarified that earlier SB 1246 language did not require a civil suit to seek penalties, but a subsequent amendment added that requirement to the bill.

Member Milford-Rosales asked whether the bill's $10,000 civil penalty for blocking emergency vehicles for more than 30 minutes had already been negotiated or whether it could still be amended to reduce the 30-minute threshold. He referenced a recent AV outage that blocked traffic and SFMTA T-Third service and noted that incidents that last less than 30 minutes could still have significant consequences.

Ms. Crabbe noted that it was late in the legislative process because bills needed to be approved by the Legislature by the end of August. She said staff would raise the issue with the bill's author. She added that SB 1246 was a first step and that staff would also consider CAC comments when developing future legislative priorities around Avs.

Member Milford-Rosales said he supported SB 1246 and looked forward to future efforts to strengthen AV regulation. He then asked staff to provide a summary of the status of SB 1167 and its definitions for electric bicycles, specifically how the bill distinguished between electric bicycles and more dangerous motorized vehicles.

Martin Reyes, Principal Transportation Planner, Government Affairs, stated that the Transportation Authority currently had a support position on SB 1167 (Blakespear). He explained that the bill clarified the definition of an electric bicycle and established prohibitions on manufacturers marketing vehicles as electric bicycles when they did not meet the bill's definition. He stated that staff reviewed approximately 10 e-bike bills at the beginning of the legislative session covering a range of issues. He explained that most of the bills were no longer proceeding, while SB 1167 and another e-bike bill by Assemblymember Wilson continued to move forward. He added that he could provide additional information after the meeting.

Chair Siegal stated that she supported the recommended support if amended position on SB 1246, although she was disappointed that the bill had been weakened and hoped it would serve as a starting point for future efforts. She thanked staff for monitoring SB 1216 and working with stakeholders and urged the Board to take stronger action to help secure funding for affected programs. She explained that the funding supports SFMTA capital projects as well as Muni's free and discounted fare programs.

During public comment, Edward Mason stated there should be legislation to require licenses for bicyclists and scooters. He recommended charging AV manufacturers a fee to test vehicles in San Francisco.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Member Labaro (1)

Abstention: CAC Member Ortega (1)

7. San Francisco Transportation Plan 2050+ Update – INFORMATION

Rachel Hiatt, Deputy Director for Planning, introduced the item and Suany Chough, Assistant Deputy Director for Planning, presented the item.

Member Ford asked whether the proposed $80 billion investment plan would serve as a distributional guideline for allocating funding after 2050, including directing 67% of the funds to transit operations.

Ms. Chough explained that the investment plan covers the period through 2050 and establishes funding priorities but does not commit funding to specific projects or programs. She added that the proposed funding levels were based on identified needs and were intended to address those needs.

Member Ford referenced her experience with an annual planning process and stated that she viewed the SFTP as identifying goals without clearly describing the actions that would achieve them. She asked how the plan would improve transportation reliability given its stated objectives.

Ms. Chough explained that the SFTP is a long-term funding plan and therefore does not provide project-level implementation details. She added that the plan identifies broad funding priorities, including transit maintenance, and assumes funding levels for agencies such as SFMTA, BART, and Caltrain over the next 25 to 30 years.

Ms. Hiatt explained that the SFTP's funding needs and investment priorities were developed from detailed estimates for individual projects and project categories, including transit maintenance, major transit projects, bicycle infrastructure, and roadway maintenance that were developed for Plan Bay Area, the region's long-range transportation plan.

Member Ford asked whether the SFTP included a list of planned, cost-estimated, and prioritized projects organized by the plan's goals and whether the investment plan identified how much of the documented need could be funded based on available resources.

Ms. Chough explained that the SFTP identifies some individual projects but that most of the funding is organized by program rather than by specific projects, such as individual curb ramps.

Chief Deputy Director Maria Lombardo explained that the SFTP serves as a 30-year investment vision for San Francisco rather than a programming document that assigns funding to specific projects. She stated that most transportation funding was already committed to existing purposes, such as transit operations, leaving only a limited amount of discretionary funding where this was a choice about how to use that funding. She continued by reiterating that the SFTP, like Plan Bay Area, generally organizes investments into broad funding categories, with limited project-specific exceptions – typically for major capital projects with air quality impacts, and that it serves as a guide for future funding priorities and project selection. She ended by noting that programming or assigning funds to specific projects typically happen through efforts such as the Prop L 5-Year Prioritization Programs

Member Barz asked why staff prepared a long-range transportation plan.

Ms. Chough explained that the SFTP was developed in part to satisfy regional planning requirements and to inform Plan Bay Area. She stated that staff used regional growth and revenue projections to develop the plan, establish local priorities, and provide input to the regional planning process. She added that inclusion in the regional plan was required for some projects to qualify for certain funding sources.

Ms. Lombardo added that the update before the CAC was a minor update and that it was occurring during a period of uncertainty regarding transit funding as multiple Bay Area operators – including Muni, BART, and Caltrain, continued to struggle with lower revenues and travel behavior changes post-pandemic. She explained that previous versions of the SFTP informed reauthorization of the local sales tax that led to Prop K and Prop L. She stated that future major updates would likely be used to inform consideration of new local or other revenue sources, but this minor update had less focus on that area given efforts already underway to address the transit fiscal cliff such as the regional and local measures on the November ballot.

Member Barz stated that a 30-year planning horizon was difficult to compare with shorter-term planning processes and asked whether staff prepared the long-range transportation plan because it was required as part of the regional transportation planning process led by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) pursuant to state and federal requirements.

Ms. Hiatt confirmed Member Barz's understanding and explained that the SFTP brings together the funding needs and priorities of multiple transportation modes and operators, including Caltrans, into a single countywide planning process. She added that individual operators prepare their own capital improvement plans, while the SFTP allows priorities to be evaluated across agencies and transportation modes.

Member Barz asked how public outreach influenced the SFTP and whether the feedback resulted in changes to the plan or staff's planning priorities.

Ms. Chough explained that the draft investment plan was revised to reflect lower projected revenues since it needed to be financially constrained. She stated that public outreach reinforced staff's recommendation to maintain high levels of investment in transit operations, transit maintenance, and street and freeway maintenance, and that feedback supporting reliable transit helped shape the Vision Plan's investment priorities.

Member Barz stated that, based on the outreach results, she would have prioritized additional investment in expanded transit service and said that staff should bring future funding tradeoffs and investment options to the CAC for discussion before finalizing recommendations. She added that the discussion improved her understanding of the purpose of the SFTP and encouraged staff to involve the CAC more directly in future decision-making.

Ms. Hiatt explained that major transit expansion priorities are evaluated during major updates to the SFTP and explained that the current investment scenario was based on priorities established during the 2022 major update and the San Francisco Transit Strategy. She added that the investment scenario included funding for several major transit expansion projects at varying levels and that some projects received only partial funding to support continued advancement. She concluded by noting that the next major update would provide an opportunity to reconsider San Francisco's transit expansion priorities and said that the Board already directed staff to consider that issue.

Member Ortega stated that she agreed with Members Ford and Barz regarding the need for greater emphasis on major transit improvements. She said that she would like the next major update to include a comprehensive review of SFMTA's transit network, including whether routes should remain primarily downtown-oriented. She also asked how the SFTP accounted for long-term inflation, population projections, and post-pandemic recovery trends in developing its 30-year funding assumptions.

Ms. Chough explained that the minor update relied on MTC projections [which the Transportation Authority provided input to] rather than a comprehensive reassessment of costs and revenues and that those projections resulted in about a 12% reduction in anticipated revenues. She stated that the next major update would include a ground-up analysis of costs and revenues. She added that the current plan expressed costs in constant 2020 dollars and that the next major update would use MTC's year-of-expenditure methodology.

Member Ortega stated that clearly identifying the use of constant-dollar and year-of-expenditure cost estimates would help improve understanding of project budgets. She said that staff should address opportunities to lower project costs in future updates, where appropriate, and explain any such efforts. She also said that staff should include an overlay graph comparing the unconstrained and constrained investment scenarios to illustrate the differences more clearly.

Member Baumgarten stated that she appreciated the SFTPs long-term vision. She asked whether improvements to transit reliability, frequency, and on-time performance identified through public outreach were funded through the transit operations budget or a different funding category.

Ms. Chough explained that improvements to transit reliability were supported through both transit operations and major transit projects. She stated that lower-cost improvements, such as transit priority lanes, signal priority, boarding islands, and other Muni Forward improvements, helped improve transit speed and reliability, while major transit projects, such as new routes and grade separations, fell under the major transit projects category.

Member Baumgarten stated that she believed the SFTP reflected the interests of District 3. She asked how community members could continue providing input as the plan evolved and whether future opportunities for public feedback would be available so CAC members could help share information with their communities.

Ms. Chough explained that the next major update would provide the primary opportunity for public input on the SFTP. She said that staff would pursue more robust outreach, particularly in communities with large populations of non-English speakers, by meeting residents where they are, such as at community events and farmers markets. She added that staff would welcome the CAC's assistance in promoting outreach efforts and engaging community members in future planning activities.

Ms. Lombardo explained that the SFTP primarily was intended to guide funding levels for broad program categories rather than specific projects, while the CAC also had opportunities to provide input on prioritizing specific projects and locations through separate planning and fund programming processes such as the sales tax 5-Year Prioritization Programs.

Member Kim stated that improving transit reliability required evaluating post-pandemic travel demand and adjusting transit service accordingly. He explained that recent experiences with Caltrain and SFMTA service following major events illustrated the need to better align service frequency and operating schedules with actual demand, including evenings and weekends. He added that transit operations funding should include analysis of travel patterns and demand to support service planning.

Chair Siegal asked for the total cumulative unfunded need in the updated SFTP. Ms. Chough replied that she could follow up with that information. Chair Siegal then stated that she valued the SFTP as a public resource that informed her understanding of funding priorities and supported discussions about future revenue sources. She added that she looked forward to reviewing the final, more detailed report.

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that he questioned assumptions regarding job growth and major transit investments based on his views about demographic trends, travel behavior, and broader societal conditions. He added that changing transportation preferences, including the use of rideshare services, should be considered when evaluating transportation needs. He asked whether new major transit projects were affordable given those concerns.

Roland Lebrun stated that he believed the current approach to transportation planning was ineffective and advocated for a more coordinated regional strategy. He added that he supported developing a single integrated transportation corridor extending from Gilroy to the North Bay under one managing entity. He also stated that Link21 should be included in those regional planning efforts.

Other Items

8. Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION

Member Levine asked for an update on the Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit project comparing current conditions with conditions before the project was completed. He asked staff to prepare a study for CAC members, rather than a presentation, reporting on the project's results as of 2026.

Member Margarita asked whether staff could evaluate the Silver Avenue area in District 9, including Sweeny Street between Silver Avenue and Princeton Street, to identify potential safety improvements. She stated that the area lacked sufficient traffic-calming measures and referenced a pedestrian fatality and multiple hit-and-run collisions. She said that staff should pursue preventive improvements to slow traffic and improve pedestrian safety.

There was no public comment.

9. Public Comment

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated that he experienced audio and video issues while attending meetings of the Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA). He said that the Transportation Authority's meeting audio and video setup worked well and he encouraged staff to share the camera arrangement and audiovisual technology with the TJPA..

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

1455 Market Street, 22ND Floor, San Francisco, California 94103 415-522-4800 info@sfcta.org www.sfcta.org

DRAFT MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, September 9, 2026

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Siegal called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m.

CAC members present at Roll: Najuawanda Daniels, Sean Kim, Venecia Margarita, Austin Milford-Rosales, and Kat Siegal (5)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Jerry Levine, Clara Baumgarten, Phoebe Ford, and Rachael Ortega (4)

2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Siegal recognized September as Transit Month in the Bay Area, celebrating transit agencies, drivers, workers, and riders, and encouraged everyone to explore the region by transit and thank transit operators and workers.

Chair Siegal reported that public engagement was underway for the Transportation Authority-led Bayview Street Safety and Truck Relief Study and the Western Addition-Geary Boulevard Community Study. She noted that the first round of Bayview outreach concluded in August and included engagement with community leaders and organizations, neighborhood tabling, and a multilingual survey, with additional stakeholder workshops planned in October and a second round of outreach anticipated next spring. She said that Western Addition-Geary Boulevard outreach included September community events and town halls, along with a multilingual survey seeking feedback on study goals, neighborhood priorities, safety concerns, and desired uses and amenities along the corridor. Chair Siegal pointed interested parties to the agency website (www.sfcta.org) for more information about the studies.

There was no public comment.

3. Approve the Minutes of the July 22, 2026 Meeting – ACTION

There was no public comment.

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

The minutes were approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Daniels, Kim, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, and Siegal (5)

Absent: CAC Members Baumgarten, Ford, Levine, and Ortega (4)

4. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate $22,500,000 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions, to the Transbay Joint Powers Authority for The Portal Project Engineering Phase Activities Starting October 1, 2026, and Appropriate $3,500,000 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions, for The Portal Project Oversight, Engagement, and Work Program for Initiation of Pre-Construction — ACTION

Carl Holmes, Deputy Director for Capital Projects, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Siegal asked how recent California Air Resources Board (CARB) changes impacting the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund could affect anticipated state funding for The Portal Project, how much funding was expected from that source, and whether alternative funding sources had been identified.

Mr. Holmes replied that staff was monitoring the funding risk and had noted it in the Board memorandum. He stated that the final outcome was not yet known, but that the overall funding amount had been reduced for sources the project is targeting, increasing the risk. He added that staff was discussing contingency options with TJPA, including adjustments to early works or contract phasing, but that no alternative had been finalized.

Member Margarita asked about the risk of project funding partners withdrawing, particularly the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) given its significant share of project funding.

Mr. Holmes replied that the partnership with the FTA remained strong and that the project continued to advance through the engineering phase toward a full funding grant agreement. He added that the project team met monthly with FTA and its oversight consultants.

Member Margarita asked for clarity on planned service to the Salesforce Transit Center in the future.

Mr. Holmes clarified that Salesforce Transit Center would be the terminus of the rail extension, with Caltrain serving it initially and California High-Speed Rail planned to serve it in the future.

Member Ford asked about the role, organizational structure, staffing, and governance of TJPA, including who it reported to. She also asked how the approximately $600 million work plan was divided between construction and land acquisition versus professional services and how much of the project management and engineering work was performed by staff versus consultants.

Mr. Holmes replied that TJPA was a partnership including but not limited to board representation from San Francisco and the Peninsula. He noted that San Francisco Board of Supervisors President Mandelman served as Vice Chair and that Jeff Gee, representing Caltrain, served as President of the TJPA Board.

Alfonso Rodriguez, Project Director at TJPA, added that TJPA was a joint powers authority whose membership included the City and County of San Francisco [including the SFMTA], Caltrain, California High-Speed Rail, and AC Transit, with a total of four of seven voting Board members appointed by San Francisco. He explained that TJPA drew its authority from its member agencies, had fewer than 25 employees, and relied heavily on consultants to support The Portal Project. He added that the request included right-of-way and design work and that TJPA planned to issue requests for proposals for designers. Mr. Rodriguez also stated that nearly 10% of the project's estimated cost had already been constructed in the form of the train box beneath Salesforce Transit Center and that FTA had allowed approximately $730 million in previously invested costs to count as local match toward the planned CIG funds.

Member Ford stated that when The Portal Project returned to the CAC in future meetings, it would be helpful to clarify the respective responsibilities of TJPA, the City, and other agencies and establish a baseline for monitoring consultant costs compared with in-house work.

Member Kim asked how the existing train box would be maintained while it remained unused and how future changes in train specifications could affect the train box.

Mr. Holmes replied that the train box was essentially an unused concrete basement beneath Salesforce Transit Center and did not yet contain rail infrastructure. He stated that its maintenance requirements were minimal and that rail would be installed as part of future project work.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked how much had been spent on consultant reports for the project over the years including for work that was no longer relevant citing vents planned to accommodate diesel-Caltrain service. He expressed concern about anticipated ridership, citing several Bay Area transit projects that he said had achieved substantially less ridership than originally estimated, and asked what ridership was anticipated for the $8 billion Portal Project and whether autonomous vehicles would reduce future transit ridership.

Roland Lebrun stated that options should remain open in the coming months in case other funding sources were needed to keep Muni and BART operating. He disputed describing Salesforce Transit Center as a terminus, citing the California State Rail Plan and stating that it was intended as a through station with multiple rail operators. He also referenced a proposal he said he had submitted to MTC regarding regional rail assets and private-sector operation and cited the Société Nationale des Chemins de Fer Français (SNCF), the French national railway company, in connection with earlier California high-speed rail planning and Morocco's high-speed rail system.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Daniels, Ford, Kim, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, and Siegal (6)

Absent: CAC Members Baumgarten, Levine, and Ortega (3)

5. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt San Francisco's One Bay Area Grant Cycle 4 Project Nominations – ACTION

Nicolette Chan, Senior Transportation Planner, and Erin Slichter, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Kim asked what the 120% nomination target meant.

Ms. Chan explained that MTC asked each Congestion Management Agency (CMA) to submit project nominations totaling up to 120% of its nomination target. She stated that San Francisco's 120% target was $56.6 million and that, after the set-asides for CMA planning and the Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Program, $48.7 million remained for the call for projects. She added that when MTC selected projects, it would aim to fund each county close to its 100% target, which was $39.2 million for San Francisco.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, added that MTC is the agency that selects the projects to be funded and to do this, they need a larger pool of projects to choose from, which was why counties were asked to nominate projects totaling 120% of their target.

Member Kim asked whether the $5.8 million for the Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Program over the next four years included staff expenses or was entirely for third-party expenses.

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, replied that the $5.8 million covered a combination of staff time to administer and oversee the program, as well as funding for the contractor that runs the program and its subconsultants. She added that she could not recall whether the current funding also supported staff at the school district, although it had in past iterations.

Member Kim requested that the SFMTA provide information for the past four years on the total funding for the Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Program, including a breakdown of funding for third-party expenses and in-house staff expenses.

Ms. LaForte stated that the CAC typically considered an item annually for the local match required for federal OBAG funds and that the approximately $220,000 annual allocation Member Kim recalled was the required local match. She added that staff would provide background information on what had been approved in April.

Member Ford asked for the individual project scores and asked about the relative scoring of the Treasure Island Electric Ferry Pilot compared with the proposed BART improvements at the 16th Street station, citing the difference in ridership between the two projects and indicating that she would have thought the BART project would have scored higher than the ferry project.

Ms. Chan stated that the total scores for each project were provided in Attachment 3 of the memorandum.

Member Ford noted that the Treasure Island Electric Ferry Pilot scored three points higher than the 16th Street Mission Elevator Modernization project and one point lower than the 22nd Street Station ADA Improvement project. She stated that the scores appeared somewhat subjective and asked what was distinctive about the proposed first-of-its-kind electric ferry and what caused it to score higher.

Ms. Slichter stated that the Treasure Island Electric Ferry Pilot scored well on many factors such as project readiness and deliverability and transit reliability and accessibility because the electric ferry would provide three times the capacity of the current ferry, which she said sometimes could not accommodate all waiting passengers. She stated that the project also received strong scores for community support, serving an Equity Priority Community, and environmental sustainability.

Member Ford asked whether the additional ferry capacity would come from more ferry trips or from greater passenger capacity on each vessel.

Ms. Slichter replied that the additional capacity would come from the larger vessel, which could carry approximately 150 passengers compared with about 50 on the current ferry. She added that the electric ferry also would include additional bicycle parking to support bicycle travel between the East Bay and San Francisco as part of the Bay Skyway.

Member Ford stated that the project readiness criterion could favor projects that had already advanced over projects that might provide greater benefits or value. She requested that, when the scoring criteria were considered in the future, staff consider reducing the weight given to project readiness, noting that access to funding itself could help make projects more ready.

Ms. LaForte explained that the federal funds used for OBAG were subject to strict timely-use-of-funds requirements [set by federal entities and layered on by MTC to avoid loss of funds to the region] and that those requirements were a primary factor in evaluating project readiness and deliverability. She added that two prior OBAG cycles had provided funding for BART elevator projects, including elevator work at Embarcadero Station.

Ms. Slichter added that the prior OBAG-funded BART elevator work also included BART stations along Market Street.

Ms. LaForte continued to explain that since both of the prior OBAG-funded BART elevator projects had experienced delivery issues and neither BART elevator project was completed, that this factored into the evaluation of project readiness for the 16th Street Mission Elevator Modernization project in the current cycle.

Member Milford-Rosales asked whether the Treasure Island ferry service would include any frequency improvements or whether the proposed change was limited to increased vessel capacity.

Suany Chough, Assistant Deputy Director for Planning, replied that staff was developing the business plan for the ferry service and did not anticipate significant changes to the schedule. She stated that the service was expected to operate about 14 trips, approximately the same as the current service.

Member Milford-Rosales noted that state requirements to transition transit vehicles to electric propulsion could increase costs for local transit agencies, including infrastructure and vehicle costs. He asked how the ferry's increased passenger capacity was considered as an environmental benefit relative to the benefit of electrification itself, stating that a primary benefit of public transportation was shifting people from cars to shared vehicles.

Ms. Chough replied that the larger ferry would accommodate more passengers as population and jobs grew on Treasure Island and would be more efficient to operate with the same size crew. She stated that most funding for the new vessels and electrification infrastructure had come from other state and federal grants as part of broader San Francisco Bay ferry electrification efforts. She added that the ferry business plan was evaluating operating costs and developing a 10-year funding plan and that OBAG funding would provide significant support for the service. She also stated that providing emission-free ferry service was important for Treasure Island as an Equity Priority Community.

Member Milford-Rosales asked whether he correctly understood that most funding for electrification had come from broader state and federal ferry electrification grants and that the current request was primarily to support initial service.

Ms. Chough confirmed that the OBAG funding was for the first three years of the pilot service (operations). She stated that after the pilot period, the service would rely on Treasure Island-specific funding sources, including a developer subsidy and a congestion management tool identified in the plan.

Member Milford-Rosales stated that he supported increasing ferry capacity and frequency between Treasure Island and the rest of San Francisco given the difficulty of traveling to and from the island without a car. He stated that available funding should prioritize improving transit service over related improvements.

Chair Siegal stated that she was surprised the 16th Street Mission Elevator Modernization project had not ranked more highly given its importance for reliability and accessibility at a heavily used station in an Equity Priority Community and appreciated staff's earlier responses. She noted that the project application indicated limited competitiveness for other funding sources and asked whether alternative funding could be identified to help fund the project. She also asked whether the Transportation Authority could help BART complete its current elevator projects more quickly so that future elevator projects, such as those at 24th Street and Balboa Park stations, could be more competitive for funding.

Ms. LaForte replied that the Transportation Authority had previously funded BART elevator projects through Prop AA, as well, which dedicates a portion of revenues to transit reliability and accessibility improvements, and that Prop L also included funding for BART state-of-good-repair projects. She stated that the next five-year Prop L programming process would begin around the same time the following year and added that, depending on project readiness, the 16th Street elevator project might be positioned to seek construction funding through OBAG 5.

Michael Gerbracht, Project Manager at BART, stated that the 16th Street elevator project was in the early stages of design and was scheduled to be ready for construction in 2029. He said BART hoped to identify additional funding before then and noted that other elevator projects, including Embarcadero, other Market Street stations, and Glen Park, were further along. He added that 16th Street was expected to be approximately the 10th or 12th elevator delivered through the program and that 24th Street and Balboa Park were among the priorities for future planning and design.

Member Ford asked whether BART's elevator project delivery had improved over successive projects, how BART was measuring that performance from project to project, and what key barriers continued to affect project delivery.

Mr. Gerbracht stated that BART had made changes to elevator design requirements and technical specifications after addressing accessibility and construction challenges. He said vendor, consultant, and industry input had resulted in stronger contract packages and that lessons learned from projects further along in design were being incorporated into the 16th Street elevator project. He added that BART expected these changes to improve the project's schedule and delivery and said the program was continuing to apply lessons learned from earlier projects.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun expressed concern about the recommendation to advance Oakdale Avenue rather than Evans Avenue as the preferred location for the Bayview Caltrain Station and asked why the station location recommendation had not previously come before the CAC. He referenced prior planning for an Oakdale station, the vacation of Quint Street, relocation of the Southeast Community Center, and nearby San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) digester facilities as reasons for his concern. He asserted that work on the Pennsylvania Avenue Extension had influenced the station location and advocated instead for stations at Evans Avenue and Paul Avenue. He also opined that the Downtown Rail Extension (or The Portal) cost twice as much as the proposed new Transbay tunnel and requested that the Oakdale recommendation be brought back to the CAC for discussion.

Ms. Lombardo added that the Bayview Caltrain Station Location Study would come before the CAC for approval before going to the Board. She added that staff was completing public outreach prior to bringing the item to the CAC.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Daniels, Ford, Kim, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, and Siegal (6)

Absent: CAC Members Baumgarten, Levine, and Ortega (3)

Other Items

6. Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION

Member Kim requested that SFMTA be invited to a future CAC meeting to provide an update on parking fees in Golden Gate Park, including how the changes would be implemented and when they would take effect.

Member Margarita stated that the CAC should reconsider how it evaluates and approves large transportation investments in light of other needs facing San Francisco, including housing and homelessness. She also expressed concern about the transportation budget deficit and its potential effects on workers and employment and encouraged greater consideration of how individuals and the community could support the transportation system.

Chair Siegal requested an update on San Francisco programs and projects that could be at risk due to reliance on Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) and Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) funding following changes to the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF). She noted her understanding that the recently concluded legislative session had not identified new funding to backfill the reduced funding available.

Ms. Lombardo stated that the CAC would receive a legislative update at the next meeting and noted that staff was also awaiting the Governor's decisions on pending bills.

There was no public comment.

7. Public Comment

During public comment, Edward Mason expressed concern about disruptions caused by corporate commuter buses in residential neighborhoods. He described recent incidents at 21st and Church streets and 24th and Noe streets in which disabled or stranded commuter buses required large tow trucks and disrupted traffic and Muni service for extended periods. He added that multiple commuter buses arriving around the same time near 24th and Church streets also contributed to neighborhood congestion.

Roland Lebrun responded to concerns raised about the scale of transportation spending and stated that he had recently written to MTC proposing a different approach. He raised concerns about the Downtown Rail Extension, citing concerns about its cost, lack of a connection to the East Bay, platform design, transfers to Muni light rail, and potential construction impacts in SoMa. He stated that, after advocating on these issues for many years, he proposed turning the broader rail alignment over to the private sector, with work performed in-house rather than through consultants, and referenced a $20 billion project with $5 billion in private investment.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:32 p.m.