# METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION Meeting Transcript



1	JOINT MTC ABAG LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
2	FRIDAY, MAY 9, 2025 10:05 AM
3	
4	[Meeting will begin shortly]
5	
6	chair, mtc lc, david canepa: I would like to call to order the
7	meeting of the joint joint ledge joint mtc abag legislation
8	committee. This meeting is being webcast on the mtc web site.
9	Members of the public participating by zoom wishing to speak
10	should use the raised hand feature or dial star 9 and you will
11	be called upon at the appropriate time. Teleconference
12	attendees will be called upon by the last for digits of their
13	phone number. Roll call vote will be taken for action items
14	due to remote committee member participation. Will the clerk
15	conduct roll call to confirm a quorum is present?
16	
17	clerk, martha silver: chair canepa?
18	
19	chair, mtc lc, david canepa: here.
20	
21	<pre>clerk, martha silver: carlson?</pre>
22	
23	v. Chair, ken carlson: here.
24	
25	<pre>clerk, martha silver: ahn?</pre>



```
1
2
    chair, eddie ahn mtc pc: here.
3
    clerk, martha silver: andersen?
4
5
    candace andersen: here in my office diablo road.
6
7
8
    clerk, martha silver: burt?
9
    pat burt: here.
10
11
    clerk, martha silver: campos?
12
13
    pamela campos: present.
14
15
    clerk, martha silver: thank you. Member corzo is absent.
    Ecklund?
17
18
19
    pat eklund: present.
20
    clerk, martha silver: ashcraft?
21
22
23
    marilyn ezzy ashcraft: present.
24
    clerk, martha silver: giacopini, non-voting?
25
```



```
1
2
    speaker: here.
3
    clerk, martha silver: john-baptiste is absent. Kaplan.
4
5
    rebecca kaplan: here.
6
7
8
    clerk, martha silver: mahan is absent. Mashburn?
9
   mitch mashburn: sorry. I was muted. I'm here.
10
11
    clerk, martha silver: at your noticed location?
12
13
   mitch mashburn: I am, yes, ma'am.
14
15
16
    clerk, martha silver: thank you. Member rabbitt?
17
18
    david rabbit: I'm here at 575 administration drive room 100 a
19
    in santa rosa california.
20
    clerk, martha silver: thank you. Member ramos?
21
22
   v. Chair, belia ramos, abag: hereromero?.
23
24
25
    v. Chair, carlos romero abag ac: present.
```



1 2 clerk, martha silver: williams? We have a quorum. 3 chair, mtc lc, david canepa: thank you colleagues. Before 4 5 asking for the motion on the consent items commissioner papan has asked for a brief update on the statutes of sb63. MISS 6 7 Lona? 8 rebecca long: thank you chair canepa. Senate bill 63 was 9 amended on APRIL 29th consistent with the agreements that the 10 authors made with senator cortese and senator mcnerney the 11 chairs of the senate transportation revenue taxation committee 12 so the bill was amended shortly after those hearings the bill 13 passed senate transportation committee by vote of 11 to 3 with 14 one abstention and 4 to 1 and senate were all from republics 15 16 to address the concern that led to the commission to adopts a 17 support if amended position the bill in APRIL specifically 18 amendment removed intent language that counties and transit 19 operators develop a transit operations financial responsibility and implementation plan or t friendship acronym 20 21 so reference to the t friendship were taken out and basically 22 the authors intend that the region and can't still develop the expenditure plan basically for on you each plan basically for 23 how each county share of measure funds, the different transit 24 25 agencies fundeds in the measure so those changes made mtc's



position now in support and senate transportation committee 1 other organizations officially in support include bart 2 3 caltrain, soul san francisco county transportation agency the bill is going to be heard next week in the senate 4 5 appropriations committee we expect it to be put on suspense as referred to then come off later in the month then it needs 6 7 pass the full senate JUNE 6th. 8 9 chair, mtc lc, david canepa: thank you. 10 speaker: sorry on that topic, wee have a letter that's in 5a 11 in public comment from the three vta members on sb63. Should I 12 wait until that agenda topic? 13 14 chair, mtc lc, david canepa: through counsel? 15 16 counsel, kathleen kane: just one moment. Sorry. So, sb63 is 17 18 not agendaized on this agenda anywhere. So, we can acknowledge the receipt of the letter in public comment. And as part of 19 the public comment item, if members wish to make their own 20 comment at that point, they can do so, but we should avoid a 21 substantive colloquy on it and one way information update as 22 we just had is something that is permissible but we can't 23 engage in a substantive discussion. 24



chair, mtc lc, david canepa: thank you for that update. Do I 1 have a motion and second to approve the consent calendar? 2 3 marilyn ezzy ashcraft: ezzy ashcraft moves approval. 4 5 chair, mtc lc, david canepa: okay. 6 7 8 david rabbit: rabbitt, second. 9 chair, mtc lc, david canepa: okay. Okay great. MAY I have a 10 roll call, please. 11 12 counsel, kathleen kane: we need to check for public comment on 13 this item. 14 15 16 clerk, martha silver: there was no written correspondence received on this item and there is no one in the boardroom or 17 zoom wishing to speak on this item. 18 19 chair, mtc lc, david canepa: okay. 20 21 clerk, martha silver: and the motion, just for the record, was 22 by ezzy ashcraft and the second was by williams. She called it 23 in the room first. 24



```
1
    chair, mtc lc, david canepa: great.
2
3
    clerk, martha silver: chair canepa?
4
5
    chair, mtc lc, david canepa: ayevice chair carlson?
6
7
    v. Chair, ken carlson: aye.
8
9
    clerk, martha silver: member ahn?
10
    chair, eddie ahn mtc pc: aye.
11
12
13
    clerk, martha silver: anderson? Andes anned aye.
14
    clerk, martha silver: burt?
15
16
17
    pat burt: yes.
18
19
    clerk, martha silver: campos?
20
21
    pamela campos: yes.
22
23
    clerk, martha silver: corzo? Is absent. Member ecklund?
24
    pat eklund: aye.
25
```



```
1
2
    clerk, martha silver: ashcraft?
3
    marilyn ezzy ashcraft: aye.
4
5
    clerk, martha silver: john-baptiste is absent. Kaplan?
6
7
8
    rebecca kaplan: aye.
9
    clerk, martha silver: mahan is absent. Mashburn?
10
11
    mitch mashburn: aye.
12
13
    clerk, martha silver: thank you. Member rabbitt?
14
15
16
    david rabbit: aye.
17
18
    clerk, martha silver: ramos?
19
    chair, belia ramos abag ac: yes.
20
21
22
    clerk, martha silver: romero?
23
    v. Chair, carlos romero abag ac: yes.
24
25
```



1 clerk, martha silver: williams? 2 3 wanda williams: aye. 4 5 clerk, martha silver: thank you. Passes unanimously by all 6 members present. 7 8 chair, mtc lc, david canepa: that brings us to agenda item 3a 9 fiscal year 2025, 2026 state budget update. This is an information item. Rebecca long, I understand you're covering 10 this item today with julie snyder. Will you provide the 11 12 report? 13 rebecca long: yes. Thank you. So, this year it looks to be 14 15 another difficult year for california state budget driven by 16 weaker than expected tax receipts and persistent cost pressures not to mention the great degree of uncertainty about 17 the impact of federal policy decisions on the state's economy. 18 We expect a kind of two stage budget process where the 19 legislature will meet their constitutional deadline to adopt a 20 budget by JUNE 15th then a second bill budget bill JR. As that 21 22 I call it will be reminded and adopted later this summer into fall when updated tax data is available and there is a more 23 solid understanding of the federal policy funding picture a 24 key factor in terms of federal considerations is what happens 25



1	to medicaid, numbers for medicaid and medical in california is
2	quite stark federal fund contribute about 30% of the entire
3	state budget in terms of medicaid, there are 15 million
4	californians covered under medicaid. What we're looking at
5	particularly in our universe is cap-and-trade, and also
6	transportation funding and housing funding. In your memo,
7	there is a recap of the mtc abag advocacy principles on cap-
8	and-trade, and next week will be the MAY revision. We expect
9	that to come out on wednesday, and we do expect the governor
10	to provide insight into the administration's priorities and
11	proposal for cap-and-trade. As a reminder, it's set to expire
12	in 2030, but there is a lot of energy this year to extend it.
13	The other items attached to this in your agenda are some
14	really encouraging developments for our bahfa funding ask in
15	the state budget. There are 16 members of the bay area
16	delegation have signed a letter in support and that's attached
17	as well as a very extensive coalition letter with about 40
18	different organizations in support of our \$30 million budget
19	request. And I just want to commend julie snyder for all the
20	work on that. It's really, you know, encouraging that we have
21	got, you know, key bay area leaders backing this ask, even in
22	a tight year. That concludes my report and happy to answer any
23	questions you have.



```
chair, mtc lc, david canepa: great. Are there any questions?
1
    Is that director ahn?
2
3
    eddie ahn: yes.
4
5
    chair, mtc lc, david canepa: commissioner ahn.
6
7
8
    eddie ahn: I was surprised the memo disappoint reference an
    earlier ask, I believe those $2 billion of transit operating
9
    bridge funding that the bay area legislators requested why
10
    isn't that in the staff memo right now?
11
12
    rebecca long: thank you there hasn't been development on that
13
    which is why it want highlighted we have heard that the bay
14
    area caucus is going to be submitting kind of a summary of
15
16
    their priorities we did hear that is going to be their
    priority list so that is really encouraging. You know, given
17
18
    the broader context just about the significant uncertainty and
    federal funding risk, the $2 billion ask is ambitious. We're
19
    very much in support of it, but you know we don't expect to
20
    hear much about that, potentially not until the budget bill
21
    junior is adopted.
22
23
    speaker: thank you.
24
```



1	chair, mtc lc, david canepa: any other comments? Commissioner
2	ramos?
3	
4	chair, belia ramos abag ac: thank you so much. I'll add I had
5	opportunity to speak with senator wiener yesterday, I think.
6	And he did mention that the summary letter had five parts and
7	that the bahfa request was the 5th, and the preceding four
8	were all transit oriented and transit oriented and
9	transportation oriented.
10	
11	chair, mtc lc, david canepa: great. Thank you any additional
12	comments? I'm sorry. Supervisor andersen?
13	
14	candace andersen: thank you very much. Regarding cap-and-trade
15	any discussion about formulas impacting transit and moving
16	forward how that might be beneficial to the fiscal cliffs that
17	we have seen repeatedly [Laughter] and we're seeing
18	right now whether we might see money going towards that?
19	
20	rebecca long: we have not seen anything concrete yet. As I
21	think we MAY have shared, the legislature has kind of informal
22	working groups on cap-and-trade, and some of the rumors that
23	we're hearing coming out of that I believe on the assembly
24	side is that there is interest in moving away from formulas
25	and continuous appropriations which has been really vital for



why cap-and-trade has been so helpful for both housing and 1 2 transit because there has been an ability to kind of count on 3 that level of funding year over year even though the revenues do fluctuate a bit. Of course, if it's not continuously 4 5 appropriated that means legislature gets to make decisions about it each year. So, they tend to like that. So, that's 6 what we're hearing. And it's a bit concerning and we are 7 8 certainly making the case that they hold on to continuous appropriations for housing and transit. 9 10 candace andersen: thank you. 11 12 chair, mtc lc, david canepa: all right. Seeing no hands in the 13 chambers or remotely. Is there any public comment? We'll give 14 15 a minute for public comment, MADAM Clerk. 16 17 clerk, martha silver: there was no written correspondence 18 received on this item and there is no one in the boardroom or zoom wishing to speak on this item. 19 20 chair, mtc lc, david canepa: okay great. Are there any other 21 22 board members who would like to make comments on this? Seeing none. That brings us to agenda item 3b assembly bill 804 wicks 23 medical housing support services and this is brought to us by 24 julie snyder. 25



1	
2	julie snyder: good morning sorry, afternoon. MR. CHAIRMAN
3	and members. Ab 804 by assemblymember wicks is a
4	reintroduction of the bill that mtc and abag supported in 2023
5	it would make services covered benefit under medical for
6	enrollees who are either experiencing homelessness or at risk
7	of homelessness in order to stabilize their housing situation
8	so services include things like help in finding affordable
9	place to live, grants for moving expenses, assistance with job
10	search whole range of services that are considered an
11	appropriate use of health care dollars because it reduces the
12	use of more expensive health care services this is relevant to
13	bahfa's work because it would provide a reliable funding
14	source for the services component of supportive housing that
15	we hope to fund ourselves, as well as secure dollars for
16	locals to fund. The change would require federal approval
17	under the medical waiver process, if approved the feds would
18	cover 90% of cost and state 10%. Currently 21 other states
19	across the political spectrum have secured this waiver.
20	Whether or not the federal government approves it for
21	california, staff believes it's important to demonstrate to
22	policy makers that demand for these types of services is high.
23	And for this reason, we are recommending a support position.
24	Thank you.



```
chair, mtc lc, david canepa: thank you so much. Do I have a
1
2
    motion and second to reserve a support position on assessment
3
    assembly bill 804 wicks.
4
5
    speaker: motion.
6
7
    speaker: second.
8
9
    chair, mtc lc, david canepa: thank you very much. Is there any
    public comment is no written comments received for this item,
10
11
    and there no members in the boardroom or zoom wishing to speak
    on this item.
12
13
    chair, mtc lc, david canepa: all right. Are there any
14
    additional comments from my colleagues? We have a motion. We
15
    have a second. Will the clerk conduct a roll call vote?
16
17
18
    clerk, martha silver: will do. Chair canepa?
19
    chair, mtc lc, david canepa: aye.
20
21
22
    clerk, martha silver: vice chair carlson?
23
    v. Chair, ken carlson: yes.
24
```



```
1
    clerk, martha silver: member ahn?
2
3
    eddie ahn: aye.
4
5
    clerk, martha silver: andersen?
6
7
    candace andersen: aye.
8
9
    clerk, martha silver: burt?
10
    pat burt: yes.
11
12
13
    clerk, martha silver: campos?
14
15
    pamela campos: yes.
16
    clerk, martha silver: corzo is absent. Member ecklund?
17
18
19
    pat eklund: aye.
20
    clerk, martha silver: ashcraft?
21
22
23
    marilyn ezzy ashcraft: aye.
24
    clerk, martha silver: john-baptiste is absent. Kaplan?
25
```



```
1
2
    rebecca kaplan: aye.
3
    clerk, martha silver: mahan is absent. Mashburn?
4
5
   mitch mashburn: aye.
6
7
8
    clerk, martha silver: member rabbitt? We'll loop back. Member
9
    ramos.
10
11
   belia ramos: yes.
12
13
    clerk, martha silver: romero?
14
15
    carlos romero: yes.
16
    clerk, martha silver: williams?
17
18
19
    wanda williams: aye.
20
    counsel, kathleen kane: we appear to be having technical
21
22
    difficulties with member rabbitt's connection. He is at a
23
   noticed location. So we need to verify whether that location
    is app before we can finalize the vote. Through the chair if
24
```



we want to suspend this item and go on to the only remaining 1 informational item we can do that. 2 3 david rabbit: I'm here. 4 5 counsel, kathleen kane: you're here. Okay. 6 7 8 david rabbit: it's an aye. I apologize. 9 chair, mtc lc, david canepa: thank you so much commission are 10 rabbitt. With that, madam clerk, I believe it is approved is 11 that correct. 12 13 clerk, martha silver: correct. Motion passes unanimously by 14 15 all members present. 16 chair, mtc lc, david canepa: all right. Agenda item 3c, senate 17 18 bill 750 cortese e california residential mortgage insurance program. This is an action item. Julie snyder will you provide 19 20 the report. 21 22 julie snyder: sb750 cortese is a bill that would offer state 23 credit enhancements and loan insurance for multi-family development this state backing would reduce the agency's cost 24 of borrowing from the private market the concept is models 25



1	after similar state agency that focuses on health care
2	facilities which staff recommends support position as
3	requested by senator cortese's office we ask if you approve
4	that to use the urgency procedures so we can submit a letter
5	before the senate appropriations committee decides whether or
6	not to move the bill offer suss spence file. Happy to answer
7	any questions.
8	
9	chair, mtc lc, david canepa: thank you very much. Do I have a
10	motion and second to reserve a support position on senate bill
11	750 cortese abag executive board commission respectfully for
12	approval with urgency procedures during the changes.
13	
14	carlos romero: this particular insurance program does this
15	such as affordability restrictions? I'm just trying to
16	understand.
17	
18	julie snyder: great question. The original version of the bill
19	did not have affordability restrictions it was focused on
20	multi-family development but a recent amendment focus it on
21	low and moderate income and below.
22	
23	v. Chair, carlos romero abag ac: thank you very much. I'll
24	make the motion.



```
pat eklund: I'll second.
1
2
3
    chair, mtc lc, david canepa: do we have any public comment?
4
5
    clerk, martha silver: there is no written correspondence
    received on this item and no one in the boardroom or zoom
6
7
   punish wishing to speak.
8
9
    chair, mtc lc, david canepa: board members? Seeing none. Roll
    call vote.
10
11
    clerk, martha silver: canepa?
12
13
    chair, mtc lc, david canepa: aye.
14
15
16
    clerk, martha silver:
17
18
    v. Chair, ken carlson: yes.
19
    clerk, martha silver: ahn?
20
21
22
    eddie ahn: yes.
23
    clerk, martha silver: anderson?
24
```



```
1
    candace andersen: yes.
2
3
    clerk, martha silver: corzo is absent. Ecklund?
4
5
    pat eklund: aye.
6
7
    clerk, martha silver: ashcraft?
8
9
    marilyn ezzy ashcraft: aye.
10
11
    clerk, martha silver: john-baptiste is absent. Kaplan?
12
13
    rebecca kaplan: aye.
14
    clerk, martha silver: mahan is absent. Mashburn?
15
16
    mitch mashburn: yes.
17
18
19
    clerk, martha silver: ramos?
20
    chair, belia ramos abag lc: aye.
21
22
23
    clerk, martha silver: williams?
24
    wanda williams:
25
```



1 2 clerk, martha silver: motion passes unanimously by all members 3 present. 4 5 chair, mtc lc, david canepa: great. Thank you very much. Agenda item 3d housing and legislative landscape. Let me just 6 inform members that this report is in your packets. This is an 7 8 information item. Julie snyder will provide the report. 9 julie snyder: thank you, MR. Chair. Yeah, mentioned, as you 10 11 did, MR. Chair that there is an outline in your packet of some of the highest profile housing bills of this session, 12 organized by the three p's plus the fourth p in planning. 13 We're showing you where we have a bay area author as well as 14 15 the supporters and some other dynamics there. So, I'm first 16 going to offer a few general obvations about the sacramento housing policy landscape and hit a couple of highlights in the 17 18 interest of time. So, won't surprise to you hear because you are working on this at the local level, that sacramento's 19 attention to housing policy has dramatically increased in the 20 last couple years as our affordability challenges reach 21 further up the income spectrum and also as we have seen, a 22 23 really solid political constituency in favor of housing development arise legislators have been increasing not only 24 the number of bills but the breadth of issues that they're 25



1	focused on we're pretty much looking under every rock every
2	piece of the housing ecosystem to what are we doing for
3	students, post entitlement process, about construction costs
4	that are driven by new building standards looking at all
5	places for improvements. Another nascent shift that we're
6	starting to see impact of is election of renters to both the
7	senate and the assembly. The two house renters caucus now has
8	ten members and for the first time ever, both chairings of the
9	housing committees are renters. If history is any indication,
10	their inclusion in the inner policy making sphere in
11	sacramento it have a significant influence on their peer's
12	perception of landlord tenant issue supervisor their
13	willingness to take tough votes on those issues. This is
14	really a new day in sacramento. So, I look forward to having
15	more to report to you in the coming years. Specific to bills
16	hitting highlights on page one of attachment a are summary of
17	three significant bills related to the regional housing needs
18	allocation process, housing elements, and the sustainable
19	communities strategy. These measures touch on mtc abag's core
20	responsibilities under state law. Staff has been deeply
21	engaged in analyzing their impact in the context of the three
22	principles that are in your advocacy program. And providing
23	technical assistance to the authors. Let's see. I'm going to
24	skip some of the details on those. But just know that we
25	continue to work with these authors other ands to refine their



1	approaches to make sure that the regional housing needs
2	allocation process is implementable in line with your planned
3	bay area 2050 principles and allows you and our agencies to
4	balance competing state priorities. I'm going to segue over to
5	the preservation category, which is on page five of your hand
6	out, just a quick update on our sponsored bill ab1670. A
7	reminder that this bill would give rhna credit to cities and
8	counties for unsubsidized affordable housing that's converted
9	to long-term affordability. Happy to report that the league of
10	cities is on board with this. It's moving through the
11	legislature with unanimous bipartisan support. We'll know
12	later this month whether it gets off of the vaunted
13	appropriations committee assistance file. Turning back to page
14	three just want to mention the two builders remedy bills that
15	were highlighted by commissioner burt at your last meeting. A
16	bit of background, the builders remedy, generally, allows
17	housing development that are inconsistent with the underlying
18	zoning to move forward if a jurisdiction doesn't adopt a
19	housing element by the statutory deadline. It's been very
20	controversial in this last round especially as housing
21	elements have become more and more complex, they're taking
22	localities more time to do, hcd more time to review, so we had
23	a number of cases where the builders remedy was in effect. The
24	50 of these bills is ab 650 by legislator diane papan
25	sponsored by the league of cities. It has been amended coming



1	be out of assembly housing committee to remove the changes to
2	the berleds remedy piece which had significant opposition. The
3	bill would however still give cities and counties an
4	additional six months in the rhna housing element process in
5	recognition of that complexity that I talked about earlier. So
6	far I think it still has a positive from our perspective in
7	that sense. The second bill that was designed to reign theous
8	of burliest remedy was by senator josh becker sb 457 in the
9	senate housing committee on a 1 to 2 vote last week doesn't
10	mean it's it becomes a two-year bill it can be reconsidered
11	in JANUARY. I'm going to wrap up there we have a number of
12	really significant other bills with housing bonds a bill that
13	would reduce tenant cap sorry rent cap for tenants a number
14	would impact local zoning and we're happy to answer any
15	questions
16	
17	chair, mtc lc, david canepa: thank you julie. Commissioner
18	papan?
19	
20	gina papan: thank you. Are we going to look at sb715, on page
21	one.
22	
23	<pre>julie snyder: by senator alan?</pre>
24	
25	<pre>pat eklund: yes.</pre>



1	
2	julie snyder: I can share some details that was one of those
3	that I had pulled out but skipped over.
4	
5	<pre>pat eklund: if you could send it to us in an e-mail, and a</pre>
6	copy of the bill, that would be great. Obviously, the high
7	fire severity zone and how allocation would be distributed
8	very interested in having abag and mtc see as well take a look
9	at that we're going to start the new rhna processing on and
10	need to have more information about what they're trying to do.
11	
12	chair, mtc lc, david canepa: thank you very much. Public
13	comment.
14	
15	clerk, martha silver: I have nothing in the zoom space nothing
16	received in writing and we're on 3d?
17	
18	chair, mtc lc, david canepa: that is correct.
19	
20	clerk, martha silver: and no one has approached the podium in
21	the boardroom.
22	
23	chair, mtc lc, david canepa: thank you very much. I'm seeing
24	no comments moving to agenda item three, senate bill 125



statutes of 2023 transit transformation task force proposed to 1 2 mtc priorities for report to the legislator alix bockelman. 3 alix bockelman: good afternoon commissioners and abag board 4 5 members this is an information item and we're looking to see if the joint legislation committee has input into a letter 6 that we're trying to craft. Next slide. Most of you know of 7 8 sb125 in terms of all money it brought to transit \$4 billion statewide, next slide [Laughter] -- it also establishes a 9 transit transformation task force statewide that was really to 10 develop policy recommendations to grow transit ridership and 11 improve transit experience for all users. I actually serve on 12 the task force as does the general manager of bart weta, 13 several other transit agencies, good bay area representation 14 15 the task force is supposed to send a report to the legislature 16 by OCTOBER of 2025. Next slide. In the statute, there were a 17 lot of things that the task force was supposed to look at. The way that the report is shaping up is in certain categories, 18 better service, better outcomes, transit and land use are 19 interconnected, safety is fundamental, transit should be 20 operationally sustainable. And there is a lot of detailed 21 22 recommendations under each of these and that brings me to the next slide which is that we think it would be helpful for the 23 bay area to have some areas that we really prioritize and can 24 emphasize as this is so important to think about how the state 25



- 1 might be able to assist our transit going forward.
- 2 Fundamentally we want to lift up that expanded stable reliable
- 3 funding for transit is key to supporting transformational
- 4 change and should be clearly called out as the highest
- 5 priority for the state. That's bullet number one. I think that
- 6 that -- just want to underline that. I think that's very
- 7 important. We also think that the state could lead on transit
- 8 workforce development this is a challenge for transit
- 9 operators and we think there is opportunity for the state to
- 10 really help in this regard. We also think that the state
- 11 should empower regions on transit coordination. Most people do
- 12 make their trips within a region I think we're doing a lot in
- 13 this region and we think that is the way to go. We also think
- 14 that the state partnership is needed to maximize impact. This
- 15 includes areas with transit priority investments. It also
- 16 really maybe reevaluate ing just our timing of the innovative
- 17 clean transit regulation as you're trying to balance whether
- 18 you can run more service versus capital invests. We really
- 19 think certain things need to be lifted up and that's why we
- 20 put this together. There is more detail in the summary sheet.
- 21 Next slide. And again this is an information item. We're
- 22 looking for any input, feedback you have today, so that we can
- 23 adjust our letter accordingly. We're also seeking input from
- 24 the region's transit general managers and we'll be meeting
- 25 with the bay area partnership bored which includes ctas on



1	monday to get their input then hope to finalize a letter to
2	send to the task force before their next meeting so it can
3	shape this report before it's finalized in OCTOBER. That
4	concludes my presentation
5	
6	chair, mtc lc, david canepa: thank you. Is there any public
7	comment on the report?
8	
9	clerk, martha silver: there is no written correspondence
10	received on this item there is one member of the public in the
11	boardroom that would like to speak on this item. Adina levin.
12	You have one minute.
13	
14	speaker: can you slide be brought up that had that list of
15	items?
16	
17	alix bockelman: I believe that was slide four, I believe.
18	
19	speaker: sorry. I got my notes. Thank you very much for
20	getting the comments from the mtc and the bay area transit
21	agencies all together to influence this important state level
22	program couple thoughts on these priorities, transit funding
23	is top extremely important especially operating funding where
24	the state has traditionally underfund the transit operations
25	saying regions should lead at coordination is good but also



1

## DATE

overall state support and state funding and state incentives

for other regions is also, that will be helpful for us, it 2 3 will help our leadership, others to learn from our experiences. And, so, keeping that is also good. A couple of 4 5 topics that are important and not listed are accessible transportation and capital project reform and I can put my 6 7 comment in writing. Thank you. 8 clerk, martha silver: thank you adina. And there are no other 9 members of the public wishing to speak on this item. 10 11 chair, mtc lc, david canepa: great of the let me bring it back 12 to the board. Commissioner kaplan and then commissioner 13 14 ecklund. 15 16 rebecca kaplan: thank you so much. This is a great start and I really appreciate the point about supporting the regions to be 17 18 the place where coordination happens on things like maps, schedules, fare, media, things of that nature, that perhaps, 19 wanting the state to help with things like that and pursuing 20 21 potentially additional state resources to support the continuation of efforts that I know mtc has already done quite 22 23 a lot of but there is more to do around fare integration fare media and next phase of clipper as well as maps and wayfinding 24 and things like that, that I think could go a long way to 25



1	improving the transit coordination from the riders
2	perspective, independent of the governance issue of the
3	transit operators. So, I think those are great points. I think
4	that the transit workforce is a real issue. You know, I know
5	ac transit other and operators have talked about their bus
6	operator shortages, and so wanting more support around
7	workforce development, workforce training, I think it's going
8	to be really important going forward, or some of our transit
9	agencies won't be able to operate. One of the issue us that
10	mentioned briefly, that I do think warrants further
11	development is the question of what is to happen with the 0-
12	emission vehicle program. There is a variety of them in
13	different transit operators, we know the caltrain
14	electrification that recently launched has been a big success
15	and it's attracted more riders and made caltrain faster. But
16	at the same time, the federal government is pulling back on
17	some of the funding for some of our innovative leading zero-
18	emissions bus programs. So maybe that's something just to flag
19	for future discussion. But the question of how do we deal with
20	the zero-emissions vehicle plans and programs and how they're
21	funded and how they're implemented going forward. Ac transit
22	has done a lot of work on this and has done a lot of studies
23	about the different zero-emissions technologies as have others
24	in our region participated on that. And then, the issues that
25	I think would help with transit transformation, but MAY be



beyond the scope of what's been discussed so far, I'm not sure 1 if there has been discussion of universal transit pass 2 programs as part of transit transformation. But there has been 3 a variety of them launched in different places throughout the 4 5 bay area. I think uc berkeley was one of the first. There has been several others that have shown great success in 6 increasing transit ridership and transit usage through the 7 8 distribution of reduced bulk priced transit passes. And, so, that is one way to support our transit operators for the long-9 term. The other nice thing about increasing transit pass usage 10 11 is that there is a lot of time and energy lost with individual cash payments as people board a bus or enter a facility, and 12 so getting more people on to passes is not only incentivizes 13 each individual to use transit, but can actually reduce 14 transit dwell time, cash payment processing time. So it can 15 16 create efficiencies in a bunch of ways. And of course the other thing we talked about in our prior committee that could 17 18 really help transit for the long-term is to support the more 19 development around transit hubs, more housing development, commercial and other development around transit hubs that 20 isn't, itself, typically considered a transit transformation, 21 but it is in the sense that it generates that ridership base 22 and that revenue base for the long-term sustainability of 23 transit. Thank you. 24



1 chair, mtc lc, david canepa: all right. Go commissioner ecklund then commissioner anderson. 2 3 pat eklund: great. Thank you very much. First of all, on the 4 5 first page, I would like to suggest that this be mtc and abag's priority for report to the legislature. If abag were 6 doing -- we're helping with transit, we're involved with 7 8 housing, and, ideally, this should be a joint report; in my opinion. Secondly, on page four. You don't have anything down 9 here for housing. And I think it's important that part of the 10 11 advocacy priorities for both mtc and abag is funding, especially for low-income housing, adjacent or near transit. 12 And then this is going to sound like it's coming out of the 13 blue -- [Laughter] -- but I am continually struck by the 14 change communities are going through, with the closure of 15 16 macy's and all the other commercial developments. And in fact, in marin county, the northquate mall, which is in san rafael, 17 18 which is the area that I grew up in, in the '60s, and that 19 whole mall is being converted to commercial and housing, but primarily housing. So, all of these changes, due to the 20 economic changes, are totally influencing where housing and --21 22 and shopping, and all this other kind of stuff, and how are 23 people going to be able to live. And I really think that things have changed since covid. And we heal haven't had that 24 discussion philosophically about how that is impacting some of 25



1	the policies of housing and transportation, and where we're
2	going as a region. Things are dramatically changing under our
3	feet, in my opinion, and we really haven't had a discussion
4	about it. And, so, I would really love to have that discussion
5	and see what the long-term direction we're going to be going
6	to, into the bay area, and it's going to be different for each
7	county. But, my goodness, we need to have that discussion,
8	because we're supposed to be helping or to drive or lead
9	this change. But it sounds to me like a lot of us are just
10	following it, because we haven't had that discussion. I know
11	that sound like a, sort of, high in the sky thing, but I would
12	love to have that kind of a discussion. I have just been
13	seeing the change. And also too, most of you don't know, that
14	I have a 98-year-old mother. And she's doing great. She
15	wouldn't be able to live in the house that I was raised in if
16	it wasn't for our family support. So, there is a lot of other
17	seniors that don't have that ability. And marin has the most
18	senior population in the bay area. And so how that changes the
19	demographics and the other parts of the bay area too is
20	important as well. Because marin is going to be changing. But,
21	anyway, those are just three comments. Kind of the last one
22	out of the blue, andy. I'm sorry. [Laughter] Andy lives in
23	marin so he experiences a lot of the things that I'm well,
24	I don't know if he's experienced it, but I definitely do.
25	Especially well, I won't go into all the details but I'm



very close to the senior community in novato, which I think is 1 the highest in marin. But, anyway, I would like us to have 2 3 that discussion. So, hopefully others will agree. I would be glad to help shape it if you need somebody to work with andy. 4 5 chair, mtc lc, david canepa: thank you commissioner eklund. 6 Commissioner andersen. 7 8 candace andersen: thank you. I appreciate when the staff 9 report talked about adjusting a timeline for 0-emission 10 11 vehicle regulation. I would love to make sure that mtc is regularly updated with what our transit operators are facing, 12 with just how challenging it has been, and just the reality of 13 trying to run our fleets of zero-emissions vehicles. That's 14 going to be very personality, as an agency, as mtc 15 16 commissioners, we regularly receive updates on that, I like the updates from the transit agency workforce with the 17 18 innovation and alliance working on that and looking to not only just create transit workers as we know them today but 19 also emerging careers in opportunities in mobility technology. 20 And the other thing too, that's not mentioned so much is first 21 and last mile. So, for, while we're an urban county in contra 22 23 costa, we have 19 cities. Most of our bart stations are not in urban areas so we really want to be focused on that last mile 24



and so hopefully there will be some potential recommendations, 1 funding to get people that last mile. So, thank you very much. 2 3 chair, mtc lc, david canepa: great. There are any additional 4 5 questions? You know, I just really want to thank the staff. This transit transformation work is just so critically 6 important. We have been working on it for such a long time 7 8 and, my opinion, you know, especially here at mtc in terms of leading regionally, we're well-positioned to do that. And, so, 9 these things require investments. We look at transit 10 11 transformation. I know we have talked a little bit, commissioner kaplan, about fare integration. At the end of the 12 day, it's all about the ends user and how we move them through 13 the system and how we connect them to different places, 14 whether you live in east palo alto, or whether you live in 15 16 marin. So, just really want to thank the staff for their continued work and looking forward to future updates. That 17 brings us, if you can imagine, I know the report is in our 18 packets, is agenda item 4a, the washington D.C. Legislative 19 update. 20 21 22 rebecca long: thank you chair canepa. I'm going to follow my 23 colleague georgia's track record and say that is in your 24 packet for your perusal.

This transcript was prepared from television closed captioning and is not certified for its form or content. Errors and omissions within this transcript have likely occurred. This document is provided as a convenience only and is not an official record of any action taken.



chair, mtc lc, david canepa: thank you so much. Is there any 1 2 public comment? Very good. Very good commissioner romero. Is 3 there any public comment? 4 5 clerk, martha silver: there was no written correspondence 6 received on agenda item 4a. There is one member of the public with their hand raised to speak on agenda item 4a. Roland, go 7 8 ahead. You have one minute. 9 speaker: thank you. I would like to echo director ecklund's 10 11 concern about the discussion about how we prioritize transportation, and housing, and vice-versa. But I would like 12 to keep it simple. Specifically \$1 million is the cost of \$1 13 million home. So when san francisco wants an \$8 billion, 1 and 14 a half mile extension for caltrain, that is a cost of \$8,001 15 16 million homes. When san jose wants a \$13 billion bart extension, that is the cost of 13,000, \$1 million homes. And 17 when vta, \$150 million in three months figure out, that is the 18 cost of 150, \$1 million homes. Thank you. 19 20 21 chair, mtc lc, david canepa: great. Thank you very much, MR. Lebrun. Is there any other public comments. 22 23 clerk of the board: there are no other members of the pb 24 25 public wishing to speak on agenda item 4a.



1 chair, mtc lc, david canepa: great. Thank you very much. Any 2 3 committee member comments? Seeing none. That brings us to agenda item five, public comment. Before we go to public 4 5 comment, director burt -- commissioner burt? 6 pat burt: thank you. So, I just wanted to call out to your 7 8 attention, there is an attachment to 5a which is joint letter by the three vta board members who are mtc, commission 9 10 members, and in laying out our perspective on what might be 11 the conditions for our vfrment ta participation in sb63 and the regional transit measure. It's important to note that at 12 our last board meeting at vta, we had just that day provided 13 the board with polling results. The board was not ready to 14 take a position. In addition, some board members, particularly 15 16 some newer board members, just had a philosophical orientation toward a local measure. And, so, we did not move forward with 17 endorsement of a letter on behalf of the vta board. And that 18 is not what this is. Nevertheless, it lays out some factors 19 that we would be very interested in pursuing. Particularly 20 21 that the funds be directly, go to the participating counties, rather than a new governing body, that there be greater 22 clarity on the funding for transit transformation, percentage 23 of the set aside, and the functions. And then regarding the 24 caltrain share that because as we have noted, we still have 25



1	the three different counties that are working through some
2	governance issues that are related to funding share issues,
3	that we we have the funding obligations go to those
4	particular agencies, and the funding go to those agencies,
5	while we resolve what would be the fare portion. And then
6	lastly, to extend the opt in deadline. If we can if the
7	legislators to do so. So that's a summary. And I would say
8	also that we recognize that, really, whether it's san mateo's
9	issues, or santa clara's issues, it's really a need for us to
10	engage with mtc leadership and try to reconcile these
11	different needs and wants. So, thank you very much.
12	
13	<pre>pat eklund: excuse me is it possible for us to get a copy of</pre>
14	what he
15	
16	chair, mtc lc, david canepa: sure. Can we get commissioner
17	ecklund a copy of the letter? I think
18	
19	pat eklund: both of us have not I believe
20	
21	clerk, martha silver: it's on the white sheet of paper that
22	kimberly handed around to everybody.
23	
24	alan abbs: and it's attachment to 5a in the agenda as well.
25	



v. Chair, carlos romero abag ac: thank you. Now that we're on 1 the topic of the regional measure, on APRIL 21st samtrans the 2 3 transportation authority and ccaq submitted a letter to both dave cortese and mcnerney, and I wanted to say for the record 4 5 because I think perhaps the letter MAY have not gotten across 6 the notion that what we put in the letter are not 90s sand in terms this is what the county needs and if you don't provide t 7 8 we won't move forward. Perhaps we could have worded it a little differently. And I'm speaking on behalf of others who 9 signed this letter and the ta. But we want to make it clear 10 that we MAY be at opposite ends but we assume we're going to 11 participate in this we have to figure out a way to negotiate 12 where we can all be on board, but we're going to get there, 13 it's not to be interpreted as if we don't have these things 14 15 the county is not going to participate. We have folks who are 16 going wow you're a little striding on this so we just wanted to these issue not categorical necessarily so. 17 18 19 chair, mtc lc, david canepa: thank you. Commissioner burt, and you being on mtc and many on caltrain, at our caltrain 20 meeting, discussion of santa clara potentially opting in so 21 you being part of the process and really dealing with 22 23 difficult circumstances with other board members I think your leadership is extremely important and I'm glad you're a part 24 of this body. Public comment? Sorry, commissioner ashcraft? 25



1	
2	marilyn ezzy ashcraft: thank you. I want to thank executive
3	director andy fremier who has accepted our invitation, you
4	know, grovelling, too, it didn't take much, but the city
5	mayor's conference, alameda conference is wednesday, on the
6	ferry actually 63 came up came up it was a lively
7	discussion I can see there wasn't thorough understanding so I
8	magnanimously offered at the next mayor's conference we could
9	get someone from mtc. So, thank you very much, look forward to
10	a well attended conference I'm looking for all 14 mayors from
11	alameda county it's a way of helping educate everyone which is
12	important.
13	
14	chair, mtc lc, david canepa: thank you for convene ing such a
15	meeting. Any public comment.
16	
17	clerk, martha silver: as commissioner better mentioned we
18	received written correspondence combined letter from
19	commissioners mahan, abe-koga, and better, it was posted
20	online and distributed to all commissioners and committee
21	members. And we have adina levin. In-house and one member of
22	the public. One minute.
23	
24	adina levin: yes. So, glad to see various potential
25	participants in regional funding MAY be inching chores there



1

## DATE

is a lot more work to do but progress seems to be going in a

good direction. Glad to see wanting more clarification on the 2 3 transit transformation investments is a good thing to do and that's what san mateo county also clarified out loud at some 4 5 of the board meetings that was a direction that san mateo county would also support that, clarification. Lastly in terms 6 of working on the caltrain governance, those are very, very 7 8 important issues. And, also, when voters vote to fund regional transit, that people will really very much expect that transit 9 to run. So, having an agreement that allows different agencies 10 11 to actually negotiate against each other to not have the service run is something that would be pretty bad for a 12 measure. So, I urge an agreement that does not get to that 13 14 outcome. Thank you. 15 16 clerk, martha silver: thank you adina. And next up is aleta dupree. Aleta, go ahead and unmute yourself. You have one 17 18 minute. 19 speaker: thank you, chair canepa and members. Aleta dupree for 20 the record, she and her with team folds. Good meeting today. 21 22 Lots going on. Speaking generally, the heart of legislation is make things happen and there is lots of things going on 23 unfortunately ab1372 which deals with railroad electricity, I 24 guess it's in suspense for now. I know the biggest thing on a 25



1	lot of our minds is about the regional funding of our diverse
2	transportation systems, which I support. I just try to get out
3	there and ride the circuit. Transit taxes are a lot less than
4	any for a car. I haven't had a car in 15 years. And I like
5	cars of the don't get me wrong. But I don't want to be driving
6	them in downtown san francisco. It's the transportation system
7	that helps me get around. It's not easy being away from you.
8	But I'm back with you today. Thank you.
9	
10	clerk, martha silver: thank you. There are no other members of
11	the public wishing to speak under general public comment.
12	
13	chair, mtc lc, david canepa: thank you. Agenda item six is the
14	adjournment next meeting. Next meeting of the joint mtc abag
15	legislation committee will be held friday JUNE 13th, 2025 at
16	9:45 A.M. At bay area metro center 375 beale street san
17	francisco and other remote locations. Any changes to the
18	schedule will be duly noticed to the public. This meeting is
19	





Broadcasting Government