METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Bay Area Metro Center
375 Beale Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
TEL 415.778.6700
WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

Memorandum

Date:	July 23, 2025
To:	Metropolitan Transportation Commission
From:	Carina Lieu, Policy Advisory Council Chair
Regarding:	July 2025 Council Report to Commission

Summary:

At its June 24, 2025 meeting, the Policy Advisory Council took action on SB 63, the proposed regional transportation revenue measure, and provided comments on related legislative matters. Below is a summary of that action and the Council's priorities. The Council also discussed broader system-level priorities that provide context to our recommendations and underscore what we mean when we advocate for trust, equity and transparency.

Legislative Updates

Action on SB 63 – Transportation Revenue Measure

The Council adopted the following motion:

> "The Council supports the staff recommendation with an amendment to strengthen the efficiency study provision by requiring it to be interagency in nature and focused on reducing duplication, improving service connections, and aligning service with demand to grow ridership. Additionally, the Council urges the Commission to restore the original $55 million allocation for rider-focused improvements or, alternatively, to set that amount as a fixed percentage of total revenues. This approach would allow funding to scale proportionally if more counties, such as Santa Clara, opt into the measure."

This action reflects the Council's commitment to improving the rider experience, promoting regional coordination, and ensuring future flexibility in funding allocation.

Council Context on Rider-Focused Improvements

In addition to the formal motion, Councilmembers shared perspectives that clarify how "rider-focused improvements" should be understood in practice. While not all of these ideas are intended for inclusion in the bill language, they reflect priorities that the Council believes are essential—and should guide implementation, communications, and funding decisions.

Members embraced the staff-recommended term "rider-focused improvements" in place of "transit transformation" and noted that the revised framing more clearly communicates the types of tangible, on-the-ground investments that riders—particularly those from transit-dependent communities—can expect from this measure.

Efficiency Study: Members voiced strong support for an interagency study that is funded off the top rather than deducted from rider-focused investments. They emphasized the need for a clear implementation plan with deadlines, defined responsibilities, and involvement of experienced public-sector service planners—not solely external consultants. The study should focus on reducing duplication, improving system connectivity, and aligning service with actual demand.

Paratransit and Accessibility: The Council highlighted the need for seamless one-seat paratransit rides across counties and the removal of duplicative eligibility screenings. Members also noted the importance of capital investments in lighting, wayfinding signage, station cleanliness, and elevator staffing, especially for seniors and people with disabilities.

Rider Experience as an Equity Issue: Speed, frequency, cleanliness, and visible staffing—such as ambassadors and elevator attendants—were repeatedly named as essential for improving safety, wayfinding, and trust in the system. These factors were framed not just as service enhancements but as equity priorities.

Fare Integration and Wayfinding: Councilmembers expressed strong support for completing the regional fare integration and signage work that is already well underway. There was concern that delays or funding reductions could undermine years of progress. Several emphasized the importance of retaining regional coordination to prevent fragmented, duplicative efforts at the county level.

Revenue Mechanism: There was brief discussion of the tradeoffs between a sales tax and a gross receipts tax, acknowledging the political and equity implications of each. Members understood that the current proposal aims to maximize viability for the November ballot.

Legislative Updates

In addition to SB 63, staff and Councilmembers discussed several active bills and ongoing negotiations relevant to regional transportation, planning, and public participation. Below is a summary of those updates and clarifications provided during the meeting:

- **SB 670 (RHNA Reporting):** A Councilmember asked whether this bill involves substantive changes to the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process. Staff clarified that SB 670 is primarily a reporting measure that allows jurisdictions to receive partial credit for units in the pipeline.
- **AB 707 (Remote Participation Rules):** Members raised questions about implications for remote participation rules under AB 2449. Staff noted that while "just cause" requirements remain in place for legislative bodies, advisory bodies such as the Council may continue to allow remote participation without showing just cause, provided cameras are on and the meeting has an in-person option for the public.
- **Transit Funding Negotiations:** There was interest in the status of negotiations between the Governor and Legislature regarding additional transit funding. Staff indicated that the Governor has until June 30 to sign the budget, which includes a new line-item for Bay Area operators facing a fiscal cliff.
- **AB 334 (Data Sharing and Privacy):** Concerns were raised about data privacy, especially for individuals traveling for sensitive reasons. Staff assured the Council that California law

limits data sharing (e.g., FasTrak data), requires a search warrant, and permits retention only for billing purposes.

- **Transit Loan Support:** A question was raised regarding whether the Governor supports a proposed $750 million no-interest transit loan, referencing Senator Wiener's mention of a $1.1 billion figure. Staff confirmed the loan provision is preserved in the final bill but did not confirm the Governor's explicit position.