400 Capitol Mall, Suite 2340 Sacramento, CA 95814 916-323-5400 www.calsta.ca.gov

Transit Transformation Task Force (TTTF) – Meeting #13
California State Transportation Agency
September 30, 2025 | 10:00 am – 4:00 pm
MEETING MINUTES AS PREPARED BY PROJECT STAFF

Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) 1415 L Street #300 Sacramento, CA 95814

**Background:** <u>SB125</u> established the Transit Transformation Task Force (TTTF) to develop policy recommendations to grow transit ridership, improve the transit experience, and address long-term operational needs. The California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) appointed 25 members to the TTTF, including representatives from state government, local agencies, academic institutions, advocacy organizations, and other stakeholders. CalSTA, in consultation with the TTTF, will prepare a report of findings and policy recommendations based on the TTTF's efforts and submit it to the Legislature by October 31, 2025.

**Note:** These meeting minutes were prepared by SB 125 project staff and not approved by the Task Force, since Meeting #13 was the final Task Force meeting.

#### **TTTF Members**

(X indicates member was present in the room)

X	Kome Ajise, Southern California Association of Governments	X	Eli Lipmen, Move LA	X	David Sforza, Assembly Transportation Committee
X	Rashidi Barnes, Eastern Contra Costa Transit Authority	X	Juan Matute, UCLA Institute of Transportation Studies	X	Laura Tolkoff, SPUR
X	Alix Bockelman, Metropolitan Transportation Commission	X	Kate Miller, Napa Valley Transportation Authority/Vine Transit	X	Michael Turner, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
X	Sharon Cooney, San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (MTS)	X	Lorelle Moe-Luna, Riverside County	X	Kari Watkins, UC Davis

			Transportation Commission		
X	Chad Edison, CalSTA, Chair	X	Seamus Murphy, San Francisco Bay Water Emergency Transportation Authority	X	Mark Watts, Transportation California
	Marlon Flournoy, Caltrans	X	Laurel Paget-Seekins, Public Advocates	X	Melissa White, Senate Transportation Committee
X	lan Griffiths, Other Stakeholder with Subject Matter Expertise in Transportation	X	Michael Pimentel, California Transit Association		Jim Wunderman, Bay Area Council
X	Amy Hance, City of Clovis	X	Robert Powers, San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART)		
	James Lindsay, Amalgamated Transit Union		Carl Sedoryk, Monterey-Salinas Transit District		

#### **Agenda Topics**

- 1. Welcome (Chad Edison, CalSTA, TTTF Chair)
  - Opening remarks expressing gratitude to the Task Force members and the public.
- **2. Opening Remarks** (Toks Omishakin, CalSTA Secretary and James Hacker, CalSTA Undersecretary)
  - Secretary Omishakin thanked the Task Force for nearly two years of work, noting the dedication, expertise, and passion that made the final report possible. They noted recent funding commitments, including \$1 billion annually for high-speed rail, \$400 million for the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, and \$200 million for the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program, and closed by thanking participants on behalf of the Governor and Legislature.
  - Undersecretary Hacker thanked the 25 Task Force members and more than 100 stakeholders who contributed to 13 meetings over 22 months, emphasizing the group's role in shaping five guiding

principles for sustainable, safe, reliable, accessible, and community-supporting transit. They commented that while the final report marked the Task Force's conclusion, it should be viewed as a launching pad for turning recommendations into legislation and real policy change, supported by continued collaboration.

#### 3. Public Comments

- Adrianna Rizzzo (Californians for Electric Rail) commented that the
  draft report missed key elements, including a dedicated state
  source for operating revenue, noting California's limited support
  had left places like the Inland Empire with less service despite
  population growth. They also called for multi-year capital
  investment frameworks to control costs and stronger
  recommendations on fare and schedule integration to improve the
  rider experience.
- Carl Sedoryk (Task Force member) commented that he was unable to make today's meeting, and expressing gratitude for the Task Force members and input process.
- Adina Levin (Seamless Bay Area) commented that operating funding was central to SB 125's charge, noting California underfunds transit operations compared to other major states. They said without strong recommendations, the Task Force would fall short of legislative goals and urged providing at least a menu of substantial funding options.
- Mark Vukcevich (Streets for All) commented in support of earlier points on operating funding and fare integration, noting that the Task Force was created to deliver truly transformative recommendations. They commented that failing to include strong proposals in these areas would leave key policy issues unaddressed and fall short of SB 125's legislative intent. They concluded by urging the Task Force to ensure dedicated funding is reflected in the final recommendations.
- Andrew Hernandez (citizen) commented that while the Task Force had previously supported extending CEQA exemptions for certain transit projects under SB 922, those exemptions did not include light or heavy rail. They noted that CEQA litigation often delays projects and increases costs, wasting taxpayer dollars. They urged expanding exemptions to cover all rail projects within urbanized areas or clusters to prevent unnecessary lawsuits and speed project delivery.

- 4. Roll Call (Chad Edison, CalSTA, TTTF Chair)
  - Call to order, roll call, establishment of quorum, and housekeeping items.
- **5.** Approval of the TTTF Meeting Minutes for August 26, 2025 (Chad Edison, CalSTA, TTTF Chair)
  - A motion was made to approve the meeting minutes for August 26, 2025 and enable staff to approve the final TTTF13 meeting minutes for September 30, 2025.
  - Motion/Second: Cooney/Ajise
  - Ayes: Ajise, Barnes, Bockelman, Cooney, Edison, Griffiths, Hance, Lipmen, Matute, Miller, Moe-Luna, Murphy, Paget-Seekins, Pimentel, Powers, Sforza, Tolkoff, Turner, Watkins, Watts, White
  - Noes: n/aAbstain: n/a
  - Absent: Flournoy, Lindsay, Sedoryk, Wunderman
  - Motion approved.
- 6. Staff Report, discussion, and possible action on TTTF Report Tranche 3 (Chad Edison, CalSTA, TTTF Chair)
  - a) Staff Report (Hunter Owens, SB125 Staff)
    - Provided an overview of the staff report and highlighted new and updated recommendations and strategies included in Tranche 3 of the Report. Highlighted recommendations and strategies included those on fleet and asset management; workforce recruitment, retention, and development; TDA reforms; transit oversight and reporting; capital construction costs and timelines; and new revenue sources.

### b) Public Comment

Marianna (Strategies Actions for a Just Economy) commented that
alternatives to the farebox recovery ratio are essential, especially
for Los Angeles, where a large working-class ridership relies on transit
as a lifeline. They noted that despite LA Metro's low farebox
recovery ratio of 4.3% in FY 2023, ridership has been growing with
new rail lines expanding access across the city. They emphasized
that rising living costs make fares burdensome for many families and

- argued that shifting away from the farebox metric would better reflect transit growth and benefits to riders.
- Adina Levin (Seamless Bay Area) commented that current funding recommendations were insufficient and too long-term, stressing the need for medium-term sources to boost service and ridership. They noted Bay Area transit delivers about 50% less service per capita than comparable Canadian metros, directly limiting ridership growth.
- Carlos Gonzalez (Strategies Actions for a Just Economy)
   commented that alternatives to the farebox recovery ratio were
   needed to better reflect Los Angeles' transit growth and protect
   working-class riders who make up the majority of the system's users.
   They noted LA Metro's farebox recovery is only about 4% and said
   eliminating fares would help families struggling with inflation and
   limited access to resources. They urged the Task Force to adopt
   more sustainable funding approaches that support equity and
   ridership.
- Patricia (citizen) commented that the farebox recovery ratio should be eliminated, describing it as a farce and a detriment. They noted it wastes agency effort, requires constant legislative fixes, and provides no meaningful value, suggesting alternatives would be more effective.

#### c) Task Force Discussion

- Limited Value of W Recommendations: Task Force members
  expressed a variety of opinions on this topic. Several felt that W.1–
  W.3 do not introduce new ideas, since regions already have
  authority to reprogram revenues or review allocations. They
  suggested that including these as formal recommendations could
  be misleading, and preferred treating them as background context
  rather than new actions.
- Preventive Maintenance and TDA Flexibility: Task Force members
  expressed a variety of opinions on this topic. Discussion of
  recommendation W.2 revealed differing views: some felt TDA funds
  are already flexible enough to cover preventive maintenance,
  while others noted that state accounting rules create challenges
  with farebox recovery calculations. Members recognized that
  aligning with federal rules could add short-term flexibility but might
  be less necessary if TDA reform eliminates farebox requirements.

- Risks of Changing Local Sales Tax Uses: Task Force members
  expressed a variety of opinions on this topic. Multiple members
  raised concerns about W.3, cautioning that altering the use of
  voter-approved local sales taxes could undermine public trust in
  ballot measures. They stressed that "promises made, promises kept"
  is central to passing and renewing these measures, and noted that
  reallocation across modes could damage credibility with voters.
- State Share Backfill as a Novel Concept: Task Force members
  expressed a variety of opinions on this topic. Some saw potential in
  W.4's idea of reallocating unused federal formula funds and using
  state share dollars to backfill regions that prioritize transit. Some felt
  that clearer language is needed to distinguish this from existing
  reprogramming authority.
- Broader Need for New and Flexible Revenue Sources: Task Force
  members expressed a variety of opinions on this topic. Many
  emphasized that the W recommendations do not address the more
  urgent need for new, stable sources of transit funding. Members
  highlighted the importance of expanded state and federal support,
  new revenue tools (including possible increases to the LTF sales tax),
  and greater flexibility across state transportation funds to support
  both operations and capital.
- A Motion was made to eliminate the following recommendation presented in the staff report and move the sentiments into the narrative of the report (in bold italics and strikethrough)

Strategy
Strategy W: Reprogram and re- focus existing revenues

Strategy	Policy Recommendation
	W.2. Explicitly align definitions of capitalized maintenance between federal and TDA programs so that regions can better support operations within the TDA framework for LTF and STA funds
	W.3. Allow additional flexibility in the use of local option sales taxes to support transit operations, especially for older Local Option Sales Taxes by allowing regions to reprogram revenues to support transit services when in alignment with state and regional priorities

- Motion/Second: Ajise/Moe-Luna
- Ayes: Ajise, Barnes, Bockelman, Cooney, Griffiths, Hance, Lipmen, Miller, Moe-Luna, Murphy, Pimentel, Powers, Turner, Watkins, Watts
- Noes: Matute
- Abstain: Edison, Paget-Seekins, Sforza, Tolkoff, White
- Absent: Flournoy, Lindsay, Sedoryk, Wunderman
- Motion approved.

#### d) Task Force Discussion (continued)

- Recommendation X.1 and Eligible Entities and Boundaries: Task Force members expressed a variety of opinions on this topic. They discussed whether ballot authority should apply to transit agencies broadly, only to transit districts with clear geographic boundaries, or also to regional entities. Some members noted the challenge of aligning taxation boundaries with service areas, especially when operators cross jurisdictions.
- Recommendation X.1 and Appropriate Revenue Tools: Task Force
  members expressed a variety of opinions on this topic. While sales
  taxes were recognized as the most viable for raising substantial
  funds, several members raised concerns about over-reliance,
  capped rates, and regressive impacts. Alternatives such as parcel
  taxes, property-based tools like tax increment financing, or simply

- authorizing "taxes" more broadly were discussed as ways to expand flexibility.
- Recommendation X.1 and Balancing Local and Statewide Funding
  Needs: Task Force members expressed a variety of opinions on this
  topic. Some members cautioned that empowering local ballot
  measures alone will not address long-term transit needs, and others
  emphasized the necessity of new, stable statewide funding sources.
  Some noted this should be a distinct and high-priority
  recommendation separate from local options.
- Recommendation X.1 and Flexibility and Voter Trust in Future
   Measures: Task Force members expressed a variety of opinions on
   this topic. Some members suggested designing future local tax
   measures with programmatic flexibility to adapt over time, while
   others warned that too much flexibility could erode voter
   confidence. Some members noted the importance of balancing
   adaptability with clear commitments to ensure continued public
   trust.
- Need for New State Funding: Task Force members expressed a
  variety of opinions on this topic. Most felt that reallocating existing
  funds is insufficient, and that new, dedicated, and flexible state
  revenues are needed to stabilize transit operations in the near term,
  expand service in the midterm, and meet long-term transformation
  goals. Some members noted that operations must be prioritized,
  with separate attention to capital funding so neither is overlooked.
- Menu of Potential Revenue Sources: Task Force members expressed a variety of opinions on this topic. Rather than endorsing a single mechanism, several members suggested including in the report a menu of funding sources (e.g., payroll taxes, corporate taxes, highincome taxes, rental car fees). This would give policymakers options while avoiding premature specificity. Some members noted the importance of linking funding choices to the scale of resources needed for transformation.
- Road Charge and Fuel Tax Transition: Task Force members
   expressed a variety of opinions on this topic. Some members
   supported ensuring that transit is an eligible use within future
   mechanisms that replace declining fuel tax revenues, noting the
   importance of backfilling losses from diesel sales taxes. Others
   voiced concerns that tying transit funding too closely to passenger
   vehicle road-user charges could undermine the primary purpose of
   such charges—maintaining road infrastructure. Some members

- emphasized the need for clarity on which revenue streams are being replaced and noted that any new system should at least maintain existing transit funding levels, while leaving flexibility to draw on a broader range of future revenue mechanisms.
- Flexibility and Regional Choice: Task Force members expressed a
  variety of opinions on this topic. Some members noted that it was
  important to grant regions greater flexibility to use existing state
  transportation funds (e.g., STIP) for both operations and capital,
  even if this requires statutory or constitutional changes. Others
  noted that decisions should remain regionally driven, reflecting
  differing mixes of operational and capital needs across California.
- Balancing Operations vs. Capital: Task Force members expressed a
  variety of opinions on this topic. While some wanted to combine
  both in a single funding recommendation, others advocated for
  keeping operations and capital separate so operations funding
  does not get overshadowed. The compromise direction was to
  prioritize a strong operations-focused recommendation, while
  ensuring a parallel item explicitly supports capital needs,
  maintaining equal status but distinct emphasis.
- Ensuring Future Flexibility: Task Force members expressed a variety
  of opinions on this topic. Some members indicated that any new
  system should allow transit to benefit from future revenue sources,
  but some cautioned against foreclosing the state's ability to
  replace the gas tax. Some members suggested language
  refinements to maintain flexibility while carving out an explicit
  protection for road maintenance funding.
- A Motion was made to approve the following new recommendation (in bold italics and strikethrough)

Strategy	Policy Recommendation
N/A	Implement new state funding mechanisms to stabilize transit agencies in the near-term, increase and enhance transit service in the mid-term, and deliver transit service that aligns with the goals of the report over the long-term. To implement this recommendation, the Legislature should consider the multiple new revenue sources identified in the report, as edited, for transit operations in order to increase usage of transit service.

- Motion/Second: Pimentel/Miller
- Ayes: Ajise, Barnes, Bockelman, Cooney, Griffiths, Hance, Lipmen, Matute, Miller, Moe-Luna, Murphy, Paget-Seekins, Pimentel, Powers, Tolkoff, Turner, Watkins, Watts
- Noes: None
- Abstain: Edison, Sforza, White
- Absent: Flournoy, Lindsay, Sedoryk, Wunderman
- Motion approved.
- A Motion was made to approve the following new recommendation (in bold italics and strikethrough)

Strategy	Policy Recommendation
N/A	Legislation creating funding alternatives to replace fuel taxes, should include allowing transit operations and capital as an eligible expense (among other expenses) for funds raised from both passenger and commercial vehicles. Legislation that establishes such a solution should maintain funding for transit at levels equal to at least the funding levels for transit provided by the existing sales tax on diesel fuel.

• Motion/Second: Bockelman/Ajise

- Ayes: Ajise, Barnes, Bockelman, Cooney, Griffiths, Hance, Lipmen, Matute, Miller, Moe-Luna, Murphy, Paget-Seekins, Pimentel, Powers, Tolkoff, Turner, Watkins
- Noes: None
- Abstain: Edison, Sforza, Watts, White
- Absent: Flournoy, Lindsay, Sedoryk, Wunderman
- Motion approved.

### e) Task Force Discussion (continued)

- Proposal Specifics and Legislative Clarity on the Proposed LTF
  Increase: Task Force members expressed a variety of opinions on
  this topic. There was a robust discussion related to a draft
  recommendation on increasing the Bradley-Burns uniform sales/use
  tax by 0.25% and dedicating the increment to the Local
  Transportation Fund (LTF). Some members suggest differently
  worded versions of this draft recommendation.
- Distribution and Governance: County Formulas vs. Regional Needs: Task Force members expressed a variety of opinions on this topic. Some members discussed who should allocate the new funds and how: keep standard RTPA/LTF processes, shift allocation to MPOs/regions, or ensure distributions reflect service need rather than county boundaries. Some expressed concern about "pet projects" and suggested a new regional transportation fund concept; others cautioned against redesigning allocation rules in this forum.
- Uneven Benefits Across Regions and Operators: Task Force members
  expressed a variety of opinions on this topic. Several members
  noted the LTF approach could under-serve multi-county/regional
  operators (e.g., Bay Area systems like BART/Caltrain) while
  benefiting many small and rural operators.
- Positioning Within a Broader Funding Strategy: Task Force members expressed a variety of opinions on this topic. Some members felt the LTF increase should be framed as one option—ideally an early/initial stabilization tool—within a larger menu of state revenue measures (sales tax changes, pricing, bonds, income/payroll/corporate taxes, etc.). Other members favored specificity to help the Legislature; others preferred a comprehensive menu (referencing the April list) rather than a single mechanism.
- Procedural Scope and Political Feasibility: Task Force members expressed a variety of opinions on this topic. Some members noted

that coupling a specific tax increase with an ad-hoc allocation redesign could jeopardize support and legislative viability. Other members urged either voting on the base proposal (increase + dedicate to LTF) or reverting to the general "menu" approach to maintain coalition unity and momentum.

 A Motion was made to approve the following new recommendation (in bold italics and strikethrough)

Strategy	Policy Recommendation			
N/A	As an initial transit stabilization recommendation, effectively double Local Transportation Fund (LTF), by increasing the Bradley-Burns Uniform Local Sales and Use Tax Law by 0.25% for a total of 1.50%. The new 0.25% would be dedicated to LTF.			

- Motion/Second: Watts/Cooney
- Ayes: Cooney, Hance, Lipmen, Moe-Luna, Watts
- Noes: Ajise, Barnes, Bockelman, Edison, Griffiths, Matute, Miller, Murphy, Paget-Seekins, Powers, Tolkoff, Turner,
- Abstain: Pimentel, Sforza, Watkins, White
- Absent: Flournoy, Lindsay, Sedoryk, Wunderman
- Motion failed.
- A Substitute Motion was made to approve the following new recommendation (in bold italics and strikethrough)

Strategy	Policy Recommendation
N/A	As an initial transit stabilization recommendation, effectively double Local Transportation Fund (LTF), by increasing the Bradley-Burns Uniform Local Sales and Use Tax Law by 0.25% for a total of 1.50%. The new 0.25% would be dedicated to LTF and be allocated by RTPAs and the distribution to be flexible by service needs.

- Motion/Second: Griffiths/Bockelman
- Ayes: Ajise, Bockelman, Cooney, Griffiths, Matute, Moe-Luna, Murphy, Watts
- Noes: Barnes, Edison, Hance, Lipmen, Miller, Paget-Seekins, Powers, Turner
- Abstain: Pimentel, Sforza, Tolkoff, Watkins, White
- Absent: Flournoy, Lindsay, Sedoryk, Wunderman
- Motion failed.
- A Second Substitute Motion was made to approve the following new recommendation (in bold italics and strikethrough)

Strategy	Policy Recommendation
N/A	As an initial transit stabilization recommendation, effectively double Local Transportation Fund (LTF), by increasing the Bradley-Burns Uniform Local Sales and Use Tax Law by 0.25% for a total of 1.50%. The new 0.25% would be dedicated to LTF and the allocation methodology would be worked out through the legislative process

- Motion/Second: Cooney/Watts
- Ayes: Cooney, Lipmen, Matute, Watts
- Noes: Ajise, Barnes, Bockelman, Edison, Griffiths, Hance, Miller, Murphy, Paget-Seekins, Powers, Tolkoff, Turner
- Abstain: Moe-Luna, Pimentel, Sforza, Watkins, White
- Absent: Flournoy, Lindsay, Sedoryk, Wunderman
- Motion failed.
- A Motion was made to approve the following new recommendation (in bold italics and strikethrough)

Strategy	Policy Recommendation
N/A	Implement new state funding mechanisms for transit capital projects that increase, enhance and maintain transit service and delivers transit service that aligns with the goals of the report and other state mandates. To implement this recommendation, the Legislature should consider the multiple new revenue sources identified in the report, for transit capital in order to increase usage of transit service.

- Motion/Second: Turner/Ajise
- Ayes: Ajise, Barnes, Bockelman, Cooney, Griffiths, Hance, Lipmen, Matute, Miller, Moe-Luna, Murphy, Pimentel, Tolkoff, Turner, Watkins, Watts
- Noes: n/a
- Abstain: Edison, Paget-Seekins, Sforza, White
- Absent: Flournoy, Lindsay, Powers, Sedoryk, Wunderman
- Motion approved.
- A Motion was made to approve the following recommendation with the following modifications (in *bold italics* and *strikethrough*)

Strategy	Policy Recommendation
X. Support local communitie s in raising revenues	X.1. Consider additional flexibility in the ability for transit agencies, regions, or advocates voters to place measures on the ballot by allowing transit agencies and regions, to have authority to place measures on the ballot for portions of their service areas or entire service area, similar to how cities can place sales taxes on the ballot without enabling legislation.

Motion/Second: Griffiths/Watkins

- Ayes: Ajise, Barnes, Bockelman, Cooney, Edison, Griffiths, Hance, Lipmen, Matute, Miller, Murphy, Paget-Seekins, Pimentel, Powers, Tolkoff, Turner, Watkins, Watts
- o Noes: n/a
- o Abstain: Moe-Luna, Sforza, White
- o Absent: Flournoy, Lindsay, Sedoryk, Wunderman
- Motion approved.
- A Motion was made to approve the following recommendation with the following modifications (in *bold italics* and *strikethrough*)

Strategy	Policy Recommendation
W. Reprogram and re- focus existing revenues	W.4. Identify opportunities for regions to reprogram FHWA formula for transit uses as allowable under federal law.  Consider opportunities to temporarily support regions that program FHWA-formula funds into FTA or for transit purposes for a limited duration by matching with state share dollars where available to help eliminate a backlog in spending FHWA formula dollars.  W.4. Identify opportunities to support regions that reprogram FHWA formula funds for transit uses as allowable by law, by matching with state share dollars with a specific focus on helping eliminate the backlog and the Statewide unobligated balance to maximize overall revenue to the State via the August redistribution process.

- Motion/Second: Ajise/Matute
- Ayes: Ajise, Barnes, Bockelman, Cooney, Edison, Griffiths, Hance, Lipmen, Matute, Miller, Moe-Luna, Murphy, Paget-Seekins, Pimentel, Powers, Tolkoff, Turner, Watkins, Watts
- o Noes: n/a
- o Abstain: Sforza, White
- o Absent: Flournoy, Lindsay, Sedoryk, Wunderman

- o Motion approved.
- A Motion was made to approve the following recommendations with the following modifications (in bold italics and strikethrough)

Strategy	Policy Recommendation
Y. Generate new revenue through value- capture	<ul> <li>Y.1. Give transit and other government agencies the ability to sell air rights or other development incentives to create development opportunities above and near transit stations and facilities to generate additional revenue via sale and/ or investment</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Y.2. Explore opportunities to allocate revenue from managed lanes and other forms of pricing in California's most congested regions to expand fund transit service, giving travelers reliable alternatives to driving alone</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Y.3. Update increment financing tools to make it easier for transit agencies to capture value and establish district, with a specific focus on removing the number of bodies and votes that need to approve the creation of a TIF district</li> </ul>

- Motion/Second: Watts/Lipmen
- Ayes: Barnes, Bockelman, Cooney, Edison, Griffiths, Hance, Lipmen, Matute, Miller, Moe-Luna, Murphy, Paget-Seekins, Pimentel, Powers, Tolkoff, Turner, Watkins, Watts
- o Noes: n/a
- o Abstain: Sforza, White
- o Absent: Ajise, Flournoy, Lindsay, Sedoryk, Wunderman
- Motion approved.
- A Motion was made to approve the following recommendations with the following modifications (in bold italics and strikethrough)

Strategy	Policy Recommendation
Z. Create new revenue through efficiencies and higher ridership service offering	z.1. Allow agencies to retain state grant and discretionary funding if projects come in under-budget as incentive, available to be used on an eligible project within the same program without recompeting
	<ul> <li>Z.2. Allow agencies to borrow against future STA and LTF or other state share revenues for projects that will improve efficiencies and lower operating costs with a defined return on investment.</li> </ul>

- o Motion/Second: Cooney/Griffiths
- Ayes: Cooney, Edison, Griffiths, Matute, -Luna, Murphy, Pimentel, Powers, Tolkoff, Turner, Watkins, Watts
- o Noes: Hance, Paget-Seekins,
- o Abstain: Barnes, Bockelman, Sforza, White
- Absent: Ajise, Flournoy, Lindsay, Lipmen, Miller, Sedoryk, Wunderman
- Motion failed.
- A Motion was made to approve the following new recommendation with the following modifications (in bold italics and strikethrough)

Strategy	Policy Recommendation
N/A	The legislature should look for means to allow maximum flexibility to transit agencies when expending state transportation funds (e.g., Article 19)

- o Motion/Second: Hance/Tolkoff
- Ayes: Barnes, Bockelman, Cooney, Griffiths, Hance, Lipmen, Matute, Miller, Moe-Luna, Murphy, Paget-Seekins, Pimentel, Powers, Tolkoff, Turner, Watkins

o Noes: n/a

o Abstain: Edison, Sforza, Watts, White

o Absent: Ajise, Flournoy, Lindsay, Sedoryk, Wunderman

Motion approved.

• A Motion was made to approve the following recommendation with the following modifications (in *bold italics* and *strikethrough*)

Strategy	Policy Recommendation
AA. Coordinate with and incentivize manufactur ers to collaborate on zero- emission bus and paratransit vehicle fleet	AA.2. Facilitate statewide coordination to address zero emission vehicles and related technologies not in service due to lack of OEM support to render vehicles operational and to ensure vehicles are adequately maintained

- Motion/Second: Lipmen/Watkins
- o Ayes: Edison, Griffiths, Lipmen, Matute, Moe-Luna, Watkins
- o Noes: Barnes, Hance, Powers
- Abstain: Bockelman, Cooney, Miller, Murphy, Paget-Seekins, Pimentel, Sforza, Tolkoff, Turner, White
- o Absent: Ajise, Flournoy, Lindsay, Sedoryk, Watts, Wunderman
- Motion failed.
- Task Force general discussion and possible action on TTTF Report Tranches
   1 & 2 (Chad Edison, CalSTA, TTTF Chair)
  - a) Staff Report (Hunter Owens, SB125 Staff)

Summarize the staff report on updates to Tranches 1 & 2 and highlighted the new draft strategies and recommendations developed around the topics of service and fare coordination/integration, and coordinated scheduling, mapping, and wayfinding. Presented two draft strategies and six draft recommendations, which reflect and build on prior Task Force meetings in October 2024 and August 2025.

### b) Public Comment

- Adina Levin (Seamless Bay Area) commented that state-level policy and support are vital for coordination efforts that improve convenience and ridership. They said partial state funding and technical assistance would help and urged better alignment between schedule coordination, service planning, and capital planning.
- Carl Sedoryk (Task Force member) commented that they did not support creating another governmental agency to coordinate transit operators, arguing that agencies can manage coordination independently. They said adding another bureaucratic layer would not improve efficiency.
- c) Task Force Discussion on Service and Fare Coordination/Integration, and Coordinated Scheduling, Mapping, and Wayfinding
  - Perspectives on Regional Empowerment and Clarity of Roles: Task Force members expressed a variety of opinions on this topic. Several supported empowering regions to lead on fare, service, and wayfinding coordination, emphasizing the need for clear roles and responsibilities. Some members noted that California's size and diversity require flexibility in determining which entities—MPOs, counties, or transit agencies—should take the lead. Others noted that new coordination mandates could add bureaucracy or duplicate existing regional efforts. Some members questioned the practicality of designating regional leads across such a large, diverse state and cautioned that new mandates could interfere with existing governance, labor agreements, or agency independence.
  - Regional Progress and Variability across the State: Task Force
    members expressed a variety of opinions on this topic. Several
    members noted that progress varies widely, with the Bay Area often
    cited as a leader in fare and wayfinding integration, while other

- regions are still building capacity. Some members agreed that any statewide framework should remain flexible, allowing each region to build on existing strengths.
- Improving the Rider Experience through Integration: Task Force
  members expressed a variety of opinions on this topic. Some
  members felt that better coordination is essential to improving the
  rider experience. They noted that inconsistent signage, mapping,
  and scheduling confuse passengers and discourage transit use.
   Some members pointed to major events like the Olympics as
  moments that demand clear, multilingual wayfinding, and
  referenced international models where seamless integration makes
  transit simple and appealing.
- Funding as a Central Enabler: Task Force members expressed a
  variety of opinions on this topic. Despite differing views on structure,
  many members agreed that dedicated funding is crucial for
  coordination to succeed. Some members noted that local efforts
  often lack stable resources and supported state funding to expand
  integration and make these activities eligible for future programs.
- A Motion was made to table all recommendations under Strategy ZZ and Strategy AAA:

Strategy	Policy Recommendation
ZZ. Empower Regions to lead on fare, service, mapping, and	<ul> <li>ZZ.1. The legislature could consider requiring and funding multi-operator regions to identify a regional body, lead agency or collaboratives of operators with a responsibility to define the service goals of the transit network, identify key hubs and corridors where route and time connections are most important to riders, and consider the most effective method for timetable updates among participating transit agencies.</li> </ul>
wayfinding coordinatio n	<ul> <li>ZZ.2. Recommend regions, a lead agency or collaboratives of operators facilitate fare policy discussions with goal of increasing ridership and revenue.</li> </ul>

Strategy	Policy Recommendation
	AAA.1. Provide technical assistance to transit agencies that request it through a statewide identity verification program that transit agencies can use to verify discounted fares
AAA. Ensure State support	<ul> <li>AAA.2. Develop tools and technical assistance to help ensure inter-operability between payments systems statewide, along with determining how to sell inter- regional, multi-operator trips that often link to the state rail network.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>AAA.3. Recommend opt-in common data collection, analysis, and publication standards across agencies to improve interoperability (e.g., General Transit Feed Specification, Operational Data Standard, TIDES) to local and regional agencies</li> </ul>
	AAA.4. Develop tools and provide support for regions and agencies for service planning to support other recommendations and help facilitate interregional planning.

- Motion/Second: Cooney/Barnes
- o Ayes: Barnes, Cooney, Hance, Powers
- Noes: Bockelman, Edison, Griffiths, Lipmen, Matute, Murphy, Paget-Seekins, Sforza, Tolkoff, Watkins
- o Abstain: Pimentel, Turner, White
- Absent: Ajise, Flournoy, Lindsay, Miller, Moe-Luna, Sedoryk, Watts, Wunderman
- Motion failed.
- A Substitute Motion was made to approve the following recommendations with the following modifications: (in bold italics and strikethrough)

Strategy	Policy Recommendation
ZZ. Empower Regions to lead on fare, service, mapping, and wayfinding coordinatio n	ZZ.1. The legislature could consider requiring and funding multi-operator regions to identify a regional body, lead agency or collaboratives of operators with a responsibility to define the service goals of the transit network, identify key hubs and corridors where route and time connections are most important to riders, and consider the most effective method for timetable updates among participating transit agencies.
	<ul> <li>ZZ.1. Define California's transit coordination regions and identify a suitable lead transit coordinating entity within each region responsible for advancing service coordination, fare integration, and mapping and wayfinding coordination.</li> </ul>
	ZZ.2. Recommend regions, a lead agency or collaboratives of operators facilitate fare policy discussions with goal of increasing ridership and revenue.
	IZ.3. Provide funding for regional integration programs, including fare integration, service coordination, consistent mapping and wayfinding, to be led by transit coordinating entities within each region.
	<ul> <li>ZZ.4. The legislature could consider empowering transit coordinating entities in each region with clear mandates and sufficient resources to effectively lead transit coordination, including fare integration, service coordination, and providing consistent mapping and wayfinding.</li> </ul>

- o Motion/Second: Griffiths/Lipmen
- Ayes: Bockelman, Edison, Griffiths, Lipmen, Matute, Paget-Seekins, Tolkoff, Watkins
- o Noes: Barnes, Cooney, Hance, Murphy, Powers
- o Abstain: Moe-Luna, Pimentel, Sforza, Turner, White
- Absent: Ajise, Flournoy, Lindsay, Miller, Sedoryk, Watts, Wunderman

- Motion failed.
- A Second Substitute Motion was made to approve the following recommendations as written in the staff report with no modifications:

Strategy	Policy Recommendation
ZZ. Empower Regions to lead on fare, service, mapping, and	<ul> <li>ZZ.1. The legislature could consider requiring and funding multi-operator regions to identify a regional body, lead agency or collaboratives of operators with a responsibility to define the service goals of the transit network, identify key hubs and corridors where route and time connections are most important to riders, and consider the most effective method for timetable updates among participating transit agencies.</li> </ul>
wayfinding coordinatio n	<ul> <li>ZZ.2. Recommend regions, a lead agency or collaboratives of operators facilitate fare policy discussions with goal of increasing ridership and revenue.</li> </ul>

- o Motion/Second: Paget-Seekins/Bockelman
- Ayes: Bockelman, Edison, Griffiths, Lipmen, Matute, Moe-Luna, Murphy, Paget-Seekins, Tolkoff, Watkins
- o Noes: Cooney, Hance, Powers
- o Abstain: Barnes, Pimentel, Sforza, Turner, White
- Absent: Ajise, Flournoy, Lindsay, Miller, Sedoryk, Watts, Wunderman
- Motion failed.
- A Motion was made to approve the following recommendations with the following modifications (in *bold italics* and *strikethrough*)

Strategy	Policy Recommendation
AAA. Ensure State support	AAA.1. Provide technical assistance to transit agencies that request it through a statewide identity verification program that transit agencies can use to verify discounted fares
	<ul> <li>AAA.2. Develop tools and technical assistance and funding to help ensure incentivize inter-operability between payments systems statewide., along with determining how to sell inter-regional, multi-operator trips that often link to the state rail network.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>AAA.3. Recommend opt-in common data collection, analysis, and publication standards across agencies to improve interoperability (e.g., General Transit Feed Specification, Operational Data Standard, TIDES) to local and regional agencies</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>AAA.4. Develop tools and provide opt-in support for regions and agencies for service planning to support other recommendations and help facilitate interregional planning.</li> </ul>

- o Motion/Second: Paget-Seekins/Griffiths
- Ayes: Barnes, Bockelman, Cooney, Edison, Griffiths, Hance, Lipmen, Matute, Murphy, Paget-Seekins, Pimentel, Powers, Tolkoff, Turner, Watkins
- o Noes: n/a
- o Abstain: Sforza, White
- Absent: Ajise, Flournoy, Lindsay, Miller, Moe-Luna, Sedoryk, Watts, Wunderman
- o Motion approved.
- 8. Next Steps (Chad Edison, CalSTA, TTTF Chair)
- 9. Adjourn (Chad Edison, CalSTA, TTT Chair)
  - Thank you to the Task Force and the public.
  - Meeting adjourned.

For additional information please visit our webpage: <a href="https://calsta.ca.gov/subject-areas/sb125-transit-program">https://calsta.ca.gov/subject-areas/sb125-transit-program</a>