

From: [REDACTED]
To: [commissionstreamlining](#)
Subject: Please Retain the SFMTA Citizens' Advisory Council (CAC)
Date: Saturday, September 13, 2025 3:35:58 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To the Members of the Commission Streamlining Task Force and the Board of Supervisors:

As a long-term San Francisco resident and a frequent SFMTA transit rider, I strongly urge you to retain the SFMTA Citizens' Advisory Council (CAC) in its present form. I regularly attend meetings of the CAC as well as the SFMTA Board of Directors. So I know from personal experience that the CAC and the MTA Board perform very different functions.

First: the CAC is fully representative of all eleven SF districts, and the SFMTA Board is not.

The CAC has designated representatives from each of San Francisco's 11 supervisorial districts, appointed by that district's supervisor. Accordingly, every SF district resident has an assigned CAC representative whose job it is to hear and, more importantly, to respond to their unique concerns. Whenever I have a transit issue, I go directly to my CAC district representative, who sees it as his (or her) job to respond to me, understand my concerns, and determine whether that concern should be elevated to the MTA Board. By contrast, there are only 7 MTA Board members, appointed by the Mayor. That means that at least 4 or more city districts have no designated representative on the MTA Board at any given time.

Second, the MTA Board operates in a formal atmosphere that limits public access and receives, but does not respond to, public comment. By contrast, CAC meetings are informal, held when working people can participate, and public comment is both

received and responded to. The MTA Board meets at 1:00 PM, which means the public must appear in person (absent an ADA accommodation) to make public comments when most people are at work. And if a member of the public poses a question to the Board, they are sternly reminded that the public comment session is NOT a question and answer period. The public is left with the perception that they are free to offer comments under strict time limits, for whatever good that may do, but any questions will go unanswered. By contrast, CAC meetings are informal, they take place after working hours, and questions from the public, along with robust general discussion, are encouraged and answered during the meeting.

Third, and most important, the CAC is the only avenue available to the public to bring resolutions before the MTA Board for a vote.

The MTA Board does not offer individual members of the public any mechanism to present a resolution for discussion, public comment, and a Board vote. By contrast, the CAC is empowered to draft resolutions and present them to the MTA Board. Thus, the CAC gives the public their only direct mechanism to propose potential topics for Board resolutions which, if advanced by the CAC and adopted by the Board, can build a transit system that actually serves the needs of its riders.

For example, in 2020, SFMTA unilaterally decided to remove the J-Church from the downtown subway. When riders learned of this, there was overwhelming public opposition, but SMFTA pressed ahead and in 2021, restored all Muni Metro lines to the subway EXCEPT the J-Church. Troubled by MTA's refusal to listen to its own riders, citizens contacted their CAC representative. On December 2, 2021, the CAC unanimously approved a resolution for presentation to the MTA Board that would restore the J-Church to the subway. On December 7, 2021, the MTA Board approved that resolution, and J-Church downtown service was restored.

Significantly, the CAC accomplished this on the exact timetable already established by SFMTA, which had selected December 7 as the date for the MTA Board's decision. *Thus, it is simply not the case, as stated in the Streamlining Task Force Memo dated Sept. 5, 2025 (p. 49) that the CAC's input "creates an extra layer of review that slows down MTA actions and decision-making."* Indeed, the SFMTA itself supports retaining the CAC.

In closing, the CAC gives the public direct and vital input into transit decisions that the MTA Board simply does not provide. And, as the Streamlining Task Force Memo correctly acknowledges, building public trust in SFMTA is "especially critical" now, when SFMTA, which has already alienated riders by cutting transit service, is about to ask voters to impose new taxes to bail SMFTA out of a massive budget deficit. The Streamlining Task Force is correct in stating that "The CAC provides an added layer of public engagement, transparency and oversight at a time when the MTA needs to draw upon public trust and support to fund its ongoing operations."

For all of these reasons, I urge you to retain, and not to "consolidate," the CAC.

Karen Kennard

SF resident and SFMTA transit rider