

Bay Area Rapid Transit/AC Transit ILC Notes – May 14, 2025**1. Opening – called to order at 9:00am****a. Roll Call**

- i. Present: Director Robert Raburn, Director Elizabeth Ames, Director Murphy McCalley, Director Jean Walsh (Chair), Director H. E. Christian Peoples additional AC Transit Staff and BART Staff.

b. Announcements/public comment

- i. It would be beneficial to have a transit connection (between different services) webpage for cases such as last week's morning BART service delays.

c. Notes from Previous Meeting**2. New Discussion Items****a. Legislative Update**

- i. **Alex Walker:** The May Revision to the state budget is happening today, so both AC Transit and BART legislative teams will be monitoring this. It is expected to be a rough situation, potentially the worst since the 2008 Recession. This is partly affected by the LA wildfires – LA County tax filing has been extended to October, which adds room for fluctuation. The California Transit Association has convened a working group to discuss priorities, which Claudia Burgos at AC Transit and I, at BART, are both a part of. We will not know exactly how this is going to turn out, but our agencies are involved in this discussion. There is a \$2 billion ask in the budget, led by Senator Arreguin and Mark Gonzalez. This is an ongoing advocacy process and will not be included in the May revision. SPUR and Bay Area partners, including our agencies, are working to advocate for this.
- ii. **Walker:** An update on Senator Arreguin and Senator Weiner's Senate Bill 63, which authorizes regional measures: There were amendments made on April 29 that removed language relating to the Transit Operations Financial Responsibility Implementation Plan (TFRIP) because the process is starting and since the language had no force of law it was taken out, but the project and conversation is continuing. Another amendment clarified that the provisions of the bill only apply to counties identified in the transportation revenue measure district. If there are provisions around reporting requirements, if you're not part of the tax regime there are no requirements for anything in the Bill being applied to your county. There is also an amendment that requires MTC to submit a report to legislature by March 31, 2026, impacting AC Transit, BART, Caltrain, and Muni from rail connectivity projects, amongst other projects. The legislature has a statement calling for the Bay Area to focus on increasing ridership. This was moved to a suspense file for additional discussion, with no opposition. Results will be known on Friday May 23. There are ongoing conversations with county CTAs about an exponential plan. San Mateo county is working with CCAG to create a poll and Santa Clara County is working on a letter of concerns to be discussed.

- iii. **Walker:** There are 3 bills that both AC Transit and BART have a shared position on. AB 394 would extend a sentencing enhancement for assault on operators to all transit employees and contractors, currently on suspense file. SB 71, put forth by Senator Weiner, which would put a permanent CEQA exemption on transit projects – this is also in suspense and going to be discussed May 23. SB 239 would allow for more teleconferencing flexibility under to Brown Act for advisory committees – this is on the Senate floor with a deadline of June 6 to move on to Assembly. Information about Bills can be found at leginfo.legislature.ca.gov in more detail.
- iv. **Maria Henderson:** Federal update: Congress is in session and today the House Transportation Housing and Urban Development subcommittee is holding a hearing on the FY2026 for the DOT. The Senate appropriations committee will be holding a similar hearing. The House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee will hear from representatives from other committees. Latifah Simon is going to testify at today's hearing, likely highlighting the public transit Fiscal Cliff and the need for federal funding. Finally, the house is working on the Budget Reconciliation bill, which is the tax cut extensions of proposed cuts for Medicaid and SNAP.

b. Clipper Bay Pass Pilot Update

- i. **Mike Eisman:** First big news, UC Berkeley students voted in April to join the Clipper Bay Pass pilot through a raise in their student fees, which is very big for the program. Student support was tremendous.
- ii. **Ryan Reeves:** Clipper Bay Pass came out of the region's fare coordination and integration study's recommendation to have an institutional pass program to improve customer experience and increase ridership. Any service that uses Clipper is included. Phase 1 of the pilot launched in 2022 and was regionally funded, and Phase 2 launched in 2024 and is being sold as a product to employers, universities, and property managers. Phase 1 was a randomized control trial giving 25% of students (at each of 5 college campuses) upgraded passes. Initial data showed that those with Bay Pass took about 30% more trips than those with a single agency pass, such as AC Transit Easy Pass. The key differences in Phase 2 is that it is not federally funded and is not a randomized control trial. We have 11 organizations with active contracts and 5 with pending contracts, including UC Berkeley which will be starting in August. We continue to have interest and are taking contracts on a rolling basis. There have been more than 2 million trips in the first year of the pilot, primarily on Muni, BART, and AC Transit, but across other operators as well. We get great feedback from users on the impact of the pass, which they say makes it easier to get around, more affordable, and making transit a more obvious choice. We have over 80,000 participants in Phase 2 including customers from healthcare, city government, tech, affordable housing, and social services, and beyond. This is running as a revenue neutral or positive program currently. MTC and the transit operators agreed to participate in Bay Pass through summer 2027. Operators are reimbursed based on the actual passenger usage at the Full Clipper fare.

Additional net revenue will depend on the operator's overall share of Phase 2 ridership.

- iii. **Director Ames:** Advocating for Cal State East Bay to get involved.
 - 1. AC Transit has tried numerous times to get CSEB involved and interested, however they have a lot of commuter students and inexpensive parking. They also have their own bus program that is free to students. Bay Pass is likely more attractive to them, however, since it includes BART. There are a range of steps involved in getting Bay Pass on a student referendum so the program can be used.
- iv. **Director Walsh:** What is the cost for students?
 - 1. In the area of \$140 per semester.
- v. **Eisman:** The Free/Discounted Interagency Transfer Pilot is for people who do not have Bay Pass so that they can get free transfers. This was part of the fare policy vision statement adopted by former GM Mike Hirsch. We explain this to customers as "you only pay the full fare of the first agency you use and transfers to other agencies within 2 hours of the first boarding are discounted up to \$2.85 per transfer." \$2.85 is the highest local bus fare in the region, so this would make any transfers to buses free. This policy will go into effect at the same time as the Next Generation Clipper system is put into effect; all operators have signed an MOU. It will be an 18-month pilot deployment with an automatic 24-month extension if funding is available. The proposed methodology for distributing the \$22.5 million budget for this is to use MTC allocations based on % of 2019 fare revenue. Additionally, operators are responsible for the first 50 cents off each transfer. This number will be adjusted based on growth.
- vi. **Public Comment:** The time limit should be extended to 3 hours with consideration of routes that only run once an hour, or the 2 hours should instead start after exiting BART instead of upon entry.
 - 1. Some of the North Bay operators will already have this 3-hour limit due to long trips, but this will continue to be looked into.

3. Update on Past Items

- a. **AC Transit Operator Restroom Update**
- b. **Final 2025 Joint Priorities**
- c. **Paratransit Update**
- d. **Service and Operations Updates (including bus bridges)**
- e. **Regional Coordination Update**
 - i. **Question:** Why wasn't Union City included in the TRANSFER plan? It is a valuable hub that makes getting to the South Bay a lot quicker than if one had to go through San Francisco.
 - 1. **Andy Metz:** The Project Working Group was made up of representatives from the 7 large operators and 3 smaller ones in the Bay Area. We voted as a group to select these hubs with special consideration of some key factors including hubs that are served by 3+ agencies and have a number of low frequency (over 15 minute) service. The other 4 hubs were

most advocated for by the agencies in the PRW but if Union City can be improved in the future, this would be good.

4. **Future Agenda Items**
 - a. **Paratransit One-seat Ride Pilot**
 - b. **Regional Wayfinding Report**
 - c. **3rd Party Review of Methodology managed by MTC**
5. **Committee Member Comments**
6. **Next Regular Meeting:**
 - a. August 13, 2025
 - b. November 12, 2025
7. **Adjourned: 10:33**