

Ride the Vote 2026

Ballot Endorsements

Ballot Information

Candidate Transportation Questionnaires



San Francisco Transit Riders

November 2026 edition



We couldn't do any of this work without our members.

[Donate to SFTR to become a member and support more projects like this one!](#)

www.sftransitriders.org/donate

Follow us @SFTRU: [Instagram](#), [Bluesky](#), [Facebook](#), [LinkedIn](#), [Threads](#), [Twitter](#), [Mastodon](#)

Contents

Official San Francisco Transit Riders Ballot Endorsements 6

 Vote YES on H and RTM! 6

 Vote NO on G! 6

Additional Ballot Information 7

 Measure A 7

 Measure B 8

 Measure D 8

 Measure E 9

 Measure F 10

 Proposition 42 10

 Proposition 43 11

 Proposition 45 12

Candidate Transportation Questionnaire Responses 13

 United States House of Representatives, CA-11 | Scott Wiener 14

 California State Assembly, District 17 | Matt Haney 22

 Board of Education | Virginia Cheung 26

 Board of Education | Ryan Hazelton 31

 Board of Education | Phil Kim 34

 Board of Education | Laurance Lee (Laurance Lem Lee) 38

 Board of Education | Reina Tello 42

 Board of Education | Tim Tung 45

 Community College Board | Elijah Ball 50

 Community College Board | Monroe Lace 52

 Community College Board | Leah LaCroix 55

 Community College Board | Bunny McFadden 58

 Community College Board | Erwin Tam 61

BART Board, District 8 Sara Barz.....	64
Board of Supervisors, District 4 Jeremy Greco	70
Board of Supervisors, District 4 Alan Wong.....	79
Board of Supervisors, District 6 Alex Behrend	89
Board of Supervisors, District 6 Matt Dorsey	95
Board of Supervisors, District 8 Gary McCoy.....	102
Board of Supervisors, District 8 Michael Nguyen.....	107
Board of Supervisors, District 10 Pearci "PJ" Bastiany III	113
Board of Supervisors, District 10 Dion-Jay (DJ) Brookter	124
Board of Supervisors, District 10 Deandra Bryant.....	138
Board of Supervisors, District 10 J.R. Eppler	145
Other candidates	155
About SFTR.....	156

Official San Francisco Transit Riders Ballot Endorsements

Vote YES on H and RTM!

Keep Muni rolling

Since the start of the pandemic, Muni has faced years of service stagnation and cuts due largely to reduced citywide tax revenue and increasing costs. Now, Muni faces a \$300M+ operating budget deficit, which, if left unaddressed this year, will require the agency to cut as much as 30% of all service to make ends meet. That means eliminating entire routes, doubling wait times, ending evening service, and suspending historic streetcar and cable car service. Together, measures H and RTM (Regional Transit Measure) will fill Muni's operating budget deficit, fund current levels of service, and stop those cuts.

Measure H is a local, square footage-based parcel tax which makes big skyscraper and mansion owners pay more of their fair share. Measure H will generate enough to fill about half of Muni's deficit.

Measure RTM is a regional sales tax (1% in San Francisco) which will help fill the remaining half of Muni's deficit while also generating enough for BART, Caltrain, and other agencies which are also facing major budget deficits and service cuts.

Vote YES on Measures H and RTM so we can save Muni service and continue the fight for meaningful improvements to Muni for riders.

Vote NO on G!

Save Sunset Dunes

SFTR endorsed the creation of Sunset Dunes two years ago, and since then Sunset Dunes has become one of San Francisco's most popular parks, easily accessible via eight different Muni routes. Initial concerns about slowdowns for cars and transit have proven mostly unfounded, with the most-affected car trips increasing by only four minutes, and some trips even increasing in speed. Voters should vote NO on G to preserve one of San Francisco's most beautiful and transit-accessible parks.

Additional Ballot Information

While these measures did not meet the SFTR Board's criteria for endorsement, here's some information from a transit-centric perspective that may help you as you decide how to vote.

Measure A

Charter Changes Affecting Various City Departments and Commissions

What does it do?

- Makes broad updates to city departments and commissions. For SFMTA, it would transfer the SFMTA Citizens' Advisory Council (CAC) from the Charter to the Municipal Code, making it easier to modify or abolish in the future. It would require that the CAC include both pedestrians and cyclists. It would codify SFMTA's existing authority over taxis, fares, fees, and personnel; allow the SFMTA board to define "on-time performance"; replace a separate SFMTA climate-action plan with participation in citywide climate planning; and make some changes to MOUs and relationships with personnel. It would also no longer require SFMTA to chair the Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation (ISCOTT), but it does not abolish ISCOTT.

Potential pros for transit:

- Adds a requirement that the SFMTA Citizens Advisory Council (CAC) must include both pedestrians and cyclists (not just transit riders), which is in line with San Francisco's current transit first policy.
- Cleans up obsolete and redundant language/requirements in the SFMTA section of the City Charter.
- Allows SFMTA board to define "on-time performance," giving greater flexibility since current language is outdated and doesn't consider the current headway management system; Gives advocates an opportunity to push for stronger definitions.

Potential cons for transit:

- Moves the SFMTA's voter-established Citizens Advisory Council (CAC) from the City Charter to city code, making it easier for the city to modify or eliminate the CAC without a vote of the people.
- In the City Charter, removes section 8A.100, which sets the voter-approved goals of the SFMTA and requires the remaining SFMTA sections to be interpreted with those goals in mind.

- Allowing the SFMTA board to define “on-time performance” could potentially lead to loosening those definitions.

Measure B

Establishing a Municipal Finance Corporation and a Public Bank

What does it do?

- Authorizes the establishment of a Municipal Finance Corporation (MFC) and a Public Bank as non-profit corporations, and sets the mission, principles and governance structures of those organizations.
- Puts the framework in place, but does not yet fund the Public Bank. Funding would need to be approved by voters in a future election.

Potential pros for transit

- The Public Bank, once established, would provide a stable and robust funding source for Muni and other city projects.
- Consistently identifies environmental sustainability and climate infrastructure as core lending priorities – transit projects should be eligible under this criteria.
- It’s now or never – the state's current authorization for cities to pursue public banks is set to expire in 2028.
- This measure is low-risk because it does not yet establish a funding mechanism.

Potential cons for transit

- Prop B does not explicitly call out transit projects as a funding priority, instead referencing “equity, social justice, and environmental sustainability” more broadly.
- It is unclear whether current state/federal rules will allow the bank to move forward.
- Even if voters approve the measure, separate legislation will be needed to actually capitalize the bank.

Measure D

Changes to Ballot Measure Process

What does it do?

- Makes it harder to place local ballot measures on the ballot. Removes mayoral power to unilaterally place ballot measures. Increases threshold for BoS placement from four members

to six. Increases threshold for citizen placement from 2% of registered voters (~10,600 signatures) to 10% of registered voters (~42,500 signatures).

Potential pros for transit

- Would lead to fewer spontaneous/unprofessional measures on the ballot, potentially leading to less competition/conflicts for future coalition-supported transit-related ballot measures.

Potential cons for transit

- Would make it significantly harder for advocates to place transit-related ballot measures on the ballot.
- Would likely not make it significantly harder for moneyed interests to place their own measures on the ballot.

Measure E

City Administrator's Authority and Changes to City

What does it do?

- Gives the City Administrator a stronger, more exclusive role in establishing citywide purchasing and contracting rules. Makes the SFMTA and other departments subject to those City Administrator rules. Reduces the number of contracts that require Board of Supervisors approval. Extends the City Administrator's term to ten years.
- SFMTA retains substantive authority over its transportation mission and contracts, but that authority becomes subordinate to City Administrator procurement authority and rules. The measure does not preserve the current broad exception for some SFMTA goods and services.

Potential pros for transit

- Makes it easier for smaller businesses to get city contracts, which can make those contracts more competitive and therefore faster/more affordable.
- Simplifies and standardizes contracting rules across all city agencies, reducing confusion and barriers to entry.
- Allows the City Administrator to delegate some authority to departments, meaning SFMTA could theoretically maintain control over their most technical contracts if given approval to do so by the City Administrator.

Potential cons for transit

- Would eliminate SFMTA's procurement independence, making the agency subject to the City Administrator's rules and potentially exposing the City Administrator as a second decisionmaker on transit projects.

- A general citywide process may not fit the specialized nature of transit procurement.
- Re-delegation of any powers to SFMTA is not guaranteed.
- Less legislative/public oversight: Places more control in the hands of the City Administrator, a mayoral appointee.
- Could put some SFMTA equity and contracting programs at risk

Measure F

Changes to Executive Branch Management

What does it do?

- Allows the mayor to fire any of his appointed board members and commissioners (i.e. all members of the SFMTA Board) without cause—currently they can only be fired with cause. Allows the mayor to hire and fire department heads without cause. Currently, for the SFMTA, the power to hire and fire the department head—the Director of Transportation—is in the hands of the SFMTA Board and can only be done with cause.

Potential pros for transit

- Codifies the mayor's already-strong power over the SFMTA, making it more transparent who calls the shots.
- A mayor who is good for public transportation would be able to more easily implement positive changes through SFMTA.

Potential cons for transit

- Codifies the mayor's already-strong power over the SFMTA, removing almost all independence from the SFMTA board and the SFMTA's director of transportation.
- A mayor who is bad for public transportation would be able to more easily implement negative changes through SFMTA.
- Lessens the value of community input and public comments if all of the leaders of the agency ultimately report to the same person.

Proposition 42

Prohibits New State Personal Property Taxes and Certain Retroactive State Taxes

What does it do?

- Prohibits any new state tax that either (1) taxes the ownership or control of personal property (including retirement accounts, financial assets, investment accounts, business interests, and intellectual property), or (2) applies retroactively based on the taxpayer's conduct, activities, or a status that occurred before the new tax's effective date, with limited exceptions.

Potential pros for transit

- No transit-specific pros identified.

Potential cons for transit

- Reduces the state's ability to fund transit and other services through new progressive wealth taxes.
- Would make transit funding more dependent on narrower tax sources, making future transit funding measures harder to design.
- New taxation on vehicles like cars and private aircraft would be prohibited, eliminating them as potential sources for transportation funding.
- Would maintain or increase pressure on fares, local taxes, general funds, or service cuts if state revenue options narrow.

Proposition 43

Limits Voters' Ability to Raise Revenues for Local Government Services

What does it do?

- Makes it harder for voters to approve certain local taxes. Beginning January 1, 2027, a local special tax proposed by voter petition would require approval by two-thirds of voters, rather than a simple majority.
- Would take effect at the start of next year, which means it cannot affect the validity of Props H and RTM.

Potential pros for transit

- No transit-specific pros identified.

Potential cons for transit

- Any future voter-initiated transit taxes similar to Prop L (2024), Prop H, and Prop RTM would become harder to pass, requiring a large two-thirds vote instead of a simple majority.
- Allows a $\frac{1}{3}$ minority to block an otherwise popular tax to fund transit.
- Makes independent citizen-led campaigns like Prop L (2024) more difficult by requiring them to spend more money to persuade more than a majority of voters.
- The only reliable way to pass a tax with less than $\frac{2}{3}$ of the vote would be by passing a general tax, which cannot be guaranteed to fund a specific department like SFMTA.

Proposition 45

Modifies Environmental Review for Certain Projects

What does it do?

- Makes certain public and private projects eligible for new project CEQA review and court challenge procedures. For example, new procedures would tighten time limits for environmental review, reduce the scope of what courts can consider when reviewing legal challenges, and reduce requirements for alternatives analyses.

Potential pros for transit

- Faster approval of transit projects that do not already qualify for existing SB 288 (sustainable transportation) or AB 2503 (electric rail) exemptions. For example: Major new/expanded transit yards or diesel-powered heavy rail projects.
- Less risk that a CEQA lawsuit stops an entire project.
- Potentially lower costs from avoiding CEQA delays.

Potential cons for transit

- Prop 45 would not be limited to projects that reduce greenhouse-gas emissions or increase transit use, and could therefore be used to fast-track highway expansion projects and similar negative projects deemed “essential.”
- A highway project could have fewer alternatives analyzed, including transit-oriented alternatives.
- California High Speed Rail would not be eligible for these benefits.
- Reduced opportunities for public input on local projects.
- High short-term costs of implementing changes, including at the local level.
- Expedited processes and lower barriers could lead to worse environmental impacts and higher long-term costs.
- Faster approval of projects does not necessarily mean faster construction.
- Many greenhouse-gas reducing transit projects already benefit from CEQA exemptions under SB 288 and AB 2503.

Candidate Transportation Questionnaire Responses

We asked your candidates where they stood on the transportation issues that matter to you. Read how they answered our questionnaire on the following pages.

United States House of Representatives, CA-11 | Scott Wiener

Do you have a section on your website about public transit, transportation, or mobility? If so, please provide a link.

From my website: <https://www.scottwiener.com/transportation>

My full transportation platform is linked from that page and is at:

https://cdn.prod.website-files.com/66232e42420708fcbd70a3a4/6a39b2f148916bf40c9a6b8c_SW%20Transportation%20Platform%202026.pdf

How do you usually get around San Francisco? Please tell us when and why you use cars, trains, Muni buses, bikes, walking, wheelchairs, or any other mode you frequently use for transportation.

I've been a daily Muni rider and frequent BART rider since I moved to San Francisco in 1997. Transit is my primary way of getting around the city, and I regularly experience Muni's good, bad, and ugly firsthand, from the much-improved Van Ness BRT to the T line to the Bayview, where you can sometimes jog faster than the train runs. Transit is my default way to get around because it's fast, safe, convenient, and I enjoy being around other San Franciscans.

I walk regularly for shorter trips around the city, because I enjoy seeing our beautiful city up close and connecting with people along the way.

I also drive for certain trips, typically when transit is not available or the timing would not work.

How often do you ride public transit?

Daily

If elected, what would be your top transportation priorities? This can include priorities related to public transit, active transportation, driving, or any other mode of transportation.

We need more public transit, and we need service that's fast, safe, and reliable and that

gets people where they need to go. We also need to build and run these systems without burning through budgets so we get faster, more reliable transit going to more places. I will work to make sure that transit isn't just good enough, but is the first choice of many. I have spent my career doing exactly that — at the local level as a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and at the state level in the Senate.

On the Board, I led the 2011 streets bond campaign, authored the transit development impact fee, and wrote Prop B, which now generates over \$60 million annually for Muni. In the Senate, I have led the fight to prevent catastrophic Bay Area transit service cuts — securing a \$400 million emergency state appropriation in 2023 and a bridge loan in 2025 — and I authored SB 63, the law authorizing the five-county Regional Transit Measure. I also joined colleagues to triple the share of the 2017 gas tax increase dedicated to transit, bike, and pedestrian infrastructure.

For decades, the federal government has favored highways while underinvesting in transit operating and capital funding. In Congress, I will change that, and fight to:

- Establish permanent federal operating assistance for large urban transit systems, so agencies like Muni, BART, and Caltrain aren't perpetually forced into service cuts when revenues dip
- Reform federal funding formulas to give states and regions greater flexibility to redirect highway dollars to transit operations
- Establish new ZEV sales requirements aligned with California's existing policies, and increase subsidies for transit buses, trucks, and other harder-to-decarbonize vehicles
- Expand e-bike and e-scooter subsidies and make e-bike maintenance an eligible commuter benefit, reducing short car trips
- Mandate that states spend meaningful shares of federal highway dollars on bike and pedestrian infrastructure, and expand the Transportation Alternatives Program to fund protected networks rather than piecemeal striping
- Support reauthorization and expansion of the Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) program — currently set to expire after FY2026 — authorizing \$5 billion annually through 2031 and shifting more funding toward implementation
- Ensure USDOT actively enforces Complete Streets principles and embeds active transportation as a core requirement in surface transportation reauthorization

- Align transportation funding with housing and land use outcomes that increase ridership and lower emissions
- Pursue legislation to increase regional network management authority to achieve integrated transit outcomes in regions throughout the country

In Congress, I will also work to bring home federal funds for transit capital projects, as listed below in my response to the federal surface transportation law question.

Do you support building a subway along Geary/19th Avenue, as described by the [SFCTA's June 2026 report](#)? If so, how will you advance its implementation while you are in Congress?

Yes, I support a Westside Subway to the Richmond and Sunset, along Geary and 19th Avenue, to ease traffic and expand transit access in the Richmond and the Sunset.

I authored the ordinance that launched the current subway planning process for San Francisco, and I welcome the SFCTA's finding that the case for a Geary/19th Avenue subway is promising. To introduce this ordinance in 2015, I wrote an essay called "San Francisco Should Always Have a Subway Under Construction," and I still believe in this.

In Congress, I will work closely with local and regional stakeholders to bring home federal funds for this rail connection as well as other transit capital projects, while also advancing funding, procurement, and permitting reforms to ensure that our transit dollars go farther, and work for us faster.

Muni, BART, and Caltrain all face structural deficits, and San Francisco leaders have warned of a potential BART collapse if the Regional Transit Measure and Prop H fail this November. What role should federal funding play in supporting operating deficits for big-city transit systems – not just capital projects – and would you sponsor or support legislation allowing flexible federal operating aid?

Yes, I will sponsor and fight for transit operating support to become a core federal responsibility, as well as for federal operating aid to be flexible.

Despite being the backbone of the urban economy, large transit systems receive no permanent dedicated federal operating support. When revenues fall, agencies like Muni, BART, and Caltrain are forced into service cuts and fare increases. The pandemic has likely

reshaped how travel demand is distributed across cities, leaving already fragile balance sheets even more exposed. This instability is the result of federal policy choices, not an inevitability.

I've long championed increased funding for public transit. As a member of the Board of Supervisors, I wrote and passed a ballot measure tying Muni funding to population growth. That ballot measure today produces over \$60 million annually for Muni, and without it, we already would have seen significant service cuts. In California, I fought and secured emergency operating funding to prevent Muni, BART, Caltrain, and other transit systems from collapsing after the pandemic. I then authored and championed a law (SB 63) authorizing a historic long-term regional funding ballot measure tied to a seamless rider experience, network integration, and accountability for safety, cleanliness, and reliability. That approach will stabilize service and create space to improve it, but it should not be limited to one region. And as an economic engine for the rest of the country, it should not fall on San Francisco taxpayers alone to keep these systems afloat.

In Congress, I will work to make transit operating support a core federal responsibility by sponsoring and advancing policies that include:

- Permanent federal operating assistance for large urban transit systems through increased formula funding
- Increased flexibility for states and regions to redirect federal highway funds to transit operations
- Authority for states to dedicate highway toll revenues to transit service
- A federal employer transit contribution requirement for large employers
- Full parity in commuter benefits for transit, biking, and micro-mobility, not just for driving

Operating funds keep service on the street, stabilize the workforce, and prevent far more expensive system failures later by letting transit agencies dedicate more resources to state of good repair.

The current federal surface transportation law (the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law) expires in 2026, and its reauthorization is one of the first major transportation bills the next Congress will write.

What would you fight for in the reauthorization for San Francisco?

The reauthorization of the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law is an opportunity to shift our federal

priorities away from highways and repair our underinvestment in public transit, street safety, and climate resilience, while also bringing federal dollars to San Francisco.

In San Francisco, we have a variety of transformative public transit projects at various stages of planning, design, and review. In Congress, I will work closely with local and regional stakeholders to bring home federal funds for these transit capital projects and ensure we cut red tape at the federal level to make them happen:

- Completing the Portal to connect Caltrain and future California High-Speed Rail to the Salesforce Transit Center in downtown San Francisco
- Westside rail connections along Geary and 19th Avenue to ease traffic and expand transit access in the Richmond and the Sunset
- Central Subway extension to North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf
- Building out a complete network of rapid bus lanes to continue the remarkable improvements to bus speed and reliability Muni has made in recent years
- Add a Caltrain Stop in the Bayview to restore service to the neighborhood
- New transbay rail crossing (Link21) to connect San Francisco, the Peninsula, the East Bay, and the Northern California mega-region with regional rail
- Expanded ferry terminals and service on the San Francisco waterfront
- Pennsylvania Avenue Extension to grade-separate Caltrain and High-Speed rail throughout all of San Francisco

Additionally, I support planning and funding more rail projects in the city, whether infill stations on existing BART or Muni lines, or new rail connections that we haven't considered pursuing due to a lack of funding.

As part of the reauthorization, I would also push for the following nationwide improvements:

- **Massive Capital and Operations Funding for Public Transit:** I would push for permanent federal operating assistance for large urban transit systems such as Muni, BART, and Caltrain through increased formula funding, as well as federal grants for modernization.
- **Vision Zero and Federal "Complete Streets" Standards:** Bringing my work on "Complete Streets" national, I would push to mandate that federal transportation dollars used for street modifications automatically incorporate safety improvements to encourage active transportation and keep all road users safe. I would also push to

strengthen federal vehicle safety standards, including intelligent speed assistance.

- **Aligning Federal Transit Funding with Increasing Ridership by Building Housing:** I would look to align federal transportation funding with land use outcomes that increase ridership. This would build on my landmark transit-oriented development law (SB 79) that requires California cities to allow denser housing development within a half mile of high-quality public transit stops.
- **Fund Shared Mobility Programs and Active Transportation Improvements:** The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program has been used under President Biden's Infrastructure Law to fund the Bay Area's Bay Wheels program. I would work to enhance the ability of other discretionary programs to fund shared mobility programs like bike share, as well as active transportation improvements.

San Francisco voters have twice affirmed transit-first governance and a 1993 measure requires city officials to ride transit regularly. Members of Congress aren't bound by city policy, so if elected, how will you stay connected to everyday riders in San Francisco rather than just agency executives or city officials?

I will continue to be a daily rider of our city's public transit systems when I am here in San Francisco, just as I have done as a city Supervisor and currently as a State Senator. And I will continue meeting with and working with transit riders, seniors and people with disabilities, youth and families, our LGBTQ+ community, labor and business leaders, and our city's advocates and organizations who work to improve our public transit.

If elected, you will have the opportunity to bring positive transportation changes to the whole country, not just San Francisco. What changes would you push for to improve public transportation and intercity rail travel nationwide?

In Congress, I will fight to stabilize, expand, and improve our transit systems, invest in intercity high-speed rail, and fix the broken bureaucratic processes that create the unacceptable delays and cost-overruns that have become all too common in recent years. In addition to working to establish dedicated funding for building out a National High-Speed Rail Network, I will also make sure that our capital dollars go farther, by fighting for:

- A shift toward predictable, formula-based transit capital funding so agencies can plan, hire, and build with confidence
- NEPA modernization: expanded categorical exclusions for climate-beneficial transit projects (such as bus lanes and bike lanes), enforceable review timelines, and limits

on duplicative review when state analysis has already occurred — building on what I accomplished at the state level with SB 288 (and extended by SB 922 and SB 71)

- Modernization of Buy America rules to allow limited pilot use of proven off-the-shelf vehicles
- Targeted waivers of certain federal safety standards to enable controlled experimentation
- Requirements that federally-funded projects comply with codes in effect at project approval — not a moving target
- Support for joint procurement across transit agencies to reduce rolling stock costs
- Creation of a national transit center of excellence within USDOT and a strengthened FTA role as a true delivery partner, including allowing federal funds to be used for in house staffing at transit agencies

Regional transit should be experienced by riders as a network, despite being operated by many agencies. Fragmentation undermines reliability and discourages ridership. I will support federal policies that:

- Strengthen metropolitan planning organizations as regional network managers
- Tie increased federal funding to fare integration and schedule coordination
- Require open-loop payment systems while protecting discount programs
- Expand FTA oversight focused on rider outcomes rather than formal compliance

Federal conditions must be applied carefully so they improve service rather than destabilize it.

I will also push for clear authorization for Amtrak to fund state-supported routes. Currently, shorter Amtrak-operated routes must be funded by state/local governments. We should encourage the national rail company to invest in shorter inter-regional routes like the Capitol Corridor service, which is state funded, locally governed, and contracted out to Amtrak to operate.

Do you support this year's Proposition H and the Regional Transit Measure (RTM), which together will generate revenue to maintain service for Muni, BART, Caltrain, and other transit agencies?

Yes, I strongly support both Stronger Muni For All (Prop H) and the Regional Transit Measure (RTM). I authored the law (SB 63) allowing the Regional Transit Measure to be on the ballot. It took me, my team, and our fantastic coalition including San Francisco Transit

Riders three years of legislative work to get this law passed and thus to allow this essential measure to be brought to voters.

I also very much support Prop H. Along with the Regional Transit Measure, this measure is essential to prevent Muni service cuts and to continue service improvements. Our field team has consistently encouraged voters to sign and now vote for both the Muni parcel tax and regional sales tax ballot measures, and has organized multiple mobilizations in support of both.

Do you support this year's Proposition G, which will close Sunset Dunes and reopen the Great Highway to cars during weekdays?

I do not support Prop G, which would destroy Sunset Dunes park. I authored the official Opponent's Argument against Proposition G, along with President Mandelman, Supervisors Dorsey, Mahmood, Melgar, and Sauter, and the Sierra Club.

I have supported closing the Upper Great Highway to cars since November 2020, when I joined other officials in urging the SFMTA to maintain the pandemic-era pedestrian and bicycle closure.

Did you support 2024's Proposition L, which would have taxed ride-hail companies to generate up to \$30 million annually for transit in San Francisco?

Yes, I was an early endorser of Prop L to provide critically-needed operational funding for Muni. I signed the official Proponent's argument, and supported the campaign in the field.

California State Assembly, District 17 | Matt Haney

Do you have a section on your website about public transit, transportation, or mobility? If so, please provide a link.

No.

How do you usually get around San Francisco? Please tell us when and why you use cars, trains, Muni buses, bikes, walking, wheelchairs, or any other mode you frequently use for transportation.

I get around San Francisco in a lot of the same ways most San Franciscans do: I walk and take Muni and BART.

I walk whenever I can, especially for shorter trips around the city. I also regularly use Muni and BART, and as someone who represents San Francisco while working in Sacramento, I see firsthand how important reliable transit connections are for people trying to get to work, school, appointments, or just across town.

I want it to be easy and practical for San Franciscans to get where they need to go without having to rely on a car. That's a big part of why I've fought for more funding for Muni, BART, and Caltrain, while also supporting safer streets and better infrastructure for people walking and biking.

A city like San Francisco works best when people have real choices for how they get around, and when public transit is frequent, safe, reliable, and convenient enough to be the easiest choice for more trips.

How often do you ride public transit?

I regularly use public transit, walk, and take rideshare to get around San Francisco. I take Muni and BART when they can get me where I need to go, but there are still too many gaps in frequency and reliability that can make transit difficult to depend on, especially with a busy schedule.

I also regularly take Amtrak's Capitol Corridor to and from Sacramento for work, and it's a great example of how strong regional rail can give people a convenient, sustainable alternative to driving.

That's exactly why we need to keep investing in public transit. San Franciscans should be able to count on Muni and BART to show up frequently, get them where they need to go on time, and be a reliable option for getting around the city every day.

If elected, what would be your top transportation priorities? This can include priorities related to public transit, active transportation, driving, or any other mode of transportation.

My top priority is making San Francisco a world-class transit city where people can get around safely, quickly, and reliably without needing a car.

In the immediate term, that means protecting BART, Muni, and Caltrain from devastating service cuts. I've supported state bridge funding for Bay Area transit and co-authored legislation to give the region a path toward a dedicated, long-term source of funding. But long-term sustainability can't just be about filling budget holes. We have to grow ridership, and that means delivering the basics riders expect: transit that is frequent, safe, clean, and reliable. We should pair sustainable funding with accountability and measurable improvements in service.

I also see transit and downtown recovery as deeply connected. We won't bring downtown back if it's difficult to get there, and our transit systems won't fully recover if the places they serve aren't thriving. We need more housing, businesses, entertainment, and activity around transit, while making it easier for people to get downtown without a car.

Finally, we need to keep investing in safe streets. That means safer infrastructure for people walking and biking, better connections to transit, and giving San Franciscans more safe and practical alternatives to driving.

Last year the Legislature passed and the Governor signed SB 63, authorizing the November 2026 regional transit measure (RTM), and in recent years has delivered state and regional subsidies to delay Bay Area service cuts. But these are one-time or ballot-dependent fixes. Would you support creating a permanent, dedicated state funding stream for transit operations? If so, what would that look like and what structural reforms, if any, would you attach to it? How would you work with legislators in less transit-dependent districts to support funding for public transit operations in San Francisco and statewide?

Yes. California needs a permanent, dedicated funding stream for public transit operations. We cannot continue lurching from one fiscal cliff to the next or relying on temporary funding to prevent devastating service cuts. The state's recent bridge funding has been critical, but it was explicitly designed as a temporary solution while California develops a longer-term approach.

I would support guaranteed, ongoing state funding for transit operations that gives agencies the stability to plan for the future, maintain service, and increase frequency. That funding should come with clear expectations: riders deserve transit that is safe, clean, frequent, and reliable. The best path toward long-term financial sustainability is getting more people back on transit, and we do that by providing service people can actually depend on.

I also think we need to change the way we talk about transit funding statewide. This isn't just a San Francisco issue. Californians in urban, suburban, and rural communities rely on buses and trains to get to work, school, health care, and their families. California already supports transit agencies of all sizes across the state.

I would work with legislators from every part of California to build a statewide funding approach that recognizes those different needs. Reliable public transit supports our economy, reduces congestion, connects people to opportunity, and gives Californians more choices for how they get around. It should be treated as essential transportation infrastructure and funded accordingly.

Do you support this year's Proposition H and the Regional Transit Measure (RTM), which together will generate revenue to maintain service for Muni, BART, Caltrain, and other transit agencies?

Yes.

Do you support this year's Proposition G, which will close Sunset Dunes and reopen the Great Highway to cars during weekdays?

No.

Did you support 2024's Proposition L, which would have taxed ride-hail companies to generate up to \$30 million annually for transit in San Francisco?

Yes.

Board of Education | Virginia Cheung

Do you have a section on your website about public transit, transportation, or mobility? If so, please provide a link.

Not currently. Transportation hasn't had its own section, but after working through this questionnaire it makes sense to add one. Especially when getting to school is inseparable from attendance, and attendance is the issue I've centered this campaign on.

How do you usually get around San Francisco? Please tell us when and why you use cars, trains, Muni buses, bikes, walking, wheelchairs, or any other mode you frequently use for transportation.

I drive more than I'd like to, and the reason is the thing I most want to fix.

I'm a single mother working full-time while running for office. I didn't own a car until 2023, when I separated from my son's father. I live in the Excelsior. He attends elementary school in the Sunset. There is no direct transit route between them. Making drop-off, pick-up, work, and evening commitments on that trip without a car is not realistic.

I don't offer that as a personal complaint. It's a policy failure sitting exactly where my two worlds meet. San Francisco assigns children to schools across the city and then doesn't provide the crosstown service that would let their families get there without a car. Every family in that position is pushed into car ownership they may not be able to afford — or into chronic lateness and absence. We then treat the absence as a family problem.

When my schedule allows, I take Muni, and walk.

How often do you ride public transit?

Three to four times a week; most often on weekends and evenings, when my schedule isn't dictated by the school run. I would ride daily if crosstown service made that possible.

If elected, what would be your top transportation priorities? This can include priorities related to public transit, active transportation, driving, or any other mode of transportation.

First, protect Free Muni for Youth. It is the single most important transportation program the city runs for our students.

Second, restore and protect school-serving Muni service, including the School Trippers cut this year.

Third, safe routes to and from school—including sanctuary from ICE—and to after-school and extracurricular programs, which often require a second trip later in the day, sometimes after dark.

Fourth, frequency and crosstown connections for the southern and western neighborhoods, where families are most often assigned far from home and least well served.

And to be direct about this cycle: I support Proposition H and Measure RTM. If both fail, SFMTA has said Muni faces roughly 30% service reduction and the elimination of up to 20 routes. There is no version of that which doesn't land on our students.

How can SFUSD help make access to school easier for families who cannot or do not drive?

SFUSD holds something no transit agency has: the actual map. We know where every student lives and which school they're assigned to. That is a complete origin-and-destination dataset for roughly 49,000 daily trips, and right now it mostly sits inside an enrollment system.

My first action would be to direct the district to produce that analysis, anonymized and aggregated, and bring it to SFMTA as a formal request, with BART at the table for the Glen Park and Balboa Park connections. Not "please add service," but "here are the thousand families making this specific trip at this specific hour, and here is what it currently costs them."

Second, the district should be a standing participant in SFMTA's service planning rather than a stakeholder consulted afterward. School bell times and Muni schedules are set by two agencies that barely talk to each other, and families absorb the gap.

Third, we should be honest with families during enrollment about what a given assignment will actually require. A parent choosing a school deserves to know there's no direct route before they accept the seat, not in September.

What role should the school board and SFUSD play in student transportation, including bike and transit-rider education, secure bike parking at schools, and supporting school-street safety and transit access projects near schools?

Secure bike parking at every school that can accommodate it, and bike racks sized to actual demand rather than to a decade-old standard. The district should distribute lights and locks, and partner with local nonprofits on helmet giveaways because the cost of those items is a real barrier for our families.

Transit-rider education belongs in schools: how to plan a trip, what to do when a connection fails, how to recognize an unsafe situation, and specifically who to report harassment to and how. Students who know how to use the system use it.

On bike education, I'd route it through the programs that already exist and already carry it; Safe Routes to School and the SF Bicycle Coalition have run youth bike and pedestrian safety instruction in this city for years, with the training protocols and insurance that come with it. That's the right structure: the district provides access, facilities, and class time; experienced partners deliver the instruction. The district can teach children street safety and to ride safely by partnering with the experts who do it well and practice through field trips and outings.

Every SFUSD school is served by at least one Muni route, including special "School Trippers" for afternoon service. SFMTA cut several School Trippers this year, and if Measures H and RTM do not pass to increase Muni funding, SFMTA may need to eliminate up to 20 Muni routes citywide. If elected, what will you do to protect school-serving Muni service and strengthen coordination between SFUSD, SFMTA, and other city leaders to protect Muni service to schools?

I support Proposition H and Measure RTM, and I'd use the Board's platform to say so publicly before November 3.

Beyond the ballot: I'd move a resolution calling for the reinstatement of the School Trippers cut this year, with the ridership and attendance data to support it. A resolution alone is a press release, so I'd pair it with a standing joint working group between SFUSD, SFMTA, and the Board of Supervisors on school-serving service, so this is a continuing

relationship rather than a reaction each time cuts are announced.

If the measures fail, the Board's job becomes triage, and it should be done with the district's own data in hand: identify the school-serving lines whose loss would most damage attendance for students with the fewest alternatives, and make protecting those lines a formal district ask backed by the Board of Supervisors.

I'd also say plainly that service cuts to school routes are an attendance issue and a budget issue. We are funded on average daily attendance. Cutting the bus that gets a child to school costs this district money, which is a case I can make at City Hall that no one else at that table is making.

About 14,000 SFUSD students rely on Muni daily through Free Muni for Youth. What are your thoughts on the Free Muni for Youth program? Will you fight to preserve it if it is ever at risk of cancellation?

About 14,000 of our students rely on it every day. For many of them it is the only reason the assignment they received is reachable at all.

I'm an unequivocal supporter, and yes, I will fight to preserve it if it is ever at risk. I'd go further: the district should be actively enrolling eligible students rather than waiting for families to find the program. If there are students who qualify and aren't signed up, that's a gap SFUSD can close itself.

San Francisco's [Transit First Policy](#) applies to all officers, boards, commissions, and departments of the city and county, and states that within San Francisco, travel by public transit, by bicycle and on foot must be an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile. Do you support the principles laid out in the full Transit First Policy?

Yes. And I'd note that for school communities it's also a safety policy; fewer private vehicles circling a school at bell time is the most direct thing we can do to protect children walking and biking there.

A [1993 ballot measure](#) made it official city policy that all elected city officials must ride Muni or other public transit to work at least twice a week. If elected, how closely will you abide by this policy?

I already do this and will continue to. I'd also commit to riding the routes that serve our schools specifically, including at bell times, rather than only the trips that are convenient for me. If I'm going to ask SFMTA to protect a line, I should have been on it.

Board of Education | Ryan Hazelton

Do you have a section on your website about public transit, transportation, or mobility? If so, please provide a link.

No

How do you usually get around San Francisco? Please tell us when and why you use cars, trains, Muni buses, bikes, walking, wheelchairs, or any other mode you frequently use for transportation.

I do not own a car. I use a bicycle or walk to get around to most places, and then ride Muni buses and trains when riding my bicycle is not a suitable option (too much carry, timing, etc.). I most frequently utilize my bicycle because it is faster, easier, and blends exercise with mobility.

How often do you ride public transit?

I ride public transit 1-2x a week when I am unable to utilize my bicycle.

If elected, what would be your top transportation priorities? This can include priorities related to public transit, active transportation, driving, or any other mode of transportation.

In my role as Chair of the SF Childcare Planning & Advisory Council and Executive Director of Mariposa Kids, an afterschool and summer program for children, my top priority if elected will be to defend funding for and continue advocacy for Free Muni for All Youth. I would also advocate for increased safety and quality conditions on Muni that support families and children utilizing these services to get to and from school and other family activities. Lastly, continued funding and support for crossing guards in school zones will be a priority for me to allow families cycling or walking to/from school to have safer paths to campus.

I spoke with KQED about our crossing guards in August 2026 at the start of the current school year: <https://www.kqed.org/news/12095317/san-francisco-uses-new-speed-limit-law-to-help-kids-get-to-school-safely>

How can SFUSD help make access to school easier for families who cannot or do not drive?

Muni already reaches every SFUSD school, and the Free Muni for Youth program means every student rides free, no application, no Clipper tap required. That's a real foundation, but the enrollment lottery undermines it: families placed far from home, sometimes with impossible commute times layered on top of a parent's own commute, still need a car-dependent trip Muni can't realistically cover twice a day. Fixing the broken assignment system so more families get a genuinely nearby school is itself a transit-access issue, since proximity is what makes walking, biking, or a single-transfer Muni ride actually work for a family without a car.

What role should the school board and SFUSD play in student transportation, including bike and transit-rider education, secure bike parking at schools, and supporting school-street safety and transit access projects near schools?

The school board and SFUSD should partner with SFMTA to install ample bike racks on sidewalks outside every school, integrating bike and transit-rider education directly into curriculum so kids grow up knowing how to navigate the city safely, and improving how drop-off and pick-up zones are designed so double-parked cars don't block streets and bike lanes right when kids are most exposed. I'd also use the board's voice to advocate for school-street safety projects, slower speeds and safer crossings near campuses. As we implement the assignment reform I've pushed for, I'd want proximity and realistic transit access built into that planning from the start, so a "nearby" school is one families can actually reach on foot, by bike, or by Muni.

Every SFUSD school is served by at least one Muni route, including special "School Trippers" for afternoon service. SFMTA cut several School Trippers this year, and if Measures H and RTM do not pass to increase Muni funding, SFMTA may need to eliminate up to 20 Muni routes citywide. If elected, what will you do to protect school-serving Muni service and strengthen coordination between SFUSD, SFMTA, and other city leaders to protect Muni service to schools?

SFMTA faces a \$307 million deficit, and if Propositions H and RTM don't pass this November, the agency has said it could eliminate up to 20 Muni routes and cut service by roughly 30% districtwide. I support both measures. Beyond that vote, I'd push for a standing coordination table between SFUSD and SFMTA specifically protecting school-serving routes and Trippers from being the first cuts on the table, since these routes serve a captive population with no alternative if lost. I'd also want SFUSD data on enrollment and school schedules shared directly with SFMTA route planning, so service decisions account for when and where kids actually need to move.

About 14,000 SFUSD students rely on Muni daily through Free Muni for Youth. What are your thoughts on the Free Muni for Youth program? Will you fight to preserve it if it is ever at risk of cancellation?

Every day at Mariposa Kids, I see what it takes for families to actually get their kids where they need to be, and Free Muni is often what makes that possible for families who can't drive or can't afford another option. Roughly 14,000 SFUSD students depend on it daily. I will fight to preserve it, the same way I've spent my career fighting to get resources to the families who need them most, whether that was pushing to release childcare funds that sat unused for years or building a coalition to fund free and affordable summer camps when the city couldn't. Protecting Free Muni is that same fight, just wearing a different hat.

San Francisco's [Transit First Policy](#) applies to all officers, boards, commissions, and departments of the city and county, and states that within San Francisco, travel by public transit, by bicycle and on foot must be an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile. Do you support the principles laid out in the full Transit First Policy?

Yes

A [1993 ballot measure](#) made it official city policy that all elected city officials must ride Muni or other public transit to work at least twice a week. If elected, how closely will you abide by this policy?

I will either do this or ride my bicycle.

Board of Education | Phil Kim

Do you have a section on your website about public transit, transportation, or mobility? If so, please provide a link.

N/A

How do you usually get around San Francisco? Please tell us when and why you use cars, trains, Muni buses, bikes, walking, wheelchairs, or any other mode you frequently use for transportation.

I take Muni daily to get to work, and like many San Franciscans, I depend on it as a primary mode of transportation. I also purchased a used electric car with my partner this year. We use it minimally during the week, and use it on weekends to get to and from school (I am a doctoral student in education at Berkeley, traveling both by BART and/or by car) and to visit family in the East Bay.

How often do you ride public transit?

I ride public transit daily. Muni is my primary way of getting to and from work.

If elected, what would be your top transportation priorities? This can include priorities related to public transit, active transportation, driving, or any other mode of transportation.

Public transportation is not a luxury in San Francisco; it is essential infrastructure. Reliable, affordable transportation is also foundational to a thriving public school system. Students cannot learn if they cannot consistently and safely get to school, and educators cannot serve them as effectively if they are navigating unreliable commutes.

As a School Board member, my priorities are protecting affordable transit access for students, ensuring reliable service to our schools, improving coordination between SFUSD and SFMTA, and supporting safe walking, biking, and transit routes around school communities. More broadly, I believe transit reliability, frequency, safety, and sustainable funding must remain top civic priorities.

How can SFUSD help make access to school easier for families who cannot or do not drive?

Reliable, affordable transportation is foundational to a thriving public school system. Students cannot learn if they cannot consistently and safely get to school, and educators cannot serve them as effectively if they are navigating unreliable commutes.

As a School Board member, my priorities are protecting affordable transit access for students, ensuring reliable service to our schools, improving coordination between SFUSD and SFMTA, and supporting safe walking, biking, and transit routes around school communities. More broadly, I believe transit reliability, frequency, safety, and sustainable funding must remain top civic priorities.

What role should the school board and SFUSD play in student transportation, including bike and transit-rider education, secure bike parking at schools, and supporting school-street safety and transit access projects near schools?

The School Board should set a clear expectation that transportation access and school-street safety are part of creating the conditions for students to succeed, and partner with the Superintendent to ensure the District has the necessary conditions to meet these expectations. SFUSD should work proactively with SFMTA and other City agencies to identify transportation barriers around our schools and advocate for solutions.

I support transit-rider and bike-safety education, secure and accessible bike parking at schools, Safe Routes to School initiatives, and street designs that make it safer for students and families to walk, bike, and take transit. We should also engage students themselves in this work. Young people are among Muni's most frequent riders and can tell us directly where unreliable service, unsafe intersections, or other transportation barriers affect their ability to get to school.

Every SFUSD school is served by at least one Muni route, including special "School Trippers" for afternoon service. SFMTA cut several School Trippers this year, and if Measures H and RTM do not pass to increase Muni funding, SFMTA may need to eliminate up to 20 Muni routes citywide. If elected, what will you do to protect school-serving Muni service and strengthen coordination between SFUSD, SFMTA, and other city leaders to protect Muni service to schools?

Cuts to school-serving Muni lines are an education issue because thousands of our students depend on transit every day. As a School Board member, I will advocate strongly for

protecting routes and services that students rely on to get to and from school.

I also believe SFUSD and SFMTA need more intentional and regular coordination. Decisions about bell schedules, enrollment, school locations, student assignment, and Muni service affect one another. SFUSD should proactively share data and planning information with SFMTA and identify where service changes could create barriers for students before those changes are made.

As Board President, I have worked to strengthen SFUSD's partnership with City Hall and other City agencies. I will continue using that role to ensure the needs of students and educators are represented in citywide conversations about Muni's future and to advocate for sustainable transit funding. I have proudly endorsed Prop RTM.

About 14,000 SFUSD students rely on Muni daily through Free Muni for Youth. What are your thoughts on the Free Muni for Youth program? Will you fight to preserve it if it is ever at risk of cancellation?

Absolutely. Free Muni for Youth is an essential program and particularly important for low-income families. Transportation costs should never become a barrier between a student and their education.

I am committed to preserving Free Muni for Youth and would advocate alongside students, families, SFMTA, and City leaders to protect it if it were threatened. The program does more than help students get to school: it gives young people greater independence and access to libraries, after-school programs, jobs, recreation, and everything else San Francisco has to offer. Public transit should remain a reliable, accessible, and no-cost option for young people throughout our city.

San Francisco's [Transit First Policy](#) applies to all officers, boards, commissions, and departments of the city and county, and states that within San Francisco, travel by public transit, by bicycle and on foot must be an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile. Do you support the principles laid out in the full Transit First Policy?

Yes

A [1993 ballot measure](#) made it official city policy that all elected city officials must ride Muni or other public transit to work at least twice a week. If elected, how closely will you abide by this policy?

I will continue using Muni every day to get to and from work.

Board of Education | Laurance Lee (Laurance Lem Lee)

Do you have a section on your website about public transit, transportation, or mobility? If so, please provide a link.

I do not have a dedicated transportation page. My campaign website is <https://www.lauranceleesf.com/>.

How do you usually get around San Francisco? Please tell us when and why you use cars, trains, Muni buses, bikes, walking, wheelchairs, or any other mode you frequently use for transportation.

I use public transit and drive, depending on where I'm going and my schedule. I usually drive to campaign events. For events downtown and in Chinatown, I drive about half the time, generally when I have a full day of commitments or am going in the evening.

How often do you ride public transit?

I ride public transit about four times a week.

If elected, what would be your top transportation priorities? This can include priorities related to public transit, active transportation, driving, or any other mode of transportation.

My starting point is simple: a good public school needs a dependable way to get there. I grew up in SFUSD, and today I volunteer in our schools. I want students to arrive safely, on time, and ready to learn.

My priorities are reliable Muni service that fits school and after-school schedules, preserving Free Muni for Youth, and safer walking and biking routes. I would also work to protect accessible transportation for students with disabilities. I want SFUSD to treat transportation barriers as part of its attendance work and bring students and caregivers into decisions early. We should measure whether their trips actually become easier.

How can SFUSD help make access to school easier for families who cannot or do not drive?

Growing up in SFUSD, I took the 38 Geary to Presidio and the 28 19th Avenue to Lowell. I encouraged my daughter to use public transit too, and she began riding the J Church on her own in seventh grade. I want more children to have that independence and their parents to feel confident about the trip.

SFUSD should work with SFMTA to make service fit school and after-school schedules, help students learn their routes, and listen when families report difficult transfers or unsafe stops and crossings. Travel information should be available in families' home languages.

School assignment and program placement also need to account for realistic travel times, especially for caregivers getting children to different schools. When transportation keeps a student from attending regularly, our attendance teams should help the family find a solution.

What role should the school board and SFUSD play in student transportation, including bike and transit-rider education, secure bike parking at schools, and supporting school-street safety and transit access projects near schools?

SFUSD should be an active partner. I would support working with San Francisco Transit Riders and other Safe Routes to School partners on age-appropriate transit and bicycle education, practice trips, and family outreach. Students should know how to plan a trip, transfer, and seek help when something goes wrong.

Schools also need secure bike parking, accessible entrances, and safer approaches, including crossings and well-designed School Streets projects. As a licensed general contractor and bond oversight volunteer, I would ask that facilities planning include these everyday needs from the start. I would support transit access and street safety projects near schools, with students, families, staff, and neighbors involved in making them work. Schools without a strong PTA deserve just as much attention.

Every SFUSD school is served by at least one Muni route, including special "School Trippers" for afternoon service. SFMTA cut several School Trippers this year, and if Measures H and RTM do not pass to increase Muni funding, SFMTA may need to eliminate up to 20 Muni routes citywide. If elected, what will you do to protect school-serving Muni service and strengthen coordination between SFUSD, SFMTA, and other city leaders to protect Muni service to schools?

I support Proposition H and am leaning yes on Measure RTM. Students need dependable

Muni service to get to school and home after activities. I would advocate for stable funding and protecting the routes families rely on, with clear reporting on how the money is spent and whether service improves.

I would push for regular coordination among SFUSD, SFMTA, student representatives, and city leaders, with a named district staff lead and public updates. Before service changes, SFUSD should share bell times and student travel needs with appropriate privacy protections, and ask SFMTA to explain the school impacts and alternatives. I would advocate for restoring needed School Trippers and matching service to dismissal and after-school schedules.

My approach is partnership with follow-through: identify the problem, agree on who will act, and report back to families. Riders should not have to navigate two agencies to get one problem addressed.

About 14,000 SFUSD students rely on Muni daily through Free Muni for Youth. What are your thoughts on the Free Muni for Youth program? Will you fight to preserve it if it is ever at risk of cancellation?

Yes. I support Free Muni for Youth and would fight to preserve it. Getting to a public school should not depend on whether a family can afford a fare or has a car. The program also gives young people access to libraries, jobs, activities, and the independence that comes with learning to get around their city.

I appreciate San Francisco Transit Riders' work helping families learn about the program. SFUSD should make that information easy to find, in the languages families use, and pair it with practical transit education. Free service and dependable service belong together: students need both an affordable ride and a bus that gets them there.

San Francisco's [Transit First Policy](#) applies to all officers, boards, commissions, and departments of the city and county, and states that within San Francisco, travel by public transit, by bicycle and on foot must be an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile. Do you support the principles laid out in the full Transit First Policy?

Yes. I support making public transit, walking, and bicycling safe, convenient, and attractive ways to get around San Francisco. For schools, that means dependable buses, safer crossings, secure bike parking, and fewer conflicts at arrival and dismissal.

I would bring those principles into school facilities planning and our work with city agencies. The improvements must also work for students with disabilities and caregivers with limited mobility. Families should be able to choose transit, walking, or biking because those options meet their daily needs. That is how we build lasting confidence in them.

A [1993 ballot measure](#) made it official city policy that all elected city officials must ride Muni or other public transit to work at least twice a week. If elected, how closely will you abide by this policy?

Yes. I will ride Muni or other public transit at least twice a week for my school board work. I would use those trips to listen to riders and understand the routes students depend on, including travel to school visits and meetings. Experiencing the waits, transfers, and crowded buses is part of being accountable to the people who use them every day.

Board of Education | Reina Tello

Do you have a section on your website about public transit, transportation, or mobility? If so, please provide a link.

no

How do you usually get around San Francisco? Please tell us when and why you use cars, trains, Muni buses, bikes, walking, wheelchairs, or any other mode you frequently use for transportation.

My best form of transportation depends on the destination. More often than not I drive my car. Previous to running for Board of Education, I was working a full time job and two or three side gigs. Hardly ever was transit a viable option as some shifts were too close in time to allow for the use of public transportation. Especially when I was commuting out of the city. If there were to be an expansion of Public transit, I would definitely use it.

How often do you ride public transit?

Whenever the destination is accessible and there is no time constraint, or the need to transport additional items.

If elected, what would be your top transportation priorities? This can include priorities related to public transit, active transportation, driving, or any other mode of transportation.

I would like to ensure reliable transportation to every school. Both for families and for educators and staff.

How can SFUSD help make access to school easier for families who cannot or do not drive?

SFUSD can invest in small neighborhood schools so that there isn't a need to cross the city for access to or a quality education.

What role should the school board and SFUSD play in student transportation, including bike and transit-rider education, secure bike parking at schools, and supporting school-street safety and transit access projects near schools?

The school board should ensure that district leadership works in collaboration with the school communities to identify their needs and find the solutions to address them.

Every SFUSD school is served by at least one Muni route, including special "School Trippers" for afternoon service. SFMTA cut several School Trippers this year, and if Measures H and RTM do not pass to increase Muni funding, SFMTA may need to eliminate up to 20 Muni routes citywide. If elected, what will you do to protect school-serving Muni service and strengthen coordination between SFUSD, SFMTA, and other city leaders to protect Muni service to schools?

As a community organizer I've supported Free Muni for Youth, and the campaign to get Free Muni for All (it did not pass). I would use whatever powers to be supportive. My family relied on muni 6-12 grades.

About 14,000 SFUSD students rely on Muni daily through Free Muni for Youth. What are your thoughts on the Free Muni for Youth program? Will you fight to preserve it if it is ever at risk of cancellation?

My sibling was a lead in that campaign, it is one of the San Francisco legacy's that must be protected to ensure low income families can remain in San Francisco. Additionally as an environmental justice organizer this benefits out climate goals.

San Francisco's [Transit First Policy](#) applies to all officers, boards, commissions, and departments of the city and county, and states that within San Francisco, travel by public transit, by bicycle and on foot must be an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile. Do you support the principles laid out in the full Transit First Policy?

I absolutely support improvements to Public Transportation. And in theory, yes it would be ideal to have everyone use a method other than a private vehicle. In practice I have not seen transit be accessible to all working class families, including mine. I would like to see us move away from a punitive approach to discourage the use of private vehicles.

A [1993 ballot measure](#) made it official city policy that all elected city officials must ride Muni or other public transit to work at least twice a week. If elected, how closely will you abide by this policy?

I am very fortunate and privileged to have a schedule that can be flexible, so I anticipate that my job will be supportive and patient with my arrival time to the office. It is a policy that I'm sure it's meant to ground elected officials to the reality constituents face. I have been low income and I've lived in under-resourced neighborhoods, so I know not all transit experiences are created equal. I wish the policy was better at capturing the real experience.

Board of Education | Tim Tung

Do you have a section on your website about public transit, transportation, or mobility? If so, please provide a link.

No

How do you usually get around San Francisco? Please tell us when and why you use cars, trains, Muni buses, bikes, walking, wheelchairs, or any other mode you frequently use for transportation.

I walk for recreation and to get to my final destination after riding Muni. I ride Muni to commute to work or to travel around San Francisco, particularly where there is regularly traffic congestion or limited parking. I drive my car when I am time constrained or need to carry large or bulky items that are difficult to take on public transit.

How often do you ride public transit?

Several days a week.

If elected, what would be your top transportation priorities? This can include priorities related to public transit, active transportation, driving, or any other mode of transportation.

My top transportation priority is making it easier and safer for students to get to school without relying on a family car.

Reliable transportation is also an academic issue. Transportation difficulties can contribute to chronic absenteeism, so SFUSD should measure whether students can get to school safely, reliably, affordably, and on time. It is not enough for a transit route to simply exist nearby.

As the Board works toward revising the student assignment policy and oversees school reorganization decisions, I would make transportation access an explicit consideration. The District should evaluate travel times, transfers, walking and biking conditions, transportation capacity, and potential impacts on attendance when developing assignment

and program location recommendations.

I would also advocate for reliable Muni service to schools, safe routes and crossings, school-street improvements, secure bike parking, and transit, walking, and biking education. I would hold the Superintendent accountable for measurable improvements in transportation access and reliability within SFUSD's control.

How can SFUSD help make access to school easier for families who cannot or do not drive?

SFUSD should treat school assignment and transportation as closely connected. Families who cannot or do not drive should not face a major transportation burden simply because of where their child is assigned, and unreliable transportation can become a barrier to attendance.

As the Board works toward revising the student assignment policy, I would require transportation access to be considered in school-zone and program-location recommendations. The District should evaluate travel times, transfers, walking and biking conditions, and available SFUSD transportation before finalizing those decisions.

The goal should be a high-quality school within a practical distance of home while preserving access to language immersion and other specialized programs. Free Muni for Youth is an important part of making those choices accessible.

Access means more than geographic proximity. SFUSD should consider whether students can make the trip in a reasonable amount of time with reliable service and safe walking or biking connections, and provide families with clear information about their options.

What role should the school board and SFUSD play in student transportation, including bike and transit-rider education, secure bike parking at schools, and supporting school-street safety and transit access projects near schools?

The Board should set policy, establish measurable student access goals, allocate SFUSD resources, and hold the Superintendent accountable, but not manage Muni operations.

I would expect the Superintendent to incorporate transportation into assignment and school planning analysis and report to the Board on travel times, transfers, walking and

biking access, SFUSD transportation capacity, and safety around schools.

The Board can establish expectations and allocate resources for transit education, secure bike parking, and safe routes to school, and hold the Superintendent accountable for implementation. Where improvements require action by SFMTA or other agencies, the Superintendent should bring evidence about student needs to those decision makers and advocate for improvements.

Every SFUSD school is served by at least one Muni route, including special "School Trippers" for afternoon service. SFMTA cut several School Trippers this year, and if Measures H and RTM do not pass to increase Muni funding, SFMTA may need to eliminate up to 20 Muni routes citywide. If elected, what will you do to protect school-serving Muni service and strengthen coordination between SFUSD, SFMTA, and other city leaders to protect Muni service to schools?

I would make reliable school-serving Muni a priority in SFUSD's advocacy with SFMTA and city leaders. Potential Muni service reductions could directly affect students who depend on transit to get to school.

SFUSD should identify the Muni routes and School Trippers most important to students and quantify how proposed changes would affect travel times, transfers, crowding, pass-ups, and attendance.

I would bring that evidence to the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, SFMTA, and regional decision makers and advocate for maintaining the services that students depend on. For School Trippers, I would advocate for maintaining capacity where it is needed to accommodate student demand and prevent excessive crowding and pass-ups.

I would also advocate for new, sustainable Muni funding rather than balancing recurring funding problems primarily through service cuts. The SFUSD Board does not control the Muni budget, but it can make the consequences for students clear and advocate for a sustainable solution.

Transportation impacts should also be incorporated into the student assignment redesign so SFUSD plans for changes in student transportation demand rather than reacting afterward.

About 14,000 SFUSD students rely on Muni daily through Free Muni for Youth. What are your thoughts on the Free Muni for Youth program? Will you fight to preserve it if it is ever at risk of cancellation?

I support Free Muni for Youth and would advocate for preserving it on a sustainable, long-term basis.

Transportation should not be a financial barrier to attending school, participating in extracurricular activities, or accessing programs across San Francisco. Free Muni is especially important for students who cannot rely on a family car and for those traveling across the city for language immersion or other specialized programs.

But free transit only works if students can rely on the service. Affordable, reliable, and sufficiently frequent transit are complementary goals.

The SFUSD Board does not control Free Muni's funding or eligibility. If the program were at risk, I would advocate with SFMTA and city leaders for a sustainable funding solution rather than shifting the cost to students and families. I would also track transportation access alongside attendance data to identify when transportation costs or reliability contribute to missed school days.

San Francisco's [Transit First Policy](#) applies to all officers, boards, commissions, and departments of the city and county, and states that within San Francisco, travel by public transit, by bicycle and on foot must be an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile. Do you support the principles laid out in the full Transit First Policy?

Yes, I support San Francisco's Transit First Policy and its goal of making public transit, walking, and bicycling effective alternatives to private automobile travel.

As a school board member, I would apply those principles to decisions within SFUSD's authority, including student assignment, program locations, facilities, and transportation. That means considering whether students can reach school safely and reliably without requiring a parent to drive.

I would also expect the Superintendent to advocate with SFMTA and city leaders for transit priority, pedestrian safety, school-street improvements, and bicycle infrastructure that improve students' ability to reach school.

The Board cannot control Muni operations or city streets, but it can make student transportation needs part of SFUSD's decisions and advocate publicly for improvements.

A [1993 ballot measure](#) made it official city policy that all elected city officials must ride Muni or other public transit to work at least twice a week. If elected, how closely will you abide by this policy?

I would abide by the policy and ride Muni or other public transit to work at least twice a week.

Elected officials should experience public transportation firsthand. Regularly riding Muni provides a perspective that reports cannot fully capture: reliability, crowding, transfers, accessibility, and the everyday experience of riders.

I would use that experience not simply to comply with the policy, but to listen to riders and better understand where the system is working and where it is falling short. I would pay particular attention to students and families who depend on Muni to get to school.

That firsthand experience would complement my data-driven approach to Board oversight.

Community College Board | Elijah Ball

Do you have a section on your website about public transit, transportation, or mobility? If so, please provide a link.

N/A

How do you usually get around San Francisco? Please tell us when and why you use cars, trains, Muni buses, bikes, walking, wheelchairs, or any other mode you frequently use for transportation.

I live in one of the densest parts of the City, Lower Nob Hill. Of all 32 years of my life, I've only owned a car for a year when I lived in Phoenix. I normally rely on my two feet or take the MUNI (mainly underground and the 1 or 30).

How often do you ride public transit?

Daily unless walking.

If elected, what would be your top transportation priorities? This can include priorities related to public transit, active transportation, driving, or any other mode of transportation.

If elected, I would make sure that our 2030 Master Plan Update takes into consideration mobility on campus, this includes, walking, wheeling, biking, and transit. As a campus planner, I have created guidelines that address campus mobility so I have the experience to make sure we are asking the right questions and addressing mobility issues.

How can City College help make access to campus easier for people who cannot or do not drive?

By making sure we continue to enhance the commuting experience. That is having adequate way finding in multiple languages, working with the city to make sure we can have proper lighting, seating, and shade for user comfort, (something I've done for 2 community colleges professionally. Additionally, working with the city to make daily transit affordable and free for our most financially burdened students, (this also needs consideration for our faculty and staff too as a way to reduce VMT).

San Francisco's [Transit First Policy](#) applies to all officers, boards, commissions, and departments of the city and county, and states that within San Francisco, travel by public transit, by bicycle and on foot must be an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile. Do you support the principles laid out in the full Transit First Policy?

I 100% support.

CCSF students have been pushing for a transit pass as fares rise and Muni/BART face cuts, but the college currently only offers limited passes through support programs, with no universal pass. SFSU students ride free on Muni and all Clipper systems with their Gator Pass. Would you support creating a similar universal transit pass for CCSF students? If so, how would you fund it?

Yes. When I attended SFSU we did not have transit funding. I understand how that can lower class retention. City College could look at finding funding from the state by working with our state assembly reps or turning to the city to ask voters to help offset costs that would ultimately support our local economy and student outcomes.

A [1993 ballot measure](#) made it official city policy that all elected city officials must ride Muni or other public transit to work at least twice a week. If elected, how closely will you abide by this policy?

I already do this so I'd say, if elected I'd abide and my ridership would go beyond 2x a week.

Community College Board | Monroe Lace

Do you have a section on your website about public transit, transportation, or mobility? If so, please provide a link.

No.

How do you usually get around San Francisco? Please tell us when and why you use cars, trains, Muni buses, bikes, walking, wheelchairs, or any other mode you frequently use for transportation.

I have never owned a car. I do not plan to own a car. For me, public transit is how I have reached school, work, community, and opportunity throughout my life.

Every school day, I take the 8 from my SRO in SOMA to Martin Luther King Jr. Academic Middle School, where I work as a public school teacher.

Public transit has been part of my relationship with San Francisco since I was a child. In high school, I would take BART into the city to LYRIC's Purple House. Having the independence to get there on my own deepened my love for San Francisco. These trips showed me what reliable public transportation can mean for a young person searching for a place to call home.

How often do you ride public transit?

Every single day, often more than once a day.

If elected, what would be your top transportation priorities? This can include priorities related to public transit, active transportation, driving, or any other mode of transportation.

Transportation should never be the reason a student cannot get to class.

1. A universal transit pass for every City College student.
2. Complete pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements at Ocean Campus. I support completing the I-280 Ocean Avenue project, including replacing the dangerous ramp with a signalized intersection, adding crosswalks and curb ramps, and extending a protected bicycle lane along Ocean Avenue. I would like to see City

College remain a partner as this project moves to construction and as the San Francisco County Transportation Authority studies a pedestrian and bicycle path along City College's Ocean Avenue frontage.

3. Improve Muni service to City College. I support the K Ingleside Rapid project, including transit signal priority, longer two-car train platforms, and other Muni Forward improvements.

How can City College help make access to campus easier for people who cannot or do not drive?

Every student deserves a safe route to the classroom, whether they arrive by transit, bicycle, wheelchair, or on foot.

Ocean Campus is served by Muni, BART, and the protected bicycle lane on Frida Kahlo Way. I want City College to build on these investments with secure bicycle parking, safe pedestrian crossings, and accessible paths. The College should be an active partner with SFMTA as improvements at Ocean Campus are completed. On campus, we should continue increasing secure bicycle parking, particularly as we look to increase enrollment.

I would also support conducting a transportation needs assessment to identify gaps in transit access by campus, route, and time of day. We should know whether students are facing obstacles to morning, evening, or weekend classes and use that data when advocating for service improvements with Muni, BART, and regional transit agencies.

San Francisco's [Transit First Policy](#) applies to all officers, boards, commissions, and departments of the city and county, and states that within San Francisco, travel by public transit, by bicycle and on foot must be an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile. Do you support the principles laid out in the full Transit First Policy?

I strongly support San Francisco's Transit First principles. As trustee, I would hold these principles into decisions on campus planning, transportation partnerships, and pedestrian and bicycle access.

CCSF students have been pushing for a transit pass as fares rise and Muni/BART face cuts, but the college currently only offers limited passes through support programs, with no universal pass. SFSU students ride free on Muni and all Clipper systems with their Gator Pass. Would you support creating a similar universal transit pass for CCSF students? If so, how would you fund it?

Yes, absolutely. As close to a promise I intend to keep: I will secure a universal transit pass for City College students.

I use my Gator Pass to get to and from class as an EdD student at San Francisco State University. City College students deserve this same opportunity.

The question for me is not whether we should pursue a universal transit pass. The question is determining the most durable and stable way to pay for a universal transit pass. City College should study successful models such as the Gator Pass and determine a funding structure that makes the most sense for City College and its students.

SFSU funds its Gator Pass through a mandatory student transportation fee. I would work through the Board and Chancellor to obtain an institutional price from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and determine exactly what it would cost to provide a universal pass to every City College student. California law already authorizes community colleges to establish a transportation-services fee capped at \$101 per semester. I would also identify parking and transit revenues to decrease the cost to students and protect City College's budget.

A [1993 ballot measure](#) made it official city policy that all elected city officials must ride Muni or other public transit to work at least twice a week. If elected, how closely will you abide by this policy?

I would easily exceed the policy.

Community College Board | Leah LaCroix

Do you have a section on your website about public transit, transportation, or mobility? If so, please provide a link.

[Meet the Candidates & Endorsements | City College Board of Trustees — Our City College Slate](#)

How do you usually get around San Francisco? Please tell us when and why you use cars, trains, Muni buses, bikes, walking, wheelchairs, or any other mode you frequently use for transportation.

I take public transit daily as my sole and primary mode of public transportation. I was raised on Muni! My household growing up was transit dependent, and as a city kid (now city adult) I've maintained a reliance on Muni, Bart, AC Transit, Samtrans, etc. as my modes of traversing the city. I don't have a license or own a car, a point of commentary amongst my family and friends too!

How often do you ride public transit?

Multiple times, daily!

If elected, what would be your top transportation priorities? This can include priorities related to public transit, active transportation, driving, or any other mode of transportation.

I would like to work on creating transit passes for CCSF students, on par with what our neighboring colleges and universities provide to their students. CCSF is very much a commuter college and our main/Ocean campus is situated in a transit dense neighborhood. This is an incredible opportunity to support our students and amplify student leaders who have been organizing on this issue for quite some time.

As the legislative architect and champion of Free Muni for Youth, and having worked to ensure both pilot and permanent funding for the program, I am eager to join CCSF student organizers advocacy on this effort. I am deeply committed to transit access, and transit passes for our students is a chief priority for me as CCSF Trustee.

How can City College help make access to campus easier for people who cannot or do not drive?

Transit passes for your students would be a great first step. It's a missed opportunity to better support access to our campuses for our campus community.

San Francisco's [Transit First Policy](#) applies to all officers, boards, commissions, and departments of the city and county, and states that within San Francisco, travel by public transit, by bicycle and on foot must be an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile. Do you support the principles laid out in the full Transit First Policy?

I support the Transit First policy and the principles laid out in the policy 100%. Public transportation is the great equalizer. I feel most connected to principled two which states, " *Public transit, including taxis and vanpools, is an economically and environmentally sound alternative to transportation by individual automobiles. Within San Francisco, travel by public transit, by bicycle and on foot must be an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile.*"

To that end, public transportation must also be a viable alternative meaning it must also ensure safety, accessibility, and reliability in order for it to truly be a sound alternative for SF residents.

CCSF students have been pushing for a transit pass as fares rise and Muni/BART face cuts, but the college currently only offers limited passes through support programs, with no universal pass. SFSU students ride free on Muni and all Clipper systems with their Gator Pass. Would you support creating a similar universal transit pass for CCSF students? If so, how would you fund it?

Yes! I envision funding will be a combination of minimal student fees, CCSF investment, and Bay Area transit agency partnership. I am excited to dive into the funding opportunities to make a universal transit pass a reality, within my term.

A [1993 ballot measure](#) made it official city policy that all elected city officials must ride Muni or other public transit to work at least twice a week. If elected, how closely will you abide by this policy?

I will abide by this policy 100%, and will exceed the twice a week mandate as I am a transit

rider in my daily life.

Community College Board | Bunny McFadden

Do you have a section on your website about public transit, transportation, or mobility? If so, please provide a link.

<https://www.ourcitycollege.com/about>

See section called "Transportation"

<https://www.ourcitycollege.com/bunny-mcfadden>

See section called "Accomplishments"

How do you usually get around San Francisco? Please tell us when and why you use cars, trains, Muni buses, bikes, walking, wheelchairs, or any other mode you frequently use for transportation.

Muni
BART
Walking
Driving / carpooling

I love public transit! I am unfortunately now in a less accessible neighborhood than I once was, and I see daily the negative impacts of not having public transit like BART or a regular bus service as close by as we used to.

I'm raising my children to love public transit as well. Their absolute favorite is when we can ride BART to mom's work, when we can take Muni to the ballgame (although we didn't go as much this year after Pride Month), and when we can take the bus to new neighborhoods to explore.

I have a bike, but it's in need of repair and I've been a bit too busy to do that lately.

I do drive when I have a lot of different activities across neighborhoods. For instance when I had to gather signatures as part of the paper-pulling process for this race, I was grateful to have my old Mini so that I could take the kids with me to the UESF office in North Beach, run over to Alamo Square to meet Supervisor Preston and say hi to Major, and go to the Mission. Cars certainly come in handy in a citywide race that pulls you in four directions at once. HOWEVER! My dream is a fully-funded transit system that's never ever blocked by

private corporations like Waymo or caught up in unfair budget cuts from politicians who don't actually care about public transit. If anything this race has taught me to appreciate even more the fact that we've fought for the systems we have, and we need to keep fighting for what our City deserves!

How often do you ride public transit?

multiple times a week!

If elected, what would be your top transportation priorities? This can include priorities related to public transit, active transportation, driving, or any other mode of transportation.

policies related to student needs on public transit, especially coordinating with SFMTA & BART board on transit pass!
Additionally, whatever needs are raised by students, faculty, staff, and the City College community

How can City College help make access to campus easier for people who cannot or do not drive?

Prioritize public transit
Make choosing transit the easiest
Make sure campus portfolio is thoughtful; don't suddenly close the campus closest to BART

San Francisco's [Transit First Policy](#) applies to all officers, boards, commissions, and departments of the city and county, and states that within San Francisco, travel by public transit, by bicycle and on foot must be an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile. Do you support the principles laid out in the full Transit First Policy?

YES!

CCSF students have been pushing for a transit pass as fares rise and Muni/BART face cuts, but the college currently only offers limited passes through support programs, with no universal pass. SFSU

students ride free on Muni and all Clipper systems with their Gator Pass. Would you support creating a similar universal transit pass for CCSF students? If so, how would you fund it?

I would!

I'd work carefully & collaboratively with the rest of the Board to determine the most appropriate way to fund it without putting additional burden on the backs of students & the working class.

A [1993 ballot measure](#) made it official city policy that all elected city officials must ride Muni or other public transit to work at least twice a week. If elected, how closely will you abide by this policy?

I will abide by it!

Community College Board | Erwin Tam

Do you have a section on your website about public transit, transportation, or mobility? If so, please provide a link.

My campaign website is erwintam.com

How do you usually get around San Francisco? Please tell us when and why you use cars, trains, Muni buses, bikes, walking, wheelchairs, or any other mode you frequently use for transportation.

I enjoy walking around my neighborhood to Golden Gate Park, West Portal, and Stern Grove. I typically will ride Muni eastbound to locations accessible to the L-Taraval or N-Judah, such as the Financial District, Civic Center, or the Castro. I will ride the 48-Quintara to Noe Valley or Bernal Heights.

I work for the State of California and drive to my duty station in Sacramento. I also drive to visit my parents and my sister and her family.

How often do you ride public transit?

I grew up taking the 83-Pacific from my pre-school and elementary school to my grandparent's house in Chinatown. I continued to take public transportation daily in high school and while working in downtown San Francisco. Currently, I ride Muni a few round-trips a week on average.

If elected, what would be your top transportation priorities? This can include priorities related to public transit, active transportation, driving, or any other mode of transportation.

With the passage of Proposition H in November, my transportation priorities would be to reduce VMT and improve safe transit access to the main campus and education centers.

How can City College help make access to campus easier for people who cannot or do not drive?

According to the Supplemental EIR for CCSF's new parking garage, an estimated 56% of

students and 30% of faculty and staff do not use cars to travel to CCSF's main campus. The campus is served by BART and Muni access through Balboa Park Station. Almost 9% of students take a ride-share vehicle or taxi to the main campus.

I would seek to understand the drivers for the transit usage because there is a significant gap between faculty, staff, and students. In addition, understanding the driver of the use of rideshare for students could help inform improving campus access. Lastly, the pass mentioned in a subsequent question could also make it easier for people who do not drive.

San Francisco's [Transit First Policy](#) applies to all officers, boards, commissions, and departments of the city and county, and states that within San Francisco, travel by public transit, by bicycle and on foot must be an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile. Do you support the principles laid out in the full Transit First Policy?

Yes

CCSF students have been pushing for a transit pass as fares rise and Muni/BART face cuts, but the college currently only offers limited passes through support programs, with no universal pass. SFSU students ride free on Muni and all Clipper systems with their Gator Pass. Would you support creating a similar universal transit pass for CCSF students? If so, how would you fund it?

I support the exploration of a transit pass either a Muni/BART San Francisco pass or a universal Clipper Pass. Funding will be the largest challenge to any new program.

SFSU's Gator Pass is funded through a \$130 fee collected from each student each semester. CCSF recently received funding for Free City College and levying a fee on all students - even for a transit pass, may seem to run counter to the Free City College ideals.

Further, about 40% of CCSF's courses are offered online only and not all students are full-time students. I would ask the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration to review costs and identify potential funding sources through a lens of student equity.

A [1993 ballot measure](#) made it official city policy that all elected city officials must ride Muni or other public transit to work at least twice a week. If elected, how closely will you abide by this policy?

I have spent most of my career working in downtown San Francisco and regularly rode Muni to and from work, including the 31AX, L-Taraval, and N-Judah lines. Currently, I work for the State of California and drive to my duty station in Sacramento.

BART Board, District 8 | Sara Barz

Do you have a section on your website about your platform? If so, please provide a link.

<https://www.sarabarz.com/priorities>

How do you usually get around San Francisco? Please tell us when and why you use cars, trains, Muni buses, bikes, walking, wheelchairs, or any other mode you frequently use for transportation.

For my commute, I typically combine a bike ride with a private shuttle and BART. To get around in San Francisco and Oakland, my family primarily relies on BART and an ebike. However, we use all the modes to get around: walking, Muni, personal car, Lyft, taxi, Waymo, etc. My son, age 4, has recently outgrown a stroller, but during the first 3 years of his life we became well acquainted with the elevators of BART and Muni.

How often do you ride public transit?

I probably ride transit 5 days per week.

If elected, what would be your top priorities for BART?

BART's fiscal cliff is overwhelmingly the most important issue I will face on the Board. No other priority matters if BART does not survive this existential crisis. I volunteered to help gather signatures for the local and regional transit funding measures and am using my campaign to reach as many voters as I can about the importance of these measures. If RTM passes, the Board's responsibility is to create a stable financial future for BART. The measure conditions future funding on continued independent financial oversight, so I'll push the Board to adopt the Financial Efficiency Review Independent Oversight Committee's recommendations and to report publicly on progress against them. BART needs to continue to establish stable revenue sources for operating funds beyond fares, and overseeing that transition will be a key part of my work. If RTM does fail, I will fight to keep District 8 stations open and do everything I can to prioritize the working-class riders who have no other option.

Next, BART needs to get the basics right. Everyone deserves trains that show up, elevators

and escalators that work, fare gates that don't close on riders, signs that tell them where to go, and stations that are clean. The Board's budget and oversight powers are important here. I'll ensure the capital budget prioritizes state-of-good-repair and accessibility funding ahead of decades-out megaprojects and will make sure these rider experience issues get the attention they deserve at board meetings.

Lastly, we need to plan for more transit for the westside of San Francisco, which has been left behind as BART has expanded outwards. The Link21 planning process is underway, and it's crucial in this early stage that the voices of westsiders are heard. Through my work on the SFCTA CAC and for MTC, I understand the regional planning transportation process and how to advocate for my constituents.

San Francisco's [Transit First Policy](#) applies to all officers, boards, commissions, and departments of the city and county, and states that within San Francisco, travel by public transit, by bicycle and on foot must be an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile. If elected, how will you use your position on the BART Board to advance the Transit First Policy?

While the BART Board has limited authority to make changes within San Francisco, I fully support the Transit First policy and will use what levers we have to push progress forward.

I live a multimodal life, and BART riders like me expect a system that caters to their needs. BART has done meaningful work at many stations to improve transit and bike connections and address pedestrian safety, but this process largely has not been extended to San Francisco. The westside District 8 stations—Glen Park and Balboa Park—urgently need pedestrian and bike safety improvements and better, more legible connections to Muni. Similarly, the downtown stations need clearer wayfinding for connections; riders shouldn't need to wander around looking for bus stops when transferring from BART. Based on my experience on the SFCTA CAC and in neighborhood advocacy, I have developed relationships within San Francisco to navigate our local processes and take these ideas from lines on a planning map to changes on the ground.

What role do you think law enforcement, fare enforcement, community ambassadors, and private security should play, if any, in patrolling transit? What should BART do to improve safety and the sense of safety for riders?

Everyone deserves a clean and safe ride on BART from the station entrance to their destination. But safety must mean equitable safety for all, not safety strategies that fall

uneven on riders who are unhoused, in crisis, or marginalized. As Director, I'll push BART to invest in the full continuum of people who keep stations safe, including unarmed Transit Ambassadors, Crisis Intervention Specialists, Station Agents, and coordination with DPH Street Teams and other social service providers.

These teams also need to work together to provide the right resources to the right people, not just enforcement that moves people along. San Francisco BART stations are patrolled and staffed by many agencies and service providers: SFPD; BART Police; BART Transit Ambassadors; BART Crisis Intervention Specialists; Station Agents; District Works restroom and elevator attendants; and DPH Street Teams. Instead of each of these groups working independently, all staff working in and around stations need to be able to work as a team to enhance public safety and provide compassionate services to those in need.

Similarly, public safety means focusing on who doesn't feel safe using the system, not just crime statistics. BART's "Not One More Girl" initiative was a groundbreaking partnership with community organizations to address gender-based harassment on BART, which remains a barrier to transit ridership. Championing and expanding these efforts is an important part of addressing the ongoing safety needs of daily riders.

At the same time, physical design improvements have been proven to improve safety at low cost and without relying on policing. The new fare gates—which have brought real improvements but also must be fixed to address accessibility and performance problems—and the lighting and architectural upgrades at 19th St Oakland have been shown to reduce crime and lower maintenance costs while making stations more inviting and comfortable. Bringing these efforts to San Francisco stations will help improve safety and improve the rider experience at the same time, without more enforcement.

It's also important that enforcement not disproportionately affect low-income riders. Existing fare enforcement must be paired with fare equity programs like Clipper START, which must be open to more riders and easier to access, to ensure that riders are not being forced to pay fares they can't afford.

BART adopted a balanced FY27 budget with \$18M in cuts, but pandemic relief has run out and the district faces a \$375M structural deficit riding on this November's RTM. If RTM fails, BART's own analysis contemplates cutting up to 63% of service, ending service at 9 PM, closing stations, and raising fares. As a director, what would your priorities be in that scenario – which cuts would you fight, and would you support any of them? What are BART's alternatives if RTM does not pass?

It is clear that BART cannot cut its way out of this situation. BART's costs are largely fixed, and slashing service levels very quickly reaches a point of diminishing returns where cuts reduce ridership—and revenue—more than they save in expenses, leading to a transit "death spiral." I volunteered to help gather signatures for the local and regional funding measures and believe that passing RTM is essential to secure the future of BART and transit across the region.

Should the Regional Transit Measure fail, BART will face agonizing decisions. As Director, I would continue to uphold the Alternative Service Plan approved by the Board in February 2026 and fight to ensure that District 8 stations remain open and are as well served within that plan as feasible. At the same time, I would emphasize equitable access and prioritize the needs of those with the fewest transit options, providing as much safety-net service as possible while seeking regional solutions to the crisis.

Several BART stations double as stations for Muni Metro, but with limited exceptions, there is currently no way to directly transfer between the two agencies without first climbing back up to the concourse level. Do you think BART and Muni should work together to facilitate easier transfers between their platforms at these stations? If so, how?

Definitely. I co-founded Seamless Bay Area precisely because these kinds of barriers and agency fragmentation deter people from riding transit and provide a terrible rider experience. The region has made progress—the transfer credit is a great improvement—but the bars between Muni and BART in the downtown stations are a tangible physical reminder of how much more we need to go to achieve a seamless transit system.

As far as I'm aware, the agencies have never investigated the cost of creating a direct connection between the platforms. We should understand the cost of the required capital construction and look to funding sources like the money in RTM earmarked for regional transit integration to get this done, ideally before we mark 50 years of inconvenient transfers at our most-used stations.

What role should fares and fare increases play in the future of BART? Do you support raising fares to balance BART's budget and keep up with the cost of inflation, or should BART consider lowering or freezing fares to grow ridership? If you support raising fares, how should BART address equity concerns for low-income riders? If you support fare decreases or fare freezes, what alternative funding sources do you support?

The Bay Area's transit fare structure has long penalized people who have no choice but to live far from their jobs with higher fares. In addition to BART fares, workers who need to take multiple buses to get to/from BART face additional fares just for crossing transit agency lines. The recent introduction of the Clipper transfer credit has helped here, but again, this program is only temporary and its implementation has gaps that need to be filled.

Seamless Bay Area, which I co-founded, has long championed a vision for an integrated transit fare system across the entire region. Much as I would like to wave a magic wand, BART's fiscal reality puts real constraints on its ability to make major changes to its fare structure alone. BART has long operated as a system heavily dependent on fares to cover operating costs. RTM is a step toward addressing that problem, but fares will still play a major role in BART's finances going forward. Yet in a region with such wealth, we need to continue to find regional solutions to transition to a more equitable system. As BART Director, I would work with the Fare Integration Task Force toward a regionwide system that puts riders first.

Fare capping is another important feature I will champion for fare equity. The current system rewards higher-income riders, who are more likely to have access to pretax transit dollars and have the funds to purchase BART high-value discount tickets in advance. Instead, many transit agencies around the world offer daily, weekly, and monthly fare caps to all riders. With fare caps, discounts are automatic after riding a certain number of times, providing equitable universal discounts without the need to afford expensive tickets upfront.

Fare discount programs are an important way to make transit affordable for low-income riders. At MTC, I was the original project manager for the Means-Based Transit Fare Discount Pilot Program, now called Clipper START, which provides a 50% discount across all Bay Area transit agencies to low-income riders. While this program is a lifeline for those who rely on it, it is both temporary and insufficient. The program needs to be made permanent and available at higher income levels. I would love to study how enrollment can be automatic for as many eligible riders as possible to reduce the administrative burden of requiring yet another application and income verification process.

What station-level improvements would you prioritize in San Francisco's BART stations? Which SF stations do you consider most underserved?

It's important that we improve the physical design of stations to provide a welcoming and safe environment. Recent lighting and architectural improvements at 19th St Oakland

station are a great model for what we need to bring to San Francisco stations to improve the rider experiences.

BART plazas are the front door to the BART system, but in San Francisco, many of them are uncomfortable places to wait for a transfer or inaccessible to families with strollers or riders with mobility challenges. Even at Embarcadero and Montgomery, they are largely devoid of the retail that is so common in world-class transit cities. We can do much more with BART stations to make the service welcoming to riders.

The new fare gates have demonstrated how simple infrastructure changes can both improve safety and reduce operational costs. At the same time, the BART Accessibility Task Force has raised real concerns about the new fare gates, which can be difficult for some wheelchair users to navigate, and these must be addressed promptly and thoroughly.

Furthermore, as discussed above, Glen Park and Balboa Park need pedestrian and bike safety improvements in the surrounding areas, especially given the number of students who use Balboa Park.

Board of Supervisors, District 4 | Jeremy Greco

Do you have a section on your website about public transit, transportation, or mobility? If so, please provide a link.

<https://jeremygreco2026.com/why-running>

How do you usually get around San Francisco? Please tell us when and why you use cars, trains, Muni buses, bikes, walking, wheelchairs, or any other mode you frequently use for transportation.

I drive, walk and take MUNI. I drive, walk, and take Muni regularly. I'm part of a one-car family, so we use our car strategically. During the weekdays, I drive to work near Laurel Village, where my daughter also attends school. On my way to work, I drop my wife off at 1 California. After work, I often need the car to take my youngest daughter to volleyball practices and games and to pick my wife up from work.

I walk frequently, especially in the evenings at Sunset Dunes, and I walk to local shops, restaurants, and cafes in the neighborhood.

On weekends, I often take Muni to museums, farmers markets, and other destinations around the city. Having reliable Muni service gives us another way to get around without needing a second car. I use different modes depending on where I'm going and what works best for my family.

How often do you ride public transit?

At least once a week.

If elected, what would be your top transportation priorities? This can include priorities related to public transit, active transportation, driving, or any other mode of transportation.

My top transportation priority is making our streets safer for everyone, especially children. I want to see slow streets and traffic-calming measures around all San Francisco schools so

that students can safely walk and bike.

In District 4, I also want protected bike lanes on Noriega Street. Noriega is an important commercial corridor, and we should make it safer and more comfortable for people who bike while maintaining access for transit, deliveries, businesses, and drivers.

We need a future where we can reduce driving and make one-car households a realistic option for more families. That means investing in reliable, frequent Muni service and making walking and biking safer and more convenient. My own family is a one-car household, and having good transportation alternatives makes that possible.

Looking further ahead, I would explore the feasibility of an underground transit line along Geary Boulevard to provide faster, more reliable east-west transportation and better connect the Richmond, Western Addition, and downtown.

My goal is a transportation system that gives San Franciscans real choices and makes it possible for more families to live with one car, or no car, if they choose.

Do you believe it is important to reduce car dependence in District 4? Why or why not? If yes, how will you achieve that?

Yes. I believe reducing car dependence is important for District 4 and for the future of San Francisco.

We should build a city where walking, biking, and public transportation are safe, convenient, and reliable enough that people can choose them for more of their daily trips. That means investing in Muni, improving pedestrian safety, building protected bike infrastructure, and making our streets safer around schools.

I also think we should think bigger about transit. I would explore the feasibility of an underground Geary transit line as a long-term investment in fast, reliable east-west transportation.

My goal is to make it easier for families to live with one car or no car and to make driving less necessary for everyday life.

The [N Judah Transit and Safety Project](#) is currently in planning. What infrastructure changes would you like to see along the N Judah to improve the experience for transit riders?

The N Judah is a lifeline for the Outer Sunset, and I want to see this project make a real difference for riders.

One of my priorities would be bringing back the N Express during peak commute times. We should provide a faster option for riders traveling longer distances from the Outer Sunset to downtown and other major destinations.

I also want to see transit signal priority, dedicated transit lanes where feasible, and better stop spacing so that the N Judah can move more quickly and reliably. Every stop should also be accessible, with safer crossings and better protection for pedestrians and people waiting for the train.

If we want more San Franciscans to choose transit instead of driving, Muni has to be fast, reliable, safe, and accessible. The N Judah should be a transit service people can depend on every day.

San Francisco's [Transit First Policy](#) applies to all officers, boards, commissions, and departments of the city and county, and states that within San Francisco, travel by public transit, by bicycle and on foot must be an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile. Do you support the principles laid out in the full Transit First Policy?

Yes. I strongly support the principles of San Francisco's Transit First Policy.

San Francisco has limited street space, and we should prioritize moving people safely and efficiently rather than prioritizing private automobiles. That means giving Muni priority through dedicated transit lanes and signal priority, while also making walking and biking safer and more attractive.

I also support the policy's emphasis on accessibility, pedestrian safety, bicycle infrastructure, parking policies that encourage transit use, and investment in regional public transportation.

For me, Transit First is about creating real choices. If we want people to drive less, we have

to give them a transportation system that is reliable, safe, accessible, and convenient.

What role do you think law enforcement, fare enforcement, community ambassadors, and private security should play, if any, in patrolling transit? What should Muni do to improve safety and the sense of safety for riders?

I believe Muni should have a visible, welcoming presence of city-employed community ambassadors who can help riders, de-escalate conflicts, provide information, and help people feel safe. Safety on transit should not automatically mean armed law enforcement.

I've been on a crowded Muni bus when an undercover officer brandished a gun, and it was not a safe-feeling experience. I would reserve law enforcement for situations that genuinely require police intervention rather than making armed officers the default presence on Muni.

I also would not rely on private security firms for routine transit safety. If we are going to have people responsible for safety on a public system, they should be accountable to the public. For people experiencing mental-health or behavioral-health crises, I would like to see crisis-response teams that can respond with the appropriate training and resources.

I am also not a strong supporter of fare enforcement as a primary safety strategy. I would like to see San Francisco move toward making Muni free. If our goal is to dramatically expand ridership and make transit an attractive alternative to driving, eliminating the fare barrier would be a meaningful step.

Muni should feel safe, welcoming, accessible, and easy to use. The people riding it should feel that the system is there to serve them, not police them.

Muni funding is on the ballot this year. If Measures H and RTM do not pass, Muni will be facing a deficit of \$322m starting this year, which could lead to cuts of as much as 30% of all Muni service. How should the City address the Muni deficit if these measures do not pass? What kinds of SFMTA cuts would you support or oppose?

I do not support cutting Muni service to balance the budget. Public transportation is an essential public service, and cutting the service that working people, seniors, students, people with disabilities, and families rely on is not a solution I would support.

If these measures do not pass, I would focus first on finding new revenue and identifying efficiencies that do not reduce service. San Francisco is a wealthy city with major industries that benefit enormously from having a functioning public transportation system. I believe we should ask those industries to be good stewards of the city they depend on and explore additional progressive revenue sources to maintain Muni.

I would also look carefully at administrative and other non-service reductions before cutting buses and trains. I would oppose cuts that reduce frequency, eliminate routes, shorten hours, or make it harder for people to get where they need to go.

If we want people to drive less and make Transit First a reality, we cannot simultaneously make public transportation less available. We need to invest in Muni, grow ridership, and build a sustainable funding system that protects service for the long term.

Even if both Measure H and RTM pass, they will only generate enough funding to keep Muni running at current levels of service. Do you believe Muni should expand or restore service? If so, what future revenue sources should be on or off the table?

Yes. I believe Muni should expand and restore service. If we want San Francisco to reduce driving and make Transit First a reality, we need a transit system that is frequent, reliable, accessible, and available when people need it. Maintaining today's level of service should be the floor, not the goal.

I would prioritize restoring service that has been cut and increasing frequency on heavily used routes. I would also support expanding service as ridership grows, including exploring free Muni as a long-term goal.

For future funding, I would look first to progressive revenue sources and to asking major businesses and industries that depend on San Francisco's transportation system to contribute to its long-term health. I would also explore revenue tied to reducing automobile dependence, while being careful not to place additional burdens on working people.

I would not support balancing Muni's future on the backs of riders through higher fares or on the backs of working families through regressive taxes. If we want people to choose transit over driving, we need to make transit the better choice and fund it accordingly.

Since the pandemic, different Bay Area transit agencies have adopted a variety of fare policies to help recover ridership and revenue. This year, the SFMTA Board voted to raise fares to \$3.10 starting in FY27-28, which will be the most expensive base fare for local bus service in the country. Other agencies have [lowered fares](#) or [eliminated fares](#), and have seen ridership grow as a result.

Currently, only about [8%](#) of Muni's total revenue comes from fares.

What role should fares play in the future of Muni? Do you support lowering, freezing, or eliminating fares to grow ridership, or should Muni continue to raise fares to meet rising costs? If you support raising fares, how should Muni address equity concerns for low-income riders? If you support fare-free public transportation, fare freezes, or fare decreases, what alternative funding sources do you support?

I support moving toward fare-free Muni. Fares should not be a barrier to getting around San Francisco, particularly for low-income residents, seniors, students, and families. If only a small share of Muni's overall revenue comes from fares, I believe we should look at the larger funding picture rather than continually asking riders to pay more.

I would freeze the current fare rather than continue raising it, while working toward eliminating fares altogether. Making Muni free could also help us achieve a larger goal: getting people out of cars and onto public transportation.

To replace fare revenue, I would look to progressive revenue sources and ask major businesses and industries that depend on San Francisco's transportation system to contribute more to keeping that system strong. I would also explore revenue from sources that benefit from reduced traffic and a stronger transit system.

Muni is a public service. We should fund it as an essential part of the city's infrastructure, not expect the people who rely on it most to bear an increasing share of the cost.

A [1993 ballot measure](#) made it official city policy that all elected city officials must ride Muni or other public transit to work at least twice a week. If elected, how closely will you abide by this policy?

Absolutely. I would not just meet the twice-a-week requirement, I would pledge to ride Muni to City Hall five days a week. Muni to City Hall five days a week.

The N Judah is practically a straight shot from the Outer Sunset to City Hall, making it a natural choice for my commute. As a Supervisor, I want to experience Muni the way the people I represent do: the delays, the crowded trains, the accessibility challenges, and the things that work well.

If I'm going to advocate for better Muni service, I should be riding it regularly and listening to the people who rely on it every day.

San Franciscans have strongly supported SFMTA's independence from the city's electoral politics in two separate elections over the past several decades, including Prop E in 1999 and Prop A in 2007. What are your positions on SFMTA's independence from the Board of Supervisors and the mayor's office? How would you make SFMTA more accountable to San Franciscans?

I support SFMTA's independence from the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. Transportation decisions shouldn't change every time there's a political disagreement. We need to be able to make long-term investments in Muni, safer streets, and better ways to get around.

But independence doesn't mean SFMTA shouldn't answer to the public. Riders deserve a voice. Neighborhoods should be heard before major changes are made, and SFMTA should be honest about what's working and what isn't.

I want an SFMTA that can make bold, transit-friendly decisions, but never forgets who it serves: the people of San Francisco.

Transit-only lanes provide faster and more reliable service, and improve safety on busy corridors. They prevent buses from being stuck in traffic and save money that can be reinvested in additional transit service. Sales tax analysis of recent transit lane projects have shown no measurable negative effects on businesses where transit lanes have been installed. If elected, would you work to expedite the creation of new transit-only lanes in San Francisco? What streets in your district would you prioritize for transit-only lanes and other needed transit improvements? What would you do if those improvements face pushback?

Yes. I would work to expedite the creation of new transit-only lanes, particularly on corridors where they can significantly improve reliability and travel times.

In District 4, I would start with Noriega Street. Noriega is a major east-west corridor serving the Outer Sunset, and improving transit reliability there would benefit both daily riders and the neighborhood's businesses and residents. I would also look at transit signal priority, stop spacing, pedestrian safety, and other improvements alongside a transit-only lane.

When these projects face pushback, I would listen to residents, riders, merchants, and other stakeholders and work to address legitimate concerns. But I also believe leadership means being willing to make changes that serve the broader public good. We cannot improve Muni if every proposed improvement is abandoned the moment there is opposition.

I would use data, pilot projects, and community engagement to demonstrate what works and make adjustments where needed. The goal is to make public transportation faster and more reliable while creating streets that work for the entire community.

Do you support this year's Proposition H and the Regional Transit Measure (RTM), which together will generate revenue to maintain service for Muni, BART, Caltrain, and other transit agencies?

Yes

Do you support this year's Proposition G, which will close Sunset Dunes and reopen the Great Highway to cars during weekdays?

Absolutely not. I strongly support keeping Sunset Dunes open as a permanent public park and oppose reopening the Great Highway to cars on weekdays.

Sunset Dunes is an extraordinary public space that provides recreation, access to nature, and a place for San Franciscans to walk, run, bike, and enjoy the coast. I have been a consistent supporter of making Sunset Dunes permanent throughout both the June special election and the November general election.

Did you support 2024's Proposition L, which would have taxed ride-hail companies to generate up to \$30 million annually for transit in San Francisco?

Yes.

Board of Supervisors, District 4 | Alan Wong

Do you have a section on your website about public transit, transportation, or mobility? If so, please provide a link.

How do you usually get around San Francisco? Please tell us when and why you use cars, trains, Muni buses, bikes, walking, wheelchairs, or any other mode you frequently use for transportation.

I use a mix of transportation methods depending on where I'm going and what my schedule looks like. I regularly drive, especially when traveling across the city, attending multiple events in a day or carrying materials. I also take the muni when I can, particularly when traveling along major transit corridors or heading downtown.

For shorter trips, I walk whenever possible, especially around the Sunset and when visiting neighborhood businesses or community events. Having grown up in San Francisco and spent much of my life here, I know how important it is to have transportation options that are safe, reliable, and accessible.

How often do you ride public transit?

I ride public transit occasionally. Most of the time, I drive or I walk because it's the easiest way for me to get between meetings, events and other commitments throughout the day.

If elected, what would be your top transportation priorities? This can include priorities related to public transit, active transportation, driving, or any other mode of transportation.

My top transportation priority is making it easier and safer for people to get around the city, regardless of how they travel. I especially want to improve Muni bus service. For many residents, buses are the most practical way to get to work, school, appointments, and other

neighborhoods, and we need service that is frequent, safe, reliable, clean and easy to use.

In District 4, I want to make sure we maintain strong bus connections within the Sunset and to other parts of the city, while also improving the reliability of the N Judah and L Taraval. I would prioritize keeping buses running frequently, reducing unnecessary delays, improving bus stops and shelters, and making transit more accessible for seniors and people with disabilities.

Street safety is also a priority, particularly around schools, commercial corridors, and intersections that are difficult for seniors, children, and people with disabilities to navigate. I support practical improvements like safer crossings, better lighting and visibility, and signal changes where they can reduce collisions.

Transportation shouldn't be a fight between people who drive, take the bus, ride a bike, or walk. We should focus on making each of those options safer and more reliable so people can choose what works best for them.

Do you believe it is important to reduce car dependence in District 4? Why or why not? If yes, how will you achieve that?

I think we should make it easier for people to choose alternatives to driving, but I don't think we should make driving more difficult just for the sake of reducing car use. Many District 4 residents rely on cars because of where they work, family responsibilities, mobility needs, or because public transit does not always get them where they need to go reliably.

The best way to reduce car dependence is to give people better options. That means more frequent and reliable Muni service, especially buses that connect the Sunset to other neighborhoods, along with improvements to the N Judah and L Taraval. It also means safer walking and biking routes and making sure seniors and people with disabilities can comfortably access transit.

If taking the bus, train, walking, or biking becomes safer and more convenient, more people will naturally choose those options when they work for them. My focus is on expanding choices rather than taking options away.

The [N Judah Transit and Safety Project](#) is currently in planning. What infrastructure changes would you like to see along the N Judah to improve the experience for transit riders?

I would like to see improvements that make the N Judah more reliable, accessible, and comfortable for the people who depend on it. That includes better and more accessible boarding areas, improved shelters and lighting at stops, and safer crossings so seniors, people with disabilities, and families can get on and off the train safely.

Reliability also needs to be a major focus. I support looking at signal improvements that give the N priority at intersections and other practical changes that reduce unnecessary delays and help trains stay on schedule. I also want to make sure we address crowding, particularly during peak hours. Constituents have also mentioned creating a rapid line to allow faster travel during commuting hours.

As this project moves forward, I think it is important to listen closely to riders, residents, and small businesses along N Judah. The goal should be a faster and more reliable N while making thoughtful improvements that work for the neighborhoods it serves.

San Francisco's [Transit First Policy](#) applies to all officers, boards, commissions, and departments of the city and county, and states that within San Francisco, travel by public transit, by bicycle and on foot must be an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile. Do you support the principles laid out in the full Transit First Policy?

Yes. I support the principles of San Francisco's Transit First Policy. We should make options such as public transit, walking and biking safe, reliable and practical alternatives to driving.

For me, Transit First means investing in frequent and reliable Muni service, improving bus and rail connections, making streets safer for pedestrians and people with disabilities and building infrastructure that allows transit to move more efficiently. I also recognize that many residents still depend on cars because of their jobs, family responsibilities, mobility needs or where they live. Our goal should be to give people more safe and reliable transportation choices and make it easier to choose transit when it works for them.

What role do you think law enforcement, fare enforcement, community ambassadors, and private security should play, if any, in patrolling transit? What should Muni do to improve safety and the sense of safety for riders?

Everyone should feel safe riding Muni. I support having community ambassadors on transit who can provide a visible presence, assist riders and help de-escalate situations before they become more serious. Law enforcement should be available when there is a genuine public safety threat or criminal activity but not every situation on transit requires a police response. Our police department is already understaffed, and we should not overwhelm officers by asking them to respond to situations that can be handled safely by trained ambassadors, behavioral health professionals or other appropriate personnel.

Fare enforcement should be fair and consistent, with an emphasis on helping riders understand and comply with the system rather than unnecessarily escalating encounters. I do not believe private security should replace trained public employees or community ambassadors.

Muni can also improve safety by keeping vehicles and stations clean and well maintained, improving lighting and visibility at stops and making it easier for riders and operators to quickly report safety concerns. We need a combination of prevention, trained personnel, and an appropriate law enforcement response when necessary so people feel comfortable using transit.

Muni funding is on the ballot this year. If Measures H and RTM do not pass, Muni will be facing a deficit of \$322m starting this year, which could lead to cuts of as much as 30% of all Muni service. How should the City address the Muni deficit if these measures do not pass? What kinds of SFMTA cuts would you support or oppose?

If these measures do not pass, the city and SFMTA will have to make some difficult budget decisions. I would prioritize protecting core Muni service and avoiding cuts that make the system significantly less useful for riders. Cutting routes or reducing frequency can create a cycle where service becomes less reliable, fewer people choose to ride and Muni loses additional revenue.

Before making major service cuts, I would want SFMTA to continue looking closely at its administrative costs, contracts, vacancies, operations and other areas where it can find efficiencies without reducing service. We should also look for additional revenue

opportunities and work with regional and state partners to identify funding that can help close the remaining gap.

If cuts ultimately become necessary, I would prioritize preserving frequent bus and rail service, paratransit and routes that people depend on to get to work, school, medical appointments and other essential destinations. I would oppose across-the-board service reductions that significantly increase wait times, as well as cuts that disproportionately affect seniors, people with disabilities, low-income riders and neighborhoods with fewer transportation alternatives.

The goal should be to protect the Muni service people rely on every day while making sure we are spending transit dollars wisely and putting as much of that funding as possible toward reliable service.

Even if both Measure H and RTM pass, they will only generate enough funding to keep Muni running at current levels of service. Do you believe Muni should expand or restore service? If so, what future revenue sources should be on or off the table?

Yes. Maintaining current service should be the floor, not the long-term goal. In District 4, I would prioritize more frequent and reliable service on the N Judah and L Taraval, as well as stronger bus services connecting the Sunset to other parts of the city. I especially want to improve connections between neighborhoods so residents have more options to get to work, school, appointments and commercial corridors without having to rely on a car or travel toward downtown first.

As funding becomes available, Muni should expand frequency and restore service where there is demonstrated demand, particularly on routes where riders experience long waits, crowding or unreliable connections. For District 4, that also means paying attention to the needs of seniors, families and residents who may depend on buses for shorter trips within the neighborhood.

For future funding, I am open to looking at a range of options, including regional and state funding, contributions from businesses that make significant use of our streets, and other dedicated transportation revenue. I also think SFMTA needs to continue finding efficiencies internally so that new funding can translate into better service for riders.

I would be cautious about relying on fare increases to close funding gaps. Any future revenue proposal should provide stable funding without placing an unreasonable burden

on riders and working families.

Since the pandemic, different Bay Area transit agencies have adopted a variety of fare policies to help recover ridership and revenue. This year, the SFMTA Board voted to raise fares to \$3.10 starting in FY27-28, which will be the most expensive base fare for local bus service in the country. Other agencies have [lowered fares](#) or [eliminated fares](#), and have seen ridership grow as a result.

Currently, only about [8%](#) of Muni's total revenue comes from fares.

What role should fares play in the future of Muni? Do you support lowering, freezing, or eliminating fares to grow ridership, or should Muni continue to raise fares to meet rising costs? If you support raising fares, how should Muni address equity concerns for low-income riders? If you support fare-free public transportation, fare freezes, or fare decreases, what alternative funding sources do you support?

I don't think we should rely on continually raising fares to solve Muni's financial challenges. Keeping Muni affordable is important to growing ridership and making transit a practical alternative to driving, particularly for residents who depend on it every day.

We need to evaluate Muni's long-term funding picture and the impact of fare increases on ridership. I also support maintaining and expanding discounted or free fare programs for low-income riders, seniors, youth and people with disabilities. I am open to exploring lower fares if we can identify sustainable funding to replace the lost revenue but I would want to make sure any change does not come at the expense of frequency or reliability.

We should look beyond fare costs for long-term funding, including regional and state funding, contributions from businesses that make significant use of our streets, and other dedicated transportation revenue. SFMTA should also continue looking internally for efficiencies so that more funding goes directly toward service.

For District 4, affordability and service have to go together. A lower fare does not help much if the bus does not come frequently or the N Judah and L Taraval are unreliable. My priority is making Muni affordable while also improving the frequency, reliability, and neighborhood connections that make people want to use it.

A [1993 ballot measure](#) made it official city policy that all elected city officials must ride Muni or other public transit to work at least twice a week. If elected, how closely will you abide by this policy?

I have not ridden Muni as often as I should and I can do better. Part of the reason is that I walk a lot. I live and work in District 4 and I walk to meetings, businesses and community events around the district at least twice a week.

I also recognize that walking works particularly well for me because I am young, able-bodied and a fast walker. For many seniors, people with disabilities, families with young children, and people traveling longer distances, walking is not a practical alternative to Muni. That's one of the reasons I believe we need transit that is frequent, reliable, accessible and easy to use.

I will make a good-faith effort to ride Muni more regularly. As Supervisor, I am making decisions about Muni service, reliability, safety and funding and riding transit gives me an opportunity to experience the system firsthand and hear directly from riders.

San Franciscans have strongly supported SFMTA's independence from the city's electoral politics in two separate elections over the past several decades, including Prop E in 1999 and Prop A in 2007. What are your positions on SFMTA's independence from the Board of Supervisors and the mayor's office? How would you make SFMTA more accountable to San Franciscans?

I support maintaining SFMTA's independence and respect the structure voters have established. Transportation decisions should be based on safety, reliability, ridership and the needs of the transportation system rather than changing with every election or becoming overly politicized.

However, independence should not mean a lack of accountability. SFMTA makes decisions that have a major impact on people's daily lives, and residents should have a meaningful opportunity to shape those decisions before they are finalized. I would like to see earlier and more consistent community outreach, clearer explanations of how major projects and service changes are developed and better reporting on whether projects actually achieve the results SFMTA promised.

We have several examples in District 4 where this matters. As SFMTA considers changes to the N Judah, riders, residents, and small businesses along the route should have a real

opportunity to weigh in before major decisions are made. We should also learn from the L Taraval project and make sure major construction and transit improvements are communicated clearly and that impacts on residents and businesses are addressed throughout the process. I also want SFMTA to pay more attention to bus service within District 4, particularly north-south connections that can be difficult and infrequent today.

As Supervisor, I would work closely with SFMTA to make sure District 4 residents have a voice in these decisions, follow up when problems arise, and hold the agency accountable for the results, while still respecting its responsibility to manage the transportation system.

Transit-only lanes provide faster and more reliable service, and improve safety on busy corridors. They prevent buses from being stuck in traffic and save money that can be reinvested in additional transit service. Sales tax analysis of recent transit lane projects have shown no measurable negative effects on businesses where transit lanes have been installed. If elected, would you work to expedite the creation of new transit-only lanes in San Francisco? What streets in your district would you prioritize for transit-only lanes and other needed transit improvements? What would you do if those improvements face pushback?

I support transit-only lanes where they can meaningfully improve the speed and reliability of Muni, and I would work with SFMTA to move projects forward more quickly when there is a clear benefit to riders.

In District 4, one of our biggest transit challenges is north-south connectivity. I would prioritize looking at transit improvements where they make sense. I also want to improve the reliability of our east-west service, including the N Judah and L Taraval, and make bus routes like the 7, 18, 29, 48, and 66 more frequent and reliable. The District 4 Mobility Study has shown that transit within the district can take significantly longer than driving, so improving those connections needs to be a priority.

When a project faces pushback, I think SFMTA needs to engage residents, riders, and small businesses early rather than presenting a nearly finished project and asking the community to react to it. I would want to understand the specific concerns, look at the data, and see whether the project can be adjusted without losing the transit benefits we are trying to achieve.

Community input should help us build better projects, but we also need to be willing to move forward with improvements when the evidence shows they will make transit faster,

safer, and more reliable.

Do you support this year's Proposition H and the Regional Transit Measure (RTM), which together will generate revenue to maintain service for Muni, BART, Caltrain, and other transit agencies?

Yes, I support both Proposition H and the Regional Transit Measure. Reliable public transportation is essential for San Francisco, and allowing major cuts to Muni, BART, or Caltrain would make it harder for people to get to work, school, medical appointments, and other parts of the Bay Area.

For District 4, maintaining Muni funding means protecting the N Judah, L Taraval, and the bus routes that connect the Sunset to the rest of the city. Regional transit is also important for District 4 residents who rely on BART and Caltrain for work, school, and other trips outside San Francisco.

I recognize that both measures ask taxpayers to contribute more at a time when affordability is already a major concern. That is why I also believe transit agencies need to demonstrate that they are using these funds responsibly, continuing to find efficiencies, and putting the money toward reliable service that riders can actually see and experience.

Do you support this year's Proposition G, which will close Sunset Dunes and reopen the Great Highway to cars during weekdays?

Yes, I support Proposition G. I have consistently supported a compromise that keeps the Great Highway open to cars on weekdays while preserving it as recreational space on weekends and holidays.

I believe this approach recognizes both the value of Sunset Dunes as a public space and the transportation needs of people who live on the west side. Many District 4 residents still rely on the Great Highway for commuting, taking children to school, getting to appointments, and traveling north and south through the district.

I also understand why people value having this space for walking, biking, recreation, and spending time along the coast. Keeping it closed to cars on weekends and holidays preserves that opportunity while restoring weekday access for people who depend on the

roadway.

Did you support 2024's Proposition L, which would have taxed ride-hail companies to generate up to \$30 million annually for transit in San Francisco?

Yes. I supported Proposition L in 2024 and signed the official argument in support of the measure. I believed it was reasonable to ask ride-hail and autonomous vehicle companies that make significant use of our streets to contribute toward the public transportation system.

I continue to believe we should look at ways to diversify Muni's funding so that we are not relying primarily on riders or continually raising fares to maintain service. Companies whose business models depend heavily on our transportation infrastructure can be part of that conversation.

Board of Supervisors, District 6 | Alex Behrend

Do you have a section on your website about public transit, transportation, or mobility? If so, please provide a link.

<https://alexforalld6.com/policy-for-all>

How do you usually get around San Francisco? Please tell us when and why you use cars, trains, Muni buses, bikes, walking, wheelchairs, or any other mode you frequently use for transportation.

I use MUNI buses and rail for almost all my transportation ... grocery shopping, errands, work, social life, etc. I'll walk lots of places too, but that is often after I've taken MUNI. With the reduction in MUNI service, I'm very occasionally forced to use a ride hail app.

How often do you ride public transit?

Every single day, multiple times a day

If elected, what would be your top transportation priorities? This can include priorities related to public transit, active transportation, driving, or any other mode of transportation.

I cannot tell you how many times over the last year or so I've had one or two small buses skip the stop where I'm waiting because accordion buses aren't used on major lines after certain times anymore. It's this and other "enshitification" strategies that put enormous pressure on San Francisco residents and tourists to pay expensive ride fees to tech companies like UBER and Lyft. (I've never taken Waymo or other robot vehicles, and I never will. So I don't know what those abominations costs ... I am greatly concerned cut rate prices are being used to slash ride hail driver compensation.)

When I'm on the Board of Supervisors, I will address how the Mayor and his appointees are coercing San Franciscans into financially supporting massive and wealthy tech companies by the decline of service hours or large enough buses in the evenings. It's the epitome of "reverse Robin Hood" ... take from the poor and middle class thru coercion and have that money go to the rich.

November's progressive parcel tax for Muni is only a first step towards fulfilling the promise of San Francisco's Transit First policy. District 6 may be The City's most transit-friendly neighborhood, but traveling elsewhere means relying on an underfunded system that's too slow, too infrequent, and too unreliable all too often.

To meet the needs of District 6 (and all San Francisco) residents, we must:

Provide more frequent service so residents can get transit when we need it;
Restore the transit lines that connect us to the rest of the city;
Create transit priority lanes to keep buses from getting stuck in traffic.

Last year, Mayor Lurie announced that he would be welcoming Waymo vehicles to Market Street. In doing so, he also had to open the corridor to other commercial vehicles, including luxury limousines like Uber Black. Do you support Mayor Lurie's decision to allow more types of vehicles on Market Street? What is your vision for the future of transportation on Market Street?

I do not support prioritizing Waymo or Luxury Limos on Market Street. The priority is to make those uber-wealthy limo users and the billion-dollar tech firms that provide ride hail services to pay for more buses and rail to serve Market Street and downtown. Once there's sufficient MUNI service, then we can consider luxury and robot conveyances.

San Francisco's [Transit First Policy](#) applies to all officers, boards, commissions, and departments of the city and county, and states that within San Francisco, travel by public transit, by bicycle and on foot must be an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile. Do you support the principles laid out in the full Transit First Policy?

YES, and furthermore...

San Franciscans have repeatedly affirmed our Transit First policy but the politicians who rule us consistently ignore it on behalf of their wealthy campaign contributors who drive, can afford frequent use ride hail technology, or are stakeholders in the Silicon Valley tech coalition clogging our streets with vehicles or ruining the environment with data centers needed for their dystopian experiments on San Franciscans.

What role do you think law enforcement, fare enforcement, community ambassadors, and private security should play, if any, in patrolling transit? What should Muni do to improve safety and the sense of safety for r

Muni Riders must be informed of their rights and that they are not allowed to be detained by Fare Enforcement personnel. I would work to get this legal information posted on every single bus. As our constitutional rights are being eroded in SF, we must not trick people into being detained on Muni. Community ambassadors have enough on their plates and must not be diverted into patrolling MUNI buses and trains. And there should be NO private security on Muni. Lastly, SFPD can continue to enforce driver and rider safety as it has for years.

Muni funding is on the ballot this year. If Measures H and RTM do not pass, Muni will be facing a deficit of \$322m starting this year, which could lead to cuts of as much as 30% of all Muni service. How should the City address the Muni deficit if these measures do not pass? What kinds of SFMTA cuts would you support

I oppose any more cuts to Muni service, or cuts to Muni that will necessitate further cuts to service. The cut to Muni I do support is the fare inspector program which costs millions more to run than it brings in.

I am also confident both measures will pass and we should all do everything in our power to ensure they do so. If they don't we need to immediately redirect any flexible funds towards saving muni, including the millions we're spending on fare-cops who cost more than they bring in and ensure other departments like the SFPD & DPW don't use Muni as their piggybank.

Even if both Measure H and RTM pass, they will only generate enough funding to keep Muni running at current levels of service. Do you believe Muni should expand or restore service? If so, what future revenue sources should be on or off the table?

transit levels of service have declined in the past 25 years and its incumbent we restore that. this means more investment from the general fund and increasing parking revenue. we should also move forward with congestion pricing.

also, higher diesel prices are costing Muni an extra \$1M/month. we need to leverage out trolleybus and public power infrastructure to get ourselves off diesel.

Since the pandemic, different Bay Area transit agencies have adopted a variety of fare policies to help recover ridership and revenue. This year, the SFMTA Board voted to raise fares to \$3.10 starting in FY27-28, which will be the most expensive base fare for local bus service in the country. Other agencies have [lowered fares](#) or [eliminated fares](#), and have seen ridership grow as a result.

Currently, only about [8%](#) of Muni's total revenue comes from fares.

What role should fares play in the future of Muni? Do you support lowering, freezing, or eliminating fares to grow ridership, or should Muni continue to raise fares to meet rising costs? If you support raising fares, how should Muni address equity concerns for low-income riders? If you support fare-free public transportation, fare freezes, or fare decreases, what alternative funding sources do you support?

Muni must eliminate fares completely. Since The City supported the costly Fare Inspector experiment, I suggest a far less expensive experiment to pilot ... the elimination of fares while promoting a nobody-turned-away-for-lack-of-funds (ntaflof) approach. This keeps Muni a universal program which treats every rider the same while also reinforcing that far too many of us are stretched impossibly thin by the current economic status quo.

Some charitable membership groups have adopted this approach and actually seen their coffers take in more from participants than when memberships, subscriptions, or price-for-service were used.

And instead of eliminate the jobs of fare inspectors altogether, we can make them Transit Ambassadors and retrain them to come on board to take care of the bus or train ... clean up trash or spills, announce they can provide assistance, directions, timing of buses or trains interesting with the line, and hand out Bluetooth earbuds to people so they turn down their music or phones. (And since he's been willing to donate technology to city departments, we could ask billionaire Chris Larsen to donate the earbuds to be given out. If he refuses, I bet Saikat Chakrabarti would be interested.)

Supervisors also need to be vocal advocates for state operations funding & restoring the funding from the greenhouse gas reduction fund. We need to redirect the 16B/yr we spend on roadbuilding to transit operations.

A 1993 ballot measure made it official city policy that all elected city officials must ride Muni or other public transit to work at least twice a week. If elected, how closely will you abide by this

I will take MUNI to work every day unless on the very rare occasion that work requires a trip someplace where public transit is not feasible given other demands of the my office. (The example that comes to mind is a regional policy gathering some place in the Bay Area followed by meetings back in The City ... but even then I may still use MUNI or other public transit part way to avoid getting stuck in traffic.)

San Franciscans have strongly supported SFMTA's independence from the city's electoral politics in two separate elections over the past several decades, including Prop E in 1999 and Prop A in 2007. What are your positions on SFMTA's independence from the Board of Supervisors and the mayor's office? How would you make SFMTA more accountable to San Franciscans?

We tried making SFMTA free of political meddling and it clearly hasn't worked as members of the Board routinely hold up projects and the Mayor, both this one and his predecessor, put their thumbs on the scale for (wealthier) automobile users against transit riders, pedestrians, and cyclists.

Once we recognize that transportation is political and technocratic tweaks to "take the politics out of it" don't work we must make governance more democratic via an elected MTA board that will uphold our transit first policy and make sure our public rights of way are for everyone.

San Franciscans have repeatedly affirmed our Transit First policy but the politicians who rule us consistently ignore it on behalf of their wealthy campaign contributors who drive, can afford frequent use ride hail technology, or are stakeholders in the Silicon Valley tech coalition clogging our streets with vehicles or ruining the environment with data centers needed for their dystopian experiments on San Franciscans.

Transit-only lanes provide faster and more reliable service, and improve safety on busy corridors. They prevent buses from being stuck in traffic and save money that can be reinvested in additional transit service. Sales tax analysis of recent transit lane projects have shown no measurable negative effects on businesses where transit lanes have been installed. If elected, would you work to expedite the creation of new transit-only lanes in San Francisco? What streets in your district would you prioritize for transit-only lanes and other needed transit improvements? What would you do if those improvements face pushback?

I would absolutely expand and increase transit only lanes. We also need to step up enforcement of tickets to cars and SUVs that violate traffic laws for these lanes. And if the drivers with ride hail corporations and robot ride hail tech firms violate these traffic laws or delay buses, those firms must be fined or sued by The City.

Do you support this year's Proposition H and the Regional Transit Measure (RTM), which together will generate revenue to maintain service for Muni, BART, Caltrain, and other t

YES, I SUPPORT BOTH

Do you support this year's Proposition G, which will close Sunset Dunes and reopen the Great Highway to cars during weekdays?

I will vote against re-opening the Great Highway to cars in November. Having grown up on the northern Peninsula with family in The City, I have great sentimental attachment to The Great Highway. I also think it's closure needs to be tied to much more transit options. I can say from personal experience that MUNI and Samtrans service is not sufficient to the southern and western parts of The City. I also take very seriously the concerns and anger of folks in The Sunset and western part of The City. And I will remain open to their ideas and solutions about the situation.

Did you support 2024's Proposition L, which would have taxed ride-hail companies to generate up to \$30 million annually for transit in San Francisco?

Not only did I support Prop L (Fund The Bus) in 2024, I gathered hundreds of signatures to get it on the ballot.

Board of Supervisors, District 6 | Matt Dorsey

Do you have a section on your website about public transit, transportation, or mobility? If so, please provide a link.

N/A

How do you usually get around San Francisco? Please tell us when and why you use cars, trains, Muni buses, bikes, walking, wheelchairs, or any other mode you frequently use for transportation.

I live only a few blocks from City Hall, so I generally walk to and from my office. I use a combination of transit and bikeshare to run errands, go to meetings, and attend events in and outside of my district. When going anywhere further than a short walk, however, I generally default to bikeshare. If bikeshare availability or weather conditions are poor, I take transit. I may also take transit if I have to go to a part of the city that does not have good bike infrastructure. I'm informed that I am among the top 1 percent of users on our bikeshare system, and my LyftBike profile shows that I've ridden more than 4,500 miles since becoming a member.

How often do you ride public transit?

Several times per week.

If elected, what would be your top transportation priorities? This can include priorities related to public transit, active transportation, driving, or any other mode of transportation.

I'd start by finishing what's already underway: the Howard Street companion project to Folsom, extending the protected two-way bikeway network through the heart of SoMa. I'd prioritize closing the gaps advocates have flagged repeatedly like 7th Street, where I've been working with SFCTA on a study recommending a jughandle intersection treatment, and Townsend Street near the Caltrain terminus, where bike volume is high but protection is inconsistent.

I'd also push to extend Second Street's protected lanes to eliminate the unprotected gaps that currently interrupt an otherwise solid corridor. Given Treasure Island's unique position

as a car-light, ferry-dependent community, I'd continue building out its cycling infrastructure as the island's population grows, using it as a proof point for what fully bike-integrated neighborhood design can look like. This will be even more important when the island gets bikeshare later this year.

My approach is to prioritize corridors that are both part of the Vision Zero high-injury network and carry meaningful existing bike volume, since that's where the safety case is strongest and hardest to argue against.

Last year, Mayor Lurie announced that he would be welcoming Waymo vehicles to Market Street. In doing so, he also had to open the corridor to other commercial vehicles, including luxury limousines like Uber Black. Do you support Mayor Lurie's decision to allow more types of vehicles on Market Street? What is your vision for the future of transportation on Market Street?

I have a few reservations about how this played out. Market Street's car-free transformation delivered results including the fact Muni got 14% faster and more reliable, and roadway injuries dropped 40% once the corridor was reserved for transit, biking, and walking. I understand the Mayor's interest in supporting downtown recovery, and Waymo's own safety data is strong.

My vision for Market Street's future is a corridor that keeps transit speed and pedestrian safety as the non-negotiable baseline, with any additional vehicle access tightly bounded, time-limited, and continuously evaluated against real safety and Muni-reliability data. If the pilot's data shows transit speeds or pedestrian safety measurably worsening, I'd want the city to scale it back. Five years of hard-won gains on Better Market Street shouldn't be unwound based on the argument that any vehicle presence helps struggling storefronts, without evidence connecting the two.

San Francisco's [Transit First Policy](#) applies to all officers, boards, commissions, and departments of the city and county, and states that within San Francisco, travel by public transit, by bicycle and on foot must be an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile. Do you support the principles laid out in the full Transit First Policy?

Yes, and I've put that support into practice. The Folsom Street redesign, which I strongly support alongside SFMTA and Public Works, converts general travel lanes to a dedicated transit-only lane between 4th and 10th Streets, plus a protected two-way bikeway because Folsom has been part of the city's high-injury network for years, and a street designed to

move freeway traffic isn't serving the residents and small businesses along it anymore.

I'd like to see that same logic applied on Howard Street, Folsom's companion corridor, when that project breaks ground. Both streets were built decades ago to move trucks between the freeway and warehouses; SoMa today is a dense residential neighborhood, and its streets should reflect that.

I think transit-first is easiest to defend, politically and from a policy perspective, on corridors that are already documented high-injury streets with strong existing transit ridership; that is where the safety case and the mobility case reinforce each other. In my district that includes segments of Mission Street and parts of the SoMa grid feeding into the Transit Center.

I support transit-only lanes on major corridors because we need to make transit fast and attractive for current and future riders citywide. We can support transit and be responsive to individual community needs at the same time.

What role do you think law enforcement, fare enforcement, community ambassadors, and private security should play, if any, in patrolling transit? What should Muni do to improve safety and the sense of safety for riders?

I'd prioritize a layered approach: better lighting, adequate seating, and real-time arrival information at every stop, paired with unarmed community ambassadors as the frontline presence on corridors and at stations, since ambassadors build trust in a way armed police may not do for some riders. I still support full police staffing and fare enforcement, because reliability and order both matter to the rider experience, especially for the working commuters who make up most ridership in my district. But I'd lead with other quality of life improvements to address the everyday sense of safety that shapes whether people choose transit at all. Accessibility also means physical maintenance: working elevators, adequate lighting at BART and Muni nodes, and station design that serves all San Franciscans.

Muni funding is on the ballot this year. If Measures H and RTM do not pass, Muni will be facing a deficit of \$322m starting this year, which could lead to cuts of as much as 30% of all Muni service. How should the City address the Muni deficit if these measures do not pass? What kinds of SFMTA cuts would you support or oppose?

I'm hopeful voters approve both the Regional Transit Measure sales tax and the local parcel

tax this November. Muni's operating deficit is a grave threat to a district like mine that depends entirely on transit functioning. But if either fails, I don't think the answer is accepting deep service cuts without a fight for alternatives.

First, I'd look at leveraging the city's negotiating position for state and federal backfill funding, similar to the \$590 million bridge loan Governor Newsom secured through MTC this year, and I'd push our state delegation hard for a longer-term commitment if local measures come up short. For example, I have leveraged the bully pulpit of my office to impact real change at the state level through a resolution in 2023: "Urging the Governor and State Legislature to Provide Operations Funding to Help San Francisco's Transit Systems Survive as They Recover From the Pandemic."

Second, I'd want SFMTA to pursue efficiency and revenue tools within its own control before cutting service: more aggressive fare enforcement (which I've consistently supported), parking and curb management revenue in high-demand corridors like SoMa and the Financial District, and a hard look at overhead and non-service costs before frontline service is touched.

Third, I'd support revisiting a scaled-down version of whichever revenue measure failed rather than abandoning new revenue altogether — sometimes a measure fails on structure or timing, not on the underlying premise that Muni needs money. I'd rather go back to voters with something more targeted than allow service in transit-dependent districts like mine collapse.

What I'd resist is treating cuts to core Muni lines serving downtown, SoMa, and Mission Bay as an acceptable outcome, as those routes carry the workers and residents this city's economic recovery depends on. That approach is both punitive to residents who willingly choose to live without cars or cannot afford other means of transit, and is short-sighted of our longer-term climate goals.

Even if both Measure H and RTM pass, they will only generate enough funding to keep Muni running at current levels of service. Do you believe Muni should expand or restore service? If so, what future revenue sources should be on or off the table?

Yes, San Francisco shouldn't treat "just maintain current service" as good enough long-term, especially for a district like mine that depends entirely on transit functioning well. Restoring service that was already cut and eventually expanding into underserved corridors should be the goal once Measure H and RTM stabilize the base.

Going forward, I'd want any new revenue source to be fair, reasonable, and sufficient over the course of time to solve the problem, not just politically expedient. I'd keep tax increases that fall hardest on lower-income residents off the table as a first resort, and I'd prioritize sources tied to entities benefiting from San Francisco's transit and infrastructure investment before looking at broader regressive options.

Since the pandemic, different Bay Area transit agencies have adopted a variety of fare policies to help recover ridership and revenue. This year, the SFMTA Board voted to raise fares to \$3.10 starting in FY27-28, which will be the most expensive base fare for local bus service in the country. Other agencies have [lowered fares](#) or [eliminated fares](#), and have seen ridership grow as a result.

Currently, only about [8%](#) of Muni's total revenue comes from fares.

What role should fares play in the future of Muni? Do you support lowering, freezing, or eliminating fares to grow ridership, or should Muni continue to raise fares to meet rising costs? If you support raising fares, how should Muni address equity concerns for low-income riders? If you support fare-free public transportation, fare freezes, or fare decreases, what alternative funding sources do you support?

Given fares only cover about 8% of Muni's total revenue, I don't think fare policy should be treated as a primary lever for closing the agency's structural deficit because the math doesn't support that. A higher base fare risks discouraging exactly the ridership growth that would help Muni's finances and mode-share goals more than incremental fare revenue does. I'd support freezing fares at minimum, and I'm open to exploring reduced or free fares for specific populations where evidence from peer agencies shows ridership gains that offset the modest revenue lost.

I don't think full systemwide fare elimination is fiscally responsible, but I do think the city has been asking fares to do more work than an 8%-of-revenue source reasonably can. I'd rather pursue dedicated funding sources like this November's regional and local transit measures, and stronger enforcement against fare evasion revenue leakage than continue raising fares on riders who are often the most transit-dependent and least able to absorb it.

A [1993 ballot measure](#) made it official city policy that all elected city officials must ride Muni or other public transit to work at least twice a week. If elected, how closely will you abide by this policy?

I'd have no trouble abiding by it — I already do, and then some. I don't own a car. I get around by Muni, bikeshare, and on foot most days as my default mode of transportation.

San Franciscans have strongly supported SFMTA's independence from the city's electoral politics in two separate elections over the past several decades, including Prop E in 1999 and Prop A in 2007. What are your positions on SFMTA's independence from the Board of Supervisors and the mayor's office? How would you make SFMTA more accountable to San Franciscans?

I support SFMTA's structural independence as San Francisco voters have twice affirmed it. Insulating day-to-day transit operations from short-term electoral pressure has generally served the agency well, and I don't think the Board should be second-guessing operational decisions better made by dedicated transit professionals.

That said, independence and accountability aren't mutually exclusive, and I think SFMTA could provide clearer public reporting on how fare, fee, and tax revenue actually gets spent, more responsive engagement with district supervisors on corridor-specific safety and reliability concerns, and incorporation of public feedback into service planning rather than treating outreach as a formality after decisions are largely made. My approach has been to work directly and collaboratively with SFMTA on projects in my district rather than trying to legislate around their authority.

Transit-only lanes provide faster and more reliable service, and improve safety on busy corridors. They prevent buses from being stuck in traffic and save money that can be reinvested in additional transit service. Sales tax analysis of recent transit lane projects have shown no measurable negative effects on businesses where transit lanes have been installed. If elected, would you work to expedite the creation of new transit-only lanes in San Francisco? What streets in your district would you prioritize for transit-only lanes and other needed transit improvements? What would you do if those improvements face pushback?

Yes, I strongly support bus-only lanes, bulb-outs, and signal prioritization. I helped secure over \$11 million in Transportation Authority funding for the Folsom Streetscape project, which adds a dedicated Muni transit-only lane and new boarding islands for the 12-Folsom and 27-Bryant lines on one of the city's highest-injury corridors.

On the jurisdictional challenge, since transit agencies need Board of Supervisors and sometimes Caltrans approval for street changes, I think the fix is prioritizing transit-only

conversions on corridors that are simultaneously part of the Vision Zero high-injury network and carry strong existing ridership — that's where the safety case and the mobility case reinforce each other, making approval easier to secure locally. I'd also support giving SFMTA more streamlined authority to implement quick-build transit priority treatments without requiring a full legislative process each time, similar to how quick-build bike infrastructure has been able to move faster than traditional capital projects.

Do you support this year's Proposition H and the Regional Transit Measure (RTM), which together will generate revenue to maintain service for Muni, BART, Caltrain, and other transit agencies?

Yes.

Do you support this year's Proposition G, which will close Sunset Dunes and reopen the Great Highway to cars during weekdays?

I oppose it. I co-sponsored the 2024 measure that permanently closed the Great Highway to create Sunset Dunes, and I don't think we should reverse that decision less than two years after voters approved it by a clear margin. Sunset Dunes has drawn over 1.7 million visits since opening. SFMTA's own analysis puts the cost of reopening the highway at roughly \$14 million. Reversing this beloved park would be fiscally irresponsible. I understand the concerns of Sunset District residents affected by the traffic pattern change, but undoing a permanent public park to restore a weekday commuter shortcut isn't the right tradeoff, especially when a majority of the Board and citywide voters have already weighed in.

Did you support 2024's Proposition L, which would have taxed ride-hail companies to generate up to \$30 million annually for transit in San Francisco?

Yes, I supported Prop L. We should do everything we can to make sure Muni is fast, frequent, reliable, clean and safe for all. While voters approved it, it was ultimately nullified by a provision in a competing ballot measure. I think that outcome was a loss for Muni's funding picture, and I remain open to a similarly structured rideshare and AV tax in the future, provided it's designed fairly and doesn't simply get undone by a competing measure again.

Board of Supervisors, District 8 | Gary McCoy

Do you have a section on your website about public transit, transportation, or mobility? If so, please provide a link.

Yes, I do! You can find it here: <https://www.garymccoysf.com/priorities>

How do you usually get around San Francisco? Please tell us when and why you use cars, trains, Muni buses, bikes, walking, wheelchairs, or any other mode you frequently use for transportation.

I ride Muni and walk for most of my trips around the district and across the city. I also bike recreationally in Golden Gate Park and along JFK Promenade and Sunset Dunes, and I drive when I need to. I think of myself as equally a transit rider, pedestrian, cyclist, and driver. I live in Twin Peaks, so I know firsthand how badly we need better frequency and reliability on the Muni lines people up here depend on.

How often do you ride public transit?

Anywhere from a few times a week to once or twice a day.

If elected, what would be your top transportation priorities? This can include priorities related to public transit, active transportation, driving, or any other mode of transportation.

My top priority is protecting funding for Muni so that we can continue to improve frequency, reliability and safety—what riders tell us over and over again are the most important things to them. We must pass Prop H and Measure RTM to prevent devastating service cuts. I believe, for District 8, we must focus on improving and expanding bus service. Bus projects are cheaper and easier to accomplish than subways and light rail, and get people where they need to go just as well. I'm also proposing that we, where we can, give segments of the 24 line bus signal priority, transit lanes and bus bulbs to get one of the city's most-used buses—which runs through the heart of District 8—moving faster and more efficiently. This wouldn't be a "BRT" line, but would be "BRT inspired."

On streets, I would deliver the District 8 segments of the Biking and Rolling Plan, protect our District 8 slow streets as well as the incredible new parks Sunset Dunes and JFK

Promenade that are well-used by so many in the District, add speed cameras to dangerous corridors like San Jose, and complete badly-needed bike infrastructure on 17th St. Finally, I would support efforts to make ride-hail and robotaxi companies pay their fair share for the congestion they add.

Do you support the [Church and Market Street Intersection Improvements](#), which will enhance the streetscape, expand access to the J Church, and improve safety for people walking and riding transit?

Yes! I strongly support it, and support improvements like this across the District.

San Francisco's [Transit First Policy](#) applies to all officers, boards, commissions, and departments of the city and county, and states that within San Francisco, travel by public transit, by bicycle and on foot must be an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile. Do you support the principles laid out in the full Transit First Policy?

Yes! I strongly support the Transit First Policy.

What role do you think law enforcement, fare enforcement, community ambassadors, and private security should play, if any, in patrolling transit? What should Muni do to improve safety and the sense of safety for riders?

Riders feel safest when service is frequent and dependable, and when stops, vehicles, and stations are clean and well lit. When people feel unsafe on transit, they're often responding to the challenges and discomfort of being in an enclosed space with someone who is either experiencing a substance use disorder or mental health crisis. Muni and BART vehicles and stations become the indoor space for people with nowhere else to go. I would invest in continued training and support for our transit operators, who are on the front lines dealing with this crisis and who are often successfully able to de-escalate situations without involving police. I'd also invest in transit ambassadors and behavioral health outreach workers who can connect people in crisis to care. Any approach to safety on transit needs to be tied to a broader behavioral health plan. I'm proposing we build behavioral health campuses at our hospitals to get people who need care off of transit and into safe, indoor spaces with the resources and beds needed to get people stable. I believe that police and other first responders should be there for emergencies, but armed officers should not be

our answer to every situation.

Muni funding is on the ballot this year. If Measures H and RTM do not pass, Muni will be facing a deficit of \$322m starting this year, which could lead to cuts of as much as 30% of all Muni service. How should the City address the Muni deficit if these measures do not pass? What kinds of SFMTA cuts would you support or oppose?

I would support using reserves to backfill the cuts until another measure is put on the ballot, and if not possible, I'd defer to the SFMTA's leadership on which cuts would be the least harmful to the city. This would be a terrible (almost unthinkable) situation, and I truly hope we won't be in the position to have to make these awful choices.

Even if both Measure H and RTM pass, they will only generate enough funding to keep Muni running at current levels of service. Do you believe Muni should expand or restore service? If so, what future revenue sources should be on or off the table?

Yes, absolutely. Keeping Muni at today's level is the floor, not the ceiling. Investing in transit is the best way to increase ridership and continue to improve and expand the system. Once we stabilize funding, I want to expand service frequency on our busiest corridors, several of which run through District 8, and invest in rapid bus infrastructure where possible. I also support requiring ride-hail and robotaxi companies pay their fair share, like they would've had to with Prop L in 2024. I'd work closely with state and federal leaders to pursue regional, state and federal transit funding.

Since the pandemic, different Bay Area transit agencies have adopted a variety of fare policies to help recover ridership and revenue. This year, the SFMTA Board voted to raise fares to \$3.10 starting in FY27-28, which will be the most expensive base fare for local bus service in the country. Other agencies have [lowered fares](#) or [eliminated fares](#), and have seen ridership grow as a result.

Currently, only about [8%](#) of Muni's total revenue comes from fares.

What role should fares play in the future of Muni? Do you support lowering, freezing, or eliminating fares to grow ridership, or should Muni continue to raise fares to meet rising costs? If you support raising fares, how should Muni address equity concerns for low-income riders? If you support fare-

free public transportation, fare freezes, or fare decreases, what alternative funding sources do you support?

Fare revenue is important—if more for the notion of collective care and investment in our transit system than the actual funds generated—and I’m glad we’re stepping up fare enforcement and bringing in extra money when we badly need it. I also strongly support protecting Free Muni for Youth and the student BayPass so cost does not keep young people off transit. We build lifetime riders who will use and pay for the system as adults.

I also want to grow ridership and support free fares for those who need them by bringing in progressive taxation revenue, including making ride-hail and robotaxi companies pay their fair share.

A [1993 ballot measure](#) made it official city policy that all elected city officials must ride Muni or other public transit to work at least twice a week. If elected, how closely will you abide by this policy?

I already rely on Muni to get around. I would be glad to meet and exceed that standard.

San Franciscans have strongly supported SFMTA’s independence from the city’s electoral politics in two separate elections over the past several decades, including Prop E in 1999 and Prop A in 2007. What are your positions on SFMTA’s independence from the Board of Supervisors and the mayor’s office? How would you make SFMTA more accountable to San Franciscans?

I respect that voters twice chose to insulate SFMTA’s professional operations from day-to-day political pressure, and I won’t look to undo that. Independence and accountability can go hand-in-hand, though. I would hold SFMTA accountable the way I would any agency, through public metrics on reliability and safety, rider satisfaction, and financial transparency about how money is spent.

Transit-only lanes provide faster and more reliable service, and improve safety on busy corridors. They prevent buses from being stuck in traffic and save money that can be reinvested in additional transit service. Sales tax analysis of recent transit lane projects have shown no measurable negative effects on businesses where transit lanes have been installed. If elected, would you work to expedite the creation of new transit-only lanes in San Francisco? What streets in your district would

you prioritize for transit-only lanes and other needed transit improvements? What would you do if those improvements face pushback?

Yes. I strongly support transit-only lanes – they’re one of the cheapest and fastest ways to make our transit more reliable, frequent, and fast, and as Supervisor, I plan to focus on this. I would prioritize the busiest Muni corridors running through District 8 where buses get stuck today, like the 24. I would bring merchants and the disability community to the table early, like I did when I was beginning to work on car-free JFK during my time at Rec and Park. Evidence shows that transit lanes do not hurt local business, and I’m confident that faster transit can help our businesses.

Do you support this year’s Proposition H and the Regional Transit Measure (RTM), which together will generate revenue to maintain service for Muni, BART, Caltrain, and other transit agencies?

Yes. I am a strong supporter of both. They’re how we prevent catastrophic cuts to Muni, BART, Caltrain, and the other agencies that we all depend on to keep us and our economy moving.

Do you support this year’s Proposition G, which will close Sunset Dunes and reopen the Great Highway to cars during weekdays?

No. I oppose Proposition G. I unequivocally support Sunset Dunes, and I do not want to close one of the best new parks in the city.

Did you support 2024’s Proposition L, which would have taxed ride-hail companies to generate up to \$30 million annually for transit in San Francisco?

Yes. I supported Proposition L in 2024 to make ride-hail companies pay their fair share for transit, and I’d support bringing that kind of measure back.

Board of Supervisors, District 8 | Michael Nguyen

Do you have a section on your website about public transit, transportation, or mobility? If so, please provide a link.

<https://www.michaelnguyen4sf.com/priorities>

How do you usually get around San Francisco? Please tell us when and why you use cars, trains, Muni buses, bikes, walking, wheelchairs, or any other mode you frequently use for transportation.

I usually take public transit to get to and from work (37 bus, MUNI underground). I have a car and use it on weekends to run errands, but I also love walking and taking bike share when possible. I really enjoy being a transit rider because it gives me freedom to check emails, follow up with friends over text, read books, and relax while I get to where I need to go. I grew up in Texas and hated having to be stuck in my car, in traffic, to do most things, so having access to a robust transit system here in San Francisco has changed my life!

How often do you ride public transit?

Daily, during the week. Occasionally on weekends, especially when I am travelling to places I know where parking will be a challenge.

If elected, what would be your top transportation priorities? This can include priorities related to public transit, active transportation, driving, or any other mode of transportation.

I would fight to expand Free MUNI to Youth under 26, a recommendation coming straight from the Youth Commission. I would expand car free spaces like Wiggle Plaza (I introduced a resolution to do this at the DCCC), and implement safer streets for all by ensuring the biking and rolling plan is fully implemented by 2030.

Do you support the [Church and Market Street Intersection Improvements](#), which will enhance the streetscape, expand access to the J Church, and improve safety for people walking and riding transit?

Yes! I think this plan is a huge win. I recently spoke with Julie from Thorough Bread, a small business owner nearby, who has partnered with the Planning Department and SFMTA for many months. She shared with me the plans for the intersection improvements, and I am glad to see placemaking move from policy idea to reality. I am super excited to see the improvements come to fruition, and I look forward to spending time there when it is completed!

San Francisco's [Transit First Policy](#) applies to all officers, boards, commissions, and departments of the city and county, and states that within San Francisco, travel by public transit, by bicycle and on foot must be an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile. Do you support the principles laid out in the full Transit First Policy?

Yes. I served as a past president of the board of Livable City and I'm lucky to count Tom Radulovich as one of my supporters. I firmly believe that walking, biking, and public transit should be the best ways to get around SF and will work on policies to achieve that vision.

What role do you think law enforcement, fare enforcement, community ambassadors, and private security should play, if any, in patrolling transit? What should Muni do to improve safety and the sense of safety for riders?

I'd prioritize community ambassadors as the backbone of transit patrols, not armed police as the default presence. The feeling of safety on transit matters just as much as the data on who rides it. It's hard to build and easy to lose, and everyone, especially women and elders, should feel safe getting where they need to go.

BART's ridership gains after hardening its gates show that people respond to visible, common sense changes. We probably can't afford the same fare gate overhaul for Muni, but we can bring that same thinking to what we can control: more community ambassadors on platforms and in vehicles, consistent fare enforcement, better lighting, and real time arrival information so people aren't standing alone and anxious on an empty platform. Safety on transit should come from visible care and presence, not from turning every stop into a show of force.

Muni funding is on the ballot this year. If Measures H and RTM do not pass, Muni will be facing a deficit of \$322m starting this year, which could lead to cuts of as much as 30% of all Muni service.

How should the City address the Muni deficit if these measures do not pass? What kinds of SFMTA cuts would you support or oppose?

I sincerely hope it doesn't come to this, and that both Measure H and the Regional Transit Measure pass. If they don't, the City shouldn't balance the deficit on riders' backs. I'd push for new sustainable revenue instead: closing the corporate Prop 13 loophole, which still lets Disneyland pay property taxes based on 1978 values, could bring San Francisco an estimated \$1.1 billion a year, a huge portion of which should go toward public infrastructure like Muni.

This is personal for me. Twenty commuter lines could be cut, including the 37 Corbett, the bus I ride. That's a massive disruption for working families, and it would push more cars back onto our streets. I'd oppose service cuts and fight to find the money elsewhere in the City's \$16.9 billion budget first.

Even if both Measure H and RTM pass, they will only generate enough funding to keep Muni running at current levels of service. Do you believe Muni should expand or restore service? If so, what future revenue sources should be on or off the table?

Muni should expand routes and frequency, not just maintain what we have now. Restored and more frequent service on routes like 38 Geary, 24 Divisadero, and 43 Masonic, which already saw frequency cuts, and routes like the 5 Fulton, 9 San Bruno, and 31 Balboa, which got truncated at Market Street, would do more for ridership than any ad campaign. Buses that show up on time and often enough to actually rely on are what bring riders back.

On revenue, I want developers and billionaires paying their fair share toward infrastructure like Muni, and I support closing the corporate Prop 13 loophole and fighting for a local income tax, both of which could send real money toward transit. I'd support continued fare compliance and parking revenue optimization within reason. What I won't support is reviving fares for youth, low income seniors, and people with disabilities who currently ride free. That's being floated as a cost saving option, and it's completely backwards. We should be expanding free and reduced fare access, not clawing it back to patch a deficit this deep.

Since the pandemic, different Bay Area transit agencies have adopted a variety of fare policies to help recover ridership and revenue. This year, the SFMTA Board voted to raise fares to \$3.10 starting in FY27-28, which will be the most expensive base fare for local bus service in the country.

Other agencies have [lowered fares](#) or [eliminated fares](#), and have seen ridership grow as a result.

Currently, only about [8%](#) of Muni's total revenue comes from fares.

What role should fares play in the future of Muni? Do you support lowering, freezing, or eliminating fares to grow ridership, or should Muni continue to raise fares to meet rising costs? If you support raising fares, how should Muni address equity concerns for low-income riders? If you support fare-free public transportation, fare freezes, or fare decreases, what alternative funding sources do you support?

I support fare-free public transportation, full stop, if we can backfill what fares currently bring in. Only 8 percent of Muni's revenue comes from fares, and charging the most expensive base bus fare in the country isn't going to be what grows ridership. We live in one of the richest cities on earth. We should have transit to match.

Short of full fare-free service, I'd start with Fare-Free Fridays, letting people build the habit of riding transit regularly, tied to downtown activities the way Muni already does for Chase Center events. A lot of our transit's old model assumed everyone commuted downtown five days a week, and remote work changed that. We should change how we operate to account for that shift. We can also expand free muni to youth under 26 and seniors.

On funding, I'd back closing the corporate loophole in Prop 13, pushing a local income tax on people earning more than \$100 million a year, and exploring public-private partnerships to bring private wealth into the system. That's a more sustainable foundation than asking riders, especially low income riders, to cover the gap through higher fares.

A [1993 ballot measure](#) made it official city policy that all elected city officials must ride Muni or other public transit to work at least twice a week. If elected, how closely will you abide by this policy?

Yes, I'll likely take public transit daily.

San Franciscans have strongly supported SFMTA's independence from the city's electoral politics in two separate elections over the past several decades, including Prop E in 1999 and Prop A in 2007. What are your positions on SFMTA's independence from the Board of Supervisors and the mayor's office? How would you make SFMTA more accountable to San Franciscans?

I believe SFMTA's independence from day-to-day politics was the right call, and I'd preserve it. I've served on nonprofit boards, and I understand why insulating operational decisions from election-year pressure matters, and how to hold a budget accountable without micromanaging it.

That said, independence from the Board of Supervisors isn't the same as independence from accountability. When something is glaring, like raising fares to the highest base bus fare in the country while service still gets cut, I'd call for public hearings, push for audits through the Controller or Budget and Legislative Analyst, and keep regular, direct communication with SFMTA leadership rather than waiting for the next budget cycle to raise concerns.

I'd also use the tool that's often overlooked: as a Supervisor, I'd sit on the San Francisco County Transportation Authority board alongside my colleagues, since all eleven Supervisors also serve as SFCTA commissioners. SFCTA plans and funds major transit and capital projects citywide, and it's historically stepped in when SFMTA dragged its feet on fixes the public needed. That gives me real influence over what gets funded and prioritized, without compromising SFMTA's operational independence.

Transit-only lanes provide faster and more reliable service, and improve safety on busy corridors. They prevent buses from being stuck in traffic and save money that can be reinvested in additional transit service. Sales tax analysis of recent transit lane projects have shown no measurable negative effects on businesses where transit lanes have been installed. If elected, would you work to expedite the creation of new transit-only lanes in San Francisco? What streets in your district would you prioritize for transit-only lanes and other needed transit improvements? What would you do if those improvements face pushback?

Yes, I'd work to expedite transit-only lanes. The data backs it up: faster, more reliable buses, safer corridors, and no measurable harm to the businesses along them.

In District 8, I'd prioritize extending transit-only lanes on Church Street, building on the red lanes already in place for the J Church and 22 Fillmore, and I'd push to study a dedicated transit lane on Castro Street, which carries the 24 Divisadero, 33, and 35 buses through one of our busiest commercial corridors. Sanchez between Duboce and Market is a mess, but it's a cut-through traffic problem more than a transit problem since no line runs there. That's exactly why I authored a DCCC resolution supporting traffic calming and a Neighborhood Thoroughway on that corridor: the fix there is slowing down cars and reclaiming the street for residents, not adding bus priority to a street without buses.

When these projects face pushback, and they will, I'd lead with the data: the city's own analysis shows no measurable negative impact on businesses near transit lanes. But data alone doesn't win over a skeptical merchant or neighbor. I'd bring the same approach I use everywhere else in this campaign: real community process before a design is finalized, direct conversations with the businesses and residents most affected, and a willingness to adjust specifics, parking loading zones, bulb-out placement, while holding the line on the core goal of faster, safer transit.

Do you support this year's Proposition H and the Regional Transit Measure (RTM), which together will generate revenue to maintain service for Muni, BART, Caltrain, and other transit agencies?

Yes, I have endorsed both.

Do you support this year's Proposition G, which will close Sunset Dunes and reopen the Great Highway to cars during weekdays?

No, I am a No on G.

Did you support 2024's Proposition L, which would have taxed ride-hail companies to generate up to \$30 million annually for transit in San Francisco?

Yes.

Board of Supervisors, District 10 | Pearci “PJ” Bastiany III

Do you have a section on your website about public transit, transportation, or mobility? If so, please provide a link.

https://sfgreens.org/questionnaires/2026/bastiany_d10.html

How do you usually get around San Francisco? Please tell us when and why you use cars, trains, Muni buses, bikes, walking, wheelchairs, or any other mode you frequently use for transportation.

Today, I drive more often than I did before the pandemic, but I still take Muni buses from time to time. My transportation habits have changed over the years, and public transit has been an important part of my life in San Francisco.

As a USF undergraduate, I relied entirely on Muni to get around the city and became very familiar with most of the major bus lines. After college, I continued using Muni while also commuting into San Francisco from Santa Rosa or Sacramento before the pandemic. Those trips included Golden Gate Transit, Amtrak’s Capitol Corridor, BART, and Muni rail.

That experience gives me a personal connection to both local transit and regional travel involving multiple agencies. Although I now drive more, I want transit to be a dependable, practical option—not something people have to plan their entire day around. My priorities are shorter waits, reliable connections, and service that makes getting across San Francisco and the Bay Area easier.

How often do you ride public transit?

Currently I mainly drive, but will still use Muni bus or rail several times a month still.

If elected, what would be your top transportation priorities? This can include priorities related to public transit, active transportation, driving, or any other mode of transportation.

My top transportation priorities are reliable Muni, safer streets, accessible travel, and

stronger connections for District 10 residents.

First, I will fight to prevent service cuts by supporting Connect Bay Area and Stronger Muni for All. I will prioritize frequent all-day and late-night service, operator staffing, maintenance, bus-only lanes, signal priority, and better T-Third reliability. During construction and service disruptions, residents need accessible replacement service, clear multilingual information, and dependable transfers.

Second, I will advance safer walking, biking, and rolling routes through protected bike connections, safer crossings, lighting, curb ramps, accessible boarding, and adequate crossing times—especially near schools, senior housing, transit stops, and on high-injury corridors. I support repurposing lanes or parking where it delivers meaningful safety and transit improvements, while preserving essential disability access, loading, and emergency response.

Third, I will improve connections between Muni, BART, Caltrain, SamTrans, and other regional services through coordinated schedules and affordable transfers. I will pursue planning and funding for a T-line extension along Geneva Avenue toward Balboa Park and study better shoreline transit serving India Basin, Hunters Point, and Candlestick. District 10 deserves practical improvements now alongside a credible long-term transportation vision.

Plans to replace the aging Islais Creek Bridge, which carries the T-Third across the creek between Dogpatch and the Bayview, would sever a major artery and halt light rail service south of UCSF for two years. How would you ensure the replacement is built with minimal service disruption? How will you fight to keep transit riders connected during construction?

I will insist on a fully funded, rider-tested replacement service before the bridge closes—not a shuttle plan developed after residents lose their connection. Public Works currently projects construction from fall 2028 to fall 2030, giving us time to prepare properly.

I will push SFMTA and Public Works to:

- Provide frequent, wheelchair-accessible replacement buses connecting Sunnydale and Bayview to operating T-Third service and UCSF, with enough capacity to prevent overcrowding.
- Establish temporary transit lanes, signal priority, and managed loading along detours so replacement buses do not sit in construction-related traffic.
- Strengthen the 15 and late-night connections, coordinate transfers, and avoid

additional fare charges caused by the disruption.

- Deliver accessible temporary stops, shelters, seating, lighting, multilingual signs, real-time information, and staff at major transfer points.
- Maintain protected, continuous walking, biking, and rolling routes around the closure.

I will hold public oversight hearings, require construction milestones and monthly progress reports, and press for safe opportunities to shorten the closure and reopen rail sooner. Riders, disability advocates, operators, merchants, and neighborhood organizations must help shape the plan. Success should be measured by actual travel times, waits, missed connections, and accessibility—not simply whether a replacement bus exists.

D10 residents face congested buses, freeway barriers, and unreliable options that push many to drive. Which specific transit improvements would you champion to make transit a more viable option for more residents?

I would champion a District 10 network with more capacity, better east–west connections, safer stops, and clean transportation options.

- Deploy larger, articulated zero-emission buses on crowded routes, paired with more frequent service—not simply larger vehicles with longer waits. My goal is clean-energy buses throughout District 10, backed by charging infrastructure and reliable maintenance.
- Strengthen service along Evans, Oakdale, Palou, and Paul avenues with transit priority, coordinated connections, safer freeway crossings, and targeted traffic enforcement against speeding and blocked bus lanes.
- Add lighting, shelters, seating, accessible boarding, and clear arrival information so waiting for transit feels safe and comfortable.
- Expand Bayview Shuttle vehicles, hours, and coverage, and secure funding beyond its current November 2027 grant horizon. Preserve phone booking and wheelchair-accessible service.
- Explore targeted Waymo and Zoox ride vouchers where authorized service is available, with accessibility, affordability, and performance safeguards. These would supplement—not replace—public transit, particularly during service gaps.
- Advance a feasibility study for a Pier 96 ferry terminal connecting Bayview to the Ferry Building, including operating funding, accessible landside connections, and affordable fares.

Residents should have dependable alternatives to driving, whether traveling across the district, downtown, or to regional transit.

The [Bayview Shuttle program](#) serves relatively few riders, but among those it serves it is extremely popular – often a lifeline to reach destinations unserved or underserved by fixed-route transit options. The program is currently grant-funded only through November 2027. What is your vision for the future of this program, and how should the city continue to serve the needs of those who rely on it? For example, will you fight for longer-term funding, or for fixed Muni routes to fill in current gaps?

I will fight for stable, multi-year funding to keep the Bayview Shuttle operating beyond November 2027. Residents should not lose a lifeline because a grant expires. SFMTA reported an average of 211 rides daily in May 2026 and a sustained 4.9-out-of-5 rider rating—evidence that the service matters to the people using it.

My vision is both a stronger shuttle and stronger fixed-route Muni—not one replacing the other. I would pursue City funding alongside regional and state grants, with a continuity plan adopted before current funding ends. I would prioritize more vehicles and longer evening and weekend hours where rider demand demonstrates need, while preserving wheelchair accessibility, multilingual phone booking, affordable fares, and community oversight.

I would use shuttle trip data and resident feedback to identify recurring travel patterns that could support improved Muni service, particularly along Evans, Oakdale, Palou, and Paul avenues. Fixed routes should carry predictable demand efficiently; the shuttle should continue serving harder-to-reach destinations and residents whose needs fixed routes cannot adequately meet.

Success must include access to groceries, medical appointments, jobs, and regional transit—not ridership totals alone. I would also protect the program’s local driver-training and employment opportunities.

San Francisco’s [Transit First Policy](#) applies to all officers, boards, commissions, and departments of the city and county, and states that within San Francisco, travel by public transit, by bicycle and on foot must be an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile. Do you support the principles laid out in the full Transit First Policy?

Yes. I support the full Transit First Policy, including its parking provisions. Its central purpose is the safe, efficient movement of people and goods—not maximizing the number of private automobiles our streets can accommodate. It requires every City department, board, and commission to help make transit, walking, and bicycling attractive alternatives to driving.

As Supervisor, I will apply those principles through budget decisions, street projects, and oversight: protect Muni funding, expand transit lanes and signal priority, improve pedestrian safety, build connected protected bike routes, and support parking policies that encourage alternatives where transit is strong. New development must contribute to the transportation needs it creates, and regional agencies must coordinate reliable service and connections.

In District 10, Transit First must mean actual investment—not asking residents to drive less while leaving them with unreliable service. I will prioritize frequent, accessible transit, safe crossings, better stops, and connections that work for seniors, people with disabilities, families, and late-night workers.

I also support innovative services such as the Bayview Shuttle, provided they strengthen access without undermining Muni. Transit First should be an operating standard across City government, not simply a statement of intent.

What role do you think law enforcement, fare enforcement, community ambassadors, and private security should play, if any, in patrolling transit? What should Muni do to improve safety and the sense of safety for riders?

Transit safety should combine visible, accountable staff, prevention, and rapid response—not rely solely on police or fare citations.

Community ambassadors should be the everyday presence: helping riders, discouraging harassment, de-escalating conflicts, and connecting people to services. SFMTA's existing ambassadors already support conflict prevention and response. I would expand their coverage at priority stops, late-night routes, and construction transfer points.

Law enforcement should respond to violence, credible threats, and serious crimes, while respecting civil rights and avoiding racial profiling. Fare inspectors should focus on fair, consistent compliance, education, and enrollment in free or reduced-fare programs—not treating inability to pay as a public-safety threat. SFMTA already trains inspectors in de-

escalation and fare-program outreach.

I support a carefully evaluated my Martial Arts Community Protection Initiative (MACPI) transit-safety pilot using trained, licensed, unarmed security personnel, including qualified martial artists and veterans, to supplement—not replace—Muni staff. Their duties would be assistance, observation, de-escalation, and emergency escalation, with clear limits, public oversight, complaint procedures, and no role in immigration enforcement.

Muni should also improve lighting, shelters, cleanliness, reliable service, accessible reporting, and timely follow-up. Riders and operators should help identify unsafe locations and evaluate whether interventions actually reduce harm and improve confidence.

Muni funding is on the ballot this year. If Measures H and RTM do not pass, Muni will be facing a deficit of \$322m starting this year, which could lead to cuts of as much as 30% of all Muni service. How should the City address the Muni deficit if these measures do not pass? What kinds of SFMTA cuts would you support or oppose?

If Measures H and RTM fail, I will push for emergency City and state support while developing durable replacement revenue—not accept drastic service cuts as inevitable.

I would propose a dedicated 0.01% gross-receipts tax on new AI companies in San Francisco with annual revenue above \$1 million to help fund Muni. The proposal would need clear definitions, legal review, revenue estimates, and voter approval where required. It would supplement—not replace—other funding: at that rate, \$1 billion in taxable revenue produces \$100,000.

I would support cutting duplicative administration, unnecessary consulting, low-performing contracts, and nonessential spending after independent review. I would also accelerate bus lanes and signal priority so existing operating resources provide more reliable service.

I would oppose across-the-board service reductions and cuts to paratransit, low-income fare assistance, essential maintenance, and operator safety. Frequent routes, late-night service, and neighborhood connections must be protected, particularly in District 10.

If reductions become unavoidable, they must follow public equity analysis and rider consultation, preserve practical alternatives, and include a restoration plan. Low ridership alone should never determine whether a community lifeline survives.

Even if both Measure H and RTM pass, they will only generate enough funding to keep Muni running at current levels of service. Do you believe Muni should expand or restore service? If so, what future revenue sources should be on or off the table?

Yes. Preventing cuts is the floor, not the goal. I support restoring service where reductions have left residents with long waits or missing connections, then expanding frequency, capacity, and evening and weekend service—particularly in District 10. Expansion must include operators, maintenance, and transit priority, not just additional vehicles.

I would put these revenue sources on the table:

- Progressive contributions from large employers and institutions that benefit from Muni.
- A dedicated 0.01% gross-receipts tax on new San Francisco AI companies with annual revenue above \$1 million, subject to legal review and revenue analysis. This would be supplemental funding, not a complete solution.
- Commercial parking-tax reform, revenue from appropriate development of SFMTA property, and stronger ongoing City, state, and regional support. Parking taxes and property-development revenue have previously been identified as potential operating-funding sources.
- Philanthropic partnerships for specific improvements, without giving donors control over service decisions.

I would oppose balancing expansion on higher fares for low-income riders, eliminating discounts, or relying on punitive fines. I would also oppose treating borrowing or one-time donations as permanent operating revenue.

Every funding proposal should identify the service it buys, protect vulnerable residents, and include transparent spending and performance reporting.

Since the pandemic, different Bay Area transit agencies have adopted a variety of fare policies to help recover ridership and revenue. This year, the SFMTA Board voted to raise fares to \$3.10 starting in FY27-28, which will be the most expensive base fare for local bus service in the country. Other agencies have [lowered fares](#) or [eliminated fares](#), and have seen ridership grow as a result.

Currently, only about [8%](#) of Muni's total revenue comes from fares.

What role should fares play in the future of Muni? Do you support lowering, freezing, or eliminating fares to grow ridership, or should Muni continue to raise fares to meet rising costs? If you support raising fares, how should Muni address equity concerns for low-income riders? If you support fare-free public transportation, fare freezes, or fare decreases, what alternative funding sources do you support?

I support freezing Muni fares while developing a funded path toward lower fares and ultimately fare-free service. Riders should not repeatedly pay more for service that remains unreliable. However, eliminating fares must not come at the expense of frequency, accessibility, maintenance, or operator staffing.

Immediately, I would protect Free Muni and reduced-fare programs, simplify multilingual enrollment, and support affordable regional transfers and fare capping. Petaluma's fare-free pilot used General Fund support to replace fare revenue—a useful example of making affordability an explicit budget commitment, though San Francisco must develop its own funding plan.

To replace fare revenue and expand service, I support progressive contributions from large employers, commercial parking-tax reform, dedicated City funding, and stronger ongoing state and regional support. I would also propose the supplemental 0.01% gross-receipts tax on new San Francisco AI companies earning over \$1 million annually, subject to legal and fiscal review.

I would oppose using punitive fines or higher fares on low-income riders as the primary response to rising costs. Any move toward fare-free Muni should include reliable replacement revenue, adequate capacity, and public evaluation of ridership, access, and service quality. Affordable transit and dependable transit must advance together.

A [1993 ballot measure](#) made it official city policy that all elected city officials must ride Muni or other public transit to work at least twice a week. If elected, how closely will you abide by this policy?

If elected, I will commit to riding Muni or other public transit to work at least twice a week and aim to exceed that minimum. I will build transit into my regular schedule, not treat it as an occasional photo opportunity.

As a USF undergraduate, I relied entirely on Muni and became familiar with most major bus

lines. Before the pandemic, my regional commutes also involved Golden Gate Transit, Capitol Corridor, BART, and Muni rail. Although I drive more today, serving as Supervisor should mean experiencing the system I help fund and oversee.

I will use those trips to stay connected to riders' everyday experiences: crowding, waits, missed transfers, stop conditions, and accessibility. I will share regular updates about what I observe and how my office follows up. Riding transit does not replace listening to residents whose needs differ from mine, but it is an essential part of accountable leadership.

San Franciscans have strongly supported SFMTA's independence from the city's electoral politics in two separate elections over the past several decades, including Prop E in 1999 and Prop A in 2007. What are your positions on SFMTA's independence from the Board of Supervisors and the mayor's office? How would you make SFMTA more accountable to San Franciscans?

I support SFMTA's operational independence from both the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor's Office. Transit planning, street safety, and service decisions should follow evidence, rider needs, and Transit First—not election cycles or pressure from politically connected interests. Propositions E and A established and strengthened that independence; the Mayor still appoints directors, subject to Board confirmation.

Independence must come with accountability. As Supervisor, I would:

- Evaluate nominees for transportation expertise, regular transit use, equity commitments, and willingness to challenge political interference.
- Push for accessible public dashboards showing reliability, crowding, missed service, accessibility failures, project costs, and progress by neighborhood.
- Hold oversight hearings on persistent failures and require public corrective-action plans with deadlines, without micromanaging daily operations.
- Seek independent performance and contract reviews, including advisory analysis from USF and SFSU public-administration faculty and students.
- Strengthen multilingual, disability-accessible engagement and require meaningful rider and operator input before major service changes.

District 10 residents must have a real voice in decisions that affect their mobility. I will advocate forcefully for our needs while respecting SFMTA's professional authority. The standard should be independent decision-making, transparent spending, and measurable improvements—not political control disguised as accountability.

Transit-only lanes provide faster and more reliable service, and improve safety on busy corridors. They prevent buses from being stuck in traffic and save money that can be reinvested in additional transit service. Sales tax analysis of recent transit lane projects have shown no measurable negative effects on businesses where transit lanes have been installed. If elected, would you work to expedite the creation of new transit-only lanes in San Francisco? What streets in your district would you prioritize for transit-only lanes and other needed transit improvements? What would you do if those improvements face pushback?

Yes. I will work to expedite transit-only lanes through quick-build projects, coordinated departmental approvals, dedicated funding, and clear delivery deadlines.

In District 10, I would prioritize Bayshore Boulevard for bus priority and Third Street for stronger T-Third signal priority and protection from vehicle interference. I would also prioritize transit lanes on appropriate bridge-construction detours before the Islais Creek closure. Bayview's community transportation plan identifies unreliable service and long travel times as major barriers and recommends signal improvements for the T-Third.

Along Evans, Oakdale, Palou, and Paul avenues, I would pursue corridor-specific improvements: targeted bus lanes where feasible, queue jumps, signal priority, accessible boarding, shelters, lighting, and safer crossings. Geneva Avenue also deserves stronger transit priority and connections toward Balboa Park.

If projects face pushback, I will meet early with riders, residents, disability advocates, operators, and merchants. I will address legitimate concerns about loading, emergency access, accessibility, and traffic diversion through design changes—not automatically abandon transit priority to preserve parking.

I would support monitored pilots with published travel-time, safety, and business-access results. Community engagement should improve projects and build trust, but it should not become an indefinite veto over safer, more reliable transportation.

Do you support this year's Proposition H and the Regional Transit Measure (RTM), which together will generate revenue to maintain service for Muni, BART, Caltrain, and other transit agencies?

Yes on H, Yes on RTM

Do you support this year's Proposition G, which will close Sunset Dunes and reopen the Great Highway to cars during weekdays?

Yes on G, although Sunset Dunes should be still used and turned into a Venice Beach style park.

Did you support 2024's Proposition L, which would have taxed ride-hail companies to generate up to \$30 million annually for transit in San Francisco?

Yes I did!

Board of Supervisors, District 10 | Dion-Jay (DJ) Brookter

Do you have a section on your website about public transit, transportation, or mobility? If so, please provide a link.

<https://www.dj4d10.com/platform>

How do you usually get around San Francisco? Please tell us when and why you use cars, trains, Muni buses, bikes, walking, wheelchairs, or any other mode you frequently use for transportation.

I use public transit at least five days a week, primarily Muni, and I walk every day as part of my commute and daily routine. I also occasionally use ride-hailing services when transit is not practical or when traveling late at night.

I own a vehicle, but I use it selectively, generally for trips where transit is less practical or reliability is essential, such as scheduled meetings, site visits, interviews, grocery shopping, transporting larger items, or traveling to destinations that are not well served by transit. I try to use the transportation mode that best fits the trip, and for many of my day-to-day activities, that means walking or taking Muni.

I believe a strong transportation system gives people real choices, whether they walk, bike, take transit, or drive when necessary.

How often do you ride public transit?

Almost every day, but a minimum of 5 days/week.

If elected, what would be your top transportation priorities? This can include priorities related to public transit, active transportation, driving, or any other mode of transportation.

My transportation priority would be to make it easier, safer, and more reliable for people to get around San Francisco without having to depend on a car. In District 10, transportation is also an issue of equity and economic opportunity: residents need reliable connections to jobs, schools, health care, grocery stores, and other essential services.

First, I would protect and improve Muni service. That means maintaining reliable service, increasing frequency where demand warrants it, improving connections between Southeast neighborhoods and the rest of the City, and pursuing sustainable funding so budget shortfalls do not result in service cuts that disproportionately affect transit-dependent communities. Muni should be treated as essential public infrastructure, not simply another City program to cut when budgets are tight. SF Transit Riders similarly identifies fast, reliable, easy-to-use service connecting every neighborhood as a core goal.

In District 10, I would make improving the T-Third a particular priority. The T is a critical connection between Bayview-Hunters Point, Visitacion Valley, Dogpatch, Mission Bay, SoMa, Union Square, and Chinatown, and recent signal-priority improvements have already demonstrated that targeted investments can improve reliability. I would continue expanding transit signal priority, improve stops and boarding, and pursue additional measures that keep the T moving.

I would also invest in safe, connected walking and biking infrastructure, particularly around Third Street and in neighborhoods that have historically been underserved by transportation investment. The Bayview Community Pathway is a good example of community-driven planning that connects residents to schools, parks, grocery stores, community facilities, and transit while improving safety for people walking, biking, and rolling.

Finally, I would make transportation decisions with the people who rely on these systems most. That means listening to riders, seniors, people with disabilities, workers, young people, and residents of historically underserved neighborhoods and ensuring their priorities shape investments. We should pursue a transportation system where taking Muni, walking, biking, or rolling is a genuinely attractive and reliable option—not because everyone has to use the same mode, but because everyone should have meaningful choices about how they get around.

Plans to replace the aging Islais Creek Bridge, which carries the T-Third across the creek between Dogpatch and the Bayview, would sever a major artery and halt light rail service south of UCSF for two years. How would you ensure the replacement is built with minimal service disruption? How will you fight to keep transit riders connected during construction?

Replacing the Islais Creek Bridge is necessary to improve public safety, seismic resilience, and long-term transportation reliability. But Bayview should not bear unnecessary burdens during construction. For a neighborhood that is already one of San Francisco's most transit-isolated, a two-year disruption to the T-Third and Third Street would significantly affect residents, workers, students, seniors, small businesses, and freight movement. The project itself is not the problem; how we deliver it is.

My priority would be completing the project as quickly and safely as possible while minimizing disruption through strong coordination, proactive mitigation, and clear accountability. That means maximizing off-site prefabrication and other construction methods that can shorten the bridge closure, coordinating Public Works, SFMTA, SFPUC, utilities, emergency services, and other agencies under a single implementation plan, and holding every agency accountable for clear timelines and deliverables.

Transit mitigation must be in place before construction begins—not treated as an afterthought. I would fight for reliable replacement service with frequent connections, including buses at least every 10 minutes during peak periods, an express Bayview–Civic Center connection, coordinated transfers, and transit signal priority to keep buses moving. I would also support expanding the Bayview Shuttle where needed, particularly for seniors, people with disabilities, and residents traveling to essential services.

We should use the project to strengthen the broader transportation network as well. That means improving alternate routes such as Evans Avenue, Cesar Chavez Street, Jerrold Avenue, and Toland Street; evaluating the Illinois Street Bridge as part of the Safer Illinois vision; and advancing pedestrian, bicycle, and transit improvements before construction begins.

Finally, I would establish regular community oversight and public reporting throughout construction and ensure small businesses receive proactive communication, wayfinding, marketing, and construction-impact assistance.

We should not simply replace a bridge and accept two years of disruption. We should leave Bayview with a stronger transportation network, better transit access, safer streets, and more resilient infrastructure than it had before construction began.

D10 residents face congested buses, freeway barriers, and unreliable options that push many to drive. Which specific transit improvements would you champion to make transit a more viable option for more residents?

I would focus on making transit faster, more frequent, more reliable, and better connected across District 10 and to the rest of San Francisco. Residents should not have to choose between an unreliable trip on Muni and driving because transit takes significantly longer.

First, I would prioritize improvements to the T-Third, including expanded transit signal priority, dedicated transit lanes where feasible, improved stops and boarding, and more frequent service. The T is a critical spine connecting Bayview-Hunters Point, Visitacion Valley, Dogpatch, Mission Bay, SoMa, and downtown, and improving its reliability would benefit thousands of Southeast residents.

I would also champion transit-only lanes on major D10 corridors where they can meaningfully improve reliability, including Third Street and other high-ridership corridors identified through community and SFMTA planning. Buses should not be sitting in the same congestion as private vehicles when transit is carrying large numbers of people.

We also need to improve connections between neighborhoods that are separated by freeways, industrial areas, and other physical barriers. That means strengthening cross-town connections, improving transfers between Muni routes, expanding transit signal priority, and making walking and biking connections to transit safer and more direct.

I would fight to preserve and expand the Bayview Shuttle, particularly for seniors, people with disabilities, and residents traveling to destinations that fixed-route Muni does not adequately serve. At the same time, we should identify where shuttle service demonstrates a permanent need that should ultimately be addressed through the fixed-route network.

Finally, reliability requires sustainable funding. I would work to protect Muni from service cuts and pursue long-term operating revenue so improvements in frequency and reliability can be sustained.

The goal is not simply to give residents more transit options. It is to make those options reliable enough, frequent enough, and convenient enough that taking transit becomes the practical choice for more trips.

The [Bayview Shuttle program](#) serves relatively few riders, but among those it serves it is extremely popular – often a lifeline to reach destinations unserved or underserved by fixed-route transit

options. The program is currently grant-funded only through November 2027. What is your vision for the future of this program, and how should the city continue to serve the needs of those who rely on it? For example, will you fight for longer-term funding, or for fixed Muni routes to fill in current gaps?

The Bayview Shuttle is a necessary band-aid solution to a much larger systemic transportation problem. It provides a critical lifeline for residents in the Southeast who currently face gaps in reliable, convenient connections to the rest of San Francisco. I would fight to secure longer-term funding for the shuttle so that residents who rely on it are not left without service when the current funding expires.

But we cannot mistake the band-aid for the cure. The long-term goal should be to build a transportation system where residents do not need the Bayview Shuttle simply to access the same opportunities and services that are readily accessible to residents in better-connected neighborhoods. The Southeast of San Francisco has been choked off from the rest of the City for too long, and that lack of quality transportation is an equity issue.

As Supervisor, I would fight for both immediate and structural solutions. In the short term, the City needs to commit to maintaining and sustainably funding the Bayview Shuttle for as long as residents need it. We should also continue listening to riders and using ridership data and community input to identify gaps in service.

At the same time, we need concrete commitments from the City and SFMTA to bring the Southeast's transportation options up to par with other well-connected neighborhoods. That means improving the reliability, frequency, and connectivity of Muni; strengthening the T-Third and other key routes; improving transit signal priority and transit-only lanes where appropriate; strengthening connections between Southeast neighborhoods and the rest of the City; and addressing the infrastructure barriers that have historically isolated the Southeast.

We should set clear goals and timelines for improving transportation access in the Southeast and hold the City accountable for delivering on them. Residents should not have to rely indefinitely on a grant-funded shuttle to compensate for systemic gaps in the City's transportation network.

The Bayview Shuttle is an important temporary solution, and I will fight to preserve it. But our ultimate goal must be a transportation system that provides every San Franciscan with reliable, high-quality access to jobs, schools, health care, businesses, and the rest of the City—regardless of what neighborhood they live in.

San Francisco's [Transit First Policy](#) applies to all officers, boards, commissions, and departments of the city and county, and states that within San Francisco, travel by public transit, by bicycle and on foot must be an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile. Do you support the principles laid out in the full Transit First Policy?

Yes. I fully support San Francisco's Transit First Policy and its principle that public transit, walking, and bicycling should be attractive alternatives to traveling by private automobile. The policy is an important framework for building a transportation system that is more accessible, sustainable, safe, and equitable.

But Transit First also has to mean transit for every neighborhood. We cannot ask residents to choose public transportation when the quality, reliability, frequency, and connectivity of transit varies so significantly across the City. The transportation inequities experienced by Southeast neighborhoods demonstrate why implementing Transit First requires more than adopting a policy—it requires making the investments necessary to deliver on it.

I would support prioritizing reliable and frequent Muni service, transit signal priority and dedicated transit lanes where appropriate, safer pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, better connections between Southeast neighborhoods and the rest of the City, and continued investment in programs like the Bayview Shuttle while permanent service gaps are addressed.

As Supervisor, I would hold the City accountable for actually implementing Transit First and ensuring that transportation investments are distributed equitably. Every San Franciscan should have access to a high-quality transportation system that allows them to get to work, school, health care, businesses, and other opportunities without having to depend on a private automobile.

What role do you think law enforcement, fare enforcement, community ambassadors, and private security should play, if any, in patrolling transit? What should Muni do to improve safety and the sense of safety for riders?

Transit safety requires a layered approach, and no single form of enforcement or security can solve every problem. Riders should feel safe and welcome on Muni, and our approach should distinguish between fare compliance, quality-of-life concerns, and serious criminal activity.

Community ambassadors and other Muni staff should have a significant role in creating a visible, welcoming presence on buses, trains, and at stops and stations. They can provide information, help riders navigate the system, de-escalate conflicts, identify problems, and connect people to appropriate services. I support expanding these community-based approaches, particularly when ambassadors reflect and have strong ties to the neighborhoods they serve.

Fare enforcement should focus on compliance and education rather than unnecessarily criminalizing poverty. We should make sure riders understand fare policies and have easy access to reduced-fare programs, while addressing intentional fare evasion in a fair and proportional way. I also believe we need to look seriously at whether increasing fares is the right long-term strategy for Muni when affordability is already a barrier to transit use. SFMTA's own budget documents show that fare revenue represents a relatively small share of the agency's overall funding, while the agency faces significant structural financial challenges.

Law enforcement has an important role when there is a serious crime, violence, a credible threat to public safety, or a situation that requires a police response. But we should not rely on police to address every issue on transit. Muni should continue investing in community-based safety strategies, behavioral health responses, violence prevention, and other interventions that can address problems before they escalate.

I would be more cautious about the role of private security. Any private security personnel working on or around Muni should operate under clear standards, training, accountability, and coordination with SFMTA, and should complement—not replace—public transit staff and appropriate public safety services.

Ultimately, Muni improves safety and the sense of safety by making the system work well. That means frequent and reliable service, clean and well-maintained vehicles and stations, adequate lighting, functioning elevators and escalators, visible staff, effective reporting systems, and prompt responses when riders report problems. SFMTA's MuniSafe program already emphasizes increasing reporting, improving security staffing, working with community partners, and addressing safety equity; I would build on that work and hold the agency accountable for measurable improvements in how safe riders actually feel.

Safety also has to be equitable. Riders in every neighborhood—including the Southeast—deserve the same expectation of a clean, reliable, safe, and welcoming transit system. We should invest in the conditions that make people feel safe while ensuring that enforcement is fair, proportional, and focused on keeping people safe rather than simply increasing citations or arrests.

Muni funding is on the ballot this year. If Measures H and RTM do not pass, Muni will be facing a deficit of \$322m starting this year, which could lead to cuts of as much as 30% of all Muni service. How should the City address the Muni deficit if these measures do not pass? What kinds of SFMTA cuts would you support or oppose?

Muni is essential public infrastructure, and I would treat major service cuts as a last resort. If Measures H and RTM do not pass, the City cannot simply accept massive reductions in Muni service as inevitable. We need to pursue every available option to protect service while developing a sustainable, long-term funding model for public transportation.

First, I would push the City to identify additional recurring revenue and use available City resources to protect core Muni service. That should include pursuing additional progressive revenue, maximizing regional, state, and federal transportation funding, identifying new revenue from sources such as parking and transportation-related fees, and continuing to identify administrative and operational efficiencies within SFMTA. SFMTA has already identified significant cost savings and efficiencies, but the agency's own budget planning makes clear that efficiencies alone will not solve the structural deficit.

I would also oppose balancing the budget primarily through cuts to the service that working people rely on. I would strongly oppose eliminating neighborhood routes, substantially reducing frequency on core routes, cutting evening and weekend service, or making disproportionate reductions to Southeast neighborhoods and other communities that already have fewer transportation options. SFMTA has identified cuts that could eliminate up to 20 Muni routes, double wait times on some frequent services, and reduce evening service by more than 60%. Those types of reductions would undermine the City's transportation goals and make it harder for people to get to work, school, health care, and other essential destinations.

I would prioritize protecting frequent and reliable service, particularly the routes that connect historically underserved neighborhoods to jobs, schools, health care, and the rest of the City. That includes protecting and improving service in the Southeast, where transportation inequity is already a significant issue.

At the same time, we need to be honest that Muni's financial crisis is structural and cannot be solved by one-time funding or short-term cuts. The City should use this moment to establish a sustainable transportation funding strategy that recognizes public transit as essential infrastructure. That means a long-term commitment from the City, stronger regional partnerships, and recurring revenue that can support reliable service year after year.

If cuts ultimately become unavoidable, I would insist that SFMTA use an equity-based

process to determine where reductions occur, considering existing transportation access, ridership, frequency, geographic isolation, and the availability of alternatives. We should not make cuts simply because they are easy to implement. We should protect the service that people depend on most and the communities that have the fewest alternatives.

San Francisco cannot achieve its Transit First goals while simultaneously allowing Muni service to deteriorate. Our transportation system is an equity issue, an economic issue, and an environmental issue. I would fight to protect Muni service while working toward a sustainable funding model that allows us to improve—not continually reduce—the quality and accessibility of public transportation across every neighborhood.

Even if both Measure H and RTM pass, they will only generate enough funding to keep Muni running at current levels of service. Do you believe Muni should expand or restore service? If so, what future revenue sources should be on or off the table?

Yes. Muni should ultimately restore and expand service. Maintaining today's level of service is an important baseline, but it should not be the ceiling for what San Francisco expects from its public transportation system.

We need to restore service that was reduced during and after the pandemic, while also expanding service where there are longstanding gaps. That is particularly important in the Southeast, where residents have fewer reliable transportation options and have historically had less access to the same level of connectivity available in other parts of the City. We should use ridership data, community input, and transportation equity considerations to identify where additional frequency, longer service hours, new routes, and better connections are most needed.

To fund that expansion, I would support a combination of progressive and transportation-related revenue sources. The City should continue pursuing regional, state, and federal transportation funding; explore progressive revenue measures that ask those with greater ability to pay to contribute more; and consider transportation-related sources such as parking, congestion-related fees, and dedicated fees or taxes on private transportation services such as rideshare. We should also make sure large developments and major institutions that benefit from San Francisco's transportation infrastructure contribute appropriately to maintaining and improving that infrastructure.

I would not support making fare increases the primary strategy for funding Muni. Transit is essential infrastructure, and fares should not become a barrier to accessing jobs, education,

health care, and other essential services. Given that fare revenue represents a relatively small share of Muni's overall funding, we should not ask riders—particularly low-income riders—to carry a disproportionate share of the burden.

I would also oppose revenue strategies that disproportionately burden low-income residents or communities that already face transportation inequities. Any new funding mechanism should be evaluated for its impact on affordability and equity.

Ultimately, San Francisco should have a transportation system that does more than maintain the status quo. We should restore what was lost, invest where service is inadequate, and build toward a system where every neighborhood has reliable, frequent, and accessible public transportation.

Since the pandemic, different Bay Area transit agencies have adopted a variety of fare policies to help recover ridership and revenue. This year, the SFMTA Board voted to raise fares to \$3.10 starting in FY27-28, which will be the most expensive base fare for local bus service in the country. Other agencies have [lowered fares](#) or [eliminated fares](#), and have seen ridership grow as a result.

Currently, only about [8%](#) of Muni's total revenue comes from fares.

What role should fares play in the future of Muni? Do you support lowering, freezing, or eliminating fares to grow ridership, or should Muni continue to raise fares to meet rising costs? If you support raising fares, how should Muni address equity concerns for low-income riders? If you support fare-free public transportation, fare freezes, or fare decreases, what alternative funding sources do you support?

I do not believe Muni should continue relying on fare increases as a primary strategy for addressing its structural budget challenges. I would support freezing fares and working toward reducing them over time, particularly as we pursue a sustainable long-term funding model for Muni.

Transit is essential public infrastructure, and fares can be a real barrier for low-income residents and working families. Raising the cost of every trip can discourage people from using transit, particularly when we are simultaneously asking San Franciscans to drive less and use public transportation more.

Instead of continually asking riders to pay more, we should treat Muni as the essential

public infrastructure that it is and identify broader, more sustainable sources of funding. That should include progressive local revenue, regional, state, and federal transportation funding, and transportation-related revenue. I am also open to exploring dedicated fees or taxes on private transportation services, including rideshare companies, particularly where those services contribute to congestion or draw trips away from public transit. We should also examine contributions from major developments and institutions that benefit from San Francisco's transportation infrastructure.

The principle should be straightforward: if we want people to choose public transportation over private vehicles, we should not structure our funding system in a way that makes public transit increasingly expensive while private transportation alternatives continue to grow. Those who benefit from and contribute to the transportation system should help fund the public infrastructure that makes the entire system function.

I also support fare policies that make transit more affordable and encourage ridership, including fare capping and targeted or expanded free and reduced-fare programs. We should continue to look for ways to reduce the cost burden on frequent and low-income riders, including maintaining free and discounted fares for youth, seniors, people with disabilities, and other populations who face greater barriers to transportation.

Ultimately, we should measure the success of our fare policy not simply by how much revenue we collect from riders, but by whether we are making transit more accessible, increasing ridership, and providing reliable service. Muni is a public good. We should build a funding system that recognizes its value to our economy, environment, and communities rather than placing an ever-greater burden on the people who depend on it.

A [1993 ballot measure](#) made it official city policy that all elected city officials must ride Muni or other public transit to work at least twice a week. If elected, how closely will you abide by this policy?

I would absolutely follow the policy, and I already ride public transit regularly as part of my daily commute and routine. I believe elected officials should experience the transportation system firsthand and understand what riders experience every day, from reliability and frequency to safety, cleanliness, accessibility, and connections between neighborhoods. If elected, I would continue riding Muni regularly because you cannot effectively improve a system you do not experience yourself.

San Franciscans have strongly supported SFMTA's independence from the city's electoral politics in two separate elections over the past several decades, including Prop E in 1999 and Prop A in 2007. What are your positions on SFMTA's independence from the Board of Supervisors and the mayor's office? How would you make SFMTA more accountable to San Franciscans?

I support SFMTA's independence from the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor's Office. Public transportation is critical infrastructure, and decisions about our transportation system should not be subject to short-term political considerations or electoral politics. SFMTA needs the independence to make long-term investments and operational decisions based on technical expertise, data, and the needs of riders.

At the same time, independence cannot mean a lack of accountability. SFMTA should be accountable to San Franciscans through clear performance goals, transparent reporting, meaningful public engagement, and measurable outcomes around reliability, frequency, safety, accessibility, and equity.

As Supervisor, I would respect SFMTA's operational independence while holding the agency accountable for delivering a transportation system that serves every neighborhood. The people who rely on Muni every day should have a meaningful voice in evaluating whether SFMTA is meeting those responsibilities.

Independence from politics and accountability to the public are not mutually exclusive. We need both.

Transit-only lanes provide faster and more reliable service, and improve safety on busy corridors. They prevent buses from being stuck in traffic and save money that can be reinvested in additional transit service. Sales tax analysis of recent transit lane projects have shown no measurable negative effects on businesses where transit lanes have been installed. If elected, would you work to expedite the creation of new transit-only lanes in San Francisco? What streets in your district would you prioritize for transit-only lanes and other needed transit improvements? What would you do if those improvements face pushback?

I absolutely support expediting the creation of new transit-only lanes in San Francisco. Transit-only lanes are one of the most straightforward ways to improve Muni reliability and travel times while making our streets safer and getting more value out of our existing transit system.

In District 10, I would prioritize the T-Third and Third Street corridor, Bayshore Boulevard, and other major transit corridors connecting Bayview-Hunters Point, Visitacion Valley, Dogpatch, Potrero Hill, and the rest of the Southeast to downtown and other parts of the City. We should also look at transit signal priority, improved stops, safer pedestrian connections, and other improvements that allow buses and trains to move more efficiently.

Transportation is an equity issue. Residents in the Southeast should not have to spend more time traveling simply because they live in a neighborhood with fewer transportation options. If we are serious about Transit First, we need to make transit faster, more reliable, and more competitive with driving.

When improvements face pushback, I would make sure the City is engaging residents, businesses, workers, and other affected stakeholders early and transparently. We should listen to legitimate concerns and make reasonable adjustments where possible, while being clear about the transportation and safety benefits of the project. Opposition from individual interests should not automatically prevent improvements that serve the broader public.

As Supervisor, I would work with SFMTA and the community to move these projects forward, establish clear timelines, and hold the City accountable for delivering the transit improvements Southeast residents have been waiting for.

Do you support this year's Proposition H and the Regional Transit Measure (RTM), which together will generate revenue to maintain service for Muni, BART, Caltrain, and other transit agencies?

Yes. I strongly support Proposition H and the Regional Transit Measure (RTM). Both are important investments in maintaining reliable public transportation and protecting the transit systems that connect San Francisco and the broader Bay Area.

Do you support this year's Proposition G, which will close Sunset Dunes and reopen the Great Highway to cars during weekdays?

No. I oppose Proposition G, but not because I think every argument for reopening the Great Highway is wrong. The City should take congestion and Westside mobility concerns

seriously and invest in better transportation alternatives.

However, spending \$9.8 million to convert a successful public space back into a road—and potentially another \$1.9 million annually to maintain that arrangement—sets a very high bar. I would rather see those resources invested in transit, traffic management, and other transportation improvements that address Westside mobility without giving up a public space that has become an important recreational and community asset.

We should be looking for transportation solutions that expand people's options rather than simply dedicating more public space and resources to private automobile travel. That means improving Muni reliability and connections, managing congestion more effectively, and investing in transportation infrastructure that serves residents across the City.

Did you support 2024's Proposition L, which would have taxed ride-hail companies to generate up to \$30 million annually for transit in San Francisco?

Yes. I supported Proposition L because I believe private transportation companies that contribute to congestion and benefit from San Francisco's transportation infrastructure should help support the public transit system. Proposition L would have dedicated revenue from transportation network companies and autonomous vehicle businesses to Muni services and fare discount programs.

I believe we should continue looking at transportation-related revenue sources that ask private transportation services to contribute to the public infrastructure we all depend on. We should not continue placing an increasing share of Muni's financial burden on the riders who rely on it most.

Board of Supervisors, District 10 | Deandra Bryant

Do you have a section on your website about public transit, transportation, or mobility? If so, please provide a link.

How do you usually get around San Francisco? Please tell us when and why you use cars, trains, Muni buses, bikes, walking, wheelchairs, or any other mode you frequently use for transportation.

How often do you ride public transit?

I do not currently ride Muni regularly. I am the mother of a child with a disability who does not understand danger, and because of safety concerns and incidents I have seen and heard about on public transportation, driving is currently the safest option for my family. That does not change how strongly I support public transit. Muni is essential to San Francisco and to thousands of District 10 residents who depend on it every day.

If elected, what would be your top transportation priorities? This can include priorities related to public transit, active transportation, driving, or any other mode of transportation.

My priorities are safety, reliability, accessibility and affordability. Riders should feel safe waiting for and riding Muni, and operators should be able to do their jobs without being assaulted, threatened or exposed to dangerous behavior. I also want reliable service in every D10 neighborhood, safer and covered bus stops, better accessibility for seniors and people with disabilities, and transportation decisions that include the people who actually use the system.

Plans to replace the aging Islais Creek Bridge, which carries the T-Third across the creek between Dogpatch and the Bayview, would sever a major artery and halt light rail service south of UCSF for two years. How would you ensure the replacement is built with minimal service disruption? How will you fight to keep transit riders connected during construction?

District 10 cannot simply lose a major transportation connection for two years without a serious replacement plan. Before construction begins, I would require SFMTA and other agencies to present a detailed continuity plan, including frequent replacement buses, direct connections around the closure, accessible service for seniors and people with disabilities, clear signage and real-time information. I would also push for construction phasing and scheduling that minimizes the length of major disruptions. D10 residents should not bear the burden of a major infrastructure project without reliable alternatives.

D10 residents face congested buses, freeway barriers, and unreliable options that push many to drive. Which specific transit improvements would you champion to make transit a more viable option for more residents?

I would champion more reliable and frequent Muni service in District 10, especially in neighborhoods where residents have limited options. I support safer and covered bus stops, better lighting, improved accessibility for seniors and people with disabilities, and stronger connections between neighborhoods and major transit lines. I also want better safety for both riders and operators. Transit has to be safe, reliable, and convenient if we expect more residents to choose it over driving.

The [Bayview Shuttle program](#) serves relatively few riders, but among those it serves it is extremely popular – often a lifeline to reach destinations unserved or underserved by fixed-route transit options. The program is currently grant-funded only through November 2027. What is your vision for the future of this program, and how should the city continue to serve the needs of those who rely on it? For example, will you fight for longer-term funding, or for fixed Muni routes to fill in current gaps?

I support continuing the Bayview Shuttle, with **driver and passenger safety as the first priority**. Residents who depend on the shuttle need safe and reliable transportation to places that regular Muni routes may not adequately serve. Before the current funding ends,

I would work to identify longer-term funding and determine where permanent Muni routes could fill service gaps. Any expansion should include appropriate safety measures for both the people operating the service and the passengers using it.

San Francisco's [Transit First Policy](#) applies to all officers, boards, commissions, and departments of the city and county, and states that within San Francisco, travel by public transit, by bicycle and on foot must be an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile. Do you support the principles laid out in the full Transit First Policy?

Yes, I support the principles of the Transit First Policy, but **safety must come first for both drivers and passengers**. We need reliable public transportation and safe options for walking and biking, while also recognizing the needs of seniors, people with disabilities, families, and residents who may not have adequate transit alternatives. People will be more willing to use public transportation when they know they can travel safely and operators know they can do their jobs safely.

What role do you think law enforcement, fare enforcement, community ambassadors, and private security should play, if any, in patrolling transit? What should Muni do to improve safety and the sense of safety for riders?

My first priority is **the safety of Muni drivers and passengers**. I support community ambassadors, appropriate fare enforcement, and law enforcement when there are threats, assaults, drug activity, or other dangerous behavior. Drivers should not have to fear being assaulted while doing their jobs, and passengers should not have to feel unsafe riding or waiting for transit. Enforcement should be fair and respectful, but dangerous behavior cannot be ignored.

Muni funding is on the ballot this year. If Measures H and RTM do not pass, Muni will be facing a deficit of \$322m starting this year, which could lead to cuts of as much as 30% of all Muni service.

How should the City address the Muni deficit if these measures do not pass? What kinds of SFMTA cuts would you support or oppose?

If these funding measures do not pass, my priority would be protecting **driver and passenger safety and essential Muni service**. I would first look at administrative savings, efficiencies, and other funding sources before making cuts that affect frontline safety or essential routes. I would oppose cuts that leave District 10 residents, seniors, people with disabilities, or transit-dependent families without reliable transportation. Whatever financial decisions are made, we cannot balance the budget by compromising the safety of the people driving our buses or the passengers who depend on them.

Even if both Measure H and RTM pass, they will only generate enough funding to keep Muni running at current levels of service. Do you believe Muni should expand or restore service? If so, what future revenue sources should be on or off the table?

I support maintaining and improving Muni service, but safety and reliability must come first. Before expanding service, we must make sure drivers have a safe working environment and passengers can ride safely. I would consider responsible new revenue sources while first examining administrative spending and efficiencies. Frontline service, operators, safety, and essential neighborhood routes should be protected from cu

Since the pandemic, different Bay Area transit agencies have adopted a variety of fare policies to help recover ridership and revenue. This year, the SFMTA Board voted to raise fares to \$3.10 starting in FY27-28, which will be the most expensive base fare for local bus service in the country. Other agencies have [lowered fares](#) or [eliminated fares](#), and have seen ridership grow as a result.

Currently, only about [8%](#) of Muni's total revenue comes from fares.

What role should fares play in the future of Muni? Do you support lowering, freezing, or eliminating fares to grow ridership, or should Muni continue to raise fares to meet rising costs? If you support raising fares, how should Muni address equity concerns for low-income riders? If you support fare-free public transportation, fare freezes, or fare decreases, what alternative funding sources do you support?

I do not want increasing fares to become the automatic solution to Muni's financial problems, especially when fares make up a relatively small portion of Muni's overall revenue. I support keeping fares affordable and protecting discounted programs for low-income riders, seniors, youth, and people with disabilities. Whatever fare policy we adopt, our investment must prioritize safe, reliable service for passengers and a safe workplace for drivers.

A [1993 ballot measure](#) made it official city policy that all elected city officials must ride Muni or other public transit to work at least twice a week. If elected, how closely will you abide by this policy?

I respect the purpose of this policy because elected officials should experience the transportation system they are responsible for overseeing. Because I have a child with a disability and specific transportation and safety needs, there may be circumstances when riding Muni is not practical for my family. However, as Supervisor, I would make a serious effort to ride the system regularly, speak directly with drivers and passengers, and experience firsthand the safety and service issues they face.

San Franciscans have strongly supported SFMTA's independence from the city's electoral politics in two separate elections over the past several decades, including Prop E in 1999 and Prop A in 2007. What are your positions on SFMTA's independence from the Board of Supervisors and the mayor's office? How would you make SFMTA more accountable to San Franciscans?

I support SFMTA having the professional independence necessary to operate the transportation system, but independence should never mean a lack of accountability. The Board of Supervisors and the public should have meaningful oversight of how money is spent, how service decisions affect neighborhoods, and whether SFMTA is protecting its workforce and riders. My priority would be making sure drivers can do their jobs safely and passengers have safe, reliable transportation.

Transit-only lanes provide faster and more reliable service, and improve safety on busy corridors. They prevent buses from being stuck in traffic and save money that can be reinvested in additional

transit service. Sales tax analysis of recent transit lane projects have shown no measurable negative effects on businesses where transit lanes have been installed. If elected, would you work to expedite the creation of new transit-only lanes in San Francisco? What streets in your district would you prioritize for transit-only lanes and other needed transit improvements? What would you do if those improvements face pushback?

I support transit improvements that make service safer and more reliable, but I would not automatically support putting a transit-only lane on every street. I would look at each proposal individually, including its impact on traffic, residents, small businesses, emergency access, and pedestrian safety. My first priority is protecting drivers and passengers while improving reliability. I also believe residents and businesses should have meaningful input before major street changes are made.

Do you support this year's Proposition H and the Regional Transit Measure (RTM), which together will generate revenue to maintain service for Muni, BART, Caltrain, and other transit agencies?

I support finding sustainable funding that protects essential transit service, but my priority is making sure that funding produces **safe and reliable transportation for passengers and safe working conditions for drivers**. Before committing to any funding measure, I want transparency about how much money will be raised, how it will be spent, and how much will directly support frontline service and safety.

Do you support this year's Proposition G, which will close Sunset Dunes and reopen the Great Highway to cars during weekdays?

This issue is outside District 10, but I believe transportation decisions should balance safety, accessibility, neighborhood needs, traffic impacts, and reliable transportation. I would listen closely to the residents directly affected and review the transportation and safety impacts before taking a position.

Did you support 2024's Proposition L, which would have taxed ride-hail companies to generate up to \$30 million annually for transit in San Francisco?

I support the goal of securing additional funding to protect Muni service, particularly when that money supports **driver and passenger safety, reliable service, and affordable transportation**. For any tax proposal, I also want accountability and transparency so residents know the money is actually being used for its intended purpose.

Board of Supervisors, District 10 | J.R. Eppler

Do you have a section on your website about public transit, transportation, or mobility? If so, please provide a link.

Yes. My transportation platform appears under “Re-Connecting Our District” on my issues page: <https://www.jreppler.com/issues>. It describes my work on the 15 and 55 bus lines and my priorities for stronger transit connections, safe walking and bicycle routes, and an Oakdale Caltrain station.

How do you usually get around San Francisco? Please tell us when and why you use cars, trains, Muni buses, bikes, walking, wheelchairs, or any other mode you frequently use for transportation.

A healthy mix of public transit, my electric bicycle and the car I share with my wife. I also enjoy taking “Muni Adventures” with my son. Those trips are a time to catch up, a chance to explore our city together and teach my son how transit connects our neighborhoods.

How often do you ride public transit?

Almost daily

If elected, what would be your top transportation priorities? This can include priorities related to public transit, active transportation, driving, or any other mode of transportation.

District 10 deserves transit people can count on and streets people can use safely. My priorities are full signal priority for the T Third; stronger east-west and cross-town Muni service, including restoration of the 10 Townsend; and advancing an Oakdale Caltrain station with a credible funding and operating plan.

I would also prioritize safe crossings, continuous sidewalks, and protected bicycle connections from Visitacion Valley and the Bayview to the rest of the city. The City must take responsibility for neglected streets and coordinate maintenance with safety improvements.

We need stable operating funding so better infrastructure comes with frequent service. New development should help fund the transit and street improvements its residents and workers need. I helped establish the 55 Dogpatch and served on the working group for the 15 Bayview-Hunters Point Express. I would bring that same approach to these priorities: listen to riders, develop workable plans, secure funding, and track delivery publicly.

Plans to replace the aging Islais Creek Bridge, which carries the T-Third across the creek between Dogpatch and the Bayview, would sever a major artery and halt light rail service south of UCSF for two years. How would you ensure the replacement is built with minimal service disruption? How will you fight to keep transit riders connected during construction?

The bridge must be replaced safely, but Bayview residents cannot be left with an improvised transit plan for two years. Before construction, I would press Public Works and SFMTA for a fully funded replacement-service plan developed with riders, operators, disability advocates, and merchants.

That plan should include frequent, accessible shuttle buses for the full service day, safe and convenient transfers, clear multilingual information, and transit priority on detour streets so replacement buses do not sit in traffic. The 15 and overnight service also need reliable detours. Riders should not pay an additional fare because construction forces a transfer.

I would seek an independent review of construction staging, prefabrication, and other feasible ways to shorten the closure, without promising rail service where engineering cannot support it. The replacement service should be tested before the bridge closes. Public reporting on travel times, crowding, missed trips, and construction milestones should trigger timely corrections. Maintaining riders' access belongs in the project's funded scope.

D10 residents face congested buses, freeway barriers, and unreliable options that push many to drive. Which specific transit improvements would you champion to make transit a more viable option for more residents?

I would start with trips that are hardest today: getting across the district, connecting Visitacion Valley to the Bayview and Potrero Hill, and reaching jobs and appointments without multiple long waits.

Full T Third signal priority would make the line we already have work better. Stronger cross-town routes, restored 10 Townsend service, and better connections to BART and Caltrain would expand where residents can go. I would press for service levels that address overcrowding on the 8 and 9 corridors and reliable transfers between the 15, 19, 24, 44, and T Third.

An Oakdale Caltrain station could put regional jobs within easier reach of Bayview residents; advancing it requires coordination with Caltrain, capital funding, and a service plan. Safe freeway crossings, accessible stops, and continuous walking and bicycle connections are part of transit access, too. I would use neighborhood travel times, crowding, and missed-service data to prioritize investment, with particular attention to seniors, people with disabilities, and workers traveling outside commute hours.

The [Bayview Shuttle program](#) serves relatively few riders, but among those it serves it is extremely popular – often a lifeline to reach destinations unserved or underserved by fixed-route transit options. The program is currently grant-funded only through November 2027. What is your vision for the future of this program, and how should the city continue to serve the needs of those who rely on it? For example, will you fight for longer-term funding, or for fixed Muni routes to fill in current gaps?

I would fight for a funded continuation plan before the current grant expires. Low ridership alone does not tell us whether a service is valuable: a trip to groceries, medical care, or a transit connection can be essential for someone whose neighborhood lacks alternatives.

SFMTA should evaluate the shuttle with its riders, including wait times, reliability, accessibility, cost per trip, and which destinations fixed routes cannot serve. Where demand is concentrated, frequent fixed-route service may be the better long-term investment. Where hills, disability, or dispersed destinations make that impractical, an accessible on-demand service can fill a real gap.

I would pursue a mix of City funding and eligible state or regional support, while improving outreach and connections to Muni. Any transition should preserve access for current users. The City should not let a grant deadline decide whether a resident can reach a doctor's appointment.

San Francisco's [Transit First Policy](#) applies to all officers, boards, commissions, and departments of the city and county, and states that within San Francisco, travel by public transit, by bicycle and on foot must be an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile. Do you support the principles laid out in the full Transit First Policy?

Yes. I support the full Transit First Policy: safe and efficient movement of people and goods, priority for transit and active transportation in limited street space, accessible pedestrian routes, safe cycling, regional integration, and transportation investment that keeps pace with development.

In District 10, implementing that policy means making the alternatives to driving genuinely useful. Multigenerational households in the Bayview and Visitacion Valley often depend on cars because transit does not serve their trips reliably. I would expand those alternatives while maintaining disability access, paratransit, loading, and essential goods movement.

Transit First should guide budgets, land use, and street design across departments. We should measure whether it delivers shorter trips, safer streets, and affordable access to jobs and services, especially in neighborhoods the City has underserved.

What role do you think law enforcement, fare enforcement, community ambassadors, and private security should play, if any, in patrolling transit? What should Muni do to improve safety and the sense of safety for riders?

Riders and operators deserve a system where harassment, violence, and threats receive a prompt response. Police should address serious crimes and credible threats, with accountable practices. Trained community ambassadors can help riders, de-escalate conflicts, and provide a visible, welcoming presence. Behavioral health crises should receive a clinician-led response when safe, with police backup for genuine danger.

Fare inspectors should focus on fair, consistent compliance and connecting eligible riders with reduced or free fares. Inability to pay should not become a criminal matter. I would require transparent reporting on enforcement and complaints so we can identify discriminatory patterns.

Private security, where used, must have clear duties, training, oversight, and a complaint process; it cannot substitute for public accountability. Safety also requires reliable service, working lights and elevators, clean vehicles and stops, clear reporting tools, and follow-through when riders report problems. We should ask riders and operators whether these measures are improving their daily experience.

Muni funding is on the ballot this year. If Measures H and RTM do not pass, Muni will be facing a deficit of \$322m starting this year, which could lead to cuts of as much as 30% of all Muni service. How should the City address the Muni deficit if these measures do not pass? What kinds of SFMTA cuts would you support or oppose?

I would treat failed measures as a transportation emergency, not permission to dismantle Muni. The City's adopted budget already uses a state loan and savings to preserve near-term service; that is a bridge, not a durable solution.

I would seek additional state and regional operating support and review the City budget for a time-limited contribution with an explicit funding source. SFMTA should also publish an updated contingency plan, scrutinize contracts and interdepartmental charges, and pursue transit-priority improvements that save operating time. No one should pretend administrative savings alone can close a gap of this scale.

I would oppose across-the-board service cuts, loss of essential late-night service, and reductions that strand neighborhoods with few alternatives. I would protect paratransit and maintenance needed for safety and reliability. I would consider deferring lower-priority discretionary spending and capital work where legally available funds can actually support operations. Any unavoidable service changes should be evaluated for equity and connectivity, with riders involved before decisions are made.

Even if both Measure H and RTM pass, they will only generate enough funding to keep Muni running at current levels of service. Do you believe Muni should expand or restore service? If so, what future revenue sources should be on or off the table?

Yes. Stabilizing Muni is the first step; restoring useful routes, increasing frequency, and serving growing neighborhoods must follow. I would prioritize restoration of the 10 Townsend, stronger cross-town connections, crowded routes, and service outside traditional commute hours.

For operations, I would consider dedicated, progressive revenue tied to the people and businesses that benefit from a functioning transportation system, including appropriately designed business or commercial-property taxes and ride-hail taxes. State operating support and fair contributions from major institutions should also be pursued. New development can fund eligible capital improvements, but one-time fees cannot be treated as permanent operating revenue.

Pricing scarce curb space can support transit where good alternatives exist, with protections for disability access and attention to neighborhood conditions. I would oppose relying primarily on higher fares, escalating fines, or parking penalties in transit-poor neighborhoods. Each proposal needs a public revenue estimate, equity analysis, clear uses, and accountability for the service it will deliver.

Since the pandemic, different Bay Area transit agencies have adopted a variety of fare policies to help recover ridership and revenue. This year, the SFMTA Board voted to raise fares to \$3.10 starting in FY27-28, which will be the most expensive base fare for local bus service in the country. Other agencies have [lowered fares](#) or [eliminated fares](#), and have seen ridership grow as a result.

Currently, only about [8%](#) of Muni's total revenue comes from fares.

What role should fares play in the future of Muni? Do you support lowering, freezing, or eliminating fares to grow ridership, or should Muni continue to raise fares to meet rising costs? If you support raising fares, how should Muni address equity concerns for low-income riders? If you support fare-free public transportation, fare freezes, or fare decreases, what alternative funding sources do you support?

Muni should become easier to afford, and fare increases should not be the default response to its budget problems. I favor pursuing a fare freeze backed by replacement funding, preserving existing free and reduced-fare programs, and making enrollment simpler. Fare capping and affordable transfers between agencies help people who cannot pay for a monthly pass up front.

I support moving toward broader fare reductions as stable operating revenue becomes available. I would not promise universal fare-free service without funding the revenue replacement and capacity needed to serve additional riders. A cheaper fare is little help if the bus no longer runs.

Dedicated local and regional revenue, state operating support, appropriately designed ride-hail or business taxes, and savings from faster service should support affordability. Fares should be assessed alongside service quality and household costs, with an equity analysis before changes. The goal is a dependable system people can afford to use, rather than balancing the budget on those who have the fewest alternatives.

A [1993 ballot measure](#) made it official city policy that all elected city officials must ride Muni or other public transit to work at least twice a week. If elected, how closely will you abide by this policy?

I would meet the policy's expectation of taking Muni or other public transit to work at least twice a week and use transit for additional trips when practical. Regular riding should be part of the job: it helps elected officials understand missed connections, crowding, inaccessible stops, and the difference between a schedule and a rider's experience.

I would bring problems I encounter to the agency through the same accountable process I expect for constituents, and follow up on whether they are resolved.

San Franciscans have strongly supported SFMTA's independence from the city's electoral politics in two separate elections over the past several decades, including Prop E in 1999 and Prop A in 2007. What are your positions on SFMTA's independence from the Board of Supervisors and the mayor's office? How would you make SFMTA more accountable to San Franciscans?

I support preserving SFMTA's professional independence in operating the transportation system. Route planning and safety decisions should be grounded in rider needs, evidence, and the City's Transit First Policy, with meaningful public participation.

Independence must come with accountability. The Board of Supervisors should use its lawful budget, legislative, and oversight responsibilities to require clear explanations of spending, service performance, and project delivery. I would seek public reporting on reliability, crowding, accessibility, neighborhood service equity, and the handling of rider complaints.

SFMTA should explain tradeoffs before major changes, engage communities in their languages, and show how feedback affects decisions. Directors and managers should be evaluated on results. I would work with the agency to fix problems and secure funding while respecting the division between elected oversight and day-to-day operations.

Transit-only lanes provide faster and more reliable service, and improve safety on busy corridors. They prevent buses from being stuck in traffic and save money that can be reinvested in additional transit service. Sales tax analysis of recent transit lane projects have shown no measurable negative effects on businesses where transit lanes have been installed. If elected, would you work to expedite the creation of new transit-only lanes in San Francisco? What streets in your district would you prioritize for transit-only lanes and other needed transit improvements? What would you do if those improvements face pushback?

Yes. I would work to accelerate well-designed transit lanes and other improvements that let buses and trains move more people reliably. Full signal priority on Third Street is an immediate priority. I would also press SFMTA to evaluate transit priority on Bayshore Boulevard and San Bruno Avenue, and east-west corridors such as Cesar Chavez and Evans, using actual delay, crowding, street geometry, and safety data to identify the right treatments.

The treatment may be a continuous lane, a queue jump, signal changes, or stop improvements; the goal is a faster, safer trip. Temporary priority on Islais Creek Bridge detours must be part of construction planning.

When there is pushback, I would listen early and address loading, disability access, emergency access, and merchant needs. My work bringing neighbors together around the 17th Street protected bike lane showed the value of resolving concrete concerns. I would publish the evidence, use pilots where useful, and adjust designs based on results while holding to the need for reliable transit.

Do you support this year’s Proposition H and the Regional Transit Measure (RTM), which together will generate revenue to maintain service for Muni, BART, Caltrain, and other transit agencies?

Yes. I support Proposition H and the Regional Transit Measure. District 10 residents need a functioning Muni network and reliable connections to BART, Caltrain, and other regional services. Deep cuts would mean longer trips, more traffic, and fewer opportunities for people who depend on transit.

These measures should come with clear reporting, independent oversight, and an expectation that agencies improve reliability and use resources efficiently. Passing them is a foundation for a stronger system, and I would continue working for the service and connections our neighborhoods need.

Do you support this year’s Proposition G, which will close Sunset Dunes and reopen the Great Highway to cars during weekdays?

No. I support retaining Sunset Dunes as a public park. I also take seriously the concerns of west-side residents who need reliable routes to school, work, and medical appointments. The City should address those trips through safer intersections, better transit connections, and practical traffic management on surrounding streets, while preserving the park's public access.

Did you support 2024’s Proposition L, which would have taxed ride-hail companies to generate up to \$30 million annually for transit in San Francisco?

Yes. I supported asking ride-hail companies to contribute to the public transit system that keeps San Francisco moving. Dedicated transit revenue should help sustain service and reduce reliance on fare increases, with transparent reporting on how the funds are spent.

Other candidates

We attempted to include the below candidates' questionnaire responses in this voter guide, but we did not receive a response from them by publication time:

Office	Candidate	Reason
US Representative, District 11	Connie Chan	No response received.
US Representative, District 15	Charles Hoelter	No response received.
	Kevin Mullin	No response received.
CA State Assembly, District 17	Manuel Noris-Barrera	No response received.
CA State Assembly, District 19	Catherine Stefani	No response received.
	Philip Louis Wing	No response received.
Board of Education	Autumn Brown Garibay	No response received.
	Alida Fisher	No response received.
Community College Board	Ruth Ferguson	No response received.
	Rome Moses Jones	No response received.
	Jeremy Lee	No response received.
	Lisa Wynn	Could not find contact info.
Board of Supervisors, District 2	Nicholas Berg	No response received.
	Guy McCoy	No response received.
	Monthanus Ratanapakdee	No response received.
	Stephen Sherrill	No response received.
Board of Supervisors, District 4	Albert Chow	No response received.
Board of Supervisors, District 8	Darshini Patel	No response received.
	Emanuel "Manny" Yekutieli	No response received.
Board of Supervisors, District 10	Theo Ellington	No response received.
	Ellsworth "Ell" M. Jennison Jr.	Could not find contact info.
	Mike Trouble Lin	No response received.
	Jamo Muhammad	No response received.
	Jessica Pessecow	Could not find contact info.
	Shawn M. Richard	Could not find contact info.



About San Francisco Transit Riders

San Francisco Transit Riders is a rider-centered organization that advocates to make public transit the first choice for getting around San Francisco.

San Francisco Transit Riders staff:

SARA JOHNSON, Executive Director

DYLAN FABRIS, Community & Policy Manager

REANNE LACOSTA, Communications & Membership Manager

JAIME VILORIA, Outreach & Organizing Manager

Ride the Vote voter guide compiled by Dylan Fabris with thanks to SFTR members for their feedback, insight, and support. In particular:

Troy S.	Tommy O.	Christa D.
Sprague T.	Nancy H.	Richard R.
	Gary F.	

We couldn't do any of this work without our members.

[Donate to SFTR to become a member and support more projects like this one!](#)

Follow us @SFTRU: [Instagram](#), [Bluesky](#), [Facebook](#), [LinkedIn](#), [Threads](#), [Twitter](#), [Mastodon](#)
www.sftransitriders.org

The Ride the Vote candidate questionnaire responses and additional ballot information are provided to the public for informational purposes only and do not imply endorsement by San Francisco Transit Riders. San Francisco Transit Riders does not endorse electoral candidates. Responses to this questionnaire are presented as submitted by the candidate unless otherwise noted.