

MINUTES
MEETING OF THE SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

February 12, 2026

[Clerk's note: Except where noted, public, staff and board member comments are paraphrased. The full comment can be heard by reviewing the recording at the [MTS website](#).]

1. Roll Call

Chair Whitburn called the Board meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. A roll call sheet listing Board member attendance is attached as Attachment A.

2. Public Comment

Loree St. Germain – provided a verbal statement to the Board during the meeting. Loree stated that she had submitted a letter regarding two MTS-related incidents and described difficulty delivering it in person and by fax before providing it to the clerk for the record. She stated the letter detailing two MTS incidents, including a bus passing her stop and a driver refusing to let her board at 12th and Imperial. She reported that during the second incident, a homeless individual attempted to take her belongings, and the bus driver left the scene. She also expressed concerns about poor communication and lack of response to her prior complaints.

Miguel Aguirre – provided a verbal statement to the Board during the meeting. Miguel stated that he was the managing partner for Grand Central West, owner of the McDonald's building at the Trolley Station. He explained that he was following up on prior communication regarding the Station. He invited MTS Board Members and the CEO to visit the site and stated that issuing an RFP would attract significant investment, noting stakeholder interest and upcoming major events as opportunities for improvement.

Dale McEnany – provided a verbal statement to the Board during the meeting. Dale stated that as a daily rider and transit advocate, he had received consistent feedback that the Trolley's smell negatively affected perceptions of cleanliness. He suggested that improving odor would be a cost effective way to enhance rider experience and address concerns tied to a proposed fare increase, noting that cleanliness had scored low in a recent MTS survey.

Blair Beekman – provided a verbal statement to the Board during the meeting. Blair stated that he had been a San Diego resident for over three years and a regular bus rider, expressing appreciation for Route 3 and its frequent service. He acknowledged ongoing discussions about potential fare increases and funding challenges and encouraged the Board to pursue more creative, forward thinking solutions rather than relying primarily on fare hikes and service reductions. He also raised concerns about Trolley conditions at night, stating that while he supported cleanliness and sanitation efforts, he believed the vehicles were being kept uncomfortably cold and requested that temperatures be moderated.

CONSENT ITEMS:

3. Approval of Minutes

Action would approve the January 15, 2026 Board of Directors meeting minutes.

4. CEO Report

- 5. Rio Vista Platform Design Phase II – Approval and Adoption of Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, Approval of Project, and Authorization of Engineering and Design Support Work Order**
Action would 1) Adopt Resolution No. 26-02, Approving and Adopting a MND and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the Rio Vista Platform Design Phase II Project and Approving the Project; 2) Ratify Work Order Amendment No. WOA353-AE-09.01, under MTS Document No. PWL353.0-22 with Dokken Engineering (Dokken), in the amount of \$141,335.96, for the development of environmental documents required for construction, and development of 90% construction plans, specifications, and estimates; and 3) Authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute Work Order Amendment No. WOA353-AE-09.02, under MTS Document No. PWL353.0-22 with Dokken, in the amount of \$148,689.69, for implementation and additional engineering and Design Support During Construction (DSDC) services and related right-of-way support for the Rio Vista Platform Design Phase II Project.
- 6. Interior Bus Cleaning Services – Sole Source Contract Award**
Action would authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to: 1) Execute MTS Doc. No. B0788.0-26, with the ARC of San Diego (ARC), for deep cleaning the interiors of San Diego Transit Corporation (SDTC) buses for a five (5) year base period with two (2) 1-year options for a total of seven (7) years in the amount of \$3,710,143.68; and 2) Exercise each option year at the CEO's discretion.
- 7. Purchase of Water - Contract Award**
Action would authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute MTS Doc. No. G3131.0-26, with MJ Service Industries LLC, for the purchase of water for five (5) years in the amount of \$417,446.92 (including 7.75 % CA Sales Tax).
- 8. Printing Timetables – Contract Amendment**
Action would 1) Ratify MTS Doc. No. G2686.1-23, with Neyenesch Printers, Inc. (Neyenesch), in the amount of \$85,805.64; 2) Ratify MTS Doc. No. G2686.2-23 (Amendment 2), with Neyenesch, in the amount of \$55,303.66; and 3) Authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute MTS Doc. No. G2686.3-23 (Amendment No. 3), with Neyenesch, to add \$53,203.74 in additional funds due to an increased demand for printed timetables.
- 9. Proposed Revisions to MTS Policy No. 50 (Engineering and Construction Expense Cost Recovery for Plan Review, Real Estate Actions, and Right of Entry Permits) – Policy Revision**
Action would approve revisions to MTS Policy No. 50 (Engineering and Construction Cost Recovery for Plan Review, Real Estate Actions, and Right of Entry Permits) to increase the current right of entry permit and real estate license fees.
- 10. HPE Synergy Blades and Nimble Storage – Contract Award**
Action would authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute MTS Doc. No. G3105.0-26, with GigaKOM Corporation (GigaKom), a Small Business (SB), for the purchase of HPE Synergy Blades and Nimble Storage, in the amount of \$415,073.54, inclusive of 7.75% CA sales tax.

11. Homeless Encampment Cleanup Services – Contract Award

Action would authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute MTS Doc. No. PWG453.0-26, with Urban Corps of San Diego County (Urban Corps), for on-call homeless encampment cleanup services in the amount of \$763,045.56 for a five (5) year period.

12. Purchase of Oil, Lubricants, and Liquids Contract Award

Action would authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to: 1) Execute MTS Doc. No. G3182.0-26, with Blue Angel International LLC (Blue Angel), a Small Business (SB), for the purchase of Oil, Lubricants, and Liquids for five (5) years in the amount of \$186,999.98 (including 7.75 % CA Sales Tax); and 2) Execute MTS Doc. No. G3183.0-26, with Jamison Transportation Products (Jamison), a SB, for the purchase of Oil, Lubricants, and Liquids for five (5) years in the amount of \$1,023,094.06 (including 7.75 % CA Sales Tax).

13. SAP Support Services – Amendment

Action would authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to execute Amendment No. 1 to MTS Doc. No. G2447.0-21, with Labyrinth Solutions, Inc. (LSI), for additional funds for as-needed SAP Support Services in the amount of \$326,000.00.

14. Operations Budget Status Report for December 2025

Public Comment:

There were no Public Comments.

Board Comment:

There were no Board Comments

Action Taken

Board Member Downey moved to approve Consent Agenda Item Nos. 3 to 14. Vice Chair Goble seconded the motion, and the vote was 13 to 0 in favor with Board Member Elo-Rivera, and Board Member Vaus absent.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

15. California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) Transit Transformation Task Force Report (Michael Pimentel, California Transit Association)

Michael Pimentel, California Transit Association Executive Director, presented on California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) Transit Transformation Task Force Report. He provided details on: California Transit Association, Transit Transformation Task Force, Association’s Advisory Committee, association’s priorities, association’s specific priorities, Transit Transformation Task Force report, and association’s response.

Public Comment

Manny Rodriguez – provided a verbal statement to the Board during the meeting. Manny stated that he was representing Ride SD and expressed disappointment with the report, noting that while the presentation was informative, it lacked clarity about why stronger action was not taken. He asked for greater transparency regarding which members of the task force limited progress,

referencing the mention of “political will.” He emphasized the need for accountability and asked who transit riders should contact to ensure accountability.

Blair Beekman – provided a verbal statement to the Board during the meeting. Blair thanked the Board for the opportunity to comment on the item and stated that it related to his earlier remarks regarding potential transit cuts. He indicated that coordination with San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) on budgeting and best practices would be important in addressing upcoming financial challenges and future planning efforts.

Board Comment

Board Member Montgomery Steppe thanked staff for the presentation and stated that although she appreciated the effort, she was disappointed with the outcome of the task force report. She expressed concern that task force members were reportedly unable to vote on the recommendations submitted to the legislature, describing this as a fundamental procedural issue she wished to explore further. She also noted that many recommendations reflected actions already underway and did not advance more innovative funding ideas, such as alternative tax measures. Ms. Cooney stated that the task force had the first meeting online and every other meeting was in person at different locations, and voted on specific agenda items set by staff, often focused on technical matters. She noted that some votes were split but those divisions were not reflected in the final report. She added that sustainable funding was consistently identified as the top priority but this issue was deferred until the final meeting. She stated that the task force did not vote on or approve the final report submitted to the legislature. Board Member Montgomery Steppe asked about the agenda-setting, stating that typically a Chair works with staff to help shape the agenda. She asked whether members of the task force had taken initiative in influencing agenda items and whether that level of engagement had occurred. Ms. Cooney explained that the Chair of the task force was a member of the CalSTA administration rather than from the transit industry. She stated that members were often frustrated by agenda items that appeared without prior input or clarity regarding their origin. She noted that even discussions held within working groups, including conversations about TDA reform with MTS’s CFO, were not reflected in the final report or recommendations. She added that legal requirements, including Bagley-Keene provisions, may have limited transparency and collaboration, but she emphasized that members were frequently presented with pre-set agenda topics that had not been vetted with them in advance.

Board Member Minto stated that while staff-generated agendas are common in government, they can sometimes focus too heavily on minor or remedial items rather than core policy issues. He suggested that stronger or more dynamic leadership might help guide more substantive discussions. He also asked about the practical consequences of the bill’s outcome, specifically inquiring about the potential operational impacts on MTS resulting from the lack of completed legislative action. Ms. Cooney stated that SB125 was intended as stopgap funding, not a long-term solution to transit’s fiscal challenges. She explained that the task force’s goal was to generate policy recommendations to help transform and strengthen transit systems statewide, and she noted that this broader policy direction was ultimately missing from the final outcome. Board Member Minto stated that the explanation clarified his concerns, stating that without substantive discussion or a defined list of policy actions, meaningful progress could not be achieved.

Chair Whitburn asked Mr. Pimentel to address what he described as a subtext in the discussion regarding what went wrong in the process. He requested clarification on whether there were

specific factors that contributed to the task force's failure to achieve the desired outcomes. He also asked about the anticipated next steps and the direction moving forward. Mr. Pimentel stated that limited progress resulted from structural issues within the task force, including insufficient time dedicated to major topics like sustainable funding and policy development largely driven by CalSTA and staff rather than task force members. He noted that members did not have final oversight of the report and that a supermajority vote to advance funding options was reduced to a footnote rather than included as a formal recommendation. He explained that moving forward, the California Transit Association (CTA) would continue developing legislative priorities, with a strong focus on long-term funding solutions and renewed efforts on TDA reform, emphasizing that CTA would remain actively engaged in shaping those efforts. Chair Whitburn thanked Mr. Pimentel for his insight and participation in the discussion. He also expressed appreciation to CEO Cooney for her efforts related to the matter.

Action Taken

No action taken. Informational item only.

16. San Diego Transit Corporation (SDTC) Pension Investment Status (Erik Williams, with RVK Inc., and Mike Thompson)

Mike Thompson, MTS Deputy Chief Financial Officer, and Erik Williams, RVK Investment Manager, presented on San Diego Transit Corporation (SDTC) Pension Investment Status. They provided details on: Investment structure as of 6/30/2025, investment details as of 6/30/2025, FY 2025 performance, long term performance details, and investment structure summary.

Public Comment

There were no Public Comments.

Board Comment

Board Member Moreno thanked staff for the presentation and asked for clarification regarding which workers are included in the SDTC. Mr. Thompson responded the SDTC represents the bus operations side, including drivers, mechanics, and certain management employees on the bus side.

Action Taken

No action taken. Informational item only.

17. San Diego Transit Corporation (SDTC) Employee Retirement Plan's Actuarial Valuation as of July 1, 2025 (Anne Harper and Alice Alsberghe with Cheiron Inc., and Mike Thompson)

Mike Thomspson, MTS Deputy Chief Financial Officer, Anne Harper, Cheiron, and Alice Alsberghe, Cheiron, presented on San Diego Transit Corporation (SDTC) Employee Retirement Plan's Actuarial Valuation as of July 1, 2025. They discussed: background, plan contributions FY 2026-2027 (based on 2025 Actuarial Valuation), plan history, plan projections, amortization policy review, staff summary, and staff recommendation.

Public Comment

Blair Beekman – provided a verbal statement to the Board during the meeting. Blair thanked the Board for the item and described the presentation as informative and helpful. He stated that he had also intended to comment on the previous item, noting that it provided a clear and educational overview of current pension and financial practices. He expressed appreciation for the transparency and encouraged continued efforts to share similar explanations in the future.

Board Comment

Board Member Downey asked how negotiated wage increases for employees are factored into pension liability projections, specifically whether the liability is adjusted at the time raises are approved or recalculated retroactively. Ms. Harper explained that when employees receive pay raises, those increases are recognized in the year they occur. She stated that the updated salary information is incorporated into actuarial projections at the next valuation, which then adjusts the projected future benefits accordingly. Board Member Downey acknowledged that factors such as increased life expectancy and higher salaries can affect pension liabilities. She asked whether the agency is appropriately accounting for these factors and whether the current funding approach is correct or if any changes should be considered. Ms. Harper confirmed that the plan's assumptions account for projected salary increases and expected retirement timing. She explained that when actual experience differs from assumptions, the resulting gains or losses are recognized and amortized over a set period.

Board Member Bush thanked the consultant team for the report and noted that the visualizations helped clarify complex pension concepts. He stated that it appeared the agency was in a strong position financially and welcomed that assessment, particularly given challenges many public agencies face with pension obligations. He also commended Board Member Moreno for previously raising concerns about pension assumptions. He noted that her earlier caution proved valuable over time and acknowledged her leadership in encouraging the Board to adopt more conservative projections that ultimately benefited the agency. Ms. Harper explained that projections are important for illustrating how liabilities, assets, and the funding policy interact over time. She noted that these projections help both actuaries and Board members better understand how the plan's unfunded liability is expected to be paid down. Board Member Bush stated that he found it difficult to conceptualize the small variance in investment projections, referencing a difference of about \$35,000 and noting that it suggested the projections were essentially very close to the expected outcome. Ms. Harper explained that the plan uses a five-year smoothing method for investment gains and losses, recognizing one-fifth of those changes each year. She noted that this approach stabilizes asset values used in funding calculations and indicated that recent deferred gains may result in additional recognized gains in upcoming years if markets remain stable.

Vice Chair Goble thanked staff for the presentation and moved the staff recommendation and Chair Whitburn seconded the motion.

Board Member Moreno thanked staff for the report. She asked for clarification on a statement made near the end of the presentation regarding the expected funded ratio outlined in the agency's policy, noting that she did not catch the specific details. Ms. Harper explained that under the new or alternative funding policy, the agency is expected to reach 100% funded status by 2045. She emphasized that, based on current assumptions, the funded ratio is projected to increase each year under the policy, with no anticipated annual decreases, provided all actuarial assumptions are met. Board Member Moreno asked staff to quantify the

additional cost associated with extending the amortization period from 12 years to 20 years, specifically requesting the estimated dollar amount of the increased contributions compared to maintaining the current timeline. Ms. Harper explained that extending the amortization period from 12 to 20 years would result in higher total contributions over time due to the longer payment schedule. She stated that the approximate additional cost could be determined by comparing cumulative contributions under the current schedule through 2038 with those projected under the extended schedule. However, she noted that she had not calculated the exact dollar difference. Ms. Cooney stated that the cost difference would depend on investment performance, noting that extending the amortization period could reduce potential investment returns because larger payments are not made upfront. She added that this reflects the broader balance public agencies must maintain between building reserves and funding current needs. Board Member Moreno acknowledged the projected \$5 million near-term savings but noted that extending the amortization period could increase total costs over time. She asked how much additional cost the extension would create under the current assumptions and what impact it might have on future MTS boards. Mr. Thompson explained that the main difference occurs in the later years of the schedule. He stated that the unfunded liability would have been paid off by 2039, with payments typically around \$1 million annually afterward, but under the extended timeline payments of about \$12 million would continue until 2045. He noted that this effectively shifts those costs to future years. Board Member Moreno clarified that the extended schedule would require roughly \$12 million annually in later years and calculated that the change could result in approximately \$102 million in additional costs, based on current assumptions.

Ms. Alsberghe clarified that the additional cost would not total \$102 million because earlier-year contributions would be lower under the extended schedule. She explained that the change reflects a shift from a 12-year to a 20-year payment period, meaning the benefits themselves remain the same while only the timing of payments changes. Board Member Moreno stated that she understood the explanation and noted that there are still active contributions from members who remain part of the pension plan. Ms. Cooney clarified that it is not only member contributions funding the plan. She stated that the agency also contributes to the pension plan each year. Board Member Moreno stated that while she understood the funding sources and budget considerations, she remained uneasy because a specific estimate of the long-term cost had not been provided, noting the difficulty in projecting the total cost through 2046. Ms. Harper estimated that, based on a rough calculation comparing the new amortization schedule with the previous policy, the additional cost would likely fall somewhere between \$25 million and \$40 million. Mr. Thompson stated that the total pension benefits, about \$300 million over 60 years, do not change with the new schedule. He explained that the policy only changes the timing of how the unfunded portion is paid into the plan. Board Member Moreno stated that while the change would save money in the near term, it would likely result in paying \$25–\$40 million more over the extended period. Ms. Harper noted that one important aspect of amortization policies is that the Board has the discretion to change them at any point in the future. Board Member Moreno stated that, given her financially conservative approach and the impact on future Boards, she was not comfortable supporting the proposal and was leaning toward a no vote.

Chair Whitburn asked whether the Board already had the necessary data to calculate the difference in total contributions by simply adding the projected payments under the current amortization policy through 2046 and comparing them with those under the proposed policy. Ms. Harper explained that when reviewing the extended amortization projections, the figures after 2039 include approximately \$1–\$1.5 million annually in normal cost payments for remaining plan members. She noted that these amounts would need to be subtracted, roughly

\$10 million in total, when comparing the policies to estimate the true difference. Mr. Thompson stated that the exact figure was not immediately available but noted an estimate of \$25–\$40 million, emphasizing that the payments would go into the agency’s own pension plan. Ms. Cooney stated that any cost estimate would ultimately be a best estimate based on current actuarial assumptions and the plan’s expected 6% investment return.

Board Member Moreno stated for the record that she and her staff had requested the cost estimate the day prior to the meeting.

Chair Whitburn asked whether extending the amortization schedule would simply spread payments over a longer period or whether it would result in additional costs, similar to the extra interest incurred when refinancing a home over a longer term. Ms. Harper explained that extending the amortization from 12 to 20 years is similar to refinancing a mortgage: payments are lower annually but spread over a longer period, resulting in more interest paid into the pension fund over time. Ms. Alsberghe explained that the plan’s unfunded liability is about \$150 million. She stated that paying it over 20 years instead of 12 lowers near-term payments but increases total interest, while both approaches still reach full funding, the difference is the timing of payments. Chair Whitburn stated that he supported extending the payments and understood it would create some additional long-term cost. However, he reiterated Board Member Moreno’s question, suggesting the total difference could likely be determined quickly by adding the projected payments under each scenario, and asked whether that calculation could be done promptly. Ms. Cooney asked staff whether someone from the budget team could perform the calculation during the meeting to determine the cost difference between the two amortization schedules.

Board Member Minto stated that the cost difference is more complex than simply adding the payments because multiple financial factors affect the outcome. He explained that investment returns and compounding on funds saved in earlier years could offset some of the additional interest from extending the amortization period. He noted that because future returns and savings are uncertain, the actual cost difference could vary and may be lower, or potentially higher, than rough estimates such as \$40 million. Ms. Harper stated that cost estimates depend on actuarial assumptions used to calculate liabilities. She noted that actual contributions will ultimately be determined by the plan’s real-world experience, which affects the cost of providing benefits. Board Member Minto stated that plan costs can also change based on workforce size and retirement trends, making it difficult to determine an exact long-term cost estimate.

Board Member Downey stated that the difficulty in determining a precise cost estimate relates to the smoothing process used for investment returns. She noted that returns vary each year and are averaged over a set period, which makes it challenging to project an exact figure, and she referenced earlier clarification that the plan would still meet its funding targets under that approach. Ms. Harper explained that the asset smoothing mechanism is already incorporated into the projected contribution amounts. She added that the projections assume the plan will earn an average 6% return annually on a market value basis going forward.

Board Member Elo-Rivera asked whether the analysis accounts for the difference between the present and future value of money when comparing payments made in different years. Ms. Harper clarified that the projected contribution amounts are shown in today’s dollars. She explained that while the liabilities are discounted to present value, the listed contribution amounts, such as the \$13 million projected for 2038, are expressed in current-dollar terms. Board Member Elo-Rivera stated that when discussing costs being pushed into the future, those

amounts are expressed in present-day dollars. He noted that payments made later will likely have lower real value than payments made earlier due to changes in the value of money over time, though he acknowledged this cannot be calculated with exact precision. Ms. Harper explained that the pension plan is closed, meaning liabilities are expected to decline each year as the participant population decreases. She noted that the plan uses a conservative 6% assumed rate of return aligned with its asset allocation, along with conservative assumptions including mortality projections. She stated that these factors reduce overall risk compared with many other pension plans.

Larry Marinesi, MTS Chief Financial Officer (CFO), stated that a quick calculation of the projected contributions suggested a difference of about \$51 million. He emphasized that the total benefits paid over the life of the plan would ultimately remain the same, and that the key issue is the timing of payments, whether to contribute more upfront to generate investment returns or reduce near-term contributions given current fiscal constraints. Chair Whitburn asked for confirmation that the total amount of money paid into the system would ultimately be the same regardless of whether the amortization period is shorter or extended. Ms. Harper clarified that contributions into the pension system are designed to pre-fund benefits so that assets accumulate with interest and can pay members when benefits are due. She explained that actuaries estimate liabilities based on assumptions about investment returns, demographics, and other factors, and the unfunded actuarial liability represents the gap between expected assets and projected obligations. She noted that changes in assumptions, such as lower investment returns or shifts in the retiree population, can significantly alter the liability and required contributions. She emphasized that the payment schedule is designed to address the current unfunded liability, but the actual cost of the plan ultimately depends on future experience, including investment performance and changes in the plan's membership. Chair Whitburn clarified that the question concerned the total projected contributions under the current amortization schedule compared with the proposed 20-year schedule, assuming all other factors remain constant. He noted that extending the amortization would increase total contributions by approximately \$51 million. Ms. Harper clarified that the \$51 million increase is an expected estimate, emphasizing that it is based on assumptions and projections rather than a guaranteed outcome.

Ms. Cooney stated that the proposal is part of a broader strategy to extend available operating and capital funds and help the agency reach 2030 without hitting a fiscal cliff. She noted that the discussion should also consider the benefits of avoiding service cuts and deferred maintenance, which could create higher costs in the future. She emphasized that the goal is to balance financial sustainability while continuing to provide reliable transit service to the community.

Action Taken

Vice Chair Goble moved to 1) Receive the SDTC Employee Retirement Plan's (Plan) Actuarial Valuation as of July 1, 2025 (Attachment A and B), 2) Adopt the staff recommended UA amortization from the current 12-year remaining term to recalibrated 20-year amortization; and 3) Adopt the resulting pension contribution amount of \$16,470,975 for FY 2027 (Attachment B – Page B-9). Chair Whitburn seconded the motion, and the vote was 12 in favor (Board Member Downey, Board Member Fernandez, Board Member Foster, Board Member Mendoza, Board Member Minto, Board Member Bush, Board Member Leyba-Gonzalez, Board Member Montgomery Steppe, Board Member Dillard, Board Member Elo-Rivera, Chair Whitburn, and Vice Chair Goble) to 2 Board Members opposed (Board Member McCann and Board Member Moreno), with Board Member Vaus absent.

OTHER ITEMS:

18. Chair, Board Member and Chief Executive Officer's (CEO's) Communications

Board Member Leyba-Gonzalez stated that several small business owners near Sea Coast had asked about the status of CCTV security cameras that were expected to be installed at the new bus stops in the area. He noted that while the new stops had been well received, the cameras had not yet been installed, and he requested an update and potential timeline so he could relay that information back to the business owners.

Board Member Mendoza introduced Board Member Smith as the newest member of the Lemon Grove City Council, noting that he was appointed to fill Mr. Faiai's seat. She also stated that he would serve as her alternate on the Board. Chair Whitburn congratulated Councilmember Smith, noting that the Board looked forward to his participation when appropriate.

Board Member Montgomery Steppe thanked CEO Cooney and staff for organizing the Rosa Parks Transit Equity Day celebration at Mesa College. She noted that the event included a proclamation presentation, recognition of artist Ibn Edwards, who designed the Black History Month PRONTO card and related bus wrap, and participation from college and district leadership. She added that the event honored Rosa Parks' role in transit equity and also recognized Claudette Colvin, whose earlier act of resistance helped inspire the civil rights movement.

Board Member Downey noted that a public commenter at SANDAG suggested adding electric scooter charging stations near transit stops to support riders who use scooters for first- and last-mile travel. She shared the idea with MTS staff for awareness while SANDAG explores the concept.

Vice Chair Goble thanked staff for installing additional bus benches in El Cajon, noting that the hotter temperatures in the area make seating important for riders waiting for buses. He expressed appreciation for the improvement to rider comfort.

19. Remainder of Public Comments Not on The Agenda

There were no additional public comments.

ADJOURNMENT

20. Next Meeting Date

The next regularly scheduled Board meeting is March 19, 2026 at 9:00 a.m.

21. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:56 a.m.

/s/ Stephen Whitburn
Chairperson
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System

Filed by:

Approved as to form:

/s/ Lucia Mansour
Clerk of the Board
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System

/s/ Karen Landers
General Counsel
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System

Attachment: A. Roll Call Sheet

SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
ROLL CALL

MEETING OF (DATE): February 12, 2026 CALL TO ORDER (TIME): 9:00 a.m.
 RECESS: _____ RECONVENE: _____
 CLOSED SESSION: _____ RECONVENE: _____
 ORDINANCES ADOPTED: _____ ADJOURN: 10:56 p.m.

JURISDICTION	BOARD MEMBER		ALTERNATE		PRESENT (TIME ARRIVED)	ABSENT (TIME LEFT)
City of Chula Vista	Cesar Fernandez	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jose Preciado	<input type="checkbox"/>	9:00 a.m.	10:56 p.m.
City of Chula Vista	John McCann	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jose Preciado	<input type="checkbox"/>	9:00 a.m.	10:56 p.m.
City of Coronado	Carrie Downey	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mark Fleming	<input type="checkbox"/>	9:00 a.m.	10:56 p.m.
County of San Diego	Monica Montgomery Steppe	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Paloma Aguirre	<input type="checkbox"/>	9:08 a.m.	10:56 p.m.
City of El Cajon	Steve Goble (Vice-Chair)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Phil Ortiz	<input type="checkbox"/>	9:00 a.m.	10:56 p.m.
City of Imperial Beach	Matthew Leyba- Gonzalez	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mitch McKay	<input type="checkbox"/>	9:00 a.m.	10:56 p.m.
City of La Mesa	Patricia Dillard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mark Arapostathis	<input type="checkbox"/>	9:00 a.m.	10:56 p.m.
City of Lemon Grove	Jennifer Mendoza	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jessyka Heredia	<input type="checkbox"/>	9:00 a.m.	10:56 p.m.
City of National City	Marcus Bush	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jose Rodriguez	<input type="checkbox"/>	9:08 a.m.	10:56 p.m.
City of Poway	Steve Vaus	<input type="checkbox"/>	Peter De Hoff	<input type="checkbox"/>	ABSENT	ABSENT
City of San Diego	Vivian Moreno	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jennifer Campbell	<input type="checkbox"/>	9:00 a.m.	10:56 p.m.
City of San Diego	Sean Elo-Rivera	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Joe LaCava	<input type="checkbox"/>	10:05 a.m.	10:56 p.m.
City of San Diego	Todd Gloria	<input type="checkbox"/>	Henry Foster	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9:08 a.m.	10:52 a.m.
City of San Diego	Stephen Whitburn (Chair)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kent Lee	<input type="checkbox"/>	9:00 a.m.	10:56 p.m.
City of Santee	Ronn Hall	<input type="checkbox"/>	Laura Koval John Minto	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9:00 a.m.	10:56 p.m.

SIGNED BY THE CLERK OF THE BOARD: /s/ Lucia Mansour