



DRAFT MINUTES

Citizens Advisory Committee

Wednesday, July 22, 2020

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Larson called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

CAC Members Present: Robert Gower, David Klein, John Larson, Jerry Levine, Stephanie Liu, Kevin Ortiz, Peter Tannen, Danielle Thoe, Sophia Tupuola, and Rachel Zack (10)

CAC Members Absent: none (0)

Transportation Authority staff members present were Tilly Chang, Michelle Beaulieu, Cynthia Fong, Rachel Hiatt, Anna LaForte, Maria Lombardo, Yvette Lopez-Jessop, Hugh Louch, Kaley Lyons, Mike Pickford, Eric Young, and Luis Zurinaga (Consultant).

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Larson reported that Items 6 and 7 were continued from the June CAC meeting due to time constraints and the items were approved on first reading at the July 14 Board meeting, so there was still opportunity for CAC members to weigh in on those items. He added that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and Association of Bay Area Governments requested the public to provide feedback at an upcoming digital workshop on July 29 to inform the region's Plan Bay Area 2050. Chair Larson also reported that Member Danielle Thoe requested an urgent item related to a proposed Caltrain sales tax measure be agendized at that evening's meeting.

Ms. Thoe commented that staff had forwarded to CAC members a Caltrain tax measure resolution just introduced at the Board of Supervisors' (BOS') meeting the day prior, with the BOS intending to act on the measure on July 28 and SFMTA on August 4. She added that since there was an August 7 deadline for Caltrain to take the final vote to place the measure on the November 2020 regional ballot, there was an urgency to agendize the Caltrain 1/8-cent sales tax topic in order for CAC members to discuss the item and provide input.

There was no public comment on the Chair's Report.

Danielle Thoe moved to agendize the urgent Caltrain sales tax item, seconded by Robert Gower.

The item was agendized, without objection, by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Tannen, Thoe, Tupuola, and Zack (10)

Absent: none (0)



Consent Agenda

3. **Approve the Minutes of the June 24, 2020 Meeting - ACTION***
4. **Quarterly Investment and Debt Compliance Report - INFORMATION***
5. **Progress Report for Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project - INFORMATION***

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

David Klein moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Rachel Zack.

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Tannen, Thoe, Tupuola, and Zack (10)

Absent: none (0)

End of Consent Agenda

6. **Adopt a Motion of Support for the Approval of the Fiscal Year 2020/21 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program of Projects - ACTION***

Mike Pickford, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item.

Member Peter Tannen asked if there was feedback on how successful the e-bike program had been to date. Mr. Pickford answered that SFMTA had provided a study from Portland State University, showing that e-bike subsidies proved successful in reducing emissions and sometimes were more cost-efficient than providing subsidies for electric vehicles. Mr. Tannen asked for the link to the study and Mr. Pickford agreed to send it to CAC members.

Member David Klein asked about the placement of the new bike racks and clarification on the expansion of locations for the service. Mr. Pickford answered that staff could provide the link to SFMTA's online map of the rack placement throughout the City, as well as information on project requests and outreach being done by SFMTA.

Mr. Klein asked if there was any information on the PresidioGo bus capacity, whether buses were being replaced or extended. Mr. Pickford answered that the Presidio project was to replace an existing bus with a transit-style bus similar to those at UCSF. Emily Beaulac, Transportation Operations Specialist at the Presidio Trust, added that it had a 22-seat capacity with standing room sections.

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy & Programming, asked Jason Hyde, Senior Transportation Planner at SFMTA, to speak on how locations were prioritized for bike parking. Mr. Hyde explained that a lot of racks were requested by the public but staff also proactively targeted installations in Communities of Concern, using information from neighborway / corridor projects, bike share/scooter share programs, and gap locations on the map where usages were high.

CAC Member Kevin Ortiz asked which organizations were being considered for outreach to Communities of Concern for the Emergency Ride Home program. Alex Bogdan, Senior Marketing and Community Engagement Manager at the Department of the Environment, answered that staff had not yet identified specific organizations but that the agency had a robust database of Community Based Organizations (CBOs) and a team that conducts ongoing outreach throughout San Francisco. She added she could follow-up to obtain specific names and contacts, if desired.



Mr. Ortiz asked how were applications received in regards to undocumented persons and communities of color that might not have access to internet. Sidd Mandava, Planner at SFMTA, answered that the first part of the program included outreach through CBOs community based transportation plans, and Board of Supervisors' offices. He said they would also have hard copy applications and translate them into at least Spanish, Mandarin, and Filipino.

CAC member Rachel Zack asked what the projected use of the Emergency Ride Home project would be or numbers from last year. Mike Pickford explained that the effectiveness is not measured by how many rides it provides since the program is meant to provide a level of comfort or reassurance to folks that they have a ride home if they need it. Alex Bogdan, Department of the Environment, said the program limits usage to 4-5 times per year per individual and pre-COVID they usually saw 4-5 reimbursements per month, which has declined during shelter-in-place. Ms. Bogdan noted that the program previously lacked funds to support outreach and translations, activities which are included in the current funding request. She said they hope to improve outreach to communities of color, non-English speakers and that this would improve usage, but there is no data yet to make a projection. Mr. Pickford provided a brief overview of the Air District's cost-effectiveness methodology for this type of project, e.g. the sponsor is allowed to use the San Francisco workforce, which is a large population, as the basis for evaluating program effectiveness.

CAC member Sophia Tupuola shared her concern around the lack of usage of the current bike racks and how she is hearing concerns about the loss of parking spaces. She acknowledged the desire to move to more sustainable modes of travel, but noted in many communities of concern, travelling by car is the only safe way to move around. She asked what type of program and outreach will be implemented to communities of concern to ensure more usage of the bike racks. Member Kevin Ortiz echoed Ms. Tupuola's comments and requested that the SFMTA provide concrete outreach plans with a list of who they plan to talk to so the CAC can review the list and provide feedback to the SFMTA. Mike Pickford answered that he would pass down the information and have the SFMTA project manager get in touch.

Danielle Thoe asked how SFMTA chooses their funding sources for the new bike racks noting other types of investments might result in greater emissions reductions. Mike Pickford responded that their funding plan includes TFCA, programmed Prop K sales tax funds and revenue from the bike share and scooter share programs. Ms. Thoe noted that there seem to be about 300 requests for bike racks per year, which seems to indicate the need for a stable funding source rather than competitive grants.

Mr. Larson noted for this source, staff makes decisions about priorities based on what has been submitted. He observed that it may seem odd that the Emergency Ride Home Program is tied to clean air and yet e-bikes, which seem so logically in the wheel house of this program needs some sort of dispensation, but that is a reflection of the current program requirements established by the Air District.

There was no public comment.

Stephanie Liu moved to approve the item, seconded by Rachel Zack.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Tannen, Thoe, Tupuola, and Zack (10)



Absent: none (0)

7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Affirm the San Francisco County Transportation Authority's Commitment to Supporting Efforts to Improve Cost-Effectiveness and to Advance Equity in Project Development and Delivery for Certain San Francisco Projects Proposed for Plan Bay Area 2050 - ACTION*

Michelle Beaulieu, Principal Transportation Planner, Government Affairs, presented the item.

David Klein asked what the threshold was for receiving an equity flag in the Plan Bay Area process, commenting that there are so many considerations factoring into equity that it doesn't seem possible to have a single measure for equity.

Ms. Beaulieu acknowledged that the Plan Bay Area approach was just one way to assess equity. For this purpose, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission divided high and low income at the 50% household income level and then used a ratio, e.g. if more benefits accrue to folks in the lower half of income, that project was deemed as advancing equity. Mr. Klein noted San Francisco would skew toward higher income given the population demographics versus another county like Solano. Ms. Beaulieu acknowledged this was accurate and stated that staff appreciates MTC setting this process up to raise equity flags and then asking congestion management agencies to respond with ways they will help to advance equity. She continued to note that this is why the proposed staff response points to the transit affordability programs that SFMTA already has in place as one example.

Mr. Klein noted that this equity methodology not capture the impacts of when high speed transit comes into an area that didn't have it before and suddenly that area becomes a very desirable place to live, and the very people you were trying to benefit may not be there as much. This is an example of the many angles to consider.

Ms. Beaulieu agreed noting that PBA 2050 addresses more than transportation. She said it also has a land use component that is making recommendations for things like tenant protection programs and planning for additional funding for affordable funding in the region.

There was no public comment.

Robert Gower moved to approve the item, seconded by Danielle Thoe.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Tannen, Thoe, Tupuola, and Zack (10)

Absent: none (0)

Caltrain Sales Tax Measure - INFORMATION/ACTION

Chair Larson called the Caltrain sales tax measure item for discussion.

Ms. Thoe introduced the item and elaborated on the background of the Caltrain sales tax measure which is under consideration for potential placement on the November 2020 ballot. She noted that Caltrain has no dedicated source of revenues and this makes it difficult to budget and plan since each year the amount of funding it will have is subject to negotiations among the members agencies. She also noted that there have been long standing governance issues related to Caltrain. Ms. Thoe said that she'd been tracking the Caltrain sales tax issue and saw that the San Francisco Board of Supervisors



(BOS) recently had proposed some governance provisions as part of the resolution that would support the Caltrain sales and those provisions would affect how and when the sales tax revenues could be disbursed to Caltrain. Ms. Thoe thanked staff for providing some background to her in advance of the meeting and asked staff to explain to the CAC the latest proposals and provide some context for how we got to the current situation, and what the options were on the table. She concluded by noting that District 6 has the most dangerous streets in the city and the most used Caltrain station in the city. She emphasized the importance of retaining Caltrain as a commute option for District 6 residents and expressed concern about post shelter-in-place impacts on congestion if Caltrain is unable to run regular service.

Director Chang thanked the CAC for allowing time in the meeting to discuss the item and further discussed the history and background of the Caltrain sales tax measure. She said yesterday three members of the San Francisco BOS introduced a Caltrain sales tax ballot measure resolution that included a set of provisions that they felt laid out the most responsible and comprehensive path for future Caltrain operations, long-term development, modernization, and increased service reliability, by addressing new revenue sources and establishing a process and timetable to address governance and accountability reforms. She said the resolution also provides funds for the immediate and continued operation of Caltrain service. Director Chang noted Caltrain governance is not a new issue and acknowledged it is very complex and frustrating, saying that staff shares the frustration with the public that has received a patchwork of information through social media and the press.

Director Chang continued by explaining that Supervisor Walton is one of three San Francisco Caltrain directors, with San Mateo and Santa Clara counties having three directors each, as well. She said the Caltrain sales tax committee and the ad hoc governance committee have been working collaboratively over the past year. She stated that 18-months ago Supervisor Walton - and she believed Mayor Liccardo of San Jose, had raised the need to address governance in parallel with discussions of a permanent revenue measure for Caltrain, which is needed for near term operations and the future development of Caltrain toward electrification and the long term vision described in Caltrain's Business Plan. Director Chang recounted that Supervisor Walton in his capacity as a Caltrain director had some trouble getting governance related items agendaized at the Caltrain Board last fall. Eventually, a governance-related item was agendaized and this led to the formation of ad hoc governance committee comprised of Caltrain Directors Walton, Cindy Chavez (Santa Clara) and David Pine (San Mateo). This committee worked with independent counsel to try and understand the ways Caltrain governance is currently set out in various agreements. For example, one real property agreement gave Samtrans certain governance rights (such as being the managing agency for Caltrain) in exchange for forgiving a portion of debt owed to Samtrans for purchase of original right-of-way for Caltrain. Another provision allows the same person who is the CFO and CEO of Samtrans to serve as the CEO of Caltrain. Director Chang said a lot of this information was aired publicly for the first time at the July 9 meeting of the ad hoc governance committee which despite good faith efforts that extended through the ensuing weekend, did not allow enough time for partner counties to come to agreement on a path forward before the San Francisco BOS July 14 deadline for November ballot submittals. Director Chang explained that Supervisors Walton and Peskin wanted to find a path forward that provided confidence that governance studies would continue in a timely way and that there would be CEO accountability to the Caltrain Board given that Samtrans currently has authority over the CEO position.



Director Chang further said that Supervisor Walton had long been raising concerns about the regressivity of the sales tax, and noted that this issue and governance came together for him given that the ability to manage the risk of regressivity lies heavily on the ability to shape policy and the ability to ensure equal representation. Director Chang noted that over the past year, it has been good to see responsiveness to Supervisor Walton's request for certain provisions in the ballot measure to create affordable fares; he helped support a means based fare pilot; and Caltrain staff has produced an equity study which helps identify the demographics of Caltrain riders which can inform planning to increase moderate and lower income riders. Director Chang continued by saying that Supervisor Walton wanted to ensure that this work would continue and to ensure equal representation for both San Francisco and Santa Clara noting that 80% of Caltrain revenue is generated in the two counties. She said her understanding was that Caltrain Director Chavez shared some of the same concerns.

Director Chang said that after the San Francisco BOS declined to introduce the Caltrain sales tax measure on July 14, San Francisco and Santa Clara elected officials along with members of the State Legislative delegation issued a joint statement calling for continued collaboration and problem solving to find a path forward. Ultimately, the agreed to language for the Caltrain sales tax resolution would provide for \$40 million to go directly towards immediate and continued Caltrain operations with another \$40 million at a second time point, with these points providing a timeline to come to agreement on governance. Director Chang explained that throughout this period Caltrain could access additional funds via a 2/3 vote of the Caltrain Board, otherwise the sales tax revenues would remain in a Caltrain-held escrow account. Another key time point is December 2022, if a governance solution is not reached, all parties agree to seek assistance from the state legislature (2023 legislation session) to resolve the matter. Director Chang closed by saying the resolution doesn't mandate a specific governance solution, it provides a timeline to do so, while providing funds for Caltrain to continue operations in the meantime.

Chair Larson asked if San Mateo and Santa Clara counties must pass resolutions with the same language for the escrow account to be legally binding and if the governance provisions would be in the ballot language. Director Chang answered that her understanding was that the escrow language would not be included in the ballot and affirmed that all the other member agencies would have to approve the exact same provisions.

Chair Larson asked how confident San Francisco was that the other participating agencies would take similar action. Director Chang answered that she couldn't speak for the other parties but her understanding was that Santa Clara would seek to pass their resolution by August 6, the day the Caltrain Board would take their final action. She added the San Francisco supervisors' goal was to have timely conversation and progress about governance and that they were open to feedback or ideas to address the issues. Director Chang noted that there was a useful governance study that was produced as part of the Caltrain Business Plan process. She suggested that interested CAC members review the Caltrain Board meeting of July 9 for additional information on governance.

Jerry Levine asked when the sales tax would expire. Director Chang adding that it was estimated at \$100 million annually, pre-COVID. [Chief Deputy Lombardo responded later in the meeting that it was being proposed as a 30-year sales tax.]



Ms. Thoe asked if Caltrain staff would be able to address the CAC at some point and if the sales tax would be able to address Caltrain's immediate funding needs.

Director Chang answered that Transportation Authority staff were only able to confirm agendaizing the topic late that day and had extended the invitation late in the day to Caltrain General Manager/CEO Director Jim Hartnett and his staff to come speak at CAC this evening if they were available or if not, invite them to come to the CAC at a future date if desired. She added staff of each operating agency were working together to determine the immediate funding need for the following year's service. Director Chang cited significant fare losses with COVID, e.g. Caltrain ridership has plummeted to 5% of pre-COVID levels. She said Caltrain, like other transit operators, was having to make tough decisions given the financial conditions. She said if the sales tax passes, the \$40 million should be enough to cover the COVID-fare revenue losses and keep the service running, but if they need more, the Caltrain Board would have the option to access additional funds from the escrow account with two-thirds vote under the new proposal.

David Klein commented that he was unsure if he could support the sales tax measure because the majority of Caltrain ridership are people with high salaries and at companies making billions of dollars. He commented that the measure seemed to be taxing the common person disproportionately more than the more wealthy person, that everyone was having to pay for a rail system that not everyone benefited from.

Ms. Thoe commented that she had also grappled with the same issue that Mr. Klein mentioned, but as she researched the issue she has become more excited about the future possibilities, citing the fare discount program introduced by Supervisor Walton and comparison of fares where, for example, San Francisco to San Bruno fare is cheaper than a full fare Muni ride and it would be cheaper with a discount. Ms. Thoe commented that talking Caltrain between Bayshore to 4th and King Station is the fastest way between those two points on public transit. Ms. Thoe agreed there was not an equitable distribution of ridership on Caltrain that reflects the community demographic but hoped that this is an opportunity to highlight the discount programs and Caltrain as an option and hoped that some of the regressiveness of the sales tax will be offset by some of the programs that Caltrain can provide and additional service, making it a more equitable system.

Chair Larson appreciated Ms. Thoe's points, noting that most people probably don't think about Caltrain as an intra-San Francisco commute option.

Member Rachel Zack asked what the other options were for resolving the governance issue, expressing concern about putting a major piece of public infrastructure in danger.

Director Chang replied that there may not be another clear path at this point, and added that this compromise was crafted working with colleagues in the south bay. She noted that the San Francisco supervisors shared the concerns Mr. Klein raised. Director Chang said the language has been introduced and could be changed, but would need to be mirrored in actions across the other approving bodies (7 in total), and to receive support from Supervisors Walton and Peskin would need to achieve the objectives and commitments sought by the supervisors. She reiterated that governance was important in managing the risk of regressivity through policy making, and there was still a little bit of time to change language to the ballot measure to find compromise language that would be amiable for San Mateo County as well.

Stephani Liu asked about the financial situation if additional federal relief funds were



not made available and if the ballot measure was not passed. Director Chang noted that many operators, not just Caltrain, would be facing increased financial challenges if there is not another tranche of federal relief funds. With respect to Caltrain, she said staff would find funds elsewhere to continue essential Caltrain service operations for the next two years, bridging the gap to the next election, and hoping that there is a recovery around that time. Director Chang said in her opinion there is no existential threat to not passing the measure this year, noting that Senator Jerry Hill's Senate Bill 797 does not appear to include a sunset date, so partner agencies could keep trying to pass a measure at the ballot. Emphasized that it isn't just Caltrain facing these financial challenges, but also Muni and other operators around the bay. She emphasized the importance of staying focused on the actual need when determining what level of essential services was appropriate.

During public comment, Roan Katal commented that even though San Francisco had committed to helping Caltrain, Santa Clara may have had a tougher decision since they also needed to fund their own transit system, the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, and he requested Caltrain not be put at the mercy of that decision. He also commented that Caltrain Board passed a business plan in the previous year that addressed equity concerns, particularly the lack of daytime service, and recognized that if they provide (pre-COVID) BART style service they could get BART style ridership.

Ms. Thoe asked Director Chang what would happen if one of the other counties did not contribute their portion of funding saying she had heard that if one of the member agencies doesn't contribute all their funds, the others often follow suit. She asked if one of the other counties couldn't or didn't want to contribute funds politically, would San Francisco work to ensure there was at least service for its residents, or what the options would be.

Director Chang acknowledged that the financial situation was dire all around. In the past, when another member county didn't provide all the funds for whatever reason, sometimes the other members followed suit. On other occasions, counties had loaned money to one another, and asking the region for funding help was another option. Ms. Chang said ultimately, it came down to a policy decision within each county taking into consideration all the other needs they have to address. Chief Deputy Director Lombardo affirmed Director Chang's comments and added that there was still the possibility of additional federal relief as well.

Chair Larson asked for assistance in crafting language for a potential motion, reminding members that the sales tax resolution the CAC has been discussing is a resolution to place a measure on the ballot, and the

Ms. Liu commented that she would be supportive of any agreement the counties could make amongst each other and the priority should be to get something on the ballot for the voters to decide.

Robert Gower agreed that a more general motion would be preferable.

Director Chang suggested that the CAC could pass a motion of support for the resolution as introduced or amended by the sponsoring supervisors (Walton, Peskin, Haney), which would recognize all the work that had gone into developing the resolution while giving the sponsors the flexibility to respond to modifications proposed by other member agencies, acknowledging ongoing conversations between elected officials and their representatives, while having the flexibility of the CAC's support.

Mr. Gower asked for further clarification on how this topic.



Director Chang clarified that the goal was for all three counties (rather than just two) represented in the Caltrain Governance Ad Hoc Committee to be unanimous in bringing forth the measure to the voters, so that was why she made the recommendation of allowing flexibility of supervisorial sponsors' decisions to amend the motion.

Peter Tannen spoke in favor of the CAC approving something along the lines of general support, recognizing the complexity of the situation.

Chair Larson made a motion in agreement with what Director Chang recommended, stating that it was important to acknowledge the efforts put forth by the Supervisors to assure San Francisco communities were well represented, especially from an equity standpoint. He said he didn't want a motion that just supports putting the sales tax measure on the ballot with the message that here is the money and continue proceeding as before.

John Larson moved to support the Caltrain sales tax resolution as written or amended by the three supervisorial sponsors (Walton, Peskin, Haney), seconded by Jerry Levine.

There was no public comment on the new motion.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Tannen, Thoe, Tupuola, and Zack (9)

Abstains: Ortiz (1)

Absent: none (0)

Chair Larson thanked Danielle Thoe for agendizing the Caltrain item and enabling this important discussion. He said he hoped that this crisis would provide an opportunity for Caltrain to really rethink about what it had been doing and, hopefully, to be able to implement what the CAC heard about in the Caltrain Business Plan.

Ms. Thoe also thanked staff for helping to agendize the item and providing background to her and the CAC.

8. Progress Report for the Central Subway Project - INFORMATION*

Luis Zurinaga, project management oversight consultant to the Transportation Authority, and Nadeem Tahir, Program Director, Central Subway, presented the item.

Jerry Levine commented about the substantial amount of federal funds in the project and he said he recalled a federal requirement of 2% for art and other amenities. He asked if this was being applied to this project.

Mr. Nahir said there was a robust art program and SFMTA works with the Art Commission. The latter commissioned all the art work that was determined through a competition.

Peter Tannen asked what the complications with the auto train control and radio systems are that have exasperated the most recent delays.

Mr. Nahir said the train control and radio systems were designed around 2010 at the start of the project. Since then, SFMTA has changed some of the requirements that are now being implemented on the existing system as well. This triggered re-designs for the Central Subway, the need for contractor negotiations, and change orders - all of which took some time to complete.



Mr. Tannen asked for more information about the delay in committed funds as outlined in the memo.

Tom Maguire, Sustainable Streets Division Director, SFMTA said the memo is thorough in talking about areas where the schedule has slipped, and that it is tracking to go a little over budget; however, Mr. Maguire said SFMTA will not know with certainty if they are above or below the budget until closer to completion. He reported that the SFMTA has a rainy-day fund for situations like this with funding in place for potential overruns. He said the memo has the best estimate available now but cautioned as we get to the end of a large, complex project like this we learn a lot more. Mr. Maguire estimated that they would have a better forecast in about a quarter.

Mr. Larson mentioned the last question from Mr. Tannen was how reasonable is the use of rainy day funds for the project given that SFMTA is about to fall off the financial cliff due to COVID, and said it sounds like SFMTA built in those contingencies, as well. Mr. Maguire replied affirmative.

There was no public comment.

9. Update on the 15 Third Bus Study [NTIP Planning] - INFORMATION*

Due to time constraints this item was continued to the call of the Chair.

There was no public comment.

10. Traffic Congestion Mitigation Tax (TNC Tax) Program Guidelines - INFORMATION*

Due to time constraints this item was continued to the call of the Chair.

There was no public comment.

Other Items

11. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

No new items were introduced.

12. Public Comment

Through the chair, Peter Tannen asked some questions on item 11, which had been continued due to time constraints. Mr. Tannen shared his concerns on the two new routes that are being considered for implementation this summer when 40 existing routes have been cut and may not return for years and Director Tumlin has said Muni will fall off a financial cliff in less than two years. He also asked how the analysis can be finalized, if it didn't account for COVID behavior impacts and assumed T-line service will be the same as in fall of 2019. In addition, Mr. Tannen commented on limited community engagement, put on hold due to the pandemic, and that the new routes would accommodate new riders mostly shifting from other routes, and that the routes would overlap to some extent with existing routes.

Hugh Louch, Deputy Director for Planning, said that SFMTA is not proposing to bring both of the routes into existence at this time. He explained that there are two distinct efforts happening. One is the subject Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program (NTIP) planning study that the Transportation Authority conducted at the request of Commissioner Walton and these are the findings of that study. At the same time and associated with bringing back its rail service, the SFMTA is looking at bringing back an additional bus route. Part of the reason for doing this is because the rail service



would look pretty different than before with, for example, the T interlining with the M and at different frequencies the shutdown. The point of the route under consideration is to supplement and complement the rail service, which will be at reduced service compared to pre-COVID.

Mr. Louch continued noting that the study team has been concerned about the limited engagement. He said that the SFMTA is starting a more robust engaging process to make sure the route they are considering to bring forward with the return of rail service would respond to community needs and provide effective connections for those who are most dependent on transit right now. In contrast, Mr. Louch said the analysis for the NTIP study was pretty much done pre-pandemic and didn't consider that. However, he noted both efforts share the focus of trying to close equity gaps.

Finally, to Mr. Tannen's comment on mode shift, Mr. Louch said there is some shifting anticipated from other routes, but that the NTIP study also forecasts quite a lot of new riders.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:31 p.m.