



DRAFT MINUTES

Citizens Advisory Committee

Wednesday, May 26, 2021

1. Call to Order

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

Present at Roll: Rosa Chen, Robert Gower, John Larson, Jerry Levine, Peter Tannen, and Danielle Thoe, Sophia Tupuola (7)

Absent at Roll: David Klein, Stephanie Liu (entered during item 2), Kevin Ortiz (3)

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Larson preceded his regular Chair's Report and stated on behalf of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), it was shocking and saddening to hear about the tragic loss of life in San Jose. He shared their heartfelt condolences towards the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority community and families of victims of the terrible event.

Chair Larson shared that CAC members were provided a link to the agency's website with the Executive Director's Report given at the May 25 Transportation Authority Board meeting. He encouraged folks to read the whole report as there was a lot of good information on the restoration of transit services by Muni and regional operators, which he shared was exciting to see, as well as updates on various funding, legislative and project delivery topics.

With respect to the Assembly Bill (AB) 550 (Chiu), he said he was disappointed to report that the bill, endorsed by the CAC, which would have authorized a speed safety camera pilot program in San Francisco and in limited other locations across the state, did not make it out of the state Appropriations Committee on May 20. This means the bill will not move forward this legislative session. He shared that staff would be regrouping with San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and Assemblymember Chiu to determine why it was held back and work to identify ways to mitigate those factors if similar legislation is proposed in future years. Chair Larson added that while the bill had broad support from local jurisdictions and walking and biking advocacy organizations, there was significant opposition on record at the time of the hearing, including from the California Teamsters Public Affairs Council, California Conference Board of the Amalgamated Transit Union, and California Walks. Staff is refocusing advocacy on AB 43 (Friedman), which will give cities greater flexibility in setting local speed limits based on safety.

Lastly, Chair Larson reported on ConnectSF, sharing that it is a multi-agency collaborative process to build an effective, equitable, and sustainable transportation system for San Francisco's future. He said a few meetings ago, the CAC heard an update on the Transit Corridor Study, being led by the SFMTA in coordination with the Transportation Authority and Planning Department. In late June, the Transportation Authority expects to begin outreach on the Streets and Freeway Study, he said. Chair Larson noted that the study complemented the Transit Corridor Study by working to



identify strategies and projects to achieve the city's long-range vision focusing on streets and freeways and looking at all modes of travel on our streets. He said that staff would share details on the upcoming outreach as soon as they were set and would return to the CAC with an update on both the Streets and Freeway and Transit Corridor Studies in June.

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

- 3. Approve the Minutes of the April 28, 2021, Meeting - ACTION**
- 4. State and Federal Legislation Update - INFORMATION**
- 5. Adopt a Motion of Support to Authorize the Executive Director to Execute Master Agreement, Program Supplements and Fund Transfer Agreements-Thereto with the California Department of Transportation for State-Funded Transit Projects - ACTION**
- 6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Recommend Approval of the Revised Administrative Code, Debt, Fiscal, and Investment Policies - ACTION**

There was no public comment.

David Klein motioned to approve the consent agenda, seconded by Jerry Levine.

The consent agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Buffum, Chen, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Tannen, Thoe, Tupuola (10)

Absent: Ortiz (1)

End of Consent Agenda

- 7. Allocate \$9,762,378, with Conditions, and Appropriate \$100,000 in Prop K Funds for Nine Requests, and Allocate \$926,928 in Prop AA Vehicle Registration Fee Funds for One Request - ACTION**

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Jerry Levine asked what Public Works did with the street repair and cleaning equipment that was replaced using Prop K funds.

Ms. LaForte answered that the equipment would be sold, and that Prop K would receive an amount proportionate to its share of the total funding for any piece of equipment with a sales price of \$5,000 or more.

David Klein asked if there was a possibility that the new equipment could be electric.

John Leal, with Public Works, answered that electric versions of the needed equipment with sufficient performance capabilities were not yet available. He said six months previously Public Works had tested an electric street sweeper, but the machine had insufficient power to negotiate San Francisco hills. Mr. Leal said there might be acceptable low-emissions options in the next couple years.

Peter Tannen asked why the project limits for the Central Embarcadero Quick Build project stopped at Broadway.



Casey Hildreth, SFMTA, answered that the project team prioritized the central portion of the corridor because of design challenges and the high cost of constructing improvements north of Broadway.

Chair Larson asked if a member of the public could request a street tree even if there were no existing tree basin in the requested location. He also asked if only certain kinds of trees could be requested.

Nicholas Crawford, Bureau of Urban Forestry, said that an inspector from the Bureau evaluated proposed sites both with and without existing basins. He said evaluation factors included sufficient space, tree viability, etc. He said the Bureau maintains a list of recommended tree species but was open to other suggestions.

Nancy Buffum noted that she had expected to see a Prop K request for District 4 Bikeways and asked what had happened to that request.

Ms. LaForte answered that the District 4 Bikeways request was still being finalized and would be before the CAC in an upcoming meeting.

Mr. Tannen asked if the LEDs in the new signal heads to be installed by the Traffic Signal Visibility Upgrades project were better than older LEDs.

Geraldine De Leon, with SFMTA, answered that signal heads with LEDs far outperformed older signal heads with incandescent lights.

Bryant Woo, with SFMTA, added that LEDs consumed much less energy than incandescent lights, but noted that LEDs dimmed with age and would eventually need to be replaced also.

Sophia Tupuola asked if there was an alternative to the usual process for the public to submit requests for amenities such as new traffic signals and street trees. She noted that low-income neighborhoods were less likely to engage with the city's 311 system than higher income neighborhoods.

Elizabeth Ramos, with Public Works, acknowledged that lower request rates were associated with lower income neighborhoods. She said the City's upcoming budget would likely include dedicated funds for public improvements in District 10, which had historically received lower levels of public investment.

Mr. Crawford added that the City's upcoming budget may have additional funds for street trees in District 10 as well.

Chair Larson suggested that Public Works consider a stand-alone project for planting street trees in District 10.

Danielle Thoe said street trees had a traffic-calming impact, so were an appropriate use of transportation improvement funds, but also had a lot of other benefits. She asked if there was a public body to provide input on street trees.

Mr. Crawford answered in the affirmative and said the Urban Forestry Council provided input on the City's comprehensive urban forest plan and related issues and pointed out that a meeting of the Council was scheduled two days hence on Friday, May 28. He said the Bureau of Urban Forestry worked closely with the Council, as well as Friends of the Urban Forest, and was attempting to rebuild public trust after many years during which the urban forest suffered from neglect.



During public comment Roland Lebrun commented that the costs of the signal head upgrades, new signals and street trees was unreasonably high and provided an example of costs in San Jose as a point of comparison.

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

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Buffum, Chen, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Tannen, Thoe, Tupuola (10)

Absent: Ortiz (1)

8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve the Fiscal Year 2021/22 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program of Projects - ACTION

Mike Pickford, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item.

Mr. Tannen asked, regarding Emergency Ride Home, whether it was typical for the direct cost for rides to be lower than marketing and outreach costs for the program and how this compared to other jurisdictions. Mr. Pickford responded that direct costs are low because the point of the program is not to provide rides, but to ensure that people have confidence in sustainable modes by providing a safety net if they need it. He said that hopefully the average person would never need to use a ride provided by the program.

Alex Bogdan, Senior Strategist for Marketing & Community Engagement with San Francisco Environment, said that this program was long standing, but that many people were still not aware of the program, so they had included additional funds in the requested amount for a robust marketing campaign, including translation of program materials.

Chair Larson said that he understood the awareness of the program was low and people might be surprised to learn that it existed.

Mr. Tannen asked why rides from transportation network companies (TNCs), such as Uber and Lyft, were not eligible for reimbursement. Mr. Pickford said that the Transportation Authority Board had directed that TNC rides should not be eligible for reimbursement and had wanted to support the taxi industry.

Chair Larson commented that the cost per bike rack sounded very high, but that he understood many costs were loaded into that overall total.

Ms. Thoe said the San Francisco State bike cage project sounded like a great way to retroactively construct secure bike parking in existing car parking structures. She asked if similar projects had been done in other housing sites and if that was possible in the future, or if this funding was limited to public entities, like San Francisco State. She said that there are bike parking requirements for new construction, but that repurposing car parking could be a good way to retroactively add bike parking in existing housing structures.

Mr. Pickford responded that SF State was eligible as a public entity and that private entities were only eligible to apply for electric vehicle charger projects. He said that staff could ask the Air District if private housing entities could be made eligible for bike parking projects. He said that the Transportation Authority had funded another bike cage on San Francisco State's campus that was nearing completion.



Robert Gower asked for more detail on the process through which locations would be selected for short term bike parking racks. He asked what decision points go into the physical selection of a site.

Adrian Leung, Bikeshare & Bike Parking Program Manager for SFMTA, said that SFMTA sited racks in response to requests and proactively based on capital projects and in response to data, including scooter and bike share trip data and citations. He said that after SFMTA receives a request, they send a survey technician out to the location and that person evaluates the location according to SFMTA's Bike Parking Guidelines document. He said the guidelines include geometric clearance standards to not impede other uses of the sidewalk and curb area. He said that locking a bike up overnight in a major city, such as San Francisco, was still a risky proposition.

Mr. Gower asked if SFMTA sited racks in areas that would be less likely to have bikes stolen. Mr. Leung said that siting decisions were based more on requests and concerns from local stakeholders and the aforementioned clearance guidelines, rather than whether a location would be more or less likely to have bikes stolen.

Mr. Gower said it would be nice for SFMTA to consider crime risk factors in siting bike racks, such as prioritizing locations that are close to streetlights to deter bike theft.

Mr. Leung said that he would talk to SFMTA survey technician staff to ask about feasibility of considering crime risk in siting racks.

Mr. Pickford said that SFMTA had also changed certain technical bike rack standards to prevent theft, such as using square tubing that is slower to cut than round tubing.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked how many people had used Emergency Ride Home in the past and whether outreach had been successful. He also asked whether program marketing would include a link between people's travel choices and environmental impacts.

Chair Larson responded that the metric of the program's success is not necessarily how many people use it, but it would be good to better understand the connection between the decision to use transit or bike and having a ride home in an emergency.

Nancy Buffum motioned to approve the item, seconded by David Klein.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Buffum, Chen, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Tannen, Thoe, Tupuola (10)

Absent: Ortiz (1)

9. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the Proposed Fiscal Year 2021/22 Budget and Work Program - ACTION

Lily Yu Principal Management Analyst, Finance and Administration presented the item.

There was no public comment.

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

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Buffum, Chen, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Tannen, Thoe, Tupuola (10)

Absent: Ortiz (1)



10. Adopt a Motion of Support to Program \$2,050,000 in Senate Bill 1 Local Partnership Program Formulaic Program Funds to Two Projects, Amend the Prop K/Local Partnership Program Fund Exchange for the 101/280 Managed Lanes and Express Bus Project to Reprogram \$1,300,000 in Prop K funds to Two Projects, and Appropriate \$1,300,000 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, to Two Projects - ACTION

Kaley Lyons, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item.

Chair Larson expressed support for the I-280 Southbound Ocean Avenue Off-Ramp Realignment Project entering the design phase and was glad to see various fund sources were coming together to advance these projects in the southwest corner of the city.

Robert Gower expressed appreciation for investment in the Ocean Avenue and Geneva Avenue off-ramps and said it was great to see coordination in these areas to improve connections, especially as the area would continue to grow.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun provided comment on slide 6 of the presentation and said that the east side of Yerba Buena Island was where the Link21 new Transbay tunnel would start and the first red dot was on the existing tunnel which was fine, but the other red dot may be an issue because there would be two large shafts in the middle of a construction area that would be needed to launch the tunnel boring machine. He said there was an identical project in London called LIMMO that can be viewed online to see an example. He said that this should be considered to avoid having to demolish brand new infrastructure on Yerba Buena Island in order to construct Link21.

Robert Gower motioned to approve the item, seconded by Chair Larson.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Buffum, Chen, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Tannen, Thoe, Tupuola (10)

Absent: Ortiz (1)

11. Fare-Free Muni for All - INFORMATION

Michelle Beaulieu, Principal Transportation Planner, presented the item with Dianna Hammons, Timothy Manglicmot and Jonathan Rewers from the SFMTA.

Chair Larson noted that it was sobering to see the long-term budget challenges even with federal relief.

Mr. Klein noted that a family of four would only receive discounts if making 40% more than a single person, \$129,000 for a family of four to qualify versus a single person making \$90,000. He noted that it seemed strange to penalize more people versus a single person. He asked if Free Muni didn't pass if it would be possible to provide a steeper discount to a wider group of San Franciscans. He asked if it doesn't pass would SFMTA look at expanding programs to encourage higher ridership and make the programs more impactful. He stated that a lot of time when we look at taxes, they are targeting the most vulnerable communities like the sales tax, so it seems like there is an opportunity to offer discounts to a wider swath of the community.

Ms. Hammons stated that the numbers shown are based on Bay Area median income or the federal poverty level, which do scale with more members of a household. She stated that the SFMTA recognizes that using federal levels in San Francisco for



anything is not adequate. She stated that it was something that they need to look at in their budget, and that they had committed to bringing something back to the SFMTA Board of Directors looking at varying threshold levels. She stated that one of the challenges they have is administration. When the Lifeline program was established, the level was set to be consistent with thresholds used by the state or city for programs they provide, so that someone could just share their MediCal card, and that enrollment in those other programs provides automatic enrollment in Lifeline. She stated that though it would create a bit of administrative challenge, the SFMTA is committed to looking at different thresholds. She said that in her role overseeing the management of these programs, she was also committed to not creating a barrier to accessing this program, creating a system where people have to wait in line for hours. She stated that this work involves multiple considerations such as having to identify the revenue, and also ensuring that they can staff the program(s) to administer it effectively and respectfully for people who qualify.

Mr. Rewers added that in the last budget cycle they did consider some of the things that Ms. Hammons mentioned, and had a well thought out new fare structure, which included Free Muni for All Youth to remove the income requirement for youth under the age of 19 in the city. He said that when the pandemic hit the SFMTA made the agreement with the Board of Supervisors (BOS) to not change any fares and so were not able to implement that program, but it has been an SFMTA Board commitment to expand eligibility in that area, and staff is committed to going back to them in the fall.

Ms. Tupuola thanked staff for naming some of her concerns about accessibility. She said that as the city moves into a tech-dominant means of living, some of her community falls through the cracks. She asked how we can streamline the process to give people access to transportation. She also named safety as a reason why people don't ride Muni, because they don't feel safe.

Chair Larson said that in terms of accessibility, the slide with the different programs made the process seem daunting, and that he could see the appeal of just making it free for everyone. He said he was sure staff were working on making it as seamless and accessible as possible to everyone.

Ms. Hammons noted that these issues weren't unique to SFMTA's programs, and that their programs have higher participation rates than what is seen in social service programs like MediCal and the food programs. She said that the SFMTA has worked a lot with the Human Services Agency (HSA) and the Department of Homelessness, and it is a problem across the board. She said that by partnering with other agencies, like the School District to be able to do automatic eligibility, it helps but it is still a challenge. She said they were committed to making sure that citizenship is not a barrier and trying to get people to trust local government to get people to participate in these programs. She noted that non-participation rates are higher with some programs that have higher financial benefits. She said that they are continuing to work with partners across the city and the country, and that there is a group of agencies with programs like this where they discuss how to get more people involved. Ms. Hammons said every year they do something different to try and improve and said she looks forward any ideas about how to do things better. She said that it was understood that the status quo wasn't good enough.

Chair Larson said that they understood and saw some of the efficiencies compared to other regions. He said he wasn't sure why one would buy a pass in Seattle given the costs shown.



Mr. Levine stated that he thought Fare Free Muni for All was a great concept, and that his concerns were around the budget information, that the cost impacts are greater than any hard revenues available for a program. He knew there was going to be a pilot for three months and said he doesn't want to get to a position where people anticipate a program, then there is a free-for all because funds are not available. He stated he was uncomfortable without any large reliable revenue sources to be projected past next year.

Mr. Rewers said that Mr. Levine hit on the exact issue. He said that the agency has committed to restoring service to 85% of pre-pandemic levels by January for two reasons. One being that the SFMTA needs to hire operators and agents and make promotions, and train new operators and maintenance staff and that would take time after a hiring freeze for the last year. The second is that 30% of the agency is being run on a one-time dollar that they don't know can be replaced. He said that they need to take time to see how ongoing revenues like fares recover, so that if they return more service, they will know that the agency has the ability to sustain the service and won't have to end up with a service cut. Mr. Rewers said the agency recognizes that when people rely on a bus trip and adjust their schedule to fit that or if they want a train to get them somewhere on time, the agency wants to sustain that service because it is impactful if they constantly adjust service, or if it is not reliable.

At 8 p.m. Chair Larson left the meeting and Vice Chair Klein took over presiding the meeting.

Mr. Thoe stated that she appreciated the presentation and the work that has gone into it and the conversation about Fare Free Muni and the cost of rides. She said that she learned that after 13 BART trips on the \$98 Muni and BART pass, Muni is losing money on that deal, so she thanked Muni for being progressive and willing to take the loss. She said that is a critical connection, and BART provides different service in the city than Muni is able to do. She said that there was a lot of information in the presentation and that the numbers make it seem like Fare Free Muni at this time isn't a reasonable long-term viable proposition, but that when you look at the fare increases, Muni fares have risen far beyond the rate of inflation, similar to Muni's cost of doing business. She asked if there should be a goal to get back to Muni fares rising with inflation. She noted that Muni fare increases over the last 15 years are not sustainable themselves as people will not continue to ride Muni if fares double in the next ten years as they did in the last ten years. She asked the SFMTA budget staff if they wanted to tie that to inflation, what would need to happen, what policy initiatives would be needed, and what fare price would be reasonable. She stated that she thinks there are a lot of people who have end goals that they want to see, and as budget experts what do they see as possibilities to fill the gaps.

Mr. Rewers stated that this relates to what was done for the last budget cycle. He noted that the SFMTA has a fare indexing policy, so they do not select the fare increase, that indexing happens automatically with two triggers. The SFMTA won't raise the cost every year, it has to grow to a certain point, a quarter, he said. The two triggers are Consumer Price Index (CPI) or inflation, if it goes up at a certain rate that triggers a fare increase. The second is labor costs of the agency, and the labor costs typically track with CPI with a small difference. He said there have been some years with no cost increase, but if CPI and the labor cost goes up, it triggers a fare increase. Last time, the agency decided not to do what they had done in the past and just do an across the board increase. Instead, they looked at who they were impacting with



different fare products. They also looked at the costs of the agency and what was generating enough to cover costs.

Ms. Hammons stated that to add a historical perspective back to 2004, as so many agencies had done the agency hadn't raised fares for almost ten years because of the strong economy. What the agency decided at that point was to adopt the indexing policy to not have these periods of no increase. She said it seemed backwards that in good economic times, the agency didn't need the money or have a reserve, so they didn't raise fares. She noted that there was a balance but that not raising fares at all was an issue. She said that at the same time as this fare policy was established, the agency created the rainy day fund so that they would have money to sustain themselves, but that the agency is reaching the point where there needs to be a balance.

Mr. Manglicmot noted that fare indexing was done to the nearest quarter. He also added that the reason for the indexing policy is that if they weren't indexed, and costs continued to rise, the public would see a steep increase all at once, but less frequently, because fares need to catch up with expenditures. Further, he said they didn't want that to potentially harm ridership, which could cause what is known in the transit agency as the "death spiral". He said the agency wants a predictable indexing policy for all revenue (not just fares) that the agency controls.

Ms. Thoe asked if anyone could answer the question about moving forward. She stated that she understood the indexing, and that it was a common sense logical policy, but that it was outpacing inflation on its own and disincentivizes using transit. She asked about other revenue streams, if it were possible to increase indexing on other revenue streams for activities that we want to disincentivize like driving, because she feels that costs can't continue to increase as they have because it becomes untenable.

Mr. Rewers said that they did do things like Ms. Thoe suggested and that it was the theory of the SFMTA in 1999 when the voters combined the Municipal Railway and the Department of Parking and Traffic, that the surplus revenues that parking generated would cover the gaps that Muni transit had had for a very long time. He said that San Francisco is a progressive city that disincentivizes parking and driving and that because of this, revenues have declined because fewer people are driving. He said that in the last budget, the SFMTA extended parking meter hours in the evening and would be extending parking meter hours into Sunday but that the agency has run out of days of the week.

Ms. Hammons noted that over time Muni fares have gone up but that other fines have gone up more like street sweeping tickets. She said that the SFMTA has focused on transit first, but there is only so much you can do with that. She said that the same way that they have discount programs on fares, they are also working on programs to provide relief to low-income folks who get parking tickets or are towed. It is a balance, but the agency is reaching the point where only so much is sustainable, e.g., how high can parking tickets and fares go. She said that they need to be looking for dedicated revenue streams to support operations in a different way.

Mr. Manglicmot noted that the agency did go line by line through revenue sources to see what could be maximized, and that some are capped by state law. He said that most driving-related sources are maxed out.



Vice Chair Klein thanked everyone for good questions and answers and opened the item up to public comment.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun said he hoped Muni was coordinating with the MTC regional fare coordination task force, which is trying to harmonize fares across all nine Bay Area counties.

Edward Mason stated that the Free Fare for All blurs with the discount programs, and that he agrees with Mr. Lebrun on the big picture. He said this item focused on essential workers and that we should be encouraging discretionary riders to increase overall ridership and support transit. He stated that requiring a welcome back to trusting transit from COVID and frequent on time service is pre-mature. He asked if Muni is currently capable of providing world-class consistent service with hours of operation, reliability, frequency, extra on-board operators and extra vehicles to rapidly deploy to disruptions. He said that due diligence requires an organization budget headcount chart with actual and on-board personnel because he feels that they are lacking personnel to adequately provide the service. He asked if on the funding slide, a new sales tax would provide \$100 million, if that is the new Prop K future, and would that generate \$100 million per year. He also asked what the Salesforce Tower would generate in parcel tax, with the given range. He noted that parcel taxes are based on a 2-dimensional size not 3-dimensional. He said that Free Muni should be delayed and attracting discretionary riders from a financial perspective makes no sense.

12. Update on the Pennsylvania Avenue Extension Project - INFORMATION

Yana Waldman, Assistant Deputy Director for Capital Projects presented the item.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun said that he had investigated the PAX project prior to the Railyard Alignment and Benefits (RAB) Study. Mr. Lebrun said that any station on the PAX alignment would need to have 700 feet of length for each platform. He said that 7th Street and Cesar Chavez Street would be feasible station locations. He stated his preference for the long tunnel alignment option for the project. Mr. Lebrun indicated that an additional tunnel beneath Potrero Hill had been historically contemplated for the corridor by Union Pacific Railroad. He added that the alignments would be close to the I-280 freeway.

Other Items

13. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

On behalf of Sophia Tupuola, Vice Chair Klein asked how the Transportation Authority could ensure safety in the communities of concern during times of peaked violence. He said in the past week there was a man walking around the community with an AK-47 killing at least 3 community members from Double Rock and Potrero Hill projects. He said she would like the youth to be able to safely leave their homes and get around the city to do essential things and asked if there were ways to delegate more Muni ambassadors to those areas to walk youth to bus stops.

Vice Chair Klein said it has been some time since they have had people in charge of office public safety come before people in charge of policing public transit to join the Board. He encouraged it be brought to their attention y staff, at a next convenient meeting that individual can give a presentation on this and updated stats as it pertains to transportation.,

Mr. Gower requested a presentation on the future of the Slow Streets program as they come out of the pandemic. He said multiple District 11 neighborhoods and borders



are talking about what permanency of the program look like. He said in particular the communities want to expand and continue the slow streets program in the post pandemic period and want to understand the process of who the county stakeholders are that are looking into the slow streets and which funds will be maintained. He said, in particular, there were a lot of questions around into John F Shelley Drive in McLaren Park. He said that neighborhood organizations are trying to keep the Slow Streets program because of the positive impacts it has had on McLaren Park. He asked who are the stakeholders, how are the decisions made and how can community members have robust discussions with the right individuals that can make sure their questions are heard.

Vice Chair Klein said it's an excellent idea and asked staff if it is a reasonable request that can be arranged.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director said they would follow up on that request.

Ms. Buffum shared that over the past weekend, there was a demonstration of over 300 people, predominantly with children out on the Great Highway. She said the interest in keeping it a park and for recreation for people is incredibly strong. She also emphasized that the Great Highway does not belong to District 4 it belongs to the entire city and she requested an update on the JFK Drive topic.

Ms. Thoe echoed Ms. Buffum's comments and said in the District 6 neighborhood they have less park space than any other community in the city and the Great Highway has been a great space for her to recreate and get fresh air. With respect to safety on Muni, she said she heard the transit assistance program have been shut down during COVID, and she said an update on rolling the program back out would be appreciated. She also provided a link for a workshop for a residential bike parking event.

Vice Chair Klein said as a resident of District 1, he doesn't feel like he has more power or right to say what happens to the Great Highway. He said he is however concerned about traffic and how additional traffic affects the neighborhood in that area especially with kids. He said he wants to make sure that all the experts give them their insights on what is occurring and what the community needs.

There was no public comment.

14. Public Comment

During public comment Roland Lebrun commented on the performance of the Microsoft Teams platform. He also suggested a timer be added so that public commenters can be aware of their time and asked staff to provide closed captioning as another option for viewers, if possible.

Vice Chair Klein said that the suggestions were great and turned to staff for next steps.

Ms. Lombardo replied that staff would look into the requests.

15. Adjournment

Vice Chair Klein expressed sympathy from one public agency to another to the family members of those that were targeted in the recent Santa Clara Valley Transit Authority tragedy. He said being a part of the transit circle, it would be remiss to not recall their memories on this day.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:39 p.m.