



DRAFT MINUTES

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Tuesday, July 27, 2021

1. Roll Call

Chair Mandelman called the meeting to order at 9:42 a.m. and noted that Commissioner Melgar was excused from items where she would be absent during the meeting.

Present at Roll Call: Commissioners Chan, Haney, Mandelman, Mar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Stefani, and Walton (9)

Absent at Roll Call: Commissioners Melgar (entered during item 7) and Safai (2)

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Mandelman reported that the city's re-opening had a positive effect on the agency's revenues. He shared that sales tax collections in May were \$8.3 million, 24% higher than in April, and only about 15% lower than the May 2020 year on year figure. He added that the Prop D TNC tax revenue was also improving, with May collections – shared by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and San Francisco County Transportation Authority (Transportation Authority), totaling \$800,000 rising 23% above April's figures. These revenue figures he said, and the rising traffic and transit ridership figures are telling a story of recovery that is welcomed by all.

Chair Mandelman also reported that he is looking forward to SFMTA's update on their Transportation Recovery efforts and apologized to BART for needing to shift their Transportation Recovery presentation to one of the September meetings, due to a busy agenda today. He said they appreciate the extraordinary efforts of BART to add service and bring back riders starting August 2, including adding midday and weekend frequencies, the return of late night service past 9 p.m., and reducing Clipper fares by 50% for the month of September. For more information on BART's "Welcome Back Plan", he suggested visiting BART.gov/news.

Chair Mandelman congratulated the Transportation Authority team on the reaffirmation of their long-term sales tax Bond Rating of AAA by ratings agency Fitch. He said that this was the highest possible rating and reflects their staff's excellent financial management of the sales tax program, as well as the stable outlook and resilience of the sales tax base. He continued, saying as the agency goes forward to secure their next credit facility, this will help the agency to minimize the cost of borrowing and maximize proceeds for the benefit of taxpayers and the public. He thanked Chief Financial Officer Cynthia Fong and Deputy Director for Policy and Programming Anna LaForte on this terrific achievement.

Chair Mandelman said as they conclude their work for the first part of the year, he wanted to thank the Board along with their staff, and the Transportation Authority



team, for their hard work and involvement. He said they have accomplished a lot, from advocating for policies and new infrastructure funding programs to advancing citywide and neighborhood plans, to funding street safety projects in every District. He wished everyone a well-deserved rest and relaxation in the upcoming August Board recess.

3. Executive Director's Report - INFORMATION

Tilly Chang, Executive Director presented the item.

There was no public comment.

4. Approve the Minutes of the July 13, 2021 Meeting - ACTION

There was no public comment.

Vice Chair Peskin moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Commissioner Stefani.

The minutes were approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Haney, Mandelman, Mar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Stefani, and Walton (9)

Absent: Commissioners Melgar and Safai (2)

Consent Agenda

5. [Final Approval] Allocate \$14,892,610 and Appropriate \$200,000 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, for Eight Requests - ACTION

6. [Final Approval] Award a 15-Month Professional Services Contract, with an Option to Extend for an Additional 6 Months, to EMC Research, Inc. in an Amount Not to Exceed \$100,000 for Voter Opinion Survey and Public Messaging Services for Transportation Sales Tax Reauthorization - ACTION

Commissioner Ronen moved to approve the consent agenda, seconded by Commissioner Mar.

The consent agenda was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Haney, Mandelman, Mar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Stefani, and Walton (9)

Absent: Commissioners Melgar and Safai (2)

End of Consent Agenda

7. [Final Approval on First Appearance] Appropriate \$180,000 in Prop K Funds for Capital Project Delivery Review and Best Practices Study - ACTION

Chair Mandelman introduced the item noting that it is an item that stems from their recent discussions at the Board regarding the city's ongoing challenges on delivering large transportation capital projects such as Van Ness BRT and Central Subway, being on time and on budget. He said in April, this body held a hearing on the recent audit of SFMTA's capital project delivery which found a variety of systemic issues in a way they deliver large projects, such as the Twin Peaks tunnel track repair that was delayed by over a year and came in \$35 million over budget. Chair Mandelman shared that at their last meeting they received an update on the Better Market Street



project, which after ten years of planning is set to break ground early next year in a phase 1 scope that has been significantly scaled back due to lingering uncertainty of the duration and possible impacts of construction. He shared that he and Vice Chair Peskin requested that the Transportation Authority staff lead a review of current city experiences, lessons learned, and industry best practices for the industry management of large capital transportation projects so that they can improve their performance in delivering the transportation system that San Franciscans deserve. He thanked Director Chang and Eric Cordoba, Deputy Director for Capital Projects for working with them to develop the proposal. He continued by saying he is glad to see it on the agenda so that the important work can get underway.

Eric Cordoba, Deputy Director for Capital Projects presented the item per the staff memorandum.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Ronen moved to approve the item, seconded by Vice Chair Peskin.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Haney, Mandelman, Mar, Melgar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Stefani, and Walton (10)

Absent: Commissioner Safai (1)

8. Adopt the District 4 Mobility Study Report - ACTION

Camille Guiriba, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Commissioner Mar expressed support for the District 4 Mobility Study Report and said since District 4 is car dependent he would like to provide residents with more mode choices. He specifically supported the neighborway network, decorative crosswalks, Lincoln Way traffic calming, and community shuttle. He said that he would like the neighborway project to include greening in order to increase biodiversity in the district. He acknowledged that people sent in emails about the District 4 Mobility Study Report stating that the neighborway has not received input from the public. He said that the public will be able to provide input in the design phase where street selection and number of streets will be finalized. He noted that double parking and small business loading zone access are common problems in the district.

Commissioner Mar and Commissioner Melgar said that they want BART to be expanded to the westside of San Francisco.

Commissioner Melgar expressed that the westside districts share many of the same challenges. She pointed out that many of the intersections with high injury rates are located at the borders of districts. She also noted that there are a lot of trips made between the western districts and so there needs to be a focus on increasing connectivity between those districts. Commissioner Melgar asked questions about the areas represented in the travel market analysis and what the connector routes represented on the 5-minute network map.

Ms. Guiriba responded that Figure B in the report represents the map of the travel market analysis areas within San Francisco. She also responded that the connector routes represent less frequent bus routes that are not among the 5-minute and



frequent networks of the ConnectSF Transit Strategy.

During public comment, a caller said that they opposed the adoption of the District 4 Mobility Study Report because the study survey respondents were not diverse, both in regard to race and income, and so the survey did not accurately capture the district.

Stephen Gorski opposed the adoption of the report and said that there needs to be more focus on making the roads safer for drivers. They said that they do like the idea of a community shuttle. They said that the time of board meetings are not convenient for the public and so many people are not able to provide public comment.

Two callers called to oppose the report adoption and asked for clarification regarding whether cars would be banned from the streets that become a part of the neighborway. Both callers opposed cars being banned from accessing the streets.

Luke Bornheimer said that he supports the adoption of the report because he wants more sustainable modes of transit and safer streets.

Dave Alexander, a parent from District 1, called in support of the adoption of the report and said that the neighborways were highly needed.

Another caller opposed the adoption of the report and asked for the streets to remain open to cars. They also said that the crosswalks in the district need to be safer and that they need more lighting.

At the request of Chair Mandelman, Ms. Guiriba responded to public comments regarding whether the neighborways would close streets to traffic. She stated that the study presented different potential street treatments, such as traffic diverters, but did not identify specific treatments for the recommended network. She added that specific treatments would be determined through the follow-on outreach and design phase led by SFMTA.

Commissioner Mar moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Melgar.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Haney, Mandelman, Mar, Melgar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Stefani, and Walton (10)

Absent: Commissioner Safai (1)

9. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Transit Recovery Plan Update - INFORMATION

Jeffrey Tumlin, SFMTA Director and Julie Kirschbaum, Director of Transit presented the item.

With respect to the financial policy, Vice Chair Peskin commented that he took issue with the notion that Director Tumlin stated that SFMTA couldn't borrow, yet they borrow all the time.

Director Tumlin replied that Vice Chair Peskin was correct, and that the SFMTA can borrow for capital, but it is challenging for them to borrow for operations. He clarified that he oversimplified, because in some ways which they work to operationalize the capital money in order to save money. He offered as an example of a way they use



capital money in order to help with operations is making investments in speed and reliability for transit that improves their operating efficiency.

Vice Chair Peskin noted that SFMTA uses general obligation bonds to pay for staff whom are involved in capital projects, which is considered operating money.

Director Tumlin said that is operating money, but associated with capital projects, and not Muni service operations.

Vice Chair Peskin observed that when they are using general obligation bonds to build things and or to install new overhead wiring, the staff time would be chargeable to that bond.

Director Tumlin replied in the affirmative and explained that the focus of the presentation was on Muni service operations.

Commissioner Chan asked if they could define structural deficit, and said she thinks that is what a general obligation bond is for, so she would like to understand the structural deficit that they are referencing on top of the capital maintenance and improvements.

Director Tumlin said the structural deficit is a result of their operating expenses rising more quickly than their revenues. He said as they have strived to maintain a consistent rate of service, in order to do so, they have had to cut investments such as maintenance. He added that in some of their core functionality like their Human Resources division which experienced significant cuts a couple of years prior, that has now become an obstacle in their pace of hiring. He said that one of the factors that Muni Performance Working Group found was one of Muni's reliability problems stemmed from disinvestment in maintenance on both the capital and operating sides. He shared an example of not investing enough in the maintenance on their transit vehicles, which resulted in the vehicles not lasting as long, and becoming more unreliable. He added that disinvestments in maintenance on the capital side of their budget, such as the antiquated train control system, impacted their reliability. With regard to their fleet, Director Tumlin noted that previously they had the oldest fleet in the nation, and as a result suffered from unreliability.

Commissioner Chan observed that their structural deficit consists of fleet, management, capital improvements, and day to day maintenance. She said this sounds like their structural deficit is still tied to capital improvements.

Director Tumlin said the structural deficit and maintenance problems are on both the operating and capital side of their budget. On the operating side, he said are all of the crews that do day to day maintenance of their infrastructure such as their overhead lines division. He said they have a 50% vacancy rate there, and 30% vacancy rates, which is typical, in many of their other day to day maintenance divisions. With regard to the capital side of their budget, Director Tumlin shared that they have suffered disinvestment in maintenance. He said where they have focused their limited resources in service, rather than in investing in rebuilding core infrastructure, and he turned to Ms. Kirschbaum to share more examples.

Ms. Kirschbaum said they have worked closely with the Board of Supervisors over the last decade to bring the fleet up to a state of good repair. She said one of things that the Board charged them with was maintaining it to the highest standard, so that they were getting the full value of their capital investment. She said that same program



hasn't happened on the infrastructure side which is why they are seeing the challenges and the reliability problems in the subway and on other parts of the track system. She added they are very committed to making sure their workforce is paid according to the rising cost of living in the Bay Area, and a big part of the structural deficit is the disconnect between the cost of living that is rising and their revenue sources which are not.

Commissioner Chan said through a briefing she learned that their personnel budget was around 60% and asked for the dollar amount of their overall operation budget for their structural deficit when it comes to their day to day operations.

Director Tumlin said that number is related to their state of good repair problem. He said they have been papering over their structural deficit by disinvestment in maintenance, therefore their structural deficit is creating a debt on their capital side with regard to maintenance, which is unsustainable.

Commissioner Chan thanked Director Tumlin for his response and said the point she is trying to make is that when they talk about structural deficit it is critical for her to understand the dollar amount and exactly what they are talking about. She said that as the Vice Chair mentioned earlier, there are other ways they can borrow, and they have been to fix a piece of their structural deficit. At the same time, she said, they were exploring other sources to fix the deficit and it would be helpful for them to understand what the other side is and what they are fixing.

Director Tumlin noted that they recently held an 8 hour budget workshop for the SFMTA Board that went into their budget in tremendous detail and he would be happy to deliver any portion of it to the Board to help them understand the limitations on their budget and the reality that they face, as well as their projections moving forward.

Commissioner Preston thanked the SFMTA staff, and his fellow colleagues Chair Mandelman and Commissioner Chan for their participation during the Board of Supervisors hearing on Friday. He commented on the collapse in fare revenue mentioned by Director Tumlin and noted that it was really important to view them in the context of the overall funding from the federal government. He said they have received a massive amount of money from the federal government and are now by every metric in a far superior economic position right now, then they were immediately before the pandemic. He added that they can discuss and debate how best to spend the funds, and there will be some differences of view on how much to save for a future rainy day versus using them today with so many lines suspended. With regard to the gross amount of the all the funds mentioned by Director Tumlin he said they are talking about over \$700 million in unanticipated federal funding. He continued saying savings to the agency of an estimated \$150 million during the pandemic from reduced operations, and a \$120 million reserve, adding that not one penny of the reserve money had been touched throughout the pandemic, even why they are suspending lines. Commissioner Preston said he believes there is a choice being made behind having the lines suspended on whether to restore service now. He said there remains no plan for restoring all the lines that have been suspended, some of which have not been running for 16 months. He asked for clarification from Director Kirschbaum when she refers to getting back to 100% service, that this was not a commitment that all lines will come back.



Ms. Kirschbaum disagreed and said they committed to a process where they bring stakeholders, community members and other's choices. She said one choice would restore routes, another would restore some routes but invest in other choices that would grow ridership and build on some of their other goals. She said it is misleading to say that they haven't committed to a plan. Ms. Kirschbaum noted that they have said within the next 3 to 4 weeks they will be bringing 3 service options, and they are taking this time to ask questions because that is their job to ask questions and to give the people choices while looking at different paths they can go down, and then they will begin to implement. She mentioned that when they implement the winter service restoration, they're going to choose 1 of 3 paths based on public input, one of which is to restore lines. She added that another path is to invest in their frequent network to give people quicker access to more connections, with the third path being a hybrid of the two. She said the point is that they will have choices based on data and a plan, and they will be bringing this in the next several weeks up to stakeholders.

Commissioner Preston asked for clarity regarding the restoration to 100% being there are 3 different types of scenarios they will be rolling out and getting input on. He said that under two of the scenarios, not every line comes back, which put them at a place where they are trying to achieve 100% restoration while not returning some lines.

Ms. Kirschbaum confirmed that in 2 of 3 of the scenarios not every line comes back. She, said however, the assertions that SFMTA already has a plan set makes her uncomfortable as they are looking at investing transit resources based on public feedback. She reiterated that one of the options would restore all of the lines that were active before the pandemic, but they also believe that the city has changed and there are new connections to consider and that it was worth having the discussion about investing in more frequency in key corridors. She said they are looking at a 85%, 100%, and 110% service level based on 3 different service investment strategies.

Director Tumlin emphasized that this process will happen in a public and transparent way. He said they have not made any decisions about how they are allocating their service, as they want to make sure they are taking advantage of these unprecedented time to accommodate the changes in travel patterns that have accelerated due to the pandemic. He said they may bring the service back exactly as it was before, but they have a responsibility to make sure they are seeking out the best they can from their limited service hours, while they work with the everyone to make sure that Muni has the resources that it needs in order to expand significantly.

Commissioner Preston reiterated his desire to be clear with the public that 100 percent restoration does not mean the goal is to bring back all the lines.

Director Tumlin said they have been transparent with their options, and one of the options brings back all of the lines, and it may be the option that they choose. He notes that the other options try to accommodate changes in travel behavior as well as address some of the problems they had prior to the pandemic such as crush loads on the 38 Geary. Director Tumlin said as planners and technicians they have a responsibility to figure out how best to allocate those service hours, which results in them presenting choices to the public.



Ms. Kirschbaum stated that she believes Commissioner Preston explained it correctly and understands the scope of the 3 options. She said these options are something they are not trying to hide behind and are trying to be communicative about.

Commissioner Preston said SFMTA should be using this time to get transit lines them back up and running as quickly as possible. He added, what remains lacking is that there is not a plan to bring back all the lines with metrics as to what needs to happen at each step in order to make that happen. He cautioned that the prolonged pause may contribute to the dreaded transit death spiral.

Director Tumlin responded saying that they are reactivating lines as quickly as possible, but the limitations are dependent on the pace of hiring and training. He said they are working as hard as they possibly can to staff up from over a year of a hiring freeze and a dramatic loss of staff. He added that they also want to make sure that their service restoration plan is done in conjunction with their policy makers and the public, which is why they are spending this next five months to develop the plan. He said that then coincides with not just their winter service restoration but the additional restorations that they hope to do over the next calendar year.

Commissioner Preston thanked Director Tumlin for his response and added there is nothing stopping SFMTA from releasing a plan for when certain metrics are met, all services will come back. He said he understands that it cannot happen tomorrow, but there is nothing standing in the way for that kind of commitment and the status quo of uncertainty of lines returning is being held over folks' heads.

Commissioner Melgar thanked Director Tumlin and Ms. Kirschbaum for their presentation and work, acknowledging that it has been a pretty heavy lift. With regard to the mismatch in service restoration she asked if it wouldn't behoove them to restore the service in areas where it is actually happening rather than where it is, meaning the interconnectivity between Districts 1,4 and 7 and as students are returning back to school. Commissioner Melgar also noted that they all agree that Muni is important for the life of the city and they don't want to be caught in the transit death spiral. She said she feels that the Board along with the Mayor are being underestimated, because she doesn't believe anyone in the leadership of the city would allow the fiscal cliff that SFMTA is suggesting as an outcome in the event they spend the money too quickly. She said she wonders if investing right now to support what is needed would advert that in terms of ridership.

Director Tumlin thanked Commissioner Melgar for her comments and said they are eager to get financial support from wherever they can from any unit of government. He clarified that their biggest concern is what happens to them in 2023. He said they do not want to be back in the same position they were 6 months ago which was looking at 20% layoffs across the agency and catastrophic service cuts. Director Tumlin reiterated that the one time federal funding covers the current year, but runs out before their other revenue services sources are expected to recover. He said any financial backstop that the city budget could provide them would reduce the risk of accelerating service expansion without having to have a significant risk of layoffs in 2023. He said they are playing a risk game and one thing they don't want to risk is the employment of their workforce.

Commissioner Melgar said she understands and added that when they are talking about the feelings of the voters towards the system, it is more than an economic or



efficiency calculation, it is also about how they value the system, which is sometimes emotional. She said when a bus is not running or has changed from what they have been used to for the last 30 years, there are emotional decisions that happen when they suggest the need to raise taxes, for example. She said the conversation is about how they are investing in and valuing the system as the leadership of the city, because that will affect how much San Franciscans are going to want to support Muni.

Director Tumlin replied that Commissioner Melgar encapsulated the support and needs of today's riders. With regards to the needs of the west side, he said that is a question they are trying to address over the next 5 months through their study. He said that the pandemic accelerated long-term changes in travel patterns. He said the previous Muni system was designed primarily to serve trips to/from the financial district and that has since shifted. He said they need to do better accommodating travel particularly on the west side, which is much more oriented north south and within the west side than it is around the financial district. Director Tumlin said these are questions they want to raise over the next 5 months, so that they have a transit system that best serves the travel behavior of San Franciscans at every possible resource level. He said if they identify new additional resources, the question is how they would spend those new resources.

Ms. Kirschbaum added that those were great examples of why they think they should be taking a moment to look at the service structure. She said she understands it's not an easy path, and they are listening to feedback, but are also balancing it with the fact that the city has changed. She said they think when presented with data and choices, San Franciscans can make decisions based off that.

Director Tumlin added that they are also accelerating improvements to their Human Resources department, so that if money is identified, they can pivot quickly and staff up more readily than they are currently able to. He said if money does come in the voters will expect them to quickly deliver improvements.

Commissioner Preston thanked Commissioner Melgar for her comments that hit on important issues. He said he's concerned about a strategy that will pit neighborhoods against each other particularly in the revenue measure discussions, and it is not the right time for that. He also emphasized that there is a case to be made for investing more in the core services and looking at the other lines. He said to be proposing that at this time at the expense of parallel and lower ridership routes is a difficult conversation to have, but not a bad conversation to have. He continued stating that doing this in a middle of a pandemic when lines are suspended is the wrong time. He suggested they release the plan to immediately restore everything at least until all lines are running, and then convene the longer term conversation they want to have. Commissioner Preston said that the process so far has been anything but neutral in his opinion, when it comes to the three options that were presented. He said he agrees that informed decisions are key, however, so far within the documents it has showed a push towards the options that do not bring back all lines. Lastly, Commissioner Preston asked where the workers stand when it comes to the decisions on not investing short term in restoring the transit system aggressively because of concerns of the agency regarding protecting its workers from layoffs in the long term. He referenced the President of Local 250A and say that they are firmly in support of full restoration and bringing the lines back. He said though it's an obligation for SFMTA leadership to care about the workforce, and it's also important



that the Commissioners are listening directly to labor and those that are working across the system who are keeping the buses and trains running and who have been speaking out in favor of full restoration.

Chair Mandelman asked for clarification on the two constraints for full service restoration: a workforce constraint which is short term and financial constraint being long term. He said in the shorter term there is a workforce problem as they don't have the operators, technicians, mechanics, etc., to bring back 100% service and it won't come until sometime in 2022.

Ms. Kirschbaum confirmed that to be correct.

Chair Mandelman asked if the restoration that they're implementing in August will get everyone their jobs back.

Ms. Kirschbaum replied yes.

Chair Mandelman also asked if the 85% goal for January gets everyone back to their jobs along with additional people they are trying to bring online.

Ms. Kirschbaum replied in the affirmative and said that like in August, they will have to bridge any gaps between the hiring and the service start up with some short term use of overtime.

With respect to the financial constraint, Chair Mandelman asked if it was a constraint they are projecting out to 2023, but trying to make reasonable decisions in 2022 about what the future years will look like. He said they will know what they are putting on the ballot in terms of SFMTA revenue well before June if it's on the June ballot, and well before November if it's on the November ballot. He added that they will know by the middle of next year whether the Mayor along with the Board are proposing additional general fund support for Muni operations. Chair Mandelman said he is also uncomfortable with the idea of holding back and not getting to that 100% and 110% service that San Franciscans deserve, but on the other hand he appreciates that SFMTA is not spending at a rate that they will not be able to sustain over time.

Director Tumlin replied that currently they have not received any assurances from any level of government that additional money is available to them, so they are needing to spread their money out. He said the minute they get assurances, that will significantly reduce the risk of catastrophic service cuts later and will allow them to start expanding services. Director Tumlin added that once the likelihood of those funds being available becomes clear, they will be ready to go full speed to get to 110% or whatever level they can get to.

Chair Mandelman added that it is about the same time SFMTA's workforce constraint of 85% and above is addressed. He noted that they brought on more workers to make that happen, and though they are in a position to bring on and train more people, they are trying to decide whether to do that.

Director Tumlin replied that Chair Mandelman was correct, and they have been fortunate to have the next 5 months for planning, because they want to be able to have a plan in place, so if they can get to 110%, they know exactly what to do with that money whether it's how to invest in north/south transit or how to invest more in equity. He said that is why they are spending this time to catch up with their long



range planning in a public transparent fashion, so at whatever level of resource they hit they have a plan and are ready to implement it quickly.

Chair Mandelman thanked Ms. Kirschbaum and Director Tumlin and opened the item up for public comment.

During public comment, a caller suggested they should set up donation sites to help with their financial crisis. They also noted that they support bringing all the Muni lines back, including the 43 as it allows them to get to the Disney Museum to take classes.

Patricia Arack with Senior and Disability Action said as a senior and disabled person she would be afraid to ride the bus. She said it's scary for vulnerable people and asked what they are planning to do to make it safe for them.

Lisa Church, District 3, called in support for the 100% service restoration. They said they need Muni back, and they want to see the funds spent on the restoration of service, and everything that falls under that.

Hamilton Carter who lives on the border of District 10 and 11 called in support of 100% service restoration. They said they need these lines back, as people use the buses to get to more places other than work.

A District 8 senior resident said that that Muni's main train control system must be upgraded. They said they recognize it's a capital improvement project, but they are cutting off their nose if they don't do this as quickly as possible since reliable service is very important to the public.

A 32 year resident of San Francisco said working from home will be the new normal which justifies two of the restoration options presented. They said once people become comfortable with riding BART again, the congestion will not be a factor anymore, yet that's what they are putting all their focus on. They noted that two of the options proposed less service which seems at odds with the Congestion Pricing Study which was conceived in a pre-pandemic paradigm, noting one can't have it both ways.

A District 1 resident called in support for 100% Muni restoration. They said the buses are full and would like them to be on time and reliable. They said reduction of service goes against the transit first city notion.

A District 4 resident called in support for 100% restoration. They said they are personally afraid to use Muni because of the violence risk and the inability to get to their destination on time. They also agreed with the previous commenter who spoke on congestion pricing, and cited the lack of need to get downtown as well the current lack of congestion.

Cat Carter with SF Transit Riders said they are looking forward to the service restoration but urge SFMTA to be bolder in returning suspended routes by winter. She said that riders have been left behind and will continue to be left behind if lines are not returned. With respect to using capital funds to support transit operations, she said they should highlight places that are being held back because of the lack of transit priority.



10. Vision Zero SF Action Strategy Update - INFORMATION*

Tom Maguire, Director of Streets Division, SFMTA, provided opening remarks saying that Vision Zero remained a top commitment for the SFMTA and that the draft Action Strategy included bold steps forward. He said in 2019, SFMTA presented on five quick build street transformations, and thanked the Board for their support on the passage of Proposition D, as they were able to implement 20, quadrupling the output of quick build projects. He said the quick build projects included daylighting every street on the high injury network and that SFMTA had a data and community driven systems approach.

Ryan Reeves, Vision Zero Program Manager, SFMTA, presented this item.

Commissioner Walton said District 10 was the district with the second highest rate of pedestrian fatalities and his office worked with SFMTA, the Transportation Authority and San Francisco Public Works (SFPW) to add signage, speed humps, roundabouts, quick build projects and other traffic calming improvements. He asked what was needed to stop collisions in District 10.

Ms. Reeves said that the action strategy was a citywide plan and did not include district specific measures. She continued saying that the tools shown in the plan such as network level improvements, quick builds, signal upgrades and retiming and intersection improvements would be used across the city as part of a citywide approach.

Commissioner Walton said a plan should have specific strategies for areas where there were higher levels of concerns and asked why it took so long for improvements to be implemented.

Ms. Reeves said that SFMTA made a commitment within the strategy that their work would be focused on the high injury network and in communities of concern. She said the quick build program, which was two years old, was implemented to address project delays and that quick builds were delivered in about a quarter of the time taken to deliver traditional capital projects.

Jamie Parks, Livable Streets Director, SFMTA, added that SFMTA was focused on accelerating project delivery and was committed to expanding the quick build program. He said that the demand for improvements expanded more quickly than SFMTA was able to expand their capacity, which was a challenge, but they were pushing themselves to deliver safety improvements.

Commissioner Walton clarified that his question was not centered around quick builds but was about how long it took to realize traffic calming solutions in their communities. He also asked about the education aspect of the vision zero work.

Ms. Reeves said that the education campaigns and outreach focused on the most dangerous driving behaviors to address crash factors such as reducing speeding, stopping at crosswalks, and reducing red light running. She mentioned an active campaign was for safer left turns since left turns were a high proportion of crashes in the city, which they combined with engineering treatments to slow left turning motorists.

Uyen Ngo, Vision Zero Education and Outreach Coordinator, SFMTA, said SFMTA used a variety of outreach strategies including door to door hangers, and merchant



and intersection posters. She said that for the safer left turn campaign, SFMTA funded six community organizations to develop videos and trainings, worked with Lighthouse for the Blind on braille tactile maps for mobility trainings, and worked with Bayview Opera House on artist public service announcements. She said SFMTA also had digital advertising which was important to expand their reach and target specific audiences.

Commissioner Melgar said she did not agree with looking at past injuries and crashes to prioritize safety, she said they knew low-income people, people of color, the elderly and children were injured the most and they could prioritize neighborhoods with high concentrations of those populations. She said she shared the frustration of Commissioner Walton of wanting a stop sign or speed hump installed and needing to prove that there were crashes before SFMTA paid attention. She said the implementation of improvements needed to be faster, easier, and integrated with safe routes to school. She asked when SFMTA would roll out what it would take to get to vision zero instead of doing piecemeal implementation.

Ms. Reeves said SFMTA saw the high injury network as a predictive tool for where collisions occurred and that much of their work was proactive outside of the high injury network.

Commissioner Stefani said that the 2020 data showed the same number of fatalities as when Vision Zero began in 2014 and there were more fatalities in 2020 than in 2019. Regarding the red-light camera program, she said there was supposed to be eight cameras installed by 2020 and the presentation included expanding the program with eight relocations by 2022. She asked why SFMTA was not looking beyond 2022 to expand the red-light camera program to 2024.

Ricardo Olea, Transportation Engineering, Streets Division, SFMTA, said the red-light camera program was a two-to-three-year capital program which was supposed to begin design in 2020 and required bids and a construction period. He said the eight expansion sites would include locations with the highest number of red-light crashes reported and where they had already implemented other engineering measures. He said SFMTA had a program to improve signal visibility and timing and wanted to place the cameras at locations where they did not have further engineering changes to make. Regarding expanding the program, he said it was part of the capital program which was continuously reviewed and was combined with the signal upgrade program to make signals more prominent. Additionally, he mentioned that the red-light camera program had an impact on SFMTA's operational budget, and each location required approximately \$45,000 in funding to maintain the system. He said there were currently sixteen operational cameras, and it would be expanded to include an additional eight cameras.

Commissioner Stefani said she hoped the program could be expanded to include more than the eight red-light cameras that were planned.

Commissioner Haney asked what was holding them back from acting to significantly reduce severe and fatal crashes. He said they set a goal but were not any closer to meeting the goal and he was not confident that the draft Action Strategy would get the city to the goal. He said there were 160 miles of high injury streets in San Francisco and there were no safety improvements planned for about half of the



network. He asked what was holding them back from bolder actions and mentioned streets in his District that would be untouched under the plan.

Ms. Reeves confirmed that there were about 160 miles of high injury network streets and said half of the network already had a significant corridor level safety project completed or a project that was in the planning, design, or construction phase. She said the plan proposed either corridor level projects or programmatic intersection-based treatments for the remainder of the high injury network. She said the draft Action Strategy outlined a shift in SFMTA's commitments and they were waiting for more information on Assembly Bill (AB) 43 to determine what additional authority they could use to reduce speed limits. She mentioned AB 550 and said they were unable to get authority to use speed cameras. She said major street design was a large part of Vision Zero, but work was still needed to get to zero.

Commissioner Haney said there were twelve left turn traffic calming program projects a year and asked why there was a limit.

Ms. Reeves said SFMTA committed to one hundred traffic calming locations per year and said there was a pilot program with seven locations which were being evaluated. She said SFMTA had preliminarily identified thirty-five additional high priority locations, pending the results of the left turn traffic turning pilot. She said SFMTA committed to completing the additional locations over the next three years and could share the list of locations.

Commissioner Haney asked for clarification that the entire high injury network would receive significant safety improvements, through prior and upcoming work. He asked about the enforcement plan along the high injury network for intersections and bike lanes.

Ms. Reeves said the presentation included a map which showed half of the network where corridor level improvements were completed or are in planning and design. She said SFMTA proposed to complete quick builds on the remainder of the network where appropriate and that the plan would cover the remainder of the high injury network between the quick build programs and programmatic safety intersection treatments.

Commander Perea, San Francisco Police Department, said the high injury network was a citywide focus and that all stations were responsible for traffic safety and control. He said their goal was that 50% of the enforcement would be focused on violations that caused severe injury and fatalities. He said that they were 54% above goal in the first quarter of last year and they were at 49% in the first quarter of this year. Commander Perea added that their focus was on the high injury network, working collaboratively with SFMTA to respond to initiatives like Better Market Street, and safety concerns across the city.

Commissioner Haney said enforcement was an important part of Vision Zero and there were many improvements that were ineffective or not safe due to traffic violations. He asked if there was a plan that addressed certain areas or intersections.

Commander Perea said yes, all of the District Captains worked collaboratively to respond to locations with past collision data and community concerns. Coming out of travel restrictions, he said they saw an increase in traffic and non-compliance with the vehicle code. He pointed to a study, which said the presence of uniformed police



officers impacted driving behavior. He said their greatest challenge was the demand for police services and the limited number of personnel hours available to dedicate to this work. With this, he said they try to be response and strategic with their work.

Vice Chair Peskin said comparing traffic deaths to homicides and drug overdose deaths raised questions about how we prioritized resources. He asked about the injury report and if the interdepartmental task force was still meeting.

Ms. Reeves said the Vision Zero Task Force met quarterly and was chaired by SFMTA and San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH) in strong partnership with the police department, SFPW, and the Transportation Authority. She said they were eager to fill the SFDPH chair role as they brought a critical lens to the work that was unique to San Francisco.

Shamsi Soltani, Vision Zero Epidemiologist, SFDPH, said the data that was used for injuries was from police data and data from Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital. She said there was a delay in receiving the hospital data due to the pandemic, but she had recently received it and hoped to release a report within two weeks on the severe injury trends for the last two years, which would add to all the data they had since 2011.

Vice Chair Peskin requested that SFMTA and SFDPH provide him with a briefing as he did not receive a regular briefing on the topic and said he was concerned about shared spaces, that were filling daylighted corners, creating hazardous conditions that could result in injuries or fatalities.

Chair Mandelman asked how long the SFDPH co-chair role had been unfilled.

Ms. Reeves said it had been unfilled for about a year and a half and mentioned that they had a strong team from SFDPH that led a lot of the Vision Zero work such as updating the high injury network, leading the fatality tracking, reporting, and severe injury tracking.

Commission Preston said his district continued to have high numbers of traffic related injuries and that many travelled through the district to get to other locations. He said in the past week there were two major crashes and that there was a lot that could be done locally like transit only lanes and bike lanes that were not inhibited by state restrictions to reducing speeds. He said Fell Street was a good example of a bike lane reducing speeds by up to 14% without changing the speed limit. He asked about the plans for reusing traffic lanes for other purposes as a strategy to reduce speeds while work was done to change state law.

Ms. Reeves agreed that road diets had safety benefits for all road users in addition to being a speed management strategy as was reflected in the Action Strategy. She said the comprehensive speed management plan proposed in the draft Action Strategy, in response to requests from advocates, would address the tools needed to reduce speeds.

Mr. Parks continued that reducing the number of travel lanes was a critical tool to reducing speeds which had been applied on most quick build projects and many capital projects. He said sometimes SFMTA would use that space for a transit lane or a bike lane but in some cases, they removed a lane for safety, such as on California Street through the Richmond District. He said lane removal was a tool that they would continue to use as part of the speed management plan.



Commissioner Preston said his office was ready and willing to work with SFMTA on a bold District 5 plan because there was support for reducing speeds and implementing road diets. He said he hoped to have district specific initiatives and a plan that pushed the envelope. Touching on slow streets, he was concerned about motorists driving down the slow streets and the intersections with slow streets. He mentioned Page Street and the artwork that community members set up as informal barriers. He asked for an update on signage and barriers for slow streets.

Mr. Parks clarified that slow streets were not part of the Vision Zero strategy but was a complementary goal and they were committed to slow streets and the program's future post-pandemic. He said that SFMTA received new posts and signage and were in the process of replacing the temporary barriers, but it was not a long-term solution. He said SFMTA planned to go through a community-based process to determine next steps for each slow street.

Commissioner Preston said he would love to be a part of the conversation around making slow streets permanent to help achieve the Vision Zero goals.

During public comment, a caller from District 6 said they appreciated the work that went into the plan but that it was not enough. They said the plan doubled down on the same piecemeal actions that were ineffective over the past seven years. They said this plan was supposed to get them to zero by 2024 and what was heard was insufficient. They asked if the budget showed values why the quick build program was constrained by funding when the unfunded need was a fraction of the city's budget. They continued that if Vision Zero depended on mode shift, why was there a presentation on the risk of providing too much Muni service too soon. They asked the Board to take the visionary and transformative actions to get to zero.

Ann Turner, who worked on Van Ness and Pine Street, said she hoped for a more aggressive Action Strategy to protect pedestrians. She said she was turning 80 and was frightened by the speeding motorists as she walked along Franklin or Pine Streets. She asked for speed limits to be enforced and said the city should reach out to Senators for legislative help to reduce speeds.

Nancy Arbuckle, a senior in District 2, said she did not own a car and did not feel safe while walking on San Francisco streets. She was excited when she first learned of Vision Zero, but it turned into "Progress Zero". She recognized that things changed with actions and said we needed safe streets as there were too many close calls on our streets. She said we needed to prioritize pedestrian and bicyclist safety and needed to shift from a car-centric city to a city that was safe for pedestrians.

Dave Alexander of District 1 and the parent of two children, said he was a Walk San Francisco (Walk SF) member and organizer of the Richmond Family Transportation Network in District 1. He said they put their eggs in one basket with AB 550 and that they should see if AB 43 could help engineers expand their tools around schools and senior centers. He said they should put more of an emphasis on design which could remove law enforcement as enforcement. Lastly, he said they needed real outreach to underrepresented communities and mentioned that outreach in the Tenderloin was expensive but seven different language interpretations were needed.



Jodie Medeiros, Executive Director of Walk SF, said they learned a lot in the last seven years in support of Vision Zero and that it was time, with this last Vision Zero Action Strategy, to harness all that learning and take the proven solutions that could happen quickly and affordably. She said the draft actions they were on the right track but did not do enough to save lives and prevent tragedies on our streets. She urged the Board to make recommendations to the SFMTA to go even further and to help find the funding for more improvements, especially doubling the quick build program. She said every high injury street must have safety improvements by 2024.

Marta Lindsay, on behalf of the Vision Zero Coalition, said they believed the draft Action Strategy could get the city back on track with traffic safety but asked if the work in the strategy was enough to ensure a significant reduction in severe and fatal crashes within three years. She said they did not think so and that there needed to be solutions that were fast, inexpensive, and proven, that could happen at scale. She said the draft strategy was not there yet, not even with the funding to do twenty quick builds per year.

Julie Nicholson of District 8, member of Families for Safe Streets, and a parent of three girls, said San Francisco needed to take bold action for safe streets. She said she was going to be a number in the severe injury update report because on January 4, 2020, she was hit while jogging in the Panhandle when a speeding motorist ran a red light and hit another vehicle making an illegal left turn. She said one vehicle hit her and she broke her neck and back. She said it haunted her that every fifteen hours someone was transported to Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital. She urged the Board to push for the next Action Strategy to be bold so we could have safer streets.

Patricia Arack with Senior and Disability Action and Concerned Residents of the Sunset, said Vision Zero was a great idea but there was no decrease in fatalities. She said that by closing the Great Highway, SFMTA sent an average of 19,000 vehicles into the Sunset District. She said that when she walked, she was never sure if she was going to come home in one piece because of the increase in traffic. She mentioned that everything seemed to be built for bicyclists but that the majority of sunset residents needed their cars because only 2% rode bikes. She said Vision Zero would never be a success if the Great Highway was closed.

A District 4 resident said Vision Zero was a good goal but that they would not be safer by closing streets to vehicles and deferring funding to accommodate a few bicyclists. They said the closure of the Great Highway was an example of a project that cost more money and increased collisions noting that when the roadway was open, there was one collision since 2017, but since it closed there were several collisions and injuries, which needed to be addressed.

A caller said that closing the Great Highway made it more difficult to achieve Vision Zero by 2024. They said the closure pushed thousands of vehicles from a safe road with no fatalities onto streets that are on the high injury network. They added that the closure would add more traffic to streets that were more dangerous according to the city's own assessments. They agreed with Vice Chair Peskin and said that the parklets program had the potential to worsen safety because they reduced visibility for crossing pedestrians and turning motorists. They said the Vision Zero team should provide input into safety projects.



Jamie Michaels, a District 5 resident, urged the implementation of a bold Vision Zero Action Strategy that applied new research, innovation, and technology. She noted that she and her neighbors spent a decade trying to get traffic calming devices installed and they were installed last year but only had a modest effect on slowing cars. She said her street was identified by navigation apps as the quickest way across town and it was frustrating to live in the land of high tech where navigation apps were developed while solutions for slowing traffic felt like low tech. She urged consideration and deployment of tools that would effectively slow traffic.

Lisa Church of District 3, said projects may take two or three years to deliver but they should not be called quick. She said money could be saved on studies and staff time if they just walked down the street and witnessed speeding cars, double parking, cars in bike lanes, and unsafe turns. She said she spent 30 minutes walking and counted close to 50 issues. Lastly, she said they knew what the problems were and asked the staff to mitigate them.

Judy Gorski, District 4, said Vision Zero was a good goal and thought it was good that slow streets were not part of the action. She did not agree that closing streets to accommodate a few bicyclists made streets safer. She mentioned the closure of the Great Highway as an example of creating more collisions when, before its closure, there was one collision in four years. She said there were 20,000 vehicles on neighborhood streets and \$500,000 was spent on traffic calming that did not work.

Malcolm Jaramillo, a community organizer with the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition, said that he was affected by traffic violence as his father was hit and injured while bicycling on Cesar Chavez and said he was left with chronic pain and was not able to bike since. He said as a District 9 resident in the Portola, his family's home was bounded by two high traffic corridors, Silver and San Bruno avenues and that any time he moved within the neighborhood he was risking his life. He said they needed bold and consistent leadership and urged the Board to push for the next Action Strategy to be more aggressive.

Rick Gurley, who lived in San Francisco for 45 of his 67 years lived in Bernal Heights and was a member of WalkSF and the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition. He said he lived with pain as the result of a Muni bus hitting him as he rode his bike. He said the right to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness must be the guiding principles for transportation planning. He said San Francisco must take bold action to improve their traffic infrastructure and to educate the public to eliminate traffic injuries and deaths.

A District 5 resident mentioned JFK Drive, which was a high injury corridor and no one had been injured or killed since that became a pedestrian and bicycle only thoroughfare. He thanked Commissioners Preston and Haney for working to keep areas of the city open to pedestrians and bicyclists. He said the draft Action Strategy was not bold enough.

Leanne Chang, a parent in District 1, said she was concerned about street safety and there were trips she would not take by bike because of that concern. She said slow streets made it possible for her family to get around much more than before the pandemic. She asked the Board to push for the next Action Strategy to be more aggressive to keep people safe.

A caller said it was too often that people were being killed on our streets or suffered life altering injuries and post traumatic stress disorder. They said it was too often that



approved projects preserved parking and throughput and not safety. They continued that the safest designs often never reached a vote, and the safest proposals were never presented to the public because city staff wanted to avoid angry input. They relayed that it was too often that the city blamed state laws instead of doing everything they could do.

Jessica Jenkins, a District 5 resident, and parent said children could not walk around San Francisco because there were too many cars and distracted driving. She said she was able to relax on streets that were closed to motorists and was dismayed that slow street were not part of the Vision Zero Action Strategy. She said the replacement of four way stops by traffic lights on Haight Street resulted in higher speeds as motorists raced to beat the light, her 311 requests for daylighting and ADA compliant curb ramps on high injury corridors were ignored and companies like Doordash and Amazon prioritized speed over safety.

A caller said Vision Zero was a laudable goal, but he was a cynic. They said the Great Highway was a safe route and, with the closure, 20,000 cars a day were forced onto residential streets, so the streets were less safe with the closure.

Eric Rozell, Manager of the Tenderloin Community Benefit District's Pedestrian Safety Program, and Co-Chair of the Tenderloin Safety Task Force, spoke on behalf of the neighborhood to urge the city to take bold and immediate actions to create safe streets. He said SFMTA had repeatedly stated its commitment for prioritizing street safety and urged the agency to invest in street safety in the Tenderloin. He additionally requested that SFMTA provide funding for Tenderloin pedestrian safety programs so work could continue with providing safe crossings and outreach for seniors, youth, people with disabilities, and the unhoused.

Jennie Yew, called representing her mother, who became a traffic violence victim in 2011.

A caller spoke in support of more funding for Vision Zero and stated that the city failed repeatedly as every fifteen hours, another person became the victim of traffic violence. They said they were the victim of traffic violence and asked for pedestrian safety, active mobility, and transit improvements.

Raul Maldonado said in 2021 he became a member of San Francisco Bicycle Coalition, Kid Safe San Francisco, and San Francisco Transit Riders to advocate for walking and biking. He said he supported the next Action Strategy being more aggressive. He called on the city to provide safe and equitable transportation.

A member of the Vision Zero Coalition, a father, and a victim of traffic violence, spoke on behalf of Kid Safe SF. He said the city needed to take action and the draft Action Strategy would not get us to zero fatalities by 2024. He said he did not want to lose his child to traffic violence. He said we needed bold and well-funded changes for our streets to decrease fatalities and increase safety, including the strategy outlined by the Vision Zero Coalition and by working with the Fire Department. He urged the Board to push SFMTA to make the strategy bolder to eliminate traffic fatalities.

A caller from the Lower Great Highway said Vision Zero was designed to reduce fatalities and the closure of the Great Highway pushed 19,000 onto neighborhood streets, decreasing safety.



Commissioner Chan said she agreed with Commissioner Melgar's comments about not waiting until there was a fatality before improvements were implemented and she appreciated Vice Chair Peskin asking for the injury report, not just information on fatalities. She said the previous Friday the Board of Supervisors Government Audits & Oversight Committee had a hearing to discuss traffic collision data gathering and she was pleased that her colleagues with institutional knowledge discussed Vision Zero and what needed to be done. She said that there was a fundamental challenge with Vision Zero because our approach was intervention. She suggested that we transition from an intervention approach to a prevention approach, which would ease the frustration heard from her colleagues and the public. She urged SFMTA to prioritize Vision Zero with funding and staffing and with a prevention approach to roadway safety.

Chair Mandelman concluded with saying that Vice Chair Peskin was correct that former Board President Yee would be proud of the Board. He said they expressed support for the city being bold and for the SFMTA and other departments to move aggressively toward the 2024 Vision Zero goal. He said he did not think the city was on track to meet the 2024 goal, and he shared the concern of his colleagues who had a desire to see the city move more aggressively. He urged SFMTA to accelerate quick build projects, implement more red-light camera enforcement, and work to be bolder along the lines of what Commissioner Preston discussed. He said to go forth, save lives and do it quickly.

Other Items

11. Introduction of New Items - INFORMATION

There were no new items introduced.

12. Public Comment

During public comment a caller thanked Commissioner Mar for his earlier comments. He said as a District 1 resident they supported the goals and objectives in the District 4 mobility study as it was presented. They said they understand they are not discussing the Great Highway, but he pointed out that the proposed pilot closure will negatively impact several of the recommended improvements within the D4 Mobility study, particularly those related to safety and transit. He said that they have an inter-related transit network, therefore the projects need to consider impacts on the transportation system holistically and on each other.

A District 4 resident said there is unequal treatment with the Upper Highway being closed. They said that with the highway closed the street sweeper comes at least twice a day, however prior to the closure it would only come once. They also mentioned that the hours for the meetings are a struggle to make for people that work, and asked the Board to consider a better time.

A caller said the amount of people that were surveyed does not balance out with the number of residents. They said it may cost \$20,000, but they would like to see a mailing go out to residents, then they may have some restored faith that they are honest about wanting to listen to the residents. They said there are 80% drivers who are being ignored.

Judi Gorski asked Commissioner Mar to clarify for citizens of the Sunset District who need to drive the nine streets being turned into neighborways, and if vehicles will be



able to share these streets. She said with 85,000 people living in the Sunset, only 2% are bicyclists, and asked why there is a constant deference to bicycle lanes narrowing their streets and removing parking spots needed by their residents. She asked why they would vote to keep their constituents in harms way.

Dr. Heidi Moses, mother living with her family in District 4 says that San Francisco needs to take bold action for safe streets now. She said there are few car-free safe spaces like the Great Highway that have shown that simple steps can improve safety. She said that her family used to commute by car, but now with the car-free spaces it is finally safe to bike.

Luke Bornheimer with Kid Safe SF, said collision and injuries are down more than 30% in the Outer Sunset since the car closure, and added that Outer Sunset is actually safer. He said support for the full promenade pilot is 2 ½ times greater than any roadway configuration, which was validated by the SFMTA survey, along with written and verbal public comment given at the Transportation Authority Board meeting.

Steve Gorski resident of the Outer Sunset said they are not taking into account all the accidents that have happened on the Lower Great Highway. He said when they looked at the study they used the entire District 4, not just the few blocks surrounding the Great Highway.

Anastasia Monopolis said that she really wants them to push the capital project of fixing the tunnel because 4 years is too long. She said trains cannot get through the tunnel to go downtown, J Church has been kicked off the line, and given her inability to go down flights of stairs she has no way to travel downtown.

Charlie Perkins said traffic accidents are down throughout the city everywhere because less people were driving during the pandemic. He said there was actually no drop in accidents during the pandemic, including the accidents that occurred on the overflow streets such as 48th Avenue. and La Playa even though overall traffic patterns were down.

A caller said since the closure there have been many collisions in the streets near the closed highway and have created delays for their emergency responders. They said no streets should be obstructed while the Upper Great Highway remains closed to vehicles and during the 19th Avenue construction, they should not be diverting traffic simultaneously into their neighborhoods.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:54 p.m.