

# Agenda Item 4.

## Meeting #2 Recap, Minutes & Follow-Ups



San Francisco  
County Transportation  
Authority

October 14, 2021

---

## Themes from Meeting #2

---



- Recognition that **maintaining the existing systems** is critical
- **Strong support for paratransit** and a recognition that the needs will grow
- Interest in a **project prioritization process** that includes an equity consideration
- Questions about **leveraging** – what programs are best able to tap into additional funding sources?

# Engagement Opportunities



San Francisco  
County Transportation  
Authority

## Online Survey

- [www.sfcta.org/expenditureplan](http://www.sfcta.org/expenditureplan)

## Presentations to Groups

- **We will come to you** - email [expenditureplan@sfcta.org](mailto:expenditureplan@sfcta.org)

## Chinese, Russian and Spanish Focus Groups

- Planned for late October/November

## Virtual Town Halls

- Saturday November 6, 2021 at 11:00 AM
- Tuesday November 16, 2021 at 6:00 PM



## Administrative modifications:

- Prop K Legacy Projects incorporated (see attachment)
- Funding redistribution within Muni Transit Maintenance Rehabilitation and Replacement programs, per SFMTA request
- Eligible agencies/project sponsors refined

# Prop K Legacy Projects



Project Name	Funding (millions of 2020\$)
Geary Rapid Improvements, Phase 2	\$10.00
Caltrain Downtown Rail Extension	\$19.50
Quint-Jerrold Connector Road	\$4.73
Bayshore Caltrain Pedestrian Connection	\$2.00
<b>Total New Expenditure Plan Funding</b>	<b>\$36.23</b>

- Legacy projects have been added to various programs in the New EP. See Legacy Project factsheet for details.
- If any of these funds are allocated prior to the operative date of the new EP (Jan. 1, 2023), these figures will be reduced by an equivalent amount.

# Priority 1 Funding Level Comparison



San Francisco  
County Transportation  
Authority

Investment Type	Prop K	Draft New EP	Change
Transit Maintenance	40.0%	40.5%	=
Major Transit Improvements & Enhancements	26.0%	27.4%	↑
Safe and Complete Streets	10.5%	11.5%	↑
Streets Maintenance (includes signals and signs)	10.6%	8.9%	↓
Paratransit	8.6%	8.6%	=
Transportation Demand Management, Citywide & Neighborhood Planning	1.2%	2.4%	↑
Freeway Safety, Operations, Redesign (planning)	3.4%	1.8%	↓

*Prop K percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding errors. Preliminary Draft EP does not sum to 100%.*

# Expenditure Plan Priority Funding Levels



San Francisco  
County Transportation  
Authority

Prop K Priority Level	Total Revenues (2003 \$s)
Priority 1	\$2,350 million
Priority 2	\$2,626 million
Priority 3	\$2,800 million

Draft New EP Priority Level	Total Revenues (2020 \$s)
Priority 1	\$2,388 million
Priority 2	\$2,938 million

Prop K included three priority levels of funding. We are recommending a similar approach with the New Expenditure Plan.

The Preliminary Draft New EP focuses on Priority 1. Priority 2 level funding distribution will be determined by the EPAC.

We could develop a Priority 3 funding level as well.

# Questions?



**San Francisco  
County Transportation  
Authority**

**Email: [ExpenditurePlan@sfcta.org](mailto:ExpenditurePlan@sfcta.org)**



Table 1 - PRELIMINARY DRAFT New Transportation Sales Tax Expenditure Plan (EP)						
#	New EP Category - Subcategory - Program/Project	New Since Prop K	Eligible Agencies	Priority 1 Funding (2020 million\$*)	Priority 1 %**	Revision Notes
<b>A - Major Transit Projects</b>					<b>23.30%</b>	
1	Muni Bus Reliability and Efficiency Improvements		SFMTA	\$110.00	4.61%	Funding increased to include Prop K legacy project
2	Muni Rail Core Capacity	New	SFMTA	\$57.00	2.39%	
3	BART Core Capacity	New	BART	\$50.00	2.09%	
4	Caltrain Service Vision: Capital System Capacity Investments	New	PCJPB	\$10.00	0.42%	
5	Caltrain Downtown Rail Extension and Pennsylvania Alignment		TJPA SFCTA	\$329.50	13.80%	Funding increased to include Prop K legacy funding
<b>B - Transit Maintenance &amp; Enhancements</b>					<b>43.93%</b>	
<b>i. Maintenance, Rehabilitation and Replacement</b>					<b>39.23%</b>	
6	Muni - Vehicles		SFMTA	\$453.75	19.00%	SFMTA requested funding redistribution between rows 6-7 to increase funding for Facilities
7	Muni - Facilities		SFMTA	\$118.45	4.96%	
8	Muni - Guideways		SFMTA	\$238.82	10.00%	
9	BART		BART	\$21.25	0.89%	
10	Caltrain		PCJPB	\$100.00	4.19%	
11	Ferry		GGBHTD Port of SF	\$4.54	0.19%	
<b>ii. Transit Enhancements</b>					<b>4.70%</b>	
12	Transit Enhancements		BART PCJPB <del>SFCTA</del> SFMTA SFPW TIMMA	\$38.21	1.60%	Project sponsors limited to operating agencies only
13	BART Station Access, Safety and Capacity		BART <del>SFCTA</del> SFMTA SFPW	\$9.31	0.39%	See above
14	New Bayview Caltrain Station		PCJPB SFCTA SFMTA SFPW	\$27.73	1.16%	Funding increased to include Prop K legacy project; SFPW sponsor added for legacy project
15	Mission Bay Ferry Landing	New	Port of SF	\$7.00	0.29%	
16	Next Generation Transit Investments	New	BART PCJPB SFCTA SFMTA	\$30.00	1.26%	

17	<b>C - Paratransit</b>			SFMTA	\$205.38	8.60%	
	<b>D - Streets and Freeways</b>					18.44%	
	<b>i. Maintenance, Rehabilitation and Replacement</b>					5.14%	
18	Street Resurfacing, Rehabilitation and Maintenance			SFPW	\$105.00	4.40%	
19	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Maintenance			SFMTA SFPW	\$17.67	0.74%	
	<b>ii. Safe and Complete Streets</b>					11.50%	
20	Safer Streets (signals, traffic calming, bikes and peds)			SFCTA SFMTA SFPW	\$226.87	9.50%	
21	Curb Ramps			SFPW	\$23.88	1.00%	
22	Tree Planting			SFPW	\$23.88	1.00%	
	<b>iii. Freeway Safety and Operational Improvements</b>					1.80%	
23	Vision Zero Ramps	New		<del>Caltrans</del> SFCTA SFMTA	\$8.00	0.33%	If needed, agencies may pass through funds to Caltrans
24	Managed Lanes and Express Bus	New		<del>Caltrans</del> SFCTA SFMTA	\$15.00	0.63%	See above. Name changed to reflect programmatic nature
25	Transformative Freeway Projects and Other Safety and Operational Improvements	New		<del>Caltrans</del> Planning SFCTA SFMTA SFPW	\$20.00	0.84%	See above. Programs combined to provide flexibility
26	Transformative Freeway Projects						
	<b>E - Transportation System Development &amp; Management</b>					6.78%	
26	<b>i. Transportation Demand Management</b>			BART PCJPB Planning SFCTA SFE SFMTA TIMMA	\$30.00	1.26%	
	<b>ii. Transportation, Land Use and Community Coordination</b>					5.53%	
27	Neighborhood Transportation Program			Planning SFPW SFCTA SFMTA	\$40.00	1.67%	
28	Equity Priority Transportation Program	New		Planning SFPW SFCTA SFMTA	\$40.00	1.67%	
29	Development Oriented Transportation	New		BART PCJPB Planning SFPW SFCTA SFMTA	\$42.00	1.76%	Funding increased to include Prop K legacy project
30	Citywide / Modal Planning			Planning SFCTA SFMTA	\$10.00	0.42%	
<b>TOTAL DRAFT NEW EXPENDITURE PLAN FUNDING***</b>					<b>\$2,413.25</b>	<b>101.05%</b>	

- \* All funding amounts are in millions of 2020 dollars including the total revenue
- \*\* EP percentages are based on a percent of the recommended (conservative) 30-year revenue forecast, net of existing obligations.
- \*\*\* EP percentages do not add up to 100% of the recommended (conservative) 30-year revenue forecast in this preliminary draft, and totals may not add up due to rounding



## Prop K Legacy Project Descriptions

This fact sheet provides information on the Prop K Legacy Projects recommended for inclusion in the Preliminary Draft New Expenditure Plan. Prop K is the current sales tax program that is in effect, approved by San Francisco voters in 2003.

We propose carrying forward the four projects described below into the New Expenditure Plan with a total of \$36.23 million in sales tax 'legacy funds'. Each of the projects is underway, is a subsequent phase of a project funded with the Prop K sales tax, and/or has a financial commitment that we wish to memorialize in the New Expenditure Plan to provide certainty and support project delivery. The legacy projects are similar to the "grandfathered" projects in Prop K that were carried forward from the predecessor Prop B Expenditure Plan.

The proposed legacy funds are programmed to the four projects in the 2021 Prop K Strategic Plan update that the Transportation Authority Board is anticipated to approved in November 2021. If the Transportation Authority allocates all or a portion of these funds prior to the operative date of the New Expenditure Plan (i.e., January 1, 2023 if approved at the June 7, 2022 election), the proposed legacy funding amount will be reduced by an equivalent amount.

*Note: Amounts shown are in 2020 \$s.*

1. **Caltrain Downtown Rail Extension:** Construction of a grade-separated extension of Caltrain to the new Salesforce Transit Center at the current site (Mission and 1st Streets) near BART and MUNI Metro. Includes project development and capital costs. Sponsoring Agency: TJPA, SFCTA. *Proposed Legacy Funding: \$19.5M*

Project is included under: Caltrain Downtown Rail Extension and Pennsylvania Alignment.

Rationale: Phase 2 of Salesforce Transit Center funded by Prop K. Project is also seeking approval this fall to enter the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA's) New Starts program and to initiate the FTA Project Development Phase this fall. The New Starts program is highly competitive and has tight deadlines for advancing, including securing full funding for project implementation. The TJPA is seeking a target New Starts grant size of \$1.5-2.5 billion.

2. **Geary Rapid Improvements Phase 2:** Enhance the performance, safety, and comfort level of transit and pedestrian travel along the Geary corridor between Stanyan Street and 34th Avenue. Project includes transit improvements such as bus-only lanes, signal optimization, upgraded transit stops, and pedestrian improvements such as highly visible crosswalks, sidewalk extensions, median refuges, and lighting. Includes project



development and capital costs. Sponsoring Agency: SFMTA. *Proposed Legacy Funding: \$10.0M*

Project is included under: Major Transit Projects - Muni Bus Reliability and Efficiency Improvements

Rationale: Phase 2 of Geary Rapid Improvements Project.

3. **Quint-Jerrold Connector Road:** Construction of a new road along former Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way between Quint Street and Jerrold Avenue to restore access that was cut off by the construction of a Caltrain berm. Includes project development and capital costs. Sponsoring Agency: SFCTA, SFPW. *Proposed Legacy Funding: \$4.73M*

Project is included under: Transit Enhancements - New Bayview Caltrain Station

Rationale: The City and County of San Francisco is currently in right-of-way negotiations to acquire property to construct the roadway which is an agreed to mitigation for the local community (see project description for more detail).

4. **Bayshore Caltrain Pedestrian Connection:** New pedestrian connection to the existing Bayshore Caltrain Station from Bayshore Boulevard through the Schlage Lock site. The project was identified in the 2013 Bi-County Study as an interim solution to support planned growth in the area and as a neighborhood priority. Sponsoring Agency: SFMTA. *Proposed Legacy Funding: \$2M*

Project is included under: Transportation, Land Use and Community Coordination - Development Oriented Transportation

Rationale: This \$2 million commitment is included in the Development Agreement for the Schlage Lock site.

**Total Proposed Legacy Funding: \$36.23M**



# DRAFT MINUTES

## Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee

Thursday, September 23, 2021

### 1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

**Present at Roll Call:** Members: Jay Bain, Anni Chung, Majeid Crawford, Zack Deutsch-Gross, Jesse Fernandez, Mel Flores, Amandeep Jawa, Sharky Laguana, Aaron Leifer, Jessica Lum, Maryo Mogannam, Susan Murphy, Calvin Quick, Eric Rozell, Earl Shaddix, Yensing Sihapanya, Kim Tavaglione, Joan Van Rijn, Christopher White. Alternates Sitting in for Members: Daniel Herzstein (20)

**Absent at Roll Call (joined afterwards):** Rosa Chen, Nick Josefowitz, Jodie Medeiros, Pi Ra, Maurice Rivers (5)

**Absent:** Rodney Fong (alternate attended), Maelig Morvan, (2)

### 2. EPAC Chair's Remarks

Chair Jawa thanked members, staff, and agencies for attending. He said that the Transportation Authority Board and staff want to hear from all of us—what are our priorities, what do we want to make sure is included, what relative funding levels make sense to us, how do we want the sales tax program to be administered. He said that the main topics on the agenda that evening were several proposed programs for the New Sales Tax Expenditure Plan that focus on maintaining the transportation system – both the streets and the transit infrastructure for Muni, BART and Caltrain, as well as taking a look at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA's) paratransit program that serves seniors and persons with disabilities.

Chair Jawa noted that at the September 23rd meeting, there was a lot of interest in seeing more data and that staff have included relevant materials under agenda item 3 in the packet, including the full equity analysis report that was the focus of the prior meeting. He acknowledged that the EPAC had expressed interest in making sure equity was part of the prioritization process for identifying which projects the New Expenditure Plan would fund and that the prioritization process and related policies were anticipated to be discussed in meetings 4 or 5 and beyond. Lastly, Chair Jawa noted that the minutes were also included under item 3 and that they provide a summary of the conversations that took place in the breakout rooms.

There were no questions or comments from the EPAC.

### 3. Meeting #1 Recap, Minutes and Follow-Ups - INFORMATION

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

There were no questions or comments from the EPAC.



**4. Public Comment**

During public comment, Ed Mason said that project sponsor presentations tend to be too general. He said that resource tables and metrics were lacking and that street repaving processes are inefficient and gave an example of a road segment being repaved in April and another part of the same road being repaved in July. He said complete streets philosophy puts landscaping under the discretion of the local level. Mr. Mason continued stating that street trees were buried in bicycle and pedestrian funding, but not mentioned in the San Francisco Public Works (SFPW) presentation and said that SFPW should separately fund street trees. He said that fixing sidewalks contributes to pollution due to cement and said the substitute for cement is three times the cost. Lastly, Mr. Mason said curb ramp replacements have issues, including hairline cracks, leading them to question if construction was being done correctly.

**5. Maintaining the System: Street Repaving and Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities - INFORMATION**

Michelle Beaulieu, Principal Transportation Planner, Government Affairs; Oscar Quintanilla, SFPW; and Jonathan Rewers, SFMTA, presented the item.

A member asked if the funding included protected bike lanes and their implementation in communities of concern, whether the funding was enough, and if other sources of revenue were available.

Mr. Rewers replied that the program funding that was the subject of the presentation was for maintenance after the bike lanes were put in. He added that the funding was insufficient and previously, SFMTA had relied on repainting to be done when SFPW repaved streets. He said with additional paint and lanes now installed, a more sophisticated maintenance program would be needed, which SFMTA was in the process of developing.

Chair Jawa added that this meeting's focus was about maintaining what we have and not expenditures for new improvements.

A member asked whether bus usage was a project selection criterion for street resurfacing.

Ramon Kong, SFPW answered that factors for street selection included the Pavement Condition Index (PCI) score, multimodal route usage (which includes transit use), and whether it is an arterial or residential street as they have different life cycles.

A member referenced the frequent use of firetrucks in the Tenderloin and wondered if that was factored in to paving prioritization. They also asked how SFMTA prioritized curb ramps, street, and sidewalk maintenance.

Mr. Rewers staff replied that SFMTA replaces curb ramps during major capital projects (such as when installing new traffic signals), but SFPW handles regular maintenance.

Mr. Quintanilla said SFPW would present on the curb ramp program at the next meeting. For sidewalks, he said that SFPW responds to calls and prioritizes safety hazards. He said SFPW repairs about 600 locations per year and that the number continues to grow. Mr. Quintanilla explained that SFPW prioritizes sidewalk repairs based on 311 calls and aligning with large capital projects, but they are only responsive and not proactive, which is their ultimate objective.



A member noted that a lot of crosswalk paint was almost non-existent in the Tenderoin.

Mr. Rewers said that SFMTA prioritizes crosswalk maintenance based on 311 calls, similar to what SFPW does for sidewalk repair and that like SFPW, SFMTA would like to be more pro-active on maintenance rather than reactive.

A member asked whether maintenance work was done in-house or through requests for proposals and contractors and noted an apparent lack of coordination saying they seen some sections of street repaved multiple times.

Mr. Kong replied that SFPW has have monthly coordination meetings with all utility companies to coordinate repairs and said that utility companies apply to SFPW for permits when they need to get into the street to do maintenance. They said SFPW paves curb-to-curb, but utility companies pave only the portion of the street needed for utility maintenance, so it may seem as though paving is being done multiple times but it's actually utility trench restoration. He also said the SFPW operation yard crews pave about 100 blocks per year and 400-500 additional blocks per year are paved through contractors.

A member said that maintenance was reactionary and asked if there were algorithms to plan for maintenance needs.

Mr. Kong replied that SFPW used PCI scores to plan and coordinate paving projects together for efficiency. They said contracts were typically 40-50 blocks at a time.

A member noted the \$318 million funding gap SFPW showed for street resurfacing and asked if the \$88 million shown in the slide deck as local sales tax program was the predecessor sales tax (Prop K).

Mr. Quintanilla clarified that the \$88 million in sales tax shown was from the proposed new expenditure plan.

Chair Jawa pointed out that even with the proposed sales tax amount, the street resurfacing program showed a funding gap.

A member inquired whether it may be appropriate to set aside funding to improve the efficiency of repaving streets.

## **6. Maintaining the System: Muni, BART and Caltrain - INFORMATION**

Michelle Beaulieu, Principal Transportation Planner, Government Affairs, Jonathan Rewers, SFMTA, Priya Mathur, BART, and Anthony Simmons, Caltrain presented the item.

A member asked if transit operators expected service needs to return to pre-pandemic volumes, how work from home would impact ridership, and if that was reflected in the budget. They said that BART's elevator attendant program helped lower maintenance costs and increased accessibility and asked if the budget reflected these savings. They also asked if there were plans to expand the elevator attendant program into other areas.

Priya Mathur replied that currently BART weekend ridership was recovering better than commuter (weekday) ridership. She said BART had restored (pre-pandemic) service to maintain rider appeal. She added that BART continued to invest in the elevator attendant program and favors expansion dependent upon adequate funding.





Anthony Simmons, Caltrain, responded that Caltrain was currently running 104 trains per weekday, up from 92 trains pre-pandemic. He said this change was to meet the needs of a different market (not just peak period commuters) and provide greater certainty to riders. He said Caltrain would also keep adjusting the timetable as needed to meet BART trains at the Millbrae station.

An EPAC member asked if SFMTA considered adopting ISO standards for their asset management process.

Jerad Weiner, with the SFMTA staff replied that he was certified by the ISO, and that SFMTA was starting to growing their staff capacity to align with the standard, but they had not yet sought certification.

A member asked for confirmation on whether SFMTA had finalized decisions for vehicle replacements and whether SFMTA would have the flexibility to fund trolleybuses if they decided to use them in the long term.

A member asked if there were timesavings or reliability estimates that would be seen if the state of good repair (SOGR) backlog was addressed.

Mr. Rewers replied that yes, the SFMTA could provide data showing increased reliability with additional SOGR investment, citing vehicles as a good example of this.

Mr. Rewers continued by noting that to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, SFMTA was looking at converting to an all-electric fleet. He said trolley coaches could be part of the solution or not - still to be determined, but that there would always be overhead lines since the light rail vehicles required them.

## **7. Paratransit - INFORMATION**

Michelle Beaulieu, Principal Transportation Planner, Government Affairs, and Jonathan Rewers, SFMTA presented the item.

There were no questions from the EPAC.

*The Brown Act meeting was suspended to allow members to participate in breakout rooms. The minutes below summarize discussions in the breakout rooms for reference and reflect the breakout group report outs after the Brown Act meeting was resumed.*

During the breakout room, a member stated that they support funding the need for maintenance, because this is so important. The member stated that they were interested in seeing government be more efficient as well.

Another member asked how the efficiency of using taxis vs vans for paratransit was being examined. They also wanted to know about savings that might occur with lower ridership. They were interested in community serving service versus commuter service on BART and Caltrain in particular. Finally, they stated that paratransit was a very important investment in the plan.

One member stated that relying on 311 is a hinderance to some communities who don't speak English or have concerns about contacting authorities. They wanted to see how equity could be included in prioritization. The member also stated that maintaining streets in high-car ownership neighborhoods might be rewarding that behavior when the city is supposed to be transit first.

Transportation Authority staff noted that street maintenance and smooth pavement can benefit all users of the road.



A member noted that it would be interesting to see the comparison of what is in Prop K versus what is proposed for the new Expenditure Plan, and the reasons behind that. They stated that they felt there was a strong case made for the importance of maintenance.

Another member echoed the above sentiment, and expressed a desire for an analysis of why certain investments should be made instead of others. They stated that paratransit is critical particularly with rapid buses that skip blocks which is difficult for older adults.

A member stated that it was important that the SFMTA continue to improve its asset management program, and that the group should consider how the sales tax can support the planning and implementation of new asset management systems. They also noted that San Francisco has the highest road repaving costs in the region, and that we should invest in understanding why that is and take proactive steps to make changes. Finally, the member stated that they wanted to support the pitch from BART, saying that the agency is an essential part of San Francisco's transportation infrastructure. They noted that BART carries more San Mateo riders than Caltrain, supporting economic activity.

One member asked whether the group would discuss the Expenditure Plan policies, and Transportation Authority staff confirmed that they would. The member further noted that they were impressed by BART's elevator attendance program. They asked if the program would be growing. They also asked if BART was expanding their training for maintenance workers.

BART staff replied that they would love to expand the program, if funding is available, and that they invest a lot in training the maintenance team.

One member asked about the impact of Uber/Lyft on the taxi program as it relates to paratransit. Another member responded that the taxi program had been essential to the paratransit program. Transportation Authority staff noted that they could share the agency's past work on TNC (e.g. Uber/Lyft) impacts on San Francisco.

During the breakout room, a member was frustrated that there was not a lot of depth in the presentations and said that there could have been a meeting on each of the topics. They asked how much the agencies were in competition with each other for the funds and what the ask was of the EPAC. The member wanted to know if the EPAC was supposed to determine the percentages each agency should get or if they would look at individual programs at each agency to determine what was or was not necessary.

Transportation Authority staff acknowledged the good feedback and the volume of information, adding that the Transportation Authority was looking for any questions or concerns about the programs and funding levels, and wanting to know if the need for the programs was clear.

The member said some programs seemed more necessary than others.

A member wanted to see a side-by-side comparison of the current Expenditure Plan with the proposed New Expenditure Plan, including with descriptions of the programs. They said the need for the programs were obvious, so they wanted to know what the priorities were and whether they were based on equity. They asked how the EPAC was supposed to look at the need and make decisions based on priorities.

Transportation Authority staff said the information available on the website for the programs being discussed at this meeting provided the funding level and eligibility



from the Prop K Expenditure Plan (the one currently in place) and the Proposed New Expenditure Plan that the EPAC will help shape.

A member said it was a lot to look at, but all the agencies and programs were important. They said their slight bias was looking at how residents in Districts 10 and 11 could get downtown faster because they did not have access to BART. They echoed the previous comments and said it was not clear what the EPAC was being asked to do.

A member said they were happy to see that the projections were based on keeping the sales tax consistent at a half-cent. They said they did not know paratransit operations were part of the program and expressed concerns that such an important service relied on a volatile tax. They said there was a reason why we typically saw capital expenses as opposed to operating expenses when we discussed how to program and allocate the funds.

A member said it would be helpful to know each agency's philosophy for understanding their needs and priorities. They asked which programs would be more successful with federal and state funding, which could fill gaps. They said it would be helpful for EPAC members to know if some programs did not have other funding sources that could backfill the sales tax funds. Since this was a San Francisco sales tax, they asked if the city had higher allocations for local needs compared to what is allocated for regional transportation.

A member said the street repaving program was perplexing to residents because many agencies had projects that dig up the streets. They said they did not think we should spend more than what was designated in the draft program description of the expenditure plan to come up with a system to maintain the streets given the limited funding availability within the sales tax. Procedurally, they said it would help to have the program descriptions on the slides in the breakout rooms. They asked if the BART presentation was asking for significantly more funding than was listed in the draft expenditure plan.

Transportation Authority staff confirmed that was the case.

Staff asked if there were questions about or feedback on the program descriptions.

A member said that they needed more information to ask detailed questions on the program descriptions.

A member said the expenditure plan should not include funding for motor coach replacement given the city's priority to move away from diesel vehicles to zero emission vehicles.

SFMTA staff said they were supposed to start the electric vehicle transition with the next vehicle procurement; however, they were still figuring out how the technology would work, if they could purchase enough vehicles of the right size, if they could transition the entire fleet, and how to transition the facilities at the same time. They said the language was in place to give SFMTA the latitude to figure out the technology and transition questions. SFMTA staff said it was their priority to transition, but they may have to purchase another round of hybrid vehicles before they can begin to fully transition the vehicles.

A member asked that with SFMTA predicting, prior to the pandemic, that they would have a five-year deficit, how would the EPAC know that the management and oversight of new funding would be used correctly.



Transportation Authority staff said their job was to ensure accountability and transparency with how the sales tax funds were used, that the Transportation Authority Board approved all the allocations on a project level, and that there was reporting in place to ensure that the public was able to track each grant. The member asked if the Transportation Authority would allocate additional funds if the money was not being used wisely.

Transportation Authority staff said that the Transportation Authority ensured that the funding was being spent in line with the expenditure plan and that the scopes of work, schedules and budgets were delivered as approved by the Board.

Transportation Authority staff asked how important the programs presented were.

A member said each program was important and mentioned that there was only \$17 million in sidewalk and pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure which was such a small amount compared to all the other maintenance requests. They mentioned that it was the same amount as SFPW's equipment and was the smallest amount being requested besides the \$5 million for ferries. They said in terms of equity, everyone used sidewalks and pedestrian safety infrastructure, so the program deserved more funding.

A member seconded that and added that due to the aging population in San Francisco, paratransit was important. The member was concerned that there was not enough funding for the additional aging population and their needs.

A member said it may be helpful for the group to understand how Prop K funds were programmed and allocated.

Transportation Authority staff agreed that it was a good idea to explain to the EPAC how the program would be implemented.

A member said they were looking forward to more depth for each topic in the future. Procedurally, the member asked if the agendas were supposed to be emailed prior to the meetings because they were not receiving them.

Another member said they received an updated calendar invite but would prefer that the agenda be sent via email with a clear subject line, such as "Agenda for EPAC".

During the breakout room, a member asked about the utilization level of the paratransit fleet and if the demand fluctuates.

SFMTA staff replied that the utilization was high and that they have both replaced and expanded on the fleet, to give a sense of the demand. A member noted that if demand continues to increase, it will factor into the decision process.

Transportation Authority staff added that the goal was to provide a stable operating source with the sales tax for a significant amount of time (e.g. around 20+ years, if possible), but acknowledged that if demand continues to grow and costs rise faster than revenues, another new source of funding would need to be found in the future.

A member asked if the revenue of the proposed program would be enough to cover the 40% of the paratransit budget that the current expenditure plan funds.

SFMTA staff replied that the proposed plan aims to maintain an average of 40%, and they would continue to look for alternative sources of funding.

Transportation Authority staff added that the initial draft of the expenditure plan was based on the low forecast and the EPAC may want to think about whether the



paratransit program might be a good candidate to receive some of the higher revenue forecast funds also known as Priority 2 revenues.

A member asked whether the paratransit program considers issues of language access.

SFMTA staff replied that language services were provided.

A member was curious if there were demographics for who uses the paratransit programs. They asked if outreach could be conducted for districts with less use to spread awareness of the available services.

SFMTA staff responded that they collect some information from calls and pick-up locations and would check if demographic information for paratransit use was available.

A member asked for elaboration in reference to SFPW staff stating that the newer, low-emission vehicles are not ready for San Francisco's geography. The member also asked how the city might be affected by not utilizing those vehicles.

Transportation Authority staff replied for certain types of vehicles, that the cleanest and greenest vehicles cannot yet reliably handle San Francisco's topography. They said staff always asked about clean technology options when SFPW requested funds for street cleaning and repair equipment as it was of high interest to the Board and Community Advisory Committee.

A member asked for the expected lifespan of the new equipment.

Transportation Authority staff replied that it varies by vehicle type and that they were not familiar with the useful life of the street cleaning and repair vehicles, but could follow up if desired. SFMTA staff said that buses typically last for 12 years.

The member mentioned how expensive vehicles can be cheaper to operate in the long run since they can be offloaded at a higher price and have a longer lifespan.

A member asked if there were plans to fund the painting of pedestrian safety zones and similar infrastructure. The member also asked if bike rental services could benefit from this funding.

SFMTA staff responded that the painting for pedestrian safety zones and protected bike lanes is new, so the funding had not been used much in the current Prop K Expenditure Plan. They said that SFMTA would use the proposed funds to refresh and maintain them, and the program was anticipating those future needs as more and more paint is used as part of bicyclists and pedestrian safety measures citywide.

A member expressed concerns that the process of using 311 calls to prioritize repaving and maintenance was not equitable as some communities do not use or know how to access 311. The member also wondered if there were other methods to approach maintenance prioritization.

Transportation Authority staff noted that street repaving, for example, had an inspection process that included driving around the city to evaluate pavement conditions and 311 was just a piece of the prioritization picture. They said the Community Advisory Committee regularly asked about how agencies prioritized their projects. They also noted that in the past SFPW has used some funds to proactively reach out to equity priority communities and to conduct field inspections for the curb



ramps program as an effort to address equity concerns with 311 as a basis for establishing priorities.

A member expressed concern about the proposed budget for the bike maintenance program not accounting for the increasing demand for bike infrastructure.

SFMTA staff said the budget does account for the increase.

A member said she was aware of the demand for paratransit programs as she works with an organization serving low- to middle-income residents.

A member addressed the importance of bike infrastructure as there was anxiety for new and returning bikers in San Francisco. They gave an example of an incident at the intersection of Silver and Alemany Boulevard where a cyclist was killed and added that it seemed to have little news coverage and investigation and did not result in significant improvements as was sometimes seen in other parts of the city.

During the breakout room, a member said that it was jarring to see that all funds could be spent on maintenance rather than new projects, because the needs are so great.

A member agreed and said that the proposed amount of funding is lower than the requests and there are limited funds but everything discussed seems very important.

A member said that in terms of pedestrian and bicycle programs, pedestrian facilities seem like they should be a higher priority as everyone is a pedestrian at some point.

A member said that the group had talked about better systems for scheduling maintenance projects as it is mostly based on 311 reports for some of the programs and asked if some of the funding in the expenditure plan should be used to come up with a strategy to develop a better and more systemic approach to maintenance.

A member responded that maintenance should be preventative rather than reactionary. They said that disenfranchised communities do not use the 311 system, and the communities that use the system the most get the most benefit.

A member agreed and said they use 311 in the Tenderloin but incidents are not resolved. They said there should be an improved means to report issues, especially for those that are not tech savvy. They said they were open to providing funding to get a better system in place.

A member said that each program discussed seemed worthwhile and it will come down to the details of tradeoffs the committee is willing to make.

A member said that in terms of economic recovery, all programs discussed are needed and they are waiting to hear the rest of the presentations to dive deeper because if all funds were spent on maintenance, it still would not be enough.

A member said that many programs have federal or state matching funds, so they can leverage additional funding.

A member said that in order of priority, what does the most good for the most people is a combination of Muni and pedestrian improvements and the other programs are lower, especially in regards to equity.

A member referenced a comment at a recent San Francisco Board of Supervisors meeting that a 7-year recovery is anticipated for downtown, and asked if some projects geared toward supporting transit downtown should not take such high importance



compared to other projects that need funding. They said they were not sure of this approach but wanted to raise it for discussion.

BART staff referenced the earlier presentation and said that a large number of people were taking BART in the southeast corridor of the city. They said BART provides access for District 7 and San Francisco State, among others, and that BART can help address equity.

A member asked about BART and equity with respect to the role it plays in the southeast corridor.

BART staff responded that there were 55,000 riders and the areas BART reaches are different. They said that transit speed can be faster with BART.

A member said they were representing District 10, including the Bayview, Sunnydale, and Visitacion Valley, and Muni is the transit option available in that area unless someone is taking BART to a job at the San Francisco International Airport. They said during the pandemic certain lines were stopped, but they had been reinstated. They said they heard reports of buses not stopping for riders because of violence and other factors and being able to access Muni and BART for District 10 was critical.

A member asked if funds could be sequenced to prioritize some projects in the next 10 years over others, such as funding projects for downtown in later years rather than in the near-term.

A member asked how the COVID-19 pandemic was being taken into account and said that things would be different in the future but there is uncertainty on what that difference would look like. They asked how we could plan for many years of capital funding with uncertainty from the pandemic.

Staff responded that the Expenditure Plan establishes eligibility for programs and projects and is designed to be flexible over the 30-year term. They said there was also a 5-year prioritization process to determine project priorities on a 5-year cycle. They said many details were involved in the prioritization process, including working closely with sponsors on a detailed scope, schedule, budget and funding plan. They said the prioritization process was a public process as well.

During the public breakout room, a member of the public stated that they understood the needs of the programs and the descriptions, though was curious about why the Transportation Authority and Expenditure Plan included street trees and assumed that was because of local community decision making on the topic. They continued to explain the Forestry Plan and said that street trees should have been completed under Proposition E because it has a dedicated set aside from the General Fund for street trees. They also said the cement industry contributes to pollution (6%) which was never brought up by advocates for trees and it was important to consider the downside to trees. They also said if someone gets a tree, they are responsible for the maintenance of the basin, which can be a lot of work for someone who is a caregiver or works a lot of hours.

Jay Bain said that San Francisco had a very low tree canopy, especially in some areas of the city, and was curious about the inclusion of metrics to make sure that the canopy increases rather than decreases. They also raised that tree canopy was an equity issue and if the Expenditure Plan includes funding for street trees, the tree canopy should be something that was advanced through this funding.



Transportation Authority staff responded that they could follow up with SFPW on the metrics used for assessing the tree canopy.

A member of the public pointed out that the presentation showed needs for funding the paratransit program at current levels and provided feedback that, in their work supporting older adults in getting rides, they often heard about problems with the paratransit program and that it needed to improve. They asked if there was available data about what would be needed to fund improved paratransit service and if the cost shown takes the growing aging population into account in terms of future increased need. They continued to explain that the cutback in Muni service led to more people using the essential trips card which made it clear that people need more paratransit service if bus service does not come back on key lines, especially on lines that are still discontinued as seniors often cannot walk the extra few blocks to their other neighborhood route.

A member of the public from the Bay Area Council said that BART needs were very important, knowing how much of San Francisco relies on BART for local trips, and said that pre-pandemic ridership had 75% of trips starting or ending in San Francisco. They explained that the Bay Area Council had been hearing from its base that BART was critical for returning to work and economic activities and this supports that it is a critical time to make sure the community can rely on all available modes. They urged the EPAC to fund BART in the Expenditure Plan.

A member of the public said that the most important needs were SFMTA's repairs and such, then Caltrain, then BART. They said although BART was important, there were less trips going to downtown now and for the foreseeable future. They said SFMTA needed funding now.

A member of the public said more clarification was needed on whether street trees would be discussed at a future meeting, or if this topic would slip into the pedestrian and bike improvement category because it was only 1% of the budget. They said that the budget for the establishment of new trees should fall under Prop E, since it is maintenance, and noted that when the program started, District 8 had the highest percentage of trees and continued to get more.

They also said that the efficiency of SFPW was important because sometimes there was work done by a contractor on one block and then the city would do an adjacent block, which seemed inefficient to spend money to bring equipment back and forth. They said it would be good to see accountability and a report out of actions and used the example of the 2003 expenditure plan including Geary BRT to be rail ready, which did not happen, and in these situations it was useful to evaluate what was said versus what was done to develop a plan to act.

## **8. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.





## Paratransit User Demographics

Transportation Authority and SFMTA staff prepared this factsheet to address questions raised by the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC). This fact sheet provides information about who is using the Paratransit program and how the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) provides information for new and existing users, including those whose primary language is not English. The Paratransit program is partially funded by the current Prop K half-cent transportation sales tax and is proposed for inclusion in the Preliminary Draft New Expenditure Plan.

At the September 23<sup>rd</sup> EPAC meeting, SFMTA staff presented on its Paratransit program for seniors and persons with disabilities. The meeting materials can be found here: <https://www.sfcta.org/ExpenditurePlan> (scroll to bottom of page).

### What is Paratransit?

The SFMTA provides paratransit service to seniors and persons with disabilities who are unable to use Muni's regular fixed route service. The SFMTA's paratransit program includes:

- Door-to-door shared van service
- Shop-a-Round / Van Go Shuttles
- Ramp Taxi Incentive Program
- Essential Trip Card Program (during COVID-19 pandemic)

The SFMTA has provided, on average, 762,000 paratransit trips per year in the last 5 years pre-COVID.<sup>1</sup>

### Who uses Paratransit?

The SFMTA conducts an Annual Paratransit Customer Satisfaction Survey among active riders who have recently completed a trip. The survey is conducted with a statistically significant sample size. The information below is from the 2019 San Francisco Paratransit Customer Satisfaction Survey.

#### Income

There is no income requirement to register for the Paratransit program. Of the 78% of respondents to the 2019 survey that provided their annual household income:

- 97.5% of respondents earn less than \$75,000 annually<sup>2</sup>
- Reported median annual income: \$17,396

---

<sup>1</sup> Data provided by Jonathan Cheng, SFMTA Paratransit Program manager

<sup>2</sup> To qualify for Free Muni for Seniors or Free Muni for People with Disabilities, a single person household's annual income must be less than \$89,650.



### Race & Ethnicity

<b>Race/Ethnic Identification</b>	<b>% of Paratransit Respondents</b>	<b>% of San Francisco Population<sup>3</sup></b>
Caucasian/White	48%	46%
Asian/Pacific Islander	18%	36%
Black/African American	18%	5%
Latino/Hispanic	13%	15%
Native American	2%	<1%
Two or More Races	-	5%
Other (Unspecified)	-	7%
Did not Answer	4%	-

### Preferred Language

<b>Preferred Language</b>	<b>% of Paratransit Respondents</b>
English	66%
Russian	14%
Chinese	7%
Spanish	7%
Tagalog	2%
Japanese	<1%
Vietnamese	<1%
Farsi	-
Unspecified	3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>

<sup>3</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, Esri Forecasts for 2020, obtained through the “Demographic and Income” Profile



### SF Paratransit Riders by Supervisorial District Based on Home Address

Supervisor District	% of Respondents
1	8%
2	5%
3	8%
4	7%
5	14%
6	18%
7	8%
8	7%
9	8%
10	10%
11	7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>

### What languages are available for Paratransit users?

The SFMTA is committed to ensuring that language is not a barrier to accessing Paratransit services. The following initiatives work to ensure language accessibility for all:

- The Paratransit Broker contract requires that staff proficient in Chinese, Russian, and Spanish are available. These three languages are the most commonly spoken by Paratransit users aside from English.
- Language interpreters, both in-person and by phone, are made available to all clients for any verbal communication.
- All essential material (i.e. SF Paratransit applications) are made available in 10 languages (English, Arabic, Chinese, Filipino, French, Japanese, Korean, Russian, Spanish, Thai, and Vietnamese) online. SF Paratransit staff will also mail applications in any of these languages to clients upon request.
- Other material, such as Rider’s Guide and the SF Access Online/Taxi Online portals, have translations in the four primary languages of SF Paratransit clients (English, Russian, Chinese, Spanish).
- All written material has Title VI language regarding language access included, informing the public about who to contact for accessible formats and alternative languages.

The Paratransit Broker contract also includes a requirement for outreach sessions to make sure eligible users are aware of the service. Outreach sessions can be held at



senior centers and community organizations. In addition, if Paratransit staff determine there are areas of the city not well represented, outreach sessions can be targeted to those communities.