



**San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority**

1455 Market Street, 22ND Floor, San Francisco, California 94103 415-522-4800 info@sfcta.org www.sfcta.org

DRAFT MINUTES

Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee

Thursday, November 4, 2021

1. Call to Order

Vice Chair Anni Chung called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Present at Roll Call: Jay Bain, Anni Chung, Zack Deutsch-Gross, Jesse Fernandez, Mel Flores, Sharky Laguana, Jessica Lum, Susan Murphy, Calvin Quick, Pi Ra, Earl Shaddix, Yensing Sihapanya, Wesley Tam, Joan Van Rijn, Christopher White (15)

Absent at Roll Call: Rosa Chen, Majeid Crawford, Rodney Fong, Amandeep Jawa, Nick Josefowitz, Aaron Leifer, Jodie Medeiros (arrived during item #4), Mario Mogannam, Maelig Morvan, Maurice Rivers, Eric Rozell, Kim Tavaglione (arrived after roll call) (12)

Alternates Present: Sasha Hirji (1)

2. EPAC Chair's Remarks

Vice Chair Anni Chung thanked staff and the public for attending and described the focus of the meeting as the last four proposed programs for the new Expenditure Plan, which fall under transportation development and management. Vice Chair Chung added that the goal is to see if EPAC can reach an agreement on the new plan, and that tradeoff discussions will begin at the following meeting where Transportation Agency staff will provide trade-off options for the EPAC to consider based on the feedback.

Vice Chair Chung explained that the format for the evening's meeting is the same as for previous meetings, where Transportation Agency staff give context for agency presentations, then agency staff will present. Following the presentations, EPAC members will ask questions followed by breakout rooms with report-backs. She said that SFMTA staff will also present on the 2022 Muni General Obligation Bond at the request of EPAC members.

3. Meeting #4 Recap, Minutes and Follow-Ups - INFORMATION

Michelle Beaulieu, Principal Transportation Planner, Government Affairs, with the Transportation Authority (SFCTA) presented the item. There were no questions from the EPAC.

4. Transportation System Development & Management: Transportation Demand Management - INFORMATION

Michelle Beaulieu, SFCTA; Jonathan Rewers, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA); and Rachel Hiatt, SFCTA presented the item.

A member asked if the proposal was to add Transportation Demand Management (TDM) as a new expenditure plan category and if sales tax revenue would be the only source of funding.

Michelle Beaulieu, SFCTA, replied that the Prop K Expenditure Plan had a TDM category, but said it was a smaller percentage of the overall plan than the



corresponding category proposed for the new expenditure plan. She said there were other funding sources for which some TDM projects and programs were eligible and which could be leveraged by Prop K funds.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, clarified that said many local TDM strategies were difficult to fund with other sources, particularly ongoing programs, so they tended to be funded from SFMTA's operating budget and local sales tax revenues. She said there a few sources, which require local match, that could be tapped to test out new TDM ideas so that they could eventually compete for other funding if they are proven effective.

Jonathan Rewers, SFMTA, referenced Transportation Fund for Clean Air funds as an example of a grant source for which TDM projects were sometimes eligible.

A member asked about integrating TDM and education efforts to encourage mode shift to transit.

Mr. Rewers replied that there were examples of pilot education programs, including some efforts in Mission Bay, to familiarize people with using public transit. He also mentioned a Federal Transit Administration grant for studying how to get riders back on transit post-pandemic. He said that mode shift, getting people to switch from cars to other forms of transportation, was a long-standing SFMTA goal and it was built into the agency's strategic plan.

Ms. Lombardo added that the proposed eligibility criteria for the TDM category of the new expenditure plan included education, which was a change from Prop K. She explained that the proposed TDM program allowed for testing new ideas to see if they were cost effective and beneficial in terms of reducing congestion and/or shifting travel from single occupant vehicles to sustainable travel modes such as biking, walking or taking transit.

A member asked if the revenue generated from a potential future congestion pricing program would be a significant source of transportation funding.

Rachel Hiatt, SFCTA, replied that the congestion pricing scenarios that had been studied would generate sufficient revenue to self-fund the program, though it would operate at a deficit for a substantial start-up period similar to the tolling plan for Treasure Island that was presented. Ms. Hiatt said congestion pricing revenues potentially fund other transportation projects over the long term.

The member suggested that programs like paratransit travel training and Walk to Work could be education programs funded under the TDM program. The member also suggested that free Muni for everyone or free Muni for low-income users could be eligible as incentive pricing programs, along with expansion of the free paratransit program, as effective mode shift strategies.

Ms. Beaulieu replied that proposed eligibility details were listed in the agenda packet list and said at least some of those programs would be eligible.

Mr. Rewers, SFMTA added that existing fare support programs were primarily equity-related and pointed out that they were quite expensive. He advised the EPAC that the proposed TDM expenditure plan category was too small to support fare support programs and was intended to provide "seed money" to test new programs.

Ms. Lombardo acknowledged the desire for more discounts and incentives but said such programs would have to look to other sources for funding as the scale is not



commensurate with the size of the proposed TDM program given all the other ongoing programs that also require funding from the half-cent sales tax. She confirmed Mr. Rewers observation that the TDM program could be used to help develop and test a new program or new/revised fare discounts designed to achieve mode shift.

A member suggested that funding should be increased for TDM incentive programs and events such as Walk to Work and Transit Month. The member asked if the Safe Routes to School program would be eligible for funding under the new expenditure plan.

Mr. Rewers suggested that EPAC should consider priorities and make recommendations on the relative shares of sales tax funding for education programs and capital improvement projects.

Ms. Beaulieu noted that TDM was one of the categories that had grown the most in overall fund share compared to the current Prop K Expenditure Plan, and acknowledged the comment that some EPAC members support that growth and potentially even more of an increase.

A member agreed that funding for TDM should increase. The member said that some projects eligible for TDM program funds, such as Safe Routes to School, had also been mentioned at the EPAC meeting #3 as eligible for funds from the Safer Streets program, and they asked which program these projects could potentially be funded from or whether it could be both.

Mr. Rewers, SFMTA answered that in the proposed expenditure plan there was overlap between the TDM and Safer Streets programs, which could both support education programs. He said that in the current Prop K Expenditure Plan, only education programs for bicycle users were eligible for the Streets and Traffic Safety category (e.g. Bicycle Circulation/Safety program) and the rest fell under TDM. He emphasized that the categorizations tended to distinguish capital improvements from encouraging people to change their transportation choices, i.e. education and incentive programs.

Ms. Lombardo clarified that the proposed eligibility criteria allowed education efforts to be funded from both the Safer Streets program and the TDM program; however, the latter requires that the education programs support mode shift from single occupant vehicles to sustainable modes.

5. Transportation System Development & Management: Transportation, Land Use, and Community Coordination - INFORMATION

Michelle Beaulieu, Mike Pickford, and Kaley Lyons from the SFCTA presented the item.

A member expressed support for the Neighborhood Transportation Program (NTP) and said the Tenderloin speed reduction project was a good example of the program's benefits. The member commented that the proposed \$600,000 funding cap per supervisorial district would not get very far given the costs of even simple improvements such as speed bumps and stop signs.

Ms. Beaulieu acknowledged that the program was relatively small and said the funding was intended to leverage other funding sources.

Ms. Lombardo added that while NTP was fairly limited in scale, the proposed expenditure plan included other larger programs for street improvements such as the Safer Streets program. She said NTP funds could be helpful in identifying and prioritizing neighborhood-scale, community-supported improvements. She said



sometimes these were new, stand alone recommendations and other times they were enhancements that could be integrated into larger projects that agency's such as the SFMTA may have already been advancing.

The member replied that street safety improvements comprised the smallest part of the proposed expenditure plan, and said leveraging opportunities were not guaranteed. The member emphasized that the proposed levels of street safety funding showed that it was still a struggle to secure sufficient funding for those types of projects.

A member asked what the different colors represented in the Development Oriented Transportation map (presentation slide 48).

Ms. Beaulieu explained that the Board of Supervisors had adopted an expanded number of Priority Development Areas, which were each represented with a different color on the map. She said that all the development areas were prioritized equally in the regional plan for the Bay Area called Plan Bay Area 2050.

A member expressed concern that Parkmerced was not labelled as an Equity Priority Community in the map on slide 43, and pointed out that it had been identified as an area where rents were disproportionately high compared to household incomes. The member also asked if the proposed expenditure plan included transportation projects in District 7, in which three large housing projects were planned.

Ms. Beaulieu pointed out that Parkmerced was within in the Priority Development Area boundaries shown on the Equity Priority Communities map, though it was not called out in one of the labels naming example neighborhoods. She said there were several ongoing and recently completed District 7 transportation projects in the Balboa Park Station area, as well as a new Ocean Avenue planning effort that is just getting going, which would seek to prioritize improvements in the corridor.

The member added that Stonestown Village would also be a large project and hoped that it would be added to the list of projects eligible for sales tax funds, if not already on it. The member said transportation improvements and TDM would also be needed to accommodate a large project planned by the University of San Francisco in the Parnassus area. The member generally expressed concern that the proposed expenditure plan did not sufficiently address the needs of District 7.

Ms. Beaulieu acknowledged the district's transportation needs. She explained that the expenditure plan primarily lists programs that can fund certain types of improvements rather than naming specific projects so that it could be flexible enough to be relevant for the 30-year plan period. The programmatic approach allows the project sponsors to request funds for projects that may not be known today.

Ms. Lombardo added that the westside supervisors agreed on the need for transportation planning and improvements to accommodate anticipated growth and emphasized the need for community engagement in developing those plans. She said the Development Oriented Transportation category had partly been developed with that in mind.

A member asked for clarification on whether the location for a new Caltrain station had been decided, saying the decision would impact the Bayshore Caltrain pedestrian connector.

Ms. Beaulieu answered that the location had not been decided.



A member asked why the Department of Public Health (DPH) was not a part of the NTP program, as they had conducted effective neighborhood planning efforts in the past.

Mr. Rewers responded that the SFMTA sometimes funded DPH planning projects such as for Vision Zero-related efforts, and in some cases SFMTA used pass-through funds originally allocated from the Prop K sales tax program.

A member echoed previous concerns about insufficient funding and planning for district-specific projects. The member expressed concern that \$100,000 over a 5-year timeline for plans and studies was not much and asked whether the amount would be inflation-adjusted.

Ms. Beaulieu replied that sales tax was not the only fund source for neighborhood-level planning, noting that funds from the California Air Resources Board and other City agencies could be leveraged by sales tax funds. Ms. Beaulieu also said that amounts in the proposed expenditure plan were not inflation-adjusted.

Ms. Lombardo added that any of the fund categories in the proposed expenditure plan could support planning efforts and that planning efforts were not limited to the NTP category, which was intended to provide some level of geographic equity and allow increased involvement by the Board of Supervisors in prioritizing neighborhood-scale, community-based projects in their districts.

A member commented that more housing developments were planned in certain districts, especially affordable housing projects. The member asked whether there was a way to align transportation funding with neighborhoods that were investing the most in affordable housing.

Ms. Beaulieu replied that the Development Oriented Transportation program prioritized projects in Priority Development Areas for just that purpose.

Ms. Lombardo noted that MTC supported improved transportation infrastructure in Priority Development Areas at the regional level and had a funding program that would give proportionately more funding to jurisdictions that produced the most housing, particularly affordable housing. She continued to say that that approach may not be desirable for the Development Oriented Transportation program since part of the intent is to provide an incentive for the new west side Priority Development Areas to support housing growth. To accomplish that, some of the sales tax funds need to be directed toward the west side Priority Development Areas and not just toward the downtown where there may be net more housing being developed.

Ms. Beaulieu added that state-level grant programs, such as the Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities program, also funded transportation projects that supported affordable housing developments.

6. Enhancing and Expanding our System: Next Generation Transit Investments & Transformative Freeway Projects - INFORMATION*

Michelle Beaulieu, SFCTA; Aliza Paz, SFCTA; Jonathan Rewers, SFMTA presented the item.

A member asked whether filling in the Geary underpass was a decided goal for the proposed projects.

Aliza Paz, SFCTA, answered that there was no recommendation to do this and that it was being referenced as an example of a type of project focusing on big,



transformative improvements that could reconnect communities that had been divided by past streets and freeways projects.

The member added that the City originally thought the underpass was beneficial and asked if the City was now wanting the underpass filled, with an at-grade crossing at Geary and Fillmore.

Ms. Beaulieu reiterated that this was just an example of a potential project. She added that there was interest in exploring how we can rethink the way the City is built, and this funding would allow the City to do that.

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.

Break-out discussions of Items 4, 5 and 6

A member commented that some of the programs discussed in Items 4 and 5 had also been mentioned in the discussion on the Safer Streets category. They said the major differences in the TDM category were the emphases on innovative projects and evaluating effectiveness.

A SFCTA staff member said that the program was intended to be flexible so as to fund innovative ideas as well as approaches that had been proven effective.

A member commented that the TDM category was intended to encourage mode shift but expressed concern that it was a small amount of funding. They pointed out that the larger fund categories didn't set standards for eligibility and effectiveness based on mode shift.

A member asked for clarifying information about the decision-making process for prioritizing the NTP funds but expressed support for the intention behind having a category based on geographic equity and a community-based planning model.

A member said there were many unmet transportation needs in District 10, and expressed the hope that the NTP category could help distribute transportation improvements more equitably. They emphasized the importance of community-based planning and expressed concern that some planned transportation projects had been made without sufficient effort to involve the community.

Another member echoed the concerns about District 10, saying the community needed to weigh in on development projects with major transportation impacts such as the large parking lot proposed as part of the Amazon facility.

A member commented that the proposed TDM program was still tiny despite being expanded compared to the current expenditure plan. They expressed concern that programs like Safe Routes to Schools (SRTS) were still squeezed, saying SRTS had to renew its funding every two years.

A SFCTA staff member pointed out that the proposed TDM category would be competitive, so TDM grants for SRTS would still have to be renewed and program performance evaluated [SRTS could also seek funds from the Safer Streets program.].

A member wondered about the extent to which TDM could effect real change. They pointed out that a great deal of mode-shift behavior was happening regardless of TDM such as remote work.



A SFCTA staff member responded that evaluation of TDM programs would have to be responsive to future travel patterns.

Another staff member offered to contact the EPAC member offline concerning changing travel behavior.

A member echoed comments about the TDM share of the whole expenditure plan. They expressed the opinion that the proposed funding levels and the fact that funds were segmented into fixed categories wouldn't bring about sufficient mode shift to achieve a meaningful goal such as 80% transit by 2030. They said real progress toward such a goal would require reduced fares, street redesign, etc., and that the program was not expansive enough.

A member commented that the level of NTP funding in the recommended expenditure plan was the same as it had been in the Prop K program whereas project costs had increased, resulting in a net decrease in value.

A member commented that the new expenditure plan should have a place for studies and pilot projects ascertaining the impacts and potential benefits of new transportation modes, especially micro-mobility technologies.

A member noted that there might be better ways to use the Geary underpass than filling it in, such as covering it to allow transportation modes to continue underneath and building housing or something else on top. They said this might be a more cost effective approach because the City spent so much to create it not so long ago.

A SFCTA staff member responded that the example projects such as reimaging the Geary underpass illustrates the extensive planning and outreach that would be required prior to any decision to move forward.

A member said EPAC needed to understand how all the pieces of the expenditure plan fit together to understand the tradeoffs and see what possibilities there were for increasing funding for important program areas like TDM and Transportation, Land Use and Community Coordination. The member also expressed disappointment that more projects weren't planned for the west side of the City and insufficient outreach during project development. They said priorities were off if they prioritized filling the Geary underpass.

A SFCTA staff member reiterated that the funding for the transformative projects - both transit and streets and freeways, is intended to be seed money to support early planning, conceptual engineering and environmental work for potential projects, along with community engagement.

A member raised concerns about next generation transit investments and said SFMTA talks a lot about how they do outreach, but in the many years they had lived in San Francisco they had never been invited to a meeting. They said posted signs at bus stops inviting people to provide input via a website was a limited form of outreach. The member also said there was insufficient oversight over outreach for projects and generally expressed a lack of trust in SFMTA's outreach process.

A SFCTA staff member noted that when SFMTA or other agencies applied to the Transportation Authority for allocation of funding the Community Advisory Committee and Board typically honed in on community engagement.

A member asked how all the different planning efforts in the Transportation, Land Use and Community Coordination program related to ConnectSF.



A SFCTA staff member responded that ConnectSF was a multi-agency, long-range planning effort by the Planning Department, SFMTA, and SFCTA. They said that under the aegis of ConnectSF there were modal studies such as the Streets and Freeway Study and the Transit Investment Strategy that the EPAC has heard referenced in multiple presentations. It also includes the San Francisco Transportation Plan (SFTP), and the Transportation Element of the General Plan. The staff member said this effort sought to improve coordination among all the city's long-range plans. They explained that the SFTP was informed by the other ConnectSF work products, as well as other plans by regional transit operators, community-based planning efforts, the City's Climate Action Plan, and other agency planning efforts. The SFTP produces an investment plan that is fiscally constrained by the federal, state, regional and local revenues that San Francisco is anticipated to receive over the next 30 years and also has an investment vision which assumes additional revenues and investments to help move closer toward the Connect SF and SFTP goals. She concluded by noting that the proposed new Expenditure Plan helps to implement the SFTP.

A member said the proposed expenditure plan under-funded the TDM program.

A SFCTA staff member recommended that EPAC could address that issue by recommending shifting Priority 1 funding between the programs and by recommending Priority 2 funding.

A member asked where ferries fit into the proposed expenditure plan, and said there hadn't been any discussion of ferries other than at Treasure Island. The member said they would like to hear more about the ferry network.

The member asked about the role of school buses in potentially reducing congestion, saying that some parents drove children to school because they couldn't rely on public transit.

The member advocated for expanding transit service to the west side of the City, addressing vehicle accessibility in Golden Gate Park, and resolving the issue of whether Great Highway should be open or closed. They said SFMTA's vision of a 5-minute transit network didn't appear to address westside transit needs.

An SFMTA staff member responded that the 5-minute network map in the presentation had been intended to depict an idea of what such a network could look like rather than mapping out specific lines.

A member asked about the idea of private shuttle services and suggested that SFMTA could facilitate such services by providing driver training for Class B licenses.

A SFCTA staff member responded that shuttle pilot projects could be eligible for funding under the proposed expenditure plan.

A member who sat on the Mayor's Council for Recovery said the City would not be getting more school buses and was not interested in additional contracts for school bus service. The member expressed interest in Free Muni for youth and hoped that sales tax funds could help support it.

An EPAC member suggested that the expenditure plan include policies on the quality of outreach conducted with sales tax funds.

Another EPAC member suggested that the culture of work may be changing from a focus on commuting downtown.

A member said their organization was looking at investments in ongoing bike



education combined with a bike loan program as a model for encouraging bike use. They emphasized the need for community-based planning and community-based resources.

A member of the public commented that they did not have faith in the value of investment for rail expansion and said heavy rail extensions cost over \$1 billion a mile. They expressed the same sentiment regarding the BART to San Jose extension. They also expressed that people might not understand what the funding was going towards unless they read all the associated documents, and mentioned the Geary underpass fill project as an example. They questioned why the public should spend money on these projects when there was an inability to control the existing infrastructure. They continued by saying they would like to see the questions from the SFMTA survey done in 2021 on the General Obligation Bond. The commenter expressed that questions could be phrased to elicit a desired response and sometimes did not give a full picture of the pros and cons.

The same member of the public said that, in reference to Safe Routes to School, there was no documentation reporting the number of children riding their bikes to school. The commenter said that often buses were filled with high school students and would sometimes skip stops since they were so crowded. They said although there were benefits for the environment, they questioned the success of the program as the information was not complete and expressed frustration in trying to understand the program and its benefits. They continued by questioning the success of TDM efforts and referenced a BART program aimed at incentivizing riders that, in their view, had not been very successful. The commenter asked if there are ways to collaborate with employers to sign on transportation methods to get their employees to work, since many employers had commuter buses. The commenter also noted there was a lack of transparency and feedback with these programs since there was no data on the success of these programs.

The same member of the public asked, regarding Treasure Island developments, how much of the \$120 million in funding from the developer was actually paid by taxpayers. The commenter said that there was a lack of information and transparency regarding total costs, and said that, from personal experience, the fog on Treasure Island made it an undesirable place in which to live. They then commented that TDM efforts rarely had publicized decision processes and the environmental benefits were not evaluated. As an example the commenter gave the Highway 101 report, and asked if a pollution index monitor had been installed. They emphasized that there needed to be public transparency in decision processes and impacts.

The same member of the public said Muni education programs had room for improvement, and contrasted them with programs from the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, such as its Youth Outreach program, which funds in-school educational events on transportation use, and its Daycation program, which assists seniors in familiarizing and getting comfortable with using transit. The commenter also noted that Muni's proposed five-minute network is detrimental to seniors as it could discontinue routes that seniors relied on.

7. Proposed 2022 Muni Reliability and Street Safety Bond - INFORMATION*

Jonathan Rewers, SFMTA, presented the item.

A member asked whether the 2014 SFMTA General Obligations bond had been paid back.



Mr. Rewers responded that according to statutory requirements for long-term capital projects, there was a 20-to-25-year payback period, so the bond was likely still being paid off.

The member asked whether a General Obligation bond could be expected every 8 years.

Mr. Rewers replied that the 8-year gap was unusually short because some of the funds had been used to assist the City's recovery from the 2008-2012 recession, but that generally a transportation bond should be anticipated on 10-year cycles.

A member asked why the current proposed bond was \$100 million less than the previous 2014 bond.

Mr. Rewers replied that the size of the bond had to be reduced to allow it to be issued sooner, as more of the City's revenue capacity was committed to paying off the previous bond.

A member said that the \$32 million proposed for traffic signals in the 2022 bond did not seem sufficient.

Mr. Rewers replied that funding for signals from the current Prop K Expenditure Plan had never been advanced because the SFMTA had a conveyor-belt approach to delivering signals projects. He agreed that there was a significant backlog of needed signal improvements, and said SFMTA was targeting high-need areas with the bond funds. He emphasized that the bond revenues are applied to more ready to go projects that are able to spend the funds down quickly and that was reflected in the amount proposed for signals.

The member asked about other available funding sources for traffic signals.

Mr. Rewers replied that other sources included the ATP [Active Transportation Program] program and the Highway Safety Improvement Program. He added that the SFMTA had been successful in using sales tax funds to leverage other funding for major corridor projects.

Ms. Lombardo added that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's federal One Bay Area Grant program offered another opportunity to leverage sales tax funds for signal projects.

The member asked what the total funding need for traffic signals was.

Mr. Rewers explained that signals projects included audible signals, pedestrian countdown signals, and updated signal controllers in addition to upgrading signals and constructing signals at new locations.

Emily Heard, SFMTA, said that the total need for signal repair was estimated at about \$1.9 billion.

8. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:03 p.m.