



DRAFT MINUTES

Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee

Thursday, October 28, 2021

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:07 p.m.

Present at Roll Call: Annie Chung, Majeid Crawford, Zack Deutsch-Gross, Jesse Fernandez, Mel Flores, Jessica Lum, Jodie Medeiros, Calvin Quick, Pi Ra, Eric Rozell, Earl Shaddix, Yensing Sihapanya, Wesley Tam, Kim Tavaglione, Joanie Van Rijn, Chris White (16)

Absent at Roll Call (joined afterwards): Jay Bain, Amandeep Jawa, , Maurice Rivers (3)

Absent: Rosa Chen, Rodney Fong, Nick Josefowitz, Sharky Laguana, Aaron Leifer, Maryo Mogannam, Maelig Morvan, Susan Murphy (8)

Alternates present: Alexander Hirji (1)

2. EPAC Chair's Remarks

Michelle Beaulieu, Principal Transportation Planner, Government Affairs presented remarks on behalf of Chair Jawa, and thanked EPAC members, the public, and staff for attending. She said the focus of the meeting would be proposals for the draft New Expenditure Plan including Major Transit Projects and Transit Enhancements, and that each agency would present on program needs, benefits, and the role of sales tax revenue. She said the meeting would also review the project prioritization process that would be established by the Expenditure Plan.

Chair Jawa acknowledged that this is a lot of information for EPAC members and the public and encouraged attendees to email questions to staff.

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

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

A member asked whether questions should be directed to transit agencies or to the Transportation Authority.

Ms. Beaulieu responded that project sponsors provided contact information for staff in their presentations and that it was helpful for questions to also be sent to Transportation Authority staff so they are aware of EPAC member questions.

A member said that they hear agencies talk about equity but not how they will incorporate equity into their work. They asked if agencies would be coming back to provide more information and answer questions from the EPAC on this topic.

Ms. Beaulieu said that agencies should be sharing more information on this topic in their presentations and said that staff could invite them back to provide more information if needed.



A member asked how the new Expenditure Plan would interact with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA's) General Obligation Bond also going to the ballot in 2022 and expressed concern that evaluating funding sources in silos would make it difficult for the EPAC to make informed decisions.

Ms. Beaulieu acknowledged the comment and said this topic could be added to the agenda for the next meeting.

A member expressed support for funding transit education noting that it was critical to get the most value out of transit investments.

A member expressed support for funding for street trees noting that trees are important for air quality and quality of life.

A member expressed that they wanted further clarity on how equity would be implemented in the new Expenditure Plan.

4. Enhancing and Expanding our System: Major Transit Projects - INFORMATION*

Michelle Beaulieu, SFCTA; Jonathan Rwers, SFMTA; Priya Mathur, BART; Anthony Simmons, Caltrain; Alfonso Rodriguez, Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA); and Jesse Koehler, SFCTA presented the item.

Chair Jawa expressed support for the BART Core Capacity program and observed that he had a sense that BART had been expending money in outlying stations to the detriment of the core BART system.

Priya Mathur, BART, responded that \$3.5 billion was being invested in core capacity and an additional \$3.5 billion would be invested in the core system to maintain a state of good repair. She acknowledged that in the past, BART had invested more in system extensions but now BART's focus for sales tax funding was improving the capacity of the core system.

Chair Jawa asked BART to clarify if the Core Capacity program included a second Transbay crossing.

Priya Mathur, BART, responded that it did not and said that was part of the Link21 project.

Chair Jawa asked Caltrain when the agency expected electrification to be complete.

Anthony Simmons, Caltrain, responded that electrification would be complete in 2024.

Chair Jawa asked for clarification about what portion of the Pennsylvania Avenue Extension (PAX) would be underground and how it relates to the TJPA's Downtown Rail Extension (DTX) project.

Alfonso Rodriguez, TJPA explained the DTX would underground Caltrain from 4th and Townsend to the basement of the Salesforce Transit Center. Jesse Koehler, Rail Program Manager, added that the PAX would underground the tracks from 4th and Townsend where DTX ends to a to be determined point north or south of the 22nd Caltrain Street station, which would allow for the elimination of street level rail crossings.

A member noted that the DTX project was important to emissions reductions and asked if there were differences in how existing sales tax funds and the proposed additional sales tax funds in the new Expenditure Plan would be used.

Alfonso Rodriguez, TJPA responded that existing Prop K sales tax funds were being



used to advance project design and development for the DTX, and the new authorization would primarily support construction.

A member asked SFMTA to clarify if changes, such as replacement by bus service, were being made to the M-Ocean light-rail line, noting that the M served Equity Priority Areas in the southwest quadrant of San Francisco. They also noted that transit service to Parkmerced had not been restored and that this was inequitable.

Jonathan Rewers, SFMTA, responded that the current bus substitution was related to capital projects and COVID-related changes. He said he would follow up with the relevant SFMTA staff to get information on service restoration plans for the M line.

A member asked BART if they had data on post-pandemic commute behavior and if they knew the racial composition of BART commuters vs. non-commuters.

Priya Mathur, BART, responded that BART was serving primarily essential workers during the pandemic and that off-peak and weekend trips had rebounded more quickly than commute trips. She said that BART expected many employers to bring workers back to the office for 2-4 days/week, and that as a result commute ridership may be lower than pre-pandemic levels. Ms. Mathur continued by saying that BART did not have demographic data that allowed commute trip vs. non-commute trip comparisons, based on recent customer surveys the bulk of riders identified as non-white, low-income, and transit reliant.

A member asked BART staff to clarify if BART had enough rail cars to increase service and if sales tax funds would be used to purchase more trains.

Priya Mathur, BART, responded that there was a procurement effort underway to replace 669 rail cars with Fleet of the Future rail cars and purchase 106 rail cars for fleet expansion, including 60 for the BART-to-Silicon Valley Phase I Extension. She noted that there would be additional rounds of procurement to purchase core capacity rail cars and rail cars to support BART-to-Silicon Valley Phase II Extension. [The proposed Bart Core Capacity program in the preliminary draft new Expenditure Plan includes purchase of additional BART rail cars.]

A member asked if sales tax funds would cover accessibility improvements at the 22nd Street Caltrain Station.

Anthony Simmons, Caltrain, responded that the agency was evaluating accessibility upgrades at the 22nd Street Station, but had not determined the funding source for the upgrades.

With respect to the PAX, a member asked the Transportation Authority to clarify how they would balance the large cost of eliminating at-grade crossings with the benefits that would be delivered to pedestrians, cyclists, and transit service, and urged agency staff to be creative in finding ways to save money. They also asked how it was that undergrounded was already identified as the preferred option.

Jesse Koehler, Rail Program Manager, responded that the Transportation Agency was leading pre-environmental phase scoping of the PAX and that work did look at tunnels of differing lengths. He explained the San Francisco Planning Department completed the Railyard Alignment And Benefits Study (2018) that had identified the Pennsylvania Avenue Extension as the preferred alignment. He acknowledged that this would require a large investment and said the project would continue to evaluate a range of alignments.



A member asked if the \$130 million referenced in the presentation for SFMTA light rail fleet expansion was for the current vehicle procurement contract.

Jonathan Rewers, SFMTA, answered that it was for a future contract option for additional vehicles.

A member asked SFMTA to clarify the funding source for the proposed train control upgrade program.

Jonathan Rewers, SFMTA, responded that the funding plan would look to multiple sources and SFMTA had identified the sales tax as one possible source.

5. Enhancing and Expanding our System: Transit Enhancements - INFORMATION

Michelle Beaulieu, SFCTA; Jonathan Rewers, SFMTA; Priya Mathur, BART; Kaley Lyons, SFCTA, presented the item.

There were no questions on this item.

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 on Items 4 and 5

A member commented that the presentations had been excellent.

A member pointed out that the EPAC had heard from BART and Caltrain at previous meetings, and the presentations at Meeting #4 were additional requests for programming.

A member suggested that it would be helpful to see a tally of the total funding request by agency and another member agreed.

A member commented that all the transportation agencies were proposing improvements to the transportation system, and said the more important issue was the equitability of those improvements. They expressed disappointment in the prospects for improvements to the M-Ocean View light rail line.

A member disagreed that the issue of equity had been ignored, saying that Caltrain had proposed improved service to the Bayview and BART had discussed the needs of its low-income riders.

A member responded that the needs of Equity Priority Communities had not been realistically addressed. They pointed out that the bus serving Caltrain's Bayview station was the slowest transit route from Bayview to downtown. They said the Parkmerced area included extensive Equity Priority Communities, with no enhancements planned there.

A member said transit enhancement programs appeared to focus on maintenance costs, speed and reliability, which had system-wide benefits. They suggested that customer experience improvements had more potential to address equity concerns, as well as fare coordination among transit services. As an example, they said the fastest way to get from Mission and Geneva required separate fares for BART and Muni.

A member expressed concern about the apparent lack of planned improvements for transit service to Parkmerced and the possible discontinuation of the M Ocean View line.

Another member said they were under the impression that there were plans to



underground the M-line.

A member said discussion in their break-out group appeared to focus on the proper balance of funding for SF-specific transportation improvements vs. that for regional improvements.

A member pointed out that many of the proposed improvements to regional systems actually focused on service to the Bayview, including the Caltrain projects, the Downtown Extension and the Pennsylvania Avenue alignment. The member said it was the local transit agency - Muni - that addressed equity less than they should have.

A member said most of the proposed projects were on the east side of the City, with few on the west side.

A member said more money was needed for safe streets improvements, adding that the total funding proposed for transit was much higher. They argued that the streets were important because everyone used them.

A member wondered if it was useful to have a policy that prioritized improvements to the local transportation network over regional improvements.

A member responded that they felt local and regional systems were both important because San Francisco was the regional hub.

A member said it was not clear from the agency presentations how equity goals would be met.

A member expressed concern that the agency presentation appeared to include few immediate plans to address the needs of the City's west side. They said the goal of car-free transportation should be addressed in all areas, whether or not they were Equity Priority Communities. They also said the presentations discussed planned projects, but were short on information about the order in which the projects would be implemented or when they would be complete. They added that elevator service in transit stations throughout the City was poor and asked if there were plans to make improvements.

SFMTA staff said elevator enhancement wasn't eligible for the Expenditure Plan programs listed on the Meeting #4 agenda, but said Muni had a program of elevator improvements. They acknowledged that east side improvements had been prioritized, saying that travel demand was highest in that area of the City.

A BART staff member said BART was putting together funding for elevator improvements at the downtown stations. They expressed gratitude for Transportation Authority funding for elevator attendants, a program with high public satisfaction. Regarding the equity discussion, the BART staff member pointed out that not all residents of the region's outlying areas were high-income, and said all five of BART's routes served Equity Priority Communities.

A member said low-income BART passengers were often workers who had been displaced from San Francisco. They said an equity strategy should address hours of operation, since low-income workers often needed off-peak transportation.

A member said BART had a program of regular maintenance for its trains and asked if Muni had something similar.

A SFMTA staff member said all Muni vehicles and infrastructure were on programs of regular maintenance to proactively prevent breakdowns.



A member said projects were often not ready to advance when programmed funds became available, tying up funding that could be used on other projects. They suggested that the Expenditure Plan should include a policy to address project readiness.

SFCTA staff responded that there were multiple opportunities to review project readiness, including when funds were allocated to a project and when they were programmed for future allocation. They said Transportation Authority staff conducts a reasonableness review of projects at both times, including project readiness. They said the issue was difficult to completely solve since conditions, opportunities and priorities were constantly changing.

A member said that properly addressing equity required additional planning effort and expense to conduct public outreach as part of needs assessment rather than waiting until project concepts had been developed.

SFCTA staff noted that the reauthorization proposal doubled the funding for planning and said expenditure plan categories that emphasized planning would be discussed at EPAC Meeting #5.

SFCTA staff pointed out that SFMTA had done an excellent job with their Bayview planning effort, for which the agency won awards.

A member asked what investments were proposed for the T-Third Muni line in the Bayview.

SFMTA staff responded that future improvements included the opening of the Central Subway project, a new set of sensors, and technical upgrades. They added that recent improvements to speed up service included camera detection and the Mission Bay Loop, which opened immediately before the COVID pandemic so benefits were not being experienced yet. They said that Prop K sales tax dollars supported improvements on this line, and additional improvements were proposed to be funded by the reauthorized sales tax. They stated that SFMTA was collecting data and would perform before and after studies.

A member asked for more information on the Muni Core Capacity project, specifically whether it would include improvements on the surface light rail lines or if it would only improve service in the subway.

SFMTA staff responded that Muni Forward provided improvements on the whole surface network and worked to speed up service moving in the core, but didn't include improvements to address congestion in the core. They added that subway disruption caused delay on the surface light rail system. They said that where light rail lines had switches and turnarounds, SFMTA could consider turnarounds to address bottlenecks, but they did not have that option on all lines. They stated that the proposed train control system would eventually expand to surface lines as well.

Transportation Authority staff said that BART was successful in securing state and federal funds for its Core Capacity program, so they were expecting that as SFMTA refined the scope and branding for its Core Capacity program it would also be very competitive for discretionary funding.

A member stated that they wanted trees and plants incorporated into quick-build and complete streets projects, especially in the Tenderloin.

Transportation Authority staff replied that trees and landscaping were sometimes



included in larger corridor projects and could also be incorporated into some projects funded under the existing Prop K sales tax Transit Enhancements category.

A member asked what access improvements BART was implementing at the Civic Center station.

BART staff offered to provide the EPAC with information on the improvements. They noted that BART was replacing the escalators at all downtown San Francisco stations as well as constructing new canopies.

Transportation Authority staff referenced slide 5 of the BART presentation for Item 5, noting it provides a list of previously funded sales tax transit enhancements projects to get an idea of what projects had been supported in the past. They noted that BART also had a funding program specifically for BART station access improvements.

A member asked if there was an opportunity to provide more secure bicycle parking at Civic Center station than the current bicycle racks and lockers.

Transportation Authority staff responded that these types of improvements could be funded in the Transit Enhancements or the Bicycle Improvements programs. They noted that those types of improvements were also competitive for state and federal funding.

A member asked whether BART used sales tax funding to fund parking lots near BART stations outside of San Francisco.

BART staff responded that they did not.

A member asked if sales tax funds could be used for bike stations similar to the existing station at the 4th and King Caltrain station. They asked whether BART could incorporate them at new locations such as the Upper Yard development project.

A member asked how different agencies were measuring equity and how agencies were being innovative, such as partnering with equity organizations. They stated that metrics such as reliability and trip time were inadequate.

Transportation Authority staff replied that the next agenda item would start to touch on how equity was used in project prioritization.

A member asked about the justification for BART's proposed faregate upgrade project and that, since enforcement activities could be inequitable, why BART was proposing to invest in them.

BART staff responded that the existing faregates were unreliable and if they went out of service they had to be repaired in place, causing queuing for riders entering the station. They said that new faregates would be configured with components that could be switched out and repaired offsite.

A member asked if the BART faregate project included station hardening components.

BART staff replied that the new faregates would be more resistant to fare evasion, but other key benefits were maintainability and reliability.

A member asked for an update on projects around the Parkmerced development, and noted they were expensive.

SFMTA staff responded that the development project was slowed due to the COVID pandemic and that SFMTA had studied moving the light rail line serving the site underground in the ConnectSF planning effort.



A member reflected on how the COVID-19 pandemic had impacted traffic and said that trips would rebound but trip patterns were uncertain. They said they would like to feel better informed to understand more about transit agencies projections for recovery.

Transportation Authority responded that the Expenditure Plan is designed to be long-term and flexible so while there is uncertainty around what trip patterns look like post-pandemic, the Expenditure Plan would be flexible to accommodate changing needs in the future.

A member said they would like to see greater communication among agencies, including BART, SFMTA, and Caltrain and said that people used multiple modes and they would like smoother connections between transit and more collaboration among agencies.

A member said they like the ideas for transit enhancements, including community engagement, placemaking, and said the Balboa Park Station example was good. They also said that transit enhancements should be localized and providing information in relevant languages was important.

A member said that the draft New Expenditure Plan had several programs that were not part of Prop K, including core capacity and the Caltrain service vision, and they would like more information on where the ideas came from and why the decision was made to include them.

Transportation Authority staff responded that many new programs came out of analysis done for ConnectSF, including the Transit Corridors Strategy and Streets and Freeways Study, as well as the San Francisco Transportation Plan. They also said that the major capital projects from Prop K were completed or underway which provided space to include new major transit projects in the draft New Expenditure Plan.

A member said that they support biking, walking, and transit and appreciated that BART specifically noted what they were requesting and how it differed from the draft New Expenditure Plan. They said at first the funding request seemed large but then saw that the BART percentages within the draft New Expenditure Plan were small. They said they were trying to weigh the importance of each transit piece and said that all transit is interconnected. They said they assumed decisions were based on having more context and insight and that they were trying to understand all of the needs and requests, especially in light of future tradeoff conversations the EPAC would have.

6. Expenditure Plan Policies - INFORMATION*

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, presented the item, noting there would be more time to discuss the policies at a future meeting.

A member requested that staff consider adding scoring criteria to the definition of equity and asked staff to clarify how projects should demonstrate that they are meeting equity goals.

Chair Jawa acknowledged the comment and noted that more information and discussion would be required.

A member asked how youth and seniors were considered in MTC's definition of Equity Priority Communities.



Ms. Lombardo showed slide 121 with the region's definition and noted that seniors were included, but youth were not.

A member said that criteria and scoring were necessary to strengthen the equity policy.

A member said that they agreed an equity policy should be included in prioritization and said that the west wide of San Francisco may not receive investment if only looking at designated Equity Priority Communities so they would like to make sure it is not completely left behind.

A member noted that the definition of seniors used to calculate Equity Priority Communities varied from the City of San Francisco's definition of seniors (75 years vs. 65 years).

8. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:04 p.m.