



DRAFT MINUTES

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Tuesday, November 16, 2021

1. Roll Call

Chair Mandelman called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m. and noted that Commissioners Peskin and Ronen were excused from the meeting.

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

Absent at Roll Call: Commissioners Peskin and Ronen (2)

2. [Final Approval on First Appearance] Resolution making findings to allow teleconferenced meetings under California Government Code Section 54953(e) - ACTION*

Britney Milton, Clerk of the Transportation Authority, presented the item.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Chan moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Preston.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

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

Absent: Commissioners Peskin and Ronen (2)

3. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Mandelman shared his excitement for infrastructure week. He reported that on Monday, November 15, President Biden signed the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act and thanked President Biden, Speaker Pelosi and the Congress, for working so hard to pass the historic bipartisan legislation that would make \$1.2 trillion in funding available for infrastructure programs across the transportation, energy and water sectors. He said, of the amount, transportation is by far the largest component with \$475 billion over the next 5 years, which is a 56 percent increase above Congress's last five-year transportation bill, and \$157 billion in one-time stimulus funding. He shared that the estimates for California are still being developed, however, based on formula funds they could expect: \$30 billion for roads and bridge repair, such as for the Yerba Buena Island (YBI) West Side Bridges project, \$9.5 billion for public transit improvements statewide including for Muni, BART and Caltrain; and \$384 million over five years to build a network of chargers for electric vehicles. Chair Mandelman noted that the bill also included new discretionary funds including \$36 billion nationally for intercity rail and \$15 billion for the Federal Transit Administration's competitive Capital Investment Grant Program, which funds projects



like BART and Muni Core Capacity and the Caltrain Downtown Rail Extension, plus over \$2 billion for active transportation and a new Safe Streets and Roads for All Program to implement Vision Zero plans.

He added to the good news, sharing that they just heard the United States Department of Transportation (US DOT) awarded the agency's YBI West Side Bridges project an \$18 million federal RAISE grant to seismically retrofit this set of structures and roadways connecting the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge to Treasure Island on the west side of YBI. He thanked Speaker Pelosi and Senator Padilla for their support as well as Mayor Breed, Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA) Chair Fei Tsen and Commissioner Haney for their leadership in advocating for the project.

Chair Mandelman continued by sharing that they will prepare to compete for the funding opportunities with the reauthorization of their transportation sales tax, being discussed by staff at a virtual Town Hall at 6 p.m. on November 16. He extended an invite to all interested members of the public to tune in and provide input on how best to prioritize these critical local funds that will serve as local match and seed money to develop their projects to compete for grants.

Lastly, Chair Mandelman acknowledged the anniversary of World Day of Remembrance for Road Traffic Victims. He shared that this year's event would be held Sunday, November 21 at 3 p.m. at City Hall. He said that the program was organized by Walk San Francisco (WalkSF) and is open to all. He continued sharing that together, participants will create a memorial in front of City Hall, honoring those who have been hurt and killed in traffic crashes, and they would recommit themselves to eliminating these preventable deaths and injuries. He noted that he would be out of town and would miss the event but he has asked staff to agendaize a Vision Zero hearing for their second December Transportation Authority Board meeting. He concluded saying that he looks forward to hearing the City's updates and engaging in the discussion about how they can continue to take action.

During public comment, David Pilpel said that with regard to the federal funding issue, he is concerned about the Public Employee Pension Reform Act in California and how it would impact federal transit funding. He asked if the Transportation Authority could provide a letter of support to help resolve this issue. Additionally, given the news of the federal RAISE grant, he suggested that staff utilize Congressmember Spear to help advocate for San Francisco priorities in her last year of office.

4. Executive Director's Report - INFORMATION

Tilly Chang, Executive Director, presented the item.

There was no public comment.

5. Approve the Minutes of the October 26, 2021 Meeting - ACTION

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Chan moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Commissioner Preston.

The minutes were approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Haney, Mar, Mandelman, Melgar, Preston, Safai,



Stefani, and Walton (9)

Absent: Commissioners Peskin and Ronen (2)

Consent Agenda

6. [Final Approval] Execute Contract Renewals and Options for Various Annual Professional Services in an Amount Not to Exceed \$725,000 Contracts - ACTION

Commissioner Preston moved to approve the consent agenda, seconded by Commissioner Chan.

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

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Haney, Mar, Mandelman, Melgar, Preston, Safai, Stefani, and Walton (9)

Absent: Commissioners Peskin and Ronen (2)

End of Consent Agenda

7. State and Federal Legislation Update - INFORMATION

Amber Crabbe, Public Policy Manager, and Jason Tai, Principal at Tai Ginsberg + Associates, federal legislative advocate for the Transportation Authority, presented this item per the staff memorandum.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated the Transportation Authority should not be talking about supporting the High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA) when talking about supporting the overall project. He said that by statute, the HSRA did not have the exclusive right to design, build, or finance high speed rail. He asked the Transportation Authority to support the electrification of Caltrain to Gilroy.

Anastasia Yovanopoulos said she was glad to hear that more state and federal funding would be available for transit and added that she hoped someone would make sure it would come to San Francisco.

Aleta Dupree stated that she supported the High Speed Rail project, but it was currently a train to nowhere unless the segments from the Central Valley to San Jose and from Bakersfield to Los Angeles were completed. She added that these gaps needed to be filled in, similar to the way the gaps in the interstate highway system were filled in many years ago. She asked the Transportation Authority to support that effort.

8. Adopt the 2021 Prop K Strategic Plan and Amend 11 5-Year Prioritization Programs - ACTION*

Eric Reeves, Senior Program Analyst presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Commissioner Chan noted that she was aware of and supported the proposed changes in Prop K funds programmed to Geary Bus Rapid Transit Phase 2 in the Strategic Plan, but would like to dive deeper to provide additional transparency on how these changes in funding would impact the project. She noted that funds coming off of Geary would fund additional projects including the 5 Fulton, 14 Mission and 30 Stockton Muni Forward projects that support access to and from District 1.



Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, responded that the reduction in programming for the Geary Bus Rapid Transit Phase 2 was one of the most significant changes proposed in the Strategic Plan. Ms. LaForte noted that Item 10 on the agenda involved San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) requesting to use an existing Prop K grant, approved in 2015 for early design of the center-running alignment, to instead be used for a side-running alignment. Ms. LaForte noted one of the aspects of the side-running alignment was the significantly lower cost. When the prior Strategic Plan was approved in 2018, she said, the total Prop K funding for the project was at \$33 million, with a total project cost of \$240 million. She remarked that what is being done as part of the Strategic Plan update, is to recommend and preserve \$10 million in funding for Geary Bus Rapid Transit, and to reprogram the other funding to Muni Forward projects that are ready to go and are planning to request construction funding in the current year. Ms. LaForte continued saying that the construction would make some interim changes permanent with respect to priority lanes that have been in effect in the last few years. Thus, she added, there would be \$10 million remaining for Geary Bus Rapid Transit Phase 2, which is about 20% of the estimated \$50 million cost for design and construction of the side-running alignment. Ms. LaForte said that this would still allow the match to federal grants or other discretionary funding for which the project is expected to be very competitive.

Commissioner Chan asked for clarification on the total cost of Phase 2 of the center-running Geary Bus Rapid Transit project.

Ms. LaForte responded that the total cost was approximately \$240 million.

Commissioner Chan noted that if the community chose to have a side-running alignment, the total cost of the project would be around \$50 million. She asked if it was consistent with the 20% of the amount for design and construction for Prop K, the amount would be reduced from \$30 million to \$10 million.

Ms. LaForte responded that they are viewing it as a commensurate reduction in funding given the commensurate reduction in cost.

Commissioner Chan noted that District 1 still receives funding via the reduced Geary Bus Rapid Transit amount, in addition to the 5 Fulton project. She said the other Muni Forward projects help increase citywide connectivity and still provide significant value and asked if that was accurate.

Ms. LaForte responded affirmatively and noted a small placeholder of \$3 million for yet to be identified future Muni Forward improvements. Ms. LaForte noted that the Transportation Authority would be working with SFMTA to identify and bring forward plan for this funding.

Commissioner Chan responded by thanking the Transportation Authority for working on the changes with SFMTA and her office, specifically with regards to providing funding for the 5 Fulton which would cost about \$6.4 million. She said that the Transportation Authority staff had also worked with Phil Ting who allocated \$1.6 million in State funds to complete the funding plan. She reiterated support for this change and asked that staff continue to be transparent about the changes to the Geary Bus Rapid Transit project.



Commissioner Mar gave thanks to Mr. Reeves, Ms. LaForte and staff along with SFMTA for their work on the Prop K Strategic Plan priorities. Commissioner Mar continued by noting the investments in Westside rail, in specific the Geary/19th Avenue corridor strategy, stating that the pandemic emphasized the need to serve trips between neighborhoods throughout the city. Commissioner Mar continued by stating that north/south trips on the west side of San Francisco have been underinvested in and having a long-term strategy to bring rail to the 19th Avenue/Geary corridor would be necessary to meet climate and sustainability goals. Commissioner Mar noted that with Commissioner Melgar, a hearing in Land Use and Transportation Committee was convened earlier in the week on the need to plan for land use for transportation improvements particularly on the westside to meet future planned increases in housing density.

During public comment, Aleta Dupree said signal timing would help buses reduce congestion. She said a smart signal system is an equity priority for those that are transit dependent, adding that paratransit is important, and those using the service should not have to wait. With respect to the new signal contracts that are relying on lower Transportation Network Companies (TNC) revenues, Ms. Dupree encouraged people to "do their part" to increase TNC tax revenues as TNC rides are cheaper than automobile ownership. In terms of Communications Based Train Control, she said that signal work is a priority, and encouraged the funding of these worthy projects.

David Pilpel shared his support for the Geary project and said he wondered if moving from the center-running alignment to the side-running alignment required any additional environmental review. With regards to \$3.5 million to study westside rail projects, he said he has no objection to doing the planning project but the cost in his opinion seems significant given that there is not a need for a large-scale westside rail project. Mr. Pilpel continued to note that the land use and density on the westside does not support future rail projects now or in the future.

Commissioner Chan motioned to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Haney.

The motion was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Haney, Mar, Mandelman, Melgar, Preston, Stefani, and Walton (8)

Absent: Commissioners Peskin, Ronen, and Safai (3)

9. Allocate \$3,835,710 in Prop K Funds and \$4,794,258 in Prop AA Funds, with Conditions, and Appropriate \$320,000 in Prop K funds for Four Requests - ACTION

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, and Camille Guiriba, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item.

Chair Mandelman asked if the Transit Signal Priority (TSP) program was making a positive impact.

Ms. LaForte responded that the agenda packet included an effectiveness evaluation report from 2019 and invited SFMTA staff to respond more fully.

Liliana Ventura, SFMTA, added that the findings of the 2019 report revealed that TSP improved passenger trip times through a corridor by 2% - 3%, even though TSP may



not have been installed at all the signalized intersections on those corridors. Ms. Ventura also noted that the report found a 13% reduction in the time that buses were stopped. She said SFMTA's next evaluation would look at smaller corridor segments in which TSP had been implemented at all the signalized intersections.

Chair Mandelman asked what level of improvement SFMTA expected the program to ultimately yield on completion of the program.

Ms. Ventura answered that 10% reduction in passenger trip times along fully equipped corridors was likely.

Chair Mandelman asked how soon that level of benefit would be achieved.

Ms. Ventura said SFMTA's next program evaluation, anticipated in 2022, would give an indication of progress toward meeting that level of benefit.

Chair Mandelman asked about the cost of the project to date.

Ms. Ventura answered that the TSP program expended between \$10 million and \$12 million. She said the original estimate for completion was \$30 million but the scope and cost were reduced to meet budget constraints. Ms. Ventura said the original scope included every signalized intersection along every transit route, whereas the scope of the pending request was to install TSP at the intersections along Muni Rapid routes that had been skipped when TSP had first been implemented along those corridors. She said the program would also prioritize segments needed by emergency response vehicles.

Chair Mandelman commented that nearly a decade of work had gone into the TSP program with relatively modest results.

Commissioner Safai expressed support for the Mission/Geneva Safety project, saying that it was much needed and that a woman had lost her life the previous year due to the conditions in those corridors.

During public comment, Aleta Dupree expressed support for the TSP program, and said the city should set a goal to implement TSP on all signals along transit routes. She said that the effectiveness of TSP would be reduced unless implemented with maximum continuity. She also expressed support for the Mission/Geneva projects, saying the many trip hazards and potholes along those corridors were problematic in an area with such a large population of elderly residents.

Commissioner Chan moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Safai.

The motion was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Haney, Mar, Mandelman, Melgar, Preston, Safai, Stefani, and Walton (9)

Absent: Commissioners Peskin and Ronen (2)

10. Amend the Geary Bus Rapid Transit Phase 2 Conceptual Engineering Report Project to Revise the Scope and De-obligate \$1,892,152 of \$6,319,470 in Prop K Funds - ACTION

Dan Tischler, Principal Transportation Modeler, and Liz Brisson, Major Corridor Manager with SFMTA presented the item.



Commissioner Chan said that Phase 1 of Geary Bus Rapid Transit was a success and stated her belief that lessons learned from Phase 1 and Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit project supported the revised design. She shared that she was appreciative of the SFMTA and Transportation Authority staff's critical thinking on the project, specifically on the block by block design. She said she also believed that the pandemic changed the Richmond significantly due to shared spaces, slow streets, and some of the road closures. With regard to the side running lanes from Stanyan to 34th Avenue, she said it was a worthwhile discussion to be had over the coming year. Commissioner Chan said she wanted to make sure that the city continued the conversation with the community, because due to the pandemic, it is hard to tell if the community is aware of the significant changes to the project design. She said the public outreach is a critical phase because the public needs to understand the trade-offs.

Commissioner Chan suggested making an amendment to the staff recommendation, with the amendment including that the Board reviews the block by block design, cost estimates, and funding plan and ensuring that there is a diverse and inclusive second round of outreach.

Ms. LaForte explained that there was already a condition in the recommendation stating that prior to outreach round 2, SFMTA would provide preliminary materials. She asked if Commissioner Chan wanted to see stronger language.

Commissioner Chan explained that she specifically wanted funds held and then released after the Board reviewed the block by block design and preliminary cost and benefits calculations.

Ms. Brisson stated that she had already set up meetings to coordinate with Commissioner Chan's office and that SFMTA would not have a cash flow issue if some of the funds were placed on reserve.

Commissioner Chan expressed her appreciation for the work Ms. Brisson has been doing to coordinate with her office.

Chair Mandelman said that this was a good example of not allowing the perfect be the enemy of the good in that the original project had some issues and that a modified design could meet the project goals more effectively. Chair Mandelman noted that he has been hearing about bus rapid transit on Geary for 20 years, but the proposed side running lane design does not really feel like bus rapid transit. Chair Mandelman asked for SFMTA staff to speak to the tradeoffs.

Ms. Brisson agreed with Chair Mandelman and said that the tradeoffs were that with a center running transitway, the lanes were more protected, whereas with side running bus lanes, cars were allowed access to the bus lanes to turn or park. She said the center running design would not allow for differentiated local and rapid stops and would lose time at center-to-side and side-to-center transitions. Ms. Brisson stated that SFMTA staff expects the overall performance to be roughly similar between the two design options. She said other differences between the two alternatives were construction impacts and parking impacts because the side running transit lanes cause more loss of parking. She continued by saying the side running design is also significantly cheaper than the center running alignment.



Chair Mandelman noted that a tradeoff of the side running bus lanes is not having a protected busway, but it would allow for a better limited stop service while not losing local stops. He asked if Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit had the same issue.

Ms. Brisson responded by saying that Van Ness does not have tiered service.

Chair Mandelman asked which was environmentally superior alternative.

Ms. Brisson responded that she thought the locally preferred alternative was chosen as environmentally superior, but there were no big differences across the scenarios.

Executive Director Chang reminded the commissioners that level-of-service was the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) metric back then, but that vehicle miles traveled is the metric now, so the environmental assessment might be a bit different with the current metric.

During public comment Mr. Pilpel stated that the side running alternative qualifies as bus rapid transit. He said he supports the design change and suggested that the Transportation Authority develop a more consistent approach for evaluating major corridor projects in the future. Additionally, he suggested defining major corridors and having a consistent process for scope and communication as he thinks this would be helpful for staff, the public, decision makers.

Christopher Peterson stated that with the new design it would be crucial to minimize problems with double parked cars and delivery vehicles. He said that those could be big enough issues to remove many of the benefits. He said that he thinks Phase 2 is quite different from Phase 1 and success in Phase 1 might not be duplicated in Phase 2. Mr. Peterson said he was concerned that the amendment gives one commissioner veto power over the design and that he did not think that one commissioner should have that power.

A caller indicated that they support side-running bus lanes. They said side running bus lanes reduced conflicts with people crossing extra lanes to get to bus stops and center running lanes require more construction which is more difficult and takes longer and also makes it more difficult to change plans in the future.

Ms. LaForte clarified the language for the proposed amendment. She stated that she understood Commissioner Chan's motion was to amend the staff recommendation to put \$1.2 million of this funding on reserve, to be released by the Board, pending agreement between the District 1 Supervisor's Office, Transportation Authority staff, and SFMTA staff on the proposed draft project designs on a block-by-block basis and review of preliminary assessment of benefits and impacts, cost estimate and funding plan, and draft outreach materials for public outreach round 2.

Commissioner Chan made a motion to amend the item, seconded by Commissioner Walton.

The motion to amend was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Haney, Mar, Mandelman, Melgar, Preston, Safai, Stefani, and Walton (9)

Absent: Commissioners Peskin and Ronen (2)

Commissioner Chan made a motion to approve the item as amended, seconded by



Commissioner Walton.

The motion was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Haney, Mar, Mandelman, Melgar, Preston, Safai, Stefani, and Walton (9)

Absent: Commissioners Peskin and Ronen (2)

11. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Transit Recovery Update - INFORMATION

Julie Kirschbaum, Director of Transit with SFMTA presented this item.

Commissioner Preston thanked the other commissioners and SFMTA for their work to help release the new plan and acknowledged their commitment to respond to the changes requested by the commissioners and other advocacy groups. He added that prior to the restoration plan there was frustration that there wasn't a SFMTA commitment to releasing a plan of 100% pre-pandemic restoration and restoring all the suspended lines. He added that the Board has been clear on pushing for restoration, and with that are critical of the survey that was being used to frame the options for service restoration. Commissioner Preston noted the plan that was presented makes some very significant changes, and he thanked Ms. Kirschbaum for her leadership in moving the conversation forward. He stated that the plan is not perfect, but it restores many of the lines that the advocates in his office, on the Board, and the public have demanded since last year. He added that the proposed restorations are major, specifically in his district for Japantown and the Western Addition, and other parts of the city.

With regard to District 5 proposed restorations, Commissioner shared that the 6 Parnassus, 21 Hayes, and the 43 Masonic would be huge improvements, and added that he is appreciative and encouraged to see the restoration of the 8 AX Bayshore and BX, which are essential lines in the city. Commissioner Preston reiterated that the suspension of lines with no commitment to return, created a major rift between transit riders and SFMTA, consuming a lot of their time and energy. He said he firmly believes that the proposal presented offered hope that SFMTA is embarking on a new path to unify elected officials, riders and operators to restore and expand public transit for the future. He added that to the extent the changes are not full restoration, such as lower frequencies and shortened lines, his hope is that they are temporary issues, and they will revert back to restoring the lines in the next round of service expansions.

Commissioner Preston reiterated that the February 2022 plan is a major step in the right direction and urged the Board to share their views on the proposed plan with SFMTA. He thanked SFMTA for making the commitment to Muni service restoration, and the advocates and Muni riders, who have made their voice loud and clear in demanding their lines back. He also thanked the workers and operators who are working to envision a build a greener future, and he is looking forward to advocating with them for public transit.

Chair Mandelman noted that he spoke on the J- line option at the Government Audit and Oversight Committee meeting and thanked SFMTA for their efforts in responding to some of the concerns that he raised. Chair Mandelman added that he is happy to see many of the changes that were made during the pandemic have



improved service in the tunnel for all lines except the J-line. He said that has come at a cost to those who live in Noe Valley, and it is pretty clear that the SFMTA believes that putting a number of J trains back into the tunnel, that were running into the tunnel prior to the pandemic, would compromise service in the tunnel for all riders. He added that service in the tunnel prior to the pandemic was one of the biggest problems in their system. He said the current J line is not working and he does not think option 1 is the right answer but going with either option 2 or 3 as they have evolved is an open question. He shared that his concern with option 2 is taking the current number of trains that are running and having them run along the longer line, with pretty clear resistance of adding more J lines, condemns J riders to having worse service than they had prior to the pandemic. He added however, that option 2 would be attractive if there was a commitment to maintaining at least the current level of service on the surface through trains that were terminated and were brought back, along with additional lines going into the tunnel. Chair Mandelman also reiterated that they need to find ways to get 1 seat rides into downtown, which is reflected as an effort in option 3. He continued by stating that half hour service doesn't sound great, and they will be advocating for more than that if there is demand. He added that he appreciates SMFTA's willingness to respond to the Board and members of the community.

During public comment, Kathy Setian expressed their support for the J Church option 2 of the recommendation and communicated their frustration with the lack of community input and outreach from SFMTA when the new recommendation of option 3 was added.

Edward Mason expressed his support for J Church option 2. He noted that the presentation that was made on the automatic train control system, indicated that the future system would be less reliable than as planned. With respect to the 48 line on Grandview Avenue, Mr. Mason stated that the system has been eliminated although the Muni presentation mentioned that it is within one quarter mile. He closed by stating that the any Muni documentation should be severely scrubbed and understood.

Aleta Dupree said she supports option 2 and she's maintained the importance of bringing the J train in and out of the subway. She said that she believes they can manage the subway line with multiple services. She asked that Muni rise to the level of being able to manage time slots, just as they do in New York.

Karen Kennard thanked SFMTA for the presentation and asked why SFMTA is listening to all riders but the Noe Valley J-rider community. They noted that forcing transfers unduly burdens seniors, and that SMFTA's technical analysis supports option 2. With regard to option 3 being removed, Ms. Kennard noted that decisions made without the benefit of the input from the riders they are trying to retain are bad decisions.

David Pilpel, agreed with the previous caller and suggested that if they operate the four trains: J, KT, M, and N-line, every 10 minutes in the subway, it would be doable without congestion. They added that there needs to be more daylight service, as they are providing too much service at night when it isn't needed. They also noted that the main point is coverage, with routes and span of service with sufficient capacity by way of headways and frequency and appropriate vehicle size. They said that they can



continue to work on details in future rounds, but they should increase the service and decrease as demand warrants, and above the level of the minimum policy.

Other Items

12. Introduction of New Items - INFORMATION

There were no new items introduced.

13. Public Comment

During public comment Anastasia Yovanopoulos stated that things would have gone smoother if the SFMTA asked Muni riders about their needs and plans for service restoration first, prior to paying a consulting firm. As a transit dependent senior in District 8 with mobility issues, they said that they would appreciate not having to navigate across tracks, traffic and high intersections at Church and Market streets, just to transfer to the underground to go downtown, as it is too risky and disruptive. They added that they would like to resume riding free of charge using their Clipper Card to get to medical and dental appointments downtown.

A caller voiced their support for option 2. They said the J-line has been running into downtown for decades and individuals and businesses heavily rely on it. They said that if they're going to make a change, it will curtail service, with a significant impact on elderly and disabled people. They added that there is no technical data supporting option 1, and the forced transfer is a violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) that should be looked into.

Aleta Dupree stated that the major goal should be to build a city that is more accessible and user friendly and added that they should work hard on their congestion pricing. She said that all the transportation modes are complementary and should not be pitted against each other and asked that they use their ability to fund projects that follow the basic values of equitable mobility for all.

14. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:42 p.m.