



DRAFT MINUTES

Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee

Thursday, December 9, 2021

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m.

Present at Roll Call: Members: Jay Bain, Majeid Crawford, Cathy DeLuca (for Pi Ra), Zack Deutsch-Gross, Jesse Fernandez, Amandeep Jawa, Aaron Leifer, Jessica Lum, Jodie Medeiros, Melvin Parham (for Susan Murphy), Calvin Quick, Eric Rozell, Yensing Sihakanya, Sujata Srivastava, Wesley Tam, Joan Van Rijn, Christopher White (17)

Absent at Roll Call: Rosa Chen, Anni Chung (arrived during Item 3), Mel Flores (arrived during Item 3), Rodney Fong, Sharky Laguana, Susan Murphy, Maryo Mogannam, Maelig Morvan, Pi Ra, Maurice Rivers (arrived during Item 4), Earl Shaddix, Kim Tavaglione (12)

2. EPAC Chair's Remarks

Chair Jawa noted that at Tuesday's Board meeting, the Transportation Authority Board approved the new November 2022 election target. He also noted that the EPAC would review the revised schedule during the meeting, including 3 more meetings, and thanked EPAC members for their continued service, having heard affirmatively from almost everyone that they would continue to serve on the EPAC into 2022. Chair Jawa provided a recap of where we've been and noted that staff would provide additional information on the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA). He said that at the last EPAC meeting, the EPAC started tradeoff discussions for paratransit operations. Chair Jawa also noted the desire for a more comprehensive roadmap for decision-making and said he hoped to consider leveraging and other factors at tonight's meeting.

There was no member or public comment.

3. Meeting #6 Recap, Minutes and Follow-Ups - INFORMATION*

Michelle Beaulieu, SFCTA, presented the item.

A member asked if seed funding could cover pilot programs.

Michelle Beaulieu responded that pilots were eligible in the draft Expenditure Plan and that seed funding could be considered for that use.

A member said that the new carbon reduction program identified three types of programs and asked if these were confirmed or if they could be expanded.

Ms. Beaulieu responded that they were examples and not meant to include the full range of what was eligible.

A member said that the new pots of funding would not close existing funding gaps, but asked if it could be used to help prioritize local funding, i.e. use federal dollars for x, and local dollars for y.



Ms. Beaulieu responded in the affirmative and said that she would share table showing estimated leveraging ability. She said that the leveraging information had not changed recommendations in the draft Expenditure Plan because it was a small percent of the need for varying programs.

Maria Lombardo said that the new buckets of funding would be helpful but noted that funding was always nuanced and projects need to be ready to compete for federal funding and local dollars would help to get projects ready to compete.

A member commented that there was no 'free' money, but the ability to leverage more was what they were most interested in.

There was no public comment.

4. Draft Expenditure Plan Discussion - INFORMATION*

Michelle Beaulieu, SFCTA, presented the item.

Chair Jawa asked, in regard to the schedule, if the EPAC should have everything nailed down by January 27th with only final details left for the February 10th meeting.

Ms. Beaulieu confirmed that was the goal. Ms. Beaulieu shared a work-in-progress context table that staff was preparing for an upcoming meeting.

A member asked on the table shown if the column for draft potential future funds showed future funds other than sales tax.

Ms. Beaulieu confirmed.

Ms. Lombardo added that some columns in the table were necessarily simplified for ease of use and said that the predominant improvement to the program was the basis for the classification use for columns such as maintain, enhance, and expand.

A member asked for more clarification on maintain, enhance, expand - and asked who/howdetermined the identification.

Ms. Beaulieu responded that it was based on the benefit of the program investment. She said, for example, that 'maintain' represented replacing assets already in place and 'enhance' represented improving the user experience but not expanding miles of rail.

A member said that they understood how high leveraging made a case for additional funding, but asked if lower leveraging would make a good case for that as well.

Ms. Beaulieu agreed and said that we want the sales tax to leverage funding, but there were some projects that were important to complete even where leveraging wasn't possible and added that it may be cheaper or easier to fully fund some projects at the local level.

A member asked for understanding of ridership and greenhouse gas emissions reductions when thinking about the projects and said nothing tangible was included.

Ms. Beaulieu responded that information was available for some projects, but not all and said staff would look to project sponsors to get information, which may be added later. She noted most of the plan was made up of programs so this information would be hard to produce except for the few examples of projects named in program descriptions.

Chair Jawa agreed that ridership and greenhouse gas emissions data was a great idea.



Chair Jawa asked about the potential ridership at a Bayview Caltrain Station and said that he rarely saw people getting on Caltrain at the Paul Avenue station.

Ms. Beaulieu responded that there was an ongoing study to determine a precise location for the station.

Ms. Lombardo said that ridership numbers were available from a Transportation Authority study completed a while ago and staff would check with the Planning Department regarding ridership information available from the ongoing study.

A member contrasted the Bayview Caltrain Station with the Mission Bay Ferry Landing and said it felt as though the Mission Bay Ferry Landing was for privileged people that do not want to drive over the bridge and would rather take a ferry. She said there did not seem to be many equity considerations related to that project.

Ms. Lombardo said staff would follow up to see if there was a plan to serve Treasure Island, an Equity Priority Community.

A member asked if there was an estimate for how many people would be served by the ferry landing for sporting events in the area to better understand overall usage.

Ms. Beaulieu responded that staff would look into that to see if information was broken out in that manner.

A member asked if analysis of projected private vehicle traffic was used to show the ferry landing could replace a certain number of vehicle trips and if we could use driving behavior to see what routes were being taken and what mode shifts were happening.

Kaley Lyons said the SF Port has estimated capacity at 6,000 passengers per day and said she would follow up with the Port for additional information.

A member noted that ferries provide transportation redundancy and could help people get across the bay in an emergency.

A member asked if the term pedestrian and bicycle facilities differed from capital infrastructure.

Ms. Beaulieu responded that facilities were sidewalks, bike lanes, and quick builds, among others, and include capital infrastructure but it was just a different term used.

Ms. Lombardo said there was not a perfect division of project types. She said in the current (Prop K) measure, best practices for facility maintenance dealt with the new paint on the street. She said this was previously primarily restriping, but with an explosion of quick-build projects, additional maintenance such as safe hit posts were needed. She said SFMTA would be developing a capital management approach to deal with pedestrian and bicycle maintenance in the future.

A member asked for clarification on no funding gap shown for street resurfacing.

Ms. Beaulieu responded that not all money dedicated to street resurfacing, but staff think there would be enough money to maintain existing assets.

Ms. Lombardo said that the remaining funding gap was zeroed out because the cost shown was to maintain the current level of Pavement Condition Index (PCI). She said staff would make sure that when they complete the context table it will reflect what it would take to get to the ideal state of good repair, consistent with Plan Bay Area.



A member said the Safer Streets subcategory seemed to include many disparate programs. They said there was a huge amount of need and a massive funding gap shown on the table. They asked if it was possible to break down the subcategory to make it more comprehensible, including the range for leveraging ability.

Ms. Beaulieu said that the current Prop K Expenditure Plan includes a number of smaller subcategories and staff combined several in the draft new Expenditure Plan to provide flexibility and understanding that projects tap into multiple buckets. She said many projects have several different types of components and combining the programs into one subcategory would make administration more streamlined.

Ms. Lombardo added that staff could provide more backup information on individual pieces, but confirmed the rationale for putting them into one bucket. She added that staff would be vetting the needs numbers for all categories.

A member said Safer Streets had a huge funding gap compared to other programs, which was especially relevant to funding needs. They asked what the gap represents.

Ms. Beaulieu responded that staff would help break down the needs number.

The member said that Ms. Beaulieu's comment that the Transformative Freeways program was primarily for planning and public engagement was very helpful and asked that type of information be made available to EPAC members.

Ms. Lombardo said the final table would be updated to include that type of information.

A member said they were glad for more information on equity benefits identification for each program and said otherwise someone looking at this may see the Equity Priority Transportation Program and think that was the only program serving Equity Priority Communities.

Chair Jawa said that information related to greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) helps him to frame all the issues and said that equity was a north star, and GHG reduction was another and would like to see additional information related to GHG.

Ms. Beaulieu said the information was available for some projects but getting GHG information for programs would be more difficult.

Chair Jawa asked that when staff completes the context table, that staff include a "version" and last revised date at the top of the table since it would presumably be updated by staff.

A member said that the equity tags were representing the equity potential but may not be the actual project. They said when the discussion on category rules (policies?) happens, they would like to link equity to execution of projects. They asked that as staff looks at putting rules on funding, they consider making an equity analysis nexus to execution of project in some way.

Ms. Beaulieu said this would be discussed in relation to the policies included in the new Expenditure Plan, including equity consideration in administering the funding. She said that each program was different so the staff recommendation was to maintain flexibility within the prioritization process to apply to each program as appropriate. She said this was one place to include equity and that more information would be provided regarding the 5 year prioritization process (5YPP) as well.



Ms. Lombardo said that for GHG, there were some specific projects with that information but staff could also look at the city's Climate Action Plan, which may have a proxy for GHG reduction that could be used for this effort.

A member asked if there were comments made when Prop K was being developed regarding equity and if there were specific kinds of recommendations made that staff feel could help resolve those issues. She asked if it was possible to tell if this draft Expenditure Plan addressed those issues.

Ms. Lombardo said that the Prop K Expenditure Plan development was part of the San Francisco Transportation Plan (SFTP) update and geographic equity analysis was part of that plan. She said key findings then were around transit access, and that bicycle and pedestrian projects did not have a strong project pipeline and had worse performance. She said equity at that time (2003) was less about Equity Priority Communities and more about geographic equity and that it did not come up as much in EPAC then. She added that through the 5YPP process the Neighborhood Transportation Program was created to help develop project pipelines in each supervisorial district and emphasized the importance of planning for projects in order to be competitive for additional outside funding.

The member asked when the EPAC would talk about the criteria to look at for prioritization, including equity. They said there were many projects ready to build because planning already happened. They expressed concern and said they did not want to make the same mistakes as Prop K and would like to solve issues so this Expenditure Plan reflected all of San Francisco and the needs of all residents.

Ms. Lombardo said this would be the topic of upcoming EPAC meetings and urged the EPAC to keep in mind that this would be a 30 year plan so it needed to be flexible to adapt to things that come up. She added that quick build projects did not exist when Prop K was approved, but Prop K was flexible enough to accommodate funding for quick builds.

The member agreed with the need for flexibility but said they wanted to be careful.

A member asked how the equity benefits for proposed programs could be more concrete and substantive. They commented that in the prior presentation on equity findings, there may be some conflation in broad categories. They gave an example that while Chinatown was on the map as an Equity Priority Community, there were many affluent financial district folks who lived nearby as well. They asked what it meant to check the equity box, did it address transportation costs or investment in transit that disproportionately benefits low-income housing. They asked how to advance equity in planning and said that investments did not reduce transportation costs in Equity Priority Communities. They asked if staff had information they had heard from community organizations that work with equity populations and asked that it be included here for more dimension. They also asked about income per capita said they would like finer grained details to make sure the Expenditure Plan was delivered in an equitable way.

Ms. Beaulieu said that staff would give more consideration to the information related to equity.

Ms. Lombardo agreed with the comment that equity flags were representative of a program's potential. She said that equity could be incorporated in many ways, including outreach to communities now and in how funding decisions would be made, including requiring projects to have robust community engagement.



A member said they run a nonprofit for low income families and they would like to see Census data. They said Mission Bay wasn't a neighborhood 15 years ago and asked what the focus was, whether that was reducing congestion of a new neighborhood or something else. They said there were goals, but they would like to see the data-driven impact and what was actually serving people of color.

Ms. Beaulieu said that this could potentially be done for projects, but that it was trickier with programs and work would be done in the prioritization process for project selection. She said the equity analysis for reauthorization was available online and that it included a map of Equity Priority Communities based on census data and would look for other helpful maps to pull from.

A member said the table showed two programs with major funding gaps: Safer Streets and Muni Facilities Maintenance. They asked about the implications of these gaps.

Ms. Beaulieu said that staff could help contextualize this and for Safer Streets it would help to break it down by mode. She said the category included a lot, such as redesigning of every street in San Francisco which had a very high cost. She said this was different than street resurfacing which included a cap at 75 PCI, for example. She said some funding for Muni facilities would also be included in the GO Bond proposal which was included in the draft potential funding sources.

Ms. Lombardo said SFMTA's prior presentation on facility maintenance would provide some context and that staff was working with SFMTA to look for new funding, including a potential new regional revenue measure. She said there were shortfalls for all categories.

Chair Jawa said it would be helpful to see the remaining funding gap as a percent instead of a number and to show what was recommended as a percent of what was asked for.

Ms. Beaulieu said that potential future funds were aspirational numbers and not secured or definite, with limitations on funding. She said a program showing a funding gap of \$0 did not mean it was fully funded. She said, for example, DTX had a funding plan that included a large federal grant TJPA had not yet applied for and was not definite. She said staff would add percent to provide context.

A member asked if the funding for the Pennsylvania Alignment (PAX) was only for planning and said leveraging for planning funds only would theoretically be lower.

Ms. Beaulieu said the total funding need was the total DTX cost + planning/early phases of PAX. She said staff would add a note about lower leveraging ability for planning.

A member said that transportation had been a tool to uplift privileged classes and harm non-privileged with aggressive projects, such as what happened in the Fillmore, Japantown, and bulldozing Geary. They said what equity looked like for communities harmed by decades of pain was different than what was being presented and said that what equity looked like moving forward was different for those historically harmed. They appreciated the powerful comments made about making the new Expenditure Plan equitable and said they would go back to organizations and community members and get their thoughts on how to add equity here. They said this was almost status quo and that it was difficult to change but that everyone wanted to try. They said they were not landing anywhere but were hoping for clarity over the next few meetings.



Chair Jawa thanked the member for their valuable perspective, acknowledged that it was hard for people to overcome their own background and biases and hoped the member would continue to bring ideas.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked how accurate revenue forecasts were for Prop B and Prop K. He said there was mention about the "last mile" which conflicts with Muni indicating the city was about 98% covered within ¼ mile. He asked where developer fees were and said growth was not funding growth and that expansion should be paid for by developers. He said Prop E maintains street trees and that a future proposition should be used for street tree planting. He said it was not mandated by complete streets policy and that it was up to local jurisdictions. He said there were greater needs than trees, and we don't have the full costs of trees. He also said curb ramps allocations to San Francisco Public Works should be conditioned and that cracks were developing soon after new curb ramps were put into place. He said that regarding climate change, the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) noted climate impacts for any item going to their Board for approval and the Transportation Authority should adopt something similar.

5. Public Comment

During public comment, Roland Lebrun said that anything VTA includes about the climate was made up.

Edward Mason said he would be interested in seeing the context table.

6. Adjournment

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