



# AGENDA

## San Francisco County Transportation Authority Meeting Notice

**Date:** Tuesday, February 8, 2022; 10:00 a.m.

**Location:** Watch SF Cable Channel 26

Watch [www.sfgovtv.org](http://www.sfgovtv.org)

**PUBLIC COMMENT CALL-IN:** 1 (415) 655-0001; Access Code: 2481 557 6225 # #

To make public comment on an item, when the item is called, dial '\*3' to be added to the queue to speak. Do not press \*3 again or you will be removed from the queue. When the system says your line is unmuted, the live operator will advise that you will be allowed 2 minutes to speak. When your 2 minutes are up, we will move on to the next caller. Calls will be taken in the order in which they are received.

**Commissioners:** Mandelman (Chair), Peskin (Vice Chair), Chan, Haney, Mar, Melgar, Preston, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, and Walton

**Clerk:** Angela Tsao

**Remote Access to Information and Participation:**

This meeting will be held remotely and will allow for remote public comment pursuant to AB 361, which amended the Brown Act to include Government Code Section 54953(e) and empowers local legislative bodies to convene by teleconferencing technology during a proclaimed state of emergency under the State Emergency Services Act so long as certain conditions are met.

Members of the public are encouraged to watch SF Cable Channel 26 or visit the SFGovTV website ([www.sfgovtv.org](http://www.sfgovtv.org)) to stream the live meetings or watch them on demand. Written public comment may be submitted prior to the meeting by emailing the Clerk of the Transportation Authority at [clerk@sfcta.org](mailto:clerk@sfcta.org) or sending written comments to Clerk of the Transportation Authority, 1455 Market Street, 22nd Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103. Written comments received by 8 a.m. on the day of the meeting will be distributed to Board members before the meeting begins.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                                    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Roll Call</li> <li>2. <b>[Final Approval on First Appearance]</b> Approve the Resolution making findings to allow teleconferenced meetings under California Government Code Section 54953(e) - <b>ACTION*</b></li> </ol> | <p><b>Page</b></p> <p><b>5</b></p> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|



- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 3. Community Advisory Committee Report - <b>INFORMATION*</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | 9  |
| 4. Approve the Minutes of the January 25, 2022 Meeting - <b>ACTION*</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | 17 |
| 5. Appoint One Member to the Community Advisory Committee - <b>ACTION*</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 23 |
| 6. Adopt Fiscal Year 2022/23 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Local Expenditure Criteria - <b>ACTION*</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 29 |
| 7. Approve the 2022 State and Federal Legislative Program - <b>ACTION*</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 39 |
| 8. Award Contracts to Ten Shortlisted Consultant Teams for a Three-Year Period, with an Option to Extend for Two Additional One-Year Periods, for a Combined Amount Not to Exceed \$3,000,000 for On-Call Transportation Planning Services and Authorize the Executive Director to Negotiate Contract Payment Terms and Non-Material Contract Terms and Conditions. - <b>ACTION*</b> | 55 |
- Recommended Teams: Alta Planning + Design Inc., Arup North America Ltd., Fehr & Peers, Kittelson & Associates Inc., McKinsey & Company, Mott MacDonald Group, Inc., Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates, Inc., Parisi Transportation Consulting, Steer Group, and WSP USA, Inc
- Other Items**
9. Introduction of New Items - **INFORMATION**
- During this segment of the meeting, Commissioners may make comments on items not specifically listed above or introduce or request items for future consideration.
10. Public Comment
11. Adjournment

\*Additional Materials

---

Items considered for final approval by the Board shall be noticed as such with **[Final Approval]** preceding the item title.

The meeting proceedings can be viewed live or on demand after the meeting at [www.sfgovtv.org](http://www.sfgovtv.org). To know the exact cablecast times for weekend viewing, please call SFGovTV at (415) 554-4188 on Friday when the cablecast times have been determined.

The Legislative Chamber (Room 250) and the Committee Room (Room 263) in City Hall are wheelchair accessible. Meetings are real-time captioned and are cablecast open-captioned on SFGovTV, the Government Channel 26. Assistive listening devices for the Legislative Chamber and the Committee Room are available upon request at the Clerk of the Board's Office, Room 244. To request sign language interpreters, readers, large print agendas or other accommodations, please contact the Clerk of the Transportation Authority at (415) 522-4800. Requests made at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting will help to ensure availability. Attendees at all public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical-based products.

If any materials related to an item on this agenda have been distributed to the Board after distribution of the meeting packet, those materials are available for public inspection at the Transportation Authority at 1455 Market Street, Floor 22, San Francisco, CA 94103, during normal office hours.

Written public comment may be submitted prior to the meeting by emailing the Clerk of the Transportation Authority at [clerk@sfcta.org](mailto:clerk@sfcta.org) or sending written comments to Clerk of the Transportation Authority, 1455 Market Street,



**San Francisco  
County Transportation  
Authority**

Board Meeting Agenda

Page 3 of 3

22nd Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103. Written comments received by 8 a.m. on the day of the meeting will be distributed to Board members before the meeting begins.

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code Sec. 2.100] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the San Francisco Ethics Commission at 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102; (415) 252-3100; [www.sfethics.org](http://www.sfethics.org).

[ this page intentionally left blank ]



RESOLUTION MAKING FINDINGS TO ALLOW TELECONFERENCED MEETINGS UNDER CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54953(E)

WHEREAS, California Government Code Section 54953(e) empowers local legislative bodies to convene by teleconferencing technology during a proclaimed state of emergency under the State Emergency Services Act so long as certain conditions are met; and

WHEREAS, In March, 2020, the Governor of the State of California proclaimed a state of emergency in California in connection with the Coronavirus Disease 2019 ("COVID-19") pandemic, and that state of emergency remains in effect; and

WHEREAS, In February 25, 2020, the Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco (the "City") declared a local emergency, and on March 6, 2020 the City's Health Officer declared a local health emergency, and both those declarations also remain in effect; and

WHEREAS, On September 16, 2021, the Governor signed AB 361, a bill that amends the Brown Act to allow local legislative bodies to continue to meet by teleconferencing during a state of emergency without complying with restrictions in State law that would otherwise apply, provided that the legislative bodies make certain findings at least once every 30 days; and

WHEREAS, Federal, State, and local health officials emphasize the critical importance of vaccination and consistent mask-wearing to prevent the spread of COVID-19, and the City Health Officer has issued at least one order (Health Officer Order No. C19-07y, available online at [www.sfdph.org/healthorders](http://www.sfdph.org/healthorders)) and one directive (Health Officer Directive No. 2020-33i, available online at [www.sfdph.org/directives](http://www.sfdph.org/directives)) that continue to recommend measures to promote physical distancing and other social distancing measures, such as masking, in certain contexts; and

WHEREAS, The California Department of Industrial Relations Division of Occupational Safety and Health ("Cal/OSHA") has promulgated Section 3205 of Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations, which requires most employers in California, including in the City, to train and instruct employees about measures that can decrease the spread of COVID-19,



including physical distancing and other social distancing measures; and

WHEREAS, Without limiting any requirements under applicable federal, state, or local pandemic-related rules, orders, or directives, the City's Department of Public Health, in coordination with the City's Health Officer, has advised that for group gatherings indoors, such as meetings of boards and commissions, people can increase safety and greatly reduce risks to the health and safety of attendees from COVID-19 by maximizing ventilation, wearing well-fitting masks (as required by Health Officer Order No. C19-07y), using physical distancing where the vaccination status of attendees is not known, and considering holding the meeting remotely if feasible, especially for long meetings, with any attendees with unknown vaccination status and where ventilation may not be optimal; and

WHEREAS, The San Francisco County Transportation Authority Board has met remotely during the COVID-19 pandemic and can continue to do so in a manner that allows public participation and transparency while minimizing health risks to members, staff, and the public that would be present with in-person meetings while this emergency continues; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That San Francisco County Transportation Authority Board finds as follows:

1. As described above, the State of California and the City remain in a state of emergency due to the COVID-19 pandemic. At this meeting, San Francisco County Transportation Authority Board has considered the circumstances of the state of emergency.
2. As described above, State and City officials continue to recommend measures to promote physical distancing and other social distancing measures, in some settings.
3. As described above, because of the COVID-19 pandemic, conducting meetings of this body and its committees in person would present imminent risks to the safety of attendees, and the state of emergency continues to directly impact the ability of members to meet safely in person; and, be it further



RESOLVED, That for at least the next 30 days meetings of San Francisco County Transportation Authority Board and its standing and advisory committees, including the Community Advisory Committee ("CAC") and the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee ("EPAC"), will continue to occur exclusively by teleconferencing technology (and not by any in-person meetings or any other meetings with public access to the places where any legislative body member is present for the meeting). Such meetings of San Francisco County Transportation Authority Board and its committees that occur by teleconferencing technology will provide an opportunity for members of the public to address this body and its committees and will otherwise occur in a manner that protects the statutory and constitutional rights of parties and the members of the public attending the meeting via teleconferencing; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the Clerk of the Transportation Authority is directed to place a resolution substantially similar to this resolution on the agenda of a future meeting of San Francisco County Transportation Authority Board within the next 30 days. If the San Francisco County Transportation Authority Board does not meet within the next 30 days, the Clerk is directed to place such a resolution on the agenda of the next meeting of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority Board.

[ this page intentionally left blank ]





# ***DRAFT MINUTES***

## **Community Advisory Committee**

**Wednesday, January 26, 2022**

### **1. Call to Order**

Chair Larson called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Present at Roll: Rosa Chen, Robert Gower, David Klein, John Larson, Jerry Levine, Kevin Ortiz, Eric Rozell, Peter Tannen, Sophia Tupuola (9)

Absent at Roll: Nancy Buffum (1)

### **2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION**

Chair Larson said that at the prior day's Board meeting, Chair Mandelman and Vice Chair Peskin were elected to service in those same offices for 2022. He noted that the Executive Director presented the 2021 Annual Report to the Board yesterday and it is available to review on the agency's website. He continued by noting that the Board reappointed District 9 representative Kevin Ortiz to the CAC, and newly appointed District 6 representative Eric Rozell, who also serves on the agency's Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC). He asked Mr. Rozell to introduce himself. Mr. Rozell discussed his experience in public advocacy and transit, as well as Vision Zero work such as working with Commissioner Matt Haney's office to lower speed limits and install no turn on red signs in the Tenderloin.

Chair Larson asked Rosa Chen to report on EPAC progress. Ms. Chen presented the report and announced that meetings are opened to the public, with more information available at [sfcta.org/expenditureplan](http://sfcta.org/expenditureplan). She said that the EPAC last met on January 13 and would meet again on January 27 where the EPAC would review the proposed programs and on any changes to the project prioritization process for identifying which projects will get funded after the measure is approved. She said this is the 5-Year Prioritization Program process the CAC is familiar with for Prop K

Chair Larson then announced a public survey on San Francisco's transportation priorities, with more information available at [connectsf.org/survey](http://connectsf.org/survey).

Chair Larson concluded his remarks by thanking Transportation Authority Clerk Britney Milton for her work with the agency and wished her the best in her future endeavors. Ms. Milton thanked the Chair for the kind words.

There was no public comment.

### **3. Election of Chair and Vice Chair for 2021 - ACTION\***

The Chair continued the item to the next meeting so that it could be properly noticed as elections for calendar year 2022.

### **Consent Agenda**

### **4. Community Advisory Committee Vacancy - INFORMATION**



5. **Accept the Audit Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2021 - INFORMATION\***
6. **Internal Accounting Report, Investment Report, and Debt Expenditure Report for the Six Months Ending December 31, 2021 - INFORMATION\***

There was no CAC discussion and no public comment.

**End of Consent Agenda**

7. **Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt Fiscal Year 2022/23 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Local Expenditure Criteria - ACTION\***

Mike Pickford, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

There was no public comment.

Robert Gower motioned to approve the item, seconded by Jerry Levine.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Chen, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Ortiz, Rozell, Tannen, Tupuola (9)

Absent: Buffum, (1)

8. **Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve the 2022 State and Federal Legislative Program - ACTION\***

Amber Crabbe, Public Policy Manager, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Jerry Levine asked if there was any interest in exploring an oil extraction fee on oil producers, which could raise an estimated \$4 billion a year for transportation purposes.

Ms. Crabbe responded that she hadn't heard it discussed, but she would follow up with Mark Watts, the Transportation Authority's state legislative advocate.

Mr. Levine noted that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission was exploring the idea a while ago but politically there were problems with it. He added that these fees existed elsewhere, and since California was one of the leading producers of oil, he hoped such a fee would be considered in the future.

Robert Gower asked what the time frame was for developing autonomous vehicle policy.

Ms. Crabbe replied that bills regarding autonomous vehicles were routinely introduced at the state level each year. She said that staff presented relevant bills to the Transportation Authority Board each month for input as warranted. She added that at the federal level, Transportation Authority Executive Director Chang and staff were engaged in policymaking through Director Chang's role in ITS America, and that the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) was leading engagement in federal rulemaking efforts on behalf of the city. She stated that she understood the current administration was advancing a federal autonomous vehicle policy after many years of limited federal regulation of the technology.

David Klein asked if there were studies occurring on the impact of technology on job displacement, specifically of drivers and maintenance workers. He stated that many of the jobs that were subject to displacement provided a path to middle-income wages, especially for those who don't have a college-level education.



Ms. Crabbe said the current administration was very aware of labor issues and was focused on making sure there were good jobs created as part of the transition to new technology. She said they were researching the transition's impact on jobs and developing policies such as a green jobs programs that could help mitigate negative impacts.

Mr. Klein stated that for solar technology, the green tech industry was creating quality, high-paying non-union jobs potentially at the expense of union jobs at the utility companies. He noted that he saw how similar situations could occur where union jobs at companies creating combustion engine vehicles were lost even if non-union jobs were created elsewhere.

Chair Larson asked for more detail on the Reconnecting Communities program and how it would be implemented.

Ms. Crabbe responded that the guidelines for the program were being developed by the U.S. Department of Transportation staff. She said they had released a new website related to the infrastructure bill and a timeline for releasing funding solicitations through mid-2022. She offered to share the website link with the CAC after the meeting.

Chair Larson asked if the Reconnecting Communities program could fund freeway deconstruction projects that literally reconnected communities.

Ms. Crabbe responded that freeway deconstructions had been referred to as an example of the types of projects that could receive funds from the program. She noted that the details regarding project eligibility and prioritization would be released as part of the program guidance later this year.

Chair Larson noted that the staff memorandum included a reference to the Transit Transformative Action Plan that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission approved last year. He requested a presentation about the plan at a future meeting.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked for the definition of private transit shuttles in the legislative program. He also noted that the city's Transportation Sustainability Fee was projected to receive \$25 million per year when it was implemented, and only applies to buildings with above a certain number of units. He asked why current residents were being asked to pay for infrastructure that is needed to support new growth. He stated that if agencies were advocating for growth, they should consider what funding is necessary to implement the necessary infrastructure to support it.

At the Chair's request, Ms. Crabbe responded that private transit shuttles were listed as one possible type of emerging mobility mode that could see legislation this year. She noted that the list of technologies in the legislative program was intended to be illustrative. She added that staff would monitor bills related to private transit shuttles and other modes and advocate for them to be consistent with how the city wants to see new technology implemented, such as maintaining the ability to regulate traffic on local roads and getting the data needed to evaluate and regulate their implementation.

Robert Gower motioned to approve the item, seconded by David Klein.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Chen, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Ortiz, Rozell, Tannen, Tupuola (9)

Absent: Buffum, (1)



9. **Adopt a Motion of Support to Award Contracts to Ten Shortlisted Consultant Teams for a Three-Year Period, with an Option to Extend for Two Additional One-Year Periods, for a Combined Amount Not to Exceed \$3,000,000 for On-Call Transportation Planning Services, and Authorize the Executive Director to Negotiate Contract Payment Terms and Non-Material Contract Terms and Conditions - ACTION\***

Andrew Heidel, Principal Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Mr. Ortiz noted a history of issues of consultants not meeting work order specifications or schedules and requested information as to the management and oversight process for the recommended consultants, specifically regarding how the recommended consultants would be kept responsible for meeting schedule commitments made to the Transportation Authority as well as any partner agencies.

Mr. Heidel responded that consultant project management approach was one of the key evaluation factors reviewed by the committee for this procurement and was required as part of each respondents statement of qualifications. He also said that the Transportation Authority staff recognizes their responsibility to maintain oversight over each of the consultants, primarily by working in partnership to ensure that staff are up to date via methods such as regular check-ins with the consultant to ensure completion of deliverables and responsible use of budgets.

Mr. Ortiz recognized that as part of the procurement process, staff advanced seven firms without requiring an interview based on factors including prior successful work for the Transportation Authority and completed interviews with three other firms. He recognized the need to ensure that the Transportation Authority has access to good consultants, but asked what processes were in place to ensure that new firms, especially DBE/LBE firms, who could potentially do a better job than incumbent firms, were not shut out of the procurement.

Mr. Heidel responded that the evaluation panel scored every written submission received ahead of making determinations for interviews, with a minimum score required to interview and a minimum score required to advance. He stated that the approach taken with this procurement was to develop as broad a bench as possible, and noted that the previous on-call planning contract had only five firms. He stated that the panel was specifically interested in being inclusive to DBE, LBE, and SBE firms, particularly those who were new to the Transportation Authority. He stated that many teams did provide these options and opportunities in their submittals. He also noted that a number of the prime consultants who the Transportation Authority had worked with before brought on new subconsultants, which was also viewed positively by the panel. Mr. Heidel stated that the firms that were interviewed were those which had not previously had a direct contracting relationship with the Transportation Authority before, and that some of those teams were made up entirely of firms that were new to the Transportation Authority. He concluded that the panel was pleased to hear from new firms in the procurement, including prime consultants with previous relationships that had added new subconsultants to their teams.

Mr. Ortiz requested demographic data of the firms for this contract and the prior on-call planning contract. He also requested a comparison of job creation or job availability between the currently recommended consultants and the prior contract.

Lily Yu, Principal Management Analyst, said that staff would need to follow up to provide the requested information. She did note that, in the previous planning on-call, a



total of 43% of the task orders were awarded to subconsultant firms, with 10% through DBE, 9% to LBE, and 28% to SBE firms.

Mr. Levine noted that, in the information provided on the prior on-call planning contract in Attachment 3, Arup and Nelson\Nygaard appear to have roughly 50% subconsultants, while two other consultants, Stantec and WSP, have roughly 10% subconsultant participation. He stated that this was a major difference between the firms, and asked why the amount delegated to subconsultants was so low for Stantec and WSP.

Ms. Yu stated that in the case of Stantec, specific expertise was needed as part of the startup of the Treasure Island Mobility Management Program, and this expertise was available as part of the prime consultant. With respect to WSP, she stated that they provided the expertise required directly through their own team, though the Transportation Authority did make efforts to engage subconsultants on each task order, giving the example of Transportation Network Company research being primarily passed to Strategic Cities, a subconsultant.

Mr. Levine asked if these two projects were those that had 10% subconsultant participation, and if they were single project task orders, or if the teams would be doing other things as well.

Ms. Yu noted that these were past task orders, and that no continuing work was expected.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked if the advertising in the San Francisco Examiner was done as part of the public notices that is published only on Friday, and noted that the Friday issue was not widely distributed. He also asked if the Commuter Shuttle Hub Study listed in Attachment 3 was still open, as he understood this effort was completed some time ago, or if there was a future Commuter Shuttle Hub Study anticipated.

At the request of Chair Larson, Mr. Heidel said that Attachment 3 included a list of task orders from the prior contract and said that this was not an indication of future work. He noted that many or most of the task orders listed were closed out.

Ms. Yu said that the advertisement in the San Francisco Examiner was posted on December 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2021, which was a Friday. She stated that staff would be more mindful in the future to ensure that the advertisement would be prolonged or published on a date with wider circulation. She also noted that the advertisement was published in other newspaper outlets as well.

Chair Larson expressed appreciation for this commitment and quick response.

Peter Tannen motioned to approve the item, seconded by David Klein.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Chen, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Ortiz, Rozell, Tannen, (8)

Abstain: Tupuola (1)

Absent: Buffum, (1)

**10. Major Capital Project Update - Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project - INFORMATION\***

Peter Gabancho, Project Manager with the SFMTA, and Jada Jackson with the Office of



Economic and Workforce Development, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Larson asked how SFMTA will educate the public about using the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system, including how pedestrian can safety access the boarding islands.

Mr. Gabancho replied that SFMTA was planning an outreach campaign involving media and social media material.

John Gravener, Public Information Officer with the SFMTA, added that they are working with a contractor who would help with a video about how to use the boarding islands. He said some people would be familiar with this set up because of boarding islands on Market Street. He said that they would also use social media to educate, provide information to school age children in schools nearby, etc.

Mr. Rozell asked if the Next Bus signs were delayed, would SFMTA delay opening the BRT.

Mr. Gabancho replied that they did not plan to delay opening unless absolutely necessary. He noted that the new Next Bus signs were very useful and they hope they arrive in time. However, he continued, they can start running buses and install signs as they become available without disrupting service.

Mr. Rozell referenced the Chair's earlier remarks about pedestrian safety and asked if it would be feasible to have crossing guards and/or extra ambassadors to assist at least during the reopening phase.

Mr. Gabancho replied SFMTA could look into doing that at places such as Market Street, City Hall, and Opera Plaza.

Mr. Larson asked about educating drivers to be cautious noting the safety burden should not all fall on pedestrians.

Mr. Gabancho replied the outreach and education effort would encompass everybody along the corridor, including pedestrians and drivers.

Mr. Klein asked for more detail on how SFMTA would get the word about education campaign resources on websites, YouTube, etc. and whether there would be direct outreach to schools. He urged SFMTA to be proactive in its efforts.

Mr. Gravener replied that SFMTA is using a social media channel where they have a sizable following on Twitter and Instagram and that they are reaching out to nearby schools.

Mr. Klein asked if the videos would have subtitles and/or captioning.

Mr. Gravener responded that they have not yet done the filming for the videos but they would have those elements. He said they are doing the translations and confirmed there would be captioning. He said they planned to film in February, ideally when the buses are testing to make the video more realistic.

Ms. Chen asked about if the fencing on the boarding islands is continuous or if there are gaps like on Market Street. She said that a friend had recounted that in the past a bus had lost control on Market Street and passengers were not able to get off the boarding islands with the original continuous fence design.

Mr. Gabancho replied the fencing on Van Ness are continuous, because Van Ness is a State highway and Caltrans, for safety reasons, insisted on a continuous barrier. He said that SFMTA favor a continuous barrier because it channels people to the



crosswalks. He added that the boarding platforms on Van Ness (8 to 9 feet) are considerably wider than the boarding platforms on Market Street (5 to 6 feet) which would make it easier for passengers to move around.

Mr. Rosell asked about the compliance plan to ensure vehicles are stopping at crosswalks, following the speed limit, and stopping at red lights.

Mr. Gabancho replied we are talking with traffic engineers about doing a similar level of enforcement at revenue service as for new red transit only lanes. He explained that they would increase patrols and crack down on violations for the first few months of operations so people get the message that they will stay out of bus lanes and respect crosswalk. He said that plus the education campaign would be the approach.

Jada Jackson, Project Manager at OEWD, presented.

Mr. Levine thanked Ms. Jackson for the comprehensive presentation and asked if it was possible to get the names of businesses that received grants and the amounts. He also asked how many businesses went out of business, acknowledging that the pandemic was a fact, and about the level of support businesses would receive once the project is completed.

Ms. Jackson responded that OEWD as a resource is always available to businesses, nothing that she has merchants from projects that completed 2 years ago that still contact her. Ms. Jackson said she would need to check if she can share the information on grants awarded to specific businesses. With respect to business that closed, Ms. Jackson said it is hard to track and that OEWD does not receive any notification when this happens. Instead, she explained that they may notice when they do an inventory check and by looking up information on Yelp. She noted it was particularly hard during the pandemic to determine who was open and who was choosing not to open.

Mr. Klein spoke about the program's impact and said it appeared that 20% of businesses received funding and they received the equivalent of 1 to 2 months of rent (\$5,000 - \$10,000) given how expensive space is in San Francisco. He acknowledged the significant effort of email and door to door contacts but said there were no numbers on how many folks responded and how many emails were opened. Mr. Klein said he also saw a gap given the \$5 million that was appropriated for business mitigation but only \$100,000 was distributed to 20% of businesses. Lastly, he asked why so few businesses took advantage of the City grants.

With respect to the \$5 million, Ms. Jackson said there was a series of meeting in 2019 with the Board of Supervisors to decide how that money would be utilized. She said it is a citywide construction mitigation program and that once a project delay meets the specified triggers, they then tap the \$5 million for that project. Ms. Jackson said currently no other project appears headed to trigger the need for mitigation funds. She continued to explain that Central Subway was the first project for which OEWD started the process of collecting economic impact data and that it was a self-reporting mechanism. She acknowledged that there were data gaps and said the project had been set up drawing on best practices. For the Central Subway project, OEWD made a second round of funding available, capped at \$15k, e.g. if you receive \$10,000 before you can only receive \$5,000.

Ms. Jackson said there were a lot of challenges to get businesses to apply for assistance. For example, she said some business did not apply as they felt they didn't need the help, particularly at the beginning of the pandemic, others felt they were



taking it away from other businesses that were in greater need of assistance. She noted that there was one business that relocated, and she worked closely with this business, including helping with a business entrepreneurship grant.

Mr. Klein reiterated that the effort was substantial but what that amounts that the city gives out were not. He said he hoped these efforts are supported with better resources in the future.

Mr. Ortiz asked about how long it took for a business to apply for these grants.

Ms. Jackson explained that everything that was required, such as copies of rent receipts, was to be submitted electronically, noting that there was a link on the OEWD webpage with the application. She said she followed up with the businesses to offer assistance and the length of time to complete the application process depended on the business taking the time to fill out the application.

During public comment, Edward Mason mentioned that there didn't seem to be a discount incentive program for transit riders to patronize local businesses along the corridor such as was for a VTA project. He suggested performing a lessons learned analysis.

Chair Larson thanked Mr. Mason and said the lessons learned analysis sounded like a good idea.

#### **11. San Francisco's Climate Action Plan 2021 Update - INFORMATION**

The item was continued due to time constraints of the meeting.

#### **Other Items**

#### **12. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION**

Robert Gower thanked all the presenters and staff and appreciated their efforts in responding to CAC member questions on projects.

Kevin Ortiz asked when a request he made at the prior meeting for a presentation on the Transportation Authority's general strategy and plan for public outreach on various projects, large and small would be agendaized. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, answered that staff anticipated presenting on this topic at the next CAC meeting in February.

There was no public comment.

#### **13. Public Comment**

During public comment, Edward Mason commented on the increasing number of private commuter buses staging and idling for 15-20 minutes at a time before their runs, contributing to air and noise pollution, particularly the rail slapping at 24<sup>th</sup> and Church streets. He noted also that the commuter buses were causing damage to a Prop K road repair project from years past and often running close to empty capacity.

#### **14. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:07 p.m.





# DRAFT MINUTES

## San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Tuesday, January 25, 2022

### 1. Roll Call

Chair Mandelman called the meeting to order at 10:23 a.m.

**Present at Roll Call:** Commissioners Chan, Haney, Mar, Mandelman, Melgar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, and Walton (11)

**Absent at Roll Call:** (0)

### 2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Mandelman provided a summary of the work accomplished in 2021 by the Transportation Authority, noting the agency had a lot to be proud of and that there was a lot of work yet to be done. He reported that the agency allocated a \$100 million in local funds for safer transit streets and bike lanes throughout the city; transit infrastructure and reliability improvements, paratransit service and a taxi subsidy program for seniors and people with disabilities cut off from transit access due to the pandemic; completion of the first phase of streetscape and transit reliability improvements for both the L Taraval Improvement Project and Geary Bus Rapid Transit project; Jefferson Street Plaza; Tenderloin Safe Streets Improvements; bikeways, safer sidewalks, and crosswalks in Bay View, SOMA, and the Richmond, and the launch of the first phase of a permanent city-wide closed streets network.

Chair Mandelman also reported that the agency successfully advocated for \$30 million in federal funds to support Muni operations and restore transit service and secured \$18 million for the West Side Bridges Seismic Rehabilitation on Yerba Buena Island; and advanced several long-range planning efforts including Plan Bay Area 2050, ConnectSF, and an updated Climate Action Plan, all of which would inform the San Francisco Transportation Plan 2050 update to be completed later in 2022. He noted that all of this would require ongoing funding and announced the upcoming finalization of a new 30-year spending plan to guide the renewal of San Francisco's local transportation sales tax targeting the November ballot. He thanked the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee community members for their participation and dedication serve on the committee and said he was able to join several of them and members of the public at the previous week's sales tax expenditure plan town hall.

Chair Mandelman spoke on how the Prop K sales tax program successfully leveraged four to seven times its value over the past 30 years and how renewal this year would be an important boost to many transportation priorities including the Caltrain Downtown Rail Extension, Muni and BART core capacity programs, and electric vehicle charging stations, especially given the federal resources available through last year's infrastructure bill.

Chair Mandelman thanked his colleagues for their continued collaboration in this work and looked forward to continued work together and progress in 2022.



Finally, the Chair honored and recognized Transportation Authority Board Clerk Britney Milton on her last day with the agency, commenting that Clerk Milton had been a joy to work with and had been instrumental in keeping the business of the Board on track and accessible to the public, while gracefully managing the myriad and unique challenges of the past two years of remote meetings. He expressed that Clerk Milton would be missed, thanked her, and wished her the best in her future adventures.

There was no public comment.

**3. Approve the Minutes of the January 11, 2022 Meeting - ACTION\***

There was no public comment.

Vice Chair Peskin 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, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Stefani, and Walton (10)

Absent: Commissioner Safai (1)

**Consent Agenda**

4. **[Final Approval] Appoint Eric Rozell and Kevin Ortiz to the Community Advisory Committee - ACTION\***
5. **[Final Approval] Allocate \$2,163,640 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, for Two Requests - ACTION\***
6. **[Final Approval] Accept the Audit Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2021 - ACTION\***
7. **[Final Approval] Approve Programming of \$4,055,000 in Senate Bill 1 Local Partnership Program Formula Funds for Construction of the Yerba Buena Island West Side Bridges Seismic Retrofit Project - ACTION\***
8. **[Final Approval] Approve the San Francisco Transportation Investment and Growth Strategy 2021 Update - ACTION\***

Commissioner Walton 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, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, and Walton (11)

Absent: (0)

**End of Consent Agenda**

9. **[Final Approval on First Appearance] Adopt the 2021 Annual Report - ACTION\***

Tilly Chang, Executive Director, presented the item.



During public comment, David Pilpel requested the annual report and Executive Director's Report be listed as separate items in future agendas, noting they serve different purposes. He thanked Clerk Milton for her work, wished her well, and hoped the high standards continued at the Transportation Authority with regard to meeting notices and materials, and during meetings.

Commissioner Melgar moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Ronen.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Haney, Mar, Mandelman, Melgar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, and Walton (11)

Absent: (0)

**10. San Francisco's Climate Action Plan 2021 Update - INFORMATION\***

Cyndy Comerford, Climate Program Manager with the San Francisco Department of the Environment (SFE), presented the item.

Commissioner Chan asked about funding and identifying funding sources for implementation of the Climate Action Plan (CAP), including what is the estimated budget for implementation and an explanation of dedicated sources of revenues that are being explored. Ms. Comerford responded that Commissioners Mandelman, Mar, and Haney had allocated addback funding for SFE last year for a feasibility study to look at dedicated revenue sources. She said the study will start February 1 and SFE will be working with UC Berkeley's Center for Law, Energy & the Environment as lead consultant with a goal to do a more sophisticated cost analysis and look at appropriate revenue measures. She said there may be more than one source, and it may be something that goes to the ballot and that conversation, which would engage stakeholders and experts was just starting.

Commissioner Haney noted that a big part of achieving goals was moving towards electric vehicle (EV) adoption and this showed as a big impact in the report. He asked if the City was looking at its own programs to transition San Francisco residents' vehicles and City fleet to EVs, if a big part of the emission reduction was not going to come from transit or biking but rather from people changing the vehicles they use, how would the City aggressively help with the progress. Ms. Comerford responded that the City could not replace every gas vehicle one-to-one, so it was important to reduce the number of vehicles on the road, which was captured through the other strategies such as pricing levers, public and active transportation. She said the cars that remained needed to be transitioned to EV. She continued to explain that SFE has an EV program with about \$10 million in funding to be used for charging stations especially for multi-family homes since not everyone can have a charging station in their garage, trying to have more community-led charging stations. Also, SFE plans to use a portion of the funding for transitioning light and heavy trucks. She said the EV roadmap had a plan to transition vehicles from gas to electric. She said that the federal infrastructure bill if the next bill passes, too - they would help accelerate the efforts, as they provide funding for EVs that is expected to trickle down to cities mostly for charging infrastructure but also for outreach and education.

Commissioner Preston asked whether the CAP evaluated the impact of free or



reduced fares on public transit. Ms. Comerford responded that the CAP did not include an evaluation but there was a strategy to evaluate free or reduced fares of Muni within the Transportation and Land Use (TLU) sector.

Commissioner Preston noted the concrete suggestion around using congestion pricing to decrease the use of cars through that strategy but with public transit, the focus was on building a more reliable system so people would prefer to use public transit and shifting trips from cars onto transit and less explicit on the other side of the coin decrease costs and drive folks to transit. He continued the city seemed to be refusing to move forward in a meaningful way, though other cities are doing so nationally.

Ms. Comerford referenced the specific action in the report that stated: By 2022, study the role of Muni fare programs on equity, climate, and mobility goals and adopt recommendations.

Commissioner Preston noted it wasn't listed as one of the strategies but just a recommendation to evaluate by 2022. Ms. Comerford clarified that it was like a sub strategy that was listed under TLU 1 as one of the eight supporting actions.

Commissioner Melgar thanked Ms. Comerford for her presentation and asked her to clarify how SFE would operationalize and implement the actions of the plan, and if staffing capacity was available at the level needed to meet the CAP goals like conducting the analysis Commissioner Preston just referenced, noticing requests for proposals, marketing, public education, advising SFMTA on the most effective TLU strategies to meet goals, and asked there was an accompanying organizational development plan or if SFE was planning to build out staff capacity in the community.

Ms. Comerford answered that they had met with 10 key departments that contributed to the CAP around implementation and developed a draft implementation structure for each department to brainstorm the resources needed to carry out their goals. SFE planned to collect the feedback from the agencies to present a more comprehensive implementation plan, citing the agency's own efforts to identify resources needed to meet its goals.

Chair Mandelman asked for more clarity around expanding EVs as opposed to other forms of non-carbon vehicles. Ms. Comerford responded that EVs were the most proven technology and cost effective out of the alternative options, with some San Francisco environmentalists don't consider hydrogen as sustainable because of the emissions it takes to produce the hydrogen, though it could be an option for larger trucks that were more difficult to electrify. She continued that for personal vehicles, EVs were the most proven and most accessible and anticipated more subsidies and support from the state and federal level to make EVs more affordable. She added that SFE was willing to be nimble, highlighting that if there were new proven technologies accessible to residents and public, SFE would be open to incorporate them in future updates to the CAP.

Chair Mandelman asked for more clarity about the presentation around the EV impacts and pointed to the mixed messaging in the calculations of greenhouse gas (GHG) reductions and co-benefits tables. Ms. Comerford responded that in the Transportation Authority led the emissions reduction analysis, pointing out that the Transportation Authority and SFMTA had concerns with relying so heavily on EVs



because it would not be possible to replace one-to-one every gas vehicle with an electric one. Ms. Comerford noted the chart doesn't reflect one-for-one replace as it assumes the other strategies, as well.

Chair Mandelman said it appears that even with the other strategies, switching to electric vehicles was very important to meet the city's GHG reduction goals. Ms. Comerford confirmed the statement.

Chair Mandelman asked for more clarity on the co-benefits slide. Ms. Comerford said the slide was just an example from TLU 1, the public transportation strategy, and further commented that the technical working group conducted a thorough analysis to show the co-benefits of each strategy, especially ones with smaller GHG impacts which were still important, for the City needed to look at carefully to understand the wider impacts of specific actions.

Chair Mandelman commented that it looked as if EVs have no co-benefits. Ms. Comerford asserted that EVs provided equity co-benefits for communities living near freeways and highways which are typically exposed to high levels of vehicle pollution.

Chair Mandelman asked why emissions were not reported as a co-benefit if they were the core of the EV transition and said Ms. Comerford could explain the table in more detail to him at another time. Chair Mandelman then commented that the zero emissions goal seemed like a good idea, but unrealistic and asked what the barrier to EV adoption was. Ms. Comerford answered that the market and economy would drive the EV strategy more than other strategies within the plan. Chair Mandelman noted that if the city couldn't provide enough charging stations to support the aforementioned market factors, particularly for residents without their own garage, it will be difficult to achieve the city's goals. Ms. Comerford agreed and said charging infrastructure was critical to achieving the goal.

Chair Mandelman asked to explain the evaluation framework to develop curbside charging pilots in 2022 and if there was something bolder than a pilot to achieve the goal for 2030. Ms. Comerford answered SFE was granted significant funding from the California Energy Commissioner to move forward with the recommendations and since 2019 had raised about \$10 million in funding, mostly for infrastructure in the city, making SFE well positioned to take more funding into the community and to achieve the goals.

Chair Mandelman thanked Ms. Comerford for the presentation and said he was looking forward to seeing the results of the aforementioned funding study and future updates.

During public comment, David Pilpel appreciated the presentation questions and discussion and expressed skepticism about electric vehicles and other energy conversion efforts, saying that it moved the problem elsewhere and creates others, and suggested less use, fewer trips, and more local trips as a solution. He said some of these are in the plan strategies and some need to be done by the region. Other Items

#### **11. Introduction of New Items - INFORMATION**

There were no new items introduced.



**12. Public Comment**

There was no general public comment.

Commissioners Walton, Peskin and Ronen expressed their appreciation and thanked Clerk Milton for her service and wished her well. Chair Mandelman said he expected every member of the Board felt the same way. Clerk Milton thanked the agency, Board members, and Legislative Aides and said they had been amazing to work with, despite the 100% virtual environment.

**13. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:34 a.m.



RESOLUTION APPOINTING ONE MEMBER TO THE COMMUNITY ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE OF THE SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

WHEREAS, Section 131265(d) of the California Public Utilities Code, as implemented by Section 5.2(a) of the Administrative Code of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority, requires the appointment of a Community Advisory Committee (CAC) consisting of eleven members; and

WHEREAS, There is one open seat on the CAC resulting from a member's term expiration; and

WHEREAS, At its February 8, 2022, meeting, the Board will review and consider all applicants' qualifications and experience and recommend appointing one member to serve on the CAC for a period of two years; now therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Board hereby appoints one member to serve on the CAC of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority for a two-year term; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Executive Director is authorized to communicate this information to all interested parties.



## Memorandum

### AGENDA ITEM 5

**DATE:** February 1, 2022

**TO:** Transportation Authority Board

**FROM:** Maria Lombardo - Chief Deputy Director

**SUBJECT:** 02/08/2022 Board Meeting: Appoint One Member to the Community Advisory Committee

<p><b>RECOMMENDATION</b>   <input type="checkbox"/> Information   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Action</p> <p>Neither staff nor Community Advisory Committee (CAC) members make recommendations regarding CAC appointments.</p> <p><b>SUMMARY</b></p> <p>There is one open seat on the eleven-member CAC requiring Board action. The vacancy is a result of the term expiration of Stephanie Liu (District 5 representative). There are currently 14 applicants to consider for the open seat (Attachment 2).</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Fund Allocation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Fund Programming</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Policy/Legislation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Plan/Study</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Capital Project Oversight/Delivery</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Budget/Finance</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Contract/Agreement</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: CAC Appointment</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### BACKGROUND

The Transportation Authority has an eleven-member CAC and members serve two-year terms. Per the Transportation Authority's Administrative Code, the Board appoints individuals to fill open CAC seats. Neither staff nor the CAC make recommendations on CAC appointments, but we maintain a database of applications for CAC membership. Attachment 1 is a tabular summary of the current CAC composition, showing ethnicity, gender, neighborhood of residence, and affiliation. Attachment 2 provides similar information on current applicants, sorted by last name.





## **DISCUSSION**

The selection of each member is approved at-large by the Board; however traditionally the Board has had a practice of ensuring that there is one resident of each supervisorial district on the CAC. Per Section 5.2(a) of the Administrative Code, the CAC:

“...shall include representatives from various segments of the community, such as public policy organizations, labor, business, seniors, people with disabilities, environmentalists, and the neighborhoods, and reflect broad transportation interests. The committee is also intended to reflect the racial and gender diversity of San Francisco residents.”

An applicant must be a San Francisco resident to be considered eligible for appointment. Applicants are asked to provide residential location and areas of interest but provide ethnicity and gender information on a voluntary basis. CAC applications are distributed and accepted on a continuous basis. CAC applications were solicited through the Transportation Authority's website, Commissioners' offices, and email blasts to community-based organizations, advocacy groups, business organizations, as well as at public meetings attended by Transportation Authority staff or hosted by the Transportation Authority. Applications can be submitted through the Transportation Authority's website at [www.sfcta.org/cac](http://www.sfcta.org/cac).

All applicants have been advised that they need to appear in person before the Board in order to be appointed, unless they have previously appeared. If a candidate is unable to appear before the Board on the first appearance, they may appear at the following Board meeting in order to be eligible for appointment. An asterisk following the candidate's name in Attachment 2 indicates that the applicant has not previously appeared before the Board.

## **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

The requested action would not have an impact on the adopted Fiscal Year 2021/22 budget.

## **CAC POSITION**

None. The CAC does not make recommendations on the appointment of CAC members.

## **SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS**

- Attachment 1 - Matrix of CAC Members
- Attachment 2 - Matrix of CAC Applicants
- Enclosure 1 - CAC Applications

COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS <sup>1</sup>

Name	Gender	Ethnicity	District	Neighborhood	Affiliation	First Appointed	Term Expiration
DISTRICT 5 VACANT							
Peter Tannen	M	C	8	Inner Mission	Environmental, Neighborhood, Public Policy	Feb 2008	Feb 2022
John Larson, Chair	M	NP	7	Miraloma Park	Environment, Neighborhood, Public Policy	Mar 2014	Mar 2022
Nancy Buffum	F	C	4	Sunset	Business, Disabled, Environment, Labor, Neighborhood, Public Policy, Senior Citizen	Sept 2020	Sept 2022
Robert Gower	M	C	11	Mission Terrace	Disabled, Environment, Neighborhood, Public Policy, Senior Citizen	Sept 2018	Sept 2022
David Klein, Vice-Chair	M	C	1	Outer Richmond	Environment, Labor, Neighborhood, Public Policy, Senior Citizens	Sept 2018	Sept 2022
Jerry Levine	M	C	2	Cow Hollow	Business, Neighborhood, Public Policy	Nov 2018	Nov 2022
Sophia Tupuola	F	NH	10	Bayview Hunters Point	Business, Disabled, Environment, Labor, Neighborhood, Public Policy, Senior Citizen	Mar 2019	Mar 2023
Rosa Chen	F	A	3	Chinatown	Business, Disabled, Environment, Neighborhood, Public Policy, Senior Citizen	Mar 2021	Mar 2023
Kevin Ortiz	M	H/L	9	Mission	Neighborhood, Public Policy	Dec 2019	Dec 2023
Eric Rozell	M	C	6	Tenderloin	Disabled, Neighborhood, Senior Citizen	Jan 2022	Jan 2024

\*A - Asian | AA - African American | AI - American Indian or Alaska Native | C - Caucasian | H/L - Hispanic or Latino | NH - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | NP - Not Provided (Voluntary Information)

## Attachment 2 (Updated 2.3.22)

COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE APPLICANTS <sup>1</sup>

	Name	Gender	Ethnicity	District	Neighborhood	Affiliation/Interest
1	Sauod Alzahrani	M	ME	6	N/A	Business, Disabled, Environment, Labor, Neighborhood, Public Policy, Senior Citizen and Social and Racial Injustice
2	Christine Auwarter*	F	C	5	Western Addition / Inner Richmond	Disabled, Environment, Social and Racial Injustice, Neighborhood, Public Policy
3	Tre Ely	M	AA	6	SOMA	Business, Environment, Homelessness, Public Policy, Social and Racial Injustice
4	Lun Esex*	M	NP	5	Haight-Ashbury	Business, Disabled, Environment, Social and Racial Injustice, Labor, Neighborhood, Public Policy, Senior Citizen
5	Matthew Gerson*	M	C	5	Lower Haight	Environment, Social and Racial Injustice, Neighborhood, Public Policy
6	Genna Gores*	F	C	5	NOPA	Environment, Social and Racial Injustice, Labor, Neighborhood, Public Policy
7	Kay Hones*	F	C	5	Mission	Disabled, Environment, Social and Racial Injustice, Labor, Neighborhood, Public Policy, Senior Citizen, Youth
8	Sarah Katz-Hyman*	F	C	5	Alamo Square	Environment, Social and Racial Injustice, Neighborhood
9	Evan Oravec*	M	NP	5	Haight- Ashbury	Disabled, Environment, Social and Racial Injustice, Labor, Neighborhood, Public Policy, Senior Citizen
10	Peter Sengh*	M	A	6	East Cut	Business, Environment, Neighborhood, Public Policy, Senior Citizen
11	Kat Siegal*	F	C	5	NP	NP
12	Ronaldo Smith*	M	C	6	SOMA	Environment, Neighborhood
13	Prodan Statev	M	C	6	East Cut	Business, Labor, Neighborhood, Public Policy
14	Tony Wessling	M	C	3	North Beach/Russian Hill	Business, Disabled, Environment, Labor, Neighborhood, Public Policy, Senior Citizen

\*Applicant has not appeared before the Board A – Asian | AA – African American | AI – American Indian or Alaska Native | C – Caucasian | H/L – Hispanic or Latino | NH – Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | NP – Not Provided (Voluntary Information) | ME – Middle Eastern

[ this page intentionally left blank ]



RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE FISCAL YEAR 2022/23 TRANSPORTATION FUND FOR  
CLEAN AIR LOCAL EXPENDITURE CRITERIA

WHEREAS, The Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program is funded by a \$4 vehicle registration fee collected by the California Department of Motor Vehicles in the nine-county Bay Area and forty percent of the revenues collected are available to each county on a return-to-source basis to implement strategies to improve air quality by reducing motor vehicle emissions; and

WHEREAS, The Transportation Authority is the designated Program Manager for the TFCA Program; and

WHEREAS, The passage of Assembly Bill 434 required that the designated Program Manager annually adopt criteria establishing a set of priorities for expenditure of funds for certain types of projects; and

WHEREAS, Drawing on the agency's past experience as the Program Manager for TFCA the Transportation Authority staff developed the attached draft Fiscal Year 2022/23 TFCA Local Expenditure Criteria; and

WHEREAS, At its January 26, 2022 meeting, the Community Advisory Committee considered the staff recommendation and unanimously adopted a motion of support for its adoption; now, therefore, be it



RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority hereby adopts the attached Fiscal Year 2022/23 TFCA Local Expenditure Criteria; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Executive Director is hereby authorized to communicate this information to all relevant agencies and interested parties.

Attachment:

- Attachment 1 - FY 2022/23 TFCA Local Expenditure Criteria

Enclosure:

- County Program Manager Fund Expenditure Plan Guidance for Fiscal Year Ending 2022

**Attachment 1**  
**Fiscal Year 2022/23 Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA)**  
**DRAFT LOCAL EXPENDITURE CRITERIA**

The following are the Fiscal Year 2022/23 Local Expenditure Criteria for San Francisco's TFCA County Program Manager Funds.

#### ELIGIBILITY SCREENING

In order for projects to be considered for funding, they must meet the eligibility requirements established by the Air District's TFCA County Program Manager Fund Policies for Fiscal Year Ending 2023. Consistent with the policies, a key factor in determining eligibility is a project's cost effectiveness (CE) ratio. The TFCA CE ratio is designed to measure the cost effectiveness of a project in reducing motor vehicle air pollutant emissions and to encourage projects that contribute funding from non-TFCA sources. TFCA funds budgeted for the project are divided by the project's estimated emissions reduction. The estimated reduction is the weighted sum of reactive organic gases (ROG), oxides of nitrogen (NOx), and particulate matter (PM) emissions that will be reduced over the effective life of the project, as defined by the Air District's guidelines.

TFCA CE is calculated by inputting information provided by the applicant into the Air District's CE worksheets. Transportation Authority staff will be available to assist project sponsors with these calculations and will work with Air District staff and the project sponsors as needed to verify reasonableness of input variables. The worksheets also calculate reductions in carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions, which are not included in the Air District's official CE calculations, but which the Transportation Authority considers in its project prioritization process.

**Consistent with the Air District's Guidelines, in order to be eligible for Fiscal Year 2022/23 TFCA funds, a project must meet the CE ratio for emissions (i.e., ROG, NOx, and PM) reductions as specified in the guidelines for each project type. Projects that do not meet the appropriate CE threshold cannot be considered for funding.**

#### PROJECT PRIORITIZATION

Candidate projects that meet the cost effectiveness thresholds will be prioritized for funding based on the two-step process described below:

Step 1 - TFCA funds are programmed to eligible projects, as prioritized using the Transportation Authority Board-adopted Local Priorities (see next page).

Step 2 - If there are TFCA funds left unprogrammed after Step 1, the Transportation Authority will work with project sponsors to develop additional TFCA candidate projects. This may include refinement of projects that were submitted for Step 1, but were not deemed eligible, as well as new projects. This approach is in response to an Air District policy that does not allow County Program Managers to rollover any unprogrammed funds to the next year's funding cycle. If Fiscal Year 2022/23 funds are not programmed within 6 months of the Air District's approval of San Francisco's funding allocation, expected in May 2021, funds can be redirected (potentially to non-San Francisco projects) at the Air District's discretion. New candidate projects must meet all TFCA eligibility requirements and will be prioritized based on the Transportation Authority Board's adopted Local Priorities.

#### Local Priorities

The Transportation Authority's Local Priorities for prioritizing TFCA funds include the following factors:

**1. Project Type** - In order of priority:

- 1) Zero emissions non-vehicle projects including, but not limited to, bicycle and pedestrian facility improvements, transit priority projects, traffic calming projects, and transportation demand management projects;
- 2) Shuttle services that reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT);
- 3) Alternative fuel vehicles and alternative fuel infrastructure; and
- 4) Any other eligible project.

**2. Cost Effectiveness of Emissions Reduced**– Priority will be given to projects that achieve high CE (i.e. a low cost per ton of emissions reduced) compared to other applicant projects. The Air District’s CE worksheet predicts the amount of reductions each project will achieve in ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM, and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. However, the Air District’s calculation only includes the reductions in ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM per TFCA dollar spent on the project. The Transportation Authority will also give priority to projects that achieve high CE for CO<sub>2</sub> emission reductions based on data available from the Air District’s CE worksheets. The reduction of transportation-related CO<sub>2</sub> emissions is consistent with the City and County of San Francisco’s 2021 *Climate Action Plan*.

**3. Project Readiness** – Priority will be given to projects that are ready to proceed and have a realistic implementation schedule, budget, and funding package. Projects that cannot realistically commence in calendar year 2023 or earlier (e.g. to order or accept delivery of vehicles or equipment, begin delivery of service, award a construction contract, start the first TFCA-funded phase of the project) and be completed within a two-year period will have lower priority. Project sponsors may be advised to resubmit these projects for a future TFCA programming cycle.

**4. Community Support** – Priority will be given to projects with demonstrated community support (e.g. recommended in a community-based transportation plan, outreach conducted to identify locations and/or interested neighborhoods, or a letter of recommendation provided by the district Supervisor).

**5. Benefits Equity Priority Communities** – Priority will be given to projects that directly benefit Equity Priority Communities, whether the project is directly located in an Equity Priority Community (see map) or can demonstrate benefits to disadvantaged populations.

**6. Investment from Non-Public Project Sponsors or Partners** – Non-public entities may apply for and directly receive TFCA grants for alternative-fuel vehicle and infrastructure projects and may partner with public agency applicants for any other project type. For projects where a non-public entity is the applicant or partner, priority will be given to projects that include an investment from the non-public entity that is commensurate with the TFCA funds requested.

**7. Project Delivery Track Record** – Projects that are ranked high in accordance with the above local expenditure criteria may be lowered in priority or restricted from receiving TFCA funds if either of the following conditions applies or has applied during the previous two fiscal years:

- **Monitoring and Reporting** – Project sponsor has failed to fulfill monitoring and reporting requirements for any previously funded TFCA project.
- **Implementation of Prior Project(s)** – Project sponsor has a signed Funding Agreement for a TFCA project that has not shown sufficient progress; the project sponsor has not implemented the project by the project completion date without formally receiving a time extension from the Transportation Authority; or the project sponsor has violated the terms of the funding agreement.

**8. Program Diversity** – Promotion of innovative TFCA projects in San Francisco has resulted in increased visibility for the program and offered a good testing ground for new approaches to reducing motor vehicle emissions. Using the project type criteria established above, the Transportation Authority will continue to develop an annual program that contains a diversity of project types and approaches and serves multiple constituencies. The Transportation Authority believes that this diversity contributes significantly to public acceptance of and support for the TFCA program.





## Memorandum

### AGENDA ITEM 6

**DATE:** January 27, 2022  
**TO:** Transportation Authority Board  
**FROM:** Anna LaForte - Deputy Director for Policy and Programming  
**SUBJECT:** 2/8/2022 Board Meeting: Adopt Fiscal Year 2022/23 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Local Expenditure Criteria

<p><b>RECOMMENDATION</b>   <input type="checkbox"/> Information   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Action</p> <p>Adopt the Fiscal Year (FY) 2022/23 Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Local Expenditure Criteria</p> <p><b>SUMMARY</b></p> <p>The TFCA program is funded by a \$4 vehicle registration fee collected by the California Department of Motor Vehicles in the nine-county Bay Area. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Air District) makes 40 percent of the TFCA program revenues available to each county on a return-to-source basis to implement strategies to improve air quality by reducing motor vehicle emissions. As the County Program Manager for San Francisco, the Transportation Authority is required annually to adopt Local Expenditure Criteria to guide how projects will be prioritized for San Francisco’s share of TFCA funds. Our proposed FY 2022/23 Local Expenditure Criteria (Attachment 1) do not include any changes from last year and are consistent with the Air District’s TFCA policies for FY 2022/23. The criteria establish a prioritization methodology for applicant projects, based on project type, emission reduction benefits, program diversity, project readiness, and sponsor’s project delivery track record. Additional criteria give higher priority to projects that benefit Equity Priority Communities, demonstrate community support, and, for applicants that are not public agencies, include commensurate non-public investments. Following Board approval of the criteria, we will issue the FY 2022/23 call for projects for approximately \$760,000.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Fund Allocation</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fund Programming</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Policy/Legislation</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Plan/Study</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Capital Project Oversight/Delivery</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Budget/Finance</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Contract/Agreement</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</li> </ul>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



## **BACKGROUND**

In 1991, the California Legislature authorized the Air District to impose a \$4 vehicle registration surcharge to provide grant funding to projects that address on-road motor vehicle emissions, helping the Bay Area meet state and federal air quality standards and greenhouse gas emission reduction goals. The Air District awards sixty percent of the TFCA funds through the TFCA Regional Fund, a suite of competitive grant programs for projects that reduce emissions from on-road motor vehicles. The Air District holds calls for projects for each of the project categories available (i.e. bikeways, electric vehicle charging stations, zero-emission and partial-zero-emission vehicles, and shuttle and ridesharing projects).

The Air District transfers the remaining forty percent of the TFCA funds to designated County Program Managers, such as the Transportation Authority, in each of the nine Bay Area counties to be awarded to TFCA-eligible projects. Each year the Air District adopts the County Program Manager Fund Expenditure Plan Guidance, which includes the list of eligible projects and defines policies for the expenditure of the County Program Manager Fund. The latest guidance document (enclosed) includes policies changes, such as modifying the cost-effectiveness eligibility limit (e.g. making it easier to qualify) for infrastructure improvements that support alternative transportation modes and are identified in the Air District's 2017 Clean Air Plan trip reduction and renaming shuttle project categories to "First- and Last-Mile Connections" to clarify that services aren't limited to only shuttles or buses.

As in past years, any public agency may be a project sponsor for a TFCA-funded project. Private entities may sponsor vehicles projects such as alternative-fuel vehicles and infrastructure projects, or partner with public agencies for all other project types.

## **DISCUSSION**

Our proposed FY 2022/23 Local Expenditure Criteria (Attachment 1) do not include any changes from last year and are consistent with the Air District's TFCA policies for FY 2022/23. Our experience with previous application cycles shows that the projected TFCA revenues generally are sufficient to fund most, if not all, of the projects that satisfy TFCA eligibility requirements established by the Air District, including a requirement that each project must achieve a cost effectiveness ratio as established in the adopted TFCA County Program Manager Fund Guidance. Thus, while some counties have established a complex point system for rating potential TFCA projects across multiple local jurisdictions and project sponsors, our assessment is that over time San Francisco has been better served by not assigning a point system to evaluate applications.

Upon application, projects first undergo an eligibility screening. As in prior years, only projects that meet all of the Air District's TFCA eligibility requirements will be prioritized for funding using the Transportation Authority's Local Expenditure Criteria. The prioritization criteria include consideration of the following factors:



- Project type (e.g. highest priority to zero-emissions non-vehicle projects like bike projects)
- Cost effectiveness
- Project readiness (e.g. ability to meet TFCA timely-use-of-funds guidelines)
- Program diversity
- Community Support
- Benefits Equity Priority Communities
- Investment from Non-Public Project Sponsors or Partners
- *Other factors (e.g., the project sponsor's recent delivery track-record for TFCA projects).*

We continue to work with the Air District and other County Program Managers to improve the TFCA program's effectiveness at achieving air quality benefits, decrease its administrative burden, and allow the County Program Manager's more flexibility to address each county's unique air quality challenges and preferred methods of mitigating mobile source emissions.

Next Steps. Following Board approval of the Local Expenditure Criteria, we will release the TFCA call for projects, anticipated by March 4, 2022. After reviewing and evaluating project applications, we anticipate presenting a recommended TFCA FY 2022/23 program of projects to the Community Advisory Committee in May and the Board in June 2022 for approval. Attachment 2 details the proposed schedule for the FY 2022/2023 TFCA call for projects.

## **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

There are no impacts to the Transportation Authority's adopted FY 2021/22 budget associated with the recommended action. Approval of the Local Expenditure Criteria will allow the Transportation Authority to program approximately \$765,000 in local TFCA funds to eligible San Francisco projects and to receive about \$43,000 for ongoing administration of the TFCA program. These funds will be incorporated into the FY 2022/23 budget and subsequent year budgets to reflect anticipated TFCA project cash reimbursement needs.

## **CAC POSITION**

The CAC considered this item at its January 26, 2022 meeting and unanimously adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation.



## **SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS**

- Attachment 1 - Draft FY 2022/23 TFCA Local Expenditure Criteria
- Attachment 2 - Draft Schedule for FY 2022/23 TFCA Call for Projects
- Enclosure - County Program Manager Fund Expenditure Plan Guidance for Fiscal Year Ending 2023

**Attachment 2**  
**San Francisco County Transportation Authority**  
**Fiscal Year 2022/23 Transportation Fund for Clean Air**

**Draft Schedule for Fiscal Year 2022/23 TFCA Call for Projects\***

Wednesday, January 26, 2022	Community Advisory Committee Meeting - ACTION Local Expenditure Criteria
Tuesday, February 8, 2022	Transportation Authority Board Meeting - PRELIMINARY ACTION Local Expenditure Criteria
Tuesday, February 15, 2022	Transportation Authority Board Meeting - FINAL ACTION Local Expenditure Criteria
By Friday, March 4, 2022	Transportation Authority Issues TFCA Call for Projects
Friday, April 22, 2022	TFCA Applications Due to the Transportation Authority
Wednesday, May 25, 2022	Community Advisory Committee Meeting - ACTION TFCA staff recommendations
Tuesday, June 7, 2022	Transportation Authority Board Meeting - PRELIMINARY ACTION TFCA staff recommendations
Tuesday, June 28, 2022	Transportation Authority Board Meeting - FINAL ACTION TFCA staff recommendations
Sept 2022 (estimated)	Funds expected to be available to project sponsors

\* Meeting dates are subject to change. Please check the Transportation Authority's website for the most up-to-date schedule ([www.sfcta.org/agendas](http://www.sfcta.org/agendas)).

[ this page intentionally left blank ]



RESOLUTION APPROVING THE 2022 STATE AND FEDERAL LEGISLATION PROGRAM

WHEREAS, The Transportation Authority routinely monitors pending legislation that may affect the Transportation Authority and San Francisco's transportation program; and

WHEREAS, Each year the Transportation Authority adopts a set of legislative principles to guide its transportation policy and funding advocacy in the sessions of the State and Federal Legislatures; and

WHEREAS, The attached 2022 State and Federal Legislative Program reflects key principles gathered from common positions with other local sales tax transportation authorities, County Transportation Agencies, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission; the Transportation Authority's understanding of the most pressing issues facing the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, regional transit providers serving the City of San Francisco, and other City agencies charged with delivering transportation projects; and are consistent with the advocacy approaches of the Mayor's Office; and

WHEREAS, At its January 26, 2022 meeting, the Community Advisory Committee was briefed on the proposed 2022 State and Federal Legislative Program and unanimously adopted a motion of support for its adoption; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority does hereby adopt the attached 2022 State and Federal Legislative Program; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Executive Director is authorized to communicate this program to the appropriate parties.

Attachment:

1. 2022 State and Federal Legislative Program

## Attachment 1

San Francisco County Transportation Authority  
Draft 2022 State and Federal Legislative Program

STATE		
Area	Goal	Strategy
1. Funding	a. Secure new revenue and financing measures for transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the investment of General Fund surplus revenues toward active transportation and transit projects, with a portion suballocated to regional transportation agencies (e.g., the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for the Bay Area).</li> <li>• Seek source of supplemental funding for transit operations to address long-term structural deficits forecast because of the COVID pandemic and continued work from home policies.</li> <li>• Maintain cap and trade funding for current transportation and affordable housing programs (e.g. transit operations, electric vehicle (EV) buses and infrastructure, transit expansion such as the Downtown Rail Extension) and seek opportunities to direct a larger share of available funding to them.</li> <li>• Support efforts to raise additional dedicated transportation revenue to address ongoing funding shortfalls for both capital projects and operations, including for transit state of good repair.</li> <li>• Support efforts to establish new transportation revenue mechanisms that local and regional entities can choose to implement to fund capital projects and operations.</li> <li>• Partner with local agencies and other stakeholders to advance San Francisco's priorities in the authorization of potential regional transportation funding measures.</li> <li>• Continue to monitor and, as appropriate, provide input into the next phase of the California Road Charge Pilot Program.</li> </ul>



**Attachment 1**

San Francisco County Transportation Authority  
Draft 2022 State and Federal Legislative Program

	b. Protect transportation funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocate that funds dedicated to transportation not be eliminated or diverted to other purposes.</li> <li>• Engage in any process to revise existing fund distribution formulas to ensure it does not disbenefit San Francisco.</li> </ul>
	c. Enact new revenue and financing measures for transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support efforts to raise additional dedicated transportation revenue to address ongoing funding shortfalls for both capital projects and operations.</li> <li>• Support efforts to establish new transportation revenue mechanisms that local and regional entities can choose to implement to fund capital projects and operations.</li> <li>• Partner with local agencies and other stakeholders to advance San Francisco’s priorities in the development and implementation of potential regional transportation funding measures.</li> <li>• Continue to monitor and, as appropriate, provide input into the next phase of the California Road Charge Pilot Program.</li> </ul>
	d. Secure cap-and-trade revenues for transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain funding for current transportation and affordable housing programs and seek opportunities to direct additional cap-and-trade funds to them.</li> <li>• Advocate for the dedication of a significant portion of future cap-and-trade expenditure plans to transportation and to San Francisco’s investment priorities.</li> </ul>

## Attachment 1

San Francisco County Transportation Authority  
Draft 2022 State and Federal Legislative Program

	e. Modify allocation formulas for state transportation funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support efforts suballocating decision-making over the state’s formula funds from the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (formerly known as the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act) to local and regional transportation agencies.</li> <li>• Advocate for using factors that better tie transportation funding to the true demands placed on the system, such as daytime population or transit usage.</li> <li>• Advocate to either broaden the state definition of disadvantaged communities to better align with San Francisco’s communities of concern or allow use of alternative definitions such as a regional transportation planning agency’s (e.g. MTC’s Equity Priority Communities) instead.</li> </ul>
	f. Improve implementation of state grant programs (e.g. cap-and-trade, Active Transportation Program, Senate Bill 1 program)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocate for grant application and allocation processes that are clear, streamlined, and flexible.</li> <li>• Advocate for a stronger role for regional and local governments in prioritizing local and regional projects for funding.</li> </ul>
	g. Lower the 2/3 supermajority voter approval requirement for transportation taxes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support a constitutional amendment to lower the voter approval requirement for special taxes dedicated to local transportation and affordable housing projects from 66.67% to 55% or a simple majority.</li> </ul>
2. Policy Initiatives	a. Advance San Francisco's Vision Zero goals, improving safety for all users	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work with local partners to identify and secure state and federal funding for Vision Zero projects.</li> <li>• Advocate to implement recommendations from the state Zero Traffic Fatalities Task Force, specifically authorizing the use of automated enforcement and speed safety cameras.</li> <li>• Support efforts to improve safety for all road users, including supporting bills that advance complete streets and best practices in safe roadway design.</li> </ul>

**Attachment 1**

San Francisco County Transportation Authority  
 Draft 2022 State and Federal Legislative Program

	<p>b. Support the Treasure Island Mobility Management Agency’s (TIMMA) work for sustainable mobility on Treasure Island</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support funding and authorization, as needed, for study, piloting, and implementation of innovative mobility management such as tolling infrastructure, transportation and housing affordability programs, bike and car share initiatives, and autonomous shuttle pilot.</li> </ul>
	<p>c. Improve reliably and efficiency of San Francisco’s roadway network and other transportation demand management (TDM) strategies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support new legislation that promotes innovative TDM strategies such as authorizing area-wide congestion pricing pilot programs as recommended in the city’s Vision Zero Action Strategy and Climate Action Plan (2021).</li> <li>• Support MTC’s efforts to improve compliance with occupancy requirements in High Occupancy Vehicle lanes.</li> <li>• Support other efforts to speed up transit, such as authorizing a pilot program for bus-on-shoulder freeway operations.</li> </ul>

**Attachment 1**

San Francisco County Transportation Authority  
Draft 2022 State and Federal Legislative Program

	<p>d. Ensure the implementation of emerging mobility innovations (e.g. Transportation Network Companies (TNCs), scooters, autonomous vehicles) is consistent with new mobility principles</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue efforts to ensure they are regulated and deployed in a way that balances their benefits and impacts and ensures safety, equity, and accessibility and ensure local authority is preserved as it relates to San Francisco’s local pilot and permit programs.</li> <li>• Seek authorization for additional local regulation of certain aspects of emerging mobility, where appropriate (e.g. operational standards, local mitigation fees).</li> <li>• Advocate to require access to critical data for local and regional governments for planning and monitoring purposes.</li> <li>• Continue to support efforts to develop and implement requirements for TNCs’ greenhouse gas emissions and accessibility (e.g. The California Air Resources Board’s Clean Mile Standard and the California Public Utilities Commission’s TNC Access for All initiatives).</li> <li>• Participate in state rulemaking regarding the testing, deployment, and regulation of autonomous vehicles to ensure they improve safety, mobility, and accessibility and avoid or minimize increase congestion or greenhouse gas emissions.</li> </ul>
	<p>e. Advance the adoption and integration of EVs in a manner consistent with other city priorities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocate for EV legislation to be equitable and consistent with San Francisco’s other mobility policies (e.g. transit-first, emerging mobility) and that addresses some of the unique challenges facing San Francisco’s deployment of EV infrastructure (e.g. installing EV chargers in multi-family dwellings).</li> <li>• Support funding opportunities for EV infrastructure planning, promotion, and deployment. This includes expanding eligibility of existing or new state funds to help transit operators meet the state’s Innovative Clean Transit rule that requires public transit bus fleets to be 100% zero-emission by 2040.</li> <li>• Support financial incentives for replacing combustion engine vehicles with EVs or non-auto modes such as ebikes, especially for low income individuals.</li> </ul>

**Attachment 1**

San Francisco County Transportation Authority  
Draft 2022 State and Federal Legislative Program

	<p>f. Advance measures to increase production of affordable housing as well as supportive planning, infrastructure, and services</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support efforts to establish new, dedicated state and regional funding for affordable housing.</li> <li>• Support legislative efforts to incentivize and reduce barriers to the construction of new housing, in particular affordable and moderate rate housing, that are consistent with San Francisco’s growth strategy and provides necessary support for related infrastructure and transit service needs.</li> </ul>
	<p>g. Advance legislative actions in support of other city policy goals</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support efforts to advance a more seamless public transit system in the Bay Area with integrated transit fares to benefit both low-income transit riders and attract new riders to the system, informed by recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Transit Recovery Task Force Transformative Action Plan, which was approved in 2021.</li> <li>• Work with state and local partners to affect the implementation of the California State Transit Agency’s recently approved Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure (CAPTI) that seeks to align state investments with policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to provide clean transportation options.</li> <li>• With other County Transportation Agencies (CTAs), work to modernize Congestion Management Program regulations to support key policies and reinforce CTAs’ role in state, regional, and local transportation planning, congestion management and funding.</li> </ul>

**Attachment 1**San Francisco County Transportation Authority  
Draft 2022 State and Federal Legislative Program

3. High-Speed Rail (HSR)	a. Strengthen state commitment to a blended HSR and electrified Caltrain system from San Francisco to San Jose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Work with partner agencies to advance the HSR project, oppose redirection of existing funds, and advocate that the HSR early investment projects are implemented in a manner consistent with the northern California Memorandum of Understanding to develop a blended system, including achieving level boarding at all shared Caltrain/High Speed Rail facilities.</li><li>• Advocate for the High Speed Rail Business Plan to prioritize funding for the High Speed Rail Authority's commitment of \$550 million to the Caltrain Downtown Extension, and thereby advance the Caltrain Modernization Program.</li></ul>
--------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Attachment 1**

San Francisco County Transportation Authority  
Draft 2022 State and Federal Legislative Program

<b>FEDERAL</b>		
<b>Area</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>Strategy</b>
1. Transportation Funding	a. Sustain or increase federal transportation funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocate for the approval of federal transportation spending at the higher levels authorized in the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law.</li> <li>• Support the inclusion of sustainable transportation investments, such as vehicle electrification and programs that invest in disadvantaged communities, in the climate and social spending budget reconciliation package (i.e. Build Back Better) under consideration in Congress. Secure directed funding for San Francisco’s priority transportation projects.</li> <li>• Advocate for increasing the federal gasoline tax, and for indexing it to inflation to help close the Highway Trust Fund funding deficit.</li> <li>• Support the study and piloting of grant programs for innovative approaches to transportation challenges such as congestion management, implementing public transit affordability programs, technology demonstrations, and alternative project delivery methods.</li> <li>• Support Governor Newsom’s administration and regional partners in efforts to restore and preserve transit funding currently in question due to the U.S. Department of Labor’s recent interpretation of a 2010 state pension law known as PEPR.</li> </ul>
	b. Secure additional COVID relief funding for transportation, particularly for transit operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocate for additional COVID relief funding for transit operators to sustain services that are critical to economic recovery and disproportionately provide mobility for low income, minority, and transit dependent persons.</li> <li>• Support federal funding to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on state, regional, and local governments, help backfill lost transportation revenues, and support recovery (e.g. job retention and creation).</li> </ul>

## Attachment 1

San Francisco County Transportation Authority  
Draft 2022 State and Federal Legislative Program

	c. Secure federal approvals for San Francisco's Core Capacity and New and Small Starts priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocate that Congress approves annual Core Capacity appropriations consistent with the Full Funding Grant Agreement for the Caltrain Modernization project and the BART Core Capacity project.</li> <li>• Work with local and regional partners to position San Francisco's priority projects for these and other competitive federal funding programs, including the Muni Core Capacity Program, Geary Boulevard Bus Rapid Transit, and the Caltrain Downtown Extension.</li> </ul>
2. Transportation Policy Initiatives	a. Advance autonomous vehicle regulations that improve safety and facilitate local evaluation of their performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participate in federal efforts to develop a policy framework for their testing, deployment, and regulation.</li> <li>• Partner with state and local governments to advocate for evidence-based regulations that preserve the ability of jurisdictions to appropriately oversee their safe operation and ensure the availability of collected data.</li> </ul>
	b. Address the impacts of shared mobility services (e.g. TNCs, private transit shuttles, scooters) and ensure their safety, equity and accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contribute to the development of legislation and funding programs that balance their benefits and impacts, provide for state and local regulation, and secure access to critical data.</li> <li>• Support new federal funding for pilot projects that include a robust analysis of outcomes to inform future investment and regulation.</li> </ul>
	c. Advance regulatory actions in support of other city policy goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support policies to achieve greenhouse gas emissions reduction goals (e.g. advancing the production and adoption of electric vehicles) equitably, and to shift travel to low-carbon modes, as outlined in San Francisco's Climate Action Plan.</li> <li>• Monitor other potential regulation activities (e.g. mobile applications, privacy protection) that would impact San Francisco's range of transportation services.</li> <li>• Support restoring the pre-tax transportation benefits for bicycle community, including expenses for shared bicycle systems.</li> </ul>



**Attachment 1**

San Francisco County Transportation Authority  
Draft 2022 State and Federal Legislative Program

<b>STATE AND FEDERAL (Project Delivery and Administration)</b>		
<b>Area</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>Strategy</b>
1. Project Delivery	a. Expand use of innovative project delivery strategies for transportation infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocate for additional opportunities to use alternative delivery methods to manage risk and improve implementation of transportation infrastructure projects.</li> <li>• Advocate for retention and expansion of financing programs such as Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA), as well as additional flexibility.</li> </ul>
	b. Seek integrated state and federal environmental impact studies and streamlined permitting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocate for more efficient environmental processes (both CEQA and NEPA) to reduce administrative inefficiencies, expedite project delivery, and reduce costs.</li> <li>• Support efforts to increase the efficiency of Caltrans in reviewing and approving documents and permits.</li> </ul>
2. General Administration	a. Ensure efficient and effective Transportation Authority operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocate for the streamlining of administrative requirements when multiple fund sources are used on a single project.</li> <li>• Oppose legislation and regulations that constrain the Transportation Authority's ability to efficiently and effectively contract for goods and services and conduct business. Support legislation and regulations that positively affect our effectiveness and limit or transfer our risk of liability.</li> </ul>



## Memorandum

### AGENDA ITEM 7

**DATE:** January 27, 2022

**TO:** Transportation Authority Board

**FROM:** Maria Lombardo - Chief Deputy Director

**SUBJECT:** 2/8/21 Board Meeting: Approval of the 2022 State and Federal Legislative Program

**RECOMMENDATION**  Information  Action

Approve the 2022 State and Federal Legislative Program

#### SUMMARY

Every year the Transportation Authority adopts high level goals and strategies to guide legislative strategy and advocacy while still providing the necessary flexibility to respond to specific bills and policies over the course of the legislative sessions. The 2022 State and Federal Legislative Program (Attachment 1) was developed in coordination with local, regional, and statewide partners. It focuses on securing transportation funding, advancing San Francisco's priority projects, engaging in the regulation of new transportation technologies, and expanding innovative programs to support the city's equity, mobility, climate, and Vision Zero goals.

- Fund Allocation
- Fund Programming
- Policy/Legislation
- Plan/Study
- Capital Project Oversight/Delivery
- Budget/Finance
- Contract/Agreement
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### BACKGROUND

The State and Federal Legislative Program, adopted annually by the Board, establishes a general framework to guide our legislative and funding advocacy efforts at the state and federal levels. Transportation Authority staff and our legislative advocacy consultants in Sacramento and Washington, DC, will use this program to plan strategy and communicate positions to the city's legislative delegations in addition to other transportation agencies and advocates.

The proposed 2022 State and Federal Legislative Program reflects key principles gathered from our common positions with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), the Mayor's Office, other city agencies, transit operators serving San Francisco, other local transportation sales tax authorities around the state, and the Metropolitan



Transportation Commission (MTC), as well as our understanding of the most pressing issues facing the city, the region, and our partner agencies. It is presented in the form of principles rather than specific bills or legislative initiatives to allow staff the necessary flexibility to respond to legislative proposals and policy concerns that may arise over the course of the session. Throughout the year we will be reporting on the status of bills that are of significance to the Transportation Authority and developing recommendations for positions as appropriate.

## **DISCUSSION**

Our 2022 State and Federal Legislative Program continues many themes from prior years and builds on them to address new opportunities and legislation currently being discussed at the federal, state, and regional level. Highlights are below.

### **State Advocacy.**

**Transportation Funding.** The biggest opportunity to secure revenues for transportation at the state level is through the unprecedented \$46 million surplus projected in the Governor's initial Fiscal Year (FY) 2022/23 budget, where he has proposed a roughly \$6 billion investment in transit, active transportation, freight, resilience projects, and rail grade crossings. We are working with SFMTA and the Mayor's Office to identify San Francisco priorities and with MTC on a regional advocacy strategy. The budget also included an additional \$6.1 billion over five years for zero emission vehicles, including funding for 100,000 new electric vehicle charging stations. While the proposal doesn't currently include funding for transit operations, we will advocate for a supplemental source of funding to address long-term transit operator structural deficits forecast as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and continued work from home policies.

**Climate Goals.** In 2021 the California State Transportation Agency approved the state's first Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure (CAPTI), which establishes a state direction for reducing greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector. We will continue to advocate for the adjustment of state transportation investment strategies to better align with CAPTI, specifically to focus limited resources on projects that reduce vehicle miles traveled. We will also support SFMTA's and other transit operators' effort to secure state and federal funds to help transit operators transition their fleets to clean vehicles, consistent with the state's Innovative Clean Transit rule that requires public transit bus fleets to be 100% zero-emissions by 2040.

**Vision Zero.** This year we will continue to work with the SFMTA and other city agencies to advance San Francisco's Vision Zero goals. The successful passage of AB 43 (Friedman) in 2021 established a pathway for local jurisdictions to reduce speed limits in certain conditions. Building on that success, and 2020's findings from the state's Zero Fatalities Task Force, we will support efforts to advance additional bills to advance roadway safety, potentially including the authorization of speed safety cameras.



**Emerging Mobility and Innovative Strategies.** With respect to new transportation technology and innovative strategies, we expect that the rise of emerging mobility services will continue to produce legislation. We will advocate for policies that balance their benefits and impacts; ensure safety, equity, and accessibility; and secure local access to data to support local planning and regulation, where appropriate.

**Bay Area Legislation - Transit Agency Coordination and Regional Revenue Measure.** In 2021, the regional Blue Ribbon Transit Recovery Task Force concluded its work and MTC approved the Transformative Action Plan, which identified broad goals to improve the connectivity of Bay Area transit and actions for the region to pursue in the near-term. MTC is also developing a business case for a regional transit network management structure. There remains interest in implementing longer-term connectivity strategies, such as modifications to transit governance structures, which would likely require state legislation. We will continue to engage with our partner agencies and local and regional stakeholders to provide input into any legislative proposal.

In light of the pandemic, the effort to authorize a regional transportation revenue measure was put on hold in 2021. The region is currently doing initial work to determine whether to pursue a regional revenue measure for transportation or for a combination of housing and transportation. If MTC or another entity seeks legislation to authorize placing it on the ballot, we will advocate for it to support San Francisco's priorities such as BART and Muni Core Capacity Programs, transit state of good repair, as well as other key projects such as the Downtown Rail Extension.

#### **Federal Advocacy.**

**Transportation Funding and Appropriations.** The approval of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), also known as the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, included a five-year reauthorization of the federal transportation bill at around a 50% higher level. This year our focus will be on securing appropriations to the transportation programs at the authorized levels, ensuring the outstanding commitments to the Caltrain Modernization and BART Core Capacity projects are met, and positioning priority projects for future federal funding (e.g. the Muni Core Capacity Program, Geary Bus Rapid Transit, and the Downtown Rail Extension). We will also work with SFMTA and MTC to advocate for an additional round of COVID-19 relief and recovery funding for transit operators. Finally, we will support the inclusion of additional sustainable transportation investments such as transit vehicle electrification into future climate and social spending bills (i.e. Build Back Better), as well as programs that invest in disadvantaged communities.

**Emerging Mobility and Technology.** We anticipate the federal government will continue to establish its role in regulating and funding emerging mobility and technologies, including autonomous vehicles and mobility on demand (e.g. TNCs, private transit shuttles, and shared scooter and bike services). Our focus will be on advocating those regulations first set clear goals, perform data-driven research to evaluate the public benefits and impacts of these



emerging mobility services, maintain local and state regulatory roles, and mandate access to critical data for local and regional governments to ensure their safety, equity, and accessibility.

### **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

The recommended action does not have an impact on the adopted Fiscal Year 2021/22 budget.

### **CAC POSITION**

The CAC considered this item at its January 26, 2022, meeting and unanimously adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation.

### **SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS**

Attachment 1 - Draft 2022 State and Federal Legislative Program

[ this page intentionally left blank ]



RESOLUTION AWARDING CONSULTANT CONTRACTS FOR A THREE-YEAR PERIOD, WITH AN OPTION TO EXTEND FOR TWO ADDITIONAL ONE-YEAR PERIODS TO ALTA PLANNING + DESIGN INC., ARUP NORTH AMERICA LTD., FEHR & PEERS, KITTELSON & ASSOCIATES INC., MCKINSEY & COMPANY, MOTT MACDONALD GROUP INC., NELSON\NYGAARD CONSULTING ASSOCIATES, INC., PARISI TRANSPORTATION CONSULTING, STEER GROUP, AND WSP USA, INC., FOR A COMBINED AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$3,000,000 FOR ON-CALL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING SERVICES AND AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO NEGOTIATE CONTRACT PAYMENT TERMS AND NON-MATERIAL CONTRACT TERMS AND CONDITIONS

WHEREAS, The Transportation Authority has long-range countywide, neighborhood-scale, and project-level planning and policy advisory capabilities that stem from its multiple roles and is seeking on-call transportation planning services to support its work program over the next three years; and

WHEREAS, The establishment of contracts with one or more consultant teams will enable the Transportation Authority to enlist the services of a broad range of transportation planning specialists on an on-call, task order basis; and

WHEREAS, The Transportation Authority is seeking transportation planning teams with expertise in multimodal transportation planning and conceptual design, outreach, and program management; and

WHEREAS, On November 10, 2021, the Transportation Authority issued a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for on-call transportation planning services to support the Transportation Authority's work program over the next three years; and

WHEREAS, The Transportation Authority received 16 Statements of Qualifications in response to the RFQ by the due date of December 15, 2021; and

WHEREAS, A review panel comprised of staff from the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency and the Transportation Authority evaluated the proposals based on the qualifications and other criteria outlined in the RFQ; and interviewed three firms on January 11 and 12, 2021; and

WHEREAS, Interviews for the other seven qualified firms were not conducted nor deemed necessary due to the quality of the Statements of Qualifications, prior working



experience with the Transportation Authority, and the familiarity of staff with previous work performed by these firms; and

WHEREAS, Based on the results of this competitive selection process, the panel recommended award of consultant contracts to the ten highest-ranked firms of Alta Planning + Design Inc., Arup North America Ltd., Fehr & Peers, Kittelson & Associates Inc., McKinsey & Company, Mott MacDonald Group, Inc., Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates, Inc., Parisi Transportation Consulting, Steer Group, and WSP USA, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, The scope of work described in the RFQ is anticipated in the Transportation Authority's adopted Fiscal Year 2021/22 work program and budget through relevant projects and studies, and sufficient funds will be included in future fiscal year budgets to cover the cost of these contracts; and

WHEREAS, The consulting services will be funded from a combination of federal Surface Transportation Planning grants, federal grants from Caltrans and Metropolitan Transportation Commission, local contributions from City and County of San Francisco, and Prop K funds; and

WHEREAS, At its January 26, 2022, meeting, the Community Advisory Committee was briefed on and adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority hereby awards three-year consultant contracts, with an option to extend for two additional one-year periods, to Alta Planning + Design Inc., Arup North America Ltd., Fehr & Peers, Kittelson & Associates Inc., McKinsey & Company, Mott MacDonald Group, Inc., Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates, Inc., Parisi Transportation Consulting, Steer Group, and WSP USA, Inc. for a combined total not to exceed \$3,000,000, for on-call transportation planning services; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Executive Director is hereby authorized to negotiate contract payment terms and non-material contract terms and conditions; and be it further

RESOLVED, That for the purposes of this resolution, "non-material" shall mean contract terms and conditions other than provisions related to the overall contract amount, terms of payment, and general scope of services; and be it further

RESOLVED, That notwithstanding the foregoing and any rule or policy of the Transportation Authority to the contrary, the Executive Director is expressly authorized to





execute agreements and amendments to agreements that do not cause the total agreement value, as approved herein, to be exceeded and that do not expand the general scope of services.

Attachment:

1. Attachment 1 - Shortlisted Respondents per Areas of Expertise

**Attachment 1**  
**Shortlisted Respondents**  
**On-Call Transportation Planning Services**

No.	Prime Consultant	Areas of Expertise						Subconsultants
		Transportation Planning	Corridor and Area Planning	Travel Demand Management	Neighborhood / Community Based Planning	Policy Analysis and Research	Outreach and Communications	
1	Alta Planning + Design Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	Civic Edge Consulting, LLC (DBE/SBE/LBE) Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. Safe Streets Research and Consulting (DBE) *
2	Arup North America Ltd	X	X	X	X	X	X	Access Planning AutoCase Advisory Services CHS Consulting Group (DBE/SBE/LBE) Civic Edge Consulting, LLC (DBE/SBE/LBE) Strategic Economics (DBE/SBE)
3	Fehr & Peers	X	X	X	X	X	X	Adavant Consulting (SBE/LBE) AGS, Inc. (SBE) Civic Edge Consulting, LLC (DBE/SBE/LBE) LCW Consulting (DBE/LBE) * MSA Design & Consulting, Inc. (SBE/LBE) Safe Streets Research and Consulting (DBE) * Sertior (SBE/LBE) * Telamon Engineering Consultants, Inc. (DBE/SBE/LBE) * WILTEC (DBE)
4	Kittelson & Associates Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	Circlepoint (SBE) Foursquare Integrated Transportation Planning (DBE) Toole Design Safe Streets Research and Consulting (DBE) Strategic Economics, Inc.(DBE/SBE)
5	McKinsey & Company	X				X	X	Intueor Consulting, Inc. (DBE/SBE) Motive Power, Inc. (SBE)
6	Mott MacDonald Group	X	X	X	X	X	X	ACUMEN Building Enterprise, Inc. (DBE/SBE) Circlepoint (SBE) Elite Transportation Group, Inc. (DBE/SBE) GHT Capital LLC (DBE/SBE) * Leading Mobility Next Steps Marketing, Inc. (DBE/SBE/LBE) Whitlock & Weinberger Transportation (DBE/SBE) *

## Abbreviations:

DBE: Disadvantaged Business Enterprise

SBE: Small Business Enterprise

LBE: Local Business Enterprise

\* New DBE/SBE/LBE subconsultant firms within the last 5 years.

No.	Prime Consultant	Areas of Expertise						Subconsultants
		Transportation Planning	Corridor and Area Planning	Travel Demand Management	Neighborhood / Community Based Planning	Policy Analysis and Research	Outreach and Communications	
7	Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates	X	X	X	X	X	X	Access Planning Chaudhary & Associates, Inc. (DBE/SBE) Civic Edge Consulting, LLC (DBE/SBE/LBE) CivicMakers, LLC (SBE/LBE) * Ewald & Wasserman Research Consultants, LLC (SBE/LBE) * InterEthnica (SBE/LBE) Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. JMA Civil, Inc. (SBE) * M Lee Corporation (DBE/SBE/LBE) MSA Design & Consulting Inc. (SBE/LBE) Resource Systems Group, Inc. Ross & Baruzzini Sam Schwartz Engineering DPC Silicon Transportation Consultants (DBE/SBE) Strategic Economics (DBE/SBE) Transportation Analytics (DBE/SBE) VST Engineering Inc. (DBE) *
8	Parisi Transportation Consulting	X	X	X	X	X	X	Ronny Kraft Consulting (DBE/LBE) Safe Streets Research & Consulting (DBE) *
9	Steer Group	X	X	X		X	X	ARTEMIA Communications, Inc. (SBE/LBE) * GHT Capital (DBE/SBE) *
10	WSP USA, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	Civic Edge Consulting, LLC (DBE/SBE/LBE) EMC Research Jay Primus Transportation Analytics (DBE/SBE) Urban Field Studio (DBE/LBE) *
	<b>Total Firms Shortlisted by Areas of Expertise</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	

## Abbreviations:

DBE: Disadvantaged Business Enterprise

SBE: Small Business Enterprise

LBE: Local Business Enterprise

\* New DBE/SBE/LBE subconsultant firms within the last 5 years.



# Memorandum

## AGENDA ITEM 8

**DATE:** January 27, 2022

**TO:** Transportation Authority Board

**FROM:** Rachel Hiatt - Deputy Director for Planning

**SUBJECT:** 02/08/2022 Board Meeting: Award Contracts to Ten Shortlisted Consultant Teams for a Three-Year Period, with an Option to Extend for Two Additional One-Year Periods, for a Combined Amount Not to Exceed \$3,000,000 for On-Call Transportation Planning Services, and Authorize the Executive Director to Negotiate Contract Payment Terms and Non-Material Contract Terms and Conditions

<p><b>RECOMMENDATION</b>    <input type="checkbox"/> Information    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Award Contracts to Ten Shortlisted Consultant Teams for a Three-Year Period, with an Option to Extend for Two Additional One-Year Periods, for a Combined Amount Not to Exceed \$3,000,000 for On-Call Transportation Planning Services</li> <li>• Authorize the Executive Director to Negotiate Contract Payment Terms and Non-Material Contract Terms and Conditions</li> </ul> <p><b>SUMMARY</b></p> <p>On November 10, 2021, we issued a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for on-call transportation planning services to support our work program over the next three years, up to a maximum of five years. The establishment of contracts with one or more consultant teams will enable us to enlist the services of a broad range of transportation planning specialists on an on-call, task order basis. By the due date of December 15, 2021, we received sixteen Statements of Qualifications (SOQs) in response to the RFQ. Interviews were held between January 11 and 12, 2022. Based on this competitive selection process, the review panel, with participation from the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and the Transportation Authority, recommends the award of consultant contracts to the ten top-ranked teams: Alta Planning + Design Inc., Arup North America Ltd., Fehr &amp; Peers, Kittelson &amp; Associates Inc., McKinsey &amp; Company, Mott MacDonald Group, Inc., Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates, Inc., Parisi Transportation Consulting, Steer Group, and WSP USA, Inc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Fund Allocation</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Fund Programming</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Policy/Legislation</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Plan/Study</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Capital Project Oversight/Delivery</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Budget/Finance</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contract/Agreement</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</li> </ul>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



## **BACKGROUND**

We are seeking on-call planning services to support our work program over the next three years. The establishment of contracts with one or more consultant teams will enable us to enlist the services of a broad range of transportation planning specialists on an on-call, task order basis. The current on-call planning contracts with Arup North America Ltd., Iteris, Inc., Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates, Inc., Stantec Consulting Services, Inc., and WSP USA, Inc. will expire May 31, 2022.

We have long-range countywide, neighborhood-scale, and project-level planning and policy advisory capabilities that stem from our multiple roles. As the Congestion Management Agency for San Francisco County, we conduct local and regional planning studies addressing congestion management, transportation system development, and urgent policy issues to advance key Board or Expenditure Plan priorities, particularly where multi-jurisdictional conditions exist.

## **DISCUSSION**

We are seeking transportation planning teams with expertise in multimodal transportation planning and conceptual design, outreach, and program management. General areas of expertise sought in prospective teams include:

- Transportation Planning
- Corridor and Area Planning Studies
- Travel Demand Management
- Neighborhood/Community Based Planning
- Policy Analysis and Research
- Outreach & Communications

The consultant scope of services is included in Attachment 1.

**Procurement Process.** We issued a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for on-call transportation planning services on November 10, 2021. We held a pre-submittal conference on November 18, 2021, which provided opportunities for small businesses and larger firms to meet and form partnerships. Eighty-five firms registered for the conference.

We took steps to encourage participation from small and disadvantaged business enterprises, including advertising in seven local newspapers: the San Francisco Chronicle, the San Francisco Examiner, the San Francisco Bay View, Nichi Bei, the Small Business Exchange, El Reportero, and the World Journal. We also distributed the RFQ, registration list for the pre-submittal conference, and periodic updates on the RFQ to certified small, disadvantaged, and local businesses, Bay Area and cultural Chambers of Commerce, and the Small Business Councils.

By the due date of December 15, 2021, we received 16 SOQs in response to the RFQ. The selection panel evaluated the SOQs based on qualifications and other criteria identified in the RFQ, with an emphasis on bidders' management and technical capabilities and experience. In addition, the review panel evaluated each firm's strengths and weaknesses in each specialty area for which the firm sought consideration and reviewed the prime consultant's references. We held interviews with three qualified teams on January 11 and 12, 2022. Seven other qualified teams advanced without interviews due to the quality of the SOQs, prior working experience with us, and the familiarity of staff with previous work performed by these firms. Interviews were conducted by a selection panel comprised of representatives from SFMTA and Transportation Authority staff. Based on the competitive



process defined in the evaluation criteria of the RFQ document, the selection panel recommends awarding contracts to the 10 highest-ranked firms: Alta Planning + Design Inc., Arup North America Ltd., Fehr & Peers, Kittelson & Associates Inc., McKinsey & Company, Mott MacDonald Group, Inc., Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates, Inc., Parisi Transportation Consulting, Steer Group, and WSP USA, Inc.

Given the wide range of desired proficiencies and experience, the amount and complexity of our work program, and occasional conflicts of interest or availability that arise for specific efforts, there is a need for broad and deep access to transportation planning skills in the on-call planning contract. We propose to contract with multiple consultant teams with whom we may call upon on a task order basis. Such an arrangement is currently in place through our current on-call transportation planning contracts, which has proved beneficial to the agency's work program. The recommended firms together provide us with two or more options for each requested area of expertise. Details of each firm's areas of expertise and proposed subconsultants are included in Attachment 2.

Shortlisted consultants selected for a contract will remain eligible for consideration for task order negotiation on an as-needed basis for the initial three-year term. To maintain an open and competitive process, all shortlisted consultants will be invited to submit proposals and/or participate in oral interviews as part of the task order negotiation process. While we intend to engage pre-qualified firms based on capabilities, experience, and availability, no selected team is guaranteed a task order. In addition, transportation planning services tasks valued above \$450,000, in other words 15% of total contract value, will be bid under a separate procurement process.

We will receive federal financing assistance to fund a portion of this contract and will adhere to federal procurement regulations. For this contract, we established an overall Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) goal of 12%, accepting certifications by the California Unified Certification Program. SOQs from all 10 teams met or exceeded the DBE goal. In addition, we will establish DBE, Small Business Enterprise, and/or Local Business Enterprise goals for each subsequent task order request, based on the project's funding sources and specific scope of work. All 10 prime consultants' firms are headquartered in states not on the Banned State List, which are states with laws restricting abortion access or discriminate against LGBT individuals.

## **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

The scope of work and first year's activities described in the RFQ are included in the Transportation Authority's adopted Fiscal Year 2021/22 work program and budget through relevant projects and studies, including the San Francisco Transportation Plan. Budget for these activities will be funded by a combination of federal Surface Transportation Planning grants, federal grants from Caltrans and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, local contributions from City and County of San Francisco, and Prop K sales tax funds. Sufficient funds will be included in future fiscal year budgets to cover the cost of these contracts.

## **CAC POSITION**

The CAC considered this item at its January 26, 2022, meeting and adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation..



## **SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS**

- Attachment 1 - On-Call Planning Services Scope of Work
- Attachment 2 - Shortlisted Respondents per Areas of Expertise
- Attachment 3 - Existing On-Call Bench Task Orders

## Attachment 1

### On-Call Transportation Planning Services

#### Scope of Work

The Transportation Authority require varying types and levels of project management and project development support in the following areas:

1. **San Francisco Transportation Plan (SFTP)/Countywide Planning:** The Transportation Authority regularly updates the long-range countywide transportation plan that serves as the city's blueprint for transportation system development and investment over 30 years. The SFTP identifies key transportation needs, through an analysis of future trends, and aligns these needs with projected available funding. The SFTP includes background papers and studies and strategic policy initiatives to support the investments in the transportation system.
2. **Congestion Management Program (CMP):** The Transportation Authority prepares biennial updates to the CMP and multimodal Level of Service (LOS) monitoring on the CMP network. This LOS Monitoring work is supported by a separate CMP Monitoring contract.
3. **Neighborhood Transportation Plan (NTIP) Planning Studies:** The Transportation Authority routinely conducts neighborhood planning efforts under the Prop K NTIP program. These efforts are prioritized by the District Supervisor to address activities that improve pedestrian and/or bicycle safety, encourage walking and/or biking, improve transit accessibility, and/or improve mobility for Equity Priority Communities (formerly known as Communities of Concern) or other underserved neighborhoods and vulnerable populations (e.g., seniors, children, and/or people with disabilities).
4. **Policy Studies:** Policy studies address a range of current transportation policy topics including parking, technology-enabled transportation, transportation demand management, and others. Each study is intended to provide recommendations to the Board on a specific issue of interest or concern and typically involves research, data collection, analysis and report writing.
5. **Corridor and Area Planning Studies:** The Transportation Authority prepares and reviews transportation planning studies. These may include planning for transit (including ferries), managed lanes, and street design to address Vision Zero goals. One or two new studies are typically undertaken each year. The Transportation Authority also leads deliverables, reviews, and provides input to other local, regional, and statewide transportation plans, such as the Transit Core Capacity Study (led by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, or MTC) and Link 21 (led by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District).

The Transportation Authority seeks transportation planning consultant services to support the various projects described above, and others that may arise. A list of six general areas of expertise sought in prospective teams is provided below, lettered A through F. In addition to these areas of expertise, all teams must demonstrate skills and experience in project management (scope, schedule, and budget management) and supporting technical skills that may be used across multiple areas.

- A. **Transportation Planning** - Including countywide or neighborhood planning focused on development and evaluation of transportation networks. Specific examples include:



- a. Citywide planning. Support development of future updates to the SFTP, including identifying long range needs, analyze tradeoffs across transportation projects and programs, coordinating with partner agencies, and other related tasks.
  - b. Modal Network planning. Conduct planning and design for modal networks, including pedestrian and bicycle network planning, transit network and service planning, street network planning, and similar modal studies.
  - c. Travel Market Analysis. Conduct analysis of specialized travel markets to address trips in San Francisco occur outside of the standard morning and evening peak periods or for non-commute purposes. The Transportation Authority may seek consultant assistance in developing specialized policies or service solutions to address the needs of travelers and trips, including those related to paratransit, school, trips occurring in the late night and early morning, trips by visitors and tourists, and goods/freight movement, among others.
- B. Corridor and area planning studies** - Develop studies of specific multimodal transportation investments, including potentially:
- a. Development of transportation options in a corridor
  - b. Concept design and evaluation
  - c. Preparation of Strategic, Preliminary, and Final Business Case analyses of proposed investments and supporting technical analysis and documentation
  - d. Major investment studies, alternatives analysis, project planning, and project development for major transit projects
  - e. Bus and rail operational planning, system planning, and network design
  - f. Transit facility / site planning
  - g. Transit station area planning at select locations, including demand analysis, station area planning, and similar activities
  - h. Transit and multimodal corridor planning including design options and operations
  - i. California Environmental Quality Act/National Environmental Policy Act
- C. Travel Demand Management (TDM)** - TDM policy analysis, stakeholder facilitation, program design, implementation support, and/or project evaluation services. The below is a list of potential areas of support:
- a. Development of TDM strategy at city, neighborhood, or development scale
  - b. Development conditions/approval policy
  - c. Strategies for managing existing development, including pricing and incentives
  - d. Information/marketing/education
  - e. Parking management program design
  - f. Incentives - the planning, design, and/or deployment of software in support of programs such as travel incentives and rebates, travel behavior monitoring, and user information.
  - g. Payment Technology
  - h. Coordination with local, state, and federal agencies (e.g., the MTC, the California Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration, or Federal Highways Administration)
  - i. Monitoring and evaluation

- D. Neighborhood/Community Based Planning** - Support Transportation Authority led community, neighborhood, and small area planning, in support of NTIP and Community-Based Transportation Plan development. Tasks may include:
- a. Neighborhood-scale modal planning to identify and evaluate strategies to advance the city's transit first/mode choice, safety, and equity goals
  - b. Small area studies that examine travel patterns and potential transportation improvements
- E. Policy Analysis and Research** - Develop and evaluate transportation policies in key areas such as:
- a. Toll and pricing policy development and evaluation
  - b. Identify and research innovative technologies and concepts
  - c. Support scoping, planning, and project development related to connected vehicles and/or automated vehicle technology
  - d. Market analysis and/or transportation business plan development
  - e. Develop governance models and assumptions
  - f. Economic impact analysis
  - g. Fiscal and financial analysis
  - h. Equity analysis
  - i. Funding strategy development for major transit projects
- F. Outreach & Communications** - Support outreach and communications for Transportation Authority planning projects. This may include support as part of a planning project in another category or communications-specific support where other project elements are not requested. Task support in this area may include:
- a. Strategic communication
    - i. Messaging development
    - ii. Communications development
  - b. Outreach
    - i. Strategy development
    - ii. Community involvement
    - iii. Facilitation
    - iv. Organize stakeholder groups
    - v. Develop and lead co-creation events
    - vi. Multi-media (electronic and non-electronic) outreach methods
  - c. Translation, interpretation
  - d. Visualization

While the Transportation Authority is seeking support for several specific topical areas, we will require a broad set of skills that would be used in any task order. Specifically:

- **Project Management** - Ability to manage project and/or program scopes, schedules, and budgets.
- **Modeling/Data Analysis** - Most planning studies will involve some level of data collection and analysis and may require modeling.
  - a. Data Collection

- b. Data analysis (e.g., of model output, or of third-party cellular or GPS data)
  - c. Multimodal micro-simulation
  - d. Mapping
- **Design and Cost Estimation** - Many planning studies, modal and corridor studies in particular, will require some level of concept design and cost estimation.
  - a. Conceptual design through 30% design engineering
  - b. Conceptual street/streetscape design
  - c. Planning level cost estimation

**Attachment 2**  
**Shortlisted Respondents**  
**On-Call Transportation Planning Services**

No.	Prime Consultant	Areas of Expertise						Subconsultants
		Transportation Planning	Corridor and Area Planning	Travel Demand Management	Neighborhood / Community Based Planning	Policy Analysis and Research	Outreach and Communications	
1	Alta Planning + Design Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	Civic Edge Consulting, LLC (DBE/SBE/LBE) Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. Safe Streets Research and Consulting (DBE) *
2	Arup North America Ltd	X	X	X	X	X	X	Access Planning AutoCase Advisory Services CHS Consulting Group (DBE/SBE/LBE) Civic Edge Consulting, LLC (DBE/SBE/LBE) Strategic Economics (DBE/SBE)
3	Fehr & Peers	X	X	X	X	X	X	Adavant Consulting (SBE/LBE) AGS, Inc. (SBE) Civic Edge Consulting, LLC (DBE/SBE/LBE) LCW Consulting (DBE/LBE) * MSA Design & Consulting, Inc. (SBE/LBE) Safe Streets Research and Consulting (DBE) * Sertior (SBE/LBE) * Telamon Engineering Consultants, Inc. (DBE/SBE/LBE) * WILTEC (DBE)
4	Kittelson & Associates Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	Circlepoint (SBE) Foursquare Integrated Transportation Planning (DBE) Toole Design Safe Streets Research and Consulting (DBE) Strategic Economics, Inc.(DBE/SBE)
5	McKinsey & Company	X				X	X	Intueor Consulting, Inc. (DBE/SBE) Motive Power, Inc. (SBE)
6	Mott MacDonald Group	X	X	X	X	X	X	ACUMEN Building Enterprise, Inc. (DBE/SBE) Circlepoint (SBE) Elite Transportation Group, Inc. (DBE/SBE) GHT Capital LLC (DBE/SBE) * Leading Mobility Next Steps Marketing, Inc. (DBE/SBE/LBE) Whitlock & Weinberger Transportation (DBE/SBE) *

## Abbreviations:

DBE: Disadvantaged Business Enterprise

SBE: Small Business Enterprise

LBE: Local Business Enterprise

\* New DBE/SBE/LBE subconsultant firms within the last 5 years.

No.	Prime Consultant	Areas of Expertise						Subconsultants
		Transportation Planning	Corridor and Area Planning	Travel Demand Management	Neighborhood / Community Based Planning	Policy Analysis and Research	Outreach and Communications	
7	Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates	X	X	X	X	X	X	Access Planning Chaudhary & Associates, Inc. (DBE/SBE) Civic Edge Consulting, LLC (DBE/SBE/LBE) CivicMakers, LLC (SBE/LBE) * Ewald & Wasserman Research Consultants, LLC (SBE/LBE) * InterEthnica (SBE/LBE) Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. JMA Civil, Inc. (SBE) * M Lee Corporation (DBE/SBE/LBE) MSA Design & Consulting Inc. (SBE/LBE) Resource Systems Group, Inc. Ross & Baruzzini Sam Schwartz Engineering DPC Silicon Transportation Consultants (DBE/SBE) Strategic Economics (DBE/SBE) Transportation Analytics (DBE/SBE) VST Engineering Inc. (DBE) *
8	Parisi Transportation Consulting	X	X	X	X	X	X	Ronny Kraft Consulting (DBE/LBE) Safe Streets Research & Consulting (DBE) *
9	Steer Group	X	X	X		X	X	ARTEMIA Communications, Inc. (SBE/LBE) * GHT Capital (DBE/SBE) *
10	WSP USA, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	Civic Edge Consulting, LLC (DBE/SBE/LBE) EMC Research Jay Primus Transportation Analytics (DBE/SBE) Urban Field Studio (DBE/LBE) *
	<b>Total Firms Shortlisted by Areas of Expertise</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	

## Abbreviations:

DBE: Disadvantaged Business Enterprise

SBE: Small Business Enterprise

LBE: Local Business Enterprise

\* New DBE/SBE/LBE subconsultant firms within the last 5 years.

**Attachment 3:  
On-Call Transportation Planning Task Orders (2016-2022)**

<b>Prime Consultant</b>	<b>Task Order Description</b>	<b>Task Order Amount</b>	<b>Subconsultant(s)</b>	<b>Amount to Subconsultants</b>
Arup N. America, Ltd.	Downtown Extension	\$554,305	Access Planning	\$44,000
			Jacobs/CH2M Hill	\$34,874
			Strategic Economics (DBE, SBE)	\$30,000
	Geary Bus Rapid Transit Project	\$413,912	Circlepoint (SBE)	\$404,117
	TIMMA Mandatory Transit Pass Study	\$179,203	Jacobs/CH2M Hill	\$171,790
	Lombard Crooked Street Reservations and Pricing Study	\$106,679	Fall Line Analytics (LBE)	\$5,000
	San Francisco Transportation Task Force	\$10,147	Eisen/Letunic (DBE)	\$9,219
	San Francisco Transportation Plan	\$39,903		
<b>Total Task Orders Awarded to Arup N. America, Ltd.</b>		<b>\$1,304,149</b>		<b>\$699,000</b>
Iteris, Inc.	N/A	\$0		
<b>Total Task Orders Awarded to Iteris, Inc.</b>		<b>\$0</b>		<b>\$0</b>
Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates	ConnectSF / San Francisco Transportation Plan	\$275,000	Cambridge Systematics	\$38,438
			Civic Edge Consulting (DBE, LBE, SBE)	\$93,243
	TIMMA Travel Demand Management and Transportation Affordability Program	\$168,673	Ann Carey Consulting (DBE, LBE)	\$20,394
	Vision Zero Ramp Intersections Study Phase II Planning Services	\$106,532	Parisi Transportation Consulting (SBE)	\$92,604

Prime Consultant	Task Order Description	Task Order Amount	Subconsultant(s)	Amount to Subconsultants
Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates			Ronny Kraft Consulting (DBE, LBE)	\$10,500
	Golden Gate Park - JFK Drive Access Equity Study	\$100,000	Civic Edge Consulting (DBE, LBE, SBE)	\$32,722
			En2Action	\$15,000
	Octavia Improvements Study	\$100,000	Civic Edge Consulting (DBE, LBE, SBE)	\$20,051
			Parisi Transportation Consulting (SBE)	\$74,068
	Sales Tax Reauthorization Outreach	\$70,000	Civic Edge Consulting (DBE, LBE, SBE)	\$45,963
			En2Action	\$21,155
	District 10 Mobility Management Study	\$69,975		
	Lombard Crooked Street Reservations and Pricing Study Outreach Services	\$34,622	Civic Edge Consulting (DBE, LBE, SBE)	\$29,299
			InterEthnica (LBE, SBE)	\$2,700
Alemanly Interchange Improvement Study	\$33,526			
BART Travel Incentives Program	\$2,250	Elham Shirazi (DBE)	\$2,250	
<b>Total Task Orders Awarded to Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates</b>		<b>\$959,578</b>		<b>\$498,388</b>
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	Treasure Island Mobility Management Agency Program	\$597,744	Jay Primus	\$41,880
			CDM Smith	\$23,818
<b>Total Task Orders Awarded to Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.</b>		<b>\$597,744</b>		<b>\$65,698</b>
WSP USA, Inc.	Technology Enabled Transportation	\$35,414		

<b>Prime Consultant</b>	<b>Task Order Description</b>	<b>Task Order Amount</b>	<b>Subconsultant(s)</b>	<b>Amount to Subconsultants</b>
	Emerging Mobility Pilot Framework	\$20,707		
	Transportation Network Company Research	\$8,187	Strategic Cities	\$6,538
	Commuter Shuttles Hub Study	\$2,247		
<b>Total Task Orders Awarded to WSP</b>		<b>\$66,555</b>		<b>\$6,538</b>
<b>Total Task Orders Awarded to Date</b>		<b>\$2,928,026</b>		
<b>Total Task Orders Allocated to Subconsultants (43%)</b>				<b>\$1,269,624</b>
<b>Total Task Orders Awarded to Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Firms (10%)</b>				<b>\$293,641</b>
<b>Total Task Orders Awarded Local Business Enterprise Firms (9%)</b>				<b>\$259,872</b>
<b>Total Task Orders Awarded to Small Business Enterprise Firms (28%)</b>				<b>\$824,767</b>
<b>Total Contract Amount</b>				<b>\$3,800,000</b>