## OVERALL COMMENTS

**I would like to see an allocation towards improving the rider experience with on-transit/in station ambassadors and station elevator/restroom attendants…ambassadors can offer a welcoming presence to those returning to public transit, as well as hospitality and wayfinding services…and would be able to offer/refer individuals in need to supportive services.**

**I am also curious about how funds are allocated for climate resilience (e.g. sea level rise, heavy rains) and emergency preparedness (e.g. big earthquake).**

**Fund maintenance over expansion; small programs are where equity is, not in Caltrain.**

**I would like to see monies transferred off Caltrain and added to BART.**

## MAJOR TRANSIT PROJECTS

**Muni Reliability and Efficiency Improvements**

- Keep as is
- Interest in giving P2 funding

**Muni Rail Core Capacity, e.g. Train Control**

- Keep as is
- Okay to decrease (no more than indicated in Draft Scenario A); backfill in P2 if possible

**BART Core Capacity**

- Keep as is
- Interest in increasing funding

**Caltrain Service Vision: Capital System Capacity Investments**

- Keep as is

**Caltrain Downtown Rail Extension and Pennsylvania Alignment**

- Would be open to reducing. Doesn’t look like other jurisdictions are contributing to this cost, even though commuters coming through/into San Francisco would benefit from PAX and downtown extension. Would like to see outreach to other counties before proceeding with this expenditure level.
- Interest in decreasing funding

## TRANSIT MAINTENANCE & ENHANCEMENTS

**Muni - Vehicles Maintenance**

- Would be open to reducing the rubber tire maintenance due to road damage? If so, is there an opportunity for DPW to improve the roads so MUNI vehicles could last longer? Would like to learn about DPW’s priorities for road maintenance, esp for roads used heavily by buses.
- I am not supportive of cutting these amounts from what was proposed in the preliminary draft EP
- Interest in giving P2 funding

**Muni - Facilities Maintenance**

- Keep as is
- I am not supportive of cutting these amounts from what was proposed in the preliminary draft EP

**Muni - Guideways Maintenance**

- Keep as is
- I am not supportive of cutting these amounts from what was proposed in the preliminary draft EP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Funding Flexibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BART Maintenance</td>
<td>Consider increasing to maintain and improve elevator infrastructure, access, and experience.</td>
<td>How flexible is the $100 million for Caltrain maintenance? Just comparing it to the allocation for BART maintenance in the context table, the funding needs seem basically equivalent for both systems, but the Caltrain allocation is much higher. I would support shifting some of the Caltrain maintenance funding over to BART in Priority 1, as long as the Caltrain allocation is still relieving SFMTA in the short-to-medium term from paying SF's member contributions to the PCJPB out of their operating budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Maintenance</td>
<td>Keep as is</td>
<td>Interest in decreasing funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Maintenance</td>
<td>Should add funds to support and expand ferry service to diversify transit options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Enhancements</td>
<td>Would like to see how these funds have been used in the past to illustrate how they might be used in the future. Could these funds be allocated to specific line items now? How was $38.1 determined?</td>
<td>Okay to decrease (not more than $30M); backfill in P2 if possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Station Access, Safety and Capacity</td>
<td>Why is this a separate line item if the same projects are eligible for BART maintenance and Transit enhancements? Could this be labeled to support improvements to the rider experience, such as safety ambassadors, bathroom/elevator attendants, etc?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayview Caltrain Station</td>
<td>Keep as is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Bay Ferry Landing</td>
<td>Keep as is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Generation Transit Investments</td>
<td>Keep as is</td>
<td>Okay to decrease; backfill in P2 if possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARATRANSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment 3. Summary of EPAC Member Comments
### Received between meetings regarding funding levels for Draft Expenditure Plan Programs

**February 18, 2022**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paratransit</th>
<th>Keep as is</th>
<th>If the consensus of the committee is to support a large portion of Priority 2 funding going to Paratransit (as suggested in all three January 13 scenarios), I will support it. My only wonder is whether this is an appropriate use of the Priority 1/Priority 2 distinction, given that Paratransit funding is mostly covering operating costs, which are less flexible year-over-year. I would support making most of the increases we want to make to Paratransit funding in Priority 1, and focus Priority 2 funding on programs that have less immediate needs but may require much higher levels of funding in the future (for example, Next Gen transit investments, Transformative Freeway projects, etc.).</th>
<th>Interest in increasing funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STREETS &amp; FREEWAYS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Resurfacing, Rehabilitation and Maintenance</td>
<td>Keep as is</td>
<td>Okay to decrease; backfill in P2 if possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Would like to see this increased, as the disparity between street maintenance for cars vs. bikes seems quite significant. In a post-pandemic world, should we expect more visitors, commuters, residents to walk, bike, and scoot more?</td>
<td>Interest in increasing funding; interest in giving P2 funding; met with Stefani’s staff, wondering how much urban + streetscape design is a factor in this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe and Complete Streets</td>
<td>Keep as is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Ramps</td>
<td>Keep as is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Planting</td>
<td>Would like to decrease this expense, as DPW should be responsible for street trees. Since this item also addresses public health. Does DPH allocate any budget to support this?</td>
<td>Keep as is, prioritize EPCs and neighborhoods with few street trees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision Zero Ramps</td>
<td>Keep as is</td>
<td>Okay to decrease (this mainly because I am unconvinced by the premise that these projects are a useful Vision Zero strategy, would support moving part or all of this program to Safe and Complete Streets or Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Maintenance, but defer to Bike Coalition here)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Managed Lanes and Express Bus
- **Comments:**
  - Okay reducing P1 by $5M, making up for it in P2; expand eligibility to include "planning and implementation of transit-only lanes, pending changes to Caltrans restrictions."

### Transformative Freeway & Major Street Projects
- **Comments:**
  - Within the timespan of the EP, would it be worth prioritizing this item, which I see as potentially being a key equity priority if implemented justly, for Priority 2 funding? I would be supportive of a pretty high proportion of Priority 2 funding going here, and an increase in Priority 1 funding if possible (if push comes to shove though, I would rather Priority 1 focus on transit capital needs as those directly impact Muni riders on a day-to-day basis).
  - Interest in decreasing funding

### Transportation Demand Management
- **Comments:**
  - Okay to decrease; backfill in P2 if possible
  - Interest in giving P2 funding

### Neighborhood Transportation Program
- **Comments:**
  - Okay to decrease; backfill in P2 if possible
  - Hope that the Neighborhood and Equity Priority Transportation Programs can become integrated into other project planning processes as a framework, rather than as a standalone process

### Equity Priority Transportation Program
- **Comments:**
  - Hope that the Neighborhood and Equity Priority Transportation Programs can become integrated into other project planning processes as a framework, rather than as a standalone process

### Development Oriented Transportation
- **Comments:**
  - Keep as is

### Citywide / Modal Planning
- **Comments:**
  - Keep as is