



DRAFT MINUTES

Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee

Thursday, February 10, 2022

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

Present at Roll Call: Jay Bain, Rosa Chen, Anni Chung, Majeid Crawford, Zack Deutsch-Gross, Jessie Fernandez, Rudy Gonzalez (Alternate for Kim Tavaglione), Daniel Herzstein (Alternate for Rodney Fong), Sharky Laguana, Aaron P. Leifer, Jessica Lum, Jodie Medeiros, Melvin Parham (Alternate for Susan Murphy), Calvin Quick, Pi Ra, Eric Rozell, Earl Shaddix, Yensing Sihapanya, Wesley Tam, Joan Van Rijn, Christopher White (21)

Absent at Roll Call: Mel Flores, Rodney Fong, Amandeep Jawa (arrived Item 3), Maryo Mogannam, Maelig Morvan, Susan Murphy, Maurice Rivers (arrived Item 4), Sujata Srivastava (arrived Item 3), Kim Tavaglione (9)

2. EPAC Chair's Remarks - INFORMATION

Item 2 was called after Item 3. Chair Jawa thanked members for a great meeting last time. He said that the previous meeting set the table for finishing the process. He encouraged commenters to keep remarks short. He said that the goal was to propose an expenditure plan that had broad appeal for a two-thirds majority of voters in November and that no EPAC member would get everything they wanted but the EPAC could make a good plan.

During public comment, Michael Nulty expressed support for sales tax funding of tree planting, opposing any reduction in funding from the level in the initial draft expenditure plan. He also supported more senior-related funding in the proposals.

Danny Campbell (Sheetmetal Workers Local 104) expressed support for the Caltrain Downtown Rail Extension (DTX), saying that it was a high-quality project that would benefit San Francisco residents and workers as well as construction workers.

3. Meeting #9 Recap, Minutes and Follow-Ups - INFORMATION*

Item 3 was called before Item 2. Michelle Beaulieu, Principal Transportation Planner - Government Affairs, presented the item.

There were no questions from EPAC members.

During public comment, Eliana Marcus Tyler, San Francisco Bicycle Coalition, expressed support for Safer and Complete Streets, urged higher funding levels, as well as for non-infrastructure programs such as bicycle education classes funded by Prop K,



the current half-cent sales tax. They said the bicycle education program had been effective, with a 32% increase in biking since the start of the program and graduates expressing increased confidence and feelings of safety. They said there was a growing demand for these classes, and that class participants were majority non-male and Black, Indigenous and People of Color and many classes were multilingual or held in languages other than English.

BART Director Bevan Dufty said BART had made concerted efforts to increase the progressive and equitable character of its service, noting that BART had established youth fares, an elevator attendant program, and progressive policing practices among other services. He said BART's sales tax request would provide funding for Core Capacity, new faregates and modernized elevators. He asked that EPAC consider moving some Muni Priority 1 funds to Priority 2 since they have a large program over many years and increasing Priority 1 funding for BART since their needs are in the near term, thus facilitating additional near-term funding for BART.

Carol Osorio said there would be increased need for paratransit services because of demographic trends such as the aging baby-boomer generation, and that Paratransit funding should be increased. They said Paratransit program employees were employed by the paratransit contract broker and received much lower wages than Muni employees.

Cathy DeLuca, Community Living Campaign, expressed support for increased sales tax funding for Paratransit. They said that while seniors were the fastest growing population segment in San Francisco the current sales tax allocation had not been sufficient to meet the program needs for the last five years and needed to be increased.

Marisol Ferrante, Independent Living Resource Center of San Francisco and paratransit user, said paratransit ridership would increase exponentially. They said that within the previous four years the program's on-time performance had greatly improved and advocated for sufficient funding to keep paratransit reliable.

Gloria Berry said they would like to see more about personal safety on transit, including buses, BART, Caltrain and bicycles as well. They said their daughter had been assaulted while using transit and there should be a better understanding that some people drive because other modes of transportation are not safe.

John Arantes, SEIU 1021, said they represented 1,700 BART frontline and maintenance workers encouraged the EPAC to provide additional support to address BART's needs in the expenditure plan. They said BART supported the economic recovery of San Francisco and the Bay Area post-COVID by carrying workers and residents to San Francisco and that BART was critical to supporting the survival of small businesses in San Francisco.

Josh Klipp expressed support for increased sales tax funding of the Tree Planting program. They said San Francisco was not planting enough trees to keep up with tree



removals. They noted the urban tree canopy was higher in more affluent neighborhoods and there was a lower tree canopy in low-income neighborhoods. They said in addition to providing environmental benefits, planting street trees improved street safety by slowing traffic and were one of the most affordable ways to achieve a transit friendly, environmentally-just city.

Ben Carlson, Friends of the Urban Forest, said tree canopy in San Francisco ranked near bottom among US cities and that tree losses were outpacing planting. They said the City's trees were not equitably distributed and that increasing trees was a major piece of the City's Climate Action Plan. They said the 2016 ballot initiative for street trees covered maintenance only and that this half-cent sales tax was the only dedicated fund source for planting new trees. They said reducing funding would have a devastating impact and that funding new trees would help to offset trees lost to major transportation projects in the future.

Ed Mason commented that a 2008 report by AECOM found that trees were not equitably distributed within the City and proposed several funding sources other than local sales tax, including General Obligation bonds, state Cap and Trade revenue, private contributions, and the City's general fund. He expressed opposition to sales tax funding for street trees, saying that the injury claims from uneven sidewalks, partly due to street trees, cost the City \$275,000 annually and cited sewer damaged related to trees. He also noted that manufacture of the concrete needed for sidewalk repairs had significant climate impacts.

An EPAC member proposed including money for a 3-month Free Muni pilot program, noting that a Free Muni pilot program had received majority support from the Board of Supervisors.

4. Draft Expenditure Plan Discussion - INFORMATION*

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

[Discussion of refinements to a few Expenditure Plan programs to address prior EPAC and sponsor agency requests not related to funding levels]

Chair Jawa expressed his support for the proposed program refinements.

An EPAC member asked if combining the Muni maintenance categories as proposed by SFMTA would provide flexibility to use funding for any of the maintenance programs (Vehicles, Facilities and Guideways) and asked about the implications for Priority 1 vs. Priority 2 funding.

Ms. Beaulieu noted that the proposal did not change overall funding priority levels but did provide more funding flexibility in terms of how much funding could be spent on the different types of maintenance.

The member said it still seemed that the proposal carried implications for the distribution of Priority 1 vs. Priority 2 funds.



Chair Deep clarified that the refinement scenarios were staff recommendations based on EPAC and sponsor agency feedback. He said that while combining categories provided flexibility, EPAC did need to discuss the implications for Priority 1 and Priority 2 funding levels. He suggested that the Priority 2 levels could be useful leverage when negotiating funding levels later in the meeting.

Five members expressed support for separating traffic signals from the larger Safer and Complete Streets program as proposed in the presentation and one member also expressed support for combining the two BART categories (BART Station, Access and Capacity and BART maintenance) and combining the three Muni maintenance programs into one Muni maintenance.

A member asked if “no funding changes” in the scenario chart meant that those amounts could not be changed as part of future discussion.

Ms. Beaulieu answered no, rather it meant that the program refinements being presented did not change the funding levels from the Preliminary Draft Expenditure Plan and that funding levels would be discussed next.

[Discussion on funding level revisions to reduce the Expenditure Plan by \$32.1M in order to meet the revised revenue estimate]

Chair Deep said the programs proposed for reduction were eligible for other funding and/or deferrable and had been vetted with sponsor agencies. He said if the EPAC agreed, this would get the committee to a strong position to figure out what other funding levels they would like changed. He said this part was getting the expenditure plan to meet the revised, lower revenue projection, setting the baseline of agreement to move forward with discussions.

A member expressed some dismay with the reduction to the Caltrain Downtown Rail Extension (DTX) program. They said the federal funding for DTX required local matching funds and reminded the EPAC that DTX was very important to the downtown economy and the labor community.

Chair Deep pointed out that the DTX program had been reduced because the Pennsylvania Avenue Alignment (PAX) had been separated out and PAX could be funded from Priority 2 or the Next Generation Transit Program. He said funding for DTX had not been touched.

A member expressed concern about the reduction to the Development-Oriented Transit program, given the City’s housing affordability crisis. They asked about the impact of the proposed reduction.

Ms. Beaulieu said the Development-Oriented Transit program could not fund housing directly with the transportation sales tax but would fund transportation projects that supported higher residential densities and affordable housing as a way to incentivize housing growth. She said sales tax was not the only source of funding for these types



of project and the reduction reflected input from the EPAC at the last meeting. She added that the program could be a candidate for Priority 2 funding as well.

A member asked for clarification on the Next Generation Transit Investments program.

Ms. Beaulieu responded that the program would fund early phases such as planning and project development of large transit investments like PAX, a potential westside rail line, or a second Transbay tube, and that projects were identified through the countywide plan (San Francisco Transportation Plan) and through the 5-Year Prioritization Program process that is proposed as the method to select projects to fund from the sales tax.

A member said they heard in a previous EPAC meeting there was a connection between SFMTA and Caltrain funding because SFMTA backfills San Francisco's contribution to Caltrain that's not covered by the sales tax, so they would like to understand if when cuts are made to Caltrain, it's also a cut to SFMTA because of the underlying contribution requirement.

Ms. Beaulieu said the Caltrain Service Vision: Capital System Capacity Investments program, one of the programs proposed to receive less Priority 1 funding, was separate from San Francisco's state of good repair (maintenance) commitment to Caltrain, which is reflected in the Caltrain maintenance program in the draft Expenditure Plan. She clarified that the options presented to reduce funding by \$32 million did not propose any cuts to the Caltrain Maintenance program. She said that enhancements like the Caltrain Service Vision were eligible in other programs such as Next Generation Transit Investments.

A member commented that the refinement scenario was not a precise reflection of the EPAC feedback expressed in previous meetings and that other programs had higher numbers to reduce funding. They also said the EPAC wants to center equity in decision-making and the Caltrain Service Vision was about reorienting Caltrain service to serve a broader range of passengers and they did not want to lose the opportunity for Caltrain to become a more equitable system.

Ms. Beaulieu acknowledged some divergences and said it was partially because staff took into consideration the relative size of the programs that EPAC members had indicating they were ok reducing. She said the option presented reflected staff judgment about the level of harm to programs that would result from funding cuts.

Chair Jawa said that staff's proposed scenarios had been intended to identify the outlines of a quick, if rough, consensus, and left room for EPAC to make further refinements.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, said Caltrain's Service Vision was a long-term effort that was also eligible for the Next Generation Transit Investment program because it was still in its early phases. She said Caltrain was also working on near-term equity improvements via near-term changes, such as service changes and looking at affordability programs, that would be implemented well before the Service Vision.



Chair Jawa asked the EPAC if there was consensus that Scenario 1, included in Attachment 4, provided a good baseline for further discussion as it brought the draft Expenditure Plan in line with the revised revenue estimate.

He confirmed there was consensus on Scenario 1 as the new baseline and the EPAC could move on to discussing further refinements to the funding levels in the draft Expenditure Plan.

[Funding levels discussion - Attachment 4]

Chair Jawa said the EPAC's goal was to develop an expenditure plan that could win public support. He reminded members that, while the date of the ballot measure had moved from June to November, they were approaching the deadline by which their work must be complete.

Chair Jawa called for public comment.

During public comment, Alex Lantsberg, said they were in San Francisco's electrical construction industry and expressed support for keeping whole the funding level for DTX. They said the project was vital for the City and for construction jobs, and that it would be a mistake to lose that scale of federal investment due to lack of local commitment.

Charley Lavery, Operating Engineers Local 3, urged support for DTX. They said local commitment was essential for federal funding of this magnitude and that construction projects were a lifeline for underserved communities and families. They said 20% of work hours went to apprentices in order to invest in people and create careers.

Luke Jones, a Muni operator, expressed concern that the draft Expenditure Plan was too vague regarding the scopes of projects and an overall lack of equity in the geographic distribution of funding, especially for the Bayview. They expressed opposition to the proposed reduction in funding for Muni Core Capacity.

Michael Rothmann, with the Parks & Trees Committee, expressed opposition to funding cuts for the Tree Planting program.

Bart Pantoja, trade unions representative of painters and glazers and San Francisco resident, said DTX was ready to go and would bring federal investment to the city. They said it would open up opportunities and help construction workers recover from the pandemic-related recession.

Danny Campbell, Sheetmetal Workers 104, expressed support for DTX.

Dan Torres, Sprinkler Fitters Local 43, expressed support for DTX and said that jobs in that area were crucial for their union members.

Ben Carlson, Friends of the Urban Forest, commented that the EPAC's equity-oriented priorities should support additional planting of street trees in neighborhoods that had been bypassed for urban greening in the past. He said the program was an effective measure for mitigating the impact of climate change.



John Arantes, with SEIU 1021, expressed support for additional BART funding.

John Doherty, a union member, expressed support for DTX and pointed out that the project leveraged local funds at a ratio of 11:1, helped keep San Francisco relevant, and helped keep cars off the road.

Roz Arbel expressed opposition to reducing funding for tree planting. They said trees were essential for wellbeing and help sequester CO2 and that according to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, methane concentrations had exploded, exacerbating the climate crisis.

Bill Blackwell, Plumbers & Pipefitters union, expressed support for DTX and said the last few years had been tough on construction workers and apprenticeships and DTX was ready to go.

Priya Mathur, BART, said the scenarios were not materially different than scenarios last month and they did not reflect the EPAC's intention to increase funding for BART's programs. She said BART's funding was needed for critical investments including \$100 million for core capacity and \$140 million for maintenance, renovation and replacement. She said BART had a diverse workforce, and through contracts employed tens of thousands of additional workers in the Bay Area.

Josh Klipp said if the expenditure plan went forward without funding for tree planting, there would not be broad support and there would be mobilization regarding funding for tree planting. They said trees were critical for encouraging transit, walking, and biking and that trees were important for equity and climate resiliency.

Pedro Mendez, Carpenters Local 22, expressed support for DTX and said workers in the construction trades were important to San Francisco. They said the project would provide green jobs and was important for connecting workers to housing and healthcare.

John Nulty expressed concern about trees being removed in the city. They said Prop E passed in 2017 to fund maintenance of street trees but there was no funding to plant trees. They said trees were being removed at an alarming rate and they would like to maintain \$20 million for the tree planting program.

Ed Mason said tree planting should be funded through a separate ballot measure and fund source, saying that the program competed for funds for other transportation project as long as it was included in the sales tax expenditure plan. They said that, with inflation and public debt, transportation funds would be increasingly difficult to secure.

Bang Ngo, Students for Environment and Equity at De Anza College (SEED), expressed support for an increase in funding for Paratransit, saying the current level of support was not sufficient to meet the need for the service.

Michael Nulty said funding for tree planting should not be eliminated and said, unlike other line items in the draft expenditure plan, did not have alternate fund sources.



Chair Jawa clarified that elimination of funding for tree planting was not on the table but that the EPAC was considering a reduction from \$23.8 million (Priority 1) to either \$20 million (Priority 1 plus \$4 million in Priority 2) or \$22 million (Priority 1 plus \$2 million in Priority 2), depending on the scenario.

Jonathan Rewers, SFMTA, said that Muni was the largest transit agency in the region and carried the majority of ridership in the region and unlike other agencies, did not have dedicated outside fund sources such as BART's \$3.5 billion bond or Caltrain's Measure RR [approved by San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Clara county voters], and that Muni relied on sources within San Francisco to support the system and provide a reliable, safe, clean system.

Cheryl Thornton said the Paratransit program needed additional funding and transit lines were disconnected, making it difficult to get to medical appointments, the grocery store or church without transferring buses and seniors and people with disabilities cannot use standard transit. They said 8% of the expenditure plan was not enough to meet the need.

Pamela Herhold, BART, said BART received revenue from a permanent half-cent sales tax that was shared with other operators and the \$3.5 billion BART Measure RR [approved by Alameda, Contra Costa and San Francisco county voters] was being reinvested with most investment in or benefitting San Francisco.

Chair Jawa addressed the comments that the programs seemed vague and said it was because the EPAC was tasked with laying out categories of funding and priorities for a 30-year plan. He said the committee hears the importance of paratransit and trees and the climate emergency and knows the critical role that all transit operators play in the transportation system. He said the final expenditure plan would necessarily be a compromise.

Public Comment was closed and Chair Jawa asked Ms. Beaulieu to help kick off the funding level discussion.

Ms. Beaulieu suggested starting with the Safer and Complete Streets program which received the most votes for increased funding in the prior EPAC meeting poll.

A member said speaking for the San Francisco biking community, they were leaning toward supporting Scenario 3 and suggested that the Safer and Complete Streets program would most help the City progress toward its Vision Zero goals. They said everybody was affected by a lack of safety on city streets and there was an urgent need. They asked for a minimum of \$7 million be dedicated within this program to the Safe Routes to Schools non-infrastructure program, saying it was vital for families and funding has been inconsistent which reduced efficacy.

A member referenced Scenario 3 and said that once \$90 million was separated out for signals, there was only a slight increase in the Safe and Complete Streets program and comprised only 6% of the overall Expenditure Plan. They advocated increasing Priority 2 funds for the program to bring it to 8%-10% of the Expenditure Plan. They also



expressed support for Safe Routes to School and said there was no other place in the Expenditure Plan that focused on youth, families, and children.

A member expressed caution at reducing funding for Muni Maintenance and said that Scenarios 2 and 3 had a larger cut so they preferred Scenario 1 or 2 but would not want to go to Scenario 3.

Ms. Beaulieu said there was Priority 2 funding in each scenario for equal or more funding than the baseline.

Ms. Lombardo added that Priority 2 funding would come later and maintenance needs continue, making maintenance a good candidate for Priority 2 funding which is more likely to be available in the latter half of the plan period.

A member expressed support for Scenario 2 citing increased Paratransit funding and agreement with where reductions were made.

A member expressed support for Scenario 2, saying it was the most balanced approach and agreed that Muni Maintenance needs to receive as much as possible and Scenario 2 reduced Priority 1 funds for Muni Maintenance less than Scenario 3.

Chair Jawa added that Scenario 2's increase in Priority 2 funds for the Muni Maintenance program could serve as a backstop to mitigate the decrease in Priority 1 funds.

A member said there seemed to be consensus for more funding to BART Core Capacity and they would like to reach at least \$100 million for the program. They said other counties were doing this and they would like to reach \$100 million without lowering funding for the maintenance program.

Chair Jawa asked the member for ideas on which programs to cut to make up the \$20 million difference from the \$80 million shown in Scenario 2 to the desired \$100 million.

The member suggested cuts to categories that seemed to be primarily intended for planning projects, namely Transportation Demand Management and Development Oriented Transportation, indicating there was regional funding for planning.

Chair Jawa asked staff if those were planning-only categories.

Ms. Beaulieu answered that neither category was exclusively for planning [both include planning to identify improvements and funds to implement the recommendations from the planning work] and implementation is the primary intent.

Ms. Lombardo said there may be additional federal funds available for BART Core Capacity, including the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) program for the Transportation Authority had an upcoming call for projects.

The member said the program descriptions sounded like a combination of planning and project development and did not seem like a strong capital program.



Chair Jawa asked why Scenarios 2 and 3 didn't include Priority 2 funds for BART Core Capacity.

Ms. Beaulieu answered that BART's Core Capacity needs were near-term, so Priority 2 funds would not be helpful since they wouldn't be immediately available.

Chair Jawa suggested the EPAC consider moving Priority 1 funds to BART Core Capacity from BART Maintenance and then putting Priority 2 funding to BART Maintenance.

A member expressed support for Scenario 2 but said they were disappointed BART Core Capacity hadn't reached the \$100 million mark. They said San Francisco was not matching other counties and BART and Muni served more equity populations than Caltrain while Caltrain was receiving a sizable investment. They suggested reducing Priority 1 funding for planning programs and giving the funding to BART Core Capacity and then consider giving Priority 2 funding to the planning programs.

A member expressed support for Scenario 2, citing its funding levels for Paratransit and DTX. They expressed concern about reductions to Transportation Demand Management, noting that the projects supported by the program would include anti-violence campaigns such as "Not One More Girl" and fare discount pilots. They said funding for the program was worth preserving in Scenario 2.

A member commented that equity was best served by planning-oriented programs like Transportation Demand Management because they incorporated deeper community involvement. They said Scenario 2 did not include enough funding for Paratransit, citing the Paratransit program in Prop K was running out of funds and there was increasing demand. They said Paratransit staff were trying to make it as cost effective as possible and over 13,000 people used the service.

Chair Jawa pointed out that Scenario 2 increased funding for the Equity Priority Transportation Program as well as Paratransit. He suggested that in its policy discussion the EPAC consider a new equity metric in addition to the existing one for geographic equity.

A member expressed support for Scenario 2 and appreciated the clarification on funding for tree planting, saying there was actually a modest net increase in the scenarios. They also supported preserving Transportation Demand Management funds to the extent possible but supported moving some funds from Development Oriented Transportation to BART Core Capacity if needed. They said as a labor leader they support people of color and low-income people and there was an over reliance on public transit in these populations and BART was essential.

A member expressed support for either Scenarios 2 or 3 because of the increased funding for Paratransit. They said by 2030 seniors would be 30% of San Francisco's population and there were times when paratransit users couldn't go to day centers because of a lack of a ride or taxi vouchers available. They said the funding level was not enough but appreciated the increase and could support Scenario 2 overall.



A member agreed with previous comments that Scenario 2 was balanced but expressed a preference for more funding for the Safer and Complete Streets program, including Priority 2 funding level beyond what was shown in Scenario 3. They said these categories served equity goals because the Vision Zero High Injury network strongly correlated with underserved communities.

Chair Jawa agreed with more funding for the program and asked if the additional funding could be Priority 2 funding.

The member expressed preference for Priority 1 funds. They said they understood the need for DTX funding but were unclear about the minimum level of sales tax funding needed to make the DTX project viable.

Ms. Beaulieu commented that the \$316 million for DTX in all three scenarios included \$16 million carried over from the current Prop K program.

Lily Madjus Wu, TJPA, asked that the EPAC maintain the \$300 million in new funding, along with \$16 million in legacy funding, indicating this was the only non-discretionary funding available and reducing funding would have an impact on ensuring sufficient match to qualify the DTX project for \$900 million in federal funds.

A member agreed with a previous comment that the Safer and Complete Streets program facilitated equitable transportation and expressed support for increased funding for Safer and Complete Streets.

A member commented that the draft preliminary expenditure plan and refinement scenarios lacked sufficient good choices for supporting the transportation needs of low-income communities and people of color. They said they had been under the impression from previous meetings that EPAC support for BART was stronger than for Caltrain and expressed skepticism about chasing federal dollars when federal policy had encouraged San Francisco to become car-oriented in the first place. They advocated for investments in Muni, BART, and Paratransit.

Chair Jawa expressed agreement about the importance of an equity focus and pointed out that the refinement scenarios reduced Caltrain funding by \$10 million. He said there appeared to be consensus among the members that Scenario 2 should be the new baseline for the Expenditure Plan and that there was still interest in increased funding for BART Core Capacity, Safer and Complete Streets and Paratransit. He also suggested formalizing the notion that Equity Priority Communities be a factor in prioritizing projects and said this could be discussed during the policies discussion at the next EPAC meeting.

A member proposed that the agenda for the next meeting should schedule the policy discussion prior to discussion of adjustments to Scenario 2.

Chair Jawa said that policies and funding levels would both be discussed at the next EPAC meeting.



A member expressed strong support for Scenario 2 and prioritizing Equity Priority Communities and asked how funding would be identified for the programs that were still being considered for an increase in funding.

A member commented that funding for the Safer and Complete Streets program was important for helping the City accommodate the pandemic-induced shift away from public transit to biking, walking, riding scooters, and skateboarding and did not want to overlook this transition.

A member thanked members of the public who had called to express support for tree planting. They expressed support for Scenario 2 and, if possible, moving Priority 2 funds for tree planting back to Priority 1.

A member expressed agreement with a previous comment that it was important to maintain funding for the Transportation Demand Management program but said they could support reducing funds and/or shifting to Priority 2 for Development Oriented Transportation and/or Managed Lanes and Express Bus in order to increase funding for BART.

A member expressed support for Scenario 2 because of the increased funding for Paratransit.

A member acknowledged the comments on maintaining funding for Transportation Demand Management and urged staff to think through the amount included for planning. They said some planning had already been done through ConnectSF and they would like to understand where the gaps remained and would like to know where cuts could be made.

Chair Jawa called for public comment on the funding levels discussion.

During public comment, Cheryl Thornton, a resident of the southeast section of District 10, expressed support for a new Caltrain station and more Muni bus lines, saying the area lacked good transit connections to downtown job centers.

Gloria Berry expressed appreciation for the EPAC's focus on Equity Priority Communities but disagreed that the Safer and Complete Streets program was an equity poster child. They said street closures were a nuisance and were discontinued in the Bayview and constructing curb ramps weren't a solution to repairing past harm in communities brought by transportation projects. They also asked that the EPAC find a way to better accommodate public comment.

Ed Mason said that EPAC should understand the implications of ConnectSF and expressed concern that the ConnectSF process could lead the Muni Core Capacity program to make changes that would exclude the J-line from the subway.

Cooper Makhijani expressed concern that so much sales tax funding was being considered for the DTX, given Caltrain's low ridership compared with BART and Muni. They said funding could be better spent on safer streets, maintenance deferrals and service improvements for BART and Muni.



Roland LeBrun said EPAC should understand that Caltrain ridership would increase as a result of the Downtown Rail Extension and Pennsylvania Avenue Alignment projects, and said the projects were critical to the feasibility of a second BART Transbay crossing.

Ben Carlson commented that, while the EPAC consensus might support Scenario 2, it was the worst of the scenarios for Tree Planting and urged the EPAC to protect tree funding.

Chair Deep thanked the members of the public who had called in to comment.

5. Public Comment

There was no general public comment.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:43 p.m.