



DRAFT MINUTES

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Tuesday, September 13, 2022

1. Roll Call

Chair Mandelman called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

Present at Roll Call: Commissioners Chan, Dorsey, Mandelman, Preston, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, and Walton (9)

Absent at Roll Call: Commissioners Mar (entered during Item 2) Melgar (entered during item 7) (2)

2. [Final Approval on First Appearance] Approve the Resolution Making Findings to Allow Teleconferenced Meetings under California Government Code Section 54953(e) - ACTION

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Peskin moved to approve the Resolution, seconded by Commissioner Dorsey.

The Resolution was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Dorsey, Mar, Mandelman, Preston, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, and Walton (10)

Absent: Commissioner Melgar (1)

3. Approve the Minutes of the July 26, 2020 Meeting - ACTION

There was no public comment.

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

The Consent Agenda was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Dorsey, Mar, Mandelman, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, and Walton (10)

Absent: Commissioner Melgar (1)

4. Community Advisory Committee Report - Information*

Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Member Kevin Ortiz reported that the July 27th CAC meeting was primarily focused on informational items such as an update on the CAC By-Laws and an ethics training. He continued by stating that at the September 7th meeting the CAC had a lengthy discussion on the One Bay Area Grant Cycle 3 project nominations, particularly around the Elevator Modernization design project. Member Ortiz reported that he had made the motion to move funds from the BART fare gates project to the Elevator Modernization Design for the 16th,



24th, and Balboa Park Stations that was not a part of the staff recommendation. Member Ortiz cited concerns about moving funds from those more working-class stations that are primarily serving Latine-X neighborhoods and instead using funds to replacing BART's fare gates [at San Francisco's BART stations]. Mr. Ortiz related that he did eventually vote for the staff recommendation but requested that there be ongoing updates by BART to the CAC about funding and a timeline for these stations, starting with the October and December CAC meetings.

There was no public comment.

5. Appoint One Member to the Community Advisory Committee - ACTION

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

Najuawanda Daniels spoke to her interest and qualifications in being appointed to the CAC.

Commissioner Walton expressed his support for Ms. Daniels and his excitement to have her join the CAC.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Walton moved to appoint Ms. Daniels to the CAC, seconded by Commissioner Stefani.

The motion to reappoint Ms. Daniels was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Dorsey, Mar, Mandelman, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, and Walton (10)

Absent: Commissioner Melgar (1)

6. State and Federal Legislation Update - INFORMATION*

Mark Watts, the Transportation Authority's State Legislative Advocate, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

There was no public comment.

7. Adopt San Francisco's One Bay Area Grant Cycle 3 Project Nominations – ACTION*

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Commissioner Ronen stated that she did not understand why the staff recommendation for the Elevator Modernization Design at 16th Street Mission, 24th Street Mission, and Balboa Park Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) stations was \$0 when the request was for nearly \$5 million. She also said that she did not understand why the elevators at Embarcadero, Montgomery Street, Powell Street, Civic Center/UN Plaza, and Glen Park stations were prioritized over the Mission Street and Balboa Park station elevators, when those elevators were in need of modernization.

Ms. LaForte responded that both elevator projects scored closely, however the funding for Elevator Modernization Project Phase 1.3 would round out the funding



plan for construction, which was slated to start in the beginning of 2023. She said that BART's request for the Elevator Modernization Project at 16th Street Mission, 24th Street Mission, and Balboa Park stations was for the design phase, which was slated to start in January 2025. Ms. LaForte stated that one of the things staff considered, in addition to score order, was whether alternative funding sources could be available for projects. She explained that the Transportation Authority had a history of funding elevator design and construction through the Prop K sales tax, Prop AA vehicle registration fee and potentially from state funding and that was taken into consideration in the final recommendations. She noted that the CAC amendment to report back on the funding plan and schedule for the Elevator Modernization Project at 16th Street Mission, 24th Street Mission, and Balboa Park would help ensure that the funding conversations would advance and the proposed project schedule would stay on track.

Commissioner Ronen asked BART to explain why the 16th Street Mission, 24th Street Mission, and Balboa Park elevators were deprioritized compared to the other stations and why they were on a later timeline. She stated that the 16th Street Mission and 24th Street Mission stations were a mess and they had not historically been prioritized.

Rob Jaques, Manager of Grants and Funding Advocacy at BART, responded that the elevator modernization program was a system wide program to improve and modernize all the elevators across the BART system. He stated that one of the challenges with the program was to secure funding, so the elevator team at BART had prioritized the elevators system wide based on current condition such as downtime and ridership at the station. He continued to explain that the stations with heavier use and elevators in the worst condition were prioritized first, leading to BART's prioritization of the four Market Street elevators. Mr. Jaques stated there was work done on the 24th Street Mission elevators in 2019 and 2021 to replace certain components when the elevators went out of service to work as a bridge until funding could be secured to advance design and construction for elevator modernization at that station. He continued by noting that significant funding for the four downtown elevators and the Glen Park elevator had been secured in the past several years from Prop K, Prop AA, MUNI, and other funding sources, including federal funds, and as a result, the Elevator Modernization Project Phase 1.3 would be ready to advance to construction and would be completed by 2029. Mr. Jaques stated that the remaining stations in San Francisco were in an earlier stage of development and did not have funding committed yet and if the Elevator Modernization Design at 16th Street Mission, 24th Street Mission, and Balboa Park stations was funded at this time, that would allow design to begin in a few years.

Mr. Jaques explained that one of the factors BART considered when they submitted applications for OBAG was the expenditure timeline for the funds. He explained that the obligation deadline for OBAG 3 funds was 2027 and based on that, the sequencing of BART applications reflected how quickly the projects could spend the funds. He stated that BART's top priority project (Next Generation Fare Gates) could spend the funds more quickly than the second (Elevator Modernization Phase 1.3), which could spend funds more quickly than the third project (Elevator Modernization Design at 16th Street Mission, 24th Street Mission, and Balboa Park) and that was how BART prioritized the projects for this specific funding source.



Commissioner Ronen stated that BART did request funding for the Elevator Modernization Design at 16th Street Mission, 24th Street Mission, and Balboa Park and it is the staff that recommended \$0 funding allocation and that she did not weigh in on the decision. She asked what the impact on the timeline of the Mission Street and Balboa Park elevators would be if the staff recommendation were followed.

Mr. Jaques responded that BART was looking ahead at Measure L which would have funds set aside for BART. He stated that the timeline would be impacted by various factors and there were federal resources to put towards the project, but that it could delay the design phase of the project.

Sylvia Lamb, Chief Maintenance and Engineering Officer at BART, stated that there were funds invested in the 16th Street Mission, 24th Street Mission, and Balboa Park elevators right now in the planning phase. She stated that it was not a matter of delaying that project, but rather the elevators in Phase 1.3 would be able to be accelerated because they were ready to go. She stated that BART was constantly looking for funds to keep projects moving and the elevators at 16th Street Mission, 24th Street Mission, and Balboa Park were next on the list and BART would continue to work on planning and securing funds.

Commissioner Ronen asked if the \$5 million for design would accelerate the timeline for the Elevator Modernization Design project at 16th Street Mission, 24th Street Mission, and Balboa Park.

Ms. Lamb responded yes. [Subsequently clarified that the \$5 million would enable the design phase to start in January 2025 as listed in the OBAG application.]

Commissioner Safai expressed disappointment in the staff recommendations. He stated that he supported the planning for future growth and development on Treasure Island, however the level of investment that had gone to the Balboa Park BART station and transportation infrastructure has been paltry. He stated that he had to fight between BART, SFMTA, and the Transportation Authority for \$1-\$2 million in funding to finish a plaza at the Balboa Park station. He stated that the Balboa Park station was one of the most highly frequented stations in the BART system. He stated he would support bike paths on Treasure Island. He stated that there had been stories written about seniors and people with disabilities who could not get into the station, and he would not vote for the recommendation today. He stated that he would like staff to revisit the recommendations and that the recommendations were for projects everywhere but his district and he was tired of his district being overlooked.

Commissioner Melgar echoed Commissioner Safai's comments regarding the Balboa Park station. She asked staff to discuss improvements that were happening that were not specifically transportation but related to transportation. She stated that she had been working with Commissioner Safai on the transit plan for Ocean Avenue, which the Transportation Authority had worked on as well, and which was related to the ridership at the Balboa Park BART and Muni stations. She stated that the connection of Muni and BART at the Balboa Park station, which served important schools, was terrible. She stated that it was important to create the infrastructure for young people and the merchant corridor along Ocean Avenue to succeed. She stated that the Housing Element, which would be up for approval by the Board in January 2023, had slated more density for Ocean Avenue and the surrounding neighborhoods, including affordable housing units. She expressed understanding of Mr. Jaques and Ms. Lamb's



earlier comments regarding the condition of elevators and ridership of BART stations. She asked for staff to speak to how the Transportation Authority was looking forward to the ambitious projects that were attached to additional housing and transportation funding and that were related to addressing the climate crisis.

Tilly Chang, Executive Director of the Transportation Authority, thanked Commissioners Ronen and Safai for their feedback and comments and recommended that the conversation continue with BART staff, which submitted three proposals for the OBAG Cycle 3 funding. She started that the 29 Sunset Improvement Project Phase 1 was on the staff recommendation list and served the Ocean Avenue corridor and Balboa Park and District 11 riders. She expressed understanding regarding the concerns about the funding for the Mission Street and Balboa Park elevators. She stated that the \$5 million design request was a request that staff could be creative with in terms of securing funding and could continue to work with BART staff to fund that design in parallel with the OBAG requests. She stated that OBAG was only one funding source and staff could reconsider the prioritization but must also consider all the other projects that were happening, as well.

Director Chang stated that the Transportation Authority was constantly working with the Commissioners and other transportation agencies on projects, such as the Ocean Avenue Corridor Action Plan, and on projects that have a land use component as well. She stated that the staff considered the criteria that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission established. She asked that the Board would not shift funds away from projects such as the Central Embarcadero Safety Project, the Bayview Community Multimodal Corridor, and the West Side Bridges projects. She stated that the West Side Bridges project was shovel-ready and had federal funding. She stated that staff could be creative in ways to advance the elevator design at the Mission Street stations and stated that staff would work on it and bring it back to the Board.

Commissioner Walton asked if it was possible to pull projects off the list and still vote on projects that they would like to support.

Ms. Chang replied yes.

Commissioner Ronen stated that she understood the funding was relational so the Board should consider the OBAG project nominations as a whole. She asked if continuing the item would have any negative impacts.

Ms. LaForte replied that the deadline to submit the list of prioritized projects to MTC was September 30 so the item could be continued without impact.

Commissioner Ronen made a motion to continue the item to the September 27 meeting.

Commissioner Safai seconded the motion.

Bevan Dufty, BART Board of Directors, stated that BART spoke with all the Commissioners, except for Commissioner Dorsey, during the prior Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee process and BART was outspoken in the needs they had and how important BART was in the recovery of San Francisco. He stated that he welcomed the conversation and the opportunity to work with Transportation Authority staff and to meet with Commissioners Ronen and Safai.

Janice Li, BART Board of Directors, stated that she appreciated the comments and the



due diligence and echoed Director Dufty's comments. She stated that BART would continue working with Transportation Authority staff to find a path forward and expressed a commitment to funding all the projects with the limited funding that was available.

Commissioner Mar expressed appreciation for the discussion around the elevator modernization projects at the Mission Street and Balboa Park stations to ensure they would move forward whether it was from OBAG 3 funding or another source. He expressed strong support for the 29 Sunset Improvement Project on the staff recommendation list and stated that it was an important project due to the route connecting the West side of San Francisco with the Southeastern neighborhoods and it served many schools along the line. He stated that he, along with Commissioners Chan and Melgar, had been advocating for significant improvements to North-South transit on the West side and this funding would be an important first step to improving and expanding transit there. He thanked the SFMTA and Transportation Authority for their work on the 29 Sunset Improvement Project application and the Transportation Authority staff for their work on the overall package of OBAG 3 funding proposals.

There was no public comment

Chair Mandelman continued the item at the September 27 Board meeting.

8. Allocate \$4,412,805 in Prop K Funds and \$324,000 in Prop AA Funds, with Conditions, for Four Requests – ACTION*

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Commissioner Safai said that Sickles Ave was one of the highest injury locations in the city and was extremely dangerous for children, seniors, and families. He stated that the design would address injuries, pedestrian safety, and bicycle safety issue given its located near the freeway and various neighborhoods. He also was glad that tree planting was moving forward and expressed his satisfaction with the tree maintenance work conducted by SF Clean City, a female-owned small business in district.

During public comment, Gia Grant, SF Clean City Executive Director said her organization is a non-profit that operates as a social enterprise. She added that Clean City has watered the trees in District 11 and in the southeast part of the city for about five years. She said she looks forward to seeing the data that Public Works will produce regarding survival rates for new trees. She also said that Clean City not only conducted tree maintenance but was a workforce program for low-income San Franciscans.

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

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

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

9. San Francisco Transportation Plan Update - INFORMATION*

Aliza Paz, Principal Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.



Commissioner Preston asked what assumptions about transit fares were made in the 30-year revenue projections.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, answered that the Transportation Authority used the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's long-term planning estimates. Ms. Lombardo also shared that the Free Muni for All Youth program was assumed to continue throughout the 30-year plan period.

Commissioner Preston asked for confirmation that scheduled fare increases were assumed in the revenue projections and that the projections did not include expansion of free or reduced fare programs outside of Free Muni for All Youth. Ms. Lombardo confirmed that this was correct.

Commissioner Preston noted that affordability was listed in the San Francisco Transportation Plan (SFTP) policy priorities and initiatives. He then confirmed with Transportation Authority staff that Free Muni for All Youth was the only investment in the SFTP specifically targeted at transit affordability. Commissioner Preston urged the Transportation Authority to consider additional discounted or free transit pilots or policies. Commissioner Preston noted that other peer cities across the US were piloting free or reduced transit fares. He said that he would like to see discussion in the SFTP about fare assumptions and about approaches to invest in transit affordability.

Chair Mandelman shared that it would be interesting to see how free or reduced fares affect funding for transit operations.

Tilly Chang, Executive Director, shared that the Transportation Authority understood the importance of this topic. She shared that in both the SFTP's Investment Plan, which was constrained to expected revenues, and in the Vision Plan, which assumed additional new revenues, San Francisco was unable to fund transit service equivalent to what existed in 2019. She said that this was an important debate to have: we could spend resources on improving affordability or on restoring service. Ms. Chang said that this was a national conversation as cities were faced with reduced fare revenue and expiring COVID relief funds. Ms. Chang said that we needed to move toward a different way of funding transit which was not based on ridership and fares. She referenced the library system where voters were asked to tap the city's property tax base, as one example of an alternate funding system.

Chair Mandelman asked for clarification about what transit service the SFTP Investment and Vision Plans could fund.

Mx. Paz shared that the Investment Plan could fund the same level of service that San Franciscans experienced in 2022. In the vision plan, additional revenues would allow San Francisco to restore service which would bring the city closer to 2019 service levels but some gaps would remain.

Chair Mandelman responded that while Commissioner Preston was interested in reduced fares, he was interested in frequent service. He remarked that the SFTP was unable to restore service or reduce fares but rather gets San Francisco to a place where unmet needs remain.

Mx. Paz shared that the SFTP is updated every four years, and this was a particularly challenging time for an update. They shared that there was an opportunity in four



years to revisit revenue estimates and operational changes.

Ms. Chang mentioned that the State of California could be a partner in solving these transit funding challenges, however when asked, San Francisco's state delegation noted that these challenges were a national issues, and they were hesitant to get ahead of the national conversation. Ms. Chang said the next few years could be instructive as we see how revenues change and the national conversation evolves. Ms. Chang also noted that there were challenges to how the city was allowed to allocate various funding sources. As examples, she said that the city would like to spend more money on transit operations, but some funds are only eligible to be spent on capital improvements. She noted that funding for operations was hard to find, and that reality was important to consider for future revenue measures.

Commissioner Mandelman remarked on the fact that nearly 75% of Investment Plan revenues were regional and local. He noted that our local sales tax was often used to leverage federal capital dollars and asked whether the 75% local contribution was due to operational revenues. Ms. Chang confirmed that this was the case.

Commissioner Preston shared his ongoing frustration that conversations about fare reductions were framed in the context of reduced service. He said that there needed to be a more transparent discussion around fares and the impacts of reducing them in the City's long-term plans. He said that many San Franciscans were passionate about fare relief and wanted to find alternative funding for operations. He believed assuming our fare policy remained stagnant was a missed opportunity

There was no public comment.

Other Items

10. Introduction of New Items - INFORMATION

There were no new items introduced.

11. Public Comment

Roland Lebrun commented on item 8 and said that he would like the Board or their staff, in conjunction with MTC, to pay close attention to some of the projects that come before them for funding. He suggests that they pay attention to the Caltrain Guadalupe River Bridge included in Item #8, located between Diridon and Tamien, and ask that they look closely at where the money is going rather than just the amount.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:27 a.m.