



DRAFT MINUTES

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

Tuesday, September 12, 2017

1. Roll Call

Chair Peskin called the meeting to order at 10:08 a.m.

Present at Roll Call: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Tang and Yee (9)

Absent at Roll Call: Commissioners Farrell and Sheehy (both entered during Item 3) (2)

2. Citizens Advisory Committee Report – INFORMATION

Chair Peskin stated that the CAC did not have a quorum for its September 6, 2017 meeting and instead held an informational workshop.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, stated that all of the items on the CAC agenda were presented and the CAC members in attendance engaged in discussion but since there was no quorum there were no official CAC positions on the items and no minutes from the workshop.

There was no public comment.

3. Approve the Minutes of the July 25, 2017 Meeting – ACTION

Commissioner Tang moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Commissioner Yee.

There was no public comment.

The minutes were approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Farrell, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy, Tang and Yee (11)

4. Appoint One Member to the Citizens Advisory Committee – ACTION

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

Hala Hijazi and Jackie Sachs spoke to their interests and qualifications in being appointed to the CAC.

Commissioner Farrell stated that Hala Hijazi had served the city in various capacities for over 15 years and was a District 2 resident for over 10 years. He said she had close ties to the neighborhood and various constituencies and was looking forward to her bringing a fresh perspective to the CAC. He thanked long-time representative Jackie Sachs for her service on the CAC as well.

Commissioner Farrell moved to appoint Hala Hijazi to the Citizens Advisory Committee, seconded by Commissioner Tang.

There was no public comment.

The motion to appoint Ms. Hijazi was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Farrell, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy, Tang and Yee (11)

5. Update on State and Federal Legislation – INFORMATION

Mark Watts, State Legislative Advocate, presented the item.

There was no public comment.

6. Allocate \$5,820,000 in Prop K Sales Tax Funds for Thirteen Requests, with Conditions – ACTION

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

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Farrell, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy, Tang and Yee (11)

7. Program \$20.793 Million in San Francisco's One Bay Area Grant Cycle 2 Funds to Four Projects and Amend the Prop AA Strategic Plan – ACTION

Chair Peskin commented that there was a high level of public interest given the number of people in attendance and noted that the Board did not need to take immediate action on the item.

Amber Crabbe, Assistant Deputy for Policy and Programming, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Commissioner Kim thanked staff for following up on all the questions she had previously raised about the BART Elevators and Better Market Street projects and that she was now comfortable supporting these projects.

Commissioner Cohen commented that she was not comfortable with the proposed cut to the non-infrastructure Safe Routes to School (SRTS) project. She asked about the equity impact of the funding cut and how the Board could ensure that the funds would be invested in the schools most in need of safe access infrastructure. She expressed support for the goals of the SRTS program, and recommended improved evaluation metrics to make the program more effective.

Chair Peskin said it was his understanding that the Board was mainly concerned with the effectiveness of the SRTS non-infrastructure program and said staff from the Department of Public Health (DPH) was available to answer questions about how the program was administered.

Commissioner Yee agreed that the main issue was whether the program was effective, and said he was interested in measures to evaluate and ensure effectiveness rather than cutting funding on the assumption that the program was not effective. He said he did not support the staff recommendation and instead proposed using the funds to set up a reserve that would be available if and when DPH could demonstrate that the program was effective. Chair Peskin

noted that the reserve funds would not be available until Fiscal Year 2019/20. Ms. Crabbe clarified that the proposed cut was not based on an assumption that the program was not effective, but was based on a perceived need to balance funding for non-infrastructure and infrastructure projects given Board feedback.

Commissioner Sheehy agreed that the SRTS program could be a great asset and that the issue was sufficient metrics to evaluate the effectiveness of the program. He said the effectiveness of capital improvements was a separate issue, but one that should also be evaluated.

Ana Valizdic, Program Manager at DPH, said DPH had distributed a memo to the Board outlining plans for annual reporting of program performance. She said efforts to evaluate outcomes would include bi-annual surveys regarding students' travel mode to school to evaluate changes in travel behavior and to compare against schools without an active SRTS program. She said program staff would also be working with the Vision Zero coalition to evaluate the effectiveness of the program in reducing injuries and collisions. Chair Peskin asked about the evaluation process that was already in place. Ms. Valizdic said the program began in 2009 with five elementary schools, and had been using a form created by the National Center for SRTS to track student travel modes. She said the revised evaluation program would include linkage to Vision Zero and safety outcomes. Ms. Valizdic said that in addition to outcomes, program evaluation would include performance measures such as the number of events hosted by the program, attendees, walking school bus events organized by the program, and neighborhood task force meetings between parents and program staff. Ms. Valizdic said the SRTS program would be partnering with Tenderlion Safe Passage for technical assistance on replicating its Corner Captain program and implementing performance metrics for that. She concluded that DPH would be soliciting more direct input from parents through surveys or focus groups, and that those results would be reported out as well. Chair Peskin asked how many program staff there were, to which Ms. Valizdic replied that the program consisted of 1.5 full time positions including herself.

Commissioner Kim emphasized the importance of evaluating mode shift outcomes over performance measures such as the number of meetings or participants. Ms. Valizdic clarified that evaluation of mode shift outcomes was part of the evaluation process and that DPH had already contracted with the University of California Berkeley to do the analysis. Commissioner Kim asked about results from past years. Ms. Valizdic replied that schools participating in the program had biking and walking mode shares of 27%, whereas those mode shares for non-participating schools was 22%. Commissioner Kim asked if that difference reflected an improvement as a result of the program or if participating schools could have had high walking and biking mode shares prior to participation. Ms. Valizdic replied that the program's selection methodology gave preference to schools with low walking and biking mode shares as long as there were residential neighborhoods within a mile radius.

Commissioner Fewer expressed support for fully funding the SRTS program and for safe commute education. She agreed that stronger evaluation would be helpful, but that full funding for the non-infrastructure initiatives was needed. She said infrastructure improvements and additional crossing guards were also needed, but not at the expense of the non-infrastructure program.

Chair Peskin said the lack of robust outcome evaluation in past years was what led the Board to question the effectiveness of the program. He said the relatively small commute differences

between participating and nonparticipating schools were not encouraging, given the cost of the program.

Commissioner Tang agreed and cited results from previous SRTS reports showing decreases in walking and biking. She expressed doubt about the cost effectiveness of the program and suggested that, given that driving was a necessary part of the commute for many parents, the program goals should include safe automobile drop-off of students. Commissioner Tang recommended several changes in the structure of the program, including a reduction in the number of participating schools, more comprehensive evaluations of the infrastructure needs for safe access, and a change in the selection methodology to emphasize schools with needs for safer access infrastructure. She asked how DPH coordinated with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) on identifying and prioritizing needed infrastructure improvements. Ms. Valizdic replied that the program had been coordinating with the SFMTA since before the inception of Vision Zero, and that coordination involved preparation of a prioritized list by DPH based on input from schools and parents, and validation of the proposals based on walking audits and other field investigations by SFMTA staff. Commissioner Tang said she did not consider the staff proposal to be a cut to the program because the funding would be used to enhance safe access to schools through a stronger emphasis on capital improvements.

Chair Peskin said he understood Commissioner Tang's frustration that there was no single agency or program responsible for coordinating capital improvements and non-capital initiatives.

Commissioner Kim suggested that bringing back school buses could be part of the solution.

Nik Kaestner, Sustainability Director at the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD), said SFUSD was developing a transportation plan that would be completed in about a year, and noted that a renewed school bus program was an option under consideration. He said the number of parents driving students to school increased by several percentages when the school bus program was cut several years before, so renewing the program could result in a measurable improvement in mode share. Commissioner Kim suggested that a portion of the funds allocated for SRTS could be used for a school bus program. Mr. Kaestner said eliminating unnecessary trips was more efficient than any mode of transportation, so the SFUSD transportation plan would also be looking at strategies such as increased participation in on-site after-school programs.

Commissioner Ronen said she drove her child to school given time constraints despite its participation in the SRTS program. She said getting her child to school would require a program such as a school bus or organized carpool, and that infrastructure improvements alone would not be sufficient to change the mode of her child's school commute. Ms. Crabbe also noted that the SRTS program did have a cell phone application for organizing carpools and meet-ups for parent-escorted walks to school. Tilly Chang, Executive Director, said the OBAG program was a limited fund source that was intended to be used strategically to leverage other funds and to encourage the use of more sustainable travel modes. She said she had spoken to Commissioners Tang and Sheehy about continuing the Child Transportation Study, and that outcomes of that study could include recommendations for new school buses, among other possibilities.

Chair Peskin asked about coordination among City agencies regarding school transportation. Ms. Valizdic said the SRTS program involved monthly coordination meetings with the SFMTA, frequent meetings with SFUSD and individual school administrators, as well as frequent ad hoc communication among City agencies.

Commissioner Safai commented that the SRTS program appeared to be designed to address the needs of neighborhood schools, and pointed out that many San Francisco children did not attend schools in their own neighborhoods. He said funding for a school bus program was important but was a separate conversation. He recommended that evaluation of infrastructure needs for safe access to schools be added to the scope of the program, but said the SRTS non-infrastructure program was important and supported fully funding it.

Commissioner Breed agreed that the city's school choice policy had made getting to school more complex. She said she was surprised that the SRTS program did not consider transportation options such as after-school shuttles, school buses or crossing guards. She said the program looked good on paper but that she had not heard from any parents that had benefited from the program and doubted that it delivered the needed outcomes. She also expressed doubt that infrastructure projects would necessarily be more effective, and recommended that the SRTS allocation be continued pending recommendations on the most effective ways to enhance safe access to schools. Ms. Crabbe clarified that crossing guard and school bus programs were not eligible for OBAG funds.

Commissioner Yee asked for a more detailed presentation of the results of the outcome measures, with a breakdown of the impact on all travel modes. He recommended that outcome measures emphasize safety in addition to mode shift, to which Ms. Valizdic confirmed that was the proposal going forward. Commissioner Yee noted that there was much less funding for non-infrastructure projects, and said he felt strongly that it should not be shifted to infrastructure projects. He said a balance between capital projects and education and outreach was important for an effective overall policy.

Commissioner Tang cited results of a survey of parents in the program's 2015 report showing that the top perceived barriers to students' biking and walking to school were intersection safety, traffic speed, travel time, crime and distance. She said those results supported her recommendation to use some of the SRTS funds for infrastructure improvements. She acknowledged that the amount in question would not go a long way towards construction, but suggested it could be used for planning and design so that capital projects would be more competitive for construction funds from other sources.

Commissioner Fewer said advocacy for school buses should be part of a larger discussion of education priorities such as summer school funding and equity concerns. She said if faced with a choice she would choose summer school over school buses. She pointed out that the freedom to choose distant schools presented complex equity issues because many families lacked the resources to exercise that freedom.

Commissioner Cohen noted that she had recently introduced a hearing request regarding school buses. She agreed that the school bus program was costly and said it should be able to ensure timely arrival, citing concerns with late buses in the Bayview.

During public comment, Janelle Phung with the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition (SFBC), stated that she had been a SRTS outreach worker since 2014. She said she had a petition signed by 92 families in support of full funding for SRTS. She said she worked at several elementary schools in Chinatown, and started a walking school bus at Gordon Lau Elementary with an average of 130 participants.

Greg Moore, with Tenderloin Safe Passage, commented that as the newest partner in the SRTS program, Safe Passage was excited to begin work on capacity building in other neighborhoods to share the model created over the past nine years. He said that since October 2016, through

Vision Zero Safe Streets for Seniors funding, Tenderloin Safe Passage began morning efforts and had assisted 17,200 school children with a staff of four to six people. Mr. Moore noted that Tenderloin Safe Passage conducted public engagement as well as advocacy, including parents, teachers and residents. He urged full funding of the SRTS program so that the work of Tenderloin Safe Passage could continue.

Ana Vasudeo said she managed outreach workers as part of a partnership between the SRTS program and the SFBC. She asked the Board to approve full funding for SRTS. She said \$750,000 was not enough for a street safety infrastructure project, noting that at John Yehall Chin Elementary a small infrastructure project for safe access cost \$3 million. She said the multi-cultural outreach workers with the SRTS program were a valuable resource for the partnership and the community. Ms. Vasudeo said she was impressed that 100+ Chinatown parents and 30+ Excelsior parents regularly walked together to escort children to school. She said it took substantial time and effort to cultivate these communities of volunteers and it would be detrimental if they were lost.

Kate Robinson, program director for Tenderloin Safe Passage, she said was a new member of the SRTS program. She described how volunteers stood at key points along identified safe routes in the Tenderloin to help children bypass criminal activity, dangerous intersections and general bad behavior that they might encounter along the way. She said Tenderloin Safe Passage had developed an evaluation model with the help of the University of California San Francisco and the Tenderloin Health Improvement Partnership, and was looking forward to the opportunity to share their approach with other neighborhoods starting with South of Market and Bayview. She said limiting funding for SRTS could limit the ability of Tenderloin Safe Passage to provide training to other groups.

Nancy Buffum, Family and Schools Program Manager at SFBC, urged approval of full funding for SRTS. She said she wanted to make sure the Board understood that the outreach workers collaborated with parents, school staff and other community members to increase walking and biking and decrease traffic danger around schools. She submitted to the Board over 40 letters from every supervisorial district in support of full funding for the SRTS program. Ms. Buffum said she was also the coordinator for Bike and Roll to School Week, and said the purpose of such efforts was to foster community involvement and it would be successful if and when parents began to take initiative at their children's schools.

Andrea Cristofani expressed strong support for the SRTS program, along with support for better performance metrics. She said she understood that many families had limited mode choices for their school commutes, but said there was a great deal of potential for shifting travel behavior among families who lived within a mile of their schools. She also said the program produced highly valuable intangible benefits.

Rui Jun Li, parent of Jean Parker students, expressed support for full funding for the SRTS program. She said increasing numbers of parents were walking together to escort children to the school as a result of the program. She said there was strong support for the program in her community. Chair Peskin added that Jean Parker was also the recipient of a large capital improvement for safe school access.

Natalie Burdick, Outreach Director for Walk San Francisco, urged the Board to approve the original staff recommendation for full funding for the SRTS program. She said it was the only program in the city focused on getting children safely to school. She said the proposed cut would eliminate the program's multi-lingual outreach, which was critical for improving public

health and safety, particularly in communities of concern, which were the communities with a multitude of high-injury corridors. She said the program was planning new initiatives to deliver stronger results, including neighborhood task forces to identify and advocate for capital projects to enhance safe access to schools.

Matt Dove, Director of Bicycle Programs for YMCA of San Francisco, said SRTS was an important effort for reducing barriers to bicycling. He said the YMCA had partnered with the SRTS program to deliver safe bicycling education to schools throughout the City, and urged full funding for SRTS.

A member of the public commented that the SRTS program had given her daughter confidence to walk and take public transit to school for elementary, middle and high school, and that those modes had become her preferred means to travel around the city. She said her other children for whom SRTS was not available developed a preference for driving. She advocated full funding for the program.

Lori Ko Tong, parent of a Chinese Emergent School student, said she supported full funding for the SRTS program. She said the SRTS outreach coordinator had been effective at increasing the number of participating families and arranging for the installation of additional bike racks. She said the SRTS program had introduced Bike to School Day and was providing measurable change to the benefit of the city.

Alex Darr, Richmond resident and parent, commented that he was appreciative of the city's bicycle infrastructure but believed that increasing bicycle mode share also required convincing people that it was a viable travel mode. He agreed that better evaluation metrics would be helpful but said that reducing the SRTS program pending better metrics would be a mistake. He pointed out that past decreases in bicycle mode share did not necessarily indicate that SRTS was ineffective, but could have been an indication of stronger countervailing trends. Finally, Mr. Darr voiced support for full funding of the SRTS program.

Janelle Wang, parent to students at West Portal Elementary School and Hoover Middle School and liaison for Bike and Roll to school week for West Portal Elementary, urged approval for fully funding the SRTS program. She commented that for the past six years at West Portal Elementary School, she had seen an increase in walking and biking to school. She mentioned that West Portal Elementary did not have a designated safe route to school, but said the school participated and benefited from the program resources. Ms. Wang commented that Bike and Roll events at the school grew organically each year and the SRTS program provided statistics and tips that encouraged parents to change pick-up and drop-off patterns at the school. She said the program had led the SFMTA to designate curbs for parking and loading, as well as encouraged parents to become safety walkers. She said that the SRTS program was a resource that provided the busiest segment of the San Francisco population, working families, a way to improve the safety around schools.

Catherine Kalessis, parent to students at Sunnyside Elementary School, a school board member and the health and wellness lead, commented that without SRTS their walking school bus would not have increased from 15 percent to over 80 percent student participation over the last four years. She mentioned that the SRTS assemblies had encouraged students to want to walk to school. She said that as students grew older it was important for them to want to walk places, to know how to walk safely and be able to walk safely to school. Ms. Kalessis expressed support for fully funding the SRTS program.

A member of the public who was a parent at Gratten Elementary School commented that after switching from another elementary school that was not in the SRTS program, she experienced a difference in the amount of participation, activities, enthusiasm, and community. She commented that her family changed its travel behavior and biked daily, and she said her children's increased sense of empowerment, ownership and belonging on the street had increased. She said as the school district moved toward neighborhood schools, she saw an increase in neighborhood families at the school. She noted that at her child's previous school, she had seen an increase in walking but not biking. She also said that, similar to adults traveling to work, children who did not walk or bike to school expressed concerns around traffic calming, safety and safety in numbers. She mentioned that community at Gratten may not have been aware of the SRTS program because it was embedded in the community. She added that older children did not want to ride a school bus. She said that she was investing in her children knowing what to do on the streets and understanding traffic rules as pedestrians and bicyclists, which were skills they could use as adults. She asked the Board to consider fully funding the SRTS program.

Anna Gore said she was a new mom who was starting to ride with her child by bicycle and urged the Board to fully fund the SRTS program in San Francisco. She said she was deeply concerned about reducing the funding for San Francisco's only encouragement program focused on helping families. She noted that some Commissioners had shared stories about how walking or biking did not feel like a viable option, but that was not the case for many in San Francisco, which was why the SRTS program was so important. She commented that biking was the fastest growing travel mode in San Francisco, which was the result of thoughtful and deliberate efforts by advocates and leaders, including those in the SRTS program. She said that infrastructure was important, but that the importance of education should not be understated. She said that when her child did attend public school in San Francisco, she would want him to be able to walk and bike in safe healthy streets and that this would only happen if the City continued to connect families to safe routes and encouraged families to take advantage of healthy transportation options.

Chair Peskin stated he appreciated the testimony about fully funding the SRTS program and also appreciated that were it not for the previous discussion in July and the revised proposal by staff, the Board would not have had the important underlying discussion about how to optimize the program. He invited Mr. Kaestner to provide background on the program.

Nik Kaestner commented that the SRTS partners were unlikely to object to greater investment in infrastructure, but emphasized that the importance of SRTS was that it was the one program that took a different approach, and said he felt that there should always be some kind of educational component in the city's overall strategy. He said when evaluating SRTS mode-shift outcomes it was important to ask what the effect of an infrastructure project of equal cost would have on the mode share breakdown. He also pointed out that since 1969 the number of children who walked to school nationally had dropped from 50% to 13%, and the SRTS program was fighting a similar trend in San Francisco. Mr. Kaestner briefly reviewed the way the SRTS program had evolved to increase its effectiveness. He said the program initially focused on classroom instruction, and later added outreach, education and encouragement initiatives targeted at parents since they typically made family transportation choices. He said those kinds of initiatives included walking school buses, bike trains and other activities involving parents. Recognizing the need for infrastructure improvements, Mr. Kaestner said the program also added initiatives such as neighborhood task forces to engage parents in identifying and

advocating for capital projects. Regarding families that lived farther from schools, he said the program developed a cellphone application for carpools, and had been piloting new models such as meet-up nodes from which walking school buses could depart for multiple schools. Mr. Kaestner noted a pilot project at Bessie Carmichael Elementary in which walking school buses were coordinated with anti-truancy efforts, saying that the program was attempting to align its transportation goals with educational and social equity goals of SFUSD. Mr. Kaestner said the program was continuing to develop new initiatives such as incorporating traffic safety into the Step-Up Middle School Orientation program and bicycle education and training at elementary, middle and high schools. He said the program was working with Commissioner Yee's Street Smarts program, installing bike racks at all schools, coordinating with the crossing guard program, and incorporating Tenderloin Safe Passage into the citywide SRTS program. He argued that those examples showed that the SRTS program was a dynamic one and deserving of full funding, but that he welcomed input from the Board.

Chair Peskin invited Luis Montoya, Director of Livable Streets at the SFMTA, to speak and asked him about the need for better coordination in the SRTS program. Mr. Montoya replied that there was a need for a strong agency leader but that the SFMTA had been meeting regularly with SFUSD, DPH and other agencies. He said the SFMTA was developing its Capital Improvement Program for approval next year and that the feedback regarding the need for infrastructure and the SRTS non-infrastructure program would feed into those decisions. He noted that the SFMTA served over 100 schools with the crossing guard program, but given the current high turnover rate there were only 170 crossing guards, though it would hopefully be fully staffed by October.

Commissioner Sheehy stated that his office had been in contact with SFMTA staff to figure out how to improve the crossing guard program. He said that crossing guards were essential and asked how it resulted in a situation where the school year had started without enough crossing guards. Mr. Montoya explained that the SFMTA had a number of crossing guards that decided not to accept the position which staff was not aware of until late summer. He said that the prior year the SFMTA did six batches of hiring and received 200 applications, however following the hiring process only 12 or so crossing guards were hired and trained. He noted the difficulty in recruiting for the low-wage, part-time split shift positions. He said that some Commissioners offered to work with SFMTA to recruit residents in their districts, which the SFMTA appreciated. He added that the SFMTA also worked with other agencies in the city to connect with job programs in order to receive more applicants.

Commissioner Sheehy asked if the SFMTA considered recruiting from the parent community. Mr. Montoya said that the SFMTA did recruit from the parent community in multiple languages and also went out to schools and worked directly with principals.

Chair Peskin asked if the SFMTA had expressed willingness to create a school transportation safety program regardless of it was on a high injury network. Mr. Montoya explained that as funding shifted to Vision Zero and to the primary spending of capital funding, it had resulted in a shift of funding away from schools that were not on a high injury network. He said that as part of the Capital Improvement Program update, the SFMTA was evaluating how they could effectively use the funds on and off of the high injury corridor network. He noted that the highly successful traffic calming program was one of the most important ways to reduce speeding on residential streets but would not necessarily be on the high injury network. He said that the SFMTA would increase funding around schools to better manage pick-up and drop-off areas since they received about 100 requests for that program. He said that the SFMTA had increased

their focus around school transportation safety and that they could consider creating a new program or committee specifically for that.

Chair Peskin commented that this was a great opportunity to get the agencies together to discuss potential funding sources that could help meet the various needs that had been mentioned. He suggested that Commissioners Tang and Sheehy meet with his office and staff from the Transportation Authority, SFMTA, DPH and SFUSD in the next few weeks.

Commissioner Yee commented that he would like to see the program fully funded but that he would propose providing 75% of the funding and putting the remaining 25% on reserve for a year to better evaluate the program's effectiveness. He said he also wanted to find out what the cost of a school bus program would be but that it was likely a separate conversation.

Commissioner Breed commented that she supported continuing the two requests and noted that the program was funded through August 30, 2019 and therefore continuing the funding would not create any challenges and would give the Board time to consider the various needs.

Executive Director Chang commented that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission would prefer the item be acted on before the end of the calendar year.

Commissioner Sheehy commented that he supported fully funding the program but noted that the discussion had identified a much larger issue. He said while there was limited data available on the program, the members of the public who had spoken demonstrated the effectiveness of the program. He said that the idea to bring back school buses was a great idea and noted that there appeared to be a citywide problem of getting students to and from school in regards to safety and shortages in buses and crossing guards. He said there should be a working group with all the agencies involved to systematically address the problem, but that cutting funding for a successful program was not the answer.

Commissioner Tang said she would be happy to meet with the various agencies involved but noted that she would like to see programmatic changes in the SRTS program and not just greater effectiveness. She added that she had previously requested to see the budget for the combined \$2.8 million requested, including line item detail, before the Board acted on the requests.

Commissioner Yee commented that while the program may not be considered effective overall, District 7 had seen improvements with an example being Sunnyside Elementary School seeing walking and bicycling increases and finding funding for better crosswalks.

Chair Peskin moved to sever the requests for the San Francisco Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure and Capital Improvements projects and continue them to the call of the Chair, and approve the remaining two requests, seconded by Commissioner Breed.

The motion to continue two requests and approve two requests was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Tang and Yee (9)

Nays: Commissioner Sheehy (1)

Absent: Commissioner Farrell (1)

Chair Peskin called Items 8 and 9 together

- 8. Authorize the Issuance and Sale of Senior Limited Tax Bonds in an Amount Not to Exceed \$255 million, the Execution and Delivery of Legal Documents Relating Thereto,**

**and the Taking of All Other Actions Appropriate or Necessary in Connection Therewith
– ACTION**

9. Approve a New Declaration of Official Intent to Reimburse Certain Expenditures from the Proceeds of Indebtedness – ACTION

Cynthia Fong, Deputy Director for Finance and Administration, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

There was no public comment on the items.

Commissioner Tang moved to approve Items 8 and 9, seconded by Commissioner Ronen.

The items were approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Fewer, Peskin, Ronen, Sheehy and Tang (7)

Absent: Commissioners Farrell, Kim, Safai and Yee (4)

10. 2017 San Francisco Transportation Plan Update – INFORMATION

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Ronen moved to continue Item 10 to the September 26 Board meeting, seconded by Commissioner Tang. The motion was approved without objection.

Other Items

11. Introduction of New Items – INFORMATION

There were no new items introduced.

12. Public Comment

During public comment, Jackie Sachs stated that she had served on the CAC for 20 years and would continue attending the CAC meetings and reporting out at the Board meetings during public comment. She said she frequently rode the bus and had a unique perspective on transit service in the city.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.