San Francisco Transportation Task Force 2045

August 21, 2017 Meeting
## Today’s Meeting Objectives & Agenda

### Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 mins</td>
<td>Welcome, introductions, task force updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 mins</td>
<td>Revenue measure(s): evaluation criteria and small group discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 mins</td>
<td>Revenue measure(s): sources listing and plenary discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 mins</td>
<td>Transportation needs – results of feedback &amp; survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td>Public comment, next steps, meeting evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Welcome from the Chairs + Introductions

- Welcome; co-chairs Sunny Angulo and Andres Power
- Introductions; Task Force Members
- Task Force Updates; Peg Stevenson
  - Welcome new & public members
  - Task Force work to date
  - Materials and website
  - Today’s Meeting
  - Looking Ahead
Evaluation Criteria for Revenue Measures
Universal Considerations

The proposed evaluation exercise we’re discussing today is only part of the story.

Any revenue source that is recommended by this group would be paired with an investment plan. There are a number of key considerations that will influence that full package, including:

- Accountability & Transparency
- Timing (which election)
- Equity – how revenue sources are applied, what the money is spent on, how projects are chosen, etc.

These and other factors will need to be considered when evaluating any revenue source.
Choosing a Revenue Source

There are many considerations with revenue measures, and one important one is what type of revenue source is used.
Evaluation Criteria for Revenue Sources

- The criteria below vary based on the specific type of revenue source. The three **screening criteria** below are ones that staff suggest are required for new revenue measures to meet unfunded needs.

- Criteria for revenue measures that we’ll discuss are:

  **Screening Criteria**
  - Reliable
  - Ease of establishing
  - Generates significant revenues

  **Other Criteria**
  - Economic growth/jobs impact
  - Flexible
  - Ease of administering
  - Supported by the public and stakeholders
Reliable
Screening Criterion

- Predictable revenue stream that doesn’t fluctuate significantly year to year
- Also, permanent or lasting for many years vs. one-time source

**Threshold:**
Permanent or long-term revenue sources are preferred (10+ years); unpredictable sources and/or sources with frequent downward fluctuations are not preferred.
Ease of Establishing
Screening Criterion

- Precedent exists for using the source for transportation
- No new state legislation is required
- In the case of San Francisco general obligation bonds the ability to say that the measure will not raise property tax rates

Threshold:
Revenue sources that require state authorizing legislation are considered difficult to establish.
Generates Significant Revenues
Screening Criterion

- Revenue generated is substantial enough to justify the effort to put in place

**Threshold:**
≥$50 million per year is considered substantial.
Growth Potential

• Ideally, revenues grow in value over time or at least keep up with inflation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equitable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ideally, there is not a disproportionate burden on low-income households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability to provide low-income exemptions, discounts or rebates, as well as to direct revenues toward low-income persons can help address equity even if the source itself is not considered progressive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ability to Support Policy Objectives

• Revenue source encourages behavioral or other changes that support policy objectives
  – For example, an event fee that encourages less driving or the Transportation Sustainability Fee which requires development to help pay for some of its impacts on the transportation system
Dedicated

- Cannot be diverted to other uses
- Public knows where and how funds will be spent
- May affect the voter threshold required for passage (e.g., for a general vs. dedicated sales tax)
Economic Growth/ Jobs Impact

- Revenue source has a minimal impact on economic growth and job creation
Flexible

- Revenues can be used to fund a wide range of investments, including capital and operating needs
Easy to Administer

- Existing administration system is in place
- Low effort/cost to administer vs. having to create a new mechanism (e.g., with the state for a new source)
Supported by the Public and Stakeholders

- Likely to have support and lack any significant opposition
Small Group Discussion
Small Group Discussion

- Which two criteria are most important to you? Least important to you?

- Jot a few words on post-its of why those criteria are most important to you (label with a “+”), or least important to you (label with a “-”).

- What’s missing? What other questions do you have?
Initial Set of Revenue Sources
Initial Set of Revenue Sources

In addition to many revenue measures suggested by staff, we also gathered possible revenue measures for consideration from the task force via the recent survey.

We will present to you all the revenue measures and then give you an opportunity to ask questions and give feedback.
## Initial Set of Revenue Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Revenue Source</th>
<th>From T2045 Survey?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Carbon Tax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Congestion Pricing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Gas Tax, San Francisco (10 cent)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D General Obligation Bond (GO Bond)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Gross Receipts Tax</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Income Tax – Corporate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Income Tax – Personal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Large Event Ticket Surcharge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Parcel Tax</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Payroll Tax</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Robot Tax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Initial Set of Revenue Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Revenue Source</th>
<th>From T2045 Survey?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L Sales Tax, General Fund (1/2 cent increase)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Sales Tax, Transportation (1/2 cent increase)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Sports Franchise Tax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Transportation Network Companies (TNC) Fee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P Transportation Sustainability Fee (TSF) – Increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q Vehicle License Fee (VLF) – San Francisco (SB 1492)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) – SB 1183, Bicycle Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Toll Lanes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Initial Set of Revenue Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Revenue Source</th>
<th>From T2045 Survey?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U Bridge Tolls</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Residential Parking Permit Fees</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Parking Fees</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X High-Polluting Vehicle Tax</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Vehicle License Fee (VLF) on 2(^{nd}) Vehicles</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z Property Tax - Commercial</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion of Possible Revenue Sources

- What *questions* do you have about potential revenue sources?
- What *analyses* of these sources are important to you?
- Are we *missing* anything?
Framework for Transportation Needs
Results from Survey

- 31 responses received

- Feedback was generally supportive of the organization of the categories, and spending on each category
  - Across all categories, at least 2/3 of respondents said each category was “Very Important” or “Somewhat Important”
  - Zero respondents said that any category was “Not At All Important”
## Results from Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Service &amp; Affordability</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muni Fleet, Facilities, and Infrastructure Repair &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Optimization &amp; Expansion</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transit &amp; Smart System Management</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision Zero Safer and Complete Streets</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Resurfacing</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scale: 1 = "Not at all important, 5 = Very important"*
### Highlights from Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I see [Vision Zero] as part and parcel of improving our transit system</th>
<th>Muni facilities and infrastructure maintenance, as well as vehicle rehabilitation are the areas to focus on.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addressing transit services in the neighborhoods with low levels of service and high number of seniors, children and youth, and people with disabilities (in other words communities that are transit dependent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on core capacity improvements. It’s better to have a strong foundation of services and a well maintained fleet then to continue expanding.</td>
<td>101 should be tolled. SF should have congestion pricing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend that the equity strategy definitions include (besides race, ethnicity, income, etc.) people with disabilities, seniors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Framework for Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Transit Service &amp; Affordability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Muni Fleet, Facilities, and Infrastructure Repair &amp; Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Transit Optimization &amp; Expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Regional Transit &amp; Smart System Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Vision Zero Safer and Complete Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Street Resurfacing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following slides present the information from the July meeting, using light blue font to highlight:

- **Existing bullet points that address feedback (both in-person & via survey)**
- **New bullet points added to address feedback**
Transit Service & Affordability

Could include:

- Transit service increases, including in communities of concern & late-night
- Transit fare programs (SF & regional)
- Muni Equity Strategy recommendations
- Muni service protection
- Paratransit
Muni Fleet, Facilities, and Infrastructure Repair & Maintenance

Could include:

- Muni vehicle replacement and rehabilitation
- New Muni vehicles and facilities to support service expansion
- Muni facilities and infrastructure maintenance
- System safety and accessibility improvements
- SFMTA parking facilities and parking control fleet
Transit Optimization & Expansion

Could include:

- Transit enhancement projects (e.g., Muni Forward, transit signal priority)
- Major transit expansion projects (e.g., Caltrain DTX)
- Core capacity improvements (e.g., Better Market Street, Geary BRT, BART station enhancements) including transit accessibility improvements
- Ferry projects
Regional Transit & Smart System Management

Could include:

- SF contribution to regional transit expansion projects (e.g., BART vehicles) and linking regional systems
- Freeway corridor and smart systems management projects (e.g., US 101 managed lanes)
- Transportation demand management (TDM) programs
- Congestion pricing
- Public transportation innovation
Vision Zero Safer and Complete Streets

Could include:

- Pedestrian improvements, including sidewalk accessibility
- Bicycle improvements
- Complete streets and traffic calming (including traffic signals)
- Vision Zero and Safe Routes to School non-infrastructure (e.g., Vision Zero education, evaluation, and enforcement)
- Pedestrian-scale street lighting
Street Resurfacing

Could include:

- Street resurfacing program, including *curb ramps*
Other feedback we received was not about the categories of projects but rather provided overarching values for all projects:

- Meaningful, authentic **outreach** and robust **communications**
- **Transit First** – ensure priority for Muni
- Keep pace with **technology** while prioritizing equitable access to transportation without apps
- Engage with **neighborhoods** to understand what they need and the holistic impacts of projects; “look beyond downtown”
- Prioritize projects serving **communities of concern, seniors, and people with disabilities**
- **Think regionally** with equity and affordability
Public Comment
Next Steps

Meeting Schedule (3rd Monday of each month @ 4 pm unless otherwise noted)

- **September 25th** – priorities for needs *(date changed)*
- **October 16th** – formulating revenue measures and expenditure plans
- **November 20th** – refinements to revenue measures and expenditure plans
- **December 18th** – proposals for revenue measures and expenditure plans
Thank you!

Please send comments and feedback to SFtransportation2045@sfgov.org

http://SFtransportation2045.com