



DRAFT MINUTES

Citizens Advisory Committee

Wednesday, April 28, 2021

1. Call to Order

Chair Larson called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Present at Roll: Rosa Chen, Robert Gower, David Klein, John Larson, Jerry Levine, Stephanie Liu, Peter Tannen, and Danielle Thoe, Sophia Tupuola (10)

Absent at Roll: Kevin Ortiz (entered during item 2) (1)

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Larson reported that Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) members were provided the link to the Executive Director's Report that was presented a day prior at the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (Transportation Authority) Board meeting.

He also reported that for the second year in a row the usual Bike to Work Day was reimagined due to the pandemic as Bike to Wherever Day. He said that the Transportation Authority was again a sponsor of the event and thanked the CAC for playing a part with their prior comments to have an energizer station in every District of the city. Chair Larson encouraged everyone, if they could, to hop on a bike and grab a traditional Bike to Work Day tote bag while they're out there. He shared that the San Francisco (SF Bicycle Coalition) website had a map of locations and other details: <https://sfbike.org/bike-to-whenever-day/>.

With respect to the School Access Plan, which was requested by Commissioner Mar and funded primarily by a Caltrans grant, Chair Larson reported that they would develop strategies to improve school transportation for elementary school students in San Francisco. He said, for the initial outreach, the Transportation Authority partnered with the Department of Children, Youth, and their families to design an art-based activity for children which will give students an opportunity to provide input on the kinds of transportation solutions they would like to see. He said the activity and accompanying questions would be included in community assessments being conducted for the Child and Youth Friendly San Francisco Initiative. He shared that Community Assessments would take place in the Mission, Bayview, Chinatown, Tenderloin, and Hunter's Point neighborhoods and they expect to reach over 300 San Francisco youth. He shared the direct link to the Transportation Authority's website to learn more: <https://www.sfcta.org/projects/child-transportation-study>.

Chair Larson also reported that staff indicated the Golden Gate Park Working Group and Action Framework, originally called the Golden Gate Park Sustainable Travel Study Phase 1, would be presented at the May 11 Transportation Authority Board meeting for its first hearing/approval and then May 25 for final approval. He said the report documents, a key contribution to the working group, stated the values, needs, and



priority actions identified through the process, and would be used as inputs to an upcoming public process jointly led by the Recreation and Parks Department and the SFMTA. He added that the upcoming process would develop and evaluate alternatives for JFK Drive operations.

Chair Larson also shared that staff was developing scope options to address Commissioner Walton's request for the Transportation Authority to conduct an equity and socioeconomic impact study of JFK operations. He said he knows there is a lot of interests in the future of the JFK Drive, which has been temporarily closed to cars during the pandemic and encouraged CAC members and the callers listening to stream or dial in to the May 11 Transportation Authority Board meeting.

With respect to Fare Free Muni, Chair Larson said that the Transportation Authority and SFMTA staff have been working on the item as requested by the CAC and are anticipating bringing it to May CAC. He said it slid a month so that SFMTA could focus on responding to a potential proposal by Commissioner Haney and Preston regarding a Fare Free Muni pilot. He added that SFMTA anticipates discussing this topic at the May 5 Board of Supervisors Budget & Appropriations Committee, and they can share more info with the CAC once the agenda materials are posted.

Lastly, Chair Larson shared that at their March CAC meeting, they had a presentation on the ConnectSF Transit Investment Strategy, and said if folks haven't already done so, they should weigh in on the ConnectSF Transit Investment Strategy by taking a survey, which is open until Friday. He shared a link from the Transportation Authority's website which would direct them to a short blog with the survey link:

<https://www.sfcta.org/blogs/give-feedback-san-franciscos-transit-investment-strategy>

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

- 3. Approve the Minutes of the March 24, 2021 Meeting - ACTION**
- 4. State and Federal Legislation Update - INFORMATION**
- 5. Adopt a Motion of Support to Award a Three-Year Professional Services Contract, with an Option to Extend for Two Additional One-Year Periods, to Eide Bailly LLP in an Amount Not to Exceed \$310,000 for Annual Audit Services - ACTION**
- 6. Internal Accounting Report, Investment Report, and Debt Expenditure Report for the Nine Months Ending March 31, 2021 - INFORMATION**
- 7. Progress Report for Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project - INFORMATION**

There was no public comment.

Peter Tannen motioned to approve the consent agenda, seconded by Danielle Thoe.

The consent agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Buffum, Chen, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Tannen, Thoe, Tupuola (11)

Absent: (0)



End of Consent Agenda

8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve San Francisco's Program of Projects for the 2021 Mid-Cycle Regional Transportation Improvement Program - ACTION

Aprile Smith, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item.

Danielle Thoe said that based on budget updates, it seemed that the Transportation Authority's budget was balanced and asked what the Planning, Programming and Monitoring (PPM) funds would go toward.

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming said the funds would be programmed in the Transportation Authority's annual budget for Fiscal Year 2021/2022. She said the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) was a variable fund source and that the PPM funds funded the oversight done on major capital projects including Caltrain Electrification and the Downtown Rail Extension.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director added that staff would present on the draft Fiscal Year 2021/2022 budget later on in the meeting and that with the significant drop in sales tax revenues, the Transportation Authority would need to dip into sales tax reserves to keep the budget whole in the next fiscal year and receiving extra PPM funds helped to not use additional reserves.

Peter Tannen asked about the schedule and why there was a gap between design phase completion in May 2021 and contract award in February 2022.

Joel Goldberg, SFMTA, said the gap was related to the various steps (e.g. right of way certification, obtaining allocation of funds from the California Transportation Commission (CTC) needed to access the funds before SFMTA could advertise for construction per the relevant grant guidelines.

Chair Larson asked for clarification on why the agency was honoring the Central Subway debt when the project is nearly done and couldn't the funds be used for other priorities.

Ms. Lombardo said that years ago when the Central Subway needed a Full Funding Grant Agreement [to access Federal New Starts funds], the Transportation Authority committed funds RTIP funds to the project to help SFMTA show that it had a fully funded construction phase for the project. Since not all of the RTIP funds were unavailable when the Central Subway construction contracts were awarded, the SFMTA used funds that would have gone to other SFMTA capital projects. In recognition of this, the Transportation Authority committed to honoring the remaining RTIP commitment by directing it to other SFMTA eligible RTIP funds as RTIP funds became available.

Chair Larson pointed out the importance of the Folsom Streetscape project from a photo in the presentation. He said, in the photo, a motorist was illegally crossing over the bike lane from the center lane to make a right turn and that the project was a good example of why permanent safety improvements were needed.

There was no public comment.



David Klein motioned to approve the item, seconded by Jerry Levine.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Buffum, Chen, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Tannen, Thoe, Tupuola (11)

Nays: (0)

Absent: (0)

- 9. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt a Resolution of Local Support Authorizing the Executive Director to Execute and File an Application with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission for Regional Discretionary Funding; Submit the Yerba Buena Island (YBI) Multi-use Pathway Project to the Transportation Improvement Program; and Authorize the Executive Director to Execute Funding Agreements with Caltrans for Receipt of Federal and State Funds for the YBI Multi-use Pathway Project in the Amount of \$1,000,000 from a Priority Conservation Area Grant and \$3,800,000 from a Regional Active Transportation Program Grant- ACTION**

Mike Tan, Administrative Engineer, presented the item.

Robert Gower asked about the buildout of the Treasure Island Ferry Terminal and asked what considerations had been given for integration of bikes and ferry service. He added that the ferries and ferry terminal should have adequate bicycle storage, but ferries do not currently accept e-bikes, which are becoming increasingly common.

Mr. Tan responded that they have been in contact with the developer to bring bicyclists down to the ferry terminal. He said the developer put in a bike path on Macalla but it is a steep grade. He said the ferry terminal should be completed next year and the developer has plans to build out the ferry terminal plaza which should have accommodations for bikes.

Chair Larson commented that there should be coordination with Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA) so that bicyclists can take bikes onto the ferries for the last mile to San Francisco.

Eric Cordoba, Deputy Director for Capital Projects, responded that they are having active discussions with WETA and are developing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that they will bring to the Treasure Island Mobility Management Agency (TIMMA) Committee around June. He said they know that a connection is imperative and are very excited about it. He said he envisioned bike stations, bike storage, and to the extent possible to get bikes on ferries, but said he was not familiar with the relevant restrictions on e-bikes. He added that onboarding and offboarding could be an issue, but the run is short, and the developer is conditioned to provide bike share stations at strategic locations.



Danielle Thoe said she appreciated the 5% grade of the proposed multi-use path and asked if that would apply to the bike path or just the pedestrian path.

Mr. Cordoba responded that what they are doing is studying all the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance issues as part of their planning efforts and environmental documentation. He said that there are different standards that apply as it relates to the roadway versus a separate facility itself. He said their goal is to be ADA compliant all the way through but anticipates that there will be challenges. He said they have to study from a preliminary engineering standpoint to better understand the issues and said he thinks there is a lot of potential on the entire west side bike path.

Peter Tannen commented it is a great project, noting that he has bicycled all over Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island. He said, hopefully, Caltrans will build a bicycle path to the historic pier.

Jerry Levine asked if there was a barrier or divider between east and west bike lanes and pedestrian lanes so that there are not any crossovers with the bikes and pedestrians.

Mr. Cordoba responded they are going to do everything they can to protect the bicyclists and pedestrians, so he envisions a barrier system or divider that protects bicyclists and pedestrians from vehicular traffic.

Kevin Ortiz responded that as a former resident of Treasure Island, he is excited to see this path, but he does have concerns with the new development bringing residents with higher incomes which may contribute to displacement of current residents. He said he would like to hear about the WETA MOU to make sure there are affordable bike stations for ferry access and for residents.

Mr. Cordoba responded that he understands that affordability is a key policy issue. He said they envision coming to TIMMA to discuss tolling, bike share, and ferry services while WETA moves forward to address affordability.

Chair Larson asked about the status of the Bay Area Transportation Authority's (BATA's) West Span Skyway Project.

Mr. Cordoba responded that BATA is starting further preliminary engineering but was hindered by litigation against Regional Measure 3 [a bridge toll measure]. He said everything TIMMA is doing on the multi-use path is compatible with the Skyway Project. He said BATA wants TIMMA to be the lead on Yerba Buena Island (YBI), but they cannot forget the West Side Bridges. He said there was an opportunity to save costs by coordinating the two projects.

David Klein asked how safety comes in terms of services for people if they need medical or police assistance, and would patrols start in that area.



Mr. Cordoba responded that currently BATA funds the operation and maintenance on the new eastern span. He said they do have periodic patrols, and on YBI and Vista Point they have security and other operations that are funded by BATA.

Ms. Thoe asked about the realistic time frame for riding a bike on the West Span.

Mr. Cordoba responded it is difficult to estimate because the litigation is still underway on Regional Measure 3, which is estimated to cause another 18+ months of delay. He said the conceptual engineering for the project estimated its cost at over \$350 million and Mr. Cordoba speculated that these types of projects take 2-3 years for full environmental approval and another 2-3 years for design. He added that construction would take 3-4 years, so at least 10-15 years out assuming the money is lined up, which is currently not the case.

During public comment Edward Mason asked what the anticipated usage or patronage would be for the pedestrians and bicyclists for daily, weekly and monthly periods of time that they are investing their money in.

Mr. Cordoba replied that there is data that has been estimated. He said he doesn't have it but can follow up later with the information.

Peter Tannen moved to approve the item, seconded by Robert Gower.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Buffum, Chen, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Tannen, Thoe, Tupuola (11)

Nays: (0)

Absent: (0)

Chair Larson thanked staff for the presentation and said he looks forward to the future updates. He added that Treasure Island has a lot of construction activity going on and does not look the same as it did in the past.

10. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$640,000 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, for Two Requests - ACTION

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

Peter Tannen said he looked at the Minnesota Grove on Google Street View and was impressed. He said he wanted to visit the site and recommended that others visit the grove as well.

Chair Larson said the Equity Schools that receive additional in-person resources table in the San Francisco Safe Routes to School: Equity Plan attached to SFMTA's Safe Routes to Schools Program Administration allocation request illustrated the need for



the program and that the Safe Routes to School 2019-2020 Evaluation Highlights report was well done.

There was no public comment.

Jerry Levine motioned to approve the item, seconded by David Klein.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Buffum, Chen, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Tannen, Thoe, Tupuola (11)

Nays: (0)

Absent: (0)

11. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt Updated Communities of Concern Boundaries for San Francisco - ACTION

Camille Guiriba, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item.

Sophia Tupuola asked if the data was from the 2020 census.

Ms. Guiriba responded that American Community Survey (ACS) 2011-2015 data was used for the 2017 Communities of Concern (CoC) Update and that the 2021 update used ACS data from 2014-2018.

Ms. Tupuola expressed concern about people being relocated as housing was being converted from public to private, and how they were being supported and represented in data. She also asked how they could support remaining CoCs beyond naming them.

Ms. Guiriba responded that funding would be prioritized for CoCs, and that they would be a focus of equity planning and analysis.

Michelle Beaulieu, Principal Transportation Planner for Government Affairs, added stated that a number of fund sources prioritize investments in these communities including the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)'s One Bay Area Grant program, Prop K, Transportation Fund for Clean Air, and Lifeline. She also stated that MTC makes planning funds available for these communities, to help identify a pipeline of projects for future investments. Ms. Beaulieu said that the sales tax reauthorization process is using these community designations to identify priority communities for outreach as well as funding for these areas.

Kevin Ortiz stated that he had concerns about the maps, given his experience living in San Francisco and witnessing displacement. He expressed concern about the validity of the data considering fear-mongering and response rate around the Census during the Trump presidency. Mr. Ortiz also noted that the ACS conducts samples and is not as broad as the decennial Census and asked when MTC would update these numbers again.



Ms. Beaulieu acknowledged Mr. Ortiz' concerns about the data and responded that this was just one equity lens that the region and the Transportation Authority use when considering transportation investments. She said that MTC is planning to revisit their entire framework of analysis in part to address some of the issues raised by Mr. Ortiz including displacement pressures. She noted that different parts of the region have different equity concerns and that this would be an opportunity to participate in a regional conversation about equity. Ms. Beaulieu said Transportation Authority staff would continue to work with city partners to get a broader and more up to date perspective on what is happening on the ground. Lastly, she said the agencies analysis also considered low income households across the city, regardless of whether they are located in a CoC or not.

Mr. Ortiz noted that in the 16th Street area, there was significant affordable housing being built and it didn't seem accurate to remove that part of the neighborhood out of the map. He asked if there was a plan to update this more regularly than the 4-year time frame.

Ms. Beaulieu responded that staff would bring that question to the MTC regional working groups, and that these past updates correspond to the required Regional Transportation Plan updates which take place every four years. She stated that MTC is looking to do a major update next year, which may indicate that they will be updating their analysis more regularly in the future, and that locally Transportation Authority staff would talk to the City partners about updating these analyses more regularly.

Robert Gower asked when these supplemental communities are set up, if the programs offered were tracked separately, and how effectiveness as well as demographic shifts weretracked.

Ms. Beaulieu responded that the geographies were used to prioritize funding and for planning and evaluation. She explained that the reason for the changes between the two maps was due to demographic shifts. She said that MTC has set up a threshold system, and that changing demographics in these geographies is why shifts have occurred.

Danielle Thoe stated that she appreciated the exercise to add block groups to dial in to a finer grain than the census tract level. She also echoed concerns about displacement and fear mongering around the Census and ACS surveys. She asked why the proposal was to update this now, when next year the complete system may be overhauled. She also asked about the every-four-year update, whether they were required or if there were a way to acknowledge the economic and political occurrences since 2014, to create some sort of hybrid.

Ms. Beaulieu stated that they were bringing the item to the Board now because MTC's Plan Bay Area 2050 was updating the CoCs not for its equity analysis. She said that it



may be a good sign that they want to have a more robust process to update the framework starting next year, and that these updates might occur more frequently.

Ms. Beaulieu also noted that it is important for the Transportation Authority to do this relatively small update to use these geographies for use in the San Francisco Transportation Plan 2050, which will also be finalized this year. Once MTC completes their process, the Transportation Authority could also consider a more significant update.

Chair Larson asked why the large area around Lake Merced was a CoC in the past map, and if 2021 was a refinement due to the fact that most of the area was not comprised of residential parcels. Ms. Beaulieu responded that the base census tracts and block group geographies had not changed between the two maps, and that the tract with Lake Merced was likely shifting based on a small part of the tract with residential parcels.

Mr. Larson noted that the tracts were not all equal in population which means that only a few changes could swing a tract from meeting the thresholds or not. He noted that these CoC shifts likely showed that people are being pushed out of the city, and that with the 2020 decennial census, it may behoove MTC and others to revisit this framework. He said he hoped that this can be reexamined by the Transportation Authority in the not-too-distant future.

Mr. Ortiz also noted that there is a huge homeless population in the Lake Merced area, and does not want to remove access to resources for folks who may drop off the CoC map with this update if the Transportation Authority was going to be doing this again in a year anyway.

Ms. Beaulieu stated that the timing of this update was so that these geographies can be consistent with MTC's latest update for the update of the San Francisco Transportation Plan which will be wrapped up by the end of the year.

Mr. Larson asked how often the SFTP is updated.

Ms. Guiriba noted that it is updated on the same cycle as the regional plan, every four years.

Mr. Larson noted that we have to use the data we have, but that maybe the Transportation Authority should do an interim update of the SFTP as we get the 2020 decennial census data in.

Sophia Tupuola motioned to approve the item, seconded by Danielle Thoe.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Buffum, Chen, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Tannen, Thoe, Tupuola
(10)



Nays: (1) Ortiz

Absent: (0)

12. Preliminary Fiscal Year 2021/22 Budget and Work Program - INFORMATION

Lily Yu, Principal Management Analyst, Finance and Administration presented the item.

Chair Larson asked if the revenue sales tax projections were a conservative estimate.

Ms. Yu replied that was correct.

During public comment Edward Mason asked what the definition of an express bus system was. He said there needs to be a clarification regarding what it really means.

Chair Larson replied that when the items come before the Committee, they will get further clarification.

Through the Chair, Hugh Louch, Deputy Director for Planning, said they are planning for both express lanes and express buses which include regional and Muni Express. He said they cannot prohibit the use of the lanes by other types of buses, but said the planning and funding work is for public buses.

Chair Larson said as they go forward, he hoped it would be possible to regulate the lanes in a way that will be more exclusive for public bus and transit use. With respect the Transportation Authority's proposed budget, he said there is a lot of bang for the buck for the money going to administration versus the amount of money that is going to programs.

Other Items

13. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

There were no new items introduced.

14. Public Comment

There was no general public comment.

15. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.