



# **DRAFT MINUTES**

## **Community Advisory Committee**

**Wednesday, February 23, 2022**

### **1. Call to Order**

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

Present at Roll: Nancy Buffum, Robert Gower, John Larson, Jerry Levine, Kevin Ortiz, Kat Siegal, Peter Tannen, Sophia Tupuola (8)

Absent at Roll: Rosa Chen (entered at Item 2), David Klein, and Eric Rozell (Item 6) (3)

### **2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION**

Chair Larson welcomed new CAC Member for District 5 Kat Siegal and invited her to introduce herself for the CAC. Chair Larson invited Ms. Chen to report on the latest Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC) details, noting that that the CAC would discuss the new Expenditure Plan later on the agenda.

Ms. Chen reported on the latest EPAC details and invited the public to join the final EPAC meeting on February 24.

Chair Larson commented that it seemed just yesterday that EPAC was just formed, and they were already at their final meeting. He also congratulated Ms. Chen on all the work the EPAC members had accomplished.

Chair Larson announced the Special Joint San Francisco County Transportation Authority Board and Treasure Island Mobility Management Agency (TIMMA) Board meeting to discuss the TIMMA base toll and affordability program. He also informed CAC members that a report on the Transportation Authority's public engagement approach, requested by Mr. Ortiz, would be given at the March meeting.

There was no public comment.

### **3. Election of Chair and Vice Chair for 2021 - ACTION\***

Chair Larson reported that the CAC nominated him for the position of Chair and Mr. Klein for the position of Vice Chair.

Mr. Ortiz thanked Chair Larson for his leadership in this often thankless role and asked the Chair, since diversity should be at the forefront of transportation issues, to mentor a person of color, particularly a woman of color, for leadership in the CAC.

Chair Larson appreciate the suggestion and agreed to make that commitment.

There was no public comment.

Kevin Ortiz motioned to approve elect John Larson as Chair and David Klein as Vice Chair for 2022, seconded by Jerry Levine.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Buffum, Chen, Gower, Larson, Levine, Ortiz, Siegal, Tannen, Tupuola (9)



Absent: Klein and Rozell (2)

**Consent Agenda**

**4. Approve the Minutes of the December 1, 2021 and January 26, 2022 Meetings - ACTION\***

Robert Gower motioned to approve the item, seconded by Rosa Chen.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Buffum, Chen, Gower, Larson, Levine, Ortiz, Siegal, Tannen, Tupuola (9)

Absent: Klein and Rozell (2)

**5. Community Advisory Committee Vacancy - INFORMATION**

Chair Larson invited Peter Tannen, whose term was expiring at the end of February, to comment. Mr. Tannen said he reapplied but decided to step down from CAC after 14 years of service on the committee to give another candidate the chance to serve and to hopefully increase the diversity on the CAC. He said he planned on stepping down once Commissioner Mandelman's office was able to find a replacement for the District 8 seat but would still watch the meetings and comment when interested on an item. Mr. Tannen said it was an honor to be able to serve on the CAC for so long.

Chair Larson thanked Mr. Tannen for volunteering to remain in the District 8 seat until a new candidate could be found, so that there wouldn't be a gap during the transition, as well as Mr. Tannen's intent to increase diversity.

There was no public comment for either item.

**End of Consent Agenda**

**6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$1,791,758 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, and Appropriate \$150,000 for Three Requests - ACTION\***

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

Member Robert Gower asked about the equitability with which Bike to Work Day activities would be implemented and expressed the hope that they wouldn't be focused mainly on corridors accessing the downtown.

Mr. Pickford said that in 2022, the planned focus would be on the City's Slow Streets and pointed out that staff had recommended that the allocation include a special condition that energizer stations be located in all 11 supervisorial districts.

John Knox-White, Planning Programs & Education Manager with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), confirmed that Bike to Work Day would be implemented in all 11 districts.

Mr. Gower commented that Slow Streets were not evenly distributed around the City and asked how a focus on them was compatible with equity.

Mr. Knox-White answered that Bike to Work Day would utilize Slow Streets in districts that had them, but assured the CAC that energizer stations and other activities would be distributed across the City. He added that a focus on Slow Streets did not mean that energizer stations would exclusively be located on them and said he would provide



information to the CAC regarding the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition's plan for the geographic distribution of the energizer stations.

Member Kevin Ortiz asked for the list of corridors so far identified for speed limit reduction and a map showing the locations.

Mr. Pickford referred Mr. Ortiz to the location list and map in the enclosure.

Mr. Ortiz asked about the level of outreach involved in identifying corridors for speed limit reductions.

Mr. Pickford pointed out that the request included substantial funds for outreach to the 46 Business Activity Districts where speed limits were planned for reduction.

Ryan Reeves, Senior Transportation Planner and Vision Zero Program Lead with SFMTA, said the SFMTA Board had conducted public hearings for the project and had notified communities along proposed corridors via posters and flyers posted on power poles.

Uyen Ngo, Transportation Planner with SFMTA, added that the project team had distributed posters for display by merchants; conducted door-to-door contact; distributed flyers on cars, transit shelters, and light poles; and had worked with police district stations to notify the public through police-sponsored newsletters and social media accounts.

Mr. Ortiz recommended that the project outreach team consider contacting three additional community-based organizations in the Mission district, including the American Indian Cultural District, Calle 24, and Mission Economic Development Association.

Member Sophia Tupuola suggested that allocation requests include as a matter of course a discussion/analysis on the equity benefits/impacts of the proposed project.

Chair Larson commented that Bike to Work Day publicity was also referring to Bike to Wherever Day, and asked what that meant for the intended benefit of the program. He asked if the program was focusing more on environmental and health benefits rather than traffic congestion.

Mr. Pickford said the event still advocated for bicycling as a commute mode.

Mr. Knox-White acknowledged that commute patterns had changed with the advent of the COVID pandemic, and said as commute patterns returned to normal the focus of Bike to Work Day would return to commuter trips.

Member Nancy Buffum expressed support for advocating bicycling "wherever" and "everywhere." She said in District 4, residents bicycled to many destinations besides downtown workplaces and said "Bike to Wherever" was more inclusive of children and other non-commute bicyclists.

During public comment, Edward Mason expressed apprehension that SFMTA's Core Capacity Study would recommend excluding single-car or even double-car J trains from the subway. He said the result of such an exclusion would be forced transfers on Market Street, which would be an inconvenience to mobility impaired people and to everyone in inclement weather. He also warned that any recommendation for the M-line becoming a subway should include an assurance that SFMTA would have the resources to maintain the line in a state of good repair. He said the capital costs of an improvement were not the only costs and the study should estimate the long term costs of maintaining recommended improvements.



Peter Tannen motioned to approve the item, seconded by Eric Rozell.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Buffum, Chen, Gower, Larson, Levine, Ortiz, Rozell, Siegal, Tannen, Tupuola (10)

Absent: Klein (1)

## **7. San Francisco's Climate Action Plan 2021 Update - INFORMATION**

Rich Chien, San Francisco Department of the Environment (SFE) Senior Environmental Specialist, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Larson asked if there was a plan or incentive program to get people into electric vehicles (EVs) which were expensive, and presumably costs would go down eventually, that would more aggressively get people into EVs than tax rebates.

Mr. Chien responded that the market would play a big role in reaching adoption rates set in SFE's plan, with prices decreasing as the market evolved. He said there were issues around getting people comfortable with the charging technologies that were available and the range anxiety of how far the vehicle could get, along with other factors in the decision making process. Mr. Chien further commented that the City may not feel it is its responsibility to move that market but could with a lot of education and if there were dollars or incentives to reduce the cost of EVs, they would go to those that need it the most. He also said that over time the availability of the vehicles and the price points would be more aligned. Mr. Chien noted that Governor Gavin Newsom had made strong statements about all vehicles in California being electric by a certain date. He said it was still a consumer choice and the market needed to provide availability, price points, and the right options that fit different lifestyles.

Chair Larson responded that it might get to the point where agencies needed to be aggressive in getting people into EVs and to make them affordable.

Mr. Chien responded that the prices are coming down and the availability was going to increase with activity occurring at the state and national level, as well as working with manufacturers. He emphasized that the public investment of the City and County of San Francisco should be going towards things that are shared by the entire community like public transit, active transportation, and solve for the land use issue so that people don't need to drive as much, providing better quality of life and health outcomes for all San Franciscans.

Member Nancy Buffum asked about carbon sequestering and said it seemed to be the least developed in terms of having goals or concrete plans, and not well described. She expressed concern about it having a major effect on things like reducing vehicle trips so people could recreate or encouraging people to bike and walk on healthy green public space and asked if there was funding or partnerships towards advancing the goal.

Mr. Chien responded that there were not quantitative goals around healthy eco systems. He said in a climate action plan, the focus was about mitigating climate emissions and he said that carbon sequestering was still an emerging science to understand how to quantify what natural sequestering can impact through even local efforts like using park land and street trees. Mr. Chien continued that there were ways to calculate in development, and the plan emphasized the benefits of using healthy eco systems.



Ms. Buffum responded that it was an equity issue and provided an example with District 10 which had the least canopy of trees and largest amount of paved over neglected areas, which greenscaping would make healthier. She said the conversation and attention should get elevated as a positive and would make a difference in moving the strategy forward.

Mr. Chien agreed and added that staff did make a strong attempt in the plan to highlight all the positive things that could come from pursuing all those strategies.

Mr. Levine noted that the Projected Impacts of Strategies chart showed a minimal impact to emissions reductions from biking and walking and asked how could biking and walking be put forth as more impactful.

Mr. Chien responded that the analysis was truthful about emissions impact so the focus was made on all the other benefits associated with the actions. He said that bike lanes gave people options instead of driving that were healthier for the city, people, and the environment; helped to address some of the congestion and traffic issues in the city; and added to the benefit of reduced emissions.

Member Jerry Levine responded that from the standpoint of the commitment that the city had towards emission reductions through substantial investment in bike lanes and other infrastructure investments, maybe a different strategy was needed. He noted that he was very supportive of bike lanes and alternative transportation modes but wanted to see something that showed more emissions reduction.

Drew Cooper, Senior Transportation Modeler with the Transportation Authority, responded that many things fell under the category of Transportation Demand Management, including roadway pricing and parking pricing, which could add a big impact, as emissions were coming from cars which needed to be reduced or made clean. He continued that biking and walking supportive infrastructure helped but wouldn't get as far as needed to reach the emissions goals.

Chair Larson commented that San Francisco was not like Amsterdam or the Netherlands, otherwise biking and walking would make a bigger impact.

Member Sophia Tupuola commented that past studies about increasing the bridge toll and Treasure Island tolling wouldn't impact the types of cars on the road. She raised a concern about communities of concern not having the ability to move around as freely and openly with something like biking or walking because people in the community were often targets to others, including authorities. Ms. Tupuola asked how public transportation and access could be improved within the plan for communities of concern with an understanding for their needs.

Mr. Chien responded that the Climate Action Plan emphasized racial equity as an equal importance as emissions reduction. He said all actions were put through a racial equity evaluation tool to understand how these actions can get at root causes of structural racism that presented challenges today. Mr. Chien encouraged people to read the plan to see the details on racial equity and the emphasis on considering the voices of these communities when developing policy and building infrastructure.

Member Kat Siegal asked about the Projected Impacts of Strategies chart, whether each line item was additive or stand alone in reducing emissions.

Mr. Chien invited Mr. Cooper to confirm and commented that the chart did consider the synergistic effects of different strategies being successfully implemented over time.



Mr. Cooper affirmed that it considered interactive effects and responded that those efforts may actually be competitive in some places.

Ms. Siegal asked if transit and biking and walking was a measure of the impact of complete replacement of auto trips or if it was the total impact of what could be done within the plan.

Mr. Cooper responded that it was an effort to understand the effects that could be achieved by building out the elements of the Climate Action Plan. He continued it was not saying walking is not as good as driving but rather that there were limits to how much the city could get people to walk instead of drive.

Member Kevin Ortiz noted the need for action on the climate crisis and that San Francisco should be the leading model in making sure people are driving clean cars or taking transportation to reduce emissions. He expressed concern over how the City would ensure a fool-proof plan to get people out of fossil fuel vehicles. Mr. Ortiz asked what federal funding aid the Transportation Authority was planning on applying for to allocate it directly to the city to get people on bikes and buses. He asked for emphasis on operational funding as well.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, responded that the Transportation Authority was working with the City partners to decide which projects to put forth for federal, state, and regional funding, as well as encouraging the region to do a similar effort. She said that staff would report this information back to the CAC as a legislative item.

Member Eric Rozell commented that as far as moving towards a transit green system, he did not see more information on ferries and asked if there were plan to switch to electric or hydrogen fuel.

Mr. Chien responded that the impact of those changes were at the margins. He said the main source of emissions was private cars and trucks that being driven around the city and ferry operators would need to make those decisions at the end of the life cycle of those ferries.

During public comment, Patricia Arack commented that the strategies to reduce greenhouse gases don't consider working or disabled people and provided no support in converting to electric vehicles, which only made people angry and resentful about having to give up their cars. She noted the most effective strategy is EVs and there was no word on what the city was doing to get people into EVs. She said people won't give up their cars, in some neighborhoods where they need to drive and the transit system is unsafe and doesn't work.

#### **8. Update on the Development of a New Expenditure Plan for the Half-Cent Transportation Sales Tax - INFORMATION\***

Michelle Beaulieu, Principal Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Peter Tannen said the item looked comprehensive and asked if the key finding of both strong support and opposition to Slow Streets noted in virtual Town Halls held true across other outreach events as well.

Ms. Beaulieu said yes, staff had heard a variety of opinions on Slow Streets across other outreach events as well. She said there was no one-size-fits-all approach which emphasized the need for community-based planning, which was proposed to receive an increase in funding in the draft 2022 Expenditure Plan.



Chair Larson said he was glad to see the Neighborhood Transportation Program become ingrained into the Expenditure Plan and said the program had led to interesting and worthwhile projects and was a good opportunity for community-based planning.

There was no public comment.

### **Other Items**

#### **9. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION**

Mr. Ortiz requested an update and overview on the City's and County's plan on charging stations for electric vehicles, particularly within communities of color.

Mr. Tannen requested that packets be mailed out earlier since he did not receive his until the afternoon of the meeting, especially during the weekend before a holiday. Chair Larson said staff would follow up on that.

Chair Larson requested an update on the M line infrastructure plan in regard to the Core Capacity Study (building above ground versus below ground), in particular the direction going out towards San Francisco State University and Park Merced area.

During public comment, a caller agreed with Chair Larson on the M line infrastructure development at Park Merced and said the study did not seem to reflect future demographics.

#### **10. Public Comment**

During general public comment, Edward Mason commented that the corporate commuter buses had damaged a recent asphalt on the corner of 24th and Castro streets. He also said the commuter buses were running without passengers and there seemed to be no discussion on removing commuter buses off the streets.

#### **11. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned in memory of Bob Planthold, who had spent many years as a major advocate for disabled residents, at 8:07 p.m.