



DRAFT MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, March 23, 2022

1. Call to Order

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

Present at Roll: Nancy Buffum, Rosa Chen, Robert Gower, David Klein, John Larson, Jerry Levine, Kevin Ortiz, Eric Rozell, and Kat Siegal (9)

Absent at Roll: Peter Tannen (entered during Item 5) and Sophia Tupuola (2)

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Larson acknowledged CAC member Peter Tannen, representative for District 8, who was reappointed at the March 22 Transportation Authority Board meeting and had previously told fellow CAC members he would continue to serve on the CAC until a new representative for District 8 could be found. He encouraged any interested District 8 residents watching or listening to the meeting to submit an application to be on the CAC via the Transportation Authority website at www.sfcta.org.

Chair Larson noted that CAC members should have received a copy of the Executive Director's Report presented at the March 22 Transportation Authority Board meeting and encouraged fellow members to read it as it provided short and informative updates. He spoke on the Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and Infrastructure Improvements project, which was nearing completion, including construction of the center running red transit lanes, boarding islands, streetlights, and utilities; with replacement of underground utilities and safety features such as pedestrian signals, upgraded traffic signals, and lighting soon to be completed as well. Chair Larson announced the ribbon cutting ceremony would be held on April 1 at 9:15 a.m. at the War Memorial building and members of the public may register to attend at sfmta.com. The Chair also noted that the Transportation Authority had contributed \$45 million in Prop K funds towards all phases of the project and led planning and environmental work for this first center running BRT project for the city, with a lot of input from the CAC over time. He congratulated the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority (SFMTA) and partner agencies on the upcoming start of service.

Chair Larson announced that at its March 22 meeting, the Board endorsed the 2022 Expenditure Plan for the half-cent transportation sales tax as recommended by the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC). He thanked members Rosa Chen and Eric Rozell for serving on that body, as well as staff, for the EPAC's hard work on the proposed program. He said the Metropolitan Transportation Commission was next to review the proposal before the Board of Supervisors could act to include the Expenditure Plan and a continuation of the half-cent sales tax to fund it on the November 2022 ballot.

Chair Larson also announced that outreach for the San Francisco Transportation Plan (SFTP) would soon begin, with an online survey conducted in English, Spanish, Chinese,



Filipino, and Russian. He said that staff was offering presentations to community and neighborhood groups citywide and hosting a town hall on Thursday, April 28. He asked members of the public to contact the Transportation Authority if there was an interested in receiving a presentation and noted that more information on the SFTP could be found at sfcta.org/sftp.

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

3. Approve the Minutes of the February 23, 2022 Meetings - ACTION

Nancy Buffum motioned to approve the item, seconded by Jerry Levine.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Buffum, Chen, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Ortiz, Rozell, Siegal (9)

Absent: Tannen, Tupuola (2)

4. Community Advisory Committee Vacancy - INFORMATION

Chair Larson announced the term expiration for his seat, representing District 7.

There was no public comment for either item.

End of Consent Agenda

5. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Subway Renewal Overview - INFORMATION

Julie Kirschbaum, Director of Transit with SFMTA, presented the item.

Vice Chair David Klein asked if any of the plan had to do with expanding, or strictly focused on improving and ensuring quality of service. Director Kirschbaum answered that the agency was looking to expand capacity but not to make the tunnel longer. She explained that in the Core Capacity planning study, there was some money to do technical work for the surface portion of the M Ocean View line, from West Portal to San Francisco State University, with a goal to have a high capacity corridor to run a four-car train much less impeded. Mr. Klein asked if this would increase frequency. Director Kirschbaum responded in the affirmative.

Chair Larson observed when there was a time the train control computer was new. He asked about the state of good repair and why it was such a challenge. Director Kirschbaum answered that it may have been because the agency didn't start the repairs sooner and some systems they were now playing catch on maintenance. She said the new train control system was set up to receive automatic updates to its software. She also explained that lifecycle management involves anticipating at the beginning of asset replacement what is needed to keep a system in a state of good repair and she did not believe that happened for a lot of the subway work.

Member Kat Siegal asked if the pillars of the Muni Metro Modernization plan would be executed sequentially or in parallel, and if it was overall a 10-year plan or just the subway modernization as a 10-year plan. Director Kirschbaum answered that it was concurrent work with the 10 years reflecting the overall program. She expounded that she believed in a continuous delivery model, referencing the vehicles and surface rail corridors as examples of continuous improvement within the 10-year time frame.



During public comment, Edward Mason asked if there was a project management software program that would be used on the project. He also asked if there was a subway project manager to coordinate and manage the system replacements. Mr. Mason continued that for Core Capacity he saw that as something that would require forced transfers for the J Church, K Ingleside, and L Taraval lines in the future, and expressed apprehension about the effect on seniors' mobility.

After public comment, Chair Larson asked Director Kirschbaum if she could address the public comment questions on the project management staff, software, and forced transfers. Director Kirschbaum responded that she believed her agency used P6 software, an industry standard, to manage the projects, but said she could follow up to confirm. She said there needed to be a deeper dive into the sequencing and scheduling work Mr. Mason was referring to in his comments. She also clarified that Core Capacity was a Federal Transit Administration grant program, and it did not imply a specific service plan. She continued that as an agency, from a technical standpoint, they believed the most reliable, highest capacity plan was to run very frequent trunk service with transfer service but no decisions had been made in that regard.

Member Jerry Levine commented that the need for increased capacity was predicated on substantial increases in ridership and asked if that was what ridership projections showed. Director Kirschbaum answered that state of good repair investments were needed regardless of future ridership levels to ensure safety and continuity in subway service. Regarding future service demand, she said SFMTA used multiple scenarios in its decision making and attempted to build options into its improvement programs. She said as an example, SFMTA's full light rail fleet expansion program was based on the expectation of growth in demand but included contractual off-ramps in case ridership growth was less than expected.

6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve the 2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan and 5-Year Prioritization Programs (5YPPS) and Amend the Prop K Bus Rapid Transit/Transit Preferential Streets/Muni Metro Network and Transit Enhancements 5YPPs - ACTION

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

During public comment, Edward Mason asked regarding the Salesforce Transit Center Wayfinding project how we got into the situation of needing to replace the kiosks. He asked who was responsible for the original kiosks and how much they cost. He asked whether it was the original prime contractor, Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA), or a subcontractor that developed the original wayfinding. He said that already needing to replace wayfinding kiosks at a cost of almost \$2 million caused him to shake his heads and he thought the TJPA should bear the responsibility to pay for fixing the wayfinding system.

After public comment, David Klein motioned to approve the item, seconded by Kat Siegal.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: Tupuola (1)



7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$645,108 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, and Appropriate \$557,156 for Two Requests- ACTION

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy & Programming, and Andrew Heidel, Principal Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Eric Rozell asked for details on the way SFMTA prioritized locations for bike facility maintenance.

Ms. LaForte answered that because the program had no backlog, SFMTA hadn't needed to prioritize and had been able to address requests as they were submitted or identified by SFMTA staff in the field.

Kat Siegel commented that plastic delineators seemed fragile and vulnerable to damage by vehicles. She asked if SFMTA had considered other barrier materials. Matt Lasky, Project Manager with SFMTA, said SFMTA used delineators a great deal because they were quick and easy to install and therefore relatively inexpensive. He said SFMTA had experimented with a number of different materials and concluded that bike lane buffers offering the most protection were concrete barriers, but that those were more expensive and required more time for design.

Chair Larson asked which kinds of bike facilities were included in the bicycle facility maintenance program, for example, he asked if generic bike lanes (i.e., without green paint) would be included, observing that it seemed to him that many of those lanes needed substantial work. Mr. Lasky answered affirmatively that regular bike lanes would be included, as well as painted lanes paint and delineated buffers.

During public comment, Edward Mason noted that others had made public comments at SFMTA meetings stating that Richmond residents had voted for BART many years ago but have yet to see any direct BART service, and asked why the project limits for the Geary/19th Avenue Subway Strategic Case study do not extend the full length of Geary Boulevard. He said the turn onto 19th Avenue would mean much of the Richmond would remain underserved by rail transit.

After public comment, Chair Larson and David Klein asked staff to respond to Mr. Mason's question.

Mr. Heidel said the study limits were recommendations from the City's ConnectSF strategic planning effort but said the location of the subway's turn to south was still on the table. He explained that input from transit operations staff was that terminating the subway at the beach would be difficult due to lack of room for a turnaround or a maintenance area. Additionally, he noted this and future studies would need to examine and balance the needs of both passenger demand as well as operations, particularly as it relates to tying this project into the rest of the regional rail system.

David Klein motioned to approve the item, seconded by Eric Rozell.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: Tupuola (1)

8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Release \$1,200,000 of Prop K Funds Held on Reserve for the Geary Bus Rapid Transit Phase 2 Conceptual Engineering Report - ACTION



Dan Tischler, Principal Transportation Modeler, and Daniel Mackowski, Streets Division Project Manager with SFMTA, presented the item.

Member Jerry Levine asked about how infrastructure on Geary Boulevard differs from Van Ness Avenue. Mr. Mackowski responded by saying that Geary Boulevard is newer than Van Ness Avenue but is still old and has aging utilities. The proposed work on Geary Boulevard would be minor compared to the Van Ness infrastructure work and would have less risk. However, he said that the sewers and water lines under Geary are about 100 years old and probably need replacement. He noted that the SFMTA is currently in discussion about coordinating improvements with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission.

Mr. Levine asked if local residents could park at late hour meters and not be ticketed. Mr. Mackowski responded that there is not overlap between the area proposed for extended meter hours and the current residential parking permit area. He said the meters would be a tool for businesses because they encourage parking space turnover.

Member Nancy Buffum asked a question about schools and safe street crossings and how SFMTA did outreach to schools, youth, and families with children. Mr. Mackowski responded that SFMTA did not do much specific outreach to children, but they sent information to school principals who would pass the information along to neighborhood families.

Member Buffum followed up by saying that some parent groups may offer a better way to reach parents. Mr. Mackowski agreed that this was a good idea and said he would relay this input to the outreach lead for follow-up.

Member David Klein asked if SFMTA would get rid of the red wave design for the bus stops and the glass station advertisement signs that they were often broken. Mr. Mackowski responded by noting that Clear Channel media company was responsible and that their contract continued for a few more years. He said that these issues raised by Mr. Klein will be considered at contract renewal.

Mr. Klein asked if the project would deliver capacity improvement, if travel time savings could be reinvested in route frequency, and about the timeframe of the travel time improvements. Mr. Mackowski responded by describing SFMTA's travel time analysis. He said SFMTA developed estimates of travel time savings relative to pre-COVID conditions and relative to current conditions after the implementation of the now permanent temporary emergency transit lanes (TETLs) on sections of the project corridor. He continued by saying that SFMTA's analysis showed that the TETLs delivered less than half of the overall project benefits relative to pre-COVID conditions and that the proposed project would deliver the majority of total travel time benefits.

Mr. Klein asked about community pushback. Mr. Mackowski responded by describing issues raised by community stakeholders to date. He said one of these concerns was that the project would not deliver much benefit to areas west of 25th Avenue. Mr. Mackowski described a walking tour with District 1 Supervisor Connie Chan and SFMTA Director of Transportation Jeffrey Tumlin that occurred the previous week. He said that during the walking tour, they spoke with people in the field and listened to concerns with SFMTA in feedback gathering mode.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked if there were any provisions on casino buses. Mr. Mason had seen casino buses occupying Muni bus stops at 9th and Geary Boulevard and asked if commuter buses and casino buses were going to be in the bus



lanes. Mr. Mason suggested that there may be congestion in the lanes because of these buses.

After public comment, Chair Larson asked for clarification about whether shuttle buses and casino buses being allowed to use Geary Boulevard bus lanes.

Mr. Mackowski responded by saying that San Francisco had different types of bus lanes. He explained that Haight Street and Van Ness Avenue were Muni only for technical reasons; and side running lanes were generally bus/taxi only. He continued to explain that California vehicle code defined a bus as any vehicle with 10 or more passengers and all buses were legal in the lanes, but they are not allowed to stop in the lane or block bus lanes. He said with newly passed legislation, Muni could take pictures and ticket vehicles blocking the lanes. Mr. Mackowski said he would flag 9th Avenue and Geary Boulevard for enforcement staff. He said SFMTA had done a study on the non-transit buses in transit lanes, and found that it is rare for buses to actually be delayed by commuter buses, and said SFMTA saw these lanes as super carpool lanes for any vehicles with lots of passengers.

Kat Siegal motioned to approve the item, seconded by David Klein.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Buffum, Chen, Gower, Klein, Larson, Ortiz, Rozell, Siegal, Tannen (9)

Absent: Levine, Tupuola (2)

9. Adopt a Motion of Support to Amend the Adopted Fiscal Year 2021/22 Budget to Increase Revenues by \$1.7 Million, Decrease Expenditures by \$13.3 Million and Decrease Other Financing Sources by \$50.0 Million for a Total Net Decrease in Fund Balance of \$34.7 Million - ACTION

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

Chair Larson asked for clarification on the decreases, that the expenditures were mostly because of delays, except for Vision Zero in which different funding sources were sought. Ms. Fong confirmed that this was accurate.

There was no public comment.

Chair Larson motioned to approve the item, seconded by Robert Gower.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Buffum, Chen, Gower, Klein, Larson, Ortiz, Rozell, Siegal, Tannen (9)

Absent: Levine, Tupuola (2)

Chair Larson commented that he was impressed with how fiscally well managed the agency was and appreciated staff's clear explanations of the budget.

10. San Francisco County Transportation Authority Public Engagement Methodology - INFORMATION

Eric Young, Director of Communications, presented the item.

Member Kevin Ortiz thanked staff for the presentation and asked how the agency identified stakeholders, and ensured that contacts lists are up to date. Mr. Young answered that the agency had just implemented Salesforce to improve tracking of



contact lists. He said that with new contacts, staff may monitor news coverage mentioning community representatives, engage in communities, interact with Supervisors' offices, get input from CAC members, and use other means to keep lists up to date. Mr. Ortiz suggested that staff periodically contact Supervisors' offices to help keep contacts up to date on the lists.

Mr. Ortiz also asked how focus group participants were identified, ensuring diversity minimums were met and that different communities were represented. Mr. Young answered that it depended on the type of focus group conducted with each group being unique and ensuring that there was deep engagement with members of a particular community. He described some of the factors considered such as language spoken, ethnic background, residential location, work location, and commute habits.

Mr. Ortiz asked what languages and how many the Transportation Authority translated to ensure language access was always a consideration in communications and outreach. Mr. Young answered the typical languages were Spanish, Chinese, and Filipino, which was standard across City and County of San Francisco agencies. He said there were other instances when more languages were translated beyond the standard set.

Mr. Ortiz asked if the agency had categorical lists that were specifically tailored to specific constituencies by organization or community. Director Young confirmed that this was the case.

Chair Larson noted that the Geary corridor project offered outreach materials translated in Russian and believed anything in the Tenderloin might prompt translation into Vietnamese and some other Southeast Asian languages as well.

Member Nancy Buffum reiterated her comment on the Geary Bus Rapid Transit item that when seeking broad-based input, that staff ensuring that families with children and teenage children were considered as an important community for input - one which was frequently overlooked and had a more difficult time attending outreach events than other people. Mr. Young agreed that this was another community to be considered.

Mr. Ortiz said he would like to see a concrete outreach plan for larger projects, and it would be helpful for the CAC to see that ahead of time, so they could provide input.

There was no public comment.

Other Items

11. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

Member Robert Gower commented that he often saw car collisions on the island of the inbound J Church stop in his neighborhood, sometimes with the vehicle completely flipped as a result of hitting the island. He said that he often heard from people who witnessed these incidents that they did not know how to effectively communicate their concerns or requests to city agencies to prevent these collisions from reoccurring. Mr. Gower said he also read an article from the San Francisco Chronicle calling the city's traffic calming efforts useless, indicating a strong disconnect between community concern and what the city is doing in response. He continued that SFMTA's traffic calming program seemed inaccessible and the contact was a 311 email address, which seemed like a black hole. Mr. Gower suggested there should be a resource for the public to effectively relay information and receive a response from the appropriate agencies rather than having to contact several different agencies or resort to enacting their own solutions. He expressed a desire to see engagement happen in a more



comprehensive way enabling the public to relay suggestions with dedicated responses and requested a presentation on existing resources and how the process could be streamlined for effective response from agency staff.

Member Nancy Buffum requested an update on the future of slow streets, particularly with a focus on John F. Kennedy Drive, so that the CAC could provide input on before any decisions were made. Chair Larson agreed.

Member Peter Tannen asked if there were any plans to resume in-person CAC meetings. Chair Larson answered that there was discussion about how emergency orders may or may not affect the flexibility of the group meeting in person and CAC members would be polled on their preferences.

Chair Larson requested an update on the Caltrain station in southeast San Francisco, regarding the diversion lane near Oakdale and Evans avenues. He also asked about the opening of central subway. The Chair said these could be brief informational items, perhaps under the umbrella of the ConnectSF program.

There was no public comment.

12. Public Comment

There was no general public comment.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:28 p.m.