



DRAFT MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, January 25, 2023

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

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

CAC members present at Roll: Sara Barz, Najuwanda Daniels, Calvin Ho, Jerry Levine, Rachael Ortega, Kevin Ortiz, Eric Rozell, and Kat Siegal (8)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Rosa Chen (1)

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Ortiz reported that at the past Transportation Authority Board meeting, Tilly Chang, Executive Director, presented the annual report which is available on the website. Earlier in the month, he noted that the Board also re-elected Chair Mandelman and elected Commissioner Melgar as Vice Chair. Chair Ortiz shared breaking news that the state Supreme Court dismissed challenges to the Bay Area Traffic Relief Plan approved by Bay Area voters in 2018 through Regional Measure 3 (RM3). He explained that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA) would administer RM3 bridge tolls to finance a \$4.45 billion slate of highway and transit improvements in the toll bridge corridors and their approach routes. Major projects and programs of SF interest include:

- \$500 million (M) for additional BART vehicles,
- \$325 M for the Caltrain Downtown Rail Extension,
- \$140 M for Muni Fleet and Facilities,
- \$150 M for Bay Trail/Safe Routes to Transit Projects,
- And significant operating support for ferry service, ramping up to \$35 M a year by year 5.

Chair Ortiz also welcomed CAC Member Calvin Ho, representing District 4, who introduced himself.

There was no public comment.

3. Election of Chair and Vice Chair for 2023 - ACTION*

Chair Ortiz and CAC Member Siegal spoke to their interests and qualifications in serving as CAC Chair and Vice Chair respectively.

CAC Member Ortega moved to elect Chair Ortiz as Chair and Member Siegal as Vice Chair, seconded by CAC Member Barz



Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Ho, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, Rozell and Siegal
(8)

Absent: CAC Member Chen (1)

Consent Agenda

- 4. Approve the Minutes of the November 30, 2022 Meeting - ACTION**
- 5. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the Fiscal Year 2022/23 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Local Expenditure Criteria – ACTION***
- 6. Internal Accounting Report, Investment Report, and Debt Expenditure Report for the Six Months Ending December 31, 2022 - INFORMATION***
- 7. Audit Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022 - INFORMATION***
- 8. Community Advisory Committee Vacancies - INFORMATION**

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

Member Siegal moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Member Rozell.

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Ho, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, Rozell and Siegal
(8)

Absent: CAC Members Chen (1)

End of Consent Agenda

- 9. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$4,188,294 and Appropriate \$50,000 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, Allocate \$1,179,000 in Prop AA Funds, and Allocate \$2,000,000 in TNC Tax Funds for Seven Requests – ACTION***

Lynda Viray, Transportation Planner, and Rachel Hiatt, Deputy Director for Planning, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Eric Rozell asked if different outcomes related to closing the Great Highway would it affect the relevance of the Great Highway Signal Upgrade - Additional Funds project.

Bryant Woo, Project Manager at San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), answered that the signals design was flexible and accommodated either scenario, in which both halves remain a roadway or one half gets converted.

Member Rachael Ortega asked about the J Church Muni Forward project and requested additional information on community outreach. She expressed interest in attending these events and wanted to share the details with other community members.

Felipe Robles, Project Manager at SFMTA, answered that they have information available and can provide that directly to Member Ortega. He explained they had a robust outreach strategy that would occur in the next few months involving



community meetings, briefings, neighborhood groups, and Supervisor briefings.

Member Kat Siegal asked about the design costs for the J Church Muni Forward and M Ocean View Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements projects. She added the costs were attributed to labor and wanted clarification on why the funding source was from Prop K as opposed to the sponsor.

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, answered that the design phase was typically implemented by in-house labor but not all the time. She added it was usually designers and engineers at either SFMTA or San Francisco Public Works, and there was occasionally contracted labor mainly for construction such as Quick-Builds implementation.

Member Siegal asked if in-house labor would be a cost of a capital project.

Ms. LaForte answered affirmatively that in-house labor would be considered a cost of a capital project as opposed to the sponsor's operating budget. She explained that the design phase would produce construction drawings and bid documents, allowing the project to proceed to construction.

Member Siegal asked about the pedestrian and transit boarding islands mentioned in the J Church Muni Forward project and if those improvements were applicable to any other bus or rail corridors. She wanted to know if subsequent similar improvements would require a two-year design phase or if future projects could be completed quicker.

Ms. LaForte answered this was the typical timeline for this type of project and invited SFMTA staff to speak.

Mr. Robles explained that SFMTA was proposing concrete improvements on the entire surface of the J line which was time intensive. He also added there was site specific work conducted by civil engineers such as the review of intersections and utilities that could vary from corridor to corridor. Mr. Robles said that aspects of the design had evolved to speed up the process but the civil engineer's review could often be lengthy.

Chair Kevin Ortiz asked about the Fiscal Year 2022/23 Vision-Zero Quick-Build Program Implementation (Part 1) project with respect to the Vision Zero action strategy to complete 20 quick-build projects by 2024 and how the funding request had only six corridors identified and said he wanted to know when the remaining 14 corridors would be moving forward. He also requested a status update on the quick-build program, as it appeared SFMTA was behind schedule in project implementation. Chair Ortiz said his understanding was that Franklin appeared to be the only project completed and in a prior year, there were only 10 quick-build projects finished. He voiced concern with expediting this work and wanted clarity on how SFMTA would move forward with faster implementation efforts.

Jen Wong, Project Manager at SFMTA, clarified that in 2022, SFMTA completed more than the Franklin Street quick build. She explained that the number varied per year based on the complexity of projects, staffing availability, and other factors. She stated SFMTA was committed to working on all areas of the High Injury Network and the work was spread throughout many different programs and had many other work streams that contributed to safer San Francisco streets, such as traffic calming and



slow streets projects. Ms. Wong continued by stating that the work would not end at this allocation request and work would be done on a number of corridor style projects, spot improvements, outreach, evaluation, and other administrative activities. She explained that all these were the various facets of program delivery and said that she would gladly share more information with the committee.

Chair Ortiz added that his understanding was SFMTA completed one quick-build project that was funded for 2020 in 2022 and there were projects that were completed in the previous year from a previous calendar year. He wanted to know why the work was behind schedule and the timeline for the 20 projects to be completed. He also expressed concern that the quick-build projects did not consider traffic studies such as the Valencia corridor. Chair Ortiz requested additional information on the timeline of the quick-build work.

Ms. Wong answered that in terms of the traffic analysis, every project had its own planning process tailored to the specific needs seen. She said with the Valencia Street project, the project team was responding based on outreach feedback. She continued by noting that some of the quick-build projects were in an earlier implementation phase of a larger capital project like the 6th Street or Taylor Street corridors, which had very extensive traffic analyses done. Ms. Wong stated that SFMTA staff was working with the Transportation Authority on the timing of the allocations, and continuing to queue up projects so that work could progress without stopping.

Chair Ortiz thanked Ms. Wong for the response. He asked if there was an estimated timeline for when the other projects would be implemented, particularly ones up for funding in 2023.

Ms. Wong replied that there were a large number of quick-build projects and said she would be happy to follow up via email. For example, she said that Lake Merced Boulevard would be queued up for construction and that Lincoln Way, Hyde Street, 17th Street, Bayshore Boulevard, Sloat Boulevard, and Valencia Street were in the planning phase and after outreach and approval could also begin construction in 2023. She said the projects included in the subject allocation request, like Cesar Chavez Street and Clarendon Avenue, could start later in the calendar year as well.

Ms. LaForte explained that there were also standalone quick-build projects like Central Embarcadero and Lake Merced that could be funded with Transportation Network Company (TNC) Tax revenues and suggested that staff could work with Ms. Wong's to provide the CAC with a comprehensive look at the quick-build projects that had been funded and their status along with a look at projects going forward.

Chair Ortiz requested an estimated timeline to complete projects and a report in March, if possible.

Ms. LaForte said staff could provide a report in March as part of the TNC Tax programming and allocation item that would come to the CAC.

During public comment, Chris Faust said the J Church project did not make sense in his neighborhood and the boarding islands would cause more traffic jams along with delaying the Muni lines. He also commented on the traffic light on Church and 25th streets, which he said was not a busy intersection.

Kevin Wallace said the bulb-outs would slow things down and were not needed, that



they would negatively affect the merchants by slowing down traffic and taking away parking.

Edward Mason said the light on 25th should be located somewhere else and two-car train platforms would eliminate the Liberty Street stop and impact shared spaces along the corridor. He opined that the benefits to the rider experience at a \$20 million cost were questionable. Mr. Mason said it was unnecessary to build the south side of Market/Church boarding area into the plaza. He further spoke on travel time savings.

Anastasia Yovanopoulos asked when the public was allowed to give feedback on the J Church project. She said the SFMTA would be throwing away money on something that would not work for the community. She continued that the real problem was that the trains broke down several times a day. She added that she was also concerned about the J Church's access to downtown stations being limited by the addition of a forced transfer. She asked project managers to ensure that outreach to the community was being done.

Member Ortega said that she would take the District 8 commenters' concerns to the Board. She added that she agreed the bulb-outs would make it hard for people to park on the street and not everyone has off street parking. She noted confusion on the improvement locations (25th Street vs. Cesar Chavez Street) and requested clarification on the J Church project details.

Member Siegal asked staff to speak on the callers' concerns regarding the removal of some stop signs and concerns related to pedestrian safety at those intersections.

Mr. Robles answered that the discussions around stop sign removal and bulb-out installation were what SFMTA was hoping to have during spring as part of the public outreach and that the trade-offs were understood between parking and pedestrian safety. He added that the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed a measure in the previous year directing SFMTA to improve any transit stops citywide where passengers were forced to navigate through parked cars or active traffic lanes to get on or off buses and trains, and that measure was leading SFMTA's proposals in making the specific improvements. Mr. Robles said SFMTA was noting all the public feedback in refining proposals moving forward.

Member Sara Barz said regarding the J Church project and the spring outreach, it would be helpful to have evidence-based assessment on how transit bulbs impact pedestrian safety and the data on specific trade-offs of the proposed improvements. She added that the J Church serviced the eastern part of District 7 and common complaints were about how unreliable the J Church was to get from that neighborhood to downtown, which has also caused her to favor using BART instead even though it is a farther walk. She commented that any improvements that could be made to improve the reliability of the J Church would benefit the entire city.

Chair Ortiz commented that in a previous career as a youth organizer, there was a running joke that the J Church would run faster in certain neighborhoods rather than from the east side, so he was also interested in the data about J Church improvements. He thanked the District 8 constituents for voicing their concerns and looked forward to hearing about the community engagement process with District 8 stakeholders.

Chair Ortiz expressed concern about the proposed quick-build projects and stated he



was not comfortable supporting that item. He asked for a motion to continue the item.

Member Barz asked for clarification about staff coming back with more information on quick-builds in March and asked if that addressed the Chair's concern.

Chair Ortiz clarified that his concern was about obtaining information on the effectiveness of completed projects from 2022, status updates of projects in progress, and the plan for projects to be proposed in the coming year.

In response to requests for clarification on options for the next steps the CAC could take, Chief Deputy Director Maria Lombardo explained that the CAC could make a motion to continue the Vision Zero Quick-Build Program part of the item, or the CAC sever the Quick-build Program request and vote on it separately from the rest of the requests in the item. She said it could take two months for a follow-up report to be brought back to the CAC, depending on staff resources.

Chair Ortiz asked how long the projects would be delayed if the CAC did not approve the Quick-Build Program request.

Ms. LaForte explained that the proposed projects were the first part of the process, which would allow SFMTA access to funding for design. She added that the proposal was only half of the needed funds from Prop K and staff anticipating recommending the other half of the funds from the TNC Tax, but those funds needed to be programmed first, and staff would bring back that request to the CAC in March and to the Board in April. Ms. LaForte added that the last of the Prop K allocations would be approved at the February CAC and March Board meetings since Prop L takes effect on April 1, 2023. Ms. LaForte continued by saying that staff would not be ready with the TNC Tax item in time for February CAC due to a very large number of Prop K requests moving forward and Prop L implementation work. She noted that the freeze on Prop K would not affect the TNC Tax funds. Ms. LaForte added that staff was happy to provide the information requested by Chair Ortiz, including the project list and status of the projects, which was received on a quarterly basis.

Chair Ortiz said he'd like to see a more comprehensive report or vision of the overall quick-builds rather than seeing it in pieces, so that it could be improved at one meeting. He asked for a motion on the item.

Member Siegal moved to approve the item, seconded by Member Barz.

The motion failed by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Ho, Levine, and Siegal (4)

Nays: CAC Member Daniels, Ortiz, and Rozell (3)

Abstain: CAC Member Ortega (1)

Absent: CAC Member Chen (1)

Member Levine moved to defer the J Church Muni Forward and FY23 Vision Zero Quick-Build Program Implementation (Part 1) recommendations of the item, seconded by Member Ortega.

Member Najuawanda Daniels asked for clarification on the second motion and if the Innes Avenue Sidewalk Improvements could be added the deferment because she would like information about the project.



Ms. Lombardo invited Member Daniels to ask staff about the Innes Avenue project to see if they could address her concerns.

Member Daniels expressed concerns about what outreach had been done with the community on Innes Avenue and wanted to know what the complete project entailed.

Paul Barradas, Project Manager at San Francisco Public Works, replied that they would be installing a four-foot or larger sidewalk, catchment fence, and curb ramps on Innes Avenue between Arelious Walker and Donahue Street. He said there had been some rocks falling from the hillside and there needed to be a fence to catch those, curb ramps missing, and sidewalk missing on that portion of the street. He continued that staff would conduct outreach in the area along the process.

Chair Ortiz asked if staff answered addressed Member Daniel's concerns about that project.

Member Daniels confirmed and thanked staff for addressing her concerns. She added there was no longer a need to sever the proposed project from the rest of the request.

Member Barz asked for clarification on how delay in a CAC vote would affect the funding of the quick-build projects.

Ms. Wong, SFMTA, answered that the impact of delaying a vote two months would also be a delay in the processing of funds at the Controller's Office and providing SFMTA access to the funds. She added that the sooner the funds were programmed the sooner staff could begin the planning and design phase work on the projects, which would include outreach to communities and stakeholders, developing materials and designs, conducting technical feasibility analyses, and design work for those locations.

Member Ortega expressed her concern about the community not having been involved in providing input to the proposal of the J Church. She asked if there was a point between design and construction that the CAC could see the status of the project and provide input again.

Mr. Robles said the outreach process in spring would be an opportunity for the public to provide input and refine the designs for the project.

Member Ortega said she did not want to hold up the funding for the outreach to be done on the J Church Muni Forward project and asked Member Levine if he was willing to amend the motion on the floor.

Member Levine moved to defer the FY23 Vision Zero Quick-Build Program Implementation (Part 1) request, seconded by Member Ortega.

The proposed amendment to defer the Vision Zero Quick-Build Program request failed by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Daniels, Levine, Ortega Ortiz, and Rozell (5)

Nays: CAC Member Barz, Ho, and Siegal (3)

Absent: CAC Member Chen (1)

Member Siegal suggested severing the Vision Zero Quick-Build Program request to



vote on it separately and made a motion of support to approve all of the remaining requests, seconded by Eric Rozell.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Ho, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, Rozell, and Siegal (8)

Nays: (0)

Absent: CAC Member Chen (1)

Member Siegal proposed voting to either approve or not approve of the Vision Zero Quick-Build Program request since a previous motion to defer the item failed.

Member Barz asked Chair Ortiz to restate his reasoning for deferring the Quick-Build Program request.

Chair Ortiz explained that he was not sold on the Quick-Build Program since the other projects were already behind schedule for 2022, as well as for 2023. He said an extra two months didn't concern him since the projects were already years behind. He added that he wanted to get to the root cause of why the projects were behind schedule and figure out how to expedite some of the timelines, as well as a comprehensive report on how the Quick-Build Program was implemented. He added that there was some concern about SFMTA having issues with some of the capital projects and wanted the CAC to get a better understanding.

Member Siegal moved to approve the FY23 Vision Zero Quick-Build Program Implementation (Part 1) request, seconded by Member Barz.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Ho, Levine, Ortega, Rozell, and Siegal (6)

Nays: CAC Members Daniels and Ortiz (2)

Absent: Chen (1)

10. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve the 2023 State and Federal Legislation Program – ACTION*

Amber Crabbe, Public Policy Manager, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

During public comment, Edward Mason said he was concerned about the use of scooters on sidewalks and the lack of enforcement of that activity.

Vice Chair Siegal moved to approve the item, seconded by Member Levine.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Ho, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, Rozell and Siegal (8)

Absent: CAC Members Chen (1)

11. Visitation Valley Community Based Transportation Plan Update – INFORMATION*

Due to time constraints, the Chair continued this item to the February 22, 2023 CAC



meeting.

12. Prop L Implementation Approach – INFORMATION*

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

Chair Ortiz thanked staff for their work on Prop L and the Expenditure Plan and stated that he was excited to see the implementation of Prop L.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated that he sent a letter to the Transportation Authority Board and copied the Community Advisory Committee regarding his concerns about the Downtown Extension project. He noted that the news at the start of the CAC meeting about the RM3 Supreme Court update was significant and would mean that TJPA could meet their August deadline. He expressed concern about the cost of the Downtown Extension project and noted that there was a \$900 million application to the federal government that was declined. He stated that the point of his letter was to raise concerns about the technical capability and the rising cost of the project and urged CAC members to consider the impacts on South of Market and MUNI and to consider if there could be a better alternative.

13. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Slow Streets Program Update – INFORMATION*

Shannon Hake, SFMTA, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Ortiz asked what the pedestrian and bike walk count was on the Shotwell slow street. He also questioned the framework and community engagement for extending the Shotwell slow street from 20th to 22nd.

Ms. Hake responded that SFMTA did an evaluation on slow street corridors that can be found at sfmta.com/slowstreets. She stated that on average, there was an increase in pedestrians and bikes on slow streets. She continued that 22nd was originally included, to align with the existing bike network, however there were construction projects that prevented it from being implemented yet. She said SFMTA planned to start a community engagement process soon.

Member Ortega asked how daily vehicle volumes were calculated.

Ms. Hake responded that SFMTA used tubes, left out for 3-4 days, and created an average corridor count.

Vice Chair Siegal followed up on Member Ortega's question to clarify how the average was calculated. She also asked how school zones were taken into account in the average calculation and about SFMTA's approach to egregious speeding.

Ms. Hake responded that they use the average of all blocks in the slow street corridor. Ms. Hake said that SFMTA does take into account school zones and that is captured through the peak hour per block. She said that SFMTA looks at these outliers to find strategies to reduce variations in volume and speeding. Ms. Hake continued by saying that any speeds over 25 mph are too fast when people are in the street and that the SFMTA could lower speeds to as low as 20 mph. She noted that enforcement was not a policy priority so the SFMTA focused on engineering.

Member Barz complimented Ms. Hake and her team's presentation materials for



being very accessible and user friendly. She asked whether SFMTA wanted 15 mph to be the median speed or average speed.

Ms. Hake responded that the SFMTA Board adopted a policy aiming for the median speed to be at 15 mph or slower.

Member Ho pointed out that the data on slide 9 was a year old and that it should be noted as such.

During public comment Ed Mason asked whether there was a measurement of displaced traffic from the slow streets to adjacent streets.

Member Barz asked for a response to Mr. Mason's question.

Ms. Hake responded that SFMTA did collect overall volumes for parallel streets and compared before and after. She said that SFMTA did not see significant impacts on adjacent streets in the evaluation, noting that slow streets are selected, in part, based on already low traffic volumes.

Other Items

14. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

Member Ortega asked for a discussion on bringing back SFMTA bus routes that were suspended during the pandemic, specifically the bus 76 that goes to Marin. She then asked about ridership numbers and community perception for the new Central Subway, referencing a Chronicle article. She noted that both of these requests were brought to her attention by former CAC member Peter Tanne.

Chair Ortiz requested a comprehensive report on SFMTA quick-builds, with historical data included, as well as planned and underway projects. He also requested an exploration of a community-based transportation plan for the Mission.

Member Daniels requested either information or a presentation on the Evans Street project that caused flooding over the New Years holiday.

Member Ho asked about materials on the Sunset Neighborways and the N-Judah Muni Forward project. He requested a presentation if there is no information available. Finally, he requested information on the impacts of the recent storms.

During public comment, Peter Tannen thanked CAC Member Ortega for bringing up the two items he brought to her attention and said he looked forward to hearing about them.

15. Public Comment

During public comment, Roland Lebrun noted that taking public comment is not optional. He expressed appreciation for the Zoom format, including using the chat to display which item was being presented. He then requested that a copy of the meeting transcript and video be made public as well as a count down clock for public comment.

Ed Mason observed that company commuter buses generally run empty and should not continue running, and that they are net contributors to greenhouse gas emissions.



Member Rozell supported the idea for a countdown clock.

Member Siegal echoed Mr. Lebrun's request for meeting transcripts. She continued that the Zoom format is friendlier and requested that the Transportation Authority make it as easy as possible for the public to participate in meetings when the CAC returns to in person.

16. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:38 p.m.