



# DRAFT MINUTES

## Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, February 22, 2023

### 1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Ortiz called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m.

Present at Roll Call: Members Calvin Ho, Jerry Levine, Rachael Ortega, Kevin Ortiz, Eric Rozell, and Kat Siegal (6)

Absent at Roll Call: Members Sara Barz (entered during item 2), Rosa Chen (entered during item 2), and Najuwanda Daniels (3)

### 2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Ortiz reported that state lawmakers created a select committee, chaired by Senator Scott Weiner, that is focused on assisting transit agencies that continue to negatively impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic and are now facing significant operating deficits as they fully expend federal relief funds that sustained operations during the pandemic. Chair Ortiz related that one of the Transportation Authority's main legislative goals in 2023 is to secure state support to address the pending transit operations fiscal cliff, and announced that BART, Caltrain, and SFMTA would present their agency's financial outlook at the Transportation Authority's February 28<sup>th</sup> Board meeting.

Chair Ortiz reminded the CAC that this was the last fully virtual CAC meeting due to the Governor's emergency health order expiring at the end of February. He concluded by thanking staff for adding a public comment timer and thanking the public commenter who suggested adding it.

During public comment, Hillary Brown of Urban Habitat stated that she was present.

## Consent Agenda

### 3. Approve the Minutes of the January 25, 2023 Meeting - ACTION

### 4. State and Federal Legislation Update – ACTION\*

### 5. Community Advisory Committee Vacancies- INFORMATION\*

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

Member Levine moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Member Ortega.

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Chen, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, Rozell and Siegal (7)

Absent: CAC Members Daniels and Ho (2)



## End of Consent Agenda

### 6. **Visitation Valley and Portola Community Based Transportation Plan Update - INFORMATION\***

Christopher Kidd, SFMTA Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

CAC Member Barz shared that the transportation plan appeared like a great model and expressed her appreciation.

Chair Ortiz asked whether there would be a specific liaison at the SFMTA for community contact going forward.

Mr. Kidd responded that San Francisco had success implementing the Bayview Community Based Transportation Plan with himself acting as an informal liaison. He said that he expected to fulfill a similar role for the Visitation Valley plan, however there was no formal liaison identified. Mr. Kidd shared that it could be worthwhile to make the liaison a more robust position.

During public comment, Hillary Brown stated that they were associated with Urban Habitat and asked whether the accessibility team at SFMTA had been consulted on the project.

Mr. Kidd shared that there was an advisory committee for the study with one member from SFMTA's accessible services division in addition to outreach to San Francisco's senior and disability community.

### 7. **Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the Recommendations of the Caltrain 22nd Street Station ADA Access Improvement Feasibility Study for the Preferred Improvements to Achieve Street-to-Platform Accessibility – ACTION\***

David Pape, Caltrain Principal Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Levine asked whether there was an estimate of potential disabled users of the station or how many people currently had to go to a different station because of access issues at 22nd Street.

David Pape responded that he did not have those numbers on hand but would make an inquiry and get back to Member Levine.

Member Rozell asked whether the design would allow for elevator operations.

David Pape responded that was something that would have to be looked at more specifically but was certainly something that could be investigated later although there may be challenges on the northbound platform.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated that it was an exciting project but expressed concern that the platform was not level with the train so there would still need to be someplace for wheelchairs to get on the train. He questioned whether Caltrain had any plans to raise the platform for level boarding.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Chen, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, Rozell and Siegal (7)



Absent: CAC Members Daniels and Ho (2)

**8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$16,406,910 and Appropriate \$687,236 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, and Allocate \$2,882,492 in Prop AA Funds for 23 Requests – ACTION\***

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, Mike Pickford, Principal Transportation Planner, and Aliza Paz, Principal Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Vice Chair Siegal asked if other treatments, such as stop signs, had been considered for the 38<sup>th</sup> and Geary Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons project. She commented that the rectangular rapid flashing beacons alone did not seem like enough to slow down drivers or require them to yield and asked if additional infrastructure treatments, such as narrowing traffic lanes or adding raised crosswalks, could be considered as complementary improvements to the rectangular rapid flashing beacons. She asked how the project would be evaluated to assess and monitor the effectiveness of the rectangular rapid flashing beacons for increasing driver yielding.

Jamie Parks, Livable Streets Director at SFMTA, responded that SFMTA could evaluate the effectiveness of the rectangular rapid flashing beacons at 38<sup>th</sup> and Geary as the project goes forward. He also noted that, in San Francisco and nationally, rapid flashing beacons, which rapidly flash a yellow light when a pedestrian is crossing, have been found to be one of the most effective pedestrian safety treatments. He commented that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) had found that they reduce pedestrian crashes by about 50% and about 90% of drivers yield to them. Mr. Parks noted that in the long term a full traffic signal would be an option for this location, but that would cost more than \$1 million dollars and take longer to implement. He said there was a pedestrian fatality at this intersection last year and it is one of the only uncontrolled crossings along this segment of Geary, so installing rapid flashing beacons could be a quicker solution to pedestrian safety issues.

Vice Chair Siegal responded that the study had a small sample size and asked if there was data about SFMTA's use of Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons, including data about their success.

Mr. Parks responded that there are over 30 Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons in San Francisco and he would look into the San Francisco evaluation data for them. He noted that anecdotally they work well.

Member Ortega asked if the Valencia Long-Term Bikeway Pilot project was related to the proposed middle lane bike path that had been circulated by SFMTA.

Jamie Parks, Livable Streets Director at SFMTA, responded that the Valencia Long-Term Bikeway Pilot was related to the center running bike lane proposal along Valencia, which would go to the SFMTA Board later this year. He added that regardless of the outcome of the center lane bike path proposal, Valencia Street would need a longer term vision for the street and that this study would look at additional options that have not yet been studied, such as a one-way option on Valencia Street and pedestrianizing certain blocks along Valencia Street. He said that the study would allow SFMTA to study more options and report back to refine a long-term option for Valencia Street.



Member Ortega asked if there would be more community feedback on the next phase of the study.

Mr. Parks replied that the proposed study was not an action, but rather a study to gather information on alternatives, and that the results would be presented to the community and used for future outreach. He said that the project would include a traffic and circulation study to understand impacts on parallel streets and alleys in the neighborhood of Valencia Street. There were to be made a one-way street or pedestrian street. He said that the study also included funds for merchant outreach to better understand their concerns and identify any potential options. He said that the outcome of the study would be analysis and results, which would in turn be presented and used in different forums for public outreach.

Chair Ortiz asked if the third option of a car protected bike lane along Valencia would be considered as well, and what the timeline would be to study that option. He commented that he had spoken with the Supervisor's office and that they would want the third option of a car protected bike lane on either side of the street to be considered as well. He acknowledged that there are a lot of competing interests along Valencia Street. Mr. Parks replied that SFMTA had previously studied the standard parking protected bike lane for Valencia Street and that the initial intent of the Valencia Long-Term Bikeway Pilot project was to study new options, but that it could also include a summary of the analysis about a standard parking protected bike lane so that all the potential options would be presented together. He said that the purpose of the study was to produce new information and additional options so that the benefits and tradeoffs could be looked at all together, and not to take options off the table.

Chair Ortiz asked if the end result of the study would consider the final results of the Shared Spaces program, which would change and be reduced in the coming months. He commented that he would like the study to include the end results from the Shared Spaces program along Valencia Street.

Mr. Parks replied that SFMTA could include a paragraph in the scope of work to address the Shared Spaces program. He also acknowledged that the deadline for applications is coming up, but that it is not yet known how many or which of the more than 40 Shared Spaces currently on Valencia Street would remain. He added that the study could factor in a permanent counting of the Shared Spaces once they are known in the late Spring.

Chair Ortiz replied that he had conducted his own community survey recently and that he estimated about half of the Shared Spaces would be eliminated. Chair Ortiz expressed shock and dismay that official documents had included the name "Burrito Plan." He stated that it was a problematic name, and that a different name should have been used. He stated that it was problematic and insensitive to the Latinx community to have a plan associated with one of their foods, and that he would like a different name to be used.

Mr. Parks replied that he understood Chair Ortiz's comment.

Member Barz asked if the demonstration block included in the Valencia Long-Term Bikeway Pilot project was a new idea, or if it had been done before. Member Barz also asked how it would work.



Mr. Parks replied that it was the first time that he was aware of a demonstration block being done. He said that the thought behind it was that as SFMTA goes through the circulation study and outreach process, when a particular block comes up as suitable to try out different changes, then SFMTA can test out potential changes on that block. He commented that SFMTA would be interested in applying treatments on a block-by-block basis to respond to community needs.

Vice Chair Siegal commented on the Kirkland Yard Electrification project and thanked staff for sharing additional information on SFMTA's zero emission bus rollout. She acknowledged the project was to comply with the state's Innovative Clean Transit regulation and was part of SFMTA's sustainability goal. However, she expressed concern about the substantive project investment in battery electric bus procurement and bus yards retrofit, given that SFMTA accounted for only 1% of the city's emissions. She asked if the funds should be spent on Muni's reliability and capacity investments, which would encourage the mode shift away from personal cars. She asked if SFMTA or the Transportation Authority had pushed back on the state requirement or the timeline. She also mentioned the SFMTA's COVID-related concerns about service and the transit fiscal cliff. She asked if the investment could be scheduled later to meet the 2040 requirement.

Quon Chin, Capital Programs and Construction Project Manager at SFMTA, responded on the topic of the facility plan implementation. He explained the buses would be retired at the end of their life cycle and replaced, due to their being diesel vehicles. He said diesel hybrid buses near the end of their life would also be part of the electric bus procurement. He said the diesel hybrid buses would be replaced at Kirkland Yard, but not all bus yards would be modernized because some were currently sustainable. He said Kirkland Yard would be the first facility evaluated. He said SFMTA would then review Portero Yard, which is currently under construction, and will include affordable housing. He said that the last facilities that would be part of the rollout plan would be the Presidio facilities. He stated that 2035 was SFMTA's goal to complete this plan, and the state mandate was 2040.

Vice Chair Siegal said she might send follow up questions regarding SFMTA's electrification work.

Member Barz asked about SFMTA's new approach to the Safe Streets Evaluation Program project.

Brian Liang, Livable Streets Transportation Planner and Safe Streets Program Manager at SFMTA, responded that the findings determined their new approach to projects. He said the report showed their quick-build program was effective at improving safety in the near term as SFMTA worked through longer term capital projects. He said one of the biggest takeaways was that treatments had a great impact on traffic safety regardless of project type. He said quick-builds were proven to be viable and were a great start for informing their designs for the Safe Streets projects.

Jamie Parks, Livable Streets Director at SFMTA, provided two specific examples for the Safe Streets Evaluation Program, specifically the bicycle signal phases and the No Turn on Red restrictions. He explained SFMTA worked on a bicycle signal phases evaluation in the Tenderloin and found most users complied and the bicycle signal phases worked well. He said the evaluation proved that signal separation worked at intersections with bicycle and pedestrian crossings and prompted SFMTA to invest in



bicycle signals. With respect to No Turn on Red signs, Mr. Parks said that there were anticipated conflicts with right turns on green as a result of No Turn on Red signs, but the signs proved to work well. He explained the pending 86 applications would extend the No Turn on Red to another 200 intersections.

During public comment, Hillary Brown with Urban Habitat and a member of the SFMTA Accessibility Committee commented that most of their questions had been asked by CAC Members and commented that the Transportation Authority worked with partners such as the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition.

Christ Faust urged members to reject the Next Generation Sanchez Slow Street project because it included the installation of traffic calming islands, which he stated violate the principles of the current final design which had stated there would be no solid elements. He stated that the current design employs flexible bollards, which do not impose a barrier to emergency vehicles, and that the proposal in the allocation request violated the community agreement in which SFMTA promised no permanent elements would be installed, and that it was a compromise to calm the community. He stated that the process was difficult for the neighbors who were not supportive of Slow Sanchez Street, felt their views were stifled, and felt like it was a one-sided process without balanced community input. He said that the bulb outs were an unnecessary expenditure and that the money could be better spent on fixing potholes and improving parallel streets where congestion had increased. He urged the CAC members to reject the proposal and demonstrate fiscal prudence and support for community process.

Mary Davis stated that she lived off of Valencia Street and was a biker, and expressed support for the Valencia Long-Term Bikeway Pilot project because she would like to see safety for pedestrians and bikers improve. She commented that she supported this study because it would test different configurations.

Zach Lipton stated that he traveled along Valencia Street by all modes and supported the funding request for the Valencia Long-Term Bikeway Pilot project. He commented that Valencia Street was on the High Injury Network and was not serving all members of the community well. He expressed support for the study because it would provide funds for more community outreach to imagine the best vision for Valencia Street that would serve everyone. He said he was glad to see that the project description included testing designs on pilot blocks and hoped that the pilot within a pilot process would become an active demonstration that would empower community members and allow them to see prototypes on the ground.

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

Commissioner Barz moved to approve the item, seconded by Vice Chair Siegal.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Chen, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, Rozell and Siegal (7)

Absent: CAC Members Daniels and Ho (2)

- 9. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$10,000,000 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, for Downtown Rail Extension Engineering Development and Procurement Preparation; Appropriate \$3,500,000, with Conditions, for Downtown Rail Extension Rail Program Oversight and Technical Tasks for**



**Engineering and Procurement; and Appropriate \$2,500,000, with Conditions, for Pennsylvania Avenue Extension Pre-Environmental Bridging Study – ACTION\***

Jesse Koehler, Rail Program Manager, presented the item per staff memorandum.

Member Barz asked for a better understanding of the purpose of the Pennsylvania Avenue Extension (PAX) Pre-Environmental Bridging Study and what the team would learn from it.

Mr. Koehler explained that the purpose of the study was to prepare for the environmental review, which is a significant investment of time and resources for a project such as PAX. He added that the Transportation Authority team needed to have a strong understanding of the design solution, its fundability, deliverability, and acceptance by partner agencies before undertaking an environmental review. He also acknowledged that a governance approach would be developed to involve partner agencies in future project phases. He emphasized that the scope of the study was a set of activities to prepare for a more significant level of investment and to make a recommendation about the project's readiness to advance to the environmental review phase.

Member Barz further asked if the study was typical for corridor that is also a link in the high-speed rail network under development in the state.

Mr. Koehler responded that he was not familiar with every portion of the statewide high-speed rail system, but that the PAX project developed in San Francisco was unique in terms of the scale of the project, the level of investment required, and local considerations for reconnecting neighborhoods and managing impacts to the surface transportation system by grade separating existing rail at-grade crossings at Mission Bay Drive and 16<sup>th</sup> Street. He pointed out that the 16<sup>th</sup> Street crossing was a focus of the project, as 16<sup>th</sup> Street was the most significant bus transit crossing of the Caltrain corridor. Mr. Koehler added that it will be important to have a solution to protect Muni operations while also accommodating increased Caltrain service and future high-speed rail. He added that part of the PAX study would be working with the California High-Speed Rail Authority and the state to develop a funding strategy for the project that reflects benefits to local transit, regional Caltrain operations, and the future statewide high-speed rail system.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Chen, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, Rozell and Siegal (7)

Absent: CAC Members Daniels and Ho (2)

- 10. Adopt a Motion of Support to Award a Construction Contract to Golden State Bridge/Obayashi Joint Venture, in an Amount not to Exceed \$84,399,951 and Authorize an Additional Construction Allotment of \$15,188,818; Approve a Contract Amendment with WMH Corporation in the Amount of \$2,678,000; Approve a Contract Amendment with WSP USA, Inc. in the Amount of \$5,940,382; and Authorize the Executive Director to Execute All Other Related Supporting and Supplemental Agreements for the Westside Bridges Seismic Retrofit Project – ACTION\***



Carl Holmes, Deputy Director for Capital Projects, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Barz asked for clarification on whether the project involved adding any new highway miles or only retrofitting what existed and strengthening it.

Mr. Holmes answered that the project was essentially retrofitting what was existing, with a possible slight increase in mileage.

Member Ortega added to Member Barz's question about if there are any additional highway miles for the project to address the safe merging issue for the ramp off the Yerba Buena Island onto the freeway in the construction contract.

Mr. Holmes answered that the contract would provide a transit-only on-ramp in terms of additional miles and he also referred to the Southgate Road off-ramp from I-80.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Chen, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, Rozell and Siegal (7)

Absent: CAC Members Daniels and Ho (2)

#### **11. Update on the Yerba Buena Island Multi-Use Pathway Project – INFORMATION\***

Mike Tan, Senior Engineer, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Sara Barz mentioned that she was supportive of the project and had spent time on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island which could be quite confusing to navigate. She asked about the project cost and what the major cost drivers were, the length of the bike path, and usage.

Mike Tan responded that high usage of the pathway was anticipated, from those entering the island, especially from the East Span of the Bay Bridge, new ferry services, and anticipated usage by those living on Treasure Island, with future residency growing. Mr. Tan also mentioned there are not a lot of existing sidewalks and bike paths, and said the project was taking a proactive approach to install these safety features. He explained that the drivers for the cost included the challenging site conditions, and the steep nature of the pathway - connecting from the East Span of the Bay Bridge down to the TI Ferry Terminal, on Hillcrest Rd and TI Road, over 1 mile in length. He mentioned there were areas with unstable soil conditions which would require additional foundation engineering work and the site conditions that would require engineering features necessary to build the pathway in that terrain.

CAC Member Rachel Ortega asked if there were other existing bike paths that would be connected.

Mike Tan responded there were very limited bike paths on the island. Mr. Tan added that this pathway would be an alternative to the steep pathway going down Macalla Road and said that pathway has upwards of 20% grades. The proposed path along Treasure Island Road and Hillcrest Road would not be that steep.

## **Other Items**

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





Member Levine followed up on Ed Mason's complaints about commuter buses around Church and 24<sup>th</sup> Street that either lack or have the wrong permits. Member Levine requested a response from SFMTA and stated that Mr. Mason had been documenting this issue and bringing it to the CAC's attention for years.

During public comment, Ed Mason stated that he had been following this for a decade. He claimed he had about 8,000 photos and that there were certainly violations and a lack of enforcement. He stated that the buses were basically operating empty since the COVID-19 pandemic began and the buses contributed to an already congested intersection.

**13. Public Comment**

During public comment, Roland Lebrun asked whether it would be possible to enable the 'save transcript' button on Zoom.

Ed Mason continued his previous comment and stated that no government body wanted to hold the corporate interests accountable for their commuter buses. He stated that at their height, there were one hundred buses coming through the 24<sup>th</sup> Street corridor at Church Street and that the buses caused delays for Muni. He closed by stating that the commuter buses were a net generator of greenhouse gases.

Hillary Brown asked how they could apply to the Transportation Authority's CAC. Clerk Saunders responded that she could reach out to him for information.

**14. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:36 p.m.