



DRAFT MINUTES

Citizens Advisory Committee

Wednesday, September 23, 2020

1. Call to Order

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

Present at Roll Call: Nancy Buffum, Robert Gower, David Klein, John Larson, Jerry Levine, Stephanie Liu, Kevin Ortiz, Peter Tannen, Sophia Tupuola, and Rachel Zack (10)

Absent at Roll Call: Danielle Thoe (1)

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

During the Chair's Report, Mr. Larson welcomed new District 4 CAC representative Ms. Nancy Buffum, and asked her to say a few words of introduction. Chair Larson also reported Bike to Workday has been re-envisioned as Bike to Wherever Day and will be held on September 24th. He added that the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition will be setting up stations at bike shops and businesses around the city where participants can pick up a traditional Bike to Workday tote bag.

Chair Larson reported on the Octavia Improvements Study, which is identifying potential safety and circulation improvements to Octavia Boulevard and the surrounding areas. He announced that a public survey which will allow participants to identify where they face challenges traveling through the study area by transit, bicycle, foot, or car, will be posted on the Transportation Authority's website at sfcta.org/octavia.

Chair Larson updated the CAC on recent CAC project update requests. He mentioned that since the last CAC meeting, staff has sent an email update to CAC members on the SFMTA's 16th Street Improvements project, requested by member Kevin Ortiz. He said that the Better Market Street project update requested by member Danielle Thoe, will be agendaized for a presentation at the October 27 Transportation Authority Board and October 28 CAC meetings, and that the Downtown Extension update will be agendaized before the end of the calendar year.

Chair Larson reported that at the September 15 Transportation Authority Board Meeting, there was a lengthy presentation and discussion on SFMTA Rail Service, which included a discussion on the incidents with splicers failing,



resulting in abruptly ending the planned resumption of rail service in late August. He said that staff encourages CAC members to listen to the recording or review the Board meeting minutes to hear discussion of key policy issues such as benefits and tradeoffs of possibly extending the subway shutdown to allow more transformative state of good repair improvements to be made to the subway versus a quicker fix that is more limited in scope. He added that the item will come back to the Board at a date to be determined and also will be agendized at the CAC meeting.

Lastly, per member Peter Tannen's suggestion, Chair Larson announced that the meeting will be adjourned in memory of Ernestine Weiss. He added, Peter will make a few remarks about Ernestine who was among other roles a tireless advocate for open space, affordable housing, and public transportation.

There was no public comment on the Chair's Report.

Consent Agenda

- 3. Approve the Minutes of the September 2, 2020 Meeting - ACTION**
- 4. Citizen Advisory Committee Appointments - INFORMATION**

There was no public comment on the minutes.

Kevin Ortiz moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Sophia Tupuola.

The minutes were approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Buffum, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Tannen, Tupuola, Zack (10)

Absent: Thoe (1)

End of Consent Agenda

- 5. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt Traffic Congestion Mitigation Tax (TNC Tax) Program Guidelines and Program \$7,505,686 in TNC Tax Funds to Two Projects - ACTION**

Kaley Lyons, Transportation Planner, Policy and Programming, presented the item.

Rachel Zack asked why revenue projections were off, particularly in January and February before the COVID-19 pandemic.

Ms. Lyons responded that the initial revenue projections were \$30 million annually and the chart reflected a straight average across 12 months; however, travel is cyclical with January and February typically slower travel months, and an uptick had been expected through the summer and fall.

With respect to projects that are "ready to go" and priorities, David Klein asked if there should be a new way to prioritize, and how to evaluate projects that



may be slower but more cost effective. He also asked if the proposed approach is introducing bias because of the limited funds available.

Ms. Lyons responded that there are two aspects of “ready to go” projects. In terms of allocation, funds are not allocated until projects are ready to use the funds. For prioritization, readiness is considered, but is not the top priority.

Sophia Tupuola asked if there would be preference for hiring in Communities of Concern for quick-builds. Anna LaForte responded that one aspect of quick-builds is that most work is done by city crews.

Chair Larson commented that he understood three of the categories, but was unsure of the signals, being that Prop K seems to fund a lot of signal projects. He added, he is curious how these signal projects fit in with those projects.

Ms. Lyons responded that Prop K will continue to fund signal projects, and that TNC Tax funds could also be used for signal retiming. She added, signals came up several times when seeking feedback from stakeholders, such as Audible Pedestrian Signals. Additionally, Ms. Lyons said demand for signals is higher than what the funds available through Prop K alone can support.

Jerry Levine asked what kind of oversight there might be to ensure projects are on time and on budget and at what point funds possibly get reallocated.

Ms. Lyons responded that there will be quarterly reporting, and within the guidelines it states that if sponsors do not come in for funds in the year of programming, the Board may consider reprogramming the funds.

Kevin Ortiz asked if there was a list or map of quick-builds projects in the pipeline.

Ms. Lyons said there is a list for the current request of \$2.5 million in the next agenda item, but said she was unsure about the broader pipeline.

Ms. LaForte explained that she is anticipating the \$5 million allocation request to come next spring to fund FY21/22 quick-builds. She said that staff could ask for a lookahead from SFMTA of the next tranche when it is available.

Kevin Ortiz said he would like a comparison on how those are being prioritized in Communities of Concern.

Jennifer Wong, SFMTA, said that there is a list of quick-builds available at [SFMTA.com/quickbuild](https://sfmta.com/quickbuild).

Chair Larson asked for clarification around the nomenclature of quick-builds and vision zero projects.

Ms. LaForte explained that quick-builds are planned for the Vision Zero High Injury Network, typically in advance of a permanent project. They provide low



cost improvements in advance of a larger capital project and there will be additional information in the next agenda item regarding the allocation request. The nexus to Vision Zero is that quick-builds are on the Vision Zero High Injury Network at locations with high rates of collisions and injuries.

There was no public comment.

Jerry Levine moved to approve the item, seconded by Rachel Zack.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Buffum, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Tannen, Tupuola, Zack (10)

Absent: Thoe (1)

6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$5,897,303 in Prop K Sales Tax Funds, \$378,372 in Prop AA Vehicle Registration Fee Funds, and \$2,505,686 in Traffic Congestion Mitigation Tax (TNC Tax) Funds, with Conditions, for Five Requests - ACTION

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

Sophia Tupuola asked how SFMTA would dispose of the paratransit minivans upon retirement and commented that the vehicles might have value for low income San Francisco residents who don't have other options to get around safely.

Anna LaForte replied that the vehicles had exceeded their useful life and therefore had little remaining value.

Gary Chang, SFMTA Fleet Manager, said the agency's standard practice was to auction the vehicles, and reinforced Ms. LaForte's comment that the subject vehicles were far beyond their useful lives.

Ms. LaForte said Transportation Authority staff would work with SFMTA staff to see what options exist for re-use of these or other vehicles to benefit Communities of Concern, noting that sometimes there are restrictions depending on how purchase of the vehicles was funded.

Peter Tannen asked for clarification of the symbols in the diagram of the improvements proposed for the Upper Market project.

Casey Hildreth, with SFMTA, said there was a much more comprehensive version of the diagram on SFMTA's website for the project:
<https://www.sfmta.com/projects/upper-market-street-safety-project>.

Mr. Tannen asked about the Bike Leaning Rails included in the scope of the Upper Market project and asked what do the labels reading "optional" mean.



Mr. Hildreth answered that if implemented as part of the Upper Market project, it would be the first time SFMTA had installed Bike Leaning Rails, and it would be valuable to know how they would go over with the public. He said they were an optional scope item that would be implemented if bids showed that they could be included within the project budget.

With respect to the 5th Street Quick-Build Improvements project, Mr. Tannen asked if the bus lines currently re-routed to accommodate construction of the Central Subway project, would be returned to their original routes.

Thalia Leng with SFMTA replied that the new boarding island is intended to benefit the 37-Corbett. She said the overhead wires for the re-routed trolley coaches would remain in place to provide system flexibility, but regular trolley coach service was not planned for 5th Street.

Kevin Ortiz asked which routes were served by paratransit vans, and if COVID-related service reductions had differentially affected paratransit users along routes in Communities of Concern.

Jerry Levine asked staff to invite SFMTA to provide a presentation to the CAC explaining how paratransit services were delivered, how SFMTA qualified passengers to use the services, and how services were distributed demographically and geographically.

David Klein asked if the new paratransit vans would have low-emission power systems.

Gary Chang said SFMTA is looking into a pilot to test an electric paratransit vehicle, but that they could not use battery-electric vehicles until it had a facility for charging and maintaining them.

Mr. Klein asked if the Transportation Authority had information or analysis on the geographic equitability of Prop K investments.

Ms. LaForte responded that staff could produce geographic equity analysis, but warned that these kind of reports could be misleading since major capital projects in one district may have citywide benefits, but that staff could try to find a way to approximate.

Mr. Klein said he appreciated that geographic equity was only one perspective, but that it would still be nice to have.

Jerry Levine suggested that the distribution analysis could divide Prop K investments into categories.

Chair Larson noted that there is a map on the Transportation Authority's website where one can see projects by district and he agreed it may be interesting to see some graphic that divides up projects by district. He also cited the Central Subway as an example of a project located in one district that



benefits a much broader section of the city and acknowledged the challenges of trying to divvy up the benefits of projects by district.

Robert Gower expressed appreciation for the Mansell Curb Ramps project and said that it would nicely complement and build on previous improvements along Mansell.

During public comment Chair Larson read a message from Jackie Sachs expressing support for the purchase of new paratransit vans.

Mr. Ortiz said he wasn't comfortable voting on paratransit vans without knowing what routes they would be allocated to and said he would be interested in making a motion to vote on the other items, but to defer action on the paratransit vans.

Cody Hicks, SFMTA, clarified that for this particular fleet of 28 vehicles, the paratransit program was not route-based, that it was a reservation-based system that provided curb-to-curb service for passengers who were unable to use route-based transit service. He said he could provide data on the types of populations served, if that was of interest.

Chair Larson said this tallied with his recollection of how the program was run. He asked if this is replacing vehicles with higher occupancy vehicles or increasing the number overall.

Mr. Hicks said that they are replacing vehicles 1 for 1 but the new cutaways vans are larger vehicles with capacity for 14 passengers and 4 wheelchair users compared to the minivans that have capacity for 1 wheelchair and 3 or 4 other passengers.

Chair Larson asked if one passenger makes a request and then another, how is the route assembled or do they use different vans until they run out of vans, asking if the approach used was like Super Shuttle or another approach.

Mr. Hicks said unfortunately vehicle engineers are in attendance and not the folks who are familiar with paratransit service, but said he could report back to the CAC on this topic.

Chair Larson observed that the ask before the CAC was to support the procurement of paratransit vehicles to replace 1 for 1 vehicles that have reached the end of their useful life, noting these vehicles need to be replaced one way or another. He added that the discussion revealed that it might benefit the CAC to agendize a presentation on how paratransit service was delivered. He asked Mr. Ortiz with the explanation provided if he would still like to move forward with his proposed motion to amend.

Mr. Ortiz said given the explanation he would withdraw his motion to amend the staff recommendation, but during new business would ask for an overview



of paratransit service and would be especially interested in how service is delivered with a focus on communities of concern.

Kevin Ortiz moved to approve the item, seconded by David Klein.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Buffum, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Tannen, Tupuola, Zack (10)

Absent: Thoe (1)

- 7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Authorize the Executive Director to Execute the Utility Relocation Agreement, the Right of Way Certification, Amendments to the Memorandums of Agreement (MOAs) with Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA) for Both Right of Way and Construction Phases, and All Other Related Project Agreements for the Yerba Buena Island (YBI) Westside Bridges Seismic Retrofit Project - ACTION**

Dale Dennis, consultant project manager with the Transportation Authority, presented the item.

Jerry Levine asked if any consideration was given to tunneling, and if not was it due to costs.

Mr. Dennis replied, the tunneling was never considered based on the funding received from the Highway Bridge Program which was geared for retrofitting the existing bridges that were built back in the 30's. He added that tunneling would have been a more costly approach.

Chair Larson asked about the bidding process and more clarification about how the construction manager/general contractor (CM/GC) process works.

Mr. Dennis replied that the CMGC selection process starts with a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) process when selecting a contractor. He shared in summer of 2018, the Transportation Authority issued a RFQ and received 5 different proposals from very good general contractors with their teams. He explained that it's a process where you can select a contractor based on their qualifications, experience and records as opposed to a low bid process. He said the general contractor enters into a pre-construction contract and they become a part of the design team looking at means, methods and schedules as ways to save money. Then during costs estimates there are three different teams independently developing bottoms up estimates. Mr. Dennis continued to explain that the general contractor performs 30% of the work, but not more than 70%, and said the remainder of the work has to go through the general contractor's own bid process for sub-contractors. The general contractor also has to meet the Disadvantage Business Enterprise (DBE) goals for the project, which is 11%.



There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Buffum, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Tannen, Tupuola, Zack (10)

Absent: Thoe (1)

8. Progress Report for Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project - INFORMATION

Peter Gabancho, SFMTA Project Manager, presented the item.

Chair Larson commented that it was great that all the sewer and other utility work is done and that he has been on the corridor and it was interesting to see all the work happening in the center of the street now. Chair Larson asked where will cars be able to make a left turn on Van Ness Avenue.

Mr. Gabancho replied at northbound Lombard Street and southbound Broadway.

David Klein mentioned that the lack of underground knowledge led to much of the project delay and asked how that has changed with all the improvements, such as whether there was mapping of the street now available for the future work.

Mr. Gabancho replied that the contractor provides as-built drawings which are viewed by City staff and put on file, which should reflect what the project team found and that future organizations doing work will have access to those files. He added, there is a notice of intent process that all city agencies and utilities in the city participate in wherein you describe a project that you are planning, and the agencies and utilities will share their drawings.

Mr. Klein asked about statistics of businesses affected by construction including money spent and effectiveness of any business program. He remarked that the presentation shows no statistics.

Mr. Gabancho responded that some businesses have closed since start of construction. He said that OEWD collects business statistics on how businesses have been helped and that he would follow up with OEWD to get statistics.

Eric Cordoba, Deputy Director for Capital Projects, thanked Mr. Gabancho for the presentation to the CAC and the one to the Board yesterday, and congratulated him on finishing the underground work. He also commented that the Transportation Authority Board was very interested in business statistics and that staff would work with SFMTA and OEWD to get more details.

There was no public comment.



Other Items

9. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

Jerry Levine shared that months ago a presentation on coordination, collaboration, and integration on various Transportation Agencies was presented to the CAC. He asked if staff could provide an update/follow up – whether in writing or at a future meeting about where the process is saying he recalled it touch on state legislation to advance “seamless” transit and the potential regional funding measure last year.

Stephanie Liu said she joined today’s Metropolitan Transportation Commission meeting and said there was some controversy about a strategy in Plan Bay Area 2050 that would mandate 60% of employees at large employers work from home (on any given day). She said she understood this to be related to the need to meet GHG reduction goals and said it would be great to get a presentation on this topic and to see what the plans are for the region as a whole.

Chair Larson agreed and added he would also like to see where we are in terms of climate change and resilience ideas and asked how much bolder we will need to be from a transportation perspective.

Chair Larson also suggested agendaizing the paratransit service delivery item per the CACs earlier discussion (see item #6 above).

Kevin Ortiz echoed Mr. Larson’s suggestion and also requested a presentation on how the system works for Communities of Concern, in particular.

There was no public comment.

10. Public Comment

During public comment, Chair Larson read a comment from Jackie Sachs where she asked for SFMTA to pay more attention to ensure that seniors, people with disabilities, and people walking to and from transit are safe in the Mission Bay Area, particularly with the increasing number of medical services locating there and the increase in people coming to the area and traffic. She said SFMTA should prioritize pedestrian safety first.

Peter Tannen said a few words about Ernestine Weiss, noting that while she didn’t attend CAC meetings, she was a regular fixture at the Department of Parking and Traffic and other city meetings and often focused her advocacy efforts on public transportation, open space, affordable housing, and curbing redevelopment. He said she tended to advocate for people who were powerless such as the elderly, homeless persons, and marginalized communities, and that she also served as a positive check on city government. For these reasons, Mr. Tannen said he had requested to adjourn tonight’s meeting in Ernestine Weiss’ honor.



Chair Larson commented that it was important, especially in our current times, to recognize people who are invested in and demonstrate a sincere commitment to their communities and who work long and hard to bring about change.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned in honor of Ernestine Weiss at 7:59 p.m.