



# *DRAFT MINUTES*

## Citizens Advisory Committee

Wednesday, October 28, 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, Danielle Thoe, Sophia Tupuola, and Rachel Zack (11)

**Absent at Roll Call:** (0)

Transportation Authority staff members present were Michelle Beaulieu, Anna LaForte, Maria Lombardo, Hugh Louch, Britney Milton, Mike Pickford, Eric Young and Luis Zurinaga (consultant).

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

During the Chair's Report, Mr. Larson reported that the Downtown Congestion Pricing Policy Advisory Committee will be meeting virtually the following week at 6 p.m. He shared that the agenda included the congestion pricing options under consideration and a summary of what has been heard from feedback, and said more information could be found at [sfcta.org/downtown](http://sfcta.org/downtown).

Chair Larson announced that 2020 marks the 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary of San Francisco's half-cent sales tax for transportation. He thanked the voters on behalf of the agency and the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) for their foresight in approving the implementation of a half-cent sales tax in 1989, followed by the flow of the first dollars in 1990. He continued by sharing that at that time, a group of citizens saw what was happening nationally with the federal government reducing its role in infrastructure and transit, embracing the idea that a dedicated local source of revenue was necessary to support ongoing transportation improvements across the city.

Chair Larson shared that the half-cent sales tax, renewed by voters in the form of Prop K in 2003, is even more crucial now as federal and state contributions have declined as an overall percentage of transportation funds over the years. He added that over the past 30 years, the Transportation Authority has allocated more than \$1.3 billion in half-cent sales tax funding, and on average, every dollar in half-cent sales tax funding leverages \$4 - \$7 in additional federal, state, or other funding. Chair Larson continued on to state that the money has touched every neighborhood, supporting some efforts that transformed the city as well as projects that may have been smaller but also made a big difference in people's lives.



Chair Larson introduced, Eric Young, Director of Communications, who gave a quick presentation of the Sales Tax Stories microsite ([www.sfcta.org/stories](http://www.sfcta.org/stories)). Mr. Young also thanked the CAC for their role in helping to oversee implementation of the sales tax program and for helping to identify persons who could be interviewed for the project.

There was no public comment.

### **Consent Agenda**

- 3. Approve the Minutes of the September 23, 2020 Meeting - ACTION**
- 4. Citizens Advisory Committee Appointment - INFORMATION**
- 5. State and Federal Legislation Update - INFORMATION**
- 6. Internal Accounting Report, Investment Report, and Debt Expenditure Report for the Three Months Ending September 30, 2020 - INFORMATION**
- 7. Update on the Caltrain Modernization Program - INFORMATION**

During public comment Edward Mason made a comment regarding the Caltrain Modernization program. He said in the October 16<sup>th</sup> Almanac from Menlo Park, there was an opinion piece that said that the original estimated cost of the electrification project was \$800 million but is now over \$3.2 billion. The opinion piece also mentioned an incompetent contractor in Colorado (which Mr. Mason said was referenced in the staff report) and that there is no money in the project for grade separations for high speed rail.

Luis Zurinaga, project management oversight consultant with the Transportation Authority, responded that the cost of the project is under \$2 billion. He said a long, long time ago the cost was \$800 million, but as often happens the cost increased over time [from inception to construction]. With respect to the grade separation comment, Mr. Zurinaga stated that it was never a part of the Caltrain electrification project. He explained that grade separations are addressed through a separate program that is carried out by the different municipalities.

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

The minutes were approved by the following vote:

**Ayes: CAC Members Buffum, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Tannen, Danielle Thoe, Tupuola, Zack (11)**

**Absent: (0)**

### **End of Consent Agenda**

- 8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$745,651 in Prop K Sales Tax Funds with Conditions for Three Requests - ACTION**

Mike Pickford, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item.

David Klein commented that curbside pickup zones authorized under the Shared Space program seemed to primarily benefit companies operating in the curb zone doing pickups, such as food delivery companies, and said that the study should be funded by private companies rather than public funds.



Francesca Napolitan, Curb Access Manager with SFMTA, responded that there has been an increase in e-commerce and food delivery services under COVID-19, but the zones also serve residents in their personal vehicles. She said that it would be ideal to get private funding, though SFMTA cannot require it. She said SFMTA staff have been working in partnership with the companies doing food delivery to get a more comprehensive data set to supplement this effort.

Hank Wilson, Parking Policy and Planning Manager with SFMTA, said that the Shared Spaces program has been entirely driven by local businesses submitting applications, and that the curbside pickup zones and the Shared Spaces program overall is a business-supporting project.

David Klein said that it seemed like massive revenue was being made by these private food delivery companies by squeezing revenues from small businesses. He said that with the amount of investment being made, it was difficult to imagine spending taxpayer money to help venture capitalists, unless SFMTA could provide statistics indicating a significant portion of pickups is from residents of San Francisco.

Robert Gower asked for more information on the prioritization process for shared spaces and said there was a positive safety benefit to cyclists to the extent that the spaces prevent double-parking by providing room for cars to pull fully out of traffic lanes.

Ms. Napolitan responded that under the current program, anyone requesting a space is granted one, barring a few considerations, such as fronting a bus stop or disabled parking zones.

Rachel Zack commented that traffic has been down during the COVID-19 pandemic, and the pandemic did not seem to be a reason for businesses to open up more space, because parking is available in the City currently. She said that another CAC member brought up safety and asked if there was data showing that loading policies are being adhered to and if double-parking decreases on streets with curbside loading zones.

Ms. Napolitan responded that SFMTA does not currently have that data, and that the subject of this allocation request would serve as that evaluation effort as it is designed to answer specific questions about the impacts of the curbside loading zones. She also said that in past projects that focused on curb management, there was a reduction in double-parking when loading space was provided. She said the evaluation of a pilot project on Valencia Street showed this general trend. She said that the evaluation project under CAC consideration is intended to help SFMTA understand if these zones are working and the impacts they are or are not having.

Kevin Ortiz said he wanted to know how many of the curbside pickup zones also had outdoor dining space, to be cognizant of public space and how it is being utilized.

Ms. Napolitan responded that anecdotally dining had been impacting pickup, not the other way around. She said there were many more outdoor dining permit requests than curbside pickup requests. She offered Chestnut Street as an example, saying that it was almost full of outdoor dining areas, which was exacerbating curbside pickup issues. She said she hopes the evaluation study would help SFMTA to better understand the interaction between dining and pickup.



Ms. Thoe noted that the scope indicated it was only focused on pickup zones created under the Shared Spaces program. She encouraged SFMTA staff to look beyond the Shared Spaces program and to look at the curb space that already exists as loading zones. She said that a senior living facility in her neighborhood has a loading zone in front of it that is used by delivery drivers to pick up from the restaurant next door. Ms. Thoe said that she thought that these pickup zones seemed to be a response to bad behaviors such as double-parking. She said she would like to build into the data analysis proposals for how delivery companies could pay their fair share for problems they are causing on city streets, including safety issues and the staff time expended to address these issues.

Ms. Napolitan responded that this evaluation request came out of the SFMTA's Curb Management Strategy, which took a high-level look at curb space allocation. She said that over 90% of curb space in the City was allocated to private vehicles, and that even before the pandemic this did not align with goals around more active uses. She said that this evaluation was more of a response to how the City has allocated curb space and how to use the curb to alleviate issues, such as double parking.

Peter Tannen said that curbside pickup zones were not the only type of new use for curb space under the Shared Spaces program. He asked if there would be a study considering the impact of other uses of curb space, such as dining.

Ms. Napolitan responded that a multiagency collaboration with Office of Economic and Workforce Development, SFMTA, SF Planning, Public Works, and the Entertainment Commission is involved in the approval of dining zones. She added, that this group is figuring out how to evaluate the program, which will likely occur next year. Ms. Napolitan shared that evaluation may include surveys, talking to businesses, and talking to residents to understand how well the program is meeting different needs of users. Chair Larson said that in some neighborhoods parking has not been easier during the pandemic, and he appreciates the space dedicated for pick up.

There was no public comment on this item.

Mr. Klein moved to amend the item to sever the Curbside Pickup Zones Pilot Evaluation allocation request from the other requests. Mr. Ortiz seconded.

Nancy Buffum commented that the robust discussion during the meeting was a reason to approve the request, in order for the CAC to direct the questions being asked through the study.

Mr. Gower, Mr. Tannen, and Ms. Zack all expressed agreement with Ms. Buffum.

Ms. Thoe requested a presentation on SFMTA's Curb Management Strategy at a future CAC meeting, and said she supported severing the item and having a more in-depth conversation about the overall strategy.

Mr. Klein commented that it was a mistake to believe that delivery companies would share any information with SFMTA. He said he would be more amenable to the allocation request if the cost was shared with the private companies using the space.

Mr. Gower commented that he would like more discussion on SFMTA's Curb Management Strategy as a whole in order to inform this study moving forward.



Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, noted that permits issued through the Shared Spaces program were scheduled to expire and expressed the need for timely data gathering while balancing the CAC's need to have a robust discussion of the overall strategy. She added that staff have been working to get an update on the Curb Management Strategy to the CAC and Transportation Authority Board.

Ms. Napolitan explained that curbside pickup zone permits are set to expire June 30, 2021, and it is unclear if the program will continue and in what form. She said that the need for this evaluation existed before the pandemic and Shared Spaces program, and that collecting this data now will inform long term recommendations for the regulation of curbside space.

Mr. Wilson added that SFMTA was originally planning to seek funding for evaluating all types of loading zones, but then the pandemic hit and there was suddenly a large number of curbside pickup zones spread throughout the City. He said SFMTA pivoted because the program was so large, with so many businesses requesting permits. He added that instead of asking for funds to study all types of loading zones, SFMTA decided to focus on evaluation of Shared Spaces, as they are set to expire in June, and on the opportunity to study them exists now.

Ms. Thoe appreciated the additional context provided and said it would have been helpful to have had all of this information about curbside management in a presentation on this item from the beginning. She said that she was now willing to recommend approval of the item and requested that SFMTA return to the CAC to provide a holistic presentation on its curbside program.

Chair Larson commented that the discussion served as a reminder that they are in a data gathering moment, with businesses engaged, and the Shared Spaces requests were the driving force behind changes to the curbside space. He said he would like SFMTA to gather more information through this evaluation.

Chair Larson called for a vote on the motion made by Mr. Klein and seconded by Mr. Ortiz to sever the Curbside Pickup Zones Pilot request from the other two requests, seconded by Kevin Ortiz.

The motion to sever the Curbside Pickup Zones Pilot request from the other two requests failed by the following vote:

**Ayes: CAC Members Klein, Levine, Ortiz, Tupuola (4)**

**Nays: CAC Members Buffum, Gower, Larson, Liu, Tannen, Thoe, Zack (7)**

**Absent: (0)**

Robert Gower moved to approve Item 8 as recommended by staff, seconded by Rachel Zack.

The item was approved by the following vote:

**Ayes: CAC Members Buffum, Gower, Larson, Liu, Tannen, Thoe, Zack (7)**

**Nays: CAC Members Klein, Levine, Ortiz, Tupuola (4)**



**Absent: (0)**

**9. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the Portsmouth Square Community Based Transportation Plan Final Report - ACTION**

Hugh Louch, Deputy Director for Planning, presented the item.

Jerry Levine asked about the time frame for when the bond funding becomes available for the project.

Mr. Louch replied that he doesn't have the exact timing of the bond, as it doesn't directly fund the plan recommendations, but it is anticipated to fund the larger redesigned Portsmouth Square project.

Mr. Levine asked what the time frame is for the current phase of the project.

Mr. Louch replied that this is the end for the Transportation Authority-led plan. He added that the Portsmouth Square re-design project is under environmental review and is completing design work. He added that they have coordinated with the Recreation and Parks Department to ensure they have the findings, and after it is adopted they will incorporate most of the recommendations and then incorporate them into their final design.

Mr. Levine asked if there was a time estimate for implementation.

Mr. Louch guesstimated that since the design and environmental review are very much under way, implementation could be less than two years away. He said the report recommendations before the CAC tonight represent a near-term implementation opportunity.

Peter Tannen shared that he is familiar with the area and is impressed with the many things that were considered in order to help the area function better. Mr. Tannen also asked what picture is shown on the cover of the report.

Mr. Louch replied that it is an abstractly rendered photo of Portsmouth Square.

Sophia Tupuola commented on the ambassador program, saying that she would like to make sure the hiring process is preferential to the neighboring residents. She stated that this is another way that projects can be equitable and serve the communities that they are in.

Chair Larson asked staff if there is a website at Recreation and Parks Department that has the rendering of the overall project. He asked if it could either be placed on the website or be sent out to the CAC so that they have a better overview. Mr. Larson added that he has walked around Portsmouth Square and to see something being done is fantastic. He also observed that it is not the most user friendly space to get into, so improving the pedestrian experience would be appreciated.

Director of Communications, Eric Young, provided a website link for the Portsmouth Square Improvement Project in the chat: [sfrecpark.org/1166/Portsmouth-Square-Improvement-Project](http://sfrecpark.org/1166/Portsmouth-Square-Improvement-Project).

During public comment Edward Mason stated that the casino buses require strict enforcement and should be controlled by the SFMTA aggressively. He added that the casino buses are like taxi cabs and there should be a franchise fee associated with it.



Mr. Louch acknowledge that the issues around casino buses and vehicles use of the street is much bigger than what's observed just in this one square block. He added that the comments are useful and will be passed on to SFMTA staff.

Peter Tannen moved to approve item 9, seconded by Nancy Buffum.

The item was approved by the following vote:

**Ayes: CAC Members Buffum, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Tannen, Danielle Thoe, Tupuola, Zack (11)**

**Absent: (0)**

**10. Adopt a Motion of Support to Oppose the Plan Bay Area 2050 Final Blueprint Telecommute Mandate Strategy - ACTION\***

Michelle Beaulieu, Principal Transportation Planner, Government Affairs, presented the item.

Chair Larson asked a procedural question regarding the impact of the CAC's vote on the item given that the resolution was approved on first read by the board a day before.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, answered, clarifying that when the CAC agenda was created, staff did not know if the item would be approved by the Board on its first read. Ms. Lombardo added that an approval by the CAC, if they choose to act, would show stronger support for the resolution.

Stephanie Liu noted that she watched the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) meeting discussing this 60% telecommuting mandate. Ms. Liu stated that many meeting attendees commented on the negative impacts of the mandate, including biking and walking, and requested that the mandate be re-written. She noted that MTC staff stated that the 60% telecommuting mandate was only a high-level title and that these concerns could be addressed in the policy details. Ms. Liu also mentioned that when members of the public suggested the use of trip caps or other incentives, staff responded that this 60% telecommuting mandate was the only way they could meet the greenhouse gas emission reduction target. Ms. Liu asked for more clarification.

Ms. Beaulieu replied that if the Plan Bay Area 2050 is not able to demonstrate how the Bay Area will achieve the state-mandated 19% GHG reduction by 2035, the region will be ineligible for certain state funding programs such as the Solutions to Congested Corridors program and other Senate Bill 1 funding. Ms. Beaulieu added that the Bay Area would be the first region in the state not able to demonstrate how it could reach this target. She also mentioned that with the outpouring of opposition to the telecommuting mandate, MTC staff and commissioners are brainstorming alternatives. Ms. Beaulieu stated that though the plan was approved with this strategy included, the MTC Planning Committee Chair did ask MTC staff to consider alternatives and bring them back to the Commission.

Ms. Liu asked about the purpose of this resolution.

Ms. Beaulieu answered that the resolution asks MTC to consider specific actions, such as renaming the strategy and exploring other transportation demand management



alternatives that can achieve the desired GHG reduction without the negative impacts of the telework mandate as currently written. Ms. Beaulieu added that this resolution would add San Francisco's voice to the opposition, strengthening the city's position. She noted that the last item in the resolution recommends MTC explore specific alternatives such as land use changes and halting highway expansion projects.

Jerry Levine moved to approve item 10, seconded by Danielle Thoe.

The item was approved by the following vote:

**Ayes: CAC Members Buffum, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Tannen, Danielle Thoe, Tupuola, Zack (11)**

**Absent: (0)**

#### **11. Major Capital Project Update - Better Market Street - INFORMATION**

Cristina Olea, San Francisco Department of Public Works project manager, presented the item.

Rachel Zack commented that the bricks in the sidewalks were challenging for people with disabilities and that the benefits from the revised design would not be shared by all San Franciscans. She said that the mixed flow travel lane would not have the safety and mode-shift benefits compared to the sidewalk level bikeway and that there were reliability risks with having only one lane for Muni. Ms. Zack said the old design had more public outreach than the updated proposal and many stakeholders agreed that the new proposal would not meet the goals of the project. She asked what funds were lost that prompted the redesign of the project, what project alternatives were available, and what was planned for public engagement to ensure that the project met the public's expectation for the project moving forward.

Ms. Olea responded that no funds were lost to the project and the issue was with the previous funding gap. She said the new design for Phase 1 from 5<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> streets was within the budget and left about \$30 million available for the F-Loop or other future phases. She said that for the overall project, the expectation that San Francisco would be able to find additional funds to close the funding gap had diminished because of the COVID-19 pandemic. Ms. Olea shared that the project team tried to match the design to the available funding.

With respect to alternatives, Ms. Olea said that this was the best design to move forward. She continued by stating that it allowed the project team to meet the funding deadlines and provided the biggest benefits in the near term. She explained that for transit operations, the stop spacing would be in line with the rapid spacing, the project included larger center boarding islands, which would provide accessibility and more space for buses to stop. She added that a buffer would be installed between travel lanes, and that though the bike lane was not the sidewalk level bikeway that was originally envisioned, the number of vehicles in the curb lane would be reduced by about 75%. She said the design would improve safety, compared to existing conditions. Ms. Olea shared that sidewalk work was deferred and the intent was to replace it when the overhead contract system (OCS) poles were replaced. She explained that they were dependent on Muni's Transportation Recovery Plan and this design allowed for the assessment of the project and transit after the pandemic.





With regard to outreach, Ms. Olea said there was a two-week virtual open house and two live meetings planned for November 4 and November 9 with a presentation and question and answer session.

Ms. Zack asked what would happen following the outreach and if it would lead to project alternatives.

Ms. Olea responded that it would depend on the input. She provided an example of hearing from the San Francisco Bike Coalition (SFBC) and bicycle advocates that the shared curb lane alone was not enough and with that they added a painted buffer, mountable curb and speed tables. She said the design of Muni center lanes and shared curb lanes were a set design, but there were opportunities to add treatments that did not require moving the curb line.

Robert Gower said the redesign was a major loss for the project. He said he did not see an improvement for bicyclists having to share a lane with motorists. With respect to traffic flow and bicyclist safety, he asked for more information on the study that found that the 8-foot-wide sidewalk bikeway was insufficient compared to bicyclists sharing an 11-foot-wide lane with motorists. He shared Ms. Zack's concerns about the sidewalk and expressed concern about the business community and asked about their feedback to the proposal. He asked about the safeguards to ensure that other major elements of the projects were not eliminated, such as the F-Loop. He said the proposal was a large expense with minimal benefits.

Ms. Olea highlighted that the project description was not changed in the environmental documents and the improvements could still be implemented in the future. She said the F-Loop was a priority for the City, and it was scheduled to be the next phase of the project, adding that it was part of the federal BUILD grant agreement. She said they had to reprogram the BUILD grant because the F-Loop design was delayed at the time of obligation, but as a condition of award, they must start construction of the F-Loop by June 2025. She noted that they anticipated starting in 2024.

Britt Tanner, SFMTA project manager, said they looked at best practices from other cities and noted the Crow Design Manual for Bicycle Traffic from the Netherlands and Massachusetts Department of Transportation's (MassDOT's) separated Bike Lane Planning & Design Guide, which provided width recommendations based on bicycle volume. She said that both documents recommended a bike lane of more than 11 feet with bicycle volumes over 750. She said there were 820 bicyclists counted on the morning of January 7, 2020, prior to Car-free Market Street, and they determined that an 8 foot wide cycle track would be an insufficient width particularly with the 5 foot wide pinch points which would not allow for side by side biking or passing.

Mr. Gower asked what study was conducted that determined that the bicyclists should be on the road sharing a lane with motorists.

Ms. Tanner said they also counted vehicles the same day in early 2020 and found that the volumes were low for commercial, non-Muni transit, paratransit, and taxi vehicles, which were the only vehicles allowed on Market Street. She said 44 was the highest number of vehicles counted in an hour and that did not account for commercial vehicle restrictions in peak hours in the peak direction. Ms. Tanner said that based on



the numbers, bicyclists would heavily outnumber the other modes on the roadway and, combined with the speed tables and mountable curb, there would be a traffic calming affect which would improve safety, making Market Street a bicycle and transit priority street.

Mr. Gower asked if the conclusion was that the 11-foot shared lane would be safer than the 8-foot-wide sidewalk level cycle track.

Ms. Tanner said the 8-foot-wide sidewalk level cycle track would be safer but would not be appropriate since it would not accommodate the bicycle volumes on Market Street. Ms. Olea added that because the sidewalk level bikeway would not have accommodated the bicyclists, there would have been people biking in the curb lane.

Danielle Thoe shared her concern on disability access to the center lane transit boarding island and said an elongated island would make it difficult for someone with mobility issues to know where to wait for the bus and would also extend the path of travel to the sidewalk. She expressed concern about the narrative of the sidewalk level bikeway compared to the shared lane. She said it was her understanding that the curb lane would always be a shared lane for bicyclists, so this new design would reduce the overall space available for bicyclists. Ms. Thoe said that a safe and separated sidewalk level bikeway would help increase the number of bicyclists and that the redesign happened soon after the shelter in place prior to knowing the impacts on the budget. Ms. Thoe mentioned that the project team made a large change to the project before knowing the election results, including the priorities of the new administration and the funding that may be available through COVID-19 recovery. She hoped that the project could be paused until more information was known about future funding and outreach. She added that she was a project manager who worked on a rehab project on the 1000 block of Market Street and they received various responses from SFPW on whether they needed to factor in sidewalk replacement. She said she reached out to the project team four times in the last three months and it was a challenge to not know the project status. She mentioned that they still did not have the sidewalk improvement permits for the project, which could potentially delay the rehab project. She said it was critical to conduct business outreach and to respond to people trying to understand the construction process and timeline.

Peter Tannen asked a series of questions including if bicycle friendly grates would be installed, what the quality of the sewer and water facilities were, and why the increase of bicyclists on Market Street was not expected and anticipated in the original design.

Chair Larson said this may have been a missed opportunity to coordinate construction along Market Street and that if buildings were constructed with the old sidewalk design, the sidewalk would have to be reconstructed in the future.

Ms. Olea said they had funding problems prior to COVID-19. She said the project continued to grow over the last several years as each of the departments included infrastructure and state of good repair work in addition to the project enhancements, which resulted in a project cost over \$600 million. She said the agency directors advised the project team to reevaluate the project based on the budget projections due to COVID-19. She said an email was sent in April 2020 to the stakeholders, community advisory committee, the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor's Office to inform them of the need to reevaluate the project. Ms. Olea said it took about five



months to assess the infrastructure to determine what needed to be replaced and what still had useful life. She said the agency directors did not think they could wait any longer and wanted the construction phase to move forward, building on the success of the Quick Build project and Car-Free Market Street. She said the redesign was not the project they envisioned, but it maintained the forward momentum and did not preclude future improvements. Ms. Olea said that the transit boarding island improvements would provide the expected benefits to transit performance and service. She mentioned coordinating with the accessibility working group with the Mayor's Office on Disability and the disability access coordinators at SFPW and SFMTA, to assess repairing the joints to improve sidewalk access. With respect to the sewer and water improvements, the infrastructure was updated when the BART and Muni stations were constructed.

Chair Larson asked Ms. Olea to provide a written response to the remaining questions to provide time for public comment.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun sent documentation including videos and design standards for cycle superhighways from an example in London, which showed how they implemented a similar design and said he hoped the city hadn't started from scratch on developing the concept.

During public comment, Janice Li, SFBC Advocacy Director, said the Bicycle Coalition expressed a strong reservation based on the revised proposal and said that they submitted a letter along with the San Francisco Transit Riders and Walk SF expressing opposition.

During public comment, Edward Mason noted how the project had grown in size and cost over the years and recommended that the project team cautiously proceed and should also assess the projected activity downtown.

## **12. Update on Bay Area Seamless Transit Efforts - INFORMATION**

Chair Larson continued this item due to time constraints.

### **Other Items**

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

Chair Larson suggested a curb management strategy update be agendaized for a future meeting.

Kevin Ortiz expressed interest in identifying a new revenue stream or streams for a free Muni program, and asked for a resolution to be drafted for the next CAC meeting to urge the Transportation Authority to include this as a priority in its work program.

## **14. Public Comment**

During public comment Roland Lebrun shared his concerns about meeting audio delays, and suggested adding a timer to the public comment slide so that callers can track how much time they have left.

## **15. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:52 p.m.