



DRAFT MINUTES

Citizens Advisory Committee

Wednesday, December 2, 2020

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Larson called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

Present at Roll: Nancy Buffum, Robert Gower, John Larson, Jerry Levine, Stephanie Liu, Kevin Ortiz, Peter Tannen, Danielle Thoe and Sophia Tupuola (9)

Absent at Roll: David Klein (entered during item 2), Rachel Zack (2)

Transportation Authority staff members present were Michelle Beaulieu, Colin Dentel-Post, Anna LaForte, Maria Lombardo, Hugh Louch, Paige Miller and Mike Pickford.

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

During the Chair's Report, Chair Larson extended a congratulations to Jerry Levine for being reappointed to the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC).

Chair Larson reported on the curbside management strategy which relates to item 11 on the agenda and reminded the CAC that they had a split vote but, in the end, recommended allocation of Prop K funds to San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) for a data collection project and evaluation of curbside pickup zones. He said that some CAC members along with the Board shared concerns that some of the private providers such as delivery services were not paying for the project and the Board did not approve funding for the item.

With regard to autonomous vehicles (AV) Chair Larson shared that at the November 17 Board Meeting, Board members heard about a proposed California Public Utilities Commission ruling on the deployment of drivered and driverless AV passenger service. He encouraged anyone interested to watch the meeting (www.sfgovtv.org) and added that it's a topic the CAC may want to agendize at a future meeting.

During public comment David Pilpel thanked the Chair for his remarks and asked if the item number can be announced prior to opening public comment, so that callers know what item they are commenting on.

3. Nomination for 2020 Citizens Advisory Committee Chair and Vice Chair - INFORMATION

Peter Tannen nominated John Larson for Chair and John Larson accepted. There were no further nominations for Chair.

Peter Tannen nominated David Klein for Vice Chair and David Klein accepted. There were no further nominations for Vice Chair.

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda



4. Approve the Minutes of the October 28, 2020 Meeting - ACTION

5. Approve the 2021 Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting Schedule - ACTION

During public comment David Pilpel complimented staff on the minutes. In relation to the 30th anniversary of the Transportation Authority, Mr. Pilpel said he had served on both the 1989 and 2003 Expenditure Plan Advisory Committees for the respective sales tax measures. He suggested that the past and present members of the CAC and the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committees get together to celebrate the 30th anniversary and take the time to discuss what has worked well and hasn't work so well at the Transportation Authority thus far. He said he is looking forward to the future of the Transportation Authority.

Chair Larson motioned to amend the minutes to reflect the following change on page 10, 3rd paragraph from the bottom: "Peter Tannen asked a series of questions including if bicycle friendly BART ventilation grates would be installed, ~~what the quality of the sewer and water facilities were~~, if existing old underground utilities could present problems like they did for the BRT Van Ness Improvement Project, and why the increase of bicyclists on Market Street was not expected and anticipated in the original design", seconded by David Klein.

The motion to amend the minutes was approved by the following vote:

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

Nays: (0)

Absent: Zack (1)

Danielle Thoe motioned to approve the Consent Agenda, with the minutes as amended, seconded by Jerry Levine.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

Nays: (0)

Absent: Zack (1)

End of Consent Agenda

6. Allocate \$22,726,605 in Prop K Sales Tax Funds and \$234,005 in Prop AA Vehicle Registration Fee Funds, with Conditions, for Six Requests - ACTION

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming presented the item, and introduced Licinia Iberri, SFMTA, and Ignacio Barandiaran, ARUP, to present additional information about SFMTA's Potrero Yard Modernization project.

Sophia Tupuola asked if current and anticipated ridership on SFMTA's local routes justified the proposed expenditure on the replaced 30, 30-foot Hybrid Motor Coaches, especially in light of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Gary Chang, manager with SFMTA, answered that the Orion buses serving those routes were purchased in 2007, and should have been retired in 2017 per the SFMTA guidelines. He added that two of the local routes had already been re-opened (the 37



and 67 lines). He stressed that the replacement buses should be no more than 32 feet in length because they operate on a tight turn radius and need to make turns along the narrow, windy and hilly local routes. He said the new buses would arrive between Fall 2021 to Spring 2022, and the local routes would likely be open by the end of 2021.

Peter Tannen expressed support for the staff's recommended special condition requiring a commitment to maintenance of the vehicles, including a mid-life overhaul.

Chair Larson said he was glad to hear that the local routes would re-open as he had heard mixed messages from Jeffrey Tumlin, Director of Transportation for SFMTA telling the CAC that the local routes might not come back.

Kevin Ortiz asked how the affordable housing units, planned as part of the Potrero Yard Modernization, would be distributed among the low, moderate and market rate price sectors. He said the new housing should reflect the needs of the district.

Rafe Rabelais, SFMTA, said the Request for Proposals (RFP) would be somewhat prescriptive regarding the issue of affordability, but it was best not to lock the developer into parameters that were too rigidly restrictive. He said the RFP would set a minimum goal of a 50% share of the units to be below market rate and encourage proposers to make up to 100% of the units available below market rate. He said the RFP would challenge the developer to work with the surrounding community, which had expressed a high priority for low-income and family-appropriate units.

Mr. Ortiz asked if the amount of the proposed reimbursement to losing bidders was capped, and questioned whether offering it was fiscally responsible. He suggested there would be plenty of bidders given the value of the project and the desire to get a city contract.

Mr. Barandiaran answered that the RFP would include a cap on bid reimbursements, anticipated around \$500,000 for each of two losing short-listed bidders. He said the responses SFMTA received from potential bidders during the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) process had made it clear that the proposed reimbursement was needed. Mr. Barandiaran said bidders faced a high level of risk, which bidders would be willing to carry under the following three conditions: project essentiality, a well-crafted process, and risk/reward matrix. He pointed out that bidders would have to make a significant investment, possibly \$2-3 million each, to develop their proposals, which would require creating development strategies, financial models, marketing strategies, etc. He also said reimbursement could encourage local enterprises to bid, since they might not have the resources to undertake such a risk. Finally, Mr. Barandiaran said that reimbursement would give San Francisco ownership of the intellectual property incorporated in the losing bids, allowing the SFMTA to include desirable elements from the losing bids in the final project. He said the overall return on investment in the reimbursements was significant.

Jerry Levine asked if the Potrero project would include parking and asked how the facility would be managed once operational.

Ms. Iberri answered that there would be no parking programmed for residential use or SFMTA employees. Mr. Barandiaran added that the master project company would be responsible for maintenance of both the common infrastructure and real estate components of the project. He said SFMTA would continue to be responsible for fleet operations within the facility.



Mr. Levine asked about public liability.

Mr. Barandiaran answered that real estate liability would be responsibility of developer, and liability for operations in the bus maintenance facility would be SFMTA's responsibility.

David Klein asked about the up-front costs to initiate the project, and whether initial payments to the project partner would entail financial risk to the City.

Mr. Barandiaran answered that one of the key success factors from the case studies of public/ private partnerships was that payment was made at project completion, requiring the developer to finance the entire cost of construction and incentivizing the developer to deliver the project in a timely fashion. He said no up-front payments were planned after selection of joint development partner - no retainer, no deposit.

Mr. Klein asked what would happen if the project spun out of control, along the lines of what happened with the Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit project.

Ms. Ibarra said the location of the Potrero project on a discreet site posed much lower risks than the 2-mile long corridor with many different property interfaces in the case of the Van Ness Avenue project. She said SFMTA had exercised a high level of up-front due diligence for the Potrero project, incorporating lessons learned from previous projects. She said SFMTA anticipates no substantial scope or schedule changes from those specified in the RFP.

Mr. Tannen asked about the scope elements specified for the Joice Alley Lighting Improvements project, including restoration of brick exteriors on adjacent buildings and special handwork around certain sidewalk elements.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, said staff would follow up with the Public Works project manager, who was in attendance, but experiencing technical difficulties, to answer Mr. Tannen's question.

Robert Gower commented that the time required to deliver the Excelsior Neighborhood Traffic Calming project was excessive for the simple improvements planned such as continental crosswalks. He pointed out the project kicked off in 2017 but completion was not expected until 2022. He said he was generally frustrated by the excessive length of time required for a relatively small project and suggested that long delays between outreach and implementation could undermine the success of projects.

Chair Larson added that this is a well taken comment noting that a lot of the outer neighborhood projects tend to be easy quick build projects like traffic calming and it isn't clear why it takes so long and why it seems to be the same process for a small, easy project as for a building.

Casey Hildreth, SFMTA, said he would get a detailed answer from SFMTA project manager Nick Carr. He said it was his understanding that there had been a major change in scope during the planning process that required a second round of outreach.

Danielle Thoe said that she was impressed with the Potrero project, and noted that it was a huge undertaking, and said she was pleased that at least 50% of the housing units would be affordable. She asked if the project team had considered the impact of the transit vehicle traffic on the neighborhood, particularly access to Franklin Square Park across the street. She also asked if the project had potential for open space.



Mr. Rabelais answered that the project had some potential for new open space and said the project team was considering an improved connection to Franklin Square.

During public comment David Pilpel asked if all of the proposed capital projects were actually needed at this time. Specifically, he asked whether the need for the Potrero project was immediate and whether it was necessary to replace all 30 local-route buses. He said it was his understanding that the 37 and 67 lines were using larger buses anyway. Mr. Pilpel also suggested that environmental clearance information in Transportation Authority's Allocation Request Forms (ARFs) include the Case Number and determination date. He also requested that the ARFs include project location maps as a matter of course. Lastly, he also noted that the contact information for Public Works in the ARFs was out of date.

Edward Mason asked if it was too late to cancel the Replace 30, 30-foot Hybrid Motor Coaches project, as it seemed like much effort had already been expended on the procurement given the schedule outlined in the request. He said he would like to know more about the proposed new buses, particularly whether the seating configuration would be bench-style or forward-facing. Mr. Mason also expressed concern that project consultants might be ex-employees of SFMTA.

Kevin Ortiz motioned to amend the item to include regular presentations to the CAC on the Portrero Yard Modernization project as it progresses, seconded by Jerry Levine.

The motion to amend the item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Buffum, Gower, Larson, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Tannen. Thoe, Tupuola (9)

Nays: (0)

Absent: Klein, Zack (2)

Danielle Thoe motioned to approve the item as amended, seconded by Kevin Ortiz.

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Nays: (0)

Absent: Zack (1)

7. Approve \$1 million in Former Central Freeway Parcel Revenues for the Page Street Neighborway Project - ACTION

Mike Pickford, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item.

Chair Larson asked about the raised intersection planned for the intersection of Page and Buchanan Streets.

Casey Hildreth, SFMTA, responded that the raised profile and decorative asphalt would make more of a visual impact than standard crosswalks, and had been shown to be more effective in slowing bicycle traffic as well as automobile traffic. He said other benefits included easier access for wheelchair users and disabled pedestrians, since there would be no curbs.

During public comment David Pilpel asked if the Octavia Improvement Study still being underway made the Page Street project premature. He expressed opposition to



the project because the combined effect of the proposed neighborway project, the Bikeway Pilot and Slow Street projects, all on Page Street, really limits alternatives and would increase congestion more than relieving it.

Peter Tannen pointed to the east bound traffic diverter at Webster Street, which he thought was a good idea, but said historically there has been a lot of opposition in San Francisco to putting in diverters. He asked if the diverter had been adequately vetted with the community and if there was support for it.

Mr. Hildreth referenced the graphic in the materials and apologized for not updating the graphic. He said the diverter is currently installed and is part of the Page Street Bikeway pilot project. It has been installed with plastic posts and is being evaluated. Mr. Hildreth said that the project before the CAC today is complimentary to the diverter but is not dependent upon the diverter and the associated circulation changes. He noted that so far, the diverter has been popular overall.

David Klein moved to approve the item, seconded by Peter Tannen.

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Nays: (0)

Absent: Zack (1)

8. Adopt the 15 Third Bus Study Final Report - ACTION

Hugh Louch, Deputy Director for Planning presented the item.

Sophia Tupuola expressed her concerns with observing in District 10 the shift to private transportation amidst the current pandemic and with reduced transit service. She asked what is happening in the interim to serve families and vulnerable populations that are missing out on that resource but still need to get places like traveling to pick up food boxes.

Sandra Padilla, Transportation Planner with SFMTA acknowledged Ms. Tupuola's concerns and responded that the Bayview is the neighborhood that they protected the most in terms of preserving transit service. She said they have been intentional choosing the neighborhood that houses a lot of essential workers and that was hit hardest by the pandemic by making sure transit is frequent and reliable.

Chair Larson asked if the 15 line went out to Hunter's Point or was it a new service.

Mr. Louch said that the 15 line did not go through Hunter's Point originally. He said that emerged as a concept from other planning work that had been done in that area and other community feedback received. He said there are routes that serve that area, but this is a more direct connection to downtown.

Ms. Padilla shared feedback from the working group stating that they wanted to make sure people on the hill benefited the most. She said it would have some redundancy with the existing services and residents of the hill would no longer have to wait for the 44 or 54 which are less frequent.

Danielle Thoe said she is excited to see the project move forward. She said they are getting an old bus route back which is exciting and great for the community. She gave kudos to the staff and thanked them for their hard work.



During public comment David Pilpel said he has no issue with the pilot project to determine the viability of the service, but he asked if it is the right time to do it. He asked if it would result in less service on the duplicate and parallel Muni routes and added if vehicle availability is a constraining factor, then adding the new service would delay restoring other routes elsewhere in the city. He also asked how the service relates to commitments regarding transit to serve the Hunter's Point shipyard.

Sophia Tupuola 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. Thoe, Tupuola (4)

Nays: (0)

Absent: Rachel Zack (1)

9. Appropriate \$550,000 in Prop K Sales Tax Funds, with Conditions, for the Downtown San Francisco Congestion Pricing Study - ACTION

Colin Dentel-Post, Senior Transportation Planner presented the item.

Chair Larson thanked Mr. Dentel-Post for moving through the presentation quickly and noted that the presentation is available on the agency's website in case CAC members or the public would like to review it at their leisure. Chair Larson said there has been a great deal of effort to plan for in-depth outreach and that just as the study launched, staff needed to transition outreach to accommodate shelter-in-place. He said staff worked to conduct in-depth outreach during this time and the funding request would help ensure that effective outreach will continue during shelter-in-place. He said staff had conducted research on congestion pricing in other cities and have also worked to tailor a program to the unique situation in San Francisco. He acknowledged congestion pricing being a new concept in the United States and added that conducting the study during a pandemic seemed counterintuitive given the decrease in traffic that resulted from shelter-in-place orders. Chair Larson continued that congestion is already returning and the challenges related to congestion will return as well. He noted that he is a member of the study's Policy Advisory Committee as Chair of the CAC and he would like to delegate the role to another member of the CAC and said he would follow up on this later in the meeting.

Ms. Thoe expressed interest in being involved with the Policy Advisory Committee. She said that she lives and works in District 6 in the Tenderloin and recognized that people who live inside a congestion pricing zone may receive a discount for being a resident. Ms. Thoe expressed concern that people might be incentivized to drive within the zone if they live or work there. She noted how Uber and Lyft engage in predatory practices where they attract low income drivers with vehicle leases that then require them to work long hours. She said low-income discounts and a round trip daily cap could incentivize people with low incomes to become Uber or Lyft drivers. Ms. Thoe asked how the policy could be designed to prevent people from making trips within the congestion zone when they aren't crossing the boundary.

Mr. Dentel-Post said the resident discount is something the team is looking at in one proposed scenario. He said a 50% resident discount would only affect people who are in the middle- and high-income categories because people who are low-income would qualify for discounts or exemptions regardless. Mr. Dentel-Post said that while most private vehicle trips do cross the boundary, Uber and Lyft trips are an exception.



He said most Uber and Lyft trips happen within the zone, which is why the project team is proposing to charge Uber and Lyft internal trips.

Mr. Klein asked if research had been conducted into how companies like Door Dash, Uber Eats, or Uber and Lyft could pass along a charge to the consumer. He said that the recent election showed that the companies have money to advocate for legislation they want. Mr. Klein asked whether the companies might oppose a congestion pricing proposal legislatively.

Mr. Dentel-Post said that Uber and Lyft have publicly stated that they support congestion pricing. He said they want congestion pricing to apply to all vehicles as opposed to just Uber and Lyft. Mr. Dentel-Post said the congestion pricing proposals set the fee level to be the same whether someone is taking an Uber/Lyft or a trip in a personal vehicle.

Robert Gower expressed frustration that when it comes to traffic studies on TNCs like Uber and Lyft, a fair amount of money is spent to analyze the flow of these vehicles when the TNC companies have data they are unwilling to share.

Chair Larson said that he recalls there being a representative on the study's Policy Advisory Committee from Uber or Lyft.

Mr. Dentel-Post confirmed there is a representative from Uber on the committee representing ride-hail and emerging mobility sector. He said getting data around TNCs has been an ongoing challenge. He said the Transportation Authority has data that staff have collected via technical means to understand how Uber and Lyft trips are affecting traffic. Mr. Dentel-Post said that in order to implement a congestion pricing program, state legislation would be required, and the legislation would also need to be written to allow San Francisco to charge TNC trips and have access to the TNC trip data needed to charge them.

Mr. Gower responded that congestion studies that require a lot of funding are being conducted to figure out how to address congestion and meanwhile Uber and Lyft have data that the Transportation Authority had to access independently. He said that a challenging dynamic arises when these companies have representation on the study's Policy Advisory Committee where they support their interests.

Mr. Dentel-Post acknowledged his concern.

Chair Larson echoed that getting this information is challenging and state legislation would be needed to access it. He said that this funding request is meant to support community outreach. He said the outreach is necessary because of the challenges presented by the need to conduct remote outreach.

During public comment, John Peck from the Gladstone Institute in Mission Bay said that project staff presented to Gladstone staff and heard feedback from Gladstone employees. Mr. Peck noted that Mission Bay isn't part of downtown, and that the current congestion pricing zone map includes UCSF medical center and Kaiser hospital. He added that it was unfair to charge people who are traveling to these locations. Mr. Peck noted that project staff said much traffic congestion is created by ridesharing and he feels those companies should be responsible for solving congestion. He stated that the program would benefit Uber and Lyft and this doesn't seem right. He noted how the city was committed to managing traffic when the Warriors stadium came to Mission Bay but with congestion pricing the city would be charging the public instead. He requested that the congestion pricing zone exclude



UCSF medical center and Kaiser hospital.

A commenter noted concern that Uber and Lyft support congestion pricing. The commenter asked that the CAC oppose the scope increase. The commenter noted that staff should not continue the study because the effects of congestion pricing are known in that it will decrease equity, increase surveillance, and ignore the responsibility employers have in contributing to congestion. The commenter said that employers should pay for this impact. They added that congestion pricing would make low income people captive to mass transit but would not provide sufficient funding to improve mass transit as seen in other cities. The commenter stated that staff has conducted insufficient and ineffective outreach, particularly outreach to motorists. The commenter said it is irresponsible to use funds at this time and that the study should be suspended with funds redirected to funding transit operations.

David Pilpel expressed support for the increased outreach and therefore supported the increased funding allocation.

A San Francisco resident expressed opposition to congestion pricing and doubted that enough outreach had been made to the average resident. She noted that she has to drive into the proposed zone and would be charged to go to work in the East Bay and that this would add additional money on top of the bridge toll. She said San Francisco is an expensive place to live for everyone, even for those who don't qualify for discounts. She also noted that many businesses would offer telecommuting into the future and therefore the policy may not be needed. She stated that there are alternative ways to reduce congestion and that other city projects described earlier in the meeting are making congestion worse.

Frank Moss who lives in Potrero Hill and works in Mission Bay noted concerns that the policy would not effectively reduce traffic. He asked how such a policy would be enforced and expressed opposition to the project and continuing the study.

Peter Tannen moved to approve the item, seconded by Danielle Thoe.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Buffum, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Tannen, Thoe (9)

Nays: CAC Member Tupuola (1)

Absent: Zack (1)

10. Update on Bay Area Seamless Transit Efforts - INFORMATION

The item was continued due to time constraints.

11. Curb Management Strategy & Shared Spaces Pickup Zones Evaluation - INFORMATION

The item was continued due to time constraints.

Other Items

12. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

Chair Larson reiterated if any CAC members are interested in serving on the Downtown Congestion Pricing Study Policy Advisory Committee, they should notify Transportation Authority staff (clerk@sfcta.org) and let them know why they are interested.



Following on the Potrero project presentation where the losing bidders would receive reimbursements, Kevin Ortiz asked staff to provide numbers of similar contracts that are pre-existing for capital projects at the next CAC meeting.

Chair Larson added that it would be nice for staff to show in a little more detail how the relationships between the parties are working or are put together. He noted with the newer delivery methods like the construction manager/general contractor approach, come different kinds of relationships than we are used to and he would like to know more about how the relationships are structured and how the risks are managed or avoided.

Nancy Buffum shared that she attended the town hall on the Great Highway that the Transportation Authority and District 4 Supervisor conducted. She said there were at peak some 400 - 500 people in attendance and there was a great deal of public interest in what has been presented thus far. Ms. Buffum also said Transportation Authority staff did a great job coordinating the event, including being very respectful of differing opinions.

Danielle Thoe requested an update on Better Market Street at the next meeting and stated, expressing her concern with how the project is progressing and the speed with which the team is moving forward. She noted there appears to be almost unanimous opposition to the redesign at the public meetings, but she isn't aware of any budging on the proposed design. Ms. Thoe said she would like to press staff on what can be done to really make it a Better Market Street rather than just replacing utilities, though that work clearly needs to be done.

13. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

14. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:54 p.m.