



DRAFT MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, June 23, 2021

1. **Call to Order**

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

Present at Roll: Nancy Buffum, Robert Gower, David Klein, John Larson, Jerry Levine, Kevin Ortiz, Peter Tannen, and Sophia Tupuola (8)

Absent at Roll: Rosa Chen, Stephanie Liu (entered during item 2), Danielle Thoe (entered during item 2) (3)

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

Chair Larson shared that Community Advisory Committee (CAC) members were provided a link to the agency's website with the Executive Director's Report given at the June 22 Transportation Authority Board meeting. He shared that the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (Transportation Authority) Board had a lengthy meeting with most of the time spent on public comment on the Upper Great Highway Concepts Evaluation Final Report. He added that the Board took action on its first read with final approval scheduled for July 13 and that the CAC would consider the item later on the agenda.

Chair Larson also reported that Chair Mandelman shared that in July, the Transportation Authority Board anticipates presentations from the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) on their next set of service restorations, including BART's late-night service and many more Muni lines and cable car testing in August. He encouraged CAC members and the public to watch the July 27 Transportation Authority Board meeting and said he would work with staff to agendize the presentations at the CAC, as well.

Lastly, with respect to Plan Bay Area (PBA) 2050, Chair Larson reported that after a multi-year planning effort, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and Association of Bay Area Governments published the Draft PBA 2050, including its Implementation Plan and the draft Environmental Impact Report. He said that PBA is the regional transportation plan and sustainable communities' strategy for the nine Bay Area County region. He added that the plan documents and information on public comment opportunities are available at planbayarea.org, including a virtual public workshop to be held on June 28 at 5 p.m. with a West Bay -San Francisco and Marin focus. Chair Larson shared that staff would be tracking San Francisco public input to the plan as the next phase of ConnectSF, and it would be the update of their countywide transportation plan, known as the San Francisco Transportation Plan, which would be consistent with and further detail PBA 2050 within San Francisco.



There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

3. Minutes from the May 26, 2021 Meeting - ACTION

4. State and Federal Legislation Update - INFORMATION

Referring to Item 4, Peter Tannen asked what was behind the amendment of Assembly Bill (AB) 117 to remove the incentive program for purchasing electric bicycles.

Amber Crabbe, Policy Program Manager replied that her guess was that the amendment was necessary to get the bill to move forward. She said there was nothing disallowing the addition of the incentive program in the future.

With respect to AB 550, Mr. Tannen asked for more background on why it was held up at committee.

Ms. Crabbe replied that there was too much opposition to get it out of committee, including serious concerns from labor and California Walks. She said Transportation Authority and SFMTA staff are now pivoting to focus on AB 43 (Friedman) which would provide more flexibility to local jurisdictions to lower speed limits throughout the city.

Robert Gower asked if the State Legislation positions shown in the packet were adopted by the Transportation Authority Board versus the CAC.

Amber confirmed the positions were adopted by the Transportation Authority Board.

There was no public comment.

Jerry Levine moved to approve the consent agenda, seconded by David Klein.

The consent agenda was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: Chen (1)

End of Consent Agenda

5. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$14,892,610 and Appropriate \$200,000 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, for Eight Requests - ACTION

Chair Larson said he would like to sever the Downtown Congestion Pricing appropriation from the remaining allocations since one member would need to recuse themselves.

Chair motioned to sever the Downtown Congestion Pricing allocation from the remaining allocations, seconded by David Klein.

The motion to sever was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: Chen (1)



Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, presented seven requests, excluding the Downtown Congestion Pricing Study appropriation, per the staff memorandum.

David Klein asked if there would be more bicycle safety classes in Fiscal Year 2021/22, and if they would be offered in more locations.

Crysta Highfield, with SFMTA, answered affirmatively to both questions. She also said the outreach effort would be broader to include community-based organizations other than the main contractor San Francisco Bicycle Coalition (SFBC).

Peter Tannen asked about the "visitors" mentioned in the scope description of who would be targeted for participation in bicycle safety classes, and wondered if it was a mistake.

Ms. Highfield agreed that few, if any visitors would participate and that recruiting them was not a major goal of the program, though it wasn't prohibited. She added that 1 or 2 regular commuters (who were not San Francisco residents) had participated in the past.

Jerry Levine asked if the bicycle safety classes was a good opportunity to provide bikes to students who don't have them.

Ms. Highfield answered that the classes were not bike giveaways, but said bikes were provided to students who didn't have them for use during each safety class. She pointed out that there were sources for free bikes in San Francisco for disadvantaged youth.

Sophia Tupuola asked about the on-time performance of the paratransit services.

Jonathan Cheng, with SFMTA, answered that on-time performance across the various paratransit modes had been greater than 95% since the start of the COVID -19 pandemic. He encouraged paratransit users to call Where's My Ride (415) 285-6945, and select option 3 if their San Francisco Access van was more than 15 minutes late.

Ms. LaForte said that the program's on-time performance had improved in recent years, and she directed the CAC's attention to the performance indicator chart in the paratransit allocation request form within the enclosure.

Robert Gower asked about SFMTA's level of commitment to a wide geographical distribution of bicycle safety classes.

Ms. Highfield said the contract required that classes be offered in every supervisorial district and provided a chance during each quarter to rebalance the geographical distribution of the classes.

Nancy Buffum asked if the bicycle safety classes were only for beginners, or if they were also designed for higher-skilled riders.

Ms. Highfield answered that the classes were designed for beginners, to help them get past the need for training wheels. She said the YMCA's Y-Bike program offered adult classes.

Chair Larson asked if this program cross promoted other bike classes.



Ms. Highfield thanked the chair for the question and said she would look into cross promotion opportunities.

Danielle Thoe asked if the District 4 Neighborway Network project was redundant with District 4 Mobility Study, noting both focused on project development and did not include a construction phase. She asked if there was a commitment to actually building the recommended neighborways, adding that the scope of the Neighborway Network project didn't specify a particular number of neighborways specified. She also asked if the project would evaluate impacts outside of District 4, such as possible traffic diversion.

Ms. LaForte answered that SFMTA planned to utilize Prop K placeholder funds, intended for neighborway projects, to fund the construction phase of the District 4 Neighborway Network project. She said SFMTA had provided a rough construction cost estimate of about \$300,000/mile, and pointed out that, despite its high level of outreach, the pending request was for detailed design, and would lead directly to a construction phase.

Brian Leng, with SFMTA, confirmed that the project would fully design the neighborways after determining the corridors in which they would be located.

During public comment Ed Mason asked who the contractor was for the bicycle safety classes. He also requested that allocation requests generally include a chart similar to the one on page 56 of the enclosure to show how many classes were offered in the last several years, the number of people who participated, etc.

Through the Chair, Ms. Highfield answered that SFMTA's Bicycle Safety Education program was in its third year of a five-year contract with SFBC to implement the program. She offered to share information with the CAC about the previous years of the program.

Christopher White, with SFBC, spoke in support of the request for Bicycle Safety Education and outreach. He said it was important, considering that interest in biking increased during the pandemic. Mr. White pointed out that the program enrolled just as many students during the pandemic as in previous years, despite the fact that the number of classes offered were reduced. He said the program tended to serve people who were under-represented in the city's bike lanes and clarified that SFBC rented bikes for use in the bicycle safety classes when they were needed. Finally, Mr. White said the bicycle safety classes included a great deal of cross-promotion with other programs.

Danielle Thoe motioned to approve the seven requests other than the Downtown Congestion Pricing Study, which had been severed from the original item, seconded by Sophia Tupuola.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: Chen (1)



Rachel Hiatt, Assistant Deputy Director for Planning, presented the Downtown Congestion Pricing Study appropriation.

Mr. Gower stated that he was a current member of the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) for the Study and that the PAC was offered honorariums for the remaining meetings. He stated that he has declined the honorarium so that he can vote on the congestion pricing items that come before the CAC.

Mr. Klein asked whether the fees on ride share and deliveries such as Uber Eats would be paid by the rider, the driver, or the company. He asked whether the project team is speaking to any of the executives within these companies and whether they have objections.

Ms. Hiatt stated that the project team heard consistently through outreach that the fee should not be paid by the driver and that the rider or the company should be the one to receive the fee. She added that the PAC has a representative from ride hail companies and that staff has spoken with other companies and they are aware that the fee proposed is a per trip fee. She added that they have also heard from fellow PAC members about the strong interest in passing along the fee to the riders. She pointed to a predecessor example in the per trip fee on ride hail services currently in place for San Francisco as structure could be built upon for congestion pricing.

Mr. Klein asked about businesses and noticed that there were fee adjustments based on residential income, and asked whether those would apply to small businesses, and whether minority owned businesses could be treated differently. He wanted to make sure that the companies that are already at a disadvantage would not be priced out.

Ms. Hiatt stated that the project team was very aware of the distinction between large fleets that build fees into their business model versus small contractors, and that staff have sought to have conversations directly with unions to understand those distinctions and come up with options to recognize those in policy. She stated that staff needed to do more outreach with them to come up with recommendations on that front.

Kevin Ortiz asked what community based organizations the project team was working with by name and how they were using them do to outreach.

Ms. Hiatt stated that like in the first round, the team contracts with Community Based Organizations (CBO) to host workshops. She said in the last round the project published the names in their summary of the outreach round and the memo would be distributed to the CAC.

Paige Miller, Senior Communications Manager, added that they contracted with Young Community Developers, Chinese Newcomers, Chinatown Community Development Center, Mission Economic Development Agency, Central City SRO Collaborative, Self Help for the Elderly, and APRI-SF, sharing that staff would reach out to those groups again this round. Ms. Miller added that the workshops worked as a partnership with CBOs to figure out congestion pricing policies that work for their community.

Ms. Thoe noticed from looking at the map that Laguna was the western boundary of the proposed congestion pricing area, and that the Octavia freeway entrance ramp



was within the boundary. She expressed concern that some will end up driving through neighborhoods to get on the freeway in other places as a consequence of having the boundary there. She asked whether they were studying unintended consequences of where the boundaries were and whether roadway mitigation would be needed.

Ms. Hiatt stated that one of the reasons staff recommended including the Central Freeway in the zone was to reduce diversions, to reinforce the mode and time shifting in the program, and because without including it, there would be more diversions. She added that the project team was looking at whether there would be streets that would see an increase in vehicle trips, and while overall there was a reduction in daily vehicle miles traveled, the team would look at particular streets such as Cesar Chavez that may need traffic calming to address any changes in vehicle routing that may happen. She added that the City does work with the mapping companies to include street changes and restrictions in their routing advice to drivers, but in the planning stage, they were looking at whether any particular streets would see an increase in vehicular traffic and would need traffic calming despite the overall decrease in vehicle trip making.

Ms. Buffum asked about the overall messaging about congestion pricing and said that they are talking a lot about the equity issues of folks who are struggling economically getting cost reductions for traveling in these zones, but that her fear is that the purpose would be lost, adding that the goal is to encourage people to get downtown by other means. She asked how much work is being done in the outreach to encourage getting to downtown in ways other than car trips.

Ms. Hiatt stated that she didn't spotlight the use of revenues, and the fees all go back to invest in other ways of getting to downtown, especially for those that don't have the level of transit access to downtown that they could if the program invested the revenues into improved transit access. She stated that it is part of the outreach conversation that is coming up. She clarified that the lower fees being proposed do raise less revenue than the fee levels that would have been needed with 2019 levels of congestion, but that is a tradeoff that staff will explain in this round of outreach. She concluded that the reinvestment of revenues into better downtown access in general is part of the outreach conversation.

There was no public comment.

Chair Larson noted Sophia Tupuola would need to recuse herself.

Nancy Buffum motioned to approve the Downtown Congestion Pricing allocation, seconded by Danielle Thoe.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: Chen (1)

Recused: Tupuola (1)



6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the Upper Great Highway Concepts Evaluation Final Report - ACTION

Hugh Louch, Deputy Director for Planning, and Camille Guiriba, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Mr. Levine asked if there was consideration given to having there be one way in AM and the reverse in the PM as part of Option 5. In Washington DC, there is a successful main commuter artery/thoroughfare through Rock Creek Park that has alternating lanes in the morning and at night, he said.

Mr. Louch responded that it was not looked at specifically, but it might have come up in discussion. It was not considered for two reasons, the extra cost and effort associated with safe management of the lanes and the relative balance of traffic flows between AM and PM periods. He noted that the reason the study focused on one-way southbound was because southbound vehicles have more conflicts with the other parts of the street network.

Mr. Klein noticed that collisions have gone down and asked if traffic citation trends show that traffic is slowing down in the neighborhoods. He further asked how staff is using that data to inform the suggestions.

Ms. Guiriba responded that citation data was not analyzed but that the team had heard from residents, specifically on Lower Great Highway, about bad driver behavior and re-routing onto residential streets. She also noted that SFMTA staff had been collecting volume and speed data during the closure and monitoring the effectiveness of implemented traffic calming measures.

Mr. Klein asked if there was feedback during outreach on speeding and why people voted the way that they did in such an overwhelming and completely different way from the city as a whole.

Ms. Guiriba responded that the themes heard in outreach are documented in the report. She explained that the survey asked residents about priorities for Upper Great Highway and surrounding areas, and that many respondents expressed a desire for bike/ped access. She continued to say that others were concerned about vehicle access and roadway safety. In terms of concepts, she explained that many concerns about concept 1 (four-way roadway) related to bicycle and pedestrian safety and too much space for cars. For concept 3, she explained that there were concerns about the potential for traffic and neighborhood collisions and speeding.

Mr. Klein said he sees a lot of opportunity for improvement for pedestrians and bicyclists. He suggested that it would be great to see how much is being estimated for bicyclists and pedestrians improvements separately from vehicular improvements just to see how the City is investing in infrastructure for transit and other options for mobility.

Ms. Thoe noted that in reviewing the 5 concepts, they do not seem like long-term scenarios in terms of environmental impacts. She noted the detail on long-term environmental issues in the 2012 Ocean Beach Master Plan and asked if there has been an update to the environmental conditions (i.e., coastal erosion) since 2012 and how are these factored in for long-term decisions.



Mr. Louch responded that staff did not examine the level of ongoing coastal erosion as part of this project. However, staff was aware that the Great Highway extension is compromised and needs to be removed. He mentioned that SFMTA and San Francisco Recreation and Park were thinking about a two-year horizon for a pilot and that, when Transportation Authority staff reviewed traffic patterns in the western part of the city, they were mostly stable over time. He emphasized that the study focused on evaluating return to 2019 conditions and how to handle that area from a traffic perspective while acknowledging environmental concerns.

Ms. Guiriba added that there are challenges to maintain the roadway over time and will pass on questions to SFMTA and Rec and Park on long-term environmental concerns.

Ms. Buffum asked about long-term training of drivers to not use the neighborhood streets. As a Sunset resident, she stated that the value of the pilot is to continue to train drivers to not use residential areas. She mentioned that Lower Great Highway would get congested during road closure and sand removal. She asked if staff would be measuring the volume of traffic that goes through the Sunset neighborhood. She expressed that it appears that traffic seems to be declining as driving is increasing and asked if staff had observed that change.

Mr. Louch responded that there has been data collection, but staff has not received the results of this yet. Ms. Guiriba added that SFMTA is collecting data on several neighborhood streets to understand the effectiveness of traffic calming, including vehicle volume and speeds at different times of days and weeks. She added that if there is a pilot, staff expects monitoring over time to understand how well traffic calming is discouraging traffic on those routes and towards major arterials.

Mr. Louch added that, in regard to the closure of Great Highway Extension, there is an on-going environmental process for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission project. He mentioned that staff can pass along concerns about the movement/traffic of residential streets along to SFMTA and other staff working on that effort.

Mr. Larson commented that he was glad that there is focus on the whole area including both the southern end of the study area and Golden Gate Park. He added that at the southern end, the Sunset/Sloat interchange areas are already really challenged with traffic.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated a strong preference for concept 2 and said she did not understand the \$22 million cost. As an experiment/temporary measure, he suggested keeping the 2 northbound lanes for bi-directional traffic then have southbound lanes for the promenade, adding that barriers could be installed to make sure people are safe. He also stated that he does understand concern of frontal collisions because in SOMA there are major thoroughfares that are being changed into 2-way streets, and there should be the same solutions. He concluded that he is uncertain how to handle parking.

John Eliot of the Outer Richmond stated he is not in the 53 percent that wants to reopen the roadway. He strongly urged approval of Concept 3 (full promenade) but understands north/south traffic in the Outer Richmond is difficult in a car. He added



that a 17-acre ocean side park has been created and transformed the road to a place. He noted that it is a great oasis without cars with low noise pollution.

Luke Bornheimer of Kid Safe San Francisco said the Great Walkway is the second most popular open space in San Francisco. He cited the overwhelming number of calls, emails and survey responses that support the full promenade. He added that the compromise solutions were the least popular. In addition, he added that traffic collisions in Outer Sunset are down despite increases in other parts of the city. He explained the pilot would setup a transformative space from Lincoln to Skyline by 2023. He closed by saying that the City needs to do more mode shift.

Sara Barz of District 7 supported Commissioner Melgar's and Walton's request to include previous analysis and new data to the report. She said she finds that the solutions do not address major issues such as climate change and traffic safety. Ms. Barz strongly support concept 3, full promenade as it aligns with climate and vision zero goals. She said that the Great Walkway is the 2nd most popular open space in San Francisco and a majority of those surveyed want it to stay that way. She added that she is opposed to the timed option, as it removes dedicated space for bikes and pedestrians. She asked that they approve the report and support concept 3 for full promenade.

Nancy Buffum motioned to approve the item, seconded by Peter Tannen.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Buffum, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Ortiz, Tannen, Thoe (8)

Absent: Chen, Liu, Tupuola (3)

7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Award a 15-Month Professional Services Contract, with an Option to Extend for an Additional 6 Months, to EMC Research, Inc. in an Amount Not to Exceed \$100,000 for Voter Opinion Survey and Public Messaging Services for Transportation Sales Tax Reauthorization - ACTION

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

Chair Larson asked if EMC Research has worked with the Transportation Authority before.

Ms. Beaulieu confirmed that the Transportation Authority has worked with EMC Research in the past, and that the firm has also done extensive work on transportation revenue measures in the Bay Area and in San Francisco.

Chair Larson asked when the target date for the polling will be, and whether it will include when the measure should go to the ballot.

Ms. Beaulieu stated that the timing of the polling is to be determined and confirmed that it is meant to inform whether the ballot measure should advance to June or November 2022, if that is the direction of the Board.

David Klien motioned to approve the item, seconded by Chair Larson.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Buffum, Klein, Larson, Levine, Ortiz, Tannen, Thoe (7)



Absent: Chen, Gower, Liu, Tupuola (4)

8. Streets and Freeways Strategy and Outreach Update - INFORMATION

This item was deferred to the call of the Chair.

Other Items

9. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

Nancy Buffum asked if the CAC would be able to hear a Vision Zero action strategy presentation at a future meeting.

Chair Larson agreed and said it has been a while since they've heard a presentation on Vision Zero and they would agendaize it for a later meeting.

David Klein inquired about a prior request for staff to share a summary of allocation of Prop K funds by supervisorial district.

Ms. LaForte replied that the list is ready, and they have prepared lists summarizing allocation by district and citywide for Prop K sales tax, Prop AA vehicle registration fee, and the Transportation Fund for Clean Air.

Mr. Klein replied that it was a great way to compare and contrast projects.

Chair Larson asked if it would be presented at an upcoming meeting or distributed to the members.

Ms. LaForte said they would distribute it to CAC members.

Chair Larson shared that he had discussions with Transportation Authority staff about extending CAC meetings by starting earlier. He said they can discuss more in the future, but it may help with meeting time management.

During public comment, Luke Bornheimer said he would love to see the action strategy update presented to the CAC and encouraged them to involve Jodie Medeiros with Walk San Francisco (Walk SF) and the Vision Zero Coalition to present their recommendation of the action strategy. He said being part of the coalition, he would love to present alongside them to give another perspective on an important matter, and thanked the CAC member for the suggestion.

10. Public Comment

During public comment Luke Bornheimer encouraged the CAC and staff to work on a resolution supporting one or multiple options from the Great Highway report. He said this should be done sooner rather than later and thanked the staff for their work on the report.

Chair Larson thanked the caller for their suggestion.

Roland Lebrun commented on the Great Highway report stating that the resolution was to support the report and he said at other agencies they would've accepted the report which he suggested is a more neutral approach. He also spoke in support of using Zoom instead of Microsoft Teams.

A caller said they wonder how the project meets San Francisco's climate action goals to limit CO2 emissions and if it focuses on limiting congestion while protecting their



natural resources. They shared that as an individual with a titanium right leg, the city is not doing what it needs to do when it comes to public health issues. They asked how the city is focusing on enhancing everyone's ability to use freestyle active mobility options and said they need to focus on generating other modes of travel. They added that Vision Zero is far from meeting their 2024 goals and a car-free area means Vision Zero.

11. Adjournment

Chair Larson adjourned the meeting at 8:36 p.m.