



MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, July 28, 2021

1. Call to Order

Vice Chair Klein called the meeting to order at 6:26 p.m.

Present at Roll: Robert Gower, David Klein, Jerry Levine, Kevin Ortiz, Stephanie Liu, Peter Tannen, and Danielle Thoe (7)

Absent at Roll: Nancy Buffum (entered during item 10), Rosa Chen, John Larson, Sophia Tupuola (4)

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Vice Chair Klein 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 July 27 Transportation Authority Board meeting. He reported that the outreach round for the Streets and Freeways Strategy was coming to a close, and that the Streets and Freeways Strategy was part of ConnectSF, the multi-agency collaborative process to build an effective, equitable, and sustainable transportation system for San Francisco's future. Vice Chair Klein noted that feedback could be shared at connectsf.org, where there is also information to learn more about ConnectSF. He also shared a link to the survey on the Transportation Authority's home page at www.sfcta.org.

With regard to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and BART transit recovery plans, Vice Chair Klein encouraged everyone to look through the presentations for information on upcoming service changes for both agencies. He said the Transportation Authority Board heard from SFMTA at its meeting a day prior and added that the BART presentation was deferred to the September 28 meeting due to the length of the agenda. He shared that the recordings of the presentations would be available at [SFgovTV.org](https://sfgovTV.org).

Lastly, Vice Chair Klein reminded CAC members that they would not be meeting in August, and their next meeting would take place on September 1, where they will weigh in on items headed to the Transportation Authority Board for approval later that month.

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

3. Approve the Minutes of the June 23 Meeting - ACTION

4. Adopt a Motion of Support to Authorize Examination of Transaction and Use Tax Records- ACTION

5. Investment Report and Debt Expenditure Report for the Quarter Ended June 30, 2021 - INFORMATION



6. **State and Federal Legislation Update - INFORMATION**
7. **Capital Project Delivery Review and Best Practices Study - INFORMATION**
8. **BART Transit Recovery Plan - INFORMATION**
9. **SFMTA Transit Recovery Plans - INFORMATION**

With respect to item 7, Danielle Thoe requested an interim update on the work being done as she thinks capital project delivery is something they've had hiccups on and said it would be great to have a discussion on it.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director acknowledged the request and said staff would be happy to do so.

During public comment, Edward Mason recommended in the future that there be more granularity regarding the transit service personnel inventory at the pre, mid and post pandemic levels. He said there should be a visual on the budgeted headcount by classification, available personnel and personnel vacancies, average of employee age for the classification and any anticipated retirement eligibility data to provide a better picture of SFMTA's 6000 employees, and what is needed in order to fully staff the organization.

Vice Chair Klein thanked Mr. Mason for his comment.

Peter Tannen motioned to approve the consent agenda, seconded by Jerry Levine.

The consent agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Gower, Klein, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Tannen, Thoe (7)

Absent: Buffum, Chen, Larson, Tupuola (4)

End of Consent Agenda

10. **Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the District 4 Mobility Study Final Report - ACTION**

Camille Guiriba, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Vice Chair Klein thanked staff for the presentation and asked if there were thoughts around resolving bus capacity issues in specific corridors and how to enable people to use them, including in situations where people need to transport large items such as groceries.

Ms. Guiriba replied, pointing to some of the solutions presented such as increasing the frequency of busses as part of the 5-minute city wide network and the companion services, and the community shuttle as opportunities to reduce crowding on transit and provide more space.

Ms. Thoe inquired if solutions like adding bus priority lanes and removing some private car storage on street would help speed up the existing transit before adding more shuttle services. She also asked if there was any education component to existing transit options and if so, could it be added to the report.

Ms. Guiriba answered that for the transit component, the report recommends providing transit priority lanes for the 28 and the 29 busses.

Hugh Louch, Deputy Director for Planning, added that the report had deferred to the



city-wide transit planning underway at the time, so this study focused on the local trips that might be less captured with such improvements. He added that the timeline sequencing of the study makes it seem like the neighborhood-level planning was an afterthought, but a lot of planning had already happened in the past recent months.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked how San Francisco Chained Activity Model (SF CHAMP) was used to determine travel in the district; for instance, if it were based on cellphone technology that would show here the cell phones were moving from and to District 4.

Mr. Louch explained that the SF CHAMP model uses survey data that it is not based on cellphone sensors, but relies on other data that are commonly used. He added that SF CHAMP is a tool used to predict people's travels patterns.

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

The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: Chen, Larson, Tupuola (3)

11. Streets and Freeways Strategy and Outreach Update - INFORMATION

Hugh Louch, Deputy Director for Planning presented the item.

Peter Tannen asked for clarification of the map shown on page 154 of the packet. He said the map on the left showed recent and upcoming bicycle improvements, where the map on the right showed future connections, and he asked what were the differences between the two.

Mr. Louch replied that the lighter lines on the left map were meant to indicate places where there were existing routes, and the darker green lines showed the major improvements within the last year through slow streets and various quick-build projects. He continued by stating that though they don't know where the final locations of the future bike facilities may be, they know what work needs to be done. He added that some of the work is upgrading existing network segments, which are currently being built out by SFMTA, and there are other places where they know the general corridor, but there is work yet to be done to identify the proper street and what the specific bike improvements may look like, which is presented in the map on the right.

With regard to the grade separated pedestrian crossings, Mr. Tannen said he was surprised to see it listed as a suggestion. He said in the past during the urban renewal era on Geary Street and upper Market Street, there were grade separated pedestrian crossings, but these eventually grew out of favor as people did not use them as much. He asked Mr. Louch to speak more on what was envisioned and if there were any potential locations.

Mr. Louch said they see the things that have been done including creating the situation on Geary Street that may have encouraged a separated pedestrian crossing to be something that could potentially be remedied, and there is an interest in potentially filling in that part of Geary as a transformative project. With respect to the pedestrian crossings recommendation, he said they are more focused on the freeway system, and places where there are few places to safely cross. He said an example would be around 3rd street where there is a former undercrossing and people didn't feel safe. He said there was a lot of grade change to do it, but they could conceivably design a crossing that would more or less connect Visitacion Valley and the Bayview over the freeway in a



way that felt comfortable. Mr. Louch added that there are quite a few examples of crossings over Caltrans facilities in the Bay Area. He said the project team is looking at a handful of potential locations and are working out which appear to be feasible and can be explored further. He added that they are not talking about city streets grade separations, which tend to destroy the character of the streets.

Kevin Ortiz said he's heard through groups with concerns on freeway removals and said he wanted to learn more about the outreach strategy and what would happen during step three in terms of how it would influence the San Francisco transportation plan, as well as freeway removal. He said if that was the case, what funds would be used.

Mr. Louch said the way they have been approaching it and the way the outreach is designed, they see there is strong interest from both the community and at a federal level in removals or major transformations. He continued by saying that it was not necessarily something that would require a formal removal of a freeway and there were different ways such as undergrounding that could be done, and those opportunities did exist. He said the study was starting to identify where they see those opportunities, and what was critical for them was that a robust process was needed, because they know it is a process that has to be done very carefully with the communities. He added that it's not only about transportation, but also land use so the questions in their outreach are meant to make sure they are hearing from a wide range of folks and are taking the right approach. Mr. Louch said they see an identification of possible opportunities and a further process to then workshop the opportunities citywide and specifically in the communities. He continued by stating that this will not happen overnight, but they see it as an opportunity to leverage federal funding that may come to help move some of the ideas forward. He said they want to be in a position where if they have a transformative idea and there is a strong reception, it could potentially be advanced.

Mr. Ortiz noted that the study would potentially be looking at sites that could be potentially removed for freeways, while identifying the sites moving forward. He asked if the study will be public when available and said he would like to get frequent updates as the study becomes complete. He added that he lives by the Octavia freeway entrance, so he is not only interested as a CAC member, but as a neighbor as well.

Mr. Louch thanked Mr. Ortiz for his comments and said that they welcome any thoughts on how they can best do outreach.

There was no public comment.

12. Vision Zero SF Action Strategy - INFORMATION

Michael Jacobson, Vision Zero Planner, SFMTA, presented the item.

Ms. Thoe said she appreciated SFMTA meeting with the Tenderloin Traffic Safety Task Force and that she would like the Task Force to continue being involved. She referenced presentation slides 22 and 23, which included photos of no turn on red and speed limit 20 signage and said there was a sign on the back of a bus stop where it was not visible to motorists. She said it was frustrating to see signage without other compliance strategies and that, in addition to the quick builds proposed to be built by 2024, she would like to see comprehensive compliance strategies that invest in community advocates and design elements. She said that outside of the funding needed to make capital improvements, this proposed interim piece would help save



lives and hoped it was something SFMTA invested in with this Action Strategy.

Mr. Jacobson responded that SFMTA looked forward to continuing the relationship with the Tenderloin Traffic Safety Task Force. Regarding alternatives to traditional enforcement, he said SFMTA would look forward to the recommendations from the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition (SFBC) work with the community and how they could be incorporated into the program.

Nancy Buffum asked about 20 miles per hour (mph) zones and the level of effort needed to expand that speed limit, with the understanding that it ran into state law.

Mr. Jacobson said it was possible to lower speed limits to 20 mph. He said that fortunately, in the Tenderloin, SFMTA had previously conducted speed surveys and had a neighborhood wide approach to lowering the speeds from 25 mph to 20 mph. He expressed that SFMTA looked forward to Assembly Bill (AB) 43, which, if passed, would provide more of an opportunity for the city to lower speed limits in areas like the Tenderloin that were multimodal and had mixed-use land uses. He said SFMTA was working to maximize lowering speed limits in areas across the city but did not have data for other locations to lower speed limits at the scale seen in the Tenderloin.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked if Vision Zero planned to collect data on the vehicle type involved in a collision. He said newer trucks were mounted on a higher frame that would restrict the visibility of pedestrians. Additionally, he asked if the city tracked who was at fault for collisions.

Mr. Jacobson said that when the police responded to a crash, they completed a form including the vehicle types involved. He said that the party at fault for a collision was included in the annual fatality report from the San Francisco Department of Public Health. However, he said, while fault is important, SFMTA was making safety improvements to streets regardless of fault. He said that central to Vision Zero was that people made mistakes on our roadways, but the mistakes should not result in serious injuries or death.

13. Major Capital Project Update: Caltrain Modernization Program - INFORMATION

John Funghi, Caltrain Modernization Program Director presented the item per the staff memorandum.

With regard to funding, Jerry Levine asked about the \$280 million gap in the budget in the four-party agreement that says that each is committed to helping seek and secure up to an additional \$50 million a piece for a collective \$200 million. He noted that those numbers are iffy, and he wonders with the big budget gap, what are they going to do if the funds are not available. Mr. Levine also asked if the project was able to proceed at a reduced basis, and how would they deal with a significant short fall in the budget.

Mr. Funghi replied that currently the program is not contemplating a reduced version of infrastructure, and the funding slide that was presented, creates a priority of how they anticipate filling the funding gap. He said they currently believe based on the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds and the issuance of tax-exempt bonds, they will be covering the current funding shortfall with those two funding vehicles. He said that is what will be submitted to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) as part of the project completion plan. With regard to the backstop, in terms of the four-party agreement, it is a funding vehicle that exists in the program, and was established above the \$1.98 billion program as a condition of receiving the Full Funding Grant



Agreement from the FTA. He said during the FFGA process it was contemplated that the project would need additional funding at some point in the future, and the four-party agreement was required of them in order to receive the FFGA. He continues saying in terms of the priority in getting additional funding, it will be primarily the ARPA, then the sale of tax exempt bonds.

Mr. Levine said great, adding that's what he wanted to hear.

Mr. Tannen asked for clarification as it pertains to the warning system for at-grade crossings.

Mr. Funghi said the grade crossings currently operate with a constant warning time even though their trains travel at various speeds. He said currently on the alignment they operate at a maximum authorized speed of 79 mph, but they also have a reduced restricted speed. Mr. Funghi said Union Pacific operates freight on their system as well on a different speed, so the challenge is to develop a grade crossing system that supports the various speeds of operation while not extending total gate-down times at the crossings for pedestrians or vehicular cross traffic.

Vice Chair Klein asked for clarification on the carbon credits listed in the financing plan.

Brent Tietjen, Government and Communication Relations Officer with Caltrain said the low carbon fuel credits that are going to be used to pay for electrification financing costs in the future are credits that are paid by the businesses to offset carbon emissions from them. He continued that the businesses would have to pay the money to the state, and then Caltrain would receive that money in the future when Caltrain is electrified. He added they are receiving that money because they are reducing greenhouse gas emissions through the electrification project.

Vice Chair Klein asked if any of the purchases of the trains were adjusted to the ridership. He notes that ridership may be going down since some companies have been relocating their business to other cities, and asked if commuting would go back to the way it was before the pandemic.

Mr. Funghi said the agency is going through a schedule change in order to be responsive to the riding public and in order to attract that ridership back before people change their travel patterns. He said as they return back to the office, Caltrain wants to be the attractive choice. He added that one of the attractive benefits of their trains is that they're comfortable and have all of the various amenities a commuter needs, and will get them to their destination faster than a congested freeway. He said they anticipate that ridership will go back up and the electrification project will provide a very attractive mode choice for people as they begin to make that choice when going back to work.

Vice Chair Klein replied that it sounds like they are not adjusting frequency or purchases, because they are not expecting to have dramatic shifts in ridership.

Mr. Tietjen said that their Board adopted the 2040 business plan in 2019, and they are looking forward to that goal. He said the electrification project is a long-term project and they are hopeful that things will rebound shortly but, even if not, they are trying to diversify their ridership in terms of not just getting commute riders but making it more accessible to riders throughout the day with more service off-peak. He said this will allow the commuters to use Caltrain for other commute modes and not just for going to work. He closed by stating that the benefit of the project is to have more frequency and more service.



Stephani Liu shared that she is really excited about the project and is appreciative for the presentation.

During public comment, with regard to warning times, Roland Lebrun said the time between the lights flashing and the time actually arriving should be consistent regardless of the train approach speed. He said they've known about the problem for over 10 years and noted that testing in San Jose shows that the slow-moving freight trains are giving warning times of 3 minutes instead of 30 seconds. Mr. Lebrun also touched base on the smoothness of the train rides and suggested, per an email he forwarded to the Board, that the new trains operate in diesel until all of the issues are resolved. Mr. Lebrun also requested that any further Prop K allocations are compliant with Caltrain Director Heminger's request that all meetings be held in public instead of behind closed doors.

Edward Mason asked if there were any plans in the Caltrain future for increased ridership to encourage South Bay businesses to utilize Caltrain so they can eliminate the current commuter buses from the neighborhoods. He said they are starting to reappear, and they don't want to go back to the 100 commuter buses at 24th and Church in a four-hour window in the future. He said with the ridership increase, they assume people are going to turn to faster mode of transportation. Mr. Mason shared that he always allocates 40 -50 minutes on MUNI just to get to the Caltrain station, and asked what provisions would be in place for not only ridership but for the first and last mile.

Vice Chair Klein agreed with Mr. Mason in terms of the first and last mile and invited the speakers to respond.

Mr. Funghi said with the first and last mile issue, they worked closely with the SFMTA in coordinating their schedules. He said they also do it with BART at the interconnection facility at Millbrae, and their facilities in San Jose are working with their regional transit partners.

Mr. Tietjen added that they coordinate with their partners in all three counties to ensure that their first and last mile connections are good. He said they have a strong focus on allowing bike commuters to use their trains but also improving their facilities to improve access. With regard to upcoming service changes, he said that their Board received a presentation on restoring service for Caltrain coming out of the pandemic, He said that hopefully means having more ridership by including the return of the baby bullet express, return of local trains making sure people can make connections to more stations, and more express trains throughout the day and not just during the peak. He added he is excited to get this portion of service restoration which will commence on August 30.

14. Major Capital Project Update: Better Market Street - INFORMATION

Cristina Calderón Olea, Project Manager, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Mr. Tannen asked what the likelihood would be that the 800 feet to be dug up and the utilities replaced would be representative of the entire 2 mile project corridor. He asked if the shifting of transit between side and center lanes for 800 feet would cause confusion.

Ms. Olea replied those 800 feet will be representative of a block over a BART/MUNI station but it will not be representative of the entire 2 miles. She said the utilities



between the stations are older, going back to the 1880's. She said they are trying to chip away at the project and there is a lot that they can learn but it will not be representative of the whole 2 miles.

Britt Tanner with SFMTA responded that moving transit to the center for 800 will not create confusion because they can consolidate transit stops at 7th and 8th streets to one stop at United Nations Plaza. She said it is just transitioning out of the center lane after 7th Street.

Ms. Thoe asked about the enforcement and compliance effort. She asked if there was a debrief on lessons learned on compliance efforts and what worked and didn't work. She said that it's an opportunity for them to learn a lot on compliance on streetscape and for people to exhibit safer behavior and asked if they could get best practices out of it.

Ms. Tanner responded that they have been coordinating monthly with Parking Control Officers (PCO) and San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) and there have been lessons learned. She said that they made a point to have PCO's and the SFPD out on the street the same day so that they can reinforce each other, but they found out that SFPD had less to do because there were less violations, and as a result they staggered their presence.

Vice Chair Klein asked where the quantitative data for the tradeoff was and how were they objectively were making a decision.

Ms. Olea responded that a lot of it was based on their construction management sequencing and the estimate for duration. She said it was broken into different pieces: the construction schedule, the cost, as well as scope of work.

During public comment, Edward Mason said he realized all of the construction would be done on the surface, yet the subway is beneath it. He said he assumed there would be no adverse effect with construction on the surface, and said he is apprehensive of things that will and can go wrong. He said he would like confirmation that the surface level construction will not impact the subway, such as leaking walls from moisture penetration.

Ms. Olea responded that Mr. Mason was correct, and that there is no work that goes down that deep for both of the proposed alternatives and work will be well above the subway with no plan to interrupt the subway below Market Street.

Other Items

15. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

Jerry Levine requested a presentation from Muni staff on the Van Ness Corridor. He said he would like to hear the responses to the Grand Jury Report, as well as the concerns on the businesses impacted along the corridor. He said over the course of construction, small businesses along the corridor have not been able to get their questions answered.

Vice Chair Klein revisited his request on receiving a Prop K allocation summary per supervisorial district and asked if there was an estimated date on when it will be available.

Ms. La Forte, said staff had sent out the summary to members via email. She offered to resend it.



Vice Chair Klein said he didn't realize that the summary would be sent in an email format and was looking forward to a presentation. He said he will follow up and reply to the email if he has any further questions.

There was no public comment.

16. Public Comment

During public comment, Roland Lebrun thanked the Transportation Authority for implementing closed captioning into the meetings and suggested that the archived meeting videos be uploaded on a more user friendly platform such as YouTube.

17. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:46 p.m.