

1455 Market Street, 22ND Floor, San Francisco, California 94103 415-522-4800 info@sfcta.org www.sfcta.org

DRAFT MINUTES

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Tuesday, October 19, 2021

1. Roll Call

Chair Mandelman called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m.

Present at Roll Call:	Commissioners Haney, Mar, Mandelman, Melgar, Preston, Peskin, Safai, and Walton (8)
Absent at Roll Call:	Commissioners Chan, Ronen, Stefani (all entered during item 2) (3)

[Final Approval on First Appearance] Approve Resolution Making Findings to Allow Teleconferenced Meetings Under California Government Code Section 54953(e) -ACTION

Amber Maltbie, Nossaman LLP, presented the item.

There was no public comment

Vice Chair Peskin moved to approve the item seconded by Commissioner Walton

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Haney, Mar, Mandelman Melgar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Stefani, and Walton (10)

Absent: Commissioner Safai (1)

3. Community Advisory Committee Report - INFORMATION

John Larson, Chair of the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) reported out on the September 22 CAC meeting and shared CAC input on the 2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan item later on the agenda. In response to a CAC question about the cost escalation of the Mission and Geneva Pavement Renovation, he said that staff explained that the costs increased because Public Works added blocks (i.e., expanded scope) to the project on Geneva Avenue to better coordinate with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA's) Mission/Geneva Safety Project, so it wasn't entirely owning to just the cost escalation over the last five years. He shared that during public comment, a question was raised about what was meant by more legible signage in the Transit Stop Signage Enhancement Program. He shared that SFMTA explained that every stop would have at least a color coded flag style stop sign, with a small solar powered light to help with reading. Chair Larson shared that the lights would replace the yellow stripes in which CAC members noted were hard to read. He shared that the item was approved unanimously by the committee.

With regard to the SFMTA Transportation Recovery Plan for 2022 Muni service, he shared that the CAC inquired about the challenges of returning service to pre-pandemic levels, impacts on revenue, and opportunities for making change in the new post-pandemic environment. He said a particular concern was around the survey response rates in



Page 2 of 7

communities of concern. He said, Sean Kennedy with SFMTA shared with members that staff was analyzing the responses to see where they received insufficient responses, to then focus their efforts on obtaining more survey responses from those areas. Additionally, he said that they were working with community-based organizations to distribute paper surveys at various events and locales, and were committed to sharing the survey data when ready. He shared that another issue of concern was the continued forced transfer of the J Church line prior to entering the Market Street tunnel, and not continuing onto the Embarcadero station. He shared that majority of the public commenters said they wanted to see restoration of the J Church into the subway. He mentioned that one commenter said that the single J line ride home from work and school influenced their home purchase within the proximity of J Church. During CAC discussion, he shared that Mr. Kennedy replied that the J line is on the table and may go back into the subway depending on community feedback.

With respect to the Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) update, Chair Larson said CAC members commented that specific information about business impacts was missing from the presentation, noting that it has been a continuing priority issue to the CAC. He shared that one member noted that the presentation didn't provide any detail about the depth of the work involved or how the work impacted the constituents. He added that another CAC member commented that it was inexcusable that pot-holing work had not been done early on in the project development, and asked if lessons learned had been applied to other projects. Chair Larson said that in response, project staff said they had already applied the potholing fixes (e.g. ensure it is done earlier and more thoroughly) to other projects, and in addition were committed to coordinating with the Office of Economic & Workforce Development to incorporate more detailed business impacts and mitigation information into future presentations.

During public comment Anastasia Monopolies, a District 8 resident, said that although SFMTA staff said returning the J Church to its pre-pandemic service plan is on the table, the SFMTA is sending out fliers saying they want to make accessibility improvements that are in place permanent, noting that a new elevator and sidewalk bulbouts are expensive. They questioned why SFMTA would make these expensive accessibility improvements, when SFMTA is hearing loud and clear requests to restore the J Church line.

4. Approve the Minutes of the September 28, 2021 Meeting - ACTION

There was no public comment.

Vice Chair Peskin motioned to approve the minutes, seconded by Commissioner Ronen.

The minutes were approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Haney, Mar, Mandelman Melgar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, and Walton (11)

Absent: (0)

5. State and Federal Legislation Update - INFORMATION

Amber Crabbe, Public Policy Manager, and Mark Watts, State Legislative Advocate for the Transportation Authority, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Jamie Parks, Livable Streets Director for the SFMTA, reported that Assembly Bill (AB) 43 was signed into law, authorizing local speed limit setting under certain conditions. He thanked the San Francisco state legislative delegation, the Mayor, the Transportation



Page 3 of 7

Authority Board, and stakeholder organizations for working on the dozens of iterations of the bill. He said that San Francisco sent a clear and unified message to Sacramento that changing the antiquated California speed limit laws was critical to achieving safe streets. He stated that SFMTA was eager to start implementing the bill, but it was first important to understand what the bill does and does not do, because it did not provide free reign to reduce speed limits. He said the first thing AB 43 did was eliminate speed creep, or the requirement to raise speed limits if cars are measured to be traveling faster than the existing speed limit. He noted this had not been a big issue in San Francisco but had been a concern in Southern California and elsewhere in the state. He said that, more important for San Francisco, the bill allowed the lowering of speed limits by five miles per hour on designated safety corridors and locations with high numbers of pedestrians and bicyclists. He stated that Caltrans would need to go through a rulemaking process to establish definitions for those designations, so this provision would not likely go into effect until 2024. He added that SFMTA planned to engage in the rulemaking process. He noted that the provision of the bill most likely to impact San Francisco in the near term, since it goes into effect in January 2022, was the authorization to reduce speed limits from 30 miles per hour to 25 miles per hour or 25 miles per hour to 20 miles per hour in business districts, which were defined as corridors where 50 percent of fronting properties were commercial activities. He said that SFMTA was doing analysis to determine which corridors would qualify under that provision. He stated that some corridors were obvious, such as Haight Street, Polk Street, and Valencia Street, but that others would require additional analysis, such as SOMA, the downtown core, and North Beach, where the corridors weren't as clearly defined because of their mixed uses. He added that the SFMTA Board would have to approve any changes through an ordinance, and that staff intended to bring a package of streets for consideration as soon as possible so SFMTA can get started as of January 4, 2022, when the bill goes into effect. He said that SFMTA intended to pair these speed limit changes with educational campaigns, similar to what it did earlier in the year related to traffic changes in the Tenderloin.

Mr. Parks mentioned that AB 773 passed as well, which amended the state vehicle code to include a new Slow Streets designation, with evaluation criteria and other requirements that had to be met. He said that while there was nothing prohibiting the implementation of Slow Streets before the bill, it provided legislative clarity about how they should look in San Francisco post-COVID.

Commissioner Haney said he was pleased to see that SFMTA was already moving forward to implement the speed reductions allowed by AB 43. He asked how the effort would be informed by the recently implemented speed changes in the Tenderloin. He asked if those changes had clear impacts on speed and safety in the neighborhood, and how they would apply the lessons learned to future speed reduction strategies.

Mr. Parks responded that SFMTA was in the process of collecting data to evaluate the impacts. He said the analysis of this data, once collection is complete, would inform the expansion of speed reduction efforts elsewhere in the city. He added that the analysis is anticipated to be completed in early 2022.

Commissioner Haney noted that the safety project in the Tenderloin also included changes such as new restricted right hand turns on red. He stated that other neighborhoods may also be interested in evaluation of those elements as they consider implementing Vision Zero changes.



Commissioner Chan asked for additional detail about the new law authorizing Slow Streets.

Mr. Parks said that AB 773 defined Slow Streets and set up criteria and requirements around how they need to be adopted. He stated that the SFMTA Board would have to adopt the Slow Streets program, then the agency would have to maintain a website of updated information and provide advanced notice to the public before making changes, among other requirements.

Commissioner Chan asked how SFMTA's existing Slow Streets program would be reconciled with the new state authorization.

Mr. Parks replied that SFMTA's current Slow Streets program was authorized under the current declaration of emergency due to COVID, and all Slow Streets designations would expire once the emergency declaration was over unless action is taken to extend them. He said that staff was planning to take a post-COVID Slow Streets program to the SFMTA Board for adoption in early 2022 which would identify which streets would remain Slow Streets indefinitely and which would sunset.

Commissioner Preston stated that he was disappointed that the legislation wouldn't allow speed limit reductions on safety corridors until 2024. He asked if the city could elect to act earlier where there were clear safety issues. He said that people would continue to be injured or killed in the year or two before speed limit reductions could be implemented per the legislation.

Mr. Parks responded that staff could seek confirmation from the City Attorney, but his understanding was that implementation of speed reductions on safety corridors would be prohibited until 2024 or until the state establishes a definition for what constitutes a safety corridor and implements an online judicial system tool for the public to resolve infractions. He noted that the latter requirement was included in the legislation as an equity measure to help mitigate the disparate impact of penalties. He added that if the state acts on those two requirements before 2024, SFMTA would be able to initiate its speed reduction program on safety corridors earlier.

There was no public comment.

6. Allocate \$985,700 in Prop K Funds and \$220,000 in Prop AA Funds, with Conditions, and Appropriate \$100,000 in Prop K funds for Four Requests - ACTION

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Planning, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Mandelman said he was excited to see the 14th Street Road Diet moving forward noting it has been a priority for the Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association, the McKinley Elementary School and the neighborhood. He thanked SMTA's Bryant Wu and Eddie Sui for their efforts on this project, as well as Legislative Aide, Jacob Bintliff, and Transportation Authority staff.

There was no public comment

Chair Mandelman moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Preston.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Haney, Mandelman Melgar, Peskin, Preston,



Page 5 of 7

Ronen, Safai, and Stefani (9)

Absent: Commissioners Mar and Walton (2)

7. Approve San Francisco's Program of Projects for the 2022 Regional Transportation Improvement Program - ACTION

Aprile Smith, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

During public comment, David Pilpel said he was skeptical of the benefits of the Communications-Based Train Control on the surface portion of the Muni Metro system. He said he was opposed to the use of three-car trains on surface streets on N-Judah corridor and urged the Board to prohibit three car N-Judah trains as a condition of approval of the item and any subsequent item related to the N-Judah or Communications Based Train Control. He questioned and urged the Board to ask about the impacts to passengers from the construction of the project and if it would require bus substitutions. He said SFMTA was developing a rail service plan, which would discuss the future of Muni Metro as it related to level of service, the fleet, and facilities and he asked the Board to calendar the plan for discussion once it was finalized.

Alita Dupree said Communications-Based Train Control was important and was interested in how it would work on the surface route. She said she recently rode on several New York subway lines, which were equipped with Communications-Based Train Control. She said Communications-Based Train Control provided a smooth ride and that the project was worthy of approval to allow for a safer and more efficient light rail system.

Vice Chair Peskin motioned to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Chan.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Haney, Mandelman Melgar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Safai, Stefani and Walton (10)

Absent: Commissioners Mar (1)

8. Execute Contract Renewals and Options for Various Annual Professional Services in an Amount Not to Exceed \$725,000 - ACTION

Vice Chair Peskin commented that the noticing for the item was not as transparent as it should be as it didn't clearly identify the three contracts covered under the proposed \$725,000. He said it ought to be noticed with similar detail as the prior two action items. He suggested that the item be continued to the next meeting.

Tilly Chang, Executive Director acknowledged Vice Chair Peskin's comments and noted that the change would be implemented in future notices.

The item was deferred to the call of the Chair.

Approve the 2022 Prop AA Vehicle Registration Fee Strategic Plan Policies and Screening and Prioritization Criteria and Amend the 2017 Prop AA Strategic Plan -ACTION

Mike Pickford, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.



Page 6 of 7

Commissioner Preston inquired on the reasoning for the delay of the Filmore Paving and 22-Fillmore projects and how they would be funded when ready.

Joel Ramos, SFMTA, replied that the 22-Filmore Muni Forward project was a priority and would continue to be. He added that the 22 Filmore, despite the pandemic, was still one of the most heavily traveled lines so it was important to get the project moving as quickly as possible. He said that in 2017 during the planning phase of the project SFMTA's Capital Improvement Program was still tentative. He said the project was further delayed by the pandemic. However, he said SFMTA was able to move forward with the 16th Street portion of the route, thus continuing to improve service on the 22 line.

Commissioner Preston asked when they would have confidence that at least the SFMTA portion of the project would be done.

Mr. Ramos replied that because of the 2022 service plan and changes, SFMTA did not yet have an updated project schedule. He said he would push staff to complete those updates and share them the Transportation Authority. He did share that outreach for the construction phase would begin in 2024.

Commissioner Preston expressed disappointment that the project was so delayed. He requested that SFMTA provide Transportation Authority staff and his office a projected timeline as soon as available.

Mr. Ramos acknowledged Commissioner Preston's request and said the scoping for the project would continue in the run-up to the start of the project in 2024.

Commissioner Preston inquired about funding for the projects.

Mr. Pickford answered that the Filmore transit project would be eligible for the Prop AA call for projects for the next five-year tranche of programming. He asked Oscar Quintanilla with Public Works, to address the street paving project funding.

Mr. Quintanilla assured the Board of Public Works' commitment to backfilling the \$2.4 million for the paving project when it was ready to move forward. He said their annual street resurfacing budget was about \$70 million, funded by a combination of bonds, gas tax, Prop AA and Prop K funds.

Commissioner Preston thanked staff for the responses and noted it was good to hear the money would be in place when the projects were ready to proceed. He said that all eyes were now on SFMTA with respect to the schedule and he looked forward to getting more clarity on the timeline.

There was no public comment.

Vice Chair Peskin moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Ronen.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Haney, Mandelman Melgar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Stefani and Walton (9)

Absent: Commissioners Mar and Safai (2)

10. 2021 Prop K Strategic Plan Update - INFORMATION

Eric Reeves, Senior Program Analyst, presented the item per the staff memorandum.



Page 7 of 7

There was no public comment.

Other Items

11. Introduction of New Items - INFORMATION

There were no new items introduced.

12. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:19 a.m.