



# DRAFT MINUTES

## Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, September 22, 2021

### 1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

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

Present at Roll: Rosa Chen, David Klein, John Larson, Jerry Levine, Kevin Ortiz, Stephanie Liu, Peter Tannen, Danielle Thoe, and Sophia Tupuola (9)

Absent at Roll: Nancy Buffum, Robert Gower (2)

### 2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Larson reported that next month, public outreach will be conducted for the Planning Department's Southeast Caltrain Stations Study and the Transportation Authority's Pennsylvania Avenue Extension project. He said the City and County, in partnership with Caltrain, are studying options for building a new Caltrain tunnel under Pennsylvania Avenue, rebuilding the 22nd Street Station, and building a new Caltrain station in the Bayview. He shared that the first round of joint public workshops for these coordinated studies will be held virtually next month on Thursday, October 7 at 6:00 p.m. and Saturday, October 9 at 12:00 p.m. Both dates would cover the same information and will have Cantonese and Spanish interpretation available, he shared. Additionally, Chair Larson shared that a second round of meeting were planned for November 4 and 6 and more project information could be found at [sfplanning.org/SERSS](http://sfplanning.org/SERSS). He said that staff anticipates presenting on both of the efforts to the CAC in the coming months.

Chair Larson invited member Rosa Chen who sits on the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee to provide an update. Ms. Chen reported on their first meeting was focused on equity, and Transportation Authority staff presented an equity presentation which highlighted transportation disparities across the city. She shared that the assessment looked at equity priority communities in particular which are communities on a higher proportion of low income residents and communities of color. She said city agencies need to be intentional about community-based planning to identify the investments that will best serve communities in need. Ms. Chen shared that their next meeting will be held Thursday, September 23, and they will begin discussions on their investment recommendations for the new expenditure plan.

With respect to Assembly Bill 43 (Friedman), Chair Larson shared that the bill passed the legislature on September 16. He added that the Governor has 30 days to sign, veto or allow the bill to become law. He shared that staff will agendize an update on the bill at an upcoming meeting assuming it becomes law.

There was no public comment.



**Consent Agenda**

3. **Approve the Minutes of the September 1, 2021 Meeting - ACTION**
4. **Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve San Francisco's Program of Projects for the 2022 Regional Transportation Improvement Program - ACTION**
5. **Adopt a Motion of Support to Execute Contract Renewals and Options for Various Annual Professional Services in an Amount Not to Exceed \$725,000 - ACTION**

Peter Tannen asked how the phases were determined for the Communications Based Train Control System.

Mark Hansen, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), replied that the phases were chosen to determine the best way to move forward with the project. He said the train control upgrade program would replace the aging train control system in the Market Street subway, add train control to the new Central Subway, and expand train control operations to Muni Metro on surface streets. He said the phases were determined to pilot the system on the surface in phase 1, bring train control into the subway in phase 2, and then expand train control on the surface routes in the subsequent phases. Phase 1 was selected because it would bring benefits to the T-Third line most immediately and to the Bayview and Visitacion Valley.

During public comment, Edward Mason referred to the communications based train control map and said it showed the J Church line operating to the Embarcadero. He said the J Church line had been truncated at Market Street temporarily. He said the J Church should be restored and not wait until 2025 or 2027 for access to the Embarcadero. He said there was enough information to support the number of trains in the subway post-pandemic.

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

The consent agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Chen, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Tannen, Thoe, Tupuola (9)

Absent: Buffum, Gower (2)

**End of Consent Agenda**

6. **Adopt a Motion of Support to 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 Policy and Programming presented the item per the staff memorandum.

There was no public comment.

Danielle Thoe motioned to approve the item, seconded by David Klein.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Chen, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Tannen, Thoe, Tupuola (9)

Absent: Buffum, Gower (2)

7. **Adopt a Motion of Support to 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.

Chair Larson noted that the proposal to reprogram funds from the Fillmore paving project to the Mission and Geneva project would double the amount of Prop AA funds programmed to the project and said they obviously underestimated the cost in the past. He asked if the cost of the project had doubled or if the Transportation Authority would just be putting the money that was not needed for Fillmore toward the Mission and Geneva project.

Mr. Pickford replied that staff does not expect the Fillmore project to move forward this year, so the amount of funds programmed to that project is the amount of funds under consideration for reprogramming.

Oscar Quintanilla, Principal Capital Finance Analyst with San Francisco Public Works (SFPW), said that costs for the Mission and Geneva paving project had increased because SFPW added blocks to the project on Geneva Avenue to better coordinate with SFMTA's Mission/Geneva Safety Project. He said that the project was programmed five years in advance and this was an example of things changing over time. He said the original cost estimate was around \$6 million and that it is now close to \$11 million, so while the proposal is to add Prop AA funds, Mr. Quintanilla said SFPW would also add other funds, such as gas tax funds. He said that SFPW's fund sources were dedicated to paving and that there would be funds available to backfill the Fillmore project when it is ready to advance.

During public comment Edward Mason said, related to the SFMTA Transit Stop Enhancement Phase 2 project, that he did not understand what was meant by "more legible signage". He asked if the project would improve signage for the 14R Mission Rapid bus at the Daly City BART station. He said there is currently just a yellow stripe on the pavement to indicate the stop location and that it was very difficult to figure out. He said that Sam Trans had easy to understand signage at the station.

Mr. Pickford responded that Phase 1 of the Transit Stop project was currently underway and would be improving signage along the 14/14R route.

Sean Kennedy, Transit Planning Manager with SFMTA, said that the Transit Stop Enhancement program would replace signs on the 14/14R route. He said that SFMTA had approximately 3,600 stops, many with only a yellow paint stripe indicating their location and about 1/3 without a shelter. He said this project would result in all stops having a flag-style sign and that signs would be color coded to indicate whether the route is a frequent route. He said there would also be a small solar-powered light on the sign to help riders find the stop and read the sign.

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

Ayes: Chen, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Tannen, Thoe, Tupuola (9)

Absent: Buffum, Gower (2)

**8. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Transportation Recovery Plan: 2022 Muni Service Network - INFORMATION**

CAC member Pete Tannen observed that even as someone with a transportation planning background, he found the slide deck for this item to be a bit overwhelming and it was hard to put everything all together. He wondered how members of the public would be able to digest the information and requested that the presenters keep that in mind.



Chair Larson echoed Mr. Tannen's comments and suggested the CAC could be a test case for improving the communications on this topic to the public going forward.

Sean Kennedy, Transit Planning Manager with SFMTA presented the item.

David Klein asked how it's possible that the system is able to support itself financially if there is 50% ridership and they are expecting to be at over 80% of service with the increase.

Sean Kennedy replied that this reflects their best understanding of where the trends are going and what the City Controller's office is telling them of what they can expect from the taxpayers. He said the agency's Chief Financial Officer is confident that they can sustain a 85% pre-pandemic level of service without having to raise fares. He said they don't want to just be at the 85% level and they know that even 100% pre-pandemic service levels in many ways was unacceptable, and they are hoping and pushing with funding partners to get up to 110-120% of pre-pandemic service levels within the next year or two.

Jerry Levine said in District 2, the 43 line is a particular concern especially the north end of the route and said he understands that it will be extended into the Presidio. He asked if there was any way to determine what the scheduling would be as far as the length of time it is going to run throughout the day and the various scenarios.

Mr. Kennedy said during the pandemic they cut the span of service to end at 10 p.m. and as of April they have extended 16 lines to midnight. He said he would need to verify if line 43 was extended until midnight and would follow back up with Mr. Levine.

Mr. Levine asked how that relates to pre-pandemic service.

Mr. Kennedy they would run it at a 12-minute headway until the end of service which is a little better than it was pre-pandemic.

Sophia Tupuola asked if SFMTA was making an extra effort to equitably engage communities of concern in District 10, suggesting they send paper surveys and asking what they are doing to ensure their survey response rate reflects the diverse population in the city.

Mr. Kennedy responded that at the SFMTA Board meeting they discussed the 2600 survey responses received and questioned if it reflected their ridership. He said the survey was going to run another 2 weeks, and in a couple of days, Mr. Kennedy said SFMTA would have analyzed the responses looking at neighborhood, race, gender, etc. to see where they have received insufficient responses and then focus their efforts there. He said they are working with community based organizations to push out paper survey at neighborhood events, at pop up open houses, and at busy bus stops while riders wait for the bus.

Ms. Tupuola said she would love to see the data on survey response rates for low-income riders and communities of concern.

Peter Tannen thanked Mr. Kennedy for a good presentation and then shared concerns on the J Church line not running downtown, and asked that based on the community input received, is there any chance that the J Church downtown service would be restored.

Mr. Kennedy replied that the J is definitely on the table as something that may go back in the subway depending on community feedback. He said they have seen some good results on the technical side in terms of performance, but on the non-technical side,



they want to find out how the transfer is working/isn't working for passengers. He said they have already made changes based on feedback and in August, they doubled service in the subway, which should have helped, and on October 2 they will add 20% more service to the J line. Mr. Kennedy said those changes will make the J line go from a 12-minute headway to a 10 minute headway and would help reduce the transfer time. He said they would like to survey subway riders that include J line and M line riders to see how they feel about the service changes.

Danielle Thoe said when talking about all-day lines she noticed that Mr. Kennedy didn't mention lines such as the 7R and 38X and ask if that was because there were not the focus right now. She also asked what is SFMTA considering in the event of pandemic spikes.

With respect to the express lanes Mr. Kennedy said they are not the focus right now but rather the focus is on the all-day services and said if the lines for example the 21 line, it would come back at its mid-day frequency and not its peak frequency. He said they are not adding back any expresses such as the 7X right now because the financial district is not yet coming back. He said they will monitor and have contingency plans in the event downtown activity starts picking up quickly, but said it is likely around 3-4 years until demand in the downtown area is back up. He said right now the travel patterns have changed and they don't know how long they will last, and people are using transit to go within their neighborhoods, not to go downtown, so express services are not something they are looking at currently. With respect to contingency plans for the pandemic, Mr. Sean said they do have what they have done over the last year and a half that they can draw on if needed.

Kevin Ortiz agreed that the pre-pandemic services were not up to par for what they should have for their transportation system. He said he would love to see ways where they can make improvements with the routes that they currently have operating. He said he would also like to see how they can improve ways to not have communities fighting to get lines back, such as the M line returning 8 days before school started at San Francisco State, and said he wants to make sure the community engagement processes would be easier moving forward. Mr. Ortiz said he would also like to see ways they can refine the lines they have currently such as the 22 and 55. He said the 55 was created a couple years ago to service the Dogpatch neighborhood, but if they are talking about improving the 22 line in general, he said he would like to find a way to combine the two lines to create a loop around.

Mr. Kennedy said the big issue there is the modal difference as the 22 is a trolley line and the 55 is a motorcoach. He said the trolley extension into Mission Bay was a 15-year-old idea and it had been a major capital project that they have finally finished. He said when they flipped the 22, they needed to cover Dogpatch with a service to replace it, so that's where the 55 line came in. He said when you look at what the 22 use to do versus what the 55 does now, there are significant changes based on community feedback and further growth that is happening on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. He said he understood Mr. Ortiz's overall point that combining lines where it makes sense is the way of the future.

Mr. Tannen said that he realized the 76 line is a low priority line, but he didn't see it mentioned in the presentation.

Mr. Kennedy said they put it in the express bucket and though it does not fall in the category of a normal express service, they are just not bringing it back at present due to demand issues.



Mr. Levine asked how the funding from the American Recovery Act impacted their thinking on the various scenarios.

Mr. Kennedy said they have received a lot of money from federal funds which has helped them get to 75%. He said without it they would have been much worse off. He said they are not going to direct all the funds into service and put out 100% service, because a year from now the money would dry up which would result in lay offs.

Mr. Levine agreed and said they took the right approach in dealing with the federal infusion of funds.

Chair Larson asked in terms of the parking revenue, whether the shared streets program would have a measurable impact on parking revenue going forward.

Mr. Kennedy replied that it was having an impact, but he would defer to his SFMTA colleagues for a more detailed response.

Chair Larson also asked how the ridership was going on the 58 line.

Mr. Kennedy said that considering the 58 is a brand new line and that it normally takes qwhile for new routes to catch on, add the fact that we are in a pandemic, ridership has been fair given the situation.

During public comment a caller said they were concerned about the lack of a clear and transparent public process on whether the temporary forced transfer on the J line at Market Street should be made permanent. They shared that pre-pandemic their family would ride the J line to and from work and it was one of the deciding factors when purchasing their home where they did. They suggested that the forced transfer issues be severed from the 2022 service plan and Muni provide full transparency for any future proposals and a chance at public comment.

Edward Mason said the J Church shut down issues were deemed temporary to cause the forced transfer to Market Street and yet had evolved into a permanent recommendation with enhanced streetscape of Church Street between Market and 15<sup>th</sup>. He said the walking transfer to the subway requires crossing the northbound J track which is located in the crosswalk and the tracks are especially slippery during rainy weather which is a safety hazard. Mr. Mason said the needs of the young and able body patrons for speed is what seems to be driving the recommendations and the elderly and disabled and inclement weather are not considered. He urged restoration of the J line to its basic service.

A caller said they agree with the observation that the reduction in the number of trains using the metro tunnel right now eliminated any rationale to remove the J Church from the subway.

A J Church rider said that the 2-minute time savings that would be implemented October 2 would not cut it. They said as a senior citizen with a sprained ankle, it will not save them any time, sharing that it took 57 minutes to get from 24<sup>th</sup> and Church Street to City Hall.

## **9. Progress Report for Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project - INFORMATION**

Siew Chin Yeong, Director of Capital Programs and Construction, SFMTA presented the item.

Jerry Levine requested a full comprehensive accounting of all of the business interactions and impacts on small businesses from the Van Ness BRT project. He said



he was hoping that the report could be presented to the CAC. Mr. Levine added that he walks along corridor and would like an accounting for what Muni has done or not done, and what can be done to save businesses.

Peter Gabancho, project manager with SFMTA mentioned that we need to get that information from Mayor's Office of Economic Development. He said they are directly providing business support, and they have been working with them and will reach out to the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) and get that information.

Peter Tannen asked about the schedule, which indicates that revenue operation will be in third quarter of 2022. He said the progress report mentioned that the original BRT start date was late and the project was almost 3 years behind schedule.

Ms. Yeong replied that their current projection is substantial completion by end of year and then the contractor will start preparing for the testing and training program. She said they expect to finish training and testing of the BRT system in Spring 2022. In terms of construction, she added that they anticipate reaching substantial completion in December 2021.

Mr. Gabancho replied that from discussion with construction team, the project will not go past late March or April of next calendar year.

David Klein commented that every time the project comes before them, it has a lack of details. He said the presentation does not give a sense of breath or depth of the work involved. He continued by saying that it did not allow the team to shine or showcase how much was invested in the project; that the presentation showed work but neither the impact nor effectiveness of the work, nor how it impacts the constituents.

Ms. Yeong replied that they will keep that comment in mind when preparing the next presentation and will come back with more details.

Danielle Thoe echoed Mr. Klein's comment that details are lacking. She said it was inexcusable that potholing work hadn't been done early on in project development. Ms. Thoe said that the presentation mentioned changes and lessons learned applied to Geary BRT project and said she did not know what was meant by that. She added that completely changing Geary BRT scope from center-running to curb-running was something she didn't agree with especially without detail and she said she would like to know what coordination had been going on. With regard to Better Market Street which is another major street, she asked what the specific changes were when determining underground utilities. She said that while Better Market Street on its face is a transportation project, it is truly an infrastructure project on many levels and asked if they could talk about what has been going on in terms of contracting.

Ms. Yeong replied that some key learnings related to risk identification and mitigation. With respect to Geary BRT, she shared that a lesson learned was to identify risk and impact to businesses and communities, and to decide what to do to provide the best outcome to transit operation and to minimize impacts to business and communities. With regard to potholing, she said Van Ness BRT had performed potholing but they should have done early in the project. Ms. Yeong shared that at time of the contract, they were relying on contractor to do a lot of potholing before construction began. For Van Ness BRT they applied lessons to the Taraval and 22 Fillmore project. She said Taraval was a big contract, based on the lessons learned, SFMTA paused the design phase and talked to San Francisco Water Power Sewer (SFPUC) and PG&E and conducted physical potholing with SFPUC and PG&E. This led to the decision to split



the contract into Segment A and Segment B to give PG&E more opportunity to relocate utilities. Taraval Segment A came out on schedule and on budget.

There was no public comment.

Chair Larson thanked SFMTA staff for the presentation and requested that they incorporate impacts on businesses in corridor and coordinate with OEWD for the next project update to the CAC.

**10. Update on the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee and Outreach Efforts for Development of a New Expenditure Plan - INFORMATION**

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

Mr. Levine commented that he anticipated that the missing EPAC representative from District 2, shown on the presentation, will be appointed in early October to complete the EPAC roster.

Ms. Beaulieu responded that staff have been working with district offices to fill the seats.

There was no public comment.

**Other Items**

**11. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION**

Chair Larson thanked Vice Chair Klein for presiding over the September 1 CAC meeting and providing a CAC report at the September 14 Transportation Board meeting.

There was no public comment.

**12. Public Comment**

During public comment, Edward Mason provided an updated on corporate Commuter buses sharing that the buses are nowhere near passenger capacity and have a negative impact to the environment.

**13. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.