



DRAFT MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, October 27, 2021

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Larson called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

Present at Roll: Nancy Buffum, Robert Gower, David Klein, John Larson, Jerry Levine, Stephanie Liu, Peter Tannen, Danielle Thoe (8)

Absent at Roll: Rosa Chen, Kevin Ortiz, and Sophia Tupuola (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 October 26 Transportation Authority Board meeting. He reported that September marked the end of the State legislation session, and October 10 was the last day for the Governor to sign or veto bills. He said he was excited to note that Assembly Bill 43 (Friedman) became law and that the bill provided more flexibility to local jurisdictions to lower speed limits under certain conditions in which was of high interest to CAC members. He noted that under Item 8 on the agenda, was the State legislative recap from staff, and he was looking forward to hearing an update on what is happening at the federal level.

With regard to the sales tax reauthorization, he reported that since their last meeting, the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC) had met twice. He shared that the project sponsor agencies had the opportunity to make the case for funding for maintenance, rehabilitation and replacement on our streets and transit systems, as well as for safe and complete streets projects and freeway safety and operations improvements. He added that they would continue discussing the proposed Expenditure Plan programs at their meeting on October 28 and are targeting approval of a new Expenditure Plan at their December 9 meeting.

Additionally, Chair Larson shared that the aforementioned Executive Director's Report had more information on outreach that was underway. He encouraged CAC members and others listening to take the online survey available on the Transportation Authority's website at sfcta.org/expenditureplan, along with the link to join the virtual EPAC meeting. He shared that staff would agendaize an item on the New Expenditure Plan at the December 1 CAC meeting and noted that it would be a combined November/December meeting. He thanked Rosa Chen, who was not in attendance, for representing the CAC at the EPAC.



Chair Larson also reported that member Danielle Thoe's term was expiring at the end of the month, and it would be her last meeting. He spoke on behalf of the CAC stating that though her tenure had been relatively short, they would surely miss her many articulate and thoughtful comments. He asked her to stay in touch or call in and make public comment and invited the Transportation Authority staff to say a few remarks.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director presented Danielle Thoe with a certificate of recognition and thanked her for her service on the CAC and her many contributions. Members David Klein and Jerry Levine also shared their kind remarks towards Ms. Thoe's departure.

Danielle Thoe thanked everyone for their kind words and said she would look to join the CAC again in the future and will keep an eye open for future vacancies. She added that the CAC is a unique committee where the public can comment and have impact on what is getting funded in terms of the city's transportation infrastructure, and she has enjoyed her time as well as Chair Larson's leadership.

Chair Larson thanked Ms. Thoe and said she has been a great addition with very insightful comments and encouraged her and future members who depart the committee to call into the meetings.

Lastly, Chair Larson shared news of Becky Hogue's passing earlier in the month. He shared that Becky was highly involved in her community, especially Treasure Island, where she lived for many years. He said she served as the District 6 representative on this CAC as well as a resident representative to the Treasure Island Development Authority's Community Advisory Board and former Chair of the city's Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee. He said that Becky would be fondly remembered for her legacy of community service, and he planned to adjourn the meeting in Becky's memory.

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

- 3. Approve the Minutes of the September 22, 2021 Meeting - ACTION**
- 4. Community Advisory Committee Vacancy - INFORMATION**

There was no public comment.

Robert Gower motioned 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, Tannen and Thoe
(8)

Absent: Chen, Ortiz, Tupuola (3)

End of Consent Agenda



5. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the 2021 Prop K Strategic Plan and Amend 11 5-Year Prioritization Programs - ACTION

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

Chair Larson asked if there was anything about the application process which drives sponsors to be overly optimistic about when their projects will start or request reimbursement.

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming responded that a goal of the Strategic Plan is to make funds available to projects when the sponsors anticipate that they will be able to advance, but inevitably they are not all able to do so when originally anticipated. She added that the Transportation Authority reviews applications thoroughly for reasonableness with regards to many items, including project delivery schedule. She continued saying that the Strategic Plan is the first cut of how much debt would be needed given what sponsors are indicating they can deliver projects. Ms. LaForte said nothing would suggest that it is related to the process of requesting programming or reimbursement for project costs.

Ms. Thoe asked about major capital project delivery and whether there are patterns to project delivery delays and/or any conversations to help improve on project delivery issues.

Ms. LaForte responded that they are conducting an analysis on major capital delivery project delivery to understand lessons learned, moreover, different programs have different project delivery track records. She said quick-build projects have been completed in short order, while some signals projects, for example, have taken longer periods of time, and there have been staffing issues, some of which are related to COVID-19.

Jerry Levine asked about whether making funds available to projects when they think they will need it increases costs to the program.

Mr. Reeves responded that the sales tax program is reimbursement based and the act of programming funds to projects doesn't increase the cost of financing associated with running the program, it just provides certainty to the sponsor that the funds are there if needed. The sponsor still needs to come in for an allocation of funds when the project is ready to proceed.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun asked where the Geneva-Harney Extension project went and whether the Candlestick Active Mobility & Transit Crossing was what he was looking for. He said that Caltrain is not looking to relocate the Bayshore Station and neither is the San Francisco Planning Department as part of the Southeast Rail Study.

Ms. LaForte responded that the Candlestick Active Mobility & Transit Crossing is the eastern portion of the Geneva-Harney Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project.

Jerry Levine motioned to approve the item, seconded by Danielle Thoe.



The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: Chen, Ortiz, Tupuola (3)

6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$4,935,710 in Prop K Funds and \$4,794,258 in Prop AA Funds, with Conditions, and Appropriate \$320,000 in Prop K funds for Five Requests - ACTION

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming presented four requests and Camille Guiriba, Senior Planner Transportation Planner, presented the request regarding the Ocean Avenue Mobility Action Plan.

Ms. Thoe said she was excited about the Geneva plan, and a comprehensive safe streets project getting funded. With regards to the proposed hearing loops at the BART/Muni Powell Street Station, she asked if it could be used by both BART and Muni station agents.

Isaac Lim with SFMTA replied that it is only for BART station agents.

Ms. Thoe asked why BART and Muni were not coordinating to put hearing loops in both BART and Muni station agent booths to assist hearing impaired passengers She asked if there was a way that the request could be amended to include Muni in the project as well.

Mr. Lim responded that they would have to discuss it with SFMTA to see if funds were available.

Chair Larson thanked Ms. Thoe for the comments and said that this was a source of frustration for residents that the stations are shared spaces and yet there is often a lack of collaboration between the two agencies. He inquired if there was a part of the planning process where one of the agencies reaches out to the other early on to coordinate. He added that it seemed like a missed opportunity for stations that are shared, especially in the downtown area.

Ms. Thoe noted that she would not support the funding for the project as is and proposed it be amended. She asked what would happen if the CAC took such an action.

Ms. Lombardo said that staff would follow up with BART and SFMTA to address the CAC's request. She said that unless conversations with BART revealed some sort of critical issue with a delay, staff would not advance the request to the Board for approval before exploring the CAC's request.

Ms. LaForte noted that the project is ready to advertise, so adding scope and or making changes would likely impact the schedule.

Rob Jaques, BART, replied that with regard to the possible delay, they would have to get back to staff about the implications of not advancing the request right away. He shared that when projects occur within the joint use stations, BART and Muni have ongoing planning and coordination meetings as part of



their joint maintenance agreement to manage those stations. With that, he said there is a shared responsibility between BART and Muni in implementing projects in the shared use space. However, he said within their dedicated paid areas in the stations, each operator is responsible for improvements and changes to infrastructure within those bounds. He said they can go back to Muni to discuss the project if that is the recommendation from the CAC, but they can't commit to a specific outcome, but can investigate it.

With regard to Ms. Thoe's suggestion, Mr. Klein shared his support towards the idea of doing something more thorough and comprehensive at the behest of losing time.

With respect to the Ocean Avenue Mobility Plan, Mr. Gower asked if it was known which improvements were going to be studied. He said he understands it's a long corridor, but would like to know what are the areas of focus.

Ms. Guiriba replied that a lot of the areas of focus are more on the eastern section of the corridor which are closer to the Balboa Park Station and City College. She said that one of the existing projects that they know of is rethinking the Frida Kahlo, Ocean Avenue and Geneva intersection, and it has been identified as a quick-build project and is one of the projects they are considering as part of the action plan. She said there have also been proposals for improving transit operations along that corridor. Ms. Guiriba said one of their initial tasks of the study is to do a full inventory of all the past projects to understand the status of the projects identified in previous plans, whether they have been implemented, and if not, how they can advance them forward if they become a priority as part of the action plan.

With respect to the BART and Muni coordination, Mr. Gower said he also would like to see more coordination amongst the agencies, however he noted that there is a community of ADA riders who have a need, so he was unsure about pushing the project further out. He said he would like a better understanding of what the delay would look like.

Chair Larson agreed stating that they don't want to delay for efficiency's sake if it's going to be detrimental to those who need it. He turned to Ms. LaForte for guidance on how they should proceed with the item.

Ms. LaForte stated that it would not come back to the CAC until [December 1] because of the holiday schedule. She said they can definitely communicate with BART and Muni before the upcoming Transportation Authority Board meeting to understand what the implications would be if the project were delayed, and to understand what would be required in order to coordinate and install hearing loops at Muni station agent booths as well.

Chair Larson asked if they could pass a motion that stipulated if there was a significant delay on the project, they would not seek further coordination between the agencies. He said going forward BART and Muni should coordinate before advancing joint station requests.



Ms. Lombardo confirmed that the CAC could make such a motion.

Peter Tannen expressed support for Mr. Gower's comments about the hearing loop project.

Chair Larson severed the BART Accessibility Hearing Program request from the other requests and called for public comment on it.

There was no public comment

Danielle Thoe motioned to amend the item asking BART and Muni to work together to see if the hearing loops can be installed at the Muni Station agent booth at Powell Station as part of the BART project before returning to the CAC for approval; however, if the requested coordination creates a significant delay to the project, it should advance to the November Board meetings. The motion was seconded by Stephanie Liu.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: Chen, Ortiz, Tupuola (3)

Chair Larson took public comment for the remaining requests.

There was no public comment.

Robert Gower motioned to approve the three requests, seconded by David Klein.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: Chen, Ortiz, Tupuola (3)

7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Amend the Geary Bus Rapid Transit Phase 2 Conceptual Engineering Report Project to Revise the Scope and De-obligate \$1,892,152 of \$6,319,470 in Prop K Funds - ACTION

Dan Tischler, Principal Planner for Technology, Data, and Analysis, and Liz Brisson, Major Corridors Planning Manager for SFMTA, presented the item.

Mr. Klein commended SFMTA for the agency's efforts to deliver Geary BRT under budget and on time and asked a clarifying question about the extent of the corridor. Ms. Brisson clarified that bus lanes would still continue to 34th Avenue and that the proposed change affects the segment of the corridor between Arguello and 28th Avenue that was originally planned for center running bus lanes. She said the segment from 28th to 34th avenue was and still is planned for side-running bus lanes.

Mr. Klein asked what the basis was for the 20% travel time improvement figure cited in Ms. Brisson's presentation.



Ms. Brisson explained that the 20% improvement in travel time is based on the segment of Geary BRT Phase 1 where SFMTA implemented quick-build improvements between Arguello and Gough. She said it was on the order of several minutes of travel time savings during peak periods. She said that SFMTA did a low level of effort analysis after quick build, and now that Phase 1 was fully complete SFMTA would do a full evaluation. She said the timing was tricky because of the pandemic, but SFMTA expects to do this in mid-2022. She said that there were slides that had been presented to the Geary CAC with additional details on the evaluation that she could provide. She said there was also a full report on the temporary emergency transit lanes that had been implemented on Geary in 2020 available at www.sfmta.com/templanes38.

Mr. Klein asked if those resources would explain why SFMTA decided to move forward with the side running design.

Ms. Brisson replied that the memo for the item and the SFMTA website include several points about why SFMTA is recommending this change. Ms. Brisson said she had additional slides she could present to explain the rationale for the change from center-running to side-running bus lanes.

Chair Larson asked Ms. Brisson to present the additional information after CAC questions.

Ms. Thoe expressed support for the design change from center to side-running bus lanes. She said she was never fully sold on the center-running bus lanes. She said she has used the bus bulbs implemented in Geary BRT Phase 1 and has seen how they work by not requiring buses to pull in and out of traffic at bus stops. She also said she wants to make sure that SFMTA buses on Geary can take advantage of AB 917 to ticket drivers violating the bus lane.

Ms. Brisson responded by saying that SFMTA is already taking advantage of new legislation to issue tickets to drivers blocking bus lanes.

In response to Mr. Klein's earlier questions about the rationale for the side-running design, Ms. Brisson said that side-running bus lanes allow the use of quick-build construction techniques to get benefits on the ground quickly. She said that with center-running bus lanes SFMTA would need to do all of the capital work first and that side running bus lanes require substantially less construction disruption. She said that a side-running alternative only requires heavy capital construction at bus stops and pedestrian bulbs, whereas with center running, SFMTA would need to build new curbs everywhere in the corridor. She said SFMTA also appreciated that side-running bus lanes preserve the most operational flexibility, as the center-running bus lane design did not have passing lanes. She said that center running bus lanes would be slightly faster because they are more fully protected, but side-running bus lanes have fewer stops for rapid buses. She said the center-running bus lane project would have removed more trees and SFMTA understood it was important to Richmond residents to preserve trees.

Chair Larson said that historically, the Geary BRT project was supposed to be



“light-rail ready”. He also asked whether the change from center-running to side-running indicated that stakeholders along the corridor have said that side-running was alright. He said he felt it was important to bring up the long-held dream of restoring rail to the Geary corridor.

Ms. Brisson said that people had been asking for decades about the status of rail on the Geary corridor, since it was identified during planning for the BART system, and that now a Geary/19th Avenue Street subway has been identified as a top priority through the ConnectSF planning process. Ms. Brisson also responded by saying that the city is moving forward on scoping early planning work for Geary rail, which would be paired with the Link21 plan and would likely be BART or a standard gauge subway, that would not work with surface light rail and that it would likely turn south at some point rather than following the whole corridor.

Chair Larson said that he would like the CAC to receive an update on rail corridor planning in the future. He said that a Geary subway line would obviate the battle over surface rail and trying to bring back the old surface streetcar line. He asked what happens to buses west of 34th Avenue.

Ms. Brisson responded that the transit lanes would end at 34th Avenue, but Geary buses would continue serving areas west of 34th Avenue up to their current termini.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun discussed the relationship between high speed rail, a second transbay rail crossing, and a westside subway along Geary Boulevard. He suggested that a second Transbay rail crossing would likely be a standard gauge rail crossing and was skeptical that this would help BART extend service along the Geary corridor.

Jerry Levine moved to approve the item, seconded by Danielle Thoe.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: Chen, Ortiz, Tupuola (3)

8. State and Federal Legislation Update - INFORMATION

Amber Crabbe, Public Policy Manager, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Mr. Klein asked what implementing Assembly Bill 43 required regarding speed limit enforcement, such as whether it would result in more cameras or police officers.

Ms. Crabbe replied that she would follow up with SFMTA to see what enforcement activities were planned for speed limit reductions authorized by the bill. She said that the bill did not mandate the type of enforcement, it only authorized the reduction of speed limits. She noted that the method of



enforcing speed limit reductions would be up to the individual jurisdiction.

Mr. Klein said that camera enforcement wasn't biased, but that there were inherent racial biases in police enforcement, in particular in the Tenderloin neighborhood. He stated that lowering speed limits had the potential to expand that bias by increasing the amount of traffic stops, especially during the period when drivers were still adjusting to speed limit changes. He noted that the bill could create a tradeoff between lives saved and lives incarcerated. He added that he wanted to better understand what communities any increased enforcement as a result of the bill could harm and which it could help.

There was no public comment.

9. Progress Update on the Caltrain 22nd Street Station Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Access Improvements Feasibility Study and the San Francisco Planning Department Southeast Rail Station Study - INFORMATION*

Jesse Koehler, Rail Program Manager, Nicholas Atchison, Planning Analyst for Caltrain, and Anna Harvey, Rail Program Manager for the San Francisco Planning Department, presented the item.

Robert Gower asked for additional information regarding engagement with the community regarding the virtual public outreach meetings, including efforts to connect with those without access to technology.

Ms. Harvey described the Planning Department's approach, including the provision of a telephone option for accessing meetings, as well as development of a script that is accessible for attendees without a computer. She added that outreach to community-based organizations (CBOs) was undertaken and that door hangers were dropped in the vicinity of the station sites. Ms. Harvey said that for the upcoming outreach series, the team was exploring the option to provide feedback cards to CBOs.

Chair Larson asked how many total stations within the study area could be ultimately selected.

Ms. Harvey said that the study is looking at the development of two stations - one at or near the existing 22nd Street Station and one to restore regional rail access to the Bayview.

Mr. Koehler added that the study will recommend that planning and design for a new station in the Bayview should proceed in the near-term, independent of the timeline for the Pennsylvania Avenue Extension (PAX) project.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun reinforced the need to address issues at 22nd Street Station and to restore service to the Bayview. Mr. Lebrun said that low ridership at the Paul Avenue Station was due to the minimal level of service that was provided to the station. He noted that the Bayshore station was not being studied. Mr. Lebrun said that Oakdale was impacted the Quint



Street closure. He said that the PAX tunnel could begin in the vicinity of Cesar Chavez. Mr. Lebrun said that there was also a potential station location on Seventh Street between 16th Street and Townsend Street. He noted that there are several related projects including the Link21 new Transbay rail crossing, the Downtown Rail Extension and the PAX. Mr. Lebrun said that all of these projects should be put together and move together in a cohesive fashion.

10. 101 Mobility Action Plan Update - INFORMATION

Aliza Paz, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Larson thanked the Transportation Authority for the presentation and appreciated the coordinated effort in the region.

During public comment, Edward Mason noted that there should be a pollution counter by people who travel by car on the route, similar to how we count bicyclists. He continued with notes on the 101 MAP report noting that it states there are 200 private shuttles which Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) has to get from video counts because private companies were not willing to share information; SamTrans ridership noted in the report may only account for a couple of lines, which may include the 398 route which is expected to be removed; adding HOV lanes promotes driving; VTA discontinued express bus service because of costs and offered employers to sponsor them and VTA is now using those buses to increase service; and in the South Bay people have to walk far to the bus which will make it hard to achieve goals and is leading companies to have to do major development.

Other Items

11. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

Robert Gower requested an update on the Van Ness BRT, and said it's been a while since they've had an in person update and would love to hear the progress.

Chair Larson noted that the Van Ness BRT was presented at the last CAC meeting.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director said per CAC direction they would be bringing asking the project team to provide a more detailed report, particularly with regard to business impacts in particular.

Mr. Levine said he would appreciate seeing a comprehensive overview on the business impacts of the Van Ness BART project.

Chair Larson assured Mr. Levine that it would be presented as it was one of the requests the CAC made.

There was no public comment.



12. Public Comment

During public comment, Edward Mason provided an update on the private commuter buses in Noe Valley. He said they are moving up from 20 buses an hour between the hours of 7:30 am and 8:30 am. He said the private commuter buses are running empty with 1-2 passengers, which is a wasted resource.

Roland Lebrun thanked the Transportation Authority staff for providing the closed captioning and asked if the transcript could be available for future viewing. With regard to the Caltrain presentation, he said he appreciated the stakeholder engagement and said he wished they had the same engagement designing Caltrain connections to BART in Santa Clara county. He also suggested that the Transportation Authority used the same meeting platform the Planning Department uses for their meetings so that members of public could see and listen to the meeting in real time. Lastly, with regard to the noise and pollution of private commuter buses, he said that it can be addressed by incentivizing the companies to electrify their fleet.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned in honor of Becky Hogue at 8:24 p.m.