



# ***DRAFT MINUTES***

## **Community Advisory Committee**

**Wednesday, January 26, 2022**

### **1. Call to Order**

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

Present at Roll: Rosa Chen, Robert Gower, David Klein, John Larson, Jerry Levine, Kevin Ortiz, Eric Rozell, Peter Tannen, Sophia Tupuola (9)

Absent at Roll: Nancy Buffum (1)

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

Chair Larson said that at the prior day's Board meeting, Chair Mandelman and Vice Chair Peskin were elected to service in those same offices for 2022. He noted that the Executive Director presented the 2021 Annual Report to the Board yesterday and it is available to review on the agency's website. He continued by noting that the Board reappointed District 9 representative Kevin Ortiz to the CAC, and newly appointed District 6 representative Eric Rozell, who also serves on the agency's Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC). He asked Mr. Rozell to introduce himself. Mr. Rozell discussed his experience in public advocacy and transit, as well as Vision Zero work such as working with Commissioner Matt Haney's office to lower speed limits and install no turn on red signs in the Tenderloin.

Chair Larson asked Rosa Chen to report on EPAC progress. Ms. Chen presented the report and announced that meetings are opened to the public, with more information available at [sfcta.org/expenditureplan](http://sfcta.org/expenditureplan). She said that the EPAC last met on January 13 and would meet again on January 27 where the EPAC would review the proposed programs and on any changes to the project prioritization process for identifying which projects will get funded after the measure is approved. She said this is the 5-Year Prioritization Program process the CAC is familiar with for Prop K

Chair Larson then announced a public survey on San Francisco's transportation priorities, with more information available at [connectsf.org/survey](http://connectsf.org/survey).

Chair Larson concluded his remarks by thanking Transportation Authority Clerk Britney Milton for her work with the agency and wished her the best in her future endeavors. Ms. Milton thanked the Chair for the kind words.

There was no public comment.

### **3. Election of Chair and Vice Chair for 2021 - ACTION\***

The Chair continued the item to the next meeting so that it could be properly noticed as elections for calendar year 2022.

### **Consent Agenda**

### **4. Community Advisory Committee Vacancy - INFORMATION**



5. **Accept the Audit Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2021 - INFORMATION\***
6. **Internal Accounting Report, Investment Report, and Debt Expenditure Report for the Six Months Ending December 31, 2021 - INFORMATION\***

There was no CAC discussion and no public comment.

**End of Consent Agenda**

7. **Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt Fiscal Year 2022/23 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Local Expenditure Criteria - ACTION\***

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

There was no public comment.

Robert Gower motioned to approve the item, seconded by Jerry Levine.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Chen, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Ortiz, Rozell, Tannen, Tupuola (9)

Absent: Buffum, (1)

8. **Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve the 2022 State and Federal Legislative Program - ACTION\***

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

Jerry Levine asked if there was any interest in exploring an oil extraction fee on oil producers, which could raise an estimated \$4 billion a year for transportation purposes.

Ms. Crabbe responded that she hadn't heard it discussed, but she would follow up with Mark Watts, the Transportation Authority's state legislative advocate.

Mr. Levine noted that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission was exploring the idea a while ago but politically there were problems with it. He added that these fees existed elsewhere, and since California was one of the leading producers of oil, he hoped such a fee would be considered in the future.

Robert Gower asked what the time frame was for developing autonomous vehicle policy.

Ms. Crabbe replied that bills regarding autonomous vehicles were routinely introduced at the state level each year. She said that staff presented relevant bills to the Transportation Authority Board each month for input as warranted. She added that at the federal level, Transportation Authority Executive Director Chang and staff were engaged in policymaking through Director Chang's role in ITS America, and that the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) was leading engagement in federal rulemaking efforts on behalf of the city. She stated that she understood the current administration was advancing a federal autonomous vehicle policy after many years of limited federal regulation of the technology.

David Klein asked if there were studies occurring on the impact of technology on job displacement, specifically of drivers and maintenance workers. He stated that many of the jobs that were subject to displacement provided a path to middle-income wages, especially for those who don't have a college-level education.



Ms. Crabbe said the current administration was very aware of labor issues and was focused on making sure there were good jobs created as part of the transition to new technology. She said they were researching the transition's impact on jobs and developing policies such as a green jobs programs that could help mitigate negative impacts.

Mr. Klein stated that for solar technology, the green tech industry was creating quality, high-paying non-union jobs potentially at the expense of union jobs at the utility companies. He noted that he saw how similar situations could occur where union jobs at companies creating combustion engine vehicles were lost even if non-union jobs were created elsewhere.

Chair Larson asked for more detail on the Reconnecting Communities program and how it would be implemented.

Ms. Crabbe responded that the guidelines for the program were being developed by the U.S. Department of Transportation staff. She said they had released a new website related to the infrastructure bill and a timeline for releasing funding solicitations through mid-2022. She offered to share the website link with the CAC after the meeting.

Chair Larson asked if the Reconnecting Communities program could fund freeway deconstruction projects that literally reconnected communities.

Ms. Crabbe responded that freeway deconstructions had been referred to as an example of the types of projects that could receive funds from the program. She noted that the details regarding project eligibility and prioritization would be released as part of the program guidance later this year.

Chair Larson noted that the staff memorandum included a reference to the Transit Transformative Action Plan that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission approved last year. He requested a presentation about the plan at a future meeting.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked for the definition of private transit shuttles in the legislative program. He also noted that the city's Transportation Sustainability Fee was projected to receive \$25 million per year when it was implemented, and only applies to buildings with above a certain number of units. He asked why current residents were being asked to pay for infrastructure that is needed to support new growth. He stated that if agencies were advocating for growth, they should consider what funding is necessary to implement the necessary infrastructure to support it.

At the Chair's request, Ms. Crabbe responded that private transit shuttles were listed as one possible type of emerging mobility mode that could see legislation this year. She noted that the list of technologies in the legislative program was intended to be illustrative. She added that staff would monitor bills related to private transit shuttles and other modes and advocate for them to be consistent with how the city wants to see new technology implemented, such as maintaining the ability to regulate traffic on local roads and getting the data needed to evaluate and regulate their implementation.

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

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Chen, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Ortiz, Rozell, Tannen, Tupuola (9)

Absent: Buffum, (1)



**9. Adopt a Motion of Support to Award Contracts to Ten Shortlisted Consultant Teams for a Three-Year Period, with an Option to Extend for Two Additional One-Year Periods, for a Combined Amount Not to Exceed \$3,000,000 for On-Call Transportation Planning Services, and Authorize the Executive Director to Negotiate Contract Payment Terms and Non-Material Contract Terms and Conditions - ACTION\***

Andrew Heidel, Principal Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Mr. Ortiz noted a history of issues of consultants not meeting work order specifications or schedules and requested information as to the management and oversight process for the recommended consultants, specifically regarding how the recommended consultants would be kept responsible for meeting schedule commitments made to the Transportation Authority as well as any partner agencies.

Mr. Heidel responded that consultant project management approach was one of the key evaluation factors reviewed by the committee for this procurement and was required as part of each respondents statement of qualifications. He also said that the Transportation Authority staff recognizes their responsibility to maintain oversight over each of the consultants, primarily by working in partnership to ensure that staff are up to date via methods such as regular check-ins with the consultant to ensure completion of deliverables and responsible use of budgets.

Mr. Ortiz recognized that as part of the procurement process, staff advanced seven firms without requiring an interview based on factors including prior successful work for the Transportation Authority and completed interviews with three other firms. He recognized the need to ensure that the Transportation Authority has access to good consultants, but asked what processes were in place to ensure that new firms, especially DBE/LBE firms, who could potentially do a better job than incumbent firms, were not shut out of the procurement.

Mr. Heidel responded that the evaluation panel scored every written submission received ahead of making determinations for interviews, with a minimum score required to interview and a minimum score required to advance. He stated that the approach taken with this procurement was to develop as broad a bench as possible, and noted that the previous on-call planning contract had only five firms. He stated that the panel was specifically interested in being inclusive to DBE, LBE, and SBE firms, particularly those who were new to the Transportation Authority. He stated that many teams did provide these options and opportunities in their submittals. He also noted that a number of the prime consultants who the Transportation Authority had worked with before brought on new subconsultants, which was also viewed positively by the panel. Mr. Heidel stated that the firms that were interviewed were those which had not previously had a direct contracting relationship with the Transportation Authority before, and that some of those teams were made up entirely of firms that were new to the Transportation Authority. He concluded that the panel was pleased to hear from new firms in the procurement, including prime consultants with previous relationships that had added new subconsultants to their teams.

Mr. Ortiz requested demographic data of the firms for this contract and the prior on-call planning contract. He also requested a comparison of job creation or job availability between the currently recommended consultants and the prior contract.

Lily Yu, Principal Management Analyst, said that staff would need to follow up to provide the requested information. She did note that, in the previous planning on-call, a



total of 43% of the task orders were awarded to subconsultant firms, with 10% through DBE, 9% to LBE, and 28% to SBE firms.

Mr. Levine noted that, in the information provided on the prior on-call planning contract in Attachment 3, Arup and Nelson\Nygaard appear to have roughly 50% subconsultants, while two other consultants, Stantec and WSP, have roughly 10% subconsultant participation. He stated that this was a major difference between the firms, and asked why the amount delegated to subconsultants was so low for Stantec and WSP.

Ms. Yu stated that in the case of Stantec, specific expertise was needed as part of the startup of the Treasure Island Mobility Management Program, and this expertise was available as part of the prime consultant. With respect to WSP, she stated that they provided the expertise required directly through their own team, though the Transportation Authority did make efforts to engage subconsultants on each task order, giving the example of Transportation Network Company research being primarily passed to Strategic Cities, a subconsultant.

Mr. Levine asked if these two projects were those that had 10% subconsultant participation, and if they were single project task orders, or if the teams would be doing other things as well.

Ms. Yu noted that these were past task orders, and that no continuing work was expected.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked if the advertising in the San Francisco Examiner was done as part of the public notices that is published only on Friday, and noted that the Friday issue was not widely distributed. He also asked if the Commuter Shuttle Hub Study listed in Attachment 3 was still open, as he understood this effort was completed some time ago, or if there was a future Commuter Shuttle Hub Study anticipated.

At the request of Chair Larson, Mr. Heidel said that Attachment 3 included a list of task orders from the prior contract and said that this was not an indication of future work. He noted that many or most of the task orders listed were closed out.

Ms. Yu said that the advertisement in the San Francisco Examiner was posted on December 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2021, which was a Friday. She stated that staff would be more mindful in the future to ensure that the advertisement would be prolonged or published on a date with wider circulation. She also noted that the advertisement was published in other newspaper outlets as well.

Chair Larson expressed appreciation for this commitment and quick response.

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

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Chen, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Ortiz, Rozell, Tannen, (8)

Abstain: Tupuola (1)

Absent: Buffum, (1)

**10. Major Capital Project Update - Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project - INFORMATION\***

Peter Gabancho, Project Manager with the SFMTA, and Jada Jackson with the Office of



Economic and Workforce Development, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Larson asked how SFMTA will educate the public about using the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system, including how pedestrian can safely access the boarding islands.

Mr. Gabancho replied that SFMTA was planning an outreach campaign involving media and social media material.

John Gravener, Public Information Officer with the SFMTA, added that they are working with a contractor who would help with a video about how to use the boarding islands. He said some people would be familiar with this set up because of boarding islands on Market Street. He said that they would also use social media to educate, provide information to school age children in schools nearby, etc.

Mr. Rozell asked if the Next Bus signs were delayed, would SFMTA delay opening the BRT.

Mr. Gabancho replied that they did not plan to delay opening unless absolutely necessary. He noted that the new Next Bus signs were very useful and they hope they arrive in time. However, he continued, they can start running buses and install signs as they become available without disrupting service.

Mr. Rozell referenced the Chair's earlier remarks about pedestrian safety and asked if it would be feasible to have crossing guards and/or extra ambassadors to assist at least during the reopening phase.

Mr. Gabancho replied SFMTA could look into doing that at places such as Market Street, City Hall, and Opera Plaza.

Mr. Larson asked about educating drivers to be cautious noting the safety burden should not all fall on pedestrians.

Mr. Gabancho replied the outreach and education effort would encompass everybody along the corridor, including pedestrians and drivers.

Mr. Klein asked for more detail on how SFMTA would get the word about education campaign resources on websites, YouTube, etc. and whether there would be direct outreach to schools. He urged SFMTA to be proactive in its efforts.

Mr. Gravener replied that SFMTA is using a social media channel where they have a sizable following on Twitter and Instagram and that they are reaching out to nearby schools.

Mr. Klein asked if the videos would have subtitles and/or captioning.

Mr. Gravener responded that they have not yet done the filming for the videos but they would have those elements. He said they are doing the translations and confirmed there would be captioning. He said they planned to film in February, ideally when the buses are testing to make the video more realistic.

Ms. Chen asked about if the fencing on the boarding islands is continuous or if there are gaps like on Market Street. She said that a friend had recounted that in the past a bus had lost control on Market Street and passengers were not able to get off the boarding islands with the original continuous fence design.

Mr. Gabancho replied the fencing on Van Ness are continuous, because Van Ness is a State highway and Caltrans, for safety reasons, insisted on a continuous barrier. He said that SFMTA favor a continuous barrier because it channels people to the



crosswalks. He added that the boarding platforms on Van Ness (8 to 9 feet) are considerably wider than the boarding platforms on Market Street (5 to 6 feet) which would make it easier for passengers to move around.

Mr. Rosell asked about the compliance plan to ensure vehicles are stopping at crosswalks, following the speed limit, and stopping at red lights.

Mr. Gabancho replied we are talking with traffic engineers about doing a similar level of enforcement at revenue service as for new red transit only lanes. He explained that they would increase patrols and crack down on violations for the first few months of operations so people get the message that they will stay out of bus lanes and respect crosswalk. He said that plus the education campaign would be the approach.

Jada Jackson, Project Manager at OEWD, presented.

Mr. Levine thanked Ms. Jackson for the comprehensive presentation and asked if it was possible to get the names of businesses that received grants and the amounts. He also asked how many businesses went out of business, acknowledging that the pandemic was a fact, and about the level of support businesses would receive once the project is completed.

Ms. Jackson responded that OEWD as a resource is always available to businesses, nothing that she has merchants from projects that completed 2 years ago that still contact her. Ms. Jackson said she would need to check if she can share the information on grants awarded to specific businesses. With respect to business that closed, Ms. Jackson said it is hard to track and that OEWD does not receive any notification when this happens. Instead, she explained that they may notice when they do an inventory check and by looking up information on Yelp. She noted it was particularly hard during the pandemic to determine who was open and who was choosing not to open.

Mr. Klein spoke about the program's impact and said it appeared that 20% of businesses received funding and they received the equivalent of 1 to 2 months of rent (\$5,000 - \$10,000) given how expensive space is in San Francisco. He acknowledged the significant effort of email and door to door contacts but said there were no numbers on how many folks responded and how many emails were opened. Mr. Klein said he also saw a gap given the \$5 million that was appropriated for business mitigation but only \$100,000 was distributed to 20% of businesses. Lastly, he asked why so few businesses took advantage of the City grants.

With respect to the \$5 million, Ms. Jackson said there was a series of meeting in 2019 with the Board of Supervisors to decide how that money would be utilized. She said it is a citywide construction mitigation program and that once a project delay meets the specified triggers, they then tap the \$5 million for that project. Ms. Jackson said currently no other project appears headed to trigger the need for mitigation funds. She continued to explain that Central Subway was the first project for which OEWD started the process of collecting economic impact data and that it was a self-reporting mechanism. She acknowledged that there were data gaps and said the project had been set up drawing on best practices. For the Central Subway project, OEWD made a second round of funding available, capped at \$15k, e.g. if you receive \$10,000 before you can only receive \$5,000.

Ms. Jackson said there were a lot of challenges to to get businesses to apply for assistance. For example, she said some business did not apply as they felt they



didn't need the help, particularly at the beginning of the pandemic, others felt they were taking it away from other businesses that were in greater need of assistance. She noted that there was one business that relocated, and she worked closely with this business, including helping with a business entrepreneurship grant.

Mr. Klein reiterated that the effort was substantial but what that amounts that the city gives out were not. He said he hoped these efforts are supported with better resources in the future.

Mr. Ortiz asked about how long it took for a business to apply for these grants.

Ms. Jackson explained that everything that was required, such as copies of rent receipts, was to be submitted electronically, noting that there was a link on the OEWD webpage with the application. She said she followed up with the businesses to offer assistance and the length of time to complete the application process depended on the business taking the time to fill out the application.

During public comment, Edward Mason mentioned that there didn't seem to be a discount incentive program for transit riders to patronize local businesses along the corridor such as was for a VTA project. He suggested performing a lessons learned analysis.

Chair Larson thanked Mr. Mason and said the lessons learned analysis sounded like a good idea.

#### **11. San Francisco's Climate Action Plan 2021 Update - INFORMATION**

The item was continued due to time constraints of the meeting.

#### **Other Items**

#### **12. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION**

Robert Gower thanked all the presenters and staff and appreciated their efforts in responding to CAC member questions on projects.

Kevin Ortiz asked when a request he made at the prior meeting for a presentation on the Transportation Authority's general strategy and plan for public outreach on various projects, large and small would be agendaized. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, answered that staff anticipated presenting on this topic at the next CAC meeting in February.

There was no public comment.

#### **13. Public Comment**

During public comment, Edward Mason commented on the increasing number of private commuter buses staging and idling for 15-20 minutes at a time before their runs, contributing to air and noise pollution, particularly the rail slapping at 24<sup>th</sup> and Church streets. He noted also that the commuter buses were causing damage to a Prop K road repair project from years past and often running close to empty capacity.

#### **14. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:07 p.m.