



DRAFT MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, September 7, 2022

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

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

CAC members present at Roll: Sara Barz, Nancy Buffum, Robert Gower, David Klein, Jerry Levine, Kevin Ortiz, Kat Siegal, and Peter Tannen (9)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Rozell (entered during Item 2) (1)

2. Approve the Resolution Making Findings to Allow Teleconferenced Meetings under California Government Code Section 54953(e) – ACTION*

Clerk Saunders presented the item.

There was no public comment.

Member Sara Barz moved to approve Item 2 as recommended by staff, seconded by Member Jerry Levine.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Barz, Buffum, Chen, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Ortiz, Rozell, Siegal (9)

Nays: (0)

Absent: Tannen (1)

3. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Klein reported that September was the seventh annual Bay Area Transit Month, which celebrates the role of transit in the region, with events, rides, and prizes and referred interested parties to sftransitriders.org/transitmonth/ for information on all the related events and activities. Chair Klein continued by stating that the Transportation Authority was leading the School Access Plan to recommend transportation solutions for Kindergarten to 5th grade students and their families and the project team would conduct co-creation sessions in English, Spanish, and Chinese later in the month and an online survey would be available by October for parents and caregivers to share feedback about potential strategies to improve San Francisco Unified School District Kindergarten to 5th grade transportation. He said people can sign up for email updates at sfcta.org/schoolaccess.

Chair Klein said that staff had advised that there will be a Vision Zero enforcement item on the September 28 agenda with SF Police Department staff in attendance and San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) staff have been invited, as well. He said staff was also coordinating with SFMTA staff to see if there could be an item on the Slow Streets program at the same meeting and if not then, staff would aim to confirm that item at a subsequent meeting. Both of these topics were requests made by CAC members.

Finally, Chair Klein announced that this was CAC Member Nancy Buffum's last meeting as her



term expires mid-month and she would not seek reappointment. Chair Klein thanked Member Buffum for her service and insights she brought to the CAC, particularly focusing on the inclusion of youth and families in outreach and planning and on safety improvements for pedestrians, cyclists and all street users.

Nancy Buffum thanked her fellow CAC members and encouraged them to keep up her fight for safer and more accessible streets for all and that they hold the city accountable to be truly committed to climate change.

Member Kat Siegal thanked Member Buffum for her leadership, insight and service to the CAC.

Consent Agenda

4. Approve the Minutes of the July 27, 2022 Meeting – ACTION

5. Community Advisory Committee Vacancies — INFORMATION

Member Peter Tannen said he heard that the District 8 office was expecting to have a candidate to take his seat an upcoming meeting.

Kat Siegal noted that her name is misspelled in the July meeting minutes. Transportation Authority staff apologized for the typo and said they would correct it.

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

Member Siegal moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Member Tannen.

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Barz, Buffum, Chen, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Ortiz, Rozell, Siegal, Tannen
(10)

Nays: CAC Member(s) (0)

Absent: CAC Member(s) (0)

End of Consent Agenda

6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt San Francisco's One Bay Area Grant Cycle 3 Project Nominations – ACTION

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair David Klein asked about the rationale for the prioritization process of the BART Next Generation Fare Gates and Elevator Modernization projects, noting that faregates seemed like more of an agency priority than a priority for the public and he asked if revenue was a reason that the fare gates were prioritized over the elevator projects. He stated that the Elevator Modernization Design at 16th Street Mission, 24th Street Mission, and Balboa Park stations [Mission/Balboa Elevator] project seemed to be a more responsive to the public's needs than the Next Generation Fare Gates.

Ms. LaForte replied that the Mission/BART elevator project was slated to begin design in January 2025, which was the phase for which BART had requested funds. She noted that the Transportation Authority had a history of funding elevators with Prop AA and Prop K. She stated that the Elevator Modernization Design project would be funded and that it was just a matter of



determining the fund source and timing.

Chair Klein asked if funding was available for the 16th Street Mission, 24th Street Mission, and Balboa Park elevators.

Ms. LaForte replied that there were several funding options and that the Transportation Authority would also need to fund the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) share of the elevators.

Member Ortiz expressed concerns that the Mission Street BART stations did not have design funded through the OBAG recommendation, especially considering that they were located in a working-class neighborhood. He asked if there were other revenue streams available for the project and how long the project would be delayed without receiving OBAG funds. He asked to hear more about BART's priorities and the timeline for the Mission/Balboa Elevator design project.

Aileen Hernandez, Principal Grants Officer at BART, replied that the prioritization process was based on BART's Capital Improvement Program, which took into account multiple inputs, including the end of the useful life of capital assets. She stated that fare gates were at the end of their useful life, which was why they were the top priority and she stated that BART would continue to seek funding to round out the funding plan for the Mission/Balboa Elevator design project. She stated that BART had Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funding for the elevator modernization program and that elevators were one of BART's top priorities.

Member Ortiz asked if there was a specific timeline for the elevator design at the Mission Street BART stations.

Ms. Hernandez replied that there was no definitive timeline given the incomplete funding plan. She stated that the downtown elevators had additional funds, which was why that project could move forward. She stated that any cost increases and lessons learned from the elevator modernization at the downtown elevators would influence the Mission/Balboa elevators and said if the sales tax renewal measure was approved, BART would seek funding from the Transportation Authority for the Mission/Balboa Elevator project.

Member Ortiz commented that communities of color were often put on the back burner with transportation priorities and that not having a timeline for funding high needs areas, such as in the Mission District, raised red flags.

Ms. Hernandez stated that she appreciated the feedback and she would take it back to BART.

Ms. LaForte stated that the Transportation Authority would also follow up with BART staff to better understand their prioritization process.

Member Levine asked if the new design for the Next Generation Fare Gates would be more secure to make it harder to evade fare gates and if the new design would go through a peer review process.

Albert Louie, BART Project Manager, noted that BART experienced a lot of fare evasion with the current fare gate design and had developed and designed the new fare gates to address this issue. He stated that over the past couple of years BART installed single barrier prototypes that were six feet tall and they had been successful in reducing fare evasion. He stated that BART established the design requirements and were in the process of releasing a Request for Proposals for vendors.



Member Siegal echoed Member Ortiz's concerns about the lack of funding and timeline for the Mission/Balboa Elevator design project. She noted that she was glad to hear that there was other funding available for elevators. She stated that the elevator project seemed to be more critical to create access to transit than the fare gates but noted that she understood that the fare gates were important to BART. She asked if there is a possible scenario in which both the elevator design project and the fare gates could be partially funded and asked if that would make the projects less competitive.

Ms. LaForte stated that the recommendation was not a verdict on whether or not the elevator project was important and that the Transportation Authority had a history of funding elevators and would continue to do so. She said that staff evaluated what would be competitive at the regional level since the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) ultimately selects the projects. She stated that it was possible to partially fund both projects, but that that was not where the staff recommendation landed. She noted that in either scenario, BART would need to find additional funds for both projects.

Ms. Hernandez stated that BART could share their criteria for their prioritization process. She stated that the prioritization process was for the whole agency, across the five counties, and considered what projects could be delivered. She stated that the Mission/Balboa Elevator project was in the BART Capital Improvement Program and the project would advance.

Chair Klein thanked everyone for their comments and contributions to the discussion and noted the difficulty of layering priorities amongst agencies.

Member Barz echoed Member Ortiz's concerns about the lack of funding and timeline for the Mission/Balboa Elevator design project and stated that she was glad to see the elevator projects scored higher than the fare gates project in the staff recommendations. She asked why the construction schedule for the Elevator Modernization Project Phase 1.3 took so long and why it showed an open for use date of Spring 2029.

Ms. LaForte stated that that was the open for use date for all eight elevators and that the construction would be sequenced. She stated that Transportation Authority staff would get a more detailed construction timeline from BART, when available.

Ms. Hernandez added that the timeline for the Elevator Modernization Project Phase 1.3 was very conservative and stated that the project may be able to be delivered earlier. She noted that the timeline was developed based on delivery schedules in other locations, such as Oakland. She noted that the downtown San Francisco stations had more constrained spaces and were shared with SFMTA, and therefore, they required more approvals and time for aspects such as coordinating paratransit shuttles during construction.

Member Tannen asked how the BART elevators were originally grouped into these two projects and how the decision was made to separate the projects and funding requests.

Ms. Hernandez replied that BART determined the elevator modernization projects based on deliverability, budget, and FTA funding. She stated that the Embarcadero station elevator was the pilot project for the San Francisco stations and BART stacked downtown stations behind that project. She noted that the Balboa Park station was segmented differently due to construction work that was already taking place there. She stated that she could obtain additional information from the BART staff on the schedule and segmenting of projects.

Member Ortiz asked if it would be possible to partially fund the Elevator Modernization Design project at 16th Street Mission, 24th Street Mission, and Balboa Park stations or if the Next



Generation Fare Gates project could be funded through Prop K as well. He stated that he had concerns regarding the lack of funding going to the Elevator Modernization Design project.

Ms. LaForte replied that it was possible.

Member Ortiz asked if it would be possible for BART to submit a Prop K request for funding the Elevator Modernization Design project before the next CAC meeting to ensure that nothing would fall through the cracks.

Ms. Lombardo clarified it might be better to wait to see if the sales tax renewal measure passed in November, and if it did not, she said the Transportation Authority would have the ability to free up sales tax funds for the Mission/Balboa Elevator project through a Prop K Strategic Plan amendment.

Member Ortiz stated that he was requesting an actual funding request for the Mission/Balboa elevators and a compromise to see if all of the projects could be partially funded.

Ms. Lombardo stated that the Transportation Authority did not know if San Francisco would receive the funding for the projects as proposed as MTC would make the final decision in January 2023. She confirmed that partial funding of projects was an option provided it still resulted in a usable segment. She noted that the discussion taking place was all part of the process of showing staff scores and giving the Board and the CAC the opportunity to weigh in.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun commented on the Embarcadero Resilience Master Plan and said the alignment of the new transbay crossing would have an impact on The Embarcadero. He said he would like the Transportation Authority staff and the CAC to keep an eye on the overall picture of how these projects would intersect.

Janice Li, BART Director, thanked Transportation Authority staff for their work on the item and said she would bring the feedback back to her colleagues on the BART Board. Ms. Li expressed support for the two BART projects recommended. She said if there was unlimited funding, all of the projects would be funded. She spoke in favor of the staff recommendation and suggested not creating partial funding for multiple projects and that BART was prioritizing the most construction ready projects. She said there was consensus across all nine BART Board of Directors for the fare gates project as a system priority. She stated that the fare gates had reached the end of their useful life, that the new fare gate design was more accessible for people with disabilities, people with luggage, strollers and more, and would allow greater throughput. She stated that the new design would be more welcoming for more people and create a better experience for all.

Eric Arroyo, Calle 24 Latino Cultural District, said that the Mission District had historically been placed on the backburner and that when resources were short they were typically pulled from the Mission District. He stated that the community had spent two years building the plaza and the funds were moved. Mr. Arroyo said that 24th St. Mission was the gateway and entrance to the cultural district. He said the Mission District should be prioritized, that it was as important as downtown, and that the communities of color should not be left behind.

Edward Mason asked what the expected use for the Yerba Buena Island Multiuse Pathway project would be. He stated that he seldom saw people using the Clipper Street bike lanes that were constructed and was curious about the projections for the Yerba Buena Island Multiuse Pathway usage.

After public comment, Member Ortiz made a motion to support the staff recommendation with



an amendment to add regular updates from Transportation Authority and BART staff on the Elevator Modernization Design Project at 16th Street Mission, 24th Street Mission, and Balboa Park stations. He stated that he would like BART to attend upcoming meetings in order to receive regular updates.

Chair Klein asked what the appropriate frequency of the updates would be.

Ms. LaForte replied that staff could report back next month with preliminary findings.

Member Ortiz stated that he would like initial reports in both October and December.

Ms. Lombardo clarified that the reports would include updates on the funding strategy and schedule for the project.

Member Siegal seconded Member Ortiz's motion to amend the staff recommendation.

The motion to amend the staff recommendation to require periodic updates on the funding strategy and schedule for BART's Elevator Modernization Design Project at 16th Street Mission, 24th Street Mission, and Balboa Park stations, with the first two reports at the October and December 2022 [November 30th is the joint November/December CAC meeting], was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Barz, Buffum, Chen, Gower, Klein, Levine, Ortiz, Rozell, Siegal, Tannen (10)

Nays: (0)

Absent: (0)

Member Gower made a motion to approve the amended item, seconded by Member Levine.

The item as amended, was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Barz, Buffum, Chen, Gower, Klein, Levine, Ortiz, Rozell, Siegal, Tannen (10)

Nays: (0)

Absent: (0)

7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$4,412,805 in Prop K Funds and \$324,000 in Prop AA Funds, with Conditions, for Four Requests – ACTION

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy & Programming, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Eric Rozell provided a comment on Tree Planting and Establishment saying he supported tree planting, but asked that some consideration be given to the mulch since much of it ends up on the sidewalks, where it is slippery and a clean up issue. He also noted that in areas like the Tenderloin, there were not a lot of places for pets to do their business and this should be factored into mulch selection, etc.

Member Peter Tannen asked for clarification on what extension meant for the Guadalupe River Bridge Replacement and Extension.

Peter Skinner, Caltrain, explained that they would extend the span of the bridge to accommodate future flood control.

Member Robert Gower asked if the Excelsior Neighborhood Traffic Calming: Sickles Ave Streetscape signals had pre-determined safety improvement projects for the requested amount and what phase would be funded.



Trent Tieger, San Francisco Public Works, responded that the design work was still very conceptual and that the requested funding would advance the project to a construction-ready stage, including bid documents. He added that during the detailed design phase staff would need to look into details such as utility conflicts need for curb ramps, etc.

In response to Member Gower's follow-up question about design funding, Ms. LaForte replied that the \$1 million design phase was fully funded with SFMTA Community Response funds.

Member Siegal commented that she was glad to see the Excelsior traffic calming project funded, saying it's exactly the kind of project that should be funded this year given collision trends. She continued by observing that the high cost of design of the project was a challenge since these types of safety prevention projects should be delivered at a larger scale citywide, and said she hoped there would be a way to streamline the design process for these types of projects going forward.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun spoke with respect to the Guadalupe River Bridge Replacement and Extension project located between Diridon and Tamien, which he said included two bridges in the current scope. He said it included the Main Track 1 old wooden bridge used by Union Pacific, which was not electrified, and Main Track 2, a fairly recent bridge that was electrified and would need to be partly reconfigured. Mr. Lebrun continued by saying that the third bridge (Main Track 3) was being ignored because it is found in the High-Speed Rail Environmental Impact Report for the San Jose to Merced segment. He asked Transportation Authority staff to ask Caltrain about this third bridge to understand the implications.

During public comment, Edward Mason said that the Tree Planting and Establishment request indicated that the trees would result in 19 million pounds of carbon dioxide being sequestered and asked if the real, long term number had been calculated, noting that his neighborhood was marked for repair of buckled sidewalks caused by the street trees. Mr. Mason said that cement production creates 6% of the world's pollution, and requested a more holistic calculation of carbon sequestration from a life cycle point of view.

Member Kat Siegal moved to approve the item, seconded by Member Robert Gower.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Klein, Barz, Buffum, Chen, Gower, Levine, Ortiz, Rozell, Siegal, Tannen (10)

Nays: CAC Member(s) (0)

Absent: CAC Member(s) (0)

8. State and Federal Legislation – INFORMATION

Amber Crabbe, Public Policy Manager, presented the item.

There was no public comment.

9. Community Advisory Committee By-Laws - INFORMATION

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Rolan Lebrun suggests that an additional change be made to move meetings to the first Tuesday of the month so that the CAC can hear items before board.

10. Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION

Members Peter Tannen spoke about the Van Ness bus rapid transit (BRT) project. He said that



while he had been one of the individuals asking for regular reporting on the project when it was experiencing construction delays, now that it was done, it was working very well and it had been worth the wait.

Member Levine requested regular updates on ridership numbers and travel time savings for the Van Ness BRT, noting that updates in written form over the next several months would be welcome.

Member Ortiz added that the Van Ness BRT project had made a world of difference for the 49 Muni route. He then requested that the CAC receive a presentation from BART about night service, noting a 4 a.m. bar bill recently died in the state Assembly this session. He said he wanted to know what it would cost to extend BART nightlife service, particularly wanting to know about costs on the labor and operational side so that folks have that information available for planning and funding purposes in the future.

Member Buffum expressed her appreciation that the slow street presentation would, hopefully, take place next month along with Vision Zero. She asked that attention be given to Golden Gate Park, particularly to the west end noting there is a new treatment that is opening up left turns onto MLK that was recently implemented, which cyclists and pedestrians in her neighborhood had advocated against, saying she wanted to hear more about how that is working. Member Buffum said she would also like to hear about long term planning for traffic going south on Great Highway to Lincoln because noting the bottle necks where pedestrian and cyclists come of the promenade, making the left turn very slow for cars. She opined that there had to be something that could be done to improve that area for cars and pedestrians. Member Buffum concluded by stating that she had heard there were plans for delineation of where to bike safely past the polo fields as a way to improve cyclist safety and she would be happy to see a focus on western end of Golden Gate Park included within the upcoming slow streets presentation.

Member Gower said he just biked through that parking lot by the polo fields and echoed Member Buffum's concerns that this was a risky area to bike.

Member Sara Barz said she understood that the Transportation Authority was involved in the Ocean Beach climate change adaptation project, and would like to better understand the Controller's Office cost estimate of Prop I and if that were to pass, how it would change implementation of the Ocean Beach project. She requested a presentation on this topic.

Member Barz concluded her comments by saying she, too, had also recently biked in the same area of Golden Gate Park referenced by Members Buffum and Gower and had found it confusing as a cyclist. She echoed their request for a presentation on this topic.

There was no public comment.

11. Public Comment

Ed Mason spoke about the corporate commuter bus situation at 24th and Church based on his observations this past Tuesday, the first day that Apple mandated workers come back to the office. He reported between 7 and 8 a.m., 33 buses passed through the intersection, with passenger lines ranging from 2 to 3 persons, peaking at about 18 at 8 am; 2 buses had no permits; and one bus had an expired permit. Further, Mr. Mason said he recognized bus 442, which had been operating without a permit since last September and said he had continually reported this to the SFMTA and had seen parking officers on site issuing parking citations to the driver.



Members Klein and Gower echoed Mr. Mason's frustration with the commuter bus situation and ask about what could be done in terms of enforcement.

Aileen Hernandez, a San Francisco resident, thanked the CAC for their time and dedication and for weighing in on the many challenges that the city has faced.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:04 p.m.