



DRAFT MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, September 28, 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, Rosa Chen, Najuawanda Daniels, Robert Gower, David Klein, Jerry Levine, Kevin Ortiz, Eric Rozell, Kat Siegal, and Peter Tannen (10)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: (0)

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Klein welcomed the newest member of the CAC, Najuawanda Daniels who briefly recounted her interest and qualifications for serving on the CAC. Chair Klein thanked Member Kevin Ortiz for presenting the CAC report before the Board earlier that month and related how it was encouraging to see that the CAC's recommendations had an impact on the Board's deliberations.

The Chair then highlighted the past weekend's event where Caltrain celebrated its first electric train at the San Francisco Caltrain Depot, noting that once the full Caltrain Electrification project was completed in 2024, the new electric vehicles would replace the diesel locomotives that have been running up and down the Peninsula for 150 years. The Chair remarked that the Transportation Authority contributed \$41 million in Prop K sales tax and other state and federal funds toward Caltrain's electrification and positive train control projects.

Chair Klein informed the CAC that the SF School Access Plan was beginning a survey and directed the members to where they could sign up for future updates on the agency's website (www.sfcta.org).

Finally, the Chair recognized Peter Tannen as this is his last meeting with the CAC after 14 years and a long career in transportation before that. Member Tannen said that he joined the CAC in order to stay involved in transportation after working as a planner for the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority (SFMTA) for 14 years and also thought it would be an interesting experience to be other side of the table. He thanked his fellow members of the CAC and Transportation Authority staff and said that he would still participate in the future as a member of the public.

Member Robert Gower announced that his term of the CAC was ending and that he would not be seeking reappoint due to new work obligations. He thanked his fellow members for the opportunity to serve and urged his fellow members to continue the great work that they have been doing. Chair Klein appreciated Member Gower for being both a strong advocate for District 11, as well as brining the citywide view to the table in CAC discussions.



Member Barz said that SFMTA bumped their scheduled October 14 Slow Streets presentation to their Board and noted that this would most likely delay the presentation to the CAC which had been anticipated for the October 26 meeting.

During public comment Roland Lebrun thanked Member Tannen for his service and observed that members of the public do not have term limits.

Consent Agenda

- 3. Approve the Minutes of the September 7, 2022 Meeting - ACTION**
- 4. Adopt the Community Advisory Committee By-Laws – ACTION**
- 5. Community Advisory Committee Vacancies – INFORMATION**
- 6. Adopt a Support Position on Proposition 30, the Clean Cars and Clean Air Act - INFORMATION**

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

Member Sarah Barz moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Member Kat Seigal.

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

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

Nays: CAC Member(s) (0)

End of Consent Agenda

- 7. Election of Community Advisory Committee Vice Chair – ACTION**

Chair Klein said with the CAC approving the proposed amendments to the CAC by-laws (Agenda Item 4), the CAC could hold an election to fill the Vice Chair position from now until the CAC held elections for calendar year 2023 at its January meeting.

Chair Klein called for nominations for Vice Chair.

Member Jerry Levine nominated Member Kevin Ortiz who accepted the nomination.

There were no further nominations for Vice Chair.

There was no public comment.

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Nays: CAC Member(s) (0)

- 8. San Francisco Planning Department Southeast Rail Station Study Final Report– INFORMATION***

AnMarie Rodgers, Director of Citywide Planning for the San Francisco Planning Department, presented the item per the staff memorandum.



There was no public comment.

Chair Klein thanked Ms. Rodgers for her presentation which provided background related to the Bayview Station Preliminary Design and Pre-Environmental Prop K allocation request under the next agenda item.

9. Allocate \$3,701,000, in Prop K Funds with Conditions, and Appropriate \$800,000 for Five Requests – ACTION*

Project: GGBHTD: San Francisco Ferry Terminal Security Improvement Project (\$347,000). SFCTA: Bayview Station Preliminary Design and Pre-Environmental (\$800,000). SFMTA: Application Based Traffic Calming Program FY20-21 Cycle Construction (\$2,762,000), Application-Based Traffic Calming Program FY21-22 Cycle Design (\$312,000), Schools Engineering Program FY22-23 (\$280,000).

Lynda Viray, Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Peter Tannen asked for clarification on the San Francisco Ferry Terminal Security Improvement as the packet alluded to an increase in security incidents. He wanted to know if the goal of the project was to be prepared for potential problems or whether there were past problems to be addressed.

Wilson Lau, Project Manager at Golden Gate, Bridge, Highway, and Transportation District explained that individuals had climbed over the rail and into the ferry terminals and expressways as well as homeless individuals sleeping on the property.

Member Jerry Levine asked about the decision date for the Bayview Station Preliminary Design and Pre-Environmental project.

Andrew Heidel, Principal Planner, explained that the study would last no more than 12 months and that a recommendation would be brought forward to the CAC and Transportation Authority Board for a preferred location at the conclusion of the study. Mr. Heidel estimated that timeline would be around the end of next year in 2023 in either late summer or early fall.

Member Kat Siegal asked about the timeline of the Application-Based Traffic Calming Program FY20-21 Cycle Construction. Since the traffic calming applications were received back in June 2020, she wanted to know if it was typical for there to be a two-year gap between the applications being considered and the actual construction funding being secured, and asked if there were explanations for the prolonged delay related to the pandemic or other reasons.

Damon Curtis, Project Manager at SFMTA, explained the applications for each of those traffic calming program cycles lasts for a year. The applications for FY20-21 cycle were received between July 2019 through June 2020. He said that the 12-month period was when SFMTA received applications but once applications were received, they proceeded with three different phases: 1) The planning phase begins and that takes a year; 2) next is the design phase which also takes a year; and lastly 3) the construction phase, with the latter being the subject of the item before the CAC. Mr. Curtis explained that they will be coming back to the CAC and the Board later in the year or early next year and to discuss a proposal to revamp the traffic calming program and switch to a more rolling or quarterly evaluation cycle, which would help accelerate the timeline.

Member Sara Barz asked about the school locations and prioritization of the Schools Engineering Program FY22-23.



Mr. Curtis explained that the schools had not been selected yet as walk audits were the first step once funding was received. He said SFMTA would reprioritize their list or ranking, and the five schools would be chosen within the first two or three months of allocation.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun spoke about the Bayview Station Preliminary Design. He wanted to know whether community engagement would include regional transportation advocates. He expressed how the 22nd Street redesign would not be necessary as it was fine in the current state.

Member Jerry Levine moved to approve the item, seconded by Member Kat Seigal.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Barz, Daniels, Chen, Gower, Klein, Levine, Rozell, Siegal, and Tannen (10)

Nays: CAC Member(s) (0)

Absent: CAC Member Ortiz (1)

10. Vision Zero Enforcement Update – INFORMATION*

Captain Chris Canning and Commander Peter Walsh of the San Francisco Police Department presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Klein said the profiles of who received citations were missing from the presentation in the Focus on the Five violations count. He said there was construction planned for Market Street which would force motorists into the Tenderloin and compound any issues. He said it was nice to see the Focus on the Five violations count, but there was going to be a speed limit reduction so the CAC was concerned about more people travelling through the Tenderloin, who was being ticketed and how profiling was being handled. He sought clarity on whether lower speed limits would result in more tickets in the Tenderloin.

Captain Chris Canning said the police officers focused on traffic violations and not the demographic of motorists.

Chair Klein asked if it was possible to correlate the Focus on the Five violation counts with the racial demographics of who was ticketed.

Commander Walsh said that data analysis was done by the state, and it did not correspond to a specific violation, but instead showed if the person was cited, arrested, or warned. He said it was done through the Stop Data Collection System (SDCS) which was what the police officers entered data into after a ticket was issued. He said that no law enforcement agency showed violations by demographics and what the state showed was generic.

Chair Klein asked if lower speed limits in the Tenderloin correlated with an increase in violations.

Commander Walsh clarified that the posted speed limit dropped from 25 miles per hour to 20 miles per hour in the Tenderloin, which was also the case in the Mission District and in Ingleside. He noted that if someone were cited with speeding in the Tenderloin it would be from an officer clocking them in their patrol vehicle.

Member Rozell said he had the understanding that many citations were occurring outside of the Tenderloin and asked for a more detailed map.



Captain Canning said the discrepancy may have been caused by SFPD breaking down the data by police district. He said that SFPD was working on opportunities for different reporting abilities, which would show more detail beyond police district boundaries in the future.

Member Rozell asked if there was information on those that were involved in the drug market especially when thinking about the number of hit and run incidents.

Captain Canning said no but if there was evidence of a crime while giving a ticket, it would be noted but it would be an assumption with no factual evidence linking the two together. He said it was clear that there were challenges in the neighborhood that led to a significant focus by the police department and there were peripheral crimes but no clear evidence linking the two together.

After Commander Walsh's presentation, Chair Klein said it was hard to imagine that there were so few police officers that were doing so much work.

Member Rozell observed that slides 5 and 6 showed the lack of enforcement in the Tenderloin compared to other locations in the city. He said that it was a concern because every street in the Tenderloin was on the High Injury Network yet there was a lack of enforcement compared to other neighborhoods. He said that he led the Safe Passage program in the area four hours a day and that anecdotally, there were a lot of motorists speeding, running red lights, making illegal turns, and not yielding. He said an increased police presence would be appreciated.

Member Siegal asked why the Focus on the Five citations were low during the first half of 2022.

Commander Walsh explained that the citywide numbers were not just from the traffic officers. He said previously, a lot of traffic enforcement would take place during down times when there more police officers. He mentioned that the Richmond District had a low call for service of high priorities and that their traffic statistics were higher than in the Tenderloin, where police officers were responding to higher priority calls and more serious crimes on short staffing. He said enforcement was still happening based on availability of police officer staffing.

Member Siegal asked about the dramatic decline in Focus on the Five violations over the years.

Commander Walsh said there was a confluence of reasons including a decline in proactive policing, because of accusations of profiling, and short staffing. He said they were down about 560 sworn police officers this year which increased from 300-400 sworn police officers last year. He said that in 2019, the Traffic Company had 45 officers with five squads of officers and two additional squads focused only on Vision Zero. He noted that the Vision Zero squads did not handle collisions and rarely conducted escorts. In comparison, in 2020, the staffing dropped to five sergeants and 35 officers and in 2021 they had three squads with no officers dedicated to Vision Zero because of the loss in staffing. He said that in 2022 there were four sergeants and 23 police officers and said that the Muni Task Force and Muni specific investigative unit were disbanded due to staffing. Lastly, he noted that there were less vehicles to cite as fewer people were travelling into the city.

Member Siegal appreciated the feedback and requested a follow-up presentation on



why there was such a large decline before 2019 when there were dedicated Vision Zero squads.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked if data on vehicle make, model, and year were collected and analyzed as newer pickup trucks were mounted higher than older models which could obstruct the view of pedestrians.

11. San Francisco Transportation Plan Update – INFORMATION*

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

Chair Klein asked how the funding gaps and unmet needs shown in the presentation would be filled, inquiring if sources like state and federal grants and bonds could fill the gaps.

Maria Lombardo responded that the Vision Plan included potential new revenue sources that could come from the federal, state, regional or local level; however, she said that the transportation need was very large and could not be fully met, even with these new sources. She continued to explain that one of the purposes of the San Francisco Transportation Plan was as an advocacy tool for new revenue sources, since it demonstrated the need and described a vision for what could be done with additional revenues. She concluded with an example of a new regional transportation measure that had been discussed a few years ago, but did not advance at the time, and was now being discussed again as an option.

There was no public comment.

12. San Francisco's One Bay Area Grant Cycle 3 Project Nominations Update – INFORMATION*

Chair Klein remarked that CAC members raised concerns at the September 7 CAC meeting about the lack of funds for the BART Elevator Modernization Design Project at 16th St Mission, 24th St Mission, and Balboa Park. He noted that Member Kevin Ortiz raised those concerns to the Transportation Authority Board in the CAC Report at the September 13 Transportation Authority Board meeting.

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

Member Ortiz thanked the Transportation Authority staff for their thoughtful and diligent approach to revise the recommendations and for their cognizance of the Mission community and communities in the southeastern part of San Francisco. He stated that this was a great win for the community to ensure access for people with disabilities. He asked about the name of the fund source that is under consideration for funding the remaining three BART stations needing faregates.

Ms. Laforte replied that the fund source was the Senate Bill 1 Local Partnership Competitive Program and that it was a statewide program that would fund construction only and required a 1:1 funding match. She noted that applications would be due at the end of November and that the fare gate project appeared to be eligible and competitive. She stated that the Transportation Authority would submit the application on behalf of BART, noting that this fund program was only open to taxing authorities or toll collecting entities that have voter approved measures that



fund exclusively transportation.

Chair Klein thanked the Transportation Authority staff for hearing the CAC and he thanked the CAC members for advocating for their communities.

There was no public comment.

13. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

Vice Chair Ortiz acknowledged that he received information from BART through Transportation Authority staff indicating that BART cannot run all night service because they would be unable to perform the necessary maintenance to keep the system running reliably and safely. He requested a follow on presentation from BART staff on their maintenance operations to get a better idea of the entire scope. He also requested as part of the presentation, information on late night bus services, with an emphasis on lines that had not been restored since the beginning of the Pandemic.

Member Kat Siegal asked whether the SFMTA or Transportation Authority planned to give the CAC more of an engineering focused update on Vision Zero and if not, she would like to request such a presentation. Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, Anna Laforte, responded that the 2021 Safe Street Report is anticipated to go to the October 25th Board meeting but that it could be presented to the CAC as well.

Member Ortiz asked for an update on the status of items that are in the 'new business' queue.

14. Public Comment

Roland Lebrun stated that there have been too many delays on BART service across the bay and therefore a 2nd tunnel across the bay was needed. He also advised the Transportation Authority to really consider what they were doing in regards to financing the Guadalupe Bridge crossing.

Edward Mason informed the CAC that a commuter bus 442 would be starting its 2nd year of operating without a permit and lamented that this reflected a trend of increasing numbers of buses operating either without or with mismatching permits.

15. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:29 p.m.