



# DRAFT MINUTES

## **Community Advisory Committee**

Wednesday, October 26, 2022

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

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

CAC members present at Roll: Sara Barz, Rosa Chen, Jerry Levine, Rachael Ortega, Kevin Ortiz, Eric Rozell, and Kat Siegal (9)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Najuwanda Daniels and David Klein (2)

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

Vice Chair Ortiz reported that together with Commissioner Dean Preston's office, the Transportation Authority submitted a US Department of Transportation Reconnecting Communities grant application for the Fillmore/Geary Underpass Community Planning Study, noting that the grant was intended to support a community based planning study to reimagine the Geary corridor and help mitigate past harms done to African American, Jewish and Japanese communities during past decades. Vice Chair Ortiz requested that if the grant were awarded, the Transportation Authority staff provide the CAC with a presentation on the study approach and community engagement strategy. Next, Vice-Chair Ortiz put out a call for folks to take the Ocean Avenue Mobility Action Plan survey which was open through October 28<sup>th</sup>. He explained that the Ocean Avenue Mobility Action Plan would prioritize and identify funding for traffic and pedestrian safety improvement along Ocean Avenue from Junipero Serra Boulevard to San Jose Avenue.

Vice Chair Ortiz then welcomed Rachael Ortega to the CAC. Rachael Ortega briefly introduced herself and outlined her priorities as a member of the CAC. Finally, Vice Chair Ortiz reminded members of the CAC that per the CAC by-laws, the November 30<sup>th</sup> CAC agenda would include an item to nominate CAC members to serve as Chair and Vice Chair for 2023, with the election to be held at the January CAC meeting.

There was no public comment.

## **Consent Agenda**

### **3. Approve the Minutes of the September 28, 2022 Meeting - ACTION**

### **4. Community Advisory Committee Vacancies – INFORMATION**

### **5. State and Federal Legislation Update – INFORMATION\***

### **6. Transportation Authority's Project Priorities for the Senate Bill 1 Local Partnership Program Competitive Grant Program– INFORMATION\***

During public comment, Peter Tannen asked if there was a simple way to find the reasons that the bills listed in Item 5 were vetoed or if there is a summary somewhere.



Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, responded that there was not always a reason provided. She offered to send Mr. Tannen an article from Streets Blog that covered a lot of the same bills that the Transportation Authority was tracking. She also related that there was a general theme with bills that were vetoed towards the end of session regarding concerns related to negative impacts on the state budget given the recent downward trend in state revenues.

Vice Chair Ortiz commented that he was glad that the Transportation Authority was able to seeking funds for new fare gates at the remaining BART stations.

Jerry Levine moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Eric Rozell.

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Chen, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, Rozell and Siegal (7)

Nays: (0)

Absent: CAC Members Daniels and Klein (2)

## **End of Consent Agenda**

### **7. Allocate \$941,758 in Prop K Funds and Appropriate \$175,516, with Conditions, for Five Requests - ACTION\***

Mike Pickford, Principal Transportation Planner, and David Long, Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Kat Siegal commented that the Brotherhood Way Safety and Circulation project includes a stretch located on the city's high injury corridor map. Since the Brotherhood Safety and Circulation plan would be completed in 2025, she wanted to know if short-term safety improvements on the corridor would be made while long term solutions were explored, and asked if there were any short-term plans for a quick build project as the Vision Zero goal was to make progress by 2024.

David Long explained that the plan would identify both near- and long-term solutions. He confirmed the report would be finished in 2025 as the project had a two-year planning process. He shared that the San Francisco Public Library was studying a new Ocean View Branch Library at the intersection of Brotherhood Way and Alemany Boulevard, which was part of the section on the High Injury network that Member Siegal mentioned. He said that the San Francisco Public Library was working with SFMTA on identifying near term safety improvements in the area. He added the project was still in the early stages and anticipated that the Transportation Authority would have more information in 3-4 months on safety improvements on the corridor.

Member Sara Barz asked about the Brotherhood Way Safety and Circulation Plan specifically inquiring why Park Merced was not identified in the list of community organizations and if the Transportation Authority could consider their engagement.

David Long explained how Park Merced was outside of the project area but acknowledged they are a nearby stakeholder and would be engaged early in the study.

Member Rachael Ortega asked about Bicycle Safety Education and Outreach and wanted additional information on the outreach plan and inquired whether there



would be broader engagement across the city and not the usual biking audience. She asked for clarification of the purpose of outreach for 10,000 people with 1,000 people anticipated to attend the classes.

John Knox White, Project Manager at SFMTA, explained how SFMTA was at the end of a five-year contract with the Bicycle Coalition, competitively contracted through a request for proposals process. He said that this contract included a very large outreach component that hadn't historically been a part of the bike education. The 10,000 people that Member Ortega mentioned would be part of the community outreach efforts through the Bike Coalition. He explained how there was a calendar of outreach events that the SFMTA approved every quarter such as Sunday Streets and major street fairs. He continued by stating that SFMTA's outreach plan was to reach people who were not currently feeling confident on bikes and to provide education on how to bike, rules of the road, and how to navigate certain weather. He added the outreach events would occur in all 11 districts and that SFMTA was open to suggestions on these events and other ideas from CAC members.

Vice Chair Kevin Ortiz asked about the Brotherhood Way Safety and Circulation Plan and if there were any efforts to engage with SF State groups nearby and if so which groups.

David Long explained there wasn't yet a formal outreach plan yet but he anticipated reaching out to SF State and the student population. He also expressed being open to CAC member suggestions on who to reach out to.

Vice Chair Ortiz responded that he would reach out to Mr. Long to provide more information on SF State groups as he is familiar with the area as a previous resident.

Vice Chair Kevin Ortiz asked about the Bike to Wherever Day Sponsorship 2023 and the engagement efforts that would occur. He recognized that this was an annual event and inquired how Latinx community organizations like Bicis Del Pueblo were included.

John Knox White, Project Manager at SFMTA, explained the funding request was just for a sponsorship and said that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission chooses the group that runs Bike to Wherever Day in each county. He said the group was the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition in San Francisco.

Chris Wade, Deputy Director at San Francisco Bicycle Coalition, said that there were a lot of different community groups in the build up to Bike to Wherever Day especially around planning efforts for the energizer stations located in all 11 districts. He said he would follow up to see if Bicis Del Pueblo were engaged for this event, and added that the Bicycle Coalition did engage with this organization on other different types of programming.

During public comment, Peter Tannen asked about the Hearing Loop at San Francisco Stations project and why SFMTA might perform their own analysis and design their own loops despite multiple meetings with BART to try and coordinate. He suggested that the CAC should investigate and find out why SFMTA was not coordinating with BART on loops in the stations that they both share.

Ahmad Rassai, Accessibility Program Manager at BART, explained that BART had worked with SFMTA's Annette Williams, Director of Accessibility Services. He that BART was sharing their specs with the SFMTA. [Subsequent to the CAC meeting,



SFMTA explained that they are exploring alternative design specifications that better meet their needs and that SFMTA was not ready to proceed with installation of the loops at their own booths at this time.]

Member Sara Barz asked about the Hearing Loop at San Francisco Stations and why would SFMTA need to install their own loop if it was in the same station and if one loop could serve both transit services.

Ahmad Rassai with BART explained how the loops were attached to the glass section of a Station Agent Booth, with each booth requiring its own loop.

Kat Siegal moved to approve the item, seconded by Sarah Barz.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Chen, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, Rozell and Siegal (7)

Nays: (0)

Absent: CAC Member(s) Daniels and Klein (2)

**8. Execute Contract Renewals and Options for Various Professional Services in an Amount Not to Exceed \$1,025,000 – ACTION\***

Cynthia Fong, Deputy Director of Finance and Administration, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Chen, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, Rozell and Siegal (7)

Nays: (0)

Absent: CAC Members Daniels and Klein (2)

**9. SF School Access Plan Update - INFORMATION\***

David Long, Planner, presented the item staff memorandum.

Member Barz shared that she was interested in sustainable school access and that she was a parent of a young child. She asked whether the study team had looked at best practices from other cities across the world.

Mr. Long responded that the study team had performed a review of peer cities which focused on Seattle, Portland, and Chicago. Mr. Long said that the high-level takeaway from that effort was that there was relatively little innovative work being done to support medium and long-distance school trips in other US cities. Many cities had more robust yellow school bus systems than San Francisco and used those fleets as their key strategy to address medium and long-distance school commutes. Mr. Long said that the other common strategy employed by peers was to offer discounted fares for youth who took public transit. He said San Francisco's Free Muni for All Youth program was leading the effort on this strategy.

Member Barz shared that there had been a lot of advances outside of the US, including in Asian cities such Hong Kong. She said that San Francisco could learn from



cities outside of the US as well. Member Barz then shared that she was surprised at the omission of programs like parent-organized bike buses.

Mr. Long clarified that the School Access Plan was focused on K-5 students who must make medium and long-distance trips, and that the bike bus strategy was not considered because it better fit under the umbrella of San Francisco's Safe Routes to School program which focuses on shorter trips.

Member Barz shared that some bike buses were two miles long, and said it would be much easier to follow the proposal if there were a clear definition of trip distance. She added that she would like to see some evaluation of existing policies and programs, specifically Safe Routes to Schools programs. For example, she wondered whether getting rid of yellow school buses and making kids use Muni was working well. She also shared that she saw assumptions built into some of the strategies that she would like to see fully vetted.

Member Siegel asked whether the personal safety concern was ranked.

Mr. Long responded that concerns were not ranked, but that personal safety was mentioned very often in focus groups.

Member Siegel asked whether the focus group findings about personal safety included both personal safety and physical safety accessing busses.

Mr. Long shared that most caregivers in focus groups shared concerns about being in unsafe situations, but that the study team did hear anecdotes about young students who were physically injured getting on and off of buses.

Member Siegal asked whether bus stops which were used by students could be prioritized for daylighting.

Mr. Long shared that he could follow up with the SFMTA to discuss this idea.

Vice Chair Ortiz asked for more explanation about the Muni Transit Assistance Program.

Mr. Long explained that the SFMTA hired transit ambassadors which ride the bus to de-escalate any unsafe situations which might arise. Mr. Long shared that the ambassadors were focused mostly on high school and middle school serving routes and offered to follow up with additional information.

Vice Chair Ortiz said that he would appreciate additional information and asked for clarification about whether this was for high school students or citywide. Mr. Long confirmed that the focus was on high school serving routes.

Vice Chair Ortiz then asked whether a cost estimate could be made for staffing every bus with a transit ambassador. Vice Chair Ortiz shared that it would be interesting to explore discounted or free Muni for families who took children to or from school on public transportation.

Member Rozell supported these comments.

Member Barz asked whether there was baseline mode-split information available for schools that the School Access Plan focused on. Mr. Long shared that the Transportation Authority's 2016 Child Transportation Survey found that 57% of caregivers drove their children to school and that number was higher for afterschool



activities. Mr. Long shared that the Safe Routes to School program also conducted a yearly travel tally which asked children how they arrived at school. That information was available for individual school sites and Mr. Long offered to share that information.

Member Barz shared that she lived very close to two schools in District 7 which had very different mode shares. She said that while the averages are important, the reality could be very different at different school sites as could guidance from school administrators. She asked whether the School Access Plan intended to focus on any individual schools or do case studies of specific school sites. Mr. Long responded that the School Access Plan was a citywide plan and it did not anticipate identifying individualized strategies for specific school sites.

Member Ortega asked for clarification about the transportation coordinators strategy.

Mr. Long shared that the strategies were currently high level and that the study team would spend the coming months analyzing feedback and adding detail to the strategies. Mr. Long shared that to his knowledge, there was no current role in the city that was dedicated to sharing information about transportation programs specifically for caregivers and students of SFUSD schools. Mr. Long shared that this strategy could be designed several ways. For example the role could be in the SFUSD Transportation Department or it could be focused at individual school sites. Mr. Long shared another example would be to build a transportation communications role into the job description of Beacon School Coordinators.

Vice Chair Ortiz asked whether Beacon schools had been contacted as part of the School Access Plan outreach.

Mr. Long responded that every elementary school site had been contacted about the School Access Plan, including Beacon sites. Mr. Long also shared that the plan was promoted in SFUSD's Family News Bulletin which reached all SFUSD families.

Vice Chair Ortiz noted that there was a community meeting for Supervisor Mar's district and asked whether there were plans for meetings with every supervisorial district.

Mr. Long shared that the community meeting on October 27th was the only meeting on the upcoming calendar, but that the meeting was online and open to everyone.

Vice Chair Ortiz asked if the study team could plan additional town halls. Mr. Long responded that the team could explore the idea and follow up. Vice Chair Ortiz shared that it is important to reach out to all districts.

Member Barz agreed with Vice Chair Ortiz's comments and requested additional online events in other districts. Member Barz also strongly recommended prototyping ideas before concluding a plan. In particular, she said that this would be great for the Beacon schools.

There was no public comment.

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

Member Sara Barz requested an update on Member Kevin Ortiz's recent request for the list of previously requested new business items. Maria Lombardo answered that staff had created a list of pending requests and that they would email those requests



next week. She provided an update on one request, noting that SFMTA was working on performance data in response to Member Jerry Levine's request on the Van Ness BRT that should be ready to be provided by next month's CAC meeting.

Member Eric Rozell requested an update on the Safer Taylor Street and the 6<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor Project, ideally at the next CAC meeting, but okay if later or via email.

Kat Seigel reiterated the CAC's interest in Vision Zero especially considering that there were a couple fatalities in the Sunset, making the total number this year equal to last year. Director Maria Lombardo responded that Vision Zero [information] items would go before the November 15<sup>th</sup> Transportation Authority Board and then be brought to the November 30<sup>th</sup> CAC.

Member Rachael Ortega requested a presentation from SFMTA or the Transportation Authority on the broader subject of the current transit network across the city. She has had personal issues with the reliability of public transit and would like to discuss how transit could increase connections throughout the city and not just in ways that currently existed.

Vice Chair Ortiz related that he would also like to see a master transportation plan on routes and how they integrate. He also requested a presentation from SFUSD about routes that directly go by and serve schools, as well as what buses were serving communities of interest or potentially failing to do so. He said he would like to see this presented through graphics, maps, and timetables.

Member Rozell supported the request for a network overview from the perspective of comparing pre-COVID to post-COVID to better understand where we stand and where we may be headed, including planned extensions or increases in service.

Chief Deputy Director Lombardo acknowledge that these were pretty substantial requests and said she would like to follow up with the requesters off line to get more information so staff could determine how to best bundle and address the requests.

Edward Mason commented on a previous statement from a CAC member concerning wait times and the ability to transfer between routes. He quoted some statistics from the Muni Policy and Governance Committee meeting on Tuesday that through APTA (American Public Transit Association) which revealed that about 70% of the transit agencies in the United States had to either cancel or rearrange routing in their districts due to labor shortages. Mr. Mason said that Muni did not provide this information and that he saw this as a demographic issue as younger people were less likely to want to work as transit operators and therefore this would be a long term problem.

**11. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**12. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:31 p.m.