



DRAFT MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, November 30, 2022

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

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

CAC members present at Roll: Sara Barz, Rosa Chen, Najuawanda Daniels, Jerry Levine, Rachael Ortega, Kevin Ortiz, Eric Rozell, and Kat Siegal (8)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: (0)

2. [Final Approval on First Appearance] Approve the Resolution Making Findings to Allow Teleconferenced Meetings under California Code Section 54953(e) – ACTION*

There was no public comment on the resolution.

Member Siegal moved to approve the resolution, seconded by Member Barz.

The resolution was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Barz, Chen, Daniels, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, Rozell and Siegal (8)

Nays: (0)

3. Election of Community Advisory Committee Chair – ACTION

Vice Chair Ortiz thanked former Chair David Klein for his service to the CAC and explained that when his term expired he had elected to spend more time volunteering at his son's school and being with family rather than seeking reappointment. He then called for nominations for Chair.

Member Levine and Member Rozell nominated Vice Chair Ortiz who accepted the nomination.

There were no further nominations for Chair.

There was no public comment.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Barz, Daniels, Chen, Levine, Rozell, Siegal, and Tannen (7)

Nays: (0)

Abstain: Ortiz (1)

4. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Ortiz reported that Prop L passed with 71.79% of the vote, adopting a new 30-year Transportation Expenditure Plan and extending the half-cent sales tax to fund it, noting it supersedes Prop K on April 1, 2023. Chair Ortiz recognized CAC members Rosa Chen and Eric Rozell for the many hours that they served as part of the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee which helped to shape the new plan and said the CAC would look forward to working with staff on implementing the new measure.



There was no public comment.

5. Nominations for 2023 Community Advisory Committee Chair and Vice Chair— ACTION

Chair Ortiz called for nominations for Chair for calendar year 2023, noting that the elections would be held at then .

Member Siegal nominated Chair Ortiz who accepted the nomination.

There were no further nominations for Chair.

Chair Ortiz called for nominations for Vice Chair.

Member Levine nominated Member Rozell who expressed appreciation but declined the nomination.

Chair Ortiz nominated Member Siegal who accepted the nomination.

There were no further nominations for Vice Chair.

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

6. Approve the Minutes of the October 26, 2022 Meeting – ACTION

7. Approve the 2023 Community Advisory Committee Meeting Schedule – ACTION

8. Community Advisory Committee Vacancies – INFORMATION

9. Internal Accounting Report, Investment Report, and Debt Expenditure Report for the Three Months Ending September 30, 2022 – INFORMATION

10. Major Capital Project Update: Caltrain Modernization Program - INFORMATION

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

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

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Barz, Chen, Daniels, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, Rozell and Siegal (8)

Nays: (0)

End of Consent Agenda

11. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$9,202,182 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, and Allocate \$1,000,000 in Prop AA Funds, for Nine Requests – ACTION

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

Member Sara Barz asked if the state mandate to electrify all vehicles applied to paratransit vehicles.

Becky Chen, Project Engineer at SFMTA, replied that the electric vehicle mandate from the California Air Resources Board applied to paratransit vehicles. She stated that the paratransit electric vehicle pilot would test and evaluate the reliability and serviceability of the electric



paratransit vehicle, including the ability to meet San Francisco's service needs which involved climbing hills with loaded passengers.

Member Barz asked when the deadline was to meet the state mandate to electrify vehicles.

Gary Chang, Manager of Transit Program Delivery at SFMTA, replied that the deadline was in 2035.

Member Barz asked what the average life of a gasoline paratransit vehicle was.

Ms. Chen replied that the useful life of a [gas-powered] paratransit vehicle was five years.

Member Barz noted that the gasoline paratransit vehicles procured through these requests would be replaced before the 2035 deadline to electrify all vehicles in California.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked about the mileage that paratransit vehicles accumulated in five years and asked if SFMTA had considered merging procurements with other agencies in the Bay Area for a group purchase to reduce the price of vehicles. He asked if the materials used for the Bicycle Facility Maintenance project would generate microplastics. He asked if the new bus signage for the 29 Sunset Improvement would be solar powered instead of powered through electrical conduits that require trenching. He stated that stop removals would require people on crutches and people with disabilities to walk a longer distance, which is concerning. He asked why there was a \$500 fee for the City Attorney in the Bicycle Facility Maintenance project.

Member Siegal moved to approve the item, seconded by Member Ortega. The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Barz, Chen, Daniels, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, Rozell and Siegal (8)

Nays: (0)

12. **Adopt a Motion of Support to Amend San Francisco's One Bay Area Grant Cycle 3 (OBAG 3) Project Nominations to Shift \$4,899,000 from San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA's) Bayview Community Multimodal Corridor Project to San Francisco County Transportation Authority's (SFCTA's) West Side Bridges Seismic Retrofit Project (West Side Bridges); Approve a Fund Exchange, With Conditions, of \$14,899,000 in OBAG 3 Funds From SFCTA's West Side Bridges With an Equivalent Amount of Prop K Funds Allocated to SFMTA's Light Rail Vehicle Procurement Project; and, Appropriate, With Conditions, \$14,899,000 in Prop K Funds for the West Side Bridges – ACTION***

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

Member Barz asked if this request was fundamentally to exchange funds between the two projects.

Ms. Laforte explained that that was a main focus and that the action included redirecting \$5 million in OBAG funds from the Bayview Multimodal Corridor project that was now fully funded with other funds to bring the total West Side Bridges funding to \$14,899 million. She continued to clarify the proposed fund exchange of \$14.899 million in OBAG funds for West Side Bridges with an equivalent amount of Prop K funds allocated to the SFMTA's Light Rail Vehicle (LRV) Procurement project. She said that the fund exchange would allow the West Side Bridges project to award the construction contract in March 2023, which was sooner than the OBAG funds would be available. She said the OBAG funds would be available shortly thereafter, and the LRV



project would use the OBAG funds while West Side Bridges would use the requested Prop K funds.

Member Barz asked for confirmation that there were no significant downsides or trade-offs for any of the involved projects and commented on the good work staff had done to figure out funding solutions.

Ms. Laforte confirmed this high-level takeaway was correct.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, shared her appreciation for SFMTA's support for the fund exchange. She said it was a good thing that we had so much local money in the LRVs as it allowed for the Transportation Authority to be able to make this exchange work with no harm to the LRV project.

Member Ortega asked about LRV procurement and the new vehicles were for citywide use or just for Treasure Island.

Ms. Laforte responded that these were two separate projects involved in the fund exchange. She explained that the LRV procurement project replaces the existing citywide Muni fleet of 151 vehicles with new vehicles. She noted the new LRVs are already rolling out and providing service citywide.

Member Ortega thanked the staff for the clarification and expressed support for the new LRVs.

There was no public comment.

Member Jerry Levine moved to approve the item, seconded by Member Sara Barz.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Barz, Chen, Daniels, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, Rozell and Siegal (8)

Nays: (0)

Absent: (0)

13. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the San Francisco Transit Plan 2050 – ACTION*

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

Member Siegal asked why the San Francisco Transportation Plan (SFTP) could not increase Muni operating fundings above 2022 levels. Aliza Paz explained that it was a color of money issue. The plan includes \$8.2 billion of unspecified, flexible dollars, and if all of the money went to transit then the plan couldn't fund other priorities such as street safety. Mx. Paz noted that the Investment Plan responded to feedback and invested some money in transit service and other money elsewhere.

Member Siegel followed up by asking about the plan's 4% decrease in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Aliza Paz responded by clarifying VMT reductions represent a 2050 Investment Plan comparison to a baseline scenario.

Member Levine asked how often the SFTP would be updated. Aliza Paz responded that the plan would be updated every four years alongside Plan Bay Area updates.

Member Barz asked if the SFTP would help San Francisco achieve its goal to become a net zero greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions city by 2040, and if the SFTP was consistent with the Climate Action Plan (CAP). Aliza Paz explained that SFTP is consistent with the CAP, but the two plans have differences; for instance, there are more actions (including land use related) in the CAP and



the CAP is not financially constrained while the SFTP is financially constrained.

Member Ortega asked how additional funding in the Vision Plan would be prioritized if it is secured. Chief Deputy Director Maria Lombardo responded that there was a lot more need for funding than available revenues so that prioritization was an ongoing effort. She said the Vision Plan assumed \$15 billion in potential new revenues to show which might be able to be done to move closer to the plan goals if those new revenues were invested as indicated. She said another more ground-level example of prioritization was the Prop K allocation item earlier on the agenda where there are buckets of money for certain kinds of projects (e.g. traffic calming) and the CAC helps prioritize which particular traffic calming project should receive the funds.

Chair Ortiz asked how the SFTP would meet freeway needs such as removals and needs in other areas. Aliza Paz responded that the SFTP includes funds to plan for major transformational projects. That money could be leveraged to help increase funding and close some gaps, but they acknowledge that the needs were greater than available funds, so the city would need to seek more funding for these types of projects.

Member Barz asked about new sources of revenue and noted asked why the plan did not specify specific sources. Aliza Paz responded that the Transportation Authority looked at likely sources of funds to come up with the Vision Plan amount, but the plan did not go deeper than that (e.g. by specifying particular new revenue sources).

Chief Deputy Lombardo added that the main purpose of the SFTP 2050 Vision Plan was to underscore the need for new revenues by showing how much more the city could advance toward its transportation goals with new revenues. She said there would typically be a more focused effort when it comes to developing a specific new revenue measure, pointing to the Prop L Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee work as an example.

During public comment Edward Mason suggested that the next update of the SFTP have a section on demographics. He noted that birthrates have fallen and he wondered who would use major projects in the future. Mr. Mason referred to expenditures by the Link21 program, noted the current low occupancy of San Francisco office buildings, and wondered if trains would ever be full again.

Member Siegal moved to approve the item, seconded by Member Levine.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Barz, Chen, Daniels, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, Rozell and Siegal (8)

Nays: (0)

Absent: (0)

14. Potrero Yard Modernization Update – INFORMATION*

Jonathan Rewers, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), presented the item staff memorandum.

Member Siegal asked for clarification regarding the rationale for the Battery Electric Bus Component of the project and the future mix of trolleybus and battery fleet. Mr. Rewers responded that the future facility would continue to serve trolleybus vehicles, as well as provided expanded capacity to support introduction of battery electric vehicles.

Chair Ortiz commended SFMTA for advancing the project and noted the participation of local



partners in the project's housing component, including Young Community Developers and the Mission Economic Development Agency.

During public comment, Edward Mason noted that SFMTA plans to retire diesel buses and asked if in 2050 there would be both trolleybuses and battery buses in Muni's fleet. Mr. Mason indicated that there had been past discussions regarding potential removal of overhead wires and noted that he had not seen a cost-benefit analysis of this approach. Mr. Mason said that his current understanding was that trolleybuses would be retained in the future.

15. Vision Zero-San Francisco Department of Public Health's 2022 Vision Zero High Injury Network – INFORMATION *

Items 15 and 16 were called together.

Seth Pardo, San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH) Director for the Center of Data Science, presented the item per the presentation in the packet.

Member Rozell thanked SFDPH staff for showing how the High Injury Network changed over time. He highlighted that every street in the Tenderloin District was still on the network. He emphasized the need for more improvements to be done at a faster pace.

Member Siegal asked if SFDPH staff worked with SFMTA staff to develop recommendations for improvements based on patterns in the data and the extent to which how injuries and fatalities occurred was accounted for when considering how to modify streets for improved safety.

Mr. Pardo said SFDPH had been and would continue to be committed to working with SFMTA staff on how to improve safety on our streets. He said they would assess contextual factors and predictive factors for crashes and severe injuries and fatalities. He continued that they would partner with SFMTA on engineering and other solutions.

16. Vision Zero-San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's Safe Streets Evaluation Program 2022 Report — INFORMATION *

Brian Liang, Senior Transportation Planner at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), presented the item per the presentation in the packet.

Member Sara Barz commented that it was very interesting to see the aggregated results of these different projects and thanked staff for the presentation.

Member Siegal asked Mr. Liang to discuss the limitations of quick build projects.

Mr. Liang answered that limitations were mostly related to the materials that could be used as part of the design. He noted that for quick builds, the focus was on materials that could be implemented quickly and particularly for protected bikeways, such as parking protected bike lanes using paint, or separating the bike lane using safe hit posts. He continued that with the quick build model, the intention was to come back and evaluate and upgrade what was previously installed to make it more robust, if needed. With the permanent projects, the emphasis was on concrete and permanent materials.

Member Siegal asked about the differences in outcomes based on the materials used for quick builds and permanent capital improvements.

Mr. Liang answered that SFMTA staff hadn't analyzed in depth the usage of materials but that he could add that to the evaluation team's task list. He continued that the only quick build project that he knew had been upgraded or that was in the process of being upgrading to a capital



project was the 6th Street Pedestrian Safety Project.

There was no public comment.

17. Vision Zero-Walk SF's Making San Francisco a 'Safe Speeds City': Solutions to Slow Our Streets and Save Lives Report — INFORMATION *

Jodie Medeiros, WalkSF Executive Director, presented the item per the presentation in the packet.

Member Siegal asked if any of the streets in the Tenderloin where the speed limit had been reduced to 20 mile per hour and also had quick builds or street improvements, and if speed limit reduction alone showed evidence that it lowered the median speeds of vehicles.

Ms. Medeiros responded that some of the streets in the Tenderloin also had improvements such as road diets.

Member Siegal asked if there were examples of streets where only a lowered speed limit was applied and successful in reducing the average speed.

Ms. Medeiros responded that the City only started lowering speed limits in 2022 through Assembly Bill 43 (Friedman) and only in commercial corridors. She noted that there were 30 potential corridor candidates and the City had completed about 20 corridors so far.

Member Siegal asked Transportation Authority staff if there were plans to reinstate the Vision Zero Committee of the Transportation Authority Board.

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, answered that it was not expected because the Vision Zero items were of interest to the full Board and when there was a committee only a few Board members would receive the updates.

Member Ortega asked how WalkSF's recommendations to reduce speeds would tie in with already congested streets since cars were not going away and congestion was on the rise. She cited problem areas around the I-80 off-ramps in the South of Market Area and asked if WalkSF was coordinating with city planners on solutions beyond taking away travel lanes and reconfiguring streets differently.

Ms. Medeiros said that as more people were living in the South of Market Area, the roads should be treated as neighborhood streets. Ms. Medeiros continued that WalkSF would recommend travel lane removal only after an SFMTA evaluation confirmed the need for a road diet and that it would be an appropriate measure.

Member Sara Barz asked Ms. Medeiros to elaborate on the the backlog in the SFMTA's sign shop that was mentioned in the WalkSF presentation.

Ms. Medeiros answered that WalkSF often heard from SFMTA that the reason why corridors were not getting safety signs installed quickly was because the sign shop had a large backlog of work.

Member Barz said they were surprised that that the Transportation Authority had not received a funding request to address the backlog and asked if it was something that SFMTA staff was considering.

Ms. LaForte responded that the this was an ongoing issue in both the paint and sign shops and said Transportation Authority staff would follow up with SFMTA staff to better understand this issue and how it was being addressed.



Chair Ortiz asked about the process for community engagement in advocating for safe speeds and whether WalkSF was involved in bringing along neighborhood groups and community stakeholders to inform the process.

Ms. Medeiros replied in the affirmative and said that SFMTA was getting better at conducting community engagement to ensure that stakeholders were aware of projects and given an opportunity to provide feedback on design proposals. She said WalkSF brought recommendations to the SFMTA, received from and on behalf of the community members, to help inform the SFMTA's process to design streets for safe speeds. Ms. Medeiros added that the nonprofit and community based organizations complemented the City's processes to engage the community in coming up with solutions.

Chair Ortiz responded that his own experience advocating with the SFMTA not been as positive and, historically, a lot of communities had felt that SFMTA and the San Francisco Bike Coalition did a poor job at outreach, particularly in neighborhoods like the Mission District. He added that he had a good relationship with WalkSF and felt like the organization engaged the community well and that he looked forward to ensuring engagement was done with sensitive communities to prevent them from displacement.

There was no public comment.

18. Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION

During introduction of new business, Member Levine thanked staff for providing him with information on regulations regarding what vehicles, motorized and non-motorized, were allowed to use San Francisco bike lanes. He stated that he has seen motorized vehicles and scooters in the bike lanes and wanted to confirm what was in guidelines, including the definition of what a bicycle is. He observed that the guidelines were rather confusing at times and that a public education campaign may prove beneficial. He requested that someone who is knowledgeable of the guidelines and regulations of San Francisco bike lanes give a presentation to the CAC. This request was seconded by Member Ortega.

Member Siegal drew CAC members attention to the upcoming December 6th SFMTA Board meeting where the SFMTA would be voting on the permanence of the Slow Streets Program and potentially adding more streets to the Slow Streets network.

Member Barz requested a presentation about the backlog that was experienced by the SFMTA sign shop that was referenced during item 17. Member Rozell requested that potential solutions be explored in the presentation including exploring contracting out some labor.

Chair Ortiz requested an update on the Central Subway including ridership numbers. Additionally, he also requested a presentation on the Central Freeway removal which has been mentioned in the press. He requested this in response to interest from the communities of the Mission and SOMA who have had a long history of negative impact from freeway removal and said there has been a lack of community engagement early on. He asked which agencies were involved and how.

Member Siegal requested a write up or a presentation about which funding sources under the Transportation Authority's purview could be used for transit operations and what their limitations were. Chair Ortiz seconded this request and suggested a presentation would be welcome.

19. Public Comment



There was no public comment.

20. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:34 p.m.