



# DRAFT MINUTES

## San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Tuesday, December 6, 2022

### 1. Roll Call

Chair Mandelman called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

**Present at Roll Call:** Commissioners Dorsey, Mar, Mandelman, Melgar, Preston, and Walton (6)

**Absent at Roll Call:** Commissioners Chan, Peskin, Ronen (entered during Item 1), Safai (entered during Item 4), and Stefani (5)

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

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Melgar moved to approve the resolution, seconded by Commissioner Mar.

The resolution was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Dorsey, Mar, Mandelman, Melgar, Preston, Ronen, and Walton (7)

Absent: Commissioners Chan, Peskin, Safai, and Stefani (4)

### 3. Approve the Minutes of the November 15, 2022 Meeting - ACTION\*

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Preston moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Commissioner Dorsey.

The minutes were approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Dorsey, Mar, Mandelman, Melgar, Preston, Ronen, and Walton (7)

Absent: Commissioners Chan, Peskin, Safai, and Stefani (4)

### 4. Community Advisory Committee Report - INFORMATION\*

Kevin Ortiz, Chair of the CAC, reported that the CAC elected him as Chair for the remainder of the year as well as nominated him for Chair for 2023 Kat Siegal as Vice Chair for 2023, with CAC elections to be held in January. Chair Ortiz went on to report that the CAC supported the Prop K and Prop AA allocations requests, the West Side Bridges Seismic Retrofit funding actions, and San Francisco Transportation Plan 2050 which were action items on the Board's December 6 agenda. He complimented Transportation Authority staff on their creativity in finding a funding solution for the



West Side Bridges. Chair Ortiz closed by reporting that the CAC received updates on Potrero Yard modernization, the 2022 Vision Zero High Injury Network, the Safe Streets Evaluation Program 2022 Report, and Walk SF's 'Safe Speeds City' Report.

Chair Mandelman thanked Chair Ortiz for his report and stated that he looked forward to more reports from him in the future.

There was no public comment.

**5. Appoint One Member to the Community Advisory Committee - ACTION\***

Amelia Walley, Analyst, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Commissioner Mar thanked the previous District 4 representative Nancy Buffum for her service and valuable input. Then he stated that he was pleased to nominate Calvin Ho to the CAC. Commissioner Mar described Mr. Ho as a passionate transit rider and described his qualifications. Commissioner Mar stated that Mr. Ho would bring valuable experience and perspective to the CAC and urged his fellow commissioners to support his nomination.

Calvin Ho spoke to his interest and qualifications in being appointed to the CAC.

Commissioner Mar moved to appoint Mr. Ho to the CAC, seconded by Commissioner Walton.

The motion to appoint Calvin Ho was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Dorsey, Mar, Mandelman, Melgar, Preston, Ronen, and Walton (7)

Absent: Commissioners Chan, Peskin, Safai, and Stefani (4)

**6. Allocate \$9,312,182 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, and Allocate \$1,000,000 in Prop AA Funds, for Ten Requests - ACTION\***

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

Commissioner Melgar stated that she was pleased to see progress on the 29 Sunset Improvement Project given that it was an important route between the Bayview neighborhood and Lowell High School, Lincoln High School, and other schools on the west side of San Francisco. She expressed concern about east-west connectivity and the impact it had on the desegregation order for the San Francisco Unified School District. She said she has heard from the Youth Commission that the 29 Sunset route is always full of kids, and so overcrowded that students were often passed up at stops. She expressed support for the project which would address these issues and would save 15 minutes on the route.

Commissioner Melgar stated that she thought a pilot project for a paratransit electric vehicle should have happened 10 years ago. She requested that as a condition of the approval of the funding for the Replace 18 Paratransit Vehicles project and the Replace 27 Paratransit Vehicles - Additional Funds project, that SFMTA present a plan for the transition from gasoline to electric paratransit vehicles. She stated that SFMTA had a plan for the transition to electric buses and that it was time to do the same for paratransit vehicles. She noted that the life span for paratransit vehicles was five years,



which would go by quickly, and that now was the time to demand that this important part of the Climate Action Plan happened. She stated that she supported the allocation requests but suggested that reimbursement should be conditioned upon progress towards an electrification plan for paratransit vehicles.

Commissioner Melgar said she was concerned about the Sloat and Skyline Intersection Improvements project and the stress that the closure of the Great Highway between the zoo and Daly City would put on the intersection as drivers would pass through the location on the way to Sunset Boulevard. She said that she had met with San Francisco Public Utility Commission staff and asked them to pay for improvements to the intersection as mitigation for the impacts of their project. She said she also met with Caltrans staff who showed her two different redesigns for the intersection, neither of which were proposed to be designed with funds from the allocation request.

Commissioner Melgar asked why the project only addressed signals at the intersection instead of reconfiguring the intersection per one of the two redesign options. She described the two redesign options as a T-shaped signalized intersection option and a roundabout option. She stated that she did not want to spend money on minor improvements and then have that be used as an excuse not to reconfigure the intersection in the future. She said there was land around the intersection that could be used to reconfigure the roadway, such as the lot that was used for a Christmas tree lot and zoo parking. She stated that she did not want to rush to a sub-optimal solution because of the time sensitivity to get something constructed before the Great Highway closure south of Sloat, instead of doing the right thing to redesign the intersection now.

Ms. LaForte read proposed language for the new deliverable requested by Commissioner Melgar for the Replace 18 Paratransit Vehicles and the Replace 27 Paratransit Vehicles - Additional Funds requests: "By September 30, 2023, the SFMTA shall provide an update to the SFCTA Board and CAC on the plan for transition of the SFMTA paratransit vehicle fleet to all electric vehicles by 2035, per the California Air Resources Board mandate. The plan should address at a minimum vehicle procurement, charging infrastructure, maintenance and storage of the fleet, funding, and associated risks affecting timely compliance with the mandate. The SFMTA shall provide written updates on plan implementation and refinement every 6 months, and present those to the Board and CAC, if requested."

Bryant Woo, Transportation Engineer at SFMTA, responded that the two intersection reconfiguration options for Sloat and Skyline that Commissioner Melgar referred to, a squared-up T intersection and a traffic circle, were considered in the outreach process that SFMTA did with the community starting in 2017. He stated that the traffic circle was deemed infeasible due to land acquisition from the zoo that would be required. He said the design also did not address access to the houses along the north side of Sloat with driveways and garages, and to provide access to those driveways there would need to be a parallel road next to the traffic circle, which could then be used as a cut through road and thus defeat the purpose of the traffic circle.

Mr. Woo said that the squared-up T intersection design was analyzed, and it was determined that the number of lanes and the layout of the intersection would not have been able to handle the amount of traffic that would flow through it following the Great Highway closure. He stated that the amount of infrastructure work that would be



required for the squared-up T intersection also could not be accomplished with the available budget. He said that he recognized that adding signals to the current intersection's configuration was not the best or most deluxe configuration of the intersection but noted that the proposed design did make an effort to reduce traffic speeds and control pedestrian crossings to make the intersection more accessible than it was now. He noted that this was the last intersection along the Sloat corridor and within Caltrans right-of-way that did not have a signal, making the signal an improvement over the existing conditions.

Commissioner Melgar responded that she had no issue with making improvements to the intersection but was worried that the proposed design was a small token of what was needed, which was a reconfiguration of the intersection. She noted that there were no crosswalks, and the bike lane disappeared at the intersection. She expressed disappointment that there was no community outreach or outreach with the supervisors around the current design.

Commissioner Mar thanked Commissioner Melgar for her comments about the Sloat and Skyline Intersection Improvements and thanked SFMTA for their work looking into the two other intersection reconfiguration options that had been considered. He stated that the current design was not what he had been hoping for since it was one of the most challenging intersections on the West Side. He stated that this was a project he was eager to see funded and delivered, and that it was a necessary component of the Ocean Beach Climate Change Adaptation project and a supportive project for the Great Highway pilot project. He acknowledged Assemblymember Ting for delivering critical state funding for the construction phase of this project. He said that he would have liked to see better bike infrastructure in the design, especially considering that it was located near the Lake Merced Pedestrian and Bike Improvement Project and the Outer Sloat Quick Build Project. He stated that he hoped bike infrastructure improvements could be included during the detailed design phase of the Sloat and Skyline Intersection Improvements project.

Commissioner Mar commented on the importance of the 29 Sunset Improvement Project and highlighted the advocacy of students at Lowell High School for initiating the discussion and planning for this project. He noted that Phase 1 alone would not deliver all the service improvements, but it was a meaningful and needed step forward and he thanked SFMTA staff for their work on this project.

Commissioner Dorsey asked if spot paving was included in the Bicycle Facility Maintenance project and if the \$200,000 was for specific locations.

Ms. Laforte responded that the Bicycle Facility Maintenance project referenced spot repaving in bike lanes and that the \$200,000 was for the total cost of all the work that was planned, which included materials and labor for all elements, not just spot repaving.

Commissioner Dorsey stated he was surprised that \$200,000 would cover the cost of resurfacing bike lanes, given the rough conditions of bike lanes. He said that he had experienced rough bike lane surfaces on Folsom Street. He stated that better surfacing of bike lanes could incentivize scooter riders to not ride on sidewalks. He asked if there was a larger plan or effort to look network-wide at the need for spot repaving of bike lanes.



Ms. Laforte responded that \$200,000 was unlikely to take care of all the bike facility paving maintenance needs for the entire bike network and said she would follow up with Public Works and SFMTA about how will determine and prioritization of locations.

Commissioner Melgar asked about the accelerated timeline for the Sloat and Skyline Intersection Improvements project and asked what would happen if the request was delayed by a month. She requested additional information about the new design that was presented for funding and stated that she would like to better understand the tradeoffs with going with this design and not selecting one of the two designs that Caltrans staff had seen. She stated that she did not want to give up on the bicycle safety design issues that Commissioner Mar brought up and did not want to jeopardize the state money, but also asked how much \$1.2 million would be able to accomplish.

Ms. Laforte replied that the accelerated timeline was also driven by the planned closure of the Great Highway south of Sloat in early 2024 and the need to have the intersection improvements done before the closure happened. She also noted that SFMTA was planning to incorporate this intersection into an existing signal contract, which created some cost savings due to efficiencies.

Commissioner Melgar noted that the City had been talking about the closure of Great Highway for years.

Mr. Woo replied that the urgency for the project was that delays would mean that SFMTA would not be able to deliver the signals by the estimated deadline of December 2023/January 2024 when the Public Utilities Commission planned to close the Great Highway south of Sloat. He stated that SFMTA was in ongoing talks with Caltrans to get this proposal approved through their design review because two of the legs of the intersection fall under Caltrans jurisdiction. He said that if the design was still in flux there would be subsequent delays and rippling effects that could delay the whole project.

Commissioner Melgar thanked Mr. Woo for the answer and stated that it was not adequate given that the closure of the Great Highway had been talked about for years. She requested that the Sloat and Skyline Intersection Improvements project be postponed so that there was time to understand the comparison of this new design to the two previously proposed designs. She stated that she did not want to give up on a better design and settle for a signal because there was not enough time to do more.

Commissioner Mar stated that he felt comfortable moving forward with the Sloat and Skyline Intersection Improvements allocation request given his recent meetings with Transportation Authority and SFMTA staff and with the input that District 4 had provided but said he said he appreciated Commission Melgar's comments and request for a deeper explanation about the potential for more significant redesign concepts as proposed earlier. He said he was supportive of continuing this allocation request for one week to obtain additional information.

During public comment, Francisco DaCosta expressed disappointment that the Transportation Authority did not receive enough input from the people who are serviced by paratransit, especially seniors, and stated that there was a need for a needs assessment. He also expressed disappointment that electric paratransit vehicles were not yet planned for in 2022.



Barry Toronto asked why the paratransit vehicle purchases did not include ramp taxis given that most have reached the end of their useful life. He stated that ramp taxis are now more expensive and need more subsidies, especially because the taxis are a service on demand instead of by appointment like the other paratransit vehicles. He said funding for more ramp taxi incentives would keep the diligent drivers incentivized and avoid losing their service. He said there should be a certificate program for drivers and an instructor to teach new ramp taxi drivers. He stated that the Folsom Streetscape project and the Howard Streetscape project should include wayfinding signage for drivers to understand the confusing aspects of the bike ways.

Chair Mandelman excused Commissioner Safai from the remainder of the meeting.

Chair Mandelman clarified that Commissioner Melgar had proposed two amendments to this item. The first was previously read into the record proposing addition of a new deliverable [regarding a transition plan for the paratransit vehicle fleet to electric vehicles] to the Replace 18 Paratransit Vehicles request and the Replace 27 Paratransit Vehicles - Additional Funds requests. The second was to continue the Sloat and Skyline Intersection Improvements request to give Commissioners Melgar and Mar the opportunity to discuss more in depth with staff about how to incorporate the proposed signal improvements into the broader planning around Great Highway, Sloat, and Skyline. Chair Mandelman asked if Commissioner Melgar would like to make the motion to approve the requests with two proposed amendments he just described.

Commissioner Melgar moved to approve the item as amended, seconded by Commissioner Mar.

The motion was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Dorsey, Mandelman, Mar, Melgar, Preston, and Ronen (6)

Absent: Commissioners Chan, Peskin, Safai, Stefani, and Walton (5)

**7. 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.

During public comment, Francisco DaCosta said the \$4.899 million shift from the Bayview Multimodal Corridor project was concerning because the Bayview would not receive these funds. He commented that for full transparency, the Transportation Authority's decision-making process for the amendment should have included community outreach.

Commissioner Dorsey moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Melgar.



The motion was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Dorsey, Mar, Mandelman, Melgar, Preston, and Ronen (6)

Absent: Commissioners Chan, Peskin, Safai, Stefani, and Walton (5)

**8. Adopt the San Francisco Transportation Plan 2050- ACTION\***

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

Commissioner Melgar said that it would take additional resources to realize San Francisco's goals because assumptions in the San Francisco Transportation Plan were based on existing strategies from a variety of agencies. She mentioned that the Transportation Authority Board had often discussed San Francisco's lack of progress on Vision Zero and how improvements were driven by opportunity rather than by a comprehensive plan. Commissioner Melgar shared that many people wanted to move faster and that doing so required working with partners, however she said that she was supportive of the San Francisco Transportation Plan.

During public comment, Francisco DeCosta shared that he wanted a more specific discussion of safety in the San Francisco Transportation Plan, especially related to the safety of elders and children on Muni.

Commissioner Melgar moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Mar.

The motion was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Dorsey, Mar, Mandelman, Melgar, Preston, and Ronen (6)

Absent: Commissioners Chan, Peskin, Safai, Stefani, and Walton (5)

Chair Mandelman stated that the Board would take a five minute recess and reconvene at 11:25.

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

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

There was no public comment.

## **Other Items**

**10. Introduction of New Items - INFORMATION**

There were no new items introduced.

**11. Public Comment**

Roland Lebrun commented on the CAC report, stating that the CAC did not in fact get a report on Caltrain Modernization as that item was on their consent agenda due to a packed agenda and there was no staff presentation or public comment. Mr. Lebrun went on to say that there was a 6-page report from Deputy Director of Capital Projects



Carl Holmes that highlighted potential serious issues with the project. He then commented on a previous caller's comment, noting that the funding for the southeastern corridor of San Francisco was not eliminated, rather replaced with a different funding source.

**12. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.