



DRAFT MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, March 29, 2023

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Ortiz called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

CAC members present at Roll: Sara Barz, Rosa Chen, Najuwanda Daniels, Mariko Davidson, Calvin Ho, Jerry Levine, Rachael Ortega, Kevin Ortiz, and Kat Siegal(9)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Rozell (1)

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Ortiz provided some Vision Zero updates, including the opening of the protected bike lanes Quick-Build project on Battery and Sansome streets and a \$2 million Highway Safety Improvement Program grant award to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) that combined with Prop K, will provide for the installation of over 3,000 new and replacement traffic signs such as no tun on red and new speed limit signs. He then alerted the CAC that several Vision Zero updates would be on their April 26th agenda including the 2022 Fatality Report and the SFMTA's Active Communities Plan. He closed by welcoming the new District 11 representative, Mariko Davidson, to the CAC.

Mariko Davidson stated that it was an honor to join the CAC and she was excited to represent District 11. She stated that she was a mother, an e-biker, and transportation advocate, and that she was looking forward to working with the other members of the CAC.

During public comment, Edward Mason requested that committee members speak louder so that he could hear them.

Consent Agenda

3. Approve the Minutes of the February 22, 2023 Meeting - ACTION

4. Community Advisory Committee Vacancies - INFORMATION

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

Member Levine moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Vice Chair Seigal.



The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Chen, Daniels, Davidson, Ho, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, and Siegal (9)

Nays: CAC Member Rozell (1)

End of Consent Agenda

5. **Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt Traffic Congestion Mitigation Tax Program Guidelines and Program \$21,279,740 in Fiscal Years 2022/23 and 2023/24 TNC Tax Funds to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency for Four Projects – ACTION***

Lynda Viray, Transportation Planner, Jen Wong, Vision Zero Quick-Build Program Manager at SFMTA, and Damon Curtis, Traffic Calming Program Manager at SFMTA presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Damon Curtis addressed a question Vice Chair Siegal had asked prior to the meeting about whether SFMTA anticipated a large number of applications following the commencement of the new rolling traffic calming program application period. He stated that SFMTA did expect a larger wave of applications in July due to pent up demand. He stated that it was possible that they would receive 100 to 150 applications in the first quarter but SFMTA was prepared.

Member Ortega asked if SFMTA could investigate the potential negative consequences of implementing traffic calming measures, such as new 20 mph speed limits, stating that she had observed more aggressive driving and speeding as drivers tried to get ahead of the traffic signals. She also expressed concern about the potential for the new 20 mph speed limit to impede timely bus service, which could affect transit ridership recovery.

Jen Wong responded and agreed that it was a good idea to evaluate the consequences of new 20 mph speed limits, as it was a relatively new traffic calming tool.

Member Barz asked how SFMTA planned to implement Quick Builds on the remaining 50 miles of the High Injury Network before the end of 2024.

Jen Wong responded that the results of a current consultant study would identify remaining intersections that need continental crosswalks to be implemented. She added that not all the remaining miles of the High Injury Network would be treated with major street reconfigurations, and that some would be treated with daylighting, continental crosswalks, lower speed limits, and retiming signals to allow more time for pedestrians to cross the street.

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, stated that the consultant study was expected to be completed in the next couple of months, the next Quick Build allocations were anticipated this fall, and that a presentation of the results of the study could be given to the CAC prior to the allocations. She also noted that the Active Communities Plan was expected to have results available next spring, which also could inform upcoming allocations.

Vice Chair Siegal asked if it was common for previous Quick Build projects to be



iterated on.

Jen Wong confirmed that was correct and cited the example of the 7th and 8th streets corridors. She stated that SFMTA had received initial negative feedback, so SFMTA iterated on the project by implementing separated bicycle phasing that allowed bicyclists to stay next to the curb, rather than having to merge into the traffic lane. She noted that transit-only lanes were implemented on the 7th and 8th streets corridors during the pandemic as an additional example of how Quick Build projects are iterated on. She stated that SFMTA was able to collect evaluative data on Quick Build projects and apply lessons learned to other projects.

Vice Chair Siegal asked if all applications to the traffic calming program moved forward to design and implementation, or if there was a prioritization method for application selection.

Damon Curtis replied that SFMTA has been able to advance all applications to the traffic calming program so far. He stated that should the volume of applications become too high in the future, SFMTA would implement a prioritization method or tighten eligibility requirements.

Chair Ortiz asked how SFMTA was planning to meet staffing and funding needs if the traffic calming program were to receive 150 applications in the next cycle.

Damon Curtis responded that there was infrastructure in place that would allow SFMTA to complete all data evaluation and consultation on time. He added that SFMTA may need to consider adding a sub-phase to the first quarter in the program schedule to meet staffing needs if there was a large influx of applications that quarter. He noted that adding such a phase would only add a few weeks or at most two months to the schedule. He stated that meeting staffing and funding needs would become a more salient concern if there were 150 applications to the program for the first two or three quarters in a row, and if that occurred SFMTA would need to develop a new approach. He stated that SFMTA did not anticipate this occurring.

Chair Ortiz asked what a realistic staffing level was to avoid overloading staff with applications.

Damon Curtis responded that staffing levels were based on priority and workload, so SFMTA would direct more staff to traffic calming as needed. He stated that there was no hard number on the staffing needs of the program, but rather that it varied based on need.

Chair Ortiz suggested that SFMTA could consider putting a cap on the number of applications received in a quarter, as doing so would meter staffing needs, demonstrate the competitiveness of the program, and potentially demonstrate the need for more staff.

Damon Curtis replied that the program did not need to be constrained so far, but that SFMTA would consider the option of capping applications if capacity were reached.

Chair Ortiz echoed Member Barz's concern about completing traffic calming treatments on the remaining 50 miles of the High Injury Network by the end of 2024, and asked how SFMTA would center equity and prioritize projects, particularly those in Communities of Concern.



Jen Wong responded that SFMTA had ongoing relationships with community groups and leaders which informed prioritization. She cited the example of the Tenderloin, where SFMTA had an ongoing relationship with a community group that helped them identify where the highest priorities in the neighborhood were. She also stated that priorities could be informed by the recommendations of other studies and efforts. She cited the example of the Bayview Quick-Build corridors, which were informed by the Bayview Community-Based Transportation Plan. She stated that SFMTA has sometimes received feedback that Quick-Builds were implemented too quickly, and that performing high quality public outreach took time.

Chair Ortiz noted his involvement with community engagement on the Valencia Bikeway Improvements project, which considered running a traffic study, and asked how SFMTA determined that a traffic study was needed.

Jen Wong responded that traffic studies would help inform project prioritization.

Jamie Parks, Director of Livable Streets at SFMTA added that a lot of the work to be done on the remaining 50 miles of the High Injury Network consisted of basic life-saving measures that don't have significant implications on traffic, such as continental crosswalks, intersection daylighting, painted safety zones, and signal retiming. He stated that these kinds of treatments could be implemented confidently, without the need for traffic studies. He stated that some Quick Builds have consisted of more extensive changes and required further evaluation.

Chair Ortiz asked how SFMTA identified corridor projects.

Jamie Parks replied that SFMTA tried to identify large corridor projects from previous community-based planning efforts. He stated that SFMTA tried to use the Quick-Build program to satisfy the need for implementing identified corridor projects, rather than for identifying new corridor projects.

Member Levine asked where more details about particular traffic calming program applications could be found.

Damon Curtis replied that more details could be obtained by emailing trafficcalmingapp@sfmta.com, or by emailing Mr. Curtis directly.

Member Daniels asked if there were any anticipated negative impacts from consolidating traffic calming program funding to accommodate the new, faster schedule.

Damon Curtis replied that there were no foreseen negative impacts. He stated that consolidated funding was a way to shorten the program schedule, including cutting down on the number of allocation requests. He added that reporting on the program would continue as it has been on a quarterly basis.

Deputy Director Anna LaForte reiterated that there were no foreseen negative impacts of consolidated funding and added that the Transportation Authority was interested in how this change to the funding structure would affect the program. She stated that the Transportation Authority planned to program funds to SFMTA for the traffic calming program next month, and that the allocations would likely all be included in one request, and that the Transportation Authority would ask SFMTA to report back on the program in a year's time.



During public comment, Edward Mason asked that those present speak louder, as the meeting took place in a large room.

Member Barz moved to approve the item, seconded by Vice Chair Siegal.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Chen, Daniels, Davidson, Ho, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, and Siegal (9)

Nays: CAC Member Rozell (1)

6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$2,451,857 in Traffic Congestion Mitigation Tax Funds, with Conditions, to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency for the FY23 Vision Zero Quick-Build Program (Part 2) – ACTION*

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

Member Ortega expressed that she thought the Quick-Build Program was great and asked that maintenance of previous Quick Build projects be a priority going forward.

There was no public comment.

Vice Chair Siegal moved to approve the item, seconded by Member Ortega.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Chen, Daniels, Davidson, Ho, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, and Siegal (9)

Nays: CAC Member Rozell (1)

7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Authorize the Executive Director to Enter into a Funding Agreement with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission for a Total Amount Not to Exceed \$270,000 for San Francisco Travel Diary Survey Data Collection– ACTION*

Drew Cooper, Senior Transportation Modeler, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Davidson asked how the Transportation Authority could ensure data is collected equitably from all parts of the city.

Mr. Cooper responded that the Transportation Authority used several methods to ensure a representative sample, one of which was to oversample equity priority communities.

Member Davidson asked whether there was a pause in the collection to ensure the group was representative.

Mr. Cooper responded that the data collection was split into spring and fall data collection rounds for that purpose.

Member Ho asked how much in incentives a household was paid, and how they were scaled for low-income communities.

Mr. Drew responded that the incentives were on the order of \$50 per household. He said he didn't know off-hand how the incentives were scaled.



Member Ho asked how people were recruited into the survey.

Mr. Cooper responded that the survey participation forms were mailed out and the Transportation Authority used a random addressed-based sample approach.

Member Ortega asked whether the survey would account for people who had commutes outside the city. She also asked how the survey accounted for weather, when things like heavy rain might lead to less cycling.

Mr. Cooper responded that while the Transportation Authority's proposed funding was specifically for residents of the city, the broader effort lead by MTC targeted all 9 Bay Area counties and that data was shared. Mr. Cooper added that the survey would be flexible to account for real world things that could affect the data collection, like the weather.

Member Ortega asked if there is a way to correlate to weather.

Mr. Cooper responded that there was historical data available.

Member Siegel asked if the survey quantified why specific modes were chosen and whether respondents would have preferred a different mode if it had been available or safer.

Mr. Cooper responded that there are cases when the surveys ask about what people would have done if the mode they chose wasn't available, but that this effort was focused primarily on current travel behavior.

Member Barz asked about lifestyle factors and how that factored into the survey. For example, Ms Barz recounted that she participated in a travel survey when she was on maternity leave, which significantly influenced her travel choices, and the survey hadn't asked about maternity leave.

Mr. Cooper replied that the Transportation Authority did not ask about family leave specifically, and added that this was not an issue for data integrity because that [someone being on maternity leave] was real data and fits with the way the model was applied.

Member Ortiz asked what MTC and the Transportation Authority would do in the event that certain communities did not respond.

Mr. Cooper responded that the second round of data collection could be modified to account for issues that arose in the first round, such as needing to bolster sampling for certain populations or areas of the city. He added that the random address-based sampling was an important component to ensure there were no sampling biases to the extent possible.

Member Ortiz asked when the second round of data collection would take place.

Mr. Cooper responded that the first round would take place in the spring and the second round would occur after school was back in session in the fall.

Member Ortiz asked whether the Transportation Authority could provide the CAC with an update after the first round.

Mr. Cooper said that was possible.

During public comment, Ed Mason asked how effective CHAMP had been in past



applications. He stated that many of the large TNC's had massive data collection efforts. He asked whether MTC was considering photographing license plates and matching those with a zip code. He wondered where people passing through the city were going to and coming from.

Member Ho moved to approve the item, seconded by Member Ortega.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Chen, Daniels, Davidson, Ho, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, and Siegal (9)

Nays: CAC Member Rozell (1)

8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Amend the Adopted Fiscal Year 2022/23 Budget to Increase Revenues by \$31,243,544, Decrease Expenditures by \$19,121,435 and Decrease Other Financing Sources by \$55,000,000 for a Total Net Decrease in Fund Balance of \$856,528 – ACTION*

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

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Chen, Daniels, Davidson, Ho, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, and Siegal (9)

Nays: CAC Member Rozell (1)

9. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve the Revised Administrative Code and the Debt; Equal Benefits; Investment; Procurement; Rules of Order; Sunshine; and Travel, Conference, Training, and Business Expense Reimbursement Policies – ACTION*

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

Member Ortega asked if the travel prohibition was for business or personal travel.

Deputy Director Fong confirmed that it was for business only.

Member Barz asked if the contracting prohibitions were related to the travel prohibitions.

Deputy Director Fong responded that the situation was evolving and that they were similar in spirit but not directly connected.

Chair Ortiz asked whether the travel and contracting policies were similar to the City's 12X policy.

Deputy Director Fong stated that the Transportation Authority does not have to



directly copy the City's policies but the Transportation Authority's approach likely would be similar in this regard.

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Chen, Daniels, Davidson, Ho, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, and Siegal (9)

Nays: CAC Member Rozell (1)

10. Bay Area Express Lanes Update – INFORMATION

Rachel Hiatt, Deputy Director for Planning, presented the item per the staff memorandum. Ms. Hiatt also summarized the reactions of the Board members to the presentation, noting that they were generally interested in considering express lanes in addition to HOV/carpool lanes in the ongoing study regarding 101 and 280 in San Francisco. She mentioned that a couple of Board members underscored the impacts on equity populations and stressed the need to make ensure low-income San Franciscans could benefit from express lanes. She added that there was a question about how freeways were used for local trips and whether that would affect the utility of express lanes in San Francisco.

Member Barz asked if there was any research on the benefits of express lanes as compared to HOV lanes, and whether one type was preferable.

Ms. Hiatt responded that benefits varied according to the specific corridor, citing examples in Santa Clara, where HOV lanes were crowded with Clean Air Vehicles, which prompted the need to switch to express lanes to maintain benefits, and in Southern California, where HOV lanes were not well used by transit vehicles and HOVs.

Member Barz asked about the climate impacts and benefits of managed lanes.

Ms. Hiatt responded that the benefits were to incentivize higher occupancy mode choices, such as a person choosing to use transit or HOV to complete their trip more quickly and reliably.

Member Ortega asked about the use of toll revenues.

Ms. Hiatt explained that the state authorized express lanes and required expenditure plans for each. She said revenues were usually reinvested in the corridor, but the precise use varied by corridor.

Member Ortega asked staff to consider the last-mile issue, since that prevented many from taking transit.

Vice Chair Siegal asked about policy decision making, and the Transportation Authority's role.

Ms. Hiatt answered that the Transportation Authority would need authorization from the state to implement express lanes, in the same way that many other counties have



done.

Ms. Lombardo added that San Francisco was represented on the regional express lanes policy committee, though it is an advisory position.

Vice Chair Siegal requested clarification about Clean Air Vehicles and whether they must be allowed to use HOV lanes.

Ms. Lombardo confirmed that that was a statewide rule.

Vice Chair Siegal reiterated that we should be careful in how express lanes were implemented to minimize impacts on low-income people.

Chair Ortiz asked how San Francisco would gain authority to implement express lanes. Ms. Lombardo explained that the first step would be to study express lanes, along with the affordability component, and then if the Board wished to proceed, there were various models for governance of express lanes that could be explored such as some of the examples Rachel provided.

Chair Ortiz noted that if a person were inadvertently driving in an express lane but was eligible for discounts, there should be a way to qualify that person rather than fining them, and he noted that having local control of managed lane policies would be the best way to assure this type of benefit or policy.

Member Barz asked why weekend tolling was under the jurisdiction of both the policy board and Caltrans on one of the presentation slides.

Ms. Hiatt clarified that the bodies have different authorities in different instances, adding that Caltrans is currently reviewing their policies and procedures.

During public comment, Ed Mason said that express lanes induce more traffic because they make it more convenient for those who can afford to drive. He mentioned that many SamTrans bus lines have been cut, and a report about express buses was completed ten years ago but had not been acted on. He stated that VTA contracts with California Highway Patrol to conduct enforcement of the lanes along 101 in Santa Clara.

Roland Lebrun mentioned that he had the idea for means-based tolling four years ago. He was not in favor of local control and suggested that all nine counties should work together at the regional level to find a reasonable consensus that worked for all in order to ensure a seamless experience for travelers.

Other Items

11. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

Member Levine reminded Transportation Authority staff that the CAC was promised a tour of the Southgate Road Realignment Project once it was completed. With the project nearing completion, he expressed continued interest in the CAC tour.

Member Daniels requested an update on the Evans Street corridor.

Member Davidson requested information on the underway e-bike pilots in the City and the possibility of a Transportation Authority e-bike rebate program.



Rachael Ortega requested a meeting with Transportation Authority staff to discuss her vision and broader transit hopes for the city.

Chair Ortiz requested quarterly quick-build updates from the SFMTA. He also requested information on what a cross-departmental study, that centered community, for the central freeway removal would look like as well as a presentation on what the options were to move forward.

Vice Chair Siegal asked for a presentation from the San Francisco Police Department on their current and past work to deter bike theft.

12. Public Comment

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that corporate commuter buses were basically running empty, have many violations, and cause congestion along their route. He believed that due to their low ridership, they were a net generator of pollution.

Roland Lebrun commented that the Baylands Masterplan included no regional transit integration for the Geneva extension bus rapid transit or BRT. Since there was no seamless integration between SFMTA and Caltrain, he proposed moving the Bayshore station further south into San Mateo County until it intersects with the Geneva extension which would create a regional transportation hub.

Chair Ortiz suggested some new business items. He requested a presentation on enforcement methods and ridership data for commuter buses. He also requested a presentation on the historical data and any past studies on a regional express bus network.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.