



# DRAFT MINUTES

## **Community Advisory Committee**

Wednesday, April 26, 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, Najuawanda Daniels, Calvin Ho, Jerry Levine, Rachael Ortega, Kevin Ortiz, Eric Rozell, and Kat Siegal (8)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Rosa Chen and Mariko Davidson (arrived during Consent Agenda) (2)

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

Chair Ortiz reported that Speaker Emerita Nancy Pelosi recommended \$3 million in funding to modernize an elevator at BART's 16<sup>th</sup> Street station. The CAC had previously called on the Board to fund this elevator modernization through the One Bay Area grant program but the Metropolitan Transportation Commission did not award it. Chair Ortiz then reported that the Transportation Authority had begun the District 1 Multimodal Transportation Study at the request of Commissioner Chan. The study will engage the community to identify challenges and near to long-term strategies to improve transit. Next, he announced that the CAC would receive an update on the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority's (SFMTA's) Commuter Shuttle program at their May meeting. Finally, Chair Ortiz announced that CAC meeting recordings were available on the Transportation Authority's YouTube page.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated that the proposed earmark from Speaker Emeritus Pelosi was not a lot but that hopefully it would get the project on the Federal Transit Administration's radar. He thanked the Transportation Authority for putting CAC recordings on YouTube and requested that the 'save transcript' button be enabled on Zoom.

## **Consent Agenda**

### **3. Approve the Minutes of the March 29, 2023 Meeting - ACTION**

### **4. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$4,270,000 in Traffic Congestion Mitigation Tax Funds, with Conditions, to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency for the FY24 & FY25 Application-Based Residential Traffic Calming Program- ACTION\***

### **5. Community Advisory Committee Vacancy - INFORMATION**

Vice Chair Siegal pointed out that there were two errors in the minutes that she requested to be corrected. She stated that under item 11, there was a request for a



presentation from the San Francisco Police Department on bike theft deterrence that was made by Member Barz, but was incorrectly attributed to her. Finally, she pointed out that on the vote record for the Consent Agenda, Member Rozell was recorded as nay when he was in fact absent.

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

Vice Chair Siegal moved to amend the minutes as noted above, seconded by Member Barz.

The motion to amend the minutes was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Ho, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, Rozell and Siegal (8)

Absent: CAC Members Chen and Davidson (2)

Vice Chair Siegal moved to approve the Consent Agenda as amended, seconded by Member Rozell.

The Consent Agenda, as amended, was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Member Chen (1)

## **End of Consent Agenda**

### **6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve Programming Priorities for Up to \$5,640,041 in San Francisco's Estimated Fiscal Year 2023/24 State Transit Assistance County Block Grant Funds – ACTION**

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

CAC Chair Ortiz asked about the process to decide on Urban Alchemy as the vendor for BART's Elevator Attendant Program.

Aileen Hernandez, Principal Grants Officer at BART, responded that the Elevator Attendant Program was launched as a pilot program in 2018 and at that time BART brokered a relationship with Hunters Point to provide the Elevator Attendant Program services based on the services they were providing at the Pit Stop. She noted that subsequently one of the Hunters Point staff members became the Executive Director of Urban Alchemy, which was created in 2019 as a San Francisco community-based organization. She stated that BART has had a contract with Urban Alchemy since then and the current contract with Urban Alchemy was through June 2023. She stated that BART planned to extend the contract with Urban Alchemy for two more years and that BART would go out to bid for contractors for the Elevator Attendant Program during the second year.

Chair Ortiz commented that the Elevator Attendant Program was just for the four downtown stations and if the program was expanded out to other stations in San Francisco it would be good to have community-based organizations provide the elevator attendants, particularly the Mission District based organizations in order to



build trust. He noted that he would like to see the Elevator Attendant Program at the Mission District and Balboa Park Stations.

CAC Member Barz noted that the goals of the Elevator Attendant Program were to improve safety, mobility, and accessibility for BART and SFMTA customers using the elevators. She asked if those goals were being met and how BART was assessing if the goals had been achieved.

Ms. Hernandez replied that BART submitted data to the Transportation Authority on a quarterly basis with stats about elevator usage, including usage by people with wheelchairs and strollers, and from that data there was evidence that usage had increased. She also noted that BART tracked biowaste incidents in elevators and that those incidents had decreased. She commented that BART captured quantitative and qualitative data that had shown elevator usage had increased and that indicated people felt safer and that people thanked the elevator attendants for their presence. She noted that the elevator attendants were present at the elevators during all 21 hours that service is provided, so BART collected data from throughout the day.

Member Barz asked if the performance metrics data was in the memo.

Ms. LaForte commented that the BART Elevator Attendant application included the performance metrics, but not the data on outcomes from past years and that the Transportation Authority and BART would follow up and share that information.

CAC Member Rozell stated that he supported the comments and questions poised by the two previous CAC members. He commented on his experience when he recently was at a downtown San Francisco BART station with a friend who used a wheelchair and the elevator attendant was present and deterred unwanted activity so that he and his friend were able to use the elevator, which was appreciated.

CAC Member Davidson commented that she supported and agreed with the three previous CAC members and their comments. She stated that she would like to see elevator attendants at all the San Francisco BART stations, all the way down to the Balboa Park station. She commented on her recent experience when she was with a person who needed elevator access and the swipe card did not work for access to the elevator and she had to walk up the stairs to have a BART elevator attendant buzz her in. She commented that it would have been very helpful to have an elevator attendant present.

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Member Chen (1)

**7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the School Access Plan Final Report – ACTION**

David Long, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

CAC Vice Chair Siegal asked whether the study yielded a cost estimate for new shuttle



programs.

Mr. Long responded that costs for shuttle programs varied widely according to program design, so there was no specific cost estimate, however the report did include a cost estimate for expanding existing yellow school bus program operated by the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD).

Vice Chair Siegal then encouraged the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMFTA) to explore an expansion of the Muni Transit Ambassadors Program (MTAP). Member Siegal shared conversations she had with SFSUD students in which students shared experiences of harassment. Member Rozell echoed Vice Chair Siegal's support of the MTAP program.

Member Barz asked how many families would benefit from the report's recommendations.

Mr. Long shared that the recommendations should advance study goals to improve safety, improve transportation options, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions [for students with long distance commutes]. He shared that every school trip ends at the school site, thus infrastructure safety improvements should benefit all students. He said that transit trainings would reach a more limited number of families, given that relatively few students used Muni for their school trip. Mr. Long added that caregivers shared concerns about personal safety when riding Muni during outreach, suggesting that transit trainings could help with these concerns and benefit a wider group of families than those currently taking transit. Mr. Long shared that discounted fare awareness would reach a smaller population but could benefit caregivers with low incomes who were a priority for the study.

CAC Member Barz asked whether study benefits could be quantified. She shared that school transportation was a major challenge for many parents and that she did not have confidence that the identified strategies would address the needs of parents in her district. She asked how many people would benefit and how their lives would change.

Mr. Long responded that the study did not complete a quantitative analysis to determine specifically how many caregivers lives would be changed but that if recommendations were implemented, that caregivers would have safer, more convenient, and more sustainable transportation options for school trips.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, added that many of the strategies could be advanced as pilots which could help gauge their effectiveness.

CAC Member Daniels shared concerns about the implementation of recommendations. She shared an experience where SFMTA conducted a walk-audit, but neither the school district nor SFMTA communicated next steps. She asked who would monitor the SFMTA and the school district to ensure ongoing coordination is effective.

Mr. Long shared that each walk audit included funds for the construction of low-cost improvements, so ideally SFMTA would be able to move quickly and implement walk audit recommendations.

Arcadio Fokin, SFUSD Executive Director of Transportation, shared that SFUSD collaborated with SFMTA on yellow school bus drop of zones. He shared that SFMTA



funded one position with SFUSD and that an SFUSD team was dispatched to school sites whenever safety concerns about loading zones were raised.

CAC Member Davidson noted that half of all SFUSD students lived within one mile of school and 70% lived within two miles, yet only 27% walked. She asked whether a goal could have been included to increase walking and biking. She spoke to the importance of traffic enforcement alongside infrastructure improvements.

Mr. Long responded that the School Access Plan was intended to develop strategies specifically for caregivers and students who needed to take long distance trips. He shared that SFMTA's Safe Routes to Schools program was designed to help students who lived close enough to school to walk and bike.

Crysta Highfield, SFMTA Safe Routes to School Program Coordinator, shared that the Safe Routes to School did have a mode shift goal, and that for kindergarten through 5<sup>th</sup> grade students, the program defined walkable trips as shorter than a half-mile. Ms. Highfield added that the Safe Routes to Schools program assessed trip distance and data about how students arrived at school when prioritizing schools for walking, biking, transit, and carpool programming.

CAC Member Rozell disclosed that he worked on Safe Routes to School programming in his professional capacity.

CAC Chair Ortiz asked for clarification about the shuttle strategy.

Mr. Long shared that the report defined three implementation pathways for the shuttles strategy. The first involved expanding SFUSD's existing yellow school bus program. The report also recommended that the Department of Children, Youth, and their Families fund non-profits to provide transportation to aftercare activities. The third pathway recommended that service plans for neighborhood shuttles that were already being scoped and piloted include trips for youth within their service plans.

Chair Ortiz commented that SFUSD managed yellow school bus service, not the Transportation Authority, and that the budget for the program was approximately \$30 million annually. He asked what the Transportation Authority's role would be.

Mr. Long responded that yellow school buses were expensive to operate and that this was a national problem. He shared that there was renewed interest at the state level to fund school transportation including legislation which passed during the previous legislative session which reimbursed school districts a portion of their operating expenses for home to school transportation. He shared that part of the report's recommendation involved working with SFUSD to ensure San Francisco was pursuing all funding opportunities as they arose. Another part of the recommendation was to quantify the need for yellow school bus services to help the city advocate for increased funding.

Chair Ortiz shared that he would like to see MTAP expansion moved from a tier 2 strategy to a core plan recommendation, especially within sensitive communities. He also shared that without consistent transit service, transit training and transportation coordinator strategies may be ineffective. He asked to keep root causes in mind and for more details about the pilots being considered.

Mr. Long shared that the School Access Plan recommended two implementation pathways for transportation coordinators. The first was through SFUSD's Educational



Placement Center where counselors worked with families enrolling in school for the first time. The second implementation pathway recommended that the transportation coordinator role be piloted at a Beacon School, which is a school that had implemented San Francisco's Community Schools model. Mr. Long shared that a variety of responsibilities could be included in the transportation coordinator role which extended beyond transit including sharing information about the existing transportation network, helping to enroll caregivers in existing programs, and organizing walkpools, buspools, and carpools.

Chair Ortiz asked for clarification about how the role could be staffed. Mr. Long shared that the pilot role could be funded by the Department of Children Youth, and their Families. He shared that the position could be new position or could be incorporated into the job description of an existing role at a Beacon site. Chair Ortiz recommended that transportation coordinator responsibilities be incorporated into the job description of the existing role as organizations are already trusted within the communities they serve.

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

Chair Ortiz opened the motion for discussion and requested an update for the CAC on plan implementation.

Chief Deputy Director Lombardo replied that there may be a good opportunity in the next several months when the Prop L 5-Year Prioritization Programs come before the CAC.

Chair Ortiz suggested an update in 3-6 months.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Daniels, Davidson, Ho, Levine, Ortega, and Siegal (6)

Nays: CAC Members Barz (1)

Absent: CAC Member Chen (1)

Abstain: CAC Members Ortiz and Rozell (2)

**8. Vision Zero: San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Active Communities Plan – INFORMATION\***

Christopher Kidd, SFMTA Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Rozell stated that he was involved in the Active Communities Plan in his role at the Tenderloin Community Benefit District and abstained from the discussion.

Member Levine asked if there were regulations as to what types of devices could be used in bike lanes.

Mr. Kidd responded that there were existing regulations on lane usage by electric bicycles based on the maximum speed they could achieve. He stated that mopeds were not legal in bike lanes and that many emerging mobility devices, such as electric skateboards, one wheels, and hoverboards, were in a gray area when it came to regulation. He noted that, in designing and implementing the active transportation network, the SFMTA sought to prioritize its most vulnerable users. He stated that



SFMTA was working with the Mayor's Office on Disability to design bicycle facilities with disabled people and users in mind.

Member Levine suggested SFMTA run a public education campaign about appropriate bike lane usage by different mobility devices.

Mr. Kidd thanked Member Levine for the recommendation and stated that SFMTA potentially could pursue such a campaign as a programmatic component of the plan.

Member Daniels asked how community partners from Equity Priority Communities had been chosen and requested that staff seek more partnerships in District 10, as they only had one partnership.

Mr. Kidd responded that the community partners involved in the plan were chosen in 2019 when SFMTA was applying for a Caltrans grant for the project, and that they had been brought onto the project as sub-applicants with the ability to shape the project's scope of work. He stated that they were chosen because they had the capacity and interest to participate. He stated that SFMTA was interested in working with other partners and wanted to ensure there was broad representation in the plan. He stated that SFMTA also wanted to ensure there were opportunities to engage with District 10. He added that they would be present at Bayview Sunday Streets and at the Juneteenth celebration.

Vice Chair Siegal asked if there was an explicit definition of a network based on safe and comfortable connectivity between neighborhoods.

Mr. Kidd responded that SFMTA was working to develop specific network metrics in an iterative process so that public input could influence future outcomes. He stated that there were a lot of existing plans and policies that prioritized comfortable networks and advanced mode shift and safety goals. He added that SFMTA wanted to use those existing frameworks to develop network recommendations in the Active Communities Plan. He said that the purpose of network connectivity analysis would be to hold the plan's recommendations accountable for improving access.

Member Ortega expressed appreciation for the large number of outreach activities SFMTA had planned but noted that no events had been planned for the Castro and Noe Valley until after June. She stated that she wanted to make sure at least one outreach event was in District 8 before then.

Mr. Kidd responded that SFMTA staff had been at the Castro farmers' market in early April. He stated that SFMTA wanted to ensure representation from each District in each phase of the plan's development, and requested recommendations from Member Ortega on additional organizations or events that could provide engagement opportunities.

Member Ho thanked Member Daniels for her question about equity and asked why just one Chinese language partner had been chosen, rather than several across the city.

Mr. Kidd responded that this decision had to do with Caltrans's definition of disadvantaged communities, which was more limited than the City's definition and therefore limited qualifying neighborhoods. He explained that SFMTA had chosen partnerships with groups that fell within Caltrans's definition of disadvantaged communities to be more competitive for the grant. He expressed his understanding



that there was a need to include Chinese language partnerships in the plan's development and stated that SFMTA had worked with Community Youth Center (CYC) and Chinatown Community Development Center (CCDC). as

There was no public comment.

**9. Vision Zero: Speed Management Update – INFORMATION\***

Uyen Ngo, SFMTA Vision Zero Acting Program Manager and Education Lead, presented the item per staff memorandum.

Member Ortega asked that the next update include information on the impact of lower speed limits on bus service and other traffic, and on privacy concerns surrounding automated speed cameras.

Vice Chair Siegal thanked staff for the presentation and noted that the data had shown that 20 mile per hour treatments had not resulted in significantly lower speed, and that those corridors where speeds were below 20 miles per hour had already been so before treatment. She encouraged SFMTA to avoid updating signage without updating infrastructure as it did not appear to be a worthwhile investment.

Member Rozell concurred with Vice Chair Siegal and stated that reducing speeds required infrastructure changes. He stated that the Tenderloin had piloted the 20 mile per hour program and saw some changes, but that infrastructural changes were needed on corridors that had not improved.

Member Davidson stated her understanding that action from the state legislature was needed before speed cameras and speed governors could be used, and asked if SFMTA had a plan for addressing sideshows in the meantime. She stated that there had been evidence of sideshows taking place throughout Ingleside and District 11, particularly on flatter blocks, and even in the middle of the day when people were out walking and bicycling. She asked if there was infrastructure that could be used to address this issue while enforcement capabilities were limited.

Ms. Ngo responded that SFMTA was aware of the sideshow problem and that she would check with staff about specific deterrence features installed in the past year.

Member Davidson stated that it was generally assumed that sideshows took place mostly in the Mission but stressed that they occurred in District 11 as well.

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, noted that Transportation Authority had recently funded a Neighborhood Transportation Program (NTP) project in District 6 to deter sideshow activities at freeway off-ramp areas with Botts' dots [raised yellow pavement markers] and rubber bumps.

Member Ortiz suggested that the Community Advisory Committee might benefit from a future presentation on the District 6 sideshow deterrence project, or could reach out to staff about it.

There was no public comment.

**10. Vision Zero: 2022 Traffic Fatality Report - INFORMATION\***

Iris Tsui, SFDPH Senior Epidemiologist, presented the item per staff memorandum.

Member Rozell asked if there was data on how many hit and run incidents were





related to the open-air drug market.

Ms. Tsui responded that hit and run data would be included in the 2022 final report, which would hopefully be released in early May, as it was currently under final review by Department of Public Health leadership.

Vice Chair Siegal thanked staff for the presentation and stated that the numbers were disappointing. She stated that the number of pedestrian fatalities was shocking. She asked if SFMTA was on track to fulfill their commitment to daylight all intersections on the High Injury Network by 2024.

Ms. Ngo responded that 100% of the 2017 High Injury Network had been daylighted, and that SFMTA was now working on daylighting the entirety of the 2022 High Injury Network.

Member Barz asked if it would be accurate to say that there had been a significant increase in traffic fatalities across the country.

Ms. Tsui responded in the affirmative and stated that fatalities had reached record highs during the pandemic. She stated that a slide in the presentation had been intended to compare the current fatalities with pre-pandemic numbers and didn't show the record highs during the pandemic.

Member Barz asked if San Francisco could employ strategies used by San Diego or San Jose, as those cities had fewer fatalities than San Francisco.

Ms. Tsui responded that information on other cities' strategies was not necessarily as available as San Francisco's. She stated that other cities also exhibited differences in pedestrian exposure to traffic dangers, as San Jose, for example, had higher fatalities among people in motor vehicles than among pedestrians, which differed from San Francisco.

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that he'd seen a Vision Zero report some years ago and had read police summaries of a few collisions, including one in which a person had been in the street on Van Ness Avenue in front of City Hall, and another in which somebody had climbed atop a gasoline truck and fallen off. He asked if there would be a report released regarding the causes of traffic deaths and asked if vehicle types involved in traffic fatalities were tracked. He stated that the new styles of pickup trucks made it so that the driver's view of the road was impaired. Mr. Mason stated that when he approached an intersection while walking, he stopped and looked in all four directions before crossing. He said that this behavior had resulted in drivers stopping for him to cross. Finally, he noted that he saw many people walking with their smartphones and not paying attention and asked if this behavior was addressed in the report.

Vice Chair Siegal asked if vehicle types involved in traffic fatalities were tracked.

Ms. Tsui responded in the affirmative and stated that the data would be reported in categories including small, large, and commercial vehicles, light rail vehicles, and others.

#### **11. TNCs 2020: A Profile of Ride-Hailing in California - INFORMATION\***

Item 11 was continued to the May 24<sup>th</sup> CAC meeting.



**12. Preliminary Fiscal Year 2023/24 Budget and Work Program - INFORMATION\***

Lily Yu, Principal Management Analyst, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Vice Chair Siegal commented that it was a helpful presentation on the current financial state and a good look ahead at funding requests that would come before the CAC.

Chair Ortiz said that he was excited to see a Mission community based transportation plan as a part of the presentation.

During public comment, Ed Mason stated that he saw a SFMTA presentation where he learned that taxpayer funds were being used to monitor TNCs. He questioned why public money was funding this and not the companies themselves. He then stated that the Yerba Buena Island developers were making big money but it was public money that paid to expand the roadways.

Roland Lebrun commented on the Bayview Caltrain station study and commented that in the Executive Director's performance objectives, under item 26 from Resolution 23-24, it states that the Executive Director would allocate tax funds to improve bi-county transportation around the US 101 corridor among other things. Mr. Lebrun stressed the importance of this work to the CAC.

## **Other Items**

**13. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION**

Member Levine requested a Caltrain electrification project update that included a report out on how construction work was impacting train service. He mentioned that he had heard that the train schedule was erratic due to construction.

Vice Chair Siegal requested an estimate from SFMTA for how much it would cost to daylight every intersection in the city. She also requested an explainer on the rule making bodies and regulators for TNCs.

Member Rozell requested information on the requirements for subcontractors to meet ADA requirements. He referenced that there were issues with the curb ramps along the Safer Taylor Street project.

Member Ortega requested information on how SFMTA rolled out their planned [rail] maintenance schedule noting the lack of notification about planned maintenance even when boarding at a stop.

Member Davidson requested a discussion on traffic enforcement, specifically reckless driving, and what tools were available.

Member Ho echoed Member Ortega's comments and requested information on how SFMTA does outreach and why their signage and notifications were limited. He noted he only found out about some Muni maintenance work impacting the rail schedules via a non-Muni app on his phone.

Chair Ortiz requested an update on the Potrero Yard project and the Yerba Buena Island/ Treasure Island mobility plan, particularly for all the available modes of transit on the island.



Member Barz requested an update on the status of the current CAC requested items.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun gave an update on the Caltrain electrification and stated that Caltrain had failed the short current test in November due to a mistake in the wiring between San Jose and San Francisco. He also explained that Caltrain would be requesting funding for additional trains because they had a federal mandate to increase seating. He stated that he would be sending the CAC a letter with more information.

#### **14. Public Comment**

During public comment, Ed Mason requested that CAC members speak directly into the microphones. He then stated that he read an article about how Google was looking to reduce expenses and discovered there was only one person on a commuter bus. Mr. Mason proposed that with that being the case, Google was a net generator of pollution and ridership should be shifted to Caltrain.

Roland Lebrun thanked the Transportation Authority for switching CAC meetings to Zoom and posting recordings to YouTube. He then asked that CAC meetings be livestreamed on YouTube as this would allow him to cast meetings onto a larger screen.

Chair Ortiz asked when the CAC would be receiving a presentation on corporate commuter buses.

Clerk Saunders responded that the Transportation Authority had a presentation scheduled for the May CAC meeting.

Member Levine commented that if the City could monitor the autonomous vehicles as closely as they do, they could do the same for corporate commuter buses and that they should put their priorities somewhere else.

Member Rozell requested that a map of where corporate commuter buses could and could not be used.

Chair Ortiz asked whether corporate commuter buses could use SFMTA bus stops.

Chief Deputy Director Lombardo clarified that commuter buses could use some SFMTA bus stops if they did participate in the program.

Chair Ortiz asked for that to be included in the map as well.

#### **15. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.