



MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, May 24, 2023

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Ortiz called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

CAC members present at Roll: Sara Barz, Rosa Chen, Najuawanda Daniels, Mariko Davidson, Sean Kim, Jerry Levine, Rachael Ortega, Kevin Ortiz, Eric Rozell, and Kat Siegal (10)

CAC Member Absent at Roll: Calvin Ho (1)

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Ortiz reported that outreach was conducted for the District 1 Multimodal Transportation Study through June and that a multilingual survey was available on the project website. Next, Chair Ortiz announced that the Transportation Authority was conducting outreach for Prop L implementation and project prioritization, noting that there was a multilingual survey available online until June 30th and a virtual Town Hall on June 20th. Finally, Chair Ortiz welcomed Sean Kim to the CAC as the new District 1 representative.

Member Kim introduced himself, stating that he was a small business owner, originally from South Korea, who used multiple modes of transportation to get his family around the Richmond district and the city at large.

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

3. Approve the Minutes of the April 26, 2023 Meeting - ACTION

4. Internal Accounting Report, Investment Report, and Debt Expenditure Report for the Nine Months Ending March 31, 2023 - INFORMATION*

5. State and Federal Legislation Update - INFORMATION*

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

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

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Chen, Daniels, Davidson, Kim, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, Rozell and Siegal (10)

Absent: CAC Member Ho (1)



End of Consent Agenda

6. **Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the Ocean Avenue Mobility Action Plan [NTIP Planning] – ACTION***

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

Member Barz stated that she was a member of the task force and supported the plans but wished that the infrastructure recommendations would have gone farther.

Member Davidson stated that she and her family used the corridor frequently and it was great to see improvements. She echoed Member Barz's comments about there being a need for more robust infrastructure and stated that as a cyclist she wanted to see more protected bike lanes, especially on arterial roads.

Member Rozell stated that he would like more information on why the plan proposes the sharrows and asked what wayfinding was incorporated in the project. He stated that the mix of lane styles could be confusing so there needed to be very visible wayfinding.

Mx. Paz responded that way finding would be a part of the next phase of detailed design.

Member Rozell stated that he liked the idea of mountable curbs but that he believed that wayfinding should be included in the first phase.

Vice Chair Siegal echoed the comments of the other members and asked if daylighting was recommended for all the project intersections.

Mx. Paz responded that the plan appendix lists which recommendations were made for each intersection and that daylighting was recommended for most of the intersections.

Vice Chair Siegal asked why daylighting was not recommended for all the intersections.

Mx. Paz responded that there were certain intersections limited by design concerns.

Member Ortega asked if the study had considered removing cars from the K train lane.

Michael Rhodes, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), responded that they had evaluated that possibility, but it was not ultimately recommended.

During public comment, Paula Katz stated that train stops should not be removed along the K-line. She stated that it would create a hardship for seniors, riders with disabilities, and other mobility issues. She pointed out that the SFMTA surveys only asked if the respondent was ok with stop removals, not if they were ok with making seniors and those with mobility challenges walk further.

Alyssa Chung stated that she was supportive of the recommendations but was concerned about the lack of protected bike lanes and inadequate traffic calming. She stated that her family bikes down Holloway Avenue frequently and she has had a few close calls. She stated that there needed to be more robust infrastructure improvements to protect cyclists and pedestrians.



Justin stated that he bikes down Holloway but did not often see other bikers. He supported better bike infrastructure and hoped that it would lead to more people feeling comfortable biking.

Chair Ortiz asked how many bus stops would be removed.

Michael Rhodes stated that they recommended removing one at the intersection of Westgate and Cerritos because the island was shorter than the train car and because the street was curved, the island could not be lengthened.

Chair Ortiz asked how close the next nearest train stop was.

Mr. Rhodes stated that it was at Aptos Middle School, a short block away.

Chair Ortiz asked if it would be possible to move the Westgate stop up one block.

Mr. Rhodes responded that they could look into that and they would need to consider the geometry. He stated that SFMTA would be doing community outreach as a part of the final stop removal proposal and that those results would be shared with senior leadership.

Member Barz asked what was the limitation on dedicated bike lanes on Holloway.

Mx. Paz stated that some blocks of Holloway had many driveways that make protected bikeways difficult to install. They also explained that some blocks of Holloway have existing curb extensions / rain gardens which would need to be removed in order to add bi-directional separated bike lanes.

Member Barz asked about whether traffic calming could still be considered, such as whether Holloway could become a neighborway in the future.

Mx. Paz stated that this was correct.

Member Barz asked whether this recommendation could be added to the report.

Rachel Hiatt, Deputy Director for Planning, responded that SFMTA could describe how new neighborways would be designated. She added that in order to change the recommendations in the report, the Task Force should weigh in, to respect the process of the Task Force making the study recommendations.

Member Barz moved to approve the item, seconded by Member Davidson.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Chen, Davidson, Kim, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, Rozell and Siegal (10)

Abstain: CAC Member Daniels (1)

Absent: CAC Member Ho (1)

7. TNCs 2020: A Profile of Ride Hailing in California – INFORMATION*

Joe Castiglione, Deputy Director for Technology, Data, and Analysis, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Rozell stated that he was concerned with the accuracy of the reported data and asked how the TNCs could be held accountable.



Mr. Castiglione responded that the report was meant to shine a light on the data and that the lack of integrity of the data was surprising. He added that one of the ways the Transportation Authority could do that was by engaging with the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and that both the Transportation Authority and SFMTA had flagged these issues for the CPUC over a year ago.

Member Levine echoed Member Rozell's comments and stated that the data was unacceptable and not very useful. He stated that he was especially concerned with the public safety data and that data needed to be consistent and accurate.

Chair Ortiz asked about Prop D tax revenue.

Mr. Castiglione responded that using the data to understand Prop D revenue posed some challenges because a lot of the information that was reported by the CPUC had been redacted and that made it hard to audit tax revenue collection.

Deputy Director LaForte added that Prop D was a per trip tax and that data was extremely limited as far as who paid what. She emphasized that this was one reason why this report was so important.

Member Levine asked when the next report would be.

Director Castiglione stated when unreacted data becomes available, the Transportation Authority would provide an update.

Chair Ortiz asked whether San Francisco had joined with Los Angeles and San Diego to advocate against TNCs to the CPUC.

Director Castiglione responded that the Transportation Authority worked mostly with SFMTA and the Mayor's office to coordinate on TNC issues. He stated that while other cities have not been as active as San Francisco, they are involved.

Member Davidson asked if there was any talk of penalizing companies for withholding data. She asked if there was any standardized reporting or definitions.

Mr. Castiglione replied that there have been discussions about potential actions regarding potential penalties, but that ultimately that was the discretion of the Commissioners.

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that this was a result of the culture of convenience and that TNCs were having a negative economic and climatic effect.

8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the Proposed Fiscal Year 2023/24 Budget and Work Program – ACTION*

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

There was no public comment.

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, Kim, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, Rozell and Siegal (10)

Absent: CAC Member Ho (1)



9. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the Octavia Improvements Study Final Report [NTIP Planning] - ACTION*

Rachel Hiatt, Deputy Director for Planning, presented the item per staff memorandum.

Vice Chair Siegal stated that she was generally supportive of the report recommendations but would like to see more robust infrastructure improvements including pedestrian bulb outs at every intersection along Oak and Fell Streets. She also stated that she wanted more aggressive intersection treatments to meter traffic. She asked why raised sidewalks were generally limited to side streets and not on the Boulevard.

Case Hildreth, SFMTA, responded that they would get pushback both internally and from the San Francisco Fire Department as raised sidewalks created a challenge for them on multi-lane streets with high volumes of vehicles. He said SFMTA planned to pilot raised sidewalks in the Tenderloin and would evaluate the results.

Vice Chair Siegal asked why the signals cannot be timed across Octavia Street.

Casey Hildreth responded that it was tricky because it would lead vehicles to get backed up and have to wait longer. It was assumed that this would cause driver frustration leading to increased bad driving behavior. He stated that the intersection of Market and Octavia was the bottleneck and any changes to signal timing would require a ripple effect of needed signal changes stretching all the way to downtown.

Vice Chair Siegal expressed support for the recommendation to study a dedicated HOV/transit lane on Oak, and asked why the lane would end at the Wiggle and whether it could be extended further along Oak.

Deputy Director Hiatt responded that SFMTA was installing a Quickbuild project on Oak Street west of the Wiggle that would mirror the protected bike lane on Fell Street.

Member Ortega supported the proposed regional transit hub at Civic Center as she believed the city needed more transit centers outside of the Downtown.

Member Kim stated that he had a different view from some of the members. He explained that small businesses owners need to drive to locations like the south bay and produce market or have vendors from the south bay travel to businesses, and that they use Octavia Boulevard for these trips, along with other cross town routes such as 19th Avenue. He stated that the traffic calming recommendation for the Octavia side streets is a better balance between the needs of safety and the need for traffic flow.

Member Barz asked for clarification about the regional bus network recommendation.

Deputy Director Hiatt responded that SamTrans conducted an Express Bus Feasibility Study pre pandemic which recommended routes serving the west side of San Francisco, but those routes were not being implemented because of the financial impacts of the pandemic on transit. Ms. Hiatt explained that the recommendation for regional express bus planning would include revising that study for post pandemic conditions.

There was no public comment.

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



The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Chen, Daniels, Davidson, Kim, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, Rozell and Siegal (10)

Absent: CAC Member Ho (1)

10. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the Prop L Strategic Plan Baseline - ACTION*

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

Member Kim expressed that as a new member, he was unsure of what specifically to ask and requested a general explanation for a beginner.

Ms. LaForte acknowledged that the item was complicated and went on to explain that Prop L passed in November and superseded Prop K. She stated that the last of the Prop K allocations were allocated in March and that the Transportation Authority was developing the Strategic Plan and 5-Year Prioritization Programs (5YPPs) in order to implement Prop L. She remarked that these documents were how the Transportation Authority manages the program on a financial basis and provides transparency to the Board and the public. She also noted that agencies would still need to request allocation of funds from the Board later on, but that programming status was very important.

Vice Chair Siegal commented that she would like to see the Strategic Plan specifically call out and prioritize Vision Zero projects given the number of fatalities last year and the upcoming deadline.

Member Barz asked if each Prop L programs' share of revenue was set in the ballot measure.

Ms. LaForte confirmed that was correct.

Member Barz asked how the new project delivery oversight guidelines were taking shape.

Ms. LaForte responded that the Transportation Authority has had project delivery oversight guidelines on a [major capital] projects on a project basis and anticipated basing the new guidelines on what the Transportation Authority has been doing in order to oversee that a given project is advancing according to scope, schedule, budget, and funding plan.

Member Barz commented that the new guidelines sound like an evolution of existing guidelines and asked if the intent was to avoid projects taking a long time and ballooning in cost.

Ms. LaForte replied that those were things that the Transportation Authority hoped to achieve with these guidelines. She continued that the Transportation Authority felt that if it was funding projects, it should be engaged in oversight and even if pitfalls could not be avoided, they could at least be assessed, risk could be managed, and the CAC and Board could be kept aware.



Member Rozell echoed Vice Chair Siegal's earlier comment and emphasized a desire to expedite the Vision Zero mission.

Chair Ortiz asked for further detail on the BART Core Capacity rail car replacement contract.

Ms. LaForte replied that the contract was for expansion vehicles and that the Transportation Authority was working closely with funding partners as part of a larger conversation.

Chair Ortiz opined that BART district counties should identify warehouse space so that BART could assemble and manufacture its own cars to save time and resources.

During public comment, Edward Mason remarked that given the context of multiple store closures recently, it would be a challenge to maintain revenue. He expressed concern about the instruments used to generate investment income considering interest rates and pointed to Silicon Valley Bank as an example. He referenced the Central Subway project's change orders and cost overruns and wondered if there was a need for an Auditor General, or if that was something the Transportation Authority could take on, similar to the Valley Transportation Authority.

Roland Lebrun commented that BART cars were being manufactured in the East Bay already. He said he thought it would be great if the CAC would advocate for the manufacture of high-speed trains at the same factory. He stated that as far as mega-projects go, he believed Central Subway went well. He said that the Valley Transportation Authority was being audited by the State of California and that results were scheduled to be published in October. He said the Federal government would be next.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Davidson and Ho (2)

11. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt Guidance for Development of the 2023 Prop L 5-Year Prioritization Programs - ACITON*

Mike Pickford, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Ortega asked how major projects like Central Subway were funded.

Mr. Pickford replied that larger projects tended to have more complex funding plans and that locally controlled funding sources like the Prop L sales tax were helpful for matching outside funding sources including state and federal grants. He said that funding large projects was often a process of packaging multiple funding sources together.

Member Kim asked about the status of the District 1 Mobility Study and the 19th Avenue Subway Study and whether those projects would be included in 5YPPs.



Mr. Pickford replied that the District 1 Mobility Study was funded through the Prop K Neighborhood Program. He said that Prop L Expenditure Plan included a dedicated program for the Neighborhood Transportation Program and that staff expected to recommend \$700,000 in funding for each district in that program over the coming five years, which would be the same as the prior five years. Mr. Pickford said that this item was outlining the process through which individual projects would be selected to be included in 5YPPs, adding that the item before the CAC did not identify individual projects yet.

Anna LaForte replied that recommendations coming out of neighborhood plans, such as the District 1 Mobility Study or the District 5 or District 7 studies that were considered earlier in the meeting would potentially be eligible for Prop L funding. She said that Prop L Neighborhood Transportation Program funds were intended to help with early phases of these projects, such as planning and design, to help them compete for larger grant sources and that Prop L could provide matching funds.

Ms. LaForte said other programs such as Muni Metro Core Capacity would help projects advance to compete for big money at the federal level. She said that the Portal/Downtown Rail Extension (DTX) project was competing for funds from the Federal Capital Investment Grant Program. She said it was important to put local funds on DTX to demonstrate local commitment and qualify the project for \$3.3 billion from the federal government.

Chair Ortiz expressed concern that the Neighborhood Transportation Program and Equity Priority Transportation Program were toward the bottom of the list of 28 programs in Prop L and that that did not demonstrate a commitment to those programs. He said that focusing on the neighborhoods and interconnecting them with transportation would really help bring back a lot of trust.

Chair Ortiz also recommended conducting some in-person town halls, in addition to the planned virtual town hall. He suggested working and partnering with community-based organizations in equity priority communities, especially Chinatown, the Mission, and Bayview. He suggested working with partners who had previously been involved in community-based transportation plans and that had a preexisting network to plug into.

Chair Ortiz also said that it was a problem that BART was outsourcing developing and manufacturing rail cars rather than doing that work in house. He said he would like to prioritize potentially looking at a project to manufacture rail cars.

Mr. Pickford replied that the Expenditure Plan programs were not in priority order and that the Expenditure Plan established the proportion of funds for each program, so they do not compete with one another.

Mr. Pickford said that staff were available to present on Prop L to community-based organizations at their meetings. He asked if CAC members had suggestions for organizations with upcoming meetings that may be interested in receiving a presentation.

Ms. LaForte said that the Transportation Authority sent out an email to community-based organizations regarding rescheduling the town hall to June 20th from 6pm to 7pm and notifying them that the online survey had been extended through the end of June.



During public comment, Roland Lebrun said that BART cars would be maintained at the Hayward facility. He said that there would be a massive maintenance facility just north of Diridon Station. He said that he wanted to echo Ms. LaForte's comments about the importance of local match funding for DTX. He said regarding the Development Oriented Transportation program that there would need to be more of that type of investment. He said that intermodal planning was important for areas like the boundary between San Francisco and San Mateo counties near Candlestick Point. He said that this area would have 20,000 jobs and 10,000 housing units and that we need to make transportation work with this development. He said that developers would pay for most of the infrastructure.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Chen, Kim, Levine, Ortega, Ortiz, Rozell and Siegal
(8)

Absent: CAC Members Daniels, Davidson, and Ho (3)

12. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Commuter Shuttle Bus Program - INFORMATION*

Phillip Cranna, SFMTA Enforcement and Legal Affairs Manager, and Danny Yeung, Permits and Administration Acting Manager, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Levine stated that he was worried about the large number of unlicensed or unpermitted vehicles on the streets. He stated that the information that was publicly reported did not seem to go anywhere. He stated that enforcement of these violations needed to be stepped up, especially as commuter bus ridership plummeted but the buses still blocked traffic.

Mr. Cranna responded that SFMTA had a staffing shortage but had explored shifting taxi investigators over to monitor commuter shuttle buses.

Mr. Yeung stated that there was a wide range and variety of shuttle buses, so it was not accurate to think of the commuter shuttle bus operators as all the same.

Member Levine stated that based on the feedback that the CAC had heard from members of the public, there needed to be more enforcement.

Mr. Yeung stated that the program was voluntary and not all commuter shuttle bus companies participated, for example casino and tour buses. He stated that SFMTA only controlled the local shuttle stops.

Member Rozell expressed similar concerns about the number of unpermitted buses that have been reported. He stated that he would like forced participation in the program. He asked if there was any relationship between the number of commuter buses on a street and it being included in the high injury network.

Vice Chair Siegal questioned if the program was limited to cost recovery or if it could generate revenue.



Mr. Yeung responded that a state mandate limited the program to cost recovery, including staff time, but ultimately did not give them much power.

Vice Chair Siegal asked what the basis for the state mandate was.

Mr. Cranna stated that it was Proposition 26 that limited the program to cost recovery.

Mr. Yeung elaborated that the law stated that agencies cannot impose or raise a tax without voter approval.

Chair Ortiz asked for clarification about the difference between a parking violation and an administrative violation of the program permit terms.

Mr. Cranna stated that as a requirement of companies getting a permit is that they abide by the program rules and if they violate those rules their permit can be revoked.

Chair Ortiz followed up and asked if SFMTA could set its own fines amount.

Mr. Cranna stated that the maximum amount was \$1,000.

Chair Ortiz asked if we could enforce the \$1,000 fine for every double-parking violation.

Mr. Cranna stated that there was a matrix which guided how SFMTA set fine amounts and often it was hard to tell exactly what the violation was.

Mr. Yeung stated that most of the participants in the program abided by the rules.

Chair Ortiz stated that there needed to be more deterrence of bad commuter shuttle bus behavior.

Mr Cranna stated that SFMTA had done what it could with its resources but unfortunately moving violations required the police to catch buses in the act.

Member Rozell stated that scooters had technology that indicated when they were being ridden on the sidewalk and concluded that buses could have a similar set up.

During public comment Edward Mason stated that commuter shuttle buses began to appear around 20 years ago and there was no environmental impact report. He stated that Parking Control Officers enforcement was down in recent years.

Paula Katz stated that the commuter shuttle bus companies should be assessed a tax to operate in the city. She stated that the buses did not help most people and that they symbolized the culture of convenience.

Kevin Wallace stated that technology companies came in the city 10 years ago as carpet bagger who just wanted to make money. He stated that he observed the rules broken every day and that there needed to be more enforcement.

Chair Ortiz asked why commuter shuttle buses were not regulated similar to taxis.

Mr. Cranna responded that the commuter shuttle buses fell under the CPUC's jurisdiction, so SFMTA did not have the authority to regulate and that was why the program was voluntary.

Member Levine stated that the City should develop more control over the commuter shuttle buses.



Other Items

13. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

Member Barz stated that the San Francisco Chronicle published a story about SFMTA's lack of traffic enforcement. She asked what was SFMTA's strategy for traffic enforcement, how they prioritized for safety, and how they chose their routes.

Member Rozell echoed Member Barz's comments and specified that there should be a focus on enforcement of the five most deadly traffic violations. He then reiterated his previous request for information on the requirements of sub-contractors to meet ADA compliance. He stated anecdotally that he had seen multiple instances of ADA ramps being out of compliance.

Vice Chair Siegal asked for a breakdown of how much SFMTA and SFPD spent on traffic enforcement and how they worked together.

Chair Ortiz asked for a report on how many crosswalks had been daylighted in equity priority communities. He requested representative from Assemblymember Ting's and Senator Wiener's offices present to the CAC about what their offices were doing about traffic enforcement and the transit fiscal cliff.

Member Rozell requested a presentation from SFMTA and more information on the plans to extend the hours of parking meters.

Member Ortega echoed Member Rozell's comments and asked what the reasoning behind the expansion was.

Vice Chair Siegal requested a data report on the speed reductions in the Tenderloin.

Member Kim requested information on SFMTA's future plans for parking enforcement.

Member Barz asked for information on how transit would be funded if there was no state bailout. She stated that while the decision was still pending, Assemblymember Ting's advocacy was not adequate and the Assembly needed to pass a new budget that included more funding for transit.

Member Rozell requested information about traffic enforcement in relation to the High Injury Network.

Chair Ortiz requested that Assemblymember Ting and Senator Weiner appear before the Transportation Authority Board to discuss the transit fiscal cliff.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated that it may be appropriate to start having two CAC meetings a month.

14. Public Comment

During public comment, Ed Mason stated that commuter shuttle buses had clogged streets and damaged the environment but the fees the companies paid did not cover those costs. He stated that SFMTA was losing potential revenue and that the cost were passed on to the taxpayers. He closed by saying that ridership was down and commuter bus companies should be assessed a taxi medallion fee of \$250,000 to operate.

Paula Katz stated that she appreciated the timer that showed how much time callers



had remaining to make their comment.

Roland Lebrun requested that Clerk Saunders show a video about the Bayshore Caltrain station and its lack of intermodal connections to other transit operators.

15. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:36 p.m.