



# DRAFT MINUTES

## Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, July 26, 2023

### 1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

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

CAC members present at Roll: Rosa Chen, Najuawanda Daniels, Sean Kim, Jerry Levine, Rachael Ortega, and Kevin Ortiz (6)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Sara Barz, Mariko Davidson (entered during item 6), Eric Rozell and Kat Siegal (4)

### 2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Ortiz reported that the California Transportation Commission approved \$5 million in one-time Local Partnership Program (LPP) incentive funds to award San Francisco for passing Prop L in November 2022. These funds, along with an additional \$3.44 million in San Francisco's LPP Formula funds, will be available to the Transportation Authority for allocation and programming through June 30, 2026.

Next, Chair Ortiz announced that to help inform the development of their Active Communities Plan, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency was partnering with local organizations to host a series of bike rides around the city and more information about specific rides could be found on the program website. Chair Ortiz announced that SFMTA also planned to add eight additional red-light cameras across Districts 2, 5 and 6. Finally, Chair Ortiz announced that Calvin Ho had stepped down from the District 4 CAC seat and he thanked Mr. Ho for his service.

There was no public comment.

## Consent Agenda

### 3. Approve the Minutes of the June 28, 2023 Meeting - ACTION

### 4. Community Advisory Committee Vacancies - INFORMATION

### 5. Investment Report and Debt Expenditure Report for the Quarter Ended June 30, 2023 - INFORMATION\*

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

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

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Chen, Daniels, Kim, Levine, Ortega, and Ortiz (6)

Absent: CAC Members Barz, Davidson, Rozell, and Siegal (4)



## End of Consent Agenda

### 6. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Vision Zero Quick-Build Program Project Update – INFORMATION\*

Jen Wong, Vision Zero Quick-Build Program Manager, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked how much money had been allocated to the Vision Zero Quick-Build Program since its inception. He stated that the program was trying to compensate for a culture of disrespect for safety by building safety improvements. He asked if the SFMTA had considered trying to improve the cultural component of safety issues. He recommended two online publications that contained pertinent information on the topic of traffic safety, Smart Cities Dive and Route Fifty.

Roland Lebrun asked if the standard for pedestrian crossing timing was 1.5 feet per second, which he stated was the speed of mobility-impaired people.

During CAC member discussion, Member Ortega stated that she had read about mixed reception of the Valencia Street center-running bike lane pilot in a San Francisco Chronicle article. She stated that she had also heard from several of her friends that merging into the center-running bike lane felt unsafe. She asked how the safety of the merge could be improved. She stated that there were no-left-turn and no-U-turn signs posted on Valencia Street, but that they were not enforced. She asked what plans were in place to enforce the no-turn signs and ensure the functioning of the bike lane pilot.

Ms. Wong stated that the standard for pedestrian crossing timing was 3 feet per second, which allowed more crossing time than the previous standard of 3.5 feet per second. She noted that this standard was a general rule, and actual pedestrian crossing times occasionally varied to accommodate complex intersections. She stated that allocations to the Vision Zero Quick-Build program averaged about \$5,000,000 per year. She thanked Mr. Mason for recommending the online publications. She stated that the SFMTA's Slow Streets Mural Program added artwork to roadway pavement. She agreed with Mr. Mason's sentiment that improving the cultural component of safety issues was important.

Kimberly Leung, the project manager for the Valencia Street Bikeway Pilot project, stated that the center-running bike lane ran from 15<sup>th</sup> to 23<sup>rd</sup> street. She stated that bike signals had been installed on either end of the center-running lane on July 7, 2023, and were timed to first turn green to allow bikes to enter and exit the center-running lane, then red to stop the bikes, following which the traffic signals for cars would turn green for cars to enter the intersection. She stated that the SFMTA had been working with the SFPD since April, 2023, when the no-turn signs were installed. She noted that Parking Control Officers were working to handle the new parking and loading regulations introduced along Valencia Street.

Member Davidson expressed support for Member Ortega's comments on the Valencia Street Bikeway Pilot project. She stated that she regularly biked on Valencia Street, and that signage obstructing the bike lanes and lack of parking and driving enforcement made the bike lane dangerous. She asked how SFMTA would evaluate this pilot project. She expressed hope that Skyline Boulevard would get protected



bike and pedestrian infrastructure because it was a high-speed roadway. She expressed desire for a protected pedestrian and bike connection from District 11 to Lake Merced. She stated that the sidewalk connecting the two areas on Brotherhood Way was not useful in its current state.

Ms. Leung stated that signage remained in the center-running bike lane on Valencia Street because some work remained to be done along the corridor after the signals were finished, including the installation of new bollards and loading and parking signs. She stated that the SFMTA was working with the sign shop to complete the remaining work and remove the signs from the bike lane and hoped to be able to provide an update on this the following week.

Brian Liang, program manager for Livable Streets with SFMTA, stated that the SFMTA was developing educational materials for users of the Valencia Street Pilot which were being released throughout the summer, including visual content posted on social media and the SFMTA's project website and an educational video. He stated that the formal evaluation period of the Pilot had not yet begun because the Pilot had not officially started, but that the SFMTA had been receiving feedback on the project already and was working to resolve the issues.

Member Daniels stated that the introduction of autonomous vehicles had complicated the Valencia Street Pilot. She stated that the previous Saturday, she witnessed an autonomous vehicle respond to a bike exiting the center-running bike lane by attempting to pull out of the traffic lane, but then got stuck and blocked her exit from the parking lot, so she had to call 3-1-1 for help. She stated that the interaction of autonomous vehicles with the center-running bike lane would have to be considered. In regards to the quick-build projects on the Hunters Point Boulevard, Evans Avenue, and Innes Avenue corridors, and on Evans Avenue from Cesar Chavez Street to Third Street, she stated that she drove on these corridors frequently and didn't see a benefit from the projects. She asked what the data said about the success or unintended consequences of these projects.

Ms. Wong stated that the quick-builds on Evans Avenue and on the Hunters Point Boulevard, Evans Avenue, and Innes Avenue corridors were completed and that at least one of them was still being evaluated. She stated that she could share results from the Safe Streets Evaluation Program about these projects. She stated that the SFMTA was conducting outreach on the Hunters Point Boulevard, Evans Avenue, and Innes Avenue corridor to address the issues Member Daniels noted, and that it was possible adjustments could be made to the corridor as a result of this outreach.

Member Daniels asked that Ms. Wong send her the results of the evaluations for the quick build projects.

Ms. Wong agreed to do so.

Chair Ortiz asked about the status of completing safety treatments for the entire High Injury Network with quick-builds.

Ms. Wong stated that much of the remaining work would be completed with tools in the Quick-Build Toolkit, which had been developed to facilitate complete treatment of the High Injury Network. She stated that there were roughly 50 remaining untreated miles of the High Injury Network.



Chair Ortiz asked if the SFMTA was planning to complete treatment of the High Injury Network by the end of 2024, as was the goal.

Ms. Wong confirmed that was correct.

Chair Ortiz opined that this likely wouldn't happen.

Ms. Wong stated that the SFMTA was committed to prioritizing the completion of safety treatments on the entire High Injury Network and would dedicate the necessary resources to do so.

Chair Ortiz asked what standard the SFMTA employed for the length of daylighting zones on quick-build projects.

Ms. Wong stated that the length of daylighting zones varied by traffic speed and the width of streets, and that engineers used a formula to determine the appropriate length of a daylighting zone. She stated that as a general rule, daylighting zones were ten feet long for stop-controlled intersections and 20 feet long for signal-controlled intersections.

Chair Ortiz stated that he'd heard that some businesses were concerned about the quick-build project on 17<sup>th</sup> Street from Potrero to Pennsylvania avenues. He asked what approach the SFMTA was taking to do community outreach and address concerns from small businesses along the corridor, particularly at this critical moment in their economic recovery.

Ms. Wong stated that the 17<sup>th</sup> Street quick-build project team was engaging with businesses of all sizes to understand their needs for passenger loading and commercial deliveries. She stated that she could connect Chair Ortiz with the project managers so that they could share more about the engagement process of the project.

Chair Ortiz asked that Ms. Wong connect himself and Member Daniels with the project managers for the 17<sup>th</sup> Street quick build project. He asked that he be sent the formula used for determining the length of daylighting zones.

Member Kim asked what the standard evaluation period schedule was for quick-build projects.

Mr. Liang stated that the standard evaluation period started three months after project completion. He stated that data was not typically collected immediately following a project's completion to allow the street's users to adjust to the new configuration. He stated that some projects were evaluated immediately following completion, and some projects were evaluated over multiple periods.

Member Kim asked how long the standard evaluation period was, and how the evaluation findings were addressed.

Mr. Liang stated that the standard traffic data collection period was one to three days. He stated that a typical parking study consisted of occupancy counts for a 72-hour period, whereas vehicle speed and volume studies typically lasted 24 to 48 hours. He stated that following the evaluation period, SFMTA staff processed and cleaned the data to account for unusual circumstances like construction projects or street closures that may have affected it, then used the data to determine how well the quick build project was working and if any adjustments needed to be made.



Chair Ortiz asked that the SFMTA make the Transportation Authority staff and CAC members aware when the Valencia Street Pilot project was completed and when to expect evaluation results, as there was a lot of interest surrounding this project.

Ms. Leung confirmed that the SFMTA would do so.

**7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Accept the Transportation Capital Projects Delivery Study – ACTION\***

Yana Waldman, Deputy Director for Capital Projects, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

During public comment, Mr. Mason stated that the report does not mention anything about project management certification or project management professional designation. He questioned who would be running the program. He mentioned the Valley Transportation Authority hired an Inspection General for their major capital projects to bring a level of accountability and oversight.

Roland Lebrun stated that on Slide 13 of the presentation at the bottom where related projects were shown, the Link 21 crossing was missing. He said that crossing was a Transbay Joint Powers Authority legal mandate in Senate Bill 916, which was Regional Measure 2 [bridge toll measure]. Mr. Lebrun said they would have to take down a dozen buildings to build it. He expressed concern that no one was looking at this and said it needed to be addressed as a matter of urgency before the project could proceed.

During member discussion, Member Ortega noted she has done capital project work and requested further explanation about working on estimation and budgeting. She asked if the study looked at the bidding process during this study as she had found this to be an important piece in her own work. She stated that San Francisco did not have the best reputation of working with contractors and asked if the project team had talked to any contractors about how the bid process could be improved. Finally, Member Ortega noted the report seemed broad and a great first step, but strongly encouraged the Transportation Authority to pay extra attention to the details.

Ms. Waldman provided an example related to estimation noting there was a lot of concern about the low bid process. She explained that one benefit of doing better cost estimation up front was to have a stronger understanding of what the project estimate should be to support evaluation of low bids that may not match the engineer's estimate. Next, Ms. Waldman stated that there was not a section of the study where they spoke directly to the contractors; however, contractors were able to give feedback through the San Francisco Partnering Group that the study team worked with. Through this group, they heard that contractors wanted more efficient decision making. Ms. Waldman noted that when the report talked about partnership, it referred not just to City departments but to contractors, too. As an example, Ms. Waldman mentioned a partnering session for one of the Transportation Authority's projects which included contractors, the construction management team, the owners, and membership from almost all of the city departments that were going to be working on the project. That discussion was robust, and it was the first of many partnering sessions on that project.

Member Ortega expressed interest in continuing the discussion in further detail offline. She said she might send some written comments to staff after the meeting.



Member Kim inquired who the Capital Projects Management Office (CPMO) staff would be and if they would come from SFMTA or San Francisco Public Works or an independent organization.

Ms. Waldman responded that the current draft structure of the CPMO recommended in the report would be dedicated staff that would be under the City Administrator, so it would be a sub-group to the City Administrator's Office. There would be dedicated staff and support from City departments. They would also stand-up project offices on a case by case basis including specialists.. Those individuals would be qualified by city standards.

Member Kim spoke about the L Taraval Improvement Project where he said there were construction delays because departments were not organized and the street was closed for days. He asked who would be accountable for large projects that involved multiple departments. He asked if the study had looked at examples from other cities, states, or countries. He noted that the Central Subway took ten years to complete while other countries have completed similar projects in less time and with less money. He suggested they have a study for best practices not only limited to San Francisco, but best practices in the world.

Ms. Waldman referenced the long list of studies the project team reviewed which was listed at the back of the report and noted that it included reviews of studies outside of the region and outside of the country. She agreed that projects proceeded much faster in other areas and noted one of the leading challenges in the Bay Area was all of the different agencies and jurisdictions involved. She said that that was why one of the recommendations was to establish an efficient decision-making process so that when there was a decision that needed to be made, there was a clear group empowered to make the call. She noted that the Transportation Authority hoped to work with the City departments and City Administrator's office to roll out and implement the recommendations.

Member Levine stated he wanted to follow up on Member Kim's comments, as the impact of large projects on small businesses seemed to be a consistent problem. He inquired if this had been addressed in the study.

Ms. Waldman responded that it had been brought up by a number of the Transportation Authority board members. She stated that this issue was captured under stakeholder coordination, with improved stakeholder coordination during the planning phase to make sure the project could be planned in the best possible way to mitigate challenges for businesses in the project vicinity and then on-going communication with the stakeholders, businesses, and residents so everyone was keep apprised when something was happening. She said one of the ways to reduce confusion was to have better communication.

Member Levine added that the issue of impacts on small businesses was not only during the project but also after the project was completed. He asked if there was something in the study that would provide support for small businesses for a period substantially after the project is completed.



Member Ortega asked if they could make amendments to the report later on.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, noted that the Board unanimously had recommended accepting the report at its meeting the day before and would consider final approval of the report in September after Board recess. She said that the CAC could provide input at the current CAC meeting or members could provide input after the meeting (e.g. via email) to the project team for consideration before the report went to the Board for final approval.

Carl Holmes, Deputy Director of Capital Projects, noted that with the second reading of the Board item in September, it was possible that there would be feedback or minor adjustments, but that staff still wanted to advance the report because the work was completed. He noted that the actual implementation of the recommendations would require a substantial amount of work that still needed to be done.

Chair Ortez ask if there was a set timeline for when they would reevaluate the CPMO.

Mr. Holmes explained from the perspective of the report and recommendations, they were ready to hand the report over to the City Administrator's Office and city agencies so that the group could now turn their attention to supporting implementation. He said some time would have to pass before they would be able to evaluate what was working and what was not working. He added that the City Administrator's Office might have other recommendations as they proceed, but this working group was charged with providing recommendations from all the efforts that had been made up to this point.

Member Levine inquired if they would have an opportunity in the future to get updates.

Ms. Waldman replied in the affirmative.

Chair Ortiz requested that Member Ortega include the CAC members when sending her comments to staff.

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

The motion failed by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Chen, Daniels, Davidson, Levine, Ortega (5)

Abstain: CAC Members Kim and Ortiz (2)

Absent: CAC Members Barz, Rozell, and Siegal (3)

Chair Ortiz asked what their options were since the motion failed.

Ms. Lombardo answered that a CAC member could make another motion and see if that passed or they could request to have the report be brought back to the September 6<sup>th</sup> CAC meeting. She stated if the item were to come back on September 6<sup>th</sup>, staff would bring back any comments or feedback received [which could be shared with the Board regardless of whether any changes were made to the report itself].

## **8. State and Federal Legislation Update – INFORMATION\***

Amber Crabbe, Public Policy Manager, presented the item per the staff memorandum.



Member Levine asked for clarification on whether it would be cheaper to pay the toll violation rather than the toll under the equity provisions of the Senate Bill 532.

Ms. Crabbe clarified that the violators would pay the toll plus the violation amount.

Chair Ortiz asked what concerns the Transportation Authority had with Assembly Bill 825.

Ms. Crabbe responded that the author represented a district in Southern California which had a different streetscape than San Francisco. She added that allowing bikes and scooters to ride on the sidewalks of the City would cause safety issues for pedestrians, especially people with mobility issues.

Chair Ortiz asked what amendments the Transportation Authority would like to see.

Ms. Crabbe stated that the Transportation Authority would like to see local jurisdictions given more autonomy in how they chose to enforce the law [were it to pass], similar to the bill that decriminalized jay walking and recently passed.

Chair Ortiz stated that there were equity concerns in how these kinds of laws tended to be disproportionately enforced on certain communities and that he would appreciate the opportunity to connect with Transportation Authority staff offline.

Member Kim asked what the timeline was for the equity provisions in AB 532 to be implemented.

Ms. Crabbe stated that if the bill was passed, she estimated that it would take two years at the most to implement, however she hoped it would happen much quicker.

Member Davidson stated that she supported the speed safety camera bill.

During public comment, Ed Mason stated that hasn't seen any improvement with BART and that they were still running 10 car trains. He stated that the Central Subway was a waste of money and that SFMTA should focus their resources on different routes. He stated that he did not want bikes or scooters to be allowed to ride on the sidewalk. He closed by stating that he believed it should take a 2/3 voter majority to pass any kind of taxation.

Chair Ortiz echoed Mr. Mason's remarks about not allowing scooters on sidewalks.

Roland Lebrun stated that SB 532 should consider transit agencies' high level of fare evasion before asking for more funding. He stated he had personally seen a lot of fare evasion and that Muni needed to start making everyone pay and offering programs to low income riders.

## **9. Community Advisory Committee Ethics Training - INFORMATION\***

Amber Maltbie, Nossaman, LPP, presented the item per staff memorandum.

Member Davidson asked whether there would be any change to the Brown Act to allow for remote participation by CAC members.

Clerk Saunders responded that there had not been.

There was no public comment.





## **Other Items**

### **10. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION**

Chair Ortiz stated that in light of the recent events related to the Dolores Hill Bomb, there had been a lot of public discussion about skating infrastructure or the lack thereof and the criminalization of skating in public spaces. He stated that in accordance with Article 5 of the CAC By-Laws, as Chair he wanted to establish a subcommittee to look at the available skate infrastructure and local and state law around skating. The purpose of the subcommittee would be analyze this information and then make recommendations to the CAC and the Transportation Authority Board. He appointed Members Chen and Daniels to sit on the subcommittee with him.

There was no public comment.

### **11. Public Comment**

During public comment, Ed Mason stated that many commuter shuttle buses had expired permits fiscal year basis sticker color violations have gone on for a long time there is not enough enforcement little surveillance.

Roland Lebrun stated that traffic crossing signal timing needed to be extended as they currently did not give people mobility impairments enough time to fully cross.  
Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:32 p.m.