



DRAFT MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, September 27, 2023

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Vice Chair Siegal called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

CAC members present at Roll: Sara Barz, Najuwanda Daniels, Phoebe Ford, Jerry Levine, Rachael Ortega, and Kat Siegal (6)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Rosa Chen, Mariko Davidson, Sean Kim, and Kevin Ortiz (4)

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Vice Chair Siegal reported that the Transportation Authority was leading the Bayview Caltrain Station Location Study to identify a single preferred location for the Bayview Caltrain station and reported that there would be a community outreach event at the Bayview Hunters Point YMCA. Next, Vice Chair Siegal reported that the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) provided the Transportation Authority Board with an update on the progress of its Quick-Build Program and added that SFMTA would request an additional \$5 to \$6 million in Transportation Authority funds to implement quick-build improvements to the remaining 50 miles of the High Injury Network. Vice Chair Siegal then announced that the state Legislature approved Assembly Bill 645 (Friedman), which would give Governor Newsom until October 14 to sign it into law. She said that this bill would authorize the implementation of a five-year speed safety pilot program in six California cities, which included San Francisco. Finally, Vice Chair Siegal welcomed Phoebe Ford, the newest member of the CAC representing District 4 who then introduced herself to the CAC.

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

3. Approve the Minutes of the September 6, 2023 Meeting - ACTION

4. Community Advisory Committee Vacancy – 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 Barz.

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Ford, Kim, Levine, Ortega, and Siegal (7)

Absent: CAC Members Chan, Davidson, Ortiz (3)



End of Consent Agenda

6. **Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt Eight 2023 Prop L 5-Year Prioritization Programs and Amend the Prop L Strategic Plan Baseline – ACTION**

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

Member Levine asked what the total cost of the vehicle procurement piece of BART's Core Capacity Program was and asked whether the \$35 million recommended went towards leveraging of the rail car portion.

Priya Mathur, BART Director of Funding Strategy, responded that the rail car component of the Core Capacity program accounts for \$1.1 billion and confirmed that the \$35 million was leveraged against the remainder of that amount.

Member Levine noted previous cracking in curb ramps and asked if San Francisco Public Works (SFPW) planned to use the same contractor and if the contractor was aware of the cracking issues.

Edmund Lee, project manager at SFPW, responded that the contracts typically went out to bid, so the contractor for future curb ramp projects was unknown at that time. He continued that SFPW was not aware of specific cracked locations or poor quality of work but if there were specific locations, he could take them back for review.

Member Barz asked how the \$90 million cost estimate for BART's Next Generation Fare Gates compared to similar projects in other regions.

Priya Mathur responded that she would follow up with that information.

Member Barz asked how much Prop K funding had been spent on Vision Zero efforts at freeway on- and off-ramps in the city.

Rachel Hiatt, Deputy Director for Planning, said that Transportation Authority had conducted three Vision Zero ramp plans, primarily with Caltrans' grants and Prop K match. She said those studies were around \$400,000 but she did not know how much had been spent in capital funds.

Anna Laforte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, added that recommendations of the first two phases of the study cost around \$4 million and mentioned the 13th Street Improvements as an example of implementation of recommendations from the study. She said that the collaborative process of Transportation Authority planning and SFMTA implementation had been productive.

Member Barz asked if CAC members should anticipate funding recommendations for the Active Communities Plan in a later round of 5YPPs and inquired if there were a negative cost to it being in a later round of programming.

Anna Laforte confirmed that Active Communities Plan implementation funding was included in the Safer and Complete Streets program that would be part of the third round of 5YPPs, coming in October. She stated that there was no impact to programs in later rounds and that each program bore its own share of financing costs for those programs that requested advancement of funds.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, clarified that Active Communities Plan Prop L funding would come in the form of a placeholder since the plan would not be



completed by October and that after the plan was done, SFMTA would come back with specific projects to be approved by the CAC and Board.

Member Ortega asked, if, given fare evasion, there was an anticipated Return on Investment (ROI) figure for BART's Next Generation Fare Gates.

Priya Mathur responded that there was not currently an expected ROI number but noted that BART planned to measure fare evasion pre- and post-installation of new fare gates and could share the results.

Member Siegal asked if there were recommended improvements from previous phases of the freeways study that were applicable to all freeway ramps that could be applied quickly.

Director Hiatt responded that with the Vision Zero Ramps funds, the first thing staff would do would be to consult SFMTA's Quick-Build Toolkit and identifying what could be implemented right away. She continued that with this funding, there would also be capacity to identify treatment beyond quick-builds.

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that he documented concrete cracking on 23rd Street between Church and Castro streets and that he would be happy to provide additional observations. He commented that he believed tree planting should be funded by the City budget because it was hard to determine the exact cost of the urban forest in San Francisco when it was diffused among multiple sources.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Ford, Kim, Levine, Ortega, and Siegal (7)

Absent: CAC Members Chan, Davidson, Ortiz (3)

7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$13,724,000 and Appropriate \$651,000 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions for 5 Requests – ACTION

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

Member Ford asked if the Inner Sunset Study would be completed in 2025.

Mr. Pickford responded that it would be completed by the end of 2024.

Member Ford asked if it would be possible to jump right to discussing the five recommendations without the study.

Ms. Hiatt responded that it was a Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program (NTP) request which meant it was a request of the District 7 Commissioner and that their office asked to include outreach, especially for the more transformative changes. She stated that there were some SFMTA quick-build improvements underway on Lincoln Way but none currently on Irving. She stated that it was a priority for the Commissioner to keep the process shorter than a year. Ms. Hiatt added that community outreach was very important to the Transportation Authority and the Commissioner in general and specifically in this study to ensure that nothing was overlooked as there were many stakeholders involved.

Member Barz stated that she was happy to see the study moving forward and asked if



the study area included any corridors in the High Injury Network.

Ms. Hiatt responded that Lincoln Way was included.

Member Barz asked if there was a quick-build project underway there.

Ms. Hiatt confirmed there was and added that there was community interest for improvements beyond quick-build and that SFMTA would be evaluating the area.

Member Barz pointed out that the final report for the Vision Zero freeway ramps study would be presented to the Transportation Authority Board in June or July of 2025 and asked why it would take so long to be completed. She stated that there was an urgent need for it, especially considering recent fatalities around freeway touchdowns. She asked if there was any work being done in parallel.

Ms. Hiatt responded that the 2025 timeline was when the study had to be completed by but said she would challenge the project team to see if the quick-build portion of the project could be accelerated.

Member Ford asked for clarification on what a quick-build was.

Ms. Hiatt stated that SFMTA has a toolkit of effective, quick implementation strategies that constitute what they call 'quick-builds'. She stated that freeways were complicated as they were under Caltrans' jurisdiction, and this was another reason the Transportation Authority was involved.

Joel Goldberg, SFMTA Programming and Grant Funds Manager, stated quick-builds allowed the SFMTA to complete projects in a streamlined way with temporary, lower cost improvements that could have significant benefits. He added that they could be implemented quickly, were flexible and allowed for an iterative process.

Vice Chair Siegal asked, on behalf of Chair Ortiz, how districts were prioritized for tree planting. She asked when other districts could expect to have trees planted, specifically District 9.

Nicholas Crawford, SFPW Acting Superintendent for the Bureau of Urban Forestry, responded that they sought to plant trees where they were needed most, in areas that were disproportionately impacted by heat and negative air quality issues. He added that they put a lot of thought into where they planted and they clustered their major planting due to watering needs. He said most recently they planted in Districts 11 and 10 and now targeted the Tenderloin, SOMA, and Civic Center neighborhoods as they contain 5 of the lowest canopy census districts. He closed by stating that they planted trees in all districts, including District 9, every year but the decision of where to concentrate major planting efforts depends on the previously mentioned factors.

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that a map showed 4 trees at an address on 24th Street but there were really 3 since commuter buses knocked one down. He stated that across the street a tree fell on a car. He stated that trees planted between the street and underground utility boxes did not have enough room to grow deep roots and that SFPW should be more strategic about where they plant.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Ford, Kim, Levine, Ortega, and Siegal (7)



Absent: CAC Members Chen, Davidson, and Ortiz (3)

8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve San Francisco's Program of Projects for the 2024 Regional Transportation Improvement Program, with Conditions – ACTION

Nick Smith, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Ortega asked why the \$13 million in Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) funds lapsed.

Joel Goldberg responded that the project was complex with a long timeline and it did not get the federal environmental clearance it needed in time to comply with timely-use-of-funds requirements. He noted the funds did come back to San Francisco [in a future funding cycle], and the current New Flyer overhaul project proposed for the RTIP was far simpler.

Member Ortega asked for a simple explanation of fund exchanges generally and the exchange to fund The Portal project specifically.

Anna Laforte responded that the idea behind fund exchanges was to make funding sources line up with particular projects based on project types, uses of funds, and schedules. She said that RTIP funds could not be used by a project until the funds are allocated by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). With respect to The Portal, this timing would not work with the project's needs and project delivery approach; thus, the Transportation Authority proposed the fund exchange to provide The Portal with more flexible local funds.

Ms. Lombardo clarified that the proposed New Flyer/The Portal fund exchange was a dollar-for-dollar fund exchange with no financial impact on the involved projects and that the exchange ensured that the projects were better positioned to meet the respective fund program guidelines. Ms. Lombardo added that RTIP funds were not always available when a project was ready to start construction, which made it a better suited fund source for projects that could more easily align their schedules with a fund source with a less certain timing of availability. Ms. Lombardo noted that the staff recommendation would put a significant amount of RTIP money on the New Flyer Overhaul project, and that the Transportation Authority would work closely with SFMTA to oversee the project to ensure that it could comply with the RTIP timely use of funds deadlines and other requirements.

Member Kim asked for information about the Presidio Parkway project.

Anna Laforte confirmed that the project was completed. [The remaining RTIP commitment was to pay back MTC for advancing funds needed to close the project's funding gap since RTIP funds were not available at the time the project needed them.]

Member Barz commended Member Ortega on her questions and the staff responses and asked how much in overall capital RTIP funding went toward highway projects versus transit projects.

Maria Lombardo responded that the RTIP program was originally set up to fund highway projects and opined that it was still a highway heavy program statewide, with San Francisco being an exception with all transit projects. She noted the state policy



was changing over time to be more multimodal and transit friendly, but the RTIP guidelines themselves were still slow to catch up with the policy evolution.

Member Barz followed up to ask what order of magnitude of funding went toward highway projects.

Nick Smith responded that he did not have the order of magnitude available but said the Transportation Authority looked at the projects funded by other counties like Alameda and most funding was for roadway projects. He added that MTC did provide feedback on the guidelines and constraints of the program, and would continue to provide that feedback in future cycles.

Member Ortega asked whether highways were federal or state roadways and who administered the funding.

Maria Lombardo responded that every highway, whether it was a state or federal roadway, likely had at least some federal money tied up in it. She noted that the RTIP program itself was a mixture of state and federal money.

Member Siegal asked whether lapsed funds were always returned in the subsequent cycle.

Anna Laforte confirmed that they came back in the next county share period [4-year period] and added that the funds came back in the last year of the cycle.

Member Siegal asked whether SFMTA and the Transportation Authority had a high degree of confidence in the New Flyer Midlife Overhaul project based on previous phases, and whether SFMTA had the option to quickly advertise or construct in-house.

Joel Goldberg, SFMTA, responded that lessons learned from Phase I provided confidence in the contracting approach and timeline, especially as it related to RTIP funds for phases II and III.

Gary Chang, Project Manager at SFMTA, confirmed that the work in Phase III would be contracted out. He added that based on lessons learned from Phase I, SFMTA had simplified the scope of work to replace components like-for-like, which gave them confidence that they could exercise the contract as planned.

Member Siegal thanked SFMTA for investing time and funds into the Midlife Overhauls program and noted that the New Flyers seemed reliable and were generally clean.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun recommended that the Transportation Authority ask the Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA) to remove the 4th & King station from the contract. He stated that the station should be on 7th Street.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Ford, Kim, Levine, Ortega, and Siegal (7)

Absent: CAC Members Chan, Davidson, Ortiz (3)



9. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority Paratransit Fleet Electrification Update - INFORMATION

Bonnie Jean von Krogh, Building Progress Public Affairs Manager, presented the item per staff memorandum.

Member Barz commended the SFMTA Paratransit staff on the vehicle testing approach to assess vehicle performance before a new procurement order. She asked about the number of rides that the paratransit program offered per month or per year.

Virginia Rathke, SFMTA Senior Transportation Planner, replied that she would follow up with that information.

Member Siegal asked why the paratransit new and current vehicles had a shorter useful life in comparison to buses.

Gary Chang, SFMTA Manager of Transit Program Delivery, replied that the vehicle manufacturers were certified by Federal Transit Administration (FTA) regulations. He stated the paratransit cutaway vehicles were certified for 5 years and minivans for 4 years, while buses were certified for 12 years. He noted that the FTA regulations were based on factors such as structural stability and cost to produce vehicles.

There was no public comment.

Other Items

10. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

There were no new items introduced.

11. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:09 p.m.