



# DRAFT MINUTES

## Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, October 25, 2023

### 1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

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

CAC members present at Roll: Rosa Chen, Najuawanda Daniels, Mariko Davidson, Sean Kim, Jerry Levine, Rachael Ortega, and Kat Siegal (9)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Sara Barz and Kevin Ortiz (2)

### 2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Vice Chair Siegal reported that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) had started early work on a potential 2026 regional transportation revenue measure. Over the past year, MTC staff conducted public outreach and had launched another poll. Vice Chair Siegal reported that MTC staff would be seeking Commission support on guiding principles in December and that the Transportation Authority was coordinating with San Francisco agencies to provide input to the process. Next, Vice Chair Siegal welcomed Austin Milford-Rosales to the CAC as the new District 6 representative who then introduced himself to the CAC.

There was no public comment.

## Consent Agenda

3. **Approve the Minutes of the September 27, 2023 Meeting - ACTION**
4. **Adopt a Motion of Support to Increase the Amount of Professional Services Contract with MNS Engineers, Inc. by \$250,000 to a Total Amount Not to Exceed \$5,050,000, for Construction Management Services for the Yerba Buena Island Southgate Road Realignment Improvement Project - ACTION**
5. **Adopt a Motion of Support to Authorize the Executive Director to Execute Master Agreements, Program Supplemental Agreements, Cooperative Agreements, Fund Transfer Agreements and Any Amendments Thereto with the California Department of Transportation for Receipt of Federal Funds for the Yerba Buena Island Multi-Use Pathway in an Amount up to \$3,000,000; and State Funds for Planning, Programming, and Monitoring in the Amount of \$46,000 - ACTION**
6. **San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Vision Zero Quick-Build Update - INFORMATION**
7. **Resolution Directing the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency to Incorporate Safe Routes to All Schools in the San Francisco Unified School District In the Active Communities Plan - INFORMATION**



There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

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

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Barz and Ortiz (2)

## **End of Consent Agenda**

### **8. State and Federal Legislation Update - INFORMATION**

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

Member Levine asked whether there were plans to add autonomous vehicles (AV) to next year's legislative program.

Ms. Crabbe responded in the affirmative and said that the Transportation Authority would be looking at taking a more comprehensive approach including ensuring the traffic code could be enforced on AVs, that AVs can interact safely with emergency vehicles, and that there are set thresholds for AVs to be 'licensed'. Ms. Crabbe added that Transportation Authority staff were already taking meetings on this topic.

Mr. Levine asked if there was the possibility to add more local control over AVs through either fines or legislation.

Ms. Crabbe responded that while local control would be great, the Transportation Authority was also working with the Department of Motor Vehicles and the California Public Utilities Commission to identify other options.

During public comment, Ed Mason commented that AVs were using the city as a laboratory, but the city was not seeing any benefit from that research and development. He added that city agencies are allocating resources to monitor AVs but the technology companies were not paying any of that cost, rather the residents were paying that cost. He closed by stating that any proposed legislation should include reimbursement from the AV companies.

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

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

Member Ortega asked what the useful life of a traffic signal was.

Bryant Woo, SFMTA Senior Traffic Engineer, stated that traffic signals lasted about 40 years if east of the fog line and 35 years if west of the fog line.

Member Ortega expressed her interest in more details about planned traffic calming measures due to her observation of aggressive driving behavior in the city, particularly in SoMa around freeway ramps. Member Ortega observed a decrease in aggressive drivers once measures are put into place. She expressed her concern with how traffic would be affected by proposed SoMa Arterial Traffic Callming project and



requested a future update.

Member Davis thanked staff for their presentation and asked what would happen to the unallocated [no locations yet identified] safe streets funds for schools, bike lanes, and speed safety cameras and asked how they could get those types of improvements in the city and her district specifically.

Mike Pickford clarified that the To Be Determined (TBD) designation in the Attachment 2 District(s) column was for projects where the location or locations had not been determined and that there were different factors that were used to identify locations depending on the project.

Deputy Director Anna LaForte, stated that with respect to the speed safety cameras, there was a limit on the number of cameras allowed by the state legislation. She said that SFMTA staff would bring an update on the implementation plan to the Transportation Authority Board and CAC (anticipated in January) that would include more information on locations. She stated that for schools, SFMTA would be releasing guidelines for what to expect from a school walk audit prior to the Board approving allocation of funds. She said that prioritization of bike improvements would come out of SFMTA's Active Communities Plan. She clarified that this action before the CAC was more about setting aside the funds for these projects and that specific allocation requests with a lot more details on scope, schedule, etc. would come before the CAC for action in the future.

Mr. Woo stated that SFMTA was identifying ideal locations for speed safety camera locations and noted that the 5-year pilot program limits SFMTA to 33 cameras which must be on the high injury network and not on a state route. He said this limited the number of possible streets, and that the SFMTA wanted to focus on areas around schools, with a collision history, and where speeding occurred as an example. He also stated that the Proactive School Traffic Calming Program was long standing and successful and proactively installed traffic calming measures at all schools in the city.

Member Davidson asked if the CAC would have the opportunity to comment on specific intersections.

Mr. Woo responded that he believed that would be a part of the outreach and noted that most of the speeding happens mid-block so it might be best to put cameras mid-block instead of at intersections. He added that no citation could be given unless a vehicle is going more than 11 MPH above the speed limit and that was an important consideration.

Member Kim asked about bicycle education classes. He stated that he saw a class in his neighborhood but that not many people rode their bikes to school to. He asked if schools had enough locks/parking spaces to accommodate all the bikes.

Mr. Pickford clarified that this specific project focused on adult education.

Matt Lasky, SFMTA, confirmed that this program focused on adult education and learning to ride and ride safely. Mr. Lasky stated that the League of American Bicyclists had a well-established program that SFMTA had contracted with for 10-20 years.

Member Kim asked about Safe Route to School Non-Infrastructure Project which recommended kids K-5 walk or bike to school. Member Kim stated that for this to be realistic there needed to be enough bike parking at schools. He added that the older



kids also needed safe routes to school and facilities for their bikes.

Mr. Lasky responded that there were other programs that got at that problem more directly and that SFMTA worked with SFUSD as well as the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department to put bike parking where it currently didn't exist.

Member Kim stated anecdotally that some highschoolers faced unsafe conditions on Muni buses and stated that Safe Routes to School program should include buses not just bike routes. He asked if SFMTA had any plans to improve safety on its buses and trains and what to do when someone was faced with a situation.

Director LaForte stated that staff would follow up with the SFMTA Safe Routes to School Program staff.

Member Ford stated that \$3 million for signal upgrades on the Great Highway seemed like a lot and asked if SFMTA had considered other options like roundabouts. She asked for more context as it would cost \$1 million more than the Safe Routes to School Program.

Mr. Woo stated that many of the signals needed a lot of repair or had already fallen off due to the salt air. Mr. Woo stated that the cost was actually relatively cheap since there were only two vehicular directions and one crosswalk compared to the normal four directions and four crosswalks. He explained that the scope of the project would include not just the signal work, where nothing might be salvageable because of the salt and sand, but also to provide curb ramps and update the lighting to current standards. He added that his team had not considered roundabouts instead of signals but clarified that it would cost more than \$3 million to add that infrastructure.

Member Ford stated that she worried the sand would just blow back in.

Mr. Woo agreed and added that there was uncertainty about what the Great Highway would look like in the future so his team had designed a plan that could be flexible and would work with all of the various options under consideration.

Member Ford asked why the Valencia Street Bikeway Improvements was not scheduled until Fiscal Year 2027 given the controversy around it.

Mr. Lasky stated that the pilot was scheduled to last through September 2024 as directed by the SMTA Board, although that may change. Mr. Lasky stated that the proposed funding request was for the longer term project which would be informed by a number of studies they were currently conducting on the entire Valencia corridor. He said it would take some time to plan and design the permanent project once that was decided upon.

Member Ford commented that the Safe Routes to Schools and walk audits should include bike routes to school as there was a difference between pedestrian and bike routes.

Mr. Pickford stated that many of the traffic calming measures would slow cars and benefit both pedestrians and bicyclists. He added that Vice Chair Melgar recently passed a resolution at the Transportation Authority Board directing SFMTA to prioritize safe bike routes to school for middle and high school students.

Director LaForte added that walk audits focused on a one to two mile radius around schools. She added that Vice Chair Melgar's resolution for safe passage to school



directed SFMTA to consider the location of schools when implementing the Active Communities Plan and to ensure they were connected to the network.

Vice Chair Siegal asked about SFMTA's ability to deliver the traffic signal priority projects on schedule, particularly due to her concern that stemmed from the CAC hearing past reports of the SFMTA's sign shop having a backlog due to a lack of capacity.

Mr. Woo responded that he makes it a point not to overpromise and under deliver. He stated that issues arise during more complex projects, especially when SFMTA has to integrate new systems into older infrastructure. He stated that their ability to deliver on time really depended on specific scopes of work.

Vice Chair Siegal asked if there was a design for the 7th Avenue bike lane yet.

Mr. Lasky stated that there was not a design yet. He said that the street could easily accommodate bike lanes but it would be a challenge to accommodate protected lanes given the street width.

Vice Chair Siegal asked whether the Sloat and Skyline intersection currently had traffic signals.

Mr. Woo described the intersection as partially stop sign controlled. He stated that his team was working with Caltrans and the San Francisco Department of Public Works to get a signal installed as quickly as possible. Mr. Woo stated that the signal design had 100% fully signalized controlled intersections at all crosswalks and that the design would also remove the sharrows and replace it with a Class 2 bike lane.

Vice Chair Siegal stated that she was happy to hear about the bike lane as she has avoided Sloat since the intersection was very difficult for bicyclists. Vice Chair Siegal asked if there were plans to either remove the slip lane or add traffic calming measures to slow drivers down.

Mr. Woo stated that when the Transportation Authority first approved this project, it was planned as an interim design with a reconfigured intersection plan coming later. He said that remained a long term goal and Caltrans had agreed in writing to provide  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the funding based on who was responsible for which legs of the intersection. Mr. Woo said this signal project would address the immediate concerns and handle the reroute of traffic from the Great Highway south of Sloat.

During public comment, Ed Mason stated his opinion that the current design of Valencia Street tried to accommodate too many interests in its limited space. He stated that the bike route should be shifted to Folsom Street.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Barz and Ortiz (2)



**10. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$36,545,335 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions, for Five Requests – ACTION**

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

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Barz and Ortiz (2)

**11. Adopt a Motion of Support to Program \$2,601,000 in Senate Bill 1 Local Partnership Program Formula Funds for Construction of the Yerba Buena Island Hillcrest Road Improvement Project (Hillcrest Project) and Design of the Yerba Buena Island Multi-Use Pathway (YBI MUP); Approve Two Fund Exchanges, with Conditions, to Fully Fund the Hillcrest Project, Including Accommodations for a New Class 1 Multi-Use Pathway; and Appropriate, with Conditions, \$4,850,000 in Prop K Funds for Design and Construction of the Hillcrest Project - ACTION**

Camille Cauchois, Assistant Transportation Planner, presented the item per staff memorandum.

Vice Chair Siegal asked if the proposed widening of the road to accommodate the multi-use pathway involved digging further into the hill.

Mike Tan, Senior Engineer, replied in the affirmative.

Vice Chair Siegal asked if the multi-use path would be located on the water side of the road.

Mr. Tan confirmed that the multi-use path would be located on the waterside along the entire length on Hillcrest Road and Treasure Island Road.

Vice Chair Siegal stated that she was glad that the multi-use path was being accommodated in the Hillcrest project and that it would be a great improvement over the Class II bike lane.

Member Ford asked if the project team looked into different alternatives for the project, such as narrower roads.

Mr. Tan replied that the Treasure Island Environmental Impact Report laid out a Class II bike lane for the entire length on Yerba Buena Island (YBI). He stated that this section had been studied extensively through the YBI Multi-Use Pathway Feasibility Study and also by the Bay Area Toll Authority as part of the larger West Span Skyway Project. He added that due to the nature of YBI and the limited roadways, there were limited locations to put the multi-use path.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:



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

Absent: CAC Members Barz and Ortiz (2)

**12. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Building Progress Program and Fleet Program Update – INFORMATION**

Julie Kirschbaum, SFMTA Director of Transit, and Bonnie-Jean von Krogh, SFMTA Building Progress Public Affairs Manager, presented the item.

Member Ortega asked how the leasing model would work for the joint development project at Potrero Yard and noted that it would be a missed opportunity if the SFMTA would not make revenue from it.

Ms. von Krogh responded that the Potrero Yard project would be on the SFMTA's land and the housing built would be rental units. She stated that the SFMTA would get a critical bus yard out of the project, but that the housing would be affordable housing which would generate a different level of revenue than market rate housing. She added that the SFMTA was focused on finding additional opportunities for joint development, such as at Presidio Yard and parking facilities, that would generate funding for the agency. She noted that the Potrero Yard project was a unique project and that it started with talks with the community in 2018 in which the SFMTA heard an intense need for affordable housing in that part of the city.

Chris Jauregui, a representative from the Potrero Neighborhood Collective, responded that the 4.4 acre Potrero Yard site was the SFMTA's and that there was a ground lease component. He added that the housing component, which would be adjacent to and above the bus facility, would pay for its own costs and that the developer would be responsible for the housing costs. He noted that there would be shared elements, such as shared walls and basements, which would have shared costs between the SFMTA and the developer. He reiterated that the SFMTA would not be exposed to the financial risk of the housing units.

Member Ortega asked where the buses at Potrero Yard would be stored while the site was under construction.

Ms. Kirschbaum responded that the SFMTA currently had a flatter service plan and was delivering as many bus miles as they were prior to COVID but did not need as many buses to do so. She continued that eventually the SFMTA would need more buses as San Francisco continued to recover and grow. She stated that the SFMTA was planning to store the buses at the Muni Metro East facility during construction and that they were assessing the best way to protect the assets while in storage. She stated that mid-life overhauls were scheduled for the buses and that they would be postponed until just before the vehicles were ready to be put back in service.

Member Ortega asked about the reasons for the bus manufacturers going out of business.

Ms. Kirschbaum replied that the whole industry and the Federal Transit Administration were trying to understand the state of the bus manufacturing industry. She noted that part of the reason it was struggling was because it was already an optimized



production line, the supply chain issues from COVID were difficult, and that in some cases there was almost 100% escalation in the cost of materials while the manufacturer was already locked in a contract it had to deliver on. She continued that the industry was looking at more risk sharing between private companies and the public sector, which would be good because then risk would not get built into the cost of proposals, and in things like an inflation index, which the SFMTA used for the purchase of their light rail vehicles.

Member Milford-Rosales noted that many of the hurdles for Battery Electric Buses were tied to bus manufacturers and issues with getting power from PG&E. He asked if there was consideration for expanding the trolley bus fleet.

Ms. Kirschbaum replied that the SFMTA was committed to staying in the trolley business but noted that there were barriers to expansion such as the risk that there may be no manufacturer making trolley buses and that trolley facilities were facing some of the most serious structural and earthquake issues. She added that the fleet and facility program was adaptive, and this was a reason they were seeking to update the SFMTA policy to be mode neutral, as long as it is zero emissions. She stated that they were excited about in motion charging technology and were testing it on four trolleys, which could go five to ten miles off wire and recharge in service within 45 minutes, which would open up new possibilities for upgrading the trolley fleet.

Member Kim asked if there was consideration for fare evasion prevention tools in the new buses, noting that it could help restore fare revenue and address safety issues for Muni riders, especially youth.

Ms. Kirschbaum responded that as SFMTA tackled questions about raising additional revenue, they also needed to ensure they were collecting revenue from the sources they controlled. She added that they were completing a fare evasion study, while also increasing transit fare inspectors, and had an ongoing campaign around gender-based harassment to send a strong signal there was no place for harassment of any kind. She noted that the SFMTA was also learning from BART's "Not One More Girl Campaign" which highlighted the voices of customers to improve safety for everyone. She stated that the all-door boarding model was the best model for Muni as it allowed for faster boarding and allowed for more seating for seniors and people with disabilities at the front of the bus.

Vice Chair Siegal asked if SFMTA planned to maintain a certain number of hybrids past 2040 and if they would re-evaluate closer to 2040 in case there was risk involved in not having hybrids as an option in the fleet.

Ms. Kirschbaum responded that the hybrid fleet was very resilient, and they were purchasing another round of hybrids which would give the industry another 10-15 years to help answer that question. She stated that the California Air Resources Board (CARB) required 100% zero emission vehicles by 2040 and that the SFMTA thought there may be other technologies, such as fuel cells, that could play a role in achieving that goal. She added that it was very important to consider resiliency in planning for bus procurements.

Vice Chair Siegal observed that it seemed restraining to lock public transit into a certain vehicle type moving forward and to hold public transit vehicles to a higher emissions standard than private vehicles, given that public transit contributed such a





small amount to transportation emissions in the city and region. She asked if San Francisco was involved in advocacy to protect the city from the risk of investment in cutting edge transit technology, especially considering the volatility of the manufacturing industry.

Ms. Kirschbaum replied that San Francisco's climate goals were focused on mode shift and things like more transit lanes and more transit service as they believed this was the best choice to reduce emissions. She added that they would still have to meet the zero-emission mandate, which was flexible enough for exemptions, and that the SFMTA would ask for a 2026-2029 exemption to buy the 60' hybrid buses. She noted that it would also be possible for CARB to extend the timeline and that San Francisco advocated for things like mode shift goals in the policy but was not successful.

During public comment, Ed Mason stated that he appreciated the planning as the city headed into unknown territory, such as electrical availability and the risk of not having infrastructure in place to provide all the electricity that electrification would demand. He asked if there would be a qualified work force given the aging population and if training programs, such as the one at City College, would emphasize electrical training. He added that there were additional unknown factors, such as worldwide manufacturers of trolley buses, fuel cells to make the hydrogen, and the need for green sources to make the hydrogen.

Roland Lebrun thanked SFMTA for the thorough presentation and stated that he was happy that in-route charging for electric buses was being studied. He noted that Tesla was going into the trucking industry and asked if it would be possible to incentivize them to mass produce 40' and 60' buses that could be transferred to the overhead catenary system. He expressed strong support for the Potrero Yard project and appreciated the intention of generating revenue for Muni and providing affordable housing units. He asked if any of the affordable housing units would be prioritized for Muni bus operators.

Vice Chair Seigal asked staff to respond to Mr. Lebrun's last comment.

Ms. von Krogh replied that there were two types of housing proposed at Potrero Yard- affordable housing and workforce housing. She continued that SFMTA was completing a survey and exploring the idea of creating a housing preference for SFMTA employees, as they had heard interest in this from operators and maintenance staff. She noted that the creation of a new housing preference would go through the SFMTA Board and Mayor's Office of Housing.

## **Other Items**

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

There were no new items introduced.

### **14. Public Comment**

During public comment, Ed Mason commented on micromobility stating that he almost got run over by a bike that ran a red light. He stated that there has been a proliferation in micromobility devices in the city and added that he is concerned



about safety. Next, he stated that corporate community buses were still running mostly empty which stumped him.

Roland Lebrun asked if anybody had considered that there was a future Caltrain station planned to be adjacent to SFMTA's Potrero development. Next, Mr. Lebrun thanked and appreciated Carl Holmes for attending the CAC meeting in person and staying through the end to hear comments.

**15. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:48 p.m.