



# DRAFT MINUTES

## Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, November 29, 2023

### 1. Call to Order

Vice Chair Siegal called the meeting to order at 6:15 p.m.

CAC members present at Roll: Rosa Chen, Najuwanda Daniels, Mariko Davidson, Sean Kim, Jerry Levine, Austin Milford-Rosales, Rachael Ortega, and Kat Siegal (8)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Sara Barz (entered during Item 5), Phoebe Ford, Kevin Ortiz (entered during Item 2) (3)

### 2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Ortiz reported that Senator Weiner held a Senate Select Committee hearing on Bay Area Public Transit and Transportation Authority staff testified on a modeling exercise that forecast the impact of future transit cuts that would be a result of not finding additional transit operating funds. He reported that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) estimated that the region needs an additional \$791 million dollars over the next three years and said If this funding is not identified, the Transportation Authority's model estimated significant decreases in transit ridership on the order of 100,000 daily trips. Next, Chair Ortiz announced that the Transportation Authority launched outreach for the Brotherhood Way Safety and Circulation Plan and Mission Bay School Access Plan and more information could be found on the respective project pages. Chair Ortiz then reported on the CAC's recent Skateboard Subcommittee meeting with the goal to establish an understanding of existing conditions and discuss issues, needs, and potential strategies for better supporting skateboarding in San Francisco. He said that at the subcommittee's first meeting, they heard a presentation from skateboard advocate Aaron Breetwor and focused on the current public infrastructure for skating, and current transportation code, and heard robust public comment.

There was no public comment.

### 3. Nominations for 2024 Community Advisory Committee Chair and Vice Chair- ACTION

Chair Ortiz called for nominations for Chair for calendar year 2023.

Member Levine nominated Chair Ortiz who accepted the nomination.

There were no further nominations for Chair.

Chair Ortiz called for nominations for Vice Chair.

Chair Ortiz nominated Vice Chair Siegal who accepted the nomination.

Member Daniels nominated herself.



There were no further nominations for Vice Chair.

There was no public comment on the nominations.

**4. Approve the Minutes of the October 25, 2023 Meeting - ACTION**

There was no public comment on the minutes.

The minutes were approved, without objection, by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Chen, Daniels, Davidson, Kim, Levine, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, Ortiz, and Siegal (9)

Absent: CAC Members Barz and Ford (2)

**5. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the 2023 Prop L 5-Year Prioritization Program for Muni Maintenance, Rehabilitation, and Replacement and Amend the Prop L Strategic Plan Baseline – ACTION\***

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

Member Levine requested additional information about the relationship between SFMTA and the development of affordable housing units at Potrero Yard.

Jonathan Rewers, SFMTA Chief Strategy Officer, stated that the City charter did not allow the SFMTA to invest in a joint development that would generate zero revenue. He said that due to the current housing proposal for Potrero Yard which would be 100 percent affordable, and thus was not expected to generate revenue, the SFMTA could not contribute to the project. He continued that the SFMTA could make the air rights above the site available. He said that what would occur under the housing agreement, which would likely go before the Board of Supervisors in fall 2024, would likely be a 99-year lease of that air space. He stated that the SFMTA would become the owner of the housing development following that 99-year period.

Member Levine asked if SFMTA would receive any financial benefits through such a lease agreement with the developer.

Mr. Rewers responded that the SFMTA's overall intention for its joint development program was to generate revenues for transit service. He said that at Potrero Yard specifically, the housing included was based on the City's needs as detailed in the Housing Element and that the agency would make zero dollars. He stated that the agency also wanted to test a unique project delivery method that has, so far, demonstrated time-saving benefits. He shared as an example that the project had received full entitlement and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) clearance within two years.

Vice Chair Siegal asked about the procurement of new vehicles and how Gillig would be evaluated as a potential manufacturer.

Bhavin Khatri, SFMTA Zero Emissions Program Manager, stated that the SFMTA had previously wanted to procure buses from Gillig but that they typically did not do business with large transit agencies. He said that during the SFMTA's pilot program, four bus manufacturers were evaluated but two had since dropped out of contention: one manufacturer filed for bankruptcy and the other, Novabus, pulled out of the US market. He said that the SFMTA wanted to make sure that there was competition to



procure buses to avoid being stuck with one bus manufacturer, such as their last round of bus procurements that were all from New Flyer. He stated that the SFMTA would evaluate Gillig based on reliability, performance, operability, and their ability to manufacture buses at scale. He said that the agency's next procurement of electric buses would not be until 2027 or 2028 when the Kirkland Yard opens. He reiterated that the goal was to avoid being stuck with only one manufacturer.

Vice Chair Siegal asked if the SFMTA would procure a small pilot set of vehicles or look at performance data from other cities.

Mr. Khatri responded that the SFMTA would be purchasing five electric buses from Gillig and that they were also talking to sister agencies with Gillig buses in service about performance data, such as AC Transit and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority. He stated that the SFMTA wanted to make sure that the buses could perform in San Francisco's operating environment with high grades and high passenger loads.

Vice Chair Siegal noted that Potrero Yard would include capacity for trolley buses and the transition plan to battery electric buses and asked if any of the other yards, after rehabilitation and design, would include the option to service trolley buses in the future.

Mr. Rewers responded that Potrero Yard was expanding capacity for trolley buses and would be the SFMTA's only trolley hub as of the current plan. He added that as trolley technology evolves, with things like in service charging, the SFMTA would be constantly evaluating the market and updating the Facilities Framework to be consistent with the market, and therefore the SFMTA would be able to retain the flexibility to add trolley buses in the future if it were feasible.

Chair Ortiz asked about the affordability levels and Area Median Income (AMI) ranges of the housing units that would be built next to Potrero Yard.

Mr. Rewers replied that the affordability level for the workforce housing would be set such so that it could enable housing opportunities for Muni operators. He invited Kerstin Magary, SFMTA Senior Director of Facilities and Real Property Management, to provide the details. Ms. Magary explained that the affordability levels differ for the family affordable units, which would be 20-80% of AMI, and workforce housing, which would be 80-120% of AMI. She said that the SFMTA was polling SFMTA employees to gauge interest in workforce housing and then would need to go to the Board of Supervisors to create a housing preference. She noted that they were still determining the mix of family, senior, and workforce housing.

Chair Ortiz asked what the estimated unit count was broken down by the AMI ranges.

Ms. Magary replied that the approximate ranges were 100 units for family housing on Bryant Street, a couple hundred units for family housing above the transit facility, and a couple hundred units for workforce housing, to total the 513 units.

Chair Ortiz asked if the workforce housing would be for only operators or if other jobs would be included and if they would be reaching out to the labor union.

Mr. Rewers replied that the SFMTA was surveying employees now and that 3,000-4,000 could be eligible and that this included more than operators. He also noted there was a community working group for this project that met monthly, which include



operators.

Ms. Magary added that eligibility for workforce housing would also depend on household income and number of persons in the household. She noted that the SFMTA asked the unions if they could do the survey and they were very enthusiastic. She said that the SFMTA employees eligible for the workforce housing could be anyone from custodians to operators to clerks, or whomever meets the qualifications.

Member Ortega asked what was included in the \$750,000 scope for the Station Condition Assessment project.

Mr. Rewers replied that the SFMTA would report to their Board the following week on the state of good repair and condition assessment of their assets and noted that stations were the second most deferred asset. He said that elevators, power systems, HVAC system, lighting, and communication systems are all contained within the station and would be part of the assessment. He added that assessments had been completed for facilities and traffic signals and that the cost for the Station Condition Assessment was based on general cost from previous assessments plus review of the components included in the stations. He also noted that the assessment would focus on the operating condition of the asset, beyond just the age.

Chair Ortiz asked if the SFMTA knew the range of total state of good repair costs that would be needed.

Mr. Rewers replied that the stations were a unique situation given that they were 40-50 years old and in a constant state of repair and renewal and would not be demolished and rebuilt. He said that the station assessment would include aspects such as electrical systems, resilience to weather events, fire suppression systems, lighting, safety, power capacity, and conduits. He noted that the State of Good Repair report estimates did not take into account soft costs and technology changes.

Chair Ortiz asked which stations the SFMTA anticipated would need the most work.

Mr. Rewers responded that some of the older stations that are not shared stations with BART, where jointly sponsored work had been completed, were anticipated to have greater state of good repair needs, including stations like West Portal, Church, and Van Ness.

Member Levine asked if the SFMTA would have oversight or control over the development process for the housing piece of the Potrero Yard project and what kind of relationship there would be, given that the SFMTA was not expected to generate revenue from the housing site.

Mr. Rewers replied that there would be a master project agreement between the SFMTA and the developer that would last 30 years and that there would also be a housing component agreement.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked for clarification on the four manufacturers that were part of the battery electric bus pilot program. He also asked if there was adequate training to replace maintenance staff reaching retirement age and if the training program through San Francisco City College had been successful or utilized.

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



The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Davidson, Kim, Levine, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, Ortiz, and Siegal (9)

Absent: CAC Members Chen and Ford (2)

**6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$23,040,000 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions, Appropriate \$150,000 in Prop L Funds, and Allocate \$6,000,000 in Traffic Congestion Mitigation Tax (TNC Tax) Funds for Eight Requests – ACTION\***

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

Member Milford-Rosales asked what resources were available to track the scope of existing quick-build projects. He also asked what level of protection was provided by each project.

Uyen Ngo, SFMTA Vision Zero Quick-Build Program Manager, responded that quick-build scopes were decided with an assessment from outreach and work with community partners. She added that quick-build projects had different scopes.

Member Milford-Rosales commented about 3rd Street as an example with sections that have bike lanes and sections that did not have bike lanes. He asked if there was a plan to revisit those sections to close the gaps.

Ms. Ngo responded that she would follow up with the project team for that specific example.

Member Daniels asked what work was being contracted out and if SFMTA had reached out to unions for that work.

Ms. Ngo responded that SFMTA shops do most of the work and there was a conversation with shops and the union to explore contracting out work to meet Vision Zero goals. She noted that they were also exploring hiring more staff.

Vice Chair Siegal asked how many intersections on the High Injury Network (HIN) still needed the quick-build toolkit treatments. She asked if there was an estimated cost for an intersection that needs all treatments and said she was wondering if the work could be scaled to other areas of the city and what would be the cost to apply the treatments.

Ms. Ngo responded that \$5.4 million of the \$6 million request was for the quick-build toolkit based on recommendations from the Fehr and Peers report to address approximately 900 intersections remaining on the HIN. She stated the costs vary by type of treatment and intersection.

Member Levine asked if there was a possibility to implement a public information campaign for bicycle safety education and outreach. He commented that bikes, e-bikes, scooters, and skateboards all use the bike lanes; scooters ride fast on sidewalks; etc. and said that there was a need for public safety information for users and a citywide campaign over and above the specific classes that may be held.

Tracey Lin, SFMTA Transportation Demand Manager, responded that the intent of classes was to provide resources for people to learn how to ride bicycles and scooters safely. She added the outreach component was meant to engage the community and raise awareness of the classes and enroll participants.



Member Levine commented that it was a limited approach, and a broader citywide education approach would be more helpful.

Chair Ortiz commented that it would be good to see a visual map of where quick-build improvements would be installed. He asked if the bicycle safety classes would be provided by the SF Bicycle Coalition.

Ms. Lin responded that the current contractor was SF Bicycle Coalition, but their contract was ending and SFMTA has released a Request for Proposals (RFP) to competitively select a contractor for the new contract.

Chair Ortiz suggested that the RFP could break out funding for place-based organizations that may not have done this work in the past but have relationships and know-how to reach vulnerable constituencies.

Ms. Lin responded that the RFP was released and she was uncertain if it could be updated and said she would need to check with the procurement staff.

Member Kim asked if there was a plan to expand to elementary through high school students for bike safety education.

Ms. Lin responded that they have a specific youth component and classes were broken into adult and youth.

Member Kim concurred with Member Levine's point about his experience with scooters riding fast on the sidewalk and the need to educate scooter riders on how and where to ride safely.

Member Davidson commented that one reason for bike safety classes was because people are afraid to bike on the streets. She stated that it was good to have bicycle education but asked where was the driver education. She asked if there was a way to use these educational opportunities to educate drivers about how to drive with cyclists and pedestrians. She commented that cyclists were among the most vulnerable road users and the responsibility of road safety should not be the burden of cyclists and pedestrians alone.

Member Ortega concurred with Member Davidson's points. She added that cars and their interactions with bike lanes was one of the biggest problems she observed as both a driver and bicyclist. She noted that she also used scooter share due to a late bus schedule. She commented that many of the right turn lanes were being sacrificed for bike lanes, but a lot of drivers were treating bike lanes as right turn lanes. She also added that as a bicyclist and driver, she would appreciate better education and consideration for how various users can safely share the road. She asked about how to improve driver understanding of bike lanes.

Deputy Director Anna Laforte, commented that in the memo attachment, there was a link to the quick-build interactive map where the public can see where quick-build corridor projects were located. She stated that staff expected that the map would also include the intersection specific improvements funded by this request. She responded to Member Kim's comment that Transportation Authority staff were reach out to SFMTA to clarify what classes were offered or could be offered for middle and high school students for biking safely to school, either through Bicycle Safety Education and Outreach or the Safe Routes to School program.



During public comment, Edward Mason commented that there was a lack of culture of safety in San Francisco and in the United States. He noted that he saw an ad on a Muni bus that was trying to encourage a culture of safety, with an image of a combination of a bike and car and an inscription pertaining to safety. He stated that bicyclists do not use dedicated bike streets by his estimation; for instance he said that everyone rides their bike on 24th with buses, delivery trucks, etc. but not on Jersey Street which was a dedicated bike street. He then asked why the continental crosswalk cost \$528,000 when it would be damaged by commuter buses. He added that if SF Bicycle Coalition was going to receive the contract and said he never saw any data that measures how successful the bike classes have been.

Chair Ortiz requested to sever the Vision Zero Quick-Build Program Implementation FY 24 and Bicycle Safety Education Classes and Outreach requests to vote on those separately.

Member Ortega moved to approve the remaining 6 items, seconded by Member Kim.

The allocation requests for the six items excluding the Quick-Build and Bicycle Safety Classes projects were approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Davidson, Kim, Levine, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, Ortiz, and Siegal (9)

Absent: CAC Members Chen and Ford (2)

Vice Chair Siegal moved to approve the Bicycle Safety Education Classes and Outreach allocation request, seconded by Member Barz.

The motion failed by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (4)

Nays: CAC Members Daniels, Davidson, and Ortiz (3)

Abstain: CAC Members Kim, Levine (2)

Absent: CAC Members Chen, Ford (2)

Vice Chair Siegal moved to approve the Vision Zero Quick-Build Program Implementation FY 24 request, seconded by Member Barz.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Davidson, Levine, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (6)

Nays: CAC Member Daniels (1)

Abstain: CAC Members Kim and Ortiz (2)

Absent: CAC Members Chen and Ford (2)

Chair Ortiz asked if the RFP for bike classes was still open.

Ms. Lin responded yes and said that it closed on December 5th. She added the selection process was expected to take 2-3 months with an evaluation panel.

Chair Ortiz requested that SFMTA return to the CAC with a presentation about the components of the program to provide an opportunity for the CAC to provide



additional feedback.

Ms. Lin responded that the current program was expected to end in April 2024. She added that without approval SFMTA may experience a gap in this 15-year program.

Chair Ortiz commented that he understood that the program had run for 15 years but said it would benefit from more feedback.

**7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve the 2023 San Francisco Congestion Management Program – ACTION\***

Chun Ho Chow, Modeler, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Ortega acknowledged that 93% of the city was within a 5-minute walk of Muni, but asked for clarification of the frequency of the routes that were within that 5-minute walk. She asked if it was possible to provide more information on accessibility by frequency level and by time of day.

Mr. Chow clarified that the analysis did account for frequency of service, and explained that on slide 12 of the presentation, the dark blue bar showed the percentage of the population within a 5-minute walk of a Muni route with a 5-minute frequency, the light blue bar showed the percentage of the population within a 5-minute walk of a Muni route with a 10-minute frequency, and the grey bar showed the percentage of the population within a 5-minute walk of any Muni service. Mr. Chow said that the share of the population within easy access of a Muni route with 5-minute frequency had decreased over time.

Member Ortega asked if this analysis included Muni light rail.

Mr. Chow responded that it included buses only and would follow up regarding extending the analysis to light rail. [Note: subsequent to the meeting, Mr. Chow clarified that the Muni coverage analysis shown on slide 12 does in fact include Muni buses and light rail.]

Member Ortega said that she would like everyone to be within a 5-minute walk of a Muni route with 5-minute frequency.

Vice Chair Siegal agreed that it stood out that fewer people now had easy access to frequent Muni service, and that this was a problem. She noted that transit speeds hadn't recovered as much as auto speeds and said she didn't take transit as much now because Muni came less frequently and offered less service at certain times of day. Vice Chair Siegal continued by saying that the city was missing opportunities to shift people to using transit when there was limited service, such as in the overnight time period. Vice Chair Siegal acknowledged that this was likely due to Muni operating fund constraints. She also suggested that, given lower arterial volumes, there was an opportunity to reallocate street right-of-way, so other travel modes would have faster speeds, and suggested hardening the transit right-of-way to protect and improve performance gains while there was an opportunity to do so through the reallocation of right-of-way.

Member Kim asked if the transit coverage metric could be calculated for weekends, in addition to weekdays. He also asked if the data used to calculate this metric was from the SF-CHAMP activity-based model. Member Kim said he was interested in understanding pre- and post-pandemic travel patterns across all modes, and





expressed concern that SFMTA was using old data. He asked if SF-CHAMP could provide information on current travel patterns.

Mr. Chow replied that the weekend coverage metric could be considered for inclusion in future CMP cycles.

Deputy Director for Transportation Data and Analysis, Joe Castiglione noted that the data used to calculate the accessibility metric was not from the SF-CHAMP model, but rather was based on observed scheduled data from SFMTA. He also noted that while the SF-CHAMP used actual data to calibrate to observed travel behavior, that it's main use was predicting travel patterns.

Chair Ortiz asked if the analysis could show the geographic distribution of different accessibility levels.

Mr. Chow confirmed that it did by showing the accessibility maps found on pages 37 and 38 in the CMP report. He explained that there was one map for the AM peak and another for the PM peak for CMP purposes.

Vice Chair Siegal noted that SFMTA also reports a 95% coverage, and said it sounded like light rail service was included in SFMTA's calculations.

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that our society suffered from a culture of convenience, which privileged car travel over transit with the former having much faster travel speeds. He noted that he committed himself to taking transit to classes at De Anza College when he retired, and that, as a result, he spent 300 more hours taking the bus that he could have saved by driving. He noted that one could only take transit or travel on a micromobility device if one could not afford a car. He noted that people did not recognize the environmental impacts of cars, and that even for electric cars, people had not taken into account that only 25% of power was generated by renewables, nor the weight of batteries. He noted that a cultural shift was required.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Daniels, Kim, Levine, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, Ortiz, and Siegal (7)

Absent: CAC Members Barz, Chen, Davidson, and Ford (4)

## **Other Items**

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

Member Levine asked when the next legislative program update would be before the CAC.

Deputy Director LaForte responded that it would be January.

Member Levine requested information about the possibility of a severance or extraction fee on oil operations in California which would generate \$4 billion in revenue which could be used to fund public transit. Member Levine stated that California was the only state in the country that did not have such a fee.

Chair Ortiz requested a presentation from SFMTA and other



transit agencies on their plans for labor replacement, especially maintenance staff, and how they would fill current roles and potentially add additional staff as SFMTA expands their facilities. Chair Ortiz also requested information a concept or plan for a citywide protected bike lane network if SFMTA had one. Chair Ortiz also asked for an update on the Mid-Valencia Street Pilot saying there as there was a high level of interest in the project regarding safety and small business impacts. He said SFMTA staff indicated they would bring an update to the SFMTA Board in March and that he would like to receive an update sooner given the level of interest.

There was no public comment.

**9. Public Comment**

Edward Mason commented on the culture of convenience noting that commuter shuttles weren't necessary since folks could take public transit. He said he didn't believe prior assertions that commuter shuttle riders would drive if there were no shuttles, opining that many of the riders didn't own cars. He then described the express lane in San Mateo as a 'Lexus lane' that was only moderately used.

**10. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:24 p.m.