



DRAFT MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, February 28, 2024

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Siegal called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.

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

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Phoebe Ford and Venecia Margarita (2)

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Siegal discussed The Portal (or Downtown Rail Extension), one of the signature projects in the Prop L Expenditure Plan. She announced that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) completed its formal evaluation of The Portal, resulting in a "Medium-High" rating for the project under requirements of FTA's Capital Investment Grant program. She continued by stating that this positive news set the stage for the anticipated advancement of the project into the FTA "Engineering" phase of the federal grant process through which the project is seeking a multi-billion dollar grant. These milestones are a key outcome of the multi-agency work program of the past 3+ years. In the coming months, the integrated project team would be working to support the lead agency, the Transbay Joint Powers Authority to secure remaining funding, advance procurement activities, and more.

The Chair also flagged public engagement activities underway for the District 1 Multimodal Transportation Study, funded by the Neighborhood Transportation Program, which would be discussed on an item later on the agenda.

Chair Siegal also thanked the Board for approving her reappointment for a two-year term on the CAC representing District 5 and congratulated Venecia Margarita who was appointed to represent District 9. She noted that Member Margarita was unable to attend the February meeting due to a pre-scheduled work commitment but was looking forward to joining the March meeting.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun noted that the remote video was blurry.

3. Election of Vice Chair for 2024 - ACTION*

Chair Siegal opened the floor for nominations for Vice Chair.

Member Daniels nominated herself for Vice Chair, seconded by Member Levine.

There were no other nominations.

There was no public comment.

The nomination was approved by the following vote:



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

Abstain: none (0)

Absent: CAC Members Ford and Margarita (2)

4. Approve the Minutes of the January 24, 2024 Meeting - ACTION

There was no public comment.

Member Ortega moved to approve the item, seconded by Member Milford-Rosales.

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Abstain: none (0)

Absent: CAC Members Ford and Margarita (2)

5. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the 2023 Prop L 5-Year Prioritization Program for Transportation Demand Management – ACTION

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

During public comment, Edward Mason asked whether Transportation Demand Management would change corporate commuter buses operating from San Francisco to Silicon Valley since electrified Caltrain service would soon be available and noting the proposed north-south SamTrans routes in the District 1 Multimodal Transportation Study. He wondered whether TDM and these transit improvements could encourage people to use public transit in the City and in the south bay into of the corporate commuter buses which were congesting city neighborhoods, such as at 24th and Church streets.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Abstain: none (0)

Absent: CAC Members Ford and Margarita (2)

6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$1,440,000 and Appropriate \$108,000 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions, for Four Requests – ACTION

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

Member Daniels commented on the Mission Street SoMa Transit Improvements survey that noted 68% of business owners were impacted by the curb use. She asked if there was any follow-up with the business owners on remedies to lessen the impact or provide resources to support them.

Steve Boland, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Project Manager for Mission Street SoMa Transit Improvements, confirmed that SFMTA



followed up with five property owners, nonprofit organizations, and business owners along the corridor. He added that the project occurred in stages as SFMTA implemented the Temporary Emergency Transit Lanes and the curb use changes mainly from 1st to 11th streets. He said the process was iterative and the SFMTA worked with the Museum of the African Diaspora and Bayanihan on alternatives to the curb use changes and they had been able to come up with satisfactory solutions. He provided an example of curb use changes in which the SFMTA provided a school between 5th and 6th streets in the South of Market (SoMa) neighborhood with a time limited passenger pickup and drop-off in the transit lane. He said SFMTA was responsive and innovative toward curb use changes to stakeholders along the corridor.

Member Ortega commented on the other notable findings in the Mission Street SoMa Transit Improvements survey section that stated double parking was a large issue and there was a pilot program to post additional parking signage. She added that the SFMTA would need to work with the San Francisco Police Department or another entity that could enforce the double-parking rules. She asked for more information on how SFMTA could achieve the goals of the transit program given all the double parking.

Mr. Boland responded that double-parking in transit lanes was a problem throughout the city. He said that SFMTA had done a lot of analysis on double-parking and that Mission and Downtown districts had challenging corridors. He noted that SFMTA could further enforce double-parking restrictions, but it would involve additional resources and was a matter of priorities. He said there were adjacent lanes and transit could move around double-parked vehicles without obstructing operations. He added double-parking was an ongoing challenge, but there were still project benefits.

Member Ortega commented that she would like to further discuss, at a later time, double-parking enforcement along streetcar routes and what initiatives SFMTA could pursue.

Mr. Boland responded that he understood the frustration and noted that there was more flexibility to move around double-parked vehicles along the Mission bus route as opposed to a rail route.

Member Kim commented that double-parking issues on Geary Boulevard could not be avoided due to deliveries and services activities. He added that enforcement may affect the small business owners who do not have other options available. He requested that SFMTA check on other options for merchants to minimize the impacts as commercial loading zone demands may be different in various neighborhoods.

Mr. Boland responded that double-parking was endemic in San Francisco. He said SFMTA worked to address the issue through an engineered curb use that converted parking spaces to passenger or loading spaces rather than enforcement. He added there was a net increase in yellow commercial loading zones that became full-time due to an assessment with businesses through outreach and surveys. He said this work resulted in legal curb use spaces.

Member Milford Rosales asked about the processes to select the remaining locations for the Vision Zero Left Turn Traffic Calming project.

Uyen Ngo, SFMTA Vision Zero Program Manager, responded that the left turn criteria



would be reviewed from a Quick-Build toolkit scope. She said SFMTA would apply the criteria and update the standards for both left- and right-turn traffic calming treatment and that locations would be selected after.

Member Milford-Rosales asked when the list would be available.

Ms. Ngo responded that it would be available in March and installations would be at the end of the year. She added that SFMTA would provide the locations when available.

Chair Siegal noted the Vision Zero Speed Limit Reduction project corridors that received treatments that did not result in any notable changes in speeds. She requested follow-up analysis to see if the project was beneficial given the limited staff capacity at the Sign Shop.

Ms. Ngo commented that they shared evaluations for nine corridors for the initial findings of the project implementation. She said the majority of the initial corridors had vehicles travelling at 20 miles per hour or below, and the purpose of the signage was to align with the corridor speeds. She added that evaluation work would be done as more corridors were installed and the Sign Shop installed signs on two corridors per month and was staffed to do so.

During public comment, Edward Mason suggested that locations could be set aside for deliveries and conditioned on an appointment basis through an online platform, noting delivery vehicles in the Mission blocked transit lines and that a reservation basis could be a solution to the issue.

Member Barz moved to approve the item, seconded by Member Milford-Rosales.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Chen, Davidson, Kim, Levine, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegal (8)

Abstain: none (0)

Absent: CAC Members Daniels, Ford, and Margarita (3)

7. District 1 Multimodal Transportation Study (NTP) Update – INFORMATION

Aliza Paz, Principal Transportation Planner, presented the item.

Member Kim thanked staff for the presentation and asked for more transparency around timing for bus shelters on Geary Boulevard, recalling that SFMTA said that San Francisco Public Works (Public Works) had frozen the permit process, which could mean no bus shelter upgrades until 2027 or later, and this could make riders unhappy because they were promised more amenities at these transit stops like real time transit information. He also thanked staff for including North-South Express Bus service, an idea which residents had suggested.

Member Kim urged staff to consider better transit connections in the Mobility Hubs concept, noting the lacking of bus service with SamTrans at the U.S. Veterans Affairs Hospital off Clement Street and the lacking of connections to Daly City BART.

Member Kim raised concerns that some intersections and busy streets like 25th Avenue and Clement Street did not have pedestrian timed countdowns, which posed a safety issue.



Chair Siegal shared that she often went to District 1 and thought it was a great place to get around by bike but found it hard to cross as a pedestrian and asked if more aggressive changes might be considered at unsignalized intersections, such as adding stop signs, adding traffic signals, or lengthening crossing times.

Mx. Paz responded that staff would bring this up with SFMTA to inquire about the feasibility of those recommendations for the study.

During public comment, Edward Mason suggested that signalized intersections could use flashing beacons rather than signals, which had been very effective in San Jose. He expressed concerns about ensuring that bicycles stay on the newly proposed 22nd and Fulton streets bike route to mitigate congestion on 24th Avenue. Mr. Mason also requested a marketing effort to eliminate corporate commuter buses and encourage the use of SamTrans express buses, instead, and suggested pairing mobility hub electric vehicle charging with restaurants or other business destinations to make the hubs more attractive for users.

8. Major Capital Project Update: Caltrain Modernization Program – INFORMATION

Brent Tietjen presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Ortega asked how late and how frequent in the evening trains would be running. Mr. Tietjen answered that the plan was to keep the same span of service, with the last train around midnight going to San Jose, and the same 104 trains in service in a day. Member Ortega asked Caltrain staff to consider providing service past midnight because some events finished later than the last train running, and it could help with ridership if services were expanded.

Member Ortega also asked if Caltrain had considered changing the policy for companies to buy passes in smaller amounts, tiered systems, and/or opt-in programs rather than requiring an entity to buy passes for the entire number of employees at a particular location. She continued by stating that the flexibility could benefit both the interested employer and Caltrain by helping attract more interest and ridership. Mr. Tietjen answered that the policy had not changed since the pandemic, but Caltrain had reduced the cost of the GoPass per user and could pass along the suggestion about offering employer purchases in smaller amounts.

Member Ortega noted that she knew of persons who had elected to drive to the South Bay since the cost of gas equated to the cost of riding Caltrain due to a dropped workplace GoPass program. She commented that Caltrain should look at creative ways to attract ridership particularly through employers.

Member Milford-Rosales added he had the same experience with a dropped GoPass program at his employer where there was still interest by some employees in riding Caltrain, but not enough to make it worthwhile to the employer to buy the GoPass for all employees. He also requested that Caltrain revisit that policy.

Member Chen asked about creative ways to make it easier for employers and their workers to use Caltrain like routing commuter shuttles to/from stations rather than directly to offices, and timing the drop-offs accordingly, especially with electrification making the trains run much faster. Mr. Tietjen responded that Caltrain did work with Commute.org in San Mateo County and would contact larger employers to ensure they had the right resources provide shuttles for employee to get to Caltrain stations.



Chair Siegal asked if Caltrain had considered working with local transit agencies to provide express bus service with free transfers to Caltrain stations, particularly for neighborhoods that are farther away from the stations, which could be a long commute. Mr. Tietjen affirmed that Caltrain was working with different transit agencies to ensure the connections to stations were smooth, successful, and quick. He continued that Caltrain was participating in the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's six-month BayPass pilot for region-wide fare.

During public comment, Edward Mason suggested Caltrain work with the Silicon Valley Leadership Group and Bay Area Council to encourage employers to utilize Caltrain, along with smaller van shuttles to get people to Caltrain stations. He also spoke about housing.

Roland Lebrun suggested some changes to help with the fiscal cliff, like counting non-paying passengers as part of ridership statistics and running shorter train configurations.

9. State and Federal Legislation Update – INFORMATION

Amber Crabbe, Senior Public Policy Manager, presented the item.

During public comment, Edward Mason supported transit agency coordination and cautioned that transit agency consolidation may result in loss of local control. He expressed concerns about Assembly Bill 825 (Bryan), allowing bikes on sidewalks. He also expressed safety concerns about electric scooters for riders and pedestrians alike and suggested conducting more research on scooters, describing how scooters are regulated in other cities.

Roland Lebrun requested a transcript of the meeting. He also commented that consolidation of transit agencies would not work but was possible to have the agencies coordinate with one another, describing how transportation systems in other places like London and Hong Kong work.

Other Items

10. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

There were no new items introduced.

11. Public Comment

During public comment, Edward Mason expressed concerns about regulation of electric scooter companies, particularly liability over electric scooter related casualties.

Roland Lebrun expressed concerns about potential misappropriation of federal COVID relief funds given to transit operators, particularly Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, and requested intervention by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:54 p.m.