



DRAFT MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, April 24, 2024

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

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

CAC members present at Roll: Najuwanda Daniels, Phoebe Ford, Jerry Levine, Venecia Margarita, Austin Milford-Rosales, and Kat Siegal (6)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Sara Barz (entered during Item 6), Rosa Chen, Mariko Davidson (entered during Item 5), Sean Kim, and Rachael Ortega (5)

2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Siegal discussed Caltrain continued progress on its electrification project, working toward the plan start of revenue service in the fall. She added that with part of testing, Caltrain was planning end-to-end runs of the entire Caltrain corridor on April 27, with two trains operating at the maximum allowable speed at 79 miles per hour. She also announced Caltrain's May 11, electric train tour event in San Carlos, celebrating the railroad's 160th anniversary, with more information found at caltrain.com/electric-train-tour. She noted that the Transportation Authority had contributed \$41 million in funding for Caltrain Modernization from San Francisco's half-cent sales tax for transportation and the One Bay Area Grant program.

Chair Siegal also discussed the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) seeking input on community enhancements for the Geary Boulevard Improvement Project that would foster a sense of identity along the project corridor. She added that community members weighed in on design features such as sidewalk pavers, decorative concrete, street trees, and neighborhood identity markers and noted the survey focused on locations where there was opportunity to coordinate with future construction work, including where the sidewalk was planned to be expanded at Muni 38R Geary Rapid bus stop locations. She said the public could learn more about the proposals and provide feedback via SFMTA's Community Enhancement Survey at sfmta.com/project-updates/geary-boulevard-improvement-project-communityenhancement.

Chair Siegal also reported that in response to the March 2024 Community Advisory Committee (CAC) discussion on the I-280 Northbound Geneva Feasibility Study, which also touched on work the Transportation Authority is leading on the I-280 Southbound Ocean Avenue Off-Ramp Realignment and the Vision Zero Ramps Phase 3 Study - staff had not advanced the study to the Board to allow time to conduct additional community engagement, including with CAC members.

There was no public comment.



3. Approve the Minutes of the March 27, 2024 Meeting – ACTION

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Daniels, Ford, Levine, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, and Siegal (6)

Absent: CAC Members Barz, Chen, Davidson, Kim, and Ortega (5)

4. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$140,000 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions, and Allocate \$1,021,021 in Prop AA Funds for Two Requests – ACTION

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

Chair Siegal asked if the Transit Stop Signage Enhancement Program Phase 2 was the final phase of the project and if it would include all remaining signage at transit stops by 2027.

Kira Barsten, SFMTA Transit Service Planner, confirmed that all stops would be completed at the end of Phase 2.

Chair Siegal asked whether SFMTA's new transit stop inventory system would help ensure that signage stays up to date in a timely manner as routes change. She commented that there are signs in some locations that became outdated nearly a decade ago due to route changes and asked if the inventory could help develop a quick timeline for changes.

Kira Barsten responded that an update process was built into the signage program to help make sure changes are made in a timely manner.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked if the Golden Gate Greenway project would include other excavations or utilities work that needed to be evaluated and/or repaired. He also asked if the transit stop signs would be compatible with the new transit stop shelters that Muni would be procuring in the future.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Daniels, Ford, Levine, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, and Siegal (6)

Absent: CAC Members Barz, Chen, Davidson, Kim, and Ortega (5)

5. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve Programming Priorities for Up to \$5,342,905 in San Francisco's Estimated Fiscal Year 2024/25 State Transit Assistance County Block Grant Funds – ACTION

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

Member Ford asked how many attendants the Elevator Attendant Program currently



had.

Rob Jacques, BART Manager of Funding and Advocacy, said there were 36 elevator attendants staffing the four downtown BART/Muni stations.

Member Ford asked if the Urban Alchemy contract was competitively bid and how long the contract was.

Mr. Jacques confirmed it had been competitive bid and said they had up to next year to renew the contract or rebid.

Member Margarita asked why the downtown BART stations were the only ones with elevator attendants.

Mr. Jacques said that the program was started as a partnership between BART and the City at the four downtown shared Muni and BART stations following community input. Aileen Hernandez, BART Principal Grants Officer, added that the pilot started in 2018 and at the time, they were the busiest stations systemwide, and it was important that people felt safe and that the stations were clean. She said that even with ridership down, the four downtown stations continued to be the busiest stations.

Vice Chair Daniels said she appreciated the work of elevator attendants and asked whether BART or SFMTA had considered bringing the attendant staff positions in-house. She said that non-profit work was rigorous and employee turnover was very high and that creating permanent jobs at BART or SFMTA was a way to offer folks a pathway out of poverty.

Mr. Jacques answered that BART would follow up with Transportation Authority staff to provide a more completed response. He said that Urban Alchemy did a lot of workforce development work and that BART did not have the capacity in-house but said he would look into the question further.

Vice Chair Daniels suggested that the City and County of San Francisco 9910 Public Service Trainee series position might be appropriate for these workers as it bridged the gap with non-profits and brought people into stable employment.

Mr. Jacques said that he was aware of the 9910 series that the City had, and it was something that BART could explore mirroring. He said that they were talking with BART labor representatives about it.

Member Levine asked regarding Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA)'s Treasure Island Electric Ferry Service, whether funding was in place for the purchase of a ferryboat. He asked whether it was supposed to be delivered by 2026 and what the status of the vessel was.

Mike Gougherty, WETA Director of Planning, said that the vessel was fully funded, and the WETA Board would release a request for proposals for construction next month. He noted the vessel would be completed by 2026.

Member Levine asked why committing funding to operations now made sense if the service would not begin until 2026.

Mr. Pickford answered that it was seed funding to demonstrate local commitment to other potential funding partners to help attract the rest of the necessary funding. He said that the Transportation Authority was already in the process of applying for a



federal grant to provide additional funding.

Member Levine asked if funds would be put in a holding pattern and whether it was available to the agency.

Mr. Pickford said that this would be on a reimbursement basis like most public funding sources, so no funds would be paid out until costs were incurred.

Chair Siegal asked if there was a deadline by which matching funds must be procured for the ferry service and whether allocating funds to another project such as a Treasure Island bus service would be considered.

Mr. Pickford said there was no specific deadline, but that the Transportation Authority would update the Metropolitan Transportation Commission on how ferry service was progressing, and if it was determined that the ferry service could not move forward in a timely fashion, then other options could be explored at that point.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked about on-time performance for paratransit service versus the on-time performance for taxis. He said that per-trip costs for taxis were much lower than paratransit and could be a better and more economical option that should be encouraged for some people. He questioned whether the Treasure Island ferry service should be the preferred alternative transit since sea level rise could affect development on the island. He said the Muni 25 Treasure Island bus route should be expanded with more hours and operation of service.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Daniels, Ford, Levine, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, and Siegal (6)

Abstentions: CAC Member Davidson (1)

Absent: CAC Member Barz, Chen, Kim, and Ortega (4)

6. Preliminary Fiscal Year 2024/25 Budget and Work Program – INFORMATION

Lily Yu, Finance Manager, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Ford asked if it was possible for future presentations to show more detail such as percentages on capital project expenditures, including staff work applied to planning versus capital investments.

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, explained that the capital expenditures shown in the budget included approved grants as well as anticipated new allocations for the coming fiscal year, and reflect staff's best estimate after consulting with project sponsors, about the level of expenditures to be incurred and billed to the Transportation Authority that fiscal year. She referred to the allocation request forms included as part of Item 4 in the meeting packet, which showed the percentage of funds to the five primary categories of the Prop L funds to date (showing project type in broad categories) [and amounts allocated by phase and recommended cash flow for reimbursement in the Item 4 allocation request forms]. She noted that staff were continuously monitoring the approved cash flows to ensure the budget was reflective of the current status of projects and not just what sponsor



agencies expected at the time of allocation. Ms. LaForte reiterated that the capital expenditures amount was primarily reflective of existing grants.

Member Ford clarified that she would like to see percentages within project allocations, like whether staffing took a significant part of the project. She added that it would help people see more clearly if funds were being allocated appropriately.

Ms. Lombardo offered that staff could follow up and would likely draw from the approved 5-Year Prioritization Programs and Strategic Plan, in addition to approved allocations.

Member Davidson asked when the CAC would learn more about the I-280 Ocean Avenue Southbound Off-Ramp Realignment funding and asked for confirmation that the Geneva Avenue ramp study was on hold.

Chief Deputy Director Lombardo answered that the CAC would likely see an appropriation request for the Ocean Avenue ramp project in approximately two months. She also said in response to CAC feedback at the March meeting, the I-280 Northbound Geneva Avenue Off-Ramp Study project team was engaging in further outreach before advancing the study to Board.

Chair Siegal asked what was behind the \$5 million drop in revenue, and whether staff knew if it were concentrated in certain parts of the city and if there was any reason to think there would be a decrease in funding, factoring inflation, in the future.

Ms. Yu answered that staff was projecting a decrease in Fiscal Year 2023/24 of about \$5 million, mainly based on sales tax revenue received to date, which wasn't reflective of the anticipated revenue. She added that there were lower revenues from business travel, conventions, and international travel, which were growing slower than anticipated.

There was no public comment.

7. State and Federal Legislation Update – INFORMATION

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, presented the item.

Member Davidson asked if the transportation demand management provisions of Senate Bill (SB) 1031 superseded other options employers had for compliance and whether employers could still incentivize certain forms of transportation such as biking.

Ms. Lombardo answered that employers were not precluded from incentivizing other forms of transportation beyond what was required in the bill and noted that the requirement for large employers to purchase a regional multi-operator pass such as BayPass, would require voter approved. She said MTC was still piloting the regional pass and that Phase 2 of the Clipper regional BayPass pilot program was being tested with employers and that part of the expected learnings from the pilot would be gaining insights as to the best price points for the BayPass so it worked for employers, employees, and transit operators. would be used to negotiate price points.

Member Levine supported Assembly Bill (AB) 1777 and AB 3061 but was concerned over the lack of legislation addressing local control for autonomous vehicles.

Ms. Lombardo referenced the agenda materials with information on Senate Bill 915



(Cortese), for which the agency has a support position, saying that this bill sought to provide local control for autonomous vehicles, but it was unclear if the bill would advance fully through the legislature.

Member Ford asked how work from home would be factored into the transportation demand management provisions of the bill.

Ms. Lombardo answered that details still needed to be worked out but work from home was very much a consideration in setting the price for a regional transit pass. She added that the intent was to set a price that worked for employers, while also generating more revenue and ridership for public transit.

Member Barz asked for more detail on how funds generated by the measure were expected to be used for highway widening investments.

Ms. Lombardo answered that the topic of highway widening and what types of highway investments should be eligible a regional measure was part of an ongoing discussion at the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and with interested stakeholders that was yet to be resolved. She recounted that MTC staff had developed a proposal for discussion to make highway improvements eligible for funding, including highway widening, if they were done in a climate-neutral manner, as one option. She shared that some stakeholders did not want highway widening to be an eligible use at all, while others wanted to promote express lanes that could increase climate emissions but also generate more revenue that could be reinvested in transit, affordability measures, and other investments to mitigate the increased emissions. She noted that MTC would be discussing the issue at their commission workshop the next day.

Member Barz asked if the CAC would have the opportunity to provide recommendations around highway project eligibility and whether staff was seeking other amendments beyond the three mentioned in the packet.

Ms. Lombardo reminded the CAC that the current item was agendaized as an information item so that CAC feedback would be recorded in the minutes and Chair Siegal could provide the feedback to the Board at the June 11 meeting, but the CAC couldn't act on the bill at the current meeting. With respect to amendments being sought on SB 1031, Ms. Lombardo replied that since the bill was actively being discussed and amended, staff focused on the top three most important amendments. She said staff would continue to actively participate in discussions with the bill's authors and MTC and would keep the Board and CAC updated, including with recommendations for further amendments for consideration, as relevant.

Chair Siegal asked whether the bill provisions authorized MTC to introduce a measure multiple times.

Ms. Lombardo confirmed that this was accurate through 2040, based on amendments introduced earlier in the week in the Senate.

Chair Siegal asked if voters could place a regional measure on the ballot for multiple counties without the bill.

Ms. Lombardo said that her understanding from discussions with MTC staff was that the bill needed to define MTC as a district, in order to allow a measure to be placed on the ballot in multiple counties.



Chair Siegal asked how the CAC could provide input on proposed amendments related to highway widening.

Ms. Lombardo replied that an item could be placed on next month's CAC agenda for this purpose.

During public comment, Mike Swire said that there had been opposition to include highway widenings in any revenue measures from various environmental and climate groups at prior MTC meetings. He said there was a huge need for transit funding and that San Mateo had spent over \$1 billion in highway widenings that directly competed with Caltrain transit services. Mr. Swire expressed support for the CAC's interest in recommending an amendment in opposition of highway widenings to the Board.

Roland Lebrun said that consolidation was only possible for very small operators and that consolidation of larger agencies does not make sense. Mr. Lebrun also said that billions of dollars were being wasted designing major transit stations that were contrary to providing seamless transfers between different transit operators.

Other Items

8. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

Member Levine requested a briefing update from SFMTA on the Valencia Bikeway Pilot Project and how relationships with the biking community had gone to date. Vice Chair Daniels echoed the request.

Vice Chair Daniels requested an update on the Potrero Yard Modernization Project, specifically around the proposed housing noting she had heard changes were being made.

Member Davidson requested an update on the Frida Kahlo Way Quick-Build Project.

There was no public comment.

9. Public Comment

During public comment, Edward Mason expressed his frustration at corporate commuter buses continuously running within the city without passengers, particularly on Castro Street at 24th Street, when Caltrain trains and buses were available as a commuting option down the Peninsula.

Mike Swire commenting on highway widening, noting that the driver who had killed the 4-year-old pedestrian on 4th and King streets had not been assessed any jail time for the incident. He asked the CAC and Board to immediately pause the development of the I-280 widening project at King Street, and direct staff to seek other options to improve traffic congestion.

Roland Lebrun echoed the concerns of the previous speaker and shared his own near miss traffic experience at 4th and King streets. He said he was unable to raise his hand earlier when attempting to comment on the minutes and clarified his comments about WMH Corporation that he made at a previous CAC meeting, where he had noted that Mr. William Hadaya had served on the VTA CAC.



10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:48 p.m.