



# DRAFT MINUTES

## **Community Advisory Committee**

Wednesday, April 23, 2025

### **1. Committee Meeting Call to Order**

Chair Siegal called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

CAC members present at Roll: Phoebe Ford, Sean Kim, Jerry Levine, Austin Milford-Rosales, Sharon Ng, Rachael Ortega, and Kat Siegal (7)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Sara Barz (entered during Item 4), Najuwanda Daniels, Zameel Imaduddin, Venecia Margarita, (entered during Item 6) (4)

### **2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION**

Chair Siegal began her remarks by highlighting public engagement opportunities from the April Executive Director's Report. She mentioned the Geary Fillmore Underpass Community Planning Study, a federally funded project to reimagine transportation and land use along Geary and nearby neighborhoods. She said the Transportation Authority was forming a Community Council to provide input and lead outreach, with up to 12 representatives to be selected and that applications were being accepted through Monday, May 19th.

Chair Siegal stated that the Vision Zero Freeway Ramps Study was another Transportation Authority effort with ongoing engagement opportunities and would be discussed later on the agenda. She noted that a multilingual survey was open, and three town halls were planned for May, adding that the project team sought feedback on the study's ramp locations to guide safety improvements.

Chair Siegal stated that the CAC had been regularly receiving updates on the transit fiscal cliff affecting Bay Area transit operators, especially BART, Muni, and Caltrain. She said that staff would provide a brief update on state authorizing legislation for a November 2026 regional transportation measure during the meeting. Chair Siegal also noted that the SFMTA Board had held a workshop recently, which included an economic update from the City's Chief Economist, a presentation on the next 2-year budget cycle with a projected operating deficit starting at \$320 million in the first year, and a review of recommendations from the Muni Funding Working Group's March meeting. She continued by noting that SFMTA Director Julie Kirschbaum was expected to join the May 13th Transportation Authority Board meeting to provide an abridged presentation on the upcoming budget cycle where the large operating deficits were forecast to begin, and she would summarize the Muni Funding Working Group findings.

There was no public comment.



**3. Approve the Minutes of the March 26, 2025 Meeting - ACTION**

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Imaduddin, and Margarita (4)

**4. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$861,500 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions, for Two Requests and Amend the Prop K Standard Grant Agreement for the Ortega Street Improvements [NTIP Capital] Project (Project) and Release \$280,000 in Funds Held in Reserve for the Project's Construction, with Conditions - ACTION**

Projects: Prop L: SFMTA: Embarcadero and Jefferson Quick-Build (\$744,000). District 5 Daylighting [NTP] (\$117,500).

Rachel Seiberg, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Regarding the District 5 Daylighting project, Member Kim asked if daylighting was only being constructed in District 5, whether other districts would have curbs painted red, and if daylighting was enforced in locations that were not marked. Mr. Kim also asked if there was a schedule for daylighting implementation citywide.

Shannon Hake, Transportation Planner at the SFMTA, clarified that the SFMTA would not enforce daylighting at a location until curbs were painted red. She said that the SFMTA planned to daylight citywide, with implementation of daylighting to be done in three phases. Phase 1 would be locations on the High Injury Network, which SFMTA had already mostly completed. Phase 2 would be locations in school zones within 600 feet of schools. Phase 3, the subject of this request, would daylight all other locations in District 5. Ms. Hake noted that she anticipated daylighting citywide would be complete by the end of 2026, with District 5 being the first district to be fully daylight.

Regarding the Ortega Street Improvements [NTIP Capital] project, Member Ortega asked in which circumstances the SFMTA had chosen to implement raised crosswalks and how effective painted crosswalks were.

Brian Liang, Senior Transportation Planner at the SFMTA, said that raised crosswalks were effective in slowing traffic and were selected for this project as a result of outreach to middle schools in the area. He said that school stakeholders had said there were many high-speed vehicles coming off of Sunset Boulevard. Mr. Liang added that continental crosswalks, with multiple stripes parallel to the direction of car travel, had become a City standard and were planned to be implemented at unmarked crosswalks and crosswalks with older-style markings consisting of two stripes perpendicular to the direction of car travel.

Member Barz asked if there had been projections of the number of people who would benefit from the Ortega Street Improvements project and the Northern Embarcadero and Jefferson Street Quick-Builds project.

Mr. Liang responded that there was no estimate of usage along Ortega Street, though



he stated the corridor was one of the most used bikeways in the area and had high pedestrian activity, partly due to the adjacent schools.

Casey Hildreth, Project Manager for Livable Streets at the SFTMA, stated that for the Northern Embarcadero and Jefferson Street Quick-Builds project, there had been estimates of around 2,000 cyclists per day along the waterfront and that this project was expected to increase the number of cyclists who continued north toward Fisherman's Wharf. He said that SF Port could be a resource for additional data on the number of visitors and employees in the area.

Chair Siegal said she was excited about District 5 daylighting. She asked how much it would cost to add bike racks or painted safety zones at key intersections where the District 5 Daylighting [NTP] project was creating space formerly occupied by parked cars.

Ms. Hake said she did not have an estimate of the cost to add additional painted safety zones at particular intersections, but she said they were a relatively low-cost treatment. She noted that SFMTA aimed to implement daylighting to improve visibility at intersections first, but she said SFMTA staff had started discussing potential future uses for daylit areas. She said the discussions were preliminary and did not include how future treatments would be implemented.

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

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

## **5. State and Federal Legislation Update – INFORMATION**

Martin Reyes, Principal Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Levine inquired about progress on increasing local control over autonomous vehicles (AVs). He referenced state legislation from the previous year that had been tabled or failed and asked whether it had been revived or if anyone was pursuing support for community control of AVs.

Mr. Reyes stated that there were no current bills similar to last year's efforts on data and local control.

Member Ford referenced AB 939, the Safe, Sustainable, Traffic-Reducing Transportation Bond Act of 2026, and asked how the revenue measure would impact San Francisco.

Mr. Reyes stated that the measure was a statewide general obligation bond sponsored by LA Metro. He noted that recent reports had suggested it might not move forward, and efforts were underway to gather more information and confirm its status but that if it did proceed, it could appear on the ballot alongside a potential Bay Area transportation revenue measure, meaning Bay Area voters would decide on both measures simultaneously.



Member Ortega asked if the \$20 billion bond was intended for statewide use and requested clarification on how the funds would be allocated.

Mr. Reyes stated that this type of bond could generally be used only for capital projects, including transportation projects. However, he noted that there was no specific expenditure plan yet, that projects had not been designated, and it was unclear whether the bond measure would move forward this session.

Member Barz sought clarification on whether the Transit Operations Financial Responsibility and Implementation Plan (T-FRIP) requirements had been removed from Senate Bill (SB) 63 and what was the rationale.

Mr. Reyes stated that amendments were expected to be released on Friday and he stated that during that week's committee meetings, it was decided the T-FRIP language was no longer needed because it had served its purpose by prompting local agencies to begin discussions on the expenditure plan. Mr. Reyes mentioned that the Transportation Authority had been involved in meetings with Alameda County Transportation Commission, Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA), SAMTRANS, and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) to shape the T-FRIP and inform the expenditure plan. He said that as the process was underway, state legislators agreed the language was no longer necessary, aligning with the original vision that it would not be needed in later versions of the bill.

Member Barz asked for clarification on how SB 63, which included initiatives from the 2021 Bay Area Transit Transformation Action Plan, would be funded through a regional measure.

Mr. Reyes stated the bill specified that up to 10% of revenue measure funding could go to Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for transit transformation initiatives. He noted that the specific projects or programs to be funded had not yet been determined, but MTC was developing potential expenditure plans as part of the T-FRIP process. He highlighted that the plan included customer-facing transit improvements, such as mapping, wayfinding, and fare integration, along with capital projects like transit signal pre-empt.

Member Milford-Rosales sought clarification on SB 63, asking whether it would authorize counties to add their own ballot measures.

Mr. Reyes explained that the bill authorized the creation of a new district, the Transportation Revenue Measure District, which would initially include Alameda, Contra Costa, and San Francisco counties, with San Mateo and Santa Clara able to opt in, potentially expanding it to five counties. He clarified that once the geography was established and the bill passed, MTC could place a measure on the ballot, and the counties' boards of supervisors would be required to include the measure on their ballots. He also mentioned that the bill allowed for a citizen initiative, which, if qualified, would also require the counties to place it on the ballot in the district as defined in the ballot language.

Member Milford-Rosales asked about the citizen initiative process and if it required efforts in each county to gather enough signatures for the initiative to appear on that county's ballot.

Mr. Reyes stated that, to his understanding, there was no specific signature threshold



per county, but rather a total threshold for the entire district.

Member Milford-Rosales stated that he had been confused about how the citizen initiative option might work and was initially concerned it would shift all the responsibility to advocates.

Chief Deputy Director Maria Lombardo clarified that SB 63 did not “authorize” a citizen initiative, but rather it enabled that as an option by establishing the Transportation Revenue Measure District, which would enable a citizens initiative to be placed on the ballot in the multi-county district. She explained that otherwise, there would need to be a separate citizens initiative process in each county which seemed fraught with challenges.

Chair Siegal asked whether the bill was expected to specify the percentage of funds allocated to each county or how the money would be divided.

Mr. Reyes stated that before the bill reached its final form, it was expected to include an expenditure plan. He noted that the bill would likely specify either dollar amounts or percentages allocated to operators and potentially to transit transformation as well.

There was no public comment.

**6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Amend the Adopted Fiscal Year 2024/25 Budget to Decrease Revenues by \$3,517,851 and Decrease Expenditures by \$8,877,808 for a Total Net Increase in Fund Balance of \$5,359,957 – ACTION**

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

Member Levine asked about the relationship between the Treasure Island Mobility Management Agency (TIMMA) and the Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA).

Ms. Yu explained that the Transportation Authority was designated as TIMMA with its board also serving as the board for Treasure Island [with the responsibility of implementation the Treasure Island Transportation Program]. She stated that TIDA was a city department [responsible for implementing the redevelopment plan for Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island] and clarified that while TIMMA cooperated with TIDA, the two entities were separate.

Member Levine asked whether conflicts ever arose regarding how to proceed on certain issues and inquired whether control had rested with TIDA or TIMMA.

Rachel Hiatt, Deputy Director for Planning, stated that TIMMA had specific responsibilities and authorities to implement the transportation program approved by the Board of Supervisors 15 years ago. She explained that TIMMA was tasked with implementing and operating transportation improvements on the island, while TIDA held broader authority over the overall development project, including land use, infrastructure, and utilities. She added that TIMMA had executed a memoranda of agreement with TIDA to define their respective responsibilities.

Member Levine stated that was what he’d wanted to know.

Member Ortega asked for clarification, stating that \$3.5 million from the current year's budget was deferred to the next year's budget due to project delays, and asked if that was correct.

Ms. Yu confirmed that was correct.



Member Ortega asked for clarification on the source of the additional \$8 million in deferred funds and inquired about where the funds originated.

Ms. Yu stated that the \$8 million decrease or deferral of funds from fiscal year (FY) 2024/25 to FY 2025/2026 included \$3.5 million in TIMMA funds and \$5.4 million in TNC tax expenditures.

Member Ortega asked if the \$5.4 million TNC tax had been deferred until next year because the contract hadn't been awarded yet, or if it was related to TIMMA.

Ms. Yu stated that the \$3.5 million in TIMMA grant funds and associated expenditures had been deferred to the next fiscal year.

With respect to the TNC Tax, Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, explained that the budget for expenditures had been allocated to projects with grants from the TNC tax. She clarified that the delay reflected the slower invoicing rate for quick builds and delivery rate for the traffic calming program.

Member Ortega asked if those were the instances where they had been slow to request payment.

Ms. LaForte stated that they were slow in requesting payment for quick build projects and slow in delivering traffic calming measures.

Member Ford asked about traffic calming project delivery issues and whether the delays were due to a lack of resident applications or failures in project execution, resulting in projected completion dates as late as 2027.

Ms. LaForte stated that the grants funded by the TNC tax, as reflected in the budget, supported the traffic calming program for fiscal years 2024 and 2025. She explained that the program was designed as a rolling initiative with concurrent implementation while SFMTA continued accepting applications. Ms. LaForte noted, however, that implementation had been delayed due to SFMTA focusing on a backlog of prior year applications. She added that SFMTA was expected to address the issue at an upcoming meeting, ideally next month.

Member Ford asked what the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) was and which voter-approved taxes funded it. She stated that the agency seemed to be funding significant development on Yerba Buena Island (YBI) and noted she did not recall a specific tax for those projects having appeared on the ballot.

Ms. Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, confirmed that there was no specific tax on the ballot to fund the YBI projects or the agency's CMA role. She explained that the agency's CMA role was based in state statute which had the intent of incentivizing urbanized areas to strategically link transportation funding decisions to congestion management, stemming from an era where suburban sprawl and congestion were rapidly increasing in the state. She explained there was no direct funding associated with this effort. As the CMA, Ms. Lombardo noted that the agency developed the long-range countywide transportation plan (known as the San Francisco Transportation Plan), occasionally delivered projects such as those on YBI on behalf of TIDA, and served as a single point of contact and local partner for the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). In the latter capacity, she explained that the Transportation Authority was responsible for prioritizing and/or programming various state and federal fund sources to San Francisco projects, following the guidelines



established by the MTC for the nine county Bay Area region. Finally, she stated that grant funding secured for projects like the YBI ramp projects were listed under the CMA function for accounting purposes, as they were not sales tax projects.

Member Barz asked for clarification on whether the delayed TIMMA project referred to improvements to the ferry terminal on Treasure Island.

Ms. Yu stated that was correct.

Member Barz inquired about the delay, asking if it had been related to procurement issues and whether the Buy America provision had posed a challenge.

Ms. Yu stated that the delay was due to finalizing construction cost estimates, completing the final drawings, and ensuring compliance with Buy America requirements.

Member Ortega asked for clarification on Buy America requirements.

Ms. Yu stated that under federal requirements, local agencies were required to purchase products made in America. [For construction projects funded by federal dollars, all steel, iron and manufactured products used in the project must be produced in the United States.]

Ms. Lombardo added that federal Buy America regulations complicated the process, which required more time and effort in the preparation of the documents to support the bidding process.

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 Barz, Ford, Levine, Kim, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, Ng, Ortega, and Siegal (9)

Absent: CAC Members Daniels and Imaduddin (2)

## **7. Preliminary Fiscal Year 2025/26 Budget and Work Program – INFORMATION**

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

Member Ortega expressed concern that the Transportation Authority planned to draw down \$110 million as early as summer, leaving only \$10 million remaining on the revolving credit agreement. She asked what would happen next, noting that \$10 million was insufficient given the expenditures of capital projects. She asked about the process for obtaining more credit or the options available if projects had to be cut.

Ms. Yu stated that the staff would closely monitor capital project expenditures in coordination with project sponsors. She noted that they had requested to draw down \$65 million for the fiscal year, but the drawdown would occur in separate tranches based on actual invoice needs and that she also anticipated the potential need to issue another bond in the future.

Ms. Lombardo added that approving this level of anticipated debt in the budget would balance it based on projected capital expenditures for the year. She mentioned that staff closely monitored project progress and expenses and that projects often



billed other grants first, allowing the Transportation Authority to hold onto sales tax funds longer and/or push off debt needs. She explained that when expenses were anticipated to exceed available cash, staff requested approval from the Board to draw from the revolver, and then made the actual draws in tranches only when needed and sized to fit the immediate need. She emphasized the agency's preference for just-in-time debt issuance to minimize financing costs. When nearing the limit of the revolver capacity, Ms. Lombardo said that they agency would analyze market conditions and, if necessary, seek Board approval to issue bonds or increase the revolver capacity, following due diligence analysis of the options. She added that staff worked with project sponsors to develop a reasonable estimate of capital expenditures, project delays and/or receipt of additional grants often impacted cash flow, but effective checks and balances were in place.

Member Levine referred to page 117 of the presentation, stating the total projected revenues were approximately \$197 million and that 19% of this, or \$37.4 million, came from federal grant funding. He then asked whether, given market conditions and the situation in Washington, this figure was realistic and could reasonably be expected to materialize.

Ms. Yu stated that all grants in the budget had been obligated and secured. She noted that there had been no updates from grantor agencies on potential risks, except for the Treasure Island Connects grant from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The EPA had notified them that the grant was on pause, and they were proceeding cautiously. She said that little work would be done in FY 2024/25, but the pause was expected to end, and they were budgeting accordingly. She added that any changes would prompt a budget amendment.

Member Ford stated that the presentation showed there was an expenditure of \$250 million and revenue of \$200 million, creating a 25% deficit. She stated she was concerned that such a high deficit could fully exhaust the credit, and that the presentation did not address moving projects to balance the budget and asked why revenue projections did not anticipate an increase in the coming years. She also inquired about efforts to balance the budget, given the lack of a new federal administration in the near future.

Ms. Yu stated that the budget for FY 2025/26 included a decrease in expenditures across multiple program funds, particularly the sales tax program. She said that in FY 2024/25, the Transportation Authority had budgeted \$133 million based on cash flow schedules and anticipated reimbursement requests. She explained that the sales tax budget was proposed to be reduced to \$125 million. She also mentioned that, for other programs, the cash flow schedules were closely reviewed in consultation with partner agencies to develop the preliminary budget estimates.

Member Ford asked if the deficit was \$50 million.

Ms. Yu stated that they had balanced the books (revenues vs. expenditures) using the revolving credit agreement.

Ms. Lombardo explained that project payments were typically made on a reimbursement basis, so funds are not paid out upfront. She stated that the Transportation Authority estimated annual allocations based on project schedules and adjusted them as needed if progress slowed. She stated that these adjustments may





not always be reflected in the current year's budget since projects typically had multi-year reimbursement schedules. She added that the Transportation Authority conducted a mid-year budget review, during which revenue or expenditure adjustments were made and brought to the CAC if necessary.

Member Barz stated that the use of a revolving credit agreement was typical in situations involving a deficit. She asked how significant the \$50 million deficit was and whether similar gaps between expenditures and revenues had occurred in previous years or if this was unusual.

Ms. Yu stated that the current budget process was not unusual.

Member Barz asked Ms. Yu if she knew what the difference was at the same time last year.

Ms. Lombardo stated that the previous year's amount was \$65 million, confirmed by Ms. Yu, and that staff had assumed the use of a revolver to fill the gap. She reminded the CAC that the Prop L Strategic Plan recommended for approval by the CAC the prior month, advanced sales tax funds to deliver projects faster than a pay-as-you-go (cash) approach would allow and that the Strategic Plan assumed a combination of short-term revolver loans and longer-term sales tax bonds to finance the sales tax program.

Member Barz thanked staff for the clarification and appreciated the inclusion of the work program slides. She found them to be a helpful reminder of the Transportation Authority's efforts. She then asked about the timeline for updates on major planning studies, such as the Geary reconnecting communities study.

Ms. Hiatt reported that the study had just started and that the procurement process was underway for two key aspects. She mentioned recruiting members for the 12-person community council, which would advise on the study, with formation expected by the end of May. She also said that they were procuring technical professional services, including engineering, planning, and design teams, expected to be on board by summer. She stated that work would begin thereafter and would consult with her team to determine when an update would be provided to the CAC.

Member Kim asked if he understood correctly that using revolving credit was a standard process, indicating it was time to issue a bond rather than just creating a deficit. He inquired if it served as a tool to distribute funding.

Ms. Lombardo confirmed Member Kim's assumption, explaining that issuing a bond before the projects sought reimbursement from the agency would trigger a timeframe to spend down the proceeds to maintain tax-exempt status, which they wanted to avoid given risks inherent in project delivery. She confirmed that expenses (beyond what cash could cover) were initially covered by the short-term revolver, then refunded with a bond. She added that market conditions were considered each time, noting that at times in the past, market conditions had favored renewing or expanding revolvers due to lower costs. However, when conditions changed that made a bond more economical, a bond was issued.

Member Kim stated that he understood the situation. He explained that bonds could help when interest rates were low or falling, but given the current market fluctuations, it might be better to wait until it stabilized. He acknowledged that using revolving



credit made sense and thanked staff for the clarification.

Chair Siegal appreciated having all the items listed in the work program, calling it a useful overview of discussions from the past several years. She inquired whether seeking Neighborhood Transportation Program (NTP) funding to advance adopted recommendations was primarily the responsibility of the Transportation Authority, rather than the district supervisor's office, to ensure these programs were funded and progressed.

Ms. LaForte stated that the use of NTP funds was at the discretion of the district supervisor. She explained that it could be up to the office to decide whether the funds would support an early phase of the project, such as positioning high-priority recommendations in a plan. She added that the funds could also be used for further planning or design phases to help a project compete for a discretionary grant or serve as the local match.

Chair Siegal asked if the listed projects were those the District Supervisor's office was expected to request funding for in the next budget cycle.

Ms. Lombardo stated that the supervisor might request additional funds for the next phase. She added that, now that these plans were complete, they would work with the supervisor's office to pursue discretionary funding, which might still require a match from NTP but would ideally include outside funding.

During public comment, Edward Mason expressed concern about grant funding, stating his initial reaction had been that every level of government was financially strained. He acknowledged existing guarantees on the current grants, which had led him to accept it, though he remained cautious. He emphasized his belief that all levels of government, including the state, were financially unstable. Regarding revolving credit, Mr. Mason stated that interest would be paid on any drawdown and cautioned against viewing it as free money. He also noted potential project cost increases due to inflation and recognized that the revolving credit might be a necessary compromise. On travel demand, he commented on the proposed travel diary survey, questioning what motivated people to stay in traffic despite regular delays. He suggested that a regional express bus system could offer a faster, more efficient alternative, encouraging a shift in commuter behavior.

## **8. Vision Zero Freeway Ramps Study Update – INFORMATION**

Rachel Hiatt, Deputy Director for Planning, presented the item per staff memorandum.

Member Barz expressed delight to see this move forward. She then asked why the focus was on near term improvements, Suggesting that it might be an opportunity to think big.

Ms. Hiatt responded that the grantor wanted quick build improvements and changes that could be implemented quickly. She continued by saying that while not in the scope, staff anticipates that ideas for long-range planning would be identified through the study work and engagement.

Member Barz asked why that was the case and if Caltrans was the funder.

Ms. Hiatt responded that USDOT was the funder, while Caltrans was the right-of-way operator and assisted with grant administration.



Member Barz asked how the toolkit had been developed.

Ms. Hiatt responded that the Transportation Authority had started with the Muni toolkit but expanded from there.

Member Barz, a District 7 resident and neighbor of a victim killed at one of these intersections, emphasized the need to consider the land's opportunity cost. She suggested that not all ramps may be necessary in the future and focused her questioning on the number of people impacted by these projects. She stated that framing improvements differently was important, citing examples such as 10,000 people having to go 2 minutes slower was worth it to ensure 15,000 people had a safer walk home, or that improvements had now reduced fatalities by 33%.

Member Ortega stated that the exit in the Glen Park area leads to San Jose Avenue and expressed a desire for the study continue along that path. She described San Jose Avenue as a "fake highway" with a bike lane and noted that cars exceeded 60 mph, despite the 40 mph speed limit. She stated the road leads to a traffic light where drivers end up in a left turn lane on the J Muni tracks, which she deemed dangerous. She stated there was a need for improvements in that area, not just at the exit, but along that whole stretch.

Ms. Hiatt stated there were many instances, like Bayshore and Alemany, with similar corridor-level challenges. She explained that corridors could not be addressed in this work, nor could they be designed, but visibility could be brought to such issues.

Member Ortega asked that staff add that detail to the presentation.

Member Barz stated she had ridden on the bike lane that morning, choosing San Jose Avenue as the most direct option. She emphasized that she did not take this decision lightly and never rode on San Jose Avenue with her son.

Member Margarita stated she appreciated the planned outreach for the summer. She requested the inclusion of the Mission Library and the Bayshore Library in the outreach and asked about the organizations already contacted.

Ms. Hiatt stated staff would share that information with the CAC.

Member Levine stated that there have been instances where highway off ramps and transit connections led to fatalities at the ramp. He highlighted the danger of transferring to/from transit near highways. Member Levine said the safety of transit users was a priority, stating that people should not be exposed to dangerous areas with cars when choosing to take transit.

Ms. Hiatt stated that she viewed transit ridership as a key part of meeting the goals.

Member Ford followed up on the toolkit and raised concerns about the land use around urban parcels. She questioned the necessity of having nine freeway ramps within a mile and noted that safety issues also exist on the freeway and on its off-ramps. She asked if solutions could go beyond plastic barriers and address the driver experience.

Member Siegel agreed that the long-term viability of how the freeway interacts with the city streets should be considered. She emphasized the need to slow traffic before it reached intersections and supported improvements such as crosswalk and ADA-accessible curb ramps. She asked whether such features should be standard at all



freeway ramp touch downs, eliminating the need for further study or discussion on these basic improvements.

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that pedestrian and signal signs had been hacked in Palo Alto. He emphasized the need to ensure the pedestrian signal improvements were secure from hacking.

## **Other Items**

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

Member Barz stated that the Budget and Legislative Analyst had published a policy analysis report in response to Chair Melgar's inquiry regarding the economic costs and fiscal impacts of traffic collisions in San Francisco. She noted that between 2018 and 2022, traffic collisions resulted in approximately \$2.5 billion in economic losses, either paid by private insurers, the City, or borne by individuals. She expressed concern over the \$60 million paid out due to collisions involving City vehicles, noting it was double that of SFMTA's annual streets budget. Member Barz requested a presentation from the report's authors to discuss the implications of traffic collisions in San Francisco.

There was no public comment.

### **10. Public Comment**

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that he had visited the library earlier that day and came across an email from the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition, which was soliciting participation from the city or schools in the Bike & Roll to School program. He noted the program included bikes, scooters, skateboards, and wheelchairs, prompting him to question whether funding had been approved for scooters and skateboards for school transportation.

### **11. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:03 p.m.