



DRAFT MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, May 28, 2025

1. Minutes: Clerk Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Siegal called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

CAC members present at Roll: Najuawanda Daniels, Phoebe Ford, Zameel Imaduddin, Sean Kim, Jerry Levine, Sharon Ng, Rachael Ortega, and Kat Siegal (8)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Sara Barz, (entered during Item 2) , Venecia Margarita (entered during Item 6), and Austin Milford-Rosales (3)

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Siegal congratulated Sean Kim on his reappointment to the CAC. She then reported that the Transportation Authority was conducting outreach on the I-280 Ocean Avenue Off-Ramp Project to present an overview and gather community feedback on ramp design, bike and pedestrian improvements, and connectivity priorities. She said the project aimed to realign the off-ramp into a signalized intersection with bike upgrades to Howth Street and that an in-person Town Hall had been scheduled for next month at San Francisco City College, and staff offered presentations to local groups and the CAC.

Chair Siegal stated that the Transportation Authority Board had received a presentation on the Downtown Travel Survey, based on the 2023 Bay Area household travel diary survey during their May 13 meeting. She noted that staff planned to share findings with the CAC at an upcoming meeting. She concluded by stating that the CAC would receive an update on the San Francisco Transportation Plan 2050+ later on the agenda, which incorporated data from the household travel diary survey into baseline conditions.

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

3. Approve the Minutes of the April 23, 2025 Meeting - ACTION

4. State and Federal Legislation Update – INFORMATION

5. Internal Accounting Report, Investment Report, and Debt Expenditure Report for the Nine Months Ending March 31, 2025 - INFORMATION

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Daniels, Margarita, and Milford-Rosales (3)



End of Consent Agenda

6. **Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the Proposed Fiscal Year 2025/26 Budget and Work Program - ACTION**

Cynthia Fong, Deputy Director for Finance and Administration, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Barz asked why the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) grant awarded to TIMMA was terminated and requested details on the nature of the termination.

Suany Chough, Assistant Deputy Director for Planning, stated that she also managed the Treasure Island Transportation Program and reported that the letter received was brief, citing a misalignment between the project's goals and the current administration's priorities.

Member Barz asked if Ms. Chough had ever received a similar letter before in her career.

Ms. Chough stated that she had not.

Member Barz asked about the agency's exposure to federal grants and potential risks from changes in the administration's goals.

Ms. Fong responded that staff had been anticipating this possibility, but had confirmed that current funding, primarily for Yerba Buena Island capital projects, remained unchanged. She assured the committee that any significant updates would be communicated promptly.

Chair Siegal asked whether the planned projects would be deferred or whether staff would seek alternative funding.

Ms. Chough replied that there were plans to seek other funding sources to complete projects that were previously intended to be funded by the grant. She added that the grant period began on January 1 and progress was limited as the grant had been paused in late January.

During public comment, Richard Johnson, a member of the Hayes Valley community, noted a supervisor was seeking funds for a study on closing Hayes Street, which he wanted to bring to the attention of the CAC..

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Ford, Imaduddin, Levine, Kim, Margarita, Ng, Ortega, and Siegal (10)

Absent: CAC Member Milford-Rosales (1)

7. **Adopt a Motion of Support Approve and Authorize the Executive Director to Execute a 20-Year Lease with Two Five-Year Options to Extend, with the City and County of San Francisco's Real Estate Department for Office Space Located at 1455 Market Street, in an Amount Not to Exceed \$1,126,597 for the First Year, Plus Operating and Other Lease Related Expenses, and Annual 3% Rent Increases; and to Negotiate Lease Payment Terms and Non-Material Terms and Conditions – ACTION**



Cynthia Fong, Deputy Director for Finance and Administration, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Ortega asked about the current rent increase at the property, noting it was initially 3% but had dropped to 2.5%, and inquired about the cause of the decrease.

Ms. Fong stated it had been a negotiated offer for a 13-year lease and expressed agreement with reducing costs.

Member Ortega asked about the fiscal impact, noting the increase was preferable to other options despite budget concerns from a \$100 million deficit. She then asked whether the building purchase that was planned for 2027 was still happening.

Ms. Fong stated the City had the option to purchase the building by 2027, though it was uncertain if they would, and suggested the contract might be extended beyond 20 years if continued benefits persisted.

Member Ortega asked how the City contract and ownership structure of the building would work, how it would affect financial statements compared to renting from a third party and inquired about the building's real estate value.

Ms. Fong stated she did not know the information but could follow up with the City's Department of Real Estate.

Member Levine stated that he had been concerned about the status of the potential city purchase but acknowledged that his question had been answered in the prior exchange.

Member Imaduddin asked if any analysis had been done comparing hybrid work models, such as a lease arrangement that allowed alternating months in-office and remote, to full-time in-office work in the post-COVID era.

Ms. Fong stated the Transportation Authority had considered various options and, due to the nature of their work and ongoing CAC meetings and meetings with city counterparts and others, the Transportation Authority needed a consistent space for staff to gather.

Member Kim stated that despite a down market, a 3% annual increase in San Francisco real estate could have a significant long-term impact and be seen as high.

Ms. Fong stated that the proposed lease with the City incorporated terms of a negotiated deal, which the Transportation Authority was not involved in, except to express interest in staying in the building to reduce lease and administrative costs. She added that the deal was negotiated by the City's Director of Property, approved by the Board of Supervisors, and included extended benefits to the Transportation Authority.

Chair Siegal asked if the amended lease assumption had been included in the budget presented to the CAC.

Ms. Fong stated there was no need for amendment, noting the 3% increase aligned with typical year-on-year budget and rent rises. She added that staff had accounted for a new lease in its multi-year budget projections, had expected higher costs, and found the proposed increase reasonable and close to the inflation rate.

Member Margarita stated she knew the current lease would end in 2025 and suggested thinking outside the box due to the deficit and post-COVID challenges. She proposed using Zoom or community spaces for meetings to save costs, questioned the impact of not renewing the contract, and considered buying a building instead of continuing the



nearly million-dollar annual expense.

Ms. Fong said there was a possibility of the City buying the building, which would reduce rental costs by sharing expenses among City departments. She noted a WeWork-style shared space had not been offered by the landlord. She said that many City departments were moving into the building, and none used a rotating or hoteling structure.

Member Ng asked what it meant to have an option to buy the building in 2027 and whether it would be possible to buy it in 2026 or 2028 instead.

Ms. Fong clarified that the City and County of San Francisco, not the Transportation Authority, would purchase the building. She stated the City had agreed with the landlords to exercise an option before March 2027, subject to certain terms and Board of Supervisors approval. She also stated she had not been part of the decision-making team, and the Transportation Authority was only the lessee in the arrangement.

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Ford, Imaduddin, Levine, Kim, Margarita, Ng, Ortega, and Siegal (10)

Absent: CAC Member Milford-Rosales (1)

8. San Francisco Transportation Plan 2050+ Update – INFORMATION

Suany Chough, Assistant Deputy Director for Planning, and Amy Thomson, Transportation Planner, presented the item.

Member Ortega stated that the City needed to move away from downtown-centric transit planning and adopt a more multi-hub approach like Tokyo's. She underscored the importance of improving north-south and east-west connections and addressing accessibility issues. She also asked about the current data on freight movement.

Ms. Chough stated that staff had not yet conducted a formal study of goods movement but recognized the issue's growing importance. She explained the primary focus had been on moving people, but now deliveries were increasing, raising questions about their traffic impact. She stated that it might be increasing traffic but possibly replacing shopping trips. She noted a lack of good data and expressed a desire to obtain better citywide information.

Member Ortega asked if outreach was planned to other businesses with large freight shipments to compare their impact with smaller delivery services like DoorDash and Uber Eats.

Ms. Chough stated staff had not scoped anything yet but expected the study could include freight, as well as DoorDash type trips and smaller modes like e-bikes.

Member Ortega expressed interest in the parameters set up for the analysis and asked how much less transit service there was in 2023 compared to 2019.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, stated that staff would have to follow up to get for the various operators, but it was available.



Member Ortega stated that, despite a 41% overall trip reduction and significant transit declines, she wanted to know how much transit service was reduced compared to that decrease. She also asked if she could get a copy of the base study on job access and the data behind the reported increase.

Ms. Chough stated that job access was based on their modeling and staff could probably share more detailed maps.

Chair Siegal commented that the SFMTA reported monthly service hours to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and that 2023 service levels were 88% to 94% of early 2020 levels, which she found impressive given the ridership recovery.

Member Kim commented that it was a major investment plan for the future and asked if there were any scenarios covering operational expenses. He noted that current fare and parking revenues covered only a small portion and inquired about future goals, given the high costs of projects like a new subway system. He asked whether future investments over the next ten years would result in higher or lower operational coverage.

Ms. Chough stated staff would model and analyze various investment scenarios to assess their performance against goals and share the results with the group and the public.

Member Kim commented that while major investments like the Central Subway are important, they often fail to cover operating costs, creating long-term financial issues. He highlighted the need for strategic investment to reduce dependency on general funds and increase revenue through higher ridership. He also stated that transit usage declined significantly from 2019 to 2022 despite only a small population drop, suggesting ridership relied more on commuters, including those from outside San Francisco. He asked about the lack of outreach to regional visitors and what the plan was to engage them.

Ms. Chough explained that the household travel survey data was regional and included travelers from all nine counties and that while the agency would like to improve data on leisure visitors to San Francisco, current analysis focused on today's travel behaviors. She stated that despite projected job and population growth over 30 years, baseline assumptions still included high levels of remote work, which limited expected trip increases and she said that this would be further analyzed to understand its impact on transportation and the city landscape.

Member Kim stated that local input, especially from former visitors to San Francisco, was essential for understanding public sentiment. As a small business owner, he noted that many people, including contractors and family, were now avoiding the city due to safety concerns and logistical challenges like parking and break-ins. Although safety had improved, he pointed out the need for honest feedback to develop effective plans. He said that he appreciated the report's data on travel trends among low-income and senior populations but suggested that the plan was overlooking these groups' transportation needs.

Member Barz stated that parts of the San Francisco Transportation Plan (SFTP) 2050+ presentation, based on SF-CHAMP Modeling, showed significant vehicular congestion on main arteries and highways. She said she was confused over the seemingly small change in congestion between 2023 and 2050 despite planned growth, and questioned how the network could handle such growth without worsening congestion and suggested it might hinder the City's development goals.



Ms. Lombardo commented that some parts of the highway network, in particular, were near capacity and that given that there were not plans to expand highway capacity, future growth would not be able to all take the form of vehicle travel. She emphasized the need for more transit, biking, and pedestrian options to accommodate projected growth and other ways (e.g. operational improvements) to focus on movement of people.

Member Barz stated that the vehicle network was (near) saturated and could not handle more growth, emphasizing that this issue should be the main focus in SFTP messaging. She noted that the West Side Network Study did not address the conflict between planned family housing growth, the already congested streets, and lack of good transit options, expressing concern about future livability and growth targets.

Rachel Hiatt, Deputy Director for Planning, explained that San Francisco's street and highway network had largely remained unchanged, with minimal exceptions. She stated that instead of adding or widening roads, efforts had focused on moving more people within existing roadway capacity using strategies like dedicated bus lanes, which had improved bus travel times and efficiency. She stated that these people-moving strategies were part of previous investment plans and would be reassessed for cost-effectiveness, including options on the west side.

Ms. Thomson stated that the anticipated growth in San Francisco was already included in SF-CHAMP Modeling. She explained that the West Side Network Study was being conducted recognizing the planned growth in residents and wanted to ensure that the transportation network could support them.

Member Barz stated she was concerned at the presentation's lack of focus on north-south transit through the city, noting many West Side residents had felt driving was the only option. Though supportive of rezoning for more families, she emphasized the urgent need for a clear and significant West Side transit plan, especially addressing North-South travel.

Ms. Thomson confirmed that the North-South transit connections had been identified as a need, confirmed by other existing plans and modeling results.

Member Ford stated she was concerned that the study assumed flat revenue despite significant growth in jobs and population, calling that an unreasonable assumption. She emphasized that growth should benefit current residents, not just future ones, and should be framed as enabling positive outcomes like keeping schools open and improving services, rather than increasing traffic. She stressed the need to consider freight and industrial zoning in planning, cited inadequate framing of trade-offs in the goals, and questioned whether the needs of non-drivers, especially the elderly, were being addressed.

Vice Chair Daniels asked where to find the Safety & Livability, Equity, and Environmental Sustainability goals mentioned in the presentation.

Ms. Chough stated staff used metrics to measure progress toward goals like safety, livability, environment, and equity. She said that for safety, they examined how much of the high injury network was in Equity Priority Communities (EPCs) and that for equity, they assessed affordability, job access, and transit crowding, and used these metrics to evaluate and optimize project scenarios. She explained that the goals had been elaborated on in the SFTP 2050+ report, each with descriptions and metrics and that she



would share them.

Ms. Hiatt explained that each goal area had indicators or metrics, some projected quantitatively through modeling and others qualitatively due to forecasting limitations. She stated that although forecasting future collisions was not possible, correlated measures like speeds and vehicle miles traveled were used to assess safety performance.

Vice Chair Daniels emphasized that she wanted to see and understand the equity goal.

Member Margarita asked why the network study focused only on the West Side instead of including the Northeast, South, or an overall citywide study. She questioned which adults were expected to drive less by 2050, noting that low-income people often need multiple jobs and rely on cars due to inadequate transit options. She referenced challenges with bus routes and highlighted considering regional travelers who commute into the city for work. She urged thinking beyond the West Side to address all residents' needs.

Member Imaduddin asked if the community outreach sessions had already taken place, whether there was data available, and what the findings were.

Ms. Chough explained that staff had just launched the survey last week and had already received about a hundred responses. She said staff had not yet reviewed the results but had begun meetings with community organizations and that more meetings were scheduled through mid-July, and said that no results were available to report yet.

Member Ng asked how the Transportation Authority was finding organizations to outreach to in an equitable way.

Ms. Chough explained staff had a current database of about 80 organizations and had contacted each supervisor's office to obtain more, ensuring coverage of every neighborhood and all citywide organizations.

Member Ng asked if the feedback would simply be incorporated into the SFTP 2050+ report or translated into policy priorities or projects.

Ms. Chough stated the feedback would inform priorities for reshaping the investment plan, which needed to shrink due to financial constraints, and the vision scenario, and that many comments would influence policy thinking, policy papers, and discussions, rather than direct projects or spending categories.

Member Ng asked if there had been a proposal or consideration to align the priority equity geographies used by the Planning Department with those in other departments, noting that housing, land use, and transit projects overlapped but seemed to operate using different equity geographies.

Ms. Chough explained that the Transportation Authority's equity priority community (EPC) map was available on its website and aligned with the city's standards. She said it was based off the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) regional map, with some slight refinements. She said staff were also working on analyses to evaluate different metrics for the equity priority communities.

Member Ng asked whether all city departments used the EPC boundaries or if some, like San Francisco Planning, operated based on their own boundaries, such as the Priority Equity Geographies.



Ms. Lombardo stated that the Transportation Authority used EPCs because that was what MTC used since the SFTP provided the basis for San Francisco's input into the regional plan. She also acknowledged the confusion caused by different state grant programs using varying methods to identify low-income communities. She said staff would look specifically at the Planning Department's Priority Equity Geographies to provide a more specific answer.

Member Ortega suggested considering a congestion pricing model similar to New York City's, noting it had generated revenue for the city and the New York Metropolitan Transportation Authority despite some legal challenges.

Chair Siegal stated that the SFMTA's current service cuts appeared misaligned with the previously adopted SFTP 2050 plan and the proposed 2050+ vision, highlighting that reduced transit disproportionately impacted low-income residents and risked worsening traffic. She questioned whether the Transportation Authority Board had considered urging the City to take action to address these issues.

Ms. Lombardo stated the SFTP was likely the strongest way for the Transportation Authority Board to contribute, as it set a long-range vision for transportation for the city. She noted the fiscally constrained plan reflected MTC's best estimate of available funding through 2050, which would only maintain something close to the status quo given reduced revenues; however, she noted that the Vision scenarios provided a place for hopes and dreams with potential improvements that could be funded with new revenues and that provided a basis for advocacy for additional funding.

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that he reviewed MTC's Plan Bay Area 2050 and found no demographic justification for the projected population growth to 1.2 million in San Francisco by 2025. He noted ongoing global depopulation and declining birth rates, questioning where new residents would come from. He compared the plan to past unrealized projects like the Geary Light Rail and doubted the feasibility of new transit expansions due to insufficient population and jobs. He also pointed out the lack of a regional express bus system.

Richard Johnson stated he had attended many Market & Octavia CAC meetings, and it was his first time listening to the Transportation Authority's CAC. He noted that long-term planning did not address reducing solo drivers or invest adequately in regional transit. He criticized spending on superficial projects and stressed the need to study casual travelers' needs, improve transit comfort and safety, and focus on efficient, cost-effective people movement.

9. SFMTA Muni Metro Core Capacity Planning Study Update – INFORMATION

Jesse Koehler, Rail Program Manager, and Liz Brisson, SFMTA Major Corridors Planning Manager, presented the item per staff memorandum.

Member Barz noted that the Core Capacity program was a federal grant program and that the Transportation Authority had recently lost a grant because the project no longer aligned with the current administration's goals. She asked why the SFMTA still had confidence that the federal program would continue to award projects as described.

Ms. Brisson replied that the SFMTA would not seek a grant until more four years from now. She stated that, historically, the federal Capital Investment Grant (CIG) program, which included the Core Capacity program, had bipartisan support. Ms. Brisson also



noted that the continuation of CIG was included the recent federal budget extension.

Member Barz stated that she appreciated how the SFMTA incorporated community feedback in its presentation. She said that she had a differing view regarding one issue, noting that being bold was commensurate with considering route restructuring in her view. She then asked for an explanation of the problem of aging infrastructure, noting that the challenges of growth were already well understood. She expressed interest in detailed analysis and solutions when the study's report was prepared.

Ms. Brisson explained that information regarding aging infrastructure was in SFMTA's State of Good Repair Report and offered to share this document. She noted that many infrastructure elements, such as tunnels over 100 years old and aging track and overhead catenary systems, were at or past their useful life. She explained that the SFMTA was working to identify capacity-enhancing repairs to potentially include and stated that the study team was collaborating with maintenance teams to learn more about these needs.

Member Ford acknowledged the strong role of community outreach in the study and asked about the role of rail professionals in developing recommendations, as there were certain rail improvements that the community might not recognize as important for improving capacity.

Ms. Brisson replied that the community working group included a few rail experts, and she added that they had also consulted an internal SFMTA review committee and a technical advisory committee from other Bay Area agencies. She said that SFMTA planned to seek feedback from stakeholders and the public on draft recommendations in the summer. She also said she had contacted SPUR to help gather further technical input.

Member Ford suggested looking at international benchmarks, noting that certain cities had excellent surface rail systems that are models for mid-sized cities. She also asked if capacity could be improved by funding cable cars through the general fund instead of the Muni budget.

Ms. Brisson replied that this issue was not in the study's scope but that she would share the feedback.

Member Ortega stated that she appreciated that the study had addressed concerns about the J Church line, and she noted ongoing community frustration over the stop move from 27th Street to 28th Street. She asked for information on how trains would turn around, especially near the Market and Church streets or at West Portal.

Ms. Brisson said that the study's analysis of route restructuring had been high level and included considering issues at West Portal and at Church and Market streets. She said SFMTA had studied both the option to terminate the J Church at Market Street and the option to continue along Market Street at the surface.

Member Ortega asked if the study had considered future proofing the technological aspects of the system. She said that she was concerned about maintaining and upgrading digital infrastructure as technology rapidly advanced.

Ms. Brisson explained that the study had examined various capacity solutions, including consideration of the capacity benefit of improved train control technology. She mentioned the approach being taken by the SFMTA Train Control Upgrade Project to future proof the project, and she offered to share the relevant presentation.



Member Ortega stated that digital and electronic technology needed to be included in infrastructure discussions because modern systems relied heavily on electronic components, not just mechanical ones.

Member Kim asked if the solutions considered by the study included rail replacement projects such as the recent project on the L Taraval corridor.

Ms. Brisson replied that the L Taraval line had recently been rerailed. She noted that the SFMTA had also identified other rail segments that would need rail replacement in the future, including the Judah and Ocean View corridors. She stated that rerailing of the L Taraval was necessary to keep the system functional and that there were lessons learned from L Taraval that could be applied to future projects.

Member Margarita noted that she had not reviewed historical capacity studies. She referred to lessons from past work following the 1989 earthquakes, and she stressed the importance of learning from past experience. She also said that there was a need to incorporate considerations for technology.

Ms. Brisson replied that her understanding was that past studies generally did not have a specific focus on capacity of existing systems, as earlier efforts focused more on identifying future transit expansion projects.

Chair Siegal stated that she supported upgrades to the Muni Metro system, and she emphasized her frustration with current issues such as delivery vehicles blocking tracks. She also suggested that making the entire rail system accessible should be prioritized and indicated that she looked forward to the outcome of the study.

There was no public comment.

Other Items

10. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

Member Barz asked if there was an update on the new business items previously requested.

Ms. Lombardo stated staff would send an updated. She noted that Member Barz had requested a presentation on the Budget and Legislative Analyst's report about collision costs and that staff was following up to see if staff could attend the July CAC meeting, which is typically a good time for such items due to the lack of a board meeting in August.

Member Barz requested an additional presentation on the SFTP 2050+ update for the CAC before the final update was released, due to the extensive discussion on the topic and Chair Siegal concurred.

There was no public comment.

11. Public Comment

During public comment, Edward Mason stated he had reviewed portions of MTC's Plan Bay Area 2050 and noted that by 2035, no more than 40% of the workforce at large employers (50+ employees) would commute by auto, implying 60% would use other methods. He stated that commuter shuttle buses were not addressed in the plan and that based on his observations at 24th and Church, he had found many mostly empty double-



deck shuttle buses, despite a high number of buses running. He stated Apple was the exception and considered this inefficient use a missed opportunity given prior assumptions that most would drive.

Roland Lebrun expressed gratitude for those still boarding double-decker buses in San Francisco instead of leaving for Texas. He thanked everyone for their service and participation, and encouraged them to join the Caltrain budget workshop at 9:30 a.m. the next morning.

Richard Johnson stated he was concerned about a forthcoming proposal by Supervisor Bilal Mahmood to use Octavia funds for a study to close down Hayes Street. As a resident involved in the Market & Octavia Area Plan, he opposed the use of for this purpose, citing increased neighborhood traffic and the area's absence from priority zones in a 2023 Transportation Authority study. He encouraged the CAC to prevent misuse of funds and resist ideological agendas.

Mitch from the Hayes Valley Safe Coalition stated that the Transportation Authority's 2023 Octavia Improvement Study explicitly excluded Hayes Street from the study area and did not even designate it as a secondary corridor. He questioned why Octavia special funds were being considered for a full pedestrian study of Hayes Street, despite its exclusion from the aforementioned study. He questioned whether the expenditure aligned with the study's goals and the original intent of the special fund. He also urged reconsideration of the Market & Octavia Area Plan, which identified Hayes Street as a key neighborhood commercial corridor, and called for more appropriate allocation of public funds given budget priorities.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:39 p.m.