



MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, October 29, 2025

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

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

CAC members present at Roll: Najuawanda Daniels, Sean Kim, Jerry Levine, Austin Milford-Rosales, Rachael Ortega, and Kat Siegal (6)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Sara Barz, (entered during Item 2), Phoebe Ford, Zameel Imaduddin, Venecia Margarita (entered during Item 6) (4)

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Siegal reported that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) released the draft Plan Bay Area 2050+, outlining long-term transportation, housing, and climate strategies, and that public webinars were being held. She added that MTC would be providing an update at the November 18 Transportation Authority Board meeting. She also shared that the SFMTA's new Speed Safety Camera Program had produced strong early results, with speeding reduced by an average of 72% across 15 monitored sites since its March 2025 launch, bringing all locations below posted limits. Chair Siegal said nearly 20,000 fewer vehicles were speeding daily, and two-thirds of drivers who received warnings had not reoffended. While crash data was still being evaluated, she said early signs indicated the program was improving safety and advancing Vision Zero goals. She concluded by noting that the Transportation Authority supported the pilot with sales tax funds for education and outreach.

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

3. Approve the Minutes of the September 24, 2025 Meeting - ACTION

4. Adopt a Motion of Support to Authorize the Executive Director to Execute Master Agreements, Program Supplemental Agreements, Cooperative Agreements, Fund Transfer Agreements and Any Amendments Thereto with the California Department of Transportation for Receipt of Federal and State Funds for the Treasure Island Road Improvements - Yerba Buena Island Multi-Use Pathway Segment 4 in an Amount up to \$8,985,000; and State Funds for Planning, Programming, and Monitoring in the Amount of \$380,000 – ACTION

5. State and Federal Legislation Update - INFORMATION

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

Vice Chair Daniels moved to approve the item, seconded by Member Milford-Rosales.

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:



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

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

End of Consent Agenda

6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$4,000,000, with Conditions, and Appropriate \$1,000,000 in Prop L Funds for Three Requests - ACTION

Erin Slichter, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Barz asked what was considered a 'successful' school walk audit and whether safety data was available from past walk audits.

Damon Curtis, Project Manager at the SFMTA, explained that while data on safety around schools before and after they had received improvements was not available, the SFMTA measured the success of school walk audits by the level of engagement from the school, parents, and students in the walk audits from planning through providing feedback on the recommendations coming out of the walk audit. He added that each school walk audit was unique, with schools typically receiving about a dozen improvements tailored to best fit their specific area.

Member Barz asked if enrollment data for private schools would be included in the selection of schools for walk audits during this cycle.

Mr. Curtis stated that the SFMTA had obtained public school data and had recently requested private school data, which it had received in prior years of the school traffic calming program. He explained that data from both public and private schools was used to prioritize schools each year of the program, along with collision data within a one-quarter mile of schools.

Member Barz asked if individuals could nominate schools for walk audits.

Mr. Curtis stated that the SFMTA was open to all forms of information regarding safety concerns near schools. He explained that even if a school was not scheduled to undergo a walk audit in a given year, the SFMTA would still consider any feedback about school safety and would seek to address issues through other means.

Vice Chair Daniels asked if the list of Safe Routes to Schools Focus Schools was complete, and noted that Starr King Elementary was not on the list.

Mr. Curtis stated that the SFMTA had updated this list in 2025, but he was unsure if this list was the updated version or if it included Starr King Elementary.

Vice Chair Daniels asked if the program website included information on which schools had conducted walk audits and received traffic calming improvements.

Mr. Curtis responded that this was the case.

Member Ortega asked what state or federal funding sources had been considered for the Cable Car Barn Rehabilitation project, given the facility's status as a national historic landmark.

Quon Chin, Project Manager at the SFMTA, replied that the SFMTA had been considering funding from the Federal Transit Administration, but these funds were no longer available. He noted that, given the constrained fiscal environment and the high cost of the



rehabilitation project, the SFMTA was prioritizing the upgrade the obsolete electrical infrastructure as the most critical piece of the overall rehabilitation project.

Member Ortega asked if that last rehabilitation of the Cable Car Barn had occurred in 1984.

Mr. Chin replied that the 1984 rehabilitation had essentially rebuilt the facility and upgraded it for the first time since the 1906 earthquake.

Member Levine asked if cable car operations would be closed during rehabilitation and for how long. Mr. Chin replied that a schedule of shutdowns had been developed for the 2021 Master Plan, and that this schedule would be revisited as the project's detailed design was developed.

Member Levine asked how long the anticipated shutdowns would be and expressed concern about losing the revenue generated from cable car operations during a long shutdown.

Mr. Chin responded that the SFMTA currently anticipated eight shutdowns lasting between two and four weeks each, but that he would have to check to confirm these details.

Mr. Levine replied that two to four weeks did not seem excessive.

Member Milford-Rosales commented that the cable cars were great for the city, but they also cost the SFMTA a lot to maintain. He asked if it would be possible to seek funds for the rehabilitation project from other City departments that benefit from the cable cars.

Mr. Chin responded that it would be worth considering this idea with other city stakeholders.

During public comment, John Roberts asked if the 2021 plan for the cable car barn was publicly available.

Ms. Slichter responded that it was publicly available on SFMTA's website.

Member Margarita asked if it was possible for the SFMTA to work with other City departments and nonprofits to organize a free day for older adults to be to ride cable cars and one for youth. She stated that some youth in San Francisco had never ridden a cable car and noted that there was an opportunity to allow San Francisco residents to be tourists in their own city and to explore areas of the city they have never visited.

Mr. Chin thanked Member Margarita for her suggestions and her support of the cable cars.

Chair Siegal asked if free Muni for Youth applied to cable cars.

Mr. Chin said that he would need to check and added that there was a discount available for seniors.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Ford and Imaduddin (2)



7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the Eco-Friendly Downtown Deliveries Final Report – ACTION

Alex Pan, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Ortega commented on the off-hours delivery recommendation, explaining that her workplace in San Francisco received deliveries at a warehouse on the pier. She said trucks could pull in so that they are not blocking the street, but unclear signage often caused them to park on The Embarcadero instead. She recommended adding clear signage, stronger parking enforcement, and coordination across departments to prevent delivery-related congestion. She described similar enforcement practices in New York, such as towing during moving hours, as a possible model. She also raised concerns about delivery logistics for businesses receiving palletized shipments, emphasizing that large freight deliveries could not be handled by smaller mobility options like e-bikes. She suggested the Transportation Authority include a freight study to better understand shipment types and the movement of goods throughout the city. Member Ortega also said she initially had assumed the study focused on micro-deliveries in the city involving vendors like DoorDash and similar single-point delivery services, such as food deliveries. She clarified that while she appreciated the study's approach, and the consideration of e-bike battery swapping lockers and related infrastructure, micro-deliveries and e-bike deliveries must be part of the conversation because these deliveries occupy a significant amount of delivery space in the city that is currently being overlooked.. Regarding off-hour deliveries, she asked for additional details on the proposed pilot plan and whether it was still under development.

Ms. Pan stated that the neighborhoods recommended were areas with significant curb congestion where off-hours deliveries could have an impact. She stated that once funding for further study was secured, they would begin designing these details.

Member Ortega said that some companies had already refused to deliver to her in San Francisco because of logistical challenges. She added that, while this issue was partly the companies' responsibility, it was still worth considering. She recommended that, if the project advanced, the Transportation Authority should also seek data or input from additional logistics brokers beyond UPS.

Member Kim asked if this was the final report, inquired about the next steps for any approved items, and requested the schedule for implementation.

Ms. Pan stated that the immediate next step was to secure funding for the two primary recommendations: the off-hours delivery pilot and the microhub site suitability analysis. She stated that there was no implementation timeline yet, as it depended on funding.

Member Kim asked about delivery reliability, noting his experience as a small business owner who regularly received multiple deliveries and shopped frequently. He shared that delivery companies had sometimes refused service to him in San Francisco, recounting past experiences with businesses he owned. He emphasized that small businesses, especially those handling perishable goods, require frequent deliveries because they cannot store products long-term, unlike larger businesses with substantial storage. He inquired whether any prioritization existed for certain industries.

Ms. Pan stated that they had not yet begun designing the program for a specific industry. She stated that, while details were still in development, in other locations with pilots, the food and beverage sector had been a major participant in off-hours delivery programs.



Member Kim asked about food and beverage delivery, stating that many businesses, including his, rely on Cisco and U.S. Food as primary suppliers. He explained that service depends on their schedules; if they were able to deliver, small businesses like his faced no issues, but if they were not, it created significant problems due to a lack of alternative vendors. He asked whether there had been communication with these companies.

Ms. Pan stated that the working group for the project was broader, and it was intended to identify what types of projects to pursue in the city. She added that when they moved closer to designing an off-hours delivery pilot, a different set of relevant parties would be involved, with coordination between shippers and receivers.

Member Barz expressed concerns about the study's methodology. She stated that it was unclear whether the focus was on pallets, trucks moving pallets, or small vehicles affecting traffic, and that the core problem and existing conditions were not well articulated. She stated that understanding these details was essential to improving outcomes and evaluating trade-offs. She stated support for the study's goals, including reducing collisions, lowering greenhouse gas emissions, and improving deliveries for small businesses, but noted that without data on emissions from the delivery industry, it was difficult to assess the potential impact of the recommendations. She stated that she hoped future planning studies would be more rooted in existing conditions and problem definitions and asked whether this was the first time the CAC had reviewed the study's findings or methodology.

Ms. Pan stated she believed so.

Member Barz explained she found it challenging to be effective as a CAC member when seeing only the final version of a study and having to decide whether to agree with it. She emphasized her strong support for the study's goals and recognized the critical importance of addressing delivery and freight movement to improve San Francisco. She noted, however, that her struggle was not with the recommendations themselves but with understanding how they were developed. She added that she would appreciate opportunities to discuss ongoing studies, either during meetings when possible or separately with staff outside of formal sessions.

Ms. Pan stated that Member Barz's comments reflected discussions held internally. She explained that while the project initially explored available delivery industry data, such information was scarce, and a comprehensive data collection effort was beyond the project's scope. She added that the team focused on lessons from peer cities and effective strategies, noting that off-hours delivery had proven successful elsewhere, such as in New York. Ms. Pan noted that the pilot would include targeted data collection to determine optimal locations and assess potential impacts in San Francisco.

Rachel Hiatt, Deputy Director for Planning, stated that they shared frustration over the lack of data to support recommendations. She highlighted the need for more comprehensive, citywide guidance, including creating a citywide urban freight team, pooling data and resources, and incorporating industry-specific data collection into their work to provide a stronger foundation for recommendations.

Member Milford-Rosales stated he also had initially misunderstood the original scope when reviewing the materials. He inquired about the organizations and businesses consulted, particularly in the downtown and Financial District areas. He observed that, although the Bike Messenger Association was no longer as prominent, its members



continued making deliveries, especially catering orders for office lunches using large e-bikes. He asked whether the association or its dispatchers would eventually be included in a potential pilot program.

Ms. Pan explained that e-bike delivery workers were not included in the working group but there had been a separate focus group conducted with them for a specific pilot targeting battery-swapping lockers.

Member Milford-Rosales asked what Ms. Pan meant by e-bike delivery workers, whether she was referring to the Uber Eats and DoorDash contingent or to one of the bike messenger associations in San Francisco and added that several entities existed in this space with varying levels of organization and labor protections.

Ms. Pan explained that the population they used came from participants in the Department of Environment's e-bike delivery incentive pilot, which included workers from a variety of apps and companies.

Member Margarita emphasized expanding the working group roster to include cultural districts which she observed were not represented. She noted the importance of engaging with different business merchants, such as those in Calle 24, and of being more inclusive of merchant associations and businesses. She also inquired about the logistics microhub mentioned in the presentation and how it could generate revenue.

Ms. Pan explained that in New York and Toronto, businesses that wanted to participate paid a permitting fee. She added that this approach allowed the city to implement the program in a cost-neutral manner or even generate revenue.

Member Margarita expressed empathy for business owners, noting that their well-being is often overlooked and that without businesses, people lack income. She highlighted the importance of considering working hours, health, leisure, mental health, and self-care, pointing out the strain on small business owners who may need to work late hours to accept deliveries. Member Margarita added that San Francisco's diversity and vibrancy are enriched by small business owners from various cultures and languages, many of whom were already struggling. She urged careful consideration of their well-being and livelihood, while balancing business demands.

Ms. Pan stated that unassisted deliveries had been observed in other cities. She noted that delivery workers could leave goods without anyone at the business to receive them and that various technologies existed to facilitate this, eliminating the need for staff to stay late or arrive early.

Member Margarita questioned the cost effectiveness of such technologies.

Chair Siegal agreed with other members' feedback about the need for data availability to understand existing conditions. She said she was generally supportive of the study recommendations, particularly the logistics microhub, and she appreciated the additional suggestions regarding establishing an urban freight team and improving goods movement data collection. She expressed caution about the off-hours delivery program due to safety concerns, noting recent injury and fatal collisions involving large vehicles and delivery workers at night. She asked if the off-hours delivery program and data collection efforts could explicitly include safety data to better understand current conditions and maintain or reduce injury collisions.

Member Margarita suggested that if a permit or fee were implemented for the logistics



microhub, larger, high-revenue businesses should bear the cost rather than small, low-income businesses. She added that this approach would help preserve local mom-and-pop coffee shops and small businesses, allowing them to operate alongside larger corporations, which she said contributed to the character and beauty of San Francisco. She noted that this consideration should guide any long-term implementation of the program.

Member Ortega stated that the study seemed more like an informational item than an action item and asked why it was listed as such, questioning whether the board was simply agreeing with the study.

Chair Siegal stated the purpose was to adopt the study's recommendations.

Member Ortega stated she understood why the Transportation Authority requested the CAC's support and added she wished she had received more information and actions earlier to provide adequate feedback.

Member Kim stated that the supply chain in South San Francisco, particularly near the border with Cesar Chavez, had shifted over the past decade. He explained that the area, once served by small trucks from local produce markets and Restaurant Depot, now received larger trucks because warehouses have relocated farther out to South San Francisco, Burlingame, and Brisbane. He observed that the consolidation of small businesses into larger companies, such as Cisco and U.S. Food, has increased reliance on bigger trucks. He added that factors like housing and lease costs may have influenced these trends. Member Kim requested that these logistical changes be considered, noting that strategies misaligned with city plans could make implementation challenging.

Vice Chair Daniels asked about the requirements of the Carbon Neutral Cities Alliance grant that had helped fund the study.

Ms. Hiatt stated that the grantor had no specific requirements following the study and was interested only in the recommendations. She noted the City and County of San Francisco participated in the Carbon Neutral Cities Alliance, sharing information and strategies with peer cities and bringing insights from the study back to this ongoing city exchange.

Vice Chair Daniels asked what the next steps would be if the CAC recommended accepting and supporting the report.

Ms. Pan explained that the next step involved seeking funding for the off-hours delivery pilot and the microhubs.

Ms. Hiatt added that the recommendations were to conduct pilots, which would require outreach, data collection, preparation, and engagement with operational costs during a fixed pilot period. She said that each pilot would include an evaluation component, after which the Transportation Authority would decide whether to expand, modify, or discontinue the program based on the results.

Vice Chair Daniels asked whether the next step would be to seek funding for the first two recommendations only, and that even after securing funding, there would still be a ramp-up period to implement the pilot program, including outreach and all preparatory steps, rather than immediately launching and reporting results.

Ms. Hiatt confirmed that the Vice Chair Daniels's assessment was accurate.

Chair Siegal asked whether any of the funding was likely to come from the Transportation Authority and whether the Transportation Authority Board and the CAC would have an



opportunity to provide input on specific pilot programs if concerns arose.

Ms. Pan explained that additional details could be found in the funding chapter and noted that Prop L sales tax could serve as a potential source, as certain programs within it might fund the pilots.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, acknowledged the CAC's concerns about wanting to provide earlier and more frequent feedback. She added that even if funding came from other sources, the CAC could receive interim updates at appropriate points.

Member Barz asked whether, if the CAC approved, Transportation Authority staff would then be allowed to test off-peak delivery hours in unspecified locations and explore potential microhub opportunities, with staff seeking funding, conducting pilots, and reporting back on the findings.

Ms. Pan stated that there was no single solution to improving deliveries in San Francisco and that a combination of projects would be needed. She noted that the Transportation Authority had been examining promising approaches from other cities to determine if they could be effective locally.

Member Barz stated that the discussion changed her perspective, clarifying that the study reflected a more informed hypothesis based on practices elsewhere rather than a fully executed study.

During public comment, John Roberts stated the report should first focus on data collection and include clearer goals, noting that it seemed more like an idea rather than a formal plan.

Roland Lebrun stated the study had an ulterior motive and was incomplete. He argued it failed to consider emerging technologies like drones and robots for last-mile deliveries, which were being discussed in Silicon Valley and could expand with robo-taxis in San Francisco. He stated the study overlooked revenue opportunities from public-private partnerships, citing the Amazon distribution center on 7th Street near the proposed Pennsylvania Avenue extension and 7th Street Station. Mr. Lebrun opined that the station could integrate Caltrain, high-speed rail, Muni, and potentially BART, allowing transit operators to move goods at night and reduce diesel truck traffic, which he said would benefit all parties.

Member Margarita asked if the study could examine New York's situation before its programs were implemented, including businesses that may have closed, to provide an economically and culturally inclusive perspective on potential impacts to small businesses.

Ms. Pan stated that the off-hours delivery pilot in New York was ongoing, with outreach conducted to businesses, and that businesses could choose whether to participate in the program.

Member Margarita said she had not realized that it was an opt-in program because she had envisioned the city telling businesses they would be fined for deliveries at certain times, which could require small businesses without resources to pay workers overnight to close.

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

The motion failed by the following vote:



Ayes: CAC Members Daniels, Levine, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, and Siegal (5)

Nays: CAC Members Barz and Kim (2)

Abstentions: CAC Member Ortega (1)

Absent: CAC Members Ford and Imaduddin (2)

8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve a Two-Year Professional Services Contract with WSP USA Inc. in an Amount Not to Exceed \$3,800,000 for Construction Management Services for the Treasure Island Road Improvements - Yerba Buena Island Multi-Use Pathway Segment 4 Project – ACTION

Jianmin Fong, Highway Program Manager, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Ford, Imaduddin, and Levine (3)

9. SFMTA's Application-Based Traffic Calming Program Progress Update – INFORMATION

Rachel Seiberg, Transportation Planner, introduced the item and Damon Curtis, Project Manager at SFMTA, presented the item.

Member Margarita asked why the SFMTA had to seek funds for the Fiscal Year (FY) 23 application-based traffic calming program cycle when the FY24 and FY25 program cycles were fully funded.

Mr. Curtis confirmed that funding was in hand for the FY24 and FY25 program cycles; however the FY23 program cycle had been unique because the SFMTA initially planned to skip this year. He explained that prior to FY23, SFMTA accepted applications during a 12-month period and then took 9-12 months to complete the design phase. He added that the FY23 program cycle coincided with the transition from Prop K to Prop L and that SFMTA had taken this transition period as an opportunity to revamp the program to be more efficient. As a result, Mr. Curtis said the FY24 and FY25 program cycles moved to a quarterly evaluation system; however, the SFMTA still received applications for the FY23 program cycle and at the time. Mr. Curtis continued by noting that the SFMTA was in a better financial position at the time, so leadership decided to use agency funds to start this program cycle. He concluded by stating that once the design phase was completed, SFMTA planned to request construction funds from the Transportation Authority.

Member Barz asked Mr. Curtis to confirm that SFMTA had tried pivoting from an annual program cycle to a quarterly cycle, which had not proved successful.

Mr. Curtis clarified that SFMTA had not yet pivoted back to an annual cycle, so SFMTA was still trying to figure out what to do with the traffic calming program going forward.

Member Barz asked Mr. Curtis to clarify why the quarterly cycle had not worked.

Mr. Curtis explained that it 'worked' for two quarters and then there were delays with the



data collection, which was centered around the looming backlog of traffic calming devices that needed implementation.

Member Barz asked if SFMTA had paused the traffic calming program to take stock and formulate a new program.

Mr. Curtis confirmed that was accurate. He acknowledged that other cities were running their traffic calming programs differently, and that SFMTA planned to determine the best path forward for their program.

Member Barz asked if SFMTA had a sense of how long the program pause would be.

Mr. Curtis said that SFMTA planned to have a response to this question by December 2025 when SFMTA would provide an update to the Transportation Authority Board.

Member Kim asked Mr. Curtis to share information on other cities' practices during SFMTA's December 2025 presentation.

Mr. Curtis mentioned that part of SFMTA's December presentation to the Board would summarize what SFMTA had learned and what went into their decision-making process for the future of the application-based traffic calming program.

Member Kim asked which cities SFMTA looked to for best practices, to which Mr. Curtis said several Bay Area cities, such as San Jose and Oakland, and peer cities like Los Angeles, Boston, and New York City.

Member Ortega expressed her gratitude for the presentation and stated that she looked forward to further updates.

Mr. Curtis responded that part of the Enhanced Monitoring, Reporting, and Oversight Protocol included continued monthly reporting, which SFMTA shared with Transportation Authority staff and could also share with the CAC.

Chair Siegal asked Mr. Curtis to clarify that the backlog was not related to the shift from the annual to rolling application program but rather stemmed from waiving the requirement during the pandemic to submit a petition with each application.

Mr. Curtis confirmed that the backlog was due to waiving the signature requirement for each application because of the COVID-19 pandemic. He clarified that this, in turn, resulted in a surge in traffic calming applications.

Chair Siegal summarized that there had been a lot of feedback at the June 2025 CAC meeting that SFMTA should be more conservative when committing to projects given funding concerns. She added that it might make more sense to shift to a more proactive approach, since other programs, like the Quick Build program, already used a proactive approach. She also suggested incorporating feedback from the community into that type of approach.

Chair Siegal expressed her excitement about the FY22 program cycle construction schedule, which set construction completion for early 2026. She asked Mr. Curtis how SFMTA could implement more program cycles as fast as the FY22 cycle.

Mr. Curtis responded that for FY22, there were 240 shovel-ready projects, which lent themselves well to packaging into Job Order Contract task orders. For the FY21 cycle, for the eight locations that were not yet designed, it took longer and required an iterative process, which included public hearings and final approval by the city traffic engineer. Mr.



Curtis added that he had met with San Francisco Public Works and asked them to prioritize traffic calming implementation.

There was no public comment.

Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

- 10.** Vice Chair Daniels requested that the Transportation Authority consider an economic feasibility study for a bicycle user fee. She hoped it could begin as soon as possible, emphasizing that, given the current state of the city and Bay Area transit agencies, this area was worth exploring.

Chair Siegal stated she had previously requested an update offline, but she wanted to formally ask for a status report on the Potrero Yard project, given the significant recent scope changes since the CAC supported substantial funding for the yard's electrification.

There was no public comment.

11. Public Comment

During public comment, John Roberts stated appreciation for all the work completed and for making it publicly accessible both online and in the meeting.

Roland Lebrun stated he wanted to revisit Slide 2 on item 8, the Yerba Buena Island (YBI) presentation, and clarified that his comments were unrelated to the WSP contract. He indicated the focus should be on the area immediately to the right of the proposed pathway, where the new transbay tunnel was planned to be located. He explained that he had designed the layout 10 years ago with two shafts to launch tunnel boring machines—two toward San Francisco and two toward the East Bay—allowing construction in two sections over two years. He emphasized that the current tunnel lacked a crossover for safety and ventilation, which YBI shafts would have addressed. He noted the tracks would allow shutting down work on only half the tunnel, provide ventilation, and enable intervention or evacuation via YBI. He concluded that these design elements had been the rationale for his original approach.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:04 p.m.