



DRAFT MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, June 26, 2024

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Siegal called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

CAC members present at Roll: Rosa Chen, Najuwanda Daniels, Phoebe Ford, Sean Kim, Venecia Margarita, Austin Milford-Rosales, Rachael Ortega, and Kat Siegal (8)

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Mariko Davidson (arrived during Item 6) and Jerry Levine (2)

2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Siegal reported that over the weekend, the Legislature and Governor reached agreement on the state budget, averting what would have been some significant cuts to programs like the Active Transportation Program, the Transit Intercity Rail Capital Program and Highways to Boulevards. Chair Siegal stated that Transportation Authority staff expected to provide a more detailed update at the July 9 Board meeting, but this was welcome news in a tough budget year.

Chair Siegal reported that last month the CAC had an item on Senate Bill 1031, which would have among other things authorized MTC to place a regional transportation revenue measure on the ballot. Chair Siegal stated that Senators Wiener and Wahab paused the bill to allow time for stakeholders to come together to build consensus around key issues. As part of that effort, Chair Siegal said that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) had set up a Select Committee with representation from 8 of the 9 counties, including San Francisco, to work on this task. She stated the Select Committee met earlier this week and was anticipated to meet several times this summer with the goal of informing new legislation in 2025.

Chair Siegal shared that the District 2 Safety Study had extended its survey deadline through July 14. Chair Siegal said the study would address safety challenges and barriers to access on routes to land uses that attract children, seniors, and other vulnerable road users including parks, schools, hospitals, and recreational areas. Chair Siegal said the survey sought feedback to help decide where improvements were needed and what types of improvements people would like to see and that the survey could be found on the project website at sfcta.org/d2safety.

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

3. Approve the Minutes of the May 22, 2024 Meeting – ACTION

4. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve the Fiscal Year 2024/25 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program of Projects – ACTION

Projects: SFE: Emergency Ride Home (\$91,775). SFMTA: Short-Term Bike Parking (\$506,004), Paratransit Electrification (\$45,000). SFCTA: Program Administration (\$47,445).

5. State and Federal Legislation Update - INFORMATION

During public comment, Ed Mason stated he did not understand why the Department of the Environment was involved in the Emergency Ride Home program (Item 4) when emergency ride home programs in the rest of the Bay Area were usually managed by the congestion management agency in that county.

Vice Chair Daniels moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by member Milford-Rosales.

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Davidson and Levine (2)

End of Consent Agenda

6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the 2023 Prop L 5-Year Prioritization Programs for Next Generation Transit Investments, Equity Priority Transportation Program, Development Oriented Transportation, and Citywide/Modal Planning and Amend the Prop L Strategic Plan Baseline – ACTION

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

Member Ortega asked if the Embarcadero Mobility Resilience Plan was related to other plans such as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers work on rising sea level effects. She asked how the resiliency and connectivity tied into other environmental plans on rising sea level.

Tim Doherty, SFTMA Planner, responded that they were awarded a Caltrans Planning grant for \$1.3 million to support transportation planning along The Embarcadero from the pier, Oracle Park, Mission Creek, and inland. He added this was responsive to the partnership emerging between the US. Army Corps of Engineers and the Board of San Francisco. He said this work would address significant seismic and flood risks along the waterfront as this area was critical to neighborhoods and regional connections and stated that this plan would minimize impacts to the circulation system during construction and develop a series of alternatives that could be applied once the waterfront and sea wall project were completed.

Member Ortega asked if the AV Metrics Safety & Standards Study included collaboration with the State of California and the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) and if the study's findings would be shared. On behalf of Joe Castiglione, Deputy Director for Technology, Data & Analysis, Chief Deputy Maria Lombardo read Mr. Castiglione's response in the chat stating that they hoped to use this study to inform their advocacy and input to the DMV and the California Public Utilities Commission.

Member Kim commented on the Next Generation Transit Investments and Development Oriented Transportation 5-Year Prioritization Programs (5YPPs) and how transportation patterns shifted since pre-pandemic construction plans. He asked what data would be used post-pandemic for these planning efforts. He also asked if SF-CHAMP travel model data which was previously shared to CAC would include post-pandemic data.

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, responded that it would depend on when reports were prepared, noting that San Francisco Transportation Plan 2050+ would include post-pandemic travel and circulation patterns.

Ms. Lombardo added that the Bay Area household travel diary funded by the Transportation Authority, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and VTA would provide a much-awaited comprehensive set of post-pandemic travel behavior data that would be used to update the travel demand forecasting model (SF-CHAMP) and inform plans going forward. She stated there would be at least 2 reports produced analyzing this data that would be presented to the CAC and Board.

Member Ford asked about the status of the Geary/19th Ave Subway project, noting that there had been prior studies and inquired how this one was different.

Andy Heidel, Principal Transportation Planner, responded that this current work referenced in the 5YPP (Next Generation Transit Investments) was focused on whether travel patterns made sense for certain investments and added that the study would tie into places that people traveled post-COVID such as education or hospital opportunities. He added that the current effort would ensure that it would be an important link in the region that connected Transbay travel to/from the South Bay and reimagined the project beyond a Geary subway line. He said this included evaluation if this investment could be supported. Mr. Heidel said that staff had evaluated the concept of the project in ConnectSF and the SFTP 2050. He said analysis was part of the current process and the next step would identify the line on the map, stations, placement, and evaluate whether costs were feasible. He ended by saying that they would consider if the project would be worth doing if it addressed the needs of the city and the selection of the option could prompt the start of engineering work.

Member Ford commented that a slide showed a \$20 billion cost compared to a Paris subway project with a \$3.5 billion cost. She asked if cost control was part of this study.

Mr. Heidel responded that part of the study would examine options for constructability and project deliverability that could pursue cost control. He added that this was difficult to accomplish in North America and recognized infrastructure elsewhere was delivered quickly and less expensively.

Member Ford asked what the expected outcomes from the Bi-County Study were and Ms. LaForte responded that the Bi-County Study was done in 2013 and some recommended projects from the study had advanced since then. She added this funding would allow for an update and potentially allow priorities to be revisited and reconfirmed. She said that we were working with San Mateo to address key priorities among the counties.

Member Ford expressed concern about the implementation of the Curbside Electric Vehicle Charging Pilot (Curbside EV Pilot) and said she preferred not to fund this. With respect to the Development Oriented Transportation 5YPP she observed that

incremental projects included the new traffic signals at Lincoln Blvd and suggested an ambitious scope to roll all funding into Westside Subway.

Member Margarita asked how Prop L's 28 programs were chosen.

Ms. LaForte responded that many Prop L programs were a continuation of funding of existing programs in the Prop K Expenditure Plan. She said there were also several programs that were adapted or reimagined from Prop K, and a small number were new programs, with no real predecessor. She stated an Expenditure Plan committee worked together for a year for the measure language and had recommended an Expenditure Plan structure to the Board.

Ms. Lombardo added the foundation of the Expenditure Plan was the San Francisco Transportation Plan of SFTP which included a comprehensive needs assessment for all modes and then prioritized investments in a fiscally constrained investment plan that included assumptions about reauthorizing the sales tax. She said the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee including some members from the CAC, the business community, community based organizations, and other stakeholders.

Member Ortega confirmed that Mr. Castiglione's prior response had answered her question about the proposed AV study. She commented that she understood that San Francisco had a desire to look further into AVs and that there were clear safety concerns. She expressed her opinion that AVs should be looked at on a bigger level and said the state could provide more forceful oversight than the city.

Ms. Lombardo responded that they were aware the city does not have the ability to provide that oversight but that the study would be a useful body of work to facilitate these conversations.

Chair Siegal asked about the equitable charging access goal of the EV Curbside Pilot and whether it considered the affordability of electric vehicles. She added that she understood they were out of reach for most people.

Maya Price, SFMTA Transportation Planner, responded that they were preparing to conduct more outreach and engagement in the next phase to get a better understanding of people's attitudes towards EVs and educate the community on rebate programs for low-income communities who want or need vehicles.

Chair Siegal commented that they should consider how accessible electric vehicles are and evaluate the interest before investing in the infrastructure. She commented on the AV Metrics Safety and Standards Study and shared concerns with Member Ortega about the enforceability of findings but appreciated the Transportation Authority's research on AVs and TNCs in the city. She added she was interested in the study's output.

Member Ford responded that she wanted to remove the funding for EV curbside project noting it guaranteed spots for parking which was not aligned with the transit first city goals and the active transportation community. She said she did not want to advance the project for curbside EV parking in San Francisco. She stated she wanted to make a motion that this line item does not advance in the Citywide and Modal Planning 5YPP.

Member Davidson similarly commented that she understood the proposal was for an EV curbside charging pilot, but she express concern about further entrenching parking rather than focusing on the need to diversify travel modes such as walking, bicycling,

and bus options.

Ms. Lombardo commented that SF Environment staff might be able to educate the CAC on the motivation behind the study, noting that it was not intended to be a mobility improvement plan but instead to advance recommendations from the City's Climate Action Plan.

Henna Trewn, SFE Clean Transportation Program Manager, responded that the City's goal has been to be transit first and prioritize sustainable, low-carbon modes of transportation. She added that where driving might be necessary, they wanted to help those households make an electric vehicle conversion and said the curbside charging study focus was to support multi-family households and renters who did not have access to off-street parking to be able to access charging. She added that there were existing rebates and incentives federally and regionally to get up to \$20,000 combined for a new or used electric vehicle and said staff were starting to promote this across the city to make sure that people were aware of the incentives.

Member Ortega commented that if the goal was helping people that did not have off-street parking it raised other questions. She asked that parking permits be addressed as residents are required to move their car every 72 hours and this time exceeds an EV charge. She asked what changes would occur for the 72-hour parking limit, street parking categories, and enforcement of curbside EV charging. Member Ortega added she would be interested in a secondary presentation on the SFMTA parking permit structure and the incorporation of EV charging.

Mr. Doherty responded that this was the first time the City was involved in curbside charging infrastructure. He said the California Air Resources Board mandated the entire transportation sector to be all electric and all medium- and heavy-duty vehicles with internal combustion engines no longer be sold in 10 years. He said the City was trying to be proactive given the mandate, as the transportation sector generated the most greenhouse gas emissions and pollution harmful to local communities dealing with environmental justice and health burdens. He added the City had a climate target of being net 0 emissions by 2040 and their analysis showed the transportation sector would not reach net 0 until 2080. He acknowledged the SFMTA had a transit first policy (also prioritizing biking and walking), but that the climate emergency resolution passed by their board prompted the need to utilize all tools available to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the transportation sector. He stated this was driving the feasibility study and they would be able to come back to the CAC and provide an overview and respond to additional questions and comments. He responded that a potential bridge solution to the parking concern Member Ortega raised was to have a limited pilot that would terminate in 5 years. He added that the City could stop in their role as a potential curbside charging provider at some points as the rest of the industry would have picked up. He shared that they were confident they could remain committed to transit first and electrification simultaneously.

Member Margarita commented that we were in a climate crisis and there were certain goals required by the State of California. She added that EVs were part of the environmental goals and supported the consideration of the affordability of these vehicles to low income and no income communities and people with disabilities. She said biking everywhere was not possible for everyone, such as parents, the elderly, and people with disabilities and stated that the study would be a way to evaluate

affordability and acknowledge those who did not have access to a garage.

Member Ford commented that she wanted to address curbside charging and not the subsidies. She said that multifamily buildings would likely have 2 curbside parking spaces next to the building and that the dedicated curbside for EV charging would be for the 2, likely wealthy/wealthier people in the building who may own EVs, in contrast to potentially using that curbside for a bus stop. She said there were tradeoffs to address the climate crisis and that batteries would not be the solution raising concerns with the weight of batteries, road damage, and tire particulates. She stated curbs were more valuable than charging individual private vehicles due to the limited space available and that this study should not be funded. She said she supported a study of off-street EV charging in dense neighborhoods.

During public comment, Edward Mason commented that ConnectSF did not include the Metro Rail Capacity study and said ConnectSF meant the interlining of the K and L to the exclusion of the subway and the exclusion of the J line into the subway. He stated that the government did not get involved in curbside fuel charging after Henry Ford developed cars as the industry worked on the power source and said the City would be eliminating over 14,000 spaces by daylighting next year. Mr. Mason asked about the availability of electricity, electrical grid demands, and availability of qualified workers for the infrastructure work.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun commented that EVs were the primary reason air quality had improved in the Bay Area. He discussed his EV purchase and how it included 2 years of free charging which saved money on gas. He said that he was allotted 30 minutes of charging and would be charged beyond that allotted time. He said the study was for those who live in an apartment and did not have options to charge their vehicles and said that the price of EVs have reached parity with internal combustion engine vehicles and could be purchased for less than \$20,000. Mr. Lebrun stated he supported the SFMTA study and requested they return with additional information for the CAC.

Chair Siegal severed approval of the Citywide/Modal Planning 5YPP, which included funds proposed for the EV Curbside Pilot from the other three 5YPPs.

Member Milford-Rosales moved to approve the Next Generation Transit Investments, Equity Priority Transportation Program, and Development Oriented Transportation 5YPPs, seconded by Member Ortega.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Levine (1)

Member Ford moved to amend the Citywide and Modal Planning 5YPP to remove funding for the Curbside Electric Vehicle Charging Pilot Outreach & Evaluation Placeholder, seconded by Member Davidson.

Vice Chair Daniels acknowledged CAC member feedback about the EV charging pilot and said she did not think that removing funding from the pilot would achieve the goal. She opined that people would continue to drive cars whether they were electric or gas and this was a personal choice. She acknowledged the overarching goal of transit first

with biking and walking and stated that the study/pilot would be an opportunity to learn about the work being done and provide more discussion for better solutions.

Member Margarita commented that low income and no income communities should have incentives and EV charging access and reiterated that there were households who did not have garage access. She commented that people could take turns at the charging stations and coordinate with each other. She stated that SFMTA could return with more information on the study and pilot at the July CAC meeting and members could ask additional questions.

Member Kim commented that he required a car for his small business and family and said he was unable to have a charging station where he currently lives as a renter. He commented that people need choices and the city needed a transitional plan, so a study/pilot would be needed.

Member Davidson commented that the transition to EVs was not the argument being made, but rather the concern was the allocation of curbside space for cars and making that allocation more permanent due to the investment of electric charging infrastructure. She said the study was biased toward street infrastructure for cars and that there was a need to diversify choices. She asked if the study could include an off-street EV parking component.

Mr. Doherty responded that they reviewed several off-street parking facilities for the past 5 years which had been a historic preference. He said they had parking spaces in SFMTA's lot and conducted an request for proposals and solicitation for vendors, but it did not lead to a capital project due to associated costs, such as building transformers at 5th and Mission for example. He added SFMTA was looking at both off-street parking and on-street parking for EV charging. He reiterated that the study could prompt a pilot that had the option to be terminated if it did not benefit small businesses and residents.

Member Milford-Rosales commented that the State's mandate for the EV transition added a significant burden on potential street and transportation profile changes, such as walking, biking, and public transit. He added this was biased and pushed more people toward personal vehicles and their added costs. He stated the transition plan should have creative ideas as not all people had garages.

Member Ford made a motion to amend the Citywide/Modal Planning 5YPP to remove funding for the Curbside Electric Vehicle Charging Pilot. Member Davidson seconded.

The vote on the motion to amend the Citywide/Modal Planning 5YPP was as follows and did not pass:

Ayes: CAC Members Davidson, Ford, and Milford-Rosales (3)

Nay: CAC Members Chen, Daniels, Kim, Margarita, Ortega, and Siegal (6)

Absent: CAC Members Levine (1)

Member Margarita made a motion to approve the Citywide/Modal Planning 5YPP and to require SFMTA to return to the CAC at their next meeting to present on the Curbside Electric Vehicle Charging Pilot to provide more information and respond to CAC questions. Member Milford-Rosales seconded the motion.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

Abstain: CAC Members Davidson (1)

Absent: CAC Members Levine (1)

7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$15,006,000 and Appropriate \$800,000 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions, for Five Requests – ACTION

Projects: SFMTA: Paratransit (\$13,506,000), Safe Streets Evaluation Program (\$450,000). SFPW: Tree Planting and Establishment (\$1,050,000). SFCTA: Neighborhood Transportation Program Coordination (\$100,000), San Francisco Transportation Plan (SFTP) 2050+ (\$700,000).

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

Member Sean Kim said that trees were helpful for beautification, but that they could also damage sidewalks. He asked if San Francisco Public Works (SFPW) had a budget for sidewalk repair for damage caused by the proposed trees. Nicolas Crawford, Acting Superintendent of the Bureau of Urban Forestry, with SFPW replied that tree maintenance, including pruning, removal of hazardous trees and tree related sidewalk repair, was funded by the Tree Maintenance Fund, which was a voter approved measure.

Member Kim asked if SFPW had a specific budget for the maintenance of each tree. Mr. Crawford replied that SFPW did not have a cost on a per-tree basis and that cost could vary significantly depending on factors including the size of the tree, location, and extent of pruning required. He said that at a programmatic level, the budget is approximately \$19-22 million annually for tree maintenance, sidewalk repair, tree basin maintenance, and other aspects.

Member Venecia Margarita said that not all trees damage sidewalks. She said that the City should ensure it has experts, potentially including farmworkers, to make sure appropriate trees were chosen and cared for. She said that trees beautify the city and were good for mental health. She asked for confirmation that funding for tree maintenance came from a source other than the transportation sales tax. Mr. Crawford confirmed that funding came from the Tree Maintenance Fund and not Prop L.

During public comment, Edward Mason said that the City was spending about \$2,500 per tree. He said that when the Prop L Expenditure Plan was under development, he had advocated for one fund to plan and maintain trees. He said that the way it was currently structured, the Friends of the Urban Forest come to the Transportation Authority for funding to plant trees but go to the Mayor's Office for a set aside to fund maintenance. He said that in his neighborhood, sidewalks were not getting repaired and were creating trip and fall hazards and liability costs, that planting more trees required a plan to pay to maintain them, and that the current system did not take a comprehensive look at costs.

During public comment, Roland LeBrun commented that in San Jose, there was a non-profit that would let people pick up a tree for a small donation to plant at their house. He said that because it is hotter in San Jose than San Francisco, it took a lot of water each week to ensure the trees survived. He said that in San Jose, the city would bill a homeowner for the cost to repair any sidewalk damage caused by a tree in front of their

house.

Member Margarita reiterated her suggestion of hiring experts to select trees and asked the committee to imagine if lemon trees were planted all over District 10, so that everyone would have free access to lemons. She said that this would beautify the District and create jobs, as well.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Levine (1)

8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the 2023 Prop L 5-Year Prioritization Program for Managed Lanes and Express Bus, Amend the Prop L Strategic Plan Baseline, and Appropriate \$1,000,000 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions, for the SF Freeway Network Management Study – ACTION

Aliza Paz, Principal Transportation Planner, presented the item per staff memorandum.

Member Milford Rosales asked for clarity about whether lanes would be conversions or new lanes. Mx. Paz responded that the study would have a design objective to not increase capacity and to work within the space we have now. They also noted that there were some pinch points along the freeway network that could be hard to design around making it infeasible to have a continuous lane and that the project team would need to consider using the shoulder at these locations. They added that a bus on shoulder would also be considered because of success from other pilots and implementation around transit reliability and on time performance.

Member Ortega asked who would keep and control revenues generated.

Chief Deputy Lombardo responded that was likely something to be addressed after the potential managed lanes projects were identified [so revenues could be forecast]. She noted that first call was usually operations and maintenance since the projects are on state-owned facilities and that examples of other possible uses were supporting and expanding transit service, transportation demand management programs, [affordability programs], etc.

Chair Siegel comments that the study scope appeared to reflect some earlier feedback from the CAC and public. She said she would prefer to see eligibility restricted to transit improvements and the feasibility of creating new express buses on the freeways rather than HOVs [high occupancy lanes or carpools].

During public comment, Edward Mason stated he was looking forward to a regional express bus network and asked how the lane would be enforced. He said enforcement and CHP coordination was important to ensure reliability. Mr. Mason also asked about travel patterns and noted that there were a lot of pass through trips and express bus service needed to account for these trips.

Mike Swire, San Mateo County resident, asked if 280 widening was still on the table. He said the San Mateo County CAC opposed any widening, which could include a lane conversion. He asked that the CAC follow San Mateo County CAC lead by supporting

the project under the condition that widening would not be considered saying that widening would increase air pollution, cause safety challenges, and take trips away from Caltrain service.

Chair Siegel clarified that the previously considered 280 northbound study has been paused and this project encompassed a new approach. She noted that the CAC took a stance earlier in the year to not approve lane conversions that increase capacity on the freeway.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Chen, Daniels, Ford, Kim, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegel (8)

Absent: CAC Members Davidson and Levine (2)

9. Adopt a Motion of Support to Authorize Borrowing of up to \$65,000,000 under the Revolving Credit Agreement with U.S. Bank National Association; the Extension of Such Agreement for up to Six Months; the Execution and Delivery of Related Legal Documents; and the Taking of All Other Actions Necessary or Desirable in Connection Therewith – ACTION

Items 9 and 10 were called together before Item 8. See Item 10 for minutes and vote.

10. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve a New Declaration of Official Intent to Reimburse Certain Expenditures from the Proceeds of Indebtedness – ACTION

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

With respect to Item 9, Member Ortega asked about the 0.2% unutilized rate and Ms. Fong explained that the Transportation Authority had to pay a fee to maintain the revolver and the 0.2% represented the rate that corresponded to the fee to have the unutilized capacity on standby when needed.

With respect to Item 9, Member Ortega noted that some of the projects shown as major cash flow drivers in the memo were ones that needed up front money, such as The Portal, to get federal grants. Ms. Lombardo noted that the revolver would be used to pay the bills for expenses already incurred. She said The Portal did need to show commitment of funds up front to secure certain funds and she could follow up offline with Member Ortega if she wished as that was not part of this item.

There was no public comment on Items 9 and 10.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Ayes: CAC Members CAC Members Chen, Daniels, Davidson, Ford, Kim, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, Ortega, and Siegel (9)

Absent: CAC Members Levine (1)

11. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve the Jane Warner Plaza [NTP Planning] Final Report – ACTION

Tony Esterbrooks, Section Manager with the Bureau of Landscape Architecture at SFPW, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Ortega said that she regularly frequented this area and that she was excited to see this plan for a more permanent plaza and additional space for the cafes. She said she was happy there was community feedback on the plan. She asked what the agreement was with the gas station relative to the plan. Mr. Esterbrooks replied that the gas station was privately owned, but the plan imagined what might be possible if the gas station were redeveloped.

Chair Segal asked if there was a sense of where funding for implementation would come from. Mr. Esterbrooks replied that they did not know yet. He said that there was a general obligation bond coming, but he was not sure if this project would get any funding because a lot would likely be going to Harvey Milk Plaza across the street. He said they recognized that there could be efficiencies in renovating both plazas at the same time.

During public comment, Michael Petrelis said that he represented Friends of Jane Warner Plaza and asked the CAC to reject the plan. He said that there had been no public outreach beyond the merchants group and no meetings open to the public. He said that the plan did not address immediate needs in the plaza, such as potholes and tripping hazards. He said that the \$100,000 spent on the plan would have been better spent on fixing pavement and repainting the plaza surface. He also said that his group rejected the idea of the proposed monument to poetry.

Member Margarita said she had noted the community meetings referenced in the item materials and asked Mr. Esterbrooks to respond to the claims of the public commenter. Mr. Esterbrooks replied that the goals of the project were to come up with a vision and figure out how to track down funding for a larger effort that would involve the larger community. He said that given the constraint of cost for this project, they engaged with community stakeholders including the Castro Community Benefit District, the Eureka Valley Neighborhood Association, and the LGBTQ Cultural District to gauge interest in the project. He said he completely agreed with the commenter that there were near-term maintenance issues in the plaza and that SFMTA and SFPW had recently come to agreement on sharing costs to fix some of those issues in the next few months.

Member Ortega asked for an update via email on near-term efforts to repair the plaza when more information is available.

Member Margarita asked that SFPW ensure that community members continued to be included in future planning efforts.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Davidson and Levine (2)

Other Items

12. Introduction of New Items – INFORMATION

There were no new items introduced.

13. Public Comment

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that he has been emailing the Transportation Authority about corporate commuter buses. Mr. Mason said the license plates on WeDriveU commuter buses expire on Friday and he was interested in seeing what the SFMTA will do at that time. Mr. Mason also said there was one bus that had no license plate on it and was operating in the meeting spaces with no SFMTA permit. Mr. Mason said the proliferation of, and the boldness of the corporate commuter shuttles was astounding. Mr. Mason said it would just be interesting to see what will happen because the stickers are on a fiscal year basis and starting the 1st of July, all of the shuttle buses should have a yellow sticker that is affixed to the blue permit. Mr. Mason encouraged CAC attendees to look for the or the yellow sticker if they see commuter buses because that is how they can tell it is a valid bus. Mr. Mason also stated there was a mismatch between what the company name is versus what the permit is. Mr. Mason gave an example of knowing a commuter bus is supposed to have a 10 on it, but it has a 7. Mr. Mason speculated there must be some master agreement that these buses are under and then companies are shifting these buses around and putting up the ICC requirement for the identification of the company, but companies are leaving the permit for the other company on it.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun thanked the CAC for their good discussion on curbside charging. Mr. Lebrun stated he wanted to elaborate on some suggestions to SFMTA when it presented on this topic next month saying that the SFMTA needed to let the CAC know the difference between curbside charging, which is known as level 2, and takes approximately seven hours and fast charging, which in his case takes 15 minutes. Mr. Lebrun stated he sent the CAC information that hopefully they would be able to review. Mr. Lebrun gave an example to the CAC where in San Francisco at 928 Harrison is an example of what can be done for one of the challenges SFMTA is facing this fiscal year. Mr. Lebrun stated parking revenues had dropped substantially. Mr. Lebrun stated there was a market to turn those parking spaces over to the private sector because they would use them for fast charging. Mr. Lebrun stated that could be the solution that CAC is looking for if it did not want curbside charging.

14. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:47 p.m.