



MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, September 25, 2024

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

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

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

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Sara Barz (entered during Item 6), Phoebe Ford (entered during Item 2), Venecia Margarita (entered during Item 6) (3)

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Siegal said there were a lot of updates on grant awards and project delivery in the Executive Director's Report presented at the prior day's Board meeting. She explained she would highlight just a few key points in order to leave time for the Transportation Authority, BART, Caltrain, and San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) to present on transit recovery and the fiscal cliff later on the agenda.

Chair Siegal stated that the CAC had been receiving periodic updates on the fiscal cliff since the pandemic changed the world in early 2020 with shelter-in-place orders that caused transit ridership and traffic to plummet overnight. She continued by saying she was excited to hear an update from the transit operators highlighting recovery to date, current efforts to continue to improve the customer experience and attract new riders, as well as the latest on their financial outlook.

Chair Siegal remarked that, as was fitting for Transit Month, she wanted to give a shout-out to the SFMTA and project partners on the substantial completion of the L-Taraval Improvement Project and that L riders would be thrilled to see service resume later that month (September 28) with safer streets, improved accessibility, and better Muni service. She stated that the Transportation Authority provided about \$19 million in sales tax and Prop AA (vehicle registration fee) funds for the project.

Chair Siegal stated that another exciting milestone last weekend was the beginning of electrified train service between San Francisco and San Jose along the Caltrain Corridor. She stated that this had been a truly transformative project for Caltrain and the corridor, bringing faster and more frequent service, amenities, and better air quality.

Lastly, Chair Siegal said that BART had completed the installation of new fare gates at the Civic Center station and was working on 24th Street and that all SF BART stations were expected to have new fare gates by the end of 2025, noting that Prop L was providing matching funds for this project.

Chair Siegal concluded by welcoming Sharon Ng as the newest CAC member representing District 3. Member Ng introduced herself and said she was excited to



join the CAC.

There was no public comment.

3. Approve the Minutes of the September 04, 2024 Meeting - ACTION

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Barz and Margarita (2)

Abstention: CAC Member Ng (1)

Consent Agenda

4. State and Federal Legislation Update – INFORMATION

5. Investment Report and Debt Expenditure Report for the Quarter Ended June 30, 2024 - INFORMATION

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

End of Consent Agenda

6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$8,257,000 and Appropriate \$165,000 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions, for Five Requests – ACTION

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

With respect to the Laguna Honda Gondola Study, Member Levine noted that many seniors have mobility challenges and they are others are afraid of heights and he asked how these would be addressed in the study.

Ahmed Thleiji, Rail Program Principal Engineer at the Transportation Authority responded that considering the user perspective would be part of the study.

Member Milford-Rosales said he was excited to see the Muni Forward 22 Fillmore corridor and the T Third included. He noted that the T Third scope seemed to include almost the entire corridor and asked for an explanation of what would be studied.

Michael Rhodes, Transit Priority Manager at SFMTA stated they would evaluate the entire route of the T 3rd line and identify where improvements were most needed. He added that the 22 effort focused on Fillmore because SFMTA already evaluated other sections of the route.

Member Milford-Rosales asked about access to the platform at 4th and Townsend and 4th and King as delays were common at those stops.



Mr. Rhodes responded that they would study delays along the entire route including those stops.

Member Ortega commented that there was a previous CAC presentation on bus electrification and she recalled SFMTA's desire to keep the trolleybuses in the fleet.

Bonnie Jean von Krogh, Public Affairs Manager at SFMTA stated that the Potrero Yard project would house all the trolley buses and would also be modernized for battery electric buses if trolleybuses could not be procured in the future.

Vice Chair Daniels asked whether the Laguna Honda study was dependent on residential development. She further asked if SFMTA considered if the gondola would generate revenue.

Mr. Thleiji responded that the feasibility study was not specifically tied to housing being built. He added that the study also would evaluate a shuttle.

Carl Holmes, Deputy Director for Capital Projects clarified that there was potential for future residential development and the Transportation Authority's proposed role was to provide the feasibility study to examine the potential for this project.

Member Kim noted the start date of Spring 2025 for the Muni Forward request and asked whether that would include outreach.

Michael Rhodes, Transit Priority Manager at SFMTA responded in the affirmative and noted that the schedule shows was for planning and outreach.

Member Ortega asked whether the gondola study focused only on a gondola or was general.

Mr. Thleiji responded that the study would consider a gondola, shuttles, and tram.

Member Ortega commented that a funicular be considered and noted Pittsburgh as an example.

Member Barz asked if the intention for the gondola was for public access such as MUNI or private access. She echoed Member Ortega's funicular recommendation.

Mr. Thleiji responded that it would be publicly accessible and ADA compliant and maintenance would also be considered.

Chair Siegel asked if the Muni Forward project would have more improvements on 16th Street between Church and Mission.

Mr. Rhodes responded that a westbound improvement project would be considered. He stated that 16th Street was not part of the plan because there was a separate effort for that street, but they would continue to monitor the performance.

During public comment, Edward Mason commented that the Laguna Honda Study



would be developed for senior housing. He stated that the gondola study would be a waste of taxpayer funds and cited the low ridership of the Salesforce gondola. He recalled a shuttle that went from Forest Hill to Laguna Honda. He added that SFMTA needed to exercise fiduciary responsibility.

Member Margarita asked why the 43 and 44 were not included in the 5-minute corridors.

Mr. Rhodes responded that 5-minute corridors were resource-intensive, and the 43 line was not in the priority core system such as the 38. However, he added they were complementary routes that ran at 10-minute intervals, and the 43 could be added if more resources were acquired or ridership trends changed.

Member Margarita asked that SFMTA revisit the 44 and added that it was a slow line with high ridership that connected many different communities in the city.

Mr. Rhodes responded that the 44 line was a high priority but not one of the first 4 lines considered in the current request. He speculated that it would likely be one of the top priority lines to be addressed next.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Amend the Prop K Grant for 1399 Marin Street Maintenance Facility to Allow the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) to Use the Remaining Balance of \$6,551,819 to Fund a Revised Scope of Work and Amend the Prop K Grant for Fall Protection to allow SFMTA to Use \$750,000 in Cost Savings to Expand the Scope of Work – ACTION

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

Member Ford asked why the fall protection facilities were not originally included and how cost savings were achieved.

Jeffrey Jackson, Project Manager of Capital Programs & Construction at SFMTA responded that the original improvements ended up costing less than the initial estimates.

Member Milford-Rosales asked about the Potrero Yard project and if trolleybus service would be suspended during construction.

Ms. von Krogh responded that the lines within Potrero Yard would move throughout the system while it was under construction. She added that Presidio Yard would continue its service and trolleybuses would continue operation. She said that during Potrero Yard construction some lines from the facility may have other vehicle types.

Member Ortega asked why cost savings were achieved and why the additional



facilities were being added.

Jeffrey Jackson, SFMTA stated that he would follow up.

Anna Laforte, Deputy for Policy and Programming commented that the original fall protection grant was nearly \$12 million to provide context for \$750,000 in cost savings.

Chair Siegal asked what would happen to the 1399 Marin temporary facility after the Potrero project has been completed.

Ms. von Krogh responded that 1399 Marin was being updated as a temporary facility but was used in the past for similar projects and continued to be used for a variety of uses, such as handling intake of new buses. She added that 1399 Marin would continue with the maintenance of buses and storage of buses from other yards while they get upgraded or constructed.

Edward Mason commented that the Green facility had been around for 40 years and asked why the safety upgrades were necessary. He asked if employees were working in unsafe conditions for the past years and said he supported the funding of safety improvements to prevent injuries.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Authorize the Executive Director and Other Authorized Representatives to Enter Into a Revolving Credit Agreement for \$185 Million with U.S. Bank National Association; to Borrow Certain Amounts under such Revolving Credit Agreement; to Execute and Deliver Related Documents; and to Take All Necessary or Appropriate Related Actions – ACTION

Item 8 was called after Item 9.

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

Member Ortega asked about the two different basis points shown for the U.S. Bank proposal.

Ms. Fong stated there were two costs to the facility and that the Transportation Authority would be charged 293 basis points if the agency borrowed money from U.S. Bank. Ms. Fong continued by saying that if the Transportation Authority did not borrow money, it would still be charged 20 basis points just to have the money available.

Member Ortega asked if that was the same as the current agreement.

Ms. Fong stated it would be 7% more than the last agreement to maintain the ability to drawdown funds, but if the Transportation Authority were to not borrow any funds, it would be the same cost.



Member Ortega asked for clarification on the various bank credit ratings listed.

Ms. Fong stated that there are three separate rating systems and that each have their own individual different rating structure. She said the banks are typically allowed to select which credit rating agency they like, depending on what type of investments they have to. She continued by saying that what the Transportation Authority looks for is that banks have all As and that more than one A was good and that all of them came in as at least A grade from experienced facilities.

Member Ortega asked if Sumitomo Mitsui Banking Corporation did not fully fill in all their forms because there was information missing from Attachment 1 pertaining to it.

Ms. Fong stated that Sumitomo Mitsui Banking Corporation had only indicated a letter of interest to doing business with the Transportation Authority and that they would send additional information if they agency had requested more information.

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ford, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, Ng, Ortega, and Siegal (6)

Absent: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, Kim, and Levine (4)

9. Transit Recovery and Fiscal Cliff: BART, SFMTA and Caltrain – INFORMATION

Martin Reyes, Principal Transportation Planner; Pamela Herhold, Assistant General Manager for the Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART); Devon Ryan, Government and Community Affairs Officer for Caltrain; and Rally Catapang, Section Director for Budget and Capital Finance for SFMTA presented the item.

Member Ortega noted the high cost of taking BART to the airport and limited services late in the evening. She asked whether BART was working with airports to increase ridership and whether they had funding to contribute.

Ms. Herhold noted that the higher fares at the airports were related to the premium service provided to airports and explained that services were limited in the late evenings and early mornings for system maintenance for BART. She also noted that BART paid \$2.5 million a year in rent to the San Francisco International Airport (SFO).

Member Ortega noted that timed transfers and interagency connections could help increase ridership and asked if Caltrain's GoPass program could be restructured to allow an employer to purchase passes for a portion of their workforce instead of for the entire workforce.

Ms. Ryan responded that they were re-evaluating GoPass and exploring different pass programs. She also noted that Caltrain would be re-evaluating their service schedule in January to be more coordinated with other services in the region and improve transfers.

Member Kim asked if SFMTA planned to reconfigure their bus routes to address projected deficits and whether new services could be provided to address first/last mile and similar short trips.



Mr. Catapang responded that service changes and cuts were on the table if SFMTA did not find additional funding, and SFMTA's transit planning staff was looking at travel patterns and making changes to bus routes in response to demand.

Member Ford asked what kind of funding sources could be pursued and how the region could improve service frequencies to match what is seen in other major cities.

Ms. Ryan responded that Caltrain had much better service today than before electrified service began and the service is now similar to what is seen in Zurich, explaining that the new trains can stop and start faster which contributes to increased service. She also noted that Caltrain has ordered four additional electric multiple unit trains and will be piloting a battery train on the portion of the Caltrain corridor south of San Jose. Ms. Ryan explained that Caltrain service expansion was limited due to revenues.

Member Ford asked what kind of revenue model would move forward.

Ms. Ryan responded that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) was exploring sales taxes, payroll taxes, and a combination of sales and payroll taxes, and noted that the solution was likely some form of regional taxing.

Member Barz noted that conversations at the MTC Select Committee had not been going well and that there did not seem to be a clear path to passing a regional transportation revenue measure. She asked how MTC staff had decided on studying sales and payroll taxes for the measure, why freeway tolling was not being considered, and how viable the options being considered were.

Mr. Reyes described the measure scenarios being explored by MTC staff and noted that sales tax was being pursued because it was considered more politically viable than other funding mechanisms. He also noted that parcel tax had previously been on the table but was removed from the current scenarios by MTC due to its potential competition with a future affordable housing measure. He further explained that the proposed payroll tax was also drawing concerns from the business community and that it was difficult to find a single funding mechanism that all stakeholders can support.

Ms. Lombardo noted that other countries' equivalent state and federal governments tended to invest more heavily in transit as a subsidized service and that even in the United States, other states with comparable levels of transit saw much more investment from their state in transit operations than in California, and said this needed to be part of the long-term solution.

Mr. Reyes added that implementation of tolling could take a significant amount of time due to legislative and infrastructure needs which would eliminate it from consideration when trying to address near-term funding shortfalls.

Member Barz asked for information about a previous effort to increase tolls on the Bay Bridge by \$1.50 and whether a similar, smaller tolling increase could have been part of a revenue solution, noting that a large toll increase may not be politically viable.

Mr. Reyes explained that the Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA) was currently exploring a bridge toll increase on BATA bridges to fund state of good repair needs.

Ms. Lombardo added that the proposal to raise bridge tolls for transit had not move



forward due to opposition from state legislators.

Member Milford-Rosales asked for examples from Caltrain and SFMTA about what the consequences would be if funding deficits are not addressed, suggested that information could be used as part of advocacy efforts, and asked how BART had evaluated the success of its projects. He also expressed concerns about BART's new faregates being too narrow to allow bicycles through, slow, and said the wider (ADA) gates that fit bicycles were too few in number, causing bottlenecks for cyclists at stations.

Ms. Herhold noted the feedback and said she would take it back to the fare gate team, which was continuing to monitor performance and make refinements, adding that they had metrics to measure the success of every project.

Ms. Ryan responded that Caltrain would be providing more financial information in November after the new schedule with electrified service had been in place for at least a month, which would help inform more accurate deficit projections.

Member Margarita asked how the MTC Select Committee members were chosen and who they represent, why it was difficult for Caltrain to secure Low Carbon Fuel Standards (LCFS) credits, whether cars coming into San Francisco could be charged a toll, and whether transit agencies were exploring partnerships with and shuttles to entertainment venues, especially large, multi-million dollar venues that involved large crowds existing after key transit services end or were limited frequency.

Mr. Reyes described the Select Committee's membership roster and said that they had been designated by MTC.

Ms. Ryan explained that Caltrain currently budgeted \$5 million per year from the LCFS program and that they were working to clarify their role as a heavy rail fixed-guideway operator to the California Air Resources Board in order to secure the funds.

Mr. Catapang noted that they had a partnership with Chase Center where a portion of an event ticket cost was transferred to SFMTA and the event ticket became a ticket for transit. He also noted that transit was a subsidized service and that SFMTA's cost per ride was \$8 while they only charged \$3.

Ms. Lombardo added that existing commuter benefits programs could be better advertised and mentioned the new BayPass program that MTC and other transit operators were working on, which was hoped to be a model to help with transportation demand management as well as another source of stable revenues for transit.

Member Margarita clarified that she was interested in seeing more late night transit service for event attendees at venues.

During public comment, Edward Mason suggested that Caltrain capture more commuters who currently take buses and implement medallions for commuter buses. He also discussed concerns about vandalism of the bathrooms at the Berryessa BART station.

Roland Lebrun suggested ideas on how to address transit operating deficits and discussed the need to identify funding for operations and maintenance of The Portal project.



Other Items

10. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

Member Ortega requested an update from the SFMTA about the changes it had implemented to the J line transit stops and a new stop sign for 28th Street. She said while SFMTA had indicated there was strong public support for the changes, she had listened in on the public hearing and did not receive the same impression. Member Ortega said she would be okay following up separately with SFMTA.

On behalf of Member Barz, Member Ford requested additional information on regional funding measures from the MTC or the Transportation Authority. Additionally, Member Ford also asked for an update on the Vision Zero Ramp Phase 3 Study.

Member Milford-Rosales seconded Member Barz's request to have further discussion on funding. He also stated he had a list of questions and requested follow-up with the presenters from the Transportation Authority, BART, SFMTA, and Caltrain who were present at the meeting.

Member Ortega asked to be included in the follow-up and that she had questions about fares.

There was no public comment.

11. Public Comment

During public comment, Edward Mason stated he wanted to address two issues with the corporate commuter bus program. He opined that there was no ridership on Mondays and Fridays and that the corporate commuter buses contributed to pollution rather than reducing it. Mr. Mason also stated that he had been sending the CAC emails documenting violations of corporate commuter buses. He stated that within half an hour, he had been able to document several violations which included expired or no permits and that there was no enforcement. Mr. Mason also stated that if there were more enforcement such as parking tickets then that could generate revenue for the City.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated that Caltrain staff was incorrect when they said Caltrain's maximum speed was 79 miles per hour because it was limited by the Federal Railroad Administration. Mr. Lebrun stated that an internet search that asked what the maximum operating speed was for a SRA class 5 track, the response was 80 miles per hour operating speed and 90 miles per hour for passenger trains. He stated that part of Measure RR was to provide round trips between Gilroy and San Francisco and noted that service currently only goes up to Gilroy and then passengers switch trains. Mr. Lebrun continued by saying that three measures had been passed for standard service to Gilroy in 2000, 2016, and in 2020 and there were still no platforms on tracks or capital stations and passengers were required to cross a live track on foot and then they used step stools provided by Caltrain employees to climb aboard northbound trains when the Union Pacific southbound trains block track one. Mr. Lebrun expressed his frustration and asked the CAC to help with citizen initiatives.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:51 p.m.