



MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, October 23, 2024

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Siegal called the meeting to order at 6:14 p.m.

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

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Najuwanda Daniels, Jerry Levine, and Venecia Margarita (3)

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Siegal congratulated Vice Chair Daniels and Member Ortega, who had been reappointed by the Board the previous day for another 2-year term on the CAC. She reported that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) had held the last of five Select Committee meetings, during which they had voted on key elements of a regional transportation revenue measure framework to advance to the MTC Commission for further review. Chair Siegal stated that one of the recommendations was that there should be dedicated funding for transit transformation, which included initiatives such as regional wayfinding signage, fare integration, and transit priority. She mentioned that all scenarios included at least the four counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, San Francisco, and San Mateo, which would help address financial deficits for some of the region's largest transit operators, including BART, Caltrain, Muni, and AC Transit. She added that sales, payroll, and parcel taxes were under consideration pending more information from future voter polling, and that the authorizing legislation was recommended to include language allowing for a citizen initiative with a majority voter approval threshold rather than a two-thirds threshold.

Chair Siegal said that the MTC Legislation Committee would consider these recommendations in November, before going to a special full Commission meeting on December 9 for action. Chair Siegal continued by stating that the recommendations would be used to inform potential bill language to be introduced at the beginning of the 2025 legislative session which would help Bay Area transit pivot to a new financial model and new travel patterns post-pandemic, which was critical for San Francisco and the region. She said she hoped staff would agendize a detailed update on this item for the CAC at their November or January meeting.

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

3. Approve the Minutes of the September 25, 2024 Meeting - ACTION

4. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve a Two Year Professional Services Contract with HNTB Corporation in an Amount Not to Exceed \$1,103,000 for Technical



Services for the San Francisco Freeway Network Management Study – ACTION

5. State and Federal Legislation Update - INFORMATION

Member Kim asked about Item 4 and questioned whether the \$1,103,000 in this contract was from Prop L funds or elsewhere. Member Kim stated that previously, the Board had approved \$1,000,000 for the San Francisco Freeway Network Study and wanted to know whether the money being requested for approval was for the same study or for something else.

Mx. Paz responded that this request to approve award of the contract would be funded with Prop L funds already appropriated by the Board for this purpose. Mx. Paz stated that approving the contract would allow Transportation Authority staff to enter negotiations with the consultant to start work on the project.

Member Milford-Rosales stated that he had read in the memo that this project would not include capacity increases in lanes on I-280 and asked staff to confirm whether this meant there would be no new lanes on I-280.

Mx. Paz responded that this project would have no capacity additions or lane additions, consistent with what had been presented to the Transportation Authority Board previously. Mx. Paz also shared that there were small pinch points in the network that staff and consultants might need to look at more closely to create continuous lanes through select points. Mx. Paz emphasized there would be no network-level capacity expansion.

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that the use of new data sources, such as INRIX and Streetlight, was interesting and expressed his desire to know if these data could be used to understand where regional pass-through traffic on freeways was originating and heading. Mr. Mason also mentioned that he occasionally rode the express bus from Redwood City to San Francisco and that ridership seemed very low. Mr. Mason expressed his hope that the consultant would be able to determine ways to increase transit ridership and understand where freeway traffic was coming from.

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

Items 3 and 4 of the Consent Agenda were approved by the following vote:

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

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

End of Consent Agenda

6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve a Two-Year Professional Services Contract to TY Lin International in an Amount Not to Exceed \$4,350,000 for Design and Engineering Services and California Department of Transportation Right-of-Way Approval of the Yerba Buena Island Multi-use Path Project for Segments 1 and 2; and Approve a Two-Year Professional Services Contract to WMH Corporation in an Amount Not to Exceed \$1,150,000 for 35% Design and Engineering Services for the Yerba Buena Island Multi-use Path Project for Segments 3 and 4 – ACTION

Mike Tan, Senior Engineer, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Kim asked staff to share something that would comprehensively show the



total budget, spent to date, status of construction, and the timelines for the suite of projects that the Transportation Authority is leading on Treasure Island.

Carl Holmes, Deputy Director for Capital Project, responded that he would work with Chair Siegal to provide that information to the CAC.

Member Ford asked why there were significant infrastructure projects on Treasure Island as she had been on Treasure Island recently, and found it was very lightly populated.

Mr. Holmes responded that the island's development would expand the population from 2,000 to over 20,000 residents.

Member Barz expressed concern that \$40 million a mile seems high for a Class I bike lane. She then asked if there had been any questions during the planning and conceptual design phase regarding why \$80 million was necessary for a two-mile bike lane.

Mr. Tan responded that the original environmental impact report looked at striping a bike lane at a high level only, but the need to expand the road meant a bike lane and transit lane couldn't fit. He stated that geotechnical concerns, including being on the side of a cliff also increased costs.

Mr. Holmes added that, while the end product was a class one bike lane facility, as one of the slides showed for segment one, there was a steep elevation difference, leading to the design of a structure almost like a freeway on and off-ramp - adding that it was not just a roadway with a barrier, but a concrete structural element to provide a user-friendly bicycle riding experience. He explained that, although a cyclist could ride on the east band of the Bay Bridge and traverse the island, it would currently involve walking up Macalla. He said this project would allow for a better rider experience, and they had received significant input from bicycle advocates to ensure it happened.

With respect to the transit-only lane, Mr. Holmes explained that improvements to transit to help mitigate congestion from the 20,000 residents would help achieve the goal of having 50% of travel modes not being single-occupancy vehicles. He said the subject project would provide infrastructure to support that goal. He clarified that the multi-use path was part of the Bay Skyway project, in which MTC was also a partner. While MTC was handling the work in Oakland, he said the Transportation Authority was managing the work in San Francisco and said that this multi-agency effort aimed to improve the user experience for travelers moving between Oakland and San Francisco.

Member Ford asked about the anticipated funding sources for the project, noting that the memo mentioned \$25 million as to be determined (TBD). She inquired about the level of confidence that the TBD amount would come together.

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming replied that there were several grant applications that were either pending or being written at that moment. She stated that the Transportation Authority had a pending application for a state Active Transportation Program grant, but the funding in the state program had been significantly reduced in the state budget, making that grant less likely than originally anticipated. She said the Transportation Authority would be applying for a RAISE grant, and the call for projects was expected soon. She said the Transportation



Authority was preparing an application for Senate Bill 1 Solutions for Congested Corridors for the full Bay Skyway project, which included the West Oakland link with the multi-use path and ferry components and was seeking Regional Measure 3 (bridge toll) funds, as well. She said that the Transportation Authority was confident about securing funding for construction, but it would require a significant effort as evidenced by the multiple grant applications.

Chair Siegal asked for more information on why it made sense to split the segments between multiple contractors.

Mr. Tan responded that the recommendation was to award the design contract for Segments 3 and 4 to WMH, which was the current contractor for the West Side Bridges project, and that adding this onto the contract by change order, would accelerate this work. He explained that TY Lin had worked on the Bay Bridge East Span and the environmental phase and conceptual design for the multi-use path spiral loop that TY Lin had a strong understanding of bridge structures and that was why they were recommended to take on design of Segments 1 and 2.

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that what needed to be questioned was the projected bicycle usage for the project. He recalled previous meetings where it was mentioned that people would ride bicycles from Oakland to Treasure Island, cross Yerba Buena Island, and then take a ferry into San Francisco. Mr. Mason asked how many people would actually use infrastructure, expressed concerns about the cost, and asked why the developers were not contributing financially to the project.

Through the Chair, Member Barz stated she had a question based on Mr. Mason's comment and also wanted to respond to it. She asked staff to clarify the contribution from the developers and she inquired whether there were ridership estimates for either the transit lane or the bicycle lane.

Mr. Tan responded that the Treasure Island Transportation Implementation Plan had projections. Mr. Holmes clarified that staff would provide the projected ridership in an upcoming update and he said that the developer was contributing via roads they would build and that the Transportation Authority would be contributing via roads and other infrastructure they were building and through contributions to TIDA.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Daniels and Levine (2)

- 7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt a Resolution of Local Support Authorizing the Executive Director to File an Application for \$5.5 million in Funding Assigned to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and Committing Any Necessary Matching Funds and Stating Assurance to Complete the West Side Bridges Seismic Retrofit Project (WSB Project) for Retaining Walls to Accommodate the Yerba Buena Island Multi-Use Path (YBI MUP Project); and Program \$4.5 million in Senate Bill 1 Local Partnership Program Formulaic Funds, with Conditions, to a Project of the Bay Area Toll Authority's (BATA's) Choice in Exchange for \$4.5 million in BATA Funds for the WSB Project for Retaining Walls**



to Accommodate the YBI MUP Project – ACTION

Nick Smith, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Ortega asked why the plan had originally called for temporary retaining walls until the larger walls could be built, given the sandy soil conditions. Carl Holmes, Deputy Director for Capital Projects, stated that when the Transportation Authority applied for the RAISE grant for the West Side Bridges project, they had not received the full amount. As a result, the team de-scoped the retaining walls since they had been designed to be more accommodating toward the multi-use path (MUP), with the intent of securing funds at a later date to be able to restore the deleted scope and build retaining walls that would accommodate the future MUP. Mr. Holmes said that similar to the Hillcrest Project that the committee had taken action on several months prior, now that additional funding was available, the project team was seeking to reinsert this work so the temporary retaining wall would not be needed.

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming added that the original scope had included a Class II facility in the West Side Bridges and Hillcrest projects, so these additional funds would allow larger retaining walls and a wider roadway to accommodate the MUP as a Class 1 facility.

Member Ortega commented that this approach made sense; however, she asked what would happen if the Transportation Authority received the funding for the MUP but not the funding for the retaining walls. Ms. LaForte responded that the funding in this item for the retaining walls was for construction and it would be added to an existing construction contract. She continued by stating that Item 6 was for design of the full scope of the MUP, not for construction. She explained that the retaining walls were intended to accommodate the MUP in the Westside Bridges project so the YBI MUP project would not need to go back and add them.

During public comment Edward Mason asked for clarification that the yellow transit lane shown on the map in the slide presentation was the transit lane going toward San Francisco, and the purple line was the general lane coming off the Bay Bridge.

Nick Smith, Senior Transportation Planner, confirmed that was correct and explained what would become the transit-only on-ramp had previously been a general purpose on-ramp that was now closed due to construction and that it would give transit a faster route to the Bay Bridge toward San Francisco.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Daniels and Levine (2)

8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$3,350,000 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions, and Appropriate \$750,000 in Prop AA Funds, with Conditions, for Two Requests – ACTION

Projects: SFMTA: 13th Street Safety (\$3,350,000 Prop L). SFCTA: Yerba Buena Island Multi-Use Path - Transit Lane (\$750,000 Prop AA).



Nick Smith, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Barz asked what the outcome of the \$12 million investment for the 13th Street Safety project would be. Jennifer Wong, SFMTA Project Manager, responded that the project included protected bikeways on three complex blocks of 13th Street and Duboce Avenue, as well as pedestrian safety and accessibility features, and traffic calming for drivers accessing the freeway on and off ramps. She noted that the project was on the Vision Zero High Injury Network and had seen a history of collisions and that this project was intended to address that.

Member Barz observed that the major addition was a new protected bikeway along three blocks. Ms. Wong confirmed that was correct and noted the bikeway would feature concrete medians, as well as signal upgrades at each intersection, which were the most intensive work.

Member Barz acknowledged that the traffic signals were old, and while that was a major improvement, opined that this was essentially a protected bikeway with concrete for three blocks, and because of working with Caltrans, it was more expensive than originally anticipated.

Member Barz then asked if there was a number of projected users for the bikeway. Ms. Wong responded that SFMTA had performed traffic modeling in close coordination with Caltrans, including pre- and post-pandemic data for vehicle, pedestrian and bike volumes. She said they found over 400 cyclists passed through the Duboce and Valencia intersection as well as 13th Street and Folsom Street intersection. Ms. Wong noted that Valencia and Folsom were popular north-south routes and filling this three-block gap would benefit cyclists.

Member Ford said some of the committee's questions were due to the truncated map in the slide presentation. She stated that this was a road that cyclists passed by and do not ride along, and questioned why \$12 million was being spent there when there were many other facilities that could use \$12 million with a higher impact. Ms. Wong responded that part of this project reallocated roadway space, removing a vehicle lane in each direction. She clarified that the largest cost of the project was the signal rehabilitation and upgrade to current standards which would allow proper phasing for the bikeway, and said that this area had not been touched since the earthquake.

Member Milford-Rosales asked for clarification on what location the map in the slide was showing; Ms. Wong clarified the map in the slide had been turned 90 degrees and north was to the right. Member Milford-Rosales asked whether the bikeway would be implemented in both directions and Ms. Wong responded yes.

Member Milford-Rosales noted the map was still hard to interpret and asked whether this would be like 3rd Street with short, protected areas at bus islands and nothing else. Nick Smith explained that the project would complete the bike lanes in both directions all the way from Valencia, creating a protected route under the freeway.

Member Milford-Rosales asked whether the concrete islands would be K-rail or precast curbs in contrast with custom molds poured near 3rd Street near the baseball stadium that seemed time and cost intensive to construct. Ms. Wong responded that the proposed concrete buffers would be built in-house by San Francisco Public Works



(SFPW) construction crews and were a cheaper way of delivering concrete protection, similar to 3rd Street and further east on Division. She noted, however, that some areas like Mission/Otis required a more custom solution due to the complexity of the freeway off-ramp.

Member Ortega stated she had previously biked this area frequently and her thought had been to move the bike path, explaining that she didn't want to be on this road with freeway exits where drivers were traveled extremely fast, and that while there would be signal control the city lacked enforcement. She also noted the map was confusing, especially without showing the expanded area and linkages. She asked what the improvement plan was to ensure bicyclists were not getting hit by cars speeding off the 101 and noted that the 101 off-ramp at 13th Street and Mission Street was too short and unsafe even as a driver. Ms. Wong noted there was a full image of the project proposal in the agenda packet. She explained the project included a travel lane removal and other projects and studies had shown this reduced vehicle speeds, so the hope was this project would reduce speeds in the area. She further noted that SFMTA was pursuing the project due to recommendations from SFCTA's SoMa Freeway Ramps Intersection Safety Study and San Francisco Planning Department's Market Octavia Plan (formerly The Hub), so this was an implementation project related to those recommendations. She clarified no changes would be made to the freeway off ramp itself.

Member Margarita said she shared the same concerns as Member Ortega and other members that it didn't seem like the project would make things safer. She asked where the signals were going to be placed and how long the project area was and said if it was just going to be a short span, it didn't make sense in an area with a crowded off-ramp and congestion. Ms. Wong clarified the project consisted of three blocks which, when heading east to west were Duboce Avenue from Valencia to Mission/Otis, then 13th Street from Mission/Otis to South Van Ness, then 13th Street from South Van Ness to Folsom, by Rainbow Grocery. She said both Valencia and Folsom streets were well used bike corridors and this project would provide a separated, direct connection between those streets.

Member Ford said she had friends on the Muni Funding Working Group and heard how the City was in a time of austerity. She noted that Ms. LaForte had earlier mentioned the reduction in state Active Transportation Program funds and that she felt if the goal was a connection between Folsom and Valencia it would be easier to go one block south to 14th Street and not deal with the freeway off-ramps, commenting that under the freeway was not a nice place to bike nor an intuitive connection from Valencia to Folsom. She said if the main goal was signals, she wanted to understand the main beneficiaries, and if the goal was pedestrian safety, she felt there were lower cost ways to accomplish this. She noted that the project seemed to aim for multiple objectives at a price tag of \$12 million for three blocks and she was struggling with that given today's fiscal realities.

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, apologized for the confusion over the graphic, and reference the full map that was included in the packet materials. She explained that while the Transportation Authority had programmed a million dollars to the project a year and a half ago, since then, some of the local revenues that were anticipated to fund construction had not come through. She stated the requested Prop L funds leveraged other state grants that had timely use of



funds requirements. She gave additional context that making signal improvements on Caltrans right of way, and associated Caltrans requirements, had been a major driver of the cost increases.

Member Ford said the crux of today's comments was that the bike lane component was not sensible and wondered what level of funding would have been required if it had been only a signal, lane reduction, and bulb-out project without bike lanes. Ms. Wong noted this calculation had been done and she could provide it after the meeting, but said that a significant amount of the total project cost was due to signals. She further explained there was additional scope not mentioned, including pedestrian refuge islands, accessible pedestrian signals, widened sidewalks, and repaving.

Chair Siegal said she lived in the Haight and often biked east to Potrero or Bayview and currently did wiggles up Market and down 11th or 8th to avoid the 13th Street area. As a result, she said she thought the project would be a convenient connection, creating a straight shot route in what had been a harrowing place to bike. She expressed appreciation for the proposed improvements. She questioned whether with this level of cost it would be possible to extend the connection all the way from Valencia further west to Market. She also stated that she was aware of the alternative to wiggle a block south to 14th Street but said she disliked door zone bike lanes more than being under a freeway.

Chair Siegal said she appreciated the concerns of her colleagues about the exact implementation, and asked Ms. Wong to clarify if the signal upgrades were necessary regardless of this project, or if they were needed for the bike lane and street improvements. Ms. Wong responded that it was a little of both since the signals were old and upgrades were also necessary for the bikeway. Chair Siegal asked if it was worth exploring whether it would be cheaper to route around the section of 13th Street that required signal upgrades and that as unpleasant as being under a freeway was, a lot of people did walk around in this area connecting SoMa and the Mission.

Ms. LaForte pointed out that this was a time sensitive request because there were state grants funding the project that were drivers of the timely use of funds requirements, including one that required the construction contract to be awarded next month and if there were delays in the contract, it could mean funds would be at risk.

Member Margarita asked how much state funding the project would lose if it didn't get approved. Ms. LaForte responded there were many different grants on the project, including Local Partnership Program (LPP) funds programmed by California Transportation Commission and Caltrans SHOPP fund. She said that the SHOPP funds totaled more than \$2 million, but one of the smaller grants, LPP, was driving the timing, but she needed to confirm the requirements for each source. She emphasized that the Transportation Authority didn't want to lose grant funds because it would reflect poorly on San Francisco.

During public comment, Edward Mason stated he visited a hardware store near one of the project area intersections and said that the City needed to reduce speeds and increase attentiveness of drivers coming off the freeway, and recommended speed bumps (Bott's dots). He said the City was trying to pack ten pounds into a five-pound space and said he didn't see any benefit in the larger picture.



Chair Siegel built off Mr. Mason's comment and expressed her appreciation for the lane removal.

Member Oretga asked what the control would be where the bike path crossed the freeway off-ramp. Ms. Wong responded it would be signal controlled. Member Margarita followed up, asking whether the freeway off-ramp would be narrowed from two to one lane. Ms. Wong responded that freeway off-ramp at Mission/Otis would remain as-is and the freeway on-ramp at South Van Ness would remain as-is.

Chair Siegel proposed taking the vote separately on each request and called for a motion.

Member Barz moved to approve the YBI MUP - Transit Lane project request, seconded by Member Milford-Rosales.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Daniels and Levine (2)

Member Milford-Rosales moved to approve the 13th Street Safety project request, seconded by Member Kim.

The motion failed by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Milford-Rosales, Ng, and Siegal (3)

Abstentions: CAC Members Barz, Ford, Kim, Margarita, and Ortega (5)

Absent: CAC Members Daniels and Levine (2)

9. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$2,649,000 and Appropriate \$139,890 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions, for Two Requests – ACTION

Projects: SFMTA: Bus Transit Signal Priority (\$2,649,000). SFCTA: Bayview Street Safety and Truck Relief Study (\$139,890).

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

Member Kim referenced a newspaper article that cited \$212 million needed for an updated Muni Train Control System estimated at \$700 billion in all. He asked if there would be interference between the two different systems: Transit Signal Priority and the Train Control System. He added that train control was for the subway, but buses and streetcars also operated on the same system. He asked if the systems would work together or separately.

Liliana Ventura, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Program Manager at SFMTA responded that SFMTA had two separate systems. She explained there was a rail Transit Signal Priority and a Bus Transit Signal Priority. She added that the recently approved Train Control Upgrade Project was for the first phase and specifically for underground work. She clarified the systems were different and the subject funding request was for the Bus Transit Signal Priority.

Member Kim asked if the Bus Transit Signal Priority would be integrated with SFMTA's



Train Control System in the future.

Ms. Ventura responded that Transit Signal Priority technology was moving towards cloud-based, and they anticipated the same integrated system for Bus Transit Signal Priority and Rail Transit Signal Priority.

During public comment, Edward Mason expressed his support for the signal priority project. He stated there had been a 25 year old incident of a pedestrian fatality due to a bus at the 21st and Mission Street intersection. He asked about the estimated life of the new equipment and system. He further inquired if there would be no signal interference of the communication-based transit system between the surface light rail and the subway. He expressed concerns that they should operate on a different frequency due to potential cyber-attacks.

Chair Siegal asked staff to respond to the useful life of the signals.

Ms. Ventura responded that the ITS and the Transit Signal Priority had a typical lifespan of 15 years for the entire system. She added the current Bus Transit Signal Priority system was over 20 years old and certain components aged faster such as chips and bandwidth. She stated these could become outdated between 5 to 7 years. She said SFMTA upgraded their systems every 5 to 7 years to allow for upgraded cybersecurity protocols.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Daniels and Levine (2)

10. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the District 1 Multimodal Transportation Plan Final Report – ACTION

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

Member Kim thanked staff for the study. He noted that Fulton Street had speeding issues, making the street dangerous for pedestrians, bikes, and drivers. He appreciated the recommended safety improvements in the report. He also noted that the speed limit of Fulton Street had recently been reduced from 30 mph to 25 mph, which could be updated in the report. He asked for clarification on what pedestrian-scale lighting and signage referred to.

Mx. Paz responded that pedestrian scale lighting provided light for people waiting on the sidewalk. She said the signage referred to signs at transit stops.

Member Kim asked for clarification that curbside management recommendations did not include Geary Boulevard because SFMTA had other improvement projects on the corridor, which Mx. Paz confirmed.

Member Kim asked whether Fulton Street was the first location in San Francisco to apply hardened center lines, what their purpose was, and whether they had been effective to improve safety. He stated that the speed cameras, signals, and other safety improvements on Fulton Street would help to address speeding but was unsure



whether the hardened center lines would help or would be confusing since they were a new treatment in the Richmond.

Mx. Paz answered that hardened center lines were placed to slow turn speeds of left turn vehicles and could prevent sideshows and said that these had been implemented in the Mission and on South Van Ness. Mx. Paz said they would follow up with SFMTA on their evaluation of the effectiveness of hardened center lines.

Member Kim inquired whether ridership would justify the North-South express bus routes shown in the final report. He expressed the need for more bus routes connecting the Richmond to the Sunset, and the Richmond to Daly City and other places on the peninsula.

Mx. Paz pointed to page 65 of the report which contained a draft map from a SamTrans express bus study. They said the map showed full service on the west side to make connections to destinations on the peninsula, including Daly City, Foster City, and Palo Alto. They also said staff could take comments on this plan for future coordination with SamTrans.

Member Kim stated that sidewalk repair was also an urgent need in District 1, due to sidewalk damage from trees. Member Kim also emphasized the need for better public transportation support between mini districts. Additionally, Member Kim commented that the proposed locations for mobility hubs were reasonable but questioned whether \$500,000 per site would be enough, as sites might require significant infrastructure upgrades.

Mx. Paz clarified that the \$500,000 estimate was for a detailed planning study. The detailed planning study would include a cost estimate for implementation.

Member Barz expressed concern about the green painted bike lane recommendation for Cabrillo. Member Barz shared that the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) no longer recommended door-zone painted bike lanes unless there was a buffer, which Cabrillo did not have. Member Barz also shared that Cabrillo had experienced recent speeding related collisions and was not sure how effective a conventional bike lane would be to address these collisions.

Mx. Paz responded that the intersection treatments were aimed to slow traffic and that Cabrillo had space constraints due to parking needs. Mx. Paz stated that the only way to make a protected bike lane would be to take away parking from the full corridor, which they had heard in outreach was not desired by the community. However, Mx. Paz stated that they could explore Member Barz's comment as a next phase improvement.

Member Barz asked if there was a goal to meet the NACTO volume and speed requirement for a painted, buffered bike lane.

Mx. Paz said they would follow up with SFMTA.

During public comment, Edward Mason shared that cellphone data from SamTrans showed significant numbers of travelers from the west side down the peninsula. Regarding hardened center lines, Mr. Mason asked whether there were plans to educate drivers to make wider left turns to not cross over the center line. Mr. Mason also questioned how long it would take for electric vehicle charging at charging hubs and suggested looking into charging at light poles as an alternate solution.



Richard Rothman stated that the intersection of 37th Street and Fulton was a dangerous intersection near a senior center. Mr. Rothman commented that seniors did not have enough time to cross the street and that the intersection had two recent accidents.

David Alexander from Richmond Families thanked staff and Supervisor Chan's office for the study. Mr. Alexander stated the need for more robust treatments on Cabrillo because Cabrillo was a slow street. Mr. Alexander appreciated the hardened center lines but cautioned that unsignalized intersections would not stop speeding on Fulton and that more robust treatments were needed.

Paul Rivera from Walk SF and the Richmond Families Transportation Group thanked staff and Supervisor Chan's office for the study. Mr. Rivera stated his preference for the pedestrian safety zone treatment for Fulton, shown in the bottom diagram on page 59 of the report.

Al thanked staff for the study and agreed with Mr. Rivera about preferring the pedestrian safety zone shown on page 59 of the report. Al stated that the unprotected bike lanes would not have been helpful on Cabrillo and asked whether staff could explore ways to decrease the cost of creating pedestrian bulb-outs through tactical placemaking. He also called for a more robust study of the actual safety conditions along Fulton.

Jennifer Kriz stated that she understood concerns about unsignalized intersections but also expressed concern about a light being placed at 4th and Fulton. She opined that installing the light would draw more car traffic to use 4th as a connection between Fulton and Geary.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Barz, Daniels, and Levine (3)

11. SFMTA Mid-Valencia Bikeway Project Update – INFORMATION

Paul Stanis, SFMTA Project Manager, presented the item.

Member Ortega expressed concerns about the timing of the Valencia Bikeway Project open houses, stating that scheduling from 4-6pm meant many people she knew who wanted to attend were unable to make it due to work commitments or had to rush to get there in time. She noted she had raised this issue before but wanted to continue making SFMTA and the Transportation Authority aware that, when conducting public outreach events, they need to ensure neighborhood residents who may not work in the area can attend. She stated that her partner, who uses the Valencia bike lane daily, wanted to go to the open houses and share his input but was unable to do so. She emphasized the importance of capturing feedback from the broad range of bike lane users, including commuters, when gathering community input.

Member Ortega encouraged SFMTA in the next phase of outreach to ensure it was accessible to everyone, including working commuters. She expressed concerns about the latest version of the Valencia plan with both floating and non-floating parklets,



which would result in losing even more space that merchants wanted for loading and unloading, as well as parking. She opined that this would potentially add more confusion and could lead to people trying to double park again, an issue that the center running configuration had reduced. She noted that while the center lane was not perfect and had some issues, it was better because cyclists would not have to navigate double parked cars.

Member Margarita emphasized the comments from Member Ortega about community outreach. She stated that it seemed as though the project's outreach process was not truly engaging the community. She stressed that if the intention was to keep the community informed, it was crucial to put significant effort into including all members of the community, such as businesses and churches. She expressed appreciation that parking for people with disabilities was being considered, as it was not clearly shown on the new map. Member Margarita requested that SFMTA confirm whether the new proposed configuration would eliminate the center bike lanes when the side bike lanes were added.

Paul Stanis clarified that the plan was to remove the center bike lane and place the bike lanes by the curb, which he pointed out was different from how it was prior to the center running pilot. He said that SFMTA would implement the bikeway design that was already on Valencia between 15th and Market and that the center bikeway would be removed.

Member Margarita asked if the community had been included in the decision making process and stated that the new plan didn't make sense for the safety of the cyclists. She added that if additional parking was not included in the plans, she wanted to know the purpose of the new design.

Mr. Stanis replied that SFMTA had worked with over 100 businesses on the corridor, in addition to open houses, and had collaborated closely with the two primary merchant associations, informing them that the side running bikeway design would eliminate parking and loading zones. He stated that the associations had indicated that they were okay with that outcome. Mr. Stanis noted that there had been a desire to remove the current bike lanes because they did not work for people who visited those businesses, and that parking or going into the center running bike lanes presented a quality of life issue. He stated that the open lane in the middle of the road invited people to drive down it at high speeds, including on dirt bikes and ATVs, which was very disruptive to the corridor. Mr. Stanis emphasized that SFMTA had worked closely with people throughout the corridor, beyond the open houses events. He said that they had collaborated with some merchants five or six times. He noted that SFMTA has sent invitations to merchants and explicitly presented the final designs by guiding them down the corridor and highlighting the changes, including white zones and adjustments to parking and loading areas.

Member Margarita asked if cars would be parked in the middle of the street, as they often did further south on Valencia, or what would occupy the middle.

Mr. Stanis answered by stating that nothing was happening south of 23rd and the only section being talked about was 15th through the 23rd. He said that under the proposed design there would be no center median, there would just be a lane of travel in each direction.



Member Margarita asked if there were any new meetings scheduled for community outreach that were outside the hours of 4-6pm so more people could attend.

Mr. Stanis stated that SFMTA did not plan to hold any more meetings, but pointed out that they sent out monthly email updates and would continue to keep the public informed as construction start dates approached. He said that SFMTA was still meeting with merchant associations and advocacy groups, and if anyone emailed them, SFMTA would gladly hold these conversations. He emphasized that SFMTA had a long and robust outreach and dialogue with the community over the entire year and that this had been reflected in the final design that they were hoping to approve.

Member Margarita asked about an example she said she liked in San Mateo where the street was car free, and cars were only allowed during certain hours and locations for merchants to load and unload. She noted that parking was only for people with disabilities. She mentioned that it seemed safe for pedestrians and bicyclists and inquired why this was something the SFMTA shouldn't consider for Valencia.

Member Ford said that she liked the side running lanes and that when she was traveling to Valencia, it was normally for a destination on the corridor. She noted that with the center running lanes, it was difficult to enter and exit the lanes. She said that there was a lot of concern about the floating parklets between the community and cyclists and asked if and how they had addressed the concerns about the parklets.

Mr. Stanis responded that because San Francisco does not have floating parklets, they had conversations with Oakland, and New York. He stated that San Francisco's would differ by having a raised level crossing between the parklet, prioritizing the pedestrians and forcing cyclists to slow down at that point. He said that this ramp would include signage and a railing at the crossing point forcing pedestrians to cross only at one point. He mentioned that there would be a setback for the parklet, which included a three-foot buffer space where one could step out of the parklet but would not be in the bike lane, making the pedestrian more visible.

Member Ng asked, regarding community engagement, how SFMTA had reached out beyond the merchants to the everyday person and how SFMTA had met them where they were, as they had done with the merchants. She said that associations did not always reflect the opinions of everyone.

Mr. Stanis said that SFMTA was careful about who they listened to and in what situation to make sure they were able to get a full picture of what the community and the merchants wanted.

Chair Siegel said that it appeared that most of the side running bike lanes would be protected from traffic by parked cars, but she asked what kind of protection would be in place where there was not any parking or the lane had to go around parklets.

Mr. Stanis responded that there were a few locations where parking was not present for access to fire hydrants or daylighting at cross streets and driveways, and that SFMTA was working to figure that out. He stated now that the design was finalized, SFMTA was trying to secure the fine-grained details of the project as next steps. He said that because SFMTA wanted to complete this project as soon as possible, they would likely use a version of safe hit posts, but that there were opportunities for bikeway buffer hardening as time went on.



Chair Siegel noted that Vice Chair Daniels, who was absent, had expressed concerns that a church of which she is a member in the project area had not received outreach.

Mr. Stanis stated that, for the most part, the SFMTA had visited every frontage along the corridor. However, he added that if there were a specific church or storefront that should be contacted, that information should be forwarded to him.

Member Margarita said that she wanted to direct merchants who were concerned about loading zones to the SFMTA.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked if he were to inquire about the labor and materials that had been charged to the Valencia street project, how much money had been spent in that account and what that amount represented. He asked if 3,500 people used it, whether that meant 3,500 people had traveled downtown and then returned, or if it was actually 1,750 individual people. He asked whether SFMTA had considered using a reservation system online to avoid congestion. He questioned why investment in bicycle infrastructure on Valencia was necessary and why cyclists could not use Folsom instead, rather than spending resources on this project.

Other Items

12. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

Member Milford-Rosales stated that during last month's meeting, when discussing the temporary storage of trolley bus vehicles during the trailer construction project, he remembered that the Presidio bus yard would become a battery-only bus yard in the future. He noted that he had not seen any documentation on this in other SFMTA comments and planning documents and asked if it would be possible to have someone from SFMTA come talk about their plans for the broader trolley bus fleet sometime in the future. He remarked that the trolley buses make the community's fleet greener than many others and, with the issues AC Transit has experienced switching to battery buses, expressed his view that it seemed backward to replace the trolley buses with battery buses instead of diesel ones.

Member Margarita stated that she understood SFMTA was going to present something to the Board on November 19th regarding the Valencia bikeway topic they had just discussed. She expressed a desire for a follow-up conversation with SFMTA to ensure all suggestions were carefully considered. Margarita referenced Mr. Mason, suggesting that instead of a one-hour permit online, which required use between 10:30 and 11, perhaps a daily reservation system could be explored. She mentioned in Mexico City there was a system whereby certain cars could park based on permits, such as green on Tuesdays or blue on Wednesdays. She emphasized the need to think outside the box, focusing on safety and support for small businesses, many of which had closed after decades in operation. Member Margarita stressed the importance of balancing the needs of bikers, pedestrians, drivers, and small businesses, highlighting that not everyone could use transit, such as some residents who juggled two or three jobs while raising children. She urged consideration for the entire community when SFMTA implemented parking and sidewalk measures. She requested a follow-up conversation and noted she would be forwarding information to businesses, churches, and other entities to facilitate these discussions.

Member Kim stated that he wanted to reference Member Margarita's comment, with



respect to curbside management, noting that the District 1 Multimodal Study had included curbside elements, and as a small business owner, he had experienced similar issues. He said that last year, SFMTA had removed angular parking, changing it to parallel, which resulted in fewer parking spaces. He recounted that he has to go shopping very early to get a parking space and that after 10 a.m., there was no parking available. He mentioned there were some loading zones—such as yellow zones for delivery trucks and red zones for specific vehicles—but he couldn't use them (as a business owner) with his minivan, though sometimes he had no choice. He said this created a risk of receiving a ticket. He suggested that if he could book spots through a system, it would make things easier. Member Kim proposed discussing curbside management specifically, noting that SFMTA had an existing system but felt it needed updating or new ideas.

There was no public comment.

13. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

14. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:31 p.m.