



# MINUTES

## **Community Advisory Committee**

Wednesday, January 22, 2025

### **1. Committee Meeting Call to Order**

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

CAC members present at Roll: Najuwanda Daniels, Austin Milford-Rosales, Sharon Ng, Rachael Ortega, and Kat Siegal (5)

CAC Members absent at Roll: Sara Barz, (entered during Item 9), Phoebe Ford, Sean Kim, and Venecia Margarita (entered during Item 3) (4)

### **2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION**

Chair Siegal announced the Transportation Authority Board's first 2025 meeting scheduled for January 28, would be the first for five new members and would include 2025 chair and vice chair elections, mirroring that evening's CAC elections. She stated the Executive Director's Report and 2024 Annual Report would be shared with the CAC next week.

Chair Siegal noted that at the November meeting, Member Milford-Rosales inquired about the future of San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA) trolley bus fleet, a topic she had also expressed interest in. She stated staff advised that Acting SFMTA Director Julie Kirschbaum would attend the February CAC meeting to address this issue as part of a proposed amendment to the Prop L Muni Maintenance 5-Year Prioritization Program, which funds procurement of Muni vehicles and facilities.

There was no public comment.

### **3. Election of Chair and Vice Chair for 2025 - ACTION**

Chair Siegal reported that at the November 2024 CAC meeting, she was nominated for 2025 Chair and Vice Chair Daniels for 2025 Vice Chair. She noted their qualification statements were included in the agenda.

During public comment, Edward Mason inquired about how the time allocated for public comment would be managed, particularly in cases where agenda items included multiple sub-items.

Member Milford-Rosales moved to approve the nomination of Kat Siegal for Chair.

The nomination was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Barz, Ford, and Kim (3)

Member Margarita moved to approve the nomination of Najuwanda Daniels for Vice Chair.



The nomination was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Barz, Ford, and Kim (3)

## Consent Agenda

### 4. Approve the Minutes of the November 20, 2024 Meeting - ACTION

### 5. Audit Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2024 - INFORMATION

There was no public comment.

Member Milford-Rosales moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Member Daniels.

The Consent Agenda was approved without objection by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Barz, Ford, and Kim (3)

## End of Consent Agenda

### 6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$5,284,000 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions, for Five Requests – ACTION

**Projects: Prop L: PCJPB: Predictive Arrival/Departure System (\$2,400,000). SFMTA: Bicycle Facility Maintenance (\$459,000), Duboce Triangle Slow Streets Study [NTP] (\$250,000), Lincoln Way Traffic Signals [NTP] (\$500,000). SFPW: Curb Ramps and Subsidewalk Basements No. 3 (\$1,675,000).**

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Ortega asked about the green epoxy and thermoplastic used in the Bicycle Facility Maintenance project. She stated that based on her experience, these materials became very slick when wet and requested further information on the performance of these materials under wet conditions.

Matt Lasky, SFMTA Bike Program Manager, clarified that the materials used were specifically designed for bikeways and road use. He stated that they contained a level of grit, were rated for friction, and had been tested by the manufacturer. He offered to investigate specific locations where Member Ortega had observed issues and agreed to share additional product material specifications with Member Ortega.

Member Ortega concluded by stating that water frequently dripped from the Highway 101 bridge onto the bicycle facilities on 13<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mr. Lasky stated that water dripping from the freeway was likely a mixture of water and oil from vehicles and that the issue could stem from that rather than the paint. He said that the SFMTA would investigate the issue.



Bryant Wu, Senior Traffic Engineer with SFMTA, stated that skid resistance varied based on material used and its placement. He explained that resistance tended to be lower near gutters due to water and debris accumulation.

Member Ng asked for clarification on the definition of a sub-sidewalk basement.

Mr. Wu explained that a sub-sidewalk basement was a privately owned basement located beneath the sidewalk, typically found in older parts of the city.

Member Ng requested clarification on the necessity of the proposed curb ramps and noted that many intersections included in the project already featured curb ramps positioned above the basements.

Anastasia Hadad, SFPW Curb Ramps Program Manager, clarified that areas with existing curb ramps were in the process of being converted to full bulb outs. She also stated that SFMTA had identified these areas as needing traffic calming and requested their conversion to bulb outs.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked about the thermoplastic used for bicycle facility maintenance, questioning what happens when it deteriorates and potentially flows into the Bay. He expressed concerns about the amount of plastic being used and the material's sustainability. He also expressed concern about public spending on replacing the existing curb ramps and the associated additional costs. Additionally, he commented on Slow Streets Initiatives. He said they were a public relations problem for the City and expressed concerns about their potential to be disruptive and costly for Muni.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Barz, Ford, and Kim (3)

**7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt Fiscal Year 2025/26 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Local Expenditure Criteria – ACTION**

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

Chair Siegal asked what category incentives for ridership would fall under.

Mike Pickford responded that it would likely be listed as a zero emissions non-vehicle project, as it incentivized the use of alternative modes of transportation. He stated that the Transportation Authority had funded the San Francisco Environment Department's Emergency Ride Home program, a similar program designed to incentivize sustainable modes of transportation.

Member Margarita asked about a shuttle service at San Francisco State University that was discontinued and asked how the shuttle service could be restored from BART to the university.

Mr. Pickford said he was not familiar with the exact service that Member Margarita was



referring to. He said that approximately five years ago, staff had discussed potential shuttle routes with San Francisco State University, but were not able to design a feasible project that complied with Air District eligibility requirements, which prohibited shuttle services from being too close to existing transit services.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked about the shuttle services listed in the project type, asking whether the shuttles would be public or private.

Mr. Pickford responded that the Air District required the shuttle services be open to the public, as outlined in the TFCA guidance document in the enclosure.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Barz, Ford, and Kim (3)

**8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve the 2025 State and Federal Advocacy Program – ACTION**

Amber Crabbe, Public Policy Manager, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Milford-Rosales stated that he understood there were many obstacles to getting safety data reporting from autonomous vehicles. He asked if there were any indications that would change this year.

Ms. Crabbe responded that local jurisdictions continued to receive insufficient data from autonomous vehicle companies, the California Public Utility Commission, and the Department of Motor Vehicles. She noted that in Governor Newsom's veto message on autonomous vehicle legislation last year indicated his receptiveness to the importance of performance data. She said that state agencies had also been discussing how to modify their data subsequently released draft guidelines on stepping up their role in collecting data. She stated that if data was collected, it was still unclear whether local jurisdictions would receive it. She added that even if it were only available to state regulators, it would still be a step in the right direction.

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that autonomous vehicles should pay for public sector oversight since they didn't pay medallion fees like taxis and members of the public were disadvantaged by them. He said reports should be released on autonomous vehicle incidents. He noted that the public were also disadvantaged by electric vehicle charging infrastructure, in particular curbside infrastructure.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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



Absent: CAC Members Barz, Ford, and Kim (3)

**9. Regional Transportation Revenue Measure Update – INFORMATION**

Martin Reyes, Principal Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Ortega asked why SFMTA's anticipated deficit appeared to be much higher than other agencies' shortfalls despite SFMTA performing better in terms of ridership recovery.

Mr. Reyes responded that fare revenues comprised only a portion of SFMTA's budget, and other funding sources that SFMTA relied on such as general fund and parking revenues, had not recovered as much due to the impacts of work-from-home and other changes in travel behavior.

Member Ortega asked why San Francisco generated lower tax revenues compared to Alameda, Contra Costa, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties.

Mr. Reyes explained that San Francisco's lower sales tax revenues were attributed to lower taxable sales and provided estimates of how much a half-cent sales tax in other counties generated compared to San Francisco. Mr. Reyes further clarified that a variable rate tax framework being explored in some scenarios would allow San Francisco to implement a higher tax rate as compared to other counties, which would help address its higher share of transit operating shortfalls.

Chief Deputy Director Maria Lombardo added that SFMTA carried more than half of the region's transit ridership and that approximately 60 percent of regional trips had one end in San Francisco, which contributed to the magnitude of operating shortfalls that the agency expected.

Member Margarita asked why Santa Clara had the opportunity to choose whether to opt in to the regional measure and requested information on how much SFMTA spent on overtime.

Mr. Reyes responded that Santa Clara County had been opposed to participating in a regional measure the previous year, which contributed to Senate Bill 1031 being paused, in part because they did not want to interfere with reauthorization of one of their existing sales tax measures. However, Mr. Reyes said that they had expressed a willingness to contribute to the transit operator deficits through their sales tax program.

Additionally, Mr. Reyes noted that information on overtime would be requested from SFMTA.

Member Margarita asked why Marin County was not included in the regional measure frameworks.

Mr. Reyes stated that, while Marin County had deficit challenges for Golden Gate Transit, MTC had decided to focus the regional measure on the core counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, San Francisco, and San Mateo.

Chief Deputy Lombardo added that a regional measure could also be seen as competing with a planned reauthorization of a sales tax for Sonoma-Marín Area Rail Transit, a concern that had previously been expressed by north bay representatives.



She further explained that a ballot measure is a huge lift and MTC had to take into consideration the pro's and con's of adding a particular county to the mix, including whether it would help or hinder the ability to get a measure passed.

Mr. Reyes stated that even if North Bay counties wanted to participate in a measure, MTC would eventually need to make a decision about which counties should be able to participate after considering polling results and determining which geography would offer the best chance of passing a measure.

Member Ortega asked if consolidation of transit agencies had been considered to help address anticipated shortfalls.

Mr. Reyes explained that there was general support for studying transit consolidation and the benefits it could bring. However, based on the experience with SB 1031, MTC hoped to keep those discussions separate from efforts for the regional measure for fear it would unravel support.

Member Milford-Rosales asked who would be responsible for staffing and paying for a citizen measure.

Mr. Reyes explained that a regional measure framework could be partially developed by MTC and through legislation; however, ultimately volunteers and non-governmental organizations would be responsible for raising funding, gathering signatures, and placing a measure on the ballot.

Chair Siegal asked about the obstacles in moving the Hybrid Scenario and why it had required Santa Clara County to opt in before advancing.

Mr. Reyes explained that Santa Clara County had expressed interest in contributing to shortfalls through a reauthorization of one of its own sales tax measures instead of through a regional measure. He added that MTC had developed the Hybrid Scenario in response to asks from advocates and other stakeholders who had supported advancing a large, multimodal transportation measure.

Ms. Lombardo added that MTC had developed the Hybrid Scenario to help build support from a larger, more diverse group of potential supporters.

Chair Siegal asked if the Transportation Authority would consider taking a position on Senate Bill 63 and endorsing a specific framework.

Mr. Reyes explained that staff would return to both the CAC and the Transportation Authority Board with a recommendation for a position on the bill once language had been further developed.

There was no public comment.

## **10. SFMTA Bike and Roll Plan Update – INFORMATION**

SFMTA's Christy Osorio, Transportation Planner, presented the item.

Vice Chair Daniels thanked Ms. Osorio for acknowledging that biking and rolling was a sensitive issue for District 10. She said that she was pleased that Bayview Advocates and New Community Leadership were included as partners and asked how the partners had been chosen. She asked whether the community action plans were available and requested more explanation about the level of participation by community partners.



Ms. Osorio replied that partners who led community action plan development had been selected through an application process. She said that different groups participated at different levels because some partners had a lot of capacity and background in transportation while others required more assistance, and she stated that all community action plans had been written by community partners. Ms. Osorio shared that when the Biking and Rolling Plan was adopted by the SFMTA Board, the community action plan writing process would end. Though the formal process was concluding, Ms. Osorio shared that cooperation would continue because SFMTA had committed to working with community groups to ensure the plan recommendations were implemented in the coming 10-15 years and anticipated 2-year updates which could provide check-in points.

Vice Chair Daniels thanked SFMTA for continuing to keep partners involved, especially those who had been harmed and excluded by the transportation system. She asked about the size of the grant given to community partners and if it had been equally distributed to all partners.

Ms. Osorio replied that all partners had received \$40,000, except for Poder, which was working in two communities and had received \$50,000.

Vice Chair Daniels asked if SFMTA's commitments to follow up on plans were in writing.

Ms. Osorio shared the community action plans and SFMTA commitments were available both online and in writing.

Member Barz noted that on SFMTA's North Star Network Map, there were several areas, circled in red, such as the area around City College in District 7. She asked whether there was an estimate for when plans would be developed for those circled areas.

Ms. Osorio replied that there was currently no timeline for those planning processes. She elaborated that, specifically for the City College area, interagency coordination had been required with Caltrans and the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department.

Member Barz asked whether areas that required more study might not receive any improvements over the lifetime of the plan.

Ms. Osorio responded that that was possible.

Member Barz shared that she was pleased with the focus on the National Association of City Transportation Officials all ages and abilities goal. However she noted that sometimes facilities designated as all ages and abilities did not live up to those expectations. For example, she explained that Hearst was a Slow Street, but had been consistently out of compliance with the speed goals. She asked what measures were being taken to ensure facilities were actually meeting all ages/abilities guidelines.

Ms. Osorio replied that this had been done with a combination of monitoring and data analysis. She also acknowledged that data couldn't always capture the experience of riding a route and that assessments would need to consider both data analysis and user experience.

Member Barz asked if there would be a monitoring program akin to the annual slow-



streets evaluation for this program.

Ms. Osorio shared that SFMTA's Slow Streets Program was nestled within the Biking and Rolling Plan and was one tool to implement the network. She said that analysis would happen mostly when segments were implemented rather than through a constant monitoring approach.

Member Ortega shared that she found the north star map helpful, but thought it would be helpful to see the topographic map overlaid because topography creates challenges for all-ages and abilities. She said that she also wanted to understand how SFMTA planned to handle storm drains and stormwater management, especially in the context of rising sea levels. She asked if the Biking and Rolling Plan had addressed that topic.

Ms. Osorio replied that the Bicycle Conditions Index used in the plan considered slope and noted the request for a topographic map. She shared that they were working with Public Works on facility maintenance and had a Memorandum of Understanding on that topic.

Member Barz stated that she was pleased with upgrades to some of the facilities in District 7 but was also disappointed with some aspects. She noted that there were not many protected facilities recommended and asked why no protected lanes had been recommended on Portola Drive, Monterey Boulevard, or Kirkham Street where bicycle volumes were high.

Ms. Osorio replied that residential neighborhoods typically were not good candidates for protected bike lanes because there were often many driveways. She shared that Portola did not meet the slope standard for a protected facility and that she could follow-up with information about Monterey Boulevard.

Member Barz noted that the city of Montreal had protected bike lanes on streets with driveways and that she was a little disappointed but understood there were challenges. Member Barz also noted that part of San Jose Avenue was shown as meeting the all-ages-and-abilities standard. She pointed out that there are mixing zones in that area with high speeds, and that it was not actually comfortable as a cyclist. She asked if SFMTA planned to upgrade that area.

Ms. Osorio replied that data was helpful, but didn't always tell the full story. She said that SFMTA would apply judgement in areas where data didn't match experience. Ms. Osorio shared that class III facilities, or sharrows, could be appropriate in some cases, for example, shared routes on a residential roadway, but that they were inappropriate in other areas with different traffic conditions.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked how many people actually rode bicycles and noted that many micromobility devices used bike lanes. He asked whether there was any plans to require licenses for micromobility users. He stated that he thought a licensing system would be beneficial. Mr. Mason then asked about how much money had been spent and was anticipated to be spent on biking programs.





## **Other Items**

### **11. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION**

Member Milford-Rosales expressed appreciation to staff for the upcoming trolley bus update. He then inquired about the possibility and process of inviting the author of a 2023 Columbia University study on the benefits of trolley buses compared to battery buses, specifically in relation to road impacts, to present at a future CAC meeting.

Chief Deputy Director Maria Lombardo replied that it was possible if Chair Siegal approved it and dependent on having time on the agenda.

Member Margarita asked if there was a way to lower the speed limit within San Francisco to 15 miles-per-hour (mph), citing several pedestrian deaths caused by speeding vehicles.

Chair Siegal expressed her belief that SFMTA's responses to past inquiries about Vision Zero progress had mostly been self-referential context. She stated that it was time to consider more drastic and untried measures to prevent pedestrian deaths. She also mentioned that she would like a more open-ended opportunity to ask city agencies what else could be done that hadn't been tried yet.

Member Ortega inquired whether the San Francisco Police Department could attend a CAC meeting to discuss enforcement policies, particularly regarding traffic violations. She referenced an article about a driver who, after exiting a San Francisco highway, was speeding at 98 mph, rear-ended a Waymo car, injured seven people, and caused one fatality.

Member Barz mentioned that there appeared to be several pedestrian deaths during a period when San Francisco was actively working to meet its Vision Zero goals. She expressed a desire for a different type of conversation about traffic safety and potential actions. She then echoed Member Milford-Rosales's question regarding the possibility of bringing in an external expert to speak to the CAC.

Ms. Lombardo replied that a request for an external expert to make a CAC presentation was feasible and she would follow up with Chair Siegal on the matter.

There was no public comment.

### **12. Public Comment**

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that New York City had implemented its congestion pricing plan and recommended that the CAC initiate discussions with the Transportation Authority Board to implement a similar congestion pricing plan for San Francisco, particularly to allocate the funds to support Muni.

### **13. Adjournment**

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