



MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, February 26, 2025

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Siegal called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

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

CAC Members Absent at Roll: Najuwanda Daniels, Phoebe Ford (entered during Item 8), Venecia Margarita (entered during Item 7) (3)

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Siegal welcomed Jerry Levine back to the CAC as the reappointed District 2 representative. She reported that at the previous Board meeting, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and their consultant presented a voter survey on a regional transportation measure, which was also scheduled for discussion under Item 9 on the CAC agenda. She said that the Board also received an update from the newly appointed SFMTA Director of Transportation, Julie Kirschbaum, on SFMTA's financial outlook.

Chair Siegal stated that staff had indicated that SFMTA would return in the next month or two, following the conclusion of the Muni Funding Working Group, to present recommendations on closing Muni's projected funding deficits through revenue and non-revenue strategies.

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

3. Approve the Minutes of the January 22, 2025 Meeting - ACTION

4. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve a Two-Year Professional Services Contract, with Options to Extend for Three Additional One-Year Periods, to SPTJ Consulting in an Amount Not to Exceed \$600,000 for Computer Network and Maintenance Services – ACTION

5. Adopt a Motion of Support to Increase the Amount of the Professional Services Contract with WMH Corporation by \$1,500,000, to a Total Amount Not to Exceed \$2,650,000 for the Design Phase for the Yerba Buena Island Multi-Use Path Project for Segments 3 and 4 and Yerba Buena Island Transit Lane - ACTION

6. Internal Accounting Report, Investment Report, and Debt Expenditure Report for the Six Months Ending December 31, 2024 - INFORMATION

There was no public comment.

Member Milford-Rosales moved to approve items 3, 4, and 5 on the Consent Agenda



seconded by Member Ortega.

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

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

Absent: CAC Members Daniels, Ford, Margarita (3)

End of Consent Agenda

7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Amend the 2023 Prop L 5-Year Prioritization Program for Muni Maintenance, Rehabilitation, and Replacement – ACTION

Nick Smith, Senior Transportation Planner and Bhavin Khatri, SFMTA Zero Emission Program Manager, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Levine asked about the New Jersey PCC Overhauls and whether the lifespan of vehicles was considered when they were originally purchased, and questioned the \$2 million per vehicle cost for overhaul.

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, clarified that historic vehicles and cable cars' useful lives were treated like an light rail vehicle's useful life, which is 25 years. Through a message sent to staff, Janet Gallegos, SFMTA project manager, explained that the cost of rehabilitation is mostly due to the unknown conditions of the vehicles and because nothing is off the shelf. Further, the cost is based on previous historic streetcar projects.

Member Milford-Rosales asked if there would be an alternative or cost-benefit analysis between battery-electric buses (BEBs) and trolley buses with regard to the electrification of facilities and BEB roll-out plans, and asked why, according to Mr. Khatri's presentation, SFMTA planned to reduce the size of the trolley-bus fleet. He then cited conversations with individuals at AC Transit regarding their BEB experience and said that they had noted experiences of higher-than-expected maintenance costs and reductions in service due to lower than expected performance.

Mr. Khatri responded that the reduction to the trolley fleet size was due to the consolidation of trolley buses to only Potrero Yard, where all trolley buses would eventually be housed. However, he added that the final number of trolley buses could be higher. Mr. Khatri also explained that AC Transit's routes covered significantly more mileage than SFMTA and thus required multiple charges to cover their daily mileage, while SFMTA's daily service could operate on one charge. He also noted that SFMTA's electrification needs had been expensive because electrification in general was expensive and required upgrades to multiple facilities.

Member Milford-Rosales followed up, asking if there was any plan to execute a cost benefit or alternative analysis for the trolley bus fleet by using In Motion Charging (IMC) technology.

Mr. Khatri clarified that a separate, on-going pilot program would evaluate how well IMC worked, that the IMC program was not yet ready to be deployed, that SFMTA needed to determine if the existing overhead wire and power system could handle IMC, and that SFMTA was not just looking at BEBs but also fuel cells. He added that it was too early to do a detailed cost benefit or alternatives analysis.



Member Milford-Rosales stated that an alternatives analysis seemed necessary for proceeding with conversion of the bus yard to charge BEBs.

Member Ortega asked about the Muni Metro Station Condition Assessment and what caused the budget to double. She asked if changes to the budget were due to scope creep or a poor understanding of the project costs.

Peter Gabancho, Project Manager at SFMTA, clarified that the budget had been updated after discussion with consultants about the scope of work. He said the original budget estimate had not accurately reflected project needs and that it had been a case of an inaccurate estimate rather than scope creep, which had been made clear when crosschecking the budget with consultants.

Member Ortega asked if internal metrics had changed so that cost estimates would be closer to the actual costs, which she noted could be answered off-line. Member Ortega then asked about the weight of trolley buses versus BEBs, and whether the effects of those weights on road infrastructure had been evaluated.

Mr. Khatri replied that the current BEBs and trolley buses generally weighed the same. He added that given the California Vehicle Code limitation on weight, manufacturers were working with suppliers to reduce the weight of BEBs. He also mentioned that SFMTA was pursuing buses with smaller batteries.

Chair Siegel asked about the midlife overhaul and the potential to delay Phase 2 due to cost savings that were presented to the SFMTA Board last week. She asked if project delays would impact the overall cost of the program.

Gary Chang, Project Manager SFMTA said that the delay had not yet been finalized and overhaul projects were proceeding as planned. He added that overhaul projects may be re-strategized and occur in smaller pieces.

Chair Siegel followed up by asking if other particulate emissions besides greenhouse gas emissions had been considered or would be evaluated for determining which technologies to use. Mr. Khatri clarified that SFMTA's fleet contributed around 0.02% of San Francisco's overall greenhouse gas emissions from transportation so SFMTA had not gone into further detailed analysis.

During public comment, Edward Mason commented that many historic vehicles needed rehabilitation. He also cited an increasing demand for electricity, the variability of electricity, and the need for a workforce to maintain equipment in the face of a declining birth rate and depopulation as potential challenges for fleet electrification.

During public comment, Alex Lantsberg, the Research and Advocacy Director for the San Francisco Electrical Construction Industry, circulated a report that raised the issue of proceeding with a multi-billion-dollar capital program built around a specific technology without having done appropriate analysis to determine if it was the most appropriate solution. He added that battery bus performance was lower than anticipated and that, in other jurisdictions these buses had been underutilized because of maintenance issues and because batteries degrade over time. He cited technical analysis and modeling done with Metro de Medellin and other cities that had determined their battery bus transition programs had failed. He noted concerns that SFMTA's pilot BEB buses had degraded faster than expected, as well as the high cost to put new bus technologies into service.



An online caller, Roland Lebrun, expressed gratitude for maintaining San Francisco's trolley bus infrastructure. He asserted the need for an adequate electrical grid capable of fast charging, particularly if SFMTA wanted to extend bus lines to neighboring counties, so that buses would not need to travel back to the depot to charge. He suggested the need for DC fast charging throughout the City of San Francisco.

Member Barz asked to clarify on what the committee was voting on. She also asked if the 5YPP amendment included procurement of vehicles that would support meeting CARB zero emission goals.

Ms. LaForte clarified that the vote was on the 5YPP amendment, which programmed existing placeholder funds to the midlife overhauls and other projects. Ms. Lombardo explained which projects had already been approved by the Board and described the nine new projects before the committee which were a series of vehicle overhauls and the only new vehicle procurements in this suite of projects were the paratransit vehicles and Ms. LaForte added that the facility upgrades at Kirkland Yard would support electrification.

Chair Siegal summarized that the CAC was voting on specific project programming and stated that the Kirkland Yard electrification was the only project that overlapped with the zero emission fleet.

Member Ortega asked if the Kirkland Yard Electrification project could be voted on separately from the rest of the item.

Member Barz asked to clarify what percentage of Prop L funding went to the Muni Maintenance 5YPP. Ms. LaForte replied that the Muni maintenance program over 30 years would receive the largest amount of Prop L funding. In the first five years, \$146 million had already been programmed

Chair Siegal stated she would severe approval of the proposed programming for the Kirkland Yard Electrification project from the remainder of the proposed 5YPP amendment so the CAC could have separate votes on the two elements.

Member Barz moved to approve the motion of support to amend the 2023 Prop L 5-Year Prioritization Program for Muni Maintenance, Rehabilitation, and Replacement without the proposed \$5,496,000 in Prop L funds for design of Kirkland Yard Electrification, seconded by Member Milford-Rosales.

The motion to approve the proposed 5YPP amendment exclusive of the Kirkland Yard Electrification Project was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: CAC Members Daniels, Ford (2)

Member Kim moved to approve a motion of support to program \$5,496,000 in Prop L funds for design of the Kirkland Yard Electrification project, seconded by Member Ng.

The motion failed by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Levine, and Ng (3)

Nays: CAC Members Kim, Milford-Rosales, and Siegal (3)



Abstention: CAC Members Margarita and Ortega (2)

Absent: CAC Members Daniels and Ford (2)

8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$2,000,000 in Prop L Funds, with Conditions, for Three Requests – ACTION

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

Member Barz said that she had some reservations about the Monterey Safety project. She said that she knew many of her friends and neighbors in District 7 were excited to make improvements to Monterey Boulevard, but that she was not persuaded that the suite of improvements proposed would be sufficient to improve safety on Monterey Boulevard.

Paul Stanis, Acting Pedestrian Program Manager with SFMTA, replied that the proposed treatments were selected in consultation with the Supervisor's office and came out of a walking tour last year with neighbors and the City Transportation Engineer. He said that the proposed treatments were quick-build improvements that would be highly effective and also cost effective. He said that restriping the roadway was intended to create the perception that lanes were narrower even though it was not physically narrowing the roadway. He said that other proposed improvements, such as continental crosswalk markings that would be much more visible, were pretty standard throughout San Francisco. He said that one big ticket item was the rectangular rapid flashing beacon proposed for Acadia Street would cost approximately \$50,000, which is much less than the typical cost of \$500,000 to \$700,000 for new beacons because of a more cost effective delivery approach. He said that the suite of recommendations included a lot for almost the entire stretch of Monterey that SFMTA hoped would be very effective and good value.

Member Barz said that she had been invited to participate in the walking tour, but had been unable to attend and express disappointment that there had been few follow up opportunities. She said her concern was not about the cost effectiveness of the rapid flashing beacon at Acadia, but whether there should have been a crosswalk at Acadia at all, since the intersection was very close to a freeway offramp, poorly designed and confusing. She said that vehicles regularly sped through the intersection and that she walked through the area almost everyday with her son and that it was an awful place for a crosswalk. Member Barz appreciated Mr. Stanis' clarification that proposed improvements were from the quick-build toolkit and that that was appropriate given that Monterey was on the Vision Zero High-Injury Network. However, she said that the intersection of Congo and Monterey was clearly a problem location, and she was surprised to not have seen more acknowledgement of that. She said that there had been sideswipe crashes at that location and that her son's preschool was located at that intersection.

Mr. Stanis said that he could follow up with Member Barz and other SFMTA staff who focus on traffic calming and pedestrian safety near schools to determine if there was something that could be done beyond what is proposed in the current request.

Member Ortega thanked SFMTA for providing maps to inform the Embarcadero request, especially the liquefaction map. She said she appreciated that all the various factors were being considered.



Member Margarita asked if there was potential to add a new signal on Monterey in addition to the proposed safety improvements. She said that she remembered recent discussions about eliminating crossing guards and that she was thinking about safety for children and elders along the corridor. She asked what specific improvements were included in the current request.

Mr. Stanis replied that the project included upgraded crosswalk striping, pedestrian safety zones at some corners, striping to make Monterey look narrower, and one rectangular rapid flashing beacon, which pedestrians could activate when they wanted to alert motorists that they are crossing the street. He said that the project did not include a new signal. He said that a new signal cost between \$1 million and \$1.25 million.

Member Margarita clarified that her question about Congo was whether there was an existing crosswalk there that SFMTA had improved or if it would be a whole new crosswalk.

Mr. Stanis replied that he believed there was already a striped continental crosswalk at Congo, but he reiterated that he would follow up with Member Barz, and would follow up with other SFMTA staff to determine if there were other safety improvements that could be done.

Member Barz thanked Member Margarita for her follow up questions. She said that the crossing was terrifying as a pedestrian and that her son's preschool had asked her if she knew of any possibilities to improve safety at Congo. Member Barz said that in her opinion, the reason that this stretch of Monterey was on the High-Injury Network was because the freeway offramp exited into this four-lane road with no traffic signals for approximately five blocks. She said that there were between 10,000 and 12,000 cars that drove along this stretch every day and that there was approximately a mile between traffic signals. She said that when drivers were accustomed to driving at freeway speeds, they had the instinct to continue at high speeds and push the boundaries of the four-way stops. She said she would love a bigger conversation about Monterey Boulevard. She noted that Monterey had approximately twice the traffic volume of Valencia Street, but Valencia had signals at every intersection. She said she knew that this stretch of Monterey was on the High-Injury Network and that we wanted to use the Quick-Build toolkit to improve it. She said that she had not intended to support this project, but that Mr. Stanis' responses won her over, but that there are issues that are bigger than what the Quick-Build program could do. She said there were arterials that had been signalized in the city with far less auto volume, and not signalizing others like Monterey was a mistake.

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Barz, Ford, Kim, Levine, Margarita, Milford-Rosales, Ng, Ortega, and Siegal (9)

Absent: CAC Member Daniels (1)

9. Regional Transportation Revenue Measure Polling Results – INFORMATION



Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, presented the item.

Member Margarita asked if Golden Gate Transit conducted its own poll.

Ms. Lombardo replied that she could follow up to find out. She noted that Golden Gate Transit covers the North Bay and San Francisco, and the only measure option polled that included the North Bay was the one with two taxes, which didn't poll as well as the 4 county options tested. She said that the poll results indicated that including the North Bay would make a regional revenue measure more difficult to pass.

Member Ford asked about the slides where it showed support progression with the initial vote, after info, and after opposition, inquiring if the information provided was similar to the for arguments.

Ms. Lombardo responded that that was a fair interpretation with the info also serving to educate the survey respondent more about the proposed measure.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated that the property tax element of the hybrid scenario disproportionately impacted those with lower tax assessments. He said the tax was not legal due to Prop 13.

10. Community Advisory Committee Ethics Training for Public Meetings – INFORMATION

Amber Maltbie, Legal Counsel, presented the item.

Member Kim asked if a district had a transportation project to change a lane, install a traffic signal, or remove parking, and a member had a house or business within 500 feet, should they participate in voting or recuse themselves.

Ms. Maltbie stated that a conflict was presumed if a decision involved real property within 500 feet of a member's property. She said for property between 501 and 1,000 feet, a conflict existed only if a measurable change in value was shown and that beyond 1,000 feet, a conflict was generally not presumed. She stressed notifying staff in such cases for legal consultation.

Member Kim asked for clarification on the definition of real property.

Ms. Maltbie stated that real property included physical structures, such as a brick building. She noted that a leasehold interest may be considered, though a month-to-month lease might not qualify. She recommended further discussion with staff before a vote if a member thought there might be a conflict of interest.

Member Levine stated that he had worked in government for over 40 years and had accepted only one gift—a necktie from a Swedish visitor. He said he practiced strict adherence to ethics and found it difficult to take the discussion seriously given Washington's current situation.

Member Ortega asked for clarification regarding the definition of gifts. She inquired whether gifts from a partner would fall under a different category.

Ms. Maltbie stated that the law acknowledged personal relationships where influence was not improperly exerted. She advised that accepting gifts from a partner was permissible unless the partner was a vendor to the Transportation Authority, in which case further discussion would be necessary.



There was no public comment.

Other Items

11. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

Member Levine requested data on injury accidents involving bicycles, e-bikes, and scooters, which had been previously requested when he was on the CAC. He inquired whether the information had been compiled and disseminated during his absence and asked to receive it if it was available. He also recounted a recent incident near Land's End, where a cyclist traveling at high speed passed a stopped car at a stop sign and nearly collided with him while he was on his motorcycle. The incident, which he described as potentially catastrophic, left him shaken for several days. Given this experience, he reiterated his request for comprehensive data, including reports from police logs or hospital logs, to track not only injury accidents involving these transportation modes but also fault attribution.

Member Ortega asked for more information about the Valencia bike lane, noting that its removal forces cyclists into the middle of the street and has led to the return of illegal left turns. She said that the safety improvements previously implemented had deteriorated and questioned the necessity of reconstructing the bike lane after just three years. She requested a retrospective from the SFMTA on how to prevent significant financial expenditures on projects that risk becoming widely criticized. She also highlighted the broader issue of budget deficits and lamented the loss of a protected bike lane that once served thousands of commuters.

Member Ng asked about the specific use of Prop L funds, noting that she was not present when the measure was approved. She asked for clarification on why these funds were allocated to certain projects but could not be used to address the SFMTA's budget deficit.

Member Margarita requested a report from the SFMTA on the rationale behind the proposed cutting back on the 14th Mission but route, which serves a heavily populated area from First Street to the top of the hill. She also stated she was concerned that the proposal to remove crossing guards had been considered, stating it should not have been on the table in the first place. She emphasized the importance of protecting children, the elderly, and the community, particularly near schools. Member Margarita said she was relieved the proposal had been withdrawn and hoped it would not resurface.

There was no public comment.

12. Public Comment

During public comment, Edward Mason cited two recent cases of traffic congestion caused by commuter buses. He said that at 24th and Castro, a commuter bus struck a parked truck's fender in front of the Bank of America, which was being remodeled after hours. He had emailed photos of the incident. He said on Castro Street, a woman couldn't exit her parking spot due to a nearby commuter bus. He said he later received a Muni email about a reroute at 24th and Castro, followed by another stating the bus had been towed. He noted commuter buses seemed mostly empty but suspected ridership had been rising. He urged commuters to take Caltrain, recalling his rail



commute to San Jose 45 years ago. Finally, he stated his concerns about the rise of micromobility vehicles and proposed license tags for bicycles to enhance accountability and safety.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.