



DRAFT MINUTES

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

Tuesday, March 14, 2017

1. Roll Call

Chair Peskin called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

Present at Roll Call: Commissioners Farrell, Fewer, Peskin, Ronen, Sheehy, Tang and Yee (7)

Absent at Roll Call: Commissioners Cohen and Safai (entered during Item 2), Kim (entered during Item 5) and Breed (entered during Item 6) (4)

2. Citizens Advisory Committee Report – INFORMATION

Chris Waddling, Chair of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), reported that on Item 9 the CAC raised questions about the Arguello Boulevard signal upgrades and the historical preservation being a reason for needing the environmental clearance. He said that on Item 10, he was disappointed that Cargo Way in District 10 would not be addressed, and noted the multi-jurisdictional and inter-agency coordination that would likely need to happen to move that project forward. He said on the Potrero Gateway Loop, the CAC was impressed with the ambitious nature of the project and that Prop AA funds were being used to heal a neighborhood that was adversely affected by a freeway. He said he hoped to see similar projects in neighborhoods along the freeway, particularly in the southeast area of the city. On Item 11, he said the CAC heard from a number of residents and that the pricing and reservation system seemed to have a lot of community support. Regarding Item 11, he expressed frustration with people not being made aware of Citizen Working Group meetings and said that the CAC would like to have a walking tour of the project site.

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

3. Approve the Minutes of the February 28, 2017 Meeting – ACTION

4. Update on the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project – INFORMATION

Tilly Chang, Executive Director, commented that Caltrain staff had provided an update that was included in the meeting packet but unfortunately could not attend the meeting as they were in Sacramento and Washington D.C. She said Caltrain was continuing to advocate for inclusion in the President's budget, and that staff was meeting with members of Congress to discuss the project. She said the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) had announced the delayed recommendation and signing of the Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) until the President's budget was submitted to Congress, which was expected in April/May. She said Caltrain would provide a more complete update at the next Board meeting.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated that the project update did not include that the California Department of Finance had recently replied to the California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) that it would not be authorizing the \$600 million in Prop 1A bonds since the FFGA was not signed so they could not match it. He said this was not entirely correct and that there was currently a lawsuit regarding non-compliance with the bond. He said that the year prior, San Mateo County had tried to obtain an additional \$84 million for the Caltrain Hillsdale Station which was denied by the FTA, but later appropriated \$125 million of the \$440 million in FTA formula funds dedicated to Caltrain Electrification, which created a \$125 million funding gap. He said the Metropolitan Transportation Commission recently proposed that \$95 million allocated to Santa Clara could be used to fill the \$125 million gap.

Commissioner Farrell moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Commissioner Tang.

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

Ayes: Commissioners Cohen, Farrell, Fewer, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy, Tang and Yee (9)

Absent: Commissioners Breed and Kim (2)

End of Consent Agenda

5. Appoint One Member to the Citizens Advisory Committee – ACTION

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

Myla Ablog and Daniel Kassabian spoke to their interests and qualifications in being appointed to the CAC.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Fewer moved to reappoint Ms. Ablog to the CAC, seconded by Commissioner Tang.

The motion to reappoint Ms. Ablog was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Cohen, Farrell, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy, Tang and Yee (10)

Absent: Commissioner Breed (1)

6. Adopt Positions on State Legislation – ACTION

Amber Crabbe, Assistant Deputy Director for Policy and Programming introduced the item and noted one change to the staff recommendation to revise the proposed support position for State Constitutional Amendment (SCA 6) (Wiener) to a watch position to allow relevant discussions to be had first through the Transportation 2045 Task Force that Chair Peskin had referenced earlier. Ms. Crabbe introduced Mark Watts, State Legislative Advocate, who presented the item.

Commissioner Cohen asked what the motivation of Senate Bill 493 was in reducing the penalty for failing to stop a right turn signalized intersection. Mr. Watts replied that he had heard from proponents that transportation officials had done analysis and determined that it was not as dangerous as other infractions, but that he did not have all the details.

Commissioner Cohen asked if there was support for the bill. Mr. Watts replied that the bill had only been in print for a month and more details would be available soon, but that previous legislation had some support from some bicycle advocates.

Commissioner Yee commented that Automated Speed Enforcement (ASE) was a tool that could help the city achieve zero fatalities by 2024. He said he had attended a Vision Zero conference in 2014 when he first heard about ASE and that since that time 142 communities across the country had implemented ASE and studies were demonstrating effectiveness. He said in Washington D.C. ASE led to a 70% reduction in traffic fatalities, while in New York City it had led to a 59% reduction in just four months. He said the Board needed to support the implementation of ASE not just in San Francisco but throughout the state, and that Assembly Bill (AB) 342 sponsored by Assemblymember Chiu would allow San Francisco and San Jose to pilot a system. He said there was a lot of support for the bill, including from the Mayors of San Francisco and San Jose, the Department of Public Health, and a lot of non-profits. Commissioner Yee noted that in 2014 the Board had unanimously approved Vision Zero, and in January 2016 had unanimously approved a resolution urging the state legislature to allow for ASE in San Francisco. He urged the Board and Board of Supervisors to unanimously support AB 342.

Commissioner Ronen thanked Commissioner Yee for his leadership and said that she originally had two concerns about AB 342, that additional cameras would be surveilling the city and that there would be another fine for residents who were already struggling to live in the most expensive city in the country. She said she was excited that the Treasurer's Office had created an economic justice unit to look at all of the city's fines and try to reduce them through various means. She said after meeting with Transportation Authority, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), Walk SF and San Francisco Bicycle Coalition (SFBC) staff, she understood there were proposed amendments to the AB 342 which would address both of her concerns. She said they included that the cameras would only record license plates and not people and the way data would be collected and shared would be streamlined and protected, and that there would be a gradual fee based on income to make the economic effects equal to each individual.

Commissioner Fewer stated that there was no greater deterrent to speeding than to have police officers giving tickets, and noted that the tickets were expensive and affected driving records. She said that ASE would not replace, but would be a great addition to officers.

Commissioner Safai commented that ASE could not come fast enough, as every arterial in District 11 was a high-injury corridor, and that there had been multiple collisions in just the last few weeks. He said he fully supported AB 342 as it would reduce speeding and traffic fatalities, but agreed that nothing could replace a police officer.

Commissioner Breed commented that she sat on the State Legislation Committee as a representative of the Board of Supervisors where she voted against the legislation due to concerns about the impact on individuals who are not driving their cars when they are ticketed. She said there were a number discussions on that issue and she appreciated that the tickets would not count against driving records. She noted that many people share cars and that it would not be fair to penalize someone based on another person's actions. She agreed that there was no substitution to being ticketed by a police officer but stated that she would support AB 342 and hoped that the pilot program would demonstrate that it could change driver behavior.

Commissioner Kim expressed her strong support for ASE and noted that the SFMTA, SFBC and Walk SF had spent years trying to find a sponsor in the state legislature. She said the studies showed that ASE was the number one factor in achieving vision zero and that slowing down speeds was the only way to significantly reduce injuries and fatalities. She said the few minutes saved when speeding was not worth someone's life. She said while it would be great to have police officers on every corner that was not a reality, and that police had many other priorities, but that similar to

red-light cameras, limited use of ASE could have a tremendous impact and change the driving culture. She hoped there would be a similar robust conversation at the state level as there was a need to balance the protection of citizens' privacy with that of residents' safety.

Tom Maguire, Director of Sustainable Streets at the SFMTA and Megan Wier, Director of Health, Equity and Sustainability at the Department of Public Health, presented on ASE.

Commissioner Tang asked for clarification on whether the cameras could be added to corridors managed by Caltrans. Mr. Maguire responded that AB 342 would allow the cameras to be used on any surface street or non-freeway street in the city, including Van Ness Avenue, Lombard Street, and 19th Avenue for example.

Jen Kwart, District Director from Assemblymember Chiu's Office, stated that ASE was desperately needed in San Francisco. She said that Assemblymember Chiu was sensitive to the concerns of low-income people and that he was supportive of it being an administrative fee rather than a civil penalty. She said he was committed to working on the issue at the state level and was counting on the continued support of the Board of Supervisors. Ms. Kwart emphasized that ASE would not be a replacement of a police officer but a new tool for San Francisco and San Jose to reduce speeding and serious traffic collisions.

Kathryn Angotti, Director of State and Legislative Affairs from the Mayor's Office, stated that speeding was at the heart of the issue and that ASE was a proven method to reduce excessive speeding and prevent traffic injuries and fatalities. She said it was currently being used in over 142 communities across the country including Portland, Seattle and Chicago. She thanked Assemblymember Chiu for his leadership on AB 342 which would change state law and allow the piloting of ASE on San Francisco's streets. She said the bill would be implemented as a pilot over five years and would be modified based on its results. She thanked the Board for its support of the bill.

During public comment, Ted Olson, a member of the Vision Zero Coalition, thanked Assemblymember Chiu and Senator Wiener for their leadership on this issue. He also thanked members of the Vision Zero Coalition and the Vision Task Force for their participation. He said it was significant to remember the purpose of Vision Zero, and suggested that the city emphasize education and behavior modification to show how each person was helping to reduce traffic fatalities.

Jeremy Wallenberg, stated he was a member of the Mayor's Council Advisory Body for People with Disabilities and Aging Adults, a member of the San Francisco Citizen Initiatives for Technology and Innovation, as well as a member of Vision Zero Coalition. He said he supported the legislation and that ASE was a critical tool to make the city's streets safer and would positively affect people with disabilities and aging adults.

Steve Ferrero, a member of the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition, said he had children in middle school and noted how dangerous streets were for kids.

Fran Taylor, a member of Vision Zero Coalition, said that traffic violations disproportionately affected people of color and low-income communities and that the key element of ASE was that it would remove the possibility of racial profiling and bias.

Jenny Yu commented that her mother was seriously injured by a speeding driver and their family was deeply impacted. She welcomed Assemblymember Chiu and Mayor Lee's leadership in taking a critical step toward achieving Vision Zero and urged the Board of Supervisors to vote in support of the legislation.

Cathy DeLuca, Policy Director with Walk San Francisco, thanked everyone involved in Vision Zero and thanked Commissioners Kim and Yee for initiating Vision Zero. She urged the Board to unanimously support AB 342 but said that it would be a challenge to have the bill approved at the state level. She said ASE was an effective tool to save lives, and noted that Washington D.C. had seen a 70% reduction in fatalities after implementing ASE. She added that more supporters were needed in San Francisco to show that ASE was important to save lives.

Kevin Stull, Vice Chair of the Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee, urged the Board to unanimously support AB 342. He said reducing speeding was important as it endangered children and low-income residents on a daily basis in Tenderloin neighborhood where all the streets were part of high-injury corridors. He said that speed was one of the top collision factors in San Francisco, and that ASE had been proven to decrease fatalities in 142 communities across the country.

Katie Lidell, a member of the Vision Zero Coalition, said that she lived in the South of Market area where cars frequently sped down one-way streets and that the city needed ASE.

Alice Rogers, Vice President of the South Beach, Rincon, Mission Bay Neighborhood Association, said she appreciated the support for the legislation and urged those who had not spoken to pledge their support. She noted that San Francisco had been known for its leadership in many policy areas, but was playing catch up in this area.

Theo Watts, a member of the Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee, expressed his support for ASE and said that speed was a direct contributor and factor to traffic collisions in San Francisco.

Janice Li, Advocacy Director at SFBC, thanked Commissioner Yee and Assemblymember Chiu for their leadership. She said that San Jose's City Council had already taken a unanimous support position and she urged the Board to do the same to help get AB 342 passed at the state legislature.

Commissioner Tang moved to amend the item to change the position on SCA 6 (Wiener) from support to watch, seconded by Commissioner Yee.

The amendment to the item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Farrell, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Tang and Yee (9)

Absent: Commissioners Safai and Sheehy (2)

The amended item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Farrell, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Tang and Yee (9)

Absent: Commissioners Safai and Sheehy (2)

Chair Peskin called Items 7 and 8 together.

- 7. Increase the Amount of the Professional Services Contract with AECOM Technical Services, Inc. by \$226,000, to a Total Amount Not to Exceed \$17,161,000, to Complete Design Support Services for the I-80/Yerba Buena Island Ramps Improvement Project (Phase 1), and Authorize the Executive Director to Modify Contract Payment Terms and Non-Material Contract Terms and Conditions – ACTION**
- 8. Increase the Amount of the Professional Services Contract with Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. by \$820,000, to a Total Amount Not-to-Exceed \$8,470,000, to Complete Construction Support Services for the I-80/Yerba Buena Island Ramps Improvement Project (Phase 1),**

and Authorize the Executive Director to Modify Contract Payment Terms and Non-Material Contract Terms and Conditions – ACTION

Eric Cordoba, Deputy Director for Capital Projects, presented the items per the staff memorandums.

Chair Peskin asked about the reevaluation of Quarters 10 which was included in the AECOM scope of work. Mr. Cordoba responded that Quarters 10 had already been relocated to the Clipper Cove area as part of the original Yerba Buena Island ramps project. He said that in order to meet environmental mitigation requirements they needed to prepare a report that looked at the historical significance of Quarters 10 and send it to the State Historic Preservation Office.

During public comment, Jackie Sachs urged the Board to approve the items as she was familiar with the project and the contractors.

Commissioner Breed moved to approve Items 7 and 8, seconded by Commissioner Tang.

Items 7 and 8 were approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Farrell, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy, Tang and Yee (11)

9. Allocate \$34,931,349 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, for Eight Requests, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules – ACTION

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

Regarding the Arguello Boulevard Traffic Signal Upgrade, Chair Peskin noted that Commissioner Breed had called a hearing on the lack of Prop A general obligation bond expenditures and that the request was supposed to leverage \$573,000 of Prop A funds. He asked for an explanation of why the project was using Prop K sales tax funds when most of the Prop A funds had not been spent yet. Ms. LaForte replied that she would follow up with the SFMTA on that, but that staff had been working with the SFMTA to make sure that expenditures from the Prop K program were to the extent possible complementing the Prop A general obligation bond program.

Commissioner Fewer commented that she was familiar with the 23rd Avenue Neighborway project site and that she would like a briefing on the project before the funds were allocated. She said she had met with SFMTA staff regarding 8th Avenue project but that she had concerns about the 23rd Avenue project as it was not safe for pedestrians or bicyclists, and requested that the allocation request be severed from the item. Ms. LaForte stated that staff would setup a briefing with SFMTA and her office. Commissioner Fewer commented that she did not understand the analysis behind the project and had concerns about how it was developed.

Commissioner Farrell commented that he had been trying to get traffic signal upgrades on Arguello Boulevard for several years and was glad that they were moving forward, but had not been given advance notice. He asked that his staff be included as the project moved forward.

Chair Peskin commented that the Commissioners' office had communications issues with the SFMTA but that these were being worked out. He said it was important that staff and his office reach out to Commissioners' offices for each of the Prop K allocations ahead of time so that Commissioners are not taken by surprise. He added that SFMTA staff should have worked with Commissioners Fewer and Farrell on the respective allocations but that in the absence of communications, staff had an obligation to make sure these conversations were taking place.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Fewer moved to amend the item to sever the allocation request for the 23rd Avenue Neighborway project, seconded by Commissioner Kim

The amendment to the item was approved without objection by the following vote

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Farrell, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy, Tang and Yee (11)

The amended item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Farrell, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy, Tang and Yee (11)

10. Approve the 2017 Prop AA Strategic Plan Update and 5-Year Prioritized Programs of Projects – ACTION

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

Chair Peskin asked for additional information on the application to construct canopies over entrances to the four downtown San Francisco BART stations. Mr. Pickford responded that the Transportation Authority had received an application from BART for \$500,000 for the station entrance canopies project, but that it had scored lower than the top scoring project in the Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvement category and was thus not recommended for funding.

Commissioner Safai asked for more information on the Outer Mission [paving] project and said that the name of the project was misleading because part of the project was in the Excelsior. Mr. Pickford responded that the project would renovate pavement and include sidewalk and curb ramp improvements on 68 blocks. He said that the request was toward the end of the five-year programming period and that it was expected to be completed in 2022, with construction starting in 2021.

Commissioner Safai asked for a briefing on the project to provide further details. He said that his office had met with San Francisco Public Works (SFPW) staff and that they said the project was on hold until Muni Forward came up with a plan. He said it sounded like there was some misunderstanding between the Transportation Authority and SFPW as the latter was saying funding was decreasing and would be available. Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, stated the action before the Board would program funds for the next five years [of the Prop AA vehicle registration fee program]. With respect to the subject paving project, she said the request was to program funds in Fiscal Year (FY) 2021/22 after Muni Forward planning, outreach, and design has been completed. She added that this way the funds would be available to do the paving under the same contract as other Muni Forward work. She said that the SFMTA should certainly be working with Commissioner Safai's office.

Commissioner Safai asked whose responsibility it was to coordinate with the Commissioners' offices.

Chair Peskin commented that as an agency that controlled various funding sources, one of the most important functions of the Transportation Authority was being able to effectuate the outcomes that Commissioners and their constituents were seeking, so he was hesitant to program funds when Commissioners had not been briefed by the requesting agencies.

Commissioner Safai asked whose responsibility it was to present Commissioners with a menu of options. He asked whether the action under consideration was to allocate funds for projects

without a scope that would be designed at a later date. Ms. LaForte replied that this was a programming action and would not allocate funds. She said that all of the agencies would need to return for a subsequent action with details on scope, schedule, cost and funding to request allocation of the programmed funds. She said that Prop AA was a pay-as-you-go program, so SFPW would not be able to seek allocation of the funds until FY 2021/22 when they became available. She added that there was an expectation of communication between sponsor agencies and Commissioners in advance of the allocation action, as appropriate.

Commissioner Safai commented that it seemed he was receiving conflicting information. He said that he had been told that SFPW's budget would be decreasing significantly and that they were not sure if there would be funds available for paving the corridor.

Commissioner Tang commented that staff would really appreciate having a standing briefing with all of the Commissioners' offices so that they were not presented with detailed materials for the first time at a Board meeting. She said it was to the benefit of the district to have the funds programmed so that when the time came for SFMTA and SFPW to move forward with the project, the priority of funding for the project has already been established.

Commissioner Safai said that he understood the benefit of having the funds programmed, but that he was still hearing conflicting information about whether there was enough funding for SFPW to give him a firm commitment that the project could be completed. Tilly Chang, Executive Director, replied that projects were often funded through a patchwork of sources, but she could confirm that the Prop AA funds would be available. She said that City agencies struggled because their budgets were based on two-year projections, so there was not as much certainty over a five-year period.

Commissioner Safai said that he wanted to make sure that the public understood that the action was to put the funds aside, but that the Transportation Authority would still have to work with the sponsor agencies to ensure that the projects moved forward. He said that he would welcome a briefing.

Chair Peskin commented that while the conversation was more time consuming, the new Board structure allowed all of the Commissioners to hear issues at the same time.

Commissioner Kim asked about the locations of the Vision Zero Coordinated Pedestrian Improvements and said she was glad to hear they were in the Tenderloin and South of Market areas. She asked for a map or list of locations for that project and for the Bulb-outs at WalkFirst Locations. Mr. Pickford responded that there was a list of locations for the Vision Zero project included in the enclosure and that there was a map in the presentation showing the locations. He said that the project included bulb-outs at Jones and Ellis Streets and a raised crosswalk at 8th and Minna Streets. He said that the application had originally included bulb-outs at Taylor and Turk Streets, but that they had been pulled out due to a need to coordinate with a larger streetscape project for Taylor Street.

Commissioner Kim asked about the locations for the Bulb-outs at WalkFirst Locations. Ms. LaForte read out the locations per the application.

Commissioner Kim asked for additional information on the Leavenworth Livable Streets projects. Chad Rathmann, Principal Analyst at the SFMTA, replied that the Leavenworth project was the subject of an application to the Caltrans planning grant program and that they would hear whether the grant would be awarded within the next month.

Commissioner Kim asked for additional follow-up information on the project, such as the limits

of the project area, reasoning behind selecting the corridor and the anticipated project outcomes. She also asked which intersections were included in the Turk and Golden Gate Signals Upgrade Project application. Ms. LaForte replied that there were thirteen locations, from Broderick to Laguna on Turk and Divisadero to Laguna on Golden Gate.

Commissioner Tang said that she understood that for this funding source, project readiness was important and asked if it was possible for additional projects to be funded in later years of the program when they became ready. Mr. Pickford replied that the intent of this action was to approve a five-year program which would prioritize projects to receive all of the available funding, except for the \$2.4 million recommended for an interim call for projects in the Street Repair category. He said that it was possible that additional funds would be available if other projects were completed under budget.

Commissioner Tang said that she appreciated staff's help in pushing to get projects ready to qualify for funding and that her office had shared proposals with sponsor agency staff, but she was frustrated that it was often difficult to get projects to the stage of being ready for funding sources with project readiness requirements. She said that looking at the map of recommended Prop AA projects, there were no projects in District 4 which was not acceptable. She said that she would like to follow up with staff or sponsor agencies to address this issue and noted that District 7 and District 1 only had one project each. She said that it was important not to miss out on multi-year programs, like Prop AA.

Chair Peskin noted that Commissioner Tang had to leave the meeting and asked if she would prefer continuing the vote on the item until the next meeting.

Commissioner Tang said that if other Commissioners had specific projects that they wanted a further briefing on she would be happy to continue the item. Ms. LaForte commented that the Transportation Authority had also released the One Bay Area Grant program and Transportation Fund for Clean Air calls for projects and that staff would like to work with Commissioners' offices to advance projects through those sources, or through the Prop K sales tax, which had capacity to advance projects through the planning phase.

Commissioner Tang commented that the One Bay Area Grant program focused on Priority Development Areas, which did not include District 4. She said that she would like to have a deeper conversation about funding opportunities.

Commissioner Fewer said that she had the same concern when looking at the map of Prop AA recommended projects and that she felt there would be an inequitable distribution of funds. She said that she would also like to have a conversation about how her district could access funding sources, in particular because residents of her district paid vehicle license fees that funded Prop AA. She also asked about the Arguello Signal Project from the previous item and whether the proposed Prop AA funding was for the same work. Ms. LaForte replied that the Prop K allocation in the previous item was for design of the project, while the Prop AA funds would be for construction.

Commissioner Fewer asked when the Arguello Boulevard upgrades would be in place. Mr. Pickford replied that the open for use date was in the third quarter of 2019. Commissioner Fewer asked how much was requested for the planning phase of the project. Ms. LaForte replied that the funding plan was included in the enclosure. Commissioner Fewer commented said that she would like an additional briefing on the project and that she was in favor of continuing the vote.

Commissioner Kim commented that she was glad that the SFMTA was working on wayfinding

for Muni Metro Stations. She said that in other cities she had travelled to, exits from subway stations were numbered to aid navigation and that this would be helpful for tourists and occasional transit riders.

Commissioner Breed commented that Commissioners were doing all they could to improve safety throughout the city and in their districts, but that not everything could be done at once and that a lot of work had gone into developing the projects under consideration to get them qualified for funding. She said that she realized that not every district had the projects that were desired, but she did not think that the Board should delay the programming of Prop AA funds. She said that while there were a lot of projects in District 5, the district was located in the center of the city in that a lot of people traveled through District 5 to get across the city. She said it was not as if other projects were ready and could be substituted for these specific projects. She added that she understood the desire for Commissioners to do what they could for their districts, but that they should not do so at the cost of delaying the projects under consideration.

Commissioner Yee commented that when the Transportation Authority released calls for projects and other agencies responded to them, there were two places where Commissioners should look at them. He said that if equity between districts was important then calls for projects should be framed to reflect that, and that that the sponsor agencies needed to talk to the Commissioners to ask which projects they should pursue to support each district.

Chair Peskin commented that he associated himself with Commissioner Yee's comments and said that it was important that Commissioners make themselves or their staff available for briefings. He said in a recent briefing, his staff raised questions about a bulb-out at Jackson and Stockton Streets that had not yet been addressed. He said it was important for Commissioners to be available for briefings, but that staff also needed to respond to requests in a timely fashion.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Fewer moved to continue the item to allow further discussion with Commissioners and project sponsors, seconded by Commissioner Yee.

The motion to continue the item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Farrell, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy and Yee (10)

Absent: Commissioner Tang (1)

11. Approve the Managing Access to the “Crooked Street” (1000 Block of Lombard Street) Study – INFORMATION/ACTION

Commissioner Farrell introduced the item and stated that his office had been looking at this traffic and public safety issue for five years. He said at the time his office worked with the SFMTA to consider various options, which included closing the street during the day on weekends which had mixed success. He said the cars ended up being distributed to other neighborhoods and tourists began to walk down the street instead, which prevented residents from accessing their homes. He said in the past five years the traffic in the area had doubled, and so he requested a follow-up study to look at other options, which included a potential for a reservation and pricing system. He said over two million tourists visited the street each year which had become unbearable for residents. He said the congestion affected multiple blocks in the area and had become a quality of life and environmental issue, and that residents rightly asked the city to get involved. He added that there was large neighborhood support for the study.

Andrew Heidel, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Commissioner Breed asked if the study looked at other tourist attractions such as the 'Painted Ladies', Palace of Fine Arts, and Twin Peaks among others that have comparable volumes of tourists. Mr. Heidel responded that the study did not include places such as the Painted Ladies because the area was much more free flowing and therefore difficult to do a quantitative assessment, but that it did look at the management strategies.

Commissioner Breed commented that Alamo Square received a comparable volume of tourists. Mr. Heidel responded that there was no good source of data for Alamo Square to measure the number of tourists, and that the ranking in the study was not meant to be exhaustive.

Commissioner Breed asked how the number of tourists were quantified for the study. Mr. Heidel responded that it was through focused data collection which was conducted over several weekends and included counting the number of people in cars and pedestrians. He added that it was easier on Lombard Street because there were only two access points on the block.

Commissioner Breed said she wanted to get a clearer understanding of the challenges to collecting data at places such as the Painted Ladies and Alamo Square.

During public comment, Daniel Kassabian stated he was with the Mont Claire Terrace Association and showed photos of vans blocking the intersection. He said tourist vans and buses came at all hours against city codes and that police officers were needed. He said tourists also collected in District 3 before and after visiting Lombard Street and often prevented traffic flow, and that night time was worse.

Frances Gorman commented that she was the head of the San Francisco Tour Guild ad-hoc transportation committee, and noted that their members were not responsible for the tours that violated regulations. She and the Tour Guild supported the recommendations of the study, but also requested that more opportunities for official, enforced loading zones be explored and implemented.

Richard Juster commented that he would be supportive of a study that considered the full effects of any intervention, but that it didn't seem like the study has done that. He indicated that any toll system would push congestion elsewhere, and that the non-auto congestion issue needed to be addressed, and advocated for more traffic and pedestrian control in the form of police officers who could write citations.

Stephen Taber commented that he represented Russian Hill Neighbors, and that the issues identified in the study were real and a significant problem in the neighborhood, and that they supported the recommendations. He said the reservation and pricing system was a type of congestion pricing that could make a real difference, but also noted that the non-auto issue also needed to be addressed.

Robert Girard commented that he was the president of the Russian Hill Improvement Association and that the automobile congestion in the neighborhood impacted not just Lombard Street but a number of surrounding streets as well. He said that the number of vehicles needed to be reduced, and that he supported a reservations and pricing system.

Townsend Walker commented that he lived in the Russian Hill neighborhood on Larkin Street and that the issues identified were significant and a real problem. He indicated that he strongly supported the reservations system, but did not believe that there needed to be a tolling component and said the city should pay for the system from existing revenues and the management system

should be comprehensive.

Jennifer Morrow commented that the problems identified in the study were real and had become worse. She expressed concern that staff did not ask the opinion of residents early enough in the study. She also expressed concern that the reservations and pricing system would take time to implement and asked what would be done in the meantime. She suggested that pedestrians be subject to the reservations and pricing system as well, and reiterated a desire to fix the problem quickly.

Helen Raiser commented that she was a 15-year resident of Lombard Street, at the top of the Crooked Street hill, and that she was attending to speak for the tourists. She said that a toll would just turn drivers into pedestrians, and would not work in reducing or managing volumes. Ms. Raiser stated that more input was needed from the tourism industry and car rental companies, and noted that one of the largest problems not addressed in the study was crime and car break-ins at and around the Crooked Street.

James Hickman commented that he represented the Lombard Hill Improvement Association and thanked Commissioner Farrell and staff for completing the study. He reiterated the seriousness of the problem and said that he strongly supported the recommendations put forward. He requested that the city move forward with the recommendations and fix the problem.

Frank Morrow commented that he was a 30-year resident of the 1200 block of Lombard Street. He noted that the problems created by the Crooked Street were beyond the tipping point, including air quality and safety. He said there were three to four car fires per year as cars overheated while waiting on the steep grade, and that the grade also led to cars sliding backwards and causing accidents and safety issues for pedestrians. He said he was not sure if a reservation and pricing system would be effective, but that it was a concept worth trying.

Greg Brundage commented that he as the president of the Lombard Hill Improvement Association and echoed previous speakers regarding the seriousness and complexity of the problem. He said that a reservation system would reduce the amount of cars and that the toll was the enforcement element. He said he fully supported it, and that a vote of the membership of the Lombard Hill Improvement Association found 81% support for the reservation and pricing recommendation.

John Goodman commented that he was a resident of Leavenworth Street between Lombard and Chestnut Streets, and that the issues described in the report and by others were very real and serious. He expressed support for the additional enforcement recommendations, noting that groups of dirt bikers rode on sidewalks and sped down streets. Mr. Goodman detailed two recent incidents of assault and robbery near the Crooked Street targeting tourists, and reiterated the need for real enforcement to address the safety issues.

Anne Brubaker commented that she was a member of the Russian Hill Neighbors design committee and that the problems mentioned were real. She discussed the increase in crime in the area and expressed a desire for the issues to be fixed quickly.

Jackie Sachs, member of the CAC, commented that the CAC heard the item and passed a motion of support for its adoption. She said she initially had concerns about a reservation and pricing recommendation, but remembered that other efforts to control the situation had not been successful, and felt that it was worth trying to move the recommendation forward to see if it could have an impact.

Doris Seed commented that she did not agree with the study or its recommendations. She said

there were other options that should be explored to limit the number of cars and reduce crime.

Commissioner Farrell commented that there was no perfect solution but that this was the continuation of multiple years of study. He added that the public safety and traffic issues affected multiple neighborhoods and supervisorial districts and that he fully supported studying other areas of the city that experienced similar issues.

Commissioner Breed commented that the study was representative of other tourist attractions across the city that were not safe and had car break-ins and robberies. She said the city had not done a good job of creating a positive experience for tourists and that creative solutions were needed to address the issues. She said an ambassador program could be effective, as well as additional police and parking control officers, in addition to basic amenities such as restrooms. She said the city generated a lot of revenue from tourism and the funds should be spent on a comprehensive plan for the city's tourist attractions, as each one was unique. Commissioner Breed asked how SF Travel was involved. She said she did not agree that a reservation and pricing system would be effective and that she had concerns about the study, including how the recommendations would be followed through. She said the resolution seemed to commit the Board to implementing a reservation and pricing system and that she would not support that until additional discussions were had. She also asked why the Transportation Authority was designated at lead for the reservation system and not the SFMTA.

Commissioner Farrell agreed that the city needed to address issues at other tourist attractions such as Alamo Square, but that the issues were magnified on Lombard Street since it was a single block. He said they did try an ambassador program for Lombard but that it had mixed reviews from tourists. He said his office had requested additional police officers but that this was not a high priority compared to other violent crimes happening across the city. He said a pricing system was not the perfect solution but that it would reduce congestion and provide funding to operate the system and add police officers which would make a difference for tourists and residents. He said they held several community meetings on wayfinding signs but that this elicited strong opinions from residents and took time to develop. Commissioner Farrell said that the SFMTA had been involved in the discussions but that a reservation and pricing system would need a lead agency and that the Transportation Authority had offered that.

Commissioner Farrell stated that the action was to commit to further studying the issue, and that approval of a reservation and pricing system would have to come before the Board. He said the underlying design of such a system would be to reduce congestion.

Tilly Chang, Executive Director, stated that staff had met with San Francisco Travel continuously and would be attending their committee meeting later in the week where it was expected they would recommend further studying the issue.

Commissioner Breed moved to amend the item to clarify the language in the resolution to indicate that the intent was to further study and develop the reservation and pricing system, seconded by Commissioner Farrell.

The amendment to the item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Farrell, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai and Sheehy
(9)

Absent: Commissioners Tang and Yee (2)

The amended item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Farrell, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai and Sheehy (9)

Absent: Commissioners Tang and Yee (2)

12. Update on the Railyard Alternatives and I-280 Boulevard Feasibility Study – INFORMATION

Chair Peskin stated that the item would be continued to the March 21 Board meeting.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Safai moved to the continue the item, seconded by Commissioner Kim.

The motion to continue the item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Farrell, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai and Sheehy (9)

Absent: Commissioners Tang and Yee (2)

Other Items

13. Introduction of New Items – INFORMATION

There were no new items introduced or public comment.

14. Public Comment

During public comment, Andrew Yip spoke about professionalism.

Roland Lebrun commented that when Caltrain presented at the next Board meeting, the Board should ask why the construction contracts were extended for \$20 million when they should not have been awarded in the first place. He questioned how train capacity would be increased if the number of seats on the trains was being reduced from 762 to 573. He said that the FFGA would not be approved if seated capacity was not being improved by a minimum of 10%. Mr. Lebrun said he would share a letter from the peer review group that agreed that having two sets of doors on the trains was a CHSRA and not a Caltrain issue, and that CHSRA should consider buying bi-level trains because the loading platform level would be consistent with the lower level used by Caltrain. He said the CHSRA also needed to consider input from the system operator and that the specification for the two sets of doors should be cancelled.

Jackie Sachs commented that at the February 22 CAC meeting, the CAC had passed Items 9 and 10 unanimously.

15. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:22 p.m.