



# DRAFT MINUTES

## CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

### 1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

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

CAC members present: Myla Ablog, Hala Hijazi, Becky Hogue, Brian Larkin, Peter Sachs, Shannon Wells-Mongiovi and Bradley Wiedmaier (7)

CAC Members Absent: John Larson (entered during Item 6), Peter Tannen (entered during Item 6) and Chris Waddling (3)

Transportation Authority staff members present were Amber Crabbe, Andrew Heidel, Jeff Hobson, Anna LaForte, Mike Pickford, Alberto Quintanilla, Steve Rehn and Steve Stamos.

### 2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Vice Chair Sachs reported that Santiago Lerma had resigned from his seat on the CAC to tend to his growing family, but that staff thanked him for his service and the valuable input he provided. He said the CAC would be seeking a new representative for District 9 in the coming months, and also welcomed the newest CAC member, Hala Hijazi, who was representing District 2.

Vice Chair Sachs announced that the Transportation Authority had issued its first sales tax revenue bonds on October 19. He noted that five bids were received from Bank of America, JP Morgan, Citigroup, Morgan Stanley, and Wells Fargo. He said that the winning bid had gone to Bank of America Merrill Lynch with an interest rate of 2.39%. He mentioned that San Francisco would be hosting the Focus on the Future annual conference from October 29-31 and that Chair Aaron Peskin would be providing welcoming remarks. He stated that Commissioners Tang, Sheehy and Peskin had led discussions among staff from the Transportation Authority, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), the Department of Public Health, and the San Francisco Unified School District on a range of Safe Routes to School (SRTS) issues. He said that at the request of Commissioner Kim, a special Transportation Authority Board meeting had been scheduled on November 28 at 11:00 a.m. to hold a hearing on school transportation in San Francisco. He said that the Transportation Authority was aiming to bring back a recommendation for programming the remaining \$2.8 million in One Bay Area Grant SRTS funding at the December Board meeting.

Vice Chair Sachs welcomed the Transportation Authority's new Clerk of the Board, Alberto Quintanilla. Vice Chair Sachs announced that former Clerk, Steve Stamos, had moved to the Finance Division as a Management Analyst.

There was no public comment.

Amber Crabbe, Assistant Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, stated that the school transportation hearing on November 28 would likely need to be rescheduled due to a scheduling conflict.

## Consent Agenda

3. **Approve the Minutes of the September 27, 2017 Meeting – ACTION**
4. **Adopt a Motion of Support for the Award of Three-Year Professional Services Contracts, with an Option to Extend for Two Additional One-Year Periods, to WSP USA and Resource Systems Group, Inc. in a Combined Amount Not to Exceed \$400,000 for On-Call Modeling Services – ACTION**
5. **Internal Accounting and Investment Report for the Three Months Ending September 30, 2017 – INFORMATION**

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

Becky Hogue moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Brian Larkin.

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Hijazi, Hogue, Larkin, Sachs, Wells-Mongiovi and Wiedmaier  
(7)

Absent: CAC Members Larson, Tannen and Waddling (3)

## End of Consent Agenda

6. **Adopt a Motion of Support for Allocation of \$2,941,939 in Prop K Sales Tax Funds for Five Requests, with Conditions – ACTION**

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

Vice Chair Sachs stated that he recalled a fire life safety item the prior year. Ms. LaForte replied that the prior request was for the design phase of this project.

Peter Tannen commented that he was pleased that the Valencia Bikeway project would consider safety measures for pedestrians in addition to bicyclists and that he was supportive of a potential pilot project. He asked that the stakeholder interviews include the Bicycle Advisory Committee. Ms. LaForte replied that SFMTA would include the BAC on its list of stakeholders.

Myla Ablog asked about the purpose of the Valencia Bikeway project video and if there were any projects planned for the McCoppin and Market Street intersection. She said that she often used McCoppin Street to cross Market Street and was afraid it would become a dangerous crossing, especially with the upcoming daylight savings. Kimberly Leung, Project Manager with the SFMTA, replied that the video would be used for data collection. She added that the purpose of the data collection was to get a better understanding of the behavior of vehicles, including Transportation Network Company (TNC) vehicles operating in the area. She said the SFMTA would look at the McCoppin Street segment near Valencia Street, as well as how all of the cross streets interacted in relation to the bike facility designs.

Vice Chair Sachs noted that the city of Portland had created a standard toolkit for bike lane infrastructure upgrades and asked if San Francisco had a similar toolkit. Ms. Leung replied that bicycle facility designs depended on the context of the project and noted that the designs for each project tended to vary depending on the type of street. Vice Chair Sachs said that the cities of Chicago and Minneapolis had similar toolkits but also recognized that different streets had different needs, and that as San Francisco did more bike lane projects, having a toolkit could help streamline the process. Mr. Tannen stated that as a former bicycle program manager, he could confirm that the SFMTA had a bicycle lane construction toolkit.

Bradley Wiedmaier asked if anything was planned to help transition and absorb bicycle and pedestrian travel at the southern terminus of Valencia at Mission Street. Ms. Leung replied that the Valencia Street study would look at all key intersections along the Valencia corridor. She added that the Valencia Bikeway project ended on Mission Street, but that the study would look into how bike lanes connected with other facilities which could include that intersection.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked if any lessons were learned from the current Valencia street design, and asked why Valencia Street bike facility needed to be redesigned. He asked if the youth bicycle safety education curriculum included a lesson on how to stop at stop signs, as well as how many people biked to work on Bike to Work Day in actual numbers, not just the percentages. He noted that new curb ramps often had hairline cracks soon after installation.

Julia Raskin, Community Organizer with the San Francisco Bike Coalition, spoke in support of the Valencia Street Bikeway Implementation Plan. She said that the Valencia Street bike lanes were last striped in 1999. She said that San Francisco's population had grown and that more people were biking, particularly on Valencia Street which connected Market and Mission Streets. She said that she supported protected bike lanes on Valencia to improve safety and slow down vehicle traffic. She said she looked forward to near-term improvements in the next year and to working with the SFMTA on a longer-term vision for the corridor.

Jackie Sachs said that the CAC used to have some votes against the Bike to Work Day request and said that the funds should instead go to a capital project.

Matt Dove, Director of Bike Programs at the YMCA, commented that the youth bike education program taught riders to stop at stop signs. He said he stopped using Valencia Street as a north-south connection after 15 years as a daily bike commuter due to having a small child. He said the last time he rode on Valencia Street he became a witness to an accident by an unaware TNC driver dropping off their customer in the bike lane. He said he would like Valencia Street to become a safe bike route that he could take with his child.

Ivan Abasouth, resident on 19<sup>th</sup> Street off of Valencia Street, spoke in support of the Valencia Bikeway project and added that while the bike lanes helped transform Valencia Street and the neighborhood, they were now outdated. He said that the current bike lanes did not consider the impacts from TNC and food delivery vehicles. He said that the traffic in and out of bike lanes was a significant issue and he knew of several people who had stopped using the bike lanes as a result.

Matt Brassina commented that he organized a group to form "People Protected Bike Lanes" that blocked bike lanes from vehicles. He said the Valencia bike lane was constructed in 1999 and was used by more capable riders, but needed to be designed for bicyclists with varying degrees of experience. He requested that the CAC vote in favor of funding the project.

Peter Tannen moved to approve the item, seconded by Shannon Wells-Mongiovi.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Hijazi, Hogue, Larkin, Larson, Sachs, Tannen, Wells-Mongiovi and Wiedmaier (9)

Absent: CAC Member Waddling (1)

Brian Larkin moved to rescind the vote and sever the request for Bike to Work Day, seconded by Myla Ablog.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Hogue, Larkin, Sachs, Tannen and Wiedmaier (6)

Nays: CAC Members Hijazi, Larson and Wells-Mongiovi (3)

Absent: CAC Member Waddling (1)

John Larson moved to approve the underlying requests, seconded by Brian Larkin.

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

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Hijazi, Hogue, Larkin, Larson, Sachs, Tannen, Wells-Mongiovi and Wiedmaier (9)

Absent: CAC Member Waddling (1)

Peter Tannen moved to approve the severed request for Bike to Work Day, seconded by Peter Sachs.

The severed item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Hijazi, Larson, Sachs, Tannen, Wells-Mongiovi and Wiedmaier (7)

Nays: CAC Members Hogue and Larkin (2)

Absent: CAC Member Waddling (1)

**7. Presentation on the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's 2017 Facilities Framework – INFORMATION**

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, introduced the item and Jonathan Rewers, Design Strategy and Delivery Manager at the SFMTA, who presented the item.

Hala Hijazi commented that some of the SFMTA facilities were over 100 years old and asked if any of the facilities were historically significant. Mr. Rewers replied that the Potrero, Presidio, and 1200 15<sup>th</sup> Street facilities had initial historic evaluations and did not have historic qualities. Ms. Hijazi suggested that another column be added to slide 6 of the presentation to indicate which facilities were owned or leased by the city and county of San Francisco. Mr. Rewers replied that the Facilities Framework identified only the facilities owned by the city and county of San Francisco.

Vice Chair Sachs asked if the SFMTA would be able to locate a suitable plot of land that was also affordable. Mr. Rewers replied that finding, building, and affording a suitable plot of land would be a challenge to do all at once, but that the SFMTA was working on it and believed that joint development opportunities could be an option. He said the SFMTA had been actively working on all three phases for the past two years, but would make a final decision by February 2018 on whether to continue seeking joint development opportunities.

Becky Hogue requested that Treasure Island be included on all city maps. Mr. Rewers replied that he would have Treasure Island added to the SFMTA's official map.

During public comment, Edward Mason noted that the SFMTA had sold the Upper Yard to the Mayor's Office for housing, and asked how emerging technology would be incorporated into the facility upgrades.

**8. Update on Southern Bayfront Development and Transportation – INFORMATION**

Jeff Hobson, Deputy Director for Planning, introduced the item and Adam Van de Water, Project Manager at the Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development, and Carlin Paine, Land Use Development and Transportation Integration Manager at the SFMTA, who presented the item.

Brian Larkin asked what constituted a negotiated development agreement. Ms. Paine replied that negotiated development agreements generally were large scale and involved zoning changes. Mr. Van De Water added that the projects highlighted in the presentation were multi-acre, had historic rehabilitation, brought substantial influx of housing, office, or open spaces, and included development agreements. He said that the development agreements were enabled by state law and allowed changes to standard building approvals which could lead to improved public benefits. He noted an example of a public benefit could be granting an extra floor of height if the project contributed to transit improvements.

Mr. Larkin asked how difficult it would be to get approval to proceed with a negotiated development agreement and said that it sounded like an exception was needed to the normal process. Mr. Van De Water replied that there was an extensive process for each development agreement, which included a one to three-year environmental impact report. He said that approvals would be needed throughout the various city agencies and that in many cases the projects were located on the Port of San Francisco's property. Mr. Larkin asked for clarification about the phrase "use centralized utility systems to reduce resource consumption". Mr. Van De Water replied that the phrase fell under sustainability and said that sometimes master developers prepared multiple vertical parcels for development. He explained that in the case of an office building being built next to a residential building, more efficient centralized heating or cooling plants could be installed as opposed to individual chillers and boilers on different floors or buildings.

During public comment, Edward Mason commented that he would like to see a matrix for the Transportation Sustainability Fee that would show the project and the fee paid compared to the cost to the transit entity to provide additional service required as a result of the project. He asked if the development agreements and the timeline of their approvals would be available to the public. He asked what the public process was for negotiating an extra floor on projects and if the fees collected would be required to be used in that area of the city.

## **9. Update on the Core Capacity Transit Study – INFORMATION**

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

Brian Larkin asked how the Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project would increase capacity, because he had heard that it would use the same number of buses but would be able to do a few more runs. Mr. Heidel replied that the capacity increase noted in the final environmental document was about 300 people per peak hour. He said that given the current land use forecast, the projected growth in demand was also relatively small, but still more than these 300 passengers. Mr. Larkin asked what the next steps would be for the Core Capacity Transit Study. Mr. Heidel replied that were short and medium phases, and that the study documented for the first time every project that was under consideration and how they could be coordinated. He said identifying and obtaining funding for the pre-requisite projects and receiving recommendations from all the relevant operating agencies were part of the short-term phase. He said that the long-term phases had a long lead time and could take 20 years or more.

John Larson asked if the Sunset sub area included the planned development in Park Merced and the Balboa Reservoir. Mr. Heidel responded that the planned development did include Park Merced, but he would follow up about the Balboa Reservoir. Mr. Larson said that the plan represented a large density increase to the area and that even a medium forecast was already strained. He asked if the pre-requisite projects included the 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue project or M-Line improvements. Mr. Heidel replied that neither were included in the pre-requisite projects. Mr. Larson said that he would like an update at some point on the status of the 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue project.

Bradley Wiedmaier asked if the Core Capacity study included any long-term planning for additional subways in San Francisco, especially on the west side of the city. Mr. Heidel replied that the Core Capacity study did not take a close look at the long term in San Francisco, but that subway work would be included as part of the ongoing Connect SF effort. He said in context of this study, big regional investments such as a second Transbay crossing would have a major impact on core capacity efforts throughout the city. He said that the Core Capacity study identified some routes for a second Transbay crossing that could serve other corridors within San Francisco that were currently at capacity and that both efforts would need to work together.

Shannon Wells-Mongioli commented that the results of survey on new subway tunnels had previously been presented and that it showed a lot of the development seemed to be focused on east side of the city. She said she hoped that the results of the survey would lead to a study regarding increased east-west connectivity.

During public comment, Jackie Sachs said that she was one of 55 individuals that wrote Prop B in 1989. She said one of the light-rail projects that was included was for Geary Boulevard and that she had been involved with transit on Geary since 1986. She said the Geary BRT project was supposed to be light-rail ready, but that it would not happen due to side boarding on half of the project and middle boarding on the other half.

#### **10. Update on the San Francisco Transportation Climate Sector Action Strategy – INFORMATION**

Tim Doherty, Senior Planner at the SFMTA, presented the item.

Myla Ablog commented that she was glad to see a study on urban heat effects and that she had seen the issue in her apartment complex with a lack of education on native plants. She recommended that the SFMTA look into pilot projects involving seawalls and living shorelines, but noted that hopefully those projects would not interfere with water taxis, privately owned water vessels, or ferries.

Bradley Wiedmaier asked if it was possible to assess the retrograde impact of TNCs on emissions levels. He said that new developments added extra trips and mileage and seemed like one of the biggest issues. He added that transit to the San Francisco International Airport and to downtown San Francisco were especially being affected by TNCs. Mr. Doherty replied that there was somewhat of a lag in quantifying emissions as the numbers presented were from 2015. He said that the Transportation Authority had been a global pioneer in researching the impact of TNCs, as shown in their TNCs Today report. He said that he was confident the city would receive greenhouse gas emission data from TNC trips, but that the most recent report did not provide that information. Mr. Doherty said that collaborative efforts with various public agencies had started to show how TNCs impacted the transportation sector and that future pilot programs and policies would incorporate TNC emissions.

Shannon Wells-Mongioli asked if TNCs were ultimately a help or hindrance to public transit and said that TNCs had been successful because transit options were not meeting commuter needs. She said that reliability, capacity, regularity, and location would drive the success of these alternate transportation systems, and questioned if it would be helpful to create an incentive program for TNCs to use alternative fuel.

John Larson commented that he did not understand the connection between complete streets as a strategy and climate mitigation and asked for an example. Mr. Doherty replied that investments that shifted people out of single occupancy vehicles and into more environmentally sustainable travel modes, such as biking or walking, would be helpful strategies. He said that land use changes and projects like Better Market Street would inform what transportation mode people chose, and

would have long-term ramifications around carbon footprint.

Mr. Wiedmaier commented that he thought it would make more sense to push development up towards the city's hilltops, instead of focusing development on waterfronts, but was not sure of the impacts on transit. Mr. Dougherty said that the SFMTA had reached out to the New York Metropolitan Transportation Authority to learn about the effects of super storm Sandy. He said that the SFMTA had been working closely with other city departments on a vulnerability assessment of the entire multi-modal transportation, as well as land use, housing, open space, and utilities. He added that all those findings should be available in 2018. Vice Chair Sachs said that he would like to see those findings when they became available.

During public comment Edward Mason said that people did not make the connection between impacts to the environment and using TNCs. He suggested installing a carbon-dioxide monitor along the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge to replicate the bicycle counters along Market Street. He said that announcements encouraging commuters to take public transit should be placed on bus head signs such as other local agencies did. He also said that Muni should be maintained to discourage commuters from choosing a ridesharing vehicle, and that commuters should recognize that TNCs were not environmentally sound since they involved drivers from the central valley.

#### **Vice Chair Sachs called Item 11 before Item 10.**

#### **11. State and Federal Legislative Update – INFORMATION**

Amber Crabbe, Assistant Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, presented the item.

Brian Larkin asked which state bill was vetoed by Governor Brown. Ms. Crabbe replied that Assembly Bill 17 was vetoed by the Governor.

During public comment, Edward Mason said that he was pleased Senate Bill 493 had been rejected.

#### **Other Items**

#### **12. Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION**

John Larson commented that TNC drivers frequently double parked and questioned how the city could address the issue. He said that companies like Uber and Lyft should provide guidelines to their drivers and noted that taxis typically did not block driving and biking lanes. He added that double parking was dangerous and created traffic congestion and should not just be a law enforcement issue.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi asked if any studies were available for improving parking in residential areas in the city. She said that it was not possible to park in her driveway without encroaching on the sidewalk and that she had ideas about potential legislation. She said that a former supervisor for District 9 had suggested to change some streets to lateral parking and wanted to know if that was progressing. She also asked if there was an update on the status of the BART and Muni escalators on Market and Church Streets and why there was such a long delay to fix broken escalators, and whether it was BART or Muni who were responsible for maintenance. Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, replied that this topic had previously been raised and that staff had invited Tim Chan from BART to give a presentation on the status of elevator and escalator improvements. She added that materials would be available to the CAC in the next couple weeks.

Bradley Wiedmaier said he agreed with the comments on the driving behavior of TNC drivers and asked if the CAC could get a presentation on the congestion management pricing system in place in Manhattan, New York.

Peter Tannen commented that he had watched the video of the October 24 Board meeting and noted that the Board had a thorough discussion on the major delays and cost overruns for the Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit project. He requested that the CAC also receive the project updates that the Board had requested on the progress of the project.

Hala Hijazi requested a presentation from both Uber and Lyft's compliance, regulatory, or government affairs teams to speak to how their drivers can be directed to pull over in a safe place. She also requested a presentation from the city's resiliency group and how sea level rise would impact transportation.

Vice Chair Sachs asked if it was possible for staff from the San Francisco International (SFO) Airport to present to the CAC. He said that SFO was one of the few major airports that did not have dedicated drop off locations for TNC vehicles, and wanted to know if they had a plan for addressing the impact of TNC vehicles on congestion.

**13. Public Comment**

During public comment, Edward Mason provided an update on commuter buses at 24<sup>th</sup> and Church Streets. He said two new white zones had been created for people to board Muni, but that there was a recent situation where a third bus blocked the intersection because two other buses were at the bus stop. He said that there continued to be an issue with bus departure times and had noticed that Muni buses and ridesharing services, like Chariot, double parked nearby and idled.

Jackie Sachs asked for an update on the "Other 9 to 5" study, which she had been participating in since 2015. She said that instead of using morning rush hour as a basis for capacity, the study should instead look at transportation use throughout the day. She said that bus lines like the 38-Geary, which provided service to students, senior citizens, and people of all ages, should be considered before any route changes.

**14. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:09 p.m.