



DRAFT MINUTES

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

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

CAC members present: Myla Ablog, Becky Hogue, John Larson, Peter Sachs, Peter Tannen, Chris Waddling and Rachel Zack (7)

CAC Members Absent: Kian Alavi, Hala Hijazi, Brian Larkin (entered during Item 9) and Shannon Wells-Mongiovi (4)

Transportation Authority staff members present were Anna LaForte, Warren Logan, Maria Lombardo, Mike Pickford, Oscar Quintanilla, Alberto Quintanilla, Steve Rehn, Aprile Smith, Mike Tan, Eric Young and Luis Zurinaga (Consultant).

2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Larson introduced and welcomed new District 3 CAC representative, Rachel Zack. He reported that there would be a Vision Zero Ramps open house on Tuesday, July 31 at Bayanihan Center at 1010 Mission Street. He said the project team had been working to improve street safety at 10 intersections in the South of Market neighborhood where freeway on- or off-ramps met city streets. He said the project team had spent the past few months gathering community feedback by meeting with the community and had collected more than 800 surveys.

Chair Larson reported that the Salesforce Transit Center had opened for limited Muni service on Saturday, June 16 and the full Transit Center would be opening in August 2018. He said the Transportation Authority was working in collaboration with the community, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), and developers to identify near-term, non-infrastructure solutions that improve sustainable travel options for District 10 residents and visitors alike. He said there were three scheduled transportation design lab workshops scheduled for Saturday, June 30 at Bayview Hunters Point YMCA, Sunday, July 8 at CYC Bayview, and Thursday, July 12 at El Centro.

Chair Larson reminded the CAC to provide Alberto Quintanilla, Clerk of the Board, with their list of preferred July meeting agenda items by Friday, June 29.

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

3. Approve the Minutes of the May 23, 2018 Meeting – ACTION
4. Adopt a Motion of Support for a Three-Year Professional Services Contract with Civic Edge Consulting in an Amount Not to Exceed \$150,000 for Strategic Communications, Media and Community Relations Services for the ConnectSF Program – ACTION
5. Adopt a Motion of Support for the BART Perks Evaluation Findings Document –

ACTION

Camille Guiriba, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

Peter Sachs moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Chris Waddling.

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Hogue, Larkin, Larson, Sachs, Tannen, Waddling, and Zack (7)

Absent: CAC Members Alavi, Hijazi, Larkin and Wells-Mongiovi (4)

6. State and Federal Legislation Update – INFORMATION

7. Progress Report for Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project – INFORMATION

8. Citizens Advisory Committee Appointment – INFORMATION

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

Peter Tannen moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Rachel Zack.

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Hogue, Larson, Sachs, Tannen, Waddling, and Zack (7)

Absent: CAC Members Alavi, Hijazi, Larkin and Wells-Mongiovi (4)

End of Consent Agenda

9. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Amendment of the Prop K Strategic Plan Baseline, Allocation of \$19,999,636 in Prop K Funds for Two Requests, with Conditions, and Appropriation of \$600,000 for One Request – ACTION

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, and Luis Zurinaga program management oversight consultant for the Transportation Authority, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Peter Tannen asked if the increased use of Transportation Network Companies (TNCs) and decreased use of taxi services would affect the ramp taxi incentive program.

Annette Williams, Manager Accessible Services Program at SFMTA, said in terms of the sedan service the effect was positive because there was less demand for service and a greater emphasis on paratransit trips. She said there had been a negative effect on the accessible taxi service and that it had become difficult to recruit drivers. She said the reason for the ramp taxi service incentive program was to compensate drivers that took on the additional cost of upgrading their vehicles with ramps.

Rachel Zack stated that the city of New York had a program centered around accessibility and TNCs and asked if the city had a similar program.

Ms. Williams said one of the difficulties in California was that TNCs were regulated at the state level and not at the city level. She said the city was working with the state legislature to attempt to have an influence with the California Public Utilities Commission regarding accessibility for members of the public with disabilities.

Ms. LaForte referred the public to Senate Bill (SB) 1376, sponsored by California Senator Hill, that was included in the meeting packet under Agenda Item 6.

Roland Lebrun stated that he supported paratransit request and the appropriation of \$600,000 for oversight and project delivery support for the Caltrain Downtown Extension (DTX). He spoke in opposition of the approximately \$10 million Prop K requests from the Transbay Joint Powers Authority for the DTX and asked the CAC to defer their vote until Item 12 was presented. He said there was another alignment that would save \$4 billion.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Hogue, Larkin, Larson, Tannen, Waddling, and Zack (7)

Nays: CAC Member Sachs (1)

Absent: CAC Members Alavi, Hijazi and Wells-Mongiovi (3)

10. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Allocation of \$2,442,213 in Prop K Sales Tax Funds for Four Requests, with Conditions, and Appropriation of \$854,000 in Prop K Funds for One Request – ACTION

Oscar Quintanilla, Transportation Planner, and Colin Dentel-Post, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Myla Ablog commented that the Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project had begun construction in District 5 and that she was happy to see outreach in the neighborhoods, which garnered interest from neighbors. She said she had participated in an SFMTA transit riders' union ride audit and that the SFMTA had implemented some of the suggestions right away. She noted that the traffic calming project in her neighborhood, from a few years ago, was still receiving positive feedback.

Brian Larkin said he was unclear if the presentation was related to the Geary Rapid Project east of Palm Avenue and Stanyan Street or related to the central running Geary BRT. He asked if the presentation was entirely related to the Phase 1 Geary Rapid Project.

Mr. Dentel-Post said the environmental request was for both phases of the project and the fiber optic construction request was only for phase 1 of the project. He said the fiber optic construction request would run the Stanyan Street to Market Street section of the corridor.

Brian Larkin asked if the fiber optic construction request was for signal preempt or signal hold.

Daniel Mackowski, Project Engineer at the SFMTA, said the proper term was transit signal priority on the corridor and the fiber optic construction make it more reliable.

Brian Larkin said the current transit signal priority did not work well and frankly, he could not tell if it existed. He asked how many rounds of comments the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) provided on the environmental document.

Mr. Dentel Post said it depended on how one counted, but that the FTA provided about 8 rounds of comments during the federal environmental review.

Mr. Larkin asked if the FTA added new comments with each review round or requested that previously identified concerns be re-evaluated or if it was a combination of both.

Mr. Dentel-Post said that it was a combination of both. He said the FTA provided three types of comments: they raised additional questions after staff had replied to an earlier comment, they gave new comments on sections that were previously not commented on until much later in the review process even though the text hadn't changed, and lastly, they provide direction but later reversed course.

Mr. Larkin asked if there was a way to document what appeared to be excessive reviewing and

asked if the FTA had a means to receive feedback. He asked for the status of the Geary BRT law suits.

Mr. Dentel-Post said with respect to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) litigation, the Transportation Authority has been trading briefs with the petitioners with a court date set for August 9. He said that the judge is supposed to provide a decision within 90 days. He said the records litigation should be wrapped up shortly.

Mr. Larkin asked how the records litigation was related to the Prop K requests.

Mr. Dentel-Post said the records litigation was regarding the Geary BRT project and what records the Transportation Authority was required to provide to the public.

Chris Waddling requested that the BART Balboa Park Station Area Improvements be severed due to conflict of interest.

Chair Larson approved the motion to sever the BART Balboa Park Station Area Improvements without objection.

Peter Tannen asked given the issues of the Van Ness BRT project had the SFMTA learned any lessons prior to construction of fiber optics for the Geary BRT project.

Mr. Mackowski said a lesson learned that was being applied to the Geary BRT project was to have two separate projects. He said the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUUC) had a contract with sewer, water and fiber optic cables and that there would be a separate contract to do the surface work like traffic signals, bulbs and paving. He said that would help with cost and lessen the construction impact.

Peter Tannen asked what the SFMTA did with traffic calming requests that went beyond installing speed humps and whether the more expensive options were being employed enough to impact the program budget.

Patrick Golier, Traffic Calming Program Manager at the SFMTA, said the traffic calming program managed vehicular speed mid-block in neighborhood streets and the speed humps were the most effective to slow speeds. He said the speed humps were relatively inexpensive and did not require any tradeoffs like removal of parking spaces. He said every street that was considered by the program went through an engineering review and that the program received around 50 applications a year. Mr. Golier noted that in his experience, relatively few of the more expensive interventions were needed.

Peter Tannen referred to the Balboa Park Station diagram provided in the Item 10 enclosure and asked how the curbless shared street in alternative 2 would be used when not closed for vehicles.

Tim Chan, Project Manager at BART, said the current passenger drop off lanes had vehicles entering through Niagara Avenue and exiting through Geneva Avenue. He said the project aimed to remove entry and exit off Geneva Avenue because it had been a pedestrian safety problem. He said the creation of a passenger drop off roundabout where all vehicles entered and exited off Niagara Avenue would lead to better pedestrian safety. He explained that passenger drop off activity was at its peak during weekdays and that the curbless shared street would could be used for events such as a farmer's market on the weekends. He said other locations would be available for weekend drop off on Ocean Ave and San Jose Avenue. He noted community concern on spill over parking and spill over drop offs would be remedied by creating drop off and pick up zones.

Chris Waddling asked if the curbless shared street would be open for passenger drop off during the week or would be only used for events on the weekend.

Mr. Chan said the passenger drop off area would be available to BART and Muni riders throughout the week, but that there could be periods on weekends when the drop off area would be blocked off for community events. He added that bollards would be installed to differentiate between the pedestrian pathway and vehicle drop off zone.

Mr. Waddling asked what kind of traffic controls would be implemented for the exit and entry off San Jose Avenue.

Mr. Chang said BART was working with the SFMTA to conduct a traffic study and environmental analysis. He said there were early conversations discussing traffic calming strategies, like signaled crosswalks, at the intersection of Niagara and San Jose Avenues.

During public comment Jackie Sachs spoke against the Geary BRT project and spoke in favor of a Geary Street light rail. She said she had been advocating for a Geary Street light rail since 1986 and believed that the public would prefer a light rail over the Geary BRT.

Edward Mason asked what revisions would be available for the Muni M Line that dropped off passengers on San Jose Avenue before entering the yard for its turnaround. He asked if the Balboa Park Station's proposed vehicle entrance and exit on Niagara and San Jose Avenues would impact the Muni M Line that stopped in the middle of San Jose Avenue.

David Pilpel was concerned with the closure of the Balboa Park Station access road that would impact both BART and Muni passengers. He said Muni's M and K Lines both used that access road to turn a loop and would be forced to use other routes if the access road were to be closed.

Ms. LaForte said the District 11 Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program (NTIP) Planning project would be looking at safety improvements in the vicinity of the San Jose/Geneva intersection as well as operational issues for the M-Line on San Jose Avenue including the M-Line terminus, and recommended having the SFMTA project manager present at a future CAC meeting as an update on the NTIP project.

Mr. Chan said BART would continue to confer with the SFMTA on these issues during the design phase.

Maya Ablog moved to approve the underlying item, seconded by Peter Sachs

The underlying item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Hogue, Larkin, Larson, Sachs, Tannen and Waddling (7)

Abstain: Zack (1)

Absent: CAC Members Alavi, Hijazi and Wells-Mongiovi (3)

Peter Tannen moved to approve the severed request for BART Balboa Park Station Area Improvements, seconded by Peter Sachs.

The severed item was approved by the following vote:

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

Abstain: Waddling and Zack (2)

Absent: CAC Members Alavi, Hijazi and Wells-Mongiovi (3)

Chair Larson called Items 11 and 12 together.

11. Update on the Rail Alignment and Benefits (RAB) Study – INFORMATION

12. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Pennsylvania Alignment as the Preferred Alternative

for Grade Separations at 16th Street and Mission Bay Drive on the Approach to the Caltrain Downtown Extension – ACTION

Luis Zurinaga, program management oversight consultant for the Transportation Authority, and Jeremy Shaw, Senior Planner at San Francisco Planning, presented the item.

Peter Sachs asked if it was feasible to save \$4 billion on the Downtown Extension (DTX) Prop K request from Item 9.

Susan Gygi, RAB Program Manager at San Francisco Planning, said they would be looking at ways to integrate Pennsylvania Avenue with DTX and would look at potential cost savings through the implementation of a longer tunnel bore. She said it was too early to provide a definitive answer but would have a better idea after conducting engineering and environmental reviews of the Pennsylvania Avenue extension.

Chris Waddling asked if the locations of the two potential railyard relocation sites could be shared and what impacts they would have on those communities.

Ms. Gygi said there was one location inside the city and the other located outside the city. She said the city did not own all the land for the two potential sites and that Caltrain still needed to complete their business assessment plan and blended service plans with highspeed rail, which would provide information about Caltrain's needs with respect to the yard. She said the locations could not be shared until further along in the project.

Chris Waddling said he could vote in favor of the project without knowing which communities would be affected by the relocation of the railyard.

Mr. Zurinaga clarified that the action being requested was for the alignment and not locations of the railyard sites.

Chris Waddling said he did not agree and that the locations should be shared before a vote could be taken on the alignment of DTX.

Maya Ablog asked why the endorsement of the Pennsylvania Avenue alignment was being requested at this moment. She said she would have to carefully review the report before deciding whether to approve the item.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, said the potential selection of the Pennsylvania Alignment worked with the current railyard location or with a relocated railyard. She said the alignment did not presume what would happen to the yard. She said there was no immediate deadline or requirement to get an endorsement but that there was strong interest in getting trains to the Salesforce Transit Center. She said solidifying the Pennsylvania Alignment as the preferred alternative would send a clear message to the Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA) and any private or public funders that might be interested in funding the project.

Ms. Gygi said that it was not known if Pennsylvania Alignment alternative would allow for the railyard to stay on 4th and King Streets.

Peter Sachs said that he had searched on Google maps and had found two possible locations for the new railyards; one in the Bayview and another outside the city in Brisbane.

Chair Larson said he understood the reluctance to not share possible sites until a final decision had been made and referred to land issues with the Quint-Jerrold Connector road project. He asked what would happen to the tunnels and rails that would be no longer in use if the Pennsylvania Alignment was selected.

Ms. Gygi said the Caltrain alignment north of 21st Street was on an easement owned by Caltrans

and would go back to Caltrans and south of 21st Street Caltrain owned their own alignment. She said it was not known what would happen to the tunnels and that the RAB had not investigated this.

Mr. Zurinaga said many years of evaluation determined the Pennsylvania Alignment as the preferred alignment and that the concerns raised by the CAC would be discussed and resolved during the preliminary engineering and environmental phases of the project.

During public comment Roland Lebrun referenced the Planning Departments presentation and stated that the \$10 million being requested was to construct the downtown extension from 16th Street to the Salesforce Transit Center. He said that there was an additional alternative that would save the city \$4 billion. He said the reason for the high cost was because of the alignment and bend on Townsend Street that would not allow for the same tunneling construction to be used. He suggested the use of the 7th Street alignment that allow would only require one tunneling construction.

Mr. Zurinaga said that the 7th Street alignment had been looked at multiple times and been rejected because of the complexity to build around and under city buildings. He said the alignment of the project had been carefully looked at for the last 14 years by industry experts.

David Pipel agreed that a vote should not be taken on the item until there was more information on how the relocation of the railyards would impact the city. He spoke against the support of the Pennsylvania Alignment and advocated for the Caltrain extension to downtown. He said that other alignments should be evaluated.

Peter Sachs indicated that he would be opposing the item, noting that on page 17 of the report where it summarizes pros and cons of the Pennsylvania alignment, the report stated that it requires relocation of the yard. Mr. Sachs also expressed interest in learning about the history of the 7th street alignment.

Chair Larson said it would be helpful to have a presentation on the 7th Street alignment to have a better understanding why the proposed project was rejected.

Brian Larkin moved to continue item 12, seconded by Peter Tannen.

Item 12 was continued by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Hogue, Larkin, Larson, Sachs, Tannen, Waddling, and Zack (8)

Absent: CAC Members Alavi, Hijazi and Wells-Mongiovi (3)

13. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Fiscal Year 2018/19 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program of Projects – ACTION

Oscar Quintanilla, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Rachel asked how much was spent last year on the Emergency Ride Home program and for how many years the 2 DC Fast Chargers parking spots would be reserved for Maven carshare vehicles.

Mr. Quintanilla said the Emergency Ride home program received around \$30 - \$40 thousand each year and that the 2 DC Fast Chargers parking spots were owned by the city and dedicated to carshare programs. He said according to TFCA policy the Off-Street Car Share Electrification project would need to function for 3 years before being evaluated by the SFMTA and the San Francisco Environmental Department.

Peter Tannen referred to the Ford GoBike Memberships for San Francisco State University Students program and asked what the definition was of a Pell-Grant eligible student.

Ms. LaForte said it was a federal grant program and would provide greater detail after reviewing the eligibility requirements.

Chair Larson asked how the Emergency Ride Home program reduced the pollution level of clean air.

Mr. Quintanilla said the program strived to encourage people to rely on sustainable transportation modes if ever in an emergency.

During public comment Michael McDougal said the Emergency Ride Home program had made a difference in his life and supported the item.

Chris Waddling moved to approve the item, seconded by Rachel Zack.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Hogue, Larkin, Larson, Sachs, Tannen, Waddling, and Zack (8)

Absent: CAC Members Alavi, Hijazi and Wells-Mongiovi (3)

14. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Emerging Mobility Evaluation Report – ACTION

Warren Logan, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Peter Sachs asked if the framework was scalable to additional autonomous technologies like drones. He said drone companies would seek city approved landing spots and clearances soon and recommended having regulations set in place.

Mr. Logan said the Transportation Authority was working with the SFMTA on their autonomous vehicles strategy, which currently incorporated sidewalk robots, and were in communication with the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) and the SFPUC regarding autonomous vehicles carrying passengers. He said the guiding principles of the report were scalable.

Rachel Zack stated she would be recusing herself from the vote.

During public comment David Pilpel asked if the report's cover memo could include the city's adopted drone policy and the emerging technologies task force led by Naomi Kelly of the City Administrator's Office.

Edward Mason asked for collaboration with the San Francisco Department of the Environment to study increased air pollution because of TNCs.

Mr. Logan said the Transportation Authority was working with the San Francisco Department of the Environment and other city agencies to study with impacts of ride hailing companies.

Mike McDougal spoke in favor Emerging Mobility Evaluation report.

Becky Hogue moved to approve the item, seconded by Chris Waddling.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Hogue, Larkin, Larson, Sachs, Tannen and Waddling (7)

Abstain: Rachel Zack

Absent: CAC Members Alavi, Hijazi and Wells-Mongiovi (3)

15. Update on the District 10 Mobility Study [NTIP Planning] – INFORMATION

Rachel Hiatt, Principal Planner, presented the item staff memorandum.

Chris Waddling said he had not seen outreach for workshops and asked if it had been publicized.

He requested a link to share the workshops on social media.

Ms. Hiatt said that outreach had been done and she would follow up to make sure the workshop dates were being shared with the public.

Eric Young, Senior Communications Officer, said District 10 community groups had been contacted through phone and email, posters were handed out local shops and the workshops had been shared through social media. Mr. Young said he would share the social media link to Mr. Waddling.

The CAC lost quorum at 8:14 p.m. during Item 15. The meeting was adjourned. Chair Larson continued the meeting as a workshop with any presentations or public comment not on the record.

The CAC regained quorum at 8:16 p.m. during Item 15. Chair Larson called the meeting to order.

During public comment David Pilpel stated that the SFMTA, Department of Public Works and SFPUC would start an employee shuttle service. He noted the importance of having public transportation to and from District 10 and highlighted Muni lines that needed improvements. He asked if the CAC could connect with District 10 Board of Supervisor candidates.

16. Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION

There were no new items introduced.

17. Public Comment

Jackie Sachs said Supervisor Tang suggested bringing back school buses. She said school buses would free up public buses during school commute hours.

The CAC lost quorum at 8:23 p.m. during Item 17. The meeting was adjourned. Chair Larson continued the meeting as a workshop with any presentations or public comment not on the record.

18. Adjournment

The workshop was adjourned at 8:29 p.m.