



DRAFT MINUTES

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Waddling called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

CAC members present were: Myla Ablog, Becky Hogue, John Larson, Jacqueline Sachs, Chris Waddling and Shannon Wells-Mongiovi (6)

Absent: Brian Larkin (entered during Item 2), Santiago Lerma, Peter Sachs, Peter Tannen and Bradley Wiedmaier (5)

Transportation Authority staff members present were Anna LaForte, Maria Lombardo, Mike Pickford, Steve Rehn, Steve Stamos and Luis Zurinaga (Consultant).

2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Waddling reported that the Federal Transit Administration had issued the Full Funding Grant Agreement for the Caltrain Electrification project. He also said a special CAC meeting would be scheduled in July, likely on the third or fourth Wednesday at 6:00 p.m., and he requested agenda suggestions from CAC members. He noted this was an opportunity to discuss items that the CAC usually would not have time for at regular meetings.

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

3. Approve the Minutes of the April 26, 2017 Meeting – ACTION
4. Adopt a Motion of Support to Execute Contract Renewals and Options for Various Annual Professional Services in an Amount Not to Exceed \$1,409,230 – ACTION
5. State and Federal Legislative Update – INFORMATION

Chair Waddling requested that the minutes be corrected for Item 7, as it showed that he voted in favor of the item when he actually abstained.

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Becky Hogue.

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Hogue, Larkin, Larson, J. Sachs, Waddling and Wells-Mongiovi (7)

Absent: CAC Members Lerma, P. Sachs, Tannen and Wiedmaier (4)

End of Consent Agenda

6. Adopt a Motion of Support for Adoption of the Balboa Area Transportation Demand

Management Framework [NTIP Planning] Final Report – ACTION

Jeremy Shaw with Planning Department, presented the item.

John Larson asked if the requested action was to approve the framework and whether the report would go back to the Balboa Reservoir and Balboa Park Station Community Advisory Committees (CAC's) for their input. He also asked what the purpose of the framework was.

Amber Crabbe, Assistant Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, replied that the requested action was to approve the report, as it was funded by the Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program and therefore would be approved by the CAC and Board. She said that the Planning Department had met with the Reservoir and Balboa Park CAC's over the prior year and had just presented this item to the Balboa Park CAC the night prior and would be presenting to the Reservoir CAC in July. Mr. Shaw added that the Reservoir CAC last met in February where a summary of the report was presented.

Mr. Larson asked if the report would serve as a planning document that would feed into more substantive plans such as the Residential Parking Permit program. He asked for clarification that the recommendations would continue to be discussed in various community forums and therefore it was not necessarily a final recommendation. Mr. Shaw replied that was correct.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi asked if the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) framework spoke to how needs were prioritized, such as between residents and students. Mr. Shaw replied that it did not speak to that, and said the report was just starting the conversation and that prioritization would occur in the respective community venues.

Ms. Wells-Mongiovi asked if there were any projections included for long-term traffic congestion, student enrollment or residential density. Mr. Shaw replied that the report utilized the Plan Bay Area 2040 model numbers which accounted for growth in the Reservoir and Balboa Park areas. He noted that the model numbers focused on residents but not students.

Mr. Larson stated that he had heard about a Balboa Working Group and asked if that was related to this. Mr. Shaw replied that that there had been a working group in place which included multiple city agencies meeting with San Francisco City College representatives on a monthly basis, and that TDM was one of the main topics.

Becky Hogue noted that the Public Safety Advisory Committee had recently approved a resolution for the Ocean Avenue Corridor Design. Mr. Shaw stated that a lot of public feedback and comments were directed at the Ocean Avenue improvements. He noted that the TDM framework had a limited scope but did reference complimentary projects that would warrant future study. He added that Chapter 7 of the report recommended future study of the Ocean Avenue design.

During public comment, Alvin Ja stated that he had sent the CAC a letter the previous day regarding the item. He stated that people needed to use less resources and the city should encourage people to bike, walk and use public transit instead of using single-occupancy vehicles. He said he had worked for Muni for 33 years at the Muni Metro Balboa Park Station as an operator and was very familiar with the existing conditions in the area. He stated that the Balboa Reservoir project would basically eliminate student parking but noted that City College was important to communities of concern as it was one of the more affordable colleges. He said the city should be worried about providing student access to this inexpensive education source and that this was missing from the TDM plan.

Ed Mason questioned how the city could convince people that their actions had a direct correlation with effects on the environment. He noted that many Uber and Lyft riders didn't

recognize the consequences of utilizing this service in that many drivers travel 50-100 miles to operate in the big cities. He noted that while recently waiting for a J-Muni train that was delayed it was apparent that several people chose to utilize a Transportation Network Company instead. He said people may have good intentions but that the consequences of their actions needed to be highlighted for them, such as a carbon dioxide monitor at the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, similar to a bicycle counter.

John Larson moved to approve the item, seconded by Becky Hogue.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Hogue, Larkin, Larson, J. Sachs, Waddling and Wells-Mongiovi (7)

Absent: CAC Members Lerma, P. Sachs, Tannen and Wiedmaier (4)

7. Adopt a Motion of Support for Allocation of \$55,989,751 in Prop K Funds for Ten Requests and \$2,052,000 in Prop AA Funds for One Request, with Conditions, and Appropriation of \$75,000 in Prop K Funds for One Request – ACTION

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

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi asked how traffic calming applications were prioritized. She said she knew of more than one location for which applications had been submitted repeatedly without success. Bryant Tan, with the grants division of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), replied that every application was evaluated by the same methodology, which took into account (among other factors) the collision history and average traffic speeds at each location. He said in a typical year there was enough available funding to advance the 50 highest scoring locations to design and ultimately implementation. Mr. Tan suggested contacting the program manager for details about the evaluation methodology and to inquire about specific applications.

Myla Ablog requested an update on traffic calming implementation at a future meeting. Ms. LaForte said that staff would bring a program update to the June or special July CAC meeting. Chair Waddling said he also knew of several traffic calming complaints in the Bay View, including one example in which the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) had removed speed humps in the course of a pipe replacement project but had not replaced them upon project completion. He asked if a traffic calming application was the right way to get the speed humps replaced. Mr. Tan replied that the PUC was responsible for replacing all street features that had been removed, and recommended that Mr. Waddling follow up with the PUC first and then contact the traffic calming program manager if necessary.

Brian Larkin commented that change orders to the electrical trades package contract for the Transbay Transit Center totaled nearly a quarter of the total cost, and asked for an explanation. Ms. LaForte noted that the electrical work for rooftop park accounted for about \$19 million of the \$23 million in change orders. Dennis Turchon, Senior Construction Manager at the Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA), explained that the rooftop park scope was dropped from the original trades package due to budget constraints in favor of scope elements more directly related to transit. He said that by prioritizing the scope in that way the project would stay on schedule to open for transit service in 2018. Mr. Turchon added that after the updated Transbay Transit Center budget was adopted by the TJPA Board the rooftop park scope was re-introduced as a change order. Finally, Mr. Turchon explained that part of the reason construction bids exceeded the original budget was that the redevelopment plan associated with the project was a

success, driving increases in surrounding property values and a surge of construction, thus creating a high bid environment.

Mr. Larkin asked if the Prop A general obligation bond [2014] language was so specific that it excluded interim off-site storage (needed during construction at the Burke Avenue warehouse) from eligibility for Prop A bond funds. Ms. LaForte replied that according to the City Attorney's Office, bondable expenses could only include capital assets and the subject general obligation bonds could not be used to fund services such as temporary storage. Jonathan Rewers with the SFMTA added that the design team for the Burke facility project had attempted to devise a strategy that would leave enough of the facility operational during construction to eliminate the need for offsite storage. He said, however, that offsite storage was necessary to keep the project to its very tight schedule.

Becky Hogue asked if she should recuse herself from the item since she was friends with the project manager for the Transbay Transit Center. Anna LaForte suggested that the CAC separate the vote on the Transbay Transit Center from the other allocation requests, so that Ms. Hogue could abstain from voting on the former.

Chair Waddling read a question emailed by Peter Sachs asking whether the Urban Forestry program was open to finding new locations for street trees rather than limiting its scope to replacing the trees missing from empty tree wells. Mr. Sachs' email also suggested that empty tree wells tended to be located in micro climates that didn't lend themselves to tree survival. Carla Short with San Francisco Public Works replied that the program's goal for the next couple of years was filling empty tree wells, subject to confirmation that they met current planting guidelines, including urban canopy goals. She said the results of a recent street tree census were available on the City's Urban Forestry website, showing that priority districts for tree planting were Districts 9, 10, 11 and 6. Ms. Short added that the Urban Forestry program had a team of arborists developing lists of tree species appropriate for the different micro climates found in the City.

During public comment, Ed Mason said much of the new cement installed as part of street improvement work had shrinkage cracks and recommended that Public Works exercise closer oversight. With regard to the Urban Forestry program, Mr. Mason advocated for a study on survival rates for new trees. He said that according to a report from 2016, 2,381 street trees were removed that year. Finally, he said the Trees for Tomorrow program championed by former Mayor Gavin Newsom planted 26,000 trees including some in District 8, despite urban forest census data showing that District 8 had highest concentration of street trees.

Becky Hogue moved to sever the allocation request for the Transbay Transit Center.

Myla Ablog moved to approve the severed item, seconded by Brian Larkin.

The severed item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Larkin, Larson, J. Sachs, Waddling and Wells-Mongiovi (6)

Abstain: Hogue (1)

Absent: CAC Members Lerma, P. Sachs, Tannen and Wiedmaier (4)

Becky Hogue moved to approve the underlying item, seconded by John Larson.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Hogue, Larkin, Larson, J. Sachs, Waddling and Wells-Mongiovi (7)

Absent: CAC Members Lerma, P. Sachs, Tannen and Wiedmaier (4)

8. Adopt a Motion of Support for Approval of the Fiscal Year 2017/18 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program of Projects – ACTION

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

Chair Waddling asked if the proposed locations had been announced for Phase 3 of Bay Area Bikeshare expansion. Mr. Pickford said that a map was available on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's website (<http://mtc.ca.gov/whats-happening/news/bike-share-expansion-over-80-546-ford-gobike-stations-now-identified>).

John Larson said that he appreciated that San Francisco considered CO2 emissions in its Local Expenditure Criteria for TFCA. He asked why the Air District did not consider CO2 emissions in its cost effectiveness calculations. Mr. Pickford replied that the state law that governed TFCA does not mention CO2 emissions, only "criteria" emissions, but he said that the Air District does include estimates of CO2 emissions reductions for projects for informational purposes.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi asked if there was a process for individuals or community groups to install their own bike racks on sidewalks. Heath Maddox, Senior Planner at the SFMTA, replied that there was not a program for individual shops or residents to install custom bicycle racks themselves, but they could work with the SFMTA to develop a rack, then give it to SFMTA for a free installation. He said that the SFMTA had considered a permit program but that there were not enough requests to warrant one. Ms. Wells-Mongiovi asked for clarification that not many people requested custom bicycle racks, to which Mr. Maddox replied that was correct, likely because the SFMTA provided standard racks for free. Mr. Maddox said he would send information on how to request bike racks to the CAC.

Jackie Sachs asked if the paratransit vehicles would have the same type of wheel chair lift as on buses. Mr. Pickford replied that the vehicles in the proposed project would be sedans without wheelchair lifts. He said the idea behind the project was to end up with a mixed fleet of paratransit vehicle types, rather than all large vans. Kristen Mazur, Senior Accessibility Planner at the SFMTA, replied that the sedans would not include a wheelchair lift and that there were no wheelchair accessible clean air vehicles available for purchase. She added that the fleet would likely not ever have more than 10 sedans and would continue to primarily be wheelchair accessible vehicles. Ms. Sachs noted that the wheelchair lifts on the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) shuttles and should be considered for the paratransit fleet.

Chair Waddling noted that UCSF was changing its entire shuttle fleet to electric vehicles. Ms. Mazur said that she would look into that and that the Department of Environment had been helping the SFMTA look for electric vehicles so she would pass on that information.

Becky Hogue stated that some of the paratransit vehicles were rented and asked where the funding for the rentals came from and whether they would be discontinued. Ms. Mazur replied that the SFMTA was discontinuing the rental vehicles and that as of June 1 there would be 22 new mini vans deployed, followed by 27 cutaway buses deployed in July or August. She added that the funds for the rentals came out of the SFMTA's operating budget while they were short on vehicles.

There was no public comment.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi moved to approve the item, seconded by Jackie Sachs.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Hogue, Larkin, Larson, J. Sachs, Waddling and Wells-

Mongiovi (7)

Absent: CAC Members Lerma, P. Sachs, Tannen and Wiedmaier (4)

9. Adopt a Motion of Support for Adoption of the Proposed Fiscal Year 2017/18 Budget and Work Program – ACTION

Cynthia Fong, Deputy Director for Finance and Administration, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

There was no public comment.

Jackie Sachs moved to approve the item, seconded by Becky Hogue.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Hogue, Larkin, Larson, J. Sachs, Waddling and Wells-Mongiovi (7)

Absent: CAC Members Lerma, P. Sachs, Tannen and Wiedmaier (4)

10. Adopt a Motion of Support for Modification of the Geary Corridor Bus Rapid Transit Project Locally Preferred Alternative – ACTION

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

Chair Waddling noted that Angela Paige Miller had written a letter to the CAC, which had been distributed. He added that Peter Sachs had sent comments about this item raising the issue of how the change would affect the operations of the bus rapid transit (BRT) system. Colin Dentel-Post responded that the change was not expected to have any significant negative impact and that if anything, there could be a slight positive effect on transit reliability because the additional block of outbound center bus-only lane would eliminate conflicts between the bus and vehicles making right turns or parking and loading maneuvers.

Chair Waddling asked why center-running BRT was not proposed for the entire corridor. Mr. Dentel-Post replied that center-running BRT was generally more expensive than side-running because of the need to replace medians, so extending the center lanes to 34th Avenue would add significant cost. He noted that in the case of this project change, there would not be a major cost difference because it would only be a change to striping, not medians compared to the previous proposal.

Brian Larkin said that Mr. Dentel-Post and Liz Brisson had met with him to explain the project change, and he did not see any real negative effects of the design or schedule change. He said he would prefer extension of Muni rail but that probably would not happen in his lifetime.

John Larson noted that Mr. Dentel-Post had said that stakeholders view on the project as a whole vary. He asked about the status of larger thinking about the Geary corridor and potential future light rail, and how this relates to the feedback staff heard. He also asked if it made sense for the BRT to switch between the center and side of the street, if this would still provide much benefit, and whether this alternative is really the “Locally Preferred Alternative.” Mr. Dentel-Post responded that BRT was chosen for the corridor because of its lower cost and shorter time to implement than rail. He said that Connect SF was considering rail system planning, including along Geary. He added that BRT would provide a 10-minute travel time benefit along the corridor, and that better bus service could coexist with future rail, citing the Mission corridor as an example. Lastly, he said many people in the corridor were supportive of BRT, but others oppose it. He added that during outreach there was not opposition to the project change under

consideration by the CAC.

Mr. Larson said that switching between the center and side with light rail may not make sense, and center-only might raise fewer parking concerns with merchants.

Jackie Sachs said that the streetcars used to serve the corridor but were replaced with buses. She said she was a member of the Geary Transit Task Force, which recommended light rail in the Geary corridor and that people in the corridor supported rail.

There was no public comment.

Brian Larkin moved to approve the item, seconded by Jackie Sachs.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Hogue, Larkin, Larson, J. Sachs, Waddling and Wells-Mongiovi (7)

Absent: CAC Members Lerma, P. Sachs, Tannen and Wiedmaier (4)

11. Update on Emerging Mobility Services and Technologies, Including Transportation Network Companies – INFORMATION

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

There was no public comment.

12. Update on the Kearny Street Multimodal Implementation Plan [NTIP Planning] – INFORMATION

Dan Howard, Transit Engineer at the SFMTA, presented the item.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi stated that she used to commute by bicycle along Kearney Street and noted that while there was not a lot of traffic on the street it encouraged speeding and reckless behavior, and asked how the evaluation would be conducted. Mr. Howard replied that the evaluation would be limited to traffic counts but noted that it was a community engagement project and community input would be incorporated to come up with improvements.

The CAC lost quorum at 7:38. The meeting was continued as a workshop.

13. Caltrain Proposed Fare Changes – INFORMATION

14. Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION

15. Public Comment

16. Adjournment