



DRAFT MINUTES

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

March 26, 2014 Meeting

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Glenn Davis at 6:07 p.m. CAC members present were Glenn Davis (Chair), Brian Larkin, John Larson, Angela Minkin, Eric Rutledge, Jacqualine Sachs, Peter Tannen, Christopher Waddling, and Wells Whitney. Transportation Authority staff members present were Courtney Aguirre, Tilly Chang, Erika Cheng, Chester Fung, Anna LaForte, Maria Lombardo, Chad Rathmann, and Tony Vi.

2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Davis recognized the contributions of the CAC's recently departed Vice Chair, Joseph Flanagan. He announced that a memorial for Mr. Flanagan was scheduled for next Wednesday, April 2. Tilly Chang, Executive Director, also recognized the contributions of Mr. Flanagan and expressed gratitude for the service of all CAC members, including the CAC's newest member, John Larson.

Chair Davis provided an updated on the scheduling of the upcoming mobility forum where persons with disabilities and seniors would be able to voice their mobility issues as a part of San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA's) Accessibility Strategy update process. He stated that the SFMTA was currently in the process of developing a draft version of the Accessibility Strategy and planning out its outreach strategy, and would update the CAC when it had determined the right time and format for the joint forum.

Chair Davis welcomed John Larson, a resident of District 7, to the CAC and to his first CAC meeting. Mr. Larson introduced himself and explained that he was interested in pedestrian and bicycle safety and maintaining oversight on the 19th Avenue Transit Study.

Peter Tannen shared that he was recovering from injuries sustained in a bicycle collision and he thanked everyone for their well wishes.

3. Election of Vice Chair – ACTION

Chair Glenn Davis opened the floor for nominations for the Vice Chair seat. Chair Davis nominated Christopher Waddling. Brian Larkin seconded the nomination.

There was no public comment. The motion to elect Mr. Waddling as Vice Chair passed unanimously.

Consent Calendar

Brian Larkin requested additional information regarding Item 6.

4. Approve the Minutes of the February 26, 2014 Meeting – ACTION

5. **Citizens Advisory Committee Appointment – INFORMATION**
6. **State and Federal Legislative Update – INFORMATION/ACTION**

Mr. Larkin asked for staff to clarify which state and federal legislative issues the CAC should be focused on. Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, explained that the legislative matrix provided within the CAC meeting packet included details on pending transportation-related state legislation that the Transportation Authority was tracking. She stated that the matrix included the Transportation Authority's position on the proposed legislation, and that this information was reviewed on a monthly basis by the Transportation Authority Board.

Mr. Larkin requested additional information regarding Assembly Bill 1194 – Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Program – to serve as a demonstrative example. Ms. LaForte stated that the bill was developed at the time the state's Active Transportation Program (ATP) was taking shape. She stated that the bill was introduced to ensure that the SR2S Program received a funding commitment from the state. She stated that the SR2S Program had been incorporated into the ATP and so the bill was rendered needless, for now, unless the bill's author, Assemblymember Ammiano, decided to amend it to address a different issue. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, commented that staff could provide the CAC with a legislative primer at a future CAC meeting.

Angela Minkin moved to approve Items 4 and 6 on the Consent Calendar and Jacqueline Sachs seconded the motion.

There was no public comment.

Items 4 passed unanimously.

End of Consent Calendar

7. **Adopt a Motion of Support for the Approval of the 2014 Prop AA Call for Projects Programming Recommendations and Amendment of the Prop AA Strategic Plan – ACTION – ACTION**

Chad Rathmann, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Brian Larkin requested that staff provide additional details regarding the Tenderloin-Little Saigon Neighborhood Transportation Plan's (NTP's) recommendations for projects in the Little Saigon area. Mr. Rathmann clarified that the UC Hasting's McAllister Street Campus Streetscape project that staff were recommending for Prop AA funding was derived from the Tenderloin-Little Saigon NTP. Mr. Rathmann commented that a centerpiece of the NTP was the conversion of Ellis and Eddy Streets from one-way to two-way streets, which was currently underway.

Jacqueline Sachs asked whether the proposed sidewalk project on Illinois Street was located near the proposed Golden State Warriors' stadium. Mr. Rathmann stated that the project was located south of Mission Bay.

Peter Tannen asked why San Francisco State University's (SF State's) Winston Drive Pedestrian Improvements project was cancelled. Mr. Rathmann responded that the project was cancelled because SF State no longer planned to construct a recreation center on Winston Drive, which had motivated the need for a pedestrian improvements project.

Christopher Waddling commented that the proposed Illinois Street sidewalk project was for the east side of the street between 18th and 19th Streets, where the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency was constructing the Mission Bay Transit Loop for the T-Third route. He commented that he anticipated the area would be heavily used by pedestrians in the future and that the location needed improvements. He commented that the Prop AA draft recommendations included reducing the capital reserve from about ten percent to five percent of annual revenues. He asked what qualified as an adequate level of capital reserve. Mr. Rathmann responded that the Transportation Authority's fiscal policies stated that a capital reserve should be maintained that represented five to ten percent of the annual income of a revenue source. He stated that with updated Prop AA project schedules showing slower allocations than anticipated in the Strategic Plan, as well as slower project delivery and reimbursements, staff anticipated that a five percent capital reserve would be more than adequate. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, added that vehicle registration fee revenues were projected to be stable (flat) with little fluctuation from year to year, and that reducing the capital reserve was low risk. She stated that should Prop AA revenues come in lower than anticipated, the Transportation Authority could hold programming or amend cash flow schedules.

Ms. Sachs asked whether the Phelan Loop Pedestrian Connector project was located near the end of a Muni Metro line. Mr. Rathmann confirmed that the project was located at a turnaround for the K-Ingleside Muni Metro line. He stated that staff would keep the CAC apprised of the project's progress.

Mr. Waddling moved to approve the item and Eric Rutledge seconded the motion.

There was no public comment.

The item passed unanimously.

8. Adopt a Motion of Support for Approval of the Balboa Park Station Area Circulation Study Final Report – ACTION

Chester Fung, Principal Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Angela Minkin noted that she heard from a member of the Balboa Park Community Advisory Committee (BPCAC) that at least one member of the BPCAC preferred Alternative 2 instead of the staff recommendation of Alternative 1. She noted that, with the affordable housing planned on Ocean Avenue to the west of the station area, it would become more important in the future for Ocean Avenue to have improved multimodal conditions. She asked for more information about why the technical traffic evaluation concluded that Alternative 2 was not favorable. Mr. Fung replied that the Geneva Avenue/I-280 ramp intersections experienced vehicle level of service F on a scale of A to F, which the study team saw as potentially problematic. He added that, while he had heard about the BPCAC member's preference as well, he also heard that there was support from other BPCAC members for Alternative 1, and that the study team could offer to meet with the BPCAC member to explain the evaluation results in more detail. Ms. Minkin thanked staff for that offer. She also expressed a desire to defer taking action until there was a clearer indication from the BPCAC regarding its support of Alternative 1.

John Larson expressed support for addressing the station area's multimodal conflicts. He asked how the study recommended managing the new frontage road such that drivers would be discouraged from using it as a shortcut to the freeway. Mr. Fung replied that the traffic signal at the frontage road's intersection with Ocean Avenue could be operated to provide only a small

amount of green time to the frontage road movement, thereby making it less attractive for drivers who did not otherwise need to be there. Mr. Larson expressed support for Alternative 1's Element 1, the re-configuration of the southbound I-280 Ocean Avenue off-ramp. He expressed that he felt Alternative 2 did not solve the issues on Geneva Avenue, and that perhaps Alternative 2 would shift too much traffic to adjacent interchanges like Monterey.

Christopher Waddling asked whether a hybrid of Alternative 1 (re-configuring the southbound I-280 Ocean Avenue off-ramp) and Alternative 2 (closing the northbound I-280 Ocean on-ramp) would be helpful. Mr. Fung replied that doing so would still not address the unfavorable conditions on Geneva Avenue. Mr. Waddling also asked whether adjustments to Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) fare policy to make Daly City more attractive financially would help relieve congestion around Balboa Park. Mr. Fung replied that such adjustments likely would help, but that the agencies involved, BART and the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, did not appear ready to make such an adjustment.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun expressed support for the study and urged the Transportation Authority to conduct a similar study of the circulation issues around the Oakdale area.

Angela Minkin moved to continue the item and Chair Davis seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

9. Vision Zero Update – INFORMATION

Megan Wier, San Francisco Department of Public Health, and John Knox-White, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), presented this item.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, stated that Vision Zero was adopted by the Board of Supervisors and had the goal of reducing traffic fatalities to zero in ten years through better engineering, education, and enforcement. She stated the resolution adopting the Vision Zero included five to six elements that would be accomplished in the next two years. She stated that a companion resolution was introduced by Commissioner Yee that called for coordination between City agencies on enforcement and education campaigns. She added that the Transportation Authority Board had created a Vision Zero committee to support this effort, and the committee's first meeting was scheduled for April 10.

Eric Rutledge asked how much of the committed funding (\$17 million) would be leveraged against other funds. Jonathan Rewers, Capital Financial Planning and Analysis Manager at the SFMTA, stated that the \$17 million was the base amount of committed funding for implementing WalkFirst recommendations. He stated that Phase 1 would include quickly-implemented improvements, such as paint and safe hit posts, and Phase 2 improvements would include intensive treatments, such as bulb-outs. He added that Phase 1 improvements would be temporary solutions that would last for two to four years, while Phase 2 improvements would be in design. Mr. Rewers stated that a large portion of the \$17 million would go towards these improvements, but added that the major funding sources included Prop K sales tax and SFMTA revenue bond funds, which stipulated that funds would go towards to capital improvements. He added that the City would seek funding for education projects from sources such as the state's Active Transportation Program.

Mr. Rutledge asked if education efforts would include transportation network companies (TNCs) and other drivers. Mr. Knox-White stated that TNCs were a part of the discussion on education efforts. He stated that the Prop K funding request in Item 10 of this agenda included education for all vehicle drivers and TNCs could use the curriculum. He stated that last year

had numerous collisions between large vehicles and bicyclists, and thus there was special focus on large vehicle drivers at this time. He added that the SFMTA was working on creating curriculum for all drivers that would identify issues for more types of collisions. He added that the SFMTA was working with the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition (SFBC) to educate bicyclists on how to safely bicycle on city streets.

Brian Larkin asked if the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) would conflict with the City's efforts to implement projects to reduce fatalities. Ms. Wier stated that the Vision Zero steering committee would be working to address larger policy issues and barriers to project implementation. She added that the steering committee was looking into case studies regarding CEQA. Mr. Larkin commented that CEQA needed to be reformed.

Jacqueline Sachs stated that all bicyclists should be licensed to simplify matters in cases of collisions. Ms. Lombardo stated that Transportation Authority staff had previously researched the issue and shared the results with the CAC, but would share the results again.

Angela Minkin stated that pedestrian safety and bicyclist safety depended on the presence of good lighting and stated that the city required more street lighting. She urged the City to include the Public Utilities Commission and Pacific Gas and Electric Company in its discussions. She suggested that multi-language tutorial videos explaining proper vehicle movements on YouTube could be part of the education campaign. Mr. Knox-White commented that there was a need to develop an urban streets user guide. He stated that drivers might be confused by new lane markings and additional education was necessary. He stated that street lighting was being considered in discussions.

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that funds previously allocated to the SFBC for bicycle education efforts did not provide measurable benefits. He commented that in his experience, bicyclists often violated traffic laws. He expressed interest in further discussing licenses.

Roland Lebrun commented that lack of enforcement of bicyclists was an issue.

10. Adopt a Motion of Support for Allocation of \$250,000 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, and Appropriation of \$39,000 in Prop K Funds for Two Request, Subject to the Attached Fiscal year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules, and Amendment of the Bicycle Circulation/Safety 5-year Prioritization Program – ACTION

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, offered to respond to any questions the CAC had regarding the allocation requests.

Chair Davis moved to approve the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's Prop K request for a Comprehensive SF Safe Streets Awareness and Communications Bridge Campaign, and to defer action on the Transportation Authority's Prop K request for Balboa Park Circulation Study Implementation Scoping until the CAC voted on the Balboa Park Station Area Circulation Study Final Report.

John Larson moved to approve the item, and Angela Minkin seconded the motion.

There was no public comment.

The item passed unanimously.

11. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Capital Improvement Program Update – INFORMATION

Jonathan Rewers, Capital Financial Planning and Analysis Manager at the San Francisco

Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, noted the SFMTA Capital Improvement Program would include federal, state, and local revenue sources, and include projects in the Prop K 5-Year Prioritization Programs.

Jacqueline Sachs asked for clarification on the 16th Street project the SFMTA was planning. Mr. Rewers stated the SFMTA was planning on extending the 22-Fillmore line into Mission Bay since there was a solution to the issue of conflicting trolley wires and future Caltrain electrification overhead wires. He added that there were current discussions on whether buses on the 22-Fillmore line would be center- or side-running on 16th Street, but stated side-running would be the likely chosen alternative. He added that pedestrian improvements would be included from Church Street to 3rd Street.

Chris Waddling commented that the current bike networks needed upgrading, and expressed dissatisfaction with the Cargo Way bike lanes. He stated that the current bike network did not provide bicyclists the ability to activate signals. Mr. Waddling requested details on the solution for resolving the conflict between the 22-Fillmore and Caltrain electric wires. Mr. Rewers stated the solution was that Caltrain would roll through the intersection unpowered and would regain power from overhead wires after passing the 22-Fillmore line, while power for trolley buses was maintained. He stated that King County Metro and Sound Transit in Seattle had tested this solution and demonstrated that it worked.

John Larson commented that the Balboa Park station area had poor pedestrian connectivity and pedestrian safety issues for the M-Oceanview line. He asked if these issues would be resolved in any projects in the update of the SFMTA's Capital Improvement Program. Mr. Rewers stated that these issues could be addressed and improvements would be in line with Muni's Customer First projects that would improve passenger safety and amenities. He stated that the SFMTA would present any related projects at the Balboa Park Community Advisory Committee meeting in April. Mr. Rewers stated that the SFMTA was implementing pedestrian and signal improvements in the area, but the M-Oceanview improvements were not part of the current series of implementation projects. He stated that the improvements could be considered in the future.

There was no public comment.

12. Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION

There was no new business.

There was no public comment.

13. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

14. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:17 p.m.