



DRAFT MINUTES

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

January 28, 2015 MEETING

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Christopher Waddling at 6:05 p.m. CAC members present were Myla Ablog, Brian Larkin, John Larson, Santiago Lerma, Angela Minkin, Eric Rutledge, Jacqueline Sachs, Raymon Smith, Peter Tannen and Wells Whitney. Transportation Authority staff members present were Amber Crabbe, Colin Dentel-Post, Seon Joo Kim, Anna LaForte, Maria Lombardo and Chad Rathmann.

2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

There was no Chair's Report.

3. Election of Chair and Vice Chair – ACTION

Vice Chair Christopher Waddling opened the floor for nominations for the Chair seat. Wells Whitney nominated Mr. Waddling as Chair. There were no further nominations. The motion to elect Mr. Waddling as Chair passed unanimously.

Chair Waddling opened the floor for nominations for the Vice Chair seat. Jacqueline Sachs nominated Peter Tannen. Chair Waddling nominated Wells Whitney. There were no further nominations. The motion to elect Mr. Whitney as Vice Chair passed with six votes.

Chair Waddling introduced Santiago Lerma as a new member of the CAC. Mr. Lerma said that he lived in District 9 and was looking forward to contributing to the CAC.

There was no public comment.

Consent Calendar

4. Approve the Minutes of the December 3, 2015 Meeting – ACTION

5. State and Federal Legislative Update – INFORMATION

6. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Adoption of the Fiscal Year 2015/16 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Local Expenditure Criteria – ACTION

Raymon Smith moved to approve the Consent Calendar. Angela Minkin seconded the motion.

There was no public comment.

The Consent Calendar passed unanimously.

End of Consent Calendar

7. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Allocation of \$5,199,670 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, and \$636,480 in Prop AA Funds for Eight Requests, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules – ACTION

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

Wells Whitney asked if the Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) were for cars. Mr. Rathmann clarified that RRFBs were primarily intended to alert drivers to the presence of pedestrians.

Angela Minkin commented that the District 11 community council should be reached out to regarding projects in the vicinity of Balboa Park Station.

Peter Tannen asked why RRFBs were being proposed instead of other technologies. Craig Raphael, Capital Financial Planning and Analysis and Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program Coordinator at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), replied that traditionally the city would install in-pavement flashers, however, they were less visible and more easily damaged by traffic.

Mr. Tannen voiced his support for the four bike corridors identified in the District 1 Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program planning project. Brian Larkin asked how the four corridors were chosen. Mr. Raphael replied that the corridors were identified in the 2012 Draft Bicycle Strategy and the San Francisco Planning Department's Green Connections Plan.

Mr. Larkin observed that not all four corridors were vehicle entrances to Golden Gate Park. Jonathan Rewers, Manager of Capital Financial Planning and Analysis at the SFMTA, added that the Bicycle Strategy involved developing criteria to identify projects and that this project specifically worked with Commissioner Mar's office on access to Golden Gate Park.

Myla Ablog asked why the proposed Golden Gate Avenue road diet included edge stripes but not bike lanes. Mr. Raphael replied that low traffic volumes or a lack of room on the street likely resulted in the project not including bike lanes. Mr. Rathmann added that the street was not part of the bicycle network and that the road diet project would not preclude adding bike lanes in the future.

Jacqueline Sachs asked whether there were plans to construct a three foot buffer for bicyclists on Arguello and expressed concern that such a buffer may impact disabled and senior riders of the 33-Stanyan. Mr. Raphael replied that the project was in the planning phase and that Ms. Sachs' concern was the type of issue that would be evaluated in the planning project.

Eric Rutledge commented that the map included in the enclosure accompanying the RRFB project incorrectly showed three locations (Sunset Boulevard & Moraga Street, Geary Boulevard & 22nd Avenue, and Geary Boulevard & 26th Avenue) that would be fully signalized instead through another project. He also said that he had read RRFBs were more effective than other types of beacons. Mr. Rutledge asked whether other locations in this project had been considered for full signalization.

Mr. Rewers replied that the locations in the RRFB project were identified as priorities through Walk First and that while identifying locations for RRFBs would not preclude full signalization, signals had a long lead time. He added that over the next six months, SFMTA intended to move forward quickly on projects that support Walk First and Vision Zero. Further, he said some of the electrical work done for RRFBs may be reused in subsequent signalization and that if the RRFBs were effective enough at slowing traffic, they might make signalization unnecessary in the future. He said SFMTA had seen resistance to new signals in some locations and RRFBs might be a way to add a safety treatment that was less invasive to neighborhoods.

During public comment, Roland LeBrun asked how the SFMTA was currently operating without the proposed fall protection safety systems, since it seemed like something that would be required by workplace safety regulations. He also asked how these systems could cost as much money as estimated by the SFMTA.

Roger Bazeley commented that he was concerned that there were corridors where ladder-style crosswalks were applied inconsistently. He claimed that motorists respond better to a consistent pattern of crosswalk markings and that this should be prioritized.

Wells Whitney moved to approve this item. Eric Rutledge seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with a vote of 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and Santiago Lerma abstaining.

8. Adopt a Motion of Support for Programming of Up to \$5,143,714 in Cycle 4 Lifeline Transportation Program (LTP) Funds to Two San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Projects and Concurrence with Cycle 4 LTP Prop 1B Priorities as Submitted by SFMTA and the Bay Area Rapid Transit District – ACTION

Seon Joo Kim, Senior Transportation Planner for Policy and Programming, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Brian Larkin asked about the timing of Cycle 1, and Ms. Kim responded that it was approved in 2006. Mr. Larkin commended the improved quality of the recommended projects.

Jacqueline Sachs asked why the Mobility Management project had not been recommended for Cycle 4 funding. Ms. Kim responded that the project had received a lower score than the top two projects but that the SFMTA was still proceeding with the project with other funds. Jonathan Rewers, Manager of Capital Financial Planning and Analysis at the SFMTA, added that the SFMTA was using Federal Transit Administration (FTA) New Freedom funds and working with the Transportation Authority to utilize remaining funds from a related previous LTP project. Raymon Smith asked about the level of certainty for securing the FTA funds, and Mr. Rewers responded that the MTC Commission approved the project as part of its regional recommendation.

Angela Minkin asked why the low-income focus was emphasized for the Transportation Authority's ranking while it didn't seem to be emphasized as much for transit operators' LTP Prop 1B priorities. She stated that the Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project seemed to serve as a fund swap for the Geary Corridor BRT project. Mr. Rewers agreed that it was but affirmed that the Van Ness Avenue BRT would benefit Communities of Concern. Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, explained that the Transportation Authority's LTP projects were selected through a competitive process while LTP Prop 1B projects were chosen at the transit operators' discretion. Ms. Kim added that Communities of Concern were designated by MTC to represent areas with various transportation disadvantage factors, including the low-income and minority populations.

During public comment, Roger Bazeley expressed his concern that the Expanding Late Night Transit Service project should explicitly address security issues, especially for seniors and people with disabilities, and should consider expanding the lighting and CCTV monitoring systems.

Ms. Minkin moved to approve this item. Peter Tannen seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with a vote of 8 in favor, with Myla Ablog and Raymond Smith abstaining.

9. **Adopt a Motion of Support for Reprogramming of \$10,227,540 in OneBayArea Grant Funds from the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's Masonic Avenue Complete Streets Project to the Light Rail Vehicle Procurement Project, with Conditions – ACTION**

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

Peter Tannen commented that he supported the special condition to continue to monitor the Masonic project and asked why the dual sewer system was added to the project. Jonathan Rewers, Manager of Capital Financial Planning and Analysis at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), responded that city agencies were coordinating the underground work to the extent possible to save time and costs, especially given the five-year moratorium following street repaving. Brian Larkin asked if the dual system was a state requirement, and Mr. Rewers responded that he believed so but would follow up.

Eric Rutledge asked if this was a straight swap, and Ms. Crabbe responded it was.

Chair Waddling commented on the Light Rail Vehicle project's low score compared to other OneBayArea (OBAG) projects. Ms. Crabbe responded that, despite its low score, it was an OBAG-eligible project, and the swap would enable the SFMTA to avoid potential delays to the Masonic project.

Wells Whitney moved to approve this item. Mr. Larkin seconded the motion.

There was no public comment. The motion was approved unanimously.

10. **Shuttle Program Update – INFORMATION**

Carli Paine, Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Manager at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), presented the item per the presentation included in the packet.

Wells Whitney asked if commuter shuttles had schedules and if they operated on fixed routes. Ms. Paine responded that the SFMTA asked how many stops were made and at which locations on a monthly basis. Mr. Whitney asked if the SFMTA tracked commuter shuttle vehicles while they were in San Francisco. Ms. Paine replied that the SFMTA did not track vehicles on an ongoing basis, but did use tracking data to follow up on complaints against specific vehicles. Mr. Whitney asked how many commuter shuttle vehicles were in operation on the road in San Francisco on an average day. Ms. Paine stated that she didn't know since program placards were issued for any vehicle that could possibly be in San Francisco. She continued that if she had to guess, she would say 200 per day. Mr. Whitney suggested that the SFMTA collect data on how many shuttle vehicles were on the road as part of the pilot program.

Raymon Smith asked if the SFMTA had considered pre-approving routes for commute shuttles, thereby preventing routes running through particular communities. Ms. Paine responded that the SFMTA permit process asked about commuter shuttle routes so as not to compete with Muni routes. Ms. Paine continued that the SFMTA did not dictate shuttle routes.

Myla Ablog asked if the one dollar per day fee charged by the SFMTA was enough to cover the cost of the program since it cost \$2.50 per ride on Muni. Ms. Paine replied that the shuttle pilot program was only recovering the cost of the SFMTA's program and not the cost of the shuttle operations. Ms. Paine added that SFMTA costs included data management, administration, enforcement, signage, and pilot program development. Ms. Paine continued by

saying that total program cost was allocated across all vehicle operates based on the number of stops anticipated by the operators and that this amount per stop was \$3.55. She added that the SFMTA used GPS to track how many stops were in fact being made.

Ms. Ablog also voiced her concern over the costs of additional heavy vehicles on San Francisco roads and community impacts including increased rent and Ellis Act evictions. She asked what community impact metrics the SFMTA was studying related to these issues. Ms. Paine responded that the SFMTA pilot program was limited to examining transportation and environmental impacts and regulating shuttles, but would potentially partner with other agencies to look at related issues and solutions. Ms. Ablog added that the SFMTA should consider additional community impacts when examining transportation policy issues such as expanding transit service for the increased population in San Francisco.

Angela Minkin noted that she was interested in the additional costs to streets, and questioned how the SFMTA could operate the program on a cost recovery basis and not consider infrastructure costs.

Jacqueline Sachs voiced her support for relocating a commuter shuttle stop at Van Ness Avenue and Sacramento Street, and asked that the SFMTA take into consideration those Muni stops with a high frequency of senior and/or disabled riders when deciding on where to locate additional commuter shuttle stops.

Eric Rutledge asked if Ms. Paine expected demand for commuter shuttles to increase in the future. Ms. Paine responded that she expected demand would increase. Further, she mentioned that San Francisco and the Bay Area region both had commuter benefits ordinances, which discouraged employees from taking single-occupancy vehicle trips and might include commuter shuttle incentives. In addition, Ms. Paine noted, the number of employers with existing commuter shuttles were anticipated to grow over the next few years.

Mr. Rutledge then noted that the best option could be to have employees live close to where they work. He asked if the SFMTA was surveying riders and if the SFMTA had asked how many shuttle riders would live closer to their place of employment if the shuttles weren't provided. Ms. Paine responded that the program did not include surveys at this point. She added that there was interest in encouraging other cities in the region to build more housing. Ms. Paine noted that the vacancy rates for the past quarter were lower in Silicon Valley than in San Francisco.

During public comment, Sue Vaughn, SFMTA Citizens Advisory Committee member, noted that there was a lawsuit against the pilot shuttle program. She added that if an environmental impact report (EIR) had been performed for this program, a lot of the current questions would have been answered, including how many cars the shuttles removed from the road and how many people were displaced from San Francisco. Ms. Vaughn also noted that the program was illegal and in violation of the California state vehicle code. She noted that an introduced bill, Assembly Bill 61, would amend the code to open bus stops to commuter shuttles. Ms. Vaughn commented that the pilot program was not answering the questions that an EIR would have answered.

Christine Rogers voiced her concerns over street wear, traffic congestion, safety, and neighborhood disruption. She noted that on her street one morning she counted over 50 buses and voiced her support for examining community impacts metrics. Ms. Rogers noted her interest to petition a reduction in the number of buses allowed on a street, limit the trips on one-way streets, and eliminate double-decker buses.

Andy Stadler voiced his support for the program and asked how much the residential locations

of shuttle users were taken into consideration. He noted that the commuter shuttle stop he used at San Jose Avenue and 29th Street was just relocated and that he felt unsafe because of speeding traffic and a lack of crosswalks. Ms. Paine responded to Ms. Rogers' point that the SFMTA had worked with shuttle operators to reduce congestion in Noe Valley and that she was hopeful that residents would see changes in commuter shuttle bus traffic through the neighborhood streets. She then noted that the stop at San Jose and 29th was relocated there from a location in front of a residential building, which the SFMTA tried to prevent. Ms. Paine added that capital improvements that were being considered at those stops would include crosswalk and visibility improvements.

Susan Phelan noted that she did not oppose commuter shuttles or people living in San Francisco and working in Silicon Valley. She added that commuter shuttles equated to the privatization of public transportation, and that if the city were to permit private operators then she would prefer that the drivers be treated as fairly as possible. Ms. Phelan noted specific concerns over the hours logged per day by drivers as a potential safety issue.

Roger Bazeley stated that last year Google used 480 vehicles for its commuter shuttle program. He voiced support to limit stops and routes by creating hubs for the commuter shuttles. Mr. Bazeley voiced concern over how the commuter shuttles operate on Van Ness Avenue as well as the operations of jitneys and tour buses in San Francisco. He added that increased traffic was causing delays in travel time.

Edward Mason noted that \$75,000 in costs associated with the San Francisco County Transportation Authority's commuter shuttles strategic analysis report were not recouped as part of the SFMTA's fees to commuter shuttle operators. He also noted that a past Caltrans bay area express bus project was studied but never advanced. Mr. Mason added that the effort was led by Elizabeth Deakin at UC Berkeley and that friction between transit agencies led to the project being stalled. He added that earlier there were many violations but that the situation had improved. He voiced his concern over shuttle vehicles operating on Guerrero Street, which had a three-ton weight limit. Mr. Mason noted that motor vehicles tended to drive around commuter vehicles but not Muni buses when stopped. He added that RidePal was using school loading zones and the adjacent traffic lane for drop-offs.

Roland LeBrun voiced his support for the program. He asked if GPS allowed the SFMTA to identify specific vehicles. He asked for clarification as to whether the cost per stop per day was \$1 or \$3.55. He also invited Ms. Paine to San Jose to talk about the program in San Francisco.

Chair Waddling noted that he would take notes on this item to the Plans and Programs Committee. He offered that he would accept additional comments at the Transportation Authority's public email address, cac@sfcta.org.

11. Update on Hunters Point/Candlestick Transportation Planning – INFORMATION

Peter Albert, Urban Planning Initiatives Manager at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Eric Rutledge asked what the parking policies would be for the new developments and whether there would be parking minimums or maximums. Mr. Albert replied that there would be no parking minimums and a maximum of one parking space per unit and that all parking would be unbundled from housing units. He added that 88% of new households in San Francisco did not have a car.

Chair Waddling expressed concern that the new developments would lack connections to the

existing Third Street corridor and asked what would be done to create interactions with the existing community. Mr. Albert replied that there would be high-frequency buses to the core of the Third Street corridor on Palou Street. He said that there would also be a new bike path one block south of Palou Street.

During public comment, Roland LeBrun commented that he would recommend to the Valley Transportation Authority that they invite Mr. Albert to speak. He went on to comment that there was too much emphasis on the Bayshore Caltrain station and that more focus should be paid to the Oakdale station. He said that it seemed like the expectation was that residents of the Hunters Point-area developments would travel south on Caltrain, yet he claimed northbound Caltrain would provide better service than the Muni T-Third line.

Roger Bazeley asked about the possibility of alleviating traffic with a new bridge across the bay at Hunters Point. Mr. Albert replied that a second Transbay tube was anticipated somewhere north of Hunters Point.

The CAC lost quorum at 8:06 p.m. The meeting was adjourned.

12. Major Capital Projects Update – I-80/Yerba Buena Island Interchange Improvement Project – INFORMATION

This item was tabled due to time constraints.

13. Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION

Jacqueline Sachs requested that the CAC receive updates on the Presidio Parkway and Central Subway projects.

14. Public Comment

During public comment, a commenter recommended reading the Mountain View Voice and other peninsula newspapers to learn about land use policies and attitudes that the commenter claimed impacted San Francisco.

Ed Mason commented that commuter shuttles were causing damage to the roadway when they bottomed out at 21st Street and Chattanooga Street. He said that bike racks on the back of the shuttles obscured the identification decals. He suggested that the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency require identification decals on all four sides of the shuttles.

Roger Bazeley commented a friend had been killed by a transit bus. He said that if shuttles help multimodal goals then they should be considered part of the transportation system. He went on that due to a disability he needed to use a car and that it was difficult to see bicyclists when their lights weren't working. He suggested requiring additional reflective materials. He further added that Lyft and Uber vehicles also contribute to a very complex scene for drivers to observe.

15. Adjournment

Quorum was lost at 8:06 p.m.