

DRAFT MINUTES

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

February 25, 2015 MEETING

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Christopher Waddling at 6:00 p.m. CAC members present were Brian Larkin, John Larson, Santiago Lerma, Jacqueline Sachs, Peter Tannen, Chris Waddling (Chair) and Wells Whitney. Transportation Authority staff members present were Liz Brisson, Amber Crabbe, Cynthia Fong, Ryan Greene-Roesel, Rachel Hiatt, Anna LaForte, Maria Lombardo, Mike Pickford and Chad Rathmann.

2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Waddling explained that Myla Ablog had missed four of the last 12 CAC meetings and therefore her membership was automatically terminated, but that she could be reappointed by the Board and was interested in seeking reappointment.

Chair Waddling announced that staff would offer an ethics and Brown Act training tailored for CAC members and that members should expect to be contacted about potential training dates.

Jacqueline Sachs commented that the September CAC meeting could conflict with a holiday. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, responded that the meeting had already been rescheduled and offered to re-send the meeting schedule to CAC members.

Consent Calendar

3. Approve the Minutes of the January 28, 2015 Meeting – ACTION

4. Internal Accounting and Investment Report for the Six Months Ended December 31, 2014 – INFORMATION

5. State and Federal Legislative Update – INFORMATION

There was no public comment.

Brian Larkin moved to approve the Consent Calendar. Peter Tannen seconded the motion.

The Consent Calendar was approved unanimously.

End of Consent Calendar

6. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Allocation of \$1,752,502 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, for Six Requests, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules – ACTION

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

John Larson noted that the restoration of the Great Highway had come up at a previous CAC meeting and asked whether there was a long-term plan and schedule to transform the Great Highway into a non-motorized trail. Oscar Gee, Project Manager, with San Francisco Public

Works (SFPW), replied that currently there was no schedule, but that SFPW was working with SPUR and other stakeholders on concepts. He added that establishing responsibility for maintenance of a potential trail was a key point in developing a trail project. Mr. Larson asked whether SFPW would be responsible for maintenance if the Great Highway was rebuilt as a vehicular roadway. Mr. Gee responded in the affirmative.

Santiago Lerma asked what “permanent restoration” meant and what would happen with the portion of the former roadway width that would no longer be used under the proposal. Mr. Gee replied that the road would be one-way, with southbound traffic shifted onto the former northbound lane and what had been the southbound lane would be abandoned. He added that there was a possibility of using the former southbound roadway for pedestrians and bicyclists, but that there were concerns with erosion.

Peter Tannen asked whether there would be a barrier protecting the northbound bike lane on San Jose Avenue in addition to the proposed barrier along the southbound lane. Craig Raphael, with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), replied that the barrier would only be along the southbound lane. Mr. Tannen said that it was not clear how southbound cyclists on Dolores Street would get to southbound San Jose Avenue. Mr. Raphael said that SFMTA would follow up. Mr. Tannen said that in the past a barrier protected bike facility along the Bernal Cut often collected debris and asked whether the proposed facility would suffer similarly. Mr. Raphael said that he imagined SFPW would clean the San Jose Avenue bike lane similarly to how it cleaned Market Street bike facilities.

Mr. Tannen referred to an exhibit for the proposed 7th Avenue and Lincoln Way project and asked what roadway width resulting from narrowing one traffic lane by one foot would be used for. Mr. Raphael said that SFMTA would follow up. Mr. Tannen asked whether there were detailed diagrams for the traffic calming implementation proposal locations. Mr. Raphael said that the purpose of the current request was to enable SFMTA to produce the detailed design drawings. Mr. Tannen asked whether there was a list of the 45 proposed locations in the WalkFirst Phase 1 project. Mr. Raphael said that there were currently 90 locations from which SFMTA would choose 45 and Ms. LaForte referenced the list attached to the allocation request.

Chair Waddling asked whether there had been consideration of a barrier protected northbound bike lane on San Jose Ave. Mr. Raphael replied that the southbound lane was the priority and he believed a northbound barrier protected bike lane was not feasible.

There was no public comment.

Wells Whitney moved to approve this item. Santiago Lerma seconded the motion.

The motion was approved unanimously.

7. **Adopt a Motion of Support for approval of the San Francisco Freeway Corridor Management Study Phase 1 Report – ACTION**

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

Wells Whitney asked whether the Transportation Authority was involved solely in the San Francisco study, or whether all the related efforts were one large project or otherwise being coordinated. Ms. Hiatt responded that the Transportation Authority was the lead agency only for the San Francisco Freeway Corridor Management Study and not for other related efforts outside of San Francisco. She added that different projects throughout the corridor had different agency leads, but that the agency teams coordinated with each other.

Mr. Whitney stated that the increase in travel demand seemed substantially more than could be accommodated by the strategies proposed, and that strategies such as major increases in Caltrain capacity and bus rapid transit on US 101 might be needed to achieve the goals. Chief Deputy Lombardo agreed that this type of comprehensive, multimodal approach to peninsula corridor travel demand was really needed and that there seemed to be some political momentum growing for this kind of planning. She cited Assembly Bill 378, introduced by Assemblyman Mullin, which at this point was a policy statement/challenge to the state, regional and local agencies along the corridor to come to consensus on improvements that can be made quickly in the corridor. Ms. Lombardo noted that this provides a potential legislative vehicle for FCMS and related recommendations. Ms. Hiatt added that each of the four types of strategies presented would not alone meet the goal of managing demand, but together they might and that analysis would happen in Phase 2.

Peter Tannen asked about the status of the Alemany Interchange Multimodal Improvement Study and Cesar Chavez East Transportation Study identified on page nine of Enclosure A. Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, Anna LaForte, said the Transportation Authority was waiting to hear if Caltrans would award a planning grant for the Alemany study that would supplement proposed Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program (NTIP) planning funds. With respect to the Cesar Chavez East project, she said that the Transportation Authority and SFMTA were currently engaged in discussions with the District 10 Supervisor to see if NTIP capital funds could be used to implement some of the near-term recommendations.

Santiago Lerma asked why the I-280 high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane was removed. Ms. Hiatt stated that after the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake, many segments of the freeway were damaged and closed, and so the California Department of Transportation converted some HOV lanes to mixed flow lanes to provide more single-occupant vehicle capacity.

During public comment, Roland LeBrun stated that the Santa Clara Express Lanes would be free for carpools, not discounted. He also stated that major expansion in Caltrain capacity and potentially high-speed rail was needed to provide sufficient capacity in the corridor.

Peter Tannen moved to approve this item. John Larson seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with a vote of six in favor, with Wells Whitney abstaining.

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

Eric Cordoba, Consultant Engineer, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

There was no public comment.

9. Adopt a Motion of Support for Amendment of the Adopted Fiscal Year 2014/15 Budget to Increase Revenues by \$2,959,881 and Decrease Expenditures by \$29,750,654 for a Total Net Increase in Fund Balance of \$32,710,535 – ACTION

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

There was no public comment.

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

The motion was approved unanimously.

10. Final Report of the Late Night Transportation Working Group – INFORMATION

Liz Brisson, Senior Transportation Planner, and Ben Van Houten of the Office of Economic and Workforce Development, presented the item.

Chair Waddling asked whether the survey contained information about how late night transportation needs varied among residents who lived in different parts of San Francisco and the region. Ms. Brisson said that the survey was an opt-in that represented a population of individuals who cared about late night transportation issues. She added that the survey included home zip code and that the data set was available for anyone wishing to do additional analysis and cross-tabs.

Jacqueline Sachs asked whether any Muni operators participated in the Working Group, noting that the 3-Jackson changes that occurred during the Transit Effectiveness Project were problematic. Ms. Brisson said that the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency had participated in the working group, but not a Muni operator in particular. She added that this phase of work had not done any detailed service planning, but in implementing the follow-on recommendation to consider refreshing late night bus service that a Muni operator could be invited to participate.

Santiago Lerma asked whether a lot of people rode the existing late night Alameda-Contra Costa County Transit District (AC) buses. Ms. Brisson said as part of the Late Night Working Group effort transit ridership data had been summarized, and that while she did not have it readily available she could forward it to Mr. Lerma and other interested CAC members. Mr. Van Houten added that as a part of the Bay Area Rapid Transit-AC Transit late night service pilot, ridership would be evaluated mid-way to inform next steps for the pilot's conclusion.

There was no public comment.

11. Improving West Side Strategic Analysis Report – INFORMATION

Ryan Greene-Roesel, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

John Larson asked how the West Side would be defined. Ms. Greene-Roesel indicated that although the Strategic Analysis Report (SAR) was initiated by Commissioner Tang, it would address more than just the Sunset District. She said Commissioner Tang was interested in the committee's feedback on how to define the boundaries. Mr. Larson added that he would be interested in seeing District 7 included in the analysis. He said that the 19th Avenue Transit Project illustrated a lot of the challenges in the area, which included intermodal connections and service frequency issues. He said light rail down Sloat Avenue had been considered in the past, and could be considered again along with bus rapid transit. He asked whether focus groups would be held. Ms. Greene-Roesel said that staff intended to suggest that the commissioner convene a working group to meet two to three times during the study, and that other types of focused outreach could be considered.

Brian Larkin asked whether the Richmond District would be included, and that service improvements beyond what was already planned for the Geary Corridor Bus Rapid Transit were needed, especially since it could quickly reach capacity.

Jacqueline Sachs requested that the study examine the 2-Clement route.

Santiago Lerma asked whether a Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) extension to the West Side was being considered. Ms. Greene-Roesel responded that it was not, but could be referenced as part of visioning, and that land use densities were part of the constraint.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, noted that the SAR was happening at the same time

as the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Core Capacity Transit Study examining Muni Metro and BART transbay corridor capacity needs – looking at both rail improvements and shorter term improvements such as expanded bus service. She said that relevant SAR recommendations could potentially be incorporated into the Core Capacity Transit Study, if, for example, the SAR evaluated express bus connections to downtown or to major transit hubs.

Wells Whitney indicated his support for red transit lanes, and stated that a mix of investments were needed.

There was no public comment.

12. State Road Usage Charge Pilot Program Update – INFORMATION

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

Chair Waddling asked why the State was not just looking at odometer readings. Ms. Crabbe responded that a higher-tech method would allow tracking not just of total miles traveled but also whether those miles were on public roads within the state. She said that using global positioning systems would also allow multi-tiered pricing schemes such as charging less per mile to drive off-peak or on less congested roadways. Ms. Crabbe added that these devices could have co-benefits such as providing safety and congestion alerts.

Wells Whitney said he supported the idea of a road usage charge and saw it as a way to raise money to supplement the gas tax. He proposed that the state should incentivize private sector participation to get the right technology.

Brian Larkin asked why the gas tax couldn't be raised since it was a much simpler way to collect revenue. He noted that the gas tax was performing fine today, and that it would be ten years before there was a significant enough shift in fuel efficiency to seriously degrade revenue. Ms. Crabbe replied that it could take ten years to implement a road usage charge. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, added that several states had recently raised their gas taxes.

John Larson asked how the state could avoid providing a disincentive for low emission vehicles. Ms. Crabbe responded that these drivers would still benefit by not having to pay for fuel. Mr. Larson volunteered to participate in the pilot program.

There was no public comment.

13. Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION

Jacqueline Sachs requested that the CAC receive updates on the Presidio Parkway and Central Subway projects. Ms. Lombardo noted that Central Subway would be on the April CAC agenda and Presidio Parkway would follow shortly thereafter.

Santiago Lerma requested that the CAC receive information on changes proposed for Mission Street as part of Muni Forward.

There was no public comment.

14. Public Comment

During public comment, Roland LeBrun described a video on railroad crossing safety equipment used in Great Britain that he suggested could be used along the Caltrain corridor and asked staff to pass the link along to CAC members.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:12 p.m.