



# DRAFT MINUTES

## CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

June 24, 2015 MEETING

### 1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Chris Waddling at 6:03 p.m. CAC members present were Myla Ablog (entered during item 7), John Larson, Santiago Lerma, Eric Rutledge (entered during item 7), Jacqueline Sachs, Raymon Smith, Peter Tannen, Chris Waddling and Wells Whitney. Transportation Authority staff members present were Amber Crabbe, Cynthia Fong, Chester Fung, Ryan Greene-Roesel, Andrew Heidel, Mike Pickford, Chad Rathmann and Liz Rutman.

### 2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Waddling announced that a special meeting of the CAC had been scheduled for September 2, following the August recess. He said that the recommendations from the May 14 Subcommittee meeting on the CAC's By-Laws were included for information as Item 6, and that they would be included as an action item at the next regular CAC meeting. He also said that staff would provide a look ahead of allocation requests for the next CAC meeting. (Staff later clarified that the look ahead would be sent out in August because the July CAC meeting had been cancelled.)

Jacqueline Sachs said that her term on the CAC would expire in July but that she planned to seek reappointment.

There was no public comment.

### Consent Calendar

3. Approve the Minutes of the May 27, 2015 Meeting – ACTION
4. Citizens Advisory Committee Appointments – INFORMATION
5. State and Federal Legislative Update – INFORMATION
6. Update of Citizens Advisory Committee By-Laws – INFORMATION

John Larson requested that page ten of the May 27 CAC minutes be amended to record him asking a question, rather than John Morrison.

There was no public comment on the Consent Calendar.

Raymon Smith moved to approve the Consent Calendar, seconded by Santiago Lerma.

The Consent Calendar was approved as amended by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Larson, Lerma, Sachs, Smith, Tannen, Waddling and Whitney

Absent: CAC Members Ablog, Larkin, Morrison and Rutledge

### End of Consent Calendar

**7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Authorize the Executive Director to Execute a Partial Release of the Transportation Authority's Agreement for Quitclaim of Interest in Portions of 77-79 Natoma Street, 564 Howard Street, and 568 Howard Street Parcels To Be Sold as Part of Parcel F by the Transbay Joint Powers Authority – ACTION**

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

Santiago Lerma asked for confirmation that the properties in question were currently being used for construction activities, rather than as part of the facility, and that they would be sold to finance the project. Ms. Fong replied that there was a map illustrating the locations on page 51 of the meeting packet.

Amber Crabbe, Assistant Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, noted that staff from Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA) had not yet arrived to provide information on the item.

Chair Waddling moved to continue the item until the arrival of TJPA staff, seconded by John Larson.

The motion was approved unanimously.

**Chair Waddling resumed Item 7 after Item 8.**

Ms. Fong restated Mr. Lerma's earlier question regarding the location of the parcels. Sara Gigliotti, Chief Financial Officer at TJPA, confirmed that the parcels were currently being used for construction staging. She added that TJPA had always planned to sell the parcels.

Chair Waddling asked whether the sale of the parcels would close the project's funding gap. Ms. Gigliotti responded that it would depend on the bids received, but that the sale would go a long way toward closing the funding gap, and that they would know more come September.

John Larson said that he had read that the sale was originally supposed to fund phase two of the project, but that now the funds would be used for phase one. Ms. Gigliotti responded that originally the land wasn't anticipated to be available until phase two, but that the contractor would be finished using the parcels earlier than expected so TJPA wanted to take advantage of the real estate market by holding the sale sooner.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun said that the rail connection to the terminal in phase two had been fully funded three years ago, but that increased costs in phase one had reduced funding for phase two. He said that other routes under consideration for the downtown extension conflicted with California Streets and Highways Code 30914.22, which he said were required to make a future rail connection to the East Bay.

Eric Rutledge moved to approve this item, seconded by Santiago Lerma.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Larson, Lerma, Rutledge, Sachs, Tannen, Waddling and Whitney

Abstained: CAC Member Smith

Absent: CAC Members Larkin and Morrison

**8. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Allocation of \$38,780,932 in Prop K funds, with Conditions, and Appropriation of \$671,920 in Prop K funds, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules – ACTION**

Chad Rathmann, Senior Transportation Planner, and Chester Fung, Principal Transportation

Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Jacqueline Sachs asked, in relation to the Geary Corridor Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) requests, where the bus bulbs would be located, given that the ultimate goal should be to build light rail transit. Mr. Fung replied that the bulbs would be placed in the segments where the buses would continue to operate, including numerous stops in the one-way portions of Geary Boulevard and O'Farrell Street. He noted that while staff agreed that light rail was a future goal, staff saw bus improvements to be within reach in the near term and were working toward implementing them.

Myla Ablog asked, in relation to the Geary Corridor BRT requests, whether more detail on the Japantown-area improvements could be provided to the CAC. Mr. Fung replied that a presentation recently provided to the Japantown Task Force included that detail and that he would provide that presentation to the CAC.

Wells Whitney asked whether the bulb-outs described under the Geary, 19th Avenue, and Lombard requests would be built in a travel lane or a parking lane. Mr. Fung replied that all of those bulb-outs would be installed in parking lanes.

Peter Tannen asked about the location of the one-block bike lane described under the Geary Phase 2 request. Mr. Fung replied that it would be located between Masonic and Presidio Avenues and would close the gap in the bicycle network's two parallel routes in the area to the north and south of Geary Boulevard.

Santiago Lerma asked whether the Geary Corridor BRT project would be light rail ready. Mr. Fung replied that the project would in some ways bring the corridor closer to rail ready, by reconfiguring the street and making it easier for a bigger re-design for rail could be made later, and by proposing a bus stop spacing that was closer to rail spacing than the current spacing.

Mr. Tannen asked why the 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue project was transitioning from the Transportation Authority to San Francisco Public Works (SFPW).

Liz Rutman, Senior Engineer, replied that the project had been initiated by the Transportation Authority as a bulb-out project but it was later incorporated into the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA's) Transit Effectiveness Project, now known as Muni Forward, and that SFPW was leading the design and implementation of the project. Ms. Rutman said project management was being transferred at the end of the current phase with California Department of Transportation project approval.

Mr. Tannen asked, regarding the Geneva-Harney BRT request, why San Mateo County and Caltrain had withdrawn funding from the Bayshore Station Study.

Amber Crabbe, Assistant Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, responded that there were some coordination issues with the other agencies and that they decided to disengage in the project, but that it was anticipated that they would participate in later phases of the Geneva-Harney BRT project.

Ms. Sachs asked whether the paratransit request would procure new vehicles in addition to funding operations.

Ariel Espiritu Santo, Capital Budget Lead at SFMTA, replied that the requested funds were for operations and that SFMTA had separately requested funds for vehicle procurements.

Chair Waddling asked for clarification regarding the Geneva-Harney BRT request, on whether San Mateo County and Caltrain would be participating in the next phase of work, considering that the City of Brisbane had refused to participate in a separate study of the Bayshore Caltrain

Station. Mr. Fung replied that Brisbane had communicated disagreement with San Francisco's recent proposal to consider moving the Bayshore Caltrain Station to the north. He noted that the San Francisco Mayor's Office had reached out to Brisbane to discuss the concerns raised, and that the Transportation Authority would reach out to coordinate with Brisbane during the next phase of the Geneva-Harney BRT project.

Santiago Lerma asked, regarding the Geary Corridor BRT project, how much of the ultimate goal was anticipating an eventual light rail line. Mr. Fung replied that the Geary Corridor BRT project would make it easier to implement light rail in the future because the bus-specific changes to the roadway would not be too significant. He also said that the stop spacing for the BRT project would be similar to what would be designed for a light-rail line.

Eric Rutledge said that he supported the Lombard Street Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program and looked forward to changes that would speed up the 28 bus line. He said he had noticed many people crossing Lombard Street between the Chestnut and Union Streets commercial districts and that it could really use the pedestrian improvements. He also asked for clarification of the schedule for the environmental phase and construction phase activities.

Craig Raphael, Transportation Planner at SFMTA, said that they were moving forward with the design phase of the project prior to environmental clearance, but that no construction would occur until the environmental document was completed. He said that the proposed near-term construction items should be environmentally cleared by the fall.

During public comment, Ed Mason asked which general obligation bonds SFMTA would use for the Geary Corridor BRT project. Ms. Espiritu Santo replied that the most recent voter-approved bonds would be used.

Roland Lebrun said that the location of the Bayshore Caltrain station was important to the Caltrain Baby Bullet service and that agencies were focusing too much on whether the station was in their own jurisdiction.

Wells Whitney moved to approve this item, seconded by Peter Tannen.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Larson, Lerma, Rutledge, Sachs, Tannen, Waddling and Whitney

Abstained: CAC Member Smith

Absent: CAC Members Larkin and Morrison

**9. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Award of a Two-Year Contract to AECOM Technical Services, Inc. in an Amount Not to Exceed \$400,000 for Planning and Engineering Services for the San Francisco Freeway Corridor Management Study Phase 2, and Authorizing the Executive Director to Negotiate Contract Payment Terms and Non-Material Contract Terms and Conditions – ACTION**

Andrew Heidel, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

During public comment, Ed Mason asked how the Freeway Corridor Management Study (FCMS) would integrate with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC's) project that was exploring potential express lanes, express buses, and park-and-ride lots. Mr. Heidel replied that the FCMS would take a more detailed look than the MTC study, and that those were among the ideas to be considered.

Wells Whitney moved to approve this item, seconded by Myla Ablog.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Larson, Lerma, Rutledge, Sachs, Smith, Tannen, Waddling and Whitney

Absent: CAC Members Larkin and Morrison

#### **10. Shuttle Program Update – INFORMATION**

Ryan Greene-Roesel, Senior Transportation Planner, and Hank Willson, Principal Analyst with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), presented the item.

Chair Waddling said that the shuttles were an emotionally charged topic, but that the presentation answered most of the questions he had.

Wells Whitney asked for an estimate of how many automobiles each commuter shuttle bus actually removed from city streets. Mr. Willson replied that SFMTA was collecting shuttle rider surveys as part of the program evaluation which asked about how many riders would have otherwise driven. Mr. Whitney asked if Mr. Willson had an estimate of the number of individuals commuting per day. Mr. Willson replied that there were roughly 35,000 boardings per day, including intra-city shuttles, and that the Commuter Shuttle Pilot Program was receiving boarding data from shuttle providers.

Myla Ablog asked whether the data being gathered from the Commuter Shuttle Pilot Program would inform the design and environmental review for projects on Van Ness Avenue. Mr. Willson replied that SFMTA would be sharing the shuttle data to inform project development on Van Ness Avenue and elsewhere.

Jacqueline Sachs asked if the pilot program took into account the need to stop shuttles from negatively impacting passengers boarding Muni buses on wheelchair ramps. Mr. Willson replied that the shuttle drivers had been instructed to stay out of the way of Muni buses, which was a condition in the agreement they signed to receive their permit. He said in addition, SFMTA had extended white zones in some areas to reduce conflicts with Muni, and in other areas the shuttles had been assigned to Muni stops with less Muni activity. Ms. Sachs asked what the current charge was for the shuttle operators, and Mr. Willson replied that the charge was \$3.55 per stop event, and would increase to \$3.67 in July.

Chair Waddling asked if any thought had been given to designing a route system for the shuttle buses after the pilot. Mr. Willson replied that it would be considered after the pilot program evaluation was complete, and that they currently provided feedback to shuttle operators about how to minimize the impacts of their routes. Mr. Waddling also asked if more than just Muni drivers were being surveyed (e.g. taxi drivers, private vehicle drivers). Mr. Willson replied that the plan only included surveying Muni drivers, focusing on the Muni zones.

Eric Rutledge asked if shuttle drivers would be incorporated into the Large Vehicle Training Program as part of the Vision Zero initiative. Mr. Willson replied that once the video was ready shuttle drivers would be required to complete the training.

During public comment, Christine Rogers said that shuttles had increased traffic on 26<sup>th</sup> Street in Noe Valley where she lived. She asked whether SFMTA was considering modifying shuttle sizes or routes (specifically, a hub and spoke route system) to reduce impacts to neighborhoods. Lastly, Ms. Rogers inquired if members of the public had access to the shuttle GPS data. Mr. Willson replied that SFMTA was considering the rightsizing of buses, but also noted that to the extent that buses were full, then smaller buses would mean more buses, and that a hub and

spoke system had been considered but not found to be promising. He added that GPS data would be shared with the public once ready.

Ed Mason said that the Alemany Farmers' Market at the intersection of US 101 and I-280 could serve as a hub and have smaller neighborhood buses serve it. Mr. Mason also underscored the importance of a regional express bus system since the shuttle buses returned to San Francisco empty. He also urged the city to consider a franchise fee for shuttles, and noted that South Bay cities were not building their fair share of housing. Lastly, he noted that shuttle buses were operating on steep streets like Castro and Noe Streets, and called for a full public process once the new information was available.

Roland Lebrun said that the shuttles must be allowed to use bus lanes, noting that in London the transit lanes were used by many different types of users, and called for automatic passenger counters on shuttle buses to ensure there was up to date ridership information at all times.

#### **11. Plan Bay Area Update – INFORMATION**

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

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated that he planned to submit a project for consideration.

#### **12. Geneva-Harney Bus Rapid Transit Update – INFORMATION**

Zabe Bent, Project Manager, presented the item.

Chair Waddling asked if it was possible to use Alanna Way in case of a closure or rerouting of Beatty Avenue. Ms. Bent replied that all the roads in the immediate area were subject to changes under Recology's project, which could involve vacating Beatty Avenue and reconfiguring streets adjacent to the site. She said Recology had committed to keep Beatty Avenue open until a replacement could be identified and constructed, but that the timing around changes to Beatty Avenue was still very uncertain.

Jacqueline Sachs asked how the project would benefit public housing residents in Sunnydale and Bayview-Hunter's Point. Ms. Bent replied that the project looked carefully at stop spacing and matched the guidance of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency to ensure that the bus service provided would be accessible but also provide high-quality rapid service to all residents. She said in addition, the project looked at all developments and changes along the corridor to serve existing and future residents' needs. She said the project would create a connection to regional transit hubs that didn't exist today for residents in Sunnydale and Bayview-Hunter's Point, since residents would be able to take one bus to reach the Balboa Park BART Station and Caltrain, and that bus service would be faster and more reliable. Ms. Bent said the project would also include walking and biking improvements, addressing the fact that many residents say they were not currently comfortable walking or biking in the project corridor.

During public comment Roland Lebrun stated that the Bayshore Caltrain Station should move further south. He stated that there weren't problems with Geneva Avenue under this project plan, but that the Bayshore Caltrain Station would not work if it was kept within San Francisco's boundaries. He said that it could be an incredible transit hub and among the best in the region if it were located further south. Ms. Bent replied that the study focused on the near term feasible solutions, and as such assumed that all other infrastructure stayed fixed unless there were already projects planned for implementation by 2020. She added that the Bayshore Caltrain Station was assumed to be fixed over the 2020 horizon.

13. **Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION**

Eric Rutledge stated that this would be his final CAC meeting.

Jacqueline Sachs asked about the status of the study on late night transportation, “The Other 9-to-5”, that had been presented at a previous CAC meeting, since there was no representation from bus drivers. She requested an update on the project that included the perspective of bus drivers and offered to serve on any panel created to address late night transportation.

Amber Crabbe, Assistant Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, said she would follow up with members of the Late Night Transportation Working Group on the study’s next steps.

Peter Tannen said that SPUR would be holding an upcoming forum on the study.

Raymon Smith distributed copies of proposed amendments to the CAC’s By-Laws. He proposed adding a Parliamentarian position to the CAC, which would assist the Chair in conducting the meeting and adhering to the CAC’s operating guidelines and procedures. He said that he had also proposed a change to Article I of the By-Laws to let CAC members know the authority under which the CAC operates. Mr. Smith also said the current By-Laws do not give members instructions on what to do if they will be absent., and proposed requiring members to notify the agency in advance if they will not be able to attend the meeting. He added that all CAC members should be aware of how to conduct a meeting according to Robert’s Rules of Order and should be aware of the requirements under the Brown Act.

Ms. Crabbe said that CAC members were provided proposed amendments in writing to Articles II and III with their materials and asked Mr. Smith to confirm that he proposed an amendment to Article I as well.

Mr. Smith responded that his proposed amendment had been accepted by the Transportation Authority’s legal counsel and should be included in the Subcommittee’s recommendation.

Eric Rutledge asked whether the proposed amendments that Mr. Smith distributed were included in the packet. Chair Waddling responded that they were not, but that they would be included for consideration at the next regular CAC meeting.

John Larson asked whether the proposed amendments from Mr. Smith would be incorporated into the Subcommittee’s recommendation. Chair Waddling responded that the proposed amendments from Mr. Smith would be considered as amendments to the Subcommittee’s recommendation..

Mr. Rutledge asked how the CAC would select a Parliamentarian under Mr. Smith’s proposal. Mr. Smith responded that the selection process would be the same as selecting the Chair and Vice Chair.

There was no public comment.

14. **Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

15. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:22 p.m.