



DRAFT MINUTES

PLANS AND PROGRAMS COMMITTEE

Tuesday, October 20, 2015

1. Roll Call

Chair Tang called the meeting to order at 10:09 a.m. The following members were:

Present at Roll Call: Commissioners Christensen, Farrell, Tang and Yee (4)

Absent at Roll Call: Commissioner Breed (1)

2. Citizens Advisory Committee Report – INFORMATION

Chris Waddling, Chair of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), reported that at its September 30 meeting, the CAC unanimously passed Item 7, the Prop K grouped allocation, and that the CAC had some general questions about the Y-Bike program. He said regarding the Geneva-Harney Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) request, the District 11 CAC representative questioned why service on the 29-bus line was cut when the BRT study showed an increased demand for service, and that the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) said they would respond by the next CAC meeting. Mr. Waddling said the CAC had questions on Item 9 regarding the commuter shuttle program and what would happen when it ended in January, and that SFMTA would hopefully provide an update before the end of the year. He said that regarding Item 10, the CAC had questions regarding the types of trees selected for Van Ness Avenue but that they were assured the trees would be fully sized and would fit well with the BRT system. Lastly he said that the CAC raised concerns regarding the elimination of left-turns on Van Ness Avenue, which was proposed as similar to the 19th Avenue model where left turns were only permitted in a few locations, and that drivers would have to find alternative routes.

There was no public comment.

Consent Calendar

3. Approve the Minutes of the September 15, 2015 Meeting – ACTION

4. Recommend Adopting San Francisco's Project Priorities for the 2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program – ACTION

5. Update on One Bay Area Grant Program Cycle 2 Proposal – INFORMATION

Tilly Chang, Executive Director, commented that after the meeting materials were distributed, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission provided a revised version of the One Bay Area Grant program formula fund and proposed distribution to the various counties. She noted that the San Francisco portion was slightly smaller in this version and that staff would investigate the basis for that change and would provide an update.

There was no public comment.

The Consent Calendar was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Christensen, Farrell, Tang and Yee (4)

Absent: Commissioner Breed (1)

End of Consent Calendar

6. Recommend Appointment of One Member to the Geary Corridor Bus Rapid Transit Citizens Advisory Committee – ACTION

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

Paul Chan spoke to his interest and qualifications in being reappointed to the Geary Corridor Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC).

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Yee moved to recommend reappointment of Paul Chan, seconded by Commissioner Christensen.

The motion to recommend reappointment of Paul Chan to the Geary BRT CAC was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Christensen, Farrell, Tang and Yee (4)

Absent: Commissioner Breed (1)

7. Recommend Allocating \$4,085,233 in Prop K funds, with Conditions, and Appropriating \$54,225 in Prop K funds, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules – ACTION

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

Commissioner Yee asked if the nine schools for the Youth Bicycle Safety Education Classes had been selected. Mr. Rathmann confirmed that they had been selected and were included in the Prop K allocation request form.

Chair Tang commented that the new bicycle wayfinding signs were a great idea given the clutter of the existing signs and would be a huge improvement. She said regarding the Youth Bicycle Safety Education classes, she was pleased that the city departments were working with the contractors to provide the committee with the metrics used, or at the least were working towards providing that in the future. She also commented that the Bayview Moves Van Share pilot seemed interesting and may be replicable elsewhere, and that she would like to see results once the pilot was over.

There was no public comment.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Christensen, Farrell, Tang and Yee (4)

Absent: Commissioner Breed (1)

8. Recommend Approving San Francisco's Advocacy Goals and Objectives and Project List for Plan Bay Area 2040 – ACTION

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

Commissioner Yee asked if the M-Line project on 19th Avenue was included in this list.

Ms. Crabbe confirmed that it was included as a fully-funded capital project which meant that it could start construction by 2021.

There was no public comment.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Christensen, Farrell, Tang and Yee (4)

Absent: Commissioner Breed (1)

9. Recommend Adopting the Transportation Demand Management Partnership Project Final Report Factsheets – ACTION

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

Chair Tang asked about the next steps for this work and whether some of the pilot projects would be made permanent. Ms. Greene-Roesel responded that several new initiatives had grown out of the study, such as a residential outreach pilot program being led by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency and San Francisco Department of the Environment, which would be funded through the Transportation Fund for Clean Air program. She added that there was also work underway to develop a consistent set of requirements for new development.

During public comment, Francisco DaCosta stated the 3rd Street Light Rail was not connected to Balboa Station and that it ended in Visitacion Valley, which was a missed opportunity. He stated that the city's experts, the Mayor, and the Board of Supervisors were not working closely enough with neighborhoods to understand their transportation needs.

Commissioner Christensen asked about next steps for Transportation Demand Management (TDM) now that the TDM Partnership Project was wrapping up. Ms. Greene-Roesel responded that work was planned in several areas, including the new residential outreach program; a pilot program to shift behavior using travel incentives; and work to more systematically include TDM requirements in new development.

Commissioner Christensen asked how the study's findings would shape future programs, particularly the finding that several of the employer outreach projects did not result in significant travel behavior change. Ms. Greene-Roesel responded that future voluntary employer outreach programs should focus on employers with a motivated internal champion. She said that for employers with limited interest in transportation issues, programs should offer options for participating without significant time commitments. Commissioner Christensen responded that programs seemed to work well when they filled a gap in the transportation system. She said that some private shuttle services were serving transportation needs that were not being well served by public transportation.

Tilly Chang, Executive Director, responded that it was important that the public sector provide guidance to the private sector regarding desired outcomes for services. She reiterated that the TDM Partnership Project found that programs could be more successful when there was a dedicated liaison in the neighborhood, and stated that the city should pursue efficient ways to partner with groups of employers.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Christensen, Farrell, Tang and Yee (4)

Absent: Commissioner Breed (1)

10. Major Capital Projects Update – Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project – INFORMATION

Bob Masys, Senior Engineer, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Commissioner Christensen asked about coordination with other projects, particularly the Polk Street project, in order to minimize disruption. She also asked about public outreach to keep residents and business owners as well informed as possible.

Mr. Masys responded that the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and San Francisco Public Works were jointly managing both of the projects, and that they were closely coordinating schedules of work to minimize traffic impacts. He also noted that SFMTA made public communications a very important part of the program, and had assigned a full-time Public Information Officer who would build on the successes of outreach from the Central Subway project. Mr. Masys acknowledged that construction would not be the most pleasant period, but would be worth the end result.

Commissioner Farrell asked about any obstacles that could delay the start of construction beyond spring 2016, and what the project was doing to minimize the 3-year duration of construction. Mr. Masys noted two major milestones prior to the start of construction which were actively being pursued: obtaining final California Department of Transportation permits, and reaching agreement with the contractor on a Guaranteed Maximum Price and baseline schedule. He noted the extensive utility work as one reason for the 3-year duration, but stated that bundling this work meant only digging in the street once. He said that maintaining traffic flow and minimizing construction noise at night in residential zones were key constraints that would lengthen the overall duration of construction, but that it was important to be sensitive to the residents and businesses in each part of the corridor. Mr. Masys stated that the project had a lot of public support, and that he hoped for patience from the public as the project team would do its best to balance duration and disruption.

During public comment, Francisco DaCosta stated he had been involved in the Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit project for the past 10 years, and asked to check the technical capacity of the engineers working on it, as well as the amount of public meetings that would focus on work in specific areas. He cautioned that over ten private projects would be built along the corridor in the same timeframe, including the California Pacific Medical Center. He also questioned the effect of construction on traffic on neighboring streets and nearby transit lines.

11. Introduction of New Items – INFORMATION

There was no public comment.

12. Public Comment

During public comment, Francisco DaCosta stated that for the last 25 years he had been involved with transportation issues but that he had not been coming to these meetings lately because there were no timelines or goals. He said many projects were seeing large cost increases, such as the Central Subway which started at a cost of \$600 million and was now in the billions. He said there was too much congestion on the city's streets which was leading to health hazards such as mercury and lead particulates spewing into the air but was not being discussed at these meetings. Mr. DaCosta said the former Executive Director for the Transportation Authority, José Luis Moscovich, used to put a lot of effort into the projects and allowed debate, but that

there wasn't any meaningful debate and dialogue now. He said there were discussions about building 30,000 homes in areas that were prone to liquification and flooding which would not work. He said the city was not paying attention to its housing element or general management plan, and did not have a stellar transportation program.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:08 a.m.