



# DRAFT MINUTES

## CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, December 2, 2015

### 1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Christopher Waddling at 6:14 p.m. CAC members present were Myla Ablog, Brian Larkin, John Larson, Jacqueline Sachs, Peter Sachs, Peter Tannen and Wells Whitney. Transportation Authority staff members present were Michelle Beaulieu, Amber Crabbe, Anna LaForte, Maria Lombardo, Mike Pickford, Steve Rehn, Michael Schwartz and Luis Zurinaga (Consultant).

### 2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Waddling had no items to report.

There was no public comment.

### Consent Calendar

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

#### 4. Approve the 2016 CAC Meeting Schedule – ACTION

#### 6. Adopt a Motion of Support for Reprogramming \$67,265 in One Bay Area Grant Cycle 1 Funds from San Francisco Public Works' ER Taylor Elementary Safe Routes to School Project to the Chinatown Broadway Street Design Project – ACTION

Chair Waddling requested that Item 5 be removed from the Consent Calendar and considered separately as requested by staff.

There was no public comment on the Consent Calendar.

Wells Whitney moved to approve the Consent Calendar, seconded by John Larson.

The Consent Calendar was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Larkin, Larson, P. Sachs, Tannen, Waddling and Whitney

Absent: CAC Member J. Sachs

### End of Consent Calendar

### 7. 2016 CAC Nominations – INFORMATION

Chair Waddling opened the floor for nominations for the Chair seat.

Wells Whitney nominated Chris Waddling for Chair. There were no further nominations.

Chair Waddling opened the floor for nominations for the Vice Chair seat

Wells Whitney nominated Peter Sachs for Vice Chair. There were no further nominations.

There was no public comment.

**5. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Approval of the 2016 State and Federal Legislative Program – ACTION**

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, thanked Chair Waddling to removing this item from consent. She explained that there was a revised version of the proposed 2016 State and Federal Legislative Program being distributed. The new and improved version, she continued, retained the legislative goals and objectives detailed in the longer version in the packet, but was a significant shortened and more user-friendly version as a result of Michelle Beaulieu's, (Transportation Planner) efforts. Ms. Beaulieu presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Wells Whitney thanked staff for providing a much more accessible format. Jacqueline Sachs asked if the recent issues with the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge would have an impact on the I-80/Yerba Buena Island Ramps Improvement project. Ms. Lombardo stated that the recent issues were not anticipated to impact this project. Myla Ablog thanked staff for simplifying the document but said the specific legislation citations included in the previous version were helpful and asked if they could be included. Ms. Lombardo stated that the Legislative Program was meant to be a guiding principles document and said that staff would continue to bring a matrix of specific bills that the Transportation Authority was tracking to the CAC each month, which contained the information Ms. Ablog had asked about.

During public comment, Jerry Cauthen noted that staff referenced the Geary Corridor Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Van Ness Avenue BRT, and Central Subway projects specifically. He asked why the Caltrain Downtown Extension was not included in the objectives related to Federal Core Capacity, New and Small Starts funds. Ms. Beaulieu replied that seeking full funding for the project was listed under the High-Speed Rail item in the state portion of the program. Anna Laforte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, stated that staff would also add the project to the aforementioned federal legislative goal, as well.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Larkin, Larson, J. Sachs, P. Sachs, Tannen, Waddling and Whitney

**8. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Allocation of \$638,477 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedule – ACTION**

Mike Pickford, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

John Larson stated that as a frequent user of Sloat Boulevard, any project to improve pedestrian safety was a benefit, as the street seemed dangerous for pedestrians. Mr. Larson asked for a more detailed explanation of HAWK beacons. Mr. Pickford explained the function of HAWK beacons and said that they have higher rates of driver compliance than other beacons.

Peter Sachs asked if drivers could be ticketed for running a red light at a HAWK beacon and why Sloat Boulevard was a state highway. Marcy Camacho, Assistant Project Manager at San Francisco Public Works (SFPW), responded that running a red light presented by a HAWK beacons was ticketable, but said she could not answer why Sloat Boulevard was a state highway. Jacqueline Sachs asked if there was a comprehensive analysis or plan to slow traffic on Sloat Boulevard, as recent speed limit reductions had not been very effective. Ms. Camacho responded that a repaving project headed by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) could include curb bulbouts and additional HAWK beacons and noted that Caltrans would be discussing these potential features at an upcoming community meeting. Mr. Sachs asked if

buffered bicycle facilities or zig-zag pavement markings before crosswalks were also being considered. Ms. Camacho responded that she did not have that information and encouraged people to bring these ideas up at the community meeting.

Brian Larkin asked if there was any possibility to recover the bid bond amount from the initial low bidder who withdrew. Rachel Alonso, Transportation Finance Analyst with SFPW, responded that she would follow up with SFPW contract management and provide a response.

Chair Wadding asked if there was an educational component to help drivers understand HAWK beacons. Ms. Camacho responded that no formal education would be conducted, but that she had already distributed links to some instructional online videos to neighborhood groups in close proximity to Sloat Boulevard. She added that she had not heard additional requests from community members.

Mr. Wadding asked how construction of the Polk Street project would be coordinated with the Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit project since the schedules overlap. Craig Raphael, Transportation Planner at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), responded that there had been extensive coordination between the Polk Street project team and the Van Ness BRT project team on this issue to try and minimize construction impacts. Mr. Wadding asked how the backlog of traffic calming projects was being addressed. Mr. Raphael responded that SFMTA was actively addressing projects in the backlog and was funding those projects with revenue bonds, which need to be spent within a certain timeframe. He said that SFMTA anticipates making a Prop K request in 2016 and would be happy to bring a status report on implementation of the traffic calming backlog at that time.

During public comment, Roland LeBrun noted that there was a process to request that Caltrans relinquish control of state highways to local entities, which could offer cities more flexibility in street design. Mr. LeBrun also noted how zig-zag pavement markings were in place in London. He said that another marking called a yellow box was being considered in advance of railroad crossing stop lines which would be useful for Caltrain, although this could require changes to the streets and highway code.

Peter Tannen moved to approve the item, seconded by John Larson.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Larkin, Larson, J. Sachs, P. Sachs, Tannen, Wadding and Whitney

**9. Adopt a Motion of Support for Approval of the 2015 San Francisco Congestion Management Program – ACTION**

Drew Cooper, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Myla Ablog asked if enforcement was considered as part of the congestion management analysis to take into account issues such as double parking. Mr. Cooper replied that the report did not explicitly look at those factors, but the effects from those factors were reflected in the data.

Peter Tannen noted that SB743 repealed using automobile LOS as a CEQA threshold and ask if there was a move to eliminate LOS from the CMP. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy, stated that CMP law was from 1989 and efforts were underway to update it and bring it in line with new policies like SF375, SB 743, etc. She noted, however, that even if LOS isn't use as a CEQA threshold, it is still a useful tool for measuring traffic congestion.

Chair Wadding asked if the Transportation Authority would be able to determine the maximum speed of Muni vehicles before installing “red carpets” (transit only lanes). Mr. Cooper replied

that he was not aware of that type of analysis, and observed that the study included travel and dwell times which affected the reported transit speed but did not track light-rail or off-street vehicle speeds.

Jacqueline Sachs asked why off-peak hours were not measured. Mr. Cooper replied that the Transportation Authority did not currently monitor off-peak performance as part of the Congestion Management Program because it was not required by state law. He added that other studies, including the Late Night Transportation Plan, did consider off-peak hours. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, added that off peak data was often the focus of studies like the Late Night Transportation Plan that considered special market segments. She added that BART has ridership data showing very extended peak periods and other data shows travel markets which experience weekend or other non-traditional peak hour periods.

Peter Tannen asked what could be done to further improve Muni performance during morning and afternoon peak hours. Mr. Cooper replied that projects like Muni Forward and the implementation of red transit-only lanes would increase the speed of Muni service. He added that the Transportation Authority was interested in obtaining other metrics to better understand these issues.

During public comment, Jerry Cauthen noted that it could be difficult to increase Muni vehicle speeds if projections for increased numbers of automobile trips in San Francisco come to pass. He also noted that the trend of reducing automobile capacity generally results in worsened conditions for transit. Mr. Clausen also recognized the Transportation Authority for introducing the idea of congestion pricing, but noted it was shot down, in part, due to misperceptions about the purpose and use of the funds. He suggested that a congestion pricing program should be reintroduced, but

Peter Sachs moved to approve the item, seconded by Wells Whitney.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Larkin, Larson, J. Sachs, P. Sachs, Tannen, Waddling and Whitney

**10. Update on the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's Commuter Shuttle Program – INFORMATION**

Hank Willson, Principal Analyst at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), presented the item.

Jacqueline Sachs asked how commuter shuttles would be coordinated with Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). Mr. Willson replied the shuttles would likely be routed away from Van Ness Avenue and onto parallel corridors both during and after construction of the BRT line. Ms. Sachs asked about the status of legal challenges to the shuttle program. Mr. Willson said that he believed that a judge might release a ruling on a pending challenge in January 2016.

Myla Ablog stated that she agreed with community members who have called for the shuttle program's environmental impacts to be reviewed under CEQA.

Peter Tannen asked whether increased enforcement and SFMTA project management would be funded by the fees collected from shuttle operators. Mr. Willson responded that the fees would cover the cost of enforcement and project management and that SFMTA intended to increase enforcement.

John Larson asked whether there had been a study of non-participating shuttles and specifically whether there were estimates of how many non-participating shuttles were operating. Mr.

Willson replied that non-participating shuttles had not been studied as part of the program because they had not submitted data. He added that many of the non-participating shuttles appeared to be intra-city shuttles and that many seemed to be long-standing operations that had well-established operating patterns. Mr. Willson noted that he wasn't aware of a good estimate of the number of non-participating shuttles.

Chair Waddling mentioned that SFMTA had received many specific complaints through a monitoring system it had set up. He acknowledged a member of the audience, Edward Mason, who had submitted a large number of complaints regarding violations he had observed.

During public comment, Roland LeBrun stated that the shuttles program was exemplary. He asked about daily ridership on the shuttles and whether shuttles would be permitted to use BRT lanes on Van Ness Avenue. Mr. Willson replied that there were approximately 17,000 shuttle boardings per day, so there were an estimated 8,500 shuttle riders. He said SFMTA was not planning to allow shuttles to use the BRT lanes.

Edward Mason stated that even after 16 months of operating the pilot shuttle program he was still observing violations. He said that violations not recorded in August and September before SFMTA set up the official reporting line were about 40 per month, and that there were violations missed outside the operating hours of white zones. He said that the shuttles were being used by less than 1% of the population of the city and that reduction in vehicle miles traveled was offset by fuel wasted by the shuttles as they dead headed back to their origin. He said that even though 47% of shuttle riders said they would drive alone if shuttles were not an option, the fact that 53% said that they would find use alternate transportation was significant. Mr. Mason noted that pavement damage from the shuttles could be observed on steep streets at 26th Avenue & Noe Street, but that the program was not recouping repair costs from the shuttles. He also said that the communities where the employers providing the shuttles were located – like Mountain View - should share their property tax revenue with communities where the shuttle riders live.

Jerry Cauthen said that he liked the idea of collecting many people in larger vehicles, and asked how many buses it would actually take to accommodate the number of riders, since it was only about 8,500. He said that with future growth there could be more shuttles and that the shuttles should not be allowed to interfere with Muni.

Jordan Lindsey asked whether SFMTA would apply a similar system to regulate tour and charter buses. Mr. Willson replied that SFMTA was not currently planning to and noted that there were many differences between how shuttles and tour buses operated.

**11. Overview of the San Francisco Long Range Transportation Planning Program – INFORMATION**

Michael Schwartz, Principal Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff presentation. Immediately following the presentation Item 12 was called for a joint discussion on both items.

**12. Southeast/Southwest Sector Long Range Transit Planning – INFORMATION**

Michael Schwartz, Principal Transportation Planner, introduced the item and Peter Albert, Interim Planning Director at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), who presented the item.

Peter Sachs noted the potential benefits of the M-line Core Capacity Project improvement, observing that this was really a transformative project for 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue with the potential to take the streetcar out of the middle of 19<sup>th</sup>. He said that public support for such projects would grow

with increased awareness and understanding of the benefits and opportunities afforded by such a project. Mr. Albert concurred and added that in addition to the benefits to the southeast sector, this project would significantly relieve capacity constraints for the entire metro system. He emphasized that we can never really do projects in isolation in San Francisco, but need to also look at the whole picture as is being done on the M-Line.

Chair Waddling said he hoped that lessons learned from the Mission Bay Loop project, which is currently under a legal injunction, would be carried forward into future planning efforts. Jacqueline Sachs clarified that the need for the Mission Bay Loop was reinstated as part of the T-Third project before approval of that project.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun said he felt that prospects for the 22<sup>nd</sup> Street Caltrain Station and the Oakdale Station were not looking good. On the up side, he suggested that all the changes happening may make it worth re-looking at the Paul Avenue Station.

Edward Mason asked if transportation projects would be funded through the Priority Development Area (PDA) programs or the Transportation Sustainability Fee (TSF), noting that the latter did not fund the entirety of the impacts according to the nexus study. Mr. Albert responded that projects within PDAs were eligible for regional funding while the TSF is a citywide development fee. He said the two funding sources are complementary.

### **13. Update on Cost Review of Transbay Transit Center and Downtown Extension – INFORMATION**

Luis Zurinaga, Consultant to the Transportation Authority, presented the item using the slides included in the agenda packet.

Peter Sachs commented that proceeds from the sale of Parcel F were originally intended for the Caltrain Downtown Extension rather than the Transbay Transit Center. He said future updates should show revenues along with costs to identify the funding gaps. He added that the BART pedestrian connector should not be dropped from the project, as it could be an important factor in increasing Caltrain ridership. Mr. Zurinaga clarified his recommendation was not to eliminate the pedestrian connector but to defer it to a proposed third phase if it isn't possible to secure all the funding needed at once, recognizing the very large funding gap for the extension and that the connector isn't essential for day one operations.

Jacqueline Sachs asked about the \$51 million missing items line in the revised cost estimate. Mr. Zurinaga responded that these were scope elements that should have been included in the original budget, such as a temporary structure to keep traffic moving while construction continues below street level and utility relocation. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, underscored that the end goal was to extend Caltrain service to the Transbay Transit Center. The cost review raises some considerations that are worth further evaluation and, she noted, there are other studies underway such as the Planning Department's Railyard Boulevard Study that is looking at alternate construction methodologies and alignments for the extension.

During public comment, Roland LeBrun said he regretted that there had not been time to discuss the overall scope of the project. He asked why the Central Subway, a light rail extension of approximately equal length, could be delivered for less than half the cost of the Caltrain Downtown Extension.

Jerry Cauthen said that the connection to Market Street was a very important part of the project, and that even though the trains were first priority, the city should do everything possible to identify funding to construct the connector.

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

There was no public comment.

**15. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**16. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.