



DRAFT MINUTES

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, October 26, 2016 Meeting

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Waddling called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

CAC members present were Myla Ablog, John Larson, Santiago Lerma, Jacqueline Sachs, Peter Tannen, Chris Waddling, Shannon Wells-Mongiovi and Bradley Wiedmaier.

Transportation Authority staff members present were Andrew Heidel, Jeff Hobson, Seon Joo Kim, Anna LaForte, Maria Lombardo, Mike Pickford, Michael Schwartz and Steve Stamos.

2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Waddling reported that at the special September CAC meeting, Myla Ablog had requested an update on the results of the California Road Charge Pilot Program but that the results would not be available until spring 2017. He said that in response to Peter Tannen's request at the May CAC meeting for a presentation on Muni bus and train bunching and potential solutions, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency staff would give a presentation at the November 30 CAC meeting, in addition to anticipated presentations by others on the draft The Other 9-to-5 Study, Central Subway, the Geary Bus Rapid Transit Environment Impact Report, and the Commuter Shuttle Hub Study.

Chair Waddling stated that the CAC would also hold its annual nominations for Chair and Vice Chair for the 2017 calendar year at the November 30 CAC meeting. Lastly, he noted that staff was still in the process of organizing a tour of the Transbay Transit Center likely in early December and would reach out to CAC members regarding their availability.

There was no public comment.

Consent Calendar

3. **Approve the Minutes of the September 28, 2016 Meeting – ACTION**
4. **Adopt a Motion of Support for Acceptance of the Audit Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2016 – ACTION**
5. **Internal Accounting and Investment Report for the Three Months Ending September 30, 2016 – INFORMATION**
6. **State and Federal Legislative Update – INFORMATION**
7. **San Francisco Input on the Plan Bay Area 2040 Draft Preferred Scenario – INFORMATION**
8. **Progress Report for the Van Ness Avenue Buss Rapid Transit Project – INFORMATION**

During public comment, Edward Mason asked regarding Item 7 how different perspectives held

by other jurisdictions would impact San Francisco's position as expressed in the joint letter to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission currently being developed in collaboration with Oakland and San Jose. He continued by noting that it was difficult to get a clear understanding of some of the issues given the way the materials were presented.

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

The Consent Calendar was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Larson, Lerma, J. Sachs, Tannen, Waddling and Wells-Mongiovi.

Absent: CAC Members Hogue, Larkin, P. Sachs and Wiedmaier

End of Consent Calendar

9. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Allocation of \$3,149,000 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, for Three Requests and Appropriation of \$100,000 in Prop K Funds for One Request, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules, and a Commitment to Allocate \$325,000 in Prop K Funds – ACTION

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, presented the item per staff memorandum.

Chair Waddling asked what outreach would be done when the cable cars were shutdown. Ms. LaForte responded that a preliminary communications plan was included in the allocation request. Craig Raphael, Senior Transportation Planner at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), said that the outreach plan included website and social media posts.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi asked whether there would be revenue loss as a result of shutting down the cable cars and whether this was reflected in the allocation request. Ms. LaForte said that safety and reliability improvements would help preserve the system to the benefit of long-term revenue generation and that any change in revenues due to service disruption would be reflected in SFMTA's operating budget rather than the allocation request form.

John Larson said he was happy to see traffic calming at the intersection of Elk and Sussex Streets and asked what a speed cushion was. Ms. LaForte explained that, as distinct from speed humps, speed cushions had cuts in them that allowed buses and fire trucks to pass through more easily.

Jacqueline Sachs asked what the rationale was for proposing traffic islands on streets carrying major bus lines, such as California Street and Euclid Avenue. Becca Homa, Transportation Planner at SFMTA, responded that traffic islands generally reduced vehicle speeds and provided pedestrian refuges for crossing. She said that on Euclid Avenue, the traffic islands were proposed in response to high vehicle speeds and supported by the community in the area. She said the proposed traffic islands were actually on the cross streets rather than on California Street and would not interfere with transit.

Myla Ablog expressed her support for the Vision Zero Ramps Study Phase 2. She said that Bessie Carmichael Elementary School, which was located near freeway ramps in the South of Market area, was very supportive of improving safety in the area.

Chair Waddling asked about SFMTA's plan once the traffic calming "backlog" was complete. Ms. Homa replied that the projects in this request came from prior plans that had covered the entire area and took a long time to be implemented. She said that SFMTA had developed

neighborhood traffic calming projects in smaller groups via the application-based traffic calming system and also pursued speed reduction in school zones and arterials in separate tracks. Chair Waddling asked about the application process. Ms. Homa replied that the application was a few pages and involved gathering signatures from neighboring residents, and that SFMTA analyzed and ranked the submitted applications based on multiple criteria, such as collision history and land use. She said that compared to 25-30 applications in previous years, SFMTA had received 85 applications this year, indicating a growing desire for traffic calming.

Santiago Lerma asked about the difference between a traffic island and traffic circle. Ms. Homa replied that a traffic island was smaller and often used in lieu of stop signs and could offer pedestrian refuge, where as a traffic circle was more elaborate and often included landscaping.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked whether there was a maintenance plan for the cable car equipment in place to ensure the City would not face the same situation in 15 to 30 years. He wondered how much more the City may be paying due to the lack of an ongoing (preventative) maintenance program as opposed to letting assets deteriorate so much that they need full replacement.

Ms. Sachs said that she thought cable car repairs had been rushed into service in advance of the 1984 Democratic National Convention at the Moscone Center.

Mr. Lerma asked why the cable car equipment was being overhauled rather than replaced. Ms. LaForte said that it was likely because cable cars were historic and replacement equipment was not available to procure but that staff would follow up with SFMTA.

John Larson moved to approve the item, seconded by Ms. Ablog.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Larson, Lerma, J. Sachs, Tannen, Waddling and Wells-Mongiovi

Absent: CAC Members Hogue, Larkin, P. Sachs and Wiedmaier

10. Update on Freeway Corridor Management Study – INFORMATION

Andrew Heidel, Senior Transportation Planner, and Liz Rutman, Senior Engineer at the Alameda County Transportation Commission, presented the item per the staff presentation.

Chair Waddling asked whether not having to perform major construction, such as building a new lane, was the reason why San Francisco could expect a more truncated timeline than Alameda County experienced. Mr. Heidel responded that this was one of a number of reasons for the proposed timeline and added that San Francisco also had the advantage of lessons learned from other counties to expedite the process. Shannon Wells-Mongiovi expressed a concern that U.S. 101 might not be wide enough to accommodate an additional lane within the existing roadway.

Ms. Wells-Mongiovi asked whether the Waze application had an impact on how people diverged from freeways to local roads. Mr. Heidel responded that the application caused perceptible impacts on neighborhoods and that while the city could not prevent the public from utilizing it, it could plan to minimize the impacts to neighborhoods. He said that fortunately, there were fewer opportunities in San Francisco for drivers to diverge to straight stretches on local streets that would form attractive alternate routes for congested freeway segments.

Ms. Wells-Mongiovi asked how the study defined peak traffic. Mr. Heidel responded that the study defined the peak by reviewing an entire 24 hours of data for Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and

Thursdays during the spring and measured when the average speed on freeway segments was under 45 mph.

Santiago Lerma asked how much time was saved on the average trip for paid and non-paid lanes, and whether there were benefits for the general purpose lanes. Ms. Rutman said that in Alameda County the average savings was on the order of a few minutes over the 12-mile stretch. She also noted that on an express lane with continuous access, large speed differentials were not desirable because of safety concerns. She noted that some places with physically separated express lanes, such as Highway 237 in Santa Clara County, yielded larger travel time savings. She added that on Highway 680, both the general purpose and express lanes resulted in time savings, but that that after seven years some of the travel time benefits had dwindled compared to pre-construction. She also noted that over time, people had tended to explore other alternatives, including forming carpools and trying new transit options.

Chair Waddling asked if tolls were assessed on a distance basis. Ms. Rutman responded that most express lanes used a distance-based zone setup for people who traveled further to pay more. She stated that exactly how to set up that pricing should depend on the access type. She added that for a continuous access system, pricing could be based on zones of travel, whereas for a closed access system, end-to-end or entrance-to-exit pricing could be applied, though the latter could also incorporate a function of distance travelled.

Chair Waddling asked how Alameda County dealt with income inequality and if there was a low-income entry point. Ms. Rutman responded that for this type of project, an environmental justice assessment was required, and that for Alameda County those assessments had found that both low-income and high-income drivers were willing to pay additional fees to use the lane. She added that low-income travelers tended to form carpools at higher rates, so it tended to even out. She stated that one place that had identified an equity issue was in Southern California. Mr. Heidel stated that there would need to be an equity analysis. He said that most people didn't use the lanes all the time, but rather as a reliable option in the event they had a time-critical destination, such as arriving on time to work or picking up a child from day care. He added that some of the facilities in other locations allowed people to earn toll credit by riding transit.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked what the overall goal of the project was and if it included reducing greenhouse gases. He asserted that this approach would not achieve significant greenhouse gas reduction and therefore other approaches should be considered, for example installing a CO2 monitor at the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge entry to help people make the connection between their actions and CO2 emissions. Chair Waddling asked what types of analysis could be undertaken to determine the greenhouse gas reduction. Mr. Heidel replied that a major factor in reducing greenhouse gas emissions was to move more people in fewer vehicles. He noted that the travel demand model would help inform those impacts at this stage of the project, while a full air quality analysis would be completed as part of the environmental review process.

Mr. Mason asked whether the commuter shuttles would be allowed to use these lanes for free, and whether the city would be undertaking a study to develop a regional public bus system that could use these facilities. Chair Waddling asked whether Samtrans was conducting a study on express buses. Mr. Heidel replied that there was a strong interest in developing an express bus system, and that these lanes would provide a platform to give those express buses a time advantage to make them more competitive.

11. Update on the Subway Master Plan – INFORMATION

Michael Schwartz, Principal Transportation Planner, and Graham Satterwhite, Principal

Transportation Planner at the SFMTA, presented the item.

Chair Waddling asked, in the event of additional subways being built, if BART would be the main subway operator rather than the SFMTA. Mr. Satterwhite responded that governance would be one of the questions to be figured out in the next phase of ConnectSF, the inter-agency long range transportation planning program. He noted that governance was not being considered for the Subway Vision but would need to be part of future decisions. Mr. Schwartz added that one of the issues this study did not try to address was transbay service, and that overall the study was meant to be operator neutral in its analysis.

Chair Waddling asked whether the subway approach would consider underground buses as well as underground rail. Mr. Satterwhite responded that the precise technology question was beyond the scope of the Subway Vision. Mr. Schwartz noted that creative thinking of that nature was needed for visioning exercises that the city was currently undertaking.

John Larson asked whether the two concepts presented, i.e. Concepts A and B, were just for illustrative purposes, or if they were actually screened alternatives. Mr. Schwartz responded that the two networks presented were entirely for illustrative purposes and were not intended to be sample concepts of what a new subway system might look like. He added that the public should not get attached to a full network concept and that the study was primarily seeking feedback on aspects of each network.

Mr. Larson commented that Concept A appeared to place a lot of existing surface rail underground, while Concept B appeared to connect existing subways with new lines, and that Concept B seemed more attractive for that reason. Mr. Larson asked whether tunneling was still one of the most significant challenges of construction, or whether tunneling could be done faster than in the past and therefore other parts of construction would be more challenging. Mr. Satterwhite responded that all phases of subway construction would be difficult and challenging. He said there had been improvements in tunneling, but that construction approaches were not dramatically different than what had been the approach of the recent past.

Jacqueline Sachs recounted her history in being involved in decisions about Geary Boulevard, and noted that Commissioners London Breed and Eric Mar had supported to filling in the underpasses at Fillmore and Masonic Streets. She said she recently went on a site trip which highlighted three alternatives, which included an all surface line, an all subway, or a mix involving a subway line from Market to Laguna Streets and a surface line from Laguna Street all the way to Ocean Beach. She said due to politics at City Hall, the mixed subway and surface line did not get built. Ms. Sachs said that the Muni Short Range Transit Plan concluded that the only way to relieve congestion on Geary Boulevard would be through light-rail service. She recounted the history of the B-line along Geary Boulevard that existed from 1912 to 1956, until the corridor was replaced with bus service. She asked staff to look at the final reports to see that the public wanted lightrail and not bus rapid transit. She noted that Geary light-rail was the only project from the 1989 Prop B transportation sales tax that wasn't included in the 2003 Prop K sales tax. Mr. Schwartz responded that many members of the public were interested in the Geary corridor and encouraged people to participate in the ConnectSF process to ensure their input was documented. Shannon Wells-Mongiopi noted that she located a copy of the final report online that Ms. Sachs referenced and would forward it for distribution to CAC members and staff.

Bradley Wiedmaier asked whether the study looked how to connect other parts of the city independent of existing infrastructure versus following existing routes. Mr. Schwartz responded that the study used the three points of input, including previous studies, public input, and model analysis, to think outside the box of the existing system. He said that for example the

Fillmore/Divisadero to Bayview line performed well in part because it did not have existing service. Mr. Schwartz added that the goal of new subways would also be to provide travel time savings to existing riders in addition to new riders.

Mr. Wiedmaier asked whether the boring equipment from the Central Subway was owned by the SFMTA and whether it could be used widely throughout the city or had been calibrated to the specific soils as part of the Central Subway construction. Mr. Schwartz responded that the SFMTA did not own the tunnel boring machines as part of Central Subway construction and that new ones would need to be obtained to construct new subways.

Ms. Wells-Mongiovi asked whether the study considered trips to recreation centers like the Presidio. Mr. Schwartz said that the model represented destination centers like the Presidio but that it simulated a standard weekday as opposed to weekends where a destination like the Presidio would have a different trip making pattern.

Mr. Larson noted that the only areas that seemed to have higher travel times under Concept B were at San Francisco State University and Park Merced. He said that given the greatest concentration of the middle-income population and seniors, he thought that the study should look at it due to the high reliance on transit. Mr. Schwartz responded by explaining that with subways, people would make tradeoffs in that some people would end up needing to walk farther to get to a faster service when taking the subway versus surface transit.

Mr. Wiedmaier asked whether the study looked at any projected new concentrations of housing. Mr. Schwartz responded that all of the Subway Vision analysis assumed 2040 land use projections. He added that if the study were to move forward with subways, it would take a more careful look at where land use could change in response to higher-levels of transit service.

Santiago Lerma commented that he appreciated the pop-up outreach effort. He said the study did not conduct enough of them, but that he thought they were great and asked that his comments be shared with SFMTA staff.

During public comment, Edward Mason said transportation was really a real estate development project. He said that the city was nearly at one million people and asked if the Subway Vision would increase the population to two million, and said that the study should look at elevated transit in addition to subways. He added that a proposal to put a tunnel under 19th Avenue had previously been considered but that California Assemblyman Tom Ammiano actively worked to make sure the concept was not further developed.

12. Introduction of New Items – INFORMATION

Bradley Wiedmaier asked for information on the impact of the ride sourcing industry and whether 30-Stockton and 45-Union/Stockton Muni stops near the 4th and King Caltrain station had been relocated possibly to give more space to ride sourcing vehicles. Santiago Lerma added that he was also interested in the impact of the increased delivery made by ride sourcing vehicles.

There was no public comment.

13. Public Comment

During public comment, Edward Mason commented that shuttles operated by various companies, including San Francisco Airporter and Genetech, continued to violate their agreement with SFMTA to use designated locations.

14. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.