



DRAFT MINUTES

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, January 27, 2016

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Waddling called the meeting to order at 6:08 p.m.

CAC members present were Becky Hogue, Brian Larkin, John Larson, Jacqualine Sachs, Peter Sachs and Peter Tannen.

Transportation Authority staff members present were Michelle Beaulieu, Amber Crabbe, Ryan Green-Roesel, Anna LaForte, Maria Lombardo, Mike Pickford and Steve Rehn.

2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Waddling introduced new CAC member Becky Hogue, who would be representing District 6 and resides on Treasure Island. Mr. Waddling also announced the resignation of Wells Whitney from the CAC and thanked him in absentia for his service.

There was no public comment.

3. Election of Chair and Vice Chair – ACTION

Chair Waddling announced that at the December 2 CAC meeting the positions of CAC Chair and Vice Chair had been open for nominations for the 2016 term. He said that for the Chair seat, he was the only member nominated and therefore eligible to be elected.

There was no public comment.

The motion to elect Chris Waddling as Chair was approved by the following vote.

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

Chair Waddling said that for the Vice Chair seat, Peter Sachs was the only member nominated and therefore eligible to be elected.

There was no public comment.

The motion to elect Peter Sachs as Vice Chair was approved by the following vote:

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

Consent Calendar

4. Approve the Minutes of the December 2, 2015 Meeting – ACTION

5. Internal Accounting and Investment Report for the Six Months Ended December 31, 2015 – INFORMATION

6. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Adoption of the Fiscal Year 2016/17 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Local Expenditure Criteria – ACTION

There was no public comment on the Consent Calendar.

Peter Sachs moved to approve the Consent Calendar, seconded by Brian Larkin.

The Consent Calendar was approved by the following vote:

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

Abstain: CAC Member Hogue

End of Consent Calendar

7. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Allocation of \$49,171,000 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 asked why Prop K fund leveraging for the Muni buses was listed as below the expected level in Attachment 1. Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, replied that the cost of vehicles that meet the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA's) specifications was higher than when the Prop K expenditure plan was developed and thus, more local funding was required as federal funding did not adequately cover the higher costs.

John Larson asked what happened to old MUNI buses that were taken out of service. Ariel Espiritu-Santo, Capital Project Manager at SFMTA, replied that SFMTA would sell out of service MUNI buses at auctions, but that they generally sold for very small amounts. She said that most of the buses were salvaged for materials, and that the revenue generated was not sufficient to offset the cost of acquiring new buses. Ms. LaForte added that a condition of Prop K grant agreements was that Prop K be reimbursed proportionately for any revenues resulting from the sale of capital assets purchased with sales tax funds.

Jacqueline Sachs said that new MUNI hybrid buses only had 3 seats for seniors and disabled persons, and that many did not have back windows, which she said drivers preferred to have. She asked why SFMTA purchased buses with this configuration. Ms. Espiritu-Santo said that SFMTA went through a process during the design phase to look at those components and would be happy to have a project manager follow up.

Peter Sachs said that the New Flyer buses purchased by SFMTA were similar to buses purchased by the City of Chicago. He said that from a passenger standpoint these were great buses, but said that he had heard there were issues with the hybrid drive systems breaking down early. He asked what kind of warranty was included in the contract. Ms. Espiritu-Santo said that there was a five-year warranty and that under the contract SFMTA could proactively revise the design of buses if new issues arose.

Peter Sachs asked why the design proposed for the Golden Gate Avenue buffered bike lane was not a parking buffered bike lane. Craig Raphael, Transportation Planner at SFMTA, said that he would follow up.

Peter Tannen asked whether the bike lane on Golden Gate Avenue would be in addition to existing bike lanes on Grove and McAllister Streets. Mr. Raphael said that it would be an additional route and that over the next fiscal year the SFMTA would be advancing additional routes from the Bike Strategy for implementation.

Brian Larkin asked which community based organizations (CBOs) the SFMTA would work with on Taylor Street and suggested the Southeast Asian Community Center as a candidate. Mr. Raphael said that SFMTA was working with multiple CBOs and that he would pass Mr. Larkin's

suggestion along to the project manager.

During public comment, Ed Mason said that interior LED lights that turn on when the doors open on SFMTA's new buses were blinding for passengers in the front seats. He said they should illuminate the floor rather than shine in passengers' eyes. Peter Tannen said that he agreed with Mr. Mason. Chair Waddling said that the headlights of the buses were also too bright.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

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

Abstain: CAC Member Hogue

8. **Equity Strategy for the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency – INFORMATION**

Julie Kirschbaum, Operations Planning and Scheduling Manager at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), presented the item.

Chair Waddling said that CAC member Myla Ablog had requested he relay her concern that increased service on the 38R had not alleviated overcrowding on the line. She also requested a presentation on overcrowding at a future meeting. Ms. Kirschbaum responded that when SFMTA reduced a 6 minute headway to a 4 minute headway on a route, it was a significant investment that resulted in a reduction in crowding. She said that as shown in the results from the Geary Corridor Bus Rapid Transit project modeling, improved service could attract new riders, which might be happening now, and therefore offsetting the initial crowding reduction when the 38R came on-line. Chair Waddling asked if SFMTA methodologies that compared MUNI travel times to automobile travel times took into account MUNI wait times, automobile parking times, and how MUNI travel times compared to bicycle travel times. Ms. Kirschbaum responded that the methodology incorporated randomized arrival MUNI wait times and automobile parking times. She added that the methodology did not compare MUNI travel times to bicycle travel times because this was considered a complimentary option for commuters.

Brian Larkin asked for clarification on transit signal priority for the 38R and whether it meant holding the signal or preempting the signal. Ms. Kirschbaum described the signals as a green extension with GPS technology that anticipated bus arrival. Mr. Larkin asked if transit signal priority had been implemented or if it was working correctly, because he had experienced the eastbound 38R hitting three consecutive red lights on a small stretch of Geary Boulevard. Mr. Larkin also asked why an area near Lake Street in the Richmond District had been displayed as a low-income area in the presentation. Ms. Kirschbaum responded that it may be due to a concentration of students or elderly households. Mr. Larkin asked for greater information on improvements to the overhead contact system. Ms. Kirschbaum responded that the SFMTA had done segmentation of the overhead contact system, so that if there was a problem in one area it would not propagate to other areas.

Peter Sachs requested a tour for the CAC of the SFMTA Transportation Management Center. Mr. Sachs asked if there were potential situations where transit signal priority could interfere with signal timing between buses travelling in opposite directions. Ms. Kirschbaum responded that this could happen, as the current transit signal priority system allowed any bus to receive signal priority. Ms. Kirschbaum explained that this could become problematic when expanding to hundreds of intersections, and said that SFMTA would continue to improve the system with logic rules that had preferences based on particular routes and other factors, such as typical passenger loads.

John Larson asked if the needs of some neighborhoods, such as Park Merced that had high densities and unique-need populations, including students, were being met through transportation efforts outside of SFMTA's Equity Strategy. Ms. Kirschbaum responded that SFMTA had initiated both incremental and large projects to improve service to the Park Merced/San Francisco State University area, as well as Treasure Island, such as improving OWL service.

Peter Sachs asked what SFMTA's policy was on bus bunching, and whether there was a policy to alleviate severe bus bunching. Ms. Kirschbaum responded that all MUNI drivers were trained to maintain a one block spacing between their bus and the bus in front of them, that the position of routes were monitored through the Transportation Management Center, and that interventions and adjustments were made when appropriate. Ms. Kirschbaum added that SFMTA tried to make route adjustments at terminals whenever possible to minimize disruption to passengers, and that the SFMTA Radio System Replacement Project would improve service and service adjustments, as operators would be able to communicate directly with the Transportation Management Center and see how they were performing against schedules.

Becky Hogue recommended that there should be additional service improvements to Treasure Island beyond only OWL service improvements. She noted that residents would ask what the SFMTA was doing about service during the day as well, where there was only one very crowded bus or back to back buses (bus bunching).

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, said that staff would present an update on the Radio System Replacement Project at the next CAC meeting.

There was no public comment.

9. Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program Update – INFORMATION

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

Peter Tannen asked if there were any aspects of the Cesar Chavez/Bayshore/Potrero Intersection Improvement Project that addressed pedestrian path safety issues associated with the current homeless encampment. Ms. LaForte stated that she would follow up on this, but noted that there were some simple lighting improvements that could increase the perception of safety, although it was not considered a comprehensive lighting plan.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked how Golden Gate Transit would respond to the 19 new curb bulb-outs proposed as part of the Lombard Street/US-101 Corridor Pedestrian Safety Project, as this would reduce the traffic lanes from three to two. Mr. Mason also asked if the proposed curb bulb-outs would result in congestion and pedestrian safety issues, citing the intersection of 24th and Church Streets as an example where other buses and drivers went around commuter shuttles because they tend take a long time to load or disembark passengers. Craig Raphael, Transportation Planner at SFMTA, responded that SFMTA had studied the issue of traffic congestion associated with curb bulb-outs, and that because Lombard Street was also a state highway, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) would need to approve any proposed treatments. Mr. Raphael added that Caltrans was quick to point out issues in terms of traffic impacts.

10. Bay Area Rapid Transit Travel Incentives Program – INFORMATION RGR

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

Chair Waddling asked if there were peak usage pattern charts for BART similar to the chart for Singapore shown during the presentation. Ms. Greene-Roesel responded that there were charts showing BART tracks ridership by time of day and that this information would be used to inform the design of the program.

There was no public comment.

11. Road Charge Pilot Program Update – INFORMATION

Michelle Beaulieu, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

John Larson commented that he liked the revenue model and its potential, as it was more equitable than the prior gasoline tax, and that it allowed for greater choice of payment methods. He noted that he signed up to participate in the pilot.

Peter Tannen asked how drivers who reported mileage would avoid paying the gas tax when purchasing gas. Ms. Beaulieu responded that the same program in Oregon was rebate-based, meaning a driver that enrolled in the system would be reimbursed for purchased gas.

Brian Larkin asked if there were an estimate on the cost of implementing an automatic system that reported mileage, and asked how this related to the next agenda item which included proposed gas tax increases. Ms. Beaulieu responded that she would have to follow up on the cost of implementing such a system. Ms. Beaulieu added that the gas tax was difficult to increase politically, and that if the process for increasing it was not fundamentally changed (e.g. index to inflation), the current gas tax would not be a viable long-term revenue source. Mr. Larkin stated that electric vehicle recharge stations should be subjected to a tax, as gasoline was often used to generate electricity.

Becky Hogue asked how data privacy would be addressed in the program. Ms. Beaulieu responded that the program allowed customers to request that their data not be collected.

There was no public comment.

12. State and Federal Legislative Update – INFORMATION

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

Peter Sachs stated that he believed the proposed vehicle registration fee increases were too aggressive and would amount to a regressive tax, which underscored the importance of a different road usage charge.

There was no public comment.

13. Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION

Jacqueline Sachs commented that she had recently attended a Late Night Transportation Working Group meeting that Supervisor Wiener also attended and listened to suggestions.

Peter Sachs stated that he was interested in learning more about the feasibility of new pedestrian block phases and the implementation of “zebra stripping” on high speed roads approaching crosswalks, similar to those implemented by the Virginia Department of Transportation.

There was no public comment.

14. Public Comment

Edward Mason described how he had observed two commuter shuttles in Noe Valley committing traffic violations, and said that one of the buses did not have California license

plates or a proper decal. He said that Parking Control Officers cited this shuttle and found that it was registered in Florida. Mr. Mason expressed frustration at the lack of enforcement of commuter shuttles, citing issues of commuter shuttles double parking at MUNI stops and travelling along weight restricted streets in Noe Valley.

Santiago Lerma stated that he had observed commuter shuttles double-parked in the travel lane in Glen Park, and agreed that more enforcement was needed.

John Larson stated that one shuttle service company no longer stopped at Glen Park because of size issues, which could have been a result of neighborhood complaints.

15. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.