



# DRAFT MINUTES

## VISION ZERO COMMITTEE

Thursday, April 10, 2014

### 1. Roll Call

Chair Kim called the meeting to order at 1:43 p.m. The following members were:

**Present at Roll Call:** Commissioners Breed, Kim, Mar, Wiener, and Yee (5)

### 2. Purpose of Vision Zero Committee – INFORMATION

Chair Kim gave opening remarks. She stated that the purpose of the Vision Zero Committee was to provide a public forum for accountability, to support agencies' project delivery efforts, and to build political will.

Commissioner Yee said that he would like to look at the different strategies that the Committee could use in order to achieve Vision Zero in the next ten years. He added that strategies should not be assessed in isolation and that the Committee should look at the three E's of safety (education, enforcement, and engineering) together.

Commissioner Mar commented that two children had been involved in collisions on Fulton Street in the last month and expressed concern about the safety of Fulton, Geary, and many city streets. He advised the Committee to act with great urgency on this issue, noting that the Vision Zero Committee provides an opportunity for agencies to show how they are stepping up to address pedestrian safety. He said that he would work to make funding become available quickly.

Commissioner Wiener stated that engineering solutions should be emphasized since there would always be users of the transportation system who are not paying attention to their surroundings. He expressed concern about the obstacles to implementing pedestrian safety projects and the conflicting priorities of city agencies. He stated that Vision Zero needed to involve all of the agencies involved in delivering projects, including the San Francisco Fire Department and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. He noted that the creation of the Vision Zero Committee was a positive step toward increasing understanding and buy-in from these stakeholders.

Commissioner Breed underscored the need to bring all relevant city agencies together. She stated that public outreach was critical to engaging the public and ensuring an understanding of why certain changes are being made to the streets, such as the removal of parking to accommodate safety infrastructure. She thanked the San Francisco Police Department for its enforcement efforts.

Chair Kim mentioned that the Committee was working to secure funding for communications in order to help ensure consistent messaging for Vision Zero.

Chair Mar requested that staff look at what other cities, specifically New York City, were doing around this issue.

There was no public comment.

### **3. Vision Zero Overview – INFORMATION**

Megan Wier, Epidemiologist at the Department of Public Health and co-chair of the Vision Zero Task Force, presented this item.

Chair Kim asked about what the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA's) goals and target were for enforcement and how the SFMTA could use its resources, such as Parking Control Officers (PCOs), to support this effort.

Mari Hunter, Transportation Planner at the SFMTA, stated that the SFMTA was working with its enforcement group to determine how its PCOs could aid the San Francisco Police Department to help with enforcement.

Chair Kim indicated that she would like to see specific goals from the SFMTA for involving the PCOs in safety enforcement. Commissioner Mar agreed and noted that the SFPD regularly provided data on enforcement in the Sunset district.

During public comment, Madeleine Savit from Folks for Polk commented that designing San Francisco's streets and roads for pedestrian safety should be left to the professionals in the field. Nicole Schneider, Executive Director of Walk San Francisco, encouraged the Vision Zero Task Force to create a Vision Zero Plan. She added that more analysis was needed in order to understand what it would take to achieve Vision Zero. Lenore Goldman, San Francisco Health Improvement Partnership, commented that her organization had targeted safety as its primary area of focus. She requested that Vision Zero efforts target the Tenderloin neighborhood.

### **4. Twenty-Four Near-Term Capital Projects – INFORMATION**

Seleta Reynolds, Livable Streets Manager at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), presented this item.

Ms. Reynolds stated that the engineering subcommittee of the interagency Vision Zero Task Force had been working to identify the 24 near-term capital projects to be implemented by January 2016 per the Vision Zero resolution. She noted that city agencies had identified more than 24 projects should some of the projects be found infeasible. She stated that the selected projects were identified in the pedestrian and bicycle strategies and located on the high injury pedestrian or bicycle corridors. Ms. Reynolds continued that some of the projects on the list needed some extra support to get done, but that all project could be delivered by 2016.

Ms. Reynolds explained that many but not all of the 24 projects had secured funding. She explained that, despite gaps in funding, the SFMTA was committed to delivering all 24 projects. She said that there were certain projects, such as the Polk Street Improvement Project, that could take years to actually construct; however, the SFMTA could start early rollout if aspects of the design could be implemented right away. She reported that the SFMTA would like to look at converting cycle tracks to raised tracks so that cyclists would be protected by more than just paint. She commented that evaluation of a project's design was critical, especially for projects that did not comply with the Caltrans Highway Design Manual. Ms. Reynolds noted that Persia Triangle (specifically Ocean/Geneva from Ashton to Mission) was on the list of 24 projects.

Chair Kim asked if these 24 projects would be deliverable within two years.

Ms. Reynolds confirmed that the projects would be delivered by January 2016.

Chair Kim asked what the funding needs were.

Ms. Reynolds responded that the SFMTA needed \$50,000 to get the Department of Public Works (DPW) started on the design of the raised cycle tracks on upper Market. She also stated that implementing the full project including turn restrictions on Market Street would require \$2.2 million.

Chair Kim commented that she would like to understand the funding and staffing needs so that the Committee could allocate resources to implement Vision Zero. She asked why street design took 9 to 12 months.

Ms. Reynolds responded that SFMTA staff was researching the project delivery process for completed projects to identify lessons learned. She noted that project design tended to be an iterative process involving back-and-forth with DPW to get the project priorities to line up.

Chair Kim expressed desire for suggestions from the SFMTA to the Committee on how to make the project delivery process more efficient. She asked if there were layers of the process that could be done in parallel.

Ms. Reynolds responded that there was an approach called “design at risk,” in which design was initiated before environmental approval. She said that the SFMTA agreed that different project delivery models were needed in order to get projects completed. She noted that design was traditionally done in-house and that SFMTA needed to look at bringing contractors on board.

Chair Kim stated that the Committee meeting was an opportunity to brainstorm ways to address barriers to getting projects done in the interest of saving lives.

Commissioner Wiener asked if, in Ms. Reynolds opinion, that inter-departmental relations had improved recently. She responded that the right people were now at the table and that communications with the Fire Department had been improving. She noted that achieving consensus on project design remained challenging. She stated that there were still different perspectives over which agency was responsible for work performed below street level.

Commissioner Wiener indicated he was pleased when the SFMTA Board legislated curb changes. He said that he disagreed with the Public Utilities Commission’s position on passing the cost of pipe relocation to other agencies during bulbout construction. He expressed interest in better enforcement of double parking since the issue had not been effectively addressed.

Ms. Reynolds noted that New York City and the District of Columbia had implemented some interesting operational strategies to manage double parking and that New York limited the size of delivery trucks entering the city. She noted that better understanding of these operational strategies was needed for incentivizing deliveries at the right time and place. Commissioner Wiener indicated that New York also limited the size of delivery trucks entering the city and San Francisco should also consider whether to have size restrictions on vehicles.

Commissioner Yee stated he wanted to better understand the path and potential barriers to project delivery, especially for the 24 near-term capital projects. Commissioner Mar concurred and suggested that SFMTA staff provide a flow chart with assistance from Transportation Authority staff. Commissioner Mar asked about what the process would be for implementing improvements on Fulton Street since it was not a designated high-injury corridor.

Ms. Reynolds indicated SFMTA staff would be looking at examples of up to 10 completed projects, similar to those on the Vision Zero list, to identify where the bottlenecks came from.

She said that the SFMTA traffic operations group investigated major crashes and tried to identify issues that could be addressed right away. Ms. Reynolds stated that there was a need for citywide cultural change to ensure crash reduction. Commissioner Mar indicated that enforcement efforts were particularly needed. Mr. Reynolds responded that automated speed enforcement, as Chicago was doing, was a particularly promising avenue.

Commissioner Breed agreed that cultural change was needed to promote safe behavior, and expressed concern about double parking.

Commissioner Kim asked that SFMTA present information on project delivery and what the Board could do to help support city agencies in getting projects implemented.

During public comment, Nicole Schneider, Executive Director of Walk San Francisco, encouraged the Board of Supervisors to seek bold and innovative projects and to advocate for California Environmental Quality Act reform, and indicated interest in seeing a plan that would achieve Vision Zero.

## **5. Education and Public Awareness Efforts – INFORMATION**

John Knox White, Transportation Planner at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), presented this item.

Mr. Knox White discussed the work already underway to improve coordination of pedestrian safety education activities, and emphasized that sustained education campaigns were needed. He reported that a Large Vehicle and Safer Streets Working Group had been convened and was developing recommendations, and that the SFMTA had requested funding from the Transportation Authority to develop and disseminate a large vehicle driver training program.

Commissioner Yee noted that education campaigns needed to target not only pedestrians but also drivers and bicyclists. He stated that he would like to see the Committee work with the San Francisco Unified School District and also expressed interest in the Safe Passages Program. He added that he had recently brought back the student safety patrol program.

Commissioner Mar agreed that there were district-specific efforts occurring related to the Vision Zero effort, and mentioned the San Francisco SAFE neighborhood group in particular.

## **6. Introduction of New Items**

There were no new items.

There was no public comment.

## **7. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

Chair Kim thanked the committee and the members of the public for attending this very first meeting of the Vision Zero Committee. She stated that at the next meeting in June, she looked forward to seeing information on project delivery and the schedule for the Vision Zero projects, and the role that the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency could play in enforcement.

## **8. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:18 p.m.