



DRAFT MINUTES

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

June 25, 2014 MEETING

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Glenn Davis at 6:10 p.m. CAC members present were Myla Ablog, Glenn Davis, Brian Larkin, John Larson, Angela Minkin, Eric Rutledge, Jacqueline Sachs, Peter Tannen, and Christopher Waddling. Transportation Authority staff members present were Courtney Aguirre, Anna LaForte, Seon Joo Kim, Chad Rathmann, Michael Schwartz, and Tony Vi.

2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Glenn Davis stated that the July Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting would be canceled because the Plans and Programs Committee and Transportation Authority Board were not meeting in August. He added that CAC members would be polled to confirm the best date to hold the next CAC meeting.

Consent Calendar

3. Approve the Minutes of the May 28, 2014 Meeting – ACTION
4. Citizens Advisory Committee Appointment – INFORMATION
5. State and Federal Legislative Update – INFORMATION

End of Consent Calendar

There was no public comment.

Chris Waddling moved to approve the consent calendar. Angela Minkin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Adopt a Motion of Support for Allocation of \$5,322,331 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, and Allocation of \$2,210,000 in Prop AA Funds for Six Requests, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules and Amendment of the Prop AA Strategic Plan – ACTION

Courtney Aguirre, Transportation Planner, presented the item as per the staff memorandum.

Brian Larkin requested an update on the schedule for the Downtown Extension (DTX) and information on the accommodation with high-speed rail. Scott Boule, Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA) Legislative Affairs and Community Outreach Manager, stated that the TJPA was responsible for the 1.3-mile extension, and added that the extension would accommodate both high-speed rail and Caltrain. He stated that the current blended system proposal would have three platforms and that four tracks would be used by high-speed rail and two tracks would be used by Caltrain. He stated that the schedule for the extension of Caltrain rail service to the Transbay Transit Center was dependent on funding. He stated that the Downtown Extension was designated as a regional (Metropolitan Transportation Commission) priority for

New Starts federal funds, and that the New Starts priorities for the region included the Central Subway and BART extension to Berryessa projects, and that both those projects had received federal funding agreements, thereby opening two slots for New Starts priorities in the region. He stated that access to the federal funds for construction would be dependent on securing local matching funds.

Jacqueline Sachs asked whether the CAC should expect to see an additional Prop K funding request from the TJPA for DTX in 2016 when Prop K funds from the pending allocation request were anticipated to be fully expended. Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, stated that the recommendation was to provide a similar level of funding for two more years in the update of the Prop K Strategic Plan, which would be presented to the CAC in the fall. She noted that the DTX project was on hold with the exception of engineering analysis and program management pending the development of a full funding plan.

John Larson asked for clarification regarding the Transbay Transit Center and DTX. Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, clarified that the Transbay Transit Center (Phase 1) included the Transbay Transit Center, which would replace the former Transbay Terminal and the train box, and that the DTX (Phase 2) would extend Caltrain 1.3 miles underground from its current terminus at 4th and King Streets into the new Transit Center and accommodate California's future high-speed rail.

Peter Tannen asked if the extension of medians on Dolores Street at 18th Street would include landscaping and sufficient width for crosswalks. Ramon Kong, Department of Public Works, stated that the extension would be 12 feet wide and would provide sufficient width for the crosswalk. He added that the median extension and crosswalk would be pavement given the limited funding.

Mr. Larson moved to approve the item and Ms. Sachs seconded the motion.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun expressed opposition to funding the Downtown Extension. He stated that the design of the Transbay Transit Center's train box would make tail tracks and potential rail extension to the Easy Bay impossible.

The item passed unanimously.

7. Adopt a Motion of Support for Adoption of Fourteen 2014 Prop K 5-Year Prioritization Programs – ACTION

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

John Larson asked for clarification on the definition of a neighborhood-scale transportation project in the context of the Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program (NTIP). Ms. LaForte provided examples of neighborhood-scale transportation projects (e.g. bus bulbs or corridor improvements) and explained that they should benefit residents in the immediate area, but could also benefit the larger community. Chris Waddling asked why the Quint-Jerrold Connector Road project, which was a roadway and not transit project, was included in the Transit Enhancements 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPP). Ms. LaForte stated the project was included in the Relocation of Paul Street Caltrain to Oakdale Avenue category, one of the seven categories covered in the Transit Enhancements 5YPP, because the project would accommodate the relocation of the station. Mr. Waddling noted that construction of the station was not dependent on the proposed connector road, but expressed his support for the project. Ms. LaForte responded that she concurred with Mr. Waddling's comment. She noted that with community input, the Transportation Authority Board endorsed the berm version of

the bridge replacement so as not to preclude a future Oakdale Station, and that the connector road is intended to offset community concerns about loss of access with the Quint Road and part of the overall agreement reached to ensure that the bridge replacement will support a future Oakdale Station.

Jacqueline Sachs asked why the F-Market line would need to be extended to Fort Mason, as programmed in the F-Line Extension to Fort Mason category, given the 28-19th Avenue line already served that destination. Jonathan Rewers, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Capital Financial Planning and Analysis Manager, stated the F-Market extension would provide access to Fort Mason from the east, while the 28-19th Avenue line provided access from the west. He explained that at the time when the Prop K Expenditure Plan was developed, a streetcar line was considered to bring economic benefits to the area, and that the Market Street Railway had been interested in the project. He stated that the SFMTA had not yet secured the full funding plan that was necessary for the extension, but had completed environmental review and would proceed with conceptual engineering when funds became available. Brian Larkin requested a brief scope of work and asked whether there was a plan to extend the terminus. Mr. Rewers stated that the SFMTA was currently considering two alternatives and two additional stops, and had no plan to extend beyond Fort Mason.

Angela Minkin asked if the NTIP placeholders would only fund projects identified in NTIP plans. Ms. LaForte clarified that the placeholders could fund any neighborhood-scale project, not just those from an NTIP plan, and added that the purpose of the placeholders in various categories was to support projects to be implemented in the next five years.

Eric Rutledge asked how the 5YPPs would be affected with the Vehicle License Fee (VLF) measure not appearing on the 2014 ballot. Ms. LaForte stated that projects would not come to a halt, but would continue with Prop K, General Obligation Bond (if approved), as well as other funds. She added that with the VLF measure proposed for the 2016 ballot, Prop K would help advance projects to be ready for VLF funds. Mr. Rewers stated that the SFMTA had listed the VLF as only one of numerous potential sources of funding and projects would not depend solely on VLF funds. He added that the scale of projects might vary depending on the actual funding availability, and echoed Ms. LaForte's statement that Prop K would prepare projects ready to proceed with construction when future funds became available.

Myla Ablog asked if the traffic calming program was exclusively for arterials or could include any intersections. Ms. LaForte clarified that under the application-based program, residents could apply for any intersections by August 1 each year to be evaluated and, if selected, would be constructed in the following year.

Ms. Sachs asked about the status of signals on the Geary and Palm intersection, noting that they had not been installed yet. Mr. Rewers responded that the signals were part of the Contract 61 and that he would follow up with the latest status.

Ms. Sachs requested that the SFMTA consider retiming pedestrian countdown signals (PCS) to allow a sufficient time for people with disabilities and seniors to cross, especially on wide streets such as Geary Boulevard. Mr. Rewers stated that the SFMTA had evaluated the crossing time at various locations in response to Ms. Sachs' previous request and confirmed the signals complied with the state requirement. Mr. Rewers noted that as a result of the WalkFirst analysis matching collision types with locations, the SFMTA would consider and implement more robust signal retiming adjustment citywide, which could address Ms. Sachs' concern. Ms. Sachs recommended examining demographics of people who crossed. Mr. Rewers agreed with the suggestion and added that the SFMTA would also use the WalkFirst data to implement customized solutions to increase the safety of locations with high collision histories, including

but not limited to signal retiming.

Ms. Minkin asked whether the Traffic Calming 5YPP included any projects that would involve installing PCS or crosswalks at intersections on Mission Street between Silver and Geneva Avenues. She commented that though some improvements had been installed, traffic still flowed very quickly on Mission Street. She noted that certain T-intersections were unmarked and were distant from signalized intersections and crosswalks, which resulted in jaywalking. She asked for the best method for a neighborhood group or community members to seek additional traffic calming improvements such as PCS.

Mr. Rewers responded that the SFMTA had made considerable progress on installing PCS signals throughout the city based on lengthy to-do list, but that there were still more that needed to be installed. He stated that future General Obligation Bond funds would allow the SFMTA to install more PCS throughout the city. He noted that the SFMTA tended to prioritize locations where there were high incidences of collisions. He commented that the SFMTA was striving towards implementing complete streets projects and checking for coordination opportunities. He stated that the Transit Effectiveness Project for the 14 Mission included pedestrian improvements improving access to transit such as transit and regular bulb-outs. He stated that he would follow up with specific planned pedestrian improvements for that area. He noted that there currently appears to be a gap in SFMTA's feedback loop to allow for community members to notify SFMTA of improvements that are less urgent. He stated that SFMTA typically encourages community members to voice their concerns via phoning 3-1-1. He stated that the SFMTA had plans to develop a website communication tool that would facilitate more community feedback regarding needed improvements. He stated that this feedback could then become integrated into the SFMTA's capital improvement plan.

Mr. Larson asked for clarification on the how the proposed Prop K Great Highway Restoration project corresponded to SPUR's Ocean Beach Master Plan recommendations. He commented that the project information form noted that the proposed work was not explicitly included in the plan. He stated that the plan's recommendations included closing a portion of the Great Highway due to issues with erosion, not restoring it. He commented that he did not understand why the proposed project appeared to be restoring the Great Highway, when the long-term plan was to implement a closure. Chad Rathmann, Senior Transportation Planner, stated that Transportation Authority staff would acquire additional clarification from Department of Public Works (DPW) staff. He commented that he understood that the project proposed in the 5YPP would help DPW identify a preferred alternative and eventually seek federal funding. He added that the Prop K proposed project would not preclude the future implementation of Ocean Beach Master Plan recommendations. Mr. Larson asked whether the project required federal funds, and he again asked why the proposed project included restoration work when the eventual plan was to implement a closure. Ms. LaForte stated that Transportation Authority staff would follow up with DPW staff to acquire clarification. She commented that the proposed project appeared to be focused on the implementation of necessary near-term improvements.

Ms. Sachs asked whether the 2014 Prop K 5YPPs included any funding for red light cameras. Ms. LaForte responded that none were proposed.

Ms. Ablog commented that she had heard reports of 3-1-1 not resulting in responses to issues. She asked when the SFMTA planned to implement the website communication tool to facilitate more community feedback regarding needed improvements. Mr. Rewers responded that the SFMTA anticipated the tool could be available as early as January 2015. He described how it was part of a larger effort to develop a digital capital improvement program.

Mr. Larson commented that he understood that the impact of the VLF voter measure not moving forward was about \$10 million funding gap for Vision Zero pedestrian safety improvements. Mr. Rewers stated that the immediate impact in the next two years (Fiscal Years 2014/15 and 2015/16) was lessened because the Mayor had given the SFMTA additional General Funds for Vision Zero-type projects (i.e. pedestrian, bicycle, and education projects) in Fiscal Year 2014/15. He stated that the Board of Supervisors was considering providing the SFMTA with additional funds in Fiscal Year 2015/16. He stated that the gap went from being about \$12.8 million to \$10 million, and that the SFMTA still intended to seek Prop K allocations for work, but that projects might be scaled down, phased, or timed differently.

Peter Tannen moved to approve the item and Eric Rutledge seconded the motion.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated that he would like to see improved disabled access at the 22nd Street Caltrain station. He commented that innovations in Europe (i.e. assigned key fobs that could trigger appropriate crossing times) had addressed concerns regarding pedestrian crossing times for the disabled and seniors. He commented that the Quint-Jerrold Connector Road project had serious funding issues.

The item passed unanimously.

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

Chair Davis deferred this item to the August Citizens Advisory Committee meeting.

9. Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION

There was no public comment.

10. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.