



# *DRAFT MINUTES*

## **Citizens Advisory Committee**

Wednesday, September 4, 2019

### **1. Committee Meeting Call to Order**

Chair Larson called the meeting to order at 6:16 p.m.

CAC members present: Myla Ablog, Kian Alavi, David Klein, John Larson, Peter Tannen and Sophia Tupuola (6)

CAC Members Absent: Ranyee Chiang, Robert Gower, Jerry Levine and Rachel Zack (4)

Transportation Authority staff members present were Anna LaForte, Maria Lombardo, Mike Pickford, Alberto Quintanilla, Steve Rehn, Mike Tan and Luis Zurinaga (Consultant).

### **2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION**

No minutes were taken for Item 2 due to lack of quorum.

### **Consent Agenda**

#### **3. Approve the Minutes of the July 24, 2019 Meeting – ACTION**

#### **4. Citizens Advisory Committee Appointment – INFORMATION**

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

Peter Tannen moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Sophia Tupuola.

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Alavi, Klein, Larson, Tannen, Tupuola and (6)

Absent: CAC Members Chiang, Gower, Levine and Zack (4)

### **End of Consent Agenda**

#### **5. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$26,147,587, with Conditions, and Appropriate \$100,000 in Prop K Sales Tax Funds for Twelve Requests – ACTION**

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

Chair Larson said when he first joined the CAC there was an M-Line study that developed the options for building the light rail line underground or above ground. He asked if the scope overview for the new request for additional planning meant that the project would move forward or if it still had to go through a prioritization process among a list of other projects through the Transit Corridor Study.



Sarah Jones, Planning Director at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), replied that the Muni Metro Subway Expansion Project that addresses the M-line improvements referenced by Chair Larson, had not yet been prioritized vis-à-vis other potential projects. She said the City's ConnectSF effort, which includes the Transit Corridor Study, would provide the basis for decisions about which major transit projects to prioritize. She added that it would be premature to engage in an environmental review for the Muni Metro Subway Expansion project until the ConnectSF project prioritization was complete.

Chair Larson asked what the process was within ConnectSF for prioritizing projects.

Ms. Jones said ConnectSF was a long-range planning process that would forecast the City's transportation needs over the next 50 years. She said the first phase of ConnectSF involved heavy outreach and development of a long-range vision for a highly connected city and region. Ms. Jones said it was important to evaluate the M-Line project within that context. She said as part of the current phase (Phase 2) of ConnectSF, staff would perform studies to identify key transit investments and also perform outreach to inform how to prioritize and evaluate projects. Ms. Jones said during the next phase of ConnectSF, the recommendations from the Transit Corridor Study and Streets and Freeway Study would be prioritized in the fiscally constrained San Francisco Transportation Plan.

Peter Tannen asked if there had been preliminary engineering on the redesign of 19th Avenue as part of the Combined City Project.

Ms. Jones said she believed the construction was anticipated to begin within a year.

Peter Tannen asked if any design had been done on the anticipated protected bicycle facility on the west side of 19 Avenue as part of the 19th Avenue re-design.

Ms. LaForte said Transportation Authority staff would follow up and provide any available conceptual designs of the portion of 19th Avenue where a bicycle facility was contemplated.

Myla Ablog asked if the speed radar signs recorded data.

Philip Louie, Project Manager at the SFMTA, said the speed radar signs did not record data but simply displayed the speed of approaching vehicles.

Myla Ablog said some streets had embedded sensors and asked if there were other ways besides automated enforcement to track speeds.

Mr. Louie said that the speed radar sign program focus was encouragement rather than enforcement.

Chair Larson said it might be helpful if the radar speed signs included a data gathering component that could at least record the frequency with which vehicles exceed the speed limit.

Mr. Louie said the Speed Radar Sign program did produce before-and-after studies to determine the effectiveness of the signs.



Myla Ablog clarified that her point about sensors embedded in the streets was that they could possibly capture data that the speed radar signs could not.

Ms. LaForte said the Transportation Authority would work with the SFMTA to add a deliverable to the proposed allocation for before- and after-studies on the effectiveness of the new speed radar signs.

David Klein asked why the Muni Subway Expansion project was not looking at denser areas of the city like the Richmond and Panhandle neighborhoods. He said studying the M-Line should not preclude the SFMTA from looking at other investments.

Ms. Jones said looking at the M-Line was not mutually exclusive with looking at other subway or rail projects. She said the ongoing Transit Corridor Study was looking at transportation investments all over the city, including both the Richmond and Panhandle neighborhoods.

David Klein asked if the proposed planning effort would look at the Lake Merced and/or West Portal sections of the M-Line.

Ms. Jones said the feasibility and planning studies for M-Line improvements originated from the Lake Merced development proposal. She said for that reason M-Line planning was substantially ahead of other transit investments, and said the missing piece was determining how to link the existing subway to a new subway south of West Portal.

Chair Larson asked for an explanation of Prop E tree funding and asked if Prop E was responsible for maintaining street trees.

Anna LaForte said Prop E amended the city charter to transfer responsibility from property owners to the city for maintaining trees in public rights-of-way adjacent to their property, as well as the responsibility for repairing sidewalks damaged by street trees.

Chair Larson asked for confirmation that the sidewalk repair funds were for sidewalks adjacent to city property as well as at all street corners.

Carla Short, Urban Forestry Superintendent at Public Works, replied in the affirmative and said the City was responsible for repairs to any public sidewalk damaged by tree roots, as well as corner areas not adjacent to private property.

During public comment Edward Mason asked for more information on the new seating configuration referenced in the scope of the SFMTA's New Flyer Midlife Overhaul project. Mr. Mason also said formation of hairline cracks in the cement on recently paved sidewalks was an ongoing issue on city streets and asked that the root cause be investigated, whether it be the chemical formation of the concrete, design or some other factor.

Chair Larson requested an update from Public Work to address Mr. Mason's question.

Myla Ablog moved to approve the item, seconded by Peter Tannen.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Alavi, Klein, Larson, Tannen and Tupuola (6)



Absent: CAC Members Chiang, Gower, Levine and Zack (4)

**6. Progress Report for Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project – INFORMATION**

Peter Gabancho, Project Manager for the Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit project at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), presented the item.

David Klein asked how many people were receiving text messages, emails or attending meetings. He said the card campaign for businesses along the Van Ness corridor seemed nice but wanted to know how many businesses were taking advantage of the free advertisement.

Mr. Gabancho said he would follow up with the number of individuals receiving emails and text messages. He said the Van Ness CAC had about 15 members and Business Advisory Committee had 13 members. In regard to the advertisement campaign, he said to his knowledge no businesses had used advertisement cards to date.

Chair Larson said maybe business owners should be reminded of the offer as it seemed like a pretty good opportunity to turn down.

David Klein said he was looking for the effectiveness of outreach efforts and numbers that demonstrated positive change to drive businesses affected by roadwork. He said the city owed it to the businesses with over a year delay and requested an update on the analytics of outreach efforts.

During public comment Edward Mason said there were traction power cables on the west side of Van Ness and asked if the 49 Muni line would be trolley coach or diesel powered after the project was complete. He noted that in the future the buses would be all battery powered per the City's long-range plans. He asked if overhead wires would be installed for the 49 line for 10-15 years or if it would stay as a hybrid bus. He said it appeared that there was a two-year delay on the battery powered buses and asked how it would all fit together.

Mr. Gabancho said the SFMTA was restringing overhead wires along Van Ness and said the 49 line would be electrified once construction concludes. SFMTA will run trolley buses until there are reliable battery buses.

Jackie Sachs said the right turn on red at stop lights and placing bus platforms in the middle of the street made it difficult for disabled individuals to cross the street safely. She asked if SFMTA had taken into consideration the need to provide time for seniors and disabled persons to cross the street. She also asked if the California Pacific Medical Center was affected by the construction.

**Item 7 was called before Items 5 and 6 through the call of the Chair.**

**7. 2019 Vision Zero Action Strategy – INFORMATION**

Michael Jacobson, Transportation Planner - Livable Streets at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), presented the item.

Myla Ablog asked if an example of quick build projects could be provided.

Mr. Jacobsen said the Safer Taylor Quick Build project was a good example. He said that,



while the long-term corridor project would widen sidewalks and require extensive coordination with the San Francisco Department of Public Works (SFPW), the quick build project was completed in a matter of months from approval to implementation. The quick build process allowed SFMTA to use paint and safe-hit posts to reduce travel lanes and add daylighting and paint safety zones.

David Klein asked what steps the SFMTA takes when responding to fatal or severe injury crashes. He noted that a number of the reported fatalities had occurred in District 1.

Mr. Jacobson said the SFMTA had a three-part rapid response team. The rapid response engineering team responded to sites within 24 hours and was responsible for analyzing conditions that may have contributed to the crash. He added that the engineering team would go to each site and determine state of good repair improvements that could be done quickly. Mr. Jacobson said the street team was responsible for providing emotional support to the victims' families and placing memorial posters at the sites of crashes within a week. He said the third part of the team worked with the District Attorney's office and the San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH) to ensure victims' families had access to city resources.

Peter Tannen noted that Vision Zero was happening in other cities around the world and asked how San Francisco's strategy compared to other cities.

Mr. Jacobson said the high-injury network was common in many strategies and noted that SFDPH created the methodology for the high-injury network and that had been adopted by many other jurisdictions. He said it was common to see cities provide a list of strategic actions but said the complimentary goals, including climate goals, had not been adopted by other Vision Zero cities. Mr. Jacobson said the Vision Zero Network group brought together resources shared among cities and advocates and stated that San Francisco's strategy had been lauded as forward thinking.

Sophia Tupuola asked how the City could shift travel modes in Communities of Concern and if there were plans to install bike lanes or provide bike training classes for children to bike to school.

Mr. Jacobson said Vision Zero had bike training classes as one of the strategic actions in the safe people program. He told Ms. Tupuola that if she had a specific neighborhood in mind that he could put in her contact with the appropriate SFMTA staff. Mr. Jacobson said the SFMTA was always cognizant of neighborhood interest and noted that the SFMTA's Livable Streets staff worked on bike and pedestrian projects. He said Vision Zero created framework of where safety improvements were prioritized for high-injury networks and Communities of Concern.

Chair Larson noted recent press that San Francisco was not meeting Vision Zero goals and asked if regulations banning right turns on red lights could be adopted locally or would require state legislation.

Mr. Jacobson said a ban on right turns at a red light could be adopted locally and said Vision Zero was currently looking at no turn prohibitions at a systematic level. He said later this year the city would choose eight intersections to pilot left turn safety improvements.



Kian Alavi asked how many fatalities had been reported over the past five years.

Mr. Jacobson said he would need to report back the official number for the past five years.

Mr. Alavi asked if fatalities were trending up.

Mr. Jacobson said 2017 was the low point but numbers had gone up since then. He said Vision Zero was a nation-wide battle but said Vision Zero was working systematically and holistically to make streets as safe as possible.

Mr. Alavi asked if the increase of Transportation Network Company (TNC) vehicles correlated with the rise in pedestrian and bicyclist fatalities.

Mr. Jacobson said he could not make a causal connection, but possibly use vehicle miles traveled as a proxy. He added that to date in 2019, there had been no fatalities in crashes involving a TNC driver.

Mr. Alavi stated the proliferation of TNCs should be a higher priority due to the additional forty thousand vehicles on San Francisco streets.

Mr. Jacobson noted that the regulation of TNCs was captured in the Vision Zero's transformative policy agenda.

During public comment Edward Mason said he was seeing a proliferation of skateboarders on sidewalks and was in favor of additional enforcement. He also spoke about the increase of scooters and bikes on sidewalks and said they were a safety hazard for pedestrians.

Ms. Jones said another program geared towards school travel and Communities of Concern was Safe Routes to School. She said the main goals of Safe Routes to School were safety and mode shift. She said SFMTA's program included helping children learn to ride bikes and making transit a safer alternative for children. Ms. Jones said she could provide the CAC a Safe Routes to School presentation if desired.

## **8. Update on the Caltrain Business Plan – INFORMATION**

Sebastian Petty, Caltrain Senior Advisor, presented the item.

Peter Tannen asked if the 82% farebox recovery was the current farebox recovery.

Mr. Petty said the current farebox recovery was 73% and that Caltrain predicted anywhere from 72% - 82% in the scenarios.

Peter Tannen asked what the skip stop service meant in the moderate growth scenario.

Mr. Petty said the moderate growth scenario worked on relative few discreet four track overtakes that would need to be built. He said local trains would need to be sped up to accommodate high-speed rail, express trains and local trains. Mr. Petty said Caltrain would have four local trains running an hour in each direction but there would be certain stations in the mid-peninsula area where they would only be served by every two trains. He said that was the skip stop service, and noted the station spacing was particularly close in the mid-peninsula area.

Myla Ablog asked if the service growth scenarios included incentivized mode shift to get



people out of commuter buses or if it would happen organically.

Mr. Petty said there was a lot happening on the land use side of the Caltrain corridor and noted the advantage of Caltrain being an old rail corridor with many of its stations in downtown areas. He said Caltrain was looking to keep up with development in relation to its service and added that they would be looking at the connectivity of first/last mile access. Mr. Petty said that Caltrain has heard from big employers that they would prefer to not have commuter services.

Chair Larson asked if there was a frequency tipping point to ensure dependability and ridership loyalty.

Mr. Petty said there was not one clear answer. For Caltrain, he said that the average daily distance traveled was between 22-23 miles long so riders are planning ahead to make these trips. He said the baby bullet and express drove ridership and Caltrain would like to get to 15-20 minute headways to improve dependability.

David Klein stated that he would like to push for the high growth scenario due to the increase in population that is likely to continue, pointing to the significant historical growth along the corridor. Has asked if there was ever a scenario where a city or region overbuilt rail transportation.

Mr. Petty said he could not specifically answer the question but emphasized that the details of the staff recommendation that encouraged planning for and not precluding the high growth scenario. Mr. Petty explained that the growth scenario recommended (moderate) was based on what Caltrain believed it could independently deliver and what was best for its riders. He added that one reason Caltrain was not initially recommending high growth because it would require building 15 miles of four track sections, which would have significant local impacts, including the need to take property.

David Klein asked if the 1,000 surveys received was a sufficient sample size when selecting the appropriate growth scenario.

Mr. Petty said outreach had been done through a range of different streams and the approach of the surveys was not to get an absolute statistically representative sample. He added that Caltrain had a stakeholder group with 90 different groups represented, a transportation agencies group that met monthly and a local electives group that represented all jurisdictions and also met monthly.

Luis Zurinaga thanked Caltrain for their detailed work in putting their Business Plan together. He said the Transportation Authority was supportive of the service vision that Caltrain was recommending and the remaining tasks to complete the study. He said the Transportation Authority recognized the funding and institutional challenges ahead and offered their support. Mr. Zurinaga said the Transportation Authority was requesting that Caltrain provide a funding plan that details when funding would be needed to support the improvements and operations proposed in the moderate scenario. This would allow the Transportation Authority to plan and advocate for funding sources. He stated the importance of working together to make the long range vision a reality.

During public comment Edward Mason asked if the project would eliminate the hundreds



of commuter buses that travel through San Francisco. He referenced a report that stated that 45% of people who take commuter bus would need to drive to the 4th and King Caltrain station if they did not have a commuter bus option.

**The CAC lost quorum at 8:18 p.m. during Item 8. The meeting was adjourned. Chair Larson continued the meeting as a workshop with any presentations or public comment not on the record.**

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

No minutes were taken due to lack of quorum.

**10. Public Comment**

No minutes were taken due to lack of quorum.

**11. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:18 p.m.