



# DRAFT MINUTES

## CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, November 30, 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, Becky Hogue, Brian Larkin, John Larson, Santiago Lerma, Jacqueline Sachs, Shannon Wells-Mongiovi, Chris Waddling (Chair) and Bradley Wiedmaier (9).

Transportation Authority staff members present were Executive Director Tilly Chang, Joe Castiglione, Camille Guiriba, Seon Joo Kim, Anna LaForte, Maria Lombardo and Steve Rehn.

### 2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Waddling gave a brief review of the local election results, stating that Proposition J (charter amendment creating fund programs for homeless services and transportation improvements) had passed, but Proposition K (half-cent sales tax to fund the programs created by Proposition J) had failed. He said the San Francisco Board of Supervisors would have three new members come January, and therefore the Transportation Authority's Board of Commissioners would also have three new members. Chair Waddling said that because Peter Tannen could not attend the November 30 CAC meeting, a planned information item that he had requested on bus and train bunching would be postponed until the January meeting. A planned presentation on the Central Subway project was also postponed to January due to staff availability. Chair Waddling said a Central Subway tour for the CAC that was requested by Peter Tannen would be arranged by staff if CAC members expressed an interest. Finally, Chair Waddling announced that a special CAC meeting had been tentatively scheduled for January 11, 2017 pending CAC approval of Item 6.

There was no public comment.

### Consent Calendar

3. **Approve the Minutes of the October 26, 2016 Meeting – ACTION**
4. **Adopt a Motion of Support to Increase the Amount of the Professional Services Contract with Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. by \$960,000, to a Total Amount Not to Exceed \$1,210,000 through December 31, 2019 for System Engineering Services for the Treasure Island Mobility Management Program, and to Authorize the Executive Director to Modify Contract Payment Terms and Non-Material Contract Terms and Conditions – ACTION**
5. **Adopt a Motion of Support for the Approval of the 2017 State and Federal Legislative Program – ACTION**
6. **Approve the 2017 Meeting Schedule for the Citizens Advisory Committee – ACTION**

## **7. Citizen Advisory Committee Appointment – INFORMATION**

Bradley Wiedmaier said the minutes of the October 26<sup>th</sup> CAC meeting had mischaracterized his request for a new agenda item concerning the increase in rideshare services. He said his request was specifically about the impact of ride sharing on congestion. Regarding Item 5, he said the legislative program should emphasize that any efforts to streamline the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) should nevertheless uphold the goals of the Act. He said CEQA should not be weakened, especially with regard to public input.

Jaqualine Sachs asked when her request for an information item on the Other 9 to 5 report would make it onto a CAC agenda. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, said the item would be scheduled for early 2017.

There was no public comment

Brian Larkin moved to approve the item, seconded by Jaqualine Sachs.

The Consent Calendar was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Hogue, Larkin, Larson, Lerma, J. Sachs, Wells-Mongiovi, Waddling and Wiedmaier (9)

Absent: CAC Members P. Sachs and Tannen (2)

### **End of Consent Calendar**

## **8. Nominations for 2017 Citizens Advisory Committee Chair and Vice Chair– INFORMATION**

Chair Waddling read aloud the nomination procedures for the annual election of Chair and Vice Chair of the CAC.

Chair Waddling opened the floor for nominations for the Chair seat.

John Larson nominated Chris Waddling for Chair, who accepted the nomination. There were no further nominations.

Chair Waddling opened the floor for nominations for the Vice Chair seat.

Santiago Lerma nominated Bradley Wiedmaier, who accepted the nomination. John Larson nominated Peter Sachs in absentia. There were no further nominations.

During public comment, Tilly Chang, Executive Director, expressed her thanks to the CAC for its service. She said staff and the Board valued the CAC's input on the City's transportation issues.

## **9. Commuter Shuttle Hub Study – INFORMATION**

Sarah Jones, Director of Planning at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), presented information on SFMTA's shuttle program. Camille Guiriba, Transportation Planner, presented the results of the Transportation Authority's Commuter Shuttle Hub Study.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi asked about the number of non-participating shuttle companies, and whether a list of such companies existed. Ms. Jones said she was not sure if SFMTA knew the number. She said some of the most prominent shuttle companies and services did not participate, such as University of California at San Francisco and Academy of Art University, as they would receive little or no benefit from participating. She said greater enforcement might help SFMTA understand the number of non-participating shuttle companies. Ms. Wells-Mongiovi observed that only a small number of locations in the Sunset, Richmond and Presidio areas were modeled in the Commuter Shuttle Hub Study, with only one scenario considering hubs on the west side of the city

and none with hubs in the Richmond. Ms. Guiriba responded that the scenario design process was informed by existing shuttle boarding location patterns, with a majority of boardings occurring in the Northeast quadrant of the City. She said the study assumed that Richmond-area shuttle users would take transit to their nearest hub location. Ms. Wells-Mongiovi said it was difficult to get to and from the Richmond via transit.

Jacqueline Sachs described how, at the intersection of California and Divisadero Streets, senior and disabled transit users were unable to safely access 24-line and 1-line Muni vehicles because of private shuttles blocking Muni bus stops. She also observed that good management of curb access for paratransit, paramedics, and Uber was important near facilities for the senior and disabled population. Ms. Jones replied that she would follow up with Ms. Sachs about these locations. She said this example illustrated a major reason for moving away from shared Muni zone model, as well as the challenges of locating shuttle stops.

Bradley Wiedmaier inquired about having local shuttles throughout the city that linked up with commuter shuttle hubs. Ms. Jones replied that SFMTA had not looked at this alternative. She observed that the technology companies worked directly with shuttle providers, and that SFMTA only regulated street usage. Ms. Jones suggested that the approach Mr. Wiedmaier described might involve more parties and would require additional study. Ms. Jones also noted that a key intent of the hub model was that hubs would be accessible by Muni transit vehicles. She said there were many potential transportation alternatives, and mentioned the possibility of a crowdsourced hub location. Mr. Wiedmaier observed that there were many different shuttle services competing in the same neighborhoods, and suggested that the impacts on neighborhoods would be reduced if shuttle boarding locations were pooled to hubs. He also noted that vehicle emissions and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) would be high even with a hub scenario. Ms. Jones observed that San Francisco's shuttle program had been a breakthrough in regulating new forms of transportation. However, she noted that it was a first step, and that the shuttle discussion had not yet taken place at the regional level. Mr. Wiedmaier envisioned a fleet of pooled city commuter vehicles, possibly for use by other city residents during the day. Ms. Jones responded that the Hub Study tried to design hubs so that they could also be served by public transit vehicles, but said SFMTA probably wouldn't create new services. Mr. Wiedmaier asked if Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) streets such as Van Ness Avenue or Geary Boulevard would be designed to accommodate private shuttles, or if shuttle stops would be prohibited. Ms. Jones replied that she thought it was likely that stop locations on those streets would be moved so that there would be no competition with BRT.

Santiago Lerma asked if the mode shift analysis was based on actual survey data of shuttle users. Ms. Guiriba replied that it was not, and that it was based on the SF-CHAMP mode choice model and used inputs such as boarding locations, destinations, and travel times by different modes. Mr. Lerma suggested that this meant the study couldn't actually predict how people would change modes, since there was no data on how many shuttle users had the option to drive cars. He said the SFMTA assumed the program was reducing automobile traffic but could not really verify the claim. Ms. Guiriba acknowledged the need for more and better data about the shuttle users and shuttle trips, including data such as automobile ownership.

Chair Waddling raised concerns about the assumptions and errors in any kind of modeling study. He said day-to-day variation could affect model results based on sample data. He also said single percentage point estimates weren't helpful to decision-makers, suggesting that estimates should include plus/minus standard deviation. He noted that there were 166 million VMT each day in the Bay Area, so the impacts from shuttle hubs would represent a tiny share of total regional VMT. He speculated that all shuttles could be eliminated with no observable impact on traffic. Chair Waddling also asked how carpools were handled in the model. Joe Castiglione, Deputy Director for

Technology, Data & Analysis, replied that limitations in the analysis were partly due to limited data, such as the actual origins and destinations of shuttle passengers. He said the study adapted the SF-CHAMP mode choice model for work trips. He said that while the model included a great deal of data about a variety of alternatives, there were still limitations that required the study to limit the set of alternatives. He said for instance, the study did consider using a “shared ride” mode, but couldn’t because of limitations in the data available from the Google Maps program interface (API), which was used to estimate travel times. Mr. Castiglione said the Google Maps data didn’t provide a way of distinguishing travel times for carpools, so the study was limited to analyzing a single drive mode. He said it would be possible to model the actual number of vehicles based on existing data and assumptions about vehicle occupancy.

John Larson observed that absent any statutory change, it would not be possible to eliminate commuter shuttles from City streets. He agreed that any modeling scenario involved uncertainty, but argued that modeling was nevertheless worthwhile. He said it was not surprising that going to a hub system would shift some trips to automobiles because of the reduced number of boarding locations and the likelihood that shuttle riders could afford to own cars. Mr. Larson questioned the value of a major change to the shuttle program, acknowledging the annoyances created by shuttles but suggesting that they mainly could be addressed through enforcement. He observed that rideshare services also created annoyances (such as stopping mid-block to load/off-load passengers), and noted that the City simply had limited enforcement and legislative authority.

During public comment, Bob Planthold said the Commuter Shuttle Hub Study ignored people with disabilities, despite the fact that the disabled community was a protected class whereas shuttle riders were not. He expressed frustration with the way commuter shuttles interfered with curb access to Muni vehicles. Mr. Planthold took issue with other aspects of the analysis, saying that the household travel survey data on which the mode choice analysis was based on could be 10 or more years old and thus out of date. He also said the emissions analysis was inadequate because it did not consider different emissions rates of surface arterials versus much higher speed freeway speeds.

Ed Mason observed that violations by commuter shuttles were continuing, and said that SFMTA’s shuttle program had harmed neighborhoods to accommodate corporations. As examples, he observed the high number of buses per hour in the morning and said the program had shifted curb space from use by Muni and residential parking to shuttle loading zones. He agreed with Mr. Planthold that the environmental modeling in the Hub Study could have been better. He suggested that the Bay Area Council should coordinate commuter shuttles, noting the connection with regional development, such as the Apple and Facebook campus expansions. He predicted that coupled with the lack of planned housing in Silicon Valley, the new jobs would lead to more commuter shuttles in San Francisco. He advocated for a regional bus system.

Phoebe Cutler asserted that the City had more leverage over commuter shuttles than it chose to exercise. She said low parking requirements at corporate campuses forced commuters to take shuttles. She said corporations should take more responsibility for commuter impacts and coordinate to develop imaginative transportation solutions.

Peter Warfield, Library User’s Association, expressed concern that SFMTA’s decision to remove stops near the library on the 19-line was made with insufficient consideration of the impacts to library users. He estimated the change had resulted in 400,000 additional street crossings. He also expressed concern that a system of shuttle hubs would have negative impacts on pedestrians, especially disabled pedestrians. He expressed concern that the shuttle buses not only reduced access to Muni buses, but obscured them from waiting passengers. He said the Caltrain station should be a hub in any system of shuttle hubs. He also suggested consideration of longer term changes, such as people changing home or work locations to reduce commutes. Finally, he observed that there

seemed to be a lot of empty capacity on the shuttles, questioning the need for such large vehicles.

**10. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Allocation of \$6,507,592 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, for Five Requests, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules – ACTION**

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

Chair Waddling commented on the Alemany Interchange Improvement Phase 1 project, suggesting specific enhancements such as reducing the speed limit and installing soft-hit posts along the buffered bike lanes in the west bound direction of Alemany Boulevard. He said that in the east bound direction of Alemany Boulevard and San Bruno Avenue, hashed areas on either side of the roads were often ignored by drivers and suggested adding physical barriers to prevent this issue. He expressed his support for this project and commented that it was a good example of how the Transportation Authority could successfully lead the interagency coordination of a complex project with multiple players. He urged the Transportation Authority to play this role actively for more projects. John Larson expressed his support for the project and agreement with Chair Waddling's suggested improvements, which was echoed by Shannon Wells-Mongiovi. Ms. LaForte noted that soft-hit posts were part of the project scope. Mr. Larson also noted that he had observed the flooding problems that would have to be addressed in the next phase of the project involving a new pedestrian/bicyclist path.

Brian Larkin asked about the Transit Modal Concept Study. Camille Guiriba, Transportation Planner, responded that Transit Modal Concept Study was a component of Connect SF, a long-range transportation planning process, and that this study would look at the overall transit network and evaluate the needs over the next several decades. She added that the T-Third Phase 3 Feasibility Study would feed into the Transit Modal Concept Study.

Mr. Larkin asked about the possibility of considering a rail service through Geary Boulevard in the T-Third Phase 3 Feasibility Study. Liz Brisson, Major Corridors Planning Manager at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), responded that SFMTA would continue to consider Geary Boulevard in coordination with other efforts, such as the Transit Modal Concept Study and the Subway Vision. Ms. Brisson clarified that, in the next year and half, the Feasibility Study would mainly build upon the previous technical work performed through the T-Third Phase 3 Initial Study. She stated that the findings of the Feasibility Study would be informed by a robust outreach to be conducted with the requested Prop K funds.

Chair Waddling noted that regarding the Geneva-Harney Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project, he had heard a generally favorable sentiment from neighbors but some concerns over the benefits to existing residents versus future residents. He said that with respect to the Central Segment, Little Hollywood residents were against the Blanken/Lathrop Couplet and preferred the Beatty Avenue option. He added that most everyone seemed to prefer the Beatty option except for Recology. He said he expected some positive public feedback on the new third option through the northern portion of the Recology campus.

Bradley Wiedmaier asked how the SFMTA had developed the Geneva-Harney BRT proposal from scratch where the routes and services and future developments did not currently exist. Kenya Wheeler, Senior Environmental Planner at the SFMTA, responded that residents were using a bus service along Bayshore Boulevard and San Bruno Avenue, but there was no direct connection between Balboa Park to Bayshore Boulevard. He pointed out that the BRT proposal was based on a feasibility analysis and the transportation demand model, which projected what types of trip would be made and how new transit corridors could serve these trips throughout the corridor in the next

20-25 years, as well as the land use analysis, which projected the additional development and its impact on ridership. He also mentioned that ridership from the west, east and south of the project location was anticipated to increase, including new homes in the east of U.S. 101 and many developments under construction in the west of U.S. 101. He said the requested Prop K funds would fund extensive community outreach, conceptual engineering, and environment review preparation.

Mr. Wiedmaier further asked about flexibility of the design, given several future development scenarios. Mr. Wheeler responded that in addition to its potential to deliver a high-quality service at a relatively low cost, the advantage of the BRT system was its flexibility, so it would be possible to relocate BRT stops or make adjustment to accommodate future changes. Mr. Wheeler added that the Balboa Park CAC has asked about light-rail transit (LRT) service in the corridor and he explained that the SFMTA would take a high-level look at LRT service, but would not clear it in the subject environmental study as it was considered more of a longer-term option, if it were pursued.

Jacqueline Sachs asked if the Geneva-Harney BRT had a privately funded component. Ms. LaForte explained that the Eastern Segment was funded by the private developer, and the Western Segment was funded by General Obligation bond funds, Prop K, and other funding sources.

During public comment, Edward Mason commented regarding the T-Third Phase 3 Feasibility Study that the limited budget should be spent on Fix-it-First projects rather than long-range projects such as a future light-rail extension, especially given the recent failure of the new transportation revenue measure.

Peter Warfield asked CAC members to reconsider the Replace 27 Paratransit Vans project, putting it on pause until SFMTA conducted an analysis on the paratransit vehicle that fatally struck Lurilla Harris in June 2016. He urged identification of the cause and whether there should be changes to the vehicles before procuring more of them. Mr. Warfield commented that the center boarding islands that were planned for the Van Ness Avenue BRT posed safety risks to pedestrians, especially people with disabilities. He commented he was skeptical of the outreach planned as part of the Geneva-Harney BRT project, based on his experience with SFMTA's poor outreach on the 7th and 8th Street Safety project near library.

Mr. Larson moved to approve the item, seconded by Ms. Hogue.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Hogue, Larkin, Larson, Lerma, J. Sachs, Waddling and Wells-Mongiovi (7)

Abstain: CAC Member Wiedmaier (1)

Absent: CAC Member Ablog, P. Sachs, and Tannen (3)

## **11. Findings of Child Transportation Survey Report – INFORMATION**

Joe Castiglione, Deputy Director of Technology, Data & Analysis, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chris Waddling asked about the potential to provide incentives for parents to send their children to local schools. Mr. Castiglione responded that school choice was a controversial issue and beyond the scope of this relatively small effort; thus, the study team decided not to address it as part of the study. He observed that while school choice offered opportunities that might not be available at a local school it comes at a cost to parents, children, and the transportation system. Becky Hogue added that some neighborhoods, such as on Treasure Island, did not have a local school.

John Larson asked for further explanation on the “school tripper” Muni runs. Mr. Castiglione responded that it would involve targeting routes at particular times of day at certain locations, possibly with route deviations, and that the idea was based on discussions the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency had with the school district, but not well developed yet.

Brian Larkin asked if the school district was considering resuming the school bus program. Mr. Castiglione responded that the school district currently provided limited school bus service for certain populations. He said that in his conversations with the school district, he received no indication that they would expand that service. He added that one suggestion was to consider finding ways to pool rides for children from all types of schools (public, private, etc.) that were in close proximity to one another.

There was no public comment.

## **12. Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION**

Becky Hogue said on October 21<sup>st</sup> she had represented the CAC at the ribbon-cutting ceremony for the Yerba Buena Island ramps project. She said the event was exciting for Treasure Island residents and was well attended. She said the weekend shuttle service from the parking lot to the bicycle facility had begun and seemed to be working well.

John Larson said he had taken an opportunity to walk the length of the bike path from the East Bay side. He said there was a park ranger giving visitors directions to the shuttle, and that he also had occasion to drive on the new ramp..

Bradley Wiedmaier said he had difficulty returning to the October CAC meeting after it had begun because the lobby security staff was unsure of procedures for accommodating late-arriving attendees. He wondered if the CAC was in violation of open meeting laws. Maria Lombardo said that staff had worked out a procedure with building security personnel so people could get up to the meeting at any time, but that staff would make it a point to remind building security of the procedure prior to each meeting.

Santiago Lerma commented that at a previous meeting he and Mr. Wiedmaier had raised questions about the impact of ride-sharing services and looked forward to a future information item on the issue. He acknowledged that there may not be much data on this and commented that the shuttle program was an accommodation of public resources for use by private corporations, and that the participating companies should be expected to provide the data needed for evaluating and improving the program.

During public comment Peter Warfield, Library Users Association, said pedestrian accidents were greatly under-reported, and said the Department of Public Health reported that approximately two-thirds of injuries treated at city hospitals resulted from pedestrian collisions. He also said there was a lack of clarity in the SFMTA’s use of collision statistics by not differentiating between collisions involving motor vehicles, bicycles or other pedestrians. He suggested more coverage of pedestrian issues in future CAC agendas and stressed the importance of obtaining good data on pedestrian collisions if the City wants to meet its Vision Zero goals.

Ed Mason provided examples of violations by commuter shuttles at 24<sup>th</sup> and Sanchez and on Market Street between Duboce and Church Streets, and said he felt shuttle operators were not making an effort to comply with shuttle program rules or with other relevant laws. He advocated for more vigorous enforcement.

## **13. Public Comment**

During public comment, Peter Warfield pointed out that according to the presentation on the

shuttle program, shuttles provided only about 10,000 rides daily. He wondered what the comparable figure was for Muni's transit service, and suggested that the effort to accommodate private shuttles was disproportionate to their share of total transit passengers. He also criticized SFMTA's outreach efforts for its 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Street Safety Project, saying that the outreach did not include signage and that it was unclear whether the public library had been included in the direct-mail notifications. He recommended that the CAC consider the details of SFMTA outreach efforts when planned as part of a transportation project.

Jacqueline Sachs asked that staff provide the CAC with the contact information for all members. She also asked staff to send members a full schedule of upcoming meetings just approved for 2017

#### **14. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:22 p.m.