DRAFT MINUTES

PLANS AND PROGRAMS COMMITTEE

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

1. Roll Call

Vice Chair Kim called the meeting to order at 10:15 a.m. The following members were:

Present at Roll Call: Commissioners Breed, Kim and Yee (3)

Absent at Roll Call: Commissioners Campos (entered during Item 2) and Mar (entered during Item 6) (2)

2. Citizens Advisory Committee Report - INFORMATION

Chris Waddling, Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Vice Chair, reported that at its June 25 meeting, the CAC considered and unanimously adopted Items 6 and 7 from the agenda.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun said that an important issue for seniors and people with disabilities was not having enough time to cross the street. He suggested that they be provided with a key fob that would reset the countdown signals to allow them additional time to cross the street. He also commented that Transbay Joint Powers Authority should present at a CAC meeting and provide more details on the Downtown Extension project.

Consent Calendar

- 3. Approve the Minutes of the June 17, 2014 Meeting – ACTION
- 4. Recommend Allocation of \$5,322,331 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, and Allocation of \$2,210,000 in Prop AA Funds, with Conditions, for Six Requests, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules and Amendment of the Prop AA Strategic Plan - ACTION

There was no public comment.

The Consent Calendar was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Campos, Kim and Yee (4)

Absent: Commissioner Mar (1)

End of Consent Calendar

5. Recommend Appointment of One Member to the Citizens Advisory Committee -**ACTION**

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

Raymon Smith spoke to his interest and qualifications in being appointed to the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC).

Vice Chair Kim requested that Mr. Smith provide his perspective on pedestrian safety, in particular in regards to the senior and disabled community. Mr. Smith commented that the City needed to do a better job at prioritizing the movement of seniors and disabled persons. He added that the City needed to maintain sidewalks and crosswalks for accessibility, and that seniors and the disabled needed longer crossing times and/or shorter crossing distances.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun commented on the need for the CAC to reflect the diversity of San Francisco, including the disabled community.

Vice Chair Kim expressed her appreciation for former CAC member Joseph Flanagan's work to improve pedestrian safety, public safety, and open space in the South of Market area. Ms. Kim expressed support for having the CAC reflect the diversity of San Francisco.

Vice Chair Kim moved to recommend appointment of Mr. Smith, seconded by Commissioner Campos. The motion to recommend appointment of Mr. Smith to the CAC was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Campos, Kim and Yee (4)

Absent: Commissioner Mar (1)

6. Recommend Approval of Fourteen 2014 Prop-K 5-Year Prioritization Programs – ACTION

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

Chair Mar asked if project sponsors such as the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) would have the capacity to undertake the new projects proposed in the five year plans. Ms. Lombardo responded that a large share of the programming was for the replacement of Muni's rubber-tire vehicles and would be expended easily. Ms. Lombardo stated that the SFMTA had revised the application and approval process for traffic calming projects, allowing for swifter implementation. She added that the 2014 Prop K Strategic Plan that would be presented to the Committee in September would include a proposal to establish a delegated allocation authority pilot policy that would allow certain projects that are named in a Board-adopted 5-Year Prioritization Program and that meet certain criteria, to bypass the traditional four-to six-week Board process.

Vice Chair Kim requested information regarding the status of the Bessie Carmichael Elementary School Safe Routes to School project. Ariel Espiritu Santo, Capital Budget Lead for the SFMTA, stated that the SFMTA recently completed a walking audit and was reviewing and finalizing draft recommendations. She added that the project would enter the environmental phase at the end of 2014 and construction would occur between October 2015 and 2017. Vice Chair Kim asked what types of improvements had been constructed for other Safe Routes to School projects. Ms. Santo responded that other projects included pedestrian safety improvements such as pedestrian bulbs, updated crosswalks, and bicycle infrastructure improvements. Ms. Kim commented that her office was not included in the walking audit and was unsure if community members, teachers, and parents had been involved. Ms. Espiritu Santo stated that the SFMTA would schedule a briefing with Vice Chair Kim's office to review the results of the walking audit.

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, stated that Prop K was proposed to fund the Bessie Carmichael Safe Routes to School planning phase in Fiscal Year 2014/15. Ms.

LaForte stated that the current project scope was focused on the elementary school, but the project could consider benefits to the adjacent middle school campus as well.

Chair Mar commented on the negative impacts of traffic surrounding Bessie Carmichael Elementary School and the Filipino Education Center and stated that parents should be involved in the planning process. Chair Mar added that upgrades to traffic signals and pedestrian countdown signals could be coordinated with efforts to reduce traffic speeds in the area of the schools.

There was no public comment.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Kim, Mar and Yee (4)

Absent: Commissioner Campos (1)

7. Clipper Next Generation Fare Collection Update – INFORMATION

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, introduced Carol Kuester, Director of Electronic Payments at Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), who presented the item.

Commissioner Yee asked if MTC envisioned Clipper being capable of completing parking meter and taxi ride transactions. Ms. Kuester responded that MTC was currently examining the issue, but that transit fare payments were the program's priority. She stated that transit operators had asked for Clipper to have the ability to pay for last-mile transportation services, such as bike sharing and parking. She stated that credit cards could be used to pay for taxis and parking, which may fulfill the needs of the users. She added that the inclusion of more payment options on Clipper would create operational issues and add to the overall cost and complexity of the system.

Chair Mar asked how other fare payment systems in the country were improving their systems. Ms. Kuester responded that Chicago had replaced its entire smart card inventory, and offered a debit card function, which required additional customer communication during initiation. She added that some regions used mobile bar-code ticketing applications, whereby transit riders could purchase their fare and load a bar-code onto their smart phone as proof of payment. She added that the application would function on commuter rail, but would increase boarding time for Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) and buses.

Travis Fox, Chief Information Officer at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority (SFMTA), added that the SFMTA was considering a limited duration pilot of mobile ticketing targeted at casual users such as tourists and special events visitors. Mr. Fox added that the SFMTA expected implementation to begin in the fall.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated that Clipper should include the ability to pay for car-sharing. Mr. Lebrun expressed the need for MTC to examine the maintenance of Clipper card readers.

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

Michael Schwartz, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Mar asked Peter Gabancho, Project Manager at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, to discuss lessons learned on the Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project that could be applied to the Geary BRT project.

Mr. Gabancho responded that the team needed to be aware of local and national design regulations. He said that the SFMTA was unable to design platforms like the ones used for the BRT system in Mexico City because the platforms in Mexico City would not meet the accessibility standards for level boarding per the Americans with Disabilities Act, particularly with respect to wheelchair loading.

Chair Mar asked how the \$162 million cost estimate would compare to building rail on the same route. He also asked how the costs have increased over time. Mr. Gabancho said that building light rail for the same segment as Van Ness BRT would cost \$500 million to \$600 million.

Chair Mar asked what rating Van Ness Avenue BRT would receive using the Institute for Transportation and Development Policy (ITDP) standards. Mr. Gabancho replied that the ITDP standards emphasized level boarding and platform fare enforcement, both of which are challenging in the San Francisco context. Michael Schwartz added that the project was aiming to achieve a silver rating similar to Cleveland's Health Line BRT.

Commissioner Yee asked if there would be bike lanes on Van Ness Avenue. Mr. Gabancho responded that the designated bike lane would be on Polk Street, and that there would not be lanes on Van Ness Avenue. He added that the buses would have bike racks on the front and that there would be bicycle parking near stations.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun noted that level boarding is an important part of BRT. He said the issue of lug nuts protruding from the wheels and not allowing the buses to get close enough to the platforms for level boarding does not exist in Europe and recommended that the SFMTA send a letter to bus manufacturers that this is a critical issue for future bus procurements.

9. Introduction of New Items – INFORMATION

There were no new items.

There was no public comment.

10. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:34 a.m.