

AGENDA



Geary Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting 20

Date: 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm, Thursday, September 28, 2006

Location: 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor

6:00 1. Introductions/Study Updates – INFORMATION+

The Chair will call roll and introduce agency staff and consultants. Authority staff will provide a brief study update to apprise committee members of key project work since the last meeting, including information related to the final series of public workshops. Committee members will be asked to inform their constituents about the workshops and to sign up to attend at least one of the three events.

6:10 2. Approval of Minutes – ACTION*

6:15 3. Vote to Hold an Election for the Chair Position – ACTION

Consistent with Authority practice regarding appointment of advisory committees with project-specific and time-limited mandates, the Authority Board action that created the GCAC did not specify a term limit for the Chair or Vice Chair position. Consequently, the current Chair, Bruce Balshone, has led the GCAC since August 2004. During the Vice Chair elections at the July 2006 meeting, Committee members raised the issue of whether or not to hold an election for the Chair position. The discussion was tabled in order to properly calendar the item. The GCAC is asked to decide whether or not to hold an election for the Chair position.

6:30 4. Possible Vote to Elect a Chair and Vice Chair – ACTION

If as part of Item 3 the Committee determines to hold an election for the Chair position, the Chair will solicit nominations from the floor. The Chair will close nominations and each candidate will be allowed to make a short statement to accept or reject the nomination and explain his or her qualifications. All members, including the current Chair and Vice Chair will be eligible. The committee will vote on each candidate, in the order that nominations were made, until one of the candidates receives a majority of votes. If the current Vice Chair is elected Chair, the GCAC will repeat the process, to elect a new Vice Chair. If, as part of Item 3, the Committee decides not to hold an election for the Chair position, Item 4 will be skipped.

6:40 5. Evaluation of Alternatives, Part 3 – INFORMATION

Over the past several months, Authority staff has presented various sections of the evaluation framework including transit rider experience, access and pedestrian safety, urban design, and parking. Staff will present findings on transit performance and traffic impacts, based on the results of traffic analysis and micro-simulation models (Synchro and VISSIM respectively). The measures of evaluation that will be discussed include: transit travel time relative to auto travel time, transit reliability, person delay, and traffic impacts on Geary and at key locations in the corridor. The presentation will focus on the preliminary modeling results for the PM Peak period; a complete set of evaluation results will be presented to the community at the November public workshops. **We are seeking input from the GCAC regarding the draft analysis for transit performance**

and traffic impacts. We will bring the final analysis document for committee action at the next meeting.

7:20 6. Analysis of Basic Transit Priority Treatments – INFORMATION

At the July 2006 meeting committee members requested that staff investigate the possibility of implementing only basic transit priority treatments (e.g., peak hour only dedicated lane) on Geary Boulevard en lieu of a full featured bus rapid transit project. Staff will present the pros and cons of possible treatments based on relevant analyses that have already been completed for the 2015 Build and No-Project alternatives. **This is an information item.**

7:50 7. Public Comment

8:00 8. Next Meeting/Adjournment

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, November 16, 2006 at 6 pm.

* Materials attached.

+ Materials to be provided at the meeting.

This meeting location is accessible to people who use wheelchairs. In order to allow individuals with environmental illness or multiple chemical sensitivity to attend the meeting, individuals are requested to refrain from wearing perfume or other scented products. All times shown are for information only. Items will be called at the discretion of the Chair.

If you prefer receiving future agendas via email instead of regular mail, please send your request to Julie.Kirschbaum@sfcta.org



Draft Minutes

Geary Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting 19: Thursday, July 27, 2006

The meeting began at 6:05 PM.

Present were the following members: Richard Allman, Bruce Balshone (Chair), Aida Berkovitz, Steve Boland, Leslie Clark, Steve Ferrario, David Heller, Brian Larkin, Michael Louie, Jim Misener, Bruce Osterweil, Diego Sanchez, David Schaefer, Kate White, and Rich Worner..

Absent: Jean Fraser, Suzanne Tucker, and Bobbie Webb.

Transportation Authority: Julie Kirschbaum (Senior Transportation Planner), José Luis Moscovich (Executive Director), Billy Charlton (Principal Planner), Zabe Bent (Senior Transportation Planner), Ajay Martin (Transportation Planner), and Mary Brown (Intern).

1. Introductions/Study Updates

Bruce Balshone, Chair, opened the meeting and called role. Agency staff present included: Julie Kirschbaum, José Luis Moscovich, Billy Charlton, Zabe Bent, Ajay Martin, and Mary Brown from SFCTA; Mariam Morley from the City Attorney's Office; and Paul Bignardi, Javad Mirabdal, and Karl Natvig from MTA. Consultants present included Donna Pittman (Pittman & Associates) and Helen Kwan (Chinatown Community Development Corporation).

Julie Kirschbaum provided an update regarding the Study's schedule and progress. She began by reviewing the updated GCAC meeting schedule, pointing out that an additional meeting was added in September 2006 to present the results of the micro-simulation modeling results. She also indicated that the GCAC would review the Final Report in February 2006 and that third series of public workshops would occur in October *[NOTE: the workshop dates have since shifted to early November]*.

Ms. Kirschbaum then indicated that the Study had reached a major milestone in terms of modeling work, which would be presented in a later item. Ms. Kirschbaum also gave an update of outreach activities and community presentations; this included presentations to the Tenderloin Futures Collaborative, St. Francis Square, Self Help for the Elderly, Planning Association for the Richmond, and the Japantown Merchants Association. Outreach activities also included completion of a 1,200 person survey of transit riders conducted at Geary bus stops. Ms. Kirschbaum announced the July 30 District 1 Town Hall, which will include a discussion of the Geary BRT Study.

2. Approval of Minutes

Bruce Osterweil moved to approve the May 18 minutes, seconded by Jim Misener. The minutes were approved with no abstentions. No public comment was received on this item.

3. Meeting Ground Rules

Julie Kirschbaum presented this item by reading through the meeting ground rules handout distributed at the meeting. She pointed out that this item was added to the agenda at the request of GCAC members at the May 2006 meeting. The ground rules are intended to facilitate efficient and fair meetings.

Steve Ferrario asked why ground rule #7 did not also require the Chair to take questions and comments from Committee members on all items. Ms. Kirschbaum clarified that committee discussions were addressed in #6. Mr. Ferrario further commented that he would have liked to raise an issue during the first agenda item: Introductions/Study Update, but there was no committee discussion. The Chair agreed to revisit this item.

Steve Ferrario also asked for clarification about ground rule #2, commenting that it was different than the City's rules. Miriam Morley, from the City Attorney's Office, clarified that in order to take action on an item within the city system you need the majority of the members of the board; whereas SFCTA ground rules require action items to be affirmed by a majority of the committee members present. She explained that the different rule comes from the fact that the Authority is not part of City and County; it is a separate government entity.

The Chair took public comment on this item. Roger Bazeley commented that because some items get an excess of discussion, other items at the end of the agenda do not always get enough time. He encouraged the Chair to keep the meeting on schedule so that Committee members could focus on public input for all agenda items.

Following public comment, Richard Allman suggested adding a tenth ground rule that emphasized the importance of respecting public input. The Chair suggested also adding additional language about respecting staff.

4. Vice Chair Elections

Julie Kirschbaum began this item by indicating that committee members Amber Crabbe and Andrew Green had resigned since the last meeting and thanking them for their participation. Ms. Crabbe's resignation meant that the vice-chair position was vacant.

Richard Allman expressed surprise that there was not a yearly election on chair and vice chair. José Luis Moscovich explained that the Authority Board action that created the GCAC did not specify a term limit for the chair or vice chair position, which is consistent with Authority practice regarding advisory committees with project-specific and time-limited mandates. The indicated that the committee has the flexibility to decide on when/if it re-elected these positions. David Heller indicated his support for Mr. Allman's comment and recommended voting for the chair position at the same time as the vote for the vice-chair position. He stated that an election for a Chair could improve the integrity of the "tainted committee." Steve Ferrario asked for clarification on whether or not the committee would sunset in February 2006. Julie Kirschbaum indicated that the decision would be made by the Authority Board and that GCAC members would also have an opportunity to weigh in on the issue. Bruce Osterweil and Jim Misener suggested postponing the Chair re-election until after the Final Report, if the GCAC were to remain active.

Richard Worner stated that in other committees the Chair changes annually and that one side might be heard better if there were a different Chair. Aida Berkovitz commented that changing the Chair is not of great importance. David Heller disagreed. He stated that the Chair had made up his mind and stated his belief that the committee needed a neutral chair. He indicated that he and others would feel comfortable with new leadership and urged GCAC members to reconsider.

Bruce Balshone opened nomination for vice chair. Steve Ferrario nominated David Schaefer, Aida Berkovitz seconded. Bruce Osterweil nominated Kate White, Steve Boland seconded; Brian Larkin

nominated David Heller, Rich Worner seconded. Aida Berkovitz nominated Bruce Osterweil, Brian seconded. Richard Allman nominated Jim Misener, Steve Ferrario seconded.

Before the voting began, staff clarified that committee would vote on each candidate, in the order that nominations were received until someone receives a majority of votes. Subsequently, Bruce Osterweil and Jim Misener withdrew their names. This left David Schaefer, Kate White and David Heller as the remaining candidates; they each got two minutes to state their case.

David Schaefer stated that he lives on Geary and 11th Avenue and that he understands the issues from many perspectives: he is not a merchant, but shops in the neighborhood; he rides the bus, but is not with Rescue Muni; and he rides a bike, but he is not a member of the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition. He closed by telling the group that he was fair and open-minded and would evaluate the BRT project in part based on the benefits and impacts it would provide his children.

Kate White stated that she is a resident of the Mission, who uses Muni everyday, along with less frequent use of City Carshare and her bicycle. She has 13 years of professional experience in organizational management and urban planning and has helped facilitate hundreds of meeting. Her major goal as the vice chair would be to keep the group focused. She is currently the Executive Director of the San Francisco Urban Land Institute and is interested in the project goals of both stable ridership and neighborhood livability and commercial vitality.

After Ms. White's comments, David Heller withdrew his name and commented that he did not think someone who lives in the Mission should make decisions about Geary.

On the first round of voting, David Schaefer received the majority of votes (eight votes) and was elected the new Vice-Chair.

Returning to the issue of the Chair position, José Luis Moscovich indicated that he respected the comments that had been brought up related to the Chair position, but pointed out that this item was not on the agenda. To avoid a Brown Act violation, he suggested that the Chair close the discussion and if the Committee wanted to discuss the issue further that two agenda items be added to the next meeting: 1) a discussion about whether or not to hold elections for the Chair position; and 2) a contingency item for Chair elections, if the first item identified a need. David Heller requested to the Chair that these items be put on the next meeting's agenda. Subsequently, Steve Boland made a motion, seconded by Steve Ferrario.

The Chair took public comment on this item. Richard Bazeley complemented the work of the existing Chair and offered the model of the SF Unified School District, which re-elects a chair once a year. He also pointed out that everyone on the committee has institutional memory.

5. Outreach Update from Community Partners Part 2

Elizabeth Bent, Senior Planner at the Authority presented this item. She introduced the community partner Helen Kwan from the Community Chinatown Corporation and gave an update of direct outreach activities. The \$218,000 Geary Multilingual Outreach Project is supported by a Caltrans planning grant and Prop K local sales tax. The SFCTA is working with six community based organizations (CBOs) along corridor, each representing different constituencies.

Donna Pittman (Donna Pittman and Associates), coordinator for CBO partners for the Geary Multilingual Outreach Project presented an overview and update of the project. She stated that the outreach project also functioned as a capacity building effort for the organizations and the communities they represent. She explained that doing outreach through community partners increased the quality of the feedback because stakeholders were more comfortable providing comments to organizations they were already familiar with and had built a level of trust.

Helen Kwan (Chinatown Community Development Center) gave an overview of the Chinatown Community Development Center (CCDC) and its outreach activities on the Geary BRT project. She

explained that the CCDC has a vested interest in the Geary corridor and wants to involve Asians in the planning process. Their work to date included translating all of the material for workshops, building a translatable transportation-based vocabulary, encouraging the Chinese press to generate interest on this project, and encouraging participation and attendance of Asians at most of meetings. The CCDC has provided community outreach at festivals; other outreach includes meetings with Self-help for the Elderly, Clement Street Merchant Association, Chinatown Trips, teens from Chinatown, and various CCDC properties along the corridor.

Helen Kwan stated that the stakeholders she met with generally supported a dedicated bus lane and pedestrian enhancements. She reported that seniors liked the side BRT for getting on and off the buses because they felt it was safer for them to board on the sidewalk. Some seniors questioned the need for the BRT project, stating that service on Geary is better than other lines. Some small business owners expressed concerns about construction impacts, emphasizing the importance of customers being able to walk to access their businesses. Ms. Kwan concluded by explaining the remaining direct outreach tasks her organization would sponsor.

Richard Worner pointed out that only a small number of people at the December workshops needed Chinese translation services. He expressed concern regarding the high cost of the outreach project and how much this broke down to on a per person basis. He also encouraged Ms. Kwan to emphasize the merits of the no-project alternative during her outreach.

Julie Kirschbaum and Elizabeth Bent clarified that the \$218,000 comes from a Caltrans grant and that it covers a wide range of tasks including visualizations, direct outreach, workshop activities, and press related work. Bruce Balshone advised Mr. Worner to meet with Authority staff directly if he had additional questions about the budget.

Aida Berkovitz asked for clarification from Donna Pittman about how the Multilingual Outreach Grant allowed for multiple levels of outreach. Ms. Pittman clarified that the grant allows for more in depth outreach. Rather than just meeting with the Japantown Task Force, for example, we are able to meet with other community groups that the Task Force is connected to (e.g., a senior lunch center).

David Heller asked why only 3 alternatives were being considered. Julie Kirschbaum explained that all of the proposed conceptual designs were being compared to a No Project alternative. She stated that the no-project includes lower impact transit priority investments that are likely to occur on Geary even if a BRT project is not implemented. David Heller clarified that he wants a fourth alternative evaluated – not the no-project alternative – and offered to share this new 4th alternative.

Jim Misener asked if the community partners or Authority staff had focused outreach on choice riders (i.e., people that have the option to drive). Julie indicated that they have not convened focus group specifically of drivers, but they have gone to several neighborhood meetings of which about half of the attendees are drivers.

The Chair took public comment on this item. Richard Bazeley agreed that outreach in multiple languages and outreach to drivers is valuable. He also emphasized the need for an economic impact study and more outreach to small businesses, large institutions, and schools. He cited an example about the lack of outreach to Market Street merchants regarding bicycle lanes and mentioned the suit against the San Francisco Bicycle Plan.

6. Evaluation of Alternatives Part 2

Billy Charlton, Principal Transportation Planner with the Authority, presented this item by walking the GCAC through a power point presentation, which highlighted the methodology and key finds of the preliminary travel demand forecasting.

Following the presentation Diego Sanchez asked how this forecasting applies to the Tenderloin. Billy clarified that the analysis considered the area east of Van Ness, but that the most significant changes

between the no-project and build alternatives focused on 33rd and Gough.

Bruce Osterweil asked if the no project alternative anticipates gas prices increases. Mr. Charlton clarified that there was a cost neutral assumption in terms of prices. Bruce Osterweil asked about how the model translates transit travel time savings into changes in ridership. Mr. Charlton explained that there is a whole industry based just on travel demand forecasting. This industry is focused on developing tools that capture the trade offs that people make in terms of how they react to changes in travel time. The SF-CHAMP model is calibrated to San Francisco data.

Bruce Osterweil also asked why the Center A option with BRT and local riders in the busway would attract more new riders than the Center B option with the local at the curb. Julie indicated that Center B has a slower local service than today, which offsets some of the increased ridership from the BRT service. Steve Boland asked for clarification on the hours of the 38L-Limited and asked how much of the new ridership was from the expanded hours. Ms. Kirschbaum indicated that the modeling work assumed the limited service would mirror the Muni Metro, and run until approximately 1:00 am.

Jim Misener asked about the level of aggregation (e.g., census tract, etc) for the model, since the corridor is so diverse. Billy responded that the Authority's sophisticated travel model models estimates travel patterns for each person individually using a synthetic population.

Steve Ferrario asked for clarification about what was modeled in the no-project. Billy Charlton responded that the key changes were low floor buses and transit signal priority. Mr. Ferrario also asked why an analysis was not prepared for the other alternative, referenced earlier by David Heller.

David Heller also questioned the alternatives that were examined and asked why a 4th alternative that evaluated a peak hour only dedicated lane was not considered. Steve Ferrario commented that the GCAC has never been asked to approve the alternatives being analyzed. Michael Louie expressed frustration at this comment and indicated that staff had come to the committee to discuss alternatives and the peak hour lane was not brought up. Jim Misener suggested this be properly agendized and addressed at the next meeting.

Rich Worner asked how much of a reduction in auto volumes was expected on Geary. Billy indicated that the reduction depends on location and time of day. The PM Peak ranged from 25%-34%. He commented that in the peak hour vehicular traffic on Geary at 4th Avenue was reduced by about 750 vehicles.

Richard Worner asked for the cars per day, indicating that the peak hour did not give the full picture. Mr. Charlton explained that the information was available, but he had focused on the PM peak, since transportation studies typically seek to understand the busiest time period. The Chair, Bruce Balshone, suggested that Mr. Worner follow up directly with staff regarding these issues.

Richard Allman commented that he was glad that East of Van Ness was not ignored. He added that a better southern boundary for the Tenderloin was McAllister, not Turk/Eddie. He also commented that any data on diversions from the Inner Geary Study would be helpful.

The Chair took public comment on this item. *[NOTE: All questions were taken at once and then responded to by Authority staff. In the minutes, the responses are presented directly after the question for clarity purposes.]* Rose Hillson expressed confusion about why the table showed a negative number of cars on Geary and also asked where the vehicles that were diverted off of Geary went, since the other numbers did not add up to the total negative number for Geary. She also expressed concern about vehicles being diverted onto small streets. She suggested using orange cones rather than modeling, to see where traffic goes. Billy Charlton clarified that the column with the negative number was showing the relative change over the no-project, since traffic is diverted off of Geary, the volume of cars on Geary goes down. He further explained that the table shows streets in the corridor only, not the sum total of all diversions, some of which happen outside the corridor.

Roger Bazeley requested numbers for Divisadero, Masonic, 25th and routes that go into Golden Gate

Park. He also indicated that it is important to understand what happens during peak and non-peak times. He stated that he can only support a full-featured BRT project and that he likes the Center A BRT alternative. He expressed concerns with the side alternative, indicating that currently the buses never pull over to the right and they block traffic. He also commented that having both local and limited buses in the center would improve traffic flow.

Norm Rolfe asked if the pie charts on pages 2 and 3 of the memo included trips that originated or terminated in that segment. The charts show that 44% of trips in the Tenderloin are made by automobile, which differs from census tract data. He asked why this number was so high in the Tenderloin, given the low auto ownership rates. Billy clarified that mode share graphs are trips by mode made by anybody traveling to or from the Tenderloin and are not specifically Tenderloin residents.

Alex Prodon asked Billy Charlton to comment on traffic speeds on streets with diversions and requested data regarding trips starting and ending outside of the city in both the AM and PM time periods. He asked how deep you can go with the modeling data and still have quality information. He concluded by requesting maps for different time periods. Billy stated that the percentage of trips starting outside of SF is only 10% and that the future forecast does not assume regional trips will vary across alternatives. In regards to the level of detail, he stated that this is precisely the type of analysis that this model was designed to answer questions about. This is what the model is designed for, rather than for individual block level analysis.

Eric P. Scott requested a comparison with hypothetical light rail alternatives on the surface, should the funding situation change in a few years. Julie Kirschbaum indicated that the Authority will present the analysis for 2025 BRT and light rail in November. This analysis is not being done for 2015, because it is not enough time to implement a light rail project.

Kate White moved to accept the memo, Aida Berkovitz seconded. The motion was accepted, with three opposed and the rest in favor.

7. Next Meeting – September 28, 2006

The Geary Citizens Advisory Committee is scheduled to meet next on Thursday, September 28 from 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM in the Authority's conference room at 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor.

8. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

8. Adjourn.

The Chair adjourned the meeting.