# Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee City and County of San Francisco Minutes for Tuesday, May 11, 2010 5:30 – 7:00 p.m.

1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Place (Polk Street), Room 408 Start Time: 5:30 p.m

## Present Members:

- o Liddell
- o Rothman (CHAIR)
- Hunter
- Strassner
- o Lowell (VICE CHAIR)
- o Lopez (SECRETARY)
- o Lee
- o Supawanich
- o Clark
- o Ehrlich
- o Rhoads
- o Smith
- o Nardella

#### Excused Absence:

- o Ra
- o Pelfrey
- 1. Agenda approved
- 2. Meeting Minutes Approved
- 3. Piezoeletric—Postponed
- 4. Walking Signals:
  - a. See handout with proposal by H. Strassner (below)
  - b. Paul S. proposes to conduct some background research on the matter prior to moving forward with a resolution.
    - i. Dahianna L. agrees with Paul S. and has asked to move the item to the June Agenda.
  - c. Oliver Gajda:
    - Pedestrian signal guidelines—the state roads prefer "actuated" signals
      - 1. Suggested to invite someone from CalTrans to speak on the matter and/or to ask the BOS to write a letter to Sacramento regarding the matter.
      - Countdown signals—have been proven to reduce collisions; some issues with running the conduit are not insurmountable; a large infrastructure project would be needed for pedestrian countdown signals.
      - 3. There are two types of buttons (actuated and unactuated)
- 5. Staff Report MTA:

- a. Lots of work with engineering taskforce
  - i. Working on trying to cue up another round of funding through Prop K.
    - 1. Working on several applications—going to SFCTA (more continental crosswalk conversions); reopening closed crosswalks, painting more crosswalks; cueing more Accessible Pedestrian Signals
    - 2. List of closed crosswalks
      - a. First 10 will be addressed (List shown on the screen by Oliver Gl., SFMTA)
        - i. Question from Richard R.: How were the intersections picked?
          - 1. Answer: Collisions, speeds, multilane roads (producing a multiple threat); regional equity—makes sense to do something along a corridor and not just along one intersection.
        - ii. Question from Joe N.: What's the turnaround time to reopen it?
          - 1. Answer: Within the fiscal year.
        - iii. From Joe N.: Will there be an evaluation with regards to collisions?
          - 1. Yes, but we need data over time to tell if there was a change.
- 6. Report from the Subcommittees:
  - 1. Encouragement:
    - a. Looking to reproducing the sign to post encouraging people to walk their bike on the sidewalk.
      - i. Police has been notified about the enforcement issue.
  - 2. Policy report:
    - a. In addition to SFCTA, followed up on additional sources of funding—handout
    - b. Report ready within next week
  - 3. Police (Enforcement)
    - a. Jim R.: Enforcement subtaskforce had 2 meetings with the police and enforcement and found that:
      - i. There are 37 motorcycle officers. 1/3 retiring soon.
      - ii. Not much interest in allocating more officers to active pedestrian safety enforcement.
      - iii. Will meet to talk more about recommendations.
  - 4. Engineering:

- a. Reports from all engineering and urban planning parties involved. Goal was to get a culmination of all pedestrian plans and that goal was met.
- b. Next step is to follow-up with the agencies and ensure the accuracy of the information.

### 5. Health and Education:

- a. Have not heard from Department of Public Health; however, they have confirmed that they will send out a list of pedestrian safety activities ASAP.
- b. Have not heard from Walk SF or Senior Action Network regarding pedestrian safety activities.
- c. Have received information from Safe Routes to School and the San Francisco Injury Center.

## 7. Chair's Report:

- a. Will try to make sure that the report goes to a committee hearing
  - i. It may be beneficial for one of the Supervisors to co-sponsor the bill
- b. Chair is trying to go to most of the taskforce meetings
- c. Still waiting to hear from the Streetblog Team re: broadcasting the PSAC efforts.

Notes by Dahianna Lopez, RN (PSAC Secretary)