San Francisco Transit Effectiveness Project (SFTEP)

<u>SUMMARY</u>
SFTEP Citizen Advisory Committee July 20, 2006 Meeting
One South Van Ness Avenue, 3rd Floor, Room 3074

Following is a summary of the second meeting of the SFTEP Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC).  The CAC is one of three advisory bodies established to provide stakeholder input and review during development of the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP).  This meeting was part of the "visioning" phase – an early step to broadly define big picture goals before developing proposed service changes.

<u>PARTICIPANTS</u>

| *CAC Members and Alternates* | *CAC Continued* | *Controller's Office* |
|---|---|---|
| Iqra Anjum, SF Youth Commission (Alt) | Bruce Oka, MTA Accessibility Advisory Committee | Sally Allen |
| Rachel Antrobus, SF Youth Commission | | Liz Garcia |
| Steve Boland, Rescue Muni (Alt) | Bob Planthold, Senior Action Network | |
| Emily Drennen, Walk San Francisco | Tom Radulovich, Livable City | *TEP Consultant Team* |
| Steve Ferrario, MTA CAC | Norman Rolfe, San Francisco Tomorrow | Russ Chisholm, TMD |
| Bert Hill, SF Bicycle Advisory Committee | | Bonnie Nelson, Nelson Nygaard |
| Sarah Karlinsky, SPUR (Alt) | Howard Strassner, Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee | Ben Strumwasser, CirclePoint |
| Brian Larkin, SFTA CAC | | Julie Ortiz, CirclePoint |
| Lauralee Markus, Chamber of Commerce (Alt) | *MTA* | |
| Daniel Murphy, Chair, MTA Citizen's Advisory Council | Peter Albert | |
| | Bill Lieberman | |
| | Carl Natvig | |

<u>OVERVIEW</u>

Fifteen CAC members and representatives from MTA, the Controller's Office, and the TEP consultant team attended the two-hour meeting.   The meeting included a brief review of the purpose and desired representation of the CAC, as well as broader opportunities for public participation during the TEP.  MTA Planning Director Bill Lieberman indicated that the CAC is an advisory body that should represent a mix of community members with an interest in transit policy, who ride Muni regularly, and represent the City's demographic diversity.

Of the members present at the July 20 meeting, ten indicated they ride Muni daily and of these, five noted they are transit dependent and/or don't own cars.  One member does not currently ride Muni and several others bike or walk as their primary means of transportation or in conjunction with trips on Muni.  City staff also reported on follow-up efforts to increase diversity on the CAC.  Contact was made with more than 20 community-based organizations that represent various populations.  Most noted that stretched resources pose difficulties in participating in regular advisory processes, but expressed interest in keeping informed and providing input through other public forums such as focus groups, briefings at their groups, and neighborhood newspaper coverage, among other things.

Bonnie Nelson from the TEP consulting team provided a follow-up presentation on overall trends regarding Muni's performance based on analysis of existing data included in a TEP briefing book. (See www.sftep.com under Available Documents for a copy of the book). The rest of the meeting focused on CAC member input regarding an ultimate vision for Muni and measures for success.

CLARIFICATION QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Below are questions and comments raised by CAC members during discussion of the CAC membership and the briefing binder.

**Q:** What is the Policy Advisory Group and what are they doing? **A:** The Policy Advisory Group or PAG is an advisory body, just like the CAC and the Technical Advisory Committee. Each of the three groups is going through the same visioning process and input from all will be considered equally. The PAG includes representatives from the Board of Supervisors, the MTA Board, MTA's Executive Director/CEO, the Mayor's Office, transit unions, the TEP CAC, the SFCTA, and the MTC.

**Q:** The CAC should represent all neighborhoods and all lines. The demographics appeared skewed toward certain lines and regions. **A:** While efforts have been made to establish a CAC that broadly reflects riders, demographics, and individuals with an interest in transit, we also want to ensure members maintain a citywide vision broader than just the interests of particular neighborhoods. The CAC is just one means to participate in the TEP. There are a number of other opportunities for broader public input: website, multilingual hotlines, citywide public workshops, etc.

Comments:

- Consider an outreach strategy to reach people who live in but work outside the City.

- The briefing binder is very useful, and I read it cover to cover. On the cost effectiveness point, though, I'd caution that we don't become too complacent about what appears to be positive findings. Because travel distances is the City are so short, we might be overstating the positive.

- Lack of sufficient dedicated Right of Way (ROW) and heavily congested streets are major problems plaguing Muni that we must keep in mind.

VISIONING EXERCISE SUMMARY

Following are responses to two questions: what is your vision for Muni and how would you measure success? Please note this is a summary and not a verbatim transcript. CAC input will be will be synthesized along with input from the PAG and TAC to prepare an overall visioning statement that will be shared with each group.

Overall, participants indicated reliability is one of the highest priorities, as it has biggest impact on lives and affects decisions about where to live, work and whether to take transit.  Other top concerns include speed and travel time, mode share, financial stability, and customer service.  Where multiple people made the same point, the number is noted in parenthesis.

| VISION | MEASURES OF SUCCESS |
|---|---|
| *Reliability, Speed, Accessibility* | |
| Reliable, improved headway adherence (3)<br>Faster (2)<br>Fast, frequent, and fabulous ala Los Angeles system's moniker<br>Get anywhere in the City in a reasonable amount of time<br>Buses that come right after you step up on the curb<br>Fully accessible, maintenance-free, user friendly to all people | Increased reliability<br>On time performance<br>Trips comparable in time to car trips<br>No longer than 30 minutes to get from any neighborhood to downtown<br>Increased average speed<br>Frequent, positive media coverage |
| *Mode Share* | |
| Greater mode share<br>Unconditional first choice for traveling from neighborhood to neighborhood<br>#1 choice to get around<br>More people choosing Muni over driving | Increased mode share (3)<br>Fewer car trips as population grows<br>City where owning a car is truly optional<br># of car-free households increase<br>More people on Muni, bikes, walking<br># of passengers carried<br>Muni is number one choice<br>Increased # of young riders<br>Measurable goals like BART's: % who report good value for the $; % riding who have cars |
| *Safety* | |
| Clean, safe and dignified means of transport (2)<br>Safer for pedestrians<br>Improved passenger safety and security in terms of crime<br>Improved safety in terms of accidents | Reduced lawsuits and injuries |
| *Service* | |
| Responsive for young people and school schedules (2)<br>Geographically comprehensive; improved inter-neighborhood service<br>Greater focus and emphasis on trunk lines and main corridors<br>Operates in more dedicated Right of Way<br>More money spent on smaller buses with greater frequency | Percentage of functioning equipment available for revenue service increases<br>Less crush loading |
| *Connectivity* | |
| Fully integrated system connected to local, regional, state, and international transportation<br>Connects with air, water, and high-speed rail based systems<br>Enhanced network so connections and transfers are better | |
| *Customer Service* | |
| More transparent and consistent way finding<br>More intelligent information improvements like Next Bus signage<br>Happy Muni drivers providing great customer service<br>Riders have more of a voice about their needs/requirements<br>Muni graciously shares the street with bicyclists and pedestrians<br>Muni improves harmony among riders and users of all modes<br>Fast Passes mailed to riders | Legibility of system to first time users<br>Able to get from Point A to B easily<br>No longer target of complaints<br>No complaints that drivers missed riders or didn't help them<br>Delight to take Muni<br>More attractive for paratransit users so they elect to take fixed route transit |
| *Environment* | |
| Non polluting system<br>Elegant station/ waiting areas design that enhance the public realm | |

| Finances | |
|---|---|
| Less expensive for young people | Lower O&M costs |
| Use low-cost measures to improve speed before spending billions | Cost per passenger mile or cost per trip |
| Uniform, simple fare structure (not necessarily cheaper) | Fiscal sustainability |
| Financially sustainable over the long haul | New dedicated funding sources |
| Affordable for the lowest income level or free | |
| Cheaper than driving a car | |

### ACTION ITEMS
- Punch holes in handouts for insertion into three-ring binders, or bring three-hole punch to meeting

### NEXT MEETING
- Thursday, August 10, 2006, 5 to 7 pm at One South Van Ness, 3rd Floor Conference Room #3074