



Van Ness BRT Community Advisory Committee

Thursday, September 24, 2015

6:00-7:30pm

One South Van Ness, 7th floor, Union Square Conference Room

Minutes

1. Call to order 6:05 p.m.
2. Approval of August minutes by voice vote
3. SFMTA staff updates
 - a. Van Ness Title Treatment – Leon Yu, Graphic Designer
 - i. Leon to work on design for capital corridor projects including Van Ness Corridor Transit Improvement Project
 - ii. Interagency project that needs to maintain SFMTA brand standards
 - iii. Title treatment borrows from existing Rapid campaign using chevrons from its design, conveys forward movement using modern look and feel with photography and renderings
 - iv. Current designs are conceptual designs to inform design work. Once project moves toward implementation, will use Muni Forward branding
 - v. Red and blue is Muni Forward branding
 - b. 100% Design package delivered to Caltrans September 14 once comments are received by project team
 - c. Final Design task meetings are ongoing: Traffic management, Overhead Contact System (OCS), Scheduling, Utilities, Cost Estimation, Communications and Outreach
 - d. Historical Preservation Committee update
 - i. Informational hearing October 21
 - ii. Certificate of Appropriateness Hearing November 18
 - iii. Historic District is from Fell St. to Golden Gate Ave.
 - e. Tree removal permit update
 - i. Public Works is reviewing information presented at tree hearing, as well as additional information from meetings arborist had about specific trees. Looking at street trees more closely so we can review as few trees as necessary.
 1. Most median trees require removal due to the center-running designated transit lane
 2. Sidewalk trees that are in poor health may also be removed
 - ii. Public Comment:
 - iii. Valentina – Speaking about beautiful street tree outside her window that she named Flora, concerned about tree removals

- a. Little trees won't give enough air
 - b. Animals need trees
 - c. Trees help with pollution
 - d. Cutting down trees makes a lot of noise
 - e. Concerns about dust
- f. Van Ness Business Advisory Committee
 - i. Staff recommends forming a Business Advisory Committee for the Van Ness project.
 - ii. The BAC would provide a forum for businesses to raise and discuss issues and responses
 - iii. The BAC would provide recommendations and advice on ways the City can help business during construction
 - iv. Recruiting would begin at end of October, applications due end of November
 - v. Potential BAC models could include other projects like Third Street, Transbay Terminal and Central Subway, Invest in Neighborhoods.
 - vi. The BAC could help provide feedback on staging for construction
 - vii. BAC could be helpful for businesses who are upset
 - viii. Project staff should consider reaching out to Polk Street Merchants Association and Lower Polk CBD
- g. Outreach
 - i. Market/Van Ness Neighborhood Association meeting occurred September 16. Mark Moreno said the presentation was well received and reached an important audience.
 - ii. SFMTA CAC meeting October 1, 5:00 p.m. Union Square Conference Room (1SVN 7080): Van Ness Project Update
 - iii. Presentations for Fontana West (September 24) and Fontana East (October 15)
- h. Upcoming
 - i. American Public Transportation Association (APTA) and American Planning Association (APA) conference presentations
- 4. Next meetings
 - a. October 22
 - b. November 19 (special meeting date due to holiday)
 - c. January 28, 2016 (no meeting in December due to holidays)
- 5. Final comments
 - a. Van Ness BRT CAC members:
 - i. Recommend Market and Van Ness begins construction as soon as possible for construction sequencing plans.
 - b. Public Comment:
 - i. Philip Ambers:
 - 1. Project has gotten far without following proposal outlined in EIS/EIR
 - 2. Outside, third party arborist should evaluate trees, not City Arborist
 - 3. Feels like Van Ness BRT CAC is too small. Thinks project has been very secretive. Thinks that some Van Ness BRT

CAC members should oppose project. Appreciates a cross section of perspectives.

- ii. Mary Anne Kayaitos:
 - 1. Alternative 2 from EIS/EIR should have gotten chosen rather than 3 or 4
 - 2. Staff explained that the preferred alternative selected had the best improvements and was approved by the bodies of TA and SFMTA and that Proposition K was a voter mandate that called for the construction of Van Ness BRT
- iii. Lara – resident at Green and Van Ness.
 - 1. Curious about choosing another alternative to center-running BRT.
 - 2. Utilities could be replaced with other alternatives. MTA would still proceed, as would Public Work and PUC
 - 3. Didn't hear about project and wants to know about outreach.
 - a. Staff described outreach efforts including mailers, email and web updates, as well as canvassing along the corridor
 - b. Van Ness BRT CAC members shared that they saw fliers on poles for Van Ness BRT CAC, were concerned about dust and noise