



Geary Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, January 11, 2023, 6:00 p.m.

Microsoft Teams meeting

Geary CAC Members	Project Staff
Nathan Chan	Liz Brisson (SFMTA)
Paul Epstein	Amy Fowler (SFMTA)
Sean Kim	Daniel Mackowski (SFMTA)
Caixuan (Annie) Li	David Sindel (SFMTA)
Susannah Raub	
Marian Roth-Cramer	
Eva Schouten	
Kevin Stull	
Andrei Svensson	
Devi Zinzuvadia	

Minutes

1. Call to Order

- a. Susannah Raub made a motion to begin an informal meeting (lacking quorum).
Devi Zinzuvadia seconded. Motion approved by voice vote at 6:10 pm. Quorum was reached at 6:17 pm during roll call.

2. In-person meeting housekeeping

3. Roll call

4. Approval of minutes – [October 12, 2022](#)

- a. Susannah Raub motioned to approve; Paul Epstein seconded. Minutes approved by voice vote at 6:19 p.m.

5. Geary Boulevard Improvement Project – Project update

- a. Liz Brisson presented on this item.
 - i. Marian Roth-Cramer praised the Geary evaluation report. She asked what was the Richmond publication that the slides mentioned would be used to help notify the anticipated upcoming approval meetings.
 1. Amy Fowler answered that PAR is the Planning Association for the Richmond, which has their own publication.
 - a. Marian asked whether the SFMTA has published in the Richmond Review.

- i. Amy: Not any articles, but SFMTA does place ads there for public notices.
 1. Marian asked if the project team would be interested in being interviewed about the project, since she knows the publisher.
 - a. Amy: Yes, we would be interested, though any interviews will go through SFMTA media relations office.
 2. Devi seconded this idea.
- ii. Paul Epstein asked whether an emergency water supply might be added as part of the PUC part of the project.
 1. Dan Mackowski answered that the Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS) team was consulted as part of project planning, but plans to build separately later. The only interaction with the project is a crossing at 20th Avenue.
- iii. Sean Kim commented that parking removal figures included spots within one block on Geary, rather than only on Geary, and that the actual percentage of spots removed on Geary itself would be higher. He said that merchants would find minimizing negative impacts to be the most important community element. He asked whether the community enhancement funds might be put to repair sidewalks and trim overgrown trees earlier than currently planned by Public Works. He also asked whether the SFMTA would hold a community survey about the median removal sketches presented.
 1. Liz Brisson asked what other CAC members think about the example median removal design sketches. She noted that we can't use the project budget for sidewalk repairs and tree trimming because the project's funding sources are for capital not for maintenance, but MTA could coordinate with Public Works to see if there are any opportunities to advance planned maintenance. She also noted that there will be a business marketing fund as part of the project.
 - a. Susannah Raub commented that she would feel less safe both as a pedestrian and a driver on Geary without medians, and that it would be a significant downgrade in feel and safety. She did not have strong feelings about the loss of left turn pockets.
 - b. Nathan commented that he feels that some of the sidewalk trees on Geary are rather tall and block business signs, but wants to keep trees in the median.



- i. Liz mentioned there are two separate issues here: potential trimming of sidewalk trees, and removal of median trees that would occur if the median was removed.
- c. Marian Roth-Cramer agreed that trees could be trimmed. She commented that she opposes removing the median due to safety issues, especially with the number of kids and elderly people. She said she wants to see more design on the median and community enhancement in general to make Geary a unique destination, and liked the idea of twinkle lighting or nice sidewalks.
- d. Andrei Svensson commented that the existing median design is dated, and that houseless people sometimes pitch tents in the median. He commented that parking is a complicated issue, and wondered whether creating a part-time carpool or bus/taxi lane to keep angled parking might be possible in preference to removing the median. But overall felt that the median should be retained and shrubbery improved.
- e. Susannah commented that without a median, motorists would be likely to make midblock U-turns.
- f. Susannah commented that surveying the community about these designs would likely set the project timeline back, and that it seemed that CAC members had concerns about safety, but was curious about the pros/cons of polling the community.
 - i. Liz confirmed that the designs were primarily intended to display the downsides noted by SFMTA staff, as shown by the other CAC members sharing concerns about safety and loss of urban forest. SFMTA staff are now preparing to bring the project forward through the approval process. SFMTA is not planning to poll about these sketches; they are intended as a visual aid and explanation as to why this option is not being pursued since it has been a frequent question from CAC members and other stakeholders. The main project goals are transit and traffic safety; while these options would enable transit lanes to improve transit performance, they would compromise safety objectives. In addition, the sketches indicate that removing the median would only save about 6 spaces

- between 15th and 20th aves but have safety, environmental, cost and disruption impacts along with removal of all left-turn opportunities.
- ii. Susannah noted that there have been concerns about removing angled parking, not just reduction in parking spaces.
 - iv. Susannah: PUC work is 2 ½ years. How does that change the SFMTA project? Is project on hold or are there other things to do?
 1. Liz: Detailed design will begin after approvals. Could deliver sooner without PUC, but that would be more disruptive to the community. Underground work has to be done in a segment before aboveground work can begin.
 2. Dan added that there would be a gap after quick-build regardless of PUC work to finalize the construction package for the contractor.
 - v. Susannah asked whether anything particularly interesting was learned from recent outreach.
 1. Liz: Nothing significant, just location-specific questions/discussion.

6. Geary Rapid – Evaluation and implementation update

- a. David Sindel and Dan Mackowski presented on this item.
 - i. Sean Kim asked whether parking availability data was also available for Park Presidio to 25th Avenue.
 1. David Sindel responded that the parking team does collect this data, and that it was tentatively planned to be included in the GBIP evaluation.
 - a. Sean requested that data be carefully segmented, such as by season, day-of-week and time-of-day, as averages can be misleading.
 - b. Andrei Svensson seconded that request
 - ii. Andrei commented that he appreciated the evaluation's equity metric as he's been reading Segregation by Design recently.
 - iii. Eva asked whether colored curbs would be repainted after the Geary East paving.
 1. Dan answered that repainting the color curbs as-needed is planned by the SFMTA Paint Shop, but may be a few months away.
 - iv. Susannah Raub commented that she loves the new Webster crosswalk. She commented that bus travel time on O'Farrell Street seems faster, but that it is bumpy because it wasn't repaved, and asked whether repaving was possible.



1. Dan Mackowski replied that it would have to be a separate project: SFPW chose not to include O'Farrell as part of Geary Rapid based on their evaluation of pavement quality during planning.

7. Adjourn

- a. Next meeting, April 12, 2023
- b. Meeting adjourned by voice vote at 7:26 p.m.