



Waterfront Plan Working Group
Transportation Subcommittee Meeting 1
Meeting: November 9, 2016
Meeting Notes

Transportation Subcommittee Members

Present:

Linda Fadeke Richardson (chair), TIDA
Troy Campbell, Fisherman's Wharf CBD
Kevin Carroll, Hotel Council of SF
Jeffrey Congdon, Kidder Mathews
Chris Christensen, ILWU
Carolyn Horgan, Blue and Gold Fleet
Tom Radulovich, BART/Livable City
Cristina Rubke, SFMTA Board of Directors
Anne Turner, SF Towers

Working Group & Advisory Team Present:

Mike Gougherty, Transportation Advisory Team
Kyle Lamson, Transportation Advisory Team
Nathan Nayman, Transportation Advisory Team
Alice Rogers, Working Group
Veronica Sanchez, Maritime Advisory Team
Howard Wong, Urban Design Advisory Team

Participating Agencies and Operators:

Golden Gate Bridge and Transportation District
Hanson Aggregates
PropSF
SF Bay Conservation and Development
SF Bay Railroad

SF Municipal Transportation Agency
SF Water Taxi
Tideline Marine
Water Emergency Transportation Authority

Attendees:

Mary Betlach, Golden Gate Audubon
Mike Bishop, Hanson Aggregates
Kevin Connolly, WETA
David Gavrich, SF Bay Railroad
Danylo Hawks, SF Bay Railroad
Nick Kendall, SF Bay Railroad
Frazer Thompson, P.E., Pier 39
Barbara Vincent, Golden Gate Bridge District

Port Staff:

David Beaupre, Senior Waterfront Planner
Brad Benson, Director of Special Projects
Anne Cook, Waterfront Planner
Peter Dailey, Maritime Deputy Director
Norma Guzman, Waterfront Planner
Brendan O'Meara, Maritime Marketing Manager
Diane Oshima, Planning Asst. Deputy Director
Byron Rhett, Planning Deputy Director

1. Introductions – Transportation Subcommittee Members & Audience

2. Water Transportation Suggestions

Consider loop ferry service: Alcatraz, Angel Island, and Lucas Museum

UCSF, Warriors, other adjacent land users contribute to 16th Street Ferry project

The Port could encourage developers to contribute to transportation facility capital/operating costs

The Port should support gap funding for ferry expansion for WETA and Golden Gate

The Port (City) should pursue cost/benefit analysis and greatest return on investment for transit capital investment

Transit modes can be complimentary: 55 could be rerouted to serve 16th Street Ferry landing

The Port should consider door-to-door trips and multi-modal access policy to make it seamless for the user and provide access for everybody

The subcommittee should highlight Port water transportation priorities for policymakers (Mayor, Board of Supervisors)

The Port should pursue bike amenities (lockers, parking), bikeshare, scootershare

Is Port at the table for Southern Bayfront discussions?

The Port should develop an accessibility policy

Water transportation should include different sized vessels that meet the needs of commuters

It is important to serve 1st mile and last mile connections related to water transportation; consider electric bikes and other modes

Engage with SFMTA to discuss Muni boarding efficiency along the waterfront

How to grow ferry capacity with multiple modes of access to and from ferries?

Consider role of water transportation in post-disaster recovery

Avoid commuter parking at transit terminals in the City

Clipper on water taxi?

Public-private partnership for water taxi landings: Mission Rock, Forest City, India Basin; consider barges as intermediary landings; more coordination with yacht clubs – task force to develop network of landings – policy should be ADA accessible, vessels should enable wheelchair access

3. Goods Movement Suggestions

The City should not differentiate between the Port and DPW streets for available capital funding; DPW should manage streets.

Staff should provide an inventory of streets, capital costs; seek a conversation with Public Works regarding process for DPW to accept Port streets.

How to organize truck delivery/pickups using software apps? Copenhagen has a potential model.

What is the Port's involvement in the I-280 offramp discussion?

Consider other means besides trucks; are there options by water? Is there a water transportation option to distribute fish and crab, perhaps to Pier 80? Maybe cost/double-handling considerations would be difficult.

Crab season to open safely!

What tools can the Port use to manage traffic congestion and protect general access?

Goods movement is a strategy, a policy and a set of conflicts that needs to be managed.

High-speed rail and freight are in conflict; may be a regional decision.

The Port should protect freight access – how many freight rail trips occur to/from the Port, related to Port tenants and other freight uses? Are trucks an option?

Freight rail offsets 100,000 truck trips annually, or 6 million miles of truck trips, and reduces CO2 emissions and congestion on roads. In Europe, high-speed rail and freight rail are compatible. At CPUC, Caltrain and freight rail users agree regarding compatibility. Does the Port want to be one of the only U.S. ports without freight access? Currently, the Port is served by 3 freight trains/week.

A large part of freight is contaminated soil from downtown construction. This market may last 10-15 years. Freight rail can help with post-disaster debris handling.

Freight rail transports construction materials and rail for MUNI.

The Port just signed terminal operator agreement with Pasha – new tunnels could provide enhanced freight rail access to the Pier, including caterpillar, machine parts and wind mills.

Rail could enhance bulk export at Pier 96 as well. Port received Freight Rail Administration \$3 million grant for Quint Street.

Freight is vital to Port maritime terminal viability.

How many more Port piers could be converted to freight handling? PDR is happening in a few piers that require Goods Movement support. How do we limit conflicts between truck loading and bike lanes; how to manage curb space?

Consider time of delivery or nodes for delivery.

Auto (a self-driving truck company) was acquired by UBER; automated trucks are being tested in Amsterdam in partnership with MIT. How will this technology benefit the Port?

Sand and gravel terminals move 1.3 million tons of material over Port berths which used to be trucked in to San Francisco; bulk terminals directly serve concrete batching tenants. Sand is now travelling to San Jose by truck from the Port. Is rail for bulk transport to the Peninsula an option?

Concern about maintaining Port voice in the discussion about how streets serving the Port managed.

What are the added maintenance costs of maintaining freight and who pays?

SF Bay Railroad maintains the freight line within the Port; handoff of trains to Union Pacific; route is owned by Caltrain; maintenance costs are shared between Caltrain and Union Pacific.

How to manage truck and bicycle access and improved access for both in the Southern Waterfront?

Staff to reach out to SFMTA to discuss improved truck and bike access in the Southern Waterfront – consider impacts to parking.

Curb loading priorities: pedestrian safety, MUNI, short-term dropoff, resident parking, then commuters. Maximize use of limited road space.

Examine large volume movement for passengers and goods, successful at low cost in other locations because of economies of scale. How does this work from a labor perspective?

Land Use Committee urged to examine transportation policies related to new development.

The Land Use Subcommittee encouraged staff to develop draft policy proposals from the discussion and to develop draft policy proposals for future transportation topic discussions in order to facilitate the public discussion.