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Van Ness Avenue BRT Project Background

- Key north-south link in San Francisco’s Rapid Transit network
- Recommended for BRT service in the 2004 Countywide Transportation Plan; Prop K Expenditure Plan; SFMTA Transit Effectiveness Project
- Partnership with SFMTA
- Other collaborations: SFDPW, Planning, PUC, Golden Gate Transit, Caltrans
- Top rated FTA Small Starts Project for cost effectiveness; Regional MTC Small Starts Priority
Project Purpose and Need

- Improve transit reliability, speed, connectivity and comfort
  - Separate autos from transit
  - Reduce delays associated with loading and unloading, and traffic signals
- Improve pedestrian comfort, amenities, and safety
- Enhance urban design and identity of Van Ness Avenue
- Accommodate safe multimodal circulation and access within the corridor

Frequencies of Muni 47/49 at Market Street
FULL-FEATURED BRT

- Dedicated transit lane
- Transit signal priority
- Low-floor, all-door boarding
- High-quality stops
- Real-time information
- Pedestrian amenities
EIS/EIR Planning Activities to Date

- Formation of EIS/EIR CAC in 2007
- Alternatives screening report
  - Approved in April, 2008
  - 3 build alternatives to be analyzed
- Conducted technical studies in areas with potential environmental impacts
- Significant outreach and coordination
  - Community and stakeholder meetings
  - Technical Advisory Committee
  - Authority and SFMTA CACs, Committees, and Boards
Community and Stakeholder Meetings:

Van Ness BRT Citizens Advisory Committee

Government Related Organizations
- Mayors Disability Council Physical Access Committee
- City Hall Preservation Advisory Committee
- Muni Accessibility Advisory Committee
- Urban Forestry Council

Regional Organizations:
- San Francisco Planning and Urban Research (SPUR)
- Sierra Club
- TransForm

Local Groups and Organizations:
- California Pacific Medical Center
- Cathedral Hill Neighbors Association
- Chinatown Community Development Center
- Civic Center Stakeholders Group (Opera House, Veteran’s Memorial Building, San Francisco Symphony, San Francisco Ballet, and San Francisco Conservatory of Music)
- Cow Hollow Association
- Geary BRT Citizens Advisory Committee
- Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association
- Japantown Better Neighborhood Plan Organizing Committee
- Lighthouse for the Blind and Visually Impaired
- Livable City
- Lower Polk Neighbors
- Middle Polk Neighborhood Association
- Mission Neighborhood Centers
- Pacific Heights Chapter of the American Association of Retired Persons
- Rescue Muni
- Russian Hill Neighbors
- San Francisco Bicycle Coalition
- San Francisco Transit Riders Union
- SF Towers
- Tenant Associations Coalition of San Francisco
- Tenderloin Futures Collaborative
- WalkSF
Alternative 2 – Side BRT Lanes

- OCS Pole / Streetlight replacement
- Transit Signal Priority
- Branded Vehicles with level, all-door loading
- Dedicated Bus Lanes
- Pedestrian Safety Treatments
- High Quality Station Platforms
Alternative 3 – Center BRT Lanes with Right Side Loading / Dual Medians
Alternative 4 – Center BRT Lanes with Left Side Loading / Center Median

Vehicles have doors on both sides
Cost and Funding

- Cost: $90M-$130M
- $100M already identified in planned funding
  - $20M in Prop K; $75M in FTA Small Starts funds
- Only Small Starts project in the nation to receive a “high” cost effectiveness (Project Justification) rating
  - FTA programmed $45M for project in FY 11/12 and 12/13
  - $10M recommended for 13/14
Findings: Van Ness Avenue BRT Benefits

Travel Time Between Mission/Duboce Offramp and Clay Street (Min)

- 2007 Existing: 17.5 (Bus (Route 49))
- Alt. 1 (No Build): 16.8
- VN BRT Alts 3 and 4 (with Design Option B): 12.9

8.7 Min Difference

4.3 Min Difference
Findings: Van Ness Avenue BRT Benefits

- Improve transit travel times by up to 32%
- Improve transit reliability by up to 50%
- Increase transit boardings by up to 35%
- Maintain corridor person-throughput while increasing transit mode share
- Save up to 30% of daily route operating costs
- Improve multimodal safety, including for pedestrians
Findings: One Area with Significant and Unavoidable Impacts – Traffic Circulation

- **Existing Conditions/2015**
  - 3 intersections have auto delay impacts
  - No worse than 2015 No Build Alternative

- **Long term – 2035**
  - 6-8 intersections have auto delay impacts
  - Assumes significant background growth
Other key issues/areas of interest

- Left turn removal
- Transit stop consolidation
- Parking loss
- Visual effects, including trees and landscaping
Next step is selection of an LPA

- Alternatives performance outlined in Chapter 10 of EIS/EIR
- Performance indicators grouped into categories based on Project Purpose and Need as well as issues of importance to stakeholders and decision-makers
  - Transit Performance
  - Passenger Experience
  - Access and Pedestrian Safety
  - Urban Design/Landscape
  - System Performance
  - Environmental and Social Effects
  - Operations and Maintenance
  - Construction and Capital Costs
EIS/EIR Status

- Public Draft EIS/EIR
- Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) recommendation, Spring 2012
  - Adopted by SFCTA and SFMTA boards
- Final EIS/EIR made available, Summer 2012
- Certify Final EIS/EIR in Fall 2012
Thank You!

www.vannessbrt.org
vannessbrt@sfcta.org