AGENDA

Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (GCAC)
Meeting Two

Date: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, October 30, 2008
Location: 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor
Members: Jette Swan (Moderator), Tony Biancalana, Peter Ehrlich, Kieran Farr, Joanna Fong, Marissa Louie, Margaret Massialas, Jim Misener, Bruce Osterweil, Joel Ramos, and James Rogers

6:00 1. Committee Meeting Call to Order
6:05 2. Adoption of Minutes of the July 31, 2008 Meeting – ACTION* 3
6:10 3. Updates and Announcements – INFORMATION* 7
The purpose of this item is to provide an update regarding the work conducted since the last GCAC meeting and present a GCAC meeting schedule and tentative agenda items. We are seeking comments and input from the Committee.
6:25 4. Study Workplan and Schedule – INFORMATION
Authority staff will present the workplan and schedule for the Geary BRT Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS). The purpose of this item is to provide the GCAC with an overview of project timeline and tasks, including key milestones and points of public and GCAC input. We are seeking comments and input from the Committee.
6:40 5. Public Involvement Plan – ACTION* 9
Authority staff will present the Public Involvement Plan for the Geary BRT EIR/EIS. The purpose of this item is to obtain input from the GCAC on the approach to public involvement during the EIR/EIS. We are seeking input and approval of the Geary BRT EIR/EIS Public Involvement Plan.
7:00 6. Geary BRT EIR/EIS Scoping – INFORMATION
Authority staff will present an overview of the scoping process for the Geary BRT EIR/EIS. The purpose of the scoping period is to obtain public and agency input into: the purpose and need for Geary BRT; the alternatives to be analyzed in the EIR/EIS; and the range of environmental impacts to be analyzed in the EIR/EIS. The Geary BRT scoping period will begin in November; public and agency scoping meetings are planned for December. We are seeking comments and input from the Committee.

Authority staff and project consultants will give a presentation regarding BRT elements and treatments, including examples of BRT systems that have been implemented in other cities. The purpose of this item is to broaden the GCAC’s awareness and understanding of BRT systems and the level of corridor enhancement associated with varying degrees of transit priority. This is an information item.

7:40  8.  Public Comment

7:45  9.  Adjournment

* – Materials Attached

This meeting location is wheelchair accessible. In order to allow individuals with environmental illness or multiple-chemical sensitivity to attend the meeting, individuals are requested to refrain from wearing perfume or other scented products. All times shown are for information only. Items will be called at the discretion of the Moderator.
Draft Minutes

Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Citizens Advisory Committee (GCAC):
Meeting 1 – Thursday, July 31, 2008

Present were the following members: Tony Biancalana, Peter Ehrlich, Kieran Farr, Joanna Fong, Marissa Louie, Jim Misener, Bruce Osterweil, Joel Ramos, James Rogers, and Jette Swan.

Authority staff: Zabe Bent, Tilly Chang, and Jesse Koehler

SFMTA staff: Darton Ito and Julie Kirschbaum

Consultants: Judis Santos and Myrna Valdez (Jacobs)

The Meeting started at 6:00 PM

1. Welcome and Introductions

Tilly Chang, Deputy Director for Planning, opened the meeting, introduced staff members and consultants in attendance, and had the GCAC members introduce themselves. Ms. Chang thanked the GCAC members for their service and discussed the committee’s role during the environmental analysis. Authority Chair Jake McGoldrick welcomed the GCAC members and noted the hard work that has been completed on the project to date.

2. Geary BRT Citizens Advisory Committee (GCAC) Meeting Management – INFORMATION

Ms. Chang reviewed the procedures and rules for orderly conduct of GCAC meetings. Ms. Chang noted that the Committee will strive for consensus.

Kieran Farr asked if quarterly meetings were sufficient. Peter Ehrlich suggested meeting every other month. Bruce Osterweil said that quarterly meetings seem infrequent, but noted that meetings are dependent on the availability and need for items to be heard at GCAC meetings. Zabe Bent, Principal Planner, said that the Study Team intends to bring materials to the GCAC as they are available. Ms. Chang proposed that staff review project milestones and points of GCAC input with the consultant team.

There was no public comment on this item.

3. Geary Corridor BRT Study – INFORMATION

Ms. Bent presented this item per the staff memorandum. Marissa Louie requested additional information regarding the modeling process. Ms. Bent said that staff would send the requested information. Mr. Ehrlich asked if CHAMP and VISSIM are acronyms. Staff replied that CHAMP stands for “Chained Activity-Based Model Process” and VISSIM refers to “Visual Simulation.” Jette Swan asked how the alternatives compare in price. Ms. Bent replied that Alternative 1 (Basic) and Alternative 2 (Basic Plus) have lower costs, and the full-featured BRT
alternatives (3, 4, and 5) have higher capital costs. Ms. Louie inquired about the range of costs. Ms. Chang said that costs represent a range and will change somewhat as analysis is refined. Mr. Farr noted that the project cost does not include vehicles, which will be procured through Muni’s scheduled replacement process.

Jette Swan asked what the limits of the project are. Ms. Bent said that full-featured BRT is planned between Van Ness and 33rd Avenues. Mr. Ehrlich asked if some signal improvements have already been provided in the corridor. Ms. Bent said that basic transit signal priority is currently in place at 18 intersections. Mr. Ehrlich asked how Geary BRT will interface with Van Ness BRT. Ms. Bent replied that the two project teams coordinate regularly; Ms. Chang noted the potential for smart priority technology to be deployed to support the intersection of the two corridors. Tony Biancalana asked if the construction schedules for each corridor will vary. Ms. Chang said that the projects would not be under construction at the same time.

Mr. Farr asked for clarification on the purpose of the current effort given the completion of the Feasibility Study. Ms. Bent said that the review of the Feasibility Study is to provide the GCAC with an overview of the analyses and conclusions completed during this previous project phase. Ms. Chang added that the goal of the current environmental analysis is to complete a robust process and determine a Locally Preferred Alternative.

Joanna Fong asked if a gain in parking spaces requires operating local service in the center BRT right-of-way. Ms. Bent replied that this was the case and that 3 service plans were analyzed in the Feasibility Study—all service in the center, local service on side, and skip-stop—to be further analyzed and refined in the current phase. Mr. Ehrlich and Mr. Biancalana expressed concerns with skip-stop service. Ms. Chang said that Golden Gate Transit, a partner in the study, operates service in the corridor as well. Ms. Swan asked if both center-running alternatives could accommodate local service. Ms. Bent said that the Feasibility Study found the center-running/side-medians alternative could accommodate local service and that additional analysis is required to determine if a center-running/center-median alternative could do so.

During public comment, Roger Bazeley said that additional solutions, such as circulation service, may be desired for provision of local service. Mr. Bazeley also expressed enthusiasm for wider stop spacing. Mr. Bazeley asked if comparative cost estimates will be performed. Ms. Bent replied that many aspects of cost will be assessed. Ron Miguel asked if land use planning will be conducted as part of the study. Ms. Bent said that the study will coordinate with ongoing planning processes and utilize land use projections produced by the Planning Department. Remi Tan asked if transit signal priority is included. Ms. Bent replied that this is a high priority and has already been implemented at some corridor intersections. Ms. Bent added that smart priority technology may also be an option and noted continuing coordination with the SFgo project. Mr. Bazeley asked if equipment types will be studied. Ms. Bent said that vehicle selection is part of this process and is being conducted in conjunction with the Van Ness BRT project. Jim Misener asked if proof-of-payment will be included. Ms. Bent said that this is planned. Mr. Ehrlich noted the success of New York’s proof-of-payment implementation on the cross-Bronx route. Mr. Biancalana added that low-floor buses will facilitate easier and quicker access by disabled riders.

### 4. Environmental Impact Report/Statement (EIR/EIS) Objectives and Scope of Work – INFORMATION

Ms. Bent presented an overview of the specific objectives of the Geary BRT EIR/EIS and the scope of work for this project phase. The overall objective will be to produce an environmental
document of the Geary BRT project with analysis of several types of impacts. The scope of work includes project management, documentation required by state and federal law, federal transit administration processes, and initial preliminary engineering.

Mr. Osterweil asked if the specific environmental impacts to be analyzed are specified by law. Ms. Chang said that CEQA has certain requirements and that San Francisco has developed more detailed guidelines for the environmental review process. Mr. Osterweil asked if LPA is a defined term. Ms. Chang said that the Locally Preferred Alternative is a legally defined term. Ms. Chang noted that the upcoming Scoping process will identify the alternatives for analysis and the impact areas to be studied and documented.

Ms. Louie asked for further information regarding public involvement. Ms. Bent replied that the GCAC will be presented with the Public Involvement Plan at the next meeting. Ms. Chang noted the various hard-to-reach communities along the corridor, such as merchants and non-English speakers. Ms. Louie asked if marketing for BRT will be included. Darton Ito, SFMTA, said that the two BRT projects are significant components of Muni’s Rapid Network, which is the key component of the Transit Effectiveness Project draft recommendations.

Joel Ramos asked how questions should be managed during the presentation of items and suggested that they be held until the end. James Rogers agreed.

Mr. Ramos discussed the issues at the Fillmore intersection. Ms. Bent noted some of the potential options at this location, including filling or creating parking opportunities. Ms. Chang added that the project objective is not to provide additional parking. Mr. Misener said that operational benefits are likely to increase transit ridership in the corridor. Mr. Ramos asked if information is available regarding forecast ridership and traffic data on local streets. Ms. Chang replied that this information is available and is focused on person-trips, rather than vehicle-trips. Ms. Louie asked if the project will include a traffic plan and how it might vary across alternatives. Ms. Bent replied that detailed traffic analysis will be conducted for all alternatives and said that the difference among BRT alternatives is likely to be minimal.

During public comment, Roger Bazeley discussed the business impacts of BRT systems and the findings of his own research on the topic. Mr. Bazeley offered to make this information available to the GCAC.

5. Transit Effectiveness Project Recommendations – INFORMATION

Julie Kirschbaum, SFMTA, presented this item. Ms. Kirschbaum, Program Manager for the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP), reviewed the draft recommendations of the TEP, which is a joint effort of SFMTA and the City Controller’s Office. The TEP is the first comprehensive analysis of Muni service in a generation; the TEP is particularly focused on improving reliability. Ms. Kirschbaum discussed the proposals for the Geary corridor, which include improved frequencies and 7-day provision of Limited service.

Ms. Swan asked about the impact to Balboa Street. Ms. Kirschbaum said that transit access in this location will be slightly different but is maintained. Mr. Farr asked how improvements akin to the TEP can continue in the future. Ms. Kirschbaum replied that the TEP will help to set a precedent for continuing assessment of system performance and ridership patterns. Mr. Farr asked how community feedback is affecting the process. Ms. Kirschbaum said that the public process is consistent with the project timeline and implementation is on schedule, with the potential for some pilot projects.
During public comment, Remi Tan asked about the impact of Muni operator contracts. Ms. Kirschbaum said that she was unable to speak about contract details, but noted that the operators union has approached the goal of reliability improvements as a partnership.

6. **Election of Rotating Moderators – ACTION**

This action item resulted in the election of GCAC meeting moderators for the next four meetings. The following GCAC members will moderate the next four meetings: Jette Swan (Meeting 2); James Rogers (Meeting 3); Bruce Osterweill (Meeting 4); and Peter Ehrlich (Meeting 5).

6. **Public Comment**

There was no general public comment.

7. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.
## Schedule & Tentative Meeting Topics – Geary BRT Citizens Advisory Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Approximate Timeframe</th>
<th>Key Topics (Tentative)</th>
<th>GCAC Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1       | July 31, 2008               | • Meeting Management & Procedures  
• Feasibility Study  
• EIR/EIS Objectives and Scope of Work  
• TEP Recommendations  
• Election of Moderators                                                                 | • Information  
• Information  
• Information/Input  
• Information/Input  
• Action                                      |
| 2       | October 30, 2008            | • GCAC Meeting Schedule Update  
• Study Workplan and Schedule  
• Public Involvement Plan  
• EIR/EIS Scoping Process  
• Introduction to BRT                                                                 | • Information/Input  
• Information/Input  
• Input/Action  
• Information/Input  
• Information                                      |
|         | **Early December 2008 – Public Scoping Meetings** |                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                               |
| 3       | January 8, 2009             | • Summary of Scoping Comments  
• LRT Roadmap  
• Geary Bicycle Demand Study  
• BRT Vehicle Evaluation and Selection Update *(or February)*                                                                 | • Information/Input  
• Information/Input  
• Information/Input  
• Information                                  |
| 4       | February 26, 2009           | • Existing Conditions  
• Screening and Description of Alternatives  
• Transportation System Analysis Framework                                                                                                                                                                       | • Information/Input  
• Action  
• Information/Input                                    |
|         | **Spring 2009 – Public Workshops Prior to DEIR/DEIS** |                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                               |
| 5       | April 30, 2009              | • Summary of Public Outreach/Workshops  
• Transportation Planning Issues  
• Van Ness BRT Project Update                                                                 | • Information/Input  
• Information/Input  
• Information/Input                                      |
| 6       | June 25, 2009               | • Engineering Design Issues  
• Transportation Analysis Results                                                                 | • Information/Input  
• Information/Input                                      |
| 7       | August 27, 2009             | • Draft Impact Analysis (various topics)  
• Engineering Designs, Mitigations and Cost Estimates                                                                 | • Information/Input  
• Information/Input                                      |
| 8       | October 29, 2009            | • Draft EIR/EIS  
• Summary of Public Workshops                                                                                                                                                                                     | • Information/Input  
• Information/Input                                      |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2009 – Public Workshops Prior to FEIR/FEIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Last updated October 27, 2008
Memorandum

Date: 10.27.08

RE: Geary BRT Citizens Advisory Committee

October 30, 2008

To: Geary BRT Citizens Advisory Committee

From: Zabe Bent, Principal Planner

Through: Tilly Chang, Deputy Director for Planning

Subject: ACTION – Geary BRT EIR/EIS Public Involvement Plan

Summary

The Authority is leading the environmental study of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) on Geary Boulevard, in partnership with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA). In conducting the environmental analysis, the Authority will comply with State and Federal requirements for public input and involvement. In addition, the study team will pursue additional strategies and activities to enhance public participation and reach out to diverse corridor and city stakeholders. As such, the Authority has developed a Public Involvement Plan for the current project phase. The Public Involvement Plan details the guiding principles for conducting outreach and the specific activities that provide opportunities for community and stakeholder input. We are seeking input and approval of the Geary BRT EIR/EIS Public Involvement Plan.

BACKGROUND

In 2007, the Authority completed the Geary Corridor Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Study (the Feasibility Study), in cooperation with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA). The Feasibility Study found that BRT on Geary Boulevard would improve transit service and reliability along the corridor while also improving corridor neighborhoods. In May 2007, the Authority Board approved the final report of the Feasibility Study and appropriated funds for environmental analysis of BRT on Geary. The environmental analysis will identify the benefits and impacts of BRT alternatives, recommend a preferred alternative for Geary, and develop a set of strategies to mitigate potential impacts of BRT implementation.

The Authority is leading the environmental phase of the project, in partnership with SFMTA. This phase involves:

• Conducting an Alternatives Analysis (AA) that meets Federal Transit Administration (FTA) requirements; and
• Preparing a combined Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) that meets the requirements of both the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

State and Federal statutes and regulations require opportunities for public comment at certain points during the preparation and adoption of an environmental document. The Geary BRT environmental study will comply with these requirements, as well as provide additional opportunities for public engagement and input. The Feasibility Study included an extensive outreach component, which will provide the foundation for public involvement efforts during the current project phase.
DISCUSSION

The Geary BRT EIR/EIS Public Involvement Plan (Attachment 1) details the guiding principles for conducting outreach during the environmental study. The Plan also discusses the specific activities and strategies that will be pursued to provide opportunities for community and stakeholder input.

Goals and Objectives: The goals of the Public Involvement Plan are to provide information and to establish avenues for dialogue and community involvement in the decision-making process. The objectives of the public involvement effort for this project are:

- Identify and involve all stakeholders;
- Provide information;
- Educate the community about Bus Rapid Transit and the purpose of and need for Geary BRT;
- Create a forum for generating ideas;
- Identify key issues early so that resolutions can be explored; and
- Provide a mechanism for stakeholders and the public to provide input into the decision-making process.

Meeting these objectives involves both communication and notification tools, as well as providing opportunities for input and dialogue.

Milestones and Activities: The Public Involvement Plan is built around key milestones in the Geary BRT EIR/EIS process, including Public Scoping, preparation of the Draft EIR/EIS, and the selection of a locally preferred alternative. During the current project phase, the study team will hold three series of public workshops to share information and gather community input. The meetings will be held throughout the corridor. In addition, direct outreach efforts—such as meetings with corridor stakeholders and presentations to neighborhood organizations—will be conducted as needed and requested. Finally, continuous public involvement will be facilitated through the periodic preparation of project “fact sheets”; ongoing additions to the project website; and maintenance of a contact database to provide regular updates to interested individual and groups.

Geary BRT Citizens Advisory Committee: The Geary BRT Citizens Advisory Committee (GCAC) has an important role in supporting public involvement for the EIR/EIS. In addition to meeting approximately bi-monthly to review study deliverables and advise Authority staff, the GCAC will assist in engaging the corridor’s diverse communities and the public at large. The GCAC will be instrumental in identifying and developing relationships with key stakeholders and facilitating their input.

We are seeking input and approval of the Geary BRT EIR/EIS Public Involvement Plan.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Approve a motion of support for the Geary BRT EIR/EIS Public Involvement Plan.

2. Approve a motion of support for the Geary BRT EIR/EIS Public Involvement Plan, with modifications.

3. Defer action, pending additional information or further staff analysis.

RECOMMENDATION

Approve a motion of support for the Geary BRT EIR/EIS Public Involvement Plan.

Attachment (1):

1. Geary BRT EIR/EIS Public Involvement Plan
Geary BRT EIR/EIS
Draft Public Involvement Plan

I Background

In May 2007, the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (Authority) completed the Geary Corridor Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Study (the Feasibility Study), in cooperation with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA). The study determined that BRT on Geary Boulevard would improve transit service and reliability along the corridor while also improving corridor neighborhoods cost effectively and quickly—and at a much lower cost that light rail transit. In partnership with SFMTA, the Authority is now moving the project forward to define BRT designs and operations, costs, and potential benefits/impacts by:

- Conducting an Alternatives Analysis (AA) that meets Federal Transit Administration (FTA) requirements; and
- Preparing a combined Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) that meets the requirements of both the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The Public Involvement Plan builds on outreach efforts conducted during the Feasibility Study. Knowledge and experience from this prior work will be carried forward during the environmental analysis phase. Given the project’s complexity and the study area’s size, this project will involve a significant public involvement effort.

II Objectives

The goals of the Public Involvement Plan are to provide information about the project to members of the public and project stakeholders and to establish avenues for dialogue and community involvement in the project development and decision-making process. The objectives of the public involvement effort for this project are:

- Identify and involve all stakeholders;
• Provide information;
• Educate the community about Bus Rapid Transit and the purpose of and need for Geary BRT;
• Create a forum for generating ideas;
• Identify key issues early so that resolutions can be explored and developed; and
• Provide a mechanism for stakeholders and the public to provide input into the project development and decision-making process.

Meeting these objectives involves both communication and notification tools, as well as providing opportunities for input and dialogue.

Opportunities and Challenges: Public involvement in the Geary BRT EIR/EIS faces a number of challenges and, at the same time, opportunities. Among the challenges are:

• Communicating and reaching out to people who speak no English or limited English and other hard-to-reach groups;
• Communicating and reaching out to regional stakeholders;
• Introducing the concept of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), a technology that currently does not exist in San Francisco; and
• Balancing the needs of different street users along different segments of the corridor.

The public involvement process should effectively demonstrate how, by working cooperatively, mutually acceptable solutions are attainable.

Principles: Given the challenges of engaging and involving Geary Corridor stakeholders, the Public Involvement Plan seeks to maximize the following principles:

• Quality of participation: identifying, engaging, and including the appropriate stakeholders;
• Diversity: a broad spectrum of participation;
• Education: informing and teaching the public about BRT;
• Reach: breadth and depth of outreach network;
• Accessibility: easy access to project information and materials; and
• Inclusiveness: multiple forums and opportunities to voice different and/or opposing viewpoints.
• Timing: early and ongoing dissemination of information to address previously identified issues and emerging concerns;
• Communication: broad-based and targeted outreach to build awareness about the project alternatives, analysis process, and potential benefits/impacts;
• Transparency: clear and defensible project outcomes; and
• Feedback: public involvement activities and results that are relevant to the study process, inform the public and agencies; and improve the project outcome.

III Timeline

The Public Involvement Plan is built around key milestones in the Geary BRT EIR/EIS process. The timeline of an EIR/EIS includes these key points in the study for input:

• Scoping;
• Preparation of Draft EIR/EIS;
• Selection of a Locally Preferred Alternative; and
• Adoption of the Final EIR/EIS.

Figure 1, below, summarizes the expected points in the process where these milestones will occur and the outreach strategies that will be deployed during each phase.

**Figure 1: Summary of Outreach Tools and Techniques**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1: Data Collection, Purpose &amp; Need, Scoping, Initial Analysis (Oct 2008 – Jan 2009)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Website updated with most current information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two public scoping meetings and one agency scoping meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement and postcard mailer to notify public and agencies about scoping meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial fact sheet about the project, with translation into multiple languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized meeting reporting forms for stakeholder meetings and other forums</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 2: Environmental Analysis, AA, DEIS/R Preparation, Public Hearing (Feb 2009 – Oct 2009)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Website updated with most current information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-group meetings or individual stakeholder interviews to review project alternatives and station area plans, and to identify environmental, design, and engineering issues, impacts, and mitigation measures for consideration in the EIS/EIR document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional fact sheets to inform the public about the project and status, with translation into multiple languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim public workshops (3 locations along the corridor) prior to release of DEIS/DEIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One public hearing upon release of the DEIS/DEIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notifications to public and agencies about workshops and hearings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Website updated with most current information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings with stakeholders to discuss preferred alternative and the Final EIR/EIS analysis and conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written responses to comments submitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Authority staff will also attend community meetings on an as-invited and ongoing basis throughout the study.

**IV Geary BRT Citizens Advisory Committee**

The Geary BRT Citizens Advisory Committee (GCAC) consists of 11 members representing different neighborhoods along the Geary Corridor, as well as at-large interests. The GCAC has an important role in the public involvement element of the EIR/EIS. GCAC participation in public involvement should include:

• Providing feedback to Authority staff on study deliverables and at key decision points:
  o Scoping. Purpose of and need for the project; alternatives to be analyzed; and impact areas to be studied.
Draft EIR/EIS. Results of impact analyses; significance of potential benefits and impacts; and strategies to mitigate any potential impacts.

Final EIR/EIS. Selection of preferred alternative.

- Assisting in educating the overall community about the project, and the trade-offs involved in choosing a preferred alternative;
- Identifying and developing relationships with key stakeholders and community organizations (along the corridor and citywide), and facilitating their input; and
- Attending and participating in community workshops.

The GCAC will meet approximately bi-monthly throughout the environmental phase of the project.

V Meetings and Events

State and federal statutes and regulations require opportunities for public comment at certain points during the preparation and adoption of an environmental document. The Geary BRT environmental study will comply with these requirements, as well as provide many additional opportunities for public engagement and input.

Public Workshops: At three major milestones in the EIR/EIS process, the Authority will host public workshops to share information and obtain community input:

Scoping period. The Scoping process helps determine the purpose of and need for the project; the alternatives that will be analyzed in the EIR/EIS; and the areas of potential environmental effects that will be studied. Public workshops will be held during the Scoping period to provide the public with the opportunity to provide input on these topics.

Prior to Release of Draft EIR/EIS. Public workshops will be held prior to the release of the Draft EIR/EIS to obtain public input on the results of the impact analyses and on potential strategies for mitigating any significant negative environmental impacts. These workshops will also be an opportunity to focus on design challenges at locations that require special attention, such as grade separated intersections.

Prior to Release of Final EIR/EIS. The Final EIR/EIS includes a recommendation of the Preferred Alternative. Public workshops will be held prior to the release of the Final EIR/EIS to obtain public input on any revised impact analyses, and the selection of a preferred alternative and its mitigation measures.

Public Hearings: In addition to public workshops, public hearings before elected and appointed officials with decision-making authority over the project will be held. Boards and Commissions that will hold public hearings on the project include the Authority Board, which will certify the Final EIR/EIS; and informational hearings before the SFMTA Board and the Planning Commission.

Neighborhood Organization Meetings: A key aspect of public involvement in the Geary BRT EIR/EIS is developing relationships with active community and neighborhood organizations along the Geary corridor and citywide. The EIR/EIS effort will build on relationships developed during the Feasibility Study, as well as seek new and stronger relationships. The Authority will attend meetings of neighborhood and community organizations as needed/requested to provide information and updates on the EIR/EIS, to take public input, and to participate in dialogue about the project.
Neighborhood groups and organizations already identified include:

- Japantown Task Force
- Jordan Park Neighborhood Association
- Lower Polk Neighbors
- Richmond Democratic Club
- Planning Association for the Richmond
- Russian-American Community Services
- Tenderloin Futures Collaborative
- Little Saigon Development Corporation
- Fillmore Merchants Association
- Geary Merchants Association
- Clement Street Merchants Association
- Russian Merchants Association
- Coalition to Save Ocean Beach

Regional and citywide groups and organizations already identified include:

- Rescue MUNI
- San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association (SPUR)
- Livable City
- Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
- San Francisco Bicycle Coalition (SFBC)
- Transportation and Land Use Coalition (TALC)
- Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM)

VI Communication and Notification

The communication and notification strategy for the Geary BRT EIR/EIS includes periodic points of focused notification at key study milestones, as well as venues for ongoing communication and information about the project.

Contacts Database: A key element of the Public Involvement Plan is to maintain a database of interested individuals and organizations. This contacts database will used to notify interested stakeholders at key milestones in the EIR/EIS, and about opportunities for input. The database will build upon the extensive database compiled as part of the Feasibility Study, and include individuals and organizations from all of the following categories:

- GCAC Members
- Individuals or organizations that have provided contact information at workshops or other events, or who have requested inclusion in the database
- Affected public agencies
- Local, state, and federal public officials
- Cultural Institutions
- Commuters and their representative organizations
The Contacts Database will include both mailing addresses and email addresses. Database contact information will not be used for any purpose other than to provide individuals with project-related information and notifications.

**Fact Sheets:** The Authority will develop a Fact Sheet summarizing the project status, updates, and opportunities for input. The Fact Sheet will be translated into appropriate languages. The Fact Sheet will be updated approximately quarterly. This Fact Sheet will be used as the key handout distributed at neighborhood meetings and other outreach events, and available at the Authority offices and on the project website.

**Project Website:** The Authority will maintain a website, www.GearyBRT.org, as a clearinghouse for information on the Geary BRT project and the EIR/EIS process. The website will include past archives of information, such as the Feasibility Study and associated reports and materials. The website will highlight news and updates, as well as upcoming opportunities for input and a form for contacting the study team. The website will catalog materials and information developed in support of the EIR/EIS, including GCAC agendas and materials, information presented at public workshops, and official documents.

**Media:** The Authority will provide updates to local and regional print and broadcast media at key milestones in the EIR/EIS process, through press releases and media advisories.

**Radius Mailing:** At the start of the EIR/EIS, during the Scoping period and in advance of the public Scoping meetings, the Authority will publicize the EIR/EIS effort to businesses and residents along the Geary corridor through a direct mailing. This will include information on subscribing to the project mailing list.

**Bus Notices:** At key milestones in the EIR/EIS process, the Authority will post notices in the Muni bus shelters and on the Muni buses serving the Geary corridor.