

DRAFT MINUTES

TREASURE ISLAND MOBILITY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

Tuesday, July 30, 2015

1. **Roll Call**

Chair Kim called the meeting to order at 11:11 a.m. The following members were:

Present at Roll Call: Commissioners Christensen, Kim and Wiener (3)

2. **Progress Update on the Treasure Island Mobility Management Program Policy Development – INFORMATION**

Rachel Hiatt, Principal Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Kim commented that this project would be important for the development of more robust congestion management options on Treasure Island and in San Francisco. She touched on the importance of the affordability programs for low-income residents, and expressed concern that the toll would be in operation seven days a week instead of only weekdays. She asked if there were options to make the toll more flexible for festivals and holidays. Ms. Hiatt responded that the weekend toll was recommended because of high levels of congestion on the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge during weekends. She said the toll would be in operation when transit agencies would be operating peak service, however she recommended that the tolling hours be different for weekday and weekends since the transit levels of service and times of congestion varied by day. She added that the toll would be based on the level of congestion and transit level of availability to and from the island.

Chair Kim asked if the toll plan was based on congestion for all drivers on the bridge or just congestion of Treasure Island residents and visitors getting on and off of the bridge. Ms. Hiatt responded that the toll would be linked to the overall congestion level on the bridge.

Chair Kim asked if the toll would be placed on Treasure Island residents traveling to San Francisco, a community which the residents were a part of. She said it was problematic that Treasure Island residents would be charged for the congestion on the bridge and noted that the congestion was also a result of people traveling to other places such as the East Bay. Ms. Hiatt responded that it was likely that many visitors would be using the bridge to travel to Treasure Island on the weekends.

Chair Kim stated that the current toll plans seemed problematic, but said she would understand if the toll was based on the amount of cars traveling through the on and off ramps for Treasure Island. She asked if there would always be a cost to get on and off of the bridge. Ms. Hiatt responded that there would not be a toll during late night and early morning hours.

Chair Kim stated that she could not support a toll that lasted from 10 p.m. to 6 a.m. She agreed with a toll during rush hour and other periods with high congestion, but stated that there needed to be times when San Francisco residents were not charged to travel to and from Treasure Island. Chair Kim added that she'd like to encourage Treasure Island residents to take the ferry and bike as much as possible, but did not want to impose restrictions which were not applicable to other San Francisco residents.

Commissioner Wiener stated that it was important not to deviate from the funding plan that led to the approval of the project and noted that the toll was part of the original approval, but added that it was important to develop a plan that was fair to everyone. He asked about the costs that would be incurred and for more detail about the toll, specifically what would happen if there were shortfalls in the revenue projections. Ms. Hiatt responded that the purpose of the toll would be to raise revenue for the regional transit operations, and said that it would be important to take an initial look at the level of transit service being called for in this project and then decide if it was needed or desired. She said that grant sources could help fund the capital costs and that it was expected that grant funding would be obtained, however a permanent source of operating funds for Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit) bus service and for ferry service still needed to be developed.

Commissioner Wiener stated the funds for AC Transit and the ferry service would likely come from other projects if there were shortfalls in the revenue generated from the toll. Tilly Chang, Executive Director, stated that it was important that all options were being analyzed. She noted that possible options included reducing the level of transit service, utilizing money generated by parking funds, or seeking private funding, and said that if there were budget shortfalls, the level of transit service offered would need to be re-examined.

Commissioner Wiener asked about the number of residents and homes that were expected to be on the island at buildout, to which Ms. Chang responded that there would be 20,000 residents and 8,000 housing units. She said that it would be possible that transit service costs could go down over time, and noted that transit services would be monitored so that right sized solutions could be developed.

Commissioner Wiener asked about the current number of housing units on the island, to which Ms. Chang responded that there were currently about 700.

Commissioner Wiener stated that it would be important to have a conversation with current residents about how new development would affect them, and that he had an issue with changing the tolling plans since future residents would know about the tolls when moving onto the island. He reiterated the need for a consistent, reliable ferry service and the importance of the toll once 20,000 residents lived on the island in order to lessen the impact of additional cars on the bridge. Commissioner Wiener noted that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission would like a piece of the toll because they owned the bridge, and that they may even want the toll to be higher. He added that as the decision process moved forward, it was important to take the big picture into account.

Commissioner Christensen asked to what extent nonresidential traffic, such as entertainment, hotels, and restaurants, was being considered. She noted that in District 3, transit was planned on a 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. schedule, and asked if it was possible to predict what the uses on the island may be and what they would require in terms of transportation services. Ms. Hiatt responded that recreational visitor trips were expected, especially given the hotel, conference center, urban garden, and bikeways planned on the island, but that

resident trips were still expected to make up the majority. She said that with additional parks and bike paths coming in the future, it would be important to account for more visitors looking to enjoy the open space.

During public comment, Becky Hogue commented that she agreed with Chair Kim and said that as a resident of Treasure Island it would be frustrating to have to pay a toll to travel on and off of the island during most times of the day. She stated that current residents have said that they'd like to be grandfathered in to the tolling plan, and that this had come up at the last community meeting which was well-attended because the toll was a main topic. Ms. Hogue stated that there was a lot of concern that current residents would have to pay for the new development and that it was important to not only provide affordable solutions for those who were living in low-income units, but also to those who were in market rate units, as the transportation options may still not be affordable.

Jeff Klein commented that he reviewed the Treasure Island Transportation Implementation Plan (TITIP) and stated that he did not agree with the transportation demand management (TDM) measures included in the plan. He said that the TITIP incorporated too many punitive measures for current Treasure Island residents. He added that the California Environmental Quality Act findings concluded that even if the entire package of proposed measures in the TITIP were implemented, the congestion would still not be reduced to tolerable levels, and said that he did not feel that the TDM and toll measures were equitable.

Chair Kim suggested that Mr. Klein email or leave a hard copy of his statement so that the Committee could read the rest of it.

3. **Introduction of New Items – INFORMATION**

There was no public comment.

4. **Public Comment**

During public comment, Betty Mackey stated that charging residents a toll was burdensome and unfair since existing residents had not been included in the decision making process. She said that she was not aware of the survey released to residents in fall 2014, and said that when she did find out about it in 2015 the survey was reopened but the decisions had already been made. Ms. Mackey said she felt as though the community had been left out of the process, and that although she took Muni and public transportation whenever possible, it was not always an option. She asked why the burden should be on the existing residents, and asked that the survey be considered incomplete to acknowledge that the community was overlooked.

Jeff Klein stated that it did not seem like the congestion toll would be successful in reducing congestion. He questioned the success of the toll in that if congestion were decreased, there would be less revenue generated for transit options. Mr. Klein said that the first step should be to add more transportation capacity and then look at adding the toll. He said that it was unfair that the project had gone from an idea to toll commute trips to a plan for tolling all trips and felt that drivers were being punished.

5. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:59 a.m.