



DRAFT MINUTES

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

Tuesday, February 23, 2016

1. Roll Call

Chair Wiener called the meeting to order at 11:05 a.m.

Present at Roll Call: Commissioners Avalos, Breed, Mar, Peskin, Wiener and Yee (6)

Absent at Roll Call: Commissioners Campos, Kim and Tang (entered during Item 2), Cohen (entered during Item 3) and Farrell (entered during Item 5) (5)

2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Wiener reported that although the year had just begun, there were several exciting developments to report, particularly regarding rail transportation. He said the week prior he was pleased to see the California High Speed-Rail Authority release its Draft 2016 Business Plan, which proposed to construct the northern segment of High-Speed Rail, from the Central Valley to the Bay Area, as the next priority segment, following completion of the Fresno to Bakersfield portion which was currently under construction. He said the city was very excited by this development and was working with agencies at the state, regional and local levels to bring trains into San Francisco, and specifically the new Transbay Terminal, by 2025. He said in a related planning effort, the San Francisco Planning Department was holding a series of public meetings to present its multi-agency program known as the Railyard Alternatives and I-280 Boulevard Feasibility Study, or "RAB". He said this study was examining options for the Downtown Rail Extension (DTX) of Caltrain and High-Speed Rail, together within an integrated land use and transportation vision for the South of Market/Mission Bay area. He said it was being coordinated with many efforts in the area, including the Transportation Authority's Freeway Corridor Management Study and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC's) Transit Core Capacity Study, which was looking at a second potential transbay tube. He noted that Planning Department staff would be presenting on the RAB study at the Transportation Authority's Citizens Advisory Committee the following week.

Chair Wiener said that a third rail-related development was that the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) had released its Rail Capacity Strategy for Muni the week prior. He said that in light of the heavy ridership demands and the significant growth needed to accommodate them, it was critical for the city to better understand the capacity and reliability needs across the Muni rail network over the next 25 years. He said the city must invest in strategies to remove bottlenecks as well as consider new lines to maintain the city's livability and accessibility. He said that he looked forward to learning more about SFMTA's proposals and how the city could integrate Muni, BART, Caltrain and High-Speed Rail system needs into the countywide long-range plan, as well as in the Subway Master Plan that he requested the year prior. He said for more information, the public could visit SFMTA's website at sfmta.com or people could attend the

Transportation Authority's Citizens Advisory Committee meeting on the following Wednesday.

Chair Wiener said that all of this rail planning was still in the early stages and would entail a lot of public outreach and technical studies to refine and prioritize it. He said that moving any of these projects forward would require cooperation and sustained funding efforts across local, regional, state, federal and private entities. He noted that in fall 2016, in addition to supporting the planned BART bond, the city would have an opportunity to place a local transportation measure on the ballot, which he hoped to focus on in the coming months with the Board and Mayor Lee. He said that as part of that conversation, it was critical to consider issues of affordability, access and equity. He thanked Muni's Director of Transit, John Haley, for attending the meeting to present on SFMTA's Equity Analysis and Policy Framework and recognized Commissioner Avalos' leadership on the issue. He also recognized Commissioner Campos' leadership and thanked MTC and the Association of Bay Area Governments for holding a very successful regional affordable housing and anti-displacement workshop the previous weekend in Oakland. He noted that the conference was well attended and laid important groundwork on potential strategies and solutions with the city's counterparts across the region.

Commissioner Mar stated that he had recently attended the 15th Annual New Partners for Smart Growth conference in Portland, which was organized by a local government commission based in Sacramento. He noted that Portland had a smaller population than San Francisco, though the entire Portland metropolitan area had a population of about 2.4 million people. He said that he was able to attend several different workshops with local leaders from across the country, though there were many from the San Francisco Bay Area. He said that one workshop that he found particularly interesting was regarding the tent cities located in Seattle and in Portland's Chinatown. He said that Portland's tent city was run by a non-profit, and that it was more of a collective as it included formerly homeless people living as a community while they received supportive services. Commissioner Mar said another workshop he attended looked at bus rapid transit systems and their impact on displacement, and that he learned a lot from the city of Boston. He said that Boston conducted an analysis on their Silver Line which looked at mitigating impacts not only on lower income people but seniors and people with disabilities as well. He said their vision of a transit system was that it should not displace existing residents but rather make their lives better during the influx of new residents and implementation of rapid transit. He said that he also had the opportunity to walk downtown Portland with Dan Burden of the Walkable and Livable Communities Institute, and was able to see how Portland implemented pedestrian safety features, which led him to do a walking audit in District 1. Lastly, Commissioner Mar said that Portland had a great bikeshare system and overall transportation system, and that he learned a lot from the conference which he would be using locally and regionally.

There was no public comment.

3. Executive Director's Report – INFORMATION

Tilly Chang, Executive Director, presented the Executive Director's Report.

There was no public comment.

4. Approve the Minutes of the January 26, 2016 Meeting – ACTION

There was no public comment.

The minutes were approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Avalos, Breed, Campos, Cohen, Kim, Mar, Peskin, Tang, Wiener

and Yee (10)

Absent: Commissioner Farrell (1)

Items from the Finance Committee

5. Adopt Positions on State Legislation – ACTION

Chair Wiener severed Assembly Bill (AB) 1641 and Assembly Bill First Extraordinary Session (ABX1) 25 from the Finance Committee recommendation for separate consideration.

During public comment, Gilbert Criswell requested that the Board and Executive Director lobby San Francisco's state representatives, including Senator Mark Leno and Assemblymembers Phil Ting and David Chiu, for funding for the Central Subway extension to North Beach. He said the south side of the city was essentially cut off from the north side of the city, and that from where he resided it was difficult to travel to North Beach in that he had to transfer to three different buses. He noted that with the surplus in the state budget, there should be funds available.

The underlying item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Avalos, Breed, Campos, Cohen, Kim, Mar, Peskin, Tang, Wiener and Yee (10)

Absent: Commissioner Farrell (1)

Chair Wiener stated that these two pieces of legislation, which he believed were identical, would clarify that the city had local control to determine whether or not to allow a private shuttle to use a public transportation stop. He said that staff had initially taken a watch position on the legislation, but that the Finance Committee voted to change the position to oppose. He noted that this had also happened the prior year, but that at the following Board meeting the Board voted to move back to a watch position. He said that this legislation simply stated whether a local jurisdiction had local control over whether private shuttles could utilize a public transportation stop, and that it did not require San Francisco or any other city to allow any particular shuttles to use public transportation stops. He said that thousands of residents in San Francisco relied on employer provided shuttles to travel to and from work each day, and that these shuttles took many cars off the road, and that if there were no shuttles the employees would instead use their car to get to work. Chair Wiener noted that later in the day, the Board of Supervisors would consider an appeal related to the SFMTA's commuter shuttle program, and that several members of the Board had expressed support for the program and to make it better. He said that if Commissioners did indeed support the program, then they should not oppose a bill that would simply provide clarification that the city would have local control to decide whether the shuttles used the stops. He noted that there had been legal contention by opponents of the shuttle program that the city actually lacked local control to allow the shuttles to use the stops. He said this stemmed from a dispute over the interpretation of the California Vehicle Code, which would ultimately be decided through the court system. He concluded that if Commissioners supported the shuttle program and wanted a better program, then it would make sense to support having explicit local control to make that decision.

Chair Wiener moved to amend the positions on AB 1641 and ABX1 25 from oppose to watch, seconded by Commissioner Tang.

Commissioner Campos stated that he respectfully but strongly suggested that the Board vote against Chair Wiener's motion, and noted that Chair Wiener had also opposed the Free Muni for

Youth program. He said that the settlement over the commuter shuttle program was protecting the program and that there was inaccurate and untrue information regarding the settlement. He said that this legislation was also about protecting local control, given that the Board of Supervisors' legislation already provided local control, and that the city should not allow the employers providing the shuttles to do whatever they like. He added that the settlement forced the employers to listen to the community and work with the neighborhoods to take into account the concerns of residents.

Commissioner Peskin requested that individual Commissioners explain to their colleagues on the Board and to the members of the public what their vote meant, and that the Board should demand that level of respect from one another.

Chair Wiener stated that there was nothing inappropriate or disrespectful about a Commissioner articulating their perspective and that he believed it was not consistent for Commissioners to say that they supported a strong shuttle program while opposing state legislation that would clarify that San Francisco and other cities have complete and utter local control. He said that there were people opposed to the shuttle program contending that the California Vehicle Code banned San Francisco from allowing the shuttles to use Muni stops, and that the settlement would become meaningless if the shuttles could no longer use those stops, so therefore the city should seek clarity under state law. Regarding Commissioner Campos' comment, he noted that he had expressed concerns regarding the funding for the Free Muni for Youth program but as a member of the MTC he represented San Francisco's position and voted in favor of the regional funding for the program. Chair Wiener said that if the shuttle program was to succeed, in terms of being able to transport thousands of San Francisco residents to and from work and being able to continue to have the leverage to charge a fee and to decide which routes the shuttles can travel on, then the Board should be supporting, or at a minimum not opposing, legislation that would clarify that San Francisco had local control over those decisions.

Commissioner Peskin questioned whether the SFMTA's commuter shuttle program was legal. He noted that the city had been sued over the program but that it was the city's position that the California Vehicle Code was not undermined by the program and that it was in fact legal. He said if that was the case then then this legislation should not be controversial, and that it seemed like an after the fact attempt to legalize something under state law. Commissioner Peskin said that there was a fundamental principle at stake that public transportation stops in San Francisco, which carried over 700,000 people per day, were meant exclusively for the public. He said that he would rather have the 9,000 people riding in commuter shuttles rather than in personal vehicles, but that the shuttle program may be illegal on that principle even though it was approved by the SFMTA Board.

Commissioner Kim stated that the issues surrounding the commuter shuttle program had been conflated and that it was really about whether the shuttles could stop wherever they would like. She said it appeared that the entire Board supported the shuttle program because they recognized that it exists and that it removes many cars off the roads, but that many Commissioners questioned whether it was necessary for the shuttles to have 125-200 stops throughout the city. She said the shuttles could not operate the same way that Muni buses and the public transportation system operated, but that there could still be a strong shuttle program. She said the program should be built with a lot of different balances in place and that it was not just based on one set of stakeholders. Commissioner Kim said that the roadways, streets and curbs had to be shared since most residents could not use the private shuttles. She said the program should take into account road wear, the width of streets, traffic congestion, as well as the inconveniences the shuttles placed

on neighborhoods, as the large commuter shuttles were intimidating and could cause pedestrian safety issues and conflicts. She said the program did not have to exist as it currently was, and that if Commissioners wanted a different program it didn't mean that they were against the commuter shuttles, and that the Board should stop conflating the two. She said there were ways to balance the needs of all residents, including those taking Muni, walking or cycling, without inconveniencing any of the shuttle riders.

Chair Wiener said that he appreciated Commissioners Kim's comments regarding balancing needs but said that if a court were to determine that the city lacked the authority to allow the shuttles to use even one Muni stop, then that would completely undermine the city's ability to achieve that balance. He reiterated that the legislation did not require the city to use any stops, and that it would only give the city the ability to make that determination as a local jurisdiction, with all the stakeholders and needs at the table. He added that opposing the legislation was not consistent with supporting the shuttle program.

During public comment, Bob Planthold stated that he supported the Finance Committee recommendation and therefore opposed this motion. He noted that San Francisco was not the only city that would be affected this legislation, and that small transit systems on the edge of the Silicon Valley would have difficulty withstanding the financial pressure. He said that the legislation was overly broad and simplistic and that it did not take into account many of the considerations that the city's pilot program did, such as dwell time and if the shuttles were accessible. Mr. Planthold said that the legislation neglected a lot of factors that San Francisco was working on, and that opposing the legislation did not mean that they opposed the shuttle program. He added that the program was meant to make the shuttles safe and convenient for all without impairing or interfering with public transit.

Gilbert Criswell commented that he agreed with Commissioners Campos and Kim and that he thought Chair Wiener was politicizing the issue, so as a member of the public he recommended opposing the legislation.

The motion to amend the positions on AB 1641 and ABX1 25 from oppose to watch was defeated by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Farrell, Tang and Wiener (3)

Nays: Commissioners Avalos, Breed, Campos, Cohen, Kim, Mar, Peskin and Yee (8)

The oppose positions on AB 1641 and ABX1 25 were approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Avalos, Breed, Campos, Cohen, Kim, Mar, Peskin and Yee (8)

Nays: Commissioners Farrell, Tang and Wiener (3)

Items from the Plans and Programs Committee

6. Adopt the Fiscal Year 2016/17 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Local Expenditure Criteria – ACTION

There was no public comment.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Avalos, Breed, Campos, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Peskin, Tang, Wiener and Yee (11)

7. Appoint Peter Tannen to the Citizens Advisory Committee – ACTION

There was no public comment.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Avalos, Breed, Campos, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Peskin, Tang, Wiener and Yee (11)

8. Allocate \$49,341,000 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedule – ACTION

There was no public comment.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Avalos, Breed, Campos, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Peskin, Tang, Wiener and Yee (11)

Items for Direct Board Consideration

9. Revise the Structure of the Vision Zero Committee of the Transportation Authority – ACTION

There was no public comment.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Avalos, Breed, Campos, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Peskin, Tang, Wiener and Yee (11)

10. Equity Strategy for the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency – INFORMATION

John Haley, Director of Transit at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), presented the item.

Commissioner Avalos stated that in 2014 he introduced a charter amendment to look at how Muni could establish an equity framework for how it allocated funding for operations and capital. He said ultimately it was not moved forward but that there were several meetings with community stakeholders and that a foundation was built. He said now that effort had been revitalized and Muni would be putting forward an Equity Strategy each year to address some of the inequities across the city. He noted that resources, especially capital, were not spread equally across the city, and that District 11 was an example of this. He said there were two projects within one area that he was especially concerned about, one being passengers getting off the M-Line and crossing San Jose Avenue against traffic, and the other being passengers crossing Geneva Avenue and having to walk along a very narrow Muni line to access the Balboa Park station. Commissioner Avalos said that he had brought up these issues for several years but they had never been addressed. He said the outlying neighborhoods in the city often didn't have the Muni or transit facilities that other neighborhoods have, and that this inequity, along with issues of affordability, were a major point of emphasis for him. He noted that the SFMTA had made strides in affordability, including the Free Muni for Youth program as well extensions on discounted fare rates for people with fixed income, such as seniors and people with disabilities. He said he was interested to see how the discussion would move forward, and that he wanted to look at how the city could strengthen its deficiencies, such as allocating resources to neighborhoods that are reliant on Muni and don't have other transit options.

Commissioner Tang commented that this type of study had not been done before. She noted that

the map that outlined communities of concern did not include an area near District 7 which encompassed Park Merced and San Francisco State University, though based on the most recent census she would expect it should be. Mr. Haley responded that the identified area had a high student population, and based on the criteria and approach used in this study, that was not one of the top seven areas and would likely be in the next tier of communities of concern. He added that the service improvements being offered in this strategy would benefit that area greatly however, especially on the rail side, and that he could provide a list of service changes and impact that would affect that area.

Commissioner Tang said that the general recommendations offered in the strategy included improving reliability and reducing crowding, and requested that a more detailed list of recommendations be provided at a Plans and Programs Committee meeting or other venue in order to take a deeper look at what key needs were identified and what type of metrics were used to figure out how Muni could better serve the various neighborhoods. Mr. Haley responded that the metrics were based on discussions with community groups and a review of the data, and that those metrics led them to the Mission corridor and other corridor improvements that were in the process of being implemented.

Commissioner Avalos said that the public had focused on issues of headways and reliability, but that he was also interested to see what capital, facilities and structures would be put in place to improve the experience of Muni riders and transit users. He said there were numerous places such as the Balboa Park station area that were not ideal and not receiving a lot of attention, while other areas of the city received a large portion of the capital dollars. Mr. Haley responded that the SFMTA was investing in the Muni maintenance facility but had a long way to go in looking at facilities across the city. He said SFMTA had just entered into a two-year study and was evaluating its internal and key passenger facilities such as stations and how they could be affected, but that overall they were committed to improving facilities. Commissioner Avalos said that this was an ongoing issue in District 11 and requested a briefing to discuss the M-Line and pinch point at the Balboa Park Station, as those were issues that needed to get picked up by the equity strategy.

Commissioner Mar commented that signal prioritization increased efficiency by 10-20%. He said he appreciated that the strategy would provide better service for the seven communities of concern, which included the lowest income and least supported neighborhoods, and noted that it would help improve the entire Muni system. He said that for District 1, the 31-Balboa, 38-Geary, and 5-Rapid lines would see improvements as a result even though they didn't touch one of the seven identified areas, and that they would also help District 1 residents travel to and from the core of the city a lot better.

Chair Wiener stated that he was supportive of the direction of the strategy, especially that it focused on some of the lowest income neighborhoods and those that were most transit dependent, particularly in the southern and southeast areas of the city. He noted that some neighborhoods in these areas had a real problem in the amount of time it took residents to get to the core of the city, but that this was a good start. He said that in addition to the equity factors that were analyzed for the study, it could also look at expected future population density. He said that Chinatown already had an incredibly high density and transit use, and that although it was transit rich it was still intensely overcrowded, and that having enough service was another part of the equity issue. He said that on the map in the presentation, there were portions of Districts 6 and 10 between the South of Market area and the Bayview that would be absorbing a large amount of housing, and that while it may not be low income, it was important to ensure that there was transit to support the housing. Chair Wiener said that another aspect for SFMTA to take into account was

late night and early morning transportation access. He said this was a major equity issue as many workers started work late at night and didn't get off until the early morning, many of whom were working class or low income, and that they didn't have any other transportation options because either they didn't own a car or could not park where they work. He added that tough resource decisions had to be made and that rush hour would always receive priority because of the number of riders, but that someone trying to get home from work when BART and the Muni subway were closed had to deal with infrequent OWL service, and that it should be part of the calculus. Mr. Haley responded that the late night issue had come out of discussions during the equity study, and that starting in April there would be new improvements introduced. He said OWL service would be increased from every 45 minutes to every 30 minutes to make better connections, and that two new routes would be added to close gaps in the areas that were mentioned. He said the 45 route would go from Castro to 3rd Street and the 44 route would go from Glen Park to the Bayview. He added that this was an issue they heard from community groups and that they would be moving forward to strengthen service in this area, but that most importantly this strategy had embedded principles to look at the entire system during all hours. Chair Wiener stated that he appreciated the increase in the OWL service, but that even beginning at 8:00 or 9:00 PM, before the OWL service began, service dropped off significantly.

Commissioner Avalos asked how the SFMTA would ensure that these measures would be implemented and what oversight would be in place to make sure the changes were being made. He continued that once a deficiency was identified, how would the SFMTA Board be involved and what would the recourse be.

Mr. Haley said that the first part of the process was tying the improvements to the budget process, which would allow them to use service dollars to address those needs. He said they would come back to the SFMTA Board and possibly the Transportation Authority Board on an ongoing basis to look at how well they were doing on cost per trip and ridership performance. Going forward, he said it would be anchored into the processes and systems currently in place so that it would be monitored on a regular basis and reported on. He added that the budget process was key because it put the numbers out there and gave policymakers an opportunity to review how the funds were being spent.

During public comment, Peter Straus with the San Francisco Transit Riders Union (SFTRU) said that it was unusual for a new program to come along in the city with any controversy. He said that the community advocates worked closely with the SFMTA in developing the strategy and that the SFMTA had been responsive and grasped what SFTRU was trying to achieve. He said he looked forward to seeing how needs would be identified in the future and how this would be turned into a living process in order to improve the city. He added that it reflected well on the working relationship between the SFMTA, community advocates and residents.

Bob Allen with Urban Habitat said that he had worked closely with SFMTA staff and a range of stakeholders over the past two years on this strategy. He said there were concerns about the communities of concern identified, but that this was a good foundation and would change over time to adapt with the city. He said this strategy served as a potential model for neighborhood-based analysis and community identified needs, where resources would be allocated to address deficiencies. He said as the SFMTA moved forward with implementing this strategy, they could use it to build public support and confidence for future ballot measures by showing communities the resulting benefits. Mr. Allen said that Urban Habitat changed to a more flexible position on the nature of specific policy interventions, which ranged from supporting service increases to capital improvements to line management changes. He said that he hoped this analysis would help

inform and maintain flexibility for funding sources to address the city's large range of needs, and that this would demonstrate how the city could work together to attract broader support on building a better transportation system.

Chema Hernandez Gil with San Francisco Bicycle Coalition (SFBC) stated that he supported the equity strategy and believed it was a good step towards addressing disparities in the city's transit system. He said a successful strategy would serve as a model for a comprehensive transportation strategy that would lead to smarter, targeted and more responsive investments that would result in safe and comfortable transportation alternatives for all San Franciscans. He said by implementing street safety and complete streets projects such as the Potrero streetscape, the 14-Mission Rapid, and the San Bruno multi-modal improvement project, and programs like Muni Forward and Vision Zero, the city would continue to make non-auto modes safer and more attractive. He said the strategy built upon the great work of stakeholders and community groups, and noted that SFBC had seen more collaboration between pedestrian and bike safety projects, particularly along high injury corridors and transit projects.

Angelina Yu with Chinatown Community Development Center, said that she supported the equity strategy and applauded the approach to look at rider experiences in the city's high-needs neighborhoods. She said the neighborhoods identified in the strategy were transit dependent and low income, and that these socio-economic factors made public transportation a lifeline for residents. She said the strategy put forward a living dashboard for what that rider experience look like, and where SFMTA could step in to identify those weaknesses and address them. She said the tool kit in the strategy really showed the flexibility between identifying whether it would be a service need, capital rolling stock need, or an adjustment to the service management side, which could make a huge difference for rider experiences on the ground from the Bayview to Chinatown. She said she looked forward to continue working on this and for the rollout of the 2017/18 recommendations.

Other Items

11. Introduction of New Items – INFORMATION

There was no public comment.

12. Public Comment

During public comment, Andrew Yip spoke about personal wisdom.

Peter Straus with the San Francisco Transit Riders Union urged the Board to support to the amendments to the transportation sustainability fee which would be heard by the Board of Supervisors later that day. He noted that during the Executive Director's Report, Director Chang had touched on the limited transportation funding available at the state level, which made the fee all the more important. He said the transportation sustainability fee would reestablish or raise the contributions from the commercial sector closer to the 25% level, which was the historic floor of the portion of the nexus fee contributed by commercial development, and was closer to what residential developers were required to contribute.

Gilbert Criswell urged the Board to respect 18, 19 and 20 year old young adults by providing them with free Muni service, especially since they had the right to vote. He also said that Super Bowl 50 did not produce the anticipated revenue for the Castro area and that local merchants lost a lot of revenue from the event and that residents were upset. He added that during the Super Bowl 50 events, Muni was irresponsible by providing only incremental service.

Bob Allen with Urban Habitat commented that the transportation sustainability fee, which would be considered by the Board of Supervisors later that day, was good policy and harmonized the amount of revenue that could be raised. He said that with a potential revenue measure on the fall ballot, it was important for the city to make sure that new developments were contributing to transit funding.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:39 p.m.