



# DRAFT MINUTES

## CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, March 22, 2017

### 1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Waddling called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

CAC members present were Becky Hogue, Brian Larkin, John Larson, Santiago Lerma, Jacqueline Sachs, Peter Tannen, Chris Waddling, Shannon Wells-Mongiovi and Bradley Wiedmaier (9)

Absent: CAC Members Ablog and P. Sachs (2)

Transportation Authority staff members present were Amber Crabbe, Anna LaForte, Mike Pickford, Steve Rehn and Steve Stamos.

### 2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Waddling reported at the January 25 and February 22 CAC meetings, neither candidate for the Vice Chair seat of the CAC received a majority vote so, at this meeting, the CAC would hold another vote. He said at the March 21 Board meeting, the Board reappointed Myla Ablog to the District 5 CAC seat for a two-year term, and that the next appointments would be in July for Districts 2 and 4. He said also at the Board meeting and the following Board of Supervisors meeting, Chair Peskin introduced a resolution urging the state legislature to amend the California Vehicle and PUC Codes to enable local jurisdictions to permit, conduct enforcement, access trip data for transportation network companies as warranted to ensure safety and disability access and manage congestion, which would be acted on by the Board in April.

Chair Waddling said that Item 7 would focus on the three proposed allocation requests for the Downtown Rail Extension project, which were heard for information at the Board meeting and would be considered by the Board for approval in April. He said he would request that the item be removed from the Consent Agenda to hear a brief presentation from staff. He said the Clerk has reached out to the CAC about upcoming walking tours for the Railyard Alternatives and I-280 Boulevard Feasibility Study, and that there would be an update at an upcoming meeting as well. Lastly, he encouraged CAC members to reach out to their respective Commissioners' offices to provide input and request feedback, and requested that staff presentations be limited to five minutes to allow sufficient discussion and time for public comment.

Peter Tannen commented that he would be attending the RAB walking tour on March 24.

Jackie Sachs commented that at the March 14 Board meeting the Prop AA Strategic Plan item was continued by the Board.

There was no public comment.

### 3. Election of Vice Chair for 2017 – ACTION

Chair Waddling announced that the election for Vice Chair had been continued from the January and February CAC meetings due to a lack of a majority vote.

There was no public comment.

The motion to elect Bradley Wiedmaier as Vice Chair was not approved by a majority of the CAC members.

The motion to elect Peter Sachs as Vice Chair was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Hogue, Larkin, Larson, Lerma, J. Sachs and Waddling (6)

## **Consent Agenda**

### **Chair Waddling Severed Items 5 and 7 from the Consent Agenda.**

#### **4. Approve the Minutes of the February 22 2017 Meeting – ACTION**

#### **5. Adopt a Motion of Support for Adoption of the Alemany Interchange Improvement Study [NTIP Planning] Final Report – ACTION**

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

Chair Waddling said the CAC was in receipt of a letter from a member of the public regarding future phases of the project, and asked what the next steps for the project would be. Ms. Hiatt replied that the land areas mentioned in the letter could serve as a park or nature restoration zone, and noted that the sidewalks were currently underused and unpleasant for pedestrians. She added that a park or widened sidewalk would be an additional, future phase of the project.

Chair Waddling asked for clarification if this would be in Phase 2 of the project. Ms. Hiatt replied that Phase 2 would be a crossing to San Bruno Avenue with signals, lighting and a paved walk area, but it would not include park-type improvements. She said a park with widened sidewalks would be an additional phase following Phase 2.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi commented that she was not sure what the member of the public was suggesting regarding a bike connection to Silver Avenue, to which Ms. Hiatt replied that it seemed to suggest a new bicycle route on San Bruno Avenue between Alemany Boulevard and Silver Avenue.

Chair Waddling noted that he was the chair of the Portola Neighborhood Association and that he had worked closely with former Commissioner Campos to bring attention to these improvements. He said community members had expressed a concern that there would be sufficient funding for Phase 2 of the project.

There was no public comment.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi moved to approve the item, seconded by John Larson.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Hogue, Larkin, Larson, Lerma, J. Sachs, Tannen, Waddling, Wiedmaier and Wells-Mongiovi (9)

Absent: CAC Members Ablog and P. Sachs (2)

#### **6. State and Federal Legislative Update – INFORMATION**

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

Becky Hogue moved to approve Items 4 and 6 on the Consent Agenda, seconded by Peter Tannen.

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Hogue, Larkin, Larson, Lerma, J. Sachs, Tannen, Waddling, Wiedmaier and

Wells-Mongiovi (9)

Absent: CAC Members Ablog and P. Sachs (2)

7. **Proposed Allocation of \$4,549,675 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions for the Downtown Extension - Preliminary Engineering; \$915,000, with Conditions, for the Downtown Extension Tunneling Options Engineering Study; and Appropriation of \$200,000 for Oversight of the Downtown Extension, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules – INFORMATION**

Luis Zurinaga, Consultant, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Waddling asked for clarification as to why it was an information item. Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, replied that the item was presented for information at the March 21 Board meeting and was coordinated with updates on the Caltrain Electrification project and Railyard Alternatives and I-280 Boulevard Feasibility Study, but that the proposed allocations would be advanced to the April Board meetings for action.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun commented that he was opposed to the baseline alignment as it would not permit going under the freeway and turning back to 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. He also said there were new buildings on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street which would have to be constructed around. He said that the Pennsylvania alignment would entail a grade separation at 16<sup>th</sup> Street which would cost \$4.5 billion. He said a possible solution would be to curve the alignment at 7<sup>th</sup> Street which would only include three blocks of cut and cover and would allow a future connection to the Easy Bay through an additional tunnel.

#### **End of Consent Agenda**

#### **Chair called Item 8 before 7**

8. **Adopt a Motion of Support for the Allocation of \$38,475 in Prop K Funds for One Request, with Conditions, and Appropriation of \$602,254 in Prop K Funds for One Request, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules – ACTION**

Colin Dentel-Post, Senior Transportation Planner, and Mike Pickford, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Brian Larkin asked if staff could discuss the current litigation with the Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project. Mr. Dentel-Post replied that staff could not discuss ongoing litigation in detail, but that the lawsuit was filed on February 6, 2017 by a group called “San Franciscans for Sensible Transit” which purported to represent Richmond district interests. He added that together with the City, the Transportation Authority was engaged in legal defense, and that they were confident that the Environmental Impact Report’s (EIR’s) analysis and environmental process were robust.

Mr. Larkin asked if there was precedent for a similar lawsuit. Mr. Dentel-Post replied that to his knowledge, California Environmental Quality Act challenges had previously been filed against various city projects alleging incomplete or using erroneous analyses, and noted that while some were successful the majority were not.

Mr. Larkin asked if the CAC could be provided a copy of the lawsuit. Mr. Dentel-Post replied that the lawsuit was a public document that was posted online and that staff would provide a link.

Jackie Sachs noted that there had been an article in the Richmond Review the prior month regarding the lawsuit. She said that people involved in the lawsuit wanted a light-rail system on Geary Boulevard and not a BRT system, and noted that there was no way a BRT system could be light-rail ready, especially with the uncertain funding situation at the federal level.

Peter Tannen said that the city's bicycle plan was a prior example of a lawsuit that was successful which held up the bicycle plan for several years. Mr. Dentel-Post noted that in that particular case a key issue was that a full EIR had not been completed for the project, whereas an EIR had been completed for the Geary BRT project.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun said that based on the news from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) earlier that day, federal funding from the Capital Investment Grants program may not be available for new projects. He questioned whether there was a backup funding plan for the Geary BRT project.

Becky Hogue moved to approve the item, seconded by Peter Tannen.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Hogue, Larkin, Larson, Lerma, J. Sachs, Tannen, Waddling, Wiedmaier and Wells-Mongiovi (9)

Absent: CAC Members Ablog and P. Sachs (2)

**9. Adopt a Motion of Support for Adoption of the Western Addition Community-Based Transportation Plan [NTIP Planning] Final Report – ACTION**

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, introduced the item and Danielle Harris and Monica Munowitch from the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), who presented the item.

Chair Waddling asked about the diversity of demographics of the people who attended the community meetings. Ms. Harris replied that during the project many community meetings were held and that their service provider in the Western Addition neighborhood, Mo' Magic, represented various community groups, and that they mixed and matched service providers to reach different groups.

There was no public comment.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Hogue, Larkin, Larson, Lerma, J. Sachs, Tannen, Waddling, Wiedmaier and Wells-Mongiovi (9)

Absent: CAC Members Ablog and P. Sachs (2)

**10. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Adoption of Community of Concern Boundaries for San Francisco – ACTION**

Warren Logan, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi asked how MTC's criteria for communities of concern was decided. Mr. Logan replied that MTC's definition had been revised several times before and that more factors were added over the years to capture additional disadvantaged communities.

Ms. Wells-Mongiovi asked how the percentages were calculated. Mr. Logan replied that they were based on the mean for that group and one standard deviation up.

John Larson said, when looking at the 2013 map versus the 2017 map, it was interesting to see shifts in communities. He said he appreciated that census-block analysis was conducted in the south and west parts of the city as it showed differences with MTC's analysis. He asked if MTC needed to approve the Transportation Authority's definition. Amber Crabbe, Assistant Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, replied that MTC was supportive of the Transportation Authority making its own definition and that they would accept should the Board approve it and

would use it from that point going forward.

Peter Tannen asked for the definition of a cost-burdened renter. Mr. Logan replied that cost-burdened renters were people who paid more than 30% of their income on housing.

Chair Waddling asked if 200% of the federal poverty level was a sufficient threshold, and whether it should be higher for the Bay Area. Mr. Logan replied that it was deemed sufficient, and that they tried adjusting it but it resulted in roughly the same outcome.

Brian Larkin asked why the Sea Cliff neighborhood was considered a community of concern. Mr. Logan replied that in the Transportation Authority's analysis it did not meet the other thresholds and was removed as a community of concern.

Chair Waddling asked why 10,000 people was chosen as a threshold. Mr. Logan replied that it was to be strategic, and that if continuous block groups were not used it resulted in numerous smaller areas which was not great for planning.

Jackie Sachs asked if the 2017 map took into consideration buildings that housed senior citizens and the disabled community, and referenced several streets where they were located. Mr. Logan replied that those populations would be represented in the census as there were factors for each one. Ms. Crabbe added that senior citizens and the disabled community were also spread throughout the city, and that communities of concern were intended to represent concentrations of disadvantaged communities. She noted that more specific factors were taken into consideration for these communities during the planning and funding process.

There was no public comment.

John Larson moved to approve the item, seconded by Santiago Lerma.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Hogue, Larkin, Larson, Lerma, J. Sachs, Tannen, Waddling, Wiedmaier and Wells-Mongiovi (9)

Absent: CAC Members Ablog and P. Sachs (2)

**11. Adopt a Motion of Support for Amendment of the Adopted Fiscal Year 2016/17 Budget to Increase Revenues by \$13,396,777, Increase Expenditures by \$15,356,835 and Increase Other Financing Sources by \$21,335,835 for a Total Net Increase in Fund Balance of \$19,375,777 – ACTION**

Cynthia Fong, Deputy Director for Finance and Administration, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

John Larson commented that for the Congestion Management Agency program, there seemed to be a large balance carried over from the prior fiscal year. Ms. Fong replied that the Controller's Office recently changed their revenue recognition policy in order to have city departments close their books earlier in the fiscal year, as typically city departments closed their books by Thanksgiving. She said the prior policy was that any revenue received within 90 days after June 30 was considered revenue for the prior fiscal year, but the new policy changed this period to within 60 days. Ms. Fong said that extra 30 days of revenue was therefore not captured in the prior year's financial statements and was pushed to the current fiscal year, which resulted in the large carry-over adjustment.

Mr. Larson asked if the carry-over was mostly for the Yerba Buena Island projects, which Ms. Fong confirmed.

There was no public comment.

Peter Tannen moved to approve the item, seconded by Santiago Lerma.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Hogue, Larkin, Larson, Lerma, J. Sachs, Tannen, Waddling, Wiedmaier and Wells-Mongiovi (9)

Absent: CAC Members Ablog and P. Sachs (2)

**12. Update on the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project – INFORMATION**

Casey Fromson, Government Affairs Officer at Caltrain, presented the item.

Brian Larkin asked if it was worth it for Caltrain to extend the two contracts for four months when it would cost \$20 million. Ms. Fromson replied that Caltrain would be billed the actual costs at the end so the amount could be less than \$20 million. She said the reasoning was to keep the fixed-cost contracts in place, and that for the overall project cost of \$2 billion, it was only a small piece and would come out of the project contingency.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated that the new trains that would be ordered only had 762 seats, and that Caltrain had misinformed the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) regarding the train capacity. He said the mandate by the FTA was to increase train capacity by 10% above current capacity. He noted that BART was increasing its capacity through the transbay tube by signaling but that they had recently fired their contractor. He said the Electrification project had already wasted \$158 million and was spending \$18 million per month and that Caltrain should cancel both contracts and reissue the procurements. He said the trains should have 950 seats per Caltrain's 2012 analysis and that they should be hybrid trains as that would save \$400 million and would allow the trains to continue south to Gilroy. Finally, he said cities were building along the Caltrain tracks which would require reduced speeds for high-speed rail trains.

**13. Preliminary Results of the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) Perks Program – INFORMATION**

Camille Guiriba, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff presentation.

Santiago Lerma asked if the program surveyed people as to why they changed their travel behavior. He noted that a few dollars did not seem like much of an incentive to change travel behavior and would likely need to be in the hundreds of dollars to make a significant difference. Ms. Guiriba replied that a survey was conducted in December and a follow-up was conducted in February, and that it included a question about the barriers people faced to changing their travel behavior. She said the results from those surveys would be shared as part of the full evaluation of the program.

Peter Tannen asked if staff felt that the overall cost of the program was worth the benefits. Ms. Guiriba replied that the cost-benefit analysis would be included as part of the evaluation, but that if the program continues in the future it should be focused on riders during the peak of the commute in order to be more cost-effective.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi said she had participated in the program and that the potential reward did not seem great enough to have a large number of people adjust their work hours. Ms. Guiriba replied that the level of incentive was a common response in the surveys, but that the purpose of the program was to find a price point that would be effective in shifting travel behavior, while also being cost effective for operating the program.

Ms. Wells-Mongiovi stated that there was likely a point for many people where they could not travel any earlier or later. Ms. Guiriba replied that there would always be barriers to participating, often due to inflexible work schedules, but that the program targeted people with more flexible

schedules.

Jackie Sacks if there were surveys conducted for senior citizens, the disabled community, people going to school or working that rode BART outside of the peak hours. Ms. Guiriba replied that the focus of the program was on commuter traveling during the regular 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. work period.

Chair Waddling asked if it was possible to do flexible pricing on BART. Ms. Guiriba replied that she was not aware of BART considering congestion or peak-period pricing.

Chair Waddling commented that having to spend an extra dollar each day might be more of an incentive for riders to change their travel behavior. He asked if the incentives provided were based on examples from other countries, and how those countries compared in terms of cost of living. Ms. Guiriba replied that the model for the program was a similar program in Singapore, which used the same vendor, Urban Engines, and that they did use similar incentives calculations.

Peter Tannen commented that compared to other transit providers, it was strange that BART's discount for senior citizens was so extensive, and that it would make sense to limit that discount during peak period to discourage travel during that time. Ms. Guiriba replied that she would pass that on to BART.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun commented that the flexibility needed to come from the employers through incentives. He said that it did not make sense to provide prizes to thousands of people and that it should be kept simple and limited to people who significantly change their travel behavior.

Edward Mason questioned why the Bay Area Council was not involved, and that it should be encouraging employers to offer flexible schedules. He said employers were not trying to change travel behavior and were instead using commuter shuttles to bypass peak period congestion. He asked what the results were for the Singapore program and whether cultural differences may have played a part, and noted that the more income people have the more they value their time.

Chair Waddling asking what employers were involved in the program. Ms. Guiriba replied that employers were solicited through the Chamber of Commerce and other business groups. She said it was challenging to have employers sign on before the program started, but that eventually 15 employers did sign up and engaged their employees through emails. She said program staff offered the employers technical assistance but that few employers were interested in that because they already had flexible work systems in place or other resources.

Chair Waddling commented that 15 employers did not seem like a lot, and asked if there could have been a better way to engage businesses. Ms. Guiriba replied that employer engagement was an ongoing challenge and would need to be reconsidered.

Mr. Lerma asked if BART riders were from a predominant industry, and that the employers in that industry could be targeted. Ms. Guiriba replied that industry was included in the survey and could be used in the future to help target employers.

#### **14. Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION**

Santiago Lerma asked for the CAC to be kept apprised of the status of the resolution introduced by Chair Peskin at the March 21 Board meeting regarding Transportation Network Companies.

Chair Waddling said the week prior he met with staff regarding the "Hairball" intersection, and the following week the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition held a tour of the area with residents and city staff. He said it was encouraging to see the different agencies attend and the plans they each have for improving the area, which needed attention as it was currently not a priority for the city's

department on homelessness. He said the city should engage people living in encampments so that they are not encouraged to move back into the area, and that he hoped strong community engagement would help.

There was no public comment.

**15. Public Comment**

During public comment, Roland Lebrun said the city needs to be smarter with how it spends its transportation dollars, especially the Downtown Rail Extension project. He said the city should learn as much as possible from the Central Subway project because it was a great example.

Edward Mason provided statistics from his observations of commuter shuttles during the month of February. He said in Noe Valley during 30 to 60 minutes of observations he counted 78 violations including 17 blocking or delaying a Muni bus, 15 for no California license plates, 30 for no city-issued stickers, 9 for staging, 2 for idling excessively (especially near the Safeway at Market and Duboce Streets), 13 for excessive congestion, and 1 for stalling and emitting a plume of oil. He said there would be a meeting between the SFMTA and Noe Valley community in mid-April. He said SFMTA Board Member Ramos recently commented that the Noe Valley neighborhood had to accommodate industry, however Mr. Mason said there was already too much congestion on 24<sup>th</sup> Street where many commuter shuttles competed for one stop. He said he counted 45 shuttles in 44 minutes at 26<sup>th</sup> and Valencia Streets, and questioned how the area could accommodate any more.

**16. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:47 p.m.