



DRAFT MINUTES

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Vice Chair Sachs called the meeting to order at 6:20 p.m.

CAC members present: Myla Ablog, Brian Larkin, John Larson, Peter Sachs, Peter Tannen and Shannon Wells-Mongiovi (6)

CAC Members Absent: Becky Hogue, Hala Hijazi, Santiago Lerma, Chris Waddling and Bradley Wiedmaier (5)

Transportation Authority staff members present were Amber Crabbe, Anna LaForte, Maria Lombardo, Steve Rehn, Aprile Smith, Steve Stamos and Luis Zurinaga (Consultant).

2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Vice Chair Sachs reported out during a workshop prior to the start of the meeting.

Consent Agenda

3. Approve the Minutes of the July 26, 2017 Meeting – ACTION

4. State and Federal Legislative Update – INFORMATION

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Brian Larkin.

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Larkin, Larson, Sachs, Tannen and Wells-Mongiovi (6)

Absent: CAC Members Hogue, Hijazi, Lerma, Waddling and Wiedmaier (5)

End of Consent Agenda

5. Adopt a Motion of Support for Approval of San Francisco's Program of Projects for the 2018 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), and of a Fund Exchange of \$13,752,000 in RTIP Funds with an Equivalent Amount of Prop K Funds for the Central Subway Project, with Conditions – ACTION

Amber Crabbe, Assistant Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

John Larson asked, given the [delayed] status of the RTIP funds which would not be available until after completion of the Central Subway project, if the remaining commitment was still needed or if the funds could be reprioritized to a different project. Ms. Crabbe replied that the Transportation Authority intended to honor the RTIP commitment to the Central Subway project by programming future RTIP funds to other eligible San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) projects until the commitment was fulfilled. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy

Director, added that the agencies had known for a long time that all of the RTIP funds would not be available in time to meet the project's cash flow needs, but that the early commitment of RTIP funds to the project had enabled the SFMTA to develop a full funding plan. She also noted that for a large project like the Central Subway, the SFMTA may not know the final total project cost and thus, may not release all of the unallocated project contingency until years after the project was open for service.

Vice Chair Sachs asked what would happen if the Central Subway project was completed in two years and the \$60 million in contingency was not spent. Ms. Lombardo replied that the SFMTA had previously stated it would pay back the funds to the Transportation Authority if they were not needed.

Vice Chair Sachs asked if there was a higher priority project that the funds could be used on in the near term, and whether a policy discussion was bypassed since the funds were committed to the Central Subway project. Ms. Lombardo replied that the last time the Board had acted on the funds they committed to making the Central Subway project the next priority for future RTIP fund but noted that they could revisit that decision.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated that the delays on the Central Subway project were a result of problems with the tunnel boring machine technique, which were the same problems the Downtown Extension project would incur. He said the Downtown Extension project could save \$2 billion if it used an alternative approach.

Jackie Sachs asked if the fund exchange would have any effect on the Federal Transit Administration grant awarded to the Central Subway project the year prior. Ms. Lombardo replied that it would not have any impact on the federal funding.

Peter Tannen moved to approve the item, seconded by Shannon Wells-Mongiovi.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Larkin, Larson, Sachs, Tannen and Wells-Mongiovi (6)

Absent: CAC Members Hogue, Hijazi, Lerma, Waddling and Wiedmaier (5)

6. Adopt a Motion of Support for Allocation of \$890,000 in Prop K Sales Tax Funds for Two Requests and \$2,465,316 in Prop AA Vehicle Registration Fee Funds for One Request, with Conditions – ACTION

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi commented that some of the traffic signals on Market Street were hard to see and asked why the SFMTA would relocate the signal heads from horizontal mast arms to the vertical poles which would likely decrease signal visibility. Ms. LaForte replied that the SFMTA has previously communicated that the relocation would not impact visibility or safety. Steve Rehn, Senior Transportation Planner, added that the SFMTA was planning to add mast arms to the vertical poles as part of the Better Market Street project and reiterated that the subject project was an interim project to address safety concerns.

Myla Ablog asked if the new signals would include pedestrian countdown signals as part of the Traffic Signal Upgrade project. Ms. LaForte replied in the affirmative and said they would also include audible pedestrian signals.

There was no public comment.

John Larson moved to approve the item, seconded by Myla Ablog.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Larkin, Larson, Sachs, Tannen and Wells-Mongiovi (6)

Absent: CAC Members Hogue, Hijazi, Lerma, Waddling and Wiedmaier (5)

7. Adopt a Motion of Support for Adoption of the 2017 San Francisco Transportation Plan Update – INFORMATION

Camille Guiriba, Transportation Planner, presented the item staff memorandum.

Myla Ablog asked, regarding the equity section of the plan, what the difference was between the census blocks that the Transportation Authority used and the census tracts that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) used. Ms. Guiriba clarified that this question was regarding the map of the updated communities of concern and said that this was an effort that was undertaken earlier in the year. Jeff Hobson, Deputy Director for Planning, replied that MTC used census tracts to map communities of concern while the Transportation Authority used census block groups, which were a smaller geography than census tracts but not as small as census blocks. He said the method provided better representation of the more fine-grained geography of San Francisco compared to other parts of the Bay Area.

There was no public comment.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi moved to approve the item, seconded by Brian Larkin.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Larkin, Larson, Sachs, Tannen and Wells-Mongiovi (6)

Absent: CAC Members Hogue, Hijazi, Lerma, Waddling and Wiedmaier (5)

8. Update on ConnectSF – INFORMATION

Linda Meckel, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item staff memorandum.

Peter Tannen asked how people were informed of the online survey. Ms. Meckel replied that the survey was promoted on social media accounts of various City departments, and that a link was also shared through the Futures Task Force and its network. She noted that they had received about 1,800 responses so far.

John Larson commented that there seemed to be a lot of planning and study efforts and said that if there was an organizational chart depicting how they intersected that would be helpful for future discussions. He noted that many of them seemed to have different timelines and questioned if there was overlapping efforts.

There was no public comment.

9. Progress Report for the Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit Project – INFORMATION

Peter Gabancho, Program Manager for the Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit Project at the SFMTA, presented the item.

Brian Larkin asked if two sewer lines were being installed as part of the project. Mr. Gabancho replied that they were replacing the median sewer line with two separate lines towards the outside of the street to reduce cost as well as not disrupt bus service should the sewer line need to be repaired in the future. Mr. Larkin asked for confirmation that there was currently \$10 million in claims. Mr. Gabancho replied that was for the project as whole, but most of it was related to sewer and water work. Mr. Larkin asked what the claims were about. Mr. Gabancho replied that there was a maximum negotiated price of \$19 million with the Construction Manager/General

Contractor who had hired subcontractors to do the work. He said when the bid went out the lowest received was for \$39 million though they were able to negotiate it down to \$30 million, but the contractor was still \$11 million over as a result.

Peter Tannen asked if there was a project office where the public could go for information. Mr. Gabancho replied that it was located at 180 Redwood Street. Mr. Tannen said that having modern street light poles in the Civic Center area and replica light poles for the remainder of the corridor seemed backwards. Mr. Gabancho replied that it was due to guidelines from the Secretary of the Interior that greatly discouraged the use of replica historic poles in historic districts. Mr. Tannen asked for a brief summary of why the project was behind schedule. Mr. Gabancho replied that due to the unusually wet winter they had lost 40-50 days of work, but it was also a result of the sewer and water work that went out to bid and came out \$20 million over budget, as the negotiations to reduce it by \$9 million took a long time.

Vice Chair Sachs asked if there was a cost charged to the contractor for the delay. Mr. Gabancho said he thought the contract stipulated approximately \$50,000 per day, but that it was expected that the contractor would make counter claims against the project team. He said they were currently working on a recovery schedule to get the project back on track.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi asked if the dual permitting process had contributed to the delay – and whether it was separate or additional to the contracting issue. Mr. Gabancho replied that the issues were in parallel and not in addition, but that the contracting issue was the main reason, though they did not have approval from Caltrans to start work anyway.

Ms. Wells-Mongiovi asked if there was an idea about the project team's liability for the delay. Mr. Gabancho replied that there was no liability, as it was the contractor's responsibility to get the permits.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun asked why it was decided to string wire instead of using electric buses. Mr. Gabancho said this would allow the project to utilize the existing rolling stock which did not include any electric buses, and that it was cost-prohibitive to invest in 25-30 specialized buses to just use on this line.

A member of the public asked if there would be boarding doors on both sides of the buses. Mr. Gabancho replied that the buses would only have doors on one side so that any Muni buses could be removed or added to the fleet if needed. The member of the public asked if having pedestrians walk across two or more lanes of traffic was really safer than the current scenario. Mr. Gabancho replied that looking at it as a round trip would be splitting the number of lanes being crossed, for example from four lanes at once to two lanes at the start of the trip and two at the end, so it was the same amount of risk, if not safer.

Carla Jones commented that she was frustrated with the lack of activity on the project. She said it was possible that the construction company could go out of business as a result of being \$11 million over budget which could affect the project. She said it was also getting into the rainy season and holiday season which would inhibit the ability of the project team to make up any time. She said the current construction method was not working and was causing traffic congestion.

Vice Chair Sachs said he was also frustrated with the delay on the project.

John Larson commented that the median was quickly removed but since then there had been virtually no activity.

Vice Chair Sachs called Item 10 after the Consent Agenda

10. Downtown Extension Tunneling Study Report – INFORMATION

Luis Zurinaga, Consultant, introduced the item and Keith Abey, Senior Associate at McMillen Jacobs Associates, who presented the item.

John Larson asked if the final alignment for the Downtown Extension had been decided on. Mr. Zurinaga replied that the Railyard Alternatives and I-280 Feasibility (RAB) Study was nearing completion which would start the conversation on choosing the final alignment, but noted that the Pennsylvania Street alignment appeared to be the preferred one, which was the primary alignment being studied.

Vice Chair Sachs asked whether there was a way to balance the cost of the alignment with the amount of surface disruption, including considerations such as increased traffic and vehicle emissions. Mr. Zurinaga replied that the RAB study looked at the impacts of the cut-and-cover method and would take that balance into consideration, including impacts to local businesses and loss of parking revenue.

Brian Larkin asked what a jacked box was. Mr. Abey replied that it was a concrete square cast adjacent to an excavated tunnel where hydraulic jacks would push out soil. He said it was practical for short tunnels that were 200 feet in length or less and commonly used to cross train tracks. He said it was a less appealing method because it necessitated opening up two ends of an excavation.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi asked what factors could affect the final alignment chosen. Mr. Zurinaga replied that the decision was not final yet so there were many factors that could affect it. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, added that the policymakers would need to make the final decision.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun played a video that showed a rectangle tunnel boring machine for the proposed project alignment with no surface impacts.

11. Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION

Myla Ablog requested that the next item regarding bike sharing or bike lanes also discuss dock-less bike-sharing and the companies that were operating in the city and how they impacted local and small businesses. She also requested an update on how bike lanes were planned and designed in consideration with other modes of transportation such as motorized skateboards.

Peter Tannen said regarding Item 6, the project description included in the meeting materials noted that larger signals would be installed to compensate for the removal of mast arms.

Vice Chair Sachs said that under the Transit Effectiveness Program (TEP) the SFMTA had proposed expanding the 48-Quintara route to operate for a longer period during the day but had since dropped the proposal. He requested a response from the SFMTA on why the proposal was dropped. He also asked for an update on the SFMTA's deployment schedule for the new rolling stock of light rail vehicles.

Brian Larkin said that the TEP was also supposed to add a stop for the Richmond express bus at Van Ness Avenue and that it was included in the Environmental Impact Report but had not heard anything further and would like to know the status.

12. Public Comment

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated that if the city had waited to bid out the Central Subway construction contracts until the next economic downturn it could have saved a lot of money. He said for the underpass from the Transbay Terminal to the Embarcadero, staff had indicated that it required a cut-and-cover technique but that it could be done through a jacked box technique.

Jackie Sachs requested an update on the Late-Night Working Group's progress and said the city should revert to the pre-2008 Muni bus schedule. She said regarding the July CAC workshop, the pedestrian countdown timers included with the signal upgrades were based on able-bodied people crossing the street when it should take into consideration people with impaired mobility.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.