



DRAFT MINUTES

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

Tuesday, October 17, 2017

1. Roll Call

Chair Peskin called the meeting to order at 10:07 a.m.

Present at Roll Call: Commissioners Farrell, Fewer, Peskin, Ronen, Sheehy, Tang and Yee (7)

Absent at Roll Call: Commissioners Safai (entered during Item 2), Breed (entered during Item 5), Kim (entered during Item 8), and Cohen (4)

Commissioner Tang moved to excuse Commissioner Kim, seconded by Commissioner Rohen. Commissioner Cohen was excused without objection.

2. Citizens Advisory Committee Report – INFORMATION

John Larson, Citizens Advisory Committee Member, reported that on Item 7, the Prop K grouped allocations, CAC members expressed concern over the lack of visible traffic signals on Market Street. He said that the CAC was assured that the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) was planning to add to use the largest size signals for visibility on vertical poles as part of the interim project and then relocate signals to mast arms as part of the Better Market Street project. He said that on Item 8, update on the Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit project, CAC members had questions about the bids for sewer and water line work and the overall delays to the project. He noted that members of the public reiterated frustration with the project delays and mentioned the disruptions caused by the current construction. Mr. Larson reported that on Item 10, the Downtown Extension Tunneling Study Report, CAC members were provided information on advancement on tunneling technology and assessments of the best technology to use for different portions of the project, and noted that CAC members requested an update on the Railyard Alternatives and I-280 Feasibility (RAB) Study. He noted that members of the public expressed concern over possible surface disruptions during construction and suggested that the project research tunnel boring technology. Finally, he thanked Transportation Authority staff on behalf of the CAC for their professionalism and flexibility.

There was no public comment.

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

Commissioner Yee moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Commissioner Ronen.

There was no public comment.

The minutes were approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Farrell, Fewer, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy, Tang and Yee (8)

Absent: Commissioners Breed, Cohen and Kim (3)

Items from the Vision Zero Committee

4. [Final Approval] Approve a Resolution in Support of the Proposed San Francisco Board of Supervisors Ordinance Prohibiting the Operation of Autonomous Delivery Devices on Public Sidewalks and Right-of-Ways – ACTION

Commissioner Yee introduced the item and stated that the Board had previously unanimously approved guiding principles for the management of emerging mobility services and technology. He said that the first clause of the principle was safety, which spoke to staying consistent with the city's goal of Vision Zero, and that another principal was reducing congestion and considering whether mobility technology affected traffic congestion. He said that the proposed ordinance to prohibit autonomous delivery devices aligned with the guiding principles, but noted that he would be introducing amendments to it at the Board of Supervisors meeting later that day and wished to continue the item at the Transportation Authority given the pending amendments. He said that the amendments would remain aligned with the principles but would take into account safety and impact to congestion on the city's sidewalks and would address concerns, encourage innovation, and support small businesses. Commissioner Yee added that the ordinance struck a strong cord with the public and could lead to future discussion about emerging technologies. He thanked the public for sending letters of support for the resolution.

Commissioner Yee moved to table the item, seconded by Commissioner Safai. The item was tabled without objection.

Regular Agenda

5. Adopt Positions on State Legislation – INFORMATION/ACTION

Mark Watts, State Legislative Advocate, presented the item.

Commissioner Safai asked for a summary of Senate Bill 1 (SB1) for members of the public who were not familiar with the measure. Mr. Watts replied that SB1 was a measure that would provide funding in the amount of \$5 billion per year from new gas taxes, diesel fuel taxes, and a new fee on vehicle registration. He added that the \$5.2 billion was dedicated primary to state road repair, city and county road repair, and transit maintenance.

There was no public comment.

6. Approve San Francisco's Program of Projects for the 2018 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and 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.

With respect to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's proposal to add housing policy-related conditions to the RTIP guidelines, Commissioner Yee asked if projects that crossed multiple jurisdictions also included county lines or highways such as 19th Avenue. Ms. Crabbe replied that in this context projects that crossed city boundaries and unincorporated areas of the counties would be considered to pass through multiple jurisdictions. She clarified that San Francisco would not need to worry about this aspect of the proposed guidelines because all of the projects were contained within the City and County of San Francisco. She added that this aspect of the proposed guidelines was applicable to other counties' projects, such as the managed

lanes project on U.S. 101, that would pass through many jurisdictions along the corridor through Santa Clara and San Mateo counties.

Commissioner Yee commented that previous large-scale projects were concentrated in one area of San Francisco and had benefitted residents, but also individuals who commuted into San Francisco. He said that District 7 would have a lot of growth in terms of housing but that there had been nothing done to address the need for additional public transportation. He said there was a need for resources on the west side of San Francisco, noting that District 7 would have 25,000 additional residents within the next 10 years.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Breed moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Sheehy.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Farrell, Fewer, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy, Tang and Yee (9)

Absent: Commissioners Cohen and Kim (2)

7. Allocate \$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.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked if the new traffic signal controllers had any provisions to allow for extra walk time for senior or individuals with disabilities, and whether the longer time could be activated by individuals through a senior pass on a Clipper card or some other device.

Harvey Quan, Signals Program Manager at the SFMTA, stated there were no features in the traffic signal controllers to extend walk time based on individual activation. He noted that walk times were based on the amount of time it took a typical person to cross the street.

Commissioner Tang moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Yee.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Farrell, Fewer, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy, Tang and Yee (9)

Absent: Commissioners Cohen and Kim (2)

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

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

Chair Peskin asked what had caused the 179 days of construction delay. Mr. Gabancho replied that part of the delay was a result of the wet winter last year and another part of it was contracting difficulties. He said that under the Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC) project delivery method, the SFMTA had brought in a prime contractor to help finish design and plan construction. Chair Peskin asked if the contract amount was a guaranteed maximum price. Mr. Gabancho replied in the affirmative and explained that the contractor had to put out bid packages under city guidelines for subcontracting packages. He said the price for sewer and water work was

\$19 million but received only one bid for \$39 million, which put the contractor in a \$20 million deficit. He said the prime contractor began negotiation with a sole bidder which brought the price down by \$9 million and was now ready to move forward. Mr. Gabancho added that it took longer than expected to award the subcontracting package.

Chair Peskin asked how the contractor could claim that the city was the source of the delay and issue a \$4.3 million claim. Mr. Gabancho replied that the contractor had written several letters stating that the city was responsible for the lack of competitiveness in the bid and the delay in getting the project awarded. He said that the city was working through a dispute resolution process to resolve the issue. Chair Peskin asked if the city contract included a provision for liquidated damages associated with contractor delays. Mr. Gabancho replied that there was about a \$50,000 penalty for each day of delay but that the project team was trying to minimize the delay. Chair Peskin asked if the method for recovering time would involve construction work during nights and extra days per week. Mr. Gabancho replied that the project team was looking at working extra days, doing 10 hour shifts instead of 8 hours, doing night work, and changes to the construction sequencing to do work in parallel.

Commissioner Farrell asked about the contracting process, negotiated price and contractor claim. Mr. Gabancho replied that the contractor made a claim but the claim may not be upheld and noted that contractors often made claims to recover cost. He noted that there were project changes based on owner-driven changes. Commissioner Farrell asked for clarification about owner-driven changes. Mr. Gabancho replied that the city made changes to the contract, such as the Historic Preservation Commission requesting that curbs be replaced with granite instead of the mix of granite and concrete currently used, which was not included in the original design. He said the project team has issued a proposal to the contractor and the contractor had provided a price. Mr. Gabancho explained that when the contractor signed the contract they understood what the deliverables and schedule were, so it was the contractor's responsibility to make up the time and deliver according to the agreed upon price.

Commissioner Farrell stated that he did not appreciate hearing about project delays affecting District 2 in the press and asked the project team to be proactive with alerting his office. He asked for clarification on whether it was a 6-month or 2-year delay and if recovering time would involve reducing traffic to one lane during the daytime, something which would inconvenience the public. Mr. Gabancho replied they were not going to reduce traffic to one lane during the daytime but might rearrange work to do multiple shifts of day and night work at certain times. He said the recent press article regarding the delay was misleading because it used an old project start date from the environmental report. He continued to explain that the SFMTA established the expected completion date based on the notice to proceed date when the contract was issued. He added that according to that schedule the contractor had 1085 days to complete the project and so the project was currently 6 months behind schedule. Commissioner Farrell replied that the efforts to recover time would impact District 2 residents and asked why project team had not previously informed the Board before.

Chair Peskin stated that the lack of activity along the Van Ness Corridor made it apparent that work was not happening and said that it was more frustrating because Polk Street was also under construction, which affected the northeast districts.

Commissioner Safai asked about cost overruns related to the sewer and water replacement. Mr. Gabancho replied that the \$11 million claim was because the bid for sewer and water work was higher than negotiated and the contractor was making efforts to recover funding. Dan Wade,

Director of Capital Management at the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (PUC), replied that the PUC was concerned about the \$11 million and \$4.3 million claims. He said that no work had started because the contractor was not proactive during the bidding process and that the PUC had denied these claims and wanted to see work started. Commissioner Safai suggested that the Board might ask the contractor to attend a future Board meeting.

Chair Peskin stated that one of the contractor's claim said that they did not know there was a tough bidding climate and that the city failed to tell them was meritless. He questioned whether the city should seek a new contractor for the project. Mr. Wade replied that there had been owner-driven changes and that the city would accept responsibility for them, including changes to the sewer and water work, but that the changes did not justify the contractor's claims. Ryan Freeborn, Project Manager for San Francisco Public Works, stated there had been minor adjustments to the quantities for pipe to be installed and for intersection work to minimize impacts to the public and on traffic congestion, but they were not significant.

Commissioner Safai asked what was the plan to recover the schedule. Mr. Gabancho replied that the contractor would have additional night work and longer shifts to start, but that the project team would perform a cost-benefit analysis for the schedule recovery and come up with a recommended plan. Commissioner Safai asked who was responsible for reaching out to the community. Mr. Gabancho replied that there was a multi-agency outreach team. Commissioner Safai asked about waiving the holiday moratorium. Mr. Gabancho replied that if adjacent businesses did not agree to a holiday moratorium the project could still work at night during non-business hours. Commissioner Safai asked about the impacts of bringing on a new contractor. Mr. Gabancho replied that the city could terminate the contract but that Van Ness Avenue would stay in its current state for six months to a year until a new contractor could be brought in.

Commissioner Farrell asked who was looking out for local residents. Mr. Gabancho replied that SFMTA and PUC staff were working to appease residents by keeping traffic moving and reducing noise from night work. He stated that the SFMTA and PUC would come back to the Board with a recovery schedule. He noted that the holiday moratorium was written for business frontages but that along Van Ness Avenue, the business frontages had many residents above them, and therefore strictly following the holiday moratorium rules might inconvenience residents at night.

Commissioner Farrell asked for a commitment from the project team to work with local residents and businesses. Mr. Gabancho replied that they would commit to that. Commissioner Farrell asked about outreach regarding the delay. Mr. Gabancho replied that the project team had weekly construction emails, office hours twice per week at the local project office, and a citizen group that met monthly, as well as a Business Advisory Committee.

Chair Peskin requested that the project team update the Board each month and asked about the Transportation Authority's oversight role. Eric Cordoba, Deputy Director for Capital Projects, replied that the Transportation Authority would be more involved in oversight and would work with the SFMTA, PUC, and the contractor on outreach. Commissioner Farrell asked for proactive outreach and said that he would provide local community groups for the project team to reach out to. Mr. Cordoba noted the item was presented to the Transportation Authority's CAC in late September, and he agreed that more frequent updates were necessary.

During public comment, Carla Jones stated that when State Route 1 suffered a bridge collapse, Caltrans rebuilt the bridge in eight months. She said the CM/GC method did not appear to be working and noted that the project was at least six months delayed as a result.

Jim Haas commented that the light poles on the first couple blocks of Van Ness Avenue should

have modern light poles because of upcoming construction projects that would bring about modern buildings.

There was no public comment.

9. Adopt the 2017 San Francisco Transportation Plan Update – ACTION

Chair Peskin stated that the item had been presented at the September 26, 2017 Board meeting for information.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Farrell moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Tang.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Farrell, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy, Tang and Yee (10)

Absent: Commissioner Cohen (1)

10. Accept the San Francisco Transportation Demand Management Plan – ACTION

Warren Logan, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item along with John Knox White, Program Manager at the SFMTA.

Commissioner Fewer asked for clarification regarding the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Strategy 1 and more broadly about the public engagement process. She expressed concern that the strategy described a marketing plan as opposed to developing infrastructure for public engagement. Mr. Knox White replied that the strategy dealt with aspects related to marketing and TDM, and noted that on page 14 of the plan detailed Objective 1B which “ensure[s] that TDM information and services are presented in a culturally sensitive manner and are accessible to and can be obtained by people of all incomes, abilities and ages.” He agreed regarding the need for ground-up community engagement strategies for TDM projects, hosting meetings in different languages, community engagement, and outreach materials.

Commissioner Fewer reiterated her concern regarding Strategy 1 and asked for clarification on how Strategy 1 produced Goal 4. She added that currently there was not infrastructure for public engagement related to that strategy and noted issues related to language barriers at community forums. She added that there was a difference between engagement and marketing and that engagement implied a need to bring the community along during the planning process.

Commissioner Yee commented that he supported the plan by itself, however as projects and programs moved forward, such as the Balboa Reservoir project, the SFMTA should consider transit capacity improvements to complement programs that encouraged residents to ride transit. He described an example where transit would be at capacity in certain areas of the city and how residents might oppose new projects or programs that encouraged transit use and reduced parking.

Tilly Chang, Executive Director, stated that the Transportation Authority appreciated and understood the issues raised and agreed that the partner agencies should engage the community in a series of focused dialogues similar to those held by the Department of the Environment for some of its efforts. She welcomed input from the Board in this engagement process.

Chair Peskin asked whether the Plan should be fine-tuned to address those issues. Director Chang replied that she would be happy to bring the input back to the TDM partners group.

Commissioner Yee cautioned that although the Plan was general, the city should consider its

application in specific projects.

During public comment, Ed Mason stated that transit services should be improved to accompany TDM strategies and that this was imperative in the face of emerging on-demand mobility services that may be more efficient and cost-effective for more affluent residents of San Francisco.

Commissioner Yee moved to continue the item, seconded by Commissioner Safai. The item was continued without objection.

11. Update on the Core Capacity Transit Study – INFORMATION

Andrew Heidel, Senior Transportation Planner, introduced the item and Matt Maloney, Assistant Planning Director at the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and Graham Satterwhite, Long Range Planning Manager at the SFMTA, who presented the item.

Commissioner Sheehy asked what the Glen Park pocket track was. Mr. Heidel replied that it was a concept from BART's sustainable communities' operations analysis that had looked at how all service from the East Bay into San Francisco currently turned back at Daly City. He said BART was considering ways to provide more frequent service in the core transbay area between the Berkeley and San Francisco stations and that the area around the Glen Park station provided an opportunity for trains to stop and turn back. Commissioner Sheehy asked what that concept might look like and how much construction would be involved. Mr. Heidel replied that it was only a conceptual project right now so there were no design or engineering documents, but that it would be within the current BART alignment as there were no plans to widen the subway. He said next to the Glen Park Station and I-280 there was an area where a side track could be placed. Commissioner Sheehy questioned whether this would entail a lot of construction and asked for a sense of what the impact could be. Mr. Heidel replied that it would not involve the Glen Park Station but would be adjacent to it. He said there was no additional information at this point since the pocket track had just been developed as a conceptual idea.

Commissioner Sheehy asked what the timeline or process was for having the J-Muni line and several other surface lines end at Market Street or the West Portal rather than continue through the tunnel and whether that had already been decided on. Mr. Satterwhite clarified that those changes were not recommended as part of the plan because analysis showed that the changes would not yield the desired capacity benefits. He said the analysis took into account ridership patterns, the amount of required transfers and the corresponding disincentive for riders who would have to transfer.

There was no public comment.

Other Items

12. Introduction of New Items – INFORMATION

Chair Peskin asked staff to conduct an assessment of the Senar engineering report that was distributed at the September 26 Board meeting regarding the Downtown Extension Tunneling Study Report item and work with the Transbay Joint Powers Authority in that endeavor.

13. Public Comment

During public comment, Ed Mason provided an update on the 24th and Church Streets bus stop. He said that after three years of advocating efforts the bus stop had finally been opened up to Muni buses instead of the commuter shuttles in that Muni riders could once again board from the curb rather than in the street. He said there was an additional problem with the new white parking

zones in the area as buses often stopped in the middle of the zone which caused the bus behind it to stop in the crosswalk, as well as buses stopping at an angle which blocked traffic. He said he had contacted the SFMTA and hoped the issue would be resolved soon. He added that there was still a problem of buses idling and staging in neighborhoods.

14. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:07 p.m.