



# DRAFT MINUTES

## SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

Tuesday, January 9, 2018

### 1. Roll Call

Chair Peskin called the meeting to order at 10:06 a.m.

**Present at Roll Call:** Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Peskin, Ronen, Sheehy, and Tang (6)

**Absent at Roll Call:** Commissioners Farrell, Fewer (entered during Item 4), Yee (entered during item 5), Kim (entered during item 7), and Safai (entered during item 7) (5)

### Consent Agenda

#### 2. Approve the Minutes of the December 12, 2017 Meeting – ACTION

#### 3. [Final Approval] Programming \$2,813,264 in San Francisco's One Bay Area Grant Cycle 2 Funds to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency for the Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Project, with Conditions – ACTION

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Tang moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Commissioner Breed.

The Consent Agenda was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Peskin, Ronen, Sheehy, and Tang (6)

Absent: Commissioners Farrell, Fewer, Kim, Safai, and Yee (5)

### End of Consent Agenda

#### 4. Election of Chair and Vice Chair for 2018 – ACTION

Commissioner Cohen moved to nominate Commissioner Peskin for Chair of the Transportation Authority and Commissioner Tang for Vice Chair of the Transportation Authority, seconded by Commissioner Breed.

Commissioner Ronen thanked Chair Peskin and Vice Chair Tang for their guidance the previous year and willingness to serve as chair and vice chair this year. She said that taking on the leadership meant a lot to the city and took a great deal of work and sacrifice in addition to their jobs as members of the Board of Supervisors.

Vice Chair Tang thanked Commissioner Ronen and mentioned that together with Chair Peskin they were able to overhaul the Safe Routes to School project. She thanked the Transportation Authority staff, and all involved city departments, and suggested that the Board review the new staffing structure. She welcomed any further comments and suggestions from the Board.

Chair Peskin thanked Vice Chair Tang for her leadership in reforming Safe Routes to School, and stated that it was a major accomplishment. He said that the Board celebrated a milestone relative to the city-wide Vision Zero strategy. He said that ended last year with a 41% reduction in pedestrian and cyclists' fatalities since 2013, but emphasized that the Board would not stop until it got to zero. He said that the Board had engaged in thoughtful discussions around project delivery, including the Downtown Caltrain Extension, Better Market Street, and Geary and Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit and had initiated independent analysis to evaluate the Prop K sales tax expenditure plan. Chair Peskin said that the Board had learned a lot about Transportation Network Companies (TNCs) and their impact on the city's public transit system, streets and congestion and thanked the Transportation Authority staff for their work on TNCs. He mentioned that the Board had undertaken an ambitious plan to identify a local contribution of \$100 million annually that would be placed before the voters in November towards the over \$22 billion projected unfunded need for transportation and operations through 2045. He thanked the Transportation Task Force 2045, which spent the last half year getting critical feedback, after the sales tax failed in 2016, and stated that he was honored to continue to serve as chair and looked forward to working with the Board and the citizens of San Francisco in 2018.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Peskin was elected Chair and Commissioner Tang was elected Vice Chair by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Fewer, Peskin, Ronen, Sheehy, and Tang (7)

Absent: Commissioners Farrell, Kim, Safai, and Yee (4)

Commissioner Yee made a motion to rescind the vote, seconded by Commissioner Safai. The vote was rescinded without objection.

Commissioner Cohen moved to nominate Commissioner Peskin for Chair of the Transportation Authority and Commissioner Tang for Vice Chair of the Transportation Authority, seconded by Commissioner Breed.

Commissioner Peskin was elected Chair and Commissioner Tang was elected Vice Chair by the following vote:

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

Absent: Commissioner Farrell (1)

**5. Allocation of \$110,000 in Prop K Funds for One Request, with Conditions, and Appropriation of \$180,000 in Prop K Funds for One Request – ACTION**

Mike Pickford, Senior Transportation Planner and Eric Cordoba, Deputy Director for Capital Projects, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Peskin thanked the Transportation Authority staff for the peer review and acknowledged the Transit Joint Powers Authority (TJPA) for agreeing to delay the record of decision until a meaningful and honest peer review was conducted. He hoped for a plan that would avoid a cut and cover construction method at the throat section approaching the Transbay Transit Center or on Townsend Street and avoided years of surface disruption, as well as resolving the two-track versus three-track issue. He said that he looked forward to receiving an update in April.

During public comment, Ronald Lebrun commented that money was being much better spent compared to the previous downtown rail extension allocation request and that he felt it was unfortunate that members of the public were not involved, but understood that a workshop was being organized. He assured the Board that the downtown extension project would work, because previously he had taken the successful timetable from the London Olympics and figured out a way to use the same timetable for the South of Market and a similar track configuration without any surface impacts. He reminded the Board that there were existing legislation and case law which mandated what must be achieved to qualify for Prop 1A high speed rail funds and said that he would be writing again to remind the Board of what the issues were.

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

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Fewer, Peskin, Ronen, Sheehy, Tang and Yee (8)

Absent: Commissioners Farrell, Kim, and Safai (3)

**6. Approve San Francisco's Project Priorities for the Local Partnership Program Competitive Grant Program – ACTION**

Oscar Quintanilla, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Fewer moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Ronen.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Fewer, Peskin, Ronen, Sheehy, Tang and Yee (8)

Absent: Commissioners Farrell, Kim, and Safai (3)

**7. Adopt the Balboa Area Transportation Demand Management Framework [NTIP Planning] Final Report – ACTION**

Commissioner Yee introduced the item and summarized the key points from his letter that was included in the agenda packet.

Jeremy Shaw, Planner at San Francisco Planning Department, presented the item.

Commissioner Cohen commented that free tuition for City College would create a unique impact on districts with satellite campuses and affiliations to the larger main campus. She asked what considerations were taken to mitigate the impacts of traffic into neighborhoods and to ensure that students could travel to and between campuses in an efficient and cost-effective manner.

Mr. Shaw asked if Commissioner Cohen was referring specifically to the Ocean campus or all the campuses.

Commissioner Cohen stated that she was referring to all the campuses and mentioned that District 10 had a campus that was not too far from the T-line, but that the distance could be a challenge for others. She said that it would be more efficient if there was a shuttle bus that connected the campuses together.

Mr. Shaw said that the San Francisco Planning Department and the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) were excited to be working with City College and had begun a conversation around the college's Facilities Master Plan. He said that part of the advantage of the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Framework was that there had already been a lot

of work done by the city and that some of the measures that were in the city's TDM program could be used system wide for City College.

Commissioner Cohen asked if the City College Facilities Plan was still in the conceptual development phase.

Mr. Shaw said that the project was still in the conceptual development phase and that interests in shuttles and last mile needs for students could be addressed at all of the campuses as part of the Facilities Plan.

Commissioner Yee commented that the final report was a framework and not meant to solve every issue. He said that the Framework was contingent on further studies by both City College and the Balboa Reservoir development. He acknowledged that he was hoping the Framework would have more concrete suggestions to mitigate some of the current issues. For example, he said that traffic congestion was high during commute hours with cars coming off the freeway, people looking for parking at City College, and people being dropped off and picked in front of the Balboa BART station. He said the Balboa area was rich in public transportation, where many lines converged, giving some students the option to take public transit. He observed that City College was a campus of people where the age of the students was not necessarily all 18 and 19 and that most students worked and/or had families. He said that for the development to succeed many issues, including housing, needed to be addressed.

During public comment Christine Hanson commented that the TDM Framework was based on the larger Nelson Nygaard Existing Conditions Report that was once visible from a link on the San Francisco Planning Department website, but was now only viewable if you knew where to look. She said that the information on City College's parking was collected during the last week of class and no data existed during evening classes. She said that the TDM Framework resolution stated that once approved, the Framework would serve to advise transportation decision-making in the Balboa area, for City College, and around future development at the Balboa Reservoir site, but the TDM Framework had only been presented to the City College Board of Trustees one time. She said that about 45% of City College students, who she surveyed, said they had 30 minutes or less to get to school and would lose out if the framework was adopted. She said that City College was not growing its enrollment, but instead trying to return its enrollment to prior levels, and she urged the Board to not approve the proposed framework because it would hurt the school that was still trying to recover from its prior accreditation situation.

Harry Bernstein commented that the process regarding the Balboa Reservoir land had been fraudulent and that nothing valid would follow from the City Planners' initial and continuing assertions that the student parking area for City College was underutilized. He said that no number of manipulated photographs or data made that a true statement and that parking was the absolute lifeblood of a commuter college and City College of San Francisco was the largest such entity in the state. He said it was growing once again, thanks to the Free City College initiative, and urged the Board to not adopt the TDM Framework.

Vicky Legion commented that she had taught at City College for 22 years and was a member of the Save City College Coalition. She said the Nelson Nygaard TDM Framework was flawed and she thought the plan was part of a strategy to cannibalize City College property for real estate development. She said the land had been used by City College since 1957 and during full-size enrollment the upper and lower Reservoir parking lots would be full five days a week. She said that at the Balboa Park Station Community Advisory Committee meetings, members of the public asked why utilization was counted from 10:30 at night to midnight and during finals week when

students were not attending, but never received a response. She asked the Board to reject the TDM final report.

Rita Evans commented that the Balboa Area TDM Framework in its current form was fundamentally flawed and should not be approved by the Board. She said that the report did not accurately reflect the views and concerns of residents who had shown up at public hearings over the past few years and knew that it was essential that the new residents use public transportation, bike and walk or that part of the city would be in permanent gridlock. She said to address the last-mile issue for transit connections, neighbors have repeatedly called for a developer-funded shuttle to operate between the proposed development and the Balboa Park station, but the final report barely mentioned the shuttle and did not suggest that the developer fund it. She said another area of concern was the parking demand that the neighborhood will have to absorb and that the city departments kept pointing to the existing ineffective Residential Parking Permit program as a solution. She said the city had been in the process of revising the program for years, but in its existing form it did not work and the total cost for the program, in terms of both time and money, was borne exclusively by existing residents. She said the program cost should be borne by the developers.

Steve Martin Pinto said that the Balboa Reservoir project would bring a traffic bomb the likes of which the neighborhood had never seen before and believed it was crucial that it be managed correctly. He said the TDM report made no real effort to improve the existing transportation infrastructure or provided viable transportation alternatives for the residents and future City College students. He said that bus lines were inadequate to meet current and future demands and would experience a decline of service due to impeded traffic flow. He said the item had not been addressed to the community's satisfaction and strongly encouraged the board to reject the TDM report until further accurate analysis was complete.

Michael Ahrens, member of the Westwood Park Association Board of Directors and the Balboa Reservoir Citizens Advisory Committee, commented that the report was not based on any facts or numbers and that the Facilities Committee at City College had stated that they did not support the report. He said that it did not make sense to remove 2,000 parking spaces, when the college was now free, and interested in increasing enrollment. He said that an adequate analysis would conclude that there was no alternative other than to retain that parking space.

After public comment, Commissioner Yee asked if the Balboa Reservoir development was going to conduct its own TDM study to account for its impacts.

Mr. Shaw replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Yee asked if the Balboa Reservoir development had plans for a shuttle service for City College students.

Mr. Shaw replied that he believed so, but could not give a definite response. He said that the developers were aware of the comments from the public and that the report recommended further studying a shuttle as part of the rigorous impacts analysis the developer had to do, in coordination with the SFMTA to understand the impact the development would have on public transportation and general access in the area.

Commissioner Cohen stated that she would vote against the item and believed that more parking and infrastructure was needed for City College. She said that there needed to be more due diligence and asked why no City College stakeholders were present at the meeting. She said that she had personal experience with Avalon Bay and believed it was a difficult development company to work

with. She said that she wanted to go on the record early and stated that she believed Avalon Bay would create a lot of problems and mentioned previous times that labor partners had come to the Board raising concerns of union labor not being hired for jobs. She said that the Board needed to be mindful and respectful of the people who had been living around City College for generations and mentioned that the Balboa Station Community Advisory Committee had advised against the project. She observed that she did not hear anybody speaking in support of the TDM Framework other than the Planning Department and she would be voting no.

Commissioner Yee said that he appreciated Commissioner Cohen's point of view, but mentioned that the framework was only the beginning. He said that the issues of parking and transportation needed further study and that the Balboa Reservoir Development, City College, and City officials needed to sit down and solve future parking issues. He said that the City could require the developers to pay for residential parking permits, because it would affect surrounding neighborhoods that would have students parking further away. He said that he believed that there was other land around City College that could be developed as a parking lot. He asked the Board to support the Framework, which would be a resource to the developers and City College as they come up with concrete solutions.

Commissioner Safai mentioned that Districts 7 and 11 would be impacted by the future development and that the concerns surrounding the high levels of traffic around the Balboa area were legitimate. He said that he knew that the Balboa Station Community Advisory Committee, City College Facilities Committee, and others had reservations about the project, but felt the reservations were not necessarily about the final report, but about the long-term plan. He said that the concerns of the public would be looked at in the developer's impact analysis and addressed in negotiations with the developer, including the possibility of a shuttle and the amount of available parking, and that the concerns of the neighbors were real. He said that he had similar reservations to those of Commissioner Cohen, but felt comfortable moving forward with approving the TDM Framework.

Commissioner Yee said that he had discussed potentially moving the M-Line from St. Francis Circle or from the West Portal tunnel to go underground into Park Merced and had requested that the city study keeping the K-Line underground from the same point. He stated that he believed traffic congestion would decline if the K-Line was underground all the way to the Balboa BART station, but that studies were Needed to confirm if this was true.

Commissioner Breed asked for more information on the community outreach and follow-through that was highlighted in the resolution. She asked information was incorporated into the report because of the additional public outreach performed after the item was heard at the Transportation Authority's Citizens Advisory Committee meeting.

Mr. Shaw stated that at the request of Commissioner Yee, the Planning Department returned to the community many times to hear their concerns. He said that part of the challenge was finding a way to stick with what was written in the scope of work for this grant while acknowledging there were community concerns that this project could not possibly address. He said that the Planning Department changed a lot of the TDM recommendations or refined them to make sure the community's concerns were addressed and mentioned that additional data was collected and the recommendations would be refined based on future data collection when City College or the Balboa Reservoir developer conducted their analysis. He said that for the issues that the TDM Framework could not address, the Planning Department wanted to make sure that those concerns were included in the final report. He said that safety at transit stops at night was a significant

concern that needed to be addressed throughout the neighborhood and beyond and was included in the final report.

Mr. Shaw said that since the TDM Framework was not a capital plan, there were limits to what it could do. He said many community members were invited, during the third and fourth edits, to attend a Planning Department workshop and talk about ways to get more of the community concerns into the document, and this informed the most recent version.

Commissioner Breed asked if it was accurate that many of the recommendations were based on the Planning Department's recommendation of what could be done for the community, and that information was put into the report. Mr. Shaw stated that the recommendations came from a variety of sources and started with best practices and the consultant's knowledge of San Francisco. He said there was input from City College staff, from the two Community Advisory Committees, and that the last round of edits focused on a lot more details around data and topics beyond TDM. He said that the Planning Department acknowledged that there was always more outreach that needed to be done and their intent and hope was that the process and the feedback that they received about the process would inform future planning.

Commissioner Breed asked about the outreach to City College specifically, because she had heard in the comments that there was only one presentation at their board meeting. Mr. Shaw stated that the document was first initiated and scoped in late 2015 and there had been ongoing coordination meetings with facilities staff at City College. He said that part of the challenge was that City College was going through its own facilities master plan effort, which limited opportunities for city staff to present. He added that City staff would be happy to return to talk to City College. He continued by noting that the facilities master plan was going through a reboot and there was a new chancellor, facilities manager, and project manager dedicated to the reservoir and parking concerns. He said that all those changes represented an opportunity to improve on the outreach process.

Commissioner Breed wanted to clarify that the final report was just a guide and could be changed. She said her understanding was that the report facilitated a better understanding of what the challenges were in the area and what recommendations could be used to fix those challenges. She said that she wanted to make it clear that there still was a lengthy process associated with moving anything forward. Mr. Shaw confirmed that this was true and stated that the framework created the space and opportunity for an unprecedented collaboration between staff of both City College and the City.

Commissioner Cohen asked what the attendance was like at the outreach meetings and the Community Advisory Committee meetings. Mr. Shaw stated that the meetings were always well attended, and the smaller workshops were intended to have neighborhood representatives dig into the text and ideas. He said that there were two or three of those meetings, with five or seven neighborhood representatives.

Commissioner Cohen suggested continuing the item to allow new City College staff the opportunity to fully review the TDM framework final report and found it interesting that not one member of the public was speaking in favor of the item.

Commissioner Cohen moved to continue the item, seconded by Commissioner Breed.

Commissioner Yee stated that the item was going to be brought to the Board more than six months ago, but was continued to allow for further outreach. He said that he did not believe continuing the item would bring significant changes and reiterated that he was okay with the final report because there was going to be other studies being done. He said those studies would take

into consideration some of the drawbacks and issues that had been raised during the TDM Framework and carry them into the next process.

Commissioner Cohen asked when and where the outreach was conducted. Mr. Shaw referenced one of the slides in his presentation that summarized the outreach meetings. He explained that the Planning Department appreciated that the reservoir process and framework document were both interrelated and distinct efforts. He said that the framework was not designed to resolve the reservoir challenges, but was meant to be a strong foundation that allowed different agencies to talk. He acknowledged the public comments, but did not think that there was only opposition in the neighborhood. He mentioned that there were a couple of Community Advisory Committee meetings where the Planning Department provided previous drafts of the document and there were no comments against or objections towards advancing the document to the Board. He confirmed Commissioner Yee's statements that additional outreach efforts were conducted and stated that the outreach would continue through future actionable plans, including data collection and the environmental process.

Commissioner Cohen moved to withdraw her request to continue the item, seconded by Commissioner Breed.

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

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

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

Absent: Commissioner Farrell (1)

**8. Update on the Caltrain Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project and Communications Based Overlay Signal System Positive Train Control Project – INFORMATION**

Chair Peskin thanked Michelle Bouchard for their earlier meeting and introduced Jim Hartnett, General Manager and CEO at San Mateo County Transit District, Chief Officer of Caltrain, and head of SamTrans.

Jim Hartnett and Michelle Bouchard, Chief Operating Officer at Caltrain, presented the item.

During public comment Roland Lebrun commented that an internet search of the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) website showed Caltrain had no progress on the positive train control project over the last year and stated that the Positive Train Control Plan had not been approved by the FRA. He said that Caltrain's electrification project would not have adequate capacity for bike spaces per train and he expressed concern about the overall cost of the project.

After public comment, Executive Director Chang thanked Caltrain staff for their partnership with the Transportation Authority and helping bring federal funding forward for electrification. She said that the Transportation Authority would continue to support the electrification project and the business plan development effort underway. She thanked Caltrain for their support of the Downtown Caltrain Extension and Regional Measure 3. She said that level boarding, grade separations, and coordinating with the state rail plan would be important goals moving forward, and mentioned that the upper doors mentioned in the slides would be part of that conversation. She said that the Transportation Authority continued to participate in the technical groups for the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project and Positive Train Control.



**9. Presentation on the Voter Survey Prepared for the San Francisco Transportation Task Force 2045 – INFORMATION**

Chair Peskin motioned to continue item 9. Item 9 was continued without objection.

There was no public comment.

**10. Update on the Transportation Network Companies (TNCs) Regulatory Landscape: An Overview of Current TNC Regulation in California and Across the Country – INFORMATION**

Chair Peskin motioned to continue item 10. Item 10 was continued without objection.

There was no public comment.

**Other Items**

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

There were no new items introduced.

**12. Public Comment**

During public comment Andrew Yip spoke about civil liberty and human rights.

Mr. Rice spoke against the demolition of the old Bay Bridge and felt it could have been used to reduce traffic congestion. He said that the bridge could have been reinforced with diagonal braces and pressure tested to reduce the flow of traffic.

Ace Washington spoke about the many changes he has witnessed in San Francisco and City Hall over the years.

**13. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:53 a.m.