



DRAFT MINUTES

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, January 24, 2018

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Waddling called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

CAC members present: Myla Ablog, Kian Alavi, Hala Hijazi, Brian Larkin, John Larson, Peter Sachs, Chris Waddling, Shannon Wells-Mongiovi and Bradley Wiedmaier (9)

CAC Members Absent: Becky Hogue and Peter Tannen (entered during Item 3) (2)

Transportation Authority staff members present were Michelle Beaulieu, Tilly Chang, Eric Cordoba, Cynthia Fong, Jeff Hobson, Anna LaForte, Mike Pickford, Alberto Quintanilla, Oscar Quintanilla, Steve Stamos, and Eric Young.

2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Waddling introduced new District 9 CAC member Kian Alavi and reported that two requests totaling \$290,000 in Prop K sales tax funds and the Balboa Area TDM Framework project received final approval at the January 23, 2018 Board meeting. He announced that the Transportation Authority's communications staff had started a project to update and improve the agency's website and would be looking into mobile responsiveness, improved navigation, and integration with social media. He said the communications staff would be sending CAC members a short survey tomorrow and a recommendation on a web consultant would be presented at the next CAC meeting.

There was no public comment.

3. Election of Chair and Vice Chair for 2018 – ACTION

Chair Waddling announced that at the November 29, 2017 CAC meeting, nominations were held for the positions of CAC Chair and Vice Chair for 2018. He said that for the Chair seat, John Larson and himself were nominated and therefore eligible to be elected, while for the Vice Chair seat, Peter Sachs and Becky Hogue were nominated. Chair Waddling elected to remove his name from the Chair nomination.

Chair Waddling opened public comment for the election of Chair, which there was none.

The motion to elect John Larson as Chair was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Hijazi, Larkin, Sachs, Waddling, Wells-Mongiovi and Wiedmaier (7)

Abstain: Alavi and Larson (2)

Absent: Hogue and Tannen (2)

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

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Hijazi, Larkin, Sachs, Waddling, Wells-Mongiovi and Wiedmaier (7)

Abstain: Alavi and Sachs (2)

Absent: Hogue (1)

Anna LaForte thanked Chris Waddling for his years of service as chair.

Chair Larson thanked Chris Waddling for his service and mentioned that he applied for the District 7 CAC opening at the suggestion of Chris Waddling.

Consent Agenda

4. Approve the Minutes of the November 29, 2017 Meeting – ACTION

5. Internal Accounting and Investment Report for the Three Months Ending December 31, 2017 – INFORMATION

Brian Larkin requested that page three in the minutes be amended to state “Brian Larkin asked if the switches were no load disconnect”, as opposed to “Brian Larkin asked if the switches were low disconnect”.

Myla Ablog thanked Cynthia Fong for her work on the internal accounting and investment report and for the Transportation Authority’s increased credit rating score.

Hala Hijazi noted that the internal accounting and investment report memorandum was dated January 18, 2017 as opposed to January 18, 2018.

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

Chris Waddling moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Myla Ablog

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Alavi, Hijazi, Larkin, Larson, Sachs, Tannen, Waddling, Wells-Mongiovi and Wiedmaier (10)

End of Consent Agenda

6. Adopt a Motion of Support for Allocation of \$5,086,422 in Prop K Funds for Five Requests, with Conditions – ACTION

Mike Pickford, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Myla Ablog asked if plans to reroute the Great Highway would impact the Lower Great Highway project.

Mr. Pickford stated it would not impact the proposed project. Peter Sachs clarified that the Prop K funds being requested were for the lower Great Highway and not the Great Highway, south of Sloat Boulevard.

Chris Waddling mentioned that the crosswalk that would be designed to cross the Alemany westbound lanes of traffic would end at an area that was prone to flooding on rainy days. He also said that the roadway that went underneath the freeway frequently flooded and asked whether this issue would be addressed as part of the Department of Public Work’s (SFPW) project and if it was not, how would it get addressed moving forward.

David Froehlich, Project Manager at SFPW, stated that the main components of the project were the shared bike and pedestrian paths, which included storm water retention basins to help collect storm water. He said the flooding was a larger issue throughout the corridor. He noted that the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) had planned projects such as a \$194 million project to install a new sewage line that would run the length of the corridor and included under and

above ground retention basins. He said the bike and pedestrian path project was not going to completely address the flooding issues but would help with some surface flooding issues.

Kian Alavi asked the SFMTA to explain the high estimated cost of advertising and awarding the contract to replace 30 30-foot hybrid diesel motor coaches.

Gary Chang, Project Manager at the SFMTA, stated that the hybrid diesel motor coaches were purchased in 2007 and needed to be replaced. He said the replacement cost included the time it would take to review all bids and negotiate with the vendor. He said that the request for proposals was unique because the SFMTA was soliciting bids for both hybrid and battery vehicles, which required additional time for the SFMTA staff to go over the new technology. He said that the cost was a conservative estimate.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi asked if the Muni routes receiving track replacements had been selected.

Mr. Pickford stated that page 17 of the enclosure specified the routes receiving track replacements but mentioned that routes could possibly change if higher priority locations were identified.

Peter Sachs asked if the rail replacement work at the three intersections on Taraval Street were included in a separate L-Taraval project.

Roger Nguyen, Project Manager at the SFMTA, stated that the locations selected were based upon need and that the schedule of the L-Taraval project [which will include the rail replacement work] had yet not been determined. He noted that the locations for the rail replacement project could change if needed.

Chris Waddling asked if the Alemany Interchange Improvement Phase 2 would be coordinated with Caltrans deck work on the freeway above.

Mr. Froelich stated that Caltran's project would occur between spring of 2020 and fall of 2020 with a 28-day construction duration. He said that he did not expect any impacts to or from SFPW's Alemany phase 2 project.

Kian Alavi asked if the Hairball project included lighting and if not, why not.

Mr. Froehlich stated that the Hairball project did not include lighting because segments F and G did not have lighting improvements identified in the initial study. He said that the SFMTA conducted a lighting analysis for segments F, G, M, N, and O and provided recommendations, but the current project budget did not include lighting.

Kian Alavi commented that he used the Hairball often and that the area was dark and felt unsafe at times.

Bradley Wiedmaier stated that the tracks at 5th and Market Street were in poor condition and appeared to be impacted by traffic because the street was broken up around the tracks. He said the tracks seemed to shake loose when vehicles drove over them.

Mr. Nguyen stated that the intersection was being closely monitored because of cross traffic, heavy delivery loads, and vicinity to BART system grates at street level. He said the SFMTA conducted regular inspections and had started discussions with BART to figure out a project that could fix the grates and substructures along Market Street that are under BART's jurisdiction.

John Larson stated that he was happy to hear that research was being done to possibly replace the 30-foot hybrid diesel motor coaches with all electric vehicles.

Peter Tannen asked what was being done to prevent bikes from getting stuck in the grates at 5th

and Market Street.

Mr. Nguyen reiterated that coordination had begun with BART to address this issue, which was deeper than the roadway and grates. He said the future plan was to work with BART to implement a redesign that allowed better access to the underground for maintenance.

Peter Tannen strongly recommended that any negotiation with BART considered that bikes ride over those grates.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked how much additional cost would be required in the bid process for the 30 30-foot hybrid diesel motor coaches due to the potential procurement of all electric vehicles. He also asked if there were new technical solutions that ensured rail tracks would not be loosened because of cross traffic particularly from large commuter shuttles.

Mr. Chang said there was a 30% increase in the cost estimate due to the inclusion of both hybrid and all electric technology in the bid procurement. He noted that he expects that the SFMTA will receive a high volume of bids from interested vendors.

Mr. Nguyen said the track ways were having rail clips installed that ensured rails stayed in their slots and that concrete would be placed to the top of the rails as well.

Peter Sachs moved to approve the item, seconded by Chris Waddling

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Alavi, Hijazi, Larkin, Larson, Sachs, Tannen, Waddling, Wells-Mongiovi and Wiedmaier (10)

Absent: CAC Member Hogue (1)

7. Adopt a Motion of Support for the 2018 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program Local Expenditure Criteria – ACTION

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

Chair Larson asked if projects that display greater CO2 reduction are prioritized over projects that result in lesser CO2 reduction.

Mr. Quintanilla replied that CO2 emission reductions was one of the considerations when evaluating projects and that the Air District provided worksheets for each project type that allowed the calculation of potential CO2 reductions.

Myla Ablog stated that TNC CO2 emissions were not reported and asked if TNC services like Uber eats and Amazon deliveries were being tracked.

Mr. Quintanilla said that he did not have that information. Ms. LaForte noted that item 9, Update on the TNCs Regulatory Landscape, would provide some information on this topic.

Brian Larkin asked if more information could be provided regarding the effort to support small business bicycle shops that had been linked to a bike share project funded last year.

Mr. Quintanilla replied that in last year's program, a grant to the SFMTA to support its work related to evaluating permit requests for bikeshare expansion was conditioned on Motivate, the company that operates to bikeshare program, signing an agreement with local bike rental companies to mitigate impacts of bikeshare on the latter. He explained that when the bikeshare program launched last year, it offered day passes, and promotional material catering to tourists, for example showing bicycling across the Golden Gate Bridge. He said this caused concern among local bike rental companies.

Peter Tannen asked if the funds were discontinued for the bike share project.

Mr. Quintanilla stated that since the aforementioned agreement between Motivate and the local bike rental companies had not been signed and given an Air District deadline to program funds or risk losing them for San Francisco, the Board voted on January 23, 2018 to reprogram the funds to other projects that were partially funded last year.

There was no public comment.

Peter Tannen moved to approve the item, seconded by Hala Hijazi.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Alavi, Hijazi, Larkin, Larson, Sachs, Tannen, Waddling, Wells-Mongiovi and Wiedmaier (10)

Absent: CAC Member Hogue (1)

8. Update on Quint-Jerrold Connector Road – INFORMATION

Eric Cordoba, Deputy Director for Capital Projects, presented the item staff memorandum.

Chris Waddling commented that in 2012 the Bayview was presented with three options to replace the Quint bridge and the options were a berm, bridge-in-kind, or larger bridge to support a future Caltrain station. He said the berm was the lowest cost at \$20 million and Caltrain would provide \$5 million for the connector road, but the road now cost \$16-\$20 million. He said TransMetro bought the land and now it cost double the original price. He mentioned that he was not brought into the discussion regarding the Quint project but was told the Transportation Authority was monitoring the situation. He said that the SFPUC would close portions of local roads for the Biosolids Facility Upgrade and if the Bayview was a wealthier district, that would not happen. He said he did not believe the connector road would get built and asked what mitigation the Bayview would get from the project.

Mr. Cordoba replied that the Transportation Authority found out about TransMetro purchasing land right before the holiday and that the Real Estate Division was still trying to purchase the property and was in discussions with TransMetro. He said before the city could purchase property, it required an entry right for hazardous material and archaeological testing.

Jeff Suess, Real Estate Division, explained that the city had a good relationship with TransMetro and that private entities had more flexibility than the city, when dealing with railroad companies and acquiring property. He said the Real Estate Division worked closely with TransMetro and had done numerous deals with them. He said TransMetro was collaborative, was sending properties for the Real Estate Division to evaluate, and the Real Estate Division would be exploring those leads. He said that TransMetro had two tenants on property, a concrete manufacturer and a contractor and that the Real Estate Division was looking for a replacement property and working with the tenants to relocate them. He said the cost of acquisition would be mitigated and that TransMetro had agreements with the tenants to relocate them.

Hala Hijazi asked if the Mayor's Office or District Supervisor was involved, what the role of SFPUC was, and if the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department had property.

Mr. Suess replied that San Francisco Recreation and Parks' properties were not viable because it took a vote of the people to approve sale and that the city currently did not have enough properties to meet park and recreation needs. He said the Real Estate Division was working with a network of brokers and that a couple of brokers had brought them properties to consider that were not on the market.

Hala Hijazi asked how much of the allocated funding remained.

Mr. Suess replied that none of the funding had been used for acquisition.

Mr. Cordoba mentioned that a portion of the remaining \$800,000 had been used for preliminary engineering and that the environmental investigation had not begun.

Peter Sachs commented that TransMetro never intended to use the property as a parking lot and that the Bayview was getting the short end of straw. He said it was a greater connectivity issue because of plans to build tens of thousands of housing units and millions of square feet of office space and there was no tenable solution. He said the city would be forced to give up premium land elsewhere that could be used for housing and was disappointed that the city could not buy the road for basic connectivity. He said other companies would be looking for opportunities for land swap for various projects and that the current situation with TransMetro was a problem with no solution.

Chair Larson asked if legal recourse could be taken against UPRR, since it negotiated in bad faith and asked about asserting eminent domain. He questioned whether TransMetro was a good partner for the city and if the berm was the best solution at the time.

Hala Hijazi asked if it was possible to swap land with other developers.

Mr. Suess replied that the Real Estate Division was exploring all options and that TransMetro was a transportation company that had a significant real estate business. He said TransMetro was looking at every strip of property in Bayview, but was not trying to gouge the city, and was willing to swap for another property. He said TransMetro wanted to maintain a good relationship with the city because the transportation side of the company needed it and that San Francisco did not have a history of using eminent domain. He said only the Board of Supervisors had authority to use eminent domain if it was for a greater good. He said finding a property for a concrete factory could be challenging but the Real Estate Division was working to find property.

Peter Tannen asked if the Board of Supervisors exercised eminent domain, would TransMetro be forced to release the property.

Mr. Suess replied he believed so but mentioned the city's lack of desire to take property away from a private entity.

Chair Larson requested an update on Quint next month and the status on mitigation and solutions.

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

Jeff Hobson, Deputy Director for Planning, presented the item staff memorandum.

Peter Sachs asked if the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) was a public entity and if so how were they able to avoid sunshine laws requiring freedom of information.

Mr. Hobson stated that Chair Peskin made similar comments at the January 23, 2018 Board meeting and asked that the Transportation Authority submit a sunshine request. He said he was in touch with the City Attorney's office in regard to what requests had been made and would be following up.

Peter Sachs asked if there was merit in exploring ways that the city could try to enact its own regulations, like New York City. He said an example would be congestion pricing that applied

strictly to TNCs that would go directly to the city or Transportation Authority.

Mr. Hobson said that the Transportation Authority does not have the authority to impose charges to TNC vehicles that were different from charges that would be imposed on any other passenger vehicle or vehicles of the same class according to DMV requirements.

Peter Sachs commented that there seemed to be a greater issue that needed to be looked at by the state, where the CPUC was not being an equitable player with municipalities and other government agencies and was not sharing data that would help address problems.

Mr. Hobson replied that there were other cities interested in the topic and that the state legislature has previously been encouraged to provide more local authority to have oversight over TNCs, but had so far declined to do so.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi said that TNCs arose from a lack of taxi drivers in the city and asked if the city would consider lowering the prices of taxi medallions to create greater competition among taxis and TNCs.

Mr. Hobson stated that the per trip fees imposed on TNCs by other cities around the country were typically on the order of \$0.10 - \$0.40 per trip. He said a comparable \$10 TNC trip would only incur a \$0.0333 fee paid to the CPUC, significantly lower than what was done with other cities around the country. He referred to the SFMTA for further information on taxi medallion costs. He acknowledged that the restrictions on taxi numbers in San Francisco, as in other cities, was one of the conditions that made it possible for the TNC sector to arise. He said the SFMTA was reviewing taxi regulations and making some changes, but that at this point, it would be unlikely that simply increasing the number of medallions or changing taxi regulations would by itself make it possible for taxis to compete with TNCs.

Bradley Wiedmaier asked about regulations imposed by other states and said that TNCs took advantage of passengers through price surging. He said that the state of California was responsible for the current state in San Francisco with TNCs operating outside of city regulations.

Mr. Hobson stated that pages 10 and 11 in the report discussed state regulations in Colorado and Massachusetts and mentioned that the city of Austin, Texas briefly put in regulations, before the state of Texas inserted regulatory control that preempted local authority and got rid of Austin's regulation. He said to his knowledge there was no regulation to TNC fares of any kind within the state and did not know whether TNC fare regulation existed in any other city.

Myla Ablog referred to her early question concerning CO2 emissions from TNCs and asked if the CPUC was monitoring TNCs that delivered goods.

Mr. Hobson stated that the Transportation Authority would be looking into impacts from TNC congestion and how it impacted people's lives. He said that his understanding was that CPUC regulation of TNCs is limited to transporting people. He also said that in a separate effort the Transportation Authority was researching the full array of mobility services, including goods delivery.

During public comment Edward Mason asked how and when the CPUC took regulatory responsibility over TNCs.

Jackie Sachs referred to an article in the San Francisco Examiner that discussed a pilot program supported by Mayor Ed Lee to create curb spaces for Uber and Lyft drivers to pick up and drop off passengers.

Chair Larson called items 10 and 11 together

10. **Presentation of the San Francisco Transportation Task Force 2045 Final Report – INFORMATION**
11. **Survey Prepared for the San Francisco Transportation Task Force 2045 – INFORMATION**

Michelle Beaulieu, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item staff memorandum.

Peter Sachs said that he wanted to make sure that the city learned from the failure of Props J and K in 2016 and that it was a ballot that had a lot of tax items and transportation items that passed, but J and K failed. He felt that there was an inadequate campaign, which led to a lack of public awareness on a crowded ballot. He said the results of the Transportation Task Force 2045 final report were consistent with the messaging and survey results that were seen for Props J and K. He said that was good and indicated that citizens of San Francisco did not mind additional taxes that benefited them but needed to include a campaign to educate voters.

Peter Sachs mentioned that at the November 2017 CAC meeting they had a great discussion about the subway vision and ConnectSF project and about merging big picture projects together, but that there was no real discussion of those projects in the task force final report. He said that if subway planning was a priority of the city, they needed to ensure that those ideas got incorporated into documents like the task force final report. He commented that the \$50 million to engineer and design the second TransBay tube was a start but that there were major projects that residents of San Francisco would support if they were detailed in plans or reports.

Ms. Beaulieu said that the task force ended up spending most of its time on the revenue sources and that staff made sure to include the funding needs for additional planning and implementing some of the projects from the subway vision in the report's funding gap.

Kian Alavi noted that the growth of TNCs has not slowed down and courier network services continue to grow. He said that the city not having the authority to tax these new services would harm the city's infrastructure. He also stated that as the population transitions away from vehicle ownership the city would need to evaluate how that would affect its ability to continue to tax residents when it came to vehicle revenue sources.

During public comment, Edward Mason said that the task force final report needed to consider the decisions of regional local entities, such as Menlo Park where Facebook's headquarters will be with many thousands of jobs, but no housing for the employees.

Other Items

12. **Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION**

Chris Waddling said that he had been asked to speak at the Bayview CAC on February 7th about local transportation issues in the Bayview but was not available to attend. He asked that Transportation Authority staff attend in his place and noted they would be interested in the Quint topic.

Hala Hijazi requested a one-page fact sheet that highlighted the work of the Transportation Authority and CAC and provided online resources.

Peter Tannen asked for an update at an upcoming CAC meeting on the Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit project. He noted that he would like a brief mention monthly but understood that might not be possible.

Bradley Wiedmaier asked for an update on the Mayor's pilot for TNC curbspace. He said he was reading about it in the newspaper but would like information provided at the CAC.

Kian Alavi asked if the Real Estate Division could inquire about eminent domain regarding the Quint-Jerrold connector road and asked how to advance lighting improvements at the Hairball given that the Prop K project that was approved by the CAC did not include lighting

13. Public Comment

During public comment, Jackie Sachs asked if someone could send her the final report that will be endorsed by the Late-Night Transportation Working group on February 6, 2018.

Edward Mason provided an update on corporate commuter buses in San Francisco.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:14 p.m.