



# DRAFT MINUTES

## SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

### 1. Roll Call

Chair Peskin called the meeting to order at 10:14 a.m.

**Present at Roll Call:** Commissioners Breed, Fewer, Peskin, Ronen, Sheehy, Stefani, (6)

**Absent at Roll Call:** Commissioners Kim (entered during item 2), Yee (entered during Item 3), Cohen (entered during item 10), Tang and Safai (5)

**Commissioner Breed moved to excuse Commissioner Safai, seconded by Commissioner Stefani. Commissioner Safai was excused without objection.**

### 2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Peskin reported on Transportation Network Companies (TNCs) and Driverless Vehicles and stated that the January Board meeting featured a presentation of the Transportation Authority's "TNC's Today: Regulatory Landscape" study, which outlined the regulatory arrangements that were controlled exclusively by the State of California, as compared with other states and regions around the country.

He said that one of the findings of the report, the regulatory fees TNCs like Uber and Lyft pay to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), was the subject of an action proposing to lower the rate for TNC fees on the CPUC's agenda and that Uber and Lyft wanted their fees reduced. He said that he and the SFMTA wrote an opposition letters outlining all the reasons they believed a fee reduction was a giveaway to companies unwilling to work with local governments to protect the public interest. He said that despite strong testimony at the Feb 8 CPUC meeting, from himself, the Transportation Authority, and the Los Angeles Department of Transportation, the CPUC acted to lower TNC fees from 0.33% of gross revenues to 0.25%. He said that they did manage to prevent the CPUC from reducing the fees even lower to the original staff recommendation of 0.20%, and that he remained disappointed and determined to pursue the right-sizing of CPUC's fees and enforcement activities.

Chair Peskin noted in his letter, that if the CPUC was unable to perform the appropriate regulatory oversight of this sector, it would be best to delegate related fee revenues to locales like San Francisco and allow the city to manage its public streets for the public good.

He said he was pleased to see the City Attorney's announcement that Lyft had agreed to allow transportation experts, such as the Transportation Authority's staff, to examine TNC usage data under their agreed protective order rules. He said that constituents had dealt with congested streets, pedestrian and cyclist safety issues and rampant double-parking in MUNI stops and traffic lanes for far too long, and that the TNC regulatory system had clearly failed the public. He was

hopeful that Lyft's data could at least be utilized toward scaling back the number of vehicles on city streets.

Chair Peskin said the California Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) announced the final regulations they had developed for driverless vehicles and that the DMV would start issuing permits in April for both testing and deployment of driverless cars. He said that there would be several permit conditions including the requirement to 'coordinate' with locals on law enforcement interaction plans, and that while technology could lead to less car ownership and thus less cars, the future impacts were uncertain and still raised significant concerns. He said the Board needed to ensure that the DMV and California Highway Patrol (CHP) were empowered and equipped with the necessary resources to effectively play their oversight role and be held accountable when it was not happening. He was glad that the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and Transportation Authority staff were setting up meetings with CHP and local law enforcement and first responders, to get ahead of the operational issues that may arise. He said that questions needed to be answered as soon as possible like, "How do you pull over an Autonomous Vehicle? Who will be given access to the black box data recorder in the event of a crash? or How do you report collisions and who is accountable?"

He said he was prepared to introduce Division I legislation that would create a permit requirement for any company aiming to place privatized motorized scooters in the public right of way, and that the SFMTA was likewise prepared to create conditions for that permit to minimize potential harm to the public. He said in Santa Monica, the scooters had sparked disruption, hundreds of traffic stops, and a criminal complaint against the startup and its founder. He said Bird Scooters had raised \$15 million and since expanded to Los Angeles County and San Diego and was aware that Spin and other companies intended to place hundreds of scooters in the Financial District and SOMA in the next couple of months. He said it was important for the Board to get out ahead of the scooters so that they would not block downtown sidewalks and so that they would come with safety precautions, helmets, and a plan to equitably distribute them in communities of need. He said he looked forward to furthering discussions about how to anticipate emerging technologies in a more comprehensive fashion going forward, which included Board of Supervisors review over closely-collaborating private transit corporations.

Chair Peskin stated that in January, the Bay Area Toll Authority voted to place Regional Measure 3, the Bay Area Traffic Relief Plan, on the ballot for June 5, 2018. He said it was the proposal to increase the tolls on the 7 Bay Area state-owned toll bridges (except the Golden Gate Bridge) by \$1 in 2019, \$1 in 2022 and \$1 in 2025 and that revenues would be used to fund transportation projects and programs that relieved congestion and enhanced travel choices in the bridge corridors as detailed in Senate Bill 595 (Beall). He said that consistent with Senate Bill 595 requirements, on February 13 the Board of Supervisors passed the resolution putting Regional Measure 3 on the June ballot in San Francisco and that all other Bay Area counties were expected to have taken similar actions by the end of the week. He said Regional Measure 3 included \$4.45 billion for transportation capital projects across the region, which included San Francisco priorities such as \$500 million for new BART cars, \$325 million for the Caltrain Downtown Extension, and \$140 million for new Muni vehicles and facilities. He said it also included \$60 million per year that would help support regional bus service and Transbay Transit Center operations.

Chair Peskin reported that he would be introducing a TNC tax at the Board of Supervisors to ensure that a sector that had had a profound impact on public streets, would start paying its fair share. He noted that other commensurate sectors and industries contributed tax revenue toward the general operating budget of the city, and the need for revenue to manage local issues had never

been greater. He said it was an exercise in equity and was looking forward to working to gain the Board's support on the issue.

There was no public comment.

### **3. Executive Director's Report – INFORMATION**

Tilly Chang, Executive Director, presented the Executive Director's Report.

Commissioner Kim asked for the Transportation Authority's priorities for the Lifeline Transportation Program grant funding. Director Chang said that the SFMTA had interest in closing some equity gaps from their equity strategy and looked to close late night service gaps in the Owl network. She said in the past the SFMTA had used the funds to do work on corridors that serve the overnight market and to connect to the airport.

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, added that funding levels had been erratic for the Lifeline Transportation Program and that this current cycle would have one of the smallest amounts of funds available to program to projects. She said that this was one of the few funding sources that the Transportation Authority could use to fund operating projects. Lastly, she said the Transportation Authority's call for projects had prioritized funding projects that provided access to and within communities of concern.

Commissioner Kim asked if the grant funding priorities were mainly around filling gap services in certain neighborhoods that were prioritized as equity neighborhoods. Director Chang stated that the SFMTA was in the final stages of updating its service equity strategy, but that the Transportation Authority did not have access to the full analysis yet. Director Chang said that the transit agencies were the only ones eligible and that the Transportation Authority expected to receive most of the applications from the SFMTA.

Commissioner Kim mentioned the regional discount pass that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) was studying and was interested to see what the Transportation Authority would advocate for with the city's regional partners. She said it was an opportunity to provide low income transit riders a pass that would work regionally through multiple operators and provide better transitions. She said that many low-income riders depended on multiple operators to get to work. Director Chang said that Transportation Authority staff would bring a report back to the board and thanked Commissioner Kim for her leadership at MTC.

There was no public comment.

### **Consent Agenda**

- 4. Approve the Minutes of the February 13, 2018 Meeting – ACTION**
- 5. [Final Approval] Appoint Peter Tannen to the Citizens Advisory Committee – ACTION**
- 6. [Final Approval] Allocation of \$5,806,422 in Prop K Funds for Five Requests, with Conditions – ACTION**
- 7. [Final Approval] Approve the 2018 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program Local Expenditure Criteria – ACTION**
- 8. [Final Approval] Adopt Positions on State Legislation – ACTION**

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Ronen moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Commissioner Fewer.

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

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Sheehy, Stefani and Yee (8)

Absent: Commissioners Cohen, Safai and Tang (3)

### **End of Consent Agenda**

#### **9. Update on the Quint Street – Jerrold Avenue Connector Road Project – INFORMATION**

Tilly Chang, Executive Director, and Eric Cordoba, Deputy Director for Capital Projects, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

During public comment, Chris Waddling, District 10 Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) representative, mentioned that he had been involved with the Quint-Jerrold Connector Road Project since it began and was the reason he joined the CAC. He said that while he was encouraged by the presentation, he was still skeptical and believed that TransMetro was more interested in acquiring real estate than providing transportation services. He looked forward to seeing the city reacquire the land from TransMetro, without over spending, and stated that at the January CAC meeting the CAC were told that the overall project could potentially cost 3 to 4 times the original budgeted project expense. He said that he had asked Mr. Cordoba to work with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) and Bayview CAC on upcoming land use and projects that would impact the Bayview. He said that roads in the Bayview would be temporarily closed for the next ten years and access in and out of the community would be severely impacted by all the projects. He said the Bayview did not have a lot of major ways to get out of the neighborhood and that getting around some places was becoming quite difficult.

#### **10. Update on the ConnectSF Vision Document – INFORMATION**

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

During public comment, Ted Olson, ConnectSF Task Force representative, said that ConnectSF was consistent with and coordinated with Vision Zero and said that even though the project was planned for 50 years, ConnectSF needed to continuously be evaluated. He said that an extension of California high speed rail across the Bay Area to Stockton, a second Transbay tube for BART and another bridge across the bay were all needed. He said that ConnectSF was a regional forward-looking plan and would need additional focus in the future.

### **Other Items**

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

There were no new items introduced.

#### **12. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

#### **13. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:54 a.m.