



DRAFT MINUTES

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

April 24, 2014 Meeting

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Glenn Davis at 6:08 p.m. CAC members present were Glenn Davis (Chair), Myla Ablog, John Larson, Angela Minkin, Eric Rutledge, Jacqueline Sachs, Peter Tannen, Christopher Waddling, and Wells Whitney. Brian Larkin entered the meeting during Item 11. Transportation Authority staff members present were Bill Bacon, Amber Crabbe, Cynthia Fong, Anna LaForte, Maria Lombardo, Seon Joo Kim, Colin Dentel-Post, Chad Rathmann, and Tony Vi.

2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

There was no Chair's Report.

There was no public comment.

Consent Calendar

Peter Tannen asked if the State and Federal Legislative Update item was updated monthly. Amber Crabbe, Principal Transportation Planner, responded that the item was updated on a monthly basis.

3. **Approve the Minutes of the March 26, 2014 Meeting – ACTION**
4. **Citizens Advisory Committee Appointment – INFORMATION**
5. **State and Federal Legislative Update – INFORMATION**
6. **Internal Accounting Report and Investment Report for the Nine Months Ending March 31, 2014 – INFORMATION**

Angela Minkin moved to approve Item 3 on the Consent Calendar and Chris Waddling seconded the motion.

There was no public comment.

Items 3, 4, 5 and 6 passed unanimously.

End of Consent Calendar

7. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Adoption of the Proposed Fiscal Year 2014/15 Annual Budget and Work Program and Amendment of the Prop K Strategic Plan – ACTION

Cynthia Fong, Deputy Director for Finance and Administration, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Wells Whitney asked if the Transportation Authority negotiated directly with state and federal agencies for funding. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy for Policy and Programming, responded that some state and federal funds shown in the Transportation Authority's budget were set by

statute and formula, while for other sources, the Transportation Authority typically worked to secure discretionary or competitive state and federal funds for specific projects.

Jacqueline Sachs asked if maintenance for Muni buses was a part of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) budget or the Transportation Authority's budget. Ms. Lombardo responded that the Transportation Authority could fund capital maintenance (e.g. bus replacement or major systems replacement) while day-to-day maintenance (e.g. changing oil filters) was included in the SFMTA's operating budget.

John Larson thanked Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, and Ms. Fong, for explaining the proposed annual budget process earlier in the week.

Wells Whitney moved to approve the item and John Larson seconded the motion.

There was no public comment.

The item passed unanimously.

8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve the Fiscal Year 2014/2015 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program of Projects – ACTION

Bill Bacon, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Wells Whitney stated that for a small program of only \$1 million the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) program was able to fund a large number of good projects.

Angela Minkin asked if there were issues with the Transportation Authority funding a private entity such as the University of San Francisco (USF). She also asked if the Transportation Authority should fund bike racks on Golden Gate Transit buses instead of funding bike racks on Muni buses. Mr. Bacon responded that Golden Gate Transit would install the bike racks on larger commute buses, and these racks would be in the luggage compartments under the bus. Mr. Bacon also explained that Muni's fleet was already equipped with bicycle racks and that rack design did not allow for additional bicycle capacity on Muni's fleet of buses. Mr. Bacon stated the TFCA County Manager Program Fund did not typically fund private entities, but the program's goal was to reduce emissions. He stated that since USF was a large generator of trips, and in consultation with San Francisco Environment, both agencies concluded reducing vehicle trips to USF would be beneficial to air quality. Mr. Bacon added if other public agencies had applied, those agencies might have received TFCA funds in this cycle instead of USF.

Peter Tannen asked if the Corridor Speed Reduction project would cause any potential spillover of traffic onto other streets with the lower speeds. Mr. Bacon stated there was no analysis of spillover, but stated the smoother traffic flow with the lower speeds would be an incentive for motorists to remain on the street rather than divert onto adjacent streets. Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, stated a current allocation request for Prop K would fund before and after studies, and the study could examine any impact from this project. Jonathan Rewers, Capital Financial Planning and Analysis Manager at the SFMTA, stated the SFMTA conducted a corridor based study to assess any potential impacts to 16th Street that would result from proposed transit enhancements along the corridor as a part of a TIGER grant application to the U.S. Department of Transportation. Mr. Rewers added that the WalkFirst strategy envisions that some auto traffic would move to 17th Street to prioritize transit and pedestrians on 16th Street once the transit enhancements along the corridor were completed.

Eric Rutledge asked if the Corridor Speed Reduction project was consistent with Vision Zero and WalkFirst. Mr. Rewers responded that the project was consistent and that WalkFirst

identified signal timing as a quick, cost effective way to reduce vehicle speeds. Mr. Rewers added that SFMTA was working to secure funding to complete signal timing projects on additional high pedestrian injury corridors.

Mr. Rutledge asked if the Transportation Authority could hold TFCA funds in reserve to fund different projects. Mr. Bacon responded that the Transportation Authority must program all of its TFCA funds each year or it had to return unprogrammed funds to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. Mr. Bacon added that the Transportation Authority did targeted outreach to numerous public agencies to encourage TFCA applications. Ms. LaForte added that the TFCA program was pretty restrictive and only specific project types which met the cost-effectiveness threshold were eligible for funds.

Christopher Waddling asked if the Golden Gate Transit buses with bicycle racks would be required to serve San Francisco. Mr. Bacon responded that the grant agreement would require the buses to only operate on routes serving San Francisco from Marin and Sonoma counties.

Mr. Waddling asked if the speed data reported in the scope for the Corridor Speed Reduction project was in miles per hour and if so that it seemed fast. Mr. Bacon responded that the data was in miles per hour and that the high speed number came from the way autos rapidly speed up at green signals along the corridor only to hit a red signal a couple of blocks down. This acceleration and deceleration had negative impacts on both air quality and safety and that smoothing the flow of auto traffic was the main goal of the project. Mr. Waddling asked if signs would be posted along the corridor identifying the speed to which the signals were timed, similar to the bicycle green wave signs. Mr. Bacon responded that signs were not a part of the scope but could be added by SFMTA.

Mr. Waddling asked how individual neighborhoods would be selected for the Comprehensive Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program. Mr. Bacon responded that a single pilot neighborhood had not yet been selected by SFMTA but that the neighborhood would likely be in the eastern half of San Francisco in an area with both significant residential and workplace populations. Mr. Bacon added that after the pilot was completed as funded through this grant SFMTA would evaluate the effectiveness of the program for possible expansion to other parts of the city. Ms. LaForte explained that staff would report back to the CAC once a pilot neighborhood had been selected. Ms. Minkin added that it was important to think about TDM programs in underserved neighborhoods, particularly in regards to bicycle sharing.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked in regards to the Comprehensive TDM Program if the project would complement or conflict with the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP) and what metric would be used to measure success. Mr. Bacon responded that the project would be evaluated through the results of detailed travel surveys completed by residents and employees in the target neighborhood before the start of the TDM Program and after its conclusion. Mr. Bacon added that the TDM Program and the TEP were not directly related but that the TDM Program would complement the TEP in circumstances where a TEP improvement had been completed in the neighborhood or along a transit line (e.g. 5-Fulton Limited) serving the neighborhood which would provide faster and more reliable transit service to the area. Mr. Bacon explained that TEP improvements in a neighborhood would encourage increased transit ridership in the pilot neighborhood. Mr. Rewers added that the TDM Program and TEP were complementary in that the TDM would encourage more residents and employees to ride transit which would be improved through the TEP. Mr. Rewers added that TDM should not be focused exclusively on new developments as a mitigation as it most often was currently in the city.

Eric Rutledge moved to approve the item and Wells Whitney seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

9. Adopt a Motion of Support for Approval of the Strategic Analysis Report on Local and Regional Bike Sharing Organizational Models – ACTION

Amber Crabbe, Principal Transportation Planner, presented this item per the staff memorandum.

John Larson asked how locations for stations would be determined with the expansion of Bay Area Bike Share to the East Bay since geographical equity was still being analyzed. Ms. Crabbe stated location siting would need to be balanced between community input and demand for biking. She added the system was in a start-up phase and needed station siting at locations with a critical mass of origins and destinations for bicycle trips for financial sustainability. Ms. Crabbe added that the SFMTA had analyzed locations for potential bike sharing stations in San Francisco, and had conducted preliminary outreach to gather public input.

Eric Rutledge asked if the Strategic Analysis Report recommended a governance structure. Ms. Crabbe stated the report recommended splitting governance between local and regional levels. She added local governments could proceed with a localized system first as long as they maintained the ability to integrate into a regional system in the future. She stated at the regional level, the report recommended the system be administered by a non-profit partnered with a public agency and operations be conducted by a private vendor. Mr. Rutledge asked if a regional non-profit would conflict with local decision making. Ms. Crabbe answered that decisions regarding station locations would likely remain at the local level, which would allow local jurisdictions to address their locally-defined geographical and social equity goals. She added that issues of fare structure, revenue distribution, and standards for system expansion would likely be decided at the regional level to ensure consistency across the Bay Area.

Christopher Waddling stated the Internal Revenue Service did not recognize bike sharing as a transportation mode users could deduct for pre-tax purposes and asked if there were any efforts to address this issue. Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, stated bike sharing was recently proposed as an eligible mode for pre-tax benefits in a budget subcommittee, but had not yet been approved. She said staff would continue to work with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission to monitor the progress of the proposal.

Peter Tannen asked how many companies were providing bike sharing services. Ms. Crabbe stated there were currently two companies and that the bankrupted company was recently purchased by a new owner. She added that Bay Area Bike Share was using the same infrastructure as CitiBike in New York City, so the bankruptcy issue was likely to be resolved. Mr. Tannen asked if Alta Bicycle Share operated the majority of bike sharing systems. Ms. Crabbe stated Alta Bicycle Share operated a majority of systems, and added some systems were operated by other private or non-profit vendors. Mr. Tannen asked if most systems needed to move bicycles between stations to rebalance the availability of bikes and station parking. Ms. Crabbe stated such rebalancing was a normal component of bike sharing operations, and added that additional data from the pilot program would allow analysis of its impact on operational costs.

Ms. Minkin asked for clarification on the next steps regarding geographic and social equity. Ms. Crabbe stated staff was working with the SFMTA and the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition to form a working group to solicit feedback on how to address equity. She added that strategies in Boston and Washington D.C. addressed system access for users without credit cards, targeted outreach, and adding stations in low-income areas. She stated the working group would develop goals and recommendations on how to meet those goals, and that the SFMTA would take the

recommendations under consideration as it continued to plan for expansion. Ms. Minkin remarked that the San Francisco Comprehensive TDM Program project recommended for TFCA funds under the prior agenda item could be linked with outreach on equity regarding bike sharing. Ms. Crabbe stated Mayor Quan of Oakland had spoken in support of equity and Commissioner Campos had requested multi-lingual outreach as part of the next round of bike share expansion.

Jeff Sears, Parkwide and Blazing Saddles Bike Rentals, expressed the need for bike sharing and bike rental companies to target their respective audiences and markets. He stated tourists were confused with the pricing of the bike sharing system, which damages the reputation of bike rental companies as well as the bike sharing system.

Jeanne Orellana, Parkwide and Bay City Bike, expressed the need to distinguish commuter bike sharing with recreational bike rentals. She added bike sharing stations should be located to best serve commuters rather than serving tourist destinations. She requested the siting issue be specifically addressed in the report, and suggested the integration of bike sharing system fare payment with the region's Clipper card system. She noted that the report presented a recommendation, but had not fully explored other potentially beneficial organizational models.

Amber Crabbe stated that staff integrated many of the comments submitted by bike rental companies into the report. She stated that additional efforts would be needed to provide information to tourists and other users on the differences between bike sharing and bike rentals and which would be most appropriate for their planned use. She added MTC planned to include bike sharing fare payment in the next contract for the Clipper Card administration.

Peter Tannen moved to approve the item, and Christopher Waddling seconded the motion.

The item passed unanimously.

10. **Adopt a Motion of Support for Allocation of \$456,707 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, and \$825,000 in Prop AA Funds, with Conditions, for Five Requests, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules, and Amendment of the Relevant 5-Year Prioritization Programs – ACTION**

Seon Joo Kim, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Wells Whitney moved to approve the item, and Angela Minkin seconded the motion.

There was no public comment.

The item passed unanimously.

11. **Update of the 2014 Prop K Strategic Plan and 5-Year Prioritization Programs – INFORMATION**

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, and Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, presented the item, showing how Transportation Authority staff had worked with project sponsors to respond to and incorporate feedback from the CAC. Ms. Lombardo noted how the CAC's requests for more transparency, consistency and user-friendliness had shaped the new scoring template. She added that the scoring all required all 5YPPs to give high weighting to projects stemming from community based plans and to safety, as desired by the CAC.

Angela Minkin asked if the safety criterion was a part of the ten points assigned to the program-wide criteria. Ms. Lombardo stated the safety criterion was a part of the ten points

allotted to category-specific criteria. She added the safety criterion was generally worth four points, but could be reduced from four to three points if the project sponsor created more than three criteria for the category.

John Larson asked if the 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPP) prioritization criteria affected the projects that the Department of Public Works (DPW) chose to be funded with Prop K. Rachel Alonso of DPW stated that projects were identified before the prioritization criteria was developed, and added that Pavement Condition Index (PCI) scores was the primary driver for DPW in selecting projects. She added that PCI was a 5YPP criterion for the category, and was worth the most points. Ms. Alonso stated that all of DPW's future paving projects could be found on DPW's 5-Year Paving Program map. Ms. Lombardo stated DPW's funding sources were typically very flexible in regards to location and uses and it didn't matter too much if a particular project was funded by Prop or say, gas tax subventions. She noted that DPW also used Prop K funds from the Transportation/Land Use Prop K category to match OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) funds. She added should the CAC and Transportation Authority Board change or weight the criteria in a particular way – for example, deciding to only fund WalkFirst streets, that would affect DPW's project selection choices for Prop K funding. Ms. Alonso added that WalkFirst corridors were a part of DPW's paving program, but would be funded with different funding sources.

Jacqueline Sachs asked if red light cameras would be included in the 5YPPs. Ms. Lombardo responded that Prop K funds could be used to purchase and install the equipment needed for automated enforcement. She added stemming from the Vision Zero initiative, SFMTA was looking into legislation to support expanding the use of automated enforcement and the Transportation Authority staff had been coordinating with SFMTA on this effort. She said that staff could give an update to the CAC next month.

Myla Ablog asked why the DPW paving projects received a score of zero points for the community support criterion. Ms. Alonso responded there was no projects included in the 5YPP had defined community support but that other projects in DPW's paving plan had community support, and other future paving projects might overlap with future community plans.

Brian Larkin requested clarification on programmatic categories and Expenditure Plan line items, and asked if it was possible to change the Expenditure Plan line items or whether they are fixed. Ms. Lombardo pointed to a list of the 22 5YPPs and explained that the line items were set by the voter-approved Expenditure Plan and could not be changed until year 20 of the 30-year Expenditure Plan.

There was no public comment.

12. Quint-Jerrold Connector Road and Quint Street Bridge Update – INFORMATION

Colin Dentel-Post, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chris Waddling asked if changes to Phelps Street would be made to accommodate overflow traffic during the closure of Quint Street. Colin Dentel-Post responded that although Quint Street provided an important connection, its traffic volumes were low. He stated that the previous Caltrain traffic impact study of closing Quint Street did not identify any traffic impacts. He said that the project team could look at whether any changes would be needed to Phelps Street while the Quint projects were under construction.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun said that the Oakdale Station Study design included the Quint Street underpass. He stated that in 2009 the Quint Street Bridge Replacement was

defunded and that the road proposal was introduced after the community voiced concerns about closing Quint Street. He said that there would be no way for pedestrians to cross the tracks and there would be safety issues as a result. He recommended that the Quint Street Bridge be retrofitted, the Quint Street Bridge project be merged with the Oakdale Station project, and a study be done of how to build an Oakdale Station if the underpass was closed. Colin Dentel-Post stated that, contrary to the letter provided by Roland Lebrun, replacement of the Quint Street Bridge with a berm would enable a future Oakdale Station to be constructed.

Glenn Davis asked if staff anticipated that the Quint projects would return to the CAC at any future meetings. Colin Dentel-Post replied that the next item expected to be presented to the CAC would be a funding request for final design of the Connector Road, anticipated to occur in Summer 2014.

Mr. Waddling asked how long the current emergency repairs to the Quint Street Bridge were expected to last and how much a seismic retrofit of the bridge, as recommended by Roland Lebrun, would cost. Colin Dentel-Post responded that Caltrain was inspecting the bridge on a regular basis and that the current repairs were an interim treatment to maintain safe passage over the bridge in the short term, but how long they would last before further repairs were needed was unknown and similar treatments would not be a viable option to retrofit the bridge for the long term.

13. Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION

There was no new business.

There was no public comment.

14. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

15. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:13 p.m.