



DRAFT MINUTES

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

December 3, 2014 MEETING

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Glenn Davis at 6:04 p.m. CAC members present were, Myla Ablog, Glenn Davis (Chair), Brian Larkin, John Larson, Eric Rutledge, Jacqueline Sachs, Raymon Smith, Peter Tannen, Christopher Waddling, and Wells Whitney. Transportation Authority staff members present were Drew Cooper, Amber Crabbe, Cynthia Fong, Chester Fung, Seon Joo Kim, Bob Masys, Anna LaForte, Maria Lombardo, Mike Pickford, and David Uniman.

2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Davis reminded CAC members that election of the CAC Chair and Vice Chair take place in January. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, announced that the Transportation Authority reached its 25th anniversary on the November election day and was planning on holding a series of celebrations throughout the upcoming year, including an appreciation gathering for past and present CAC members.

Consent Calendar

3. Approve the Minutes of the October 22, 2014 Meeting – ACTION

4. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Approval of the 2015 State and Federal Legislative Program – ACTION

5. Adopt a Motion of Support for Programming \$4 million in Prop K Funds to the Quint-Jerrold Connector Road Project via a Fund Swap with an Equivalent Amount of Federal Transit Administration Funds from the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board, and for Committing to Allocate the Prop K Funds for Construction of the Connector Road, with Conditions – ACTION

During public comment, Roland Lebrun pointed out that the swap was needed because the Federal Transit Administration funds could not be used for the road construction.

6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Increase the Amount of the Professional Services Contract with WMH Corporation by \$5,400,000, for a Total Amount Not to Exceed \$11,300,000 to Complete Preliminary Engineering, Environmental Analysis, and Design Services for the Yerba Buena Island Bridge Structures and Authorize the Executive Director to Modify Non-Material Contract Terms and Conditions – ACTION

7. Adopt a Motion of Support for Exercising the Second One-Year Option of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the Office of Economic and Workforce Development and to Increase the MOA Amount by \$164,600, to a Total Amount Not to Exceed \$500,000, for CityBuild Services to Promote Workforce Development for Phase II of the Presidio Parkway Project and Authorizing the Executive Director to Modify Non-

Material Agreement Terms and Conditions – ACTION

8. **CAC Appointment – INFORMATION**
9. **Internal Accounting and Investment Report for the Three Months Ending September 30, 2014 – INFORMATION**
10. **Audit Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2014 – INFORMATION**

Raymon Smith moved to approve the consent calendar. Eric Rutledge seconded the motion.

The motion was approved unanimously.

End of Consent Calendar

11. **Major Capital Projects Update – Caltrain Early Investment Program – INFORMATION**

Luis Zurinaga, Project Management Oversight Consultant for the Transportation Authority, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Wells Whitney asked if the Communications Based Overlay Signal System (CBOSS) and the electrified line would be useful for both Caltrain and high speed rail (HSR), and asked whether the station platform height was the only difference between the two systems as currently proposed. Mr. Zurinaga answered in the affirmative on the first two questions and for the third, responded that another potential difference between the train systems was the width of the trains. Mr. Zurinaga noted that it was critical for the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) and Caltrain to reach agreement on system compatibility.

Mr. Whitney asked about the reason for the cost increase. Mr. Zurinaga explained that at least \$150 million of the cost increase could be attributed to escalation. He stated additional factors included the changing construction environment and the need to increase the project contingency.

Mr. Whitney asked who had an authority to intervene if the CHSRA and Caltrain would not reach an agreement on a compatible system. Mr. Zurinaga responded that the Secretary of the State Transportation Agency (CalSTA), Brian Kelly, was aware of the issue and tracking the discussions. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, added that it was good news that CalSTA had recently stepped up and really should interest in this topic. She added that the public would have additional opportunities to provide input on the project at the various public meetings where Caltrain and the CHSRA presented the plans to fill the funding Caltrain gap and at upcoming hearings that have been scheduled. She listed the Peninsula Joint Powers Authority (PCJPB), San Francisco Board of Supervisors, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Transbay Joint Powers Authority, and Transportation Authority as likely venues. She offered to bring an update back to the CAC when information became available, perhaps after some of the upcoming compatibility hearings.

Brian Larkin asked about the crux of the platform height issue between Caltrain and the CHSRA. Mr. Zurinaga explained that each agency was advocating for a system that offered the best and most cost effective options for its service, for example, considering the number of manufacturers that produced vehicles with a certain height and resultant competition for vehicle procurement contracts. Mr. Larkin stated that taxpayers would have to bear the burden of paying for an incompatible system and he spoke in strong favor of ensuring compatibility now.

Mr. Zurinaga responded each agency was in the process of analyzing the trade-offs. Ms. Lombardo noted that a condition of the recommended Prop K allocation for Caltrain's Early

Investment Program, which was part of the next agenda item, required Caltrain to provide updates at the monthly meetings of the Peninsula Corridor Working Group, made up of signatories to the regional Memorandum of Understanding, on the progress made on compatible boarding heights technical analysis being conducted jointly by Caltrain and CHSRA staff. Ms. Lombardo added that Caltrain had delayed issuing a Request for Proposals (RFP) for vehicle procurement pending the Caltrain Board taking a policy action in the March-May timeframe.

Raymon Smith asked about the cause of the delay in the project schedule, and if the delay in issuing an RFP for vehicles would further delay the overall schedule and increase the cost. Mr. Zurinaga responded that the project had been on the shelf for years until funding was available and he clarified that the new RFP schedule had been taken into consideration as part of the revised project schedule. Ms. Lombardo added that another cause of overall delay was the result of a constructability review where Caltrain had to figure out how to stage construction since it could just shut down rail service to construct the project even though that would be faster.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated that San Francisco did not need electrification until HSR and the Downtown Extension to the Transbay Terminal was in place.

12. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Allocation of \$32,081,988 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, and Allocation of \$2,585,624 in Prop AA Funds, with Conditions, for Ten Requests, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules and Amendment of the Relevant 5-Year Prioritization Programs – ACTION

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

Myla Ablog stated that there had been an effort to initiate pedestrian signal improvements at the intersection of Webster Street and O'Farrell Street, but that location was not included in the Prop K request for Webster Street Pedestrian Countdown Signals. Craig Raphael, Transportation Planner from the San Francisco Metropolitan Transportation Agency (SFMTA), responded that he would look into it and that SFMTA was initiating a community transportation plan in the area. Jonathan Rewers, Manager of Capital Financial Planning and Analysis for SFMTA, further explained that signal projects were prioritized based on multiple factors, including existing infrastructure and collision rates. He said that the intersection in question might be currently in the planning phase and possibly in queue for implementation after completion of the design of the signals that were subject of the current request.

Raymon Smith asked if there was a list of continental crosswalk project locations. Ms. Kim responded that such a list was on page 104 of the enclosure.

Peter Tannen asked whether the proposed cycletrack on Market Street would be constructed in both directions and whether the buses that SFMTA proposed to procure for the Van Ness BRT service would be the same as the rest of the buses. Mr. Rewers replied that the cycletrack would be for both directions. He stated that SFMTA's policy was to purchase buses that were consistent in design so that buses can be used on any route, but that the buses for the BRT service might receive branding treatment to distinguish them from regular service bus. For instance, he said that new buses had the ability to use different colors on the electronic destination signs on the front of the buses.

Peter Tannen commented regarding the Mansell Corridor project that crossing that street as a hiker or bicyclist was difficult and that this project brought worthwhile improvements to an underserved area of the city and one that doesn't have a lot of bicycle facilities.

Given the large amount of Prop K funds being requested, Mr. Eric Rutledge asked SFMTA to

elaborate on the benefits of the Muni Metro East (MME) project before the CAC is asked to approve the Prop K funding request. Mr. Rewers replied that SFMTA's Real Estate and Facilities Vision for the 21st Century had identified the need for more space to accommodate its existing and future fleet; that SFMTA would be able to deploy historic streetcars faster if they were stored at MME; and that the new facility would allow for more on-site heavy maintenance and body work that currently required light rail vehicles to be moved off-site, which was expensive and kept vehicles out of service longer.

Chris Waddling stated that residents of the Dogpatch neighborhood discussed the possibility of moving the Mission Bay Loop turnaround further down or to the MME site. Mr. Waddling observed that the MME project before the CAC never came up in the discussions with the community. He suggested that had SFMTA communicated to the public its need for the MME project, it might have supported SFMTA's position on the loop discussion and facilitated the public dialogue. Mr. Rewers acknowledged Mr. Waddling's point and replied that the Mission Bay Loop was developed as part of Central Subway to facilitate service changes and was included in the original Environmental Impact Report for the Third Street Light Rail Project. Mr. Rewers added that storage needs at the MME facility were part of the reason SFMTA did not wish to change the location of the turnaround.

Mr. Tanner commented that, as a member of the Market Street Railway, he could testify that there had been a long history of historic streetcars being stored outside, and that the canopy over the storage area would be a good development. Jacqueline Sachs stated that, as a member of the Community Advisory Group for the Third Street Light Rail, she and the group supported the Mission Bay Loop project.

Chair Davis related that, despite his initial concern about using such a large amount of Prop K funds for the MME project, Mr. Rewer's explanations clarified its appropriateness.

Wells Whitney moved to approve this item, and Jacqueline Sachs seconded the motion.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated that Caltrain's electrification project would be the most expensive 50 miles of electrified track in the world and said that studies from Los Angeles and the United Kingdom estimated far lower costs for their respective systems.

Ed Mason asked regarding the MME project whether there would be sufficient capacity to accommodate possible expansions of historic streetcar routes to the Fort Mason and Golden Gate Park. Mr. Rewers responded that the existing and planned facilities would be able to accommodate the currently planned maximum expansion up to 85 vehicles, but that SFMTA would face storage capacity issues to accommodate any expansion beyond the current plan.

The motion was approved unanimously.

13. **Adopt a Motion of Support for Allocating \$872,859 in Prop K Funds, With Conditions, to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency for Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Environmental Review and Initial Construction Phase Improvements Planning; for Authorizing the Executive Director to execute a Memorandum of Agreement with the San Francisco Planning Department for the Geary BRT Project Environmental Review Phase, in an Amount not to Exceed \$139,276, and to Negotiate Agreement Payment Terms and Non-Material Agreement Terms and Conditions; and for Assigning the Professional Services Contract with Jacobs Engineering Group to CirclePoint, Increasing the Amount of the Contract by \$225,000, to a Total Amount Not to Exceed \$4,409,489, for Environmental Analysis Services for the Geary BRT Project Environmental Impact Report/Statement, and Authorizing the Executive Director to**

Modify Non-Material Contract Terms and Conditions – ACTION

Chester Fung, Principal Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Jacqueline Sachs asked whether the project would be light-rail-ready. Mr. Fung replied that light rail would be beneficial, and that the current BRT project would not preclude eventually getting light rail on the corridor. He noted that light rail would cost much more, likely in the billion-dollar range, and that sufficient funds were available only for BRT at the moment.

Ms. Sachs expressed concern about moving bus stops with high transfer activity, making it harder to transfer between the 38 Geary and other bus lines, and that the project needed to consider seniors and the disabled. Mr. Fung clarified that bus stops at high transfer activity locations would not be moved if that would make transfers harder, and that the bus stops would be relocated from near- to far-side only if the conditions were right for that bus stop, which was the case for lower-ridership, non-transfer locations. He noted that, in locating bus stops, the project team looked at a number of factors, including site conditions and proximity to senior centers.

Ms. Sachs asked when the light rail project would advance, noting that the Prop K expenditure plan included funds for Geary light rail but that the recent Prop K five-year prioritization programs did not include any funds to advance that project. She added that previous Geary studies, including in 1989, had recommended light rail. Mr. Fung replied that although Prop K included a BRT project and a light rail project, the light rail project was identified as a Tier 3 priority that would be pursued if the tax revenue provided sufficient amounts to fund Tier 1 and Tier 2 priorities, which had not yet been the case. He added that the previous studies had recommended further consideration of both bus and light rail improvements.

Peter Tannen asked where the transit queue-jumps would be located. Mr. Fung replied that the queue-jumps were proposed at O'Farrell Street near the Union Square area, and Geary Boulevard westbound at Masonic Avenue, locations with high right-turn volumes.

Brian Larkin asked why the City Attorney budget was much higher than the San Francisco Planning Department's budget and whether it was related to the professional services contract modifications relating to CirclePoint. Mr. Fung replied that the City Attorney budget was provided for assistance in ensuring that the environmental documentation meets California Environmental Quality Act and National Environmental Policy Act legal requirements, not related to the professional services contract. He added that attorneys cost more on an hourly basis, which was in part why the City Attorney budget was higher than for the San Francisco Planning Department.

Mr. Larkin asked about the approach to filling the project's significant funding gap. Mr. Fung replied that the project's funding plan included \$44 million in Prop K funds and expected \$75 million from the federal Small Starts program, leaving a funding gap. He noted that the memo identified several potential new local and regional funding sources that would be pursued after the project completed the environmental review phase. Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, potential new revenue sources could include cap and trade, a new sales tax, a vehicle license fee, and a regional toll bridge measure.

Mr. Larkin acknowledged Ms. Sachs' concerns about bus stop relocation, but expressed support for the project team's proposal to move bus stops. He asked about the proposal for Park Presidio Boulevard. Mr. Fung replied that, for the full project's Staff Recommended Alternative, the proposal was to place the bus stop in the center of Geary just east of Park Presidio Boulevard, moving it from 14th Avenue, in order to make transfers to and from the 28 19th

Avenue line easier. Mr. Larkin clarified that he wanted to know about the near-term proposal there, noting that the unloading of passengers currently did not work well with the light timing, prompting people to walk without waiting for the light to change. Mr. Fung noted that because the full project might move the bus stops to the center of the street, the near-term proposal was to minimize the work to be done there, and instead to leave the stop at its current 14th Avenue location. He added that the project team was open to considering other suggestions.

Eric Rutledge expressed support for the colorized bus lanes. He also asked how the project would approach the issue of constructing elements in the near term that would need to be demolished for the full project. Mr. Fung replied that the project team specifically considered this issue and crafted the near-term Initial Construction Phase improvements to be a subset of the full project, in order to minimize any near-term work that would need to be demolished later. He noted as examples that the colorized bus lanes and near-term bus bulbs would be constructed in the same locations they would be proposed for the full project, rather than constructing them in one place and then moving them later.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun asked how the estimate of \$1 billion for light rail was arrived at, noting light rail projects in other cities that cost less on a per-mile basis. Mr. Fung noted that the recent T-Third light rail project cost was about \$1 billion, providing one data point, while keeping in mind that every corridor was different.

Raymond Smith moved to approve this item, and Wells Whitney seconded the motion.

The motion was approved unanimously.

14. T-Third Phase 3 Concept Study – INFORMATION

Bob Masys, Senior Engineer, and Paul Bignardi, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Wells Whitney thanked the project team, mentioning that he was one of the advocates urging the study to take place. He stated it would be a shame to leave the hole and tunnel reaching North Beach without moving toward bringing rail service there.

Brian Larkin asked where this project falls in the Prop K program. Maria Lombardo answered that this project is not in the current Expenditure Plan, but when the Expenditure Plan becomes eligible to be modified and extended in year 20, this project could be included. The project could also be funded by a number of new and existing revenue measures, examples of which were provided in the memo.

Jacqueline Sachs asked about the genesis of the Kirkland Yard/Powell Street concept, and expressed concern about its suitability as a station site. Mr. Masys replied that the study drew from several sources, including earlier planning during Phase 2 and a more recent SPUR Charrette. He noted that the comparison of the routes was included in the report from a technical perspective so that the public and future decision-makers can be informed about the options. Ms. Sachs stated that we must prioritize our existing priority projects now if voters will be asked to extend Prop K in a few years.

Christopher Waddling expressed concern that the length of the T-line may cause the southern portion of the line to receive poor service compared to the northern portion. Mr. Masys stated that while the T-Line's central zone between Caltrain and Market Street is the area of highest ridership loads, all of the line will benefit from the high capacity and frequencies that the line will require. Mr. Bignardi noted that the zone south of Mission Bay Loop is planned to have two-car trains at peak headways between 5 and 7 minutes, which is as frequent as the highest

ridership metro lines today; this will be a large increase in capacity from present day T-Line service.

John Larson asked if there is a longer term plan to take the T-Line further west, toward the Marina, and if a one-way loop precludes that further extension. Mr. Bignardi noted that the report discusses options for further extension, and that none of the studied phase 3 alignments would preclude further extension. For example, the one-way loop could be a separate branch while a western extension joins the subway at North Beach. The desirability and details of a phase 4 would depend on the support and interests of the neighborhoods involved, but phase 3 designs could take into account further extension.

Chair Davis stated that this project will be a complex community process given the diversity of communities along the line, and encouraged constructive conversation including on topics such as raised by Mr. Waddling. Mr. Masys agreed, saying that the T-Line can serve as a spine to strengthen connections between these communities.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated that the study had done a lot of good work, but expressed concern about fire and life safety issues that would arise from using a one-way loop.

15. Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION

Chair Davis stated his decision not to seek reappointment to the CAC. Chris Waddling and Jacqueline Sachs expressed appreciation for Chair Davis's service on behalf of CAC members.

There was no public comment.

16. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

17. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.