



DRAFT MINUTES

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

September 2, 2015 SPECIAL MEETING

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Chris Waddling at 6:01 p.m. CAC members present were Myla Ablog, Brian Larkin, John Larson, John Morrison, Jacqueline Sachs, Peter Sachs, Chris Waddling and Wells Whitney. Transportation Authority staff members present were Tilly Chang, Eric Cordoba, Amber Crabbe, Ryan Greene-Roesel, Seon Joo Kim, Anna Laforte, Maria Lombardo, Mike Pickford, Chad Rathmann, Liz Rutman, Shari Tavafrashti and Eric Young.

2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Waddling said that staff would provide a look ahead of allocation requests prior to the next CAC meeting. He introduced Peter Sachs as the newest member of the CAC and Eric Cordoba as the new Deputy Director for Capital Projects. Mr. Sachs spoke about his background and interest in serving on the CAC. Mr. Cordoba offered to take CAC members on a tour of the Yerba Buena Island I-80 Interchange Improvement project. Chair Waddling said that project tours could be helpful for CAC members and asked staff to follow up with other possible locations, including the Transbay Transit Center.

There was no public comment.

Consent Calendar

3. Accept the Minutes of the May 14, 2015 Subcommittee Meeting – ACTION

4. Approve the Minutes of the June 24, 2015 Meeting – ACTION

5. State and Federal Legislative Update – INFORMATION

6. Investment Report for the Quarter Ended June 30, 2015 – INFORMATION

Chair Waddling requested that Item 3 be continued until the next regularly scheduled CAC meeting on October 28 so that it could be considered along with proposed changes to the CAC by-laws.

There was no public comment on the Consent Calendar.

Wells Whitney moved to approve the Consent Calendar as amended, seconded by Jacqueline Sachs.

The Consent Calendar was approved as amended by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Larkin, Larson, Morrison, J. Sachs, P. Sachs, Waddling and Whitney

End of Consent Calendar

7. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Allocation of \$9,878,876 in Prop K funds, with Conditions, and Appropriation of \$120,800 in Prop K funds, Subject to the Attached

Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules – ACTION

Chad Rathmann, Senior Transportation Planner, and Ryan Greene-Roesel, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Wells Whitney asked for clarification on the scope for the Kearny Street Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program (NTIP) request. Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, replied that the scope was on page 163 of the enclosure. Craig Raphael, NTIP Coordinator with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, said that the project would be a planning level effort for safety interventions and would consider features such as road diets, bus stops and bike facilities.

John Morrison asked about a precedent in Singapore for the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) Incentive Program. Ms. Greene-Roesel replied that that the Singapore program had relied on employer outreach and transit rider incentives. Peter Sachs asked what type of incentives might be considered for the program in San Francisco. Ms. Greene-Roesel replied that they could include cash, Clipper value, or other prizes. She said they intended to license the software that Singapore had used to run its program.

Jacqueline Sachs asked whether BART's new train cars would be compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Ms. Greene-Roesel replied that they would be.

Chair Waddling asked whether the incentive program would only be used to shift riders to the shoulders of the peak hour. Ms. Greene-Roesel replied that the project would use data to determine exactly when the incentives were needed most to reduce crowding.

Brian Larkin asked what the nature of the 4th Street Bridge Settlement was. Ms. LaForte replied that she believed it involved a number of issues including piles and delays.

Peter Sachs asked how the value of the land involved in the Quint-Jerrold project was determined. Liz Rutman, Senior Engineer, replied that the San Francisco Real Estate Office developed the estimate and that it was agreed to by all parties. Chair Waddling added that he was aware that people in the community wanted the road built, and asked how the real estate agreement would protect the City. Ms. LaForte clarified that the requested allocation was to acquire the land and that there were conditions included to protect the City, which would purchase the land on behalf of the Transportation Authority, and to protect the Prop K sales tax program should the project not move forward. She reiterated that the intent is to build the road.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun brought up the issue of equity and ensuring that Disadvantaged Business Enterprise goals were met for projects. He also commented that multiple potential crossing points over the Caltrain tracks were being closed in an area with low car ownership.

Ed Mason said that the BART incentives project should try to influence work hours by working with the Bay Area Council.

Wells Whitney moved to approve this item, seconded by Brian Larkin.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Larkin, Larson, Morrison, J. Sachs, P. Sachs, Waddling and Whitney

8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Execute a Funding Agreement with the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) District for a Three-Year Period in an Amount Not to Exceed \$406,000

for the San Francisco BART Travel Incentives Pilot Project and to Authorize the Executive Director to Negotiate Agreement Payment Terms and Non-Material Agreement Terms and Conditions – ACTION

Ryan Greene-Roesel, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Wells Whitney said that the project seemed like a viable alternative to heavy capital expenditure. He said that the first step should be to work with employers and then find out if riders were willing to change their travel times.

Chair Waddling said the program could work similar to parking meters that were repriced periodically in response to demand data. Ms. Greene-Roesel said that if riders signed up for the program, data would be collected via their Clipper cards, so there would be rich, real-time data. Chair Waddling asked if there would be an incentive to sign up. Ms. Greene-Roesel said that providing a sign up incentive would be considered, and that in Singapore individuals received extra rewards for referring their friends.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun said that it was important to come up with new lower cost ways to improve transportation.

Ed Mason said that transit would become much more crowded after the Salesforce Tower was completed, and that he did not think incentives would make enough of a difference.

John Larson moved to approve this item, seconded by John Morrison.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Larkin, Larson, Morrison, J. Sachs, P. Sachs, Waddling and Whitney

9. Plan Bay Area 2040: San Francisco Call for Projects and Draft Goals and Objectives – INFORMATION

Amber Crabbe, Assistant Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, and Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Wells Whitney asked for clarification on the public input heard related to congestion management. Ms. Crabbe confirmed that the issue had come up during discussions with advocacy groups, especially with regard to Treasure Island.

Mr. Whitney asked staff to identify which supervisorial district each of the recommended projects was in. Ms. Crabbe replied that she would provide that information at the next CAC meeting.

John Larson asked whether the public outreach could be quantified. Ms. Crabbe replied that it was difficult to engage members of the public on a long-range, high-level planning effort, so staff had also engaged specific community based organizations in discussion. Ms. Lombardo added that most of the projects under consideration originated from other planning processes that had also included own outreach efforts. Chair Waddling asked which community groups had been engaged. Ms. Crabbe replied that staff would share a list with the CAC.

Mr. Larkin asked whether this plan included requirements from Senate Bill 375. Ms. Crabbe replied that it did. Mr. Larkin asked for clarification on which projects had to be included in the sustainable communities' strategy. Ms. Crabbe replied that any project needing to move forward with construction by 2021 should be included as well as projects needing a federal action such as approval of the environmental document by 2021.

Mr. Larkin stated that the bus rapid transit project on Geary Boulevard might be implemented by 2021 and asked how a potential subsequent light rail project would be handled. Ms. Crabbe replied that the draft recommendations included a grouping of long-range transit planning projects which could include rail in the Geary corridor. Mr. Larkin said that he understood that not including a light rail project on Geary Boulevard did not mean it would not ultimately be implemented, but said that he wanted to make sure the potential project got as much visibility as possible such as by including it in the list of example projects in the long-range planning project description.

Ms. Lombardo emphasized that because Plan Bay Area (PBA) was fiscally constrained, not every project could fit within the budget. So, she said that staff worked to ensure that projects can still advance even if not fully funded through construction in PBA. To Mr. Larkin's point, Ms. Lombardo said that staff could bring a list of projects that are currently being considered in various plans such as the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA's) Rail Capacity Study and the Bay Area Core Capacity Study so the CAC could have a better idea of the many projects that are being considered in various long range planning efforts. Ms. Lombardo continued by emphasizing that PBA is not the place where San Francisco local priorities should be vetted, and said that vetting needed to take place locally such as within the San Francisco Transportation Plan. Ms. Lombardo briefly described the coordinated long range planning that is being scoped by the Transportation Authority, SFMTA, the San Francisco Planning Department and the San Francisco Mayor's Office, noting that this process would have a very robust community engagement strategy. She concluded by saying that the CAC would receive a briefing on the long range planning work in the next couple of months.

Ms. Sachs stated that she had heard news reports that seniors were having difficulty navigating Gerrard Street near the Presidio Parkway construction site. Ms. Lombardo said that changes were being implemented to alleviate those issues and she would provide that information to the CAC separately.

Ms. Crabbe encouraged members of the CAC to contact her with any input they had on project recommendations for Plan Bay Area 2040.

During public comment, Roland LeBrun said that it was important to think about a second transbay rail tunnel in Plan Bay Area 2040 because it would decongest transit hubs including the Embarcadero and Montgomery stations. He said he would advocate for the Metropolitan Transportation Commission to establish a new authority to implement such a tunnel.

10. Major Capital Projects Update – Transbay Transit Center and Downtown Extension – INFORMATION

Shari Tavafrashti, Principal Engineer, presented the item per the staff memorandum. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, said that staff would share the results of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's cost review with the CAC.

John Larson asked who had been responsible for the poor cost estimates. Ms. Tavafrashti replied that under the delivery method the Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA) had chosen, the contractor was responsible for bidding out portions of the overall project.

Peter Sachs asked how much less Parcel F might sell for given that the live auction had been cancelled. Ms. Lombardo replied that TJPA was still negotiating with five qualified bidders.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun said that he had written a letter to the CAC explaining that losing control of Block 5 would prevent a potential connection from the east side of the Transbay Transit Center to a potential transit tunnel to the East Bay.

11. Chinatown Neighborhood Transportation Plan Final Report – INFORMATION

Ryan Greene-Roesel, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Peter Sachs asked about the benefits of pedestrian scrambles for safety. Ms. Greene-Roesel responded that research showed that scrambles typically improved pedestrian safety overall, however they could result in increased pedestrian violations and increased transit delay. She said the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency would be analyzing the effects of scrambles on Kearny Street.

Wells Whitney indicated that he thought pedestrian scrambles on Columbus Street would reduce transit delay because they reduce conflicts with high volumes of pedestrians.

Jacqueline Sachs stated that scrambles should include a no turn on red sign to protect seniors.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated that a road diet would be beneficial for the corridor.

12. Update on One Bay Area Grant Program Cycle 1 Projects – INFORMATION

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

Brian Larkin asked about the cost of the environmental phase for ER Taylor and Longfellow Safe Routes to School projects, and said he anticipated it to be relatively large for the size of the projects. Ms. Kim responded she would follow up with San Francisco Public Works to obtain the cost information.

There was no public comment.

13. Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION

Tilly Chang, Executive Director, welcomed recently appointed CAC members and said that Transportation Authority Board Chair Scott Wiener had asked staff to conduct polling on potential new revenue measures. She mentioned that other counties and BART would likely move forward with new revenue measures in the near future and that there were advantages to be explored of moving measures forward in tandem. She promised to bring the results back to the CAC. Chair Waddling asked if the poll questions would ask about the amount of the potential measure. Ms. Chang confirmed that and said the polls would measure several different things.

Jacqueline Sachs said that she would like an update on the late night transit study, “The Other 9-5”, and asked for bus drivers to be included in the discussion. She said that she would like bus service brought back to the level of December 5, 2009.

There was no public comment.

14. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

15. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:06 p.m.