



DRAFT MINUTES

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

September 30, 2015 SPECIAL MEETING

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Chris Waddling at 6:03 p.m. CAC members present were Myla Ablog, Brian Larkin, John Larson, Santiago Lerma, John Morrison, Peter Tannen, Chris Waddling and Wells Whitney. Transportation Authority staff members present were Eric Cordoba, Amber Crabbe, Ryan Greene-Roesel, Seon Joo Kim, Anna Laforte, Maria Lombardo, Bob Masys, Mike Pickford and Chad Rathmann.

2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Waddling said that a CAC member had requested Item 6 be removed from the Consent Calendar and considered separately, and that Item 12 would be heard following the Consent Calendar and Item 14 would be moved up to group all the action items. He said that at the prior Plans and Programs Committee, Commissioner Christensen moved to amend the Prop K Grouped item to remove the allocation of funds to the Kearny Street Multimodal Implementation Plan in order to further develop details of the project. Chair Waddling said that CAC members recently went on a tour of the Yerba Buena Island I-80 Interchange Improvement project and that he thought members would benefit from future tours of projects. He also reported that Raymon Smith had resigned from the CAC and that women and people of color were encouraged to apply for the vacated seat.

There was no public comment.

Consent Calendar

3. Approve the Minutes of the September 2, 2015 Meeting – ACTION
4. State and Federal Legislative Update – INFORMATION
5. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Award of a Three-Year Consultant Contract, with an Option to Extend for Two Additional One-Year Periods, to Smith, Watts and Hartmann in an Amount Not to Exceed \$135,000 for State Legislative Advocacy Services, and Authorizing the Executive Director to Negotiate Contract Payment Terms and Non-Material Contract Terms and Conditions – ACTION
7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Increase the Amount of the Professional Services Contract with AECOM Technical Services, Inc. by \$1,000,000, to a Total Amount Not to Exceed \$16,935,000, to Complete Design Support Services for the I-80/Yerba Buena Island Ramps Improvement Project and to Authorize the Executive Director to Modify Contract Payment Terms and Non-Material Contract Terms and Conditions – ACTION
8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Increase the Amount of the Professional Services Contract with Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. by \$1,350,000, to a Total Amount Not to

Exceed \$7,650,000, to Complete Construction Support Services for the I-80/Yerba Buena Island Ramps Improvement Project and to Authorize the Executive Director to Modify Contract Payment Terms and Non-Material Contract Terms and Conditions – ACTION

9. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Adoption of San Francisco’s Project Priorities for the 2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program – ACTION

Chair Waddling requested that Item 6 be removed from the consent calendar and considered separately.

There was no public comment on the Consent Calendar.

Wells Whitney moved to approve the Consent Calendar, seconded by Brian Larkin.

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

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Larkin, Larson, Lerma, Morrison, Tannen, Waddling and Whitney

End of Consent Calendar

6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Execute Cooperative Agreement No. 04-2582 with the California Department of Transportation for the I-280 Interchange Modifications at Balboa Park in a Total Amount Not to Exceed \$150,000, and to Authorize the Executive Director to Negotiate Agreement Payment Terms and Non-Material Agreement Terms and Conditions – ACTION

During public comment, Aaron Goodman said that the overall impacts of the project on the corridor needed to be considered in more detail because traffic was already backing up onto the freeway.

Peter Tannen moved to approve this item, seconded by John Larson.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Larkin, Larson, Morrison, Tannen, Waddling and Whitney

Abstentions: CAC Members Ablog and Lerma

10. Adopt a Motion of Support for Approval of the San Francisco Advocacy Goals and Objectives and Project List for Plan Bay Area 2040 – ACTION

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

Brian Larkin asked if Geary light rail was included and he asked for an explanation of programmatic categories. Ms. Crabbe replied that programmatic categories included projects that would not need to be modelled either because they would not be ready for construction before 2021 or because they result in no capacity changes that could be modeled (e.g. most state of good repair projects). She explained that including the full project cost for a rail project would take up a large portion of San Francisco’s expected discretionary funding, while including planning funds would allow the project to move forward without taking funding that could be used for projects that would reach construction sooner and need to be included in this cycle of Plan Bay Area. Mr. Larkin asked for clarification that Geary light rail would not be preempted and could seek federal funding. Ms. Crabbe said that was correct. Ms. Lombardo added that Geary light rail was included as a potential project in the description of one for the Rail Capacity Long Term Planning and Conceptual Design project (project 50 in Attachment 3

to the memo).

Wells Whitney asked about the amount of regional funding that was anticipated to augment San Francisco's \$8.4 billion anticipated local discretionary amount and how projects were ranked in the plan. Ms. Crabbe replied that ideally all of San Francisco's projects would get into Plan Bay Area 2040 with no further prioritizing. She explained that if San Francisco wasn't successful in getting enough regional funds designated in the plan, staff would seek to trim programmatic categories and projects, rather than cutting projects out entirely. She said that Attachment 2 for the item had a breakdown of anticipated local versus regional discretionary amounts for each project entry and that the total request was \$1.3 billion in regional discretionary funds. Ms. Lombardo added that the figures in Attachment 2 do not include state of good repair funding, which is being accounted for through a separate process led by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. She also noted that the regional transportation doesn't prioritize local projects and that the place where that happens is at the local level in the San Francisco Transportation Plan update.

Peter Tannen asked what the lane configuration would be for the Harney Way project entry and whether all 8 lanes were really needed given plans for bus rapid transit. Rachel Alonso, Transportation Finance Analyst with San Francisco Public Works, replied that the project included two lanes for bus rapid transit and six lanes for mixed traffic, though the ultimate configuration could change.

During public comment, Aaron Goodman said that it was important to focus on equity and that District 10 needed improved transit access. He said that light rail should be built on Geneva Avenue as soon as possible. He commented that most of the transit projects in the 2013 Plan Bay Area list were downtown and that the southeast and west sectors of San Francisco also needed transit. He mentioned 19th Avenue and connections to Daly City BART as important projects.

Ed Mason said that studies related to I-280 and the railyard should consider the long-term operational costs for Caltrain.

Chair Waddling said that he would be meeting with Susan Gygi with the San Francisco Planning Department next week to discuss when she could present details of the Railyard Alternatives study to the CAC. He said that proposals to move the railyard south were extremely concerning to him and posed environmental justice concerns.

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, Tannen, Waddling and Whitney

Abstentions: CAC Member Lerma

11. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Allocation of \$4,085,233 in Prop K funds, with Conditions, and Appropriation of \$54,225 in Prop K funds, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules – ACTION

Chad Rathmann, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Santiago Lerma asked how large the signs included in the Bicycle Wayfinding Signs project would be. Mr. Rathmann replied that the example sign exhibit provided by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) in the enclosure for the item was 24" x 30".

Mr. Lerma asked if the hours of operation for the Bayview Moves pilot project were too late considering the proposed regular operating hours of 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, replied that the vans would also be available on-demand as part of the pilot project.

Peter Tannen asked for additional information on the YBike organization. Matt Dove, YBike Presidio Director, responded that the program was based at the Presidio Community YMCA and had been providing bicycle education in San Francisco in 2004 and first piloted education in schools in 2008. He added that YBike's instructors were League of American Bicyclists-certified League Cycling Instructors and that the program reached thousands of students per year.

Mr. Tannen asked if the \$10,000 was for environmental clearance for the Bicycle Wayfinding Signs project and if the clearance would result in a categorical exemption. He also asked what constituted the average cost per sign of \$1,000.

Ms. LaForte responded that the need for environmental clearance of the signage was because some locations would necessitate digging to install new sign poles.

Craig Raphael, Transportation Planner at SFMTA, responded that the cost per sign included staff time to design the signs and decide specific corridor and intersection locations on the bicycle network, as well as install the signage.

Chair Waddling asked for the size of the current sign. Mr. Raphael responded that they were relatively small. Mr. Waddling stated that the new larger signage may lead to clutter and be harder to read for people on bicycles. Mr. Raphael responded that SFMTA could test that issue during the project's pilot.

Mr. Tannen noted that multiple existing signs could be replaced with a single new sign, pointing to an example in the presentation.

Mr. Waddling noted that YBike may be teaching cycling skills to youth who have no means to buy a bicycle for their own use based on how schools are selected for the youth bicycle education. He asked if the program therefore taught students that were less likely to have a personal bicycle. Mr. Dove responded that YBike did try to match up low incomes families with organizations that could help them purchase a bike.

John Morrison asked why 29-Sunset Muni service was cut given the need for increased transit options on Geneva Avenue as evidenced by the bus rapid transit (BRT) project. Ms. LaForte responded that Transportation Authority staff would follow up with SFMTA and provide a response.

John Larson asked if Daly City's concerns over Geneva-Harney BRT included more than parking and traffic. Mr. Rathmann confirmed that those two issues were the concerns.

Mr. Larson asked if the Beatty alternative was the route through the Recology campus. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, confirmed that it was.

Brian Larkin asked for more detail on the Geneva-Harney BRT draft environmental impact report schedule. Kenya Wheeler, Senior Environmental Planner at SFMTA, stated that the Geneva-Harney BRT project was in a pre-environmental study phase, which included scope for future environmental clearance and additional outreach. Mr. Wheeler noted upcoming coordination with Muni Forward, including public input on design, and that the project's goals were to speed up transit and make transit more reliable. Mr. Wheeler added that there would be a meeting on the Bayshore Intermodal project at Recology on October 13. Mr. Wheeler added

that SFMTA was currently refining the schedule and noted that service was set to begin operations in 2021. He added that SFMTA's goal was to start the one- to two-year environmental phase in summer 2016. Mr. Larkin noted that the schedule seemed aggressive based on past BRT projects in San Francisco.

During public comment, Aaron Goodman noted the Balboa Park Citizens Advisory Committee's support for Prop K. He also voiced his support for projects that supported walking, and noted that the paths adjacent to the Alemany Market would provide a good place to pilot bicycle and pedestrian wayfinding and improved pedestrian facilities as a way to contribute to Vision Zero goals. Mr. Goodman also expressed support for shuttles projects like Bayview Moves in increasing mobility for residents and added that this could improve mobility in India Basin; light rail vehicles on the Geneva Corridor given that bus vehicles could become congested at Balboa Park – and questioned whether they would be able to access the station); and adequate access to future development at Candlestick. Mr. Waddling noted that the Transportation Authority was undertaking the Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Project Program Alemany Interchange Improvement Study and asked that wayfinding signage be included in that planning effort.

Ed Mason stated that consideration for senior pedestrians and bicycle rules of the road should be included in bicycle education.

Myla Ablog moved to approve this item, seconded by John Larson.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Larkin, Larson, Lerma, Morrison, Tannen, Waddling and Whitney

12. Update on Cost Review of Transbay Transit Center and Downtown Extension – INFORMATION

Luis Zurinaga, Consultant, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Peter Tannen asked how enforceable the recommendations of the cost review were. Mr. Zurinaga replied that they were just recommendations, but that they carried the weight of the project's funding partners. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, added that separate from the cost review, the same funding partners were developing a funding and financing plan for the project.

Wells Whitney asked who was on the board of the Transbay Joint Powers Authority. Mr. Zurinaga replied that members were Greg Harper (Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District), Jane Kim (Board of Supervisors), Edward Reiskin (SFMTA), Mohammed Nuru (SFPW, appointed by the Mayor), and Marian Lee (Caltrain).

Chair Waddling said that it seemed like there had been a lot of opportunity for these cost overruns not to have happened. Mr. Zurinaga said that a big concern was that many potential sources of funding that were used to make up for the cost increases were originally set aside for Phase II of the project. Mr. Waddling asked if anyone was investigating possible malfeasance related to the cost overruns. Mr. Zurinaga replied not at this time, but that the cost review findings did indicate errors and omissions in the cost estimates.

Brian Larkin asked for more information on why TJPA had set up its Contract Manager/General Contractor delivery method atypically. Mr. Zurinaga replied that as a result of requirements by the Department of Homeland Security, significant redesign was required, which contributed to delays in the project and that TJPA decided to put project components

out to bid as soon as they became ready, rather than waiting for a more complete picture of the overall cost.

John Larson asked what the cost review report for Phase II of the project would say and said that he was concerned we could end up with just a fancy bus station. Mr. Zurinaga replied that the first meeting on that cost review had just happened that morning. Ms. Lombardo added that the Railyard Alternatives study, led by the San Francisco Planning Department, was looking at different alignments for the train tunnel and different construction methodologies, noting that the latter could provide some cost savings as well as other advantages.

Santiago Lerma asked at what point the project would run out of funds. Mr. Zurinaga replied that all but one component of the project had been put out to bid, so the cost estimates at this point were solid.

There was no public comment.

13. Major Capital Projects Update – Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project – INFORMATION

Bob Masys, Senior Transportation Engineer, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

John Larson asked what the contingency on the project was. Mr. Masys replied that the contingency was determined from a risk-based analysis, and stands at about 30% of the cost estimate, which was robust for a project at this stage of design.

Santiago Lerma asked whether the chosen trees were appropriate for the street. Mr. Masys said there had been an extensive selection process that considered urban survivability, maintenance concerns, and aesthetics such as height and form.

Wells Whitney asked about left turns on Van Ness Avenue. Mr. Masys said that left turns would remain only at Lombard Street going northbound and Broadway going southbound. He said the limits on left turns supported maintenance of through traffic flow, similar to the way were used on 19th Avenue.

Chair Waddling asked how many left turns were being eliminated. Mr. Masys replied all but one in each direction.

During public comment, Aaron Goodman stated the bus rapid transit lanes should be extended all the way to the Excelsior area. He also stated that he supported buses with doors on both sides in order to have central platforms.

Ed Mason said that trees must be regulated and maintained so as not to interfere with or collapse onto trolley wires.

14. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Adoption of the Transportation Demand Management Partnership Project Final Report Factsheets – ACTION

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

Chair Waddling asked about the timeline for the evaluation of the Commuter Shuttles Pilot Program. Ms. Greene-Roesel responded that a draft evaluation was in progress, and that she would follow up with San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) staff to confirm the schedule and request a presentation for the CAC.

During public comment, Ed Mason voiced several concerns regarding shuttles in his neighborhood, noting violations such as shuttles operating or getting stuck on steep hills, using Muni stops without a permit (including the stop on 25th and Castro Street), and improperly

using weight-restricted streets. He said that the vehicles were too large and caused backups and traffic congestion since passengers did not off-board promptly and were restricted to a single door.

Aaron Goodman expressed concern that San Francisco State University had not adequately funded measures to manage the impacts of campus enrollment increases. He also noted concerns with the availability of public transportation to the Stern Grove music festival and stated that the Transportation Impact Development Fee should be higher to ensure funding of transportation needs resulting from new growth.

Santiago Lerma mentioned that he had also observed many shuttles continuing to use Muni stops without a permit, and that he often saw traffic backup behind an illegally parked Bauer shuttle in front of his office on Sutter Street between Van Ness Avenue and Polk Street.

Mr. Waddling indicated that he would like to see SFMTA's evaluation of the Shuttle Pilot Program and said that from his perspective, the pilot program had not been a success.

John Morrison moved to approve this item, seconded by Wells Whitney.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Larkin, Larson, Lerma, Morrison, Tannen, Waddling and Whitney

15. Update on One Bay Area Grant Program Cycle 2 Proposal – INFORMATION

Given time constraints, Chair Waddling continued Item 15 to the October 28 CAC meeting.

16. Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION

Chair Waddling said that given the significant development plans in the southeast and southwest of the city and the many transit planning efforts underway, he wanted a more comprehensive picture of how it all fit together. He requested that staff arrange for a presentation focused on the long range transit planning going on in the southeast and southwest sectors in San Francisco, how they are being coordinated, and how they relate to land use changes.

There was no public comment.

17. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

18. Adjournment

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