



# DRAFT MINUTES

## CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, July 26, 2017

### 1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Waddling called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

CAC Members present: Myla Ablog, Becky Hogue, Peter Sachs, Chris Waddling, Shannon Wells-Mongiovi and Bradley Wiedmaier (6)

CAC Members Absent: Brian Larkin (entered during Item 2), Peter Tannen (entered during Item 2), John Larson and Santiago Lerma (4)

Transportation Authority staff members present were Anna LaForte, Maria Lombardo, Aprile Smith, Oscar Quintanilla, and Steve Stamos.

### 2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Waddling reported that at the July 25 Board meeting, Peter Sachs was reappointed for another two-year term and would resume his position as Vice Chair of the CAC. He shared that at the July 11 Board meeting, the Board recognized Jackie Sachs' 20 years of service on the CAC and presented her with a certificate of recognition, however at the direction of District 2 Supervisor Farrell the Board decided to continue the remaining CAC vacancy until the September 12 meeting. Mr. Waddling noted that the Board had severed three requests for One Bay Area Grant funds that were approved at the June CAC meeting, including Better Market Street, the Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure 2019-2021 project, and BART's Embarcadero Station: New Northside Platform Elevator and Faregates project, that would now be considered by the Board in September. He said that topics that were not able to be on the July 26 agenda would be added to upcoming meeting agendas, should the timing work out. He said the CAC would be taking a tour of the Central Subway project on Friday, July 28, and noted that the next CAC meeting would be on Wednesday, September 6.

During public comment, Ed Mason asked if members of the public would be able to join the CAC's upcoming tour of the Central Subway project. Chair Waddling said that staff would check with the project manager and follow up.

Jacqueline Sachs commented that she hoped she would be reappointed to the CAC in September in order to continue overseeing the completion of projects included in the Prop K expenditure plan and provide input on the "The Other 9 to 5" report.

### 3. Approve the Minutes of the June 28, 2017 Meeting – ACTION

There was no public comment.

Becky Hogue moved to approve the item, seconded by Peter Sachs.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Hogue, Larkin, P. Sachs, Tannen, Waddling, Wells-Mongiovi

and Wiedmaier (8)

Absent: CAC Members Larson and Lerma (2)

#### 4. **Update on the Vision Zero Initiative – INFORMATION**

Kaitlin Carmody, Vision Zero Planner at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), presented the item.

Peter Sachs asked how the five priority citations were calculated. Ms. Carmody replied that the data was collected by the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD). Mr. Sachs asked for clarification given that the bar graph appeared to show close to 35,000 total citations but the table noted that the “Focus on the Five” represented 54% of the total, but only had 12,700 citations. He said he would expect the citations for “Focus on the Five” to be closer to 17,000.. Ms. Carmody replied the data may be missing totals and that she would follow up with exact figures.

Mya Ablog asked what telematics was. Chava Kronenberg, Pedestrian Program Manager at the SFMTA, replied that telematics was a device installed in every city vehicle which provides information on speed, braking, and general movements of the vehicle right before a crash.. She said telematics help the city track unsafe driving behavior and acts as a deterrent for unsafe driving.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi stated that she was familiar with the technology and that the type she had seen involved driver-facing and road-facing cameras which continually recorded audio and video and that if the vehicle engaged in unsafe maneuvers there were sensors that picked it up and signals that turned on to communicate that to the driver. Ms. Kronenberg stated that they would be happy to provide presentations on particular Vision Zero topics if the CAC was interested.

Becky Hogue asked how fatalities were counted as part of Vision Zero, and whether there was a cutoff for people who died as a result of a collision, but at a later time. Ms. Carmody replied that Vision Zero had a protocol to classify injuries and fatalities and that she believed the protocol, based on other studies, stated that if the fatality occurred more than 30 days after an incident occurred it was not included.

Chair Waddling asked whether education efforts were done for transportation network company (TNC) and delivery drivers and how that would be extended to autonomous vehicles. Ms. Carmody replied that, for the current education campaign, they were focusing radio advertisements on safety issues such as speeding to make it a more well-known issue, but that there was also advertisements placed on billboards, bus stops and Muni vehicles. Ms. Kronenberg added that autonomous vehicle safety was a new issue for many cities across the country and noted that she had recently attended a Transportation Research Board meeting that was discussing it and found that San Francisco was further ahead in that aspect given the proximity to the technology. She said educating TNC and vehicle drivers was similar to how taxi drivers were educated, but that autonomous vehicles would happen as the technology became more available. Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, added that the Transportation Authority and SFMTA Boards had recently adopted guiding principles as part of the Emerging Mobility and Services Technologies study and would be exploring safety around TNCs and how to implement Vision Zero.

Chair Waddling stated that he did not often hear the radio advertisements and asked what the budget for advertising was and what percentage of it went towards education.

Ms. Kronenberg replied that for the SFMTA most of the funding for Vision Zero was from the [Prop A] General Obligation Bond or Prop K funds, but were often part of a capital project which left a gap in funding for non-infrastructure projects. She said the funding for the advertisements was largely from grants through the state Active Transportation Program, however these were

mostly one time grants which could not be used for ongoing operations. She noted that the SFMTA had been very successful in obtaining grant funding and had received a disproportionate amount compared to the rest of the state, but still lacked a stable funding source. Ms. LaForte added that education was viewed as one of the key components of Vision Zero but was often the hardest to secure funding for. She continued by noting that the SFMTA and Department of Public Health would be evaluating what had been successful so far.

Bradley Wiedmaier asked if the count of pedestrian fatalities had a breakdown of abled and disabled individuals, as well as a breakdown of city center versus outer districts, and noted that congestion could increase safety through slower vehicle speeds. Ms. Kronenberg replied that the data was produced by SFPD and officers are not allowed to ask about disabilities as it would be a violation of the victim's rights. She said that limitation had led to a major gap in understanding pedestrian fatalities but that the SFMTA was beginning to collect data from San Francisco General Hospital which could provide more information. Ms. Kronenberg said looking at the data on severe injuries actually provided more insight on trends than did fatalities. She said that speed was always a factor in severe injuries, but that they had not seen a shift of injuries away from the downtown core.

Ms. Hogue noted that there had been discussions about the lack of data on disabled pedestrians at the Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee, and asked if the data on severe injuries was only available from San Francisco General Hospital. Ms. Kronenberg confirmed that it was only data from San Francisco General Hospital but noted that it fairly good data as it was the only level-one trauma center in the city.

Mr. Sachs stated that he would be interested in seeing the trends of severe injuries. Ms. Kronenberg replied that there was currently only two years of data available but that more would be coming.

During public comment, Ed Mason asked if the data included who was at fault, and noted that there could be multiple parties at fault. He also asked if the radio advertisements had correlated with a decline in collisions. He said that the enforcement was spread over 10 police districts which amounted to only 13 hours per week. He said that if the enforcement was done on overtime, it diminished the number of enforcement hours because of the overtime rate and the city could be getting more for the funding. Ms. Kronenberg replied that the enforcement was done on overtime, which was one of the difficulties with the grant source. Regarding fault, she said that two-thirds of the collisions listed the motorist at fault, but the data didn't exclude vehicle to vehicle collisions so that the number was likely inflated. She added that in terms of Vision Zero, fault was less important than system failure. Regarding the radio advertisements, she said there had been evaluations but that they had not been able to find a correlation between a reduction in traffic collisions and any of the counter measures at that point. She said the SFMTA still did not have the 2016 collision data and that when the current evaluation was completed in the fall it would be presented to the CAC. Mr. Mason noted that police reports indicated pedestrians being hit by vehicles late at night due to the pedestrian's fault which could get recorded in the Vision Zero data and skew the trends. Ms. Kronenberg stated that many of the evaluations look at daytime versus nighttime trends, and noted that the agencies involved had an established fatality protocol with a list of exclusions, such as suicides or medical emergencies, which determined if it was included in the Vision Zero statistics.

Jackie Sachs asked if the education component included messages discouraging people to not make right turns at red lights, as it encouraged dangerous behavior. Ms. Kronenberg replied that the education program was focused on people who already complied with traffic laws, and in particular, the five major enforcement areas that are the highest-risk behavior. She said it did not focus on individual behavior as it aimed to change the driving culture.

## 5. Update on the Central Subway Project – INFORMATION

Luis Zurinaga, the Transportation Authority's project management oversight consultant, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Peter Tannen asked what reason the contractor provided for being behind schedule. Mr. Zurinaga replied that the contractor believed that the SFMTA was responsible for the delay.

Mr. Tannen noted that a 12-month delay was significant and asked why there was not more of an advanced warning. Mr. Zurinaga stated that at the February 2017 CAC meeting the update on the project referenced a 9-month delay, but at that time there was hope that the contractor would be able to make up time and get the project on schedule. He said it was common for construction projects of that magnitude to start slow but get caught up towards the end, but that the project team now believed serious action needed to be taken.

Brian Larkin asked for clarification on why the contractor believed the SFMTA was responsible for the delay. Mr. Zurinaga stated that it revolved around the working environment in that the soil was harder than anticipated, with more rocks, and there was a disagreement over the equipment that could be used. Mr. Larkin asked if the contractor was now making up the time. Mr. Zurinaga replied that in recent months the contractor had stopped the delay from growing further but was not making up any time.

Mr. Larkin asked if the project would need to find an additional fund source since the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) funds were lower than expected. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, replied that the Transportation Authority committed significant RTIP funds to the project in 2003 but for years had advised the SFMTA that all the funds would not be available in time to meet the project's cash-flow needs due to the unreliability of state funds, so in the meantime the SFMTA had been financing the project. However, she continued that the Transportation Authority was committed to providing the \$75 million in funds to SFMTA by programming this amount to other RTIP-eligible SFMTA projects as funds become available.

John Funghi, Central Subway Project Manager at the SFMTA, stated that the project currently had a surplus of contingency, and that it had been essentially spending Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grants up until now. He said it was possible that the project would not need the \$75 million committed in RTIP funds, however it was likely that the contingency would be drawn down in the future. He noted that the FTA required a minimum of \$60 million in contingency for the project. Regarding the project delay, he said the monthly project reports, which were also distributed to the media, had forecasted the delay. He noted that the project schedule was determined several years in advance so it was not uncommon for it to be off by 10%. Mr. Funghi said the contractor was responsible for getting the project back on track, and that a subcontractor on the project was the primary reason for the delay as they were having difficulty with productivity. He said the FTA brought in experts to assess the timing of the project completion and that they identified the potential to start certain testing activities at that same time rather than in sequence. He added the goal was still to deliver the project in 2019.

Mr. Larkin asked if the testing would be done by the SFMTA or involved other agencies. Mr. Funghi replied that that the testing would be done by the contractor and was overseen by the California Public Utilities Commission, but that they would be discussing that further with the FTA.

Bradley Wiedmaier asked if it was possible to separate the testing of the different segments or if the trains could skip the Chinatown Station if it was not completed in time. Mr. Funghi replied that the FTA would be looking at that, but that it would be difficult given that there were crossover tracks south of the Chinatown Station and that the train control system would be located in that

station but essentially, they could run limited service at a lower throughput. He said that if the Chase Center opened on time they could potentially do a soft launch and do testing of trains to and from events at the center. He said they would be having those conversations as the date gets closer.

Peter Tannen asked about the \$27 million in liquidated damages and whether the contractor was expected to pay that amount. Mr. Zurinaga replied that the \$27 million figure was based on if the contractor was found to be fully responsible for the delay, but that who was responsible for how much of the delay was yet to be determined.

During public comment, Jackie Sachs commented that she was a member of the Community Advisory Group for the project which would be taking the same Central Subway tour as the CAC on August 18, before their regular meeting.

**6. Presentation on the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's Capital Improvement Program – INFORMATION**

Bryant Tan, Principal Financial Analyst at the SFMTA, presented the item.

Bradley Wiedmaier asked how the Subway Vision planning effort fit into the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Mr. Tan replied that there were planning efforts such as the Subway Vision that existed outside of the CIP and that it often depended on the funding source. He said the Subway Vision planning effort was not currently being tracked in the CIP, but that it was possible it could be incorporated in the future.

Mr. Wiedmaier asked what the gap was between the funds requested and the funds available for the current CIP. Mr. Tan replied that the SFMTA did not have a figure for the current 5-year CIP, but that the various program divisions were requested to provide 20% over projection of what they needed. He said this allowed staff to determine how much funding could be distributed into each category and provided room for prioritization. He said that for the 20-year program, a lot of the estimates provided were fluid as the needs were not certain that far out.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi asked if the CIP kept up with changes in fund sources and projected how much would be provided by each of the sources. Mr. Tan confirmed that it did and was available on the SFMTA's website at [www.sfmta.com/cip](http://www.sfmta.com/cip).

Chair Waddling commented that there was an uneven distribution of total funding projections over the 5-year period, nothing a significant drop off after 2019, and that it would be ideal if costs for longer term projects could be evenly distributed. Mr. Tan replied that the projected needs depended on the timing of the projects, and that for the next few fiscal years the SFMTA's fleet procurement and the Central Subway project were major cash flow drivers that were making total higher in the early years. He said some of the drop-off in later CIP years could be attributed to staff being more conservative in estimating costs several years out since there could be changes in revenue. He added that the estimates did not include new funding sources that were not yet certain.

During public comment, Ed Mason asked what category of the CIP Better Market Street fit into. Mr. Tan stated that Better Market Street was officially a San Francisco Public Works' project but that the SFMTA was providing funding, along with other agencies. He said it likely fit into several categories of the CIP, and that the digital CIP on the SFMTA's website might provide more clarification.

Jackie Sachs asked how much of the funding came from the SFMTA's operating funds and what assumptions the SFMTA made about discretionary fund sources. Mr. Tan replied that the operating budget was separate from the capital budget.. He said he would follow up regarding the question on discretionary funds.

**7. Public Comment**

During public comment, Ed Mason encouraged the CAC to read the staff report from Item 10.7 on the SFMTA's July 25 Board meeting. He said it detailed the 341 complaints submitted since August 2016 regarding the 24<sup>th</sup> Street area commuter shuttle pilot program, which represented 20% of all complaints citywide. He said that, while there would be two new white zones established, the shuttles needed to do a better job of coordinating with Muni buses to ease the bunching problem. He said eliminating a bulbout at the intersection of 24<sup>th</sup> and Mission Streets could help reduce traffic related bus boarding.

Myla Ablog stated that she was surprised by the recent announcement that Salesforce secured the naming rights for the Transbay Transit Center, and that the deal had appeared to be several years in the making. She said that while she agreed with the basis of using public-private partnerships to deliver projects, she disagreed with selling the naming rights for a public facility, which could lead to the diminishing of public control over these facilities.

Chair Waddling noted that the CAC had been distributed the Executive Director's Report from the July 25 Board meeting and that he thought it was a great way to provide the CAC with updates on various topics.

**8. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:46 p.m.