



# DRAFT MINUTES

## CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, March 28, 2018

### 1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Larson called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

CAC members present: Myla Ablog, Kian Alavi, Hala Hijazi, Brian Larkin, John Larson, Peter Sachs and Chris Waddling (7)

CAC Members Absent: Hala Hijazi (entered during item 10), Becky Hogue, Peter Tannen and Shannon Wells-Mongiovi (3)

Transportation Authority staff members present were Anna Harvey, Andrew Heidel, Rachel Hiatt, Jeff Hobson, Anna LaForte, Maria Lombardo, Linda Meckel, Paige Miller, Mike Pickford, Alberto Quintanilla, Oscar Quintanilla, Steve Rehn, Aprile Smith and Mike Tan.

### 2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Larson reported that the Board reappointed him as the District 7 Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) representative and noted that there was one open seat on the CAC because of the suspension of Bradley Wiedmaier due to absences, which also coincided with when his term expired. He reminded CAC members that missing four regularly scheduled CAC meetings in a 12-month period resulted in a suspension from the CAC and asked Alberto Quintanilla, Clerk of the Board, to notify CAC members who had two to three absences.

Chair Larson reported that the Vision Zero Committee of the Transportation Authority was extended for an additional two-year period and announced that April 5, 2018 was "Walk to Work Day." He said anyone could participate by walking or wheelchair rolling 15 or more minutes during their commute and that the theme was "Discover your city!" He said several routes and hubs would be set up around town, and a program would take place on the morning of April 5, 2018 at City Hall.

There was no public comment.

### Consent Agenda

3. Approve the Minutes of the February 28, 2018 Meeting – ACTION
4. Adopt a Motion of Support on the ConnectSF Vision Document – ACTION
5. Citizens Advisory Committee Appointment – INFORMATION
6. State and Federal Legislation Update – INFORMATION
7. Update on the Valencia Street Bikeway Implementation Plan [NTIP Planning] – INFORMATION
8. Update on the Adult School Crossing Guard Program – INFORMATION

## 9. Update on Late Night Transportation Plan – INFORMATION

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

Brian Larkin moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Peter Sachs.

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Alavi, Hijazi, Larkin, Larson, Sachs and Waddling (7)

Absent: CAC Members Hogue, Hijazi, Tannen and Wells-Mongiovi (3)

### End of Consent Agenda

## 10. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Allocation of \$17,008,851 in Prop K Funds for Four Requests, with Condition – ACTION

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, and Albert Hoe, Central Subway Acting Program Director for the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority (SFMTA), presented the item.

Brian Larkin asked for an update on the Chinatown station delay claim made by Tutor-Perini.

Mr. Hoe stated that Tutor-Perini had made multiple claims on the Chinatown station, with two major claims focusing on hard rock in the platform cavern side and hard rock in the head house area. He said the SFMTA had evaluated the hard rock inside the headhouse and utilized a Dispute Resolution Board (DRB) to resolve the issue. He said Tutor-Perini had some merit to their claims, but other claims had been rejected and the SFMTA was in the process of determining how much of the merited elements could be settled.

Mr. Hoe stated that Tutor-Perini had made claims based on the delay of the project but had not provided a Time Impact Analysis (TIA) to prove that the claims were affecting the critical path of Chinatown station.

Brian Larkin asked if the DRB had issued any decisions.

Mr. Hoe stated that the DRB had issued decisions on three of the four claims and said the extension of time and compensation provided to Tutor-Perini from the SFMTA was directly tied to the DRB ruling.

Brian Larkin asked if the SFMTA would be challenging the rulings made by the DRB.

Mr. Hoe said that in some instances the SFMTA were accepting partial recommendations from the DRB but were drafting a response that would state the SFMTA's disagreements with the certain parts of the rulings.

Peter Sachs stated that the CAC received an earlier update regarding possible strategies to recoup lost time and asked, with the mining work complete, if the December 2019 completion date could be moved up.

Mr. Hoe stated that the SFMTA was in the process of scheduling a Monte Carlo analysis, a Federal Transit Administration (FTA) requirement, to see if they could recover lost time. He said the SFMTA did see the opportunity to recover some time and that Tutor-Perini had been working towards recovering time. He noted that time was lost for 9 consecutive months last year and that it was not realistic to regain all the lost time. He said the SFMTA was working on the weekends, extending shifts and adding shifts to try to recover as much time as possible within the projected 18-month duration to complete the project.

Myla Ablog asked if the Bayview Community Based Transportation Plan outline study area

considered future development and adjacent areas near the Bayview, and whether it included all the public housing sites.

Christopher Kim, Bayview Community Based Transportation Plan Project Manager at the SFMTA, said that all elements of public housing were included in the study, which was specifically focused on meeting the needs of all current residents in the Bayview. He said regarding the redevelopment areas, the decision was made to leave those areas out of the plan given that there were concurrent long-range transportation plan efforts for those redevelopments. He said the SFMTA wanted to demonstrate to the community that the planning process was meant for the existing residents and not geared for improving the lives of people who would be moving into the Bayview neighborhood. Lastly, he said that the boundaries were not locked in and could be changed depending on the needs of the Bayview community.

Chris Waddling agreed that the SFMTA's process appeared to focus on the current needs of Bayview residents. He noted that the scope of the transportation plan incorrectly stated that the Bayview did not have any regional transit stops. He said that regional transit options and access were important to the transportation plan and that the SFMTA should work towards educating residents about regional transportation issues.

Chair Larson noted that the Transportation Authority Chair had requested a presentation on coordinating the traffic mitigation for several major projects citywide such as on 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Lombard that would have concurrent construction schedules. He noted that street resurfacing impacts were more minor; however, he asked if the City had considered cumulative impacts during construction for the resurfacing projects.

Ms. LaForte said that an update would be provided at the April 24, 2018 Transportation Authority Board meeting and would focus on arterial based capital projects like 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Van Ness Avenue.

Rachel Alonso, Transportation Finance Analyst at San Francisco Public Works (SFPW), said that the SFPW's routinely considered construction conflicts and ways to mitigate them.

Chair Larson said that it might be interesting to display an overlay of the different projects, including the street resurfacing projects, since people look to take neighborhood streets to avoid streets that are being resurfaced.

Ms. Alonso said that SFPW could produce such a map if requested.

During public comment Ed Mason asked why new curbs and sidewalks along 24<sup>th</sup> Street had hairline cracks. He suggested that program managers review the quality of the concrete being used and the quality of the work, noting this was not the first time he had reported on this issue to the CAC.

Chris Waddling moved to approve the item, seconded by Brian Larkin.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Alavi, Hijazi, Larkin, Larson, Sachs and Waddling (7)

Absent: CAC Members Hogue, Tannen and Wells-Mongiovi (3)

**11. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Route 66 Quintara Connectivity Study [NTIP Planning] Final Report – ACTION**

Jessica Garcia, Transit Planner at the SFMTA, presented the item.

Peter Sachs stated that he had discussed 66 Quintara and 48 Quintara/24<sup>th</sup> Street bus routes with Commissioner Tang for years and that the new report did not reveal anything that was not already

reported. He said that Muni had received funding to purchase additional buses but that there was still no action to extend the 48 Quintara/24<sup>th</sup> Street bus route. He said the report offered good data and did a good job of visualizing the needs and gaps but did not provide any new information. He said because of the long stretch of the 48 Quintara/24<sup>th</sup> Street bus route, when heading outbound, there were service gaps by the time the bus arrived in West Portal and any plan to extend the 48 Quintara/24<sup>th</sup> Street bus route service would need to include substantive measures to recover service.

Ms. Garcia said the SFMTA was doing observations at West Portal and would make sure to pass along those comments regarding the 48 Quintara/24<sup>th</sup> Street bus route.

During public comment, David Pilpel stated that when the 48 Quintara/24<sup>th</sup> Street bus route was first restructured in 1980 it only went to West Portal but a few years later was extended to Ocean beach. He said Commissioner Tang was concerned that the 66 Quintara did not provide sufficient connections to West Portal and wanted the SFMTA to investigate the matter. He agreed with the final report and recommendations for the 66 Quintara to go to West Portal and said the route should be looked at again in the future if circumstances change and the cost to fix the 48 Quintara/24<sup>th</sup> Street route during the weekday gap is relatively low. He noted that the plan to fix the weekday gap for the 48 Quintara/24<sup>th</sup> Street bus route was included in the service equity report that was recently approved by the SFMTA Board.

Mr. Pilpel said that Commissioner Tang was concerned with 6:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m. service on the 48 Quintara/24<sup>th</sup> Street bus route and understood that the SFMTA would be looking carefully at trip data to see if it made sense to make changes. He encouraged the CAC to adopt a motion of support for the final report.

Jackie Sachs recommended that the CAC oppose the final report.

Peter Sachs moved to approve the item, seconded by Hala Hijazi.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Alavi, Hijazi, Larkin, Larson, Sachs and Waddling (7)

Absent: CAC Members Hogue, Tannen and Wells-Mongiovi (3)

**12. Adopt a Motion of Support Authorizing the Executive Director to Enter Into an up to \$140 Million Revolving Credit Agreement with State Street Public Lending Corporation and U.S. Bank National Association – ACTION**

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

Peter Sachs asked why figures were redacted in the attachment.

Ms. Fong said that those figures were purposely redacted because the terms had not been set and noted that during the still underway negotiations, the terms had been lowered. She said that a comparison of cost was available on attachment one of the item.

There was no public comment.

Myla Ablog moved to approve the item, seconded by Brian Larkin.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Alavi, Hijazi, Larkin, Larson, Sachs and Waddling (7)

Absent: CAC Members Hogue, Tannen and Wells-Mongiovi (3)

**13. Adopt a Motion of Support for Amendment of the Adopted Fiscal Year 2017/18 – ACTION**

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

Chair Larson observed that there were many different types of revenues sources listed under the congestion management agency function and that they represented the second highest level of revenues only after the sales tax program. He thanked Ms. Fong for her presentation.

Brian Larkin asked if there was any potential for the Transportation Authority to get funds directly from Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) program.

Ms. LaForte stated the TIFIA program funds were awarded on a project by project basis and that it was a federal credit line that required a method of repayment.

Brian Larkin noted the low interest rates from the TIFIA program was impressive.

Kian Alavi asked if the Transportation Authority had a plan to counteract the upward trajectory of interest rates affecting financing costs.

Ms. Fong said the Transportation Authority had been following a gradual payment schedule on its short-term financing when rates were very low. Now that rates are higher, Ms. Fong said the Transportation Authority was making payments earlier, with the most recent payment made in March 2018. She said that the plan was to make the next payment in May 2018 and a final payment in July 2018, provided sufficient cash was available. Ms. Fong said she thought this was likely since the bond proceeds were allowing the Transportation Authority to meet a significant portion of the cash needs of the Prop K capital program, freeing up sales tax revenues. She said there would be a cost to maintain the availability of interim financing, but would be much smaller compared to having outstanding debt.

There was no public comment.

Hala Hijazi moved to approve the item, seconded by Chris Waddling.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Alavi, Hijazi, Larkin, Larson, Sachs and Waddling (7)

Absent: CAC Members Hogue, Tannen and Wells-Mongiovi (3)

**14. Adopt a Motion of Support for the 2019 Prop K Strategic Plan Update and 5-Year Prioritized Programs of Projects – ACTION**

Mike Pickford, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Larson informed the CAC that if they want additional information as the update process advances, a special meeting or workshop can be scheduled, if requested. He also noted that this topic would be a recurring item on the CAC agenda.

Chris Waddling requested that the CAC be provided a yearly update from the directors of each agency that received funding through the Transportation Authority.

Hala Hijazi asked for clarification on identifying lead agencies for 5YPPs.

Mr. Pickford said that for the Prop K update, the Transportation Authority would rely on sponsor agencies to propose which projects they wanted funded. For categories with multiple eligible sponsors, Mr. Pickford explained that the lead agency coordinates among the different agencies.

Ms. LaForte added that staff was asking the CAC to approve the overall approach to the Strategic

Plan and 5YPP update and the proposed lead agencies. She said the lead agencies, identified in Attachment 1 were the same lead agencies from the 2014 Prop K Strategic Plan update and noted that Transportation Authority staff had worked with the technical working group and sponsors to review the proposed approach and lead agencies and no concerns had been raised.

Chris Waddling asked what percentage of the transit funding was allocated to BART and the SFMTA for transit.

Ms. LaForte stated that BART received a minimal amount of funds compared to the SFMTA.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, added that the distribution of funds between the various transit operators was based on funding shortfalls in the regional transportation plan at the time and BART had had a very minimal capital funding shortfall at that time.

Chair Larson asked if the baseline included an analysis of leveraging assumptions and whether the assumptions were accurate.

Ms. LaForte said that the leveraging analysis would be seen in the funding plans for the major capital projects that would be part of the Strategic Plan baseline and in the 5YPP documents for the programmatic categories.

Kian Alavi asked if the Transportation Authority was responsible for the outreach to the public and he asked how the Transportation Authority would be able to connect with the public and allow them to voice any potential concerns, etc.

Ms. LaForte referenced the preliminary outreach approach strategy described in Attachment 3 of the memorandum, which identified key groups, community-based organizations and stakeholders. She said that staff was working to execute a contract with its on-call outreach consultants to provide translation services in Spanish, Chinese and Tagalog, at a minimum. She said that staff was also considering conducting paper and electronic surveys and would ask the public how they would want to spend their Prop K dollars. Ms. LaForte continued by stating that staff was also exploring providing community-based organizations in communities of concern surveys which would later be collected by the Transportation Authority. She said that input would be shared with the Prop K project sponsor agencies and that the Transportation Authority would work with project sponsors to ensure that the public's feedback was incorporated into the 5YPPs, as appropriate.

Chair Larson said that it might be difficult to fully educate the public, given the complexities of the effort.

Mr. Pickford said that any outreach strategy would include an educational component and that the public would have the opportunity to state how they wanted their Prop K funds spent over the next five-years.

Hala Hijazi asked if outreach was being conducted with city stakeholders.

Mr. Pickford said that the Transportation Authority was open to visiting all agencies and interested organizations. He said that the outreach approach specifically called out organizations representing communities of concern.

Ms. Hijazi asked how the list of organizations was constructed.

Ms. LaForte said that having a specific strategy to reach communities of concern was essential, that the outreach attachment also had a list of other key stakeholders, and that staff would be happy to provide presentations to other interested parties.

Hala Hijazi suggested that other city stakeholders, such as SPUR, BOMA and other representatives

of the business community, be reached out to ensure an inclusive list that covers all 11 districts.

During public comment, Ed Mason asked how the Prop K category for tree planting and maintenance would respond to Prop E, which shifted responsibility for tree maintenance to the City from property owners. He said that the City never disclosed the full cost of street trees and asked why trees were part of Prop K which was for transportation.

David Pilpel, said he was a former member of the Prop K Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee and said that it was important for the public to be able to provide input on fund programming and that it could be made “real” for the public by explaining how a project like fleet replacement was planned and funded with Prop K help. He suggested reaching out to former members of the Props B and K Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee, the SFTMA CAC, the Transportation Task Force 2045 and ConnectSF for input. Mr. Pilpel also suggested asking other agencies who they reach out to for input.

Jackie Sachs said that she helped write Prop B and helped pass Prop K. She said that she had been involved with the prior 5YPPs. Ms. Sachs said that the Geary light rail project was carried over from Prop B but still said that no money and that the public wants light rail on Geary, not bus rapid transit.

Michael McDougal said that the private sector had become much more involved in transportation since Prop K was passed. He encouraged the Prop K update to account for the reality of this private sector activity such as thinking about drop off as part of BART station access.

Chris Waddling moved to approve the item, seconded by Peter Sachs.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Alavi, Hijazi, Larkin, Larson, Sachs and Waddling (7)

Absent: CAC Members Hogue, Tannen and Wells-Mongiovi (3)

**Chair Larson called Item 15 and 16 together.**

**15. Adopt a Motion of Support Authorizing the Executive Director to Execute Cooperative Agreement No. 04-2647 with the California Department of Transportation for the US101/I-280 Managed Lanes in a Total Amount Not to Exceed \$227,000 and Negotiate Agreement Payment Terms and Non-Material Agreement Terms and Conditions – ACTION**

Anna Harvey, Senior Engineer, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

**16. San Francisco Freeway Corridor Management System Study Update – INFORMATION**

Andrew Heidel, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chris Waddling stated that Districts 6, 9, 10 and 11 bore a huge brunt of the emissions released on the freeways and said that communities that live around the freeways had been significantly impacted by air related diseases. He appreciated the increased person throughput that managed lanes could achieve but encouraged staff to focus on fewer cars and greater effort towards a regional transit system along the freeways.

Peter Sachs said that except for the proposed northbound shoulder lane by 5<sup>th</sup> Street and King Avenue, capacity was not being increased nor was demand being decreased. He said cars were just being rearranged on where they would be on the road and he did not understand why there would be increased delay. He also noted that the high number of HOV stickers that have been given to low-emission vehicles and stated that an express lane would essentially cater to those vehicles.

Mr. Heidel said the increased delay that was presented for each scenario was to the non-carpool

or express lane users and that the carpool or express lanes in all scenarios had free flow conditions which provided incentive in the model for travelers to form carpools or choose transit. He said the model showed some mode shift and more details would be brought back at a future meeting.

Peter Sachs said if there was a mode shift it would be more consistent in both southbound models where there was more of a continuance lane.

Mr. Heidel said some of the traffic flow had to do with the directionality of how vehicles were traveling. He said regarding HOV decals, the law that supports the decals required that vehicles with decals be given access to carpool lanes and for toll facilities, be offered a discounted toll. He said in HOV scenarios 2 or 3, the electric vehicles with stickers would be eligible to use the lanes at no cost, while in the express lane scenario there would be the option to require clean air vehicles to pay a discounted toll. He said other jurisdictions were looking at options to charge a partial toll for clean air vehicles.

Kian Alavi asked how the model considered Transportation Network Companies (TNCs) and if it accounted for the drivers who were not truly carpooling.

Mr. Heidel said there was no legal mechanism that would allow the carpool lanes to distinguish between TNC vehicles and carpool vehicles. He said that the study team would bring more detail on how different modes, including TNCs, are represented in the model in a future update.

During public comment Ed Mason asked if the study considered what the impact would be if Senate Bill 827 was passed and asked if the HOV decals helped the wealthy.

David Pilpel suggested that additional neighborhood organizations and advocacy groups be consulted to capture areas near freeway ramps along the entire corridor, and that Save Muni be added to the outreach list. With respect to the changes proposed near 5<sup>th</sup> and King, Mr. Pilpel noted that the intersection of 4<sup>th</sup> and King was likely to become much more complicated when the Central Subway comes on line. He strongly encouraged an operational analysis of this intersection.

Peter Sachs moved to approve the item, seconded by Kian Alavi.

Item 15 was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Alavi, Hijazi, Larkin, Larson, Sachs and Waddling (7)

Absent: CAC Members Hogue, Tannen and Wells-Mongiovi (3)

## **17. Major Capital Projects Update – Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit – INFORMATION**

Peter Gabancho, SFMTA Project Manager for the Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit project, presented the item.

Chair Larson asked how long the project had been known as the Van Ness Improvement Project.

Mr. Gabancho said that the project had been known as the Van Ness Improvement Project for the past three and a half years.

During public comment David Pilpel expressed his support for either retaining historic street lights or fabricating alternative poles to simulate the look of the historic lights. He asked for an update regarding the memorandum of understanding (MOU) to be signed by both the SFMTA and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to address the water and sewer issues that caused major project delays and asked if there were any schedule or cost implications.

Mr. Gabancho said that four of the historic street lights would be replicated in front of City Hall and the opera house. He said that both the SFMTA and SFPUC had signed the MOU late last



year. With respect to claims, Mr. Gabancho said the SFPUC was in the process of conducting a time impact analysis, but that the MOU did not govern how additional claims by the contractor would be handled by either agency.

**18. Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION**

Chris Waddling announced that phase one of the Alemany project, installing new bike lanes and new pedestrian access, received its first approval at the SFMTA Engineering Committee meeting and would be seeking final approval at the SFMTA Board meeting on April 17, 2018. He said he spoke with the project lead for the Industrial Street repaving project and was told that they did not fill-in medians because they wanted to encourage the community to create a project but did not engage with community. He said the result – a weed filled median – reflect poorly on San Francisco Public Works. Lastly, Mr. Waddling said he would be providing a Transportation Authority CAC update at the April 4, 2018 Bayview Community Advisory Committee meeting and encourage CAC members to do similar information sharing in their local districts.

Peters Sachs said that he was able to ride one of the new Muni trains, but that they only ran during non-peak hours despite having undergone testing by the SFMTA. He repeated his request from last month for a presentation from Director Reiskin of the SFMTA to brief CAC members on Muni Metro's operational reliability and performance issues.

Chair Larson asked if there was a formal way for the CAC to request agency leads to come and speak to the CAC.

Ms. La Forte offered to first have Transportation Authority staff reach out to the agencies and suggested that Chair Larson also mention the requests in the CAC chair's report at the next Transportation Authority Board meeting.

There was no public comment

**The CAC lost quorum at 8:20 p.m. during public comment on the Introduction of New Business (Item 18). The meeting was adjourned. Chair Larson continued the meeting as a workshop with any presentations or public comment not on the record.**

**19. Public Comment**

There was no public comment due to the loss of quorum.

**20. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:23 p.m.