



# DRAFT MINUTES

## CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, April 25, 2018

### 1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

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

CAC members present: Kian Alavi, Hala Hijazi, Becky Hogue, Brian Larkin, John Larson, Peter Tannen, Chris Waddling and Shannon Wells-Mongiovi (8)

CAC Members Absent: Myla Ablog and Peter Sachs (2)

Transportation Authority staff members present were Priyoti Ahmed, Michelle Beaulieu, Amber Crabbe, Colin Dentel-Post, Anna LaForte, Warren Logan, Maria Lombardo, Mike Pickford, Steve Rehn, and Aprile Smith.

### 2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Larson reported that on April 11, 2018 Commissioner Ronen's office along with staff from the Transportation Authority, SFMTA, San Francisco Public Works (SFPW), San Francisco Bike Coalition and District 9 (Kian Alavi) and 10 (Chris Waddling) Citizens Advisory Committee representatives, toured the "Hairball." He reported that the Railyard Alignment and I-280 Boulevard Study (RAB) was in its final stages and various meeting and workshops had been scheduled for late April and May. He said a briefing of the study findings would be presented to the Board in May. Chair Larson noted that new microphones had been installed to improve the sound quality of CAC meetings.

There was no public comment.

### Consent Agenda

#### 3. Approve the Minutes of the March 28, 2018 Meeting – ACTION

#### 4. Citizens Advisory Committee Appointment – INFORMATION

#### 5. State and Federal Legislation Update – INFORMATION

#### 6. Internal Accounting Report, Investment Report, and Debt Expenditure Report for the Nine Months Ending March 31, 2018 – INFORMATION

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

Chris Waddling moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Shannon Wells-Mongiovi.

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Alavi, Hijazi, Hogue, Larkin, Larson, Tannen, Waddling and Wells-Mongiovi (8)

Absent: CAC Member Myla Ablog and Peter Sachs (2)

### End of Consent Agenda

7. **Adopt a Motion of Support for San Francisco's Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 5 Program of Projects – ACTION**

Aprile Smith, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Shannon Wells Mongiovi asked if there was an option to change or adjust the requested allocations so that the second and third highest projects could also be funded despite the limited amount of Lifeline funds.

Amber Crabbe, Assistant Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, said that staff was able to identify additional Prop K and cost-savings from prior Lifeline projects so that the three top-ranked projects could all be funded.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi asked if there was any chance that the Prop K funding would be denied.

Ms. Crabbe said that the SFMTA was fully committed to the projects and that staff had worked with the SFMTA to incorporate the additional funding into the 2019 Prop K Strategic Plan Baseline, the subject of a separate item on the agenda.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi asked if the 30-minute wait time of the OWL bus routes could be shortened.

Tim Manglicmot, SFMTA Capital Finance, said that the 30-minute headways were a result of current available funding. He said he would check with operations to see if more service could be provided.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi asked if Muni had ever considered using on-demand scheduling during late-night hours.

Mr. Manglicmot said that a lot of what was recommended in the Lifeline program was based on the late-night transportation studies and said that the number of buses in service was dependent on available funding.

Ms. Crabbe said that the bus extension to Fisherman's Wharf was one of the recommendations from the late-night studies and was intended to serve the need for late-night bus service primarily for workers in the area.

Chris Waddling asked what was being done in terms of north to south bus service in the city and noted that many Fisherman's Wharf employees lived in the south side of the city. He asked if there was any schedule coordination between BART and Muni to ensure riders caught their transit during the 30-minute wait time windows.

Ms. Crabbe said she would have to follow up to be able to answer those questions and mentioned that the full late-night study would provide additional information.

Chair Larson commented on the conditions at BART stations and quality of life issues. He looked forward to BART continuing to fund projects, through their general fund, to keep the stations from getting worse.

Ms. Crabbe said BART was kicking off a six-month pilot of the elevator monitoring project which was funded equally between BART and the SFMTA. She mentioned that the pit stop program had sites throughout the city, and that San Francisco Public Works would have the opportunity to evaluate the sites and shift around locations if so desired.

There was no public comment.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi moved to approve the item, seconded by Kian Alavi.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Alavi, Hijazi, Hogue, Larkin, Larson, Tannen, Waddling and Wells-Mongiovi (8)

Absent: CAC Member Myla Ablog and Peter Sachs (2)

**8. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Allocation of \$2,530,880 in Prop K Sales Tax Funds for Three Requests and \$655,000 in Prop AA Vehicle Registration Fee Funds for One Request, with Conditions – ACTION**

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

Brian Larkin asked about possible strategies for back-filling Prop K funds proposed to be reprogrammed to the SFMTA's pending signal upgrade requests.

Mr. Pickford answered that staff would work with the SFMTA staff to re-prioritize Prop K funds programmed in future fiscal years. Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, added that some of the projects from which funds were re-programmed were delayed beyond Fiscal Year 2018/19, and that the SFMTA expected to deobligate several hundred thousand dollars in Prop K funds allocated to signal upgrades that were nearing completion.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi asked if one of the factors behind the high contract bids was the City's high living costs.

Ms. LaForte answered that living costs may have been part of the story, but that a confluence of factors was involved. For instance, there is so much construction work going on right now that many contractors are reaching their bonding ("insurance") limits, reducing the number of bidders and driving up costs.

Chris Waddling asked if consideration had been given to expanding the transportation demand management (TDM) business relocation program to include an education component.

Mr. Pickford replied that business relocation was not the City's only TDM program, and that education was an element of other TDM programs.

Chair Larson asked how the business relocation program would work in practice, e.g. would it include presentations to business leaders.

Mr. Manglicmot answered that the program would target new employers rather than those that were already established because new employers and their employees tended to be less familiar with transportation options and policies in San Francisco. He said the first phase of the program would research effective TDM strategies, the second phase would implement a pilot program, and the third phase would implement targeted strategies.

Chair Larson asked for the reason that the project schedule for TDM program branding was so long at 2.5 years.

Mr. Manglicmot said he would consult with the project manager and provide schedule details to the CAC.

Kian Alavi asked how the results of the business relocation program would be evaluated.

Mr. Manglicmot answered that development of an evaluation methodology was part of the scope of work for the first phase, and it would include a survey of the methodologies used by other cities. Ms. LaForte added that the staff recommendation included a condition to put the project's implementation funds on reserve, to be released following development of the

evaluation methodology. She added that staff would be happy to return to the CAC to present the methodology if the CAC is interested.

Kian Alavi asked if the business relocation program would involve incentives and whether new employees would get to provide input on what it would take to get them to take sustainable modes.

Mr. Manglicmot said it would depend on the research, but that incentives are typically pretty important.

In public comment Ed Mason suggested that a TDM program be implemented to encourage private shuttle bus passengers to use public transit, though he conceded that it is a tough sell to get people to switch from one seat rides where you are “on the clock” on the bus to a two seat ride on public transit.

Mr. McDougal questioned whether TDM branding was essential now, noting he would rather see more TDM programs in place before spending \$150,000 on branding.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Alavi, Hijazi, Hogue, Larkin, Larson, Tannen, Waddling, Wells-Mongiovi (8)

Absent: CAC Members Ablog and Sachs (2)

9. **Adopt a Motion of Support for the 2019 Prop K Strategic Plan Baseline – ACTION\***

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Brian Larkin asked if staff could provide him with a Caltrain staff contact who could answer detailed questions about the Positive Train Control project.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, answered affirmatively.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi asked if the Prop K Strategic Plan Baseline could be revised once adopted.

Ms. LaForte answered that the adoption of the Baseline would allow staff to work with eligible sponsors to develop the five-year programs of projects to be included in the 2019 Prop K Strategic Plan, which would be presented to the Board for adoption in Fall 2018 along with the 5-Year Prioritization Programs (5YPPs). Ms. LaForte continued to explain that the Board regularly approved amendments to individual 5YPPs to shift funds among programmed projects, but rarely amended the Strategic Plan itself, which impacted the finance costs of the overall program.

Brian Larkin commented that the flexibility of the Prop K program was a great advantage, contrasting this with the more burdensome process of amending the list of projects funded by the city’s Prop A General Obligation bond.

Chair Larkin asked for information on the 2019 Prop K Strategic Plan schedule.

Ms. LaForte replied that the public survey of transportation priorities would be closed in early June 2018; staff and eligible sponsors would draft proposed project lists for the 5YPPs during July and August; 5YPPs would be presented in two groups to the CAC and Board for approval in the October and November Board cycles; and the Strategic Plan would be presented for

adoption following or concurrent with adoption of the remaining 5YPPs.

In public comment, Jackie Sachs recommended that the CAC review copies of the Muni long- and short-term transit plans prior to consideration of the 2019 5YPPs.

Chair Larson asked staff to provide those documents to the CAC members.

Becky Hogue moved to approve the item, seconded by Chris Waddling.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Alavi, Hijazi, Hogue, Larkin, Larson, Tannen, Waddling, Wells-Mongiovi (11)

Absent: CAC Members Ablog and Sachs (2)

#### **10. Preliminary Fiscal Year 2018/2019 Annual Budget and Work Program – INFORMATION**

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

Becky Hogue asked if Yerba Buena Island and Treasure Island were losing funding.

Ms. Fong said that neither Yerba Buena Island nor Treasure Island were losing funding. She said the funding was in its final stages.

Peter Tannen asked if the CAC could receive a copy of the Transportation Authority's organizational chart.

Ms. Fong said that staff would send the CAC an organizational chart with pictures of each staff member.

Chair Larson asked for additional information on the Presidio Parkway settlement and asked if the recent allocation was for temporary landscaping.

Ms. LaForte said the Presidio Parkway settlement called for \$54 million to be given to the Presidio Trust to complete the landscaping for the project. She noted that it was an extensive amount of landscaping and soil commensurate with the project's scale and location in a national park. Ms. LaForte said that the \$54 million was comprised of \$37 from the State, \$15 million from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and \$2 million in Prop K funds.

Brian Larkin asked if a portion of the budget included legal costs for the Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and Presidio Parkway.

Cynthia Fong replied in the affirmative noting that the Presidio Parkway costs corresponded to the settlement that Ms. LaForte just described.

Mr. Larkin asked for more information on the Public Private Partnership study that Ms. Fong had mentioned in her presentation.

Ms. Lombardo explained that the Transportation Authority had contracted with a team led by the University of Maryland to evaluate the effectiveness of the more traditional design bid build project delivery method used for Phase 1 of the Presidio Parkway project with the Public Private Partnership approach employed for Phase 2. Ms. Lombardo said staff would be happy to present the results to the CAC when they are available, noting that using both project delivery methods on the same project offered a rather unique evaluation opportunity.

There was no public comment.

**11. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Vision Zero Ramp Intersection Study Phase 1 [NTIP Planning] Final Report – ACTION**

Priyoti Ahmed, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Larson said he was happy to see these types of projects. He said he had heard of an instance outside of San Francisco where a pedestrian had been struck and killed while using a continental crosswalk. The crosswalk was subsequently removed with an explanation that it had not met standards and they did not want to give a false sense of security. He asked if it was the City's practice to remove crosswalks.

Ms. Ahmed said was not aware of the city removing crosswalks and stated that recommendations from the study included additional crosswalks and accessibility improvements.

Chair Larson said that it was a priority in San Francisco and District 7 to support the Vision Zero initiative.

Peter Tannen commented that he traveled all over the county by bicycle and that the bicycle conditions in the study intersections were some of the scariest anywhere. He expressed his desired for quick implementation of improvements.

There was no public comment.

Chair Larson moved to approve the item, seconded by Hala Hijazi.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Alavi, Hijazi, Hogue, Larkin, Larson, Tannen, Waddling and Wells-Mongiovi (8)

Absent: CAC Member Myla Ablog and Peter Sachs (2)

**12. Update on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Association of Bay Area Governments Horizon Planning Effort – INFORMATION**

Michelle Beaulieu, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item staff memorandum.

Chris Waddling asked for clarification on the seventh white paper topic that discussed the evaluation of a second Bay Bridge crossing for vehicles and asked if there was any up front bias that might drive the results.

Ms. Beaulieu said that the analysis was requested by Senator Feinstein but that the parameters were still undefined.

Chris Waddling asked if all seven study areas would be evaluated equally.

Ms. Beaulieu said MTC staff indicated it would use the same guiding principles to evaluate each study area.

Ms. Lombardo clarified that MTC was leading the Horizon effort and that the Transportation Authority was limited in the information they were provided to date.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi suggested using QR codes instead of URL links in the presentations. She said the public could take photos of the QR codes to access the websites.

There was no public comment.

**13. Update on the Emerging Mobility Services and Technologies Report – INFORMATION**

Warren Logan, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item staff memorandum.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi asked if there was any plan to get companies to share their data.

Mr. Logan said that all companies except for ride-hailing companies gave some data to the SFMTA and that the process was getting better. He noted that Chariot was coordinating with the SFTMA to share data via API.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi asked for further information regarding the City's issues with scooter companies.

Mr. Logan said the SFMTA was in the process of creating a permit system.

Kian Alavi asked where the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) was on the issue and where the city was on taxing companies.

Mr. Logan referred to the seventh recommendation in the report to implement a permit fee and an impact fee to fund monitoring and regulation.

Kian Alavi said that Transportation Network Companies (TNCs) were taking riders off transit and were creating a two-tier system. He observed that the emerging mobility companies were creating equity issues as they wouldn't serve communities of concern any more than they had to, noting eight bike share docks in the Excelsior wasn't adequate to serve that neighborhood. Mr. Alavi said structures should be built to encourage these companies to provide services to underserved communities.

Mr. Logan noted that the bridge recommendation called for an equity study to better understand who was using the mobility services, the number of people, etc. He said the permit structure could be used to require companies to go into communities of concern before they could expand their services elsewhere.

Kian Alavi asked how scooters would impact Vision Zero.

Mr. Logan said that the safety evaluation would require a study.

In public comment Ed Mason said that legislation should require permits for any new service and that permitting was a way to catch up with new technology. He said he did not believe Byrd's announcements about how much emissions savings it was achieving and felt it was a public relations ploy.

Mr. McDougal hoped that the recommendations from the report could make it into the 2019 plan and perhaps the criteria could be used to evaluate projects in the 5YPPs.

After public comment Chris Waddling stated he had been keeping an eye on Jump bicycles and that fewer than eight bikes were typically in the Bayview neighborhood. About the same number were typically out of network and the vast majority of bikes were in wealthier neighborhoods. He noted the permit required 20% of the bicycles to be in communities of concern and he had asked SFMTA and Jump about this, but neither had responded. Mr. Waddling said that if permits were going to be used, they needed to be enforced.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi said the bike and scooter terms of service agreements stated that they could not be ridden on hills.

Ms. Lombardo replied in the affirmative,

Ms. Lombardo notified the CAC that Transportation Authority staff had reached out to the SFMTA per the CAC's request and that they would be notified when Director Reiskin would be able to present.

In public comment Jackie Sachs said that for years the MTC had had workshops throughout the

region and that the CAC should sponsor a workshop discussing the Horizon project.

**14. Public Comment**

In public comment Jackie Sachs said she was on the late-night working group and requested that the CAC receive an update, with time for public comment, and that the working group should seek input from veteran Muni bus drivers.

Ed Mason said that commuter buses on Castro Street were idling against rules and over the last 3 years there had been 2100 complaints and penalties over \$1 million. He hoped that planned SamTrans regional express bus service would take some of the shuttle traffic. He said the number of shuttles was growing significantly because the SFMTA did not cap the number of vehicles.

**15. Adjournment**

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