



# DRAFT MINUTES

## CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

December 4, 2013 MEETING

### 1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Glenn Davis at 6:06 p.m. CAC members present were Glenn Davis (Chair), Joseph Flanagan (Vice Chair), Myla Ablog, Brian Larkin, Angela Minkin, Eric Rutledge, Jacqueline Sachs, Christopher Waddling and Wells Whitney. Transportation Authority staff members present were Courtney Aguirre, Colin Dentel-Post, Cynthia Fong, Chester Fung, Rachel Hiatt, Anna LaForté, Maria Lombardo, Chad Rathmann, and Lee Saage.

### 2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Davis reminded the CAC that Joseph Flanagan had been working with Transportation Authority staff, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA's) Multimodal Accessibility Advisory Committee, and others to schedule a forum for people with disabilities and seniors to voice their mobility issues. He stated that topics covered at the forum could include difficulties riding Muni and paratransit, as well as the need to consider challenges of the disabled/seniors in the prioritization, planning, and design of capital projects. He stated that the forum could be scheduled for as early as January 2014. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, confirmed that Transportation Authority staff would keep CAC members apprised of the meeting date, location, and agenda.

Chair Davis announced the appointment of Eric Rutledge, a resident of District 7, to the CAC and welcomed Mr. Rutledge to his first CAC meeting. Mr. Rutledge introduced himself to the CAC and explained that he was interested in bringing his education in environmental studies and experience in land use development and conservation to the CAC.

Chair Davis reminded the CAC that Transportation Authority staff were still working with Prop K sponsors to finalize prioritization criteria for the 2013 Prop K 5-Year Prioritization Program updates. Ms. Lombardo explained that this information would be touched upon during Item 9 on the San Francisco Transportation Plan, which included the Early Action Program. She stated that staff were still working with Prop K sponsors, in particular SFMTA, to ensure that project prioritization criteria were clearly defined and applied to the proposed projects. She stated that staff would return to the CAC in January 2014 with an update. Ms. Lombardo concluded by stating that projects that addressed safety and strong community support would be ranked very highly based on input from the CAC.

Chair Davis reminded the CAC that elections for the CAC's chair and vice-chair would occur in January 2014.

Jackie Sachs reported that she had provided public comment at the November Plans and Programs Committee, Finance Committee, and Transportation Authority Board meetings. She stated that she emphasized the need to assess the status of projects in the Prop K Expenditure Plan (e.g. Geary Light Rail) and its predecessor, Prop B, and the level of investment and work

still needed to complete these commitments prior to committing to fund and implement new projects. She also expressed her opposition to the Transit Effectiveness Project and service cuts.

### **Consent Calendar**

Chair Davis requested that Item 6 be removed from the Consent Calendar for discussion.

- 3. Approve the Minutes of the October 23, 2013 Meeting – ACTION**
- 4. Citizens Advisory Committee Appointment – INFORMATION**
- 5. Adopt a Motion of Support for Acceptance of the Audit Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2013 – ACTION**

**Wells Whitney moved to approve the Consent Calendar and Brian Larkin seconded the motion.**

There was no public comment.

**Items 3 and 5 passed unanimously.**

### **End of Consent Calendar**

#### **6. Major Capital Projects Update – Presidio Parkway – INFORMATION**

Lee Saage, Deputy Director for Capital Projects, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Brian Larkin asked if GLC is the contractor and if the delays the project has experienced have been caused by the owner or the contractor. Mr. Saage responded that GLC is the public private partnership (P3) contractor and that it has a sub-contract with Flatiron-Kiewit Joint Venture to do construction. He clarified that the construction delays experienced so far are the subject of potential claims and that the sponsors' position at this point is that delays are the responsibility of the contractor.

Mr. Larkin asked about the challenges of working with the Presidio Trust. Mr. Saage responded that the Presidio Trust is the land owner and the project is building public infrastructure without control of the right of way. He stated that the Presidio Trust has issued permits for right of entry, but that permit procedures are not set up to accommodate a project of this size. Mr. Saage noted that the project is funding consultants to the Presidio Trust to help with the Presidio's design review and permitting processes.

Jackie Sachs asked if the Presidio Trust is funding the project. Mr. Saage stated that the Presidio Trust is not providing any funds for the project.

#### **7. Approve the 2014 CAC Meeting Schedule – ACTION**

Wells Whitney commented that he would be unable to attend the March 2014 meeting, but that the other meeting dates looked fine.

Jackie Sachs stated that the schedule should not conflict with any Jewish holidays.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, commented that the schedule could be amended at a later date if a conflict was identified.

**Mr. Whitney moved to approve this item and Brian Larkin seconded the motion.**

There was no public comment.

**The item passed unanimously.**

8. **Adopt a Motion of Support for the Allocation of \$863,090 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, for Two Requests, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules and Amendment of the Relevant 5-Year Prioritization Programs– ACTION**

Courtney Aguirre, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Wells Whitney asked if the total cost of the Bartlett Streetscape Improvement project was \$1.8 million. Ms. Aguirre stated the cost only included construction costs and that the total project cost was \$2.2 million with Prop K leveraging Prop B Streets Bond funds and city general funds.

Chair Davis stated he was concerned about the high cost for the Department of Public Works (DPW) to procure a new flusher truck and six new electric vehicles for the street cleaning program. Rachel Alonso, DPW, stated the cost included vehicle chargers for the electric vehicles and that more than half of the request would be used to procure a flusher truck. She also noted that DPW was focused on reducing fuel consumption and carbon emissions of its fleet.

Chair Davis asked which funding sources DPW had used to purchase electric vehicles in the past. Ms. Alonso stated that DPW had not purchased electric vehicles in the past, and added there were economies of scale in purchasing six electric vehicles with chargers. Chair Davis asked if the electric vehicles could be used beyond the Bartlett Streetscape Improvement project. Ms. Alonso clarified the electric vehicles would serve the entire city. Chair Davis stated he would not be willing to support the allocation request.

Mr. Whitney stated that future acquisitions of electric vehicles would be less costly because DPW would already have the charging stations.

Angie Minkin asked if other city departments would have access to the chargers. Ms. Alonso responded that currently other departments were able to use DPW's fueling stations. Ms. Minkin suggested that other departments could share the cost of the charging stations if they would be using the infrastructure, which would reduce the cost to Prop K.

Jackie Sachs asked if DPW had previously submitted allocation requests for vehicle procurement. Ms. Alonso confirmed that DPW had requested funds for vehicle equipment in the past, but that this was the first request for electric vehicles. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, stated that the funds were requested from the Street Repair and Cleaning Equipment category. She stated if the charging station would be used by vehicles other for than street cleaning and repair, Transportation Authority staff could look into a cost sharing arrangement.

Chair Davis asked what public outreach had been conducted to residents regarding the loss of 34 parking spaces on Bartlett due to the streetscape project. John Dennis, DPW Project Manager, stated that at least six community meetings had been held regarding the project and outreach had also been conducted with several neighborhood groups including the Liberty Hill Neighborhood Association. Mr. Dennis stated that there was consensus in support for the project even with the loss of parking since the community understood the public parking garage adjacent to the project had capacity to mitigate the parking impacts. He added that DPW had made changes to the design to accommodate more parking spaces. Chair Davis stated he was concerned that residents would need to pay for parking in the garage due to the loss of spaces on Bartlett which were used after metered hours by local residents.

**Angie Minkin moved to defer action on the street repair and cleaning equipment request pending information on the potential use of the charging stations by vehicles and the potential for cost sharing arrangements that may reduce Prop K costs, and**

**Chair Davis seconded the motion.**

During public comment, Edward Mason expressed the need for enforcement of double parking because of cueing for valet service on Mission Street that impacted transit vehicles.

**The item passed with seven votes in favor, with Eric Rutledge abstaining and Wells Whitney opposed.**

**Ms. Minkin moved to approve the Bartlett Streetscape Improvement project and Chair Davis seconded the motion.**

There was no public comment.

**The item passed with eight votes in favor, with Eric Rutledge abstaining.**

**9. Adopt a Motion of Support for Adoption of the San Francisco Transportation Plan – ACTION**

Rachel Hiatt, Principal Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Wells Whitney asked whether approval of the San Francisco Transportation Plan (SFTP) meant that the specific methods to raise revenue were also being endorsed. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, clarified that the SFTP did not recommend specific new revenue sources, but rather identified potential sources, and that the Mayor's 2030 Transportation Task Force had identified three new local revenue recommendations for potential consideration on the 2014 and 2016 ballots.

Jackie Sachs asked whether adoption of the SFTP would influence any extensions of Prop K. Ms. Lombardo responded that the SFTP identified the need for new revenues, but did not match or recommend specific revenue sources with specific uses. She also clarified that a new expenditure plan for Prop K could not be put into place until 2023. Ms. Sachs asked what the next steps would be should the Task Force recommendations not be approved by voters. Ms. Lombardo responded that like any effort to secure new revenues, if it didn't pass, we could regroup and try again, but that the need for new revenues was established in the technical work and would not go away.

Angie Minkin asked how the SFTP treated neighborhood planning needs, and how neighborhood plans could be updated, mentioning specifically the Mission-Geneva Neighborhood Transportation Plan. Ms. Hiatt responded that the SFTP identified that neighborhood planning was an ongoing need, and recommended that funds continue to be set aside to support neighborhood planning. She stated that the first priority was to implement existing plans, then communities could work with their supervisors or with San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) or other agencies on updating plans.

**Mr. Whitney moved to approve the item and Chris Waddling seconded the motion.**

There was no public comment.

**The item passed with eight votes in favor, with Eric Rutledge abstaining.**

**10. Adopt a Motion of Support for Approval of the 2013 San Francisco Congestion Management Program – ACTION**

Colin Dentel-Post, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Wells Whitney asked whether there was a regional working group regarding congestion management, and whether the issue was addressed county by county or at the regional level by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), citing the importance of regional

involvement in congestion management. Mr. Dentel-Post responded that each county prepared its Congestion Management Program (CMP) in coordination with MTC, which ensured consistency of county CMP updates with the Regional Transportation Plan and land use plans.

Eric Rutledge asked whether implementation of the Clipper card had affected bus delays at stops. Mr. Dentel-Post said that the transit analysis two years ago did not break out delays at stops, but that adding this detail would provide a benchmark for future comparisons.

Christopher Waddling noted that the implementation of all-door boarding would be expected to also reduce delays at stops. He asked how the boundaries were determined for congestion pricing and how that would affect residents along the boundaries. Mr. Dentel-Post clarified that the boundaries were identified in the Transportation Authority's previous Mobility, Access, and Pricing Study (MAPS), and that the CMP did not propose congestion pricing but rather synthesized MAPS and other work. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, noted that the purpose of the MAPS study was to address downtown congestion, and that staff could provide a background presentation on congestion pricing work at a future meeting, a topic which would be timely given the SFTP's findings that pricing was a very effective way to manage congestion and that the SFTP found we couldn't reach our goals without coupling pricing.

Brian Larkin asked in the presentation on the item could be posted to the website. Mr. Dentel-Post responded that it would be.

During public comment, Paul Liao asked what the status was of the pilot congestion pricing proposal considered in the 2010 MAPS report. Mr. Dentel-Post responded that the Transportation Authority was not currently working to implement a pilot project concept considered in the MAPS report, but had considered other potential means to manage congestion, including parking pricing in the ongoing Parking Pricing and Regulation Study. Ms. Lombardo added that congestion pricing for Treasure Island was moving forward as part of plans for development on the island.

Ed Mason asked whether the economic cost of transit delays had been quantified as the Texas Transportation Institute has done for auto congestion, and what the cost differential was for people riding transit as opposed to driving. Mr. Dentel-Post responded that the CMP analysis quantified travel times, focusing on the rider experience, but had not monetized them. He added that the SFTP did evaluate both auto and transit travel times as they related to economic competitiveness, recognizing that transit delays did have an economic impact.

Roland Lebrun said that pricing parking may force drivers onto transit, which was already crowded, and that staff should consider the London cordon model, which priced road space only during the day and thereby encouraged drivers to shift trips outside the peak periods. He said that parking pricing would not have the same effect.

**Wells Whitney moved to approve the item and Brian Larkin seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

- 11. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Award of an 18-Month Consultant Contract to Tyler Technologies, Inc., in an Amount Not to Exceed \$415,000, for Implementation, Licensing, Support and Maintenance Services for Microsoft Dynamics AX 2012, and for Authorizing the Executive Director to Negotiate Non-Material Contract Terms and Conditions – ACTION**

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

Wells Whitney asked if the contract included hardware costs. Ms. Fong stated the costs only included consultant and software licensing costs, and any additional hardware costs would come from the Transportation Authority's equipment budget.

Angie Minkin asked if other city departments used the same software. Ms. Fong stated the Transportation Authority and other city departments were currently using the same financial software (FAMIS), and that the City and County of San Francisco was in the process of replacing its software in the next year. She added the City and County of San Francisco was considering updating to the same software as the Transportation Authority.

**Jackie Sachs moved to approve the item and Ms. Minkin seconded the motion.**

There was no public comment.

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**12. Geary Corridor Bus Rapid Transit Project Update on Staff-Recommended Alternative – INFORMATION**

Chester Fung, Principal Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Brian Larkin asked about the proportion of the 30% travel time savings estimated for the Richmond segment of the corridor that could be attributed to each component of the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) features. Mr. Fung replied that the analysis compared the staff-recommended alternative to a no-project scenario which included almost all of the bus improvements except for the bus lane, so that the bus lane represented the bulk of the 30% travel time savings. Member Larkin asked whether the system would add capacity to avoid overcrowding. Mr. Fung replied that the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) had conducted an operational cost analysis and found that the reduced travel times saved on operational costs that could be reinvested in the form of more bus service, so the capacity of the line was expected to increase.

Jackie Sachs noted that the previous Geary Transit Task Force had found that, at Masonic, it was feasible to implement bus lanes and a bus stop in the tunnel. She added that side bus lanes were not rail-ready because rail would not go from center to side and back, and that it was important to fulfill previous plans for rail in the corridor. Mr. Fung replied that at Masonic the side bus lanes were recommended not because center lanes were infeasible, but because the user experience would be better with side lanes and a surface stop. He noted that the previous Geary reports recommended that both options, light rail and bus, be studied further. He added that one advantage of BRT was its flexibility, enabling side bus lanes that were not a large investment that would be wasted if a future rail project materialized, and that side bus lanes did not preclude future rail.

Myla Ablog asked whether the outreach would be done for Geary residents as well as merchants. Mr. Fung replied that the project team was providing notification targeting residents too, including ads at transit shelters, ads in neighborhood papers, and flyers distributed and posted at public places. He added that the project team was reaching out to neighborhood groups directly as well. He asked that CAC members contact him with any suggested groups to which to present.

Christopher Waddling noted a need to consistently discuss light rail readiness in the presentation of the information. Mr. Fung agreed. Mr. Waddling, citing the Third Street Light Rail project as one where merchants were affected, inquired about whether merchants would be compensated for disruption during construction. Mr. Fung replied that the project team had looked to other projects in San Francisco and beyond for practices that address construction

disruption, and that he did not know of any compensation provided to merchants. He added that the Geary BRT project would create less disruption to merchants than the Third Street project because the work was more akin to street re-surfacing rather than tunneling or light rail, and that access to sidewalks and travel lanes would be maintained at all times. He noted that in other projects, many found that the most important way to support businesses during construction was to provide very strong signage indicating that businesses were open during construction, and that the team would recommend that strategy and other ways to minimize the disruption.

Eric Rutledge asked whether replacing lost parking was a requirement. Mr. Fung replied that disclosing parking impacts was required, but replacing parking was not. He added that even though not required to, the agencies were interested in working with the community to find ways to address parking impacts, including replacing some of the lost parking.

There was no public comment.

**13. Update on Proposed Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program – INFORMATION**

Chad Rathmann, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum. He noted that staff would return in January to focus on potential guidelines for the planning grants proposed as part of the Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program.

There was no public comment.

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

There was no new business.

**15. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**16. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:16 p.m.