



DRAFT MINUTES

PLANS AND PROGRAMS COMMITTEE

Tuesday, December 10, 2013

1. Roll Call

Chair Mar called the meeting to order at 10:42 a.m. The following members were:

Present at Roll Call: Commissioners Breed, Mar and Yee (3)

Absent at Roll Call: Commissioners Campos (entered during Item 4) and Kim (entered during Item 4) (2)

2. Approve the Minutes of the November 19, 2013 Meeting – ACTION

There was no public comment.

The minutes were approved without objection.

3. Citizens Advisory Committee Report – INFORMATION

Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Vice Chair Joseph Flanagan reported that Items 4, 5, and 6 from the agenda were considered by the CAC at its December 4 meeting. He reported that the CAC passed Item 4 for two of the three Prop K allocation requests. He stated that the CAC deferred action on the Department of Public Works street repair and cleaning equipment request pending additional information on the potential use of the electric vehicle charging stations by vehicles that were not used for street cleaning or repair, and whether this would offer cost sharing opportunities to reduce the cost to Prop K. He stated that the CAC passed Items 5 with a near unanimous vote, with one abstention, and that it passed Item 6 unanimously.

There was no public comment.

The item was approved, without objection.

4. Recommend Allocation of \$4,563,090 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, for Three 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.

Jonathan Rewers, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), presented on the agency's escalator maintenance plan and policies regarding canopies for outdoor escalators.

Chair Mar asked if the SFMTA was responsible for maintaining escalators at the 16th Street, 24th Street, Glen Park, and Balboa Park BART stations. Mr. Rewers responded that the Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) was responsible for maintenance of the outdoor escalators at those stations, with BART and SFMTA each responsible for the indoor escalators serving their respective boarding platforms. Chair Mar asked when BART last rehabilitated or replaced these escalators and if BART planned to replace these escalators in the future. Mr. Rewers responded the SFMTA would need to follow up with BART to acquire this information.

Commissioner Yee asked for clarification on the status of rehabilitation and replacement of the 11 escalators not included in the funding request for the Escalator Rehabilitation – Phase 2 project. Mr. Rewers responded that five escalators had been rehabilitated through Phase 1 of the project, and the remaining six escalators, located at the Embarcadero and West Portal stations, would be rehabilitated in Phase 3.

Commissioner Yee asked why the maintenance costs appeared to be high. Mr. Rewers stated the SFMTA's current \$1.5 million maintenance contract was for maintenance performed over a five-year period. He added that current maintenance costs were high due to the need to fabricate older components, and that the rehabilitation of escalators with modern components would result in reduced maintenance costs in the future.

Chair Mar requested more information on the Department of Public Work's (DPW's) funding request for electric vehicles. Simone Jacques, DPW, clarified that the agency was planning to replace large trucks with six smaller electric vehicles. Chair Mar asked for more information on the type of charging stations being procured. Ms. Jacques stated the type of charging station would be dependent on the type of vehicle the agency would purchase.

Commissioner Yee requested more information on the DPW's vehicle fleet. Ms. Jacques stated that DPW's fleet was comprised of approximately 920 vehicles. She added that four vehicles were flusher trucks, of which two or three did not meet current California Air Resources Board emission standards. She stated that 50% of the vehicles were heavy-duty vehicles, such as sweepers and construction trucks, and 20% were light-duty vehicles, such as sedans and trucks. Commissioner Yee asked how the Prop K procured electric vehicles would be used. Ms. Jacques stated that the vehicles would be used by graffiti inspectors for graffiti enforcement.

Tian Feng, BART Architect, presented on the BART Entrance Canopy/Escalator Enclosure Pilot.

Commissioner Breed commented that the area behind the canopy could be subjected to climbing and vandalism. Mr. Feng stated the curved design and glazing material of the canopy would discourage climbing. He added that BART would add vinyl sheets to the canopy and would peel off the sheets as needed, based on the level of graffiti.

Chair Mar asked which station escalators BART was responsible for maintaining. Mr. Rewers stated that the SFMTA was responsible for the exterior escalators at the Powell Street station, specifically the two escalators at Hallidie Plaza, and the escalators at the Van Ness, Church, and Castro stations. He stated that BART was responsible for the escalator maintenance at the other shared stations and at BART-only stations. Mr. Feng stated BART conducted an escalator overhaul program 15 years ago, but the program did not include all of BART's escalators.

Commissioner Breed asked which agency would be responsible for canopy installation and maintenance, and if the installation would occur simultaneously with the escalator rehabilitation. Mr. Feng stated that there was no formal agreement to install escalator canopies, but stated that in general exterior escalators at joint stations were the responsibility of BART and the SFMTA contributed 50% of the associated costs.

Commissioner Breed asked for clarification on whether the canopies in the BART presentation would be the type installed in San Francisco in the future. Mr. Rewers stated that the BART canopy was a pilot and the SFMTA would wait until the pilot was completed before deciding to install canopies at joint stations. Commissioner Breed asked when the pilot would be complete. Mr. Feng stated that the pilot canopy project would be constructed by December 2014, followed

by an evaluation period of up to one year. Commissioner Breed expressed dissatisfaction at the lack of a plan to protect San Francisco escalators in the near-term and stated that waiting two to three years to consider canopies was undesirable. She asked why the escalator rehabilitation and canopy installation was not occurring simultaneously. Mr. Rewers responded that the design of canopies would need to be vetted by the public and the San Francisco Arts Commission. Mr. Rewers stated that Phase 2 of the escalator rehabilitation program would be complete in winter of 2018, and coordination with the BART pilot and the Better Market Street project would be possible then. Commissioner Breed requested that the Transportation Authority Board resolution reflect the desire for the city to coordinate on the installation of canopies.

Commissioner Kim asked if canopies were the only element not yet completed as part of Phase 1 of the rehabilitation program. Mr. Rewers stated that canopies were not part of the scope of work for either Phase 1 or Phase 2, and the current project was only for the rehabilitation and replacement of escalators. Commissioner Kim asked if the SFMTA had reviewed data on escalator service life from other cities and whether canopies contributed to an extended service life. Mr. Rewers stated that the SFMTA could investigate and report back to the Plans and Programs Committee. Commissioner Kim commented that the canopies were included within the SFMTA's 20-year capital plan and asked for clarification on which stations would have canopies installed. Mr. Rewers responded that the SFMTA would likely consider canopy installation at joint SFMTA/BART stations before non-joint stations.

Commissioner Kim requested clarification on the amount of the funding request. Mr. Rewers stated that the \$3.7 million request was to match federal funds. Commissioner Kim asked if the \$30 million in the Mayor's 2030 Transportation Task Force recommendations would only be used for canopies. Mr. Rewers confirmed this was the case. Commissioner Kim asked if the \$30 million would only be for the four joint SFMTA/BART stations. Mr. Rewers stated the canopy cost per portal was estimated at \$2 million according to BART's presentation, and that the \$30 million [planned to be matched with BART funds] would be used for as many locations as possible.

Commissioner Kim asked for clarification regarding the current request and how it corresponded to Better Market Street implementation and the Mayor's Task Force recommendations. Mr. Rewers stated that the current allocation request was to replace or rehabilitate 17 escalators to maintain a state of good repair, and that installation of canopies would be an enhancement and was considered a separate project. He stated that the timing of the installation of the canopies was dependent on the funding strategy and availability of funds generated in support of the Mayor's Transportation Task Force recommendations.

Commissioner Kim asked for information on the impact of escalator canopies on long-term maintenance. Mr. Rewers stated that canopies were only an issue for exterior escalators, whereas rehabilitation of indoor escalators constituted most of the scope of the request, and these escalators were important for ensuring access to the station platforms. He stated that outdoor exposure did impact the maintenance of escalators, but the SFMTA had not analyzed the differential maintenance costs of outdoor escalators with and without canopies.

Commissioner Kim expressed reluctance to approve the current escalator allocation request without information regarding the maintenance cost benefits of canopies. Mr. Rewers stated the SFMTA's near-term strategy was to rehabilitate as many escalators to a state of good repair and acceptable safety standards as possible. He added that the \$20 million rehabilitation project would repair or replace 17 escalators, while a single canopy would cost up to \$2 million. He

added that canopies could provide benefits for passengers and for maintenance, but the scale of benefit was undetermined at this time.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, stated the escalators were installed in the 1970s and needed to be rehabilitated or replaced. She suggested that there needed to be a lead agency on the canopy issue, and lack thereof is likely contributing to lack of a clear policy position on canopies. She stated that the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority and Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) were in the process of evaluating the impacts of installing canopies, and that Transportation Authority staff could work with BART and the SFMTA in contacting these agencies for information.

Commissioner Yee commented that he believed canopies would be beneficial, and he supported the analysis of the different maintenance cost impacts between indoor and outdoor escalators.

Scott Broder, SFMTA, stated the service life of an escalator was 25 years and protecting machinery from outdoor elements would be beneficial for long-term maintenance. However, he stated that WMATA had in the recent past spent more than \$1 million per canopy, and BART's estimate was about \$2 million per canopy. Mr. Broder said this meant the cost of a canopy was more than the cost to rehabilitate an escalator. He stated that escalator maintenance over a 25 year period was about \$360,000, and pointed out that providing a canopy and no maintenance for an escalator would cost much more than maintaining an escalator without a canopy. He stated that canopies provided a variety of benefits to both passengers and maintenance personnel, but they would not be cost effective from a maintenance perspective alone. He added that KONE, the escalator manufacturer, charged the same amount for maintenance of an indoor escalator as for an outdoor escalator -- \$1,200 per month.

Commissioner Breed asked for clarification on the long-term maintenance and service life benefits of having a canopy to protect escalators from inclement weather. Mr. Broder stated canopies could help long-term maintenance, but canopies would not be cost effective. He stated that all rehabilitated escalators would be weatherized regardless of whether a canopy was attached and the canopies themselves would incur additional maintenance costs.

Mr. Feng stated that having canopies provided multiple benefits and was considered a best practice. He stated that canopies would improve the customer experience and reduce the escalator maintenance burden. He stated that BART would work with the SFMTA and other agencies on the canopy issue.

Commissioner Campos expressed the need to determine the benefit of having canopies. Commissioner Campos asked for clarification on the escalator maintenance plan. Mr. Rewers responded that there was a maintenance plan in the form of the maintenance contract with the manufacturer. He said that the contract exceeded the manufacturer recommended standards for maintenance. Commissioner Campos stated that a maintenance contract was different than a maintenance plan, and a plan was not limited to only a contract. Commissioner Campos asked whether there was a document outlining responsibilities and tasks for the SFMTA and BART staff regarding the contractor. Mr. Rewers stated that equipment manufacturers established the maintenance plan in specifications, and the maintenance contract followed the timeline and tasks in the plans. He added that the SFMTA could provide a detailed summary of the contract. Commissioner Campos commented that a summary of the maintenance contract would be helpful, but suggested that a maintenance plan should go beyond the contractual obligations. He

expressed surprise that the SFMTA's maintenance plan was specified by the manufacturer. Mr. Rewers responded that the SFMTA had conducted a test of the recently installed escalators when the maintenance contract was up for renewal. Mr. Broder added that SFMTA had standard operating procedures for internal staff in addition to the manufacturer specifications. He said that canopies were now required by state code when installing new escalators, and said the high cost of canopies could preclude replacement of escalators in some jurisdictions. Mr. Broder said canopies were not required for the scope of the current request since the replacement of the escalator occurred in the existing truss.

Commissioner Kim asked for clarification on the state requirement of canopies. Mr. Broder responded that the state issues construction permits for escalators and had responsibility for code enforcement. He added that the state now mandates canopy installation for any new outdoor escalators. Commissioner Kim asked why canopies were not required for the escalators in the SFMTA's Phase 1 project. Mr. Broder responded that those escalators had been repaired or rehabilitated and were not new escalators.

Commissioner Kim asked if the data showed that canopies extended the useful lives of escalators to warrant their high cost. Mr. Broder responded that canopies would not be cost effective. Mr. Rewers reiterated that the contractor bids for escalator maintenance showed the maintenance cost for both indoor and outdoor maintenance was the same. He added that the life cycle cost of installing and maintaining the canopies would need to be examined in comparison to the cost of escalator maintenance. Commissioner Kim stated that if canopies were not proven cost effective, she would rather use the \$30 million included within the Mayor's Task Force recommendations for escalator canopies along Market Street for implementation of the Pedestrian Strategy. She emphasized the need to examine the cost effectiveness of installing elevator canopies. She asked why the city needed to await the results of the BART canopy pilot when canopies were already in use in other cities. Mr. Rewers responded that the SFMTA would conduct research on practices at other transit agencies.

Commissioner Yee requested an analysis of the cost and benefits of canopies, including the maintenance needs of indoor versus outdoor escalators. Commissioner Yee added that the SFMTA should examine the safety benefits of canopies to customers during inclement weather.

Tilly Chang, Executive Director, stated that Transportation Authority staff would work with the SFMTA to examine the costs and benefits of canopies.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Breed moved to approve the item.

Chair Mar amended the motion to include a condition on the escalator rehabilitation project that the SFMTA would provide a maintenance, implementation, and funding plan. Commissioner Breed accepted the amendment.

The item was approved, without objection.

5. Recommend Adoption of the San Francisco Transportation Plan – ACTION

Chair Mar expressed appreciation for the open, transparent process used to develop the SFTP.

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

Commissioner Kim asked how the SFTP compares to the Mayor's 2030 Transportation Task Force Expenditure Plan. She also expressed appreciation for the equity lens applied to the SFTP,

and concurred with the need for funding neighborhood safety projects. She added that the SFTP drives home how important local funding sources were. She also stated that she was glad to see a Strategic Vision for SOMA as a potential implementation step, noting that safety in SOMA was a top priority. Ms. Hiatt responded that the SFTP's revenue analysis identified the same primary new local revenue sources that the Task Force did, and that the investment plans were broadly consistent, though the SFTP covers a longer time period.

Chair Mar stated that having a transparent process was important, and that reaching out to communities of concern and ensuring equity was key.

During public comment, Jackie Sachs stated that when it comes time to renew the Prop K Expenditure Plan, the Transportation Authority Board should prioritize those projects that were identified in Prop B and Prop K but had not yet been completed. She cited light rail on Geary Boulevard as an example.

The item was approved, without objection.

6. Recommend Approval of the 2013 San Francisco Congestion Management Program – ACTION

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

There was no public comment.

The item was approved, without objection.

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

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

There was no public comment.

8. Major Capital Projects Update – Presidio Parkway – INFORMATION

Due to time constraints, Item 8 was deferred until next meeting.

9. Update on Proposed Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program – INFORMATION

Due to time constraints, Item 9 was deferred until next meeting.

10. Introduction of New Items – INFORMATION

Commissioner Breed stated that a few months ago, she had asked staff to explore the opportunity for funding for Kezar Drive. She noted that no department had made a funding request. She said that the project area was under San Francisco Recreation and Park property. She noted that it was a road that was in real need of a lot of work and funding, both short- and long-term. She said she would track this matter closely in the future.

There was no public comment.

11. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:35 p.m.