



# DRAFT MINUTES

## CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

January 22, 2014, Meeting

### 1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Glenn Davis at 6:03 p.m. CAC members present were Glenn Davis (Chair), Joseph Flanagan (Vice Chair), Brian Larkin, Angela Minkin, Eric Rutledge, Jacqueline Sachs, Peter Tannen, Christopher Waddling and Wells Whitney. Transportation Authority staff members present were Courtney Aguirre, Bill Bacon, Erika Cheng, Amber Crabbe, Chester Fung, Rachel Hiatt, Seon Joo Kim, Anna LaForte, Maria Lombardo, and Chad Rathmann.

### 2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Davis reminded CAC members to be mindful of the time as the meeting progressed and items were considered. He asked that CAC members keep their comments at or under 2 minutes. He stated that if a member was engaged in a substantive line of questioning, he/she would be permitted to continue so long as it was clear the discussion being had was helpful to the CAC's pending decision.

### 3. Election of Chair and Vice Chair – ACTION

Erika Cheng, Clerk, explained the election procedures.

Chair Glenn Davis opened the floor for nominations for the Chair seat. Angela Minkin nominated Chair Davis. Eric Rutledge seconded the nomination.

Chair Davis opened the floor for nominations for the Vice-Chair seat. Brian Larkin nominated Joseph Flanagan. Chair Davis seconded the nomination.

There was no public comment. The motions to elect Mr. Davis as Chair and Mr. Flanagan as Vice-Chair passed unanimously.

### Consent Calendar

Brian Larkin requested that Item 6 be removed from the Consent Calendar for discussion.

#### 4. Approve the Minutes of the December 4, 2013 Meeting – ACTION

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

#### 6. Adopt a Motion of Support for Authorizing the Executive Director to Execute a Memorandum of Agreement with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency for the Geary Corridor Bus Rapid Transit Project Environmental Review Phase, in an Amount Not to Exceed \$529,203, and to Modify the Non-Material Agreement Terms and Conditions – ACTION

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

Brian Larkin asked whether the project's current phase, planning, conceptual engineering, and environmental studies, would result in the project reaching 10% or 30% design. He added that he understood the project would reach 10% design and then be transferred over to San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) staff for final design.

Mr. Fung responded that the project's environmental review phase would result in the project being at 10-12% design and the capital cost estimate would be prepared based on this level of design. He stated that the project's next phase would include the completion of a conceptual engineering report that would take the project to 30% and then final design. He stated that the cost estimates produced at 10-12% design would be prepared using industry standard contingencies for this level of design. Mr. Fung confirmed that SFMTA would lead the project after the environmental review phase.

Mr. Larkin asked how much had been expended to-date on the Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project. Mr. Fung responded that thus far, approximately \$6.7 million had been budgeted through the environmental phase and that this included staff and consultant time. He stated that he would provide Mr. Larkin with a dollar amount associated with the earlier feasibility study.

Mr. Larkin asked for Transportation Authority staff to provide the name and contact information for the City Attorney's Office staff and SFMTA staff they had been working with on this project. Mr. Fung confirmed that he would provide Mr. Larkin with this information.

Jacqueline Sachs asked whether the Geary BRT project would be light-rail ready. She expressed concern that the proposed transitions from side to center bus-only lanes in the staff recommended alternative would not be able to accommodate future rail. She stated that earlier studies had identified light-rail for this corridor. She stated that Geary light rail was identified in Prop B and Prop K but had not been funded, and that light rail rather than BRT was needed on Geary. She stated that the Central Subway project included a spur at Union Square for Geary light rail service. She stated that Transportation Authority staff needed to consider taking advantage of a spur along the Central Subway route near Union Square for a connection with light-rail on the Geary corridor.

Mr. Fung confirmed that Transportation Authority staff had reviewed the earlier studies and that these studies had not recommended a particular alternative to move forward, but rather, a number of options, including bus rapid transit. He stated that the staff were exploring options for making the corridor light-rail ready with the design of BRT.

There was no public comment.

**Mr. Larkin moved to approve the item and Ms. Sachs seconded the motion.**

**The item passed unanimously.**

- 7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Authorize the Executive Director to Execute a Memorandum of Agreement with the Treasure Island Development Authority, in an Amount Not to Exceed \$200,000, for the**

**Fiscal Year 2013/14 Operating Budget and Work Plan to Implement the Treasure Island Transportation Implementation Plan, and to Negotiate the Agreement Payment Terms and Non-Material Agreement Terms and Conditions – ACTION**

8. **Adopt a Motion of Support for the Award of Three-Year Consultant Contracts, with an Option to Extend for Two Additional One-Year Periods, to Barbary Coast Consulting and Davis & Associates Communications, Inc. in a Combined Total Not to Exceed \$525,000 for On-Call Strategic Communications, Media, and Community Relations Professional Services and for Authorizing the Executive Director to Negotiate Contract Payment Terms and Non-Material Contract Terms and Conditions – ACTION**
9. **Adopt a Motion of Support for the Adoption of the Fiscal Year 2014/15 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Local Expenditure Criteria – ACTION**
10. **Internal Accounting Report and Investment Report for the Six Months Ending December 31, 2013 – INFORMATION**

Wells Whitney moved to approve Items 4, 7, 8, and 9 on the Consent Calendar and Jacqueline Sachs seconded the motion.

There was no public comment.

Items 4, 7, 8, and 9 passed unanimously.

**End of Consent Calendar**

11. **Adopt a Motion of Support for the Allocation of \$1,468,550 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, and \$392,450 in Prop AA Funds, with Conditions, for Four Requests, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules and Amendment of the Prop AA Strategic Plan and Relevant Prop K 5-Year Prioritization Programs – ACTION**

Seon Joo Kim, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Peter Tannen commented that the New Signal Contract 62 and Curb Ramps projects were not leveraging the amount of funds these types of projects were expected to leverage per the Prop K Expenditure Plan. Ms. Kim clarified that the leveraging reflected in the memorandum's attachment was only for the current project phase, and the Department of Public Works was actually leveraging other funding against Prop K funds for the Curb Ramps project in the earlier design phase. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, stated that the leveraging for the New Signal Contract 62 project was less than expected because there were generally limited funding sources for stand-alone signal projects.

There was no public comment.

**Wells Whitney moved to approve the item and Angela Minkin seconded the motion.**

**The item passed unanimously.**

12. **Adopt a Motion of Support for the Approval of the 2014 State and Federal Legislative Program – ACTION**

Amber Crabbe, Principal Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Wells Whitney asked how the Transportation Authority and San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) advocated for or against state and federal legislation. Ms. Crabbe responded that the Transportation Authority employed the services of a state lobbyist, Mark Watts, who works in Sacramento on legislative issues affecting transportation. She added that every month the Finance Committee agenda included a legislative update item.

Mr. Whitney commented that the information provided in the packet regarding the Transportation Authority's state and federal legislative program appeared to be general (i.e. in the form of principles, not specific bills or legislative initiatives) and inquired if the CAC would have an opportunity to review and analyze legislative details before the Board considered action on the item at its February 25 meeting. Ms. Crabbe stated that staff could include additional legislative detail in the CAC packet, but noted that state legislation was ever evolving and the legislative matrix presented to the Finance Committee would likely be out of date if presented to the CAC, which typically meets two weeks later. Mr. Wells clarified that he was interested in better understanding the Transportation Authority's legislative advocacy process. Ms. Crabbe stated the Transportation Authority worked with SFMTA staff, the Mayor's Office State Legislation Committee, and other city departments to develop its state and federal legislative program. She added the Transportation Authority also consulted legislative programs from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and other congestion management agencies and coordinated with them on legislative advocacy efforts.

Brian Larkin expressed interest in increasing the federal gas tax from 18.4 cents a gallon, and asked if Transportation Authority staff was working on this issue. He asked whether the CAC could help in some way. Ms. Crabbe stated the Transportation Authority coordinated federal advocacy with the Mayor's Office and MTC, which employed the services of a lobbyist in Washington, D.C. Mr. Larkin commented that there was a need to pursue increasing the gas tax at both the state and federal level. Ms. Crabbe stated that other potential revenue sources for transportation at the state level were being more favorably considered, since gas tax increases did not poll favorably.

Mr. Larkin commented that the polling question on raising the gas tax was only meaningful if it was framed correctly. He stated that a general increase the gas tax would poll poorly, but an increase in the gas tax tied to specific transportation improvements in public transit would poll better. Ms. Crabbe stated that MTC had conducted polling on the issue and had decided not to pursue an increase in the gas tax. She observed that when cap-and-trade auctions are applied to fuels in 2015, the related costs would likely be passed onto consumers, effectively raising gas prices in exchange for, hopefully, an increased investment in transportation and other means to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Mr. Larkin stated there was an opportunity to increase the gas tax at the state and federal level, and requested that the CAC be kept apprised on the issue.

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, shared that staff would be attending the American Public Transit Association's Legislative Conference in March with MTC Commissioners, which would coincide with advocacy efforts. She stated Congressman Earl Blumenauer presented a gas tax proposal a few months ago, and the Secretary of Transportation, Anthony Foxx, was tracking when the Highway Trust Fund would become insolvent. She added that rather than directly tackling new revenues, most current proposals in Congress were for financing tools, similar to the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) loans and other low interest loans to provide access to cash. She committed to updating the CAC regularly on this topic.

Eric Rutledge commented that he was pleased to see bike and pedestrian advocacy called out for the first time this year. He stated that funding non-infrastructure projects, such as pedestrian education, outreach, and enforcement was important, and asked if the Transportation Authority funded non-infrastructure projects. Ms. LaForte stated that Transportation Authority staff helped to coordinate the submission of non-infrastructure projects to the state for funding. She stated that the Transportation Authority could fund bicycle outreach and education using Prop K because these project types were explicitly referenced in the Prop K Expenditure Plan, which is primarily directed to fund capital projects. She stated the Prop K could only fund pedestrian infrastructure projects per the Expenditure Plan.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director for Policy and Programing, added the fact that the 2003 Expenditure Plan only called out bicycle non-infrastructure projects and not pedestrian non-infrastructure projects as eligible projects times was a reflection of the relative maturity of the two sectors at that time. She said that she anticipated that non-infrastructure pedestrian projects would be included as an eligible project type in the next sales tax Expenditure Plan. In the meantime, she said that the State's new Active Transportation Program (ATP) could fund such projects. She added that Transportation Authority staff was coordinating with other city agencies to apply for grant funds from the ATP for bicycle and/or pedestrian safety outreach. She added that there is a need for a permanent and stable source of funding for this type of work and that the Vehicle License Fee (VLF) that was being proposed for the November 2014 ballot was a really good fit given its flexibility. Mr. Rutledge stated he would like to see pedestrian safety outreach and education in a future Expenditure Plan.

Jacqueline Sachs asked if the State could restore the Proposition 42 sales tax on gasoline and commit it to transportation. Amber Crabbe stated that the sales tax on gasoline was discontinued several years ago and in its place the State approved an increase in the fuel excise tax that raised an equal amount of revenue as the Proposition 42 tax would have.

Ms. Sachs stated that she believed bicyclists should be licensed and bicycles should have license plates. She explained that these measures could provide revenue for transportation, and they would facilitate the exchange of information in the event of a collision. She requested that Transportation Authority staff examine the issue. Ms. Crabbe stated that previous research had indicated that the cost to implement and enforce a bicycle licensing program would exceed the revenues generated and was therefore cost prohibitive. She added that enforcement was currently done using driver's licenses and identification cards to track violations. Chair Davis commented that the issue raised the question of liability. Ms. Lombardo stated that many jurisdictions once had licensing programs but discontinued them, and she stated that staff could research the issue.

**Mr. Larkin moved to approve the item and Ms. Sachs seconded the motion.**

During public comment, Ed Mason stated that electric and hybrid vehicles did not pay much in gas taxes though they benefited from free access to High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes, and he asked if there were any efforts to tie such vehicles to a tax mechanism. Ms. Crabbe stated that the standards for which vehicles could use the HOV lanes was becoming more stringent with each reauthorization. She stated that linking total vehicle miles traveled to a fee or tax was being advanced at the federal level.

Roland Lebrun stated there were no cap-and-trade revenues this past year for use on projects because Governor Brown had borrowed \$500 million in cap-and-trade revenues for the General Fund. He stated that cap-and-trade revenues would be available in the next fiscal year and that Governor Brown was proposing to invest \$250 million in these revenues in high-speed rail. Mr. Lebrun commented that he was concerned that the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers

Board was not using all of its Prop 1A high-speed rail funds for electrification and the advance signal system.

**The item passed unanimously.**

**13. Draft Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program Planning Guidelines – INFORMATION**

Chad Rathmann, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Wells Whitney expressed his support for the development of the Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program (NTIP). He commented that he had been an active participant in the Columbus Avenue Neighborhood Transportation Study, and that this smaller planning study, comparable to what could be funded via the NTIP, had been able to leverage funding from other sources so that consultants could be brought on-board. He stated that planning studies were particularly helpful because their recommended projects were able to gain standing in the city's larger pipeline of projects. He suggested that community members and organizations be able to submit planning project ideas and proposals directly to the Transportation Authority for consideration by the Board. He commented that this would help round out the neighborhood involvement approach.

Angela Minkin asked whether the NTIP funds could be used to update a transportation plan and/or to advance it further. She explained that she was curious about whether NTIP funding could be used to update and/or build upon the Mission-Geneva Neighborhood Transportation Plan that was completed in 2007. Mr. Rathmann confirmed that this likely could be an eligible NTIP planning project. Ms. Minkin commented that community members were frustrated by how long it was taking to implement projects (e.g. Persia Triangle). She stated that it would be helpful to learn how to move forward with the plan's other proposals that might still make sense for the community. She commented that since the plan was from 2007, additional new community members might need to be informed about the planning process that had already occurred and engaged in an update.

Christopher Waddling expressed his support for the NTIP. He inquired about existing proposals for NTIP planning projects (i.e. ideas that had already been shared). He asked whether CAC members should contact their district supervisor to discuss project ideas. Mr. Rathmann stated that right now staff was focusing on developing NTIP guidelines, but that had already heard from a handful of commissioners regarding ideas for NTIP planning efforts, including an idea for a planning study on Lombard Street in supervisorial District 2, and a Bayview Hunters Point circulation study in supervisorial District 10.

Mr. Whitney suggested that Transportation Authority staff conduct outreach to neighborhood groups regarding the NTIP planning funds.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, stated that commissioners would likely become more aware of and focused on the NTIP after the February 11 Plans and Programs Committee meeting where this same item would be considered. If CAC members wanted to connect with their supervisors on NTIP planning ideas, it might make more sense to do so after the February committee meeting.

Brian Larkin asked whether any planning projects had been proposed for District 1. Mr. Rathmann responded that though a specific planning project had not been proposed, Commissioner Mar had expressed interest in seeing pedestrian safety projects implemented in the Geary corridor and that may lend itself to a planning effort. Ms. Lombardo clarified that

Commissioner Mar had expressed interest in having pedestrian safety capital projects implemented, but that nothing definitive had been discussed for planning efforts.

Mr. Larkin asked staff to share the presentation as he wished to discuss the NTIP with the Planning Association for the Richmond.

Mr. Waddling asked how much planning studies typically cost, and whether Transportation Authority staff would work with community groups and others to develop scopes and budgets for planning efforts. Mr. Rathmann stated that planning studies varied in costs depending on the scale of the scope. Ms. Lombardo stated that planning studies could easily range in cost from \$100,000 to \$200,000 dollars if they included some level of conceptual engineering for the top concept or two. She stated that smaller more focused efforts (such as a needs assessment or prioritization effort) could cost far less.

Mr. Whitney commented that the cost to complete a planning study could significantly vary depending on how many technical experts and consultants were involved. He stated that the Columbus Avenue Neighborhood Transportation Study benefited from having a Transportation Authority planner provide project support at no cost to the project's overall budget. He stated that the study was driven by a committed group of volunteers and that the bulk of the project's cost was assigned to compensating technical experts and consultants. He commented that neighborhood groups could accomplish a great deal for \$100,000 or less if they relied on volunteers and were flexible.

Ms. Minkin asked for a copy of the presentation that was shared. She commented that the Consent Calendar had included an approved consultant contract for outreach. She inquired whether any of that contract could be used for neighborhood outreach associated with the NTIP. She commented that a focused effort was necessary, one that was not overly dependent on volunteers and neighborhood groups. Ms. Lombardo commented that Transportation Authority staff wanted to allow the \$100,000 per district to be used flexibly to meet the varied needs of each district, yet result in meaningful planning studies that would not just sit on a shelf, but are part of a path toward design and construction of capital projects. She commented that staff anticipated a lot of up front work with commissioners, relevant public agencies, and community organizations to develop viable scopes and budgets for proposed planning efforts. She noted that the checklist referenced in the presentation would help focus that discussion.

Chair Davis asked whether it would be possible for the community to play an active role in the identification and development of NTIP planning projects. Ms. Lombardo stated that the community could indeed play a large role and that a commissioner might opt to issue a call for projects to solicit project proposals from community-based organizations in his/her their particular district. She added that ultimately commissioners would be able to approve the proposed projects since they would approve the funding allocations.

During public comment, Edward Mason stated that the Department of Public Works was hosting a community meeting regarding the 24<sup>th</sup> Street Urban Village in Noe Valley on Thursday, January 23. He stated that streetscape improvements, specifically bulb-outs, would be discussed. He stated that that the proposed bulb-outs needed to be coordinated with and considered in the face of other issues and plans (e.g. commuter buses, Transit Effectiveness Plan, etc.) that came after the streetscape improvements were conceptualized.

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

Joseph Flanagan reported that he 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 the meeting would be held in February. He stated that surveys would be distributed to assess accessibility on Muni buses and paratransit.

Christopher Waddling stated a new group called Bike Bayview would be focusing on biking infrastructure and pedestrian access, and that this was also a way to help build community interest in and awareness of transportation issues and the planning process.

Jacqueline Sachs stated there would be a public meeting on the Geary Bus Rapid Transit project on January 30, 2014 at 6:00 p.m. at 1840 Sutter Street.

Roland Lebrun expressed the need to investigate maintenance needs of the Muni light-rail vehicles. He stated that cap and trade funds would not be available for the replacement of light-rail rolling stock, as replacement of vehicles would not generate a sufficient reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.

**15. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**16. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:28 p.m.