



# DRAFT MINUTES

## CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

October 22, 2014 MEETING

### 1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Glenn Davis at 6:04 p.m. CAC members present were, Myla Ablog, Glenn Davis (Chair), Brian Larkin, Angela Minkin, Eric Rutledge, Jacqueline Sachs, Raymon Smith, Peter Tannen, and Wells Whitney. Transportation Authority staff members present were Anna LaForte, Seon Joo Kim, Steve Rehn, and David Uniman.

### 2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Davis welcomed Raymon Smith to the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC). Mr. Smith spoke on the need to improve conditions for seniors and persons with disabilities in District 6, as well as the need to focus on quality of life issues. Mr. Smith talked about his experiences serving on various other committees and added he would like to discuss how Delegated Allocation Authority could benefit the Transportation Authority in the future.

### Consent Calendar

#### 3. Approve the Minutes of the October 1, 2014 Meeting – ACTION

Jacqueline Sachs stated that Chair Davis called the meeting to order at the October 1, 2014 CAC meeting and not Peter Tannen, as indicated in the meeting minutes. Staff agreed to correct the minutes.

#### 4. State and Federal Legislative Update – INFORMATION

#### 5. Cycle 4 Lifeline Transportation Program Update – INFORMATION

There was no public comment.

**Angela Minkin moved to approve the consent calendar with the minutes as amended. Raymon Smith seconded the motion.**

**The motion was approved unanimously.**

### End of Consent Calendar

#### 6. Adopt a Motion of Support for Allocation of \$6,795,385 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, for Eleven Requests, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules – ACTION

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

Jacqueline Sachs asked if the Geneva-Harney Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) study would consider the existing public housing development. David Uniman, Deputy Director for Planning, responded that the study would consider the public housing development. Mr. Uniman stated the study included a comprehensive baseline analysis of all types of housing, jobs and transit service in the area, as well as near-term and long-term scenarios of existing and future housing.

Brian Larkin asked if the mid-life overhaul of the Caltrain locomotives would be considered a capital or operating and maintenance cost. Peter Skinner, Senior Grants Analyst at Caltrain, stated the project would be a capital cost because the mid-life overhaul would involve replacement of engines and rebuilding the vehicle to as-new condition. Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, added that overhauls were an allowable use of Federal Transit Administration capital funds for vehicle procurement or rehabilitation.

Raymon Smith asked when the Balboa Park Station Eastside Connections project had been identified in a plan for prioritization. Ms. LaForte stated the project had been in the planning pipeline for many years and there were numerous capital projects and plans in the area. Ms. LaForte added the project was recommended for the Lifeline Transportation Program funding in 2010 by the Transportation Authority Board. Ms. LaForte stated the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) was also constructing improvements in the station area and that the Bay Area Rapid Transit District had completed the Westside Connections project. Ms. LaForte added that Transportation Authority staff would follow up with Mr. Smith on recommendations of the Balboa Park Circulation Study. Angela Minkin added the Balboa Park Citizen Advisory Committee provided feedback to city agencies regarding projects in the area.

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

During public comment, Roland Lebrun noted that the memo attachment for the agenda item listed a different request amount for the Geneva-Harney BRT project than the table of contents for the packet enclosure. Mr. Lebrun also noted the planned location of the 2024 Olympic Stadium would be adjacent to the Geneva-Harney BRT, and the Transportation Authority could seek funding from preparations for the Olympics instead of Prop K.

**The motion was approved unanimously.**

## **7. San Francisco Transportation Plan and Plan Bay Area Updates – INFORMATION**

David Uniman, Deputy Director for Planning, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Jacqueline Sachs asked for clarification on the abbreviation WETA. David Uniman responded WETA was the Water Emergency Transportation Authority.

Raymon Smith asked what degree of coordination occurred between agencies for capital projects and how agencies would notify the public of construction projects. Anna LaForte stated that implementing agencies distributed project notices prior to construction. Frank Markowitz, Senior Transportation Planner at the SFMTA, stated city agencies used the Envista software to coordinate and map all upcoming utility and transportation projects as well as construction moratoriums. Mr. Markowitz added the San Francisco Public Works had five-year paving programs, but acknowledged that city agencies could coordinate more effectively. Mr. Smith stated he would follow up with Mr. Markowitz.

During public comment, Edward Mason stated San Francisco should lobby surrounding cities to accept additional housing growth, as southern cities not creating housing would create commuter shuttle impacts in San Francisco.

Roland Lebrun asked if the Transportation Authority had additional information on Regional Measure 3, a potential toll increase on Bay Area state-owned toll bridges that was assumed in Plan Bay Area. Anna LaForte responded the Metropolitan Transportation Commission was conducting polling on the next phase of bridge tolls and there was currently no proposed legislation for the measure.

Chair Davis asked if the San Francisco Transportation Plan would address the housing and

transportation linkage. Anna LaForte stated Senate Bill 375 linked housing and transportation planning and funding. Ms. LaForte added San Francisco would be disproportionately supporting future housing and jobs in the region, therefore San Francisco would advocate for receiving additional transportation funding.

#### **8. Major Capital Projects Update – Islais Creek Maintenance Facility – INFORMATION**

Luis Zurinaga, Project Management Oversight Consultant for the Transportation Authority, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Jacqueline Sachs asked if the Islais Creek Maintenance Facility would replace the Kirkland facility. Mr. Zurinaga responded the facility initially was intended to replace the Kirkland facility, but the SFMTA conducted a facilities study and found the Kirkland facility would be needed in the future. Ms. Sachs asked what bus routes would operate from the Islais Creek facility. Mr. Zurinaga responded the SFMTA would decide route choices for buses based on which routes were in proximity to the facility.

Raymon Smith asked if the facility would need to accommodate longer buses in the future. Mr. Zurinaga stated the SFMTA Transit Fleet Management Plan did not include buses longer than 60 feet. Mr. Zurinaga added that 80-foot buses would require two articulation points and would present navigation issues on San Francisco streets.

Chair Davis asked for clarification on the funding plan. Mr. Zurinaga stated all funding sources were committed except the General Obligation bond funds, which he said would be on the November ballot. Mr. Davis asked if costs would escalate further after the start of construction, as they had in Phase 1. Mr. Zurinaga responded that Phase 1 of the project only expended 90% of the budget, and he did not expect additional cost increases in Phase 2.

Eric Rutledge asked if the pending Prop A would authorize the General Obligation Plan funds for this project. Mr. Zurinaga responded affirmatively.

Angela Minkin asked if the CAC would have the opportunity to provide input when Prop K funds were requested for this project. Anna LaForte responded affirmatively. Ms. LaForte added the CAC approved Transportation Fund for Clean Air funds for the project, but the funding plan also included revenues not programmed by the Transportation Authority.

There was no public comment.

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

Jacqueline Sachs requested project updates for the Transbay Transit Center, Central Subway, and Presidio Parkway.

There was no public comment.

#### **10. Public Comment**

Edward Mason expressed the need for further enforcement of the commuter shuttle program. Mr. Mason stated shuttles traveled on Guerrero Street, which had a 3-ton weight restriction. Mr. Mason added that certain shuttle companies subcontract to other providers which do not pay program fees and stop at non-designated locations.

Wells Whitney stated the shuttles allow workers to not drive, thereby decreasing congestion, but agreed better regulation may be needed.

Myla Ablog noted a University of California Berkeley study found employees would live closer to their workplace if commuter shuttles were not available. Ms. Ablog stated an environmental

review should have been conducted before approving the shuttle policy. Ms. Ablog added that if San Francisco was to accommodate a disproportionate number of employees living in the city, the city would need to spend a disproportionate amount on transportation.

Chair Davis requested an update on the commuter shuttle program as an information item at the December or January CAC meeting.

Roland Lebrun stated that San Francisco's commuter shuttle services were similar to the situation in the United Kingdom thirty to forty years ago. Mr. Lebrun suggested the private sector could be a much stronger transit funding partner for the City, as it had become in the U.K.

## **11. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:04 p.m.