



# DRAFT MINUTES

## PLANS AND PROGRAMS COMMITTEE

Tuesday, November 18, 2014

### 1. Roll Call

Chair Mar called the meeting to order at 10:14 a.m. The following members were:

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

**Absent at Roll Call:** Commissioners Campos and Kim (entered during Item 7) (2)

### 2. Citizen Advisory Committee Report – INFORMATION

Brian Larkin, Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) member, reported that at its October 22 meeting, the CAC considered and unanimously passed Item 4 from the agenda.

#### Consent Calendar

Chair Mar removed Item 4 from the Consent Calendar to be considered as a separate item for a member of the public who wished to speak on that item.

### 3. Approve the Minutes of the October 7, 2014 Meeting – ACTION

There was no public comment.

The Consent Calendar was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Mar and Yee (3)

Absent: Commissioners Campos and Kim (2)

#### End of Consent Calendar

### 4. Recommend Allocation of \$6,795,385 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, for Eleven Requests, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules and Amendment of the Relevant 5-Year Prioritization Programs – ACTION

During public comment, Roland Lebrun questioned the need for Caltrain to rehabilitate the F40 locomotives. Mr. Lebrun stated the F40 locomotives were not capable of pulling six passenger cars. Mr. Lebrun added if the F40 locomotives remained in service they would not be able to travel to the Transbay Terminal, thereby preventing the opportunity to decommission the rail yard at the 4th and King station. Mr. Lebrun recommended Caltrain replace the diesel engine to enable the locomotive to pull six passenger cars and reduce emissions, thereby being eligible for Air District grants.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Mar and Yee (3)

Absent: Commissioners Campos and Kim (2)

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

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

Chair Mar stated the effort would be less intense than the original San Francisco Transportation Plan process, and would be focused and streamlined to identifying the needs of San Francisco and regional partners.

There was no public comment.

**6. BART Vision Update – INFORMATION**

Ellen Smith, Acting Manager for Strategic and Policy Planning at the Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART), presented the item.

Commissioner Yee asked whether BART had considered serving Treasure Island in future expansions. Ms. Smith stated BART examined an alignment serving Treasure Island, but had concerns regarding rising tides and the alignment angle needed to serve the South of Market Area, which would be an important area to serve given the projected population and employment growth. She added an alignment serving Treasure Island would be further considered.

Chair Mar asked what would be the cost of expansion. Ms. Smith stated cost estimates were unknown and alignment considerations would affect cost estimates. Ms. Smith added the cost would likely be in the billions of dollars.

Chair Mar asked for clarification regarding the Budget Czar game, which Ms. Smith had referenced in her presentation. Tilly Chang, Executive Director, stated the game was an interactive survey conducted during the outreach for the San Francisco Transportation Plan (SFTP), which asked the public to select investments based on a budget. Ms. Smith stated BART was impressed with the Budget Czar game and modified the concept for the BART Vision effort to include selection of funding sources, prioritization of projects, and outcomes and benefits. Chair Mar stated his desire to add density and other information to allow the public to understand the impacts on neighborhoods from the addition of a BART station. Ms. Smith stated the BART survey showed users benefits related to air quality, congestion, and equity based on user selection of projects.

Ms. Chang stated the Transportation Authority was coordinating with BART on the capacity study for Embarcadero and Montgomery stations, and on the Transit Core Capacity Study. Ms. Chang said the SFTP included analysis of BART investments and included an order of magnitude estimate of \$10 billion for a second BART tube and related investments. Ms. Chang added that reliability would be important to maintain BART's branding, therefore protected transit lanes and coordination with the Freeway Corridor Management Study would be critical if BART were to provide bus service. She added proposed turn backs and crossover tracks would allow BART to turn trains back to provide increase reliability and frequency of service in the urban core. She added BART would coordinate with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's Rail Capacity Study to ensure joint investment.

Chair Mar expressed satisfaction with BART's short list of potential projects. Chair Mar expressed the need to connect the westside of the city with rapid transit that were not well served by BART. He also noted that he would make an effort to avoid using BART to the beach

nomenclature, which can be misleading. He emphasized that what was really important was connected key destinations in Districts 1, 2, and 5.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun spoke on the need to connect the Transbay Terminal with the East Bay through high-speed rail.

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

Luiz Zurinaga, Project Management Oversight Consultant, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Mar thanked Mr. Zurinaga for organizing a tour of San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA's) facilities, including the Islais Creek site, to highlight SFMTA's infrastructure needs. Mr. Zurinaga offered to additionally organize tours of SFMTA facilities for interested Commissioners.

Commissioner Yee asked where the facility was located. Mr. Zurinaga stated the facility was located south of Cesar Chavez Street near Interstate 280.

There was no public comment.

**8. Introduction of New Items – INFORMATION**

There was no public comment.

**9. Public Comment**

There was no public comment

**10. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.