



DRAFT MINUTES

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

May 27, 2015 MEETING

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Christopher Waddling at 6:04 p.m. CAC members present were Myla Ablog, John Larson, Santiago Lerma, John Morrison, Eric Rutledge, Jacqueline Sachs, Raymon Smith, Peter Tannen, Chris Waddling and Wells Whitney. Transportation Authority staff members present were Liz Brisson, Colin Dentel-Post, Cynthia Fong, Seon Joo Kim, Anna LaForte, Maria Lombardo, Mike Pickford, Steve Rehn and Michael Schwartz.

2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Waddling announced that the Transportation Authority's Plan Bay Area 2040 call for projects had been issued, as indicated by Item 9, and that the CAC would receive an update at its June meeting. He said that the CAC Subcommittee held a meeting on May 14 and that the Subcommittee's recommended amendments to the by-laws were attached as Item 10. Chair Waddling also announced a list of projects for which allocation requests were anticipated for the June CAC meeting.

Raymon Smith asked if information on upcoming projects could be sent to CAC members prior to the meeting. Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, replied that the list of projects along with sponsor and phase information could be sent out in advance, but that there was a limit because staff had to work with sponsor agencies to refine requests before they were brought to the CAC.

Jacqueline Sachs said that regarding the study on late night transportation, "The Other 9-to-5", that had been presented at a previous CAC meeting, there was no representation from bus drivers. She requested an update on the project that included the perspective of bus drivers.

Chair Waddling reminded the CAC that any new items should be introduced during Item 18.

There was no public comment.

Consent Calendar

3. **Approve the Minutes of the April 22, 2015 Meeting – ACTION**
4. **Adopt a Motion of Support to Authorize the Executive Director to Execute Annual Contract Renewals and Options for Various Annual Professional Services in an Amount Not to Exceed \$1,950,000 and to Modify Contract Payment Terms and Non-Material Contract Terms and Conditions – ACTION**
5. **Adopt a Motion of Support for the Award of a Three-Year Professional Services Contract, with an Option to Extend for Two Additional One-Year Periods, to Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Co., LLP in an Amount Not to Exceed \$300,000 for Annual Audit Services, and Authorizing the Executive Director to Negotiate Contract Payment Terms**

and Non-Material Contract Terms and Conditions – ACTION

6. **Adopt a Motion of Support to Increase the Amount of the Professional Services Contract with Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. by \$224,600 for a Total Amount Not to Exceed \$596,600, for Planning and Engineering Services for the 19th Avenue/M-Ocean View Project Pre-Environmental Study Phase and to Authorize the Executive Director to Modify Contract Payment Terms and Non-Material Contract Terms and Conditions – ACTION**
7. **Internal Accounting Report and Investment Report for the Nine Months Ending March 31, 2015 – INFORMATION**
8. **State and Federal Legislative Update – INFORMATION**
9. **Plan Bay Area 2040 and Call for Projects – INFORMATION**
10. **Update of Citizens Advisory Committee By-Laws – INFORMATION**
11. **Minutes of the May 14, 2015 Subcommittee Meeting – INFORMATION**

Eric Rutledge requested that the minutes be amended to reflect that he had asked a question that was recorded on page eight of the minutes, rather than Santiago Lerma.

Raymon Smith requested that Item 10 be severed from the Consent Calendar and continued to the next meeting because he did not have adequate information at the time of the Subcommittee meeting. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, clarified that continuing the item would delay the adoption of any proposed revisions. Mr. Smith replied that he understood that adoption of the revisions would be delayed and proposed having another meeting of the Subcommittee at San Francisco City Hall to encourage public input on the CAC's By-Laws.

Wells Whitney asked for clarification that by continuing the item, it would be placed on the consent calendar as an information item at the June CAC meeting, to be voted on as an action item the following month. Chair Waddling affirmed that schedule.

There was no public comment on the Consent Calendar.

Wells Whitney moved to sever Item 10 from the Consent Calendar and continue it to the following meeting, seconded by Santiago Lerma.

The Consent Calendar was approved as amended by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Lerma, Morrison, Rutledge, Sachs, Smith, Tannen, Waddling and Whitney

Absent: CAC Members Larkin and Larson

End of Consent Calendar

12. **Adopt a Motion of Support for the Adoption of the Potrero Hill Neighborhood Transportation Plan Final Report – ACTION**

Michael Schwartz, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Wells Whitney asked when construction of the Rebuild Potrero project was planned. Mr. Schwartz responded that the current schedule had completion of the environmental phase in the summer or fall of 2015, with groundbreaking expected in 2016. Mr. Schwartz noted that the project would be phased such that the intersection treatments could remain in place for a number of years before needing to be removed, and that those materials could be relocated to

another part of the city at that time.

Peter Tannen suggested that interest in shuttle services indicated that there was a disconnect between Muni service and community needs. He questioned if the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) could deliver these services more cost-effectively than piecemeal service by many separate providers. Mr. Schwartz responded that the situation in the Potrero area was similar to that in the Bayview area, where the lower population density and higher street grades made it challenging to provide cost-effective service. He said the experience of the Bayview area showed that a service run and funded by community-based organizations could be more effective in meeting the specific needs of those organizations.

Jacqueline Sachs commented that she favored reinstating the 53-Southern Heights bus line, and asked for the analysis justifying removal of that service. Ariel Espiritu Santo, Capital Budget lead at SFMTA, said she would check with transit operations and bring that information back to the CAC.

Raymon Smith noted support for the work overall but expressed concern about the removal of the 53-Southern Heights bus line.

During public comment, J.R. Eppler with Potrero Boosters, said there was demand on both sides of the hill for shuttle service, not just along the old route of the 53-Southern Heights bus line. He noted that there may be an opportunity to have a shuttle that served both needs or just bring back the 53-line.

Raymon Smith moved to approve this item, seconded by Wells Whitney.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Larson, Lerma, Morrison, Rutledge, Sachs, Smith, Tannen, Waddling and Whitney

Absent: CAC Member Larkin

13. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Allocation of \$40,678,143 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, and Appropriation of \$162,400 in Prop K funds, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules – ACTION

Liz Brisson, Senior Transportation Planner, Colin Dentel-Post, Transportation Planner, Seon Joo Kim, Senior Transportation Planner, Mike Pickford, Transportation Planner, and Steve Rehn, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Raymon Smith asked about locations and site selection considerations for the proposed underground traffic signal conduit installations and the new and upgraded signals projects. Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, responded that each of the enclosed allocation request forms for the relevant projects included a location list and map, as well as an explanation of how they were selected (e.g., pages 69-71 and 85 of the enclosure for signal conduits, pages 54-55 and 65 for new signals, and pages 87-89 and 99 for signal upgrades).

Mr. Smith asked how the road diet, planned as part of the 6th Street project, came about. Craig Raphael, Transportation Planner at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), responded that 6th Street was identified as one of San Francisco's most dangerous roadways for pedestrians and was prioritized for improvements in the WalkFirst planning process. He said the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) would analyze a wide range of potential safety improvements, including a road diet, bike facility, and bulb-outs to name a few, and would include extensive outreach to stakeholders during the environmental review and

subsequent phases. Mr. Smith recommended that the Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee be included in the outreach efforts.

Mr. Smith questioned whether the City and County of San Francisco (City) could afford to plant additional street trees. Ms. LaForte responded that the tree planting program only included existing tree wells where trees were previously located. Chris Buck, Urban Forester with San Francisco Public Works (SFPW), elaborated that street trees regularly needed to be replaced due to old age or other causes. He said that SFPW had sufficient staff to establish the City's current population of street trees. Mr. Smith asked about long-term maintenance of the new trees. Mr. Buck replied that the City's current plan included transfer of maintenance responsibility to adjacent property owners. Mr. Smith asked about community input on the species of new trees. Mr. Buck said the City's recently adopted Urban Forest Plan recommended that the City should ultimately be responsible for maintenance of all municipal trees, but that until establishment of sustainable funding, the City would continue its transfer program. He said SFPW considered many factors in selecting species, including neighborhood concerns, pruning and other maintenance costs. Santiago Lerma recommended that SFPW establish a standard for species selection to exclude issue-prone trees.

Mr. Lerma asked if the Southwest Subway project would impact the upgrades included in the 19th Avenue City Combined project. Ms. Brisson responded that the two projects were being carefully coordinated to minimize replacement of near-term improvements with the longer-term effort.

Mr. Lerma commented that bicycle hit posts required periodic replacement and asked if there were a longer-term solution. Mr. Raphael responded that the cost of more durable solutions, such as grade-separated bike lanes, were much greater than periodic replacement of the posts.

Peter Tannen commented that he was supportive of safety improvements at the Alemany Interchange.

Mr. Tannen asked why the motor coach procurement required a waiver of the Prop K Strategic Plan policy. Ariel Espiritu Santo, Capital Budget Lead at SFMTA, replied that because of the fast pace of the project, SFMTA had to move quickly on an opportunity to execute the contract and had other funds available to execute the option. She said non-Prop K funds would be used for expenses incurred prior to Transportation Authority Board approval of Prop K funds. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, commented that the waiver was also precipitated by an administrative oversight by SFMTA. She said Prop K policy was clear that contract award should follow Transportation Authority Board consideration, so the Board would have a chance to weigh in on projects in a meaningful way.

Mr. Smith asked about the types of buses to be procured. Ms. Espiritu Santo replied that the procurement included two types of hybrid propulsion systems to allow SFMTA to compare performance. Mr. Smith asked if SFMTA had chosen a cabin configuration, and Ms. Espiritu Santo replied in the affirmative.

During public comment, Ed Mason said continuing to plant street trees in San Francisco was unsustainable, and that the proposed street tree parcel tax was not sufficiently austere.

Wells Whitney moved to approve this item, seconded by Eric Rutledge.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Larson, Lerma, Morrison, Rutledge, Sachs, Tannen, Waddling and Whitney

Abstained: CAC Members Ablog and Smith

Absent: CAC Member Larkin

14. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve the Fiscal Year 2015/16 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program of Projects – ACTION

Mike Pickford, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Waddling encouraged Caltrain to submit a similar request for bicycle parking improvements as the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency had done. He commented that University of California San Francisco operated 13 shuttles and asked why the new shuttle wasn't proposed as an addition to that existing program. Mr. Pickford responded that he would look into it and follow up with the CAC. In response to a question from Mr. Smith, Anna LaForte said the CAC would receive updated information on the shuttle project prior to the Plans and Programs Committee meeting on June 16.

There was no public comment.

Peter Tannen moved to approve this item, seconded by John Larson.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Larson, Lerma, Morrison, Rutledge, Sachs, Smith, Tannen, Waddling and Whitney

Absent: CAC Member Larkin

15. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Adoption of the Proposed Fiscal Year 2015/16 Annual Budget and Work Program – ACTION

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

Raymon Smith asked about staff's confidence that the revenue goal would be met. Ms. Fong responded that in past years Prop K revenues had always exceeded the budget forecast.

There was no public comment.

Raymon Smith moved to approve this item, seconded by Santiago Lerma.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Larson, Lerma, Rutledge, Sachs, Smith, Tannen, Waddling and Whitney

Abstained: CAC Member Morrison

Absent: CAC Member Larkin

16. Update on Caltrain and High Speed Rail Compatibility – INFORMATON

Luis Zurinaga, Project Management Oversight Consultant, introduced the item per the staff memorandum. Mr. Zurinaga introduced Casey Fromson, Government Affairs Officer, and Dave Couch, Project Delivery Director, at Caltrain, and Will Gimple with the California High-Speed Rail Authority, who were available for questions.

John Larson asked how many fewer seats there would be if the Electric Multiple Units (EMU's) were configured with four doors per side. Ms. Fromson replied that the number of seats would be reduced by 60 to 100 per train. Mr. Larson asked if it would be more cost-effective to purchase the standard cars and retrofit them with additional doors. Mr. Couch responded that

installation by the original equipment manufacturer was the preferred policy and would be more cost-effective. He added that if Caltrain transitioned to having all high-level platforms, the lower doors would be sealed and some or all of the lost seating could be recovered by installing more seats on the lower level. Wells Whitney suggested that Caltrain could use the same vehicles as the High-Speed Rail (HSR) trains and that the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) could procure cars with two levels of doors. Mr. Couch replied that HSR vehicles required capabilities far beyond those of Caltrain's vehicles, most notably that they required much greater power. He said HSR trains would be single level, so bi-level boarding would not be an option. Mr. Whitney asked if Caltrain and HSR would use the same power, control and signal systems. Mr. Couch responded in the affirmative.

Jacqueline Sachs asked if wheelchair-accessible seating would be reduced under the bi-level boarding scenario. Ms. Fromson said that all scenarios would include the same number of wheelchair-accessible spaces. Raymon Smith asked if both boarding scenarios had sufficient emergency exit capabilities. Mr. Couch responded in the affirmative. Mr. Smith asked if the funding plan was available on Caltrain's website, and Ms. Fromson answered in the affirmative.

John Morrison asked if commuter rail operators in southern California were also facing issues of compatibility with HSR. Mr. Gimple replied that compatibility issues with those operations were very different and much easier to resolve. He said compatibility with Caltrain was complicated by the need for both systems to share the same track and related infrastructure.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated that the proposed HSR trains were incompatible in width as well as boarding height. He also said that Federal Rail Administration (FRA) rules stipulated that all HSR systems must be compatible with existing infrastructure. He recommended that resolution of the compatibility issue await publication of FRA's upcoming document ETF_00103, which would set rules governing HSR compatibility with local systems. Andy Chau stated that high-level boarding was flawed because it added to the difficulty of loading bicycles onto the lower level. He also said that Peninsula cities have not yet agreed to high-level platforms, which endangered their agreements with CHSRA. Ed Mason suggested that HSR could terminate at San Jose, eliminating the Caltrain compatibility issue.

17. Transportation Sustainability Program Update – INFORMATION

Michael Schwartz, Senior Transportation Planner, and Wade Wietgreffe, Senior Planner with the San Francisco Planning Department, presented the item.

Wells Whitney asked if public outreach had begun yet. Mr. Wietgreffe responded that developer outreach was just beginning and that presentations had been made to several citizen advisory committees. He said much more outreach would take place after the nexus and feasibility studies were published in the next couple weeks.

John Larson asked how Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) would work for capacity expansion projects and wondered if the new measure would essentially be a cap on VMT. Mr. Wietgreffe pointed out that the environmental review process in itself did not approve or reject any project, but rather served to provide information about the environmental impacts of a project. He said the approval was ultimately with the decision-making body. Mr. Schwartz added that under the existing transportation metric, level of service, projects like Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit revealed significant and unavoidable impacts as part of their environmental review process, but that the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency and Transportation Authority boards both approved that project in spite of those impacts. He said that the new metric would better capture the transportation environmental impacts that were disclosed for projects like the ones Mr. Larson described.

During public comment Edward Mason stated that the program was two years behind schedule versus the last time it had been presented to the CAC. He said the CAC should question what caused the delay and how much revenue in development fees had been lost due to this delay. Mr. Mason said there was an assumption in the program that people would support the sustainable modes of travel such as bicycles and transit. He asked if ride hailing services such as Uber and Lyft would be included in the VMT calculations given their proliferation. He also stated that the fee would not address the congestion of a specific project because it would be spent citywide.

18. Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION

Chair Waddling recognized John Morrison as the newest member of the CAC and asked him to introduce himself. Mr. Morrison said he had been a teacher, entrepreneur and 8-year city councilor in Northampton Massachusetts. He said he moved to California in 1999 to become the Director of Education for the California Film Institute. Mr. Morrison said the CAC would be his first experience with government at the committee level, but that he saw membership as part of his civic service to San Francisco. He said he was a homeowner in the Crocker-Amazon neighborhood and commuted to San Rafael, so transportation was important to him.

Jacqueline Sachs requested an update on the status of night-time transit service.

There was no public comment.

19. Public Comment

During public comment, Ed Mason said that private shuttles were violating the rules of SFMTA's pilot shuttle program. Roland Lebrun commented that the capacity analysis that Caltrain performed three years ago anticipated 900 seats per train. He also said that Caltrain's work on its Communications Based Overlay Signal System (CBOSS) would be wasted because the request for proposals for its electrification project included a complete re-design of its signaling system.

20. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:23 p.m.