



# DRAFT MINUTES

## PLANS AND PROGRAMS COMMITTEE

Tuesday, October 11, 2016

### 1. Roll Call

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

**Present at Roll Call:** Commissioners Avalos, Peskin and Tang (3)

**Absent at Roll Call:** Commissioners Breed (entered during Item 6) and Farrell (entered during Item 5) (2)

### 2. Citizens Advisory Committee Report – INFORMATION

Chris Waddling, Chair of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), reported that at the September 28 meeting, the CAC unanimously approved Item 4 but noted that several members expressed concern over the high cost of the Fall Protection improvements, including the Construction Management and Support line item. He said the CAC also unanimously approved Item 5, and provided a brief summarization of the updates to the Prop AA prioritization criteria.

There was no public comment.

### 3. Approve the Minutes of the September 20, 2016 Meeting – ACTION

There was no public comment.

The minutes were approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Avalos, Peskin and Tang (3)

Absent: Commissioners Breed and Farrell (2)

### 4. Recommend Allocation of \$12,713,969 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, for Two Requests, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules – ACTION

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Tang asked about the high cost of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's Fall Protection request as noted in the earlier CAC Chair's Report, and how the new systems would differ from existing systems. Ms. LaForte responded that the request was for specialized systems at seven facilities that had different needs. She said that existing systems varied by facility, and noted that there was an existing elevated platform at Muni Metro East that had gaps at the edges and missing guardrails, while the Cameron Beach facility needed structural upgrades.

Commissioner Avalos asked how often workers were falling at these facilities and whether there had been any injuries. Commissioner Peskin said that the city had just built the Muni Metro East facility and asked why the safety systems would be deficient at a new facility. He said he

supported worker safety but questioned why this was suddenly an issue when maintenance had been conducted on the roofs of cable cars for almost 150 years. He asked if this request was driven by these facilities being out of compliance with Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations. Ms. LaForte responded that safety regulations were updated over time and that she would follow up with the requesting agencies.

**Chair Tang continued Item 4 until later in the agenda. The item was resumed after Item 8.**

Chair Tang reiterated Commissioner Peskin's question about whether the request was due to a mandate from OSHA. Doug Ullman, Architect at San Francisco Public Works, stated that the facilities in question were not currently OSHA compliant and that fines had been levied in the past. He said that if these facilities were not upgraded city workers would not be allowed to perform maintenance on the roofs of vehicles. He added that there was a separate portable platform being purchased to work on the cable cars.

Chair Tang stated that the last bond measure included funding for renovating facilities and asked how that funding related to the current request. Mr. Ullman replied that there was no overlap between what would be funded under the Prop A bond and this request. He noted that at the Muni Metro East facility there was an eight inch gap between the elevated platform and vehicle roof and that this request would extend the platform to close that gap.

Commissioner Peskin asked why handrails were not installed at the Muni Metro East facility when it was built in 2008. Mr. Ullman replied that there was an existing fall protection system with guardrails and a fall arrest system. Commissioner Peskin stated that the construction management costs seemed high. Mr. Ullman said that the costs were higher because the project was split between seven facilities and there was a high degree of coordination necessary to upgrade the facilities without interrupting operations, but that they were considered to be within an acceptable range.

There was no public comment.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Avalos, Breed, Farrell, Peskin and Tang (5)

**5. Recommend Approval of the 2017 Prop AA Strategic Plan Policies and Screening and Prioritization Criteria – ACTION**

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

Commissioner Avalos asked what the recommended revisions to the Prop AA Policies and Screening and Prioritization Criteria were. Mr. Pickford responded that language had been streamlined citing, for example, specifying that procurement was part of the construction phase and eliminating duplicative language. He said another revision was to clarify that unexpended funds would now be returned to the overall Prop AA program, rather than an individual project, if that project had completed all Prop AA funded phases. With respect to the screening criteria, Mr. Pickford said changes were intended to allow broader eligibility for projects adopted in agency plans, rather than only citywide, board-adopted plans. He added that time sensitivity had been broken out from safety as a general criterion with safety addressed in category specific criteria.

There was no public comment.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Avalos, Farrell, Peskin and Tang (4)

Absent: Commissioner Breed (1)

**6. Recommend Approval of San Francisco Input on the Plan Bay Area 2040 Draft Preferred Scenario – ACTION**

Amber Crabbe, Assistant Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Commissioner Avalos stated that he spent several years as a member of the Association of Bay Area Governments and noted that it was a great deal of effort to secure One Bay Area Grant Funds for transit-oriented development in District 11. He said a challenge in regional planning was that other cities and municipalities in the region were not considering the region's needs in terms of housing. He said he wanted to ensure that San Francisco was being a leader in achieving the goals of the Sustainable Community Strategy and putting adequate investments in housing and transportation, and noted the importance of San Francisco adopting strong priorities so that other cities and municipalities would follow suit. Ms. Crabbe responded that the transportation investment strategy was strong but that using the Plan to effect significant changes to land use, housing and jobs was an incredible challenge without additional resources. She said that San Francisco was leading the region in terms of policies, creation and funding of housing that that there were limitations at the regional level without significant additional investment and a new fund source.

Commissioner Avalos asked if San Francisco's input called for more regional funds for housing and more equity in housing regarding transportation, which Ms. Crabbe confirmed.

There was no public comment.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Avalos, Breed, Farrell, Peskin and Tang (5)

**7. Update on the Railyard Alternatives and I-280 Boulevard Feasibility (RAB) Study – INFORMATION**

Susan Gygi, Study Manager at the San Francisco Planning, Department presented the item.

Chair Tang asked how the 22 members of the Citizen Working Group (CWG) were selected. Ms. Gygi responded that the Planning Department issued a request for interest for people to apply, and that it included seats for representatives of Districts 6 and 10, community advisory committee/neighborhood representatives, as well as representatives of citywide interest.

Commissioner Peskin asked if the \$4 billion cost estimate for the current alignment included grade separations. Ms. Gygi responded that the cost estimate did not include the grade separations at 16<sup>th</sup> Street and Mission Bay Drive. Commissioner Peskin asked what the cost estimate for the grade separations would be. Ms. Gygi responded that the study was in the process of preparing those estimates for each alternative and would have them toward the end of the year. Commissioner Peskin noted that the rendering of the 16<sup>th</sup> Street grade separation appeared to be a massive undertaking and asked if \$500 million was an accurate cost estimate. Ms. Gygi replied that it would likely cost more than that, as there were utilities at that location and a deep trench was needed for it to go under the freeway and Caltrain tracks, in addition to leveling intersecting streets.

Commissioner Peskin asked if the \$4 billion cost estimate included environmental clearance, and if the current Downtown Rail Extension (DTX) alignment was environmentally cleared. Ms. Gygi responded that the current alignment was cleared, but that the Planning Department conducted a supplemental Environmental Impact Statement that was released in December 2015 and was expecting the Record of Decision to be issued in early 2017. She noted that the current alignment along Pennsylvania Avenue would be the same as DTX, but the portion outside of the DTX would need to be environmentally cleared and would be a separate endeavor. She said the alternative Mission Bay Alignment was different than DTX and would need to be environmentally cleared, though tunnel boring environmental clearance was somewhat easier than the cut-and-cover and sequential mining construction method of the Pennsylvania alignment.

Commissioner Peskin noted that the RAB Study appeared to be wrapping up in June 2017 and asked if at that point the city would be preparing a new environmental document. He noted that the Board had withheld design funds for DTX at its September meeting and asked whether a few months' delay in design would matter if there would be a delay from additional environmental clearance. Ms. Gygi responded that she could not say definitively as the study was currently considering schedule implications and would have more information regarding the costs and benefits of the different alignments at its next public meeting. She added that the goal was to complete the DTX by the time high-speed rail trains come to San Francisco in 2029, if not before. She noted that 2029 was the original completion date for DTX, but that in February the California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) had switched the initial operating segment from the Central Valley to San Francisco, so they were now planning to have trains come to San Francisco sooner.

Commissioner Peskin noted that at the September Plans and Programs Committee meeting there was discussion about the widening of the throat structure going into the Transbay Transit Center (TTC) and asked if new information was available regarding if the throat structure still had to be widened. Ms. Gygi replied that most of the planning and engineering work around the DTX had been completed by the Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA), as it was there legislative directive to provide access from the 4<sup>th</sup> and King Station to the TTC, and therefore she was not the best person to respond. Commissioner Peskin asked if there were recent discussions by the CHSRA to have shorter trains. Ms. Gygi responded that CHSRA originally planned on having 1400-foot train lengths but that a few weeks' prior the agency sent a letter to its engineers that they would be shortening the trains to 800 feet, or half of a train set. She noted that the TTC train box could only accommodate 800-foot trains so it was planning to extend the train box to accommodate the 1400-foot trains, but it had not been communicated by the CHSRA or TJPA if that extension of DTX was still being considered.

Commissioner Peskin asked about the funding plan for the \$4 billion cost estimate. Ms. Gygi replied that the TJPA Board had approved a new funding strategy in June with anticipated new funding sources, including a new sales tax measure, but noted that TJPA staff in attendance could provide a more detailed response. Mark Zabaneh, Interim Executive Director with the TJPA, responded that the funding plan including monies currently available through Plan Bay Area 2013, \$650 million in New Starts which was expected to increase in Plan Bay Area 2040, \$350 million from the Transportation Authority, \$557 million from the CHSRA, and \$300 million from bridge tolls, all of which was committed to DTX. He said there was an additional \$83 million in existing San Francisco sales tax, \$19 million in San Mateo County sales tax, \$7 million in existing bridge tolls, \$275-375 million in Mello Roos funds remaining from Phase 1 of

the project, \$45 million from the sale of Block 4 which was currently the temporary Transbay Terminal, and between \$896 million to \$1.9 billion in passenger facility charges (PFCs) based on a 2004 approved environmental document. Mr. Zabaneh said that PFCs were estimated at \$2-3 dollars for Caltrain riders to travel from the 4<sup>th</sup> and King Station to the TTC, since riders currently had to take Muni to get to the financial district or Transbay Terminal, which in 2026 dollars would be roughly the same cost. He said there would be an \$8-10 PFC for high-speed rail passengers off-boarding at the TTC, and that if high-speed rail passengers were to exit at the 4<sup>th</sup> and King Station they would have to take a taxi which would be a similar cost. He said there would not be any out of pocket cost for riders as they currently paid for it through other systems, but would allow them to remain on the trains and not need to switch transportation systems.

Chair Tang asked if only San Francisco would be implementing the PFCs. Mr. Zabaneh responded that both the Caltrain Board and CHSRA Board would have to approve the PFCs which would only apply to passengers on those systems.

Commissioner Peskin asked what the ridership at the 4<sup>th</sup> and King Station was. Ms. Gygi responded that the 2016 ridership was 15,000 Caltrain riders on weekdays, and that when Caltrain reached the TTC it was estimated to be 30,000 on weekdays. She said the CHSRA estimated that by 2040 an additional 32,000 riders would travel to the TTC on weekdays, so approximately 60-70,000 riders in total once DTX was completed. Commissioner Peskin noted that on weekends ridership was lower, and estimated that overall the PFCs would only amount to \$15 million per year. Mr. Zabaneh replied that TJPA's financial analysts had prepared these estimates based on ridership numbers from Caltrain and the CHSRA and that TJPA's request to the Board at its September meeting was to conduct a ridership study and confirm these numbers and that a robust study was needed.

Commissioner Peskin said there were two issues with the ridership estimates provided by the CHSRA, the first being that they were optimistic and used for their own funding strategy, and the second that the estimates were predicated on the train ticket between Los Angeles and San Francisco being less expensive than an airplane ticket. He added that if other cities started adding PFC fees than it would lead to the train ticket being more expensive. Mr. Zabaneh replied that if DTX was not built people would disembark at the 4<sup>th</sup> and King Caltrain station and pay other transportation networks to reach their final destination, but that DTX was giving riders a choice to stay on the train. He said the funding plan was a starting point to fully fund the project and that since the proposed PFCs would not be available until 2026 they would need to borrow against those funds through TIFIA and RIF loans. He said that even without the PFCs there was significant funding available but that the project needed the region's support in order to be successful.

Chair Tang asked why the \$4 billion estimated cost did not include the potential grade separation at 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Mr. Zabaneh replied that the environmental document did not extend to that area and therefore did not include the grade separation improvements. He said that Ms. Gygi had presented the two alignment alternatives between the DTX project and the 22<sup>nd</sup> Street Caltrain Station which were not included in the scope of the DTX project and were considered a follow-on project. Chair Tang said it was somewhat part of the project and that eventually funding would need to be secured and asked what funding sources would be available. Megan Murphy, Phase 2 Project Manager at TJPA, replied that the grade separations were not included as part of the scope as they were not being environmentally cleared by the CHSRA because they

were not currently required by the California Public Utilities Commission due to the anticipated level of service.

Commissioner Peskin commented that there was a hospital with an emergency facility on the other side of the train tracks and that people would need to be able to access the University of California San Francisco (UCSF) medical center.

Tilly Chang, Executive Director, responded that a funding plan for a project of this magnitude would always be a challenge but that the first and foremost task was to confirm what the preferred alignment was. She said that the grade separation would be an additional significant cost but would not just be a San Francisco issue, as it would be a regional investment and a state facility. She said the city would need to bring in traditional federal, state, regional and local revenue sources but also potentially non-traditional revenue sources that had been used on prior phases. Ms. Chang said these could include land-based sources such as facilities districts or tax increments which were considered value capture type of approaches because the investment would bring value to adjacent areas, and that she believed the Planning Department was considering these.

Chair Tang reiterated that deciding on an alignment was the first and foremost challenge, and asked if there would be clarity around that by the winter. Ms. Gygi responded that there were five components with five different options, and that they would be combining those into full alternatives, including cost/benefit analyses and schedule implications, all of which would be presented to the public, to the Plans and Programs Committee, and the Board of Supervisors in the winter. She said after that they would come back to the Committee in June 2017 with a presentation on how the city should look in the future.

Chair Tang agreed that there should be a follow-up presentation to the Committee with the various options in the winter, and also wanted to ensure that there was comprehensive representation on the CWG. Ms. Gygi noted that the CWG was meeting on a monthly basis and that meetings were open to the public and presentations were posted afterwards.

During public comment, Chris Waddling stated that there should be a representative from the Transportation Authority's Citizens Advisory Committee on the CWG. He said that regarding funding, the grade separation at 16<sup>th</sup> Street should be a part of the project scope as \$1 billion was going to be spent one way or another. He said that he worked at UCSF and traveled through the area in question on a daily basis and noted that new homes were being built in that area and that the proposed grade separation would damage the vibrancy of the community. Mr. Waddling added that when the alignments were presented to the public there should be some consistency in the visuals to help people's understanding.

Jim Haas commented that he was a member of the CWG since he was also a member of a citizens group for housing being built next to the TTC as well as a member of the public affairs committee for the Chamber of Commerce. He said the CWG was a very distinguished group of individuals chaired by Ron Miguel and that there was substantial representation. He noted that the RAB study was misnamed because it included the I-280 in its title when the tearing down of the freeway was a vague option in the future and that the primary purpose of the group was to extend the trains to downtown. Lastly he said that the DTX environmental document was approved nearly 15 years ago prior to Mission Bay's development and that the trenches proposed for the 16<sup>th</sup> Street grade separation would no longer work and that UCSF agreed with that.

**8. Update on Freeway Corridor Management Study – INFORMATION**

Andrew Heidel, Senior Transportation Planner, and Liz Rutman, Senior Engineer with the Alameda County Transportation Commission, presented the item per the staff presentation.

Commissioner Avalos stated that he was supportive of high-occupancy vehicle lane management on the city's freeways but noted that there were many residents that used the freeway on a daily basis, especially in the southern part of the city. He requested that staff take into consideration the differences in neighborhoods throughout the city in terms of transportation options when conducting outreach and developing the program.

There was no public comment.

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

There was no public comment.

**10. Public Comment**

During public comment, Andrew Yip spoke about social problems that resulted from departures from good character.

**11. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:58 a.m.