



# *DRAFT MINUTES*

## **PLANS AND PROGRAMS COMMITTEE**

Tuesday, June 17, 2014

### **1. Roll Call**

Chair Mar called the meeting to order at 10:19 a.m. The following members were:

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

**Absent at Roll Call:** Commissioners Breed (entered during Item 4) and Campos (entered during Item 7) (2)

### **2. Citizens Advisory Committee Report – INFORMATION**

Brian Larkin, Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) member, reported that at its May 28 meeting, the CAC considered and unanimously passed Items 4, 5, 7 and 8 from the agenda.

There was no public comment.

### **Consent Calendar**

#### **3. Approve the Minutes of the May 28, 2014 Meeting – ACTION**

#### **4. Recommend Commitment of \$2,000,000 in Fiscal Year 2015/16 Prop K Funds, with Conditions, to the Bayshore Caltrain Pedestrian Connections Project – ACTION**

#### **5. Recommend Adoption of the Balboa Park Circulation Study Final Report – ACTION**

There was no public comment.

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

Ayes: Commissioners Kim, Mar and Yee (3)

Absent: Commissioners Breed and Campos (2)

### **End of Consent Calendar**

#### **6. Recommend Appointment of One Member to the Citizens Advisory Committee – ACTION**

Courtney Aguirre, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Catherine Orland spoke to her interest and qualifications in being appointed to the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC).

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Kim stated that she would like to continue the vacancy.

The remaining vacancy was continued at the call of the Chair by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Kim, Mar and Yee (4)

Absent: Commissioner Campos (1)

**7. Recommend Allocation of \$53,539,150 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, Appropriation of \$39,000 in Prop K Funds, and Allocation of \$1,804,206 in Prop AA Funds, with Conditions, for Seven Requests, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules – ACTION**

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

Chair Mar asked whether the Glen Park Community Plan Implementation project would include bicycle-related improvements. Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, clarified that the project did not include specific improvements, but that the project's traffic calming improvements would generally benefit bicyclists.

Commissioner Yee asked whether the name of the Phelan Loop Pedestrian Connector project should be updated. He commented that it was his understanding that Phelan was no longer going to be referenced. Ms. LaForte responded that she understood that there were conversations regarding the discontinuation of references to Phelan and naming the transit stop the San Francisco City College stop. She stated that the adjacent plaza had already been named Unity Plaza by the community, but Transportation Authority staff would need to confirm whether the renaming of the transit stop was official.

During public comment, Andrew Yip complemented Mr. Rathmann on the delivery of his presentation.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Campos, Kim, Mar and Yee (5)

**8. Recommend Approval of Six 2014 Prop K 5-Year Prioritization Programs – ACTION**

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

Chair Mar asked whether the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) was exploring ways to expedite vehicle procurements in order to address vehicle failures and other malfunctions. Ms. LaForte responded that the SFMTA was engaging in a couple of different methods to expedite vehicle procurements, including participating in a multi-year joint procurement contract with King County Metro (Seattle) for trolley vehicles and issuing its own multi-year procurement contract for hybrid vehicles. She stated that the SFMTA estimated that these methods could help reduce the procurement process by about nine months.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, commented that the Citizens Advisory Committee had provided useful input on the draft Prop K 5-Year Prioritization Programs (5YPPs) and that in particular, the CAC had influenced the development of a more user-friendly and consistent scoring methodology for each category that placed the highest priority on safety and projects derived from community-based plans.

Chair Mar expressed appreciation for the updated Prop K 5YPPs, which addressed San Francisco's citywide transportation system issues as well as the needs of neighborhoods. He

expressed support for the Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program, which would allow each district to advance projects, either planning or capital, that would address its needs.

Commissioner Campos asked how the implementation of Vision Zero would be reflected in the 5YPPs. Ms. LaForte responded at its July 15 meeting, the Plans and Programs Committee would be asked to review and recommend approval of draft 2014 Prop K 5YPPs for categories for New Signals and Signs, Traffic Calming, Pedestrian Circulation/Safety, and Bicycle Circulation/Safety categories, all of which included projects and placeholders for funds that would allow for the implementation of Vision Zero-type projects.

There was no public comment.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Campos, Kim, Mar and Yee (5)

**9. Progress Report on Performance Audit of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency – INFORMATION**

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy for Policy and Programming, introduced Vince Harris, Director of Capital Programs and Construction at SFMTA, who presented the item.

Chair Mar expressed his appreciation of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA's) efforts to improve its corporate culture and its dramatically improved community engagement, noting the 5-Fulton Pilot project as a specific example.

Commissioner Campos commented that SFMTA's performance initiative was very important in light of the upcoming ballot measures. He asked how many active capital projects the SFMTA was currently handling. Mr. Harris answered that the Capital Programs and Construction division (just one of the divisions within the SFMTA that delivered capital projects) had about 40 active projects, and offered to report back to the Committee with a full list of SFMTA's capital projects.

Commissioner Campos asked how many of the 40 projects were on schedule, saying the audit had reported a lack of awareness within the SFMTA about project delivery timelines and budgets. Lucien Burgert, SFMTA Manager of Capital Controls, answered that SFMTA had implemented project scheduling and cost management software to improve project delivery. He said that 50% to 60% of projects managed by the Capital Programs and Construction division were on schedule and 80% to 90% were on budget based on the original baselines set at the end of the conceptual engineering phases. He said the SFMTA was working on agency-wide standards for baseline schedules and budgets to facilitate consistent reporting and to account for scope changes. He added that the use of consistent baselines would probably reveal a higher percentage of on-time projects.

Commissioner Campos requested an overview report analyzing the factors leading to the on-schedule status of some projects and the delay of others, and describing how project delivery was tracked. He asked that the SFMTA include information such as the on-time and on-budget percentages of active Prop K funded projects. Mr. Harris responded that the SFMTA produced a number of project delivery reports, including quarterly reports to the Transportation Authority, and would be able to provide the requested information.

Commissioner Campos asked that the SFMTA also provide the Transportation Authority with the same project delivery information provided to the SFMTA Board. He said an issue identified by the audit was that the SFMTA Board consistently approved additional funds for projects without knowing whether they were on schedule. Mr. Harris said an outcome of the audit was a comprehensive project delivery report to the SFMTA Board that provided the baseline schedules and budgets for active capital projects, and that the SFMTA Board would continue to receive quarterly updates. He said the new project tracking systems would improve the quality and quantity of information available to the SFMTA Board.

Chair Mar asked how the SFMTA planned to meet the increased staffing levels needed to deliver the large number of projects anticipated should the November transportation ballot measures pass. Mr. Harris responded that the staffing plan would focus on junior engineers and mid-level project managers because increased staffing was a long-term need and it was hoped that the training of new hires would benefit the SFMTA over the long term.

Tilly Chang, Executive Director, stated that Transportation Authority staff could also provide project delivery information to the Board on the 100 to 200 projects (depending on how individual project phases were counted) funded by the agency. She pointed out that project delivery and other information on these projects was available at any time to anyone with internet access via the Transportation Authority's MyStreetSF interactive map. She explained that project managers provide project delivery information to the Transportation Authority on a continuous basis via its online Portal, which tracks project delivery based on the schedule at the time funds were allocated. Commissioner Campos commented that project delivery reporting would be helpful in ensuring transparency. He asked for additional information regarding project manager accountability. Mr. Harris responded that the audit had recommended that project managers be involved earlier in the life of a project. He said the SFMTA had initiated a "womb-to-tomb" system in which as soon as a project was initiated, the project manager was brought on-board and held accountable through project closeout.

There was no public comment.

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

There were no new items.

There was no public comment.

**11. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**12. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.