



DRAFT MINUTES

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

September 3, 2014 MEETING

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Glenn Davis at 6:08 p.m. CAC members present were Myla Ablog, Glenn Davis, Brian Larkin, John Larson, Angela Minkin, Eric Rutledge, Jacqueline Sachs (entered during Item 10), Raymon Smith, Peter Tannen, Chris Waddling, and Wells Whitney. Transportation Authority staff members present were Tilly Chang, Courtney Aguirre, Liz Brisson, Colin Dentel-Post, Cynthia Fong, Chester Fung, Rachel Hiatt, Anna LaForte, Maria Lombardo, Chad Rathmann, Shari Tavafrashti, and Tony Vi.

2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Glenn Davis requested that the CAC consider Items 10 and 11 immediately following the Consent Calendar to allow all CAC members to be present during their review and consideration since some CAC members had indicated a need to depart early.

Angela Minkin moved to consider Items 10 and 11 after the Consent Calendar. Chris Waddling seconded the motion.

There was no public comment.

The motion passed unanimously.

Consent Calendar

Myla Ablog requested that Item 5 be removed from the Consent Calendar because of her employment with the California Department of Transportation.

3. Approve the Minutes of the June 25, 2014 Meeting – ACTION

John Larson commented that the June 25, 2014 meeting minutes contained an error. He stated that Eric Rutledge, not John Larson, had asked about the impacts of vehicle license fee funding. Staff confirmed the minutes would be updated accordingly.

4. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Award of an 12-Month Contract to Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. in an Amount Not to Exceed \$250,000, for System Engineering Services for the Treasure Island Mobility Management Program and for Authorizing the Executive Director to Negotiate Contract Payment Terms and Non-Material Contract Terms and Conditions – ACTION

6. Citizen Advisory Committee Appointment – INFORMATION

7. Investment Report for the Quarter Ended June 30, 2014 – INFORMATION

End of Consent Calendar

There was no public comment.

Raymon Smith moved to approve Items 3 and 4 on the Consent Calendar. John Larson seconded the motion. Items 3 and 4 passed unanimously.

The following items were called together:

10. **Adopt a Motion of Support for Adoption of the Draft 2014 Prop K Strategic Plan – ACTION**
11. **Adopt a Motion of Support for Adoption of the Fiscal Year 2014/15 Prop K List of Projects Eligible for Delegated Allocation Authority – ACTION**

Chad Rathmann, Senior Transportation Planner, presented on the Prop K Strategic Plan update, per the staff memorandum.

Tilly Chang, Executive Director, thanked staff and partner agencies for their work, and thanked the CAC for their guidance.

Ramon Smith asked if recommendations from the Eastern Neighborhoods Transportation Improvement Planning Study, conducted by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), would be included in the 2014 Prop K Strategic Plan.

Ms. Chang responded that the study resulted in recommendations for projects such as Folsom and Howard Streetscape, 16th Street Multimodal Corridor, and 7th and 8th Street Streetscape. She added that further planning and project development work for a number of projects from the plan were prioritized in the 2014 5-Year Prioritization Programs.

Wells Whitney asked if the Strategic Plan effectively functioned as a financial strategic plan and capital expenditure plan rather than a “what should we do” type of Strategic Plan. Mr. Rathmann responded affirmatively. Mr. Rathmann added the Prop K Expenditure Plan establishes what projects and programs are eligible for funding. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, concurred, adding that the Strategic Plan was the vehicle whereby the Transportation Authority reconciles which projects and programs get funding in which year. She concluded by noting that the Strategic Plan also provides day-to-day guidance on implementation of the Prop K program via the Strategic Plan policies.

Jacqueline Sachs asked why the Strategic Plan provided no funding for Geary Light Rail Transit, and how the project would be funded. Mr. Rathmann stated that Geary Light Rail Transit was included in the Prop K Expenditure Plan as a Priority 3 project. He explained that the three priority levels reflected different revenue projections, and that the Transportation Authority’s current projection showed sales tax revenues coming in at 82% of Priority 1 levels, the most conservative forecast. He said that additional sales tax revenue would need to be generated to achieve 100% of Priority 1 and 2 funding levels before funding could be available for Priority 3 projects such as Geary Light Rail Transit.

Ms. Lombardo noted that the SFMTA is conducting a rail capacity study to examine prioritization of Muni investments, and the regional Transit Core Capacity Study would help prioritize transit investments in the Transbay corridor. She added that the Transportation Authority would be refreshing the San Francisco Transportation Plan (SFTP), incorporating the findings from these and other studies. She stated that the SFTP would be the appropriate forum to have a comprehensive discussion about prioritizing major transit investments. Ms. Sachs added that staff should review the final report and engineering analysis of the Geary Task Force prior to considering bus rapid transit.

The CAC Chair called for public comment on the Strategic Plan portion of the items that were under discussion. Roland Lebrun asked for clarification on why funding for Caltrain Vehicles, Facilities and Guideways categories was being advanced, and if the funding would be available for the Caltrain Downtown Extension. Ms. Lombardo stated the funding for those categories is specifically for state of good repair projects and not the Downtown Extension which has its own Expenditure Plan line item. She added that the intent of advancing the state of good repair funds was so that Prop K could continue to help offset the SFMTA's annual local capital match contribution to Caltrain in the near-term.

Ms. Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, presented the pilot Delegated Allocation Authority Policy per the staff memorandum.

Brian Larkin requested clarification on which committees would be permitted to remove projects from the Prop K list of projects eligible for delegated allocation authority. Ms. Lombardo responded that the CAC and Plans and Programs Committee could recommend removing projects from the list and the Transportation Authority Board would consider these recommendations and then approve the final list. Mr. Larkin asked how often the Board did not approve a staff recommendation. He commented that he understood sponsors could lose project delivery time during the Board's August recess if awaiting the approval of an allocation. Ms. Lombardo responded that the Board relatively rarely denied funding, but that periodically the Board would modify staff recommendations such as by included additional conditions. She commented that controversial projects would be unlikely candidates for delegated allocation authority.

Raymon Smith commented that delegated allocation authority could potentially save sponsors four to six weeks. He asked whether sponsors were neglecting to submit the allocation requests on time to allow them to access funds when they needed them. Ms. Lombardo stated that delegated allocation authority would allow sponsors to not be tied to a Board schedule, and this could prove particularly helpful during the Board's August recess. She stated that the majority of the time, sponsors ought to be able to submit allocation requests on-time since the schedule is predictable and the 5YPPs are approved in advance. She stated that on those occasions when a project unexpectedly needed funds quickly, delegated allocation authority might provide the needed flexibility, assuming a project was already included on the pre-approved delegated allocation authority eligible list. She stated that delegated allocation authority would save sponsors the staff time of attending Transportation Authority meetings.

Mr. Smith asked whether delegated allocation authority could help expedite allocations to projects addressing vehicle and pedestrian conflicts. Ms. Lombardo responded that it could, noting that the draft list of projects includes local track application-based traffic calming program projects and a couple of Safe Routes to School projects.

Mr. Smith asked how the Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC) would be involved in project review. Jonathan Rewers, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Capital Financial Planning and Analysis Manager, stated that the PSAC had reviewed and provided feedback on the SFMTA's 5-year Capital Improvement Program, which included the SFMTA's Prop K projects. He stated that these projects were reflected in the recently approved 2014 Prop K 5YPPs and some were now included on the draft delegated allocation authority eligible list.

Wells Whitney commented that delegation allocation authority appeared to be a pilot study to see whether small projects could go through a less bureaucratic process to get funded. He commented that the projects included on the draft delegated allocation authority eligible list had already been reviewed by the CAC when it approved the 2014 Prop K 5YPPs. Mr. Whitney

added that he was interested in seeing an evaluation of the effectiveness of the pilot delegated allocation authority policy.

Chair Davis asked for additional information regarding the subvention processes of other agencies comparable to the Transportation Authority. Ms. Lombardo commented that in other Bay Area counties, a portion of the sales tax expenditure plans typically included annual subventions to local jurisdictions in the county. For these subvention categories, the sales tax authorities often issue payments directly to jurisdictions based on established formulas. They don't ask for project information in advance, but they do require that recipients provide an annual reports on their activities. She added that unlike San Francisco, if a jurisdiction isn't delivering projects, the sales tax authority can redirect the funds to another recipient. Chair Davis asked if citizen oversight happened at the local jurisdiction level. Ms. Lombardo opined that most places have a City Council that would approve the use of the sales tax funds, and this would offer some degree of public input and oversight.

Chair Davis stated that he did not support the implementation of a delegated allocation authority policy. He stated that he favored maintaining the current process because it ensured community input. He reminded the CAC that at the time voters approved Prop K, they were assured that oversight by a CAC would be in place and that this was a selling point. Chair Davis stated that he was open to deferring action on the item.

Peter Tannen commented that Chair Davis raised valid point about transportation and the need for community input. He stated that the delegated allocation authority policy appeared to be well thought out and the six categories defining eligibility were well-defined. Mr. Tannen commented that he had lived and worked in San Francisco for a number of years and that regardless of the merits of a particular project, there was bound to be a community member unhappy with the project. He stated that he would rather sponsors spend additional time analyzing a project than staffing a CAC meeting, and expressed his support for the more efficient use of staff time, and piloting the delegated allocation authority policy. He voiced interest in periodic reports on its implementation and he asked that staff maintain a log of complaints or issues that cropped up as the policy was implemented.

Angela Minkin asked how Transportation Authority staff planned to evaluate the policy's success. She commented that she understood that project delays could be frustrating, but that she was not certain of the value of saving four to six weeks in seeking an allocation. She commented that a shorter pilot period might be better.

Mr. Rewers commented that the delegated allocation authority policy would help the SFMTA address findings of the SFMTA's audit regarding project delivery and the Transportation Authority's Small Project Delivery White Paper. He commented that about the same amount of staff time and resources were currently dedicated to preparing an allocation request for \$6,000 or \$6 million dollars. Mr. Rewers suggested that the Transportation Authority could measure how many more small allocation requests it received in a given year from sponsors because of this new policy. He stated that the SFMTA sometimes opted to use operating budget instead of seeking a Prop K allocation for a project.

Ms. Lombardo stated that the policy was unlikely to impact the total number of allocations noting that the one of the intents of the 5YPPs was to establish the 5-year pipeline of projects so the public and sponsors know in advance what will be funded. Further, the pilot policy is based on a pre-approved annual list of project. To Ms. Minkin's point about evaluating the pilot, Ms. Lombardo acknowledged that measuring the success of the policy could prove challenging given the indirect link of saving a few staff hours by not attending two meetings and project delivery. Ms. Lombardo commented that as described in the pilot policy,

Transportation Authority staff could track the number of delegated allocations (compared to the pre-approved list), Prop K leveraging, and overall project delivery (i.e. whether projects were being completed on-time). She said that staff could also interview or survey the CAC, Board, and sponsors for their perception of whether the pilot was working well or not.

Mr. Whitney agreed that a qualitative survey could be administered at the conclusion of the pilot period. Chair Davis commented that the metrics had not been adequately detailed and would not be in place if the CAC adopted the policy that evening.

Chris Waddling commented that in order for a project to be a candidate it must be sufficiently defined within the relevant 5YPP, and that the WalkFirst 5YPP placeholders did not appear to meet this eligibility criterion. Ms. Lombardo agreed noting that neither the WalkFirst placeholders nor the Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program (NTIP) planning projects fully met this criterion. She stated that NTIP planning projects would include significant community outreach and would be projects recommended by the relevant district supervisor. She stated the WalkFirst 5YPP placeholders were added at the request of project sponsors given the focus on Vision Zero, but that Transportation Authority staff recommended conditioning allocation of the WalkFirst funds upon prior approval of the specific projects, scopes, schedules, and budgets by the Transportation Authority Board's Vision Zero Committee.

Mr. Waddling expressed concern that the CAC was ceding oversight, and he commented that the community's interest or the importance of a particular project was not necessarily tied to the overall cost of a project. He commented that he appreciated reviewing Prop K allocations because he was able to then communicate project information to other community members. Mr. Waddling commented that he also appreciated that the allocation currently in place process reminded sponsors that they were accountable to the community. He added that a time savings of four to six weeks and to spare staff from attending committee meetings were not sufficient justifications for implementing the new policy. Mr. Waddling stated that he would prefer to defer action on this item. He commented that he would like to see a proposal regarding the evaluation of the pilot, and that the CAC should be able to recommend whether or not the pilot period is extended beyond January 2016.

Ms. Lombardo clarified that the CAC any actions to modify or extend the pilot would go through the CAC and Plans and Programs Committee prior to Board approval.

Eric Rutledge expressed his support for the policy and the more efficient use of staff hours. He requested an example of how a delegated allocation authority project would move through the process. He commented that the CAC seemed to see projects return for allocations for subsequent phases. Ms. Lombardo stated a project the Redding Elementary (design) or John Yehall Chin (planning and design) Safe Routes to School projects that were currently on the eligible list might return to the CAC for allocation of construction funds if they exceeded the \$75,000 threshold or were considered projects that would benefit from increased review and additional public input opportunities made available by going through the Board cycle.

Mr. Rutledge asked whether the CAC would still review information for the design and construction phases of these projects. Ms. Lombardo responded that the CAC could currently review the 5YPP project information forms with scope, schedule, cost and funding information. She stated that if the CAC approved the delegated allocation authority policy, the subsequent item they would consider would be the approval of the Fiscal Year 2014/15 Prop K list of projects eligible for delegated allocation authority. She stated that the CAC would review and approve the list of eligible projects on an annual basis and attached to the list would be the corresponding project information forms, which would include scope, schedule, and budget

information. The 5YPP forms are an abbreviated version of the more detailed allocation request form. She explained that if the policy is approved, the CAC would not see the more detailed allocation request forms at a CAC meeting (thought they would be available on the Transportation Authority's website).

Chair Davis requested that the annual process be described again. Ms. Lombardo explained that in order to support implementation of this policy in future years, the Transportation Authority would offer project sponsors the opportunity annually to amend the 5YPPs between the quadrennial 5YPP updates. She noted that the annual process would focus on updating programming for the coming fiscal year so that more projects could be eligible to benefit from delegated allocation authority and placeholders could be replaced with more detailed information. Ms. Lombardo state staff would concurrently develop a draft list of projects eligible for delegated allocation authority and present it to the CAC, Plans and Programs Committee, and Board for review and action. She stated that once a project was included on the approved list, the project sponsor could submit an allocation request to the Transportation Authority for review and approval by the Executive Director or designee.

Mr. Rewers commented that through the annual 5YPP amendment process, the CAC would review the projects proposed for delegated allocation authority. He stated that the CAC would be able to recommend whether projects remained on the list. He stated that the pilot period was for about 16 months, which would allow the Transportation Authority and sponsors to experience one annual amendment cycle.

Mr. Rutledge commented that the appropriate checks and balances appeared to be in place and that he supported approval of the policy. He commented that the policy would allow for the saving of time and money and would ideally result in the more expeditious implementation of projects.

Mr. Larson commented that he thought that the Transportation Authority could balance the need for public input with being responsive through the implementation of this policy. He commented that the pilot period would provide opportunities for review and adjustment, if necessary. He commented that he would appreciate seeing the evaluation metrics and methods (e.g. pre/post qualitative survey).

Mr. Tannen asked what would happen if the CAC recommended a project be removed from the list of projects, but the Plans and Programs Committee and Board supported its inclusion. Ms. Lombardo responded that the CAC was an advisory committee and that ultimately it was the Board's decision. However, she stated that if the CAC recommended any removals, Transportation Authority staff would be inclined to adjust its recommendation to reflect the input since the intent is for the CAC to be comfortable with the list.

To simplify voting, Ms. Lombardo noted that the CAC could split the recommended action into two separate pieces.

Mr. Larson moved to adopt a motion of support to adopt the 2014 Prop K Strategic Plan without the delegated allocation authority policy. Mr. Smith seconded the motion.

The motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Tannen moved to adopt a motion of support to approve the delegated allocation authority policy. Mr. Smith seconded the motion and requested a friendly amendment that the approval be conditioned upon the Transportation Authority staff returning to the CAC with the pilot policy's evaluation metrics. Mr. Tannen accepted the friendly amendment.

The motion was approved with seven votes in favor, with Ms. Ablog, Chair Davis, and Mr. Waddling opposed.

12.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, said that staff would bring an evaluation matrix to the CAC at its next meeting. She presented on Item 11, describing the proposed project list for delegated allocation authority and reminding the CAC that it could choose to remove any of the projects from the list that it preferred to have go through the regular Board cycle for approval of an allocation.

John Larson asked for clarification on why the Transportation Authority would invest Prop K funds in the Great Highway Restoration project when the long-term plan for the roadway included its removal. Ms. Lombardo responded that the project naming could be made more clear, noting that the funds were for repairs needed now, well before the long-term plan could be implemented.

Mr. Larson commented that the long-term recommendation from SPUR was to not have a roadway north of Sloat Boulevard, but for the roadway to go around the San Francisco Zoo. He questioned the need for investment in a roadway that was not intended to continue to exist in the future. Ananda Hirsch, San Francisco Public Works (SF Public Works), stated SF Public Works was pursuing restoration funds for the roadway and that the agency was working with Caltrans to determine the best option for a near-term improvement to ensure it remained a functioning roadway. She stated that SF Public Works was still seeking funding for a more permanent solution.

Angela Minkin moved to approve the item and Eric Rutledge seconded the motion.

There was no public comment.

The item passed with seven votes in favor, with Ms. Ablog and Chair Davis opposed and Mr. Smith abstaining.

5. **Adopt a Motion of Support for Approval of a Resolution Authorizing the Executive Director to Execute all Master Agreements, Program Supplemental Agreements, Fund Exchange Agreements, Fund Transfer Agreements, Cooperative Agreements and Any Amendments Thereto Between the Transportation Authority and the California Department of Transportation for Receipt of Federal and State Funds, including an Agreement for a Partnership Planning Grant to Support the San Francisco Freeway Performance Initiative Study; the Planning, Programming and Monitoring Program; and the Yerba Buena Island Interchange Improvement Project – ACTION**

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy, and Cynthia Fong, Deputy Director of Finance and Administration, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Wells Whitney moved to approve the item and Chair Davis seconded the motion.

There was no public comment.

The item passed unanimously.

8. **Adopt a Motion of Support for the Adoption of the 2014 Prop K Bus Rapid Transit/Transit Preferential Streets/Muni Metro Network 5-Year Prioritization Program and the Amendment of the 2014 Prop K Transit Enhancements and BART Station Access, Safety and Capacity 5-Year Prioritization Programs – ACTION**

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

memorandum.

Peter Tannen asked for clarification on why the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP) would not be eligible for general obligation bond funding. Ms. LaForte responded that the bond funds could only be used for final design and construction, and that the Prop K funds would be used for planning phase work. Jonathan Rewers, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Capital Financial Planning and Analysis Manager, stated that the TEP, now called Muni Forward, had three implementation groups. He stated that the approximately \$13 million in Prop K funds the Transportation Authority Board had already allocated for the first group of projects were anticipated to receive design and construction funds from the proposed general obligation bond. He stated that the second group of projects would also be funded by the general obligation bond. Mr. Rewers added that the 2014 Prop K Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)/Transit Preferential Streets/Muni Metro Network 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPP) included funding for the third group of projects to allow concurrent design and planning work.

Brian Larkin asked why the Geary BRT project was receiving funding from the Transit Enhancement category. Ms. LaForte explained that each Expenditure Plan category had a funding limit established in the voter-approved Prop K Expenditure Plan. She continued by noting that the BRT category would hit its funding limit in the 2014 5YPP period so additional funding for Geary BRT was proposed from the Transit Enhancements category.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, elaborated by noting that the Transportation Authority could not adjust the funding caps. She noted that projects sometimes drew funds from multiple different Expenditure Plan categories, such as was done for the Third Street Light Rail Project. Mr. Larkin commented that it seemed counterintuitive to seek funding for a BRT project from a non-BRT category given the existence of a dedicated category for BRT projects.

Wells Whitney moved to approve the item and John Larson seconded the motion.

There was no public comment.

The item passed with five votes in favor and two votes opposed (Mr. Davis, Ms. Sachs), with two abstentions (Mr. Larkin, Mr. Smith).

9. Adopt a Motion of Support for Allocation of \$2,585,414 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, and Appropriation of \$928,415 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, for Eight Requests, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules – ACTION

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

Tilly Chang stated the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) would be withdrawing staff from the Geneva-Harney Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project as the agency was not supportive of examining the relocation of the Bayshore Caltrain station from Brisbane into San Francisco. She added that the Transportation Authority would be working with C/CAG on the issue and would determine whether C/CAG would withdraw funding support for the Geneva-Harney BRT project.

Liz Brisson, Senior Transportation Planner, presented on the Bay Area Transit Core Capacity Study per the staff memorandum.

Rachel Hiatt, Principal Transportation Planner, presented on the San Francisco Freeway Corridor Management Study per the staff memorandum. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy,

added that by the end of calendar year, staff expected to return to the CAC to present a purpose, needs and goals statement for approval, which would inform the planning work in phase 2 of the two part study.

Wells Whitney asked if the San Francisco Freeway Corridor Management Study would examine Caltrain and High Speed Rail given that both were within the same corridor. Ms. Hiatt responded that the study would examine the transit capacity within a corridor as well as the vehicle capacity within the corridor.

Peter Tannen asked whether toll lanes would be considered as an option. Ms. Hiatt responded that toll lanes would be one of the options considered.

Mr. Whitney moved to approve the item and Angela Minkin seconded the motion.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun stated that the Quint-Jerrold Connector Road would make the possibility of an Oakdale Caltrain station uncertain. He added that the Bayshore Caltrain station should not move north and that the current site south of the county line enables a truly multimodal station with light rail and BRT connections.

The item passed unanimously.

12. Draft Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program Planning Guidelines – INFORMATION

Chair Glenn Davis continued Item 12 to the October 1, 2014, CAC meeting. There was no public comment.

13. Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION

There was no public comment.

14. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

15. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:24 p.m.