



DRAFT MINUTES

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

October 1, 2014 MEETING

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Peter Tannen at 6:05 p.m. CAC members present were, Myla Ablog, Glenn Davis, John Larson, Eric Rutledge, Jacqueline Sachs, Peter Tannen, and Christopher Waddling. Transportation Authority staff members present were Tilly Chang, Amber Crabbe, Sarah Fine, Anna LaForte, Vanessa Lauf, Maria Lombardo, Chad Rathmann, and David Uniman.

2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Davis stated that the Prop K Delegated Allocation Authority item had been continued at the call of the Plans and Programs Committee Chair, Commissioner Mar.

Consent Calendar

3. Approve the Minutes of the September 3, 2014 Meeting – ACTION

4. 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 SPTJ Consulting in an Amount Not to Exceed \$550,000 for Computer Network and Maintenance Services and Authorize the Executive Director to Negotiate the Contract Payment Terms and Non-Material Contract Terms and Conditions – ACTION

5. State and Federal Legislative Update – INFORMATION

Chris Waddling moved to approve the consent calendar. Peter Tannen seconded the motion.

There was no public comment.

The motion was approved unanimously.

End of Consent Calendar

6. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Amendment of the Prop K Strategic Plan, Amendment of the Transit Enhancements and Vehicles 5-Year Prioritization Programs, and Allocation of \$131,153,142 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, for the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's Light Rail Vehicle Procurement, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules – ACTION

Brian Larkin entered during item 6.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Jacqueline Sachs asked if adoption of a new Prop K Expenditure Plan in the not too distant

future would compromise or ensure funding for the LRV procurement. Ms. Lombardo responded that recommendations included in item 7 were covered under the current Expenditure Plan. She added the Transportation Authority can adopt a new expenditure plan in year 20 of the current Expenditure Plan, and any existing commitments would be honored under the new plan.

Chris Waddling expressed concern regarding the depletion of the Vehicles-Discretionary line item and asked if this information had been communicated to BART and Caltrain. Ms. Lombardo stated that it was noteworthy that BART and Caltrain were added as eligible Prop K recipients to the Prop K Expenditure Plan on the advice of the Expenditure Plan Community Advisory Committee, which was a new feature over the prior sales tax measure. She stated that per the Expenditure Plan, the Transportation Authority could not commit funds to BART for vehicle funds if other counties also do not commit commensurate funds. Since that wasn't happening at the present, BART could not access even its guaranteed share of vehicle replacement funds. For Caltrain, Ms. Lombardo noted that Caltrain's Electrification Program including San Francisco's local match share toward the purchase of electrified vehicles and that Prop K was covering this partially through the electrification line item in the Expenditure Plan. She continued to say that the City's November bond measure in 2018 would provide the remainder of San Francisco's match for the upcoming vehicle replacement.

Brian Larkin asked if the useful life for transit vehicles was established by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) policies would prevent usage of FTA funds to replace vehicles until the end of their useful life. Ms. Lombardo answered affirmatively. She noted that key to reaching the useful life and consistently reaping the benefits of well-performing vehicles is proper maintenance. She said that SFMTA was partially tackling this issue by developing specifications for the new vehicles that would result in less maintenance. For instance, doors are a major contributor to breakdowns and transit delay. The new vehicles will have a much simpler design with many fewer parts. Mr. Larkin asked if Siemens would be manufacturing the new light rail vehicles. Ms. Lombardo answered affirmatively.

Eric Rutledge commented that addressing switchbacks on the light rail line was important for District 4. He thanked the SFMTA in addressing service reliability, and expressed support of the project which should also help with the switchback issue.

Chair Davis requested clarification regarding cash flow impacts for the Vehicles-Muni and Vehicles-Discretionary line items. Ms. Lombardo reviewed the graphics in Attachment 2 to the memo, explaining that although programming (linked to the year of allocation) would be significantly advanced, cash flow (expenditures) is actually reduced during the peak demand years in the Strategic Plan and extends out for many, many years. She explained that the result is a negligible decrease in financing costs for the Strategic Plan as a whole. She concluded by reminding the CAC that a core Prop K policy is that if a line item advances funding to accelerate project delivery, then that line item would bear the financing costs. This was done to protect ongoing programs like bike and pedestrian improvements.

Brian Larkin moved to approve this item, and Jacqueline Sachs seconded the motion.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked if any funds from planned development areas would support funding the LRV procurement contract options. Ariel Espiritu Santo, SFMTA Capital Financial Planning and Analysis, stated that neither of the options had a full funding plan. She added that potential funding for the options include area plan funds. She noted that the Market/Octavia Citizens Advisory Committee supported using area plan funds for vehicle procurement, but the amount would likely only support acquisition of one additional LRV. Ms. Espiritu Santo added that the SFMTA would continue exploring funding options for the two

contract options. Ms. Lombardo asked if using Transit Impact Development Fee (TIDF) funds was a possibility. Ms. Espiritu Santo responded that TIDF was not being explored at this time.

Roland Lebrun stated that Caltrain did not need new funding for new vehicles, as Caltrain would be purchasing new cars from Metrolink and further, it had the ability to cover costs through fares. He said that BART did not need funds since it was just relieved of a financial obligation by receiving regional funds that had been designated for Dumbarton rail service.

The motion was approved unanimously.

7. Adopt a Motion of Support for Allocation of \$496,100 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, and Appropriation of \$150,000 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, for Three Requests, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules – ACTION

Items 7 and 9 were called together.

Chad Rathmann, Senior Transportation Planner, presented item 7 per the staff memorandum.

Tilly Chang, Executive Director, presented on the Treasure Island Mobility Management Program portion of item 7 per the staff memorandum and on item 9.

Myla Ablog commented that she had met with District 5 members of other citizens advisory committees and other organizations and noted that transportation concerns were becoming more prevalent. With respect to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA's) Western Addition Community-Based Transportation Planning project, she said the main concern expressed by community members was over how the Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project would be integrated into the planning project.

Craig Raphael, SFMTA Capital Financial Planning and Analysis and Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program Coordinator for the SFMTA, responded that the SFMTA was currently mapping all planned investments in District 5, including Geary BRT, and that the BRT project would be integrated into the planning project. Mr. Raphael added that the intersections of Geary Boulevard/Steiner Street and Geary Boulevard/Webster Street had already come up as locations for study in conversations between the SFMTA and Commissioner Breed's office.

Brian Larkin asked why design was so expensive for additional sharrows since the SFMTA had already completed 75 miles of design for sharrows in San Francisco previously and that it's just paint. Jonathan Rewers, SFMTA Capital Financial Planning and Analysis, responded that staff time was used in determining where to place individual sharrows and determine the traffic impacts of the placement. Mr. Rewers added that sharrows installed on McAllister Street, for instance, needed to be evaluated by the SFMTA for their impact on the 5-Fulton Muni line. Mr. Larkin responded that the work involved with designing sharrows was almost as intensive as how a Class II bike lane might be evaluated for impacts on parking. Mr. Rewers stated that the budgeted staff time for design provided SFMTA with enough funds to support due diligence related to traffic and safety impacts.

Chris Waddling noted that a center lane was recently added on Jerrold Avenue, which has in turn made travel more difficult for bicyclists. He noted that sharrows were not included in the streets project, and asked how the SFMTA determines where to install sharrows that were not prescribed as part of the 2009 San Francisco Bicycle Plan. Further, Mr. Waddling asked how people could request sharrows on streets that were not included in the plan. Mr. Rewers responded that there were some instances where Prop B Streets Bond funds were funding

sharrows not included in the bike plan as part of follow-the-paving projects. He noted that the SFMTA was also working with the Planning Department on a modal hierarchy to provide a framework for which mode should receive the highest priority on different types of streets. Mr. Rewers gave the example of Van Ness Street and Polk Street, where the prioritized modes were transit and bicycles/pedestrians, respectively. He noted that the SFMTA was also working towards implementing an integrated project implementation policy, which would ensure a review and sign-off by all modal divisions for capital projects before the project started.

In response to the question about how someone would request a sharrow, Mr. Rewers responded that the 311 service has generally served to identify what has needed to be fixed. Mr. Rewers continued by saying that the SFMTA would soon be making it easier for people to request improvements and not simply make a report about something to be fixed by implementing a webpage related to the SFMTA Capital Plan. Mr. Rewers explained that requests made on this website would be fed directly into the capital planning process. He also noted that the Transportation Authority's Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program would be an appropriate place for people to request sharrows not included in the bike plan.

Eric Rutledge asked how much of the policy related to Treasure Island Mobility Management Program was finalized. He asked if pricing non-residential parking was a future goal or something that had already been approved. Ms. Chang responded that much of the high-level policy framework was approved as part of the agreement for the development project on Treasure Island, including that there shall be tolling, mandatory transit passes, increased transit service, and the pricing of non-residential parking. However, she explained that many policy decisions about how to set up and implement this framework have yet to be made and that these future decisions would be informed by the ongoing planning work of the Treasure Island Mobility Management Program. Ms. Chang concluded by saying that the decisions would be considered by the Treasure Island Mobility Management Board (the Transportation Authority Board acting as TIMMA) in the future.

Myla Ablog moved to approve this item. John Larson seconded the motion.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun requested that during item 12 a video of the Emirates Air Line gondola in London be shown. He noted that plans for access to Treasure Island did not increase capacity, but controlled existing capacity, which he voiced support for. Mr. Roland suggested that staff consider the feasibility of a gondola connection between Treasure Island and the Transbay Terminal, similar to London's Emirates Air Line, which, he noted, was funded privately and had the same capacity as 30 buses. He added that this could increase the capacity to transport bikes and close the gap in bicycle connection between San Francisco and Treasure Island.

The motion was approved unanimously.

8. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Draft Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program Planning Guidelines – ACTION

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Peter Tannen asked if other districts would be applying for Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program (NTIP) planning funds in the near future. Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, stated that District 5's Western Addition planning effort (the subject of a prior agenda item) would receive the first NTIP grant if approved by the Transportation Authority Board. She said that Transportation Authority and SFMTA NTIP Coordinators were currently working with Supervisor Mar's office (District 1) on vetting NTIP

ideas such as projects supporting the Bicycle Strategy, improving safety near senior centers and schools, and intersection improvements along Fulton Street. For District 2, Ms. LaForté stated a planning effort to identify pedestrian safety and streetscape type improvements on Lombard Street to coordinate with an upcoming Caltrans re-paving project was a potential candidate. She explained that the San Francisco Public Works department was initiating this effort and may be able to cover it entirely with other funds, but that remained to be determined. Lastly, she said that Supervisor Kim's office had ideas for District 6 traffic calming projects.

John Larson asked who was the audience for the guidelines, e.g. other agencies. Ms. Lombardo thanked him for a good question and replied that since the NTIP planning grants were earmarked for each district and that the District Supervisor would ultimately recommend which project(s) should be funded, the audience for the guideline was primarily agencies, Supervisors and their aides, and the Citizens Advisory Committee.

Chris Waddling asked would NTIP planning funds be on a first-come first-serve basis. Ms. Lombardo answered affirmatively, but added that NTIP ideas first had to be refined into well defined scopes, budgets, etc. She added that other considerations that would help sort out which NTIP planning efforts move forward first include whether the planning was being timed to coordinate with another project (e.g. a re-paving projects or Muni Forward project), and availability of agency staff resources.

Chris Waddling asked whether projects would be scored. Ms. Lombardo stated the program would not be a competitive grant program since grants are earmarked for each district and that the Supervisor will recommend which grants should be awarded. She continued by stating that the check list would ensure that NTIP proposals have a clear purpose and need, scope, a strong community engagement strategy, appropriate budget, etc.

Chris Waddling asked how citizens could weigh in on projects. Ms. Lombardo CAC members or the public could contact the Supervisor's office or the NTIP Coordinators with potential ideas. She added projects that all proposed NTIP planning grant allocations would go through the CAC for approval, providing the CAC and public for another opportunity to weigh in. Lastly, she noted that each NTIP planning effort have to have a strong community involvement strategy, so people can provide input during the planning effort.

Tilly Chang, Executive Director, stated the participatory budgeting process held last year in Supervisor Districts provided some priorities for improvements that might fit well with NTIP. She added Supervisor Campos had expressed interest in improvements to the Alemany-US-101 interchange near the farmer's market, and Supervisor Avalos was considering improvements near Balboa Park Station. She added the \$100,000 in NTIP planning funds could also be divided into smaller grants to target a larger number of concerns.

Craig Raphael, SFMTA Capital Financial Planning and Analysis, stated one of SFMTA's goals would be to work proactively with Supervisor's offices to proposed potential NTIP ideas that may build upon other efforts already underway or in the pipeline.

Eric Rutledge moved to approve this item, and Chris Waddling seconded the motion.

There was no public comment.

The motion was approved unanimously.

9. Progress Update on the Treasure Island Mobility Management Study – INFORMATION

Item 9 was called with item 7. See minutes under item 7.

10. Geneva-Harney Bus Rapid Transit Project Update – INFORMATION

David Uniman, Deputy Director for Planning, presented the item.

Chris Waddling expressed support for the transit couplet concept proposed for Little Hollywood, observing that the concept addressed his concern for bus conflicts on a narrow street. Mr. Waddling asked for clarification regarding the transit crossings of Highway 101. Mr. Uniman clarified that both the crossing at Blanken Avenue and at Alanna Way currently exist.

Mr. Waddling also asked for clarification regarding the proposal to widen sidewalks in the Daly City portion of the project, observing that as few pedestrians use the existing sidewalks, the right-of-way could be used for preserving existing travel lanes. Mr. Uniman responded that the sidewalk widening concept was proposed as an option for areas where new development and new pedestrian traffic are expected in the future. Sarah Fine, Transportation Planner, added that the current sidewalk widths in portions of the project area in Daly City do not match San Francisco's standards for sidewalks widths. Ms. Fine also noted that there may be potential to require new developments in the area to provide standard width sidewalks via an easement.

Brian Larkin inquired about cost estimates for the project. Mr. Uniman responded that cost estimates are being developed as part of the study and would be available in the next two to three months.

Jacqueline Sachs asked whether the Geneva-Harney Bus Rapid Transit project would interfere with Third Street Light Rail project. Mr. Uniman responded that the proposed project would connect with the T-Third Light Rail at the Arleta Muni Station, allowing passengers to transfer between the systems.

Mr. Waddling asked how the configuration of Bayshore Boulevard, including existing transit routes, would change as a result of the proposed project. Mr. Uniman responded that the current conceptual configuration of Bayshore Boulevard between Sunnydale Avenue to Blanken Avenue reflects existing conditions. The Geneva-Harney BRT would travel in mixed flow between Sunnydale Avenue and Blanken Avenue. South of Sunnydale to Bayshore Boulevard after the T-Third terminates, the BRT would travel in separated busways.

During public comment, Roland Lebrun expressed concern that the proposed bus rapid transit route would pass through a residential neighborhood and that the transit system would be subject to congestion on Bayshore Boulevard. Mr. Lebrun also recommended that staff consider extending the T-Third Muni to Geneva Avenue as a better solution. Referring to the Bayshore Intermodal Transportation Study, a planning effort led by the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, Mr. Lebrun requested that staff examine the engineering constraints of a northern location for the Bayshore Caltrain Station, noting that he did not support moving the location to the north.

11. Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION

For the benefit of CAC members and others who were not present during the Chair's report, Chair Davis reiterated that the Prop K Delegated Allocation Authority item had been continued at the call of the Plans and Programs Committee Chair, Commissioner Mar.

There was no public comment.

12. Public Comment

Roland Lebrun presented a video on the gondola in London, and stated such a system should charge tourists to recoup costs.

Edward Mason expressed the need for further enforcement of private shuttles using transit stops. Mr. Mason provided several specific examples/locations of private shuttles utilizing bus stops without authorization.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:52 p.m.