DRAFT MINUTES

SB 83 ADDITIONAL VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEE FOR SAN FRANCISCO – EXPENDITURE PLAN DEVELOPMENT CAC SUBCOMMITTEE
March 11, 2010 MEETING

5:30 pm   **Introductions**

CAC Subcommittee members present were Jul Lynn Parsons, Jacqualine Sachs, Peter Tannen, and Robert Switzer. Authority staff members present were Amber Crabbe, Anna LaForte, and Chad Rathmann.

5:35 pm   **Overview and Purpose of Subcommittee**

Robert Switzer volunteered to report back to the CAC on behalf of the subcommittee.

5:45 pm   **General Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

5:50 pm   **Polling and Nexus Determination Activities**

Robert Switzer asked if it would be necessary to have the nexus study findings to inform the polling. Anna LaForte responded that the nexus is the final hurdle in terms of what types of benefits meet the threshold of effect, and sets a defense for a legal challenge. Ms. LaForte continued that draft programs and projects in the draft expenditure plan are expected to be included in the nexus findings. Mr. Switzer then asked if the polling will ask about the current draft programs and projects. Amber Crabbe responded that the nexus study will look the entire draft programs and projects list, and that the polling is looking at a broader range of programs and projects to get a sense of what else the voters respond to. That polling work will help to condense a more specific set of projects. Mr. Switzer asked if a more limited nexus supports only a more limited polling exercise. Ms. Crabbe responded that the polling will let the Authority know how the programs and projects fall out, as well as their importance. Ms. LaForte added that voters are not always registered vehicle owners. Peter Tannen asked if there was a question in the polling about vehicle ownership. Ms. LaForte confirmed that there was a question on vehicle ownership, and also on mode use.

Mr. Tannen asked if Authority staff created the draft proposed principles, policies and programs and projects. Ms. Crabbe responded that Authority staff did create the draft proposed principles, policies and programs and projects.

Mr. Switzer asked about the timing of the product. Ms. Crabbe responded that the March 11 meeting was for refinement of project principles, and that more specific details on dollar amounts and other aspects would be discussed at another subcommittee meeting in April. The polling results will also be available to subcommittee members at that time. Ms. LaForte added that ultimately voters would

approve the expenditure plan. Mr. Switzer asked if at that time the voters would have a better sense of project types. Ms. LaForte responded that the expenditure plan would have to include everything like revenue over the life of the expenditure plan, being similar to the Prop K Expenditure Plan.

Jacqualine Sachs asked if there would be different priority funding levels as is the case with Prop K. Ms. LaForte responded that there is no anticipation of revenue fluctuations to call for priority levels, but that is something that still needs to be decided.

6:00 pm   **Proposed Principles to Guide Expenditure Plan Development**

Mr. Switzer asked how the proposed principles could include both those that leverage and/or enhance Prop K projects and support projects that are not eligible for Prop K funds. He continued that he would be more in favor of principles that look at more immediate needs (e.g. street resurfacing), as opposed to what Prop K tends to do with longer-term needs, and that projects that wait for leveraging tend to take a longer amount of time. He added that he is in favor of principles that lead to responsive projects that are popular and have a nexus with the fee.

Mr. Tannen agreed with Mr. Switzer that the idea of having principles that both complement Prop K projects and fill in gaps where Prop K funds cannot be used is a little confusing, because then the principles would seem to point to any project type. He then asked what type of time frame Mr. Switzer meant by "immediate." Mr. Switzer replied in terms of "immediate short term." Ms. LaForte added that perhaps the time frame could be annual so projects would be implemented within a year. Mr. Tannen responded that a year sounded reasonable. Mr. Switzer responded that the types of projects he was thinking about that are quite immediate, such as driver/biker alerting the city through 311 and the problem being fixed even before it becomes a project. Jul Lynn Parsons added that she liked the 311 idea, and thought the idea of texting or a system of reporting problems to 311 added to immediate public participation and voter satisfaction. Mr. Switzer agreed, and mentioned that while he is in favor of big street resurfacing projects, very responsive work is immediate gratification. He continued that perhaps $5 million could be used to purchase five trucks that drove around to do quick fix work. Ms. Parsons added these could be like community response teams that dealt with issues in the path of travel.

Mr. Tannen stated that that reminded him of certain Prop K projects, like bicycle facility maintenance, in which the MTA received an amount of money, which was spent on fixing citizen requests.

Ms. Sachs added that principles should address pedestrian safety issues like crosswalks. Ms. Parsons agreed. Ms. Crabbe added that the consultant for the nexus study has defined nexus in terms of both mitigation and benefits, and that we should be able to correlate both auto and non-auto project types. Mr. Switzer commented that the mitigation argument doesn't sell bond issues to voters. Ms. Crabbe responded that the nexus is more of a "yes/no" as to whether mitigation benefits are reasonable if it can happen. She also added that the study does not have to promote the initiative. Mr. Switzer stated that a principle for everyone should be health and safety. Mr. Tannen agreed that safety elements should be more specific in the principles. Mr. Switzer added that he thinks people understand health and safety, and they also understand liability in terms of health and safety problems not being fixed.

Ms. Parsons added that a strong component should be ease of use for people to

become involved in the program and project prioritization process through texting, 311, or something similar. Ms. Crabbe responded that consistency with a system like 311 would potentially be a possibility.

Mr. Swtizer asked if it would be helpful to be more specific about fair geographic distribution. Ms. Crabbe responded that this language is from Prop K, and meant to address different needs throughout different areas of the city. She continued that this notion would be defined further through a strategic plan.

6:20 pm   **Proposed Policies to Guide Administration of Fee Revenues and Expenditure Plan**

Mr. Switzer asked if the assumption for the new program is that project sponsors would have to come to the Authority to apply for funds. Ms. Crabbe responded that that's one of the issues the subcommittee can discuss.

Ms. LaForte added that it might make more sense to have programmatic and capital project categories, adding that the programmatic categories would provide stable levels of funding and capital project would likely have more cyclical funding needs.

Mr. Switzer commented that it sounds like the attempt is to stretch existing revenues for projects that are already out there instead of filling in the gaps where there are no funds for projects or projects that don't otherwise qualify for Prop K. Ms. LaForte responded that streetscape projects, for example, don't fit nicely into a single Prop K category, and that some types of projects are currently underfunded, such as pedestrian safety. Mr. Switzer spoke in favor of streetscape projects, stated he believes there may be a nexus for these types of projects, but that this program should address planning issues to make sure streetscape-type projects are being planned for in the first place. He continued that using the Prop K administrative process may not lend itself to a program structure that goes out and performs immediate maintenance. Ms. Crabbe responded that the current proposal is to mirror Prop K administratively, and that Prop K has some programs that are annual where sponsors come in for funds and have one year to complete projects.

Mr. Switzer asked for clarification that the two programs would not cross over. Ms. Crabbe responded that registration fee dollars would be spent on registration fee projects, and that the programs would have separate, but parallel processes

Mr. Tannen commented that he thought duplicating the Prop K process for requesting allocation and reporting was a good idea since it would be easy and efficient for city staff.

Mr. Switzer stated he would be in favor of passing by more standard project sponsor eligibility and include entities such as community improvement districts or community benefit districts. Ms. Parsons added she would also be in favor of allowing those types of groups to access the funds and that you would see results in the communities from that action, and that it would differentiate this program from Prop K. Mr. Switzer continued that with single-purpose agencies coming in and doing single-purpose projects communities are not getting comprehensive projects, and that there are few real enhancements; no lasting benefits to the communities. Ms. Crabbe remarked that that was the intent of the principle that would enhance other projects, and that Authority staff would work with subcommittee members to make the intent of that language

clearer.

6:30 pm   **Proposed Projects and Programs**

Mr. Switzer commented that some of the transit projects are not high visibility. He continued that he would be in favor of maintenance/spot improvements/safety projects responsive to a hotline or rapid response system, as well as pedestrian safety in general.

Mr. Tannen added that he personally has had good response from calls or complaints he's made to the city, and wondered how this program could change that, including making the city more responsive. Mr. Switzer added that no voter would look at maintenance or requests for maintenance from that perspective, but rather immediate need.

Ms. Crabbe added that for the next time the Authority passes a measure, this will all build a track record so the Authority wants to make sure it is transparent and delivering. Mr. Switzer added that delivery has to have visible results (i.e., Has enough of one thing been completed to make a visible impact?).

Mr. Switzer commented that the nexus may pose an issue for trees.

Ms. Sachs said she did not support for TEP-related improvements. Mr. Switzer added that he was not favor of including transit signal priority projects, transit upgrade and expansion projects, or technology-based system management projects, in part, because they seem like administration overhead to voters.

Mr. Tannen added that he was in support of complete streets projects since there would be something for everyone and a lot of voters could relate to those projects.

Ms. Sachs added she was in support of including resurfacing projects, specifically those that would include bulbouts and crosswalks.

Mr. Switzer asked if a treatment like the high visibility crosswalk like in front of City Hall could be used elsewhere and be funded by Prop K. Ms. LaForte responded that it could.

Ms. Sachs remarked that red light cameras at intersections might be good since they impact pedestrian safety, and if there is funding through the Authority for that type of project. Ms. LaForte responded that the Authority typically does not fund any red light camera program.

Mr. Switzer added that the city has a history of no- profits playing role in community development, and that their projects should not be excluded. Ms. Sachs added that getting neighborhoods involved is a positive. Mr. Switzer added that there are a number of funders that give small grants to community grants that in turn give legitimacy to community groups and mobilize constituents and communities (e.g., CDBG, CAA).

Ms. Parsons asked if Authority staff could email more information on the TFCA program, specifically the types of projects that are funded with TFCA funds.

Ms. Switzer asked Authority staff to send subcommittee members a copy of the SB 83 legislation. He also added that it would be interesting to find out how different city agencies handle requests from and responses to calls made to 311 as a way to find out what it takes to get rapid response from the city to the citizens. Ms. Crabbe responded that Authority staff can check in with 311 to get information on the request/response

track record.

Ms. Parsons added that the Authority may want to reach out to folks in places such as the Neighborhood Empowerment Network, as they might have some ideas. Ms. Crabbe added that additional input will be available from the Stakeholder Advisory Panel at the time of the next CAC Subcommittee meeting.

6:50 pm   Meeting Re-Cap and Next Steps

7:00 pm   Adjournment

Notes from Easel

Projects with Subcommittee Support

- o   Maintenance and safety rapid response/spot improvements
- o   Pedestrian safety
- o   Complete streets (including bulbouts and crosswalks)
- o   Street resurfacing

Projects without Subcommittee Support

- o   Street trees
- o   TEP-related improvements
- o   Transit signal priority projects
- o   Transit upgrade and expansion projects
- o   Technology-based system management projects