



DRAFT MINUTES

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Larson called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

CAC members present: Kian Alavi, Ranyee Chiang, Robert Gower, Becky Hogue, David Klein, John Larson, Jerry Levine, , Sophia Tupuola and Rachel Zack (9)

CAC Members Absent: Myla Ablog (entered during Item 2) and Peter Tannen (entered during Item 2) (2)

Transportation Authority staff members present were Eric Cordoba, Anna LaForte, Maria Lombardo, Alberto Quintanilla, Eric Reeves, and Aprile Smith.

2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Larson welcomed new CAC members Ranyee Chiang and Sophia Tupuola and invited them to make introductory remarks. He thanked Peter Tannen for covering the March Transportation Authority's CAC report and noted that Peter Tannen wanted to report out on a discussion had at the Board on the Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit item and would do so under Item 11. He reported that the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) was working to produce a report on their efforts to improve operational challenges, as requested by the Budget and Legislative Analyst office. He added that the SFMTA was expecting the Board of Supervisors Government Audit and Oversight Committee to request a transit performance update in April and that the SFMTA had agreed to provide the CAC with a presentation after they update the Board of Supervisors' committee.

Chair Larson reported an update on a request made by the CAC asking Transportation Authority staff to invite the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to attend an upcoming CAC meeting and provide a presentation on how SB 1376: TNC Access for All Act was being implemented. He said staff would update the CAC as soon as a date had been confirmed. He also provided an update on another CAC request for a progress update on the 1570 Burke Avenue Facility Renovation Project. He said the project was in its final stages, with expected completion at the end of April 2019, noting that the schedule was impacted by unforeseen obstructions during the foundation's seismic upgrade and design changes. He added that the SFMTA's Overhead Lines would move into Burke Warehouse and Animal Care and Control would move into the SFMTA's Overhead Lines previous occupancy of 1419 Bryant Street around the middle of May. The open for use date was a 6+ month delay from the schedule in the Prop K allocation request.

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

3. Approve the Minutes of the February 27, 2019 Meeting – ACTION

4. State and Federal Legislation Update – INFORMATION

Peter Tannen commented on the State and Federal Legislation update and thanked Transportation Authority staff for recommending that Assembly Bill 1142: Strategic Growth Counsel be amended to include lack of safe pedestrian and bicycle access and lack of transit supportive land uses as barriers to transit usage that must be measured in regional transportation plans.

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

Myla Ablog moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Jerry Levine

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Alavi, Gower, Hogue, Klein, Larson, Levine, Tannen, and Zack (9)

Abstentions: CAC Members Chiang and Tupuola (2)

End of Consent Agenda

5. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Allocation of \$62,767,634 in Prop K Sales Tax Funds, with Conditions, for Light Rail Vehicle Procurement – ACTION

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, and Alexandra Hallowell, Transit Capital Planning Manager at the SFMTA presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Larson noted that public comment communicated to the CAC prior to the meeting had expressed concern over the seating design of the new Siemens light rail vehicles (LRVs), as well as access for people with mobility issues. Chair Larson asked if Modification 3 listed in the LRV Procurement Contract Summary on page 26 of the packet was a change order addressing the seating and access concerns.

Ms. Hallowell answered that the design changes covered by Modification 3 had been incorporated in the Phase 1 procurement of 68 expansion LRVs and said Modification 5 would be an opportunity for SFMTA to address public concerns with the design of the LRVs that have already been delivered. In response to issues raised by the public she said the project team had developed several options for changes to the design of the LRV interiors, to be presented to the SFMTA Board at its next meeting. Ms. Hallowell said the proposed design changes included different types of bench seating (including a style similar to seats on the Breda LRVs), increased transverse seating, additional handholds for passengers standing mid-isle, and longer straps. She said the proposed changes also included removal of stanchions located near entrance doors to avoid obstructing access for mobility-impaired passengers. Ms. Hallowell said the project team was working with SFMTA's Multimodal Accessibility Advisory Committee to address the needs of passengers with disabilities.

Chair Larson asked if the Phase 1 LRVs would be retrofitted with the design changes once they had been approved by the SFMTA Board.

Ms. Hallowell answered that all the design changes would be included in the Phase 2 vehicles, and that some modifications, such as more and longer straps, could easily be retrofitted into the Phase 1 vehicles. She said once the SFMTA Board had selected the design changes for the contract modification she could be more specific as to which changes could be retrofitted into the Phase 1 vehicles.

David Klein asked if the strategy to accelerate the procurement schedule included accelerated training of operators and maintenance crews.

Ms. Hollowell responded that all operators had already been certified for the new LRVs as of Fall 2018.

David Klein asked about the financial cost of the accelerated schedule.

Ms. LaForte referred him to the table of direct costs and savings on page 46 of the packet, showing the finance cost associated with advancing Prop K funds, potential finance costs if Regional Measure 3 funds were unavailable, and off-setting savings on overhauls and maintenance resulting from early retirement of the Breda LRVs.

David Klein said that capacity issues could be dealt with by coupling cars and asked if the design of the Siemens LRVs was compatible with longer trains.

Ms. Hollowell answered that the Siemens LRVs were capable of 3-car trains, but SFMTA had not yet rolled out that feature, which required some changes to the automatic train control system and some infrastructure changes. She said that the SFMTA did not have a date for this rollout yet.

Robert Gower asked for clarification as to whether the reference to the Breda's seating design change mentioned earlier by Ms. Hollowell referred to the seat design or seating arrangement.

Ms. Hollowell answered that the proposal was for a similar type of seat rather than arrangement.

Robert Gower followed up with a comment that the new LRVs had been thoughtfully designed to make the vehicles easier to clean, and that the vehicles appeared to be clean even after several months of use. He cautioned against tampering with the design in such a way as to affect the cleanliness of the new trains.

Jerry Levine asked about the gap between cars for new LRVs and commented that it had been an issue of concern for vision-impaired passengers and a subject of litigation regarding the Breda LRVs.

Ms. Hollowell said she would research the issue and send a response to the CAC.

Jerry Levine asked about the required local match for the federal funds.

Ms. Hollowell answered that the federal funds available to the project through the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Core Capacity program required a 20% local match. She pointed out that only the 151 replacement vehicles qualified for federal funding, so the local match requirement did not apply to the 68 fleet expansion vehicles.

Jerry Levine asked if there was an oversight regime to ensure that the new LRVs would be maintained in a state of good repair, and what sanctions might be enforced if they were not.

Ms. Hollowell said failures were tracked by type and analyzed for fleet-wide patterns as well as for individual problem vehicles (i.e. "repeaters"). She said if SFMTA Operations identified a pattern of failures, it implemented a proactive corrective program, with the goal of preventing the need for ad hoc repairs.

Ranyee Chiang commented that the amount of room per passenger offered by the current seating arrangement was either too little or unnecessarily spacious. She asked what the impact would be on train frequency and passenger capacity with the new LRVs arrive.

Ms. Hollowell answered that the new LRVs have been carrying approximately 10% more passengers than the Bredas and noted that SFMTA is still collecting data on this topic. She also

stated that the SFMTA would be able to operate more 2-car trains as more expansion vehicles go into service, leading to an overall increase in capacity.

During public comment Robin Krop, a resident of District 6, said she was injured while riding one of the new LRVs and was no longer able to use the lateral-facing seats. She said her own informal poll of other passengers found that at least ¼ of them preferred transverse seating, and she advocated for re-designing the seating arrangement on the new LRVs to increase the number of transverse seats and seats that provide better back support.

Gene Barrish, Vice President of Save Muni, spoke in opposition to the allocation request and the accelerated procurement schedule. She said SFMTA should hold off on purchasing new LRVs pending re-design of several deficiencies, including uncomfortable seating, slow coupling to create longer trains, propulsion systems with less jerky starts and stops, more straps and removal of obstructing stanchions.

Jackie Sachs said the bench seating on the new LRVs was difficult to use for individuals with disabilities and parents with strollers.

Robert Gower asked about SFMTA's public outreach efforts related to the design of the LRVs and how people could provide input.

Ms. Hallowell answered that the SFMTA conducted extensive surveys during the design phase. Concurrent with rollout of the new vehicles SFMTA held two focus groups with multilingual and disabled riders. She said SFMTA continued its ongoing outreach with various citizen committees, including the Multimodal Accessibility Advisory Committee. Ms. Hallowell said input could also be provided to the SFMTA Director, as well as through 311.

David Klein moved to continue the item, seconded by Becky Hogue. Subsequently, upon learning that the letter raising concerns about the design issues was not a letter from the SFMTA, David Klein and Becky Hogue rescinded the motion.

Robert Gower moved to approve the item with the following amendment: conditioning approval upon SFMTA staff providing a presentation at the next meeting of the CAC on the design changes [Contract Modification 5] anticipated to be approved by the SFMTA Board at its April meeting. Rachel Zack seconded the motion as amended.

The item was approved as amended by the following vote:

 Ayes: Ablog, Chiang, Gower, Hogue, Larson, Levine, Tannen, Tupuola and Zack (9)

Abstentions: CAC Members Alavi and Klein (2)

6. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Allocation of \$1,384,671 in Prop K Sales Tax Funds, with Conditions, for Five Requests – ACTION

Eric Reeves, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Kian Alavi asked about whether Transportation Network Companies (TNCs) would be funding the TNC passenger loading zone that was proposed as part of the Fisherman's Wharf/Pier 39 Complete Street Improvements project.

Casey Hildreth, project manager at SFMTA said that the TNC companies would not be funding any portion of the project and noted that the TNC loading zone in the diagram was a conceptual design and not solely for TNC use.

Kian Alavi asked why the diagram referred to the design as a TNC loading zone if it was not solely for TNC use.

Casey Hildreth said that the spirit of the project's design was to improve traffic flow and not give preferential treatment for TNCs.

Kian Alavi stated that he was against loading zones that were to the benefit of TNC companies who were not paying for these improvements.

Myla Ablog asked whether the TNC loading zone also be used by school buses.

Casey Hildreth stated that the diagram for the Fisherman's Wharf/Pier 39 Complete Street Improvements project was a conceptual design to advance to a feasibility study. SFMTA was looking to balance traffic flow in the project area.

Chair Larson said he was happy with the District 8 proposal on Elk Street at Sussex Street as the area needed a solution.

There was no public comment.

Robert Gower moved to sever the Fisherman's Wharf/Pier 39 Complete Street Improvements project, seconded by Jerry Levine.

Robert Gower moved to approve the underlying item, seconded by Jerry Levine.

The underlying item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Ablog, Alavi, Chiang, Gower, Hogue, Klein, Larson, Levine, Tannen, Tupuola and Zack (11)

The severed item was not approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Ablog, Chiang, Klein, Larson and Zack (5)

Nays: Alavi, Gower, Hogue, Levine, Tannen and Tupuola (6)

7. **Adopt a Motion of Support for the Approval of the San Francisco Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 1 Program of Projects – ACTION**

Aprile Smith, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Peter Tannen spoke in support of all the projects and asked how BART's Elevator Attendant Initiative project would reduce fare evasion.

Tim Chan, BART's Elevator Attendant Initiative Project Manager, said that the elevators are currently outside the paid area. When the elevators were added in the 1990s, fare evasion was not a problem, but it has become a problem in recent years. Passengers have been using elevators in the free area to gain access between BART and Muni platforms from the concourse. The attendants are a deterrent. The elevator attendants keep track of passengers who go in a different direction when they see the attendant. BART instructs elevator attendants not to stop fare evasion for their safety and security, but BART has noticed that people turn around when they see the attendant.

Sophia Tupuola asked if there was information sharing between the Elevator Attendant Initiative and the San Francisco Community Health Mobility Navigation Project: Removing Health Care Transportation Barriers for Low Access Neighborhoods project.

Maria Lombardo said that the Transportation Authority would follow up with BART and SFMTA to get a response.

Myla Ablog said she had heard that people liked the elevator attendant program and had a question about the San Francisco Community Health Mobility Navigation Project: Removing Health Care Transportation Barriers for Low Access Neighborhoods project. She asked for

more information on Paratransit Plus and the taxi revenue local match.

Erin McAuliff, SFMTA Project Manager, explained that the taxi voucher program works where the customer pays \$6 dollars and receives \$30 dollars in credit for taxi rides. SFMTA considers \$6 dollars paid as taxi revenue.

Myla Ablog said she was in support and looking forward to the implementation of the Paratransit Plus and the taxi revenue local match.

Kian Alavi asked what type of outreach the SFMTA was conducting to inform the public about the taxi voucher program.

Ms. McAuliff said taxi vouchers were offered through the San Francisco Paratransit program and that all paratransit eligible riders could obtain a paratransit debit card to pay for their trips. She noted that riders that were eligible for paratransit but still needed assistance could receive paratransit plus services which provided a smaller monthly allotment, on the paratransit debit card, to pay for taxi rides.

Chair Larson asked what happened to attendants when elevators were out of service.

Mr. Chan said the scope of the attendants' work was strictly focused on the elevators and that their work would not be required if the elevators were out of service. He did note that the elevators had not been taken out of service since the inception of the program.

There was no public comment.

Myla Ablog moved to approve the item, seconded by Peter Tannen.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Ablog, Alavi, Chiang, Gower, Hogue, Klein, Larson, Levine, Tannen, Tupuola and Zack (11)

8. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Proposed Fiscal Year 2018/19 Budget Amendment – ACTION

Lily Yu, Principal Management Analyst, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Becky Hogue asked for an update on Treasure Island toll policy and if the policy had been adopted.

Eric Cordoba, Deputy Director for Capital Projects, said the toll policy had not yet been approved and was still in the study phase. He said staff anticipated bringing new recommendations to the Treasure Island Mobility Management Agency (TIMMA) Board in July 2019.

Chair Larson asked for clarification on the draw on the revolving credit loan agreement.

Cynthia Fong said the draw was no longer needed due to the proposed decrease of \$50 million in Prop K capital expenditures and that the receipt of incoming sales tax revenue and proceeds from the sales tax revenue bond would be enough to fund upcoming expenditures needs in Fiscal Year 2018/19.

Kian Alavi said he appreciated the fiscal management of the agency and asked if the projects that would not be funded in fiscal year 2018/19 were being earmarked for the upcoming fiscal year.

Ms. LaForte said that the Transportation Authority had regular communications with agencies that have received grant funds, particularly for larger projects that consume a majority of the

budget. She said most [if not all] projects would be carried forward into the Fiscal Year 2019/20 budget.

There was no public comment.

Becky Hogue moved to approve the item, seconded by David Klein.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Ablog, Alavi, Chiang, Gower, Hogue, Klein, Larson, Levine, Tannen, Tupuola and Zack (11)

9. Adopt a Motion of Support to Authorize the Executive Director to Exercise a Contract Option for On-call Project Management Oversight and General Engineering Services in an Amount Not to Exceed \$4,000,000 – ACTION

Eric Cordoba, Deputy Director for Capital Projects, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Peter Tannen asked what role Parsons Transportation Group was undertaking in regard to the Van Ness BRT project.

Mr. Cordoba said Parsons was taking a look at the environmental compliance, noting that the Transportation Authority was the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) lead agency, and, as an example, said that Parsons had looked at the lighting standard changes that had been proposed for the Van Ness BRT project.

There was no public comment.

Kian Alavi moved to approve the item, seconded by Becky Hogue.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Ablog, Alavi, Chiang, Gower, Hogue, Klein, Larson, Levine, Tannen, Tupuola and Zack (9)

Abstentions: CAC Members Ablog and Chiang (2)

10. Update on the Caltrain Modernization Program and Business Plan – INFORMATION

Sebastian Petty, Caltrain Senior Advisor, presented the item.

David Klein asked why Stanford University was selected as opposed to a public university given the amount of federal funding that was awarded to Caltrain.

Mr. Petty said Stanford University was selected given their high level of interest in the project and proximity to the corridor. He added that Stanford was providing academic support and spearheading private sector involvement to raise additional funds for the project.

Jerry Levine asked if the travel schedule would be altered once the electrification of rail was finalized.

Mr. Petty said that as the project got closer to adoption, Caltrain would look at travel schedule options. He said the end to end travel times may not change significantly but in between wait times for the intermediate stations would change.

Jerry Levine asked if ridership cost would go up.

Mr. Petty said there were no initial major shifts in fare costs anticipated outside of a rise in fares due to inflation. He said part of the business plan was to understand what Caltrain's different financial futures could look like and how it could best raise additional funding to support those

different future visions.

There was no public comment.

Chair Larson asked if the door design including varying heights to accommodate future high speed rail was still in place.

Mr. Petty said door design is still in place and state's overall goal is to still provide high speed rail in the corridor.

11. Progress Report for Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project – INFORMATION

Peter Gabancho, Project Manager for the Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit Project at the SFMTA, presented the item.

Peter recapped the CAC Chair's report and his discussion with Chair Peskin at the March 12, 2019 Transportation Authority Board meeting. He also summarized the presentation provided by the SFMTA at the March 19, 2019 Transportation Authority Board meeting in regard to the Van Ness BRT project. He noted that Chair Peskin requested a hearing on April 23, 2019 for the SFMTA and Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) to present a report on small business mitigation efforts along the Van Ness corridor.

David Klein mentioned that the presentation provided to the CAC had no data points – neither quantifiable positive or negative impacts, or even the number of signs along Van Ness Avenue that would enable the CAC to make a determination if the SFMTA's business mitigation efforts were effective though he noted it was clear a lot of effort was being expended. Mr. Klein requested that the SFMTA include some relevant data points in its future presentations.

Peter Gabancho replied that they are developing metrics to report on those [business impact] concerns. He said the SFMTA had made signage for businesses that requested it and had been in touch with businesses through written communication, door-to-door visits, and phone conversation.

Chair Larson invited members of the business community to speak at a future CAC meeting.

Maria Lombardo noted that small business owners would be at the April 23 Board meeting and encouraged CAC members to attend or view the meeting recording afterwards.

Peter Tannen asked about the status of additional sources of funds.

Peter Gabancho replied that the project was delayed and may need to secure additional funds. However, they still have project contingency left [i.e. with the shortfall the budgeted contingency is partially funded.]

Peter Tannen asked about a bicycle safety update.

Mr. Gabancho replied that they will put together an update. He mentioned that Van Ness Avenue is crowded with narrow lanes and large vehicles, which was a challenge for cyclists.

Peter Tannen suggested that Polk Street was a better alternative than Van Ness Avenue for bicyclists, especially given the recent improvements.

Robert Gower asked about steering bicyclist away by having detour signs.

Peter Gabancho replied that they would look into it and that at other meetings they have recommended Polk Street which was better suited for cycling.

There was no public comment.

12. Update on the Yerba Buena Island Southgate Road Realignment Improvements Project – INFORMATION

This item was continued to the April 24, 2019 CAC meeting due to time constraints at the CAC meeting.

There was no public comment.

13. Update on the Transbay Transit Center Girder Fractures and the Study of Governance, Management, Oversight and Delivery of the Downtown Extension – INFORMATION

Eric Cordoba, Deputy Director for Capital Projects, presented the item.

Chair Larson asked if it was determined what caused the original crack in the steel beams.

Mr. Cordoba said the crack appeared to be due to heavy stresses at a point where there were manufacturing issues and areas where welding access holes were located.

David Klein asked if there were any ethical concerns when working with McKinsey on the Downtown Extension as he recalled some issues with past business practices.

Mr. Cordoba said that the Transportation Authority had done their due diligences and were working with well-respected specialists.

Chair Larson reiterated the reasons why the Transportation Authority Board had called for the study of governance, management, oversight and delivery of the Downtown Extension, noting the concerns raised with the Transbay Joint Powers Authority Transit Bay Transit Center work.

Mr. Cordoba seconded the comments made by Chair Larson and said that the study being conducted would look at lessons learned from the Transbay Transit Center and also look at other mega rail projects to ensure the correct expertise and best practices were brought to the table for the Downtown Extension. He said funding for the project was currently limited but was being strategically used to see how to best move the project forward.

Chair Larson asked if the CAC would receive updates on the study and be able to view the draft report.

Mr. Cordoba said he was expecting a draft report in the next couple of months and that the Board and CAC would receive presentations and updates along the way.

There was no public comment.

14. Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION

There were no new items introduced.

15. Public Comment

Jackie Sachs requested an update on the Central Subway project and what work has been done.

Chair Larson agreed that the CAC should schedule a Central Subway update.

There was no public comment.

16. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.