



DRAFT MINUTES

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, May 22, 2019

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Larson called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m.

CAC members present: Myla Ablog, Ranyee Chiang, Robert Gower, David Klein, John Larson, Jerry Levine and Rachel Zack (7)

CAC Members Absent: Sophia Tupuola (entered during Item 5), Kian Alavi, Becky Hogue and Peter Tannen (4)

Transportation Authority staff members present were Tilly Chang, Colin Dentel-Post, Cynthia Fong, Camille Guiriba, Anna LaForte, Maria Lombardo, Mike Pickford and Alberto Quintanilla

2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Larson reported that at the direction of the Board, Transportation Authority staff was conducting a review and evaluation of current and alternative governance, management, oversight, finance and project delivery of the Downtown Rail Extension (DTX) project. The work had been advancing through a series of peer review workshops with input from project stakeholders. He said staff anticipated presenting the draft final report and recommendations to the Board and Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) at the June 25th and June 26th meetings, respectively.

Chair Larson informed the CAC that a copy of the Executive Director's Report from the May 21, 2019 Board meeting had been placed in-front of them for their reference.

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

3. Approve the Minutes of the April 24, 2019 Meeting – ACTION

4. State and Federal Legislation Update – INFORMATION

There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.

David Klein moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Rachel Zack.

The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Chiang, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, and Zack (7)

Absent: CAC Members Alavi, Hogue, Tannen and Tupuola (4)

End of Consent Agenda

5. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Proposed Fiscal Year 2019/20 Budget and Work Program – ACTION

Cynthia Fong, Deputy Director for Finance and Administration, presented the item per the staff

memorandum.

Chair Larson said it was nice to see debt expenditures reducing and asked if the budget anticipated any loss of funding from the federal government.

Director Chang said there were no anticipated losses of federal funding but did note that a scheduled meeting on May 22, 2019 between Senate members and the President to discuss a \$2 trillion infrastructure bill was cancelled.

Jerry Levine asked when the Transportation Network Company (TNC) tax bill would go into effect, introduced by Supervisor Peskin and Mayor Breed, if approved by the voters in November 2019.

Director Chang said typically bills were placed into effect January 1st of the following year but would need to follow up to confirm. [Confirmed]

Jerry Levine asked for further details regarding the 30-year Public-Private Partnership (P3) concession arrangement in regard to the the Presidio Parkway project and if any further discussion about it would involve the CAC.

Director Chang clarified that the concession arrangement had already been agreed upon in 2009-10 when the \$1 billion in funds needed were acquired to build both phases of the Presidio Parkway project. She said the P3 approach was selected, but not in time for the first half of the project due to structural seismic life safety issues. She added that the first phase was done through the traditional bid build process and was done by Caltrans and public management.

Director Chang said the second half of the project was packaged into a 30-year concession that included design, build, operation, finance and maintenance. She said the first years of the buildout in the southbound direction did not require public funds because of the P3 arrangement, except for a milestone payment after the facility was accepted by Caltrans. She added that within 25-30 years' time when the facility would be due to come back to Caltrans, it would be transferred in a state of good repair.

Robert Gower asked if the overhaul of Breda Light Rail Vehicles (LRV) project was due to the inability to procure additional Siemens LRVs.

Director Chang said the overhaul of the Breda LRVs was needed regardless, but the scope would be down-sized if the replacement of the Breda LRVs was accelerated.

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Chiang, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Tupuola and Zack (8)

Absent: CAC Members Alavi, Hogue and Tannen (3)

6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Award a One Year and Six Months Professional Services Contract to the Top-Ranked Firm(s) in an Amount Not to Exceed \$700,000 for Technical and Communications Services for the Downtown Congestion Pricing Study – ACTION

Colin Dentel-Post, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Larson asked if the deliverable after 18 months would be a recommended pricing structure or set of alternatives studies that would be presented to the Board.

Mr. Dentel-Post said the ideal scenario would be to build one recommended pricing structure that

also included incentives, subsidies, discounts and an investment package. He added that part of the process was to build support by molding the program based on feedback from stakeholders.

Chair Larson asked if interim reports would be presented during the 18 months of the professional services contract.

Mr. Dentel-Post replied in the affirmative and said the CAC and Board would receive updates throughout the process.

Ranyee Chiang asked what the firm's approach would be to facilitate different views in the event stakeholder views could not be integrated into one recommendation. She asked if the firm had authority to prioritize input from certain stakeholders.

Mr. Dentel-Post acknowledged that capturing the many views of stakeholders would be challenging, but said the approach needed to include broad conversations throughout the city and region that focused on equity issues and transit barriers. He also stated that it was important to capture both the concerns around congestion pricing as well the concepts that excited stakeholders to ensure broad support. He added that the ultimate decision would not be made by the consultant firm, but rather Transportation Authority staff and the Board.

Myla Ablog asked if there was a geographical boundary for the project.

Mr. Dentel-Post said there was not a boundary in terms of outreach, but the congestion pricing study would be focused on congestion that is most intense in the South of Market (SoMa), Downtown, and near freeway access points. He said the 2010 study recommended a boundary that was larger than the core area and included everything east of Laguna and north of 18th streets. He added that the new study would reopen the conversation around a geographical boundary.

Chair Larson said the ConnectSF presentation later on the agenda would provide maps that identified current traffic congestion areas.

David Klein asked why the solicitation for bids and contractors was only done through six newspaper outlets and did not include online solicitation.

Ms. Fong said request for proposal (RFP) advertisements were published in newspapers and emailed to hundreds of businesses that signed up to the Transportation Authority's RFP mailing list. She said the RFP was also included in Caltrans mailing list which identifies Disadvantaged Business and Local Business Enterprises.

David Klein asked why potential business impacts were not included in the scope of service. He said he was worried about small businesses that relied on deliveries and worked with small profit margins.

Mr. Dentel-Post stated that businesses were key constituents and outreach to them would be important for the congestion pricing program to succeed. He noted that potential impacts to businesses were identified and raised in the 2010 report. He added that along with environmental and safety goals, there would be a focus to implement a program that did not harm businesses.

Rachel Zack said her district would be affected by congestion pricing and there had been a lot of focus placed on outreach, but she wanted to make sure there would be enough focus on technical analysis in the study. She said she wanted to know more about why the firm was selected and their technical ability to solve congestion.

Mr. Dentel-Post said the firm being recommended had a strong technical background as well as team members who provided technical analysis locally and in New York. He added that Transportation Authority staff would also incorporate their travel demand model. He said the

2010 study showed that the program was feasible and found multiple scenarios that could work. He continued by explaining that the current study needed technical support to help come up with a program that met the goals and addressed stakeholder concerns.

Robert Gower asked Transportation Authority staff to clarify the staff recommendation before the CAC. He said it was difficult to support the recommendation of Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates when the proposals of all six firms were not made available.

Chair Larson said the recommendation was for support of the top ranked firm and noted that Transportation Authority staff had reviewed the proposals of all six firms. He said that if that was not a sufficient response for the CAC, that he would ask Transportation Authority staff to further explain the protocol regarding contract award actions.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, said normally the top ranked firm was listed in the memorandum, but due to the timing of these particular interviews, the top ranked firm was not known at the time of packet mailing and thus, was not listed in the memorandum. She added that since negotiations had not been completed with the top ranked firm, noting that the Transportation Authority did not share proposals publicly until after the contract was awarded. Ms. Lombardo said it was within the purview of the CAC to not act on the item.

Rachel Zack said the action to select a firm felt premature compared to information about other RFP responses she had seen in other contexts that showed the ranking of the firms.

There was no public comment.

David Klein moved to approve the item, seconded by Jerry Levine.

The item was not approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Chiang, Klein, Larson and Levine (4)

Abstained: CAC Members Ablog, Gower, Tupuola and Zack (4)

Absent: CAC Members Alavi, Hogue and Tannen (3)

7. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Allocation of \$4,629,783 in Prop K Sales Tax Funds, with Conditions, for Seven Requests and Appropriate \$100,000 in Prop K Funds for One Request – ACTION

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

Sophia Tupuola asked if the Great Highway and Erosion Plan supported the functionality of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's (SFPUC) wastewater treatment facility by Ocean Beach.

Edmund Lee, Junior Civil Engineer at San Francisco Public Works, said the goal and scope of work was to preserve the accessibility of the roadway, which was facing erosion along the coastline. He said as part of SFPUC led city project Ocean Beach long-term improvements they will be repurposing some of the lanes along the Great Highway as part of access roads to their facilities.

Sophia Tupuola said the Ocean Beach wastewater facility treated 20% of wastewater compared to 80% that was being filtered at the Bayview facility.

Myla Ablog asked why the historic open air boat cars were no longer in service.

Cody Hicks, Senior Analyst at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), said at least one of the open air boat cars was currently in service as he had seen it and noted that weather dictated when the vehicles were available for service.

Jerry Levine asked what the total cost was to rehabilitate the fleet of vintage vehicles in the subject allocation request.

Mr. Hicks said the total project cost was estimated at \$17.25 million

Jerry Levine asked if the total cost was for the 5 cars.

Mr. Hicks replied in the affirmative.

Jerry Levine asked if the SFMTA exhausted all efforts to find other vintage street cars around the world that might be in better shape and can retire cars that are in bad shape.

Mr. Hicks said he was unaware of any efforts to identify and acquire vintage street cars from around the world. He noted that the vintage street cars required unique rehabilitation and could not achieve the same cost efficiencies of scale as the standard street cars.

Jerry Levine said the \$3 million cost to rehabilitate each street cars seemed high.

Chair Larson asked if the SFMTA received in-kind support from historic streetcar groups.

Mr. Hicks stated that historic streetcar groups provided advocacy and outreach support but did not offer in-kind support that supported rehabilitation work.

Chair Larson noted that the vintage street cars had tourist and local appeal.

Chair Larson asked if the BART Powell Station Modernization project needed to include the 50% construction management cost into the total allocation request of \$672,975, if recommended for approval by the CAC.

Michael Wong, Engineer at BART, said the project cost had escalated based on the additional amount of work needed to improve an active operating system that had its own maintenance staff and construction management costs. He said the construction management would need to handle daily onsite work with the contractor and would require a resident engineer, office engineer, field inspector and administrative support to deal with requests for information and day to day project costs. He added that the Powell station had active passengers which requires a field engineer during both day and night shifts.

David Klein asked why the construction management cost was 50% when the typical cost was 15% and why the project required additional oversight.

Mr. Wong said the higher construction management cost was due to the project being conducted on an active system which required union staffing and included various BART teams.

David Klein asked if there was a comparable active project to have the CAC better understand the reason for the higher construction management cost.

Mr. Wong said although the duration of the project was scheduled for 18 months, pre-bid and closeout costs of the project were not taken into account.

During public comment Edward Mason said he believed the cost of the historic streetcar fleet was standard and mentioned a presentation he heard that detailed vintage streetcars that rusted out while being stored at the Muni Marin yard. Given the high cost, Mr. Mason observed that it might be good to re-evaluate if this was the highest priority for limited funds.

Jackie Sachs asked if the project to upgrade Embarcadero BART elevators would interrupt the Central Subway elevators.

Ms. LaForte said based on communication with BART staff, BART and SFMTA were coordinating to make sure the projects were coordinated.

Chair Larson severed the BART Powell Station Modernization project without objection.

Rachel Zack moved to approve the underlying items, seconded by David Klein.

The underlying items were approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Chiang, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Tupuola and Zack (8)

Absent: CAC Members Alavi, Hogue and Tannen (3)

Robert Gower moved to approve the BART Powell Station Modernization project, seconded by Rachel Zack.

The severed item was not approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Chiang, Klein, Larson and Levine (4)

Abstained: Ablog, Gower, Tupuola and Zack (4)

Absent: Alavi, Hogue and Tannen (3)

8. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Approval of the Fiscal Year 2019/20 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program of Projects – ACTION

Mike Pickford, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Jerry Levine asked when the TFCA was established.

Mr. Pickford said it was established in ~~1989~~ (1991).

Jerry Levine said he was in support of the proposed projects and asked if evaluations were conducted that detailed the outcome of previously funded projects.

Mr. Pickford said part of the TFCA eligibility requirement was to submit cost effectiveness calculation developed by the Air District and produce a final report and cost effectiveness worksheet at the conclusion of each project.

Ranyee Chiang recused herself from the item due to a conflict of interest.

David Klein asked if there was data around usage for the BART shuttles.

Mr. Pickford said the shuttles had begun service in February and so were relatively new for transit service. He said BART had performed initial anecdotal observations on usage. He said BART staff was in the field instructing riders were to stand and recorded the number of riders they saw riding the shuttles. He added that BART was conducting a survey and that the ridership figures used to fill out the application were based on the preliminary study.

Joel Soden, Senior Transportation Planner at BART, said BART had initial data from SamTrans and Muni automated passenger counters that differed from the reports on the field. He said the mixed data was due to having 8 transit agencies accounting for the data but looked for it to be more refined as the project progressed.

There was no public comment.

Myla Ablog moved to approve the item, seconded by David Klein.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Tupuola and Zack (7)

Abstain: CAC Members Chiang (1)

Absent: CAC Members Alavi, Hogue and Tannen (3)

9. **Adopt a Motion of Support for the Approval of the 2019 Prop AA Call for Projects Programming Recommendations Totaling \$4,140,270 for Five Projects and Amendment of the Prop AA Strategic Plan – ACTION**

Mike Pickford, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Larson asked if the requirement to split Prop AA funds between the three program categories according to a specific proportion was written into the proposition.

Mr. Pickford replied in the affirmative.

There was no public comment.

Ranyee Chiang moved to approve the item, seconded by David Klein.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Chiang, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Tupuola and Zack (8)

Absent: CAC Members Alavi, Hogue and Tannen (3)

10. **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 San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), Jorge Rivas, Deputy Director at the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) presented the item.

Rachel Zack said the signs along the corridor looked great for businesses but were hard to notice. She asked why there was no construction work on the weekend, given the schedule delays.

Mr. Gabancho said SFMTA had been pressing the contractor to put on weekend crews and the contractor would be providing the SFMTA with a proposal by June 10, 2019.

Ranyee Chiang asked if there could be further elaboration regarding the mixed responses about business signs along the corridor.

Mr. Rivas said the mixed responses had come from pedestrians and drivers. He added that the public questioned whether the signs were meant for drivers or pedestrians. He said the feedback received would be used moving forward.

Sophia Tupuola asked how many businesses along the Van Ness corridor had used the small business development center to date.

Mr. Rivas said three businesses along the Van Ness corridor were currently working with the development center but that did not mean that other businesses had not reached out to seek assistance.

Myla Ablog mentioned that she attended a community meeting at the Northern police station that highlighted the importance of keeping staging areas clean along Van Ness to prevent illegal activities during non-working hours.

Chair Larson seconded Myla's comments and mentioned that he worked near Van Ness and had witnessed such activities. He suggested fencing off vulnerable areas near staging.

David Klein asked if the funds that went towards marketing businesses on Van Ness was part of an action plan or separate.

Mr. Rivas said the marketing dollars were meant to market the Van Ness neighborhood as a whole and not individual businesses. He added that businesses could develop their own marketing plan through the help of OEWD.

David Klein asked what were potential outcomes and impacts an action plan would have for a business.

Mr. Rivas noted that every business was different, but most were seeking financial assistance. He said the action plans were dependent on the capacity of each business and varied from understanding their lease to developing a debt management plan. He also stated that OEWD worked to route each business to the different resources that were available for their needs.

David Klein asked if there was an action plan to expand from the 115 business surveys conducted and three action plans developed.

Mr. Rivas said the 115 surveys were to develop the marketing campaign and as of now outreach had been conducted to 80% of businesses along the corridor. He said OEWD was partnering with SFMTA and other city agencies to get businesses in the queue who were interested in receiving construction mitigation services.

David Klein asked how many more action plans were in the pipeline.

Mr. Rivas said OEWD anticipated 20 more businesses or 10% requesting action plans.

During public comment Edward Mason suggested a campaign enticing Clipper Card users with a 10% discount to shop and dine along the Van Ness corridor. He said the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) provided a similar discount on a past BRT construction project. He also asked if SFMTA had reached out to AC Transit to discuss any lessons learned from their BRT project along San Pablo Street.

Jackie Sachs said the right turn on red at stop lights and placing bus platforms in the middle of the street made it difficult for disabled individuals to cross the street safely. She asked if SFMTA had taken into consideration the need to provide time for seniors and disabled persons to cross the street.

Chair Larson announced that in order to help with time management, the June Van Ness BRT update would be on consent unless there were significant updates or another presentation from OEWD.

The CAC lost quorum at 8:14 p.m. during Item 11. The meeting was adjourned. Chair Larson continued the meeting as a workshop with any presentations or public comment not on the record.

The CAC regained quorum at 8:16 p.m. during Item 11. Chair Larson called the meeting to order.

11. ConnectSF Statement of Needs – INFORMATION

Camille Guiriba, Transportation Planner, and Celina Chan, Planner at the Planning Department, presented the item.

Jerry Levine asked if climate change and the need to potentially build a sea wall in the northeast section of the city were taken into account when looking at future population growth in the area, noting that most of the growth seemed planned for an area likely to be underwater in the future.

Ms. Chan said the city was working on a citywide sea level rise plan that would be presented to the Planning Commission on May 23, 2019.

Ranyee Chiang said the results from the transportation model were disheartening. She asked if the model could be used as an ongoing tool to prioritize projects around equity and reducing commute times.

Ms. Guiriba said the San Francisco transportation model was used throughout the city on various projects and also at the Transportation Authority for understanding transportation impacts for major developments. She said that as part of the San Francisco Transportation Plan (SFTP) in phase 3 of the ConnectSF effort, the project team would conduct a comprehensive project evaluation to prioritize projects that would go into the countywide plan and would use equity metrics to help evaluate projects.

Chair Larson asked if the transportation model took into account the known projects that were already in the pipeline.

Ms. Chan said land use assumptions were based on anticipated street zoning and projects in the pipeline and transportation assumptions were based on projects planned up until 2040. She added that the model detailed how the transportation system would perform with those assumptions.

Chair Larson asked if there was an opportunity to use the transportation model to test new project ideas.

Ms. Guiriba confirmed that was the intent, stating that the Streets and Freeways Study and Transit Corridors Study would develop new concepts to demonstrate how the system would perform in the future with those projects to see if we could get closer to the desired future.

David Klein echoed the comments of the CAC and asked if autonomous vehicles were included in the assumptions.

Ms. Guiriba said they were not included in the transportation model, but said separate research was being conducted to look at assumptions related to autonomous vehicles. She reported that staff's analysis should that there were too many unknowns to accurately predict the impact of autonomous vehicles in the future, but that staff could conduct sensitivity testing to help understand potential bookends of their impacts.

David Klein said the rate of growth of TNCs compared to public transit showed the need for doing something more for transit, like undergrounding transit. He said the proposed TNC tax introduced by Supervisor Peskin and Mayor Breed would help assist transit, but felt the city needed to take a stance against the high rate of TNC vehicles.

Ms. Guiriba notified the CAC that they would have opportunities throughout the study to inform staff during the process of project concepts.

During public comment Edward Mason said the ConnectSF was Senate Bill 50 on steroids and asked if south bay commuters and gentrification were taken into account in the study.

12. Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION

Ms. Ablog noted that the CAC was still awaiting a report from Scoot and requested accountability reports from other rideshare companies that had been discussed at previous CAC meetings, given the TNC tax bill that would be on the ballot in November 2019.

There were no new items introduced.

13. Public Comment

During public comment Edward Mason provided an update on of idling commuter shuttle buses, buses with no license plates or no permits and additional violations.

Jackie Sachs requested an SFMTA update in regard to issues with the Siemens LRVs and requested an update on the Third Street LRV project.

Aileen Hernandez Delos Reyes, BART liaison to the Transportation Authority, introduced herself

to the CAC and said she looked forward to working with the CAC and welcomed any feedback.

14. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:49 p.m.