



DRAFT MINUTES

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

Tuesday, June 25, 2019

1. Roll Call

Chair Peskin called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m.

Present at Roll Call: Commissioners Haney, Mandelman, Mar, Peskin, Ronen, Stefani, and Walton (7)

Absent at Roll Call: Commissioners Fewer (entered during Item 2), Yee (entered during Item 2), Brown (entered during Item 10), and Safai (entered during Item 10) (4)

Commissioner Stefani moved to excuse Commissioner Brown, seconded by Commissioner Mandelman. Commissioner Brown was excused without objection

2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Peskin congratulated BART for its receipt of a \$300 million Core Capacity grant award from the Federal Transit Administration, to boost capacity on BART's transbay service by over 30% and increasing train service for the 28,000 people that travel by BART across the bay during the peak hours. He also thanked the Bay Area Congressional delegation which advocated strongly for this grant, particularly Speaker Pelosi and Senator Feinstein, and congratulated BART Chair Bevan Dufty and General Manager Grace Crunican who worked hard to achieve the project milestone.

Chair Peskin also congratulated and recognized Ms. Crunican on her upcoming retirement from BART, after 7 years of service, and recognized her work emphasizing BART system rehabilitation and modernization, and advancing planning for a second transbay tunnel.

Chair Peskin expressed his anticipation in participating with Supervisor Mandelman and Mayor Breed in the Muni Transit Performance Working Group, in conjunction with multiple transit experts, to develop a roadmap for better and more reliable Muni service, as well as an actionable set of recommendations for the SFMTA Board and next Director to implement. He thanked Executive Director Tilly Chang and staff for lending support to the matter.

Chair Peskin closed by congratulating Director Chang on her recent award as Woman of the Year by the Bay Area Chapter of the Women's Transportation Seminar, whose mission is to recognize excellence and promote the leadership of women and minorities. Ms. Chang and two colleagues from the SFMTA, Annette Williams (Accessible Services) and Danielle Harris (Innovation/New Mobility), were recognized by their peers in the industry association. He thanked Vice Chair Mandelman for attending the event on his behalf, as he was unable to attend due to state Coastal Commission duties.

There was no public comment.

3. Executive Director's Report – INFORMATION

Tilly Chang, Executive Director, presented the Executive Director's Report.

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

4. **Approve the Minutes of the June 11, 2019 Meeting – ACTION**
5. **[Final Approval] Adopt the Proposed Fiscal Year 2019/20 Budget and Work Program – ACTION**
6. **[Final Approval] \$1,881,211 in Prop K Sales Tax Funds, with Conditions, for Four Requests and Appropriate \$100,000 in Prop K Funds for One Request – ACTION**
7. **[Final Approval] Program \$4,140,270 in Prop AA Vehicle Registration Fee Funds to Five Projects and Amend the 2017 Prop AA Strategic Plan – ACTION**
8. **[Final Approval] Approve the Fiscal Year 2019/20 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program of Projects – ACTION**
9. **[Final Approval] Award an Eighteen Months Professional Services Contract to Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates in an Amount Not to Exceed \$700,000 for Technical and Communications Services for the Downtown Congestion Pricing Study – ACTION**

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Yee moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Commissioner Ronen.

The Consent Agenda was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Fewer, Haney, Mandelman, Mar, Peskin, Ronen, Stefani, Walton and Yee (9)

Absent: Commissioners Brown and Safai (2)

End of Consent Agenda

10. Update on the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's Siemens Light-Rail Vehicle Procurement – INFORMATION

Julie Kirschbaum, Director of Transit at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), presented the item.

Chair Peskin asked if the costs of the safety modifications related to the doors and couplers that Ms. Kirschbaum had described were covered under warranty.

Ms. Kirschbaum answered in the affirmative and said the modifications would restart the five-year warranty.

Chair Peskin asked if the warranty extension covered only the systems being corrected or the entire vehicle.

Ms. Kirschbaum believed it was specific to the systems being replaced but would need to follow up with the Board to confirm.

Commissioner Yee asked if all couplers on the Siemens LRV4 trains were being replaced or if it was only the damaged couplers. Ms. Kirschbaum answered that Siemens addressed the design

flaw by removing the end stops and replacing the shear bolts on all of the vehicles. She said all couplers have been inspected and Siemens would completely replace the couplers on vehicles where the couplers had sustained other damage as a result of the design flaw. She said this kind of coupler damage would not recur since the design flaw had been addressed.

Commissioner Yee asked if the improvements had been tested. Ms. Kirschbaum answered that they had been thoroughly tested by Siemens, SFMTA engineering staff, and an independent engineer. She said California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) staff also reviewed the work, and she said that the SFMTA's LRV4 safety committee reviewed all design modifications.

Commissioner Yee asked if the modifications would nullify the warranty. Ms. Kirschbaum answered that the warranty would reset to the full five years on completion of the modifications.

Commissioner Mandelman commented that brake and coupler problems were problematic for public perception, but said he didn't know what performance expectations were reasonable during rollout of a new transit fleet. He asked if the problems with the new LRVs were matters of greater than expected concern.

Ms. Kirschbaum said issues were bound to be encountered when rolling-out a specialized fleet and added that the LRV4 was currently exceeding what she would comfortably state as a reasonable expectation.

Ms. Kirschbaum said that testing of modifications to the emergency braking system was progressing well. She said the way the LRV operators had been trained to use the emergency braking system flattened the wheels of the LRV4s, a problem that was not covered by the warranty. She reminded the Board that the training regime had been designed to ensure safe operation of a fleet with two kinds of LRVs with differing emergency braking systems. She reported that seven of the LRV4s were out of service awaiting delivery of new wheel sets because the original wheels could no longer be trued. Ms. Kirschbaum said the emergency braking system modification would eliminate that problem within five or six months, and said she would continue to keep the Board apprised of the issue as part of her monthly reports.

Commissioner Brown commented that she often rode the N-Judah line, which experienced a great deal of crowding. She asked if the new trains had automated announcements encouraging passengers to clear the doorways before the doors closed. She said such announcements would be especially important if the doors lacked the sensitivity to reopen if they were obstructed.

Ms. Kirschbaum clarified that the modifications being implemented on the doors of the new trains would provide the same level of sensitivity as that provided by the doors on the Breda LRVs. She said the public address system in the subway stations played announcements asking passengers to keep the doorways clear, and she said she would ask SFMTA staff to follow-up with the Board on whether similar announcements played inside the vehicles.

Commissioner Ronen thanked Ms. Kirschbaum for providing the Board with detailed updates on the LRV4 rollout and said it was clear Ms. Kirschbaum was taking the Board's concerns seriously.

Chair Peskin also expressed appreciation for Ms. Kirschbaum's candor and transparency, for reporting both good and not-so-good news, and for covering a wide range of issues. He said the reliability issue as detailed in the slide deck was still troubling, and said he was looking forward to more answers on seating arrangements and warranty specifics. He asked about the cost of the emergency braking system modifications and how they would be funded.

Ms. Kirschbaum said she would provide that cost figure at her next Board update.

Chair Peskin asked if SFMTA had been able to maintain good relations with Siemens. Ms. Kirschbaum answered that Siemens continued to provide excellent customer support. She said she met with the President of Siemens' rolling stock unit on a biweekly basis, that the head of Siemens' quality control division met with SFMTA on a weekly basis, and that Siemens offered as much on-site staff as needed. She said the high level of support from Siemens was an important part of the rapid completion of the door retrofit.

Ms. Kirschbaum pointed out that Siemens was responsible for the work of their sub-vendors as well as their own and clarified that so far nothing had failed that Siemens itself had built. She said discussions between SFMTA, and Siemens had focused on sub-vendor accountability and support. She said SFMTA had benefitted from reaching out to peer agencies such as Calgary Transit to help identify manufacturing issues.

Chair Peskin asked for confirmation that ultimately it was Siemens responsibility as the prime contractor to hold subcontractors accountable.

Ms. Kirschbaum replied in the affirmative.

Chair Peskin asked if SFMTA had resolved questions about the use of mirrors versus video cameras, and the size of the screens that the operators use to monitor the video. Ms. Kirschbaum answered that those issues were examples of modification decisions based on user feedback. She said SFMTA had replaced all the video monitors on the LRV4s with touchscreens that could provide split screen views from multiple cameras and zoom functionality. She said SFMTA was testing larger monitors, also based on operator feedback.

Ms. Kirschbaum added that SFMTA had replaced, under warranty, gaskets on all the exterior cameras because the gaskets had failed after repeated exposure to SFMTA's vehicle washers. She said SFMTA was troubleshooting problems that caused the camera images to freeze or pixelate, which result in removal of a vehicle from service until the problem could be corrected.

Commissioner Walton asked if all the modifications to the LRV4s that have been delivered would be duplicated by the manufacturer for the vehicles to be delivered in the future.

Ms. Kirschbaum answered that all enhancements to the Phase 1 vehicles would be rolled into the manufacture of the Phase 2 vehicles. She said that Phase 2 would incorporate additional redesigns based on customer feedback, such as seating arrangements.

Commissioner Walton asked if the excellent customer support from Siemens came at an additional cost.

Ms. Kirschbaum replied that there was no additional cost for that support.

Commissioner Mar asked if the incident in April 2019 where a customer was injured when her hand was caught in a door would have been prevented by the safety modifications SFMTA had implemented.

Ms. Kirschbaum answered that the incident could have been prevented by a combination of factors including the enhanced door.

Commissioner Mar asked if SFMTA was addressing contributing factors other than the door enhancements.

Ms. Kirschbaum said she could not provide a direct answer because of active litigation but said



SFMTA had addressed all aspects of concern related to the incident, including an effort to improve customer awareness about holding doors.

Commissioner Mar asked if Ms. Kirschbaum had full confidence that the doors would be 100% safe for passengers, if they got anything caught in a door.

Ms. Kirschbaum answered that she believed SFMTA had addressed the design issues. She said maintenance would continue to be an issue and pointed out that there had recently been a mechanical failure with a door on a Breda LRV, where a passenger's hands were stuck in a door.

Ms. Kirschbaum said the problem in that case was maintenance rather than design: a loose wire had caused the problem and was an example of the increasing maintenance needs of the older vehicles. She said SFMTA had incorporated the potential loose door sensor wire as another inspection point in its six-month door inspection regime.

Commissioner Mar said he understood Ms. Kirschbaum's explanation of how the braking system impacted vehicle availability, and asked how it impacted the rider experience.

Ms. Kirschbaum answered that the braking system did not present a passenger safety issue but rather a customer service issue. She said when SFMTA operators deployed the emergency brakes the train could not be moved until a mechanic could get to the train and manually release the brake. She described an incident in May 2019 in which a locked brake on an LRV in the subway caused a 15- to 20-minute delay in all train traffic in both directions.

Commissioner Mar asked about SFMTA's 90-day performance improvement plan, including targets on reducing the number of turnbacks. Ms. Kirschbaum offered to share the overall 90-day plan with Commissioner Mar's office, noting that she had just shared the portion of it related to LRV4s in today's presentation.

Commissioner Mar commented that in her presentation Ms. Kirschbaum had said SFMTA would no longer going to be pursuing an advanced start date for Phase 2 of the LRV4 procurement and asked if that would result in a cost savings.

Ms. Kirschbaum answered that it would not, as the additional cost resulted from a compressed procurement schedule, which would still be necessary if SFMTA was to be able to retire the Breda LRVs in less than seven years.

During public comment Alvin Ja said he was glad to hear that the doors on the Siemens LRVs had been retrofitted with additional sensors. He said he was dismayed when he first read the reports about the incident at the Embarcadero. He said the design flaw on the doors had been a known issue for two years, and asked who was at fault and how it had been approved at multiple levels of oversight. He suggested that the safety testing had been an overly bureaucratic procedure, whereas a common sense test using an actual person's hand would have been more effective, and would have identified the problem.

Roland Lebrun said he was encouraged by Ms. Kirschbaum's presentation, and said it showed that miracles take place when people in leadership step in. Mr. Lebrun said LRVs were typically equipped with a sandbox that released a fine abrasive onto the rails to improve traction and reduce wheel flattening. He said if Siemens LRVs were not so equipped there should be an explanation as to why.

Aleta Dupree expressed support for deployment of more LRVs so that there could be more 2-car trains and less crowding. She expressed concern that SFMTA's vehicles spent so much time out of service, with a goal of a 25,000 mile Mean Distance Between Failures (MDBF). She said

the New York subway system operated at a MDBF of more than 100,000 miles. She said sufficient resources should be expended to achieve standards of excellence and prevent injuries such as that sustained in the incident at Embarcadero.

Gerald Cauthen asked for clarification as to why the wheel flattening issue was not covered by warranty.

After public comment Chair Peskin said he wanted to give Ms. Kirschbaum the opportunity to further discuss the braking/ wheel flattening issue, as well as the issue raised by Mr. Lebrun regarding to the sand box.

Ms. Kirschbaum said she would look into the sandbox question and would bring the response back to the next meeting. On the second point she said the Siemens braking system was in service across the country. She said several years ago, SFMTA observed that operators could not perform the movement to engage the brakes quickly and reliably enough in the face of an immediate danger. Thus, the SFMTA went on a major education and training campaign for its operators to hit the “mushroom” emergency button, making that behavior part of their muscle memory. Ms. Kirschbaum continued to explain that rather than ask the operators to modify that muscle memory depending on whether or not they're in a Breda or a Siemens vehicle, the SFMTA would continue to emphasize pushing the mushroom for safety reasons, as they are using a mixed fleet. Further, given the frequency that they are seeing emergency braking, four instances in the last week alone, Ms. Kirschbaum said she thinks they need to pursue a design change, to avoid impacts on vehicle availability as a result.

Ms. Kirschbaum ended her comments by stating that a lot of the issues are very technical and part of how she has been educating myself has been to spend time at the Siemens plant and to really get an understanding of the complexity of their organization. She said that the SFMTA is going to hit a major milestone in the next month or so, where the final vehicle from phase 1 will come off the production line. Ms. Kirschbaum extended an invitation to members of the Board of Supervisors to join SFMTA staff for this milestone, and have an opportunity to tour the plant in Sacramento, talk to Siemens staff directly, and ask some of the questions that were asked during the meeting today. She also offered to set up a tour another day if that were more convenient and said Joel Ramos would follow up with Board members' staff.

Commissioner Safai said with respect to the issue with using the emergency brake, it would be great if we could get a representative from the transit operators to come and talk to the Board to share their perspective. With all due disrespect to Miss Kirschbaum, Commissioner Safai said it seemed crazy that SFMTA is using the emergency brake as described, noting if he used the emergency brake to stop his car every time he reached a red light, the car would last about three weeks. Through the Chair, Commissioner Safai requested that staff invite a representative of the Transit Workers Union 250 to invite him/her to give the operators' perspective the next time the Board receives an update on the LRV4s.

11. Update on the Study of Governance, Oversight, Finance and Project Delivery of the Downtown Extension – INFORMATION

Shannon Peloquin, Partner at McKinsey & Company, John Porcari, President at WSP USA, Ignacio Barandiaran, Principal and Board Director at ARUP, Geoff Yarema, Partner at Nossaman LLP and John Fisher, Vice President and Northern California District Manager at WSP USA, presented the item.

Chair Peskin thanked Director Chang, Deputy Director Eric Cordoba, and the expert panel for

the thorough presentation and said that it would help stakeholder agencies proceed. He spoke of the issues with delivery of the transit center building and the goal of avoiding the same errors in the Downtown Extension project. He said he looked forward to the remaining recommendations to be presented in July.

Chair Peskin acknowledged that it was taking a long time to explain the details in this hearing, but emphasized that discussing this issue was profoundly important. He said that the Board's earlier decision to delay allocation of funds for design of the project was controversial, but that it was the right decision and that if the Board spent time getting this project right now, it would save a lot of heartache and time in the future. He said that the presentation was a roadmap for how to move the project forward, and he said that the project was not just a megaproject, but a mega regional project.

Chair Peskin said that he heard the expert panel to be recommending a transitional governance phase and, in a few years, an entirely new governance structure. He said he expected the Board would hear more about what a new governance structure would look like at future hearings. He said that while the Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA) had previously requested funds to bring design of the entire project to 30% completion, he had heard the expert panel recommend being selective about which portions of the project were ready to advance to 30% design phase prior to entering into a comprehensive arrangement made with the California High Speed Rail Authority and Caltrain.

Mr. Fisher said that Chair Peskin's summary was accurate and that over the next month, the panel would be discussing which entities would be best suited to complete tasks identified in the project's two-year workplan. He said this assessment would be part of the recommendations on governance and oversight that the panel would present at the July 23 Board meeting.

Mr. Zabaneh, Executive Director with the TJPA, thanked the Board, Director Chang, and her staff for initiating the study and said that TJPA had actively participated and that it was very valuable. He said that the TJPA Board looked forward to the recommendations of the study, which he said would help the region and the TJPA deliver the Downtown Extension in the most effective and efficient manner. He said that the TJPA Board had requested its own peer review report from the American Public Transportation Association in December 2018. He said that the report was presented to the TJPA Board in May and that it included recommendations that would strengthen the project and the TJPA agency. He said this report was provided to the expert panel.

During public comment, Jim Patrick said that he had previously argued against conducting this study. Regarding the study's recommendations, he said that creating the TJPA in the first place was akin to the recommendation to reposition the rail program. He said that renaming the project was no big deal. He said that he was for building the most efficient railroad system as quickly as possible in order to achieve social equity. He said that this study had delayed the project nine months and the recommendations would delay it by 24 months. He said that not building the project has had an opportunity cost for the last 50 years.

Peter Straus, member of Friends of DTX, said that there was a lot of good information in the study, but that it was not balanced with a sense of urgency to construct the project. He said he was concerned that it appeared the study recommendations would delay the project by two years. He said that there were other projects that should be advancing in parallel, such as the Pennsylvania Avenue Alignment environmental studies. He said that projects often did not obtain full funding until they were shovel ready, so a lack of full funding should not be a reason

to advance the project. He said the Board should have asked the review panel how to expedite constructing the project.

Jim Haas, member of friends of DTX, said that the study recommendations could result in a two-year delay to the project and that there were parts of the project that could advance now that would not affect the broader recommendations of the study. He said that the environmental clearance process for the Pennsylvania Avenue Alignment should advance now and that the San Francisco Planning Department had funding to study the 22nd Street Station, but was waiting to begin work until the subject study was completed. He said that everything should not be stopped, but that the city should move forward with those related projects that could move forward now.

Chair Peskin said that staff was aware that the Board was in support of studies of the rail yard at 4th Street and Townsend Street.

Aleta Dupree commented that agency should learn from New York and other cities that have built efficient rail systems into their downtowns. She said that we need to have the political will to build a great railroad into downtown like New York and to not be intimidated by the cost in order to reduce congestion from single occupant vehicles.

Thea Selby, member of the friends of DTX, said she was okay with the two-year timeline to complete the recommendations of the study, as long as other related projects were advancing during that period. She said that the part of the study she agreed most with was the recommendation to have internal and external champions of the project. She said that the Board should become a champion of the project, noting that there was a void in leadership for the project.

Bob Feinbaum, President of Save Muni, said that the study had some good and some bad components. He said that the worst component was an apparent recommendation to condition the project on executing an agreement with the California High-Speed Rail Authority because the high-speed rail project may never be built. He said that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission projected that the cost of the Downtown Extension would increase \$200 million every year.

Roland Lebrun spoke in support of the study. He said that if the Downtown Extension project is to be considered of national significance, it should be combined with a proposed new transbay tunnel and rail improvements all the way to Gilroy. He said that a comparably sized project linking London with the Channel Tunnel should be reviewed as a model for project financing and delivery. Mr. Lebrun said that TJPA's peer review study should be considered in the recommendations, including reducing reliance on consultants. He said it was important to hire a chief engineer who was familiar with non-invasive tunnel design to minimize impacts to downtown.

Jerry Cauthen, Chairperson of the Bay Area Transportation Working Group, said that it was okay to take the time to conduct the peer review study, but that this action implied that the Board was taking on leadership of the project. He said that the project was bigger than just San Francisco and that the project needed a political push. He said that reconstituting the project was okay, but that the project should not be slowed down in the process, since it has been requested for many years.

After public comment, Chair Peskin said that there was a misunderstanding about delays and funding, and asked Director Chang to speak to those issues.

Director Chang thanked the panel and asked them to elaborate on their presentation following

her remarks. She commented that she believed the two years represented a work plan rather than a delay, and included work that would need to be undertaken in order to expedite the project. Ms. Chang said that contrary to Mr. Cauthen's comment that this effort was increasing local control of the project, she heard the presentation to recommend strengthening regional participation in the project. She said that it was unlikely a federal full-funding grant agreement could be obtained in two-years, but that that was still a goal worth pursuing.

Mr. Yarema said that the panel's objective is to accelerate the project and break it from some of the tasks that they have felt are holding its back. He said their objective is to see Caltrain service to the Salesforce Transit Center begin as early as possible. Mr. Yarema said that when readers see the final report, they will see multiple recommendations targeted toward achieving that goal.

Mr. Porcari said that the idea is that this up-front time can and should be used for some of the technical work that needs to be done. He said that the recommendations were required to develop the project so that it would be competitive against other projects around the country, especially for federal funding. He said the panel was suggesting front-loading as much of the recommended work as possible.

Mr. Barandiaran said in response to an earlier comment that procurement means starting a process for contracting for the beginning of construction. He said that when they talk about starting procurement in the summer of 2021, the process is comparable to the schedule that is currently published for the project. He said the published schedule calls for a start of activities in 2018, leading up to advertising for award of construction in 2021 and beginning of construction in 2022. He said the panel's recommendation would be similar to the schedule that was already on the table.

Mr. Fisher said, responding to the public comment that the project should not wait for an agreement with the California High-Speed Rail Authority, that he had a different perspective and thought that part of the early activities is to sit with the operators and get a sense of the capacity they need to bring services as soon as possible. He said Caltrain was likely to operate to the transit center first. He said the study was trying to address the reality of where that project timeline is, but also where there are potential funding contributions from outside sources.

Chair Peskin acknowledged former Transportation Authority Executive Director Jose Luis Moscovich, who was one of the panelists.

12. Update on the Muni Service Equity Strategy – INFORMATION

Commissioner Safai moved to continue the item, seconded by Commissioner Fewer.

Item 12 was continued without objection.

There was no public comment.

Other Items

13. Introduction of New Items – INFORMATION

There were no new items introduced.

14. Public Comment

During public comment, Aleta Dupree encouraged the city to develop a veterans' transportation network, especially for those with disabilities. She cited the importance of transportation services that can enable veterans to attend medical appointments and noted how she sometimes

used shared mobility devices to access public transit stops given the city's topography. She expressed appreciation that veterans can access a reduced fare clipper card.

Roland Lebrun commented that planning for a second Transbay transit crossing should be integrated with the Downtown Extension project.

15. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.