



# DRAFT MINUTES

## Citizens Advisory Committee

Wednesday, February 26, 2020

### 1. **Committee Meeting Call to Order**

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

CAC members present: Ranyee Chiang, John Larson, Jerry Levine, Stephanie Liu, Danielle Thoe, Sophia Tupuola and Rachel Zack (7)

CAC Members Absent: David Klein (entered during Item 2), Kevin Ortiz (entered Item 9), Robert Gower and Peter Tannen (4)

Transportation Authority staff members present were Michelle Beaulieu, Anna LaForte, Maria Lombardo, Alberto Quintanilla and Lily Yu

### 2. **Chair's Report - INFORMATION**

Chair Larson provided a report from last week's Policy Advisory Committee meeting for the Downtown Congestion Pricing Study and noted that there would be a minor contract amendment and update on the study at March CAC. He reported that members of the Muni Reliability Working Group provided an update to the Board at their February 25, 2020 meeting and informed the CAC that Alberto Quintanilla, Clerk of the Board, had emailed the CAC a link to the meeting for anyone who was interested in hearing the presentation. Chair Larson said an update on the Central Subway project would be provided at the March CAC meeting and informed the CAC that a copy of the Executive Director's Report from the February 25, 2020 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 January 22, 2020 Meeting - ACTION**
4. **Information on Findings of the Clean Miles Standard - INFORMATION**
5. **State and Federal Legislation Update - INFORMATION**
6. **San Francisco Muni Reliability Working Group Update - INFORMATION**
7. **Progress Report for Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project - INFORMATION**
8. **Citizens Advisory Committee Appointment - INFORMATION**

Regarding the Muni Reliability Working Group, Edward Mason, member of the public, said that the Transportation Authority, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and Planning Department all needed to meet periodically to develop a strategy for the city. He said the biggest issue was the Planning Department taking the developers requests without reviewing the impact on development.

David Klein moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Sophia Tupuola.



The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Chiang, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Thoe, Tupuola and Zack (8)

Absent: CAC Members Gower, Ortiz and Tannen (3)

**End of Consent Agenda**

**Chair Larson called Items 9, 10 and 11 together.**

- 9. Update on the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's Siemens Light Rail Vehicle Procurement - INFORMATION**
- 10. Independent Management and Oversight Report on the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's Siemens Light-Rail Vehicle Procurement - INFORMATION**
- 11. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Allocation of \$60,732,027 in Prop K Sales Tax Funds, with Conditions, for the Light-Rail Vehicle Procurement - ACTION**

Eric Cordoba, Deputy Director for Capital Projects, introduced the items.

Julie Kirschbaum, SFMTA Director of Transit, Bob Sergeant, Director of Rail and Transit, West, at T.Y. Lin International, and Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming presented the items.

Stephanie Liu asked if the blue seats were for special needs persons and for confirmation that the blue seats were not materially different from the other seats.

Ms. Kirshbaum replied in the affirmative to both questions.

Jerry Levine asked what the outcome was of the February 25 Board meeting in regard to the Light Rail Vehicle (LRV) procurement items.

Ms. LaForte said the general feedback from the Board was positive and noted that representatives from transit workers union Local 250A were present and expressed appreciation for being involved in the discussion. She said one outstanding issue raised came from Commissioner Fewer in regard to the timeline for the redesign and repair of the couplers to address the issue of the shear pins breaking under certain conditions.

Jerry Levine asked if the Board approved the Prop K allocation request for the LRV procurement.

Ms. LaForte clarified that the Board had not considered the request, but would be hearing the item during the March Board meeting cycle.

Jerry Levine asked where the costs of modification 6 and 7 overlapped.

Ms. Kirschbaum clarified that the \$53 million was built into the overall funding package of \$1.2 billion. She said \$200 million was coming from Prop K, of which about \$60 million still remained to be allocated.

Rachel Zack asked when the hydraulic unit failure was fixed.

Ms. Kirschbaum said she believed that it had been fixed for 90 days, but would need to look up the exact date.

David Klein asked if the SFMTA had a warranty for replacement shear pins.

Ms. Kirschbaum said the vehicles had a 5-year warranty that were component specific



and that Siemens was responsible for replacing the shear pins until a solution was found. She noted that once a fix was identified and the repair made, the 5-year warranty period would restart.

Stephanie Liu asked why the seats had to be lowered by two inches and how the data was collected to determine the original height of the chairs.

Ms. Kirshbaum said the seating height was set by the train box, noting that it was how the train communicated with the automatic train control system in the subway. She added that the original height of the seats met the industry requirements and the mockup of the vehicle showed no issues. She said the lowering of the seats was requested by customers because they were sliding on the benches, which she observed might not have come up until the public was able to use vehicles in service.

Stephanie Liu asked if there were any lessons learned regarding user testing and collecting data prior to implementation.

Ms. Kirschbaum said a mockup was done prior to implementation but would need to get back to the CAC with a response regarding lessons learned.

Jerry Levine asked if Siemens had contracts with other transit operators that had similar vehicles and if that would make it easier or more difficult to get spare parts.

Mr. Sergeant said Siemens provided vehicles to large transit operators worldwide but noted that operators customized their vehicles to meet their specific environments. He also said most of the parts were not available in large quantities due to the fact that Siemens received most of the parts from sub-suppliers.

David Klein said there was tremendous amount of internal analysis like distance of failure and asked if there had been an analysis comparing the metrics of Breda and Siemens vehicles.

Ms. Kirschbaum said some research was done to explain why performance improvement was a curve and added that Calgary, Canada had a similar 18 month reliability program with Siemens. She said she was not aware of other transit operators with the same performance requirement to meet and sustain the 25 thousand miles requirement.

Mr. Sergeant said he was not aware of another city that had the same type of requirement. He said it was difficult to compare Breda and Siemens vehicles.

Ms. Kirschbaum said Bredas never met performance goals and wanted to make sure that that lesson learned was applied to the Siemens vehicles. She added that performance specifications were created for each part of the Siemens vehicles.

Ranyee Chiang asked if T.Y. Lin's oversight was completed or continuing.

Ms. LaForte said T.Y. Lin's report was complete but that there was an oversight protocol that would be recommended as a condition of the Prop K allocation request for phases 1 and 2.

Danielle Thoe asked for further information regarding the expected start of coupler repair in June 2020.

Ms. Kirschbaum said one of the things staff was doing to respond to Commissioner Fewer's request regarding the couplers, was to get a more detailed timeline from Siemens of when they expected to have a design solution. She said the SFMTA would have a better idea next week and would share Siemens timeline with Transportation



Authority staff.

Danielle Thoe requested that the timeline be shared with the CAC.

Chair Larson asked why the procurement of the 151 LRVs was broken down between 50 and 101 vehicles. He asked if that was being done because the vehicles needed two different seat design types.

Ms. Kirschbaum said the reason the SFMTA broke it into two sets was because it was going to take more time to do the engineering for the double seats, which were much heavier than a single seat. She said the seats hanging from the side of the train car and make it a lot easier to keep the trains clean. She added that the heavier weight of the double seats meant that Siemens needed to rethink the engineering of the car shell.

Ranyee Chiang asked if the oversight protocol prior to T.Y. Lin's oversight work could be explained.

Maria Lombardo said the T.Y. Lin oversight request was initiated as a result of the LRV service issues that were identified in 2019. She said that for major capital projects like Central Subway and the Downtown Extension, the Transportation Authority established enhanced oversight protocols given the cost and complexities of the projects. Ms. Lombardo said a lesson learned for staff is that vehicle procurements also require an enhanced oversight protocol and said that the CAC should expect to see that going forward.

David Klein asked if the T.Y. Lin report would continue to lead oversight of the LRVs or if it was a one time report.

Ms. Lombardo said that T.Y. Lin was asked to address a list of issues highlighted by the Board, assess the problems, the proposed solutions, and the party responsible for paying the costs. She said that the final report documented this effort and its findings, and it include some recommendations related to fully addressing the issues raised, and for oversight of the LRVs going forward.

Chair Larson asked if the difficulty for disabled riders to get around the circular or curved entrance was identified as an issue when reexamining the layout of the LRVs.

Ms. Kirschbaum said the SFMTA did an intercept survey and two focus groups in English and Cantonese. She said the general consensus from the focus groups was that riders in wheelchairs did favor the layout. She noted that Siemens did a modest redesign to provide more room but were limited in what they could do given the pinch point at the vehicle doors.

During public comment Edward Mason said the 54% approval rate for longitudinal seats was not overwhelming and requested that the new LRVs have the following: room for pull cord; a predominant display of date, time and location; more priority seating at the doors and clear display of car numbers. He asked why there was a specification for bicycles on the LRVs when the plan was to expand space for more riders. He also stated that the articulation noise was loud from the wheels on the subway. Mr. Mason was surprised there was no standard for the seats and asked why the Man/Woman book was used to design the seats as opposed to the Department of Defense's specifications.

Robin Kropp said she was injured on one of the new bench seats and after that interviewed people about the new cars. She said half the people were fine and the



other half had issues with the height of the seats and benches. She requested additional blue seating on the new vehicles and said elderly and disabled riders needed transverse seating. She said she interviewed another 400 riders last March and got a 50/50 split in regard to preference of forward or sideway facing seats. She asked if there was a fund for free paratransit for those who can no longer ride public transportation.

Kevin Ortiz acknowledged the public comments in regard to public transit safety for the elderly. He asked for clarification on the use Education Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF) funds in the LRV4 funding plan as show on slide 19 of the presentation.

Ms. Kirschbaum said the Controller's Office instructed the SFMTA to treat the ERAF fund as a one time funding source to help close the project funding gap and noted that this was SFMTA's share of the ERAF funds.

Kevin Ortiz said there was major funding issues for teachers in the city and did not feel comfortable using ERAF funds, that were designed for education, on a transit project. He asked if the ERAF funding being used on the project could be reallocated into education.

Ms. Kirschbaum said the funds that were given to the SFMTA were from the city's general fund, but said she could bring back the request to the SFMTA.

Kevin Ortiz said looking forward it would be prudent to not rely on ERAF funding in the future because it may not be available.

Ms. Kirschbaum clarified that the ERAF funds shown in the LRV4 funding plan were from the previous budget and did not project into future ERAF funding.

Kevin Ortiz requested to see a list of future projects that used ERAF funding and asked if it could be presented to the CAC.

Chair Larson said he could note the request at the March 10, 2020 Board meeting during the CAC report.

Ms. LaForte said Transportation Authority staff would follow up with the CAC.

Rachel Zack moved to approve Item 11, seconded by Jerry Levine.

Item 11 was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Chiang, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Thoe, Tupuola and Zack (9)

Absent: CAC Members Gower and Tannen (2)

**12. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Allocation of \$1,000,000, with Conditions, for the Mission Street Excelsior Safety Project - ACTION**

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

Jerry Levine asked if there were walk signs at each corner or markings in the intersection to let pedestrians know they can walk when pedestrian scrambles were implemented. He said pedestrian scrambles were confusing without proper signage and markings.

Ms. LaForte acknowledged that the CAC had previously suggested educating the public when new traffic signals were designed and implemented.



Dustin White, SFMTA Project Manager, said there were a couple of different ways that pedestrian scrambles could be implemented and that the simplest form did not provide diagonal crossing. He said the simplest form allowed all four lights of straight line pedestrian walking to proceed at the same time, which allowed pedestrians to walk without any vehicular turning. He said the second type of pedestrian scramble allowed diagonal pedestrian walking and required the SFMTA to install four additional countdown signals that were directed to face diagonal movement.

Danielle Thoe said she had reached out to Commissioner Haney and the Tenderloin Safety Task Force and was told they were working on educating the public in regard to pedestrian scrambles. She said in terms of adding the diagonal crossing sign, the infrastructure in the Tenderloin was too old to implement a third crossing sign. She highlighted that pedestrian safety projects were being implemented in silos and should include infrastructure upgrades.

Rachel Zack asked if it was correct that pedestrians should not cross diagonally when there was no diagonal crossing striping.

Mr. White replied in the affirmative.

During public comment Robin Kropp said the public was confused by the new scrambles and said they were especially confusing in the Tenderloin.

Danielle Thoe asked if the allocation of the District 3 pedestrian safety funding could be conditioned to include education being put forward with signage and having staff available when implemented.

Chair Larson clarified that the District 3 request was going directly to the March 10, 2020 Board meeting and was just an information item at CAC, but noted that he could pass along her request during the Board's CAC report.

Ranyee Chiang moved to approve the item, seconded by Sophia Tupuola.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Chiang, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Thoe, Tupuola and Zack (9)

Absent: CAC Members Gower and Tannen (2)

**13. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Adoption of a Support Position for the Seamless Transit Principles - ACTION**

Michelle Beaulieu, Senior Transportation Planner, and Ian Griffiths, Policy Director with Seamless Bay Area, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Jerry Levine said he was pleased to see the resolution and shared that he started working on transit in 1984 and the first project he worked was to try to consolidate 27 transit agencies. He said he would be happy to provide any help or historic insights if needed.

Ranyee Chiang said she was excited to see the principles and asked how much of the plan was mapped out to achieve the principles, which seemed complicated.

Mr. Griffiths said the principals provided policy direction and guidance for staff. He said the proposed bill would define seamless transit and expectations/standards for each participating transit agency. Mr. Griffiths said the bill, when amended, would initiate a 1-2 year task force that would assess the 27 transit agencies and recommend



a set of legislative reforms to create clarity and capacity to deliver a seamless system.

Sophia Tupuola asked if the task force would ensure that communities of concern (COC) would be relieved of their social isolation and if there would be data to demonstrate improvement in those areas.

Mr. Griffiths said the task force was temporary and had the goal of establishing a permanent regional transit governance structure. He said there was recommendation that COC representatives be included on the task force, as part of the legislative bill. He added that the driving goals of Seamless Transit were equity and improving access overall and that it would be easier to see that once the amended bill comes out in print.

Stephanie Liu asked if there was any opposition or any roadblocks.

Mr. Griffiths said there was not any current opposition to the legislation and said one roadblock was the need to convince the public and transit agencies that this attempt to unify all 27 transit agencies would work, unlike prior attempts.

Stephanie Liu asked what was being done differently compared to past attempts.

Mr. Griffiths said they had studied past attempts and saw the importance of building public support early on. He said they were building followers on social media and asking the public to draft letters of support. Building a grassroots coalition would be key.

Rachel Zack said it was important to build a geographically diverse public coalition and asked what role the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) had played to date.

Mr. Griffiths said Seamless staff had been speaking to MTC throughout the process and that noted that MTC did not have the mandate to lead the initiative and that MTC staff had noted that legislation would be helpful. He said looking ahead, the task force would look at all agencies, not just MTC, and evaluate best practices to recommend a new structure.

There was no public comment.

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

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Chiang, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Thoe, Tupuola and Zack (9)

Absent: CAC Members Gower and Tannen (2)

**14. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Approval of San Francisco's Draft Plan Bay Area 2050 Fiscally Constrained Project List - ACTION**

Michelle Beaulieu, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Ms. Lombardo said over the next few months there would be a push to advance equity across all levels.

During public comment Edward Mason asked what the population carrying capacity was in San Francisco and said needed to be a realization that businesses needed to pay their fair share of all the requirements being put on the individual property



owners. He said that growth was not funding growth.

Kevin Ortiz moved to approve the item, seconded by Ranyee Chiang.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Chiang, Larson, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Thoe, Tupuola and Zack (8)

Absent: CAC Members Gower, Klein and Tannen (3)

**15. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Amendment of the Adopted Fiscal Year 2019/20 Budget to Increase Revenues by \$2.1 Million, Decrease Expenditures by \$71.9 Million, and Decrease Other Financing Sources by \$67.0 Million for a Total Net Increase in Fund Balance of \$7.0 Million - ACTION**

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

Chair Larson said it looked like the usual issue with slow project delivery, which was frustrating, but also allowed the Transportation Authority to save on financing costs.

There was no public comment.

Danielle Thoe moved to approve the item, seconded by Stephanie Liu.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Chiang, Larson, Levine, Liu, Thoe and Tupuola (6)

Abstain: CAC Member Ortiz (1)

Absent: CAC Members Gower, Klein, Tannen and Zack (4)

**16. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION**

Jerry Levine reiterated his prior request for an introductory presentation from SFMTA Executive Director Jeffrey Tumlin.

Chair Larson seconded the request to have Director Tumlin appear before the CAC at a future meeting.

Kevin Ortiz echoed the Director Tumlin request and reiterated a previous request for a map of geofenced Transportation Network Company (TNC) areas and the process required to geofence different sections of the city. He requested information on current and future transportation projects in the city that use ERAF funds and an update on the 16<sup>th</sup> Street Improvement Project.

Chair Larson seconded the request for an update on the 16<sup>th</sup> Street Improvement Project.

Danielle Thoe asked if staff could indicate who drafted agenda items and who would be presenting the items at the CAC.

Stephanie Liu reiterated a request for information and/or a presentation on how the various public agencies work together and on transportation funding.

Chair Larson asked if bike lanes were specifically for non-motorized vehicles or if vehicles like scooters were allowed to use bike lanes.

**17. Public Comment**

During public comment Edward Mason provided an update on idling commuter





shuttle buses, buses with no license plates or no permits and additional violations.

Jackie Sachs requested a Central Subway and Other 9 to 5 project update.

**18. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:31 p.m.