



DRAFT MINUTES

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

Tuesday, December 5, 2017

1. Roll Call

Chair Peskin called the meeting to order at 10:08 a.m.

Present at Roll Call: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Fewer, Peskin, Ronen, and Tang (6)

Absent at Roll Call: Commissioners Farrell (entered during Item 6), Kim (entered during item 13), Safai (entered during item 13), Sheehy (entered during item 13), and Yee (entered during item 13) (5)

2. Citizens Advisory Committee Report – INFORMATION

John Larson, Citizens Advisory Committee Member, reported that on item 7, update on the San Francisco Freeway Corridor Management System Study, the CAC brought forth concerns about the use of HOV lanes and expressed concern about the impact of the continued issuance of clean air stickers for single occupancy vehicles, allowing them the use of the HOV lanes. He said that the CAC had concerns that private shuttle buses would be on equal footing with public buses and would reduce the lanes effectiveness, He mentioned that further concern was voiced during public comment when private commuter buses were held up as an example of the public's subsidizing private corporate employee transportation not open to everyone. Mr. Larson reported that on item 8, Prop K allocations, the CAC recommended approval of the funds and on item 9, Local Partnership Program (LPP), the CAC recommended approval of the LPP formulaic funds for street resurfacing and LPP fund exchange with an equivalent amount of Prop K funds. He said that the CAC appreciated that LPP funds would be used right away for street resurfacing improvements.

He reported that on item 10, 2017 San Francisco Congestion Management Program, the CAC had concerns about the findings of the report indicating that citywide average transit and auto speeds had not improved over time and that the CAC suggested that the data be shown at a finer level of detail such as on individual routes as opposed to sectors of the city. Mr. Larson also reported that the CAC had concerns that the impact of Transportation Network Companies (TNCs) on congestion in the city were not being adequately captured. He continued to say that the CAC suggested that additional emphasis should be placed on transit solutions, like subway and bus rapid transit, and that the CAC would like to see studies and visioning efforts taking a more holistic approach as opposed to narrow plans that focused on a single issue. He said that representatives of the CAC, from the West side of the city, expressed a desire to see efforts that not only focused on the most congested core, but also addressed the transit needs for the rest of the city. He said that the CAC approved the item with an amendment urging the Transportation Authority and other city transit agencies to accelerate planning for dedicated transit rights of way, such as subways and bus rapid transits, with special consideration for improvements serving the West side

of the city.

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

3. **Approve the Minutes of the November 14, 2017 Meeting – ACTION**
4. **[Final Approval] Allocate \$2,941,939 in Prop K Sales Tax Funds for Five Requests, with Conditions – ACTION**
5. **[Final Approval] Award Three-Year Professional Services Contracts, with an Option to extend for Two Additional One-Year Periods, to WSP USA and Resource Systems Group, Inc. in a Combined Amount Not to Exceed \$400,000 for On-Call Modeling Services – ACTION**

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Tang moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Commissioner Breed.

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

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Fewer, Peskin, Ronen, Tang (6)

Absent: Commissioners Farrell, Kim, Safai, Sheehy, and Yee (5)

End of Consent Agenda

6. **Appointment of Two Members to the Citizens Advisory Committee – INFORMATION**

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

Kian Alavi spoke to his interest and qualifications in being appointed to the CAC.

Bradley Tanzman spoke to his interest and qualifications in being appointed to the CAC.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Ronen thanked all the individuals that applied for the vacant District 9 CAC position and noted the large number of qualified applicants. Commissioner Ronen made a motion to appoint Kian Alavi to the District 9 CAC seat and mentioned that District 9 faced complex transportation issues, and would benefit from Mr. Alavi's transportation equity and justice lens in particular.

Commissioner Kim made a motion to reappoint CAC member Becky Hogue and said that she sits on the Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee and had served as vice-chair. Commissioner Kim said that Ms. Hogue was an active citizen concerning vision zero, a Treasure Island resident and that her voice on the CAC was needed given the continued work of the Treasure Island Mobility Management Agency (TIMMA).

Commissioner Ronen moved to appoint Kian Alavi to the CAC, seconded by Commissioner Yee.

Commissioner Kim moved to reappoint Becky Hogue to the CAC, seconded by Commissioner Breed.

The motions to appoint Kian Alavi and reappoint Becky Hogue were approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Farrell, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy, Tang and Yee (11)

7. **Update on the San Francisco Freeway Corridor Management System Study – INFORMATION**

Andrew Heidel, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Mr. Heidel noted that this information item was related to Item 8 and 9, which proposed to allocate funding for future phases of this effort.

Commissioner Safai commented that focusing on I-280 in San Francisco while the rest of the Bay Area prioritized US 101 seemed odd. He also expressed concern over the four-mile gap and lack of direct connection to downtown via Interstate 280. Commissioner Safai noted that 280 was meant to be a relief point for 101, and that adjustments could weaken this. Commissioner Safai said that there was a need to improve traffic flow but that he does not feel this project accomplished this overall objective.

Chair Peskin responded that downtown is rapidly expanding toward 280.

Mr. Heidel said that Transportation Authority staff understood Commissioner Safai's concerns about changing 280 from a relief valve to something that might attract more traffic. He stated that staff focused on 280 instead of 101 because of geometric and Bay Bridge traffic challenges affecting the latter highway. Mr. Heidel said that staff will work to address Commissioner Safai's concerns in the next few months as planning work continued.

Commissioner Sheehy agreed with Commissioner Safai's concerns over adjusting 280. He said that if any changes resulted in further traffic on 280, ramps like Monterey, Alemany, and Ocean, which are already crowded, could experience additional congestion. He expressed concern that installing HOV lanes could put traffic into gridlock. Commissioner Sheehy recounted a traffic standstill on 101 near Glen Park a few months ago that resulted in gridlock on surface streets. He noted that changes affecting the 101/280 interchange affect people in surrounding neighborhoods. Commissioner Sheehy said before putting money into HOV lanes, money should be invested into ameliorating some of the systemic problems causing traffic. He shared that he had tried to get SFMTA to examine a problematic backup at the Monterey Boulevard ramp, which at times backs up onto the highway. He said that SFMTA had been indifferent, and he expressed concern that no change would happen until a large accident occurs. Commissioner Sheehy requested that a more holistic approach to traffic mitigation be taken and noted the impact that traffic had on District 8 and 11.

Mr. Heidel replied to Commissioner Sheehy that staff did consider the impact of 280 traffic on surface streets and that more details would be available in early 2018.

Commissioner Sheehy stated that traffic near Mission Bay could worsen with the Giants and now the Warriors in the area. He cited existing congestion on King, Mariposa, and 6th Streets. Commissioner Sheehy said that congestion pricing could have a chance to work, but he was not sure how likely it was to succeed. He also noted that the 101/280 interchange was chaotic in both directions.

Mr. Heidel responded that the 101/280 interchange was a known challenge. He said that if Caltrans was to build it today, it would be designed differently. Mr. Heidel explained that the split of 280 into three roadways made it difficult to implement designs to address congestion through the interchange. He also noted that the backups at and through the interchange ultimately begin at Hospital Curve on 101 or the Bay Bridge. Mr. Heidel said that to untangle congestion on 280, staff needs to address these sources on 101 and the Bay Bridge in coordination with regional partners in the East Bay and MTC to address what happens on the Bay Bridge and in the South

of Market area (SOMA).

Commissioner Sheehy said that the proposed plan seemed like an incomplete solution. He reiterated his that there was a need to more holistically develop a plan to reduce demand on both 101 and 280.

Executive Director Tilly Chang responded that the Transportation Authority was undertaking a more holistic view of freeway planning with ConnectSF and the countywide transportation plan update. She stated that this included examining how to minimize disruption to local streets. Director Chang said that staff had begun looking at difficult areas on the freeway, like the Maze and the Hairball, with Commissioner Ronen's requested District 9 freeway study. She elaborated that in this study, staff also explored how to manage parallel routes alongside 280. Director Chang posited that the potential for buses and carpools on the freeway was not fully utilized. She stated that there was a need to more holistically look at freeways and nearby arterials. She furthered that the countywide transportation plan will have a streets and freeways study. Director Chang stated that there needed to be collaboration with Caltrans, MTC, and BATA for success. She said that staff was examining physical treatments, priority lanes, pricing, and incentives to manage freeway traffic. She stated that staff was aware that increases in traffic were possible and that there was a need to holistically prepare the whole system for this.

Commissioner Kim asked what revenue from an express lane would be used for and who would administer it. Mr. Heidel responded that this had not yet been decided. He said that elsewhere in California, funds must go to alternative transit improvements in the priced corridor. He further noted that MTC had the authority to operate express lanes in San Francisco, but that there was no obligation that MTC must administer an express lane. He said that staff was exploring all options about who a potential operator could ultimately be.

Commissioner Kim agreed with Commissioner Sheehy that an express lane alone would not be the answer, but observed that the revenue generated could create an opportunity to identify and implement more attractive alternatives to driving, especially in neighborhoods affected by freeway traffic. She requested that staff study these alternatives and determine which ones express lane revenues could help fund. Commissioner Kim also requested that these improvements be rolled out in concert with any managed lane so that options are available on day one. She acknowledged that this could be difficult since the revenue would only be anticipated but hoped that it was possible. Commissioner Kim cited London's rollout of its mobility congestion plan as a positive example. Commissioner Kim noted that the express lane would not be continuous northbound and asked if this might address some of the concerns held by Commissioners Safai and Sheehy since there would be no changes to a large stretch of the freeway. She noted that she had asked staff about the possibility of 101 express lanes and said that she had heard that these could cause a significant negative impact on traffic and thus, weren't proposed. Commissioner Kim stated that there need to be less vehicles downtown. She noted that many vehicles in downtown are driven by San Francisco residents. She also stated that this traffic has large effects on SOMA residents, particularly through air quality impacts.

Commissioner Safai said that his biggest reservation was the \$6 million price of the study. He said that the study was not holistic enough to cost that amount. He also expressed concern that this action would reallocate money away from street resurfacing that neighborhoods want. Commissioner Safai noted significant recent investments in Caltrain by San Francisco and others, and stated that the focus should be on getting people out of their cars and onto Caltrain. He also noted that congestion on 280 was common on weekends near Mission Bay. He said that with one

less lane, this traffic would worsen. Commissioner Safai said that the real traffic concern was on 101, and that 101 should be a higher priority than 280. He said that alternative transit should be the top focus.

Director Chang responded to Commissioner Safai, saying that hard work was going into improving Caltrain, as exemplified by the recent award of the electrification grant. She noted that Caltrain currently runs at full capacity, which makes the highways a needed form of transportation for the time being. Director Chang said that there was regional cooperation going into the downtown extension and that once the extension is complete – offering a high-quality transit options to downtown, 101 could be examined. She stated that the needed non-driving alternatives were not in place to alter capacity on 101 at this time, and that Caltrans, who owns and ultimately controls the freeways, would not consider 101 changes until this condition is addressed. Director Chang clarified that on 280, a shoulder would be striped to add a northbound HOV lane and that no lane would be taken away. She said that ideally, this lane would feed into a 3rd Street red carpet bus lane to take buses to the Transbay Transit Center. In response to Commissioner Kim's request that driving alternatives accompany the HOV lane from the outset, Director Chang noted that MTC had funded a regional bus express study in San Mateo, which is examining the potential to significantly increase SamTrans transit service in the entire San Francisco to San Jose corridor. She said that San Mateo could run more SamTrans buses, which would utilize the HOV lane. Director Chang stated that staff was also considering the long-term and incorporating Caltrain and high-speed rail into planning. Director Chang expressed that the HOV lane could provide an opportunity to strengthen San Francisco's regional partnership with San Mateo and Santa Clara on managing both highway and transit traffic in the peninsula corridor.

Commissioner Cohen thanked Director Chang for elaborating. She then said that many new residents will move to southeast San Francisco with developments like the Warriors stadium, the Shipyard, and Pier 70. She said that this would lead to increased congestion throughout southern San Francisco. Commissioner Cohen also stated that a current multimodal congestion management study occurring in District 10 would build off past studies and inform future ones. Commissioner Cohen questioned what the long-term future for 280 will be once more alternative options, like high-speed rail, are available.

Commissioner Sheehy said that drivers from the south should have to pay, just like drivers from the north or east do. He stated that he did not believe the HOV lanes were a good solution.

Commissioner Kim said that she and Commissioner Cohen had considered congestion pricing. She stated she was glad to hear that Commissioner Sheehy was considering this as well. Commissioner Kim noted that San Francisco had added 50,000 new residents and 100,000 new jobs since 2009. She said that predicting and planning for this type of growth was impossible, and that a degree of gridlock occurring as a result was to be expected. She said that the city needs to look at pricing driving from the South Bay and investing in attractive alternative options. She also noted that San Francisco residents who drive were a big part of the congestion.

There was no public comment.

8. Allocate \$3,652,500 in Prop K Funds for Three Requests, with Conditions, and Appropriation of \$200,000 in Prop K Funds for One Request – ACTION

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

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Tang moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Farrell.

The motion was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Farrell, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Sheehy, Tang and Yee (10)

Absent: Commissioner Safai (1)

9. Approve Programming of \$6.08 Million (Estimated) in Local Partnership Program (LPP) Formulaic Program Funds to Three San Francisco Public Works Street Resurfacing Projects, and Approve a Fund Exchange of \$4.1 million in LPP Funds with an Equivalent Amount of Prop K Funds for the US 101/I-280 Managed Lanes LPP Fund Exchange Project, with Conditions – ACTION

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

Commissioner Safai asked for clarification on the use of the project funds. Ms. LaForte replied that the Transportation Authority was recommending programming \$6 million in state funds to street resurfacing projects with a fund exchange of \$4 million for the managed lanes project.

Commissioner Safai asked why \$4 million was requested to fund the study, observing that it seemed like a large amount. Tilly Chang, Executive Director, replied that in the world of environmental review it was what the Transportation Authority expected for a project of that scale to cost. She explained that there was a portion of the study which would be funded by San Mateo County for the four miles from Interstate 380 to the county line. She said that the total cost was estimated to be more than the \$4 million the Transportation Authority sought for its part in the county. She said that the environmental process had a lot of studies and analysis that were required by Caltrans. Ms. Chang said one potential bright spot was that back in 2012/2013 San Mateo County was successfully able to seek matching funds from private sector employers in the corridor for its managed lanes projects and the Transportation Authority would seek to do the same.

Commissioner Safai asked if the funds were just programming and if an agreement had been reached regarding the scope of the project. Ms. Chang replied that the request was to set aside the funds and was being requested now because the California Transportation Commission (CTC) required the Transportation Authority to tell them which projects would receive the local partnership planning funds. She said that the local partnership program funds were proposed to be put on resurfacing projects which could be delivered to the voters quickly, but the swap meant that a portion of the previously programmed Prop K funds to resurfacing could then be released and programmed to managed lanes for environmental work. She said that the item was being brought up due to the urgency of the CTC schedule and the goal was to seek matching funds from the private sector to help supplement for the environmental phase.

Commissioner Safai asked if the plan decreased funding availability for street resurfacing. Ms. Chang replied that the Transportation Authority was adding \$2 million to the previously programmed Prop K funds and giving a total of \$6 million to Public Works to do resurfacing. Commissioner Safai asked where the money was coming from. Ms. Chang replied that that the Transportation Authority had \$6 million of new state money and the idea was to give Public Works \$6 million and they would release \$4 million that they had from Prop K to allow the Transportation Authority to fund the managed lanes project, leaving a net increase of \$2 million for resurfacing. Commissioner Safai indicated he did not support the fund exchange.

Commissioner Yee commented that he appreciated where the funds were going in terms of resurfacing. Commissioner Yee said that an issue he was trying to push was undergrounding the M Line and that recently a decision was made to take a sabbatical from thinking about the project. He said that he was trying to find ways where the Transportation Authority could reactivate process and get it going again. He said that if an assumption was made that next steps could not be advanced, because of lack of funds, the project would never be completed and that a vision was needed to go after money in the future. He said that he was disappointed, and asked about the \$70 million that were set aside for the Park Merced development and supported by the community.

Ms. Chang replied that the underground project was moving along through feasibility studies conducted by the Transportation Authority and that the SFMTA decided to put it on hold pending larger prioritization conversations needed around a citywide rail investment strategy. She said that her understanding was that the SFMTA was moving forward with the central subway to go to fisherman's wharf and the M undergrounding. She said that the M Line continued to be one of the highest priority projects, with four car capacity across the diagonal of the city. She said that the work with SFMTA had shifted to city wide transit planning and particularly to city wide rail planning and mentioned that the M line continued to be a high priority system wide for SFMTA. She said an information and outreach item on these studies would be available in the Spring. Commissioner Yee commented that he would appreciate any movement as quick as possible and mentioned that District 7's population was going to increase by 20,000, with M Line already at capacity.

Commissioner Fewer commented that the item did not address the congestion concerns along Park Presidio Highway 1 in Districts 1, 2, and 7 and although she understood another corridor was being studied, she wanted to shed light on the congestion issues of Park Presidio Highway 1. She said that the city would experience an increase of population in Park Merced and would like to see what would be done to address the growth on the west side of the city.

Commissioner Sheehy asked what would happen if the \$4 million were not spent on the study. Ms. LaForte replied that \$4 million would be available for street resurfacing projects. Chair Peskin commented that that policy consideration was whether the Board wanted to start a long-term planning investment in the Highway 101/I-280 managed corridors project and thought it was a long term worthwhile investment that over time would be needed with over 100,000 people anticipated to be coming up the corridor. He said that more had to be done than just the Caltrain extension and at some point HOV managed lanes would need to be considered.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Cohen moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Tang.

The motion to approve the item failed by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Cohen, Peskin, Tang and Yee (4)

Nays: Commissioners Fewer, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy (4)

Absent: Commissioners Breed, Kim, and Farrell (3)

Commissioner Cohen made a motion to rescind the vote, seconded by Commissioner Kim.

The vote was rescinded without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Cohen, Fewer, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy, Tang and Yee (8)

Absent: Commissioners Breed, Kim, and Farrell (3)

Commissioner Kim moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Tang.

The motion to approve the item failed by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Cohen, Kim, Peskin, Tang and Yee (5)

Nays: Commissioners Fewer, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy (4)

Absent: Commissioners Breed and Farrell (2)

Chair Peskin commented that he would schedule the item for the December 12, 2017 Transportation Authority Board meeting and urged staff to connect with all of the Board members prior to the next meeting.

10. Approve the 2017 San Francisco Congestion Management Program – ACTION

Bhargava Sana, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Yee moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Sheehy.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Cohen, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy, Tang and Yee (8)

Absent: Commissioners Breed, Farrell, Fewer (3)

11. Approve the 2018 State and Federal Legislative Program – INFORMATION

Amber Crabbe, Assistant Deputy Director, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Tang moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Sheehy.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Cohen, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy, Tang and Yee (8)

Absent: Commissioners Breed, Farrell, Fewer (3)

12. Accept the Audit Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2017 – ACTION

Cynthia Fong, Deputy Director for Finance and Administration, introduced the item per the staff memorandum.

Ahmed Gharaibeh, Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Co. LLP (VTD), presented the item.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Tang moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Yee.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Cohen, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy, Tang and Yee (8)

Absent: Commissioners Breed, Farrell, Fewer (3)

Chair Peskin called Item 13 after Consent Agenda.

13. Progress Report for Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit – INFORMATION

Ed Reiskin, SFMTA Director of Transportation, presented the item.

Commissioner Safai asked for further information on the sewer-related cost issue with the contractor. Mr. Reiskin replied that the contract was a guaranteed maximum price contract and the costs for the different elements of work were agreed upon and established upfront with the contractor. He said that for the utilities work, the SFMTA agreed upon a price of \$18 million based on estimates they had done, the contractor had done and independent third-party estimates. When the contractor received the bids, Mr. Reiskin said that they came in around \$39 million dollars. He said that was something that the contractor, the SFMTA and the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) were not comfortable with, and from that point forward the SFMTA worked with the contractor to repackage and rebid the work. The rebid resulted in a price of about \$29 million, less than the original bid, but still significantly higher than the original cost estimate. Mr. Reiskin explained that the process to rebid and negotiate, with one responsive party, was what took the time and accounted for a lot of delay. Mr. Reiskin said that contractually speaking, the \$18 million was what the contractor agreed to and they signed on to when they entered the contract, though he noted that the SFMTA appreciates that it creates an \$11 million gap for the contractor. He said that the contractor did not have a legal resource to close that gap, but the SFMTA wanted to make sure they were fairly compensated for the cost of the project. He said that the contractor had submitted a claim for the \$11 million and that was something that the SFMTA would process accordingly.

Commissioner Safai asked how the claims process worked and asked for additional information on the construction management method. Mr. Reiskin replied that the delivery mechanism that the SFMTA selected for the project, after consultation with the PUC and Public Works, was a Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC) method which was different from the design-bid-build approach where the design was done in house and then a bid is put out for the whole package. He said that under the Construction Manager/General Contractor method, the contractor was brought in before the design was 100% complete to advise on constructability and to give other feedback. He said that the SFMTA negotiated a maximum price with the contractor and then allowed the contractor to take packages, such as utilities, and bid them out as they are ready. Mr. Reiskin said that it was a different way of project delivery, but also was the way Public Works delivered larger building projects, though this was SFMTA's first significant horizontal project using this delivery method. He said that SFMTA incorporated a lot of lessons learned from Public Works and PUC. Lastly, Mr. Reiskin said that the SFMTA would process claims whether related to the sewers or any others that will be received, as is typical on any large construction project, as per the admin code.

Commissioner Breed noticed that on Van Ness Avenue there was a lot of confusion about which way people are to go when driving up and down the street and was wondering if the SFMTA had any plans to add parking control officers (PCO) to the most challenged intersections during commute hours. Mr. Reiskin replied that the SFMTA was monitoring the traffic flow carefully and engaged a team of their engineers and Caltrans engineers in identifying and approving the road configurations, communications plan, and signage for commuters. He also said that if needed a PCO or police officer would be placed on site to address any confusion and SFMTA would also welcome any feedback that identified specific places of concern.

Commissioner Breed asked how the SFMTA monitored and made decisions around traffic issues pertaining to this project. Mr. Reiskin replied that the SFMTA had traffic engineers that focused exclusively on those changes related to construction and they would analyze what the contractor was proposing. He said that they informed development of the specs and they reviewed the traffic

management plans the contractors submitted and that a lot of work was involved because they needed to make sure the road would be able to function safely. In terms of monitoring, Mr. Reiskin said the SFMTA had staff, inspectors and construction management staff who all played a role. He said that they also monitor feedback that they get from the public through various venues such as the previously mentioned outreach the SFMTA was doing on the project and 311 calls.

There was no public comment.

Chair Peskin continued the item to the call of the Chair to ensure the Board could keep tabs on the project as it sought to get back on schedule.

Items from the Personnel Committee

Chair Peskin called Items 14 and 15 together.

14. [Final Approval] Evaluation of Public Employee Performance and Approve the Executive Director's Performance Objectives for 2018 – ACTION

15. [Final Approval] Set Annual Compensation for the Executive Director for 2018 – ACTION

Tilly Chang, Executive Director, introduced the item per the staff memorandum.

Commissioner Ronen thanked the Ms. Chang and the Transportation Authority staff for their accessibility and knowledge. Commissioner Kim commented that Ms. Chang had followed through the commitments she had made during the hiring process to strengthen the relationships with outside agencies and other city agencies. She said that Ms. Chang had found ways to streamline the funding with the grantees and placed the projects that were important to all to the Board on the ground. Commissioner Kim commented that she spoken with a few people about their working relationship with Ms. Chang, and how they perceived her leadership, and that it was great to hear such positive comments about her leadership style. She said that Ms. Chang was incredibly responsive at addressing the concerns of the Board and brainstorming different ideas around TNCs or yellow school buses or other topics. She said that the Board appreciated the initiative that the Transportation Authority took to conduct a study of TNCs on the road and to provide a comprehensive report.

Commissioner Yee expressed his gratitude towards Ms. Chang's leadership and thanked the Personnel Committee for doing a thorough evaluation of Ms. Chang's performance.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Ronen moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Kim.

Item 14 and 15 were approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Cohen, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy, and Yee (7)

Absent: Commissioners Breed, Farrell, Fewer, and Tang (3)

Other Items

16. Introduction of New Items – INFORMATION

There were no new items introduced.

17. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

18. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:18 p.m.