



DRAFT MINUTES

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

May 25, 2011 MEETING

1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Glenn Davis at 6:08 p.m. CAC members present were Glenn Davis, Joseph Flanagan, Brian Larkin, Jacqueline Sachs, Robert Switzer, Peter Tannen, Wendy Tran and Conrad Wu. Fran Martin entered during Item 6. Authority staff members present were Tilly Chang, Jesse Koehler, Anna LaForte, Maria Lombardo, Richard Marcus, Chad Rathmann and Steve Rehn.

2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Brian Larkin gave an update on his report to the Plans and Programs Committee at its May 17 meeting. He reported that the Committee had passed the four action items which were also on the CAC agenda and had passed through the CAC.

Consent Calendar

Items 3 through 5 were on the consent calendar. Conrad Wu asked that Item 5 be removed from the consent calendar for discussion.

3. Approve the Minutes of the April 27, 2011 Meeting – ACTION

Robert Switzer asked that the minutes be corrected to show that Jacqueline Sachs made her comments on Item 7 after the motion and vote.

4. Adopt a Motion of Support to Authorize the Executive Director to Negotiate and Execute Annual Contract Renewals with City and County of San Francisco Departments and Exercise Contract Options for On-Call Modeling Services, in an Amount Not to Exceed \$297,536 – ACTION

Mr. Switzer moved to approve this item with the correction to the minutes. Mr. Wu seconded the motion.

There was no public comment. The consent calendar passed unanimously as revised to remove Item 5 and correct Item 3.

End of Consent Calendar

5. Adopt a Motion of Support for Approval of the Revised Debt, Fiscal and Procurement Policies and Ratification of the Authority's Current Investment Policy – ACTION

Conrad Wu opined that the proposed policy revisions should be more closely reviewed by the CAC, citing as examples the conflict of interest provisions and the third and fourth paragraphs of the protest and appeals provisions in the procurement policy. Mr. Wu asked if the CAC could work with Authority staff discuss the language. Cynthia Fong, Deputy Director for Finance and Administration, suggested that interested CAC members meet with Authority staff to refine the draft policies before bringing them back to the CAC for action. She said the

timeframe for the revisions was not urgent. Mr. Wu agreed with this approach. Robert Switzer asked if the intent of the revisions were consistency, clarity and open government. He said he would like to see an explanation for each change prior to CAC action on the item and proposed that a subcommittee work with Authority staff on the policy revisions. Ms. Fong stated that Authority staff could create a matrix identifying the proposed changes and providing the rationale for each change. Glenn Davis said his understanding of the comments by CAC members on the item was that due process was an important theme in refining the policies.

Robert Switzer moved to defer action on the item until the June CAC meeting to allow staff to meet with interested CAC members to review the proposed revisions, address concerns and prepare a matrix of proposed changes and their rationale. Glenn Davis seconded the motion.

There was no public comment. The item was deferred.

Jacqueline Sachs recommended that Authority staff consult with Stephen Taber on the item.

6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve the Fiscal Year 2011/2012 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program of Projects – ACTION

Chad Rathmann, Transportation Planner, and Jesse Koehler, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, noted that it was first time the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) program was substantially oversubscribed since its inception. She added that the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Air District), which sets policy and requirements for the TFCA Program, had imposed guidelines that some sponsors find challenging so they don't apply for funds. She noted that the TFCA program requires performance measures and sets a minimum cost effectiveness threshold to be eligible for funds.

Peter Tannen asked for clarification on why the City and County of San Francisco Bicycle Fleet project was broken into two separate scopes, specifically whether it was required by the Air District and whether the combined scope would still meet the cost effectiveness criteria. Mr. Rathmann explained that, while the combined project would not have met the cost effectiveness threshold, the project's two distinct tasks—one for procurement and evaluation and the other for outreach—were completely separate project types according to the Air District's guidance for the program. Mr. Rathmann continued that Authority staff worked with the Department of Environment (DOE) to separate out the tasks and determined that the procurement and evaluation task met the cost effectiveness threshold. Mr. Rathmann added that the outreach phase not funded by TFCA could be covered by Prop K funds programmed for bicycle program projects.

Brian Larkin asked how the San Francisco Employer Commuter Benefits Program and School Ridematching Program were determined to be more cost effective than the three projects not recommended for funding. Mr. Larkin noted that a previously TFCA-funded program similar to the School Ridematching Program had been cancelled ultimately because of liability issues. Mr. Larkin expressed his doubt over the project's cost effectiveness and asked if informing parents by distributing materials through students would be sufficient. Mr. Rathmann responded that the expected level of reduced emissions and cost effectiveness were calculated from the Air District's assumptions based on prior projects and research in addition to San Francisco-specific data. Mr. Rathmann stated that the previously funded program was cancelled without any TFCA expenditures. Mr. Rathmann continued that, using the Air District's methodology, the San Francisco Employer Commuter Benefits Program demonstrated its cost effectiveness to be higher than Cesar Chavez Bike Parking Facility, for example. Mr. Rathmann

added that the Authority would continue to work with sponsors to explore alternative funding options for the Cesar Chavez Bike Parking Facility project.

Mr. Larkin stated that distributing transit passes to employers seemed more effective than outreach to employers as currently scoped in the proposed Commuter Benefits Program project. Mr. Rathmann clarified that direct incentives were not eligible for TFCA funds, and that this project specifically targets business with fewer than 20 employees since TFCA funds cannot be used to fund a mandate and the San Francisco Commuter Benefits Ordinance required that businesses with 20 or more employees offer the benefits. Ms. Lombardo added that DOE was able to demonstrate the value of the outreach program with survey results from its previous TFCA projects, which showed that employers were either unaware of commuter benefits or were unclear on how to set it up.

Krute Singa, DOE Clean Air Program Manager, explained that for the School Ridematching Program, the liability issue was resolved by having parents take responsibility for use of the ridematching website. Ms. Singa stated that numerous case studies showed that existence of a ridematching website by itself would not necessarily translate to parents' use of the website or the program, and that parents needed assistance to understand different options suggested in the website, including carpool, bikepool, and walkpool, as well as learn how to use the program. Ms. Singa emphasized that the timing was critical to provide such assistance in San Francisco as school bus services had been drastically cut and the school assignment system had changed. Mr. Larkin asked if such information was already provided on the website. Ms. Singa clarified that the website only contained matching information for pooling transportation options for children and did not have information about the change in the bus system or school assignment system. Mr. Larkin asked how DOE planned for outreach to parents. Ms. Singa responded that DOE staff would participate in a number of events and outreach campaigns involving parents in the beginning of the school year through tabling, presentations, and meetings and would also provide a large map customized for each school at the event.

Jacqueline Sachs asked about the Laguna Honda Hospital Resident, Employee, and Visitor Shuttle project, which was not recommended for funding, and if the current shuttle could continue to operate, since that Muni 89-Laguna Honda route was eliminated in December 2009. Mr. Rathmann clarified that Department of Public Health general funds currently fund the shuttle service and that Authority and DOE staff would work with DPH to submit the project to the Air District for the Regional TFCA program. Ms. Sachs asked about the timeline for that funding program, and Mr. Rathmann estimated the Regional TFCA call for projects to be released by June 2011.

Mr. Switzer proposed to remove the San Francisco Integrated Travel Demand Management (TDM) Public-Private Partnership Project from this item to vote on it with Item 9 on the Strategic Analysis Report (SAR) on the Role of Shuttle Services in San Francisco's Transportation System so that CAC members could consider the project and related items simultaneously. Ms. Lombardo said that in addition to the TFCA funding recommendation for the TDM project, there was another funding item related to the project—Item 8, which included a Prop K allocation request for local matching funds to a grant from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). Mr. Switzer noted that MTC Bay Area Climate Initiatives funds had already been awarded to this project so most of the scope would not be modifiable.

During public comment, Andy Thornley, San Francisco Bike Coalition (SFBC), spoke in support of the City and County of San Francisco Bicycle Fleet Program and noted that the project included promotion and evaluation. Mr. Thornley also spoke in support of the Regional Bicycle Sharing Pilot Project.

Mr. Switzer made a motion to approve the item without the San Francisco Integrated TDM Public-Private Partnership Project and to vote on that request with Item 9. Conrad Wu suggested deferring voting on this item in its entirety at the time of voting for Item 9 rather than amending it. Mr. Switzer expressed his concern that in that case, those involved with the other TFCA projects would have to wait until the time of the Item 9 discussion. Glenn Davis seconded Mr. Switzer's motion. The amended motion passed with six votes in favor, with Mr. Larkin and Ms. Sachs opposing.

7. **Adopt a Motion of Support for the Allocation of \$25,287,291 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, for Fifteen Annual Requests, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules, and Amendment of Three 5-Year Prioritization Programs – ACTION**

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy for Policy and Programming, presented this item per the staff memorandum.

Brian Larkin asked about the status of Prop K funding for light rail on Geary. Ms. Lombardo answered that the Geary light rail was included in the Prop K Expenditure Plan approved by the voters as a Priority 3 project, which was the most optimistic revenue scenario. She said that local sales tax revenues since the inception of Prop K had come in at approximately 80% of Priority 1, the most conservative revenue scenario, making it unlikely that funding would become available for this project.

Robert Switzer stated that the scope of the Sunset Elementary School and AP Giannini Safe Routes to School project was inconsistent with the CAC's discussion of the project at its April meeting. Ms. Lombardo responded that the subject request was for the design phase of the project, and that the design elements discussed at the April meeting had been forwarded to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) for consideration for inclusion in the project design and ultimately in the construction phase scope.

Wendy Tran asked if the \$125,000 for Bicycle Parking funded three phases of the work, including design, environmental review and construction. Ms. Lombardo answered in the affirmative. Glenn Davis asked what languages were used in the outreach efforts for the bicycle projects. Chad Rathmann, Transportation Planner, answered that in addition to English, outreach materials such as the San Francisco Bicycle Guide were produced in Chinese and Spanish. Mr. Larkin asked about the status of the Balboa Park BART Station Eastside Connection project. Ms. Lombardo answered that the SFMTA planned to submit a Prop K request for that project for presentation to the CAC at its June meeting.

Glenn Davis moved to approve this item. Robert Switzer seconded the motion.

During public comment, Andy Thornley, SFBC, spoke in support of the Bicycle Safety Classes and Bike to Work Day projects. He voiced a disclaimer that the SFBC was an interested party with regard to the bicycle projects because it currently provided some of the services for those projects under contract to the SFMTA. Mr. Thornley said Bike to Work Day 2011 was a huge success. He said behavior changes such as commute mode choice tended to be "sticky" in that they were long-lasting. He stated that San Francisco bicycle trips increased 58% during the same period that the City was enjoined from constructing new bicycle infrastructure and attributed the increase to advocacy and outreach, making outreach one of the most cost effective means of increasing bicycle mode share.

Ms. Tran asked about the number of bicycle safety class participants whose primary languages were Chinese or Spanish, and what kind of outreach was used to reach these communities. Mr. Thornley answered that each year there was at least one full class taught each in Chinese and

Spanish, generally with 35 to 40 participants in each class. Fran Martin commented that an annual participation rate of 30 to 40 non-English speaking participants was a poor showing. Mr. Thornley agreed that non-English participation should be higher. Ms. Martin asked if the teachers were multi-lingual, and suggested that each class should be conducted in at least three languages. Mr. Thornley answered that the instructors were certified by the League of American Bicyclists, and that some, but not all, were multi-lingual.

Conrad Wu asked what the SFMTA planned for future bicycle outreach to minority communities. Jessica Manzi, SFMTA Sustainable Streets Division, answered that the Prop K request would fund development of the request for proposals for the next cycle of classes, and that the SFMTA would specify increased minority outreach, especially through existing community organizations. She pointed out that the proposed project scope specifically targets ethnic minorities and women. Jacqueline Sachs suggested that outreach should also target the Filipino and Russian communities in San Francisco.

Ms. Tran asked if the bicycle projects address enforcement noting that she had experienced conflicts with bicyclists riding on sidewalks and nearly running her over when she was crossing the street. Mr. Thornley answered that enforcement measures were outside of the scope of the items under consideration. He said, however, that the SFBC was committed to safe, respectful bicycle riding and worked closely with the San Francisco Police Department on enforcement issues, and that the San Francisco Bicycle Plan included provisions for enforcement, but that SFBC mostly worked with persuasion rather than coercion.

There was no additional public comment. The item passed unanimously.

Ms. Martin commented that before the SFMTA published requests for proposals on items involving bicycle outreach, she would like to see quantitative information on the planned outreach efforts. Mr. Wu expressed concern that the CAC's action on the item did not include Ms. Martin's suggestion as an amendment to the action recommended by staff. Maria Lombardo said CAC requests and concerns could be conveyed to project sponsors at any time, and need not be directly tied to action on an agenda item. Ms. Martin confirmed that this was a suggestion and she didn't intend for it to be linked to the CAC vote.

8. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Allocation of \$1,132,170 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency for Five Projects, the Allocation of \$123,250 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, to the Department of Public Works for One Project, and the Appropriation of \$78,866 in Prop K funds for the Integrated Travel Demand Management Partnership Project, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules, and Amendment of the Relevant 5-Year Prioritization Programs – ACTION

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, Richard Marcus, Senior Transportation Planner, and Seon Joo Kim and Chad Rathmann, Transportation Planners, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Mr. Larkin asked why Prop K was a more appropriate fund source than TFCA for the SFMTA's Fell and Oak Bikeway Improvements project. Mr. Rathmann said that the Air District placed a two-year timely use of funds requirement on TFCA projects, and that staff had concerns that the project's four phases (planning, environmental, design and construction) would not be complete within that timeframe. He explained that with this proposed funding approach, the SFMTA could use Prop K funds to complete the planning, environmental, and design phases, setting the project up to be very competitive for future discretionary grant programs, including TFCA, to fund the construction phase. Ms. Lombardo added that the

Fiscal Year 2011/12 TFCA cycle was significantly over-subscribed and that using Prop K funds for the first phases of the project would allow TFCA funds to fund other eligible projects which could meet the timely use of funds requirements.

Ms. Lombardo explained that there had been an overall trend of increasingly strict timely use of funds requirements associated with discretionary grants, which was good because previously money would sit unspent and projects weren't being delivered. She indicated that the Air District's requirements were particularly tight and this then means that TFCA funds should be used for projects that are construction-ready or have straight-forward design and construction like bike parking.

Mr. Larkin suggested that staff work with the Air District to increase the timeframe for the completion of a project. Ms. Lombardo said that the Air District's mission was very focused on improving air quality and improving it quickly, so she didn't think it would be receptive to this suggestion.

Mr. Switzer said that he supported pedestrian safety efforts and wanted to see bulb-outs for which the focus was not only a single purpose for a bus stop as an example, but also aesthetic and public safety impacts.

Wendy Tran asked about the impacts of the bus bulbs for the Geneva-Mission project.

Jonathan Rewers, SFMTA Finance and Information Technology, responded that the bus bulbs sped up boarding times for the system and were a safety improvement. He added that this project included many improvements and was a major multimodal project. Mr. Rewers continued that this project could eventually include additional elements recommended in the Better Streets Plan such as landscaping and irrigation.

Fran Martin asked if this project was part of the program to provide 2% of funding for the arts program. Mr. Rewers did not know the answer but said he would get back to the CAC with the information.

Mr. Switzer made a motion to approve the item without the San Francisco Integrated TDM Public-Private Partnership Project and to vote on that request with Item 9, the shuttles SAR, so that CAC members could consider the project and related items as a whole package. Mr. Larkin seconded Mr. Switzer's motion.

There was no public comment. The item passed unanimously.

9. Adopt a Motion of Support for Approval of the Strategic Analysis Report on the Role of Shuttle Services in San Francisco's Transportation System – ACTION

Tilly Chang, Deputy Director for Planning, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Fran Martin expressed concern regarding parking impacts of shuttles in certain neighborhoods. Ms. Chang said that such "park-and-hide" behavior was common with any such service and there may be a need for improved management of on-street parking supplies in order to address these impacts.

Robert Switzer asked to what extent the shuttle stops illustrated in the SAR were mandated by the City. Ms. Chang said the report's citywide map showed shuttles provided by regional employers located in the Peninsula and South Bay. Ms. Chang added that a small number of shuttles had been mandated by the City within the greater downtown area. Mr. Switzer inquired as to the time of day that the shuttles operated. Ms. Chang said that the majority of the shuttles operated during the weekday morning and afternoon peak commute periods with approximately two to three runs per stop per peak period. She added that some stops were

served by multiple operators.

Conrad Wu asked several questions including: 1) how many individuals were employed by the employers that provided the shuttle services; 2) why some companies did not provide identifying information on vehicles serving their employees; 3) how compliance with the Muni Partners program would be enforced and how the program would seek to minimize participating companies from opting out of the program; 4) what was the rationale for the use of public funding to support private shuttles; and 5) whether community shuttles taken into consideration. Mr. Wu concluded that he felt the Muni Partners program had a narrow focus and that the rationale for the program needed to be studied further. Ms. Chang clarified that the proposed Muni Partners program was not yet underway and would still need to be shaped by the SFMTA, who would take the lead on implementing this program. Regarding the employment question, Ms. Chang responded that the study did not attempt to quantify the number of employees employed by regional shuttle operators, but that this figure could be in the tens of thousands. She added that the report did find that about 2,000 employees of those companies use the regional shuttles services daily. Regarding the provision of identifying information on shuttles, Ms. Chang noted that some employers like Genentech did show the company name on the bus, but that for most of the others that did not provide this information, the concern was for the security of their employees. She said that the SAR recommends that the Muni Partners program require shuttle operators to display a unique vehicle identifier to facilitate monitoring and community reporting. Regarding enforcement of a Muni Partners program, Ms. Chang said that the primary regulatory mechanism would be ticketing shuttle non-“Partner” vehicles who used the Muni bus zone and other red zone curb areas, as well as filing official complaints with the licensing entity, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC).

In regards to the use of public funding, Ms. Chang explained that the MTC made a grant of funds from its Bay Area Climate Initiative program to the San Francisco TDM Partnership Project, reflecting its interest in piloting the Muni Partners program as a way to increase shuttle provision and usage. Ms. Chang said that there was a public interest in efficient shuttle operations, given the public benefits (primarily air quality and congestion management) and need to manage local impacts associated with shuttle operations. Ms. Chang clarified that the funding was not supporting the operating expenses of shuttles, but for providing staff capacity and professional technical assistance for planning and coordination activities. Finally, in response to the question about community shuttles, Ms. Chang said that these types of shuttles were not the focus of the SAR but that a related current effort, the Bayview Hunters Point Mobility Solutions Study, was examining the issues and opportunities associated with community transportation in the city’s southeast sector. Finally, Ms. Chang said that the purpose of the grant-funded pilot period for the Muni Partners program was to more comprehensively assess the need for, and program requirements of, a more active and responsive shuttle management program, beginning with more systematic research regarding the current shuttles sector.

Peter Tannen expressed support for the Muni Partners program and asked for clarification regarding TDM Coordinator role. Ms. Chang said that the TDM Partnership Project was funding approximately two-thirds of a position at the SFMTA to lead the Muni Partners program. Brian Larkin asked for clarification as to what else the TDM Partnership Project grant was funding. Jesse Koehler, Transportation Planner, said that in addition to the Muni Partners program, the MTC grant would support several other activities, to be discussed elsewhere on the CAC agenda.

Wendy Tran said that she supported the Muni Partners program and suggested that members

of the general public be able to ride shuttle routes if an additional fare was paid. Ms. Chang noted that the report examined the issue of opening these closed services and that various considerations would need to be taken into account.

Mr. Switzer discussed the CAC's previous consideration of the draft report in 2010 and expressed concern that the current report did not address all of the issues that were raised at that time. Mr. Switzer said that the previous draft report identified relatively minor impacts of shuttles associated with the normal functioning of the urban transportation system. Mr. Switzer said that there was a desire for a business plan for the proposed program that would address the willingness of partners to contribute funding to the program. He said that grant funding had been secured for staff for the Muni Partners program and questioned whether there was sufficient stakeholder support for the project. Mr. Switzer said that he did not consider there to be sufficient need for improved management of shuttles to move forward with the Muni Partners program. Ms. Chang said that Authority staff did take into account the CAC's input and addressed many of the issues and requests that were raised, within the limits of the SAR's scope and budget. Ms. Chang noted that page 14 of the report listed key stakeholders who participated in the report's development. She said that shuttle providers and operators were relatively split among those interested in participating in and supporting a Muni Partners program, and those who had expressed concerns regarding such a program. Ms. Chang added that while the SAR did not develop a business plan, it does raise the need for a Muni Partners program to be sustainable, and so the Authority supports a cost-recovery based fee structure that was consistent with the larger SFMTA policy on curb use and permit rates.

Regarding the need for a Muni Partners program, Ms. Chang said that ongoing stakeholder input and public comments raised during the SAR's development strongly indicated the need and desire for more active and responsive management of shuttles, particularly as the sector continued to grow. Ms. Chang said that the TDM Partnership grant would facilitate the level of research needed to fully quantify the extent of shuttle conflicts and impacts. The project would also provide guidance to operators and the public about where shuttles should and should not be operating and parking. She noted a number of spot locations where the SFMTA had been able to address traffic and transit conflicts, including at Glen Park and near the intersection of Eighth and Market streets. Ms. Chang said that public concerns had also centered on potential safety issues, including those related to visibility impacts of shuttle operations. Mr. Wu said that it was difficult to discern what areas of public concern were matters of perception versus issues that were real.

Glenn Davis asked about former Commissioner Dufty's objective in requesting the SAR. Ms. Chang said that the commissioner had been particularly interested in how the City could respond to the growth of shuttles, which operated extensively in District 8. Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, noted that MTC also signaled the value of exploring this issue as demonstrated by its willingness to fund the pilot period of the Muni Partners program, during which time more comprehensive assessments and planning activities would be undertaken. Mr. Davis said that shuttles affected land use and the transportation system, so more informed regulation was warranted. Fran Martin said that the SAR was a good start to the process and that there was a need to better manage the shuttles sector and quantify its impacts.

Ms. Martin moved to approve this item. Peter Tannen seconded the motion.

There was no public comment. The item was approved with six votes in favor, with Mr. Switzer and Mr. Wu opposing.

Following the action regarding the SAR's approval, Mr. Davis made a motion to support the

staff recommendation for local match funding items for the San Francisco Integrated TDM Public-Private Partnership Project, which were deferred during consideration of Items 6 (TFCA) and 8 (Prop K). Ms. Martin seconded the motion.

There was no public comment. The items passed unanimously.

10. **Adopt a Motion of Support for Award of Two-Year Consultant Contracts to Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates, Fehr & Peers, and Dowling Associates, Inc., in a Combined Total Not to Exceed \$400,000, for Travel Demand Management Professional Services, with an Option to Extend for One Additional Year, and to Authorize the Executive Director to Negotiate Contract Terms and Conditions – ACTION**

Jesse Koehler, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Robert Switzer moved to approve this item. Fran Martin seconded the motion.

There was no public comment. The item passed unanimously.

11. **Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

12. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:52 p.m.