

Members of the Board

Jody Breckenridge, Chair
Jeffrey DelBono
Timothy Donovan
Anthony J. Intintoli, Jr

BOARD OF DIRECTORS' WORKSHOP
Thursday, May 28, 2015 at 10:00 a.m.
San Francisco Bay Area
Water Emergency Transportation Authority
9 Pier, Suite 111; San Francisco

AGENDA

- | | |
|---|-----------------|
| 1. <u>CALL TO ORDER – BOARD CHAIR</u> | 10:00 AM |
| 2. <u>PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE/ROLL CALL</u> | |
| 3. <u>CONSENT CALENDAR</u> | Action |
| a. Workshop Meeting Minutes – March 5, 2015 | |
| 4. <u>INTRODUCTION</u> | 10:15 AM |
| a. Summary of First Board Workshop | |
| 5. <u>WETA SERVICE CONCEPT</u> | 10:30 AM |
| a. WETA Customer Expectations | |
| b. Service Quality | |
| c. Discussion | |
| 6. <u>MISSION & GOALS</u> | 11:30 AM |
| a. Discussion | |
| 7. <u>LUNCH</u> | 12:00 PM |
| 8. <u>DRAFT SERVICE PERFORMANCE STANDARDS & SYSTEM EXPANSION POLICY</u> | 1:15 PM |
| a. Service Policy Statements | |
| b. Service Evaluation Metrics | |
| c. Examples | |
| d. Next Steps | |
| e. Discussion | |
| 9. <u>ADJOURNMENT</u> | 2:30 PM |

This information will be made available in alternative formats upon request. To request an agenda in an alternative format, please contact the Board Secretary at least five (5) working days prior to the meeting to ensure availability.

PUBLIC COMMENTS The Water Emergency Transportation Authority welcomes comments from the public. Speakers' cards and a sign-up sheet are available. Please forward completed speaker cards and any reports/handouts to the Board Secretary.

Non-Agenda Items: A 15 minute period of public comment for non-agenda items will be held at the end of the meeting. Please indicate on your speaker card that you wish to speak on a non-agenda item. No action can be taken on any matter raised during the public comment period. Speakers will be allotted no more than three (3) minutes to speak and will be heard in the order of sign-up.

Water Emergency Transportation Authority May 28, 2015 Board of Directors Workshop

Agenda Items: Speakers on individual agenda items will be called in order of sign-up after the discussion of each agenda item and will be allotted no more than three (3) minutes to speak. You are encouraged to submit public comments in writing to be distributed to all Directors.

Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA) meetings are wheelchair accessible. Upon request WETA will provide written agenda materials in appropriate alternative formats to individuals with disabilities. Please send a written request to contactus@watertransit.org or call (415) 291-3377 at least five (5) days before the meeting.

Participation in a meeting may be available at one or more locations remote from the primary location of the meeting. See the header of this Agenda for possible teleconference locations. In such event, the teleconference location or locations will be fully accessible to members of the public. Members of the public who attend the meeting at a teleconference location will be able to hear the meeting and testify in accordance with applicable law and WETA policies.

Under Cal. Gov't. Code sec. 84308, Directors are reminded that they must disclose on the record of the proceeding any contributions received from any party or participant in the proceeding in the amount of more than \$250 within the preceding 12 months. Further, no Director shall make, participate in making, or in any way attempt to influence the decision in the proceeding if the Director has willfully or knowingly received a contribution in an amount of more than \$250 within the preceding 12 months from a party or such party's agent, or from any participant or his or her agent, provided, however, that the Director knows or has reason to know that the participant has a financial interest in the decision. For further information, Directors are referred to Government Code section 84308 and to applicable regulations.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA WATER EMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS WORKSHOP

(March 5, 2015)

The Board of Directors of the San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority met at the WETA offices at 9 Pier, Suite 111, San Francisco, CA.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Jody Breckenridge called the meeting to order at 9:33 a.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Directors present were Director Jeff DelBono, Director Timothy Donovan and Director Anthony Intintoli.

Chair Breckenridge began by welcoming everyone and thanked the Board members and staff for the work involved and their commitment. She noted that the Board workshop would be the kickoff to the Strategic Plan in the family of plans which included the Strategic Plan, Emergency Response Plan, and the Five-Year Plan (Short Range Transit Plan).

2. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S INTRODUCTION

Executive Director Nina Rannells stated that the presentations were a high level overview about the three components of operations 1) existing system, 2) the expansion program, and 3) emergency response, noting that this would be the first of at least two workshop discussions.

3. WORKSHOP FACILITATOR INTRODUCTION AND OPENING REMARKS

Ms. Rannells introduced the WETA planning staff and presenters, Manager of Planning and Operations Kevin Connolly, Senior Planner Michael Gougherty and Senior Planner Chad Mason.

Ms. Rannells then introduced Diana Dorinson who would be assisting in facilitating the workshop. She noted that Ms. Dorinson was the Founder and Principal of Transportation Analytics, a women-owned company based in Oakland, CA and holds a B.S. Civil Engineering and an M.S. Transportation, both from M.I.T.

Ms. Dorinson began by stating that Board feedback was important and noted that the discussion would be broken down into three sections with time for public comment at the end of each section.

4. WETA OPERATIONS AND FERRY SERVICE PLAN

Mr. Connolly started the discussion with a presentation on Existing Vessels, Facilities, and Operations focusing on service level, vessels, and facilities in the five to ten year horizon, noting that the WETA system had been experiencing double digit ridership growth for the past three to four years and that growth was expected to continue.

Mr. Connolly stated that although the presentation was about existing facilities and existing service, the assumption would be that projects for the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion and the Central Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility are both fully funded and therefore assumed part of WETA's future system.

He addressed existing vessels and their service compatibility for each service stating that vessel placement has increasingly been determined by capacity constraints. He added that the expected job growth in San Francisco would put further demands on the system which was already

experiencing maximum capacity on some trips. He indicated that staff anticipates needing to make significant service changes in the coming years in order to meet anticipated growth and discussed the possible solutions and the limitations and impacts associated with each.

Director DelBono asked whether the current operating budget was able to handle an expansion. He further went on to state that the customer experience on board was very important to today's riders and that the ferry is a first choice for commuters and families because of the service quality. He did not want to see potential riders turned away from the service because of capacity issues or limits on parking or access. He mentioned the possibility of private shuttles in lieu of public bus service. Ms. Rannells said that WETA needed to expand its operating subsidy adding that WETA was operating everything possible within current subsidies.

Director Intintoli asked about the difference in farebox return on the two Alameda services (Harbor Bay and Alameda/Oakland) where most trips were at capacity. Mr. Connolly explained that the Alameda fares were relatively low, which could be part of why the boats are full, and noted that pricing was being addressed with the FY 2015 – 2020 Fare Program. Mr. Gougherty added that Alameda Oakland and Vallejo routes offered midday and weekend service with passengers less likely to take advantage of discounts that affected farebox recovery.

The discussion continued to vessel procurement and whether vessels that were replaced would be sold or become an active spare or part of a reserve fleet for emergencies. Mr. Connolly noted that vessel replacements and disposition is tied to grant funding availability and rules.

Mr. Connolly concluded his presentation with the needs of the service and the costs in order to capture and meet the demand for ferry service, noting that the additional cost associated with the Coast Guard's recent manning proposal under discussion is not included in the financials presented.

Director DelBono thanked Mr. Connolly for the presentation and the details noting how helpful it was in discussing possible considerations for funding and alliances. Director Donovan also expressed his appreciation of the presentation.

Public Comment

Peter Albert of SFMTA commended WETA on the presentation and discussion and suggested that adding information to the presentation of survey results, such as trip purpose of riders and alternative access modes to terminals would be helpful.

Public Comment

Veronica Sanchez of Masters, Mates & Pilots said that she looked forward to Mr. Connolly's briefing to the Captains at the membership meeting. She asked whether the 2015 budget matched what was being received from RM2 as an operating subsidy, noting the shortfall with RM2 in 2025 without a new regional toll measure.

Director DelBono indicated that he thought it important to look at ways to bring in more public transit riders from outlying areas and to consider the reverse commuters.

Director Donovan asked whether WETA had any competitors and asked about Golden Gate Ferry services. Ms. Rannells noted that Golden Gate took great pride in their ferry service and that, like WETA, their ferry service is subsidized by (Golden Gate Bridge) bridge tolls and is meant to alleviate traffic congestion on the Golden Gate Bridge Highway 101 corridor.

Mr. Connolly further expanded on the complementary nature of ferry services to bridges and other forms of transit in bridge corridors, noting that WETA was involved in MTC's Core Capacity study of the Bay Bridge transportation corridor.

Director Donovan commented that companies are offering their own shuttle service to their employees and asked what the effect would be on WETA ridership of services that parallel WETA ferry routes. Chair Breckenridge noted that there was interest in looking for partnering opportunities adding that these companies have a lot of data about their workforce demographics and that this information could be helpful in planning future WETA services.

Public Comment

Charlie Bogue of Wind + Wing Technologies reminded the Board that landmark technologies are in development, such as their wing and wind assisted ferry design that could offer fuel savings and perhaps improve ridership. He concluded that new technologies could offer new arenas of funding where traditional funding may not be available.

5. EXPANSION

Chair Breckenridge began the topic with a question as to whether or not there were any restrictions for WETA in implementing a public-private partnership service.

WETA Counsel, Stanley Taylor of Nossaman LLP, replied that such partnerships are allowed so long as the service would be within the agency's mission to provide ferry service to the general public and that private contributions would be contributing to improving public services.

Mr. Connolly described the planning process that WETA staff has developed to assess proposed expansion projects. He noted the importance of project agreements or memorandums of understanding (MOUs) with project partners that identify roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders, including the local community. Mr. Connolly further added that one of the important factors considered in developing new services is consistency and ability to integrate with the existing WETA system.

Mr. Connolly noted that the projects in the expansion program could be separated into two categories including near term projects that are well into the development stages and horizon projects that are conceptual or may have significant obstacles to overcome. He provided a status on the near term projects of Treasure Island and Berkeley and those on the horizon including Mission Bay, Seaplane Lagoon, the Carquinez Terminals, and Redwood City.

Director DelBono commented that he thought that there was limited community support in Berkeley and suggested that staff efforts be directed elsewhere and expansion reconsidered when redoing the Short Range Transit Plan. Chair Breckenridge said that she felt that the state environmental process underway for Berkeley service should be completed to allow the project to move forward in the event that project funding is made available in the near future.

Mr. Connolly explained that the Berkeley project holds great promise as a successful ferry service, noting the severely congested corridor that it would serve, the strong ridership projections, and the potential for a viable reverse commute market.

In discussing the prospect for Redwood City Service, Mr. Connolly noted that public transit funding is limited, but that there may be potential to develop a public-private partnership model for implementing this service.

Chair Breckenridge asked about water depth south of Redwood City. Director DelBono noted that the Alviso Channel had been dredged and that expansion in the South Bay needed to be explored stating that the South Bay was becoming the destination for jobs. Director Intintoli stated that the problem was money. Chair Breckenridge suggested seeking strategic partnerships with companies in the South Bay.

Ms. Dorinson suggested that a key next step would be the development of a set of proposed policy guidelines for expanding the WETA system to provide a framework for pursuing partnerships.

Chair Breckenridge questioned whether the guiding principle be based upon the responsibility to service the nine counties or determined by local communities vocalizing needs for transportation.

Ms. Rannells noted that it was her understanding that WETA's predecessor agency, the Water Transit Authority, did extensive outreach and analysis of potential sites all around the bay including the South Bay when developing its original Implementation and Operations Plan and that it was her understanding that significant access challenges exist south of Redwood City. Chair Breckenridge said opportunities for win-wins existed and that they needed to be explored.

Public Comment

Ms. Sanchez added that Alviso was infeasible due not only to water depth but concerns over bird habitats which would be problematic in the environmental review.

Mr. Connolly noted that every project had obstacles and that, provided time, money and commitment, it may be possible to identify solutions to these obstacles. He suggested that the evaluation process that was used in Contra Costa be utilized in looking at potential service options for Santa Clara County and San Mateo County with interested partners. He added that the South Bay region was already increasing transit capability and indicated that planning work would help determine if WETA could fill a niche.

Public Comment

Mr. Albert indicated his interest in being involved in the conversation. He pointed out that WETA could capitalize on some funds and provide services that would allow private companies to scale down their operation. He added that he liked the work being done by SPUR and suggested using SPUR as a think tank.

6. BREAK

Ms. Dorinson suggested a short break before moving into the next segment on the agenda and the meeting was closed at 11:48 a.m. The meeting was re-opened at 12 noon.

7. EMERGENCY RESPONSE

Mr. Gougherty provided a presentation on WETA system capabilities utilizing the existing and planned expanded system in both an evacuation scenario and an economic recovery scenario.

Chair Breckenridge stated that timeline assumed by staff was not the timeline in existing plans for emergency response, adding that the new definition of federal support was seven days once the federal government activated the emergency and that FEMA was using the same timeline for disaster planning for the maritime component. She followed up by saying that beyond the seven days was recovery, not response.

Director DelBono asked what CalOES (OES) expected of WETA in an emergency response. Chair Breckenridge stated that she had conversations with the head of OES and his staff and OES' expectation was WETA becoming the center of expertise to manage ferry transportation within the

emergency response system. She noted that after the state activates the emergency response plan, WETA would be expected to provide someone to the OES' Emergency Operations Center in the transportation node who would be able to provide solutions to transportation requirements with water being the key way of moving first responders.

Chair Breckenridge expressed a need for educating everyone about WETA's capabilities as the expectation was that WETA would have formal or informal agreements with other ferry services to draw on resources to meet regional need.

Ms. Dorinson said that the goal of the presentation was to understand the capacity of the system today and what it could be in order to determine whether capacity would be sufficient to meet the needs that would be expected of WETA.

Ms. Rannells expanded on Chair Breckenridge's comment that WETA represented ferry transit in the transportation branch of the Regional Emergency Operations Center (REOC) that includes other partners. She said that the state EOC process would determine where the highest priority was and would provide WETA with direction regarding where to focus its resources. Chair Breckenridge added that the EOC environment afforded WETA the opportunity to push back on unrealistic expectations.

Director Donovan asked whether WETA would be able to utilize the vessels belonging to Golden Gate Transit and Blue & Gold Fleet in the event of an emergency. Ms. Rannells responded that they could, and that there are examples of WETA use of these vessels on several occasions such as the BART strike. Mr. Gougherty noted that access to these vessels was not assumed in capacity calculations made for his presentation, but that it could be.

Ms. Rannells noted that, given WETA's limited public transit-focused funding, WETA's approach to addressing its emergency response mandate thus far has been to focus on strengthening its system of public transit ferry assets and core facilities that are used to provide regularly-scheduled public transit service on a daily basis that are then available to support emergency response activities to move passengers and first responders when needed in an emergency. She asked the Board if this was enough or if the Board had other ideas on how WETA might approach delivering its emergency response mandate.

Director Intintoli said that he viewed emergency response as presented and that we have to take this approach because we haven't been given the funding for emergency response. He further noted that we cannot simply buy assets to sit until they are needed in an emergency, and that with transit-based approach, the larger the WETA system grows the more effective we can be in our response. He added that more and different funding, outside of traditional public transit sources, was needed if more than this was expected from WETA.

Director DelBono requested clarification about OES' expectations of WETA and wanted to know if the expectation was to have a plan and have knowledge of and direction over all resources. He expressed concern about OES' expectations and asked if a disaster preparedness coordinator would need to be hired to develop a plan.

Chair Breckenridge noted that OES's expectation is based upon OES' understanding of what it takes to operate a ferry system adding that OES assumes that things would be moved by water if there were an emergency in San Francisco. She stated that the water aspect was part of the thought process behind the idea of creating WETA with the emergency response mandate.

Chair Breckenridge stated that we should ask OES to define what they expect of WETA, noting that WETA is the emergency operations coordinator and not the decision maker. She followed up on Director DelBono's concerns stating that the command and control of line staff would be left to the direction of the transportation entity. She noted that there was an expectation that agreements would be in place and funding available to support both public and private ferry systems to access additional resources.

Director DelBono clarified his concerns stating that a detailed plan exists for disaster response in Alameda, noting that as the fire department, plans were in place for where people would be staged, where they would be sheltered, and where to go for water, food, and supplies. He wanted to know if WETA had this same sort of plan.

Ms. Dorinson stated that Board input and guidance was needed to determine whether response be sized based upon the transit network or if it was their recommendation that WETA provide facilities and vessels beyond the transit network to come up with a broader emergency response tactical plan.

Chair Breckenridge expressed that the response should be sized to the transit network but questioned whether the network was strictly WETA or all ferries.

Ms. Rannells reminded the Board that WETA had no legislative authority to require Golden Gate Ferry to provide aid, but that a mutual aid agreement existed with Golden Gate Ferry that was utilized during the BART strikes to request and receive assistance in the form of additional ferry services. She further clarified that as part of its service operations contract, WETA is able to, and has utilized vessels from the Blue & Gold Fleet to provide assistance.

Ms. Rannells addressed Director DelBono's comment by stating that the Alameda had a very specific plan for its City, whereas WETA's plan and responsibility is related to the coordination of ferry services as a part of the region's transportation system. She stated that WETA currently has a plan and response mechanisms in place, but that the specific response to an individual emergency situation would be variable based upon the situation. She further clarified that in the event of an emergency WETA would assess its capabilities and feed this information to the state REOC, which, in turn, would determine the highest needs and direct WETA as to its priorities accordingly.

Ms. Dorinson noted that this conversation brings up an interesting question regarding vessel fleet sizing. She asked whether WETA's emergency response mandate might suggest that the agency purchase a large capacity vessel so in the event of an emergency, WETA would be able to maximize its passenger capacity. She further noted the dilemma that this raises, as a large capacity vessel may not be needed for daily services, and could drive up the ongoing operating expense of WETA's transit operation.

Mr. Connolly followed up by noting that the conversation was based upon the transit finance model in that there was a certain level of return needed from the farebox to receive subsidies and that emergency response could potentially break that model for justification beyond just the daily transportation. He stated that the same level of return could not be achieved if there was the expectation to do more. He asked the Board to think about and consider how things would work and look if WETA were going to break out of the transit finance model for the purpose and benefits of emergency response.

Ms. Rannells noted that costs needed to be defined and a different kind of funding source would need to be identified.

Ms. Dorinson asked whether this idea was worth the effort or if WETA should maintain the transit service funding model approach to all the planning exercises.

Director DelBono thought that it would be worthwhile to explore the opportunity if funding was available adding that the emergency response component would separate WETA from other transit agencies.

Chair Breckenridge commented that looking at capacity was the starting point as has been done but emphasized the importance of talking with OES to determine their expectations.

Director DelBono commented that for a municipal fire department, OES would allow the fire department to apply for a fire engine and OES would provide the fire engine and all the associated equipment and pay for maintenance. He explained that the fire department would use the fire engine on a daily basis but that the fire engine would be put into emergency service during an OES response. He asked whether funds would be available from OES to similarly purchase and maintain ferry vessels.

Chair Breckenridge stated OES understood firefighting due to experts on staff but OES did not have maritime experts. She explained that it was hard for people to comprehend all the costs associated with keeping a boat for an event that could happen once every ten years. She thought that identifying additional ferry assets needed to address current and anticipated transit operation capacity shortages within the next five to ten years was a way in which funding could be sought without solely using emergency response.

Chair Breckenridge inquired about the status of kick off meetings being initiated with the Coast Guard to bring all disaster response parties together.

Ms. Rannells replied that WETA initially met with five groups to reintroduce WETA and to have a general conversation about each of the group's plans. WETA also met with Bob Butchart and Jody Traversaro from CalOES.

Chair Breckenridge noted that Ms. Traversaro was the new regional administrator who used to have a regional operations center that closed down and had now reopened.

Ms. Rannells noted that in addition to Cal OES, WETA met with SFDEM, MTC, Blue & Gold, and the Coast Guard and is in the process of developing a work plan for updating WETA's emergency response plans to discuss at the April Board meeting.

Ms. Dorinson recapped expectations for future staff work based on the discussion 1) refine understanding of the emergency response mandate and what OES expects; 2) continuing to use the methodology of calculating response capacity using system-wide assumptions; 3) researching opportunities to secure specialized emergency response funding, separate from assessment of whether transit service is viable from a demand point of view; and 4) agreement to continue working on criteria which the Board would use to determine whether a potential service or route was worth investing efforts.

Mr. Stanley suggested that in developing criteria that WETA consider public-private models as hybrid transit models.

Chair Breckenridge noted that in a declared emergency, all expenses related to a disaster response would be reimbursed through FEMA and the federal government upon the state activating disaster response.

Director DelBono requested a discussion on how to capitalize on the resources of businesses, communities, voters and decision makers when approaching expansion.

Lastly, Ms. Dorinson reminded the Board that WETA would be coming to a breakpoint with several leave-behinds and that strategic decisions needed to be made about the kinds of fleet acquisitions that might be necessary in order to keep up with demand. She noted that the Board had indicated today that they were in agreement to continue WETA's intent to provide service to meet demand for ferry service as the basis for expansion and the parameters that would be used for planning emergency response.

The Board agreed with Ms. Dorinson's summary. Chair Breckenridge thanked Ms. Dorinson for keeping the Board focused and thanked everyone for their engagement. She further thanked those who participated in facilitating the discussion.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:08 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Board Secretary
