

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

(March 3, 2016)

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

1. CALL TO ORDER – BOARD CHAIR

Chair Jody Breckenridge called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND ROLL CALL

Chair Breckenridge led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other directors present were Vice Chair Jim Wunderman, Director Timothy Donovan and Director Anthony Intintoli.

3. REPORT OF BOARD CHAIR

Chair Breckenridge welcomed Directors, staff and guests to the meeting and asked Directors to provide their top 3 choices for future off-site Board meetings to her at the end of the meeting to help prepare for a future agenda item moving the meetings to sites other than the WETA offices in San Francisco.

4. REPORTS OF DIRECTORS

Vice Chair Wunderman said he had watched a KTVU segment on Bay Area ferries on Monday night and, having been involved in the creation of the agency, was disturbed to hear that WETA was not doing everything possible to expand service. He said private ferry services were now providing passenger service to various places in the Bay Area including Redwood City and that WETA was at a critical point of being left behind if it did not act now. He said it may be a good thing that private services were developing but Directors needed to figure out how to expand aggressively without incurring costs and risks beyond WETA's capabilities as a responsible government agency. Vice Chair Wunderman said that hearing complaints about the parking problems at the Alameda terminals and the capacity challenges that WETA's riders had been vocalizing was a good thing because capacity challenges had been expected when the agency was created. He further explained that those issues would be resolved but aggressive expansion needed to happen right now because there was demand for it.

Vice Chair Wunderman said he had not been able to hear the presentation on alternative technologies by Elliot Bay Design Group at the February Board meeting because he had to depart early but based on conversations he had with some people, he did not believe that long-term operation costs had been considered in that analysis. He said there should be long-term costs considered. Vice Chair Wunderman added that he understood concerns about vessel commonality related to new technologies but that at some point in the near future, WETA would have to adopt alternatives and in doing so, would not have a common fleet. He said that every time he saw the Governor, this was what he was focused on. He said the Governor wanted transportation and other government agencies and the private sector rethinking long-term energy use strategies and moving away from polluting and carbon-intensive solutions.

Vice Chair Wunderman then said that without Ron Cowan, WETA wouldn't exist. He explained that Mr. Cowan was an important Alameda developer and visionary who saw the opportunity for water transit to become an integral part of mass transportation and emergency response and had pushed hard to create the Water Transit Authority and then WETA.

Vice Chair Wunderman asked that an item be added to the next Board meeting agenda for Directors to consider naming a ferry vessel after Mr. Cowan. He said perhaps a Harbor Bay service vessel could be named after him since he had developed Harbor Bay in Alameda. Vice Chair Wunderman said he felt doing so would be a nice gesture to recognize someone who had provided so much leadership.

5. REPORTS OF STAFF

Executive Director Nina Rannells referred the Board to her written report and confirmed that the next Board meeting on April 7 would be held at the Alameda City Hall Council Chambers. She thanked Jennifer Ott from the City of Alameda and her staff for their assistance in securing the meeting space. She said that staff was planning an Alameda ferry facility site tour the afternoon of April 7, prior to the Board meeting in Alameda as plans are developed.

Director Intintoli said that without identification and security of new operational funding streams, the idea of expansion was problematic. He said he wanted the Board to focus on figuring out how to extend operational funding from Regional Measure 2 (RM2) and any future Regional Measure 3 (RM3) funding to support WETA in harnessing service expansion interest. He added that without doing so, it would be impossible to expand service successfully.

Ms. Rannells said staff had spoken with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) at a variety of levels to emphasize the importance of being included in the next bridge toll revenue conversation. She added that she had also reached out to MTC staff to determine if WETA could get additional RM2 money to support the expanded service it hoped to offer during the summer months or a guarantee of money if WETA spent more than their funding cap in the process of offering the much needed expanded service offerings. Ms. Rannells said she had received a positive response to that request and that she anticipated providing MTC with additional information to support the request following the Board's discussion about summer service expansion.

Ms. Rannells also explained that there were additional ongoing staff conversations with MTC about funding. She said WETA, AC Transit and BART had met with MTC in the fall regarding how the three agencies could collectively and strategically help mitigate the growing traffic congestion on Bay Area highways in the short term. She said MTC had promised a follow-up conversation which she hoped would take place within the next few months.

Vice Chair Wunderman said he agreed that RM3 was a necessity but that he had been told the measure would likely not be on the ballot until 2018. Director Intintoli said that everyone shared the vision of an expanded ferry service but that without first securing operational funding, expanding service would marginalize everything that had been put in place for current service and that would be a disaster. He said WETA had originally been created because two jurisdictions, Vallejo and Alameda, had already built successful services and there was something to take over. Director Intintoli said it was critical that the Board focus on new operational funding sources.

Chair Breckenridge said she agreed and also felt that funding required an even broader discussion because the Federal sources that WETA had relied on historically were vulnerable. She said WETA was now competing for the increasing demand in funding for roads and highways, and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) was not presently in a position to disburse the money it already had. Chair Breckenridge said the structure in place today – for operational and capital funding – was not sustainable, and the Board needed to change WETA's funding dynamics by creatively identifying new funding sources.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

Director Intintoli made a motion to approve the consent calendar which included:

- a) Board Meeting Minutes – February 11, 2016

- b) Approve Amendment to Agreement with Weston Solutions, Inc. to Provide Additional Construction Management Services for the North Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility Project
- c) Approve Amendment to Agreement with Cambridge Systematics for Ferry Ridership Forecasting Services

Vice Chair Wunderman seconded the motion and the consent calendar carried unanimously.

Yeas: Breckenridge, Donovan, Intintoli, Wunderman. Nays: None. Absent: DelBono.

7. ADOPT SHORT RANGE TRANSIT PLAN

Senior Planner Mike Gougherty presented a slideshow on this item requesting the Board to adopt the Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP). He explained that following the January Board authorization to release the draft SRTP for public comment, staff had notified riders and interested parties through WETA's email list and the BayAlerts notification system that the draft was online for review. Additionally, staff directly contacted over 30 stakeholder organizations already engaged with WETA's recent strategic planning process. As of February 26, eleven individuals and organizations had submitted 27 comments, and a summary of those and WETA's responses was provided. Mr. Gougherty explained that many of the comments received were consolidated on both the SRTP and the Strategic Plan.

Mr. Gougherty said that most of the comments WETA had received on the Draft SRTP required only clarification for the feedback providers and that based on the comments received, very little had been changed in the original draft to create the final document. Mr. Gougherty added that upon adoption of the final SRTP by the Board, it would be submitted to MTC to fulfill WETA's FTA requirement.

Mr. Gougherty said that the next iteration of the SRTP would be created in 2018 or 2019 since the Plan needed to be updated every two or three years. He said that if a new project or service was funded within the next few years, that project would appear in the next SRTP and, depending on timing, could even be added to the current SRTP after its submission to MTC. Ms. Rannells noted that WETA's SRTP included an unrequired chapter at the end which provided the FTA and MTC with overviews of potential projects that staff was working on that did not yet have funding, but for which funding sources were being explored or solicited. Chair Breckenridge clarified that the requirements for the SRTP were set by the FTA and MTC and not by WETA.

Mr. Gougherty introduced Diana Dorinson from Transportation Analytics and said she had worked on WETA's Strategic Plan and also provided staff with the technical guidance to create the SRTP.

Vice Chair Wunderman said he understood the requirements of the SRTP and asked if MTC decided to give funds to WETA with a directive that the money be used specifically for service expansion in the next two years, if WETA would be restricted from doing so if those expansion plans were not already included in the SRTP. Planning and Development Manager Kevin Connolly said no, the expansion process could move forward if funding was available and in such cases, the SRTP on file would be amended. Mr. Connolly added that in his prior position at another transit agency, the SRTP was amended just about every year to support new projects as their viability had evolved.

Vice Chair Wunderman asked if it was possible for the Board to review the current expansion policy and change it. Chair Breckenridge said the Expansion Policy was being submitted in Chapter 8 of the SRTP not as a requirement but as an informational item. Chair Breckenridge said the objective for adopting the Expansion Policy had been due diligence to create a process for responsible service expansion consideration. She said the Board could change or waive the policy or do whatever was deemed sensible based on what Directors felt was best for a project.

Vice Chair Wunderman said other Bay Area transportation agencies were looking at creative ways to speed up their processes by combining or compressing some steps and using other creative solutions to advance projects. Chair Breckenridge said that for some state level programs, permitting steps were already being sped up to cut through red tape.

Vice Chair Wunderman asked if it was possible to start the design process for a new service before securing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Director Intintoli said that had been done in the past with Berkeley, and millions of dollars had been spent on environmental studies without an MOU. Vice Chairman said he understood risk was involved and asked the Board to consider WETA's risk tolerance. He asked if it was possible to build terminals around the Bay Area to support emergency response without worrying about offering passenger service at those terminals, at least not initially. He said this had been discussed when WETA was created and asked if the SRTP would restrict WETA from doing so. Ms. Rannells said that the basic premise of the existing WETA Expansion Policy was to ensure that there was a solid partnership and plan detailing what services were going to be provided in a document solidified with agreement details and expectations that was signed by WETA and the local entity or entities who owned the terminal property.

Ms. Rannells said conversations about building a terminal solely for emergency response support in the city of Antioch had taken place several years ago. One of the questions that had repeatedly arisen in those discussions was how, and by whom, a terminal without regular transit service would be maintained. She said WETA did not have funding to build or maintain assets that were not in active service. She added that every situation was different and each MOU unique.

Mr. Gougherty said that in addition to including capital and operating plans, the SRTP contained an overview of system performance during the last three years. Mr. Gougherty said that in contrast to the prior SRTP, the new SRTP reflected record ridership levels, costs increasing slower than ridership – suggesting that the system was becoming much more productive than in its prior assessment - and a per passenger subsidy reduction of 31 percent system-wide.

PUBLIC COMMENT

City of Vallejo Community & Economic Development Director Andrea Ouse said that Vallejo was in full support of the SRTP and fully agreed with its data, especially with regard to Vallejo's projected ridership growth. She said that growth potential for both the mainland terminal in Vallejo and the new Mare Island terminal was expected to be impacted by development of the 60 acres of undeveloped land near the mainland terminal and added that the City was already working with the master developer for that land on plans to develop it. Ms. Ouse said the City was grateful to WETA for its investments thus far in the Vallejo service and said the City looked forward to furthering its partnership with WETA on investments to enhance the existing service - already at capacity - and to support much needed service expansion in Vallejo as possible.

Director Donovan asked if the City was working with Lennar as the developer on the mainland waterfront project and when the project was expected to be completed. Ms. Ouse said Lennar was the developer on Mare Island but not on the mainland and added that she expected a new plan for the mainland project to be taken to the City Council for adoption within the next few months. She said it was hoped that once begun, the project would take about three to five years to complete.

Vice Chair Wunderman made a motion to approve the item. Director Donovan seconded the motion and the item carried unanimously.

Yeas: Breckenridge, Donovan, Intintoli, Wunderman. Nays: None. Absent: DelBono.

8. IDENTIFY NEXT STEPS FOR THE DRAFT WETA STRATEGIC PLAN

Mr. Connolly presented this item requesting Board direction to identify the next steps for the Draft WETA Strategic Plan. He said that in presenting the Draft Strategic Plan in its entirety for stakeholders and other interested parties to review as a whole, a flood of feedback had been received and the process had been very valuable. Mr. Connolly said that because of this, it made sense to take more time to finalize the Plan than initially expected to support more feedback collection and review. He said the recommendation was to reopen the public comment period and appoint a subcommittee of the Board to review and evaluate the Draft Strategic Plan considering the agency's mission and vision statements with the intent that the Subcommittee would return to the full Board with a plan and schedule for further meetings and ultimately, for Plan adoption. Mr. Connolly noted that staff had also received requests for more review time which would help the Board better assure the Plan reflected what Directors wanted.

Chair Breckenridge said that the Directors and staff had read through all of the comments that had been received thus far, and she thanked everyone who had shared feedback. She said the review process had been educational and that the Board and staff appreciated the time that had been invested in the Plan review. Chair Breckenridge said she had asked staff to reengage the stakeholders from Redwood City who had spoken at the February Board meeting to identify opportunities to work with the various San Mateo agencies to develop a plan for future service.

Chair Breckenridge said that the Plan provided an accurate overview of the present and near future WETA system and its core service attributes, but its long range vision may not accurately reflect the public's demands and the strategic priorities to drive the Board to support those demands. She said that the Plan could include a more aspirational vision such as those contained in other strategic plans. Chair Breckenridge asked Vice Chair Wunderman and Director Donovan if they would participate in a Board subcommittee to review the Plan. She said that in the process, it was paramount to craft a vision and supporting strategic priorities with an objective of arriving at a final Plan for Board adoption. She reminded the Board that it was the Directors who owned the Plan and that they were responsible to stakeholders and the public to consider their interests and expectations, just as it is staff's responsibility to implement the Plan once adopted.

Vice Chair Wunderman said Chair Breckenridge's objective was well stated. He said he appreciated the work done by staff and Directors thus far on the draft Plan and said he would be happy to work with Director Donovan on the Plan. He said he agreed with Director Intintoli that the document should support how WETA would finance what it wants to do with an emphasis on expansion and added that Redwood City was a great example. He added that it was important to determine the vision along with a realistic path to achieving that vision.

Vice Chair Wunderman said he would be heading to Washington, D.C. in late May with the Bay Area Council and that if there was a better understanding of the Plan by then, it may make sense to engage congress members or agencies with funding objectives on that trip. He said the Board should identify some creative funding sources and name them because no one else was going to do that for the agency and added that this Plan was the one in which WETA should also identify and establish its green technology objectives and strategies to achieve those objectives. Vice Chair Wunderman said he was watching companies take to the Bay and because their boats were smaller and less regulated, they were able to move very quickly. He said WETA should consider finding and providing additional resources to contract with those companies, and possibly consider purchasing smaller vessels that would be less expensive, less regulated, and easier to move through the permitting process.

Vice Chair Wunderman said one of the biggest challenges with the WETA system was the "first and last mile" problem, to and from terminals, a problem it shared with other transportation systems including railroads and BART. Vice Chair Wunderman said the future of everything was here in the Bay Area and that included transportation. He said WETA should be blending in, inventing, or partnering with services

that provide that and added that if WETA could solve that problem without having to park a million cars at the terminals, it would give the agency the opportunity to expand service.

Vice Chair Wunderman said another emerging area WETA should be looking at was freight. He said WETA was really focused on passenger service, but there were many different freight needs right now and changes were happening at ports all over the Bay Area which you could see by just looking out at the Bay. He said maybe there was an opportunity for WETA to integrate its passenger services with freight services to subsidize its operations.

Vice Chair Wunderman said he welcomed the challenge to do more outreach for feedback and to work on the Plan. He said he looked forward to collaboratively identifying the right vision and strategies, and that feedback and debate would ultimately strengthen the Plan. He also emphasized that people should really feel that their feedback had been heard.

Director Donovan said he also accepted Chair Breckenridge's invitation to work on the Plan. He added that he was thrilled to have received so much feedback already. He added that staff had done a great job so far, and he looked forward to working with Vice Chair Wunderman on solidifying a final Plan that would meet the demands for WETA services. Director Donovan said funding strategies would be a key component of the process and that he looked forward to exploring those opportunities.

Chair Breckenridge asked if Directors had any other thoughts about, or objections to, the subcommittee formation to work on the Plan and they did not.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Base Reuse Director for the City of Alameda Jennifer Ott said it sounded like WETA staff had taken the City of Alameda's comments and feedback to heart in the Strategic Plan process. She said this was appreciated and that she and her colleagues in Alameda enjoyed working with staff. She said that overall, they supported the Plan and particularly the Seaplane Lagoon expansion, as well as further partnership and expansion to meet Alameda service demands. Ms. Ott said she was working concurrently on an MOU with WETA staff and on studies for Seaplane Lagoon and that \$10 million was already committed for the project by a developer. She said further funding identification was also in the works and that the Board should expect to see a Seaplane Lagoon MOU within the next few months.

Ms. Ott said she and her colleagues completely understood that it was a tricky balancing act to support current services and facilities and add expansion to meet demands. She said existing service and facilities were very important to the City of Alameda, that BART was at capacity, and that WETA was in an ideal place to help fill the resulting Bay Area transportation gaps. She added that greenhouse gases were also of concern and said she looked forward to seeing a more aggressive vision in the Plan that prioritized access to terminals, supported current services as well as expansion, and reduced emissions.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Ouse said the WETA Strategic Plan would help inform Vallejo's long range General Plan, currently in the update process for the first time in about thirty years. She said the Plan would be headed to the City Council for adoption in the fall and that ferry service was a hub for the City, perceived and well recognized as a fundamental part of a vibrant waterfront and prosperous Vallejo. Ms. Ouse said there were efforts underway for an advanced manufacturer to take the City owned 157 acres of land on Mare Island which would be a game changer for the Vallejo community. She said ferry service on the island, even if in a limited capacity, would be a huge boon for the anticipated 2,400 new employees.

Ms. Ouse said the 3 Vallejo higher education institutions – Cal Maritime Academy, Touro University and Solano Community College – were working together to build a downtown hub just a few blocks from the ferry terminal. She emphasized that the next 20 years were going to be crucial to Vallejo's economy and

that working collaboratively with WETA staff to include more ferry service in its future was paramount to assure its success. She added that she and other City staff looked forward to it.

Vice Chair Wunderman said Vallejo and Mare Island provided a perfect example of the importance of ferry service being able to connect communities, especially areas affected by military base closures that drove underperformance in jobs and the economy, with the rest of the Bay Area. He said Vallejo's plans were a great opportunity for the WETA team to make a real difference for the entire Bay Area.

Chair Breckenridge made a motion for two members from the Board to work together to elevate the Strategic Plan, with particular attention paid to creating a robust twenty year vision and the necessary strategic priorities to support that vision. Director Intintoli seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Yeas: Breckenridge, Donovan, Intintoli, Wunderman. Nays: None. Absent: DelBono.

9. APPROVE THE WETA EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

Program Manager/Analyst Lauren Gularte presented the item to approve the WETA Emergency Response Plan (ERP). She explained that once the ERP was approved by the Board, concerted outreach efforts would continue, specifically to first responder groups, Operational Areas and local jurisdictions, through training discussions and exercises to help assure that everyone was aware of WETA's emergency response role and capabilities. Ms. Gularte introduced Navigating Preparedness Founder and Managing Director Lee Rosenberg who provided a presentation on the ERP and a basic overview of the Emergency Operations Plan (EOP), an internal confidential appendix to the ERP.

Mr. Rosenberg said while the two Plans were complete and ready for approval, WETA was not able to resolve all of the issues and follow up actions identified and that more work is required to assure WETA would be ready and equipped for what was laid out in the ERP. Mr. Rosenberg said one of the biggest remaining challenges to help assure WETA preparedness was the issue of credentialing, which is a problem identified and shared by numerous other emergency response agencies and organizations throughout the state. In addition, follow-up actions such as working with law enforcement agencies to address issues like crowd management and security for WETA emergency response staff as well as continued collaboration with the California Energy Commission on provision of emergency fuel and with CalOES for the provision of resources is also required. Mr. Rosenberg said further conversations with the Port of Oakland, CalTrans, the Port of San Francisco and other agencies responsible for land that have been identified as potential locations to support temporary terminals. Finally, he said, emergency communication systems and equipment had been tested in exercises during the revision of the ERP and that refinement of the system is required to appropriately support WETA emergency response given the challenges of WETA's wide geographic range of operations.

Ms. Gularte explained if the plan is approved, staff will outreach to local law enforcement agencies informing them of WETA's emergency response capabilities and challenges including the issue of lacking a statewide credentialing system for identification of employees involved in emergency response. The objective would be to familiarize local law enforcement agencies with the types of identification held by ferry crews, including Transportation Worker Identification Cards (TWIC cards) and Blue & Gold employee identification cards. Additionally, WETA staff will be working to obtain credentials. Ms. Gularte added that WETA's contracted operator, Blue & Gold Fleet, had also prepared a draft Service Resumption Plan to mobilize their employees in the event that all normal communications systems were down and that WETA is in the process of issuing communication equipment to Blue & Gold Fleet in order to implement the Service Resumption Plan.

Director Intintoli asked if there were funds available to support emergency response other than the reserves fund WETA had set aside to support up to two months of current, regular service operations.

He said it would be difficult to provide robust emergency response if WETA had to pay for such operations and then apply for reimbursement, something that could take years to receive given the general time frame it takes to get reimbursed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Ms. Gularte explained that WETA may be able to utilize Department of Transportation (DOT) funds which could be released more expediently and were not issued on a reimbursement basis. Mr. Rosenberg said the Governor also had authority to deliver funding to WETA after proclamation of an emergency, either as direct funding to WETA or by contracting services to be used by WETA for additional staffing, fueling and for contracting with private operators for additional vessels.

Ms. Rannells said MTC may be another source to tap for emergency response funding. Chair Breckenridge agreed and added that the best strategy would be to identify all available resources and to do so early. Director Donovan agreed, and said this was especially important because the two months of operational funds WETA had in its reserves could dwindle to one month or less if WETA was called upon to provide 24/7 emergency response services.

Chair Breckenridge said that while all of WETA's Plans were vital, the ERP needed to be ready and actionable, in hand, since an emergency event could happen any day. She said there had been alignment with an enormous number of agencies around the Bay Area and throughout the state in the ERP and EOP revision process and that agencies were now much more aware and informed of WETA's capabilities and role. Chair Breckenridge said when she first joined the Board the general understanding of most agencies had been that WETA was responsible for doing all of the prioritization and coordination for emergency water transit operations. She said they now understood that WETA was not responsible for making independent decisions about emergency response but would instead be working with other agencies responsible for emergency transportation under Cal OES' direction. Ms. Gularte said that because every route in WETA's system straddled multiple Operational Areas (or counties) it is critical for the state to set regional priorities and to coordinate the emergency service plan. For example, the movement of survivors from one county to another will require consent from the receiving county to accept delivery of those people as well as coordination for survivor support services (shelters, food and water, etc.).

Chair Breckenridge said that these Plans would not only benefit WETA but the entire region. Vice Chair Wunderman said he agreed, and he commended Chair Breckenridge's leadership on the ERP revision process. He said the ERP reflected the root of why he and others had pushed for legislation to change the Water Transit Authority (WTA), an agency with no emergency response component, into the WETA of today, mandated to provide emergency response in addition to its regular ferry service operations. He said the original thinking had been that WETA would be able to replace Bay Area transportation options should they lose their abilities to serve the public. He added that the expectation had been that WETA would have a substantial flotilla amassed prior to an emergency event and that WETA's present flotilla was still very small but better than none.

Vice Chair Wunderman asked if it was possible to take control of other vessels out on the Bay in the event of emergency, specifically those of Golden Gate Ferry and private companies' vessels, and whether WETA had the authority to evacuate a group of people without any other agency's approval in the event of communications disruption. Vice Chair Wunderman said that the initial thinking behind the agency's legislative change to add the emergency component was that WETA would take control of the entire region's transportation system in the event of a disaster or emergency. He said he didn't think that was in place and that maybe it shouldn't be.

Ms. Gularte explained that WETA did have a Master Mutual Aid Agreement that could be invoked with Golden Gate Ferry but that WETA would not be able to commandeer their vessels. She said there were other private operators identified in the Plan with whom WETA could contract with to obtain additional vessels and crews. Mr. Rosenberg said that with a proclamation of an emergency, the Governor could

also direct private vessels to support WETA operations. He said WETA would not be able to do that on its own and that because some private vessels were not unionized, using those vessels could be complicated. Mr. Rosenberg said that WETA's Executive Director also had the authority to make intelligent decisions about how to best activate the ERP and could move survivors and first responders in the event of no communication with Cal OES. Chair Breckenridge said that in an emergency, the United States Coast Guard (USCG) Captain of the Port had authority over all movement on the water in San Francisco Bay and that no vessels would be allowed to move on the Bay without USCG authorization. She said there were very specific processes for inspection of infrastructure and vessels to assure safety that would also need to be considered and managed.

Operations Manager Mr. Stahnke said staff worked closely with Port of San Francisco engineers who provide facilities inspections in the event of a disaster. He said the San Francisco Ferry Building was already one of their priorities and that our contract operator employees were being trained to perform preliminary visual inspections. He said they were well-equipped to do so because they see the facilities every day during normal service operations. Mr. Stahnke further explained that WETA's current contract with Blue & Gold Fleet contained a provision that requires the use of their vessels by WETA immediately, in the event of an emergency. Chair Breckenridge said staff had extensive knowledge of the maritime resources on the entire West Coast that were available to the agency in the event of emergency and cautioned that moving survivors from one place to another when communication systems were down may be a challenge because the status of the place they were moved to would be unknown.

Vice Chair Wunderman said the ERP would always be a work in progress, but that its revised, current version was a big step forward in being able to explain and present it to the public. He suggested that a press conference held to bring the public's attention to WETA's role and responsibilities. He added that he would be happy to help with public relations and get elected officials and possibly the mayor to attend the press conference to help draw further important attention to the announcement.

Director Donovan asked if the ERP was a working document and whether it would continue to be updated as necessary. Chair Breckenridge said it was, and that the joint Federal/State Bay Area Earthquake Plan was still in draft but that as it evolved, the WETA ERP would likely be amended to ensure alignment. Ms. Rannells said that generally, after every exercise and incident, the ERP was expected to be updated based on outcomes.

Director Donovan asked how often WETA's emergency response partners met. Ms. Gularte said that staff meets regularly with a variety of different groups. Director Donovan asked if it was possible to meet more frequently to more expediently tie up the remaining loose ends of the WETA ERP. Ms. Gularte said there were numerous meetings scheduled and that all OES staff from every county was expected to attend the Mutual Aid Regional Advisory Committee (MARAC) meeting next week and that WETA's ERP was on the agenda. Chair Breckenridge said there was no single entity responsible for pulling together all of the various emergency response and supporting agencies to participate as a whole. She said WETA was now perceived as a regional asset and would be included in pertinent emergency response related discussions.

Director Donovan asked if WETA or MARAD had the equipment necessary to assure MARAD could refuel WETA vessels in the event of emergency. Mr. Stahnke said that WETA will provide the fuel hoses and camlocks and provide it to MARAD for fueling. He added that while the equipment is heavy and will be stored at WETA's maintenance facility versus being carried on vessels.

Ms. Gularte said a logistics officer from FEMA, an agency that may be responsible for providing emergency fuel to WETA, had met with staff to clarify details on what they would need from WETA to facilitate emergency fueling. Ms. Gularte said those details could now be found in the EOP. She added

that staff had also met with FEMA's state counterpart, the California Energy Commission, which requested further details that staff was in process of providing.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Veronica Sanchez of Masters, Mates & Pilots (MM&P) thanked Chair Breckenridge for her leadership on the ERP. She said there needed to be a clear solution on the credentialing challenge and suggested that the issue be included in WETA's legislative advocacy plans, in concert with other transportation agencies facing the same challenge. She said MM&P members could fulfill customer service roles and provide information and education to people when crowd management was required at terminals in the event of an emergency. Ms. Sanchez added that there needed to be better communication systems for ferry crew members and Blue and Gold in order to support communications during and emergency. She added that another emergency response asset to consider would be the 13 water taxis of Westar Marine.

Director Intintoli made a motion to approve the item. Vice Chair Wunderman seconded the motion and the item carried unanimously.

Yeas: Breckenridge, Donovan, Intintoli, Wunderman. Nays: None. Absent: DelBono.

10. AUTHORIZE RELEASE OF A REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR NORTH BAY VESSEL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. Stahnke presented this item to authorize release of a Request for Proposals (RFP) for North Bay vessel construction. He said the item was a significant milestone for WETA that would help the agency meet the increasing demands for service, provide vessels for the new Richmond ferry route, and provide much needed assets for emergency response.

Mr. Stahnke said the new Richmond route required two high-speed (34-knot) vessel additions to the current fleet to meet the 30 minute one way service schedule and provide competitive transit services with one-hour headways. He said funding for the two new vessels was included in the FY 2015/16 Capital Budget. Mr. Stahnke explained that adding these vessels to the North Bay fleet allowed for the best utilization of fleet resources to meet the demands of the Vallejo and Richmond services.

Director Intintoli asked if the *Vallejo* vessel would remain in WETA's fleet once the new vessels were put into service. Mr. Stahnke explained that it was hoped the *Vallejo* could be kept as a service back-up and for emergency response purposes because it was a valuable asset; however, he noted that the Air Resources Board required that its engines be replaced or upgraded within the next few years.

Mr. Stahnke explained that project development had included extensive outreach and a presentation on emerging technology propulsion systems to the Board by Elliott Bay Design at the February Board meeting. Mr. Stahnke said he had also just received a report from Siemens who had been working with WETA's current shipbuilder Kvichak. He said the Siemens analysis on propulsion technologies agreed with the Elliott Bay Design engineers' findings.

Chair Breckenridge said that at the February Board meeting, there had been questions about a possible trade off consideration of reduced speed North Bay vessels in exchange for possible inclusion of alternative propulsion technologies for this procurement and asked what the outcome of that had been. Mr. Stahnke said that lifecycle costs were always a consideration in new vessel procurement projects and that this project's analyses had included a variety of alternative propulsion technologies. He explained that slower transit speeds would disrupt current scheduling for Vallejo riders who already faced hour-long rides each way and would require two vessels instead of one to support each of the Vallejo and new Richmond routes during peak commute periods. Mr. Stahnke added that in the fuel consumption comparison in the alternative technology analysis for the North Bay routes, the slower,

alternatively propelled vessels would surprisingly use more fuel than the faster, higher capacity diesel engine vessels.

Mr. Stahnke said commonality was also a concern in the consideration of alternative propulsion technologies in this project and explained that commonality applied not only to captains and crews but also to infrastructure. He emphasized that WETA's current infrastructure accommodated its current fleet and that if a boat could not dock at one of WETA's terminals or maintenance facilities, there was no commonality of that aspect in that vessel. He further explained that the physical accommodation of different vessels could also require a considerably larger investment of time and capital funding.

Director Intintoli asked if it was possible to include alternative propulsion technologies on future vessels serving shorter routes like Treasure Island. Mr. Stahnke said it was and that doing so made sense for Treasure Island, especially because new infrastructure would be built for that service. He said Treasure Island service may be an ideal candidate for a zero emissions all-electric vessel. Ms. Rannells added that beginning slowly, with shorter route service, would allow more time for the technology to evolve and be tested so that hopefully it could provide good options for WETA's longer service routes as well.

Ms. Rannells said that she and Mr. Stahnke had met with Siemens for a presentation on their alternative propulsion technologies in December. She noted that Mr. Stahnke had also attended a conference in Florida on maritime propulsion emerging technologies, and staff had attended another Siemens presentation, hosted by the Bay Area Council, about their technology currently in use in other countries. Ms. Rannells further noted that staff had also engaged Elliott Bay Design to perform an alternative technologies analysis for the routes that resulted in the Board presentation at the February meeting. She said staff was most certainly interested in having the cleanest vessels possible in the WETA fleet, but that given the trade-offs in weight, passenger capacity and speed, alternative technologies did not currently make sense to include in the procurement of the new North Bay vessels.

Ms. Rannells said that the route profile for the new Richmond service had been modeled over a year ago and used as the basis in working with the City of Richmond to secure the Agreement for the service. She said staff had been very cognizant of transit times in the planning efforts for the new service. She further explained that it was important to use the faster vessels for the new service to avoid what happened on the South San Francisco route where two vessels were required to complete just three trips during peak commute periods.

Mr. Stahnke explained that the current operating funds commitments from the City of Richmond and Contra Costa County would provide a single vessel to operate on the Richmond service for about 12 years. He said if two vessels had to be used to support the service, funding would last for just 7 years.

Vice Chair Wunderman said that at some point, WETA vessels would have to begin moving away from diesel toward greener technology. He said doing so was the California way and that in the very near future, there needed to be alignment on pursuing alternative technology options. He said greener technologies would allow WETA to pursue new revenue streams and, when asking them to invest in the agency, make its case with partners that it was doing its part to reduce emissions.

Mr. Stahnke agreed and said it would be very important to remember that as WETA moved toward greener technology options it would also need to upgrade its existing facilities to support those technologies. One such example would be to add charging stations to the terminals and maintenance facilities to support electric vessels. Ms. Rannells said staff was aware of a number of funding sources available for alternative technology use and was having ongoing discussions about those possibilities in preparation for the changes ahead.

Chair Breckenridge said the time was rapidly approaching for the Board to figure out how the first alternative propulsion technology vessel would be introduced into the fleet given the existing infrastructure. She said it will be expensive and it will be difficult but that in the long run, all of the required investments will pay off with environmental benefits. She said, although not specific to propulsion technology, it was great to see that so many other green choices had been included in the North Bay vessel procurement.

Vice Chair Wunderman said a perfect example of moving ahead for the environment was when California introduced new restrictions on emissions at ports. He said everyone screamed about it but ultimately, they all complied. He said WETA would also have to make hard changes. Mr. Stahnke said WETA had already moved ahead of current EPA emissions standards.

Vice Chair Wunderman said he had spoken with a number of state legislators about WETA and water transportation generally, in trying to make a case for funding on a legislative level. He said there were about 28 legislative members that represented the Bay Area, and they represented about 25% of the entire California Legislature. Vice Chair Wunderman said that if WETA could present a case for a large infusion of funding for larger capacity vessels – and the infrastructure to support them - by inspiring with greener technologies inclusion in its plans, it may be more likely to receive the funds it so desperately required to meet increasing current service demands and future expansion efforts.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Wind + Wing Technologies Founder and President Jay Gardner provided a handout to Directors entitled WETA Alternative Propulsion Study – REVISED – March 2016. Mr. Gardner said carbon taxes were being proposed in various places in the United States and in Canada, and that Shell Oil supported the tax. Mr. Gardner said the evaluations he was providing for Directors were strictly for the Richmond service route. He added that with the addition of carbon taxes, diesel fuel would likely soon join tobacco and alcohol and be subject to a sin tax. Mr. Gardner said he was certain that existing diesel engine designers were currently thinking about what they were going to do in the future when diesel would be obsolete. He said if WETA had reduced fuel vessels, its emergency response capabilities would be extended because less fuel would be needed. He added that there were other solutions to address electric charging challenges and noted that a vessel in Norway put two battery packs on board at either end to trickle charge the engines. He said this solution provided the ability to not use a lot of energy all at once. Mr. Gardner suggested that WETA slow down and not rush to purchase new vessels without considering the alternative technology possibilities now available.

Chair Breckenridge asked Mr. Gardner why his analysis had been done only on the Richmond route when the North Bay vessel procurement included both the Richmond and Vallejo routes. Mr. Gardner said that he believed the Vallejo route needed a faster vessel and WETA should not try to use the same vessels for both North Bay routes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Wind + Wing Technologies Director of Marketing and Development Strategy Charlie Bogue said he and Mr. Gardner were very excited about the opportunity for alternative propulsion technology vessels to be included in WETA's Strategic Plan. He said he felt that the Elliott Bay Design analysis had focused on a specific hull shape for the Vallejo route and the Vallejo and Richmond routes were very different. He said that changing the hull shape of the vessel design may reduce the passenger capacity but it could also provide opportunities to use wind and other alternative propulsion technologies. He suggested that the procurement process be delayed long enough to separate the two routes to procure just one vessel specific to each route and then use taxpayer money more effectively to build a third vessel with alternative propulsion technology as an experiment that may be able to service the Richmond route.

PUBLIC COMMENT

City of Richmond Capital Projects Manager Chad Smalley said he wanted to provide the Board with clarity on Richmond's position on the matter of the vessel procurement. Mr. Smalley said there was a lot of support by the Mayor and the City generally for clean and green technologies as evidenced by the letter the City had sent to WETA recommending evaluation of those technologies. He added that it also remained the City's first and foremost objective to begin service as soon as possible, and said the Mayor was adamant about this.

Mr. Smalley further explained that service objectives were included in the operating Agreement between WETA and the Contra Costa Transportation Authority and said service had to meet or exceed those expectations to reduce the City's financial risk. He said Richmond was already heavily invested monetarily in the performance of the service and because of this, vessel speed was critical. Mr. Smalley explained that one of the contributing factors to the failure of the Richmond service in the past had been that the ferries were too slow and hence, not competitive with other transit options. He said the WETA ferry service was going to be competing with numerous other public transit options in Richmond, including Caltrain and BART and that a 30-minute voyage time was a linchpin to its success. He emphasized that consideration of slower ferries was not an option.

Mr. Smalley said Richmond understood that vessel procurement was the critical path forward to bringing the service to the City, and Richmond was not interested in the slightest delay of any sort in moving forward. He urged the Board to release the RFP for the vessels as recommended by staff.

Director Donovan said that in reviewing the current fleet's vessel retirement dates, it made sense to move forward as soon as possible with the RFP. He added that there would be more opportunities soon to consider alternative technology vessels.

Ms. Rannells said that a benefit in procuring three similar vessels through this RFP would be the ability to move them around as determined by service demands in both Richmond and Vallejo and that having the higher speed vessels would provide that flexibility. She agreed with Director Donovan that many opportunities would be coming up for new vessel procurement.

Vice Chair Wunderman said the Board had received a letter from the City of Richmond indicating that it wanted greener boats, and then heard today from Mr. Smalley that the City wanted to move forward with the RFP for reliable and proven diesel engine vessels to get service going as soon as possible. He asked Mr. Smalley if greener or sooner was the priority. Mr. Smalley replied that he wished that the City did not have to choose but that sooner was definitely the priority. Mr. Smalley said this message was from the City Manager who regrettably had not been able to attend the meeting and share the message himself.

Vice Chair Wunderman said he agreed with Ms. Rannells that it was important to have interchangeable vessels on both North Bay routes. He said staff had done a lot of analysis and evaluation of the options available for these new vessels, and there was going to be plenty of opportunity coming up to consider alternative technologies for new vessels.

Director Donovan made a motion to approve the item. Director Intintoli seconded the motion and the item carried unanimously.

Yeas: Breckenridge, Donovan, Intintoli, Wunderman. Nays: None. Absent: DelBono.

11. OVERVIEW OF UPCOMING SUMMER 2016 SERVICE PLAN

Mr. Connolly introduced the item for discussion of the summer 2016 service plan overview which would feature a number of schedule adjustments developed to respond to increasing demand for ferry service, would minimize schedule impacts to riders, and would maximize system efficiencies and utilization of

vessels and crews. He explained that WETA's peak service period was historically and consistently in August each year, and the summer schedule strategy would address the acute areas of that demand.

Mr. Stahnke explained that traditionally, the Alameda and Vallejo services had been ramped down during the winter months because demand was lower then. He said that because the South San Francisco and Harbor Bay services were primarily commute oriented, those routes' schedules remained the same year-round but that the upcoming summer schedule would add five additional weekday departures on the Alameda/Oakland route and three new weekday departures on the Vallejo route.

Mr. Connolly noted that a slower vessel was going to be used in the summer schedule to make one of the Alameda/Oakland trips. He said using the slower vessel was not an optimal solution and that it may degrade some riders' overall satisfaction, but it was the only viable option to provide an additional trip because of fleet constraints.

Mr. Stahnke said that in addition to the increase in weekday trips, additional staff would be added to support better on-time performance on the weekends. He explained that surges in ridership and the increased use of the ferries by new riders had affected on-time performance on the weekend trips and that adding more staff on the vessels and in customer service capacities was expected to increase boarding speed and on-time performance.

Ms. Rannells said that the cost for the enhanced summer demand service schedule would be spread out across two fiscal years and that she had asked MTC to consider providing funds to support the additional service.

12. OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS

No additional public comments.

Chair Breckenridge thanked everyone for their comments and attendance.

13. ADJOURNMENT

All business having been concluded, the meeting was adjourned at 4:17 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Board Secretary