

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

(August 4, 2016)

The Board of Directors of the San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority met in regular session at the Port of San Francisco at Pier 1, San Francisco, CA.

1. CALL TO ORDER – BOARD CHAIR

Chair Jody Breckenridge called the meeting to order at 1:02 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 Jeffrey DelBono, Director Timothy Donovan and Director Anthony Intintoli.

3. REPORT OF BOARD CHAIR

Chair Breckenridge welcomed Directors, staff and guests to the meeting. On WETA's behalf, she wished the United States Coast Guard (USCG) a happy birthday and congratulated the organization on turning 226 years old and still going strong. She added that she had talked with the new USCG Flag Officer and provided him with a briefing on WETA and its functions and operations on the San Francisco Bay, as well as WETA's communication process in interacting with the USCG. Chair Breckenridge said she had also had discussions since the last meeting with Cal OES Director Mike Ghilarducci and with Marine Exchange Executive Director Captain Lynn Korwatch. She said her discussion with Captain Korwatch had included grant and other funding possibilities for WETA. Chair Breckenridge added that she had also spent some time up in Seattle at Kvichak Marine Industries, where she was able to survey the construction of WETA's vessel *Hydrus*, presently underway there. She said the vessel construction was progressing and that the welding work she had seen was impressive and remarkably beautiful.

4. REPORTS OF DIRECTORS

Vice Chair Wunderman said that as a representative of the Bay Area Council (BAC), he had met with a number of regional and state representatives regarding transportation funding. He said Senator Jim Beall, the Chairman for the Senate Transportation and Housing Committee, had visited the BAC to discuss strategy for transportation funding. Vice Chair Wunderman said he was not hugely confident about a comprehensive bill getting onto the ballot for the fall at this point but that it was hoped an additional BAC visit to Sacramento at the end of the month would reveal additional information. He said the funding discussions likely would not impact WETA but added that the November ballot was expected to have three different sales tax measures for Santa Clara, Contra Costa and San Francisco. Vice Chair Wunderman added that along with the bond measure for BART, the transportation funding measures were expected to total approximately \$20 billion in funding for the future of Bay Area transportation. He said he didn't know, at this point, how much of that money would be directed to water transportation.

Vice Chair Wunderman extended an invitation to all to the BAC's Water Transportation Subcommittee meeting scheduled to take place at 10:00 a.m. on August 24. He said the meeting guest will be Kate White, Deputy Secretary of Environmental Policy and Housing Coordination at the California State Transportation Agency, who will discuss state funding for clean propulsion technology.

5. REPORTS OF STAFF

Executive Director Nina Rannells welcomed Directors to the meeting. She referred the Board to her written report and offered to answer any questions. She said the vessel replacement project for the three new vessels was expected to be brought to the Board at the September meeting. Ms. Rannells said the Gemini work had been completed and that 75 more seats were being added to increase the passenger capacity from 175 to 225, adding that the vessel was expected to be back in service within the next couple of weeks.

Ms. Rannells shared an update on the waterside construction completion of the North Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility and said it was expected that WETA would be onsite at the facility in September and that the facility would be ready for a ribbon cutting ceremony in October. She said dates being considered for a groundbreaking ceremony for the Central Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility were in mid-September and that staff would be checking in with Directors' regarding their availability.

Ms. Rannells referred the Board to the ridership report for 2016 and noted that it reflected a 20 percent increase over the prior fiscal year ending June 2015. She said that since WETA began its operations of services, there had been an overall ridership increase of more than 70 percent. Ms. Rannells noted that this was quite remarkable and reflected tremendous growth for the agency's operations over the last four years.

Ms. Rannells introduced Manager of Planning and Development Kevin Connolly who provided an overview of Alameda terminals access improvements. He said the new O'Lot parking lot at the Alameda Main Street Terminal was being used extensively and is consistently filled to about 90 percent capacity on weekdays. Mr. Connolly told Directors to expect to see results in the fall for the contract work presently underway investigating fee for parking at Harbor Bay and possibly at other terminals throughout the WETA system.

Mr. Connolly said WETA and City of Alameda staff had been working with AC Transit in marketing the Harbor Bay ferry terminal bus service to the community. He said that a free transfer was provided by WETA to all ferry riders who take the AC Transit bus service to the terminal. Chair Breckenridge requested that an update on the findings about the implementation of a parking fee in the WETA system be shared with Directors by October. He added that, if adopted by the Board, the parking fee at the Harbor Bay Terminal would likely not be implemented until early next year.

Chair Breckenridge asked for an update on the review of the Vallejo bus service analysis. Mr. Connolly said staff had already participated in the first of what would be a series of meetings planned with Vallejo partners and that meeting had included SolTrans and the Solano Transportation Authority (STA). He said WETA's Route 200 bus service contract will run through December and that it may need to be extended for up to six months while further analysis is done to determine the best implementation solution. He said changes in the way WETA had utilized the bus resources in the past were anticipated, but it was not clear at this time exactly what the changes would be and whether they would take place in January or in June.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Alameda Base Reuse Director Jennifer Ott thanked WETA staff for the Harbor Seal haul out work at Alameda Point. She said that the Harbor Bay Terminal parking fee implementation was anticipated to be an important tool in the City's kit for resolution on terminal accessibility issues as the City takes more of an active role in addressing the challenges and participating in the resolutions. She said the City Council had approved the various pieces needed to address accessibility, such as AC Transit service and the parking fee, and the next step was implementation of those pieces. Ms. Ott emphasized that AC Transit

was now committed to meeting every arrival and departure at the Harbor Bay Terminal and the next objective was to get a commitment to provide service to the Main Street Terminal.

Chair Breckenridge said she would like Directors to be thinking five and ten years ahead as they review the parking fee implementation findings and generally. She said this will help assure that WETA is proactive and not reactive so that the system grows intelligently by building foundations for the future and not just to accommodate immediate and pressing challenges.

Senior Planner Chad Mason provided an overview of the successful work done to accommodate a community of Harbor Seals at the Central Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility site at Alameda Point with a new seal haul out float. He explained that the haul out had been put in place and moved once already, with plans to move it several more times, a little bit further each time, until it was put in place permanently about 900 yards from the shore.

Ms. Rannells referred Directors to the financial documents in her report and noted that the agency had been able to hold 2016 fiscal year expenses to the same level as the prior fiscal year. She said one of the reasons for this was that fuel prices had remained low again this past year. She noted for the Directors that WETA had returned an unspent \$5 million to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), as required by MTC in their administration of these funds. Director Intintoli said WETA should have been able to retain that \$5 million in reserves in case fuel prices rise or WETA has unforeseen expenses in the new fiscal year. He asked if that was something that could be addressed for the future, perhaps with language to support it in a future Regional Measure 3 (RM3). Ms. Rannells agreed with Director Intintoli's position, and said that she had discussed that with the group working on the measure on WETA's behalf.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

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

- a. Board Meeting Minutes – June 2, 2016
- b. Authorize Release of a Request for Proposals for the *Pisces* Quarter-Life Refurbishment and Passenger Capacity Increase Project
- c. Authorize Release of a Request for Proposals for the *Mare Island* Major Component and Waterjet Rehabilitation Project
- d. Approve a Sole Source Contract with Marine Jet Power AB for the Waterjet Replacements Required as a Part of the *Mare Island* Major Component & Waterjet Rehabilitation Project

Director Intintoli seconded the motion and the consent calendar carried unanimously.

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

7. APPROVE BAY BRIDGE FORWARD FERRY ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. Connolly presented the item recommending that Directors approve the following actions in support of the Bay Bridge Forward Ferry Enhancement Program:

1. Authorize extension of the enhanced summer service schedule for the Alameda/Oakland and Vallejo ferry services through December 2017; and
2. Authorize a FY 2016/17 Operating Budget increase in the amount of \$2.0 million to support operating these service enhancements through the full fiscal year.

Mr. Connolly explained that the enhanced service would be implemented in three phases with phase one enhancements, the most immediate, to extend enhanced Vallejo and Alameda/Oakland summer service schedules through December 2017.

Chair Breckenridge emphasized the importance of educating the WETA ridership to assure they understand that the extended service offerings are presently just for the one year through December 2017. Director DelBono said Directors should see if there was any possibility to get the \$5 million WETA had to return to MTC back to support additional future service offerings. Ms. Rannells said she would take that interest back to MTC to use as a conversation starter.

Chair Breckenridge asked if parking at the Vallejo terminal was nearing or exceeding capacity with any regularity given the consistent record breaking ridership every month. Mr. Connolly said the Vallejo parking garage was not limited to ferry rider use and generally had a surplus of parking, even with the increases in the ferry ridership on the Vallejo route.

Director DelBono reiterated that it was important to figure out how to get the \$5 million that WETA had been made to return to MTC back to support service extension and meet rider and other stakeholder expectations. Ms. Rannells said she saw the award of Bay Bridge Forward funds as a first step in the process of increasing regional funds for ferries. Chair Breckenridge said further and continued work must be done to educate everyone about what is required for a truly robust regional ferry service.

Vice Chair Wunderman asked at what point WETA's service offerings would exceed terminal capacity. Mr. Connolly said the Downtown San Francisco Terminal Expansion project would expand capacity in San Francisco in 2018. He added that the planned Seaplane Lagoon terminal in Alameda would also increase terminal capacity beginning in 2020. Mr. Connolly said that in addition to terminal capacity challenges, there were other capacity concerns specific to the Oakland and Alameda service routes. He explained that the Port of Oakland's recent increased shipping business has significantly increased the traffic in the estuary traveled by the Alameda/Oakland vessels. He said this traffic was expected to further increase and continue to impact WETA's schedules.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Alameda Base Reuse Director Jennifer Ott said she and the City of Alameda strongly encouraged Directors to support the item.

Director Donovan made a motion to approve the item.

Director Intintoli seconded the motion and the item carried unanimously.

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

8. MISSION BAY FERRY LANDING STATUS REPORT

Mr. Connolly introduced this informational item with a brief slideshow presentation of the three fundamental projects that will provide the foundation to support future Mission Bay, Redwood City and Treasure Island ferry service. He explained that these three new service offerings will not be possible without the three other WETA projects that were already underway; the Central Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility at Alameda Point, the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal expansion, and new vessels construction and delivery.

Mr. Connolly introduced Port of San Francisco Senior Waterfront Planner David Beaupre and Joe Roger, Port of San Francisco Project Manager for the Mission Bay Ferry Landing terminal project. Mr. Beaupre provided a slideshow presentation with an overview of the planned Mission Bay development and ferry terminal. He explained that they had taken a preliminary look at several sites and ultimately chosen a terminal site at 16th Street, between Pier 54 and the Mission Rock Restaurant. He explained that in addition to riders from the UCSF campus and hospital and the planned Golden State Warriors stadium, additional Mission Bay ferry riders were expected to come from the million

square feet of commercial space and about 2,000 new homes that were currently in development at Pier 70, as well as residents from the burgeoning Central Waterfront, Dogpatch and Potrero Hill neighborhoods.

Mr. Beaupre said the Port of San Francisco (The Port) had already done significant community outreach over the last few months and that a formal Request for Proposal for project design and development has been issued. He said it was expected that the contract for that work would be awarded by October with hope that the service would be in place in 2021 or 2023. Mr. Beaupre said the immediate next steps were to develop a project MOU with WETA identifying how the two agencies would work together to deliver the many project pieces. He said total cost for the project was estimated between \$32 and \$45 million and funds totaling about \$6.9 million were already committed to the project, about half provided by The Port with the balance coming from the City of San Francisco General Fund. He added that the project is a high priority for the City and The Port and all partners were keen to close the funding gap as soon as possible.

Ms. Rannells thanked Mr. Beaupre and Mr. Roger for their attendance and the presentation. She said this was a very important project not just for the Mission Bay community but also for WETA as a service expansion project. Ms. Rannells said that she appreciated the Port's efforts as the landowner and project lead on terminal design and construction and said the site that had been chosen was a location that WETA fully supported from an operational standpoint. Ms. Rannells she looked forward to moving ahead on the MOU discussions.

Vice Chair Wunderman said the Mission Bay Ferry Landing Project was the most likely and important of all of WETA's current projects. He said the development of Mission Bay was predictable, because it has been in the planning stages for years but that funding had not been included as a piece of the initial planning efforts. He said that WETA did not control what got built on the land, but development and water transit went hand in hand. Vice Chair Wunderman said that funding was a major component of the early and continuing discussions about other projects in San Francisco, such as the Treasure Island development. He explained that by including the funding component in concert with the development component from the beginning, water transit and development planning could happen simultaneously and support each other. Vice Chair Wunderman suggested applying this concept of early stage, linked funding and development planning as a blueprint for future San Francisco water transit and development project discussions.

Director Donovan asked if WETA's Project Labor Agreement language would be included in the Mission Bay Ferry Landing project contracts. Ms. Rannells said that she did not know what the Port's own policies were on labor harmony, but that she would introduce this into the MOU discussion with the Port.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Veronica Sanchez of Masters, Mates & Pilots (MM&P) thanked the WETA Board and staff and The Port guests and said she was glad to see MM&P's advocacy visible and formalized in The Port partnering with WETA on the Mission Bay Ferry Landing project. She said that The Port was now engaged and very interested in WETA's work and added that a partnership between the two agencies could help mitigate a public perception that they were in competition for limited funding opportunities. Ms. Sanchez said WETA's partnership with The Port on this project was going to raise WETA's public visibility very quickly.

Mr. Connolly said that The Port Commission had been very interested in WETA and its long term plans. He said The Port's perception of WETA was as a partner and The Port was very interested in integrating their projects with WETA's services. He added that he had been invited back to present WETA's Strategic Plan to The Port Commission in the fall.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Tideline Marine Group President Nathan Nayman said that as the official water taxi of The Port he wanted to hear about the commitment in The Port's plan to integrate Tideline water taxis into the Mission Bay project.

Mr. Beaupre said that planning for the project included investigating how and where to include water taxis, either as an integrated offering or as a standalone service. He said one of the possibilities in discussion had been to use the public boat launch at Pier 52 as a water taxi stop for the area.

Mr. Nayman said he would continue the discussion about the water taxi landing directly with The Port Commission.

9. REDWOOD CITY FERRY PROJECT STATUS REPORT

Mr. Connolly introduced this informational item to provide Directors with an update on future Redwood City ferry service. He explained that WETA had done a study on potential Redwood City ferry service back in 2012 and said this study's data would be utilized and valuable as the agency moved forward to support and eventually provide a future Redwood City ferry service. He reviewed the site that had been chosen for a future Redwood City ferry terminal and explained it was a location that would not conflict with the pleasure boating and other leisure activities at the Port of Redwood City or the cement and gravel aggregate and other commercial maritime activities in the Port of Redwood City channel. He said that a private ferry operator has been operating in the channel which had spurred discussions about how best to share the tight channel resources with all of its users.

Mr. Connolly said the minimum level of service – three peak morning and three evening departures – with *Vallejo* class, high-speed vessels, would require a minimum of four boats; three to run and one as a back-up in the case of primary vessel mechanical or other unforeseen failure. Mr. Connolly said that this project would provide many benefits to the region but that it did run the risk of being dropped from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) long range plan (Plan Bay Area) because of cost. He said that WETA staff met in a series of discussions with Redwood City, the Port of Redwood City and MTC to discuss changing the shape of the project in the Plan Bay Area to reduce initial costs so that the project would be included in the plan. Mr. Connolly said that for purposes of Plan Bay Area, the project was modified to initially build out a public terminal that could be used by other operators, with the Port of Redwood City acting as the lead agency on the project. He said this would bring service into the area sooner, with WETA public service – and the associated costs for operations and vessels - in future stages of the project. Mr. Connolly explained that what was submitted to MTC as a Plan Bay Area Project was the environmental clearance and design work to support the revised vision. He said these two pieces of the project were expected to cost between \$7 and \$8 million, which could be provided from San Mateo Transportation Authority transportation sales tax measure funds previously approved by voters to support Redwood City ferry service.

Mr. Connolly emphasized that WETA would continue work with its Redwood City partners to establish an MOU in the coming weeks that will clarify exactly how the revised project will look and who will play what roles in bringing WETA public ferry service to fruition. He then introduced Redwood City Assistant City Manager Aaron Aknin who provided an overview of the Redwood City ferry terminal project.

Mr. Aknin thanked the Board for welcoming him at the meeting and Mr. Connolly for his partnership and numerous trips down to Redwood City to work on the project. He said the City was very excited about its partnership with WETA and about taking the necessary steps to bring ferry service to the City. He said there were thousands of new residential units presently under construction and several million square feet of office space being developed in close proximity to the planned ferry terminal site. He further explained that the City was committed to increasing the projected ridership numbers for ferry service and had just approved a \$500,000 transportation study with the ultimate goal of getting residents out of

their cars and onto alternative modes of transportation. Mr. Aknin said ferry service was expected to play a critical role in that long term objective.

Chair Breckenridge thanked Mr. Aknin for speaking at the meeting and asked how long he anticipated it would take to complete the transportation study. Mr. Aknin said the study was expected to take approximately six months.

Vice Chair Wunderman said both the BAC and WETA had heard from many representatives of Redwood City and the Port of Redwood City about the urgent need to bring ferry service to Redwood City. He asked if those representatives were satisfied with the approach WETA was taking. He said he understood that the new plan may not be what people were hoping for and he wanted to understand the general perception of the new plan. Mr. Aknin said the new plan had generally been received positively. He noted that the new transportation study to garner increased ridership numbers, the environmental clearances for the site and service, and the terminal design were all pieces of the larger project that were going to take some time. He explained that people were aware of this and the perception was that this new approach would position the project very well for the next Regional Transportation Plan. Mr. Aknin added that he felt it was a fine approach overall.

Vice Chair Wunderman said his perception of the Redwood City ferry service was that it was a gateway to Silicon Valley. He said he felt the service should be moved ahead as quickly as possible and he was pleased that there was a productive partnership in place working on it.

Director DelBono asked for clarification on how the revised project would be put in place. Mr. Connolly explained that the new plan was for Redwood City to take the lead on construction and maintenance of the terminal with WETA providing input as a partner. The new terminal would allow private operators to begin offering service to Redwood City right away with WETA service to follow once funding for operations and vessels had been secured. He said breaking the project up in this way guaranteed its inclusion in MTC's Plan Bay Area instead of having it omitted from the Plan because of project cost and low scoring.

Director DelBono said he was anxious to bring ferry service to the South Bay but he was not entirely comfortable hearing that private operators would be using the Redwood City terminal. He added that he understood the challenges with the MTC project assessment but he felt it would be a huge step backward to have private ferry service in Redwood City. He said he would prefer to see a developer build the terminal and then have WETA operate the service.

Director Intintoli said that would be a great idea if WETA had operational money for a Redwood City service. He said this was another example of why WETA should be included in RM3. Vice Chair Wunderman said that securing future service for Redwood City would very likely position WETA in a much better place to receive a larger share of RM3 funds. Chair Breckenridge said WETA needed more of a business case to present to MTC with regard to the project to assure it will receive the attention it deserves and this new plan was a way to create that for Redwood City.

10. TREASURE ISLAND FERRY SERVICE UPDATE

Mr. Connolly introduced this informational item and explained that WETA staff had been working with current Treasure Island stakeholders for more than a year on the Treasure Island Ferry Project. He introduced San Francisco County Transportation Authority Principal Transportation Planner Rachel Hiatt who shared a slideshow presentation overview of the Treasure Island development and ferry service plans. Ms. Hiatt explained that her work was supporting the Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA) which was overseeing the overall redevelopment of the Island. She explained that the Treasure Island Mobility Management Agency (TIMMA) was the entity legislated to oversee the unique transportation plan for the Island. Ms. Hiatt said the development Agreement, environmental findings,

and transportation plan were approved back in 2011. Ms. Hiatt said that much of the Island's development will be residential, but it will also include commercial, retail, park and trail open spaces, urban farming, a conference center and hotel, and an intermodal transportation hub to be built where the current administrative buildings are situated on the Island.

Ms. Hiatt said the project, including the transportation plan, was a high priority Plan Bay Area project. She explained that affordable housing and living on the island had been an important topic for all stakeholder boards and said there were about two thousand potentially vulnerable residents currently living in subsidized housing on the island with some in transition from being recently homeless. Ms. Hiatt said there was a 25 percent below market rate requirement for the residential developments on the Island.

Ms. Hiatt said the transportation plan for the Island included the intermodal transportation hub with offerings of brand new East Bay AC Transit service to downtown Oakland every ten minutes, ferry service every 20-30 minutes, a free – possibly autonomous - island shuttle circulator, and Muni transit every 3 1/2 minutes by 2030. She explained that additional transportation goals would require all residential units to be built within a 15-minute walk to the intermodal transportation hub, an emphasis on walking and the use of bicycles, carpooling and car sharing. She said all future residents of the Island will be required to purchase a transit pass, and there will be a congestion toll for people accessing the Island with a vehicle during peak travel times.

Chair Breckenridge asked if there would be some sort of requirement for jobs that are hourly or lower end wage positions that the employees have to be a resident of the Island. She said her concern was that if not, those employees would be driving or taking transportation on to the Island, and most likely would be coming from the East Bay. Ms. Hiatt said planners were hopeful that people would use the AC Transit bus service to come from the East Bay. She added that employees coming to work on the Island from the East Bay would have already paid a toll to cross the Bay Bridge and therefore would not be required to pay an additional access toll to get onto the Island.

Ms. Hiatt explained that Treasure Island planners would like to utilize new technologies for transportation on the Island, such as electric vehicles and green technology ferry vessels. She said the toll plans would likely include a discount or credit for high frequency users. Ms. Hiatt further explained that the original idea had been that the dedicated transit, toll and parking fares generated by residents and those accessing the Island would provide enough money to offer the transit services and maintain the transportation hub. She said over the last few months, when presenting the toll policies to her Board, her Directors have expressed interest in diversifying the transportation funding sources. She said her Directors have asked that other sources of operational funding be identified so the burden of an access toll high enough to cover all of the transportation funding required does not fall on the shoulders of the Island's population. She said their concern is that they feel Treasure Island users should not shoulder the entire burden of transportation costs on the Island and that the toll should be minimized.

Ms. Hiatt said the first residential units will be available in 2019 and that is when the shuttle and bus service is scheduled to begin. She said the growing assumption at this time is that WETA ferry service will be put in place in 2022 as that is when the developer is obligated to have waterside construction completed. Ms. Hiatt said that there were some capital funding gaps for the project, including initial vessel construction, that need to be closed. She said further details on the ferry service would be sorted in the MOU discussions with WETA staff.

Director Donovan asked if there was still a plan for a hotel to be built on the Island. Ms. Hiatt said that there was a plan in place for a 500-room hotel to be built on the Island. Director Donovan said that if a big hotel chain was planning to build on the Island, perhaps they could help out with funding gaps for transportation. Ms. Hiatt said that was a possibility.

Chair Breckenridge asked, with the ferry plans for service every 20-30 minutes, how many vessels would be needed to meet that schedule. Mr. Connolly said that service would initially run about every hour and would phase up to service every 30 minutes. He said the vessel would likely be one 450-passenger vessel that was fast with a back-up from the general fleet. Chair Breckenridge said if the vessel will be high capacity and run on new technology, the design for the vessel may not even exist yet. Vice Chair Wunderman asked if it made better sense to use smaller vessels with the objective of boarding and offboarding more quickly. Mr. Connolly said that was one of many questions that will be considered between now and 2022 when the service will be put in place.

Ms. Rannells said that throughout the ten years she had been at WETA, staff had been involved in ongoing discussions with City agencies about the Treasure Island ferry service. She said those discussions had gone through numerous evolutions, and that the initial City/developer commitments to the project was for two or three new vessels and a terminal on Treasure Island. WETA's focus has been to expand the berthing at the Downtown Ferry Building to support this new service, and to work with the City to define and develop a ferry service plan. She said that, provided that the Board was supportive, that staff would work to explore options on how to deliver sufficient vessel capacity to be able to start service once the terminal is built. Ms. Rannells said she would like to see a partnership between WETA, the City and all of the Treasure Island partners to seek and secure funding for new vessels to serve this project.

Vice Chair Wunderman said he had been working on the Treasure Island redevelopment for thirty years. He said the project presented tremendous and desperately needed housing opportunities as well a unique opportunity to create a place where people can truly live without a car. He said to build homes on the island and then have people stranded, or feeling stranded, would be a terrible waste of a tremendous opportunity. Vice Chair Wunderman said WETA needed to partner strongly with the City of San Francisco to advocate for and help secure the funding needed to provide ferry service on the Island.

Director DelBono asked what kinds of discounts or benefits low income residents would receive on tolls and transit costs. Ms. Hiatt said the residents not living in below market housing will be required to purchase a transit pass but how that would be handled for lower income users was still in discussion. She said it was likely that those residents would receive discounted passes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Sanchez said that on behalf of her union, they were very excited about the projects. She said all of the projects pointed back to grant funds. She said her union can deploy federal lobbyists on WETA's behalf in a coordinated strategy. She suggested WETA and its various city agency and other partners approach federal funding as an integrated whole instead of piecemeal, agency by agency. She said this would be an important strategy to mitigate confusion and make a more compelling request in Washington. Ms. Sanchez also suggested that WETA's lobbyist Peter Friedmann reach out to Diane Feinstein with a request to approve the release of the money for the Berkeley project that has gone unused and could possibly be repurposed for Treasure Island.

Chair Breckenridge said that with the finalization of the WETA Strategic Plan, project priorities will become clearer, and the next steps will be lining up an action plan to seek support and funding for the projects accordingly. She said WETA cannot rely on a future RM3 until it is a reality. Chair Breckenridge said she appreciated the support of all of WETA's partners.

11. CONSIDER CENTRAL BAY OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE FACILITY NAMING OR OTHER RECOGNITION PROGRAM OPTIONS

Manager of Public Information and Marketing Ernest Sanchez presented this item with the following options to honor Ron Cowan and create a mechanism for recognizing other WTAWETA leaders over time:

1. Rename the Central Bay Operations & Maintenance Facility (CBOMF) the Ron Cowan Central Bay Operations & Maintenance Facility;
2. Recognize Ron Cowan's contributions, through resolution, and on a plaque memorialization to be installed at the CBOMF;
3. Institute a "Leadership Wall" Program with Ron Cowan named as the first honoree at the Central Bay Operations & Maintenance Facility Site; or
4. Institute alternative recognition programs or actions as may be identified by the Board of Directors.

Vice Chair Wunderman said that Mr. Cowan was a leader and a visionary and he felt option 1 was what WETA should do to recognize and honor him. Vice Chair Wunderman made a motion to adopt option 1.

Director DelBono seconded the motion.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jerry Bellows of MARAD said he urged the Board to choose the more traditional option of a Leadership Wall to honor Mr. Cowan and other past and future leaders.

Director Intintoli offered a substitute motion. He said he felt WETA should leave the option open to recognize others and set a precedent in this adoption. He said he preferred that WETA follow a more traditional leadership wall that had photographs of the people who had been leaders in supporting and leading the organization in the past and going into the future. He made a motion to adopt option 3.

Chair Breckenridge confirmed with the Directors that they had read correspondence received from the Alameda community about the item.

Chair Breckenridge seconded the substitute motion to adopt option 3, to implement a leadership wall program. She said it provided the most flexibility to support multiple honorees for regional and statewide supporters and leaders. She said that when one considered where the agency had been and where it was today, especially its current level of service offerings and its emergency response role, it was quite remarkable and there were many people who contributed to that success and deserved to be honored.

Director Donovan asked if it would be possible to choose both option 1 to honor Mr. Cowan and also option 3 to honor other leaders. Ms. Rannells replied that this would be possible and that it was at the discretion of the Board. Director DelBono said that the leadership wall could be installed at any of the facilities.

Vice Chair Wunderman said he was on a Wall of Fame at San Francisco State University and he didn't think the honoring process had to be an either/or scenario. He said there were a handful of people already who could be honored on a wall and there would be more people to honor on a wall in the future. He said a wall should not replace the specific honor he supported for Mr. Cowan.

Chair Breckenridge called for a vote on the substitute motion and the motion did not pass.

Yeas: Breckenridge, Intintoli. Nays: DelBono, Donovan, Wunderman.

Director DelBono said he agreed with Vice Chair Wunderman about Mr. Cowan's contributions. He said Mr. Cowan is a visionary and a dreamer who wanted the ferry service to be the most important transportation in the Bay Area and he deserved to be honored with a building in his community. He said he recognized that Alameda was a political place and that some in the community may disagree with the decision to honor Mr. Cowan and added that this was not a concern in his decision on the matter.

Chair Breckenridge called for a vote on this initial motion and the motion passed.

Yeas: DelBono, Donovan, Wunderman. Nays: Breckenridge, Intintoli.

Chair Breckenridge said Mr. Cowan should be involved in the groundbreaking ceremony and Ms. Rannells said she understood that time was of the essence given his failing health.

Vice Chair Wunderman said he felt badly to have divided the Board on this item. He said he believed this was the first time all of the Directors did not vote unanimously. Chair Breckenridge said she felt the votes were reflective of the community's views. Vice Chair Wunderman said he appreciated the Board having the conversation and he felt a wall was great to honor leaders in the future, but he felt that Mr. Cowan deserved a more special recognition.

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

No additional public comments.

13. ADJOURNMENT

All business having been concluded, the meeting was adjourned at 3:27 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Board Secretary