



# DRAFT MINUTES

## CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, January 11, 2017 Special Meeting

### 1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Waddling called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

CAC members present were Myla Ablog, Brian Larkin, Jacqueline Sachs, Peter Sachs, Peter Tannen, Chris Waddling, Shannon Wells-Mongiovi and Bradley Wiedmaier (8).

Transportation Authority staff members present were Eric Cordoba, Cynthia Fong, Anna LaForte and Mike Pickford.

### 2. Chair's Report – INFORMATION

Chair Waddling reported that Commissioner Peskin had been elected Chair of the Transportation Authority Board after Commissioner Weiner's election to the State Senate. He said that at its January 5 Special Meeting, the Board had unanimously voted to approve the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project, along with two amendments. He said that the CAC would hold elections for Chair and Vice Chair for 2017 at its January 25 meeting, and noted that he had been nominated for Chair and that Peter Sachs and Bradley Wiedmaier had been nominated for Vice Chair. He added that statements of interest from nominated members were due to by January 18.

There was no public comment.

### 3. Approve the Minutes of the November 30, 2016 Meeting – ACTION

There was no public comment.

Peter Sachs moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Peter Tannen.

The minutes were approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Larkin, J. Sachs, P. Sachs, Tannen, Waddling, Wells-Mongiovi and Wiedmaier (8)

Absent: CAC Members Hogue, Larson and Lerma (3)

Chair Waddling called Item 5 before Item 4.

### 4. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve an Eligible List of 28 Consultants for On-Call Project Management Oversight and General Engineering Services, Authorize the Executive Director to Execute Contracts to Shortlisted Consultants for a Three-Year Period with an Option to Extend for Two Additional One-Year Periods in a Combined Total Amount Not to Exceed \$8,000,000, and Authorize the Executive Director to Negotiate Payment Terms and Non-Material Contract Terms and Conditions – ACTION

Eric Cordoba, Deputy Director for Capital Projects, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Jacqueline Sachs said that she had watched the Special Board meeting for the Geary BRT EIR and asked whether holding additional meetings to allow the new District 1 Supervisor to provide input would delay the project. Mr. Cordoba replied that he did not think the new District 1 Supervisors input would lead to a delay. Ms. Sachs said that at workshops she had attended many people had asked about constructing a light-rail line on Geary Boulevard. Mr. Cordoba replied that if requested by the Board, the list of consultants under consideration could help develop cost estimates for projects such as a potential light-rail line.

Peter Sachs asked if there was a mechanism in the consultant procurement system to ensure that the Transportation Authority was getting the best value. Mr. Cordoba replied that such a large list of consultants meant that the Transportation Authority could seek multiple bids per task.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi asked if the Transportation Authority had to pay retainer fees for the consultants. Mr. Cordoba replied that there were no retainer fees and that being on the list was not a guarantee of work for any of the consultants.

Bradley Wiedmaier asked if rates charged by consultants would change over time. Mr. Cordoba replied that consultants would provide rates and availability of key personnel at the time that the Transportation Authority was evaluating whether to execute a contract with a given firm.

Mr. Wiedmaier asked if there was a range of costs built into the cost under consideration. Mr. Cordoba replied that project budgets were usually structured to include an amount for contingency.

There was no public comment.

Bradley Wiedmaier moved to approve the item, seconded by Shannon Wells-Mongiovi.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Larkin, J. Sachs, P. Sachs, Tannen, Waddling, Wells-Mongiovi and Wiedmaier (8)

Absent: CAC Members Hogue, Larson and Lerma (3)

5. **Adopt a Motion of Support for the Allocation of \$653,101 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, to the Bay Area Rapid Transit District for the Balboa Park Station Eastside Connections – Additional Scope Project, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedule – ACTION**

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

Bradley Wiedmaier said that the BART system was approaching 50 years and that the brutalist architecture of stations such as Balboa Park was back in vogue. He said that he had aesthetic questions about additions to the Balboa Park station, such as the glass headhouse, and how they might contrast with the existing architecture. He said that BART stations were designed by prominent architects in the 1960s and asked how architectural decisions were made on integrating the new structure with the existing building. Mr. Pickford responded that retrofitting with glass would help realize the original architectural vision, but he was not sure about how other architectural decisions were made. Todd Morgan, Principal Financial Analyst at BART, replied that there had been many discussions over the design, including with architects involved in the design of the new features, and that the station needed a new “front door” to provide better access.

Chair Waddling commented that Glen Park station and Balboa Park station seemed designed by the same architect. He said that he thought the ceiling was already open glass at Glen Park station, which might be used to compare with the new Balboa Park station to see what the new design

would look like. Mr. Wiedmaier agreed with Chair Waddling, and added that Ernest Born, the designer of these two stations, was an important figure in 1950s and 1960s architecture.

Chair Waddling asked if increases in costs were due to engineers' low estimates or unrealistically low bids from contractors and whether this should be a broader concern. Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, said that there were risks associated with all contracts put out for bid, especially because the bid environment was so competitive in San Francisco right now. She noted that certain types of projects at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) were also seeing fewer bidders or even a single bidder.

Peter Sachs commented that underbidding was a broader problem, including for SFMTA's Radio Replacement project. He said it was the responsibility of the Transportation Authority and the CAC to be vigilant about looking for ways to rein in costs, particularly looking for instances where contractors or bidders did not appropriately scope things in the first place and then asked for additional funding later to complete the work.

Brian Larkin said that this contractor bid competitively and the work was not a change order, so the price seemed like about as good as could be expected. Peter Sachs commented that page 35 of the meeting packet explained the sources of cost increases versus earlier estimates and that it was the result of many factors. Chair Waddling reiterated that his concern was that the engineer's estimates were low and about their ability to make appropriate estimates.

There was no public comment.

Peter Tannen moved to approve the item, seconded by Peter Sachs.

The item was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Larkin, J. Sachs, P. Sachs, Tannen, Wells-Mongiovi and Wiedmaier (7)

Abstain: CAC Member Waddling (1)

Absent: CAC Members Hogue, Larson and Lerma (3)

## **6. Introduction of New Business – INFORMATION**

Peter Sachs said that he was looking for an analysis of why Propositions J and K failed in the November 2016 election. He said that the obvious answer to him was that city leaders did not campaign hard enough for the measures, but that he would like to hear more specifically about what went wrong. He also asked what the Transportation Authority's plan was moving forward to introduce new funding measures and how much it would cost to delay the items that Propositions J and K would have funded.

Myla Ablog said that she appreciated Transportation Authority and SFMTA staff responsiveness to community concerns about eliminating the bus stop at Geary and Laguna Streets as part of the Geary BRT project. She said that she lived on Geary Boulevard and was excited to see BRT and did not want to wait for light-rail.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi said the San Francisco Examiner had an op-ed in late December that criticized the Geary BRT project and asked what other CAC members thought, specifically those close to the Geary corridor. Ms. Sachs responded that options for constructing light-rail on Geary had been thoroughly considered by the advisory group she had been a member of and that she was so supportive of the project, she would build it herself if she had to. Ms. Ablog said that she often endured being passed up by many full buses before she was able to board and that she thought the situation would get worse if nothing was done while waiting for light-rail to be

constructed. She asked staff how long it would take to raise all the money needed for light-rail and said that she was looking forward to biodiesel hybrid buses emitting lower emissions near her residence. She said it was important to reassure businesses along Geary that everything possible was being done to maintain access to the businesses during construction.

Peter Tannen said that a few months ago he had asked for a report from SFMTA on how they handle bus and train bunching and that he was unable to attend an earlier proposed presentation, so he would like to reschedule it. He also asked if it would be possible to arrange a tour of the Central Subway while it was under construction. Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, responded that the SFMTA was scheduled to present on the bunching issue at the late January CAC meeting and that she would look into scheduling a Central Subway tour, assuming construction activities did not preclude a tour.

Chair Waddling said that there would be an opening ceremony for the reconstruction of Mansell Street through McLaren Park on January 21 at 10:00 a.m. He said that the project included repurposing a portion of the roadway for a multi-use path.

Bradley Wiedmaier asked if there was a southeast city transportation plan because that part of the city would see so much growth and transformation in coming years. He said that some of the proposed routes for transit service, such as connections from Hunters Point to the Balboa Park BART Station did not make as much sense as connecting to the Glen Park BART Station. He said that he also did not understand why people would ride the 8-Bayshore from Chinatown all the way to City College.

Jacqueline Sachs asked when there would be an update on the “The Other 9-to-5” late night transportation study. Ms. LaForte replied that she would check with staff on when the next milestone would occur that would be appropriate for an update.

Ms. LaForte clarified that the Geary light rail project was carried over from Prop B to Prop K. She said that the project was included as a priority 3 project such that it would only move forward if Prop K revenues came in at a very high level, but that revenues were not expected to reach that level.

In response to Mr. Wiedmaier’s comment, Ms. LaForte said that there were various southeast transit plans and that she would follow up after the meeting. Chair Waddling asked whether the Transportation Authority could somehow coordinate planning efforts in southeast San Francisco to better engage residents of the area who did not often get asked for their opinion. He said it would be interesting to ask them why they utilize certain bus routes.

Ms. Sachs said that there would be a Central Subway advisory group meeting the following month.

Chair Waddling said that the Mission Bay Loop Muni light-rail tracks had been approved and would be completed next year. He also said that the Golden State Warriors Arena in Mission Bay would break ground on the Tuesday following the meeting.

**7. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**8. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:03 p.m.