San Francisco County Transportation Authority
1455 Market Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, California 94103
415.522.4800 FAX 415.522.4829
info@sfcta.org www.sfcta.org

AGENDA

FINANCE COMMITTEE
Meeting Notice

Date: 11:30 a.m., Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Location: Room 263, City Hall

Commissioners: Commissioners Cohen (Chair), Wiener (Vice Chair), Farrell, Tang and Avalos (Ex Officio)

CLERK: Steve Stamos

Page

1. Roll Call

Consent Calendar

2. Approve the Minutes of the November 18, 2014 Meeting – ACTION* **5**

3. Recommend Increasing the Amount of the Professional Services Contract with WMH Corporation by $5,400,000, for a Total Amount Not to Exceed $11,300,000 to Complete Preliminary Engineering, Environmental Analysis, and Design Services for the Yerba Buena Island Bridge Structures and Authorizing the Executive Director to Modify Non-Material Contract Terms and Conditions – ACTION* **7**

As the Congestion Management Agency for San Francisco, we are working jointly with the Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA) on the I-80/Yerba Buena Island (YBI) Interchange Improvement Project, which includes the seismic retrofit of the YBI Bridge Structures on the west side of the island. Under the Memorandum of Agreement between the Transportation Authority and TIDA, consultant contract work for engineering and environmental services is managed and administered by the Transportation Authority. As part of continued preliminary engineering and design efforts and as required by federal funding, a Value Engineering Analysis (VA) Report was prepared in February 2014. The VA team's primary recommendation is to realign Hillcrest Road into the hillside utilizing several retaining walls; construction of a new realigned eastbound I-80 off-ramp bridge structure; and elimination of existing Structures #2, #3 and #6. The structures to be retrofitted (#1, 4, 7A, 7B, and 8) remain largely the same; however approach roadways, slopes, etc. are also affected. The VA Report estimates that the proposed change in scope will result in a $9 million overall project cost savings compared to the current environmentally approved alternative. Implementation of the VA Report Alternative will also improve seismic performance, simplify construction efforts, minimize maintenance cost and is preferred by TIDA. The introduction of the VA Alternative will require additional engineering and environmental analysis to be performed. Amendment of the WMH Corporation contract is contingent on the approval of additional federal funding. TIDA has the responsibility to reimburse the Transportation Authority for all costs on the project that are not reimbursed by federal or state funds and also provides the required local match. **We are seeking a recommendation to increase the amount of the professional services contract with WMH by $5,400,000, for a total amount not to exceed $11,300,000, to complete preliminary engineering, environmental analysis, and design services for the YBI Bridge Structures and authorize the Executive Director to modify non-material contract terms and**

conditions.

4. Recommend Exercising the Second One-Year Option of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the Office of Economic and Workforce Development and to Increase the MOA Amount by $164,600, to a Total Amount Not to Exceed $500,000, for CityBuild Services to Promote Workforce Development for Phase II of the Presidio Parkway Project and Authorizing the Executive Director to Modify Non-Material Agreement Terms and Conditions – ACTION* **49**

The Transportation Authority has collaborated with the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) to track local opportunities related to construction projects within San Francisco. On March 27, 2012, through approval of Resolution 12-46, the Transportation Authority authorized a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with OEWD for a one-year period with two additional one-year extension options, in an amount not to exceed $167,700, for CityBuild services to enhance local hire for Phase II of the Presidio Parkway project implementation. The Transportation Authority and OEWD wish to further this relationship and provide a structure where OEWD will provide valuable local outreach and develop a skilled workforce to enhance the opportunities for San Francisco residents to become aware of and qualified for construction jobs relating to the implementation of Phase II of the Presidio Parkway project. Through Resolution 14-61, the first one-year option on this contract was exercised to cover the services provided during October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014. This agreement will be funded by Prop K funds previously appropriated through Resolution 10-66 to the Presidio Parkway project. **We are seeking a recommendation to exercise the second one-year option of the MOA with OEWD, and to increase the MOA amount by $164,600, to a total amount not to exceed $500,000, for CityBuild services to promote workforce development for Phase II of the Presidio Parkway project and authorize the Executive Director to modify agreement payment terms and non-material agreement terms and conditions.**

End of Consent Calendar

5. State and Federal Legislative Update – INFORMATION/ACTION* **55**

Every month, we provide an update on state and federal legislation and, when appropriate, seek recommendations to adopt new positions on active legislation. The attached matrix tracks the latest activity on state bills, and the positions previously adopted by the Transportation Authority. We are recommending the following new positions this month: support for Assembly Bill (AB) 8 (Gatto); and oppose for AB 6 (Wilk), AB 23 (Patterson), Senate Bill (SB) 1 (Gaines), SB 5 (Vidak) and SB 39 (Pavley). **This is an information/action item.**

6. Recommend Approval of the 2015 State and Federal Legislative Program – ACTION* **59**

Every year, the Transportation Authority Board adopts a legislative program to guide the agency's transportation advocacy efforts at the state and federal levels. The proposed State and Federal Legislative Program reflects key principles, gathered from our common positions with other local transportation sales tax authorities around the state, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, as well as our understanding of the most pressing issues facing the region, San Francisco, and our partner agencies that deliver transportation in the city. The proposed program is presented in the form of principles, not specific bills or legislative initiatives, in order to allow staff the necessary flexibility to respond to legislative proposals and specific policy concerns that may arise over the course of the legislative session in Sacramento or Washington. Our 2015 Legislative Program continues many of the themes from the previous legislative sessions and emphasizes issues of stabilizing and protecting existing transportation funds, authorizing new transportation revenues, securing funding for San Francisco projects, advancing high-speed rail investment, supporting allocation of state cap-and-trade revenues for transportation, promoting Vision Zero safety goals, and aspiring to meet environmental and greenhouse gas reduction goals. **We are seeking a recommendation to approve the 2015 State and Federal Legislative Program.**

7. Recommend Authorizing the Executive Director to Execute a Memorandum of Agreement with the San Francisco Planning Department for the Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project Environmental Review Phase, in an Amount not to Exceed $139,276, and to Negotiate Agreement Payment Terms and Non-Material Agreement

Terms and Conditions; and Assigning the Professional Services Contract with Jacobs Engineering Group to CirclePoint, Increasing the Amount of the Contract by $225,000, to a Total Amount Not to Exceed $4,409,489, for Environmental Analysis Services for the Geary BRT Project Environmental Impact Report/Statement, and Authorizing the Executive Director to Modify Non-Material Contract Terms and Conditions – ACTION* **71**

In close collaboration with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), we are leading the environmental review phase for the Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project, which has developed a refined set of project alternatives, identified a Staff-Recommended Alternative, and documented the environmental analysis of those alternatives in an Administrative Draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement (EIR/S) that is being submitted for local and federal agency review before circulating to the public. In response to Transportation Authority Board and other input seeking faster delivery of benefits to the corridor, SFMTA staff is conducting conceptual planning for a potential Initial Construction Phase set of near-term improvements to be implemented before the full project will seek federal funds for construction. This month, the Plans and Programs Committee will consider SFMTA's Prop K request for $872,859 to cover near-term improvement planning, as well as prior SFMTA work to support the EIR/S. This new allocation would free up $389,927 for increased consultant and Transportation Authority staff costs resulting from inclusion of the near-term improvements in the EIR/S and an extended schedule. Relatedly, in order to more efficiently and cost effectively deliver the project, the technical consultant team previously led by Jacobs Engineering Group (Jacobs) will now be led by subconsultant CirclePoint for the remaining tasks. The consultant team needs an additional $225,000 to complete the environmental review phase. Lastly, we need to execute a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the San Francisco Planning Department (SF Planning) to support the EIR/S. This work is funded through a prior appropriation, but funds will pass directly from us rather than through the SFMTA. **We are seeking a recommendation to authorize the Executive Director to execute an MOA with SF Planning for the Geary BRT Project Environmental Review Phase, in an amount not to exceed $139,276, and to negotiate agreement payment terms and non-material agreement terms and conditions; and to assign the professional services contract with Jacobs to CirclePoint, increase the amount of the contract by $225,000, to a total amount not to exceed $4,409,489 for Environmental Analysis Services for the Geary BRT Project EIR/S, and to authorize the Executive Director to modify non-material contract terms and conditions.**

8. Recommend Authorizing the Executive Director to Execute a Funding Agreement with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, in an Amount Not to Exceed $300,000, for the San Francisco Bay Area Core Capacity Transit Study, and Authorizing the Executive Director to Negotiate Agreement Payment Terms and Non-Material Agreement Terms and Conditions – ACTION* **93**

The Transportation Authority is partnering with multiple agencies on the San Francisco Bay Area Transit Core Capacity Study (Study) led by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). The Study will identify short-, medium-, and long-term solutions to increase transit capacity in the Transbay and Muni Metro corridors. The Study budget includes $1 million in a federal Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Planning grant and $1 million in local match provided by the partner agencies of which the Transportation Authority's contribution is $300,000. The source of this funding was anticipated as part of a $450,000 Prop K appropriation that was approved through Resolution 15-09 in September 2014, which covered the Study's scope, schedule and budget. **We are seeking a recommendation to authorize the Executive Director to execute a funding agreement with the MTC, in an amount not to exceed $300,000, for the San Francisco Bay Area Core Capacity Transit Study, and to authorize the Executive Director to negotiate agreement payment terms and non-material agreement terms and conditions.**

9. Introduction of New Items – INFORMATION

10. Public Comment

11. Adjournment

* Additional materials

Please note that the meeting proceedings can be viewed live or on demand after the meeting at www.sfgovtv.org. To know the exact cablecast times for weekend viewing, please call SFGovTV at (415) 554-4188 on Friday when the cablecast times have been determined.

The Legislative Chamber (Room 250) and the Committee Room (Room 263) in City Hall are wheelchair accessible. Meetings are real-time captioned and are cablecast open-captioned on SFGovTV, the Government Channel 26. Assistive listening devices for the Legislative Chamber are available upon request at the Clerk of the Board's Office, Room 244. Assistive listening devices for the Committee Room are available upon request at the Clerk of the Board's Office, Room 244 or in the Committee Room. To request sign language interpreters, readers, large print agendas or other accommodations, please contact the Clerk of the Authority at (415) 522-4800. Requests made at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting will help to ensure availability.

The nearest accessible BART station is Civic Center (Market/Grove/Hyde Streets). Accessible MUNI Metro lines are the F, J, K, L, M, N, T (exit at Civic Center or Van Ness Stations). MUNI bus lines also serving the area are the 5, 6, 9, 19, 21, 47, 49, 71, and 71L. For more information about MUNI accessible services, call (415) 701-4485.

There is accessible parking in the vicinity of City Hall at Civic Center Plaza and adjacent to Davies Hall and the War Memorial Complex. Accessible curbside parking is available on Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place and Grove Street.

In order to assist the Transportation Authority's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at all public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical-based products. Please help the Transportation Authority accommodate these individuals.

If any materials related to an item on this agenda have been distributed to the Finance Committee after distribution of the agenda packet, those materials are available for public inspection at the Transportation Authority at 1455 Market Street, Floor 22, San Francisco, CA 94103, during normal office hours.

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code Sec. 2.100] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the San Francisco Ethics Commission at 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone (415) 252-3100; fax (415) 252-3112; website www.sfethics.org.

San Francisco County Transportation Authority
1455 Market Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, California 94103
415.522.4800 FAX 415.522.4829
info@sfcta.org www.sfcta.org

DRAFT MINUTES

FINANCE COMMITTEE
Tuesday, November 25, 2014

1. Roll Call

Chair Cohen called the meeting to order at 11:35 a.m.

Present at Roll Call: Commissioners Cohen, Tang and Wiener (3)

Absent at Roll Call: Commissioner Farrell (1)

Consent Calendar

2. Approve the Minutes of the October 7, 2014 Meeting – ACTION

3. Internal Accounting and Investment Report for the Three Months Ending September 30, 2014 – INFORMATION

There was no public comment.

The Consent Calendar was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Cohen, Tang and Wiener (3)

Absent: Commissioner Farrell (1)

End of Consent Calendar

4. Recommend Acceptance of the Audit Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2014 – ACTION

Cynthia Fong, Deputy Director for Finance and Administration, introduced the item per the staff memorandum. Cindy Pon, Partner at Macias, Gini & O'Connell, presented the item.

Chair Cohen asked if there were any irregularities found in the audit.

Ms. Pon responded that there were none.

There was no public comment.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Cohen, Tang and Wiener (3)

Ayes: Commissioner Farrell (1)

5. Introduction of New Items

Commissioner Tang requested that staff conduct a Strategic Analysis Report to examine transportation needs in connection to certain nodes that would help outlying neighborhoods such as the Sunset District. She said the Sunset District Blueprint identified public transportation as one of the main issues and that the San Francisco Transportation Plan noted geographic disparities in outlying neighborhoods in District 4 as well as in District 10. She requested that the

report explore how to better shuttle residents through transit nodes, whether it be local such as through West Portal or regional such as Bay Area Rapid Transit and Caltrain. She said the report should also address emerging issues such as the taxi and ride-sharing industries and that it look at pro-active alternatives on how to manage these programs. She added that she looked forward to developing a scope with the Transportation Authority.

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, commented that the Transportation Authority budgets for one to three Strategic Analysis Reports per year. She said that Strategic Analysis Reports were typically on policy issues or topics that seek quick high level information that support policy decisions or scoping to move to a next step. She added that the procedurally, once a commissioner makes a request, staff returned with a scope that was subject to approval by the Board before staff were authorized to begin work on the report.

There was no public comment.

6. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:46 a.m.

San Francisco County Transportation Authority
1455 Market Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, California 94103
415.522.4800 FAX 415.522.4829
info@sfcta.org www.sfcta.org

Memorandum

Date: 12.03.14 **RE:** Finance Committee December 9, 2014

To: Finance Committee: Commissioners Cohen (Chair), Wiener (Vice Chair), Farrell, Tang and Avalos (Ex Officio)

From: Lee Saage – Deputy Director for Capital Projects

Through: Tilly Chang – Executive Director

Subject: **ACTION** – Recommend Increasing the Amount of the Professional Services Contract with WMH Corporation by $5,400,000, for a Total Amount Not to Exceed $11,300,000 to Complete Preliminary Engineering, Environmental Analysis, and Design Services for the Yerba Buena Island Bridge Structures and Authorizing the Executive Director to Modify Non-Material Contract Terms and Conditions

Summary

As the Congestion Management Agency for San Francisco, we are working jointly with the Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA) on the I-80/Yerba Buena Island (YBI) Interchange Improvement Project, which includes the seismic retrofit of the YBI Bridge Structures on the west side of the island. Under the Memorandum of Agreement between the Transportation Authority and TIDA, consultant contract work for engineering and environmental services is managed and administered by the Transportation Authority. As part of continued preliminary engineering and design efforts and as required by federal funding, a Value Engineering Analysis (VA) Report was prepared in February 2014. The VA team's primary recommendation is to realign Hillcrest Road into the hillside utilizing several retaining walls; construction of a new realigned eastbound I-80 off-ramp bridge structure; and elimination of existing Structures #2, #3 and #6. The structures to be retrofitted (#1, 4, 7A, 7B, and 8) remain largely the same; however approach roadways, slopes, etc. are also affected. The VA Report estimates that the proposed change in scope will result in a $9 million overall project cost savings compared to the current environmentally approved alternative. Implementation of the VA Report Alternative will also improve seismic performance, simplify construction efforts, minimize maintenance cost and is preferred by TIDA. The introduction of the VA Alternative will require additional engineering and environmental analysis to be performed. Amendment of the WMH Corporation contract is contingent on the approval of additional federal funding. TIDA has the responsibility to reimburse the Transportation Authority for all costs on the project that are not reimbursed by federal or state funds and also provides the required local match. **We are seeking a recommendation to increase the amount of the professional services contract with WMH by $5,400,000, for a total amount not to exceed $11,300,000, to complete preliminary engineering, environmental analysis, and design services for the YBI Bridge Structures and authorize the Executive Director to modify non-material contract terms and conditions**.

BACKGROUND

In our capacity as the Congestion Management Agency for San Francisco, we are working jointly with the Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA) on the I-80/Yerba Buena Island (YBI) Interchange Improvement Project, which includes the seismic retrofit of the YBI Bridge Structures on the west side of the island. Under the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the Transportation Authority and TIDA, consultant contract work for engineering and environmental services is managed and administered by the Transportation Authority. TIDA has the responsibility to reimburse the Transportation Authority for all costs for the I-80/YBI Interchange Improvement Project that are not reimbursed by federal and state funds and also provides the required local match.

On December 14, 2010, through Resolution 11-28, the Transportation Authority awarded a two-year professional services contract to WMH Corporation, in an amount not to exceed $1,600,000, for preliminary engineering and environmental analysis services for the YBI Bridge Structures.

On February 28, 2012, through Resolution 12-34, the Transportation Authority increased the amount of the professional services contract with WMH Corporation by $4,300,000 for a total amount not to exceed $5,900,000.

The purpose of this memo is to seek a recommendation to increase the amount of the professional services contract with WMH Corporation by $5,400,000, for a total amount not to exceed $11,300,000, to complete preliminary engineering, environmental analysis and design services for the YBI Bridge Structures and authorize the Executive Director to modify non-material contract terms and conditions.

DISCUSSION

Consistent with the MOA between the Transportation Authority and TIDA for the I-80/YBI Improvement Project, we have undertaken the procurement and management of professional consultant services to provide the necessary engineering and environmental services to produce all necessary documents required to prepare the Seismic Strategy Reports, environmental documentation, and design for YBI Bridge Structures on the west side of the island. There are a total of eight (8) bridge structures being studied. These bridge structures are a vital component of the YBI traffic circulation system and also serve as an important part of the on and off-ramp system to I-80 and the San Francisco Bay Bridge.

The initial scope of work for the WMH Corporation contract included the preparation of Seismic Strategy Reports for all eight bridge structures. These reports were approved by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Structures Department in December 2011. The approved reports indicated that five of the bridge structures should be retrofitted in place while three of the bridge structures were recommended for replacement.

Separate environmental documents Categorical Exclusions per the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) and Categorical Exemptions per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for each of the eight bridges were approved in December 2012.

As part of continued preliminary engineering and design efforts and as required by federal funding a Value Engineering Analysis (VA) Report was prepared in February 2014 in consultation with TIDA, the San Francisco Department of Public Works (SFDPW), and independent construction experts. The VA team made various recommendations for the Transportation Authority's and TIDA's consideration to reduce overall project risk and cost. The VA team's primary recommendation is to realign Hillcrest Road into the hillside utilizing several retaining walls; construction of a new realigned eastbound I-80 off-ramp bridge structure; and elimination of existing Structures #2, #3 and #6. The structures to be retrofitted (#1, 4, 7A, 7B, and 8) remain largely the same; however approach roadways, slopes, etc. are also affected. The recommended VA Report Alternative estimated at $66 million will save approximately $9 million compared to the environmentally approved alternative estimated at $75 million. Implementation of the VA Report Alternative will also improve seismic performance, simplify construction efforts, minimize maintenance cost and is preferred by TIDA and SFDPW. Caltrans approved the VA Report in November 2014.

The introduction of the VA Alternative will require additional engineering and environmental analysis to be performed. All work necessary to prepare the required technical analysis will be performed in accordance with current Caltrans and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) policies and procedures.

The proposed milestone project schedule is shown below:

- Notice to Proceed December 2014
- Environmental Approval March 2016
- PS&E Completion December 2016
- Construction Start March 2017
- Construction Completion Summer 2019

TIDA has requested that the Transportation Authority proceed with engineering, environmental and design activities and amend the WMH Corporation contract to direct the preparation of the appropriate documents. The amendment of the WMH Corporation contract for preliminary engineering, environmental analysis and design is contingent on the approval of additional federal HBP funding. The Transportation Authority will be reimbursed for eligible preliminary engineering and design costs with a combination of TIDA and federal funds. TIDA funds will leverage the federal grant award and fulfill the local match requirement.

Since a portion of this contract is anticipated to be funded with federal financial assistance from FHWA, administered by Caltrans, the Transportation Authority will adhere to federal regulations pertaining to disadvantaged business enterprises (DBE). To date WMH Corporation has maintained 11% DBE participation from four sub-consultants: women-owned firms, ABA, David J. Powers and Associates, Inc. and Haygood & Associates Landscape Architects; and Asian Pacific-owned firm, Earth Mechanics, Inc. ABA is also based in San Francisco.

The proposed amendment to WMH Corporation would increase the existing $5,900,000 contract amount by a maximum of $5,400,000, to an amended total not to exceed $11,300,000. It would extend the existing contract through the approval of the additional environmental analysis, preliminary engineering and final Plans, Specifications and Estimate. It is anticipated that the professional services contract will be extended to March 31, 2017.

We are seeking a recommendation to increase the amount of the professional services contract with WMH Corporation by $5,400,000 for a total amount not to exceed $11,300,000 to complete preliminary engineering, environmental analysis, and design services for the YBI Bridge Structures and authorize the Executive Director to modify non-material contract terms and conditions.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Recommend increasing the amount of the professional services contract with WMH Corporation by $5,400,000, for a total amount not to exceed $11,300,000 to complete preliminary engineering, environmental analysis, and design services for the YBI Bridge Structures and authorizing the Executive Director to modify non-material contract terms and conditions, as requested.
2. Recommend increasing the amount of the professional services contract with WMH Corporation by $5,400,000, for a total amount not to exceed $11,300,000 to complete preliminary engineering, environmental analysis, and design services for the YBI Bridge Structures and authorizing the Executive Director to modify non-material contract terms and conditions, with modifications.
3. Defer action, pending additional information or further staff analysis.

CAC POSITION

The item was included on the consent calendar for the December 3, 2014 CAC meeting. The CAC unanimously adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation.

FINANCIAL IMPACTS

Under the MOA between TIDA and the Transportation Authority, TIDA will reimburse the Transportation Authority for all project costs and accrued interest, less state or federal government reimbursements to the Transportation Authority. Award of this contract amendment is subject to Caltrans' approval of an additional $3,660,000 of federal HBP funds from Caltrans for reimbursement of preliminary engineering and design services costs, anticipated in late December 2014. A portion of the proposed contract amendment will be included in the Transportation Authority's mid-year budget amendment. Sufficient funds will be included in next fiscal year's budget to cover the cost of this contract.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend increasing the amount of the professional services contract with WMH Corporation by $5,400,000, for a total amount not to exceed $11,300,000 to complete preliminary engineering, environmental analysis, and design services for the YBI Bridge Structures and authorizing the Executive Director to modify non-material contract terms and conditions.

Attachment:

1. YBI Bridge Structures Contract Amendment Scope of Services

SCOPE OF SERVICES

YBI WEST-SIDE BRIDGES RETROFIT PROJECT
(VALUE ANALYSIS PROJECT & BRIDGE RETROFIT PROJECTS #1, 4, 7A, 7B AND 8)

PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, ENVIRONMENTAL APPROVAL and FINAL DESIGN (Final PS&E)

INTRODUCTION

This Scope of Services is to provide preliminary engineering, environmental approval and final design (PS&E) services for the Yerba Buena Island West-Side Bridges Retrofit Project (Project), located along Treasure Island Road on Yerba Buena Island (YBI), in the City and County of San Francisco. This Scope of Services reflects the changes in the project resulting from a thorough value engineering and value analysis study process.

The original "environmentally approved" Project involved the seismic retrofit of five bridge structures and the replacement of three bridge structures, as well as associated roadway and slope improvements. The "environmentally approved" project was in the 65% PS&E phase of project development when the Value Analysis process was performed. WMH performed the Value Analysis (VA) Study consistent with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requirements for Structure #2. The total project cost for replacement of Structure #2, including preliminary engineering and estimated construction costs, was estimated to be greater than $20 million. For projects in this cost range, the FHWA requires that a VA Study be performed to determine if there are reasonable ways to reduce the project costs. The VA Team identified an alternative that completely revised all three replacement structures. WMH performed preliminary engineering analysis for the VA Alternative and determined that construction cost savings would be realized compared to the original "environmentally approved" alternative. This Project is now proceeding with the VA Alternative.

The Project that will now be delivered is the "Value Analysis" Project. The Value Analysis Project proposes to realign Hillcrest Road into the hillside utilizing several retaining walls; constructs a new realigned eastbound I-80 off-ramp bridge structure; and eliminates existing Structures #2, #3 and #6. The structures to be retrofitted (#1, 4, 7A, 7B, and 8) remain largely the same; however the approach roadways, slopes, etc are affected.

To deliver the Value Analysis Project, additional preliminary engineering will be required, and the environmental technical reports and environmental documents will need to be updated and resubmitted for approval. The design of the five retrofit structures (#1, 4, 7A, 7B, and 8) is 65% complete; all of this work will carry forward. The design of new Retaining walls and the Replacement Bridge will be entirely new design. Roadway design is almost all new. However, some of the preliminary engineering effort can be utilized such as field surveys, existing drainage and utility information, etc; these items will require supplemental effort for new areas of the project that are outside of the original boundaries.

The objective of this Project Scope of Services is to obtain environmental approval and prepare Construction Bid Documents (Plans, Specifications and Estimates) to Final level of completion for the comprehensive Project.

Due to Federal funding requirements, this Project will be comprised of six (6) individual projects; each bridge is an individual project. However, it is assumed that these projects will be administered as one construction contract, with six individual construction cost estimates (one for each bridge project) for tracking purposes.

SCOPE OF THE AGREEMENT

Project Elements to be designed:

- Replacement Bridge for the EB I-80 off-ramp Bridge Structure that includes a realigned EB I-80 off-ramp and new signalized intersection at Hillcrest Road
- New Retaining Wall along the uphill side of Hillcrest Road (Retaining Wall #1)
- New Retaining Wall along Treasure Island Road - north of the new EB I-80 off-ramp intersection (Retaining Wall #2)
- New Retaining Wall along Hillcrest Road - south of the new EB I-80 off-ramp intersection (Retaining Wall #3)
- New Retaining Wall along the WB I-80 on-ramp adjacent to Hillcrest Road (Retaining Wall #4)
- Seismic Retrofit of Bridge Structure #1
- Seismic Retrofit of Bridge Structure #4
- Seismic Retrofit of Bridge Structure #7A
- Seismic Retrofit of Bridge Structure #7B
- Seismic Retrofit of Bridge Structure #8
- Roadway Improvements at Treasure Island Road
- Roadway Improvements at Hillcrest Road
- Demolition of Bridge Structure #2
- Demolition of Bridge Structure #3
- Demolition of Bridge Structure #6

Services to be performed include:

- TASK 12 Project Management
- TASK 13 Preliminary Engineering
- TASK 14 Environmental Approval
- TASK 15 Finalize Design of Retrofit Structures #1, 4, 7A, 7B and 8
- TASK 16 65% PS&E

- TASK 17 95% PS&E
- TASK 18 100% PS&E
- TASK 19 Final PS&E
- TASK 20 Right of Way Certification

SCHEDULE

The project schedule milestone dates are as follows:

- Notice to Proceed December 2014
- Environmental Approval March 2016
- PS&E Completion December 2016
- Construction Start March 2017

12.0 TASK 12. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

The CONSULTANT will provide project management of each task for the entire duration of the project. Management activities will consist of administration, coordination, scheduling, meeting attendance, and quality control as stated in the following:

12.1 Project Management/ Administration /Filing - Supervise, coordinate and monitor planning and design for conformance with the City and County of San Francisco's (CCSF) standards and policies. The CONSULTANT will maintain Project Files in accordance with CALTRANS' Uniform Filing System and, when applicable, CALTRANS' Bridge Memo to Designers.

12.2 Agency/Subconsultant Coordination - Coordinate with subconsultants, adjacent project design teams and involved agencies to assure timely flow of information.

12.3 BCDC and RWQCB Coordination – CONSULTANT shall coordinate with the Bay Conservation Development Commission (BCDC) to position the Project for BCDC approval. It is assumed a Permit will be required due to the encroachment of drainage facilities into BCDC's 100-foot shoreline band. Coordination will include approval from Engineering Criteria Review Board (ECRB), Design Review Board (DRB) and the full Commission. Additionally, CONSULTANT shall coordinate with the Regional Water Quality Control Board to work towards obtaining NPDES MS4 Compliance and Permit.

12.4 CPM Schedule - Prepare a detailed Critical Path Method (CPM) schedule for the entire project using Microsoft Project software. The Microsoft Project CPM schedule will be

updated on a monthly basis. A four-week horizon schedule will also be provided at Project Development Team (PDT) meetings.

12.5 Quality Control - The CONSULTANT will implement a quality control procedure for engineering activities, perform in-house quality control reviews for each task, and submit project deliverables to SFCTA, CCSF and/or Caltrans for review in accordance with the approved schedule.

12.6 Project Funding: Tracking and Coordination – CONSULTANT shall prepare a plan and associated draft funding request documents to deliver the Project consistent with Federal Highway Bridge Program (HBP) and Prop 1B State Seismic Retrofit funding reimbursement requirements. CONSULTANT shall track and document Project expenditures to allow for obtaining eligible HBP and Prop 1B funds. CONSULTANT shall assist SFTCA in maximizing available HBP and Prop 1B funds for the Project.

12.7 PDT Meetings - Conduct monthly Project Development Team meetings. Meetings will include SFDPW, SFPUC, SFMTA, CCSF, SFCTA, and TIDA. This will include preparation and submittal of agenda, preparation and submittal of Data Request Logs, and preparation of meeting minutes for each PDT Meeting, distribution of meeting minutes and development of action items list. The agenda will be submitted prior to the meeting and the meeting minutes/action items will be submitted within one week after the meeting.

12.8 Technical Meetings – Coordinate and attend meetings such as design coordination meetings, workshop meetings, comment review sessions, and peer review meetings with SFCTA, CCSF, Caltrans and other agencies to resolve issues. Meetings will be held during performance of each task or as needed by the CONSULTANT, SFCTA, CCSF, Caltrans, or other agencies.

12.9 Stakeholder Briefings /Workshops – CONSULTANT shall coordinate, attend and direct meetings for stakeholder briefings and workshops as necessary. Stakeholders may include CCSF, SFPUC, SFWater, MTA, USCG, TIDA, Caltrans, and others.

12.10 Invoices/Progress Reports - Prepare and submit budget reports, monthly progress reports, updated schedules and invoices in accordance with SFCTA requirements.

Task 12 - Deliverables

- CPM schedule
- Meeting Materials
- Project Correspondence
- Progress Reports
- Invoices

Task 12 – Schedule

- Notice to Proceed is scheduled for December 2014

13.0 PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

This Task involves the effort necessary for preliminary engineering activities that are required due to the revised Value Analysis Project. Preliminary engineering activities that were performed previously, and are still useful and relevant, will be utilized.

This task consists of compiling and reviewing existing data pertinent to the Value Analysis Project, planning activities, identifying and requesting supplemental information and surveys, coordination with adjacent projects, obtaining information and requirements for utilities, right-of-way and permits, defining and refining the study alternative, preparing base mapping, preparing bridge advanced planning studies and preliminary structural analysis, performing traffic handling / stage construction studies, developing preliminary utility impacts, and preparing the preliminary cost estimate. CONSULTANT activities shall include, but are not limited to the following:

13.1 Data Collection and Review – CONSULTANT shall obtain and review available data and information necessary for planning and preliminary engineering of the Project. The information may be obtained from SFCTA, Caltrans, local agencies, utility owners, and other agencies and organizations. A data request log will be maintained to track data requested and obtained. Data to be reviewed includes the following**:**

- Previous plans, report(s) or documents related to the proposed project area
- As-built plans
- Utility information
- Aerial photos and any available mapping, including digitized topography
- Survey control data
- Preliminary Layout Plans
- Right-of-way information
- Existing traffic information including traffic counts, information related to TOS, and bicycle and pedestrian information

CONSULTANT shall obtain:

- An encroachment permit from CCSF to conduct site investigations to thoroughly explore existing site conditions
- Permits to Enter private property will also be requested, if necessary, for site investigations

13.2 Access Permits and Field Review - The CONSULTANT will obtain Access Permits from Caltrans, the CCSF and affected property owners to conduct field studies and surveys. The CONSULTANT will thoroughly explore existing site conditions, take photographic records and verify topographic mapping features.

13.3 Topographic Surveys - Topographical field surveys will be performed to supplement the existing Project field surveys. Surveys will include hillside above Hillcrest Road, fences and access road, trees located within the Area of Potential Effect, pavement conform elevations, foundation locations and elevations, retaining walls and expansion joint conforms, drainage facilities, slope paving, fences, terrain obscured by ground cover, structures, and utilities.

All trees to be removed will be surveyed. The limit of tree removal has increased due to the need to provide additional contractor laydown and work areas. Also, the realignment of Hillcrest Road introduces more tree removal.

13.4 Base Mapping – Base mapping limits will be expanded to accommodate the Value Analysis Project. The additional Topographic Surveys will be integrated into the Project base mapping. New "original ground" surfaces will be produced with Digital Terrain Models that incorporate the additional survey information. Additional existing drainage facilities, utilities, trees, fences, walls, etc will be added to the base mapping.

13.5 Develop Roadway Geometrics - The CONSULTANT will develop roadway, bridge and retaining wall alignments, profiles and cross-sections. Hillcrest Road, Treasure Island Road, EB I-80 off-ramp, and WB I-80 on-ramp will be redesigned. Roadway design will be coordinated with the design of new proposed retaining walls, in an effort to minimize wall height.

Geometry for the proposed EB I-80 off-ramp / Hillcrest Road intersection will be developed in coordination with the bridge structural requirements, retaining walls, bike path, and agency representatives.

13.6 Preliminary Signing and Pavement Delineation – CONSULTANT shall develop preliminary signing and striping plans for final roadway configuration. These preliminary plan sheets are needed to reach consensus on the project alternative with project stakeholders.

This work will include signs on the San Francisco Oakland Bay Bridge for the EB I-80 off-ramp.

It is anticipated that variations signing and striping will be developed and discussed with MTA, SFDPW, TIDA and SFCTA. Bicycle routes and the Bus Ramp will be of particular interest.

13.7 Preliminary Drainage – CONSULTANT shall identify and evaluate existing drainage systems for locations uphill (north) of Hillcrest Road, and other areas affected by the Value Analysis project; this information will be combined with the current "existing drainage facilities" strip maps.

Due to the extent of the Value Analysis project changes, an entirely new preliminary concept for proposed drainage facilities will be required. Preliminary design developed for drainage facilities will include realigned Hillcrest Road; all retaining walls; "new bus only" on-ramp that exits from Hillcrest Road, EB I-80 off-ramp bridge; Structure #4, locations where Structures #2, 3 and 6 will be removed, and Treasure Island Road.

The project site will require many drainage features that convey storm water from the hillside, roadway, and bridge deck. Drainage outlet locations downhill of the project will be evaluated.

13.8 Preliminary Geotechnical – CONSULTANT (EMI) shall perform the following geotechnical design services for VA Alternative Project. This scope of work covers: new Tie-Back Retaining Walls #1, #2 and #3; Standard Retaining Wall #4, and new Bridge.

Preliminary Foundation Report

A Preliminary Foundation Report will be prepared for the Type Selection phase based on existing geotechnical data. It will summarize ground conditions, verify site seismicity, and provide feasible wall and foundation types, pile load capacity curves, pile length estimates, and initial earth pressure diagrams for walls. The seismicity check is included because updates in the seismic procedures and databases have occurred since the original development of project seismic design criteria in 2010. We anticipate this task will require more than usual analysis up front to derive at a feasible design for the purpose of type selection and approval. If comments are received, they will be incorporated into a final PFR.

Deliverable: Draft/Final PFR

Field Investigation and Testing

Review: The following scope of work builds on the existing field investigation and laboratory soil data, and prior soil profiles and design strength parameters. This data will be revisited.

Field Investigation: EMI proposes to perform a site reconnaissance visit to plan a supplemental field investigation. The proposed investigation consists of drilling a total of four (4) soil and rock borings in the upslope areas using track-mounted drill rigs. The purpose of these borings is to determine the depth, composition, and strength of soil and rock materials where no factual geotechnical data exists currently. These materials affect design and construction of proposed Walls No. 1, 2 and 3. The drill locations are mainly controlled by site accessibility and will consider no or minimal environmental impact. The borings will be used for cut slope stability evaluation and foundation design and are required to determine tieback lengths. EMI will prepare a boring location map which WMH can use to secure/extend encroachment permits. The sites are not on public roadway.

Maximum six days of drilling is anticipated. EMI proposes to use the similar procedures and equipment used in the initial field investigations in 2011 and 2012. In-hole pressuremeter testing is proposed in rock to determine the in-situ bulk modulus and stress-strain characteristics. One boring may be converted to a groundwater monitoring well. Schedule and progress depends on weather conditions and permit requirements.

Laboratory Testing: EMI will select representative soil samples from boreholes for laboratory testing. Laboratory tests will be performed to determine and confirm physical and engineering characteristics of soils. Anticipated laboratory soil tests include: in-place moisture and density, grain size distribution, direct shear, undrained triaxial strength tests, pressuremeter tests, and soil corrosion tests.

All tests will be conducted in general accordance with California Test methods or ASTM standards.

Deliverable: Borehole Location Plan

Engineering Analysis and Reports

Geotechnical Engineering Analyses: Using the findings from the field investigation and laboratory testing program, we will:

- Determine final soil strength parameters,
- Finalize idealized design soil profiles,
- Recheck site seismicity criteria,
- Update and perform soil slope stability evaluation for (7) transverse sections,
- Perform foundation analysis to support wall and bridge foundation design,
- Perform pavement design for flexible or rigid pavement structural sections, and

Design methodologies will follow current Caltrans design procedures. Foundations include driven and drilled piles (CIDH/CISS) with rock sockets. Wall design and slope stability will be a key element in the evaluation. A limited finite-element analysis is included to verify the seismic performance of the global slope.

Reports: The following reports will be prepared:

- A draft Addendum Geotechnical Foundation Report will be prepared for the 65% design phase documenting the supplemental field investigation and laboratory testing, and providing a characterization of final ground conditions. It will include Log of Test Borings Sheets, slope stability evaluation, load capacity/pile data tables for bridge foundations, lateral pile design recommendations, lateral earth pressures for walls, pavement structural sections, and recommendations for foundation construction, earthwork, and pavement.
- Any review comments will be incorporated into a final Addendum Geotechnical Foundation Report for final submittal and distribution.

Deliverable: Draft/Final Addendum Foundation Report

13.9 Erosion Control & Slope Stability Analysis – CONSULTANT shall consider slope stability applications. Erosion control locations will include the hillside above Hillcrest Road, all areas that will require tree removal, areas disturbed by temporary access trestles (New Bridge and Retrofit Structure #4), and all areas disturbed by construction activities for bridge demolition (Structures #2, 3 and 4).

CONSULTANT shall evaluate replacement slope pavement and/or stability options for slope locations directly underneath the bridge structures. Erosion control Best Management Practices will be considered to inhibit erosion at the top of bank alongside the bridge structures, as well as areas that may be impacted due to construction activities.

13.10 Constructability – The CONSULTANT will conduct an independent review of the Project to verify that the proposed improvements can be constructed safely and effectively in the time allocated. The review will look at stage construction and traffic handling requirements; construction access; critical path construction activities; availability and price fluctuations of construction materials; staging areas, and disposal areas; and cost-effective construction methods. The CONSULTANT will prepare a Preliminary Construction Schedule for the Project.

13.11 Stage Construction / Traffic Handling – Stage Construction and Traffic Handling concepts will be developed that allow for the construction of the Project. Concepts will be developed through coordination with Caltrans, TIDA, SFDPW, and USCG. One-Way circulation on Hillcrest will be proposed, requiring traffic rerouting at Treasure Island / Macalla Road intersection, two-way traffic on Macalla Road, and also one-way traffic on Southgate. This concept would reduce the coverall construction duration and provide cost savings. Concepts will include construction phasing to minimize costs.

13.12 Maintenance Improvements: Identify and Develop Cost Estimates – CONSULTANT shall coordinate with SFDPW regarding maintenance needs for the existing bridge structures and develop cost estimates.

13.13 Utility Coordination - Utility information shown on plans and any other documents prepared by the CONSULTANT will be coordinated with the CCSF and SFPUC's Utility Coordinators. Additional effort will be provided to evaluate new Value Analysis Project impact areas such as the hillside above Hillcrest Road. The CONSULTANT will perform the following work activities:

- Request and review utility mapping from all affected public utility owners
- Prepare existing utility maps and submit to affected utility owners for their verification

- Positively locate underground utilities at conform locations by potholing and field survey
- Identify potential utility conflicts and develop a utility relocation strategy in coordination with the utility owners and affected stakeholders
- Maintain copies of all utility correspondence

SF Water District
CONSULTANT shall continue to coordinate with the SF Water District and its consultants to identify an alignment for the relocation of their 12" Water Line. The line is currently slated for replacement due to its age. As currently proposed by SF Water and TIDA, the 12" water line will be relocated prior to construction of this Project. WMH will provide SF Water with proposed Project cross-sections, wall information, etc to support SF Water in relocating the water line such that it will not require additional relocation.

13.14 Pavement Materials Memorandum - CONSULTANT shall prepare a pavement materials memorandum that provides a "composite pavement structural section as requested by SFDPW for Hillcrest Road. Recommendations will include new structural section, a full-depth AC section, and an AC overlay section.

13.15 Replacement Planting Conceptual Plan – CONSULTANT (HT Harvey) shall prepare a planting plan that addresses replacement planting for locations of the project that will be disturbed during construction. The replacement plan will be consistent with the Habitat Management plan that was previously prepared for YBI as part of the planning for Treasure Island Development.

Background Review
H. T. Harvey & Associates restoration ecologists will review existing background materials, including the NES MI, the most recent engineering plans, and the Yerba Buena Island Habitat Management Plan to gain an understanding of the Project.

Site Investigation
H. T. Harvey & Associates restoration ecologists will conduct a site investigation with the WMH to assess the current and anticipated conditions in order to prepare the Conceptual Revegetation Plan. We will collect up to four composite soil samples for laboratory analysis. Lab results will guide any soil amendment recommendations to be included in the Conceptual Revegetation Plan.

Conceptual Revegetation Plan
H. T. Harvey & Associates will prepare a Conceptual Revegetation Plan that will focus on revegetating areas disturbed during project construction. The conceptual plan will be prepared in accordance with the Yerba Buena Island Habitat Management Plan and will include, at a minimum, the following sections: site preparation, plant and seed species palettes, planting and seeding methodologies, and a maintenance and monitoring

program. It is assumed that there will be two iterations (draft and final) of the report. It is assumed that a moderate amount of time will be required for coordination with the Project's geotechnical and civil engineers, as well as other team members, during preparation of the plan.

13.16 Advanced Planning Studies – CONSULTANT shall prepare Advance Planning Studies for the new Structures that are included in the Value Analysis Project. This task is comprised of the subtasks described below:

SUBCONSULTANT (BCA and MGE) shall coordinate with Design Team in development of structure alternative concepts that address structure layout, structure materials, site conditions, and aesthetics.

- Evaluate alternative bridge geometry configuration for the new bridge structure
- Provide input regarding construction methodologies for various replacement structure foundation types.
- Consider construction access for all locations and the potential need for temporary access trestle for bridge construction
- Evaluate structure details in the context of visual aesthetics. Provide input on aesthetic treatment options.

Advance Planning Study

SUBCONSULTANT (BCA and MGE) shall prepare Advance Planning Studies (APS) and APS level Bridge and Special Design Retaining Wall plans.

Reports will be prepared for the following:

- Replacement Bridge (BCA) – This structure will serve as a portion of the EB I-80 off-ramp. The structure will be approximately 400-feet long and 27' wide.
- Retaining Wall #1 (MGE) – This wall will be on the uphill-side of Hillcrest Road. It will be approximately 25-30 feet in height.
- Retaining Wall #2 (MGE) – This wall will be on the downhill-side of Hillcrest Road. It will be approximately 25 feet in height.
- Retaining Wall #3 (MGE) - This wall will be on the downhill-side of Hillcrest Road. It will be approximately 25 feet in height.

Bridge and Retaining Wall APS Reports

1. Review available project data and establish design criteria
2. Attend project development meetings
3. Develop Conceptual Plan, Elevation, and Typical Section for each bridge replacement
4. Work with Team to develop workable construction staging schemes
5. Prepare Conceptual cost estimates

6. List critical design and interface issues required for final design
7. Prepare APS-level bridge and retaining wall plans, report, and checklist including the items listed above

13.17 Preliminary Structural Analysis – CONSULTANT shall perform preliminary structural analysis sufficient to define the replacement bridge and retaining wall #1, #2, #3 and #4 structures.

This Task includes the 35% / Type Selection effort to determine the bridge and wall types. Preliminary indications suggest:

- Bridge #3 – Cast-in-place prestressed concrete box girder superstructure. The foundation will likely be on CIDH piles. An area that the designers will concentrate on is minimizing the size of the CIDH piles to improve constructability.
- Retaining Wall #1 – Tie-Back Wall supported on H-Piles
- Retaining Wall #2 – Tie-Back Wall supported on H-Piles
- Retaining Wall #3 – Tie-Back Wall supported on H-Piles. This wall may require that the roadway above utilize lightweight fill
- Retaining Wall #4 – Likely a Caltrans Standard wall that does not require special details except for conforms to adjacent walls.

Effort includes construction staging and sequencing, compatibility of new foundations with existing foundations (from structures that will be replaced but the old foundations will remain buried), aesthetic treatments, conforms with existing retaining walls to remain, utility openings, etc.

13.18 Develop Design Alternative - CONSULTANT shall prepare the design alternative to be included in Design Approval Report for conceptual approval from SFDPW, TIDA and SFCTA. Design Alternative will include detail sufficient to identify non-standard features, evaluate impacts, and develop cost estimates. The following preliminary plan sheets are anticipated to be included:

- Layout Sheets
- Typical Cross-Sections
- Profile and Superelevation
- Contour Grading
- Signing and Pavement Delineation
- Stage Construction and Traffic Handling
- Structural General Plan Sheets

13.19 Exceptions to Design Standards – CONSULTANT shall identify and document non-standard geometric design features “Fact Sheets”, and submit to CCSF for review and

approval. This effort will include almost entirely new/different exceptions compared to the original project concept.

13.20 Right of Way Requirements - The CONSULTANT will coordinate the right of way requirements for the realigned Hillcrest Road and Tie-Back Walls (tie-Back wall anchor rods), and prepare preliminary right-of-way requirements maps using record data that identify those parcels that will be impacted by the improvements. The approximate dimensions and areas of parcels and/or easements to be acquired will be calculated.

13.21 Preliminary Engineers Estimate - The CONSULTANT will prepare a preliminary Engineers Estimate in Caltrans' 6-page format.

13.22 Design Approval Report – CONSULTANT shall update the Design Report that documents the Project design standards utilized and design features incorporated into the project. The purpose of this report is to obtain consensus from the stakeholders as to the Project definition prior to advancing to Final Design. This report will be significantly modified as a result of the VA Alternative project

Hydraulic and Hydrology (Drainage) Report – CONSULTANT (RMC) shall identify and evaluate existing drainage systems, and the need for replacement / new drainage elements. The project site currently includes many drainage features that convey storm water from the hillside, roadway, and bridge decks. Replacement facilities will be required, including at bridge replacement locations and to address erosion concerns. Drainage outlet locations downhill of the project will be evaluated.

A Drainage Report shall be prepared to determine the watershed areas, design flows, pipe sizes and outfall details/locations. The Drainage Study Area will include: Treasure Island Road between Structure #4 and Structure #7A; realigned Hillcrest Road and the area of the hillside above realigned Hillcrest Road; EB I-80 off-ramp including Bridge #3; and the WB I-80 on-ramp including Structure #1; and area underneath Structure #3.

CONSULTANT shall develop a Hydraulics/Hydrology model based on the 2012 version of the Caltrans Highway Design Manual and the U.S. Department of Transportation Hydraulic Engineering Circular No.22, Third Edition of the Urban Drainage Design Manual (Chapter 3 Urban Hydrology Procedures, and Chapter 4 Pavement Drainage).

It is anticipated that the rational method will be used for this exercise, as the Rational Method is one standard method used for estimating peak drainage discharges from small watersheds 330- acres or less in size per the recommendations of the State of California

Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The basic assumptions for the Rational Method are:

- The maximum runoff rate at any design point is a function of the average rate of rainfall during the time of concentration.
- The maximum rate of rainfall occurs during the time of concentration, whereby the variability of the storm pattern is neglected.

The methodology described in the Caltrans Highway Design Manual, Section 810 will be used to evaluate design flows. The following information will be confirmed or developed as part of the analysis:

- Rational Method Runoff Coefficient
- Rainfall Intensity, duration and frequency curves
- Time of concentration
- Drainage Areas
- Design Flows for multiple storm events (2-year , 25-year, 50-year and 100-year)
- Stormwater conveyance pipeline sizes

CONSULTANT shall develop the Hydraulics/Hydrology Drainage Report based on findings from the hydraulic model and in compliance with San Francisco Stormwater Management Plan and the State Water Resources Control Board's Phase II General Permit, and other BCDC requirements. In addition to the model findings, this task will also include a discussion on possible outfall alternatives and locations.

Deliverable:
- Hydraulics/hydrology models
- Development of draft and final Drainage Report. Technical memorandum will also include section on outfalls alternatives and locations.

13.24 Hazardous Materials – CONSULTANT (GEOCON) shall perform "Phase 2" hazardous materials field investigations for soils and bridge structures.

ADL and TPH Soil Sampling

Field Activities:
Collect up to 36 surface and near-surface soil samples from up to 24 locations beneath existing bridge structures at proposed excavation areas.

Laboratory Analyses:
28 soil samples for Total Lead
8 soil samples for CAM 17 metals
18 soil samples for Soluble (WET or TCLP) Lead
18 soil samples for TPHd/mo

GEOCON will prepare a Draft Soil Sampling Report for Agency review. After receipt of comments, GEOCON will prepare the Final Soil Sampling Report.

Asbestos and Lead-Containing Paint Survey

Field Activities:

Provide traffic control (rolling lane closure) for one day
Collect up to 70 bulk asbestos samples
Collect up to 16 bulk paint samples

Laboratory Analyses:

70 asbestos samples for Polarized Light Microscopy (PLM)
8 asbestos samples by PLM 400-point count
16 paint samples for Total Lead
14 paint samples for Soluble (WET or TCLP) Lead

Results will be included in a separate Asbestos and Lead-Containing Paint Survey Reports.

13.25 Storm Water Data Report - The CONSULTANT will prepare a Storm Water Data Report (SWDR) that is in compliance with Regional Water Quality Control Board MS4 requirements and City and County of San Francisco requirements.

The project site is located on an island hillside adjacent to the San Francisco Bay. Existing storm drain facilities that collect storm water from the bridges and roadways and discharge it to the Bay do not meet current storm water management standards. Several broken corrugated metal pipes currently lie on the hillside that leads to the bay for discharge. Several existing drainage facilities will be removed during construction of Project.

Replacement storm drain facilities will be included that meet RWQCB standards. This Scope of Work does not include replacement of drainage facilities that are not impacted by the Project. Hyrdomodification analysis is not included.

The Report will focus on the storm water quality issues to construct the project, implement appropriate temporary and permanent Best Management Practices (BMPs), and coordinate them with the overall phased construction. Documentation to support compliance with the new National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit (CGP) that became effective July 1, 2010 will also be prepared.

Water Pollution Control Plan Sheets and Erosion Control Plan Sheets will be prepared to support preparation of the SWDR.

13.26 Transportation Management Plan (TMP) and Lane Closure Charts - The CONSULTANT will prepare a TMP that addresses potential traffic delays on Treasure Island Road, Hillcrest Road, and the closure of the westbound I-80 on-ramp and the eastbound I-80 off-ramp.

This TMP will document the consensus concept of the traffic management and stage construction concepts that were developed during the previous preliminary engineering phase. Factors involved in this assessment will include traveler and worker safety, public outreach, expected delays, availability of detours and alternate routes, coordination with adjacent construction projects, U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) requirements, and duration of construction activities.

TMP Document will also include:

- Stage Construction Plans
- Traffic Handling Plans
- Construction Area Sign Plans
- Lane Closure Charts
- Detours and Temporary Signal locations

Task 13 - Deliverables

- Additional Design Surveys
- Updated Base mapping and DTM
- Preliminary Foundation Report
- Draft and Final Foundation Report
- Maintenance List
- Utility Relocation Concept
- Replacement Planting Conceptual Plan
- Structures Advanced Planning Studies
- Exception to Design Standards
- Preliminary Right of way requirements mapping
- Draft Design Approval Report and
- Preliminary Construction Cost Estimate
- Hydraulic and Hydrology (Drainage) Report
- Hazardous Materials Reports
- Storm Water Data Report
- Transportation Management Plan

14.0 ENVIRONMENTAL APPROVAL

This scope of work is to prepare NEPA/CEQA clearance documentation for the proposed Value Analysis Project. New NEPA/CEQA clearance documentation will be prepared for the Value

Analysis Project in lieu of the environmental approval obtained for the original bridge projects #2, 3 and 6. The primary issues to be addressed and DJP&A's assumptions are described below.

PRELIMINARY ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES FORM AND FIELD REVIEW

DJP&A will prepare the Caltrans Preliminary Environmental Studies (PES) Form (and supporting information) for submittal to Caltrans. SFCTA can then schedule the Field Review that WMH and DJP&A will attend with the Project Team. The PES Form will be used by Caltrans to determine the environmental studies required for the project. Because the Field Review has not yet been conducted, the following Scope of Work describes the studies that DJP&A believes could ultimately be required by Caltrans, based on our recent experience.

NEPA STUDIES

Based on the Field Review, preliminary engineering, and previously completed studies, DJP&A will prepare environmental technical reports per Caltrans' Supplemental Environmental Review (SER) formats. WMH and DJP&A will submit the reports to Caltrans for review and approval. Below is a discussion of reports/memos we expect Caltrans to require:

Cultural Resources

This scope includes preparation of a Section 106 Cultural Resource Study Addendum for the Yerba Buena Island Bridge Structures Project by *Far Western*, as a subconsultant to DJP&A. The purpose of the Addendum is to address Re-validation locations that were not within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) of the original Section 106 Historic Property Survey Report (HPSR). The work included in the Addendum is as follows:

- Revisions to the APE Map – WMH will define the revised limits of impacts for the Value Analysis project, including additional contractor access, realigned Hillcrest Road, and the retaining wall tie-back anchors that will intrude onto the hillside.
- An Addendum Archaeological Survey Report (ASR) short form will be prepared, based on Caltrans guidelines and consultation with Professionally Qualified Staff (PQS), building on the original ASR. The report will include a summary of any additional records search results and field surveys. This scope includes one round of Caltrans review.
- An Addendum HPSR will be prepared that incorporates the revised APE map and the ASR. This scope includes one round of Caltrans review of the HPSR.

This effort will utilize an aerial of the YBI Bridge Structures Value Analysis Project locations at a scale of at least one inch equals 200 feet for use in creating an archaeological APE map. This scope also assumes all access is granted to *Far Western* prior to commencing any archaeological survey.

Biological Resources

This scope includes preparation of an updated Natural Environment Study Minimal Impacts (NES MI) by *H. T. Harvey & Associates*, as a subconsultant to DJP&A. The updated NES will include a description of the project, the biological resources present within the project area, potential impacts on those resources, and mitigation measures for such impacts, as appropriate. Based on the 2012 NES MI, it is assumed that impacts on biological resources will not be substantial.

The revised project design layouts will be reviewed, as well as other sources of information, such as the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), to verify that no new and substantial changes pertaining to biological resources (such as documented occurrences of special-status species or changes in a species' listing status) potentially occurring on the Project site have occurred since November 2012. Due to *H.T. Harvey's* familiarity with the site, the preparation of the updated NES MI will rely primarily on that familiarity and the information contained in the 2012 NES MI and reference documents. A site visit will be conducted to discuss the project design revisions with the project team. The data collected will be used as the basis for preparing an updated NES MI per California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) guidelines.

Traffic

This scope does not include any traffic forecasts, traffic analysis or weaving analysis. DJP&A will revise the Traffic Technical Memorandum to describe the project changes and locations, what effect the changes will have on traffic at those locations, and how the project changes will not result in new or greater traffic impacts.

Hazardous Materials

The proposed Project elements will not result in any new or increased hazardous materials impacts, compared to those addressed in the Hazardous Materials Technical Memorandum. DJP&A will prepare a revised memo describing the project changes and locations, what effect the changes have on hazardous materials contamination at those locations, and how the project changes will not result in new or greater hazardous materials impacts. This scope includes one round of Caltrans review of the hazardous materials memo.

Water Quality

This scope assumes that a location hydraulic study is not needed for the proposed Project changes. The proposed Project elements will not result in new or increased water quality impacts, compared to those addressed in the Water Quality Study. DJP&A will revise the study to describe the project changes and locations, what effect the changes will have on water quality at those locations, and how the project changes will not result in new or greater water quality impacts.

Visual

DJP&A will prepare a revised Visual Resources Technical Memorandum memo describing the proposed Project locations and the visual changes resulting from the proposed changes. The revised memorandum will also include photo simulations, as necessary, and describe how views from the San Francisco shoreline would change with the proposed changes. This scope includes one round of Caltrans review of the visual memo. If required, a full Visual Impact Assessment can be prepared.

Equipment Staging

DJP&A will revise the Equipment Staging Technical Memorandum to describe the proposed Project, including any additional staging areas, and how the project changes will not result in new or greater impacts to these areas than previously described.

Air Quality $PM_{10}/PM_{2.5}$

This scope assumes no air quality analysis is needed for the Re-validation. The Yerba Buena Island Bridge Structures projects underwent interagency consultation on July 26, 2012 and SFCTA received confirmation that the Yerba Buena Island Bridge Structures projects has undergone and completed the interagency consultation requirement for $PM_{2.5}$ project level conformity. The SFCTA will provide MTC with the project information regarding the proposed changes to verify if anything else is required for the interagency consultation requirement process, based on these changes. DJP&A will coordinate with MTC and will prepare a memorandum documenting this process and any additional requirements needed based on MTC's response.

Coordinate Updated NEPA Categorical Exclusion with Caltrans

Upon approval of all revised technical studies by Caltrans, DJP&A will coordinate the completion and sign-off of the updated NEPA CE with Caltrans staff.

CEQA NOTICE OF EXEMPTION (NOE)

CEQA NOE Form

DJP&A will prepare updated CEQA NOE forms based on the revised project description and provide them to the SFCTA and WMH for review and comment. DJP&A will coordinate any revisions with the SFCTA and will provide a final version of the updated CEQA NOE for signature. DJP&A will also file the updated Cat Ex forms with the State Clearinghouse and County Clerk, if requested by the SFCTA.

BIOTIC SURVEYS

Survey for Roosting Bats

The presence of roosting bats on the viaducts could potentially constrain project construction. In order to facilitate the implementation of measures to avoid impacts on roosting bats without

constraining project work windows (i.e., to allow for the eviction of bats during the non-breeding season), a qualified bat biologist from *H.T. Harvey & Associates*, as a subconsultant to DJP&A, will conduct a survey for roosting bats prior to the onset of the breeding season (i.e., 1 April) in the year in which removal of trees and/or ground-breaking disturbance is scheduled to occur. All bridges within the project boundary and any trees within or immediately adjacent to (i.e., within 100 feet of) work areas will be assessed to determine whether they provide high-potential roost sites.

If *H.T. Harvey* detects evidence of roosting bats or determines that potential roost sites have a high probability of supporting roosting bats during the construction period, they will conduct an additional survey to determine whether an active bat roost is present. This survey will be conducted at dusk when bats can be seen emerging from their roosts, and will utilize visual observations and acoustic equipment to determine: 1) whether the roost is active; 2) the type of roost present (i.e., a day roost or night roost); 3) the approximate numbers of bats using the roost; and 4) the species of bats present. These observations will be used to inform the recommendations for avoiding potential constraints on project activities due to the presence of roosting bats. Adequately conducting this nighttime survey will require one additional biologist to assist with visual monitoring of bat activity (i.e., if bats are roosting at multiple locations on the bridge structures, two biologists would be needed to visually observe bat emergence along the length of the bridge during the survey).

Following the completion of the survey, a letter report will be prepared summarizing the results and any recommendations (e.g., bat eviction, exclusion devices, etc.) for avoiding constraints on the project's construction schedule due to the presence of roosting bats.

Nesting Bird Habitat Assessment

In order to provide the Project team with as much advance notice as possible regarding potential constraints on work activities associated with nesting birds (i.e., construction-free buffer zones up to 100 feet around active nests of non-raptors and 300 feet around active nests of raptors), and to facilitate planning for measures to minimize such constraints, *H. T. Harvey & Associates*, as a subconsultant to DJP&A, will conduct a survey to assess available nesting habitat for birds within the work area and surrounding buffers. During this survey, a qualified biologist will inspect all project areas that may be impacted by construction to assess suitability for nesting birds and feasibility of implementing measures to deter nesting in order to minimize project constraints. Following the survey, written recommendations regarding vegetation management activities and/or exclusion devices that may be implemented (in addition to regular monitoring efforts and deterrence by removal of inactive nests and nest-starts) to reduce the probability of establishment of active bird nests that might constrain construction activities, will be provided.

Tree Survey

A tree survey will be conducted by *H. T. Harvey & Associates*, as a subconsultant to DJP&A. An International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) Certified Arborist from *H.T. Harvey* will inventory and evaluate significant trees (as defined by the Public Works Code of the City and

County of San Francisco) that could be affected by the Yerba Buena Island West-Side Bridges project. Each tree found to meet the City's criteria for significant trees will be tagged with a unique identifying number. The following information will be reported for each significant tree:

- Tree identification number
- Scientific name/Common name
- Trunk diameter at breast height (4.5 feet above grade): actual dimension in inches
- Tree height: 0 (less than 20 feet) or 1 (greater than/equal to 20 feet)
- Canopy diameter: 0 (less than 15 feet) or 1 (greater than/equal to 15 feet)
- Tree condition
  - 0 (dead)
  - 1 (Poor): The tree appears unhealthy and may have significant structural defects, mechanical damage, crown dieback, and/or poor vigor
  - 2 (Fair): The tree has minor structural problems, non-fatal/disfiguring diseases, or minor crown dieback/thinning crown, but reasonable vitality and no obvious signs of decay.
  - 3 (Good): The tree is in relatively good health and structural condition.

The data obtained will be used to quantify the required mitigation for impacts on significant trees in the NES MI update. In addition, a letter report will be prepared summarizing the survey results suitable for submittal to the City and County of San Francisco Department of Public Works, per the requirements of the City and County of San Francisco Tree Ordinance.

Scope Assumptions

- The project changes will be eligible for a CE under NEPA.
- The YBI West-Side Bridges Project does not affect any Section 4(f) properties.
- A Biological Assessment and Wetland Technical Report will not be required for this updated NES MI.
- Because the level of effort required to evict bats and subsequently exclude them from the site will depend on the number and location of roosts (e.g., tree cavity, bridge), the eviction and exclusion of bats is not included within this scope of work.
- The completed Tree Survey Report will be based on requirements outlined in the City and County of San Francisco's Public Works Code and according to the standards of the International Society of Arboricultural.
- No more than 100 trees will be evaluated to determine their status as significant trees.
- On-site biologists are not included for pre-construction deterrence and/or deterrence during construction

Task 14 - Deliverables

- Environmental Technical Reports
- NEPA Approval Documentation
- CEQA Approval Documentation

Task 14 – Milestone Schedule

- Environmental Approval is scheduled for March 2016

15.0 TASK 15 FINAL DESIGN – RETROFIT PROJECTS: BRIDGES # 1, 4, 7A, 7B & 8

This Task includes the completion of Bridge Retrofit Projects #1, 4, 7A, 7B and 8. These bridge projects have already obtained environmental clearance. Structural engineering for these projects is near 65% complete. The roadway portion of the design is approximately 35% complete.

Structure Plans – Bridges– Structure Plans will be prepared for the seismic retrofit of the following bridges. These Structure Plans will include five (5) independent bridge designs. The structures will be designed according to Caltrans Standards.

- Structures to be Seismically Retrofitted:
  These Retrofit Structures were included in the original "environmentally approved" project. The retrofit strategy for each of the structures below was identified and approved in a formal Seismic Analysis and Retrofit Strategy process, and documented in Caltrans Approved Seismic Strategy Reports.
  - Structure #1 – This structure serves as the WB I-80 on-ramp to the Bay Bridge. The structure connects to the Bay Bridge. The retrofit strategy includes seat extensions for the bridge deck girders and also includes fiber reinforced column wrap to improve shear capacity for concrete columns.
  - Structure #4 – This structure supports both lanes of Treasure Island Road at the north end of the project. The retrofit strategy is to replace the steel frame substructure with a reinforced concrete substructure. The project will include drilling several 30-inch CIDH piles through the existing bridge deck; constructing concrete bent caps; reinforcing the steel superstructure girders; and repairing the bridge deck. Access to this Structure is very challenging and will require an access road and trestle
  - Structure #7A – This bridge is low to the ground, supporting the southbound lane of Treasure Island Road. Concrete blocks will be constructed underneath the bridge beams to "catch" the bridge should it slide of its piers.
  - Structure #7B – Similar to Bridge 7A, this bridge is low to the ground, supporting the southbound lane of Treasure Island Road. Concrete blocks will be constructed underneath the bridge beams to "catch" the bridge should it slide of its piers.
  - Structure #8 – Similar to Bridge 7A and 7B, this bridge is low to the ground, supporting the southbound lane of Treasure Island Road. Concrete blocks will be constructed underneath the bridge beams to "catch" the bridge should it slide of its piers.

The following deliverables will be prepared and submitted for this task:

- 65% Structure PS&E Independent Check. Independent Check will be performed for each bridge retrofit design.

- 65% "Checked" Structure PS&E (Plans, Specifications and Estimate)
  - 65% Structure Plans

Structure Plans – Bridge #1 (retrofit)
Structure Plans – Bridge #4 (retrofit)
Structure Plans – Bridge #7A (retrofit)
Structure Plans – Bridge #7B (retrofit)
Structure Plans – Bridge #8 (retrofit)

  - A separate construction cost estimate will be prepared for each bridge
  - Special Provisions will be combined into one package.

- 65% Roadway Plans
  - Roadway Sheets will be prepared that are relevant to the Retrofit Structure Plans. In some cases, the plan sheets will be further updated as part of the PS&E phase of the Value Analysis Project (Tasks 16 thru 19). The following sheets are anticipated as part of this task:

Title Sheet & Location Map
Typical Cross-Sections
Key Map & Line Index
Layout Plans
Construction Details
Temporary Water Pollution Control Plans
Erosion Control Plans, Details and Quantities
Drainage Plans, Profiles, Details & Quantities
Utility Plans
Construction Area Sign Plans and Quantities
Stage Construction Plans
Traffic Handling Plans and Quantities
Summary of Quantities

- 95% Structure PS&E

- A separate construction cost estimate will be prepared for each bridge
- Special Provisions will be combined into one package.
- Roadway Sheets will be updated that are relevant to the Structure Plans

- 100% Structure PS&E
  - A separate construction cost estimate will be prepared for each bridge
  - Special Provisions will be combined into one package.
  - Roadway Sheets will be updated that are relevant to the Structure Plans

Task 15 - Deliverables

- Structure Design: Independent Check; 95% PS&E; and 100% PS&E for Retrofit Projects #1, 4, 7A, 7B, and 8
- Roadway Design for 65% PS&E; 95% PS&E; and 100% PS&E for Retrofit Projects #1, 4, 7A, 7B, and 8

Task 15 – Milestone Schedule

- Retrofit Design is scheduled for completion in March 2016

16.0 TASK 16 FINAL DESIGN (65% PS&E)

Task consists of preparation of 65% Plans, Specifications, and Estimates for the YBI West-Side Bridges Retrofit Project. This task involves the effort associated with preparing: technical reports; 65% structural plans; independent check of structural plans, draft 65% roadway plan sheets; unedited technical provisions; and an individual engineer's estimate for each of the projects. As noted above, the project is comprised of six individual projects that are to be tracked separately for Highway Bridge Program (HBP) funding requirements. However, in order to facilitate construction staging and traffic handling of the six YBI Bridge Structure projects, in conjunction with the adjacent Caltrans San Francisco Bay Bridge construction projects, SFCTA's WB I-80 YBI Ramps project, and Treasure Island Redevelopment projects, this Project will be prepared as one combined bid package for construction. The project plans, specifications, and estimates will be developed such that the costs of each individual projects can be tracked and processed independently.

16.1 Erosion Control & Slope Stability Plan – CONSULTANT (WMH, Haygood and EMI) shall evaluate the downhill-side slope adjacent to and underneath the project bridge structures and develop slope stability measures.

Construction of the retrofit structures, retaining walls, and roadway, as well as demolition of existing structures, will impact the slope, resulting in the need for restorative contour grading and slope stability applications. Concrete slope paving currently exists underneath Structures 2, 3, 4 and 6. CONSULTANT shall evaluate

replacement slope pavement and/or stability options for slope locations directly underneath the bridge structures. Erosion control Best Management Practices will be considered to inhibit erosion at the top of bank alongside the bridge structures, as well as areas that may be impacted due to construction activities.

Haygood will provide planting and irrigation recommendations; EMI will develop slope stability details; WMH will prepare slope paving details, etc

16.2 Utility Coordination - CONSULTANT (WMH and AR/WS) shall coordinate with the CCSF, SFPUC and U.S. Navy Utility Coordinators. The CONSULTANT will perform the following work activities:

- Continue coordination to ascertain utilities of concern
- Continue coordination with SF Water regarding placement of the 12" Water line relocation
- Positively locate underground utilities at conform locations by potholing and field survey.
- Identify potential utility conflicts and develop a utility relocation strategy in coordination with the utility owners and affected stakeholders
- Maintain copies of all utility correspondence
- Prepare correspondence to utility companies as required to facilitate preparation of utility relocation design, draft utility agreements, and draft utility certification documents
- Prepare draft utility Notice to Owners, utility agreements and utility certification documents. Caltrans utility coordinator and SFCTA will review all draft documents. Upon approval from Caltrans and SFCTA legal, SFCTA will execute all required NTO's and utility agreements
- Provide schedule management and recommendations where requested with regard to the right of way utility coordination and right of way certification process.
- Coordination, meetings, contacts and correspondence with project stakeholders
- Meeting with utility owners and team members as needed
- Communication and approvals (as necessary) with Caltrans Utility Relocation Department

SFCTA will finalize and implement the final Utility Agreements.

16.3 65% Roadway and Structural Plan Sheets – CONSULTANT shall prepare 65% level plan sheets that included the following:

Task	Plan	Sheet Count	Plan Sheet Scale
2.8.01	Title Sheet and Location Map	1	1”=500
2.8.02	Typical Cross Sections	6	Varies
2.8.03	Key Map and Line Index	1	1”=300’
2.8.04	Construction Staking Survey Control Sheet	1	1”=100’
2.8.05	Layout (Removal) Plans	4	1”=30’
2.8.06	Layout Plans	4	1”=30’
2.8.07	Profile and Superelevation Diagram Plans	8	1”=50’H, 1”=10’V
2.8.08	Construction Details	24	1”=20’, Varies
2.8.09	Aerially Deposited Lead Removal Plans	3	1”=30’
2.8.10	Temporary Water Pollution Control Plan, Details and Quantities	16	1”=30’
2.8.11	Erosion Control Plan, Details and Quantities	12	1”=30’
2.8.12	Contour Grading Plans	8	1”=20’
2.8.13	Drainage Plans, Profiles, Details, and Quantities	20	1”=30’
2.8.14	Utility Plan	4	1”=30’
2.8.15	Construction Area Sign Plans and Quantities	4	No Scale
2.8.16	Stage Construction Plans	7	1”=50’
2.8.17	Traffic Handling Plans and Quantities	23	1”=30’
2.8.18	Detour Plans	3	1”=200’
2.8.19	Pavement Delineation Plans, Details, and Quantities	7	1”=30’
2.8.20	Sign Plans, Details, and Quantities	10	1”=30’
2.8.21	Summary of Quantities	2	N/A
2.8.22	Retaining Wall Plans - Retaining Wall #4	6	
2.8.23	Highway Planting and Irrigation Plans	8	1”=30’
2.8.24	Electrical – Permanent Lighting Plans and Details	8	1”=30’
2.8.25	Electrical – Permanent Signal Plans	3	1”=30
2.8.26	Electrical – Temporary Lighting Plans	9	1”=30’
2.8.27	Electrical – Temporary Signal Plans	8	1”=30’
2.8.28	Electrical – Temporary Electrical Details	1	1”=20’
	Structure Plans - Retaining Wall #1	10	
	Structure Plans – Retaining Wall #2	8	
	Structure Plans – Retaining Wall #3	8	
	Structure Plans – Bridge #1 (retrofit prepared as part of Task 15)	6	
	Structure Plans – Bridge #2 (demolish)	4	
	Structure Plans – New Bridge	24	
	Structure Plans – Bridge #3 (demolish)	4	
	Structure Plans – Bridge #4 (retrofit prepared as part of Task 15)	28	
	Structure Plans – Bridge #6 (demolish)	3	
	Structure Plans – Bridge #7A (retrofit prepared as part of Task 15)	3	
	Structure Plans – Bridge #7B (retrofit prepared as part of Task 15)	4	
	Structure Plans – Bridge #8 (retrofit prepared as part of Task 15)	4	

	TOTAL SHEETS:	**317**	

Roadway and Structure Plans Description:

Title Sheet - The Title Sheet will be prepared per City and County of San Francisco standards

Typical Cross Sections - Typical Cross Sections will be prepared to clarify the proximity of slopes, retaining walls, roadways, bridges, etc. Pavement structural sections, slope grades, etc will be included.

Key Map and Line Index - The Key Map and Line Index Sheet will be prepared.

Construction Staking Survey Control Sheet - The Project Control Sheet will be prepared per the per City and County of San Francisco standards.

Layout Removal Plans - Separate Layout Removal Plans will be prepared to clearly identify limits of removals. Removals include trees, bridge structures, retaining walls, slope paving, etc.

Layout Plans - Layout Plans will be 1"=30 scale and depict information per the Caltrans Plan Preparation Manual.

Profile and Superelevation Plans - The Profile Plans and the Superelevation Diagrams will be prepared for project alignments.

Construction Details - The Construction Detail Plans will be prepared for the following areas:

- Pavement Elevations for most of the entire project limits
- Slope Paving Details under Structure 3 and 4.
- Concrete Barrier and MBGR transition details
- Curb & Gutter and fence details
- Miscellaneous roadway detail sheets

Aerially Deposited Lead Removal Plans - Plans will be prepared to identify the location and limits of anticipated aerially deposited lead that may be disturbed by construction. The special provisions will identify where and how said material can be placed or disposed of. These plan sheets will be set up during the 65% plan preparation. During the 95% plan preparation, the plans will incorporate all of the information provided by the Hazardous Materials Report prepared in Task 12.2 of the 65% PS&E phase.

Temporary Water Pollution Control Plans - The Temporary Water Pollution Control Plans will be prepared for site specific conditions. Standard Detail WPC plan sheets will be provided in this set. For site specific treatment, plan sheets will be set up during the 65% plan preparation. During the 95% plan preparation, the plans will incorporate all of the WPC

information required by the Storm Water Data Report prepared in Task 10.10 of the 65% PS&E phase.

Erosion Control Plans, Details and Quantities - The Erosion Control Plans will be prepared for the permanent condition. The Erosion Control Plans will be prepared in addition to, and in coordination with, the replacement planting plans. Standard Detail EC plan sheets will be provided in this set. For site specific erosion control, plan sheets will be set up during the 65% plan preparation. During the 95% plan preparation, the plans will incorporate all of the EC information required by the Storm Water Data Report prepared in Task 12.3 of the 65% PS&E phase.

Contour Grading Plans - Contour Grading Plans will be prepared to identify the final earthen graded conditions within the project limits. Said plans will identify the horizontal location of proposed retaining walls, bridge abutments and foundations, grade to drain areas, and slope paving. The 65% Plan set will be set up for the locations that will require contour grading. The 95% Contour Grading Plans will include the information that is provided in the Erosion Control and Slope Stability Analysis, developed in Task 12.5 of the 65% phase.

Drainage Plans Profiles, Details and Quantities - The Drainage Plans will include the replacement of drainage facilities related to new retaining walls, Hillcrest Road realignment, replacement bridge, extension of local drainage cross culverts, and the construction of new inlets. The drainage improvements will be designed in coordination with the Hydraulics and Hydrology (Drainage) Report that is prepared in Task 12.1. The improvements will likely include the relocation and/or modification of existing inlets and appurtenant facilities resulting from the proposed improvements. Where feasible, the scope of the drainage plans is based on utilization of existing downstream drainage systems for tying in new or relocated drainage systems or extending existing systems. Temporary drainage systems required due to stage construction are included in the Stage Construction Plans.

Utility Plans - Utility Relocation Plans will be prepared per the CCSF standards. Utility sizes and approximate locations will be in accordance with the plans and/or plotted information provided by the utility owners. The utility plans will identify coordination of utilities in relationship to the proposed improvements. If directed by SFCTA, CONSULTANT shall incorporate SF Water 12" water line relocation into the plan set. Per discussion with SF Water staff, SF Water will design the water line such that it could be inserted into the plan set

With the exception of the SF Water 12" water line relocation, specific utility relocations will be referenced on the utility plans as "by others" or as shown elsewhere in the contract plans. Any utilities that are identified that are abandoned, conduit only, require "protect in place", or require relocation shall be listed and identified on the plans. This information will be available following the utility verification process for new project areas that will be performed during Preliminary Engineering Task 10.

The utility plans will also identify the high-risk utilities in conformance with the Caltrans "Policy on High and Low Risk Underground Facilities within Highway Right of Way".

Construction Area Sign Plans and Quantities - Construction Area Sign plans will be prepared that are comprised of two (2) sheets:

- Construction Area Sign plan will that covers the proposed Project area;
- Motorist Information Plan sheet that will identify temporary signage outside the physical construction area project limits. Said Motorist Information Plan will be advisory and informational to help manage traffic flow on the San Francisco Bay Bridge during construction of this Project. Signs and/or changeable message signs will be identified on the Motorist Information Plan. The location and placement of said signs will be at the direction of the Resident Engineer.

Stage Construction Plans - The Stage Construction plans will be prepared and will identify the major and minor stages of construction. Said plans will graphically identify construction areas and/or major improvements that are to be constructed within each phase of construction. This task assumes there will be four major stages of construction and two intermediate phases of construction. Stage Construction Plans will include temporary drainage requirements.

Traffic Handling Plans - Traffic Handling plans will be prepared. Said plans will identify the placement of temporary railing, location of interim travel lanes and the signage needed to convey vehicles through the construction area. One to two typical cross-sections will be shown for each stage. This task assumes there will be four major stages of construction and two intermediate phases of construction. For each change in the staging, a new temporary alignment of railing, travel lanes and signage will be needed. Temporary herein is equated to staging that is in place a minimum of a few weeks. It is assumed that one-way traffic circulation through the project site will be possible.

Detour Plans - The Detour plans will be prepared to accommodate the necessary temporary detours to construct the proposed improvements. The following detours are anticipated herein:

- One-way Hillcrest traffic circulation (clock-wise) will require that all Southgate traffic is one-way that leads to the EB I-80 on-ramp.
- During EB I-80 Off-Ramp closure, all traffic will be routed to the alternate EB I-80 off-ramp on the east side of the tunnel.
- One-way traffic circulation on Hillcrest Road and Treasure Island Road through the project site will require that all southbound traffic originating from Treasure Island must use Macalla Road Road.

Pavement Delineation Plans - Prepare Pavement Delineation plans identifying existing striping, and modifications in relationship to the proposed improvements.

Sign Plans - Prepare Sign plans identifying existing signs, installation of new regulatory, warning, and guide signs, and modifications required in relation to the roadway improvements.

Retaining Wall Plans – Retaining Wall #4 plans are included in this scope. It is assumed this wall will be a Caltrans Standard Type wall and will be designed utilizing standard details.

Planting/Irrigation Plans - Consultant shall prepare site plans, specifications and estimates for landscape and irrigation. The planting plan will be based upon the Replacement Planting Conceptual Plan prepared previously in Task 10.15 in preliminary engineering. The replacement planting plan will be consistent with the Habitat Management Plan; if the plan includes trees, they will be included in this task. Tree removal will be shown on the Layout (Removal) Plan sheets. This task does not include mitigation tree planting.

Electrical–Permanent Lighting Plans - Consultant will prepare Permanent Roadway Lighting plans and details to replace and/or relocate the existing lighting system. The lighting plans will include proposed type of poles and pole locations, pull boxes, conduit, service locations, and circuit wiring diagrams.

Electrical–Permanent Signal Plans - Consultant will prepare Permanent Signal plans and details for the proposed intersection of EB I-80 off-ramp and Hillcrest Road. The signal plans will include controllers, pole locations, pull boxes, conduit, service locations, and circuit wiring diagrams.

Electrical – Temporary Lighting Plans – Consultant will prepare temporary lighting plans as needed to accommodate the stage construction on the Project.

Electrical – Temporary Signal Plans – Consultant will prepare temporary signal plans for one (1) location to accommodate the stage construction on the Project.

Structure Plans – Bridges and Retaining Walls – Structure Plans will be prepared to 65% Checked level of completion. These Structure Plans will include six (6) bridge designs and three (3) retaining walls. The structures will be designed according to Caltrans Standards.

- Structures to be Seismically Retrofitted:
  These Retrofit Structures were included in the original "environmentally approved" project. The retrofit strategy for each of the structures below was identified and approved in a formal Seismic Analysis and Retrofit Strategy process, and documented in Caltrans Approved Seismic Strategy Reports.
  - Structure #1 – This structure serves as the WB I-80 on-ramp to the Bay Bridge. The structure connects to the Bay Bridge. The retrofit strategy includes seat extensions for the bridge deck girders and also includes fiber reinforced column wrap to improve shear capacity for concrete columns.
  - Structure #4 – This structure supports both lanes of Treasure Island Road at the north end of the project. The retrofit strategy is to replace the steel frame substructure with a reinforced concrete substructure. The project will include drilling several 30-inch CIDH piles through the existing bridge deck; constructing concrete bent caps; reinforcing the steel superstructure girders;

and repairing the bridge deck. Access to this Structure is very challenging and will require an access road and trestle

- Structure #7A – This bridge is low to the ground, supporting the southbound lane of Treasure Island Road. Concrete blocks will be constructed underneath the bridge beams to "catch" the bridge should it slide of its piers.
- Structure #7B – Similar to Bridge 7A, this bridge is low to the ground, supporting the southbound lane of Treasure Island Road. Concrete blocks will be constructed underneath the bridge beams to "catch" the bridge should it slide of its piers.
- Structure #8 – Similar to Bridge 7A and 7B, this bridge is low to the ground, supporting the southbound lane of Treasure Island Road. Concrete blocks will be constructed underneath the bridge beams to "catch" the bridge should it slide of its piers.

- New Replacement Structures:
  The following Structures were conceived during the Value Analysis process.
  - Replacement Bridge #3 – This structure will serve as a portion of the EB I-80 off-ramp. The structure will be approximately 400-feet long and 27' wide. Likely to be precast concrete box girder structure with CIDH pile foundation.
  - Retaining Wall #1 – This wall will be on the uphill-side of Hillcrest Road. It will be approximately 25-30 feet in height. Likely to be a "Tie-Back" wall supported by steel "H" piles.
  - Retaining Wall #2 – This wall will be on the downhill-side of Hillcrest Road. It will be approximately 25 feet in height. Likely to be a "Tie-Back" wall supported by steel "H" piles.
  - Retaining Wall #3 - This wall will be on the downhill-side of Hillcrest Road. It will be approximately 25 feet in height. Likely to be a "Tie-Back" wall supported by steel "H" piles.
- Structures to be Demolished:
  - Structure #2 – Tall and long steel structure on a steep slope.
  - Structure #3– Tall and long steel structure on a steep slope.
  - Structure #6 – Reinforced concrete bridge

Deliverables: *Final Roadway Design Plans – Unchecked (65% complete)*
Plan types as noted herein

Note: The above noted plans as an aggregate will be approximately 65% complete and represent the major items/areas of construction. Individual plans or types of plans may be substantially complete, while some plans or types of plans may be less complete. For example, the quantity sheets may only identify a blank table with anticipated bid items shown, and the actual quantities will not be shown.

16.4 Special (Technical) Provisions - CONSULTANT shall prepare draft technical provisions (in MS Word format) for bid items. SSP's shall be prepared generally consistent with Caltrans 2010 format standards.

16.5 Construction Quantities and Engineer's Estimate - CONSULTANT shall prepare an engineer's estimate for each of the eight individual bridge projects. Unit prices will be based upon Caltrans Contract Cost Data information and recent relevant projects. Eight individual bid schedules will be prepared.

16.6 Finalize Exceptions to Design Standards (Fact Sheets) - The CONSULTANT shall obtain final approval from CCSF for non-standard project geometric features.

16.7 Permit Applications – CONSULTANT shall prepare permit applications on behalf of SFCTA as necessary for RWQCB, BCDC and other relevant agencies. CONSULTANT shall coordinate with permitting agencies to ensure complete permit application packages are submitted and that they are consistent with stated agency requirements. David J. Powers & Associates (DJPA) will assist the Team to ensure that proposed project elements are consistent with the environmental approval documents.

The project hillside includes protected plants, trees, and special status species. DJPA will assist in identifying drainage facility locations that minimize impacts.

16.8 Constructability Assessment – CONSULTANT (ABA) will: 1) evaluate constructability of project design with regard to the unique project site; and 2) provide 65% level constructability review. Task includes site visits and assessment of potential construction staging and access requirements. Objective of this task is to assist/inform the design team regarding preparation of PS&E that buildable and compatible with site requirements for environmental impacts and traffic handling.

16.9 Prepare and Submit 65% PS&E Package - CONSULTANT shall prepare 65% PS&E packages. PS&E packages will be provided to SFCTA, CCSF, and Caltrans for review. CONSULTANT anticipates hard copy submittals.

Deliverables:

- 65% PS&E Roadway Plans – 10 Sets 11" x 17" Sheets
- 65% Structure Plans - 10 Sets 11" x 17" Sheets
- Draft Technical Provisions – 10 Sets Hard Copy
- Updated Engineer's Estimates – 10 Sets Hard Copy
- Permit applications – RWQCB and BCDC

17.0 TASK 17 FINAL DESIGN (95% PS&E)

Task 17 consists of preparation of 95% Plans, Specifications, and Estimates for the YBI West-Side Bridges Retrofit Project. This task involves the effort associated with preparing: final technical reports; independent check of structural plans; 95% checked structural plans; 95% roadway plan sheets; edited technical provisions; and an updated individual engineer's estimate for each of the eight projects. As noted above, the Project is comprised of six individual projects that are to be tracked separately for Highway Bridge Program (HBP) funding requirements. However, in order to facilitate construction staging and traffic handling of the six YBI Bridge Structure projects, in conjunction with the adjacent Caltrans San Francisco Bay Bridge construction projects, SFCTA's WB I-80 YBI Ramps project, and planned Treasure Island Redevelopment projects, this Project will be prepared as one combined bid package for construction. The project plans, specifications, and estimates will be developed such that the costs of each individual bridge projects can be tracked and processed independently.

17.1 Respond to Agency Comments from 65% PS&E Submittal

CONSULTANT shall incorporate agreed-upon comments from Caltrans, CCSF (SFDPW, SFPUC, SFWater, and MTA), TIDA, and SFCTA into PS&E. A comment-response matrix will be prepared that tracks all written comments and responses for each agency that submits comments.

17.2 Finalize all Technical Reports

CONSULTANT will incorporate agreed-upon comments from agency reviews and prepare Final engineering documents for the following:

- Hydraulic and Hydrology (Drainage) Report
- Hazardous Materials
- Storm Water Data Report
- Transportation Management Plan (TMP) and Lane Closure Charts
- Erosion Control & Slope Stability Analysis

17.3 Utility Coordination

CONSULTANT shall continue coordination with SFPUC and TIDA for their proposed utility facilities that may impact the YBI West-Side Bridges project. CONSULTANT will coordinate electrical connection points for new roadway lighting and sign illumination.

17.4 Prepare 95% Roadway and Structural Plan Sheets

CONSULTANT shall prepare 95% level plan sheets that incorporate agency review comments from 65% submittal. Roadway plan sheets will be a complete set that includes all plan sheets listed in the 65% Plan Sheet Table.

17.5 Special (Technical) Provisions

CONSULTANT shall incorporate agency review comments and prepare 95% edited technical special provisions (in MS Word format) for bid items. SSP's shall be prepared generally consistent with Caltrans 2010 format standards.

17.6 Construction Quantities and Engineer's Estimate - CONSULTANT shall prepare an engineer's estimate for each of the eight individual bridge projects. Unit prices will be based upon Caltrans Contract Cost Data information and recent relevant projects. Eight individual bid schedules will be prepared.

17.7 Finalize Exceptions to Design Standards (Fact Sheets) - The CONSULTANT shall incorporate agency review comments, update the documents, and obtain final approval from CCSF for non-standard project geometric features.

17.8 Prepare and Submit 95% PS&E Package - CONSULTANT shall prepare 95% PS&E packages. PS&E packages will be provided to SFCTA, CCSF, and Caltrans for review. CONSULTANT anticipates hard copy submittals.

Deliverables:

- 95% PS&E Roadway Plans – 10 Sets 11" x 17" Sheets
- 95% Structure Plans - 10 Sets 11" x 17" Sheets
- 95% complete edited Technical Provisions – 10 Sets Hard Copy
- Updated Engineer's Estimates – 10 Sets Hard Copy
- Final Drainage Report – 5 Sets Hard Copy
- Final Hazardous Materials Reports – 5 Sets Hard Copy
- Final Traffic Management Plan - 5 Sets Hard Copy
- Final Permit applications – RWQCB and BCDC

18.0 TASK 18. FINAL DESIGN (100% PS&E)

Task 18 consists of preparation of 100% Plans, Specifications, and Estimates for the YBI West-Side Bridges Retrofit Project. Agency comments from review of the 95% PS&E submittal will be incorporated. This submittal will be delivered as the Final PS&E submittal. This task involves the effort associated with preparing: 100% structural plans; 100% roadway plan sheets; 100% edited technical provisions; and an updated individual engineer's estimate for each of the eight projects. The project plans, specifications, and estimates will be developed such that the costs of each individual bridge projects can be tracked and processed independently.

Respond to Agency Comments from 95% PS&E Submittal

CONSULTANT shall incorporate agreed-upon comments from Caltrans, CCSF (SFDPW, SFPUC, SFWater, and MTA) and SFCTA into PS&E. A comment-response

matrix will be prepared that tracks all written comments and responses for each agency that submits comments

18.2 Prepare 100% Plan Sheets
CONSULTANT shall prepare 100% final plan sheets. Plans will incorporate agreed-upon comments from agency review of the 95% plan submittal, including constructability and bid-ability review comments from SFCTA's construction management team.

18.3 Prepare 100% Technical Special Provisions
CONSULTANT shall prepare 100% Technical Special provisions. SSPs shall include agreed-upon comments from agency review of the 95% plan submittal including constructability and bid-ability review comments from SFCTA's construction management team. SSPs will include front-end boilerplate agency that will administer the construction contract.

18.4 Prepare 100% Engineer's Estimate
CONSULTANT shall prepare 100% Engineer's Estimate. Estimate will incorporate agreed-upon comments from agency review of the 95% plan submittal.

18.5 Prepare and Submit 100% PS&E Package - CONSULTANT shall prepare 95% PS&E packages. PS&E packages will be provided to SFCTA, CCSF, and Caltrans for review. CONSULTANT anticipates hard copy submittals.

Deliverables:

- 100% PS&E Roadway Plans – 10 Sets 11" x 17" Sheets
- 100% Structure Plans - 10 Sets 11" x 17" Sheets
- 100% complete edited Technical Provisions – 10 Sets Hard Copy

19.0 TASK 19. FINAL DESIGN (FINAL PS&E)

Task 19 consists of preparation of FINAL Plans, Specifications, and Estimates for the YBI West-Side Bridges Retrofit Project. Agency comments from review of the 100% PS&E submittal will be incorporated. This package will be the Contract Bid Set. This task involves the effort associated with preparing: FINAL structural plans; FINAL roadway plan sheets; FINAL edited technical provisions; and FINAL engineer's estimate for each of the six projects. The project plans, specifications, and estimates will be developed such that the costs of each individual bridge project can be tracked and processed independently.

Respond to Agency Comments from 100% PS&E Submittal
CONSULTANT shall incorporate agreed-upon comments from Caltrans, CCSF (SFDPW, SFPUC, SFWater, and MTA) and SFCTA into PS&E. A comment-response

matrix will be prepared that tracks all written comments and responses for each agency that submits comments.

19.2 Prepare Final Plan Sheets
CONSULTANT shall prepare Final plan sheets. Plans will incorporate agreed-upon comments from agency review of the 100% plan submittal including constructability and bid-ability review comments from SFCTA's construction management team.

19.3 Prepare Final Technical Special Provisions
CONSULTANT shall prepare Final Technical Special provisions. SSPs shall include agreed-upon comments from agency review of the 100% plan submittal including constructability and bid-ability review comments from SFCTA's construction management team.

19.4 Prepare Final Engineer's Estimate
CONSULTANT shall prepare Final Engineer's Estimate. Estimate will incorporate agreed-upon comments from agency review of the 100% plan submittal.

19.5 Prepare and Submit Final PS&E Package - CONSULTANT shall prepare Final PS&E packages. PS&E packages will be provided to SFCTA, CCSF, and Caltrans for review. CONSULTANT anticipates hard copy submittals.

Deliverables:

- Final PS&E Roadway Plans – 10 Sets 11" x 17" Sheets
- Final Structure Plans - 10 Sets 11" x 17" Sheets
- Final complete edited Technical Provisions – 10 Sets Hard Copy

Task 19 Milestone Schedule:

- Final PS&E Roadway Plans are scheduled to be delivered in December 2016

20.0 TASK 20. RIGHT OF WAY CERTIFICATION

Task 20 consists of effort necessary to obtain the agency permits, utility agreements, right of way certification, and construction funding to enable the project to be "Ready to List".

Obtain Agency Permits

CONSULTANT shall coordinate, prepare exhibits, adapt the project design, attend meetings and make presentations as necessary to obtain the following agency permits:

- Bay Conservation and Development Commission Permit
  - Engineering Criteria Review Board (ECRB)
  - Design Review Board (DRB)
  - Commission
- United States Coast Guard (USCG) License Agreement

CONSULTANT shall coordinate with the USCG to reach agreement on the terms of the license agreement. Coordination will include stage construction and traffic handling.

- Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Permit
  CONSULTANT shall coordinate with the RWQCB to obtain the permit authorizing construction of the project.

20.2 Right of Way Certification

CONSULTANT shall coordinate the effort necessary to obtain right of way certification. This Task includes project documentation of the Navy right of way transfer and utility agreements.

- Prepare Draft Utility Notice to Owners
- Prepare Draft Utility Agreements
- Prepare Draft Utility Certification
- Provide schedule management and recommendations where requested with regard to the right of way utility coordination and right of way certification process.
- Coordination, meetings, contacts and correspondence with project stakeholders
- Meeting with utility owners as needed
- Individual file maintenance
- Communication and approvals with Caltrans Utility Relocation Department
- Prepare Final Utility Notice to Owners, Utility Agreements, and Utility Certification. (Upon receiving approval from SFCTA and Caltrans, SFCTA will execute all required NTO, and utility agreements)
- Assist in obtaining Utility Certification
- Assist in obtaining TIDA Use Permit (if necessary)
- Prepare draft and final SFCTA-TIDA Access and Use Agreement
- Assist in obtaining R/W Certification (RWC) including preparing draft RWC for Caltrans and team review and approval. Coordinate for SFCTA comments to RWC and work with Team on revisions and editing to RWC subject to Caltrans review and approval. (It is assumed the Navy will transfer all the required R/W to TIDA or the City and County of San Francisco.)

20.3 Construction Funding

CONSULTANT shall coordinate with Caltrans and SFCTA to obtain E-76 Approval and project funding for the project. CONSULTANT shall:

- Prepare and Submit PS&E Checklist to Caltrans DLA
- Prepare and Submit Draft and Final Funding Request for Construction (Request for Allocation for construction phase). Task includes tracking and follow-up of Caltrans coordination and processing of HBP funds

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

1455 Market Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, California 94103
415.522.4800 FAX 415.522.4829
info@sfcta.org www.sfcta.org

Memorandum

Date: 12.03.14 **RE:** Finance Committee
December 9, 2014

To: Finance Committee: Commissioners Cohen (Chair), Wiener (Vice Chair), Farrell, Tang and Avalos (Ex Officio)

From: Lee Saage – Deputy Director for Capital Projects

Through: Tilly Chang – Executive Director

Subject: **ACTION** – Recommend Exercising the Second One-Year Option of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the Office of Economic and Workforce Development and to Increase the MOA Amount by $164,600, to a Total Amount Not to Exceed $500,000, for CityBuild Services to Promote Workforce Development for Phase II of the Presidio Parkway Project and Authorizing the Executive Director to Modify Non-Material Agreement Terms and Conditions

Summary

The Transportation Authority has collaborated with the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) to track local opportunities related to construction projects within San Francisco. On March 27, 2012, through approval of Resolution 12-46, the Transportation Authority authorized a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with OEWD for a one-year period with two additional one-year extension options, in an amount not to exceed $167,700, for CityBuild services to enhance local hire for Phase II of the Presidio Parkway project implementation. The Transportation Authority and OEWD wish to further this relationship and provide a structure where OEWD will provide valuable local outreach and develop a skilled workforce to enhance the opportunities for San Francisco residents to become aware of and qualified for construction jobs relating to the implementation of Phase II of the Presidio Parkway project. Through Resolution 14-61, the first one-year option on this contract was exercised to cover the services provided during October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014. This agreement will be funded by Prop K funds previously appropriated through Resolution 10-66 to the Presidio Parkway project. **We are seeking a recommendation to exercise the second one-year option of the MOA with OEWD, and to increase the MOA amount by $164,600, to a total amount not to exceed $500,000, for CityBuild services to promote workforce development for Phase II of the Presidio Parkway project and authorize the Executive Director to modify agreement payment terms and non-material agreement terms and conditions.**

BACKGROUND

Doyle Drive serves as the South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge and is part of US-101 that provides a crucial regional link between San Francisco and North Bay Area counties. The Transportation Authority has been leading the effort since 1994, in close cooperation with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), to replace the existing Doyle Drive structure. The Transportation Authority has forged a partnership with a host of federal, state and local agencies involved with this complex undertaking. These agencies include the Federal Highway Administration, Presidio Trust, Department of Veterans Affairs, National Park Service, Caltrans, Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District, Transportation Authority of Marin, Sonoma County Transportation Authority, State Historic Preservation Office and others.

Construction of the Presidio Parkway project to replace Doyle Drive is organized into two phases. Phase I was delivered under a traditional design-bid-build process consisting of Contracts 1 through 4

for environmental mitigation, utility relocation, and the construction of portions of the permanent new parkway, one of four short tunnels under the Presidio, and a detour. Phase II includes construction of a new northbound bridge and Battery Tunnel, the Main Post Tunnels, and the Doyle Drive/Girard Road/Marina Boulevard/Richardson Avenue interchange as well as final landscaping. Phase II is to be delivered under a public-private partnership (P3) agreement, and is expected to be open by mid-2016 with a construction cost of approximately $272 million.

The Transportation Authority has collaborated closely with the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) to track local opportunities related to construction projects within the city on several projects from the inception of the agency. OEWD currently provides local workforce program planning, management, and operations including recruitment, assessment, referral, retention support for local resident job seekers, and community interface for the City on several large scale projects under construction through various City entities such as the San Francisco Public Utility Commission, the San Francisco International Airport, and the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency.

In July 2011, the Transportation Authority and OEWD began discussing the opportunities to collaborate on and facilitate the implementation of a workforce development program, as required in the Phase II contract of the Presidio Parkway project with the developer, Golden Link Concessionaire (GLC). GLC entered into a First Source Hiring Agreement (FSHA) with OEWD. Since April 2012, OEWD has been supporting the Phase II of the Presidio Parkway project by recommending qualified resources from its pool of CityBuild program graduates under a cooperative agreement with GLC to hire local labor for the construction activities per the FSHA. These efforts, similar to those provided by OEWD to support construction contracts 1-4 during Phase I, are supported by Prop K funding that the Transportation Authority reimburses to OEWD under the current Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between our two agencies.

The purpose of this memorandum is to seek a recommendation to exercise the second one-year option to the MOA with OEWD and to increase the MOA amount by $164,600, to a total amount not to exceed $500,000, for CityBuild services to continue to enhance local hire for the Phase II of the Presidio Parkway project implementation for the period from October 1, 2014 through September 30, 2015.

DISCUSSION

On March 27, 2012, through approval of Resolution 12-46, the Transportation Authority Board authorized an MOA with OEWD for a one-year period with two additional one-year extension options in an amount not to exceed $167,700, for CityBuild services to enhance local hire for the Phase II of the Presidio Parkway project implementation. The original MOA was awarded for the period of April 1, 2012 through March 31, 2013. However due to delayed construction start up, the original MOA had adequate funds to extend the service duration through September 30, 2013. Then, through Resolution 14-61, the first one-year option on this MOA was exercised for an additional $167,700 to cover the services provided during the October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014. During the past year, beginning in October of 2013, OEWD staff has supported the Presidio Parkway project and have worked very hard to ensure we meet our new hire goal of 50% to be local residents while the contractor has accelerated its construction activities.

For the Presidio Parkway project, OEWD will continue to provide an Employment Liaison Specialist(s), who will work with GLC, to provide outreach to CityBuild's network of community based organizations to identify, assess, and screen potential workers for referral to the Presidio Parkway project; facilitate the referral and hiring process with union locals and GLC; and provide onsite support to GLC and project subcontractors as required.

This approach has utilized the core skills held by each party, improving the efficiency of establishing and maintaining the First Source Hiring program. CityBuild has the primary relationship with various on-going training programs and can ensure that the workforce with required skills becomes available in a timely manner to benefit both the project and the City's employable workforce.

The tables on Attachment 1 show the statistics for the local hire since April 2013. As of September 2014, GLC has requested 313 positions to be filled through the CityBuild program and hired 309 new staff. With the growing need for skilled labor in San Francisco on several other large infrastructure projects such as the Transbay Transit Center, the contractor's request for specific high skill labor faced an availability challenge in the recent months. Therefore, CityBuild is working on developing additional skilled and certified San Francisco trade workers so that future requests for certified and experienced labor may be filled by local residents. Through the cooperative efforts of all stakeholders, a total of 113 San Francisco residents have been hired onto the project to-date.

This second one-year extension to the MOA will further the collaborative relationship between the Transportation Authority and OEWD and provide a structure where OEWD will provide valuable local outreach and help develop a skilled workforce. This effort will enhance the opportunities for city residents to become aware of and qualify for construction jobs relating to the implementation of Phase II of the Presidio Parkway project.

We are seeking a recommendation to exercise the second one-year option to the MOA with OEWD, and to increase the MOA amount by $164,600, to a total amount not to exceed $500,000, for CityBuild services to promote workforce development for Phase II of the Presidio Parkway project and authorize the Executive Director to modify non-material agreement terms and conditions.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Recommend exercising the second one-year option to the MOA with OEWD, and to increase the MOA amount by $164,600, to a total amount not to exceed $500,000, for CityBuild services to promote workforce development for Phase II of the Presidio Parkway project and authorizing the Executive Director to modify non-material agreement terms and conditions, as requested.
2. Recommend exercising the second one-year option to the MOA with OEWD, and to increase the MOA amount by $164,600, to a total amount not to exceed $500,000, for CityBuild services to promote workforce development for Phase II of the Presidio Parkway project and authorizing the Executive Director to negotiate modify non-material agreement terms and conditions, with modifications.
3. Defer action, pending additional information or further staff analysis.

CAC POSITION

This item was included on the consent calendar for the December 3, 2014 CAC meeting. The CAC unanimously adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation.

FINANCIAL IMPACTS

This MOA amendment will be funded by Prop K funds previously appropriated through Resolution 10-66. This year's activity was included in the Transportation Authority's adopted Fiscal Year 2014/15 budget. Sufficient funds will be included in next fiscal year's budget to cover the remaining cost of this MOA.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend exercising the second one-year option to the MOA with OEWD, and to increase the MOA amount by $164,600, to a total amount not to exceed $500,000, for CityBuild services to promote workforce development for Phase II of the Presidio Parkway project and authorizing the Executive Director to modify non-material agreement terms and conditions.

Attachment:

1. September 2014 Presidio Parkway First Source Hiring Summary

Attachment 1

September 2014 Presidio Parkway First Source Hiring Summary			
	Requested	**Total Hired**	**Local Hired**
Project to Date	313	309	113
Project to Date New Hire %			37%
Sep-14	43	20	7
Aug-14	30	27	9
Jul-14	78	75	30
Jun-14	39	42	16
May-14	10	9	6
Apr-14	4	3	1
Mar-14	17	20	1
Feb-14	21	15	11
Jan-14	12	16	13
2013	59	82	19

September 2014 First Source Hiring Detail				
Trade	**Requested**	**Total Hired**	**Local Hired**	**Total Local Hired to Date**
Carpenter	18	10	4	59
Cement Mason	2	2	1	3
Electrician	0	0	0	0
Iron Worker	0	0	0	1
Laborer	14	3	1	41
Operating Engineer	9	5	1	9
Pile Driver	0	0	0	0
Roofer	0	0	0	0
Total	43	20	7	113

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

San Francisco County Transportation Authority
December 2014

Bills of Interest

To view documents associated with the bill, click the bill number link. To view the bill text, click the PDF or HTML link.
Staff is recommending a support position on AB 8 (Gatto) and an oppose position on AB 6 (Wilk), AB 23 (Patterson), SB 1 (Gaines), SB 5 (Vidak), and SB 39 (Pavley).

Bill #	Author	Description	Status	Position	Comments
AB 2 Introduced: 12/1/2014 pdf html	Alejo D (Dist 30)	**Community revitalization authority.** Would state the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation that would authorize certain local agencies to form a community revitalization authority within a community revitalization and investment area, as defined, to carry out provisions of the Community Redevelopment Law in that area for purposes related to, among other things, infrastructure, affordable housing, and economic revitalization, and to provide for the financing of these activities by, among other things, the issuance of bonds serviced by tax increment revenues.	Assembly Print	New - Recommend Watch	Spot bill. The ultimate intent is for a bill that would permit the establishment of local community revitalization authorities that would finance projects using tax increment revenues.
AB 4 Introduced: 12/1/2014 pdf html	Linder R (Dist 60)	**Vehicle weight fees: transportation bond debt service.** Would, notwithstanding specified provisions or any other law, until January 1, 2020, prohibit weight fee revenues from being transferred from the State Highway Account to the Transportation Debt Service Fund, the Transportation Bond Direct Payment Account, or any other fund or account for the purpose of payment of the debt service on transportation general obligation bonds, and would also prohibit loans of weight fee revenues to the General Fund.	Assembly Print	New - Recommend Watch	Similar to several bills from 2014, this bill seeks to restore state truck fees to fund highway repair instead of supporting Prop. 1B bond debt service.
AB 6 Introduced: 12/1/2014 pdf html	Wilk R (Dist 38)	**Bonds: transportation: school facilities.** Would provide that no further bonds shall be sold for high-speed rail purposes pursuant to the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century, expect as specifically provided with respect to an existing appropriation for high-speed rail purposes for early improvement projects in the Phase 1 blended system. The bill, subject to the above exception, would require redirection of the unspent proceeds received from outstanding bonds issued and sold for other high-speed rail purposes prior to the effective date of these provisions, upon appropriation, for use in retiring the debt incurred from the issuance and sale of those outstanding bonds. These provisions would become effective only upon approval by the voters at the next statewide election.	Assembly Print	New - Recommend Oppose	Prohibits sale of bonds to support High-Speed Rail program. Directs unspent bond funds to retire debt from Prop 1A and would authorize use of bond proceeds for K-12 building purposes.

San Francisco County Transportation Authority
December 2014

Bill #	Author	Description	Status	Position	Comments
AB 8 Introduced: 12/1/2014 pdf html	Gatto D (Dist 43)	**Emergency services: hit-and-run incidents.** Would authorize a law enforcement agency to issue a Yellow Alert if a person has been killed or has suffered serious bodily injury due to a hit-and-run incident and the law enforcement agency has specified information concerning the suspect or the suspect's vehicle. The bill would require the Department of the California Highway Patrol to activate a Yellow Alert within the requested geographic area upon request if it concurs with the law enforcement agency that specified requirements are met.	Assembly Print	New - Recommend Support	This bill expands the Amber Alert system to create a new yellow alert to call attention to hit and run incidents when a person dies or suffers bodily harm.
AB 23 Introduced: 12/1/2014 pdf html	Patterson R (Dist 23)	**California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006: market-based compliance mechanisms: exemption.** The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 authorizes the State Air Resources Board to include the use of market-based compliance mechanisms. Current state board regulations require specified entities to comply with a market-based compliance mechanism beginning January 1, 2013, and require additional specified entities to comply with that market-based compliance mechanism beginning January 1, 2015. This bill would instead exempt those categories of persons or entities that did not have a compliance obligation, as defined, under a market-based compliance mechanism beginning January 1, 2013, from being subject to that market-based compliance mechanism through December 31, 2020.	Assembly Print	New - Recommend Oppose	This bill would postpone the effective date of the extension of Cap and Trade emission regulations from 2015 to 2020 for the transportation fuels system. The author is concerned that the public will be subject to a spike in fuel prices. However, the effect of the deferred will be to reduce Cap and Trade auction revenues.
AB 28 Introduced: 12/1/2014 pdf html	Chu D (Dist 25)	**Bicycle safety: rear lights.** Current law requires that a bicycle operated during darkness upon a highway, a sidewalk where bicycle operation is not prohibited by the local jurisdiction, or a bikeway, as defined, be equipped with a red reflector on the rear that is visible from a distance of 500 feet to the rear when directly in front of lawful upper beams of headlamps on a motor vehicle. This bill would instead require that a bicycle operated under those circumstances be equipped with a white flashing light on the rear that is visible from a distance of 500 feet to the rear when directly in front of lawful upper beams of headlamps on a motor vehicle, or, in lieu of the white flashing light, reflective gear worn by the bicyclist.	Assembly Print	New - Recommend Watch	This is a new approach to bike safety that would require reflective clothing or flashing lights in lieu of reflective lights.

Bill #	Author	Description	Status	Position	Comments
AB 40 Introduced: 12/1/2014 pdf html	Ting D (Dist 19)	**Golden Gate Bridge: sidewalk fees.** Current law establishes bridge and highway districts and various regional transportation authorities and transit districts, including the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District, and prescribes the powers and duties of the district, including the power to fix and collect all tolls for the use of the district's property. This bill would prohibit the district from fixing or collecting any tolls or access fees for pedestrian and bicyclist use of the Golden Gate Bridge sidewalks.	Assembly Print	New - Recommend Watch	This measure would prohibit the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway, and Transportation District from imposing tolls or fees on pedestrian or bicyclists for use of the bridge sidewalks.
SB 1 Introduced: 12/1/2014 pdf html	Gaines R (Dist 1)	**California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006: market-based compliance mechanisms: exemption.** The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 authorizes the State Air Resources Board to include the use of market-based compliance mechanisms. Current state board regulations require specified entities to comply with a market-based compliance mechanism beginning January 1, 2013, and require additional specified entities to comply with that market-based compliance mechanism beginning January 1, 2015. This bill instead would exempt categories of persons or entities that did not have a compliance obligation, as defined, under a market-based compliance mechanism beginning January 1, 2013, from being subject to that market-based compliance mechanism.	Senate Print	New - Recommend Oppose	This bill would eliminate the extension of Cap and Trade emission regulations scheduled for the transportation fuels system. Differs from AB 23 as this bill permanently prohibits the Cap and Trade regulations from affecting the fuels sector.
SB 5 Introduced: 12/1/2014 pdf html	Vidak R (Dist 14)	**California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006: market-based compliance mechanisms: exemption.** Under the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, current State Air Resources Board regulations require specified entities to comply with a market-based compliance mechanism beginning January 1, 2013, and require additional specified entities to comply with that market-based compliance mechanism beginning January 1, 2015. This bill instead would exempt categories of persons or entities that did not have a compliance obligation, as defined, under a market-based compliance mechanism beginning January 1, 2013, from being subject to that market-based compliance mechanism through December 31, 2020.	Senate Print	New - Recommend Oppose	This bill would postpone the effective date of the extension of Cap and Trade emission regulations from 2015 to 2020 for the transportation fuels system. The author is concerned that the public will be subject to a spike in fuel prices. However, the effect of the deferred will be to reduce Cap and Trade auction revenues.
SB 8 Introduced: 12/1/2014 pdf html	Hertzberg D (Dist 18)	**Taxation.** Would state legislative findings regarding the Upward Mobility Act, key provisions of which would expand the application of the Sales and Use Tax law by imposing a tax on specified services, would enhance the state's business climate and would incentivize entrepreneurship and business creation by evaluating the Corporate Tax Law, and would examine the impacts of a lower and simpler Personal Income Tax Law.	Senate Print	New - Recommend Watch	Although a spot bill, this is the author's attempt to change the emphasis of California's taxation system to incorporate taxes on services.

San Francisco County Transportation Authority
December 2014

Bill #	Author	Description	Status	Position	Comments
SB 9 Introduced: 12/1/2014 pdf html	Beall D (Dist 15)	**Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund: Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program.** Would, under the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, modify the purpose of the program to delete references to operational investments and instead provide for the funding of large, transformative capital improvements with a total cost exceeding $100,000,000. The bill would require the Transportation Agency, in prioritizing and selecting projects for funding, to consider the extent to which a project reduces greenhouse gas emissions, and would add additional factors to be considered in evaluating applications for funding. This bill contains other existing laws.	Senate Print	New - Recommend Watch	This bill would alter the focus for Rail and Transit Cap and Trade funds to only address large-scale transit projects that promote a direct connection to the state's High- Speed Rail System. Guidelines for expending the first $25 million in the Rail and Transit cap and trade funding category will be finalized soon; this will be followed by a competitive call for projects by the State Transportation Agency (CalSTA).
SB 16 Introduced: 12/1/2014 pdf html	Beall D (Dist 15)	**Department of Transportation (Caltrans).** Current law provides that the Caltrans has full possession and control of the state highway system. This bill would state the intent of the Legislature that the department identify savings from implementing efficiencies in its current programs and direct those resources into expanded activities for road repair and litter cleanup.	Senate Print	New - Recommend Watch	The author is seeking to compel Caltrans to adopt more program efficiencies and then direct the resulting savings into road repair and litter control.
SB 39 Introduced: 12/1/2014 pdf html	Pavley D (Dist 27)	**Vehicles: high-occupancy vehicle lanes.** Current federal law, until September 30, 2017, authorizes a state to allow specified labeled vehicles to use lanes designated for high-occupancy vehicles (HOVs). This bill would increase the number of those identifiers that the DMV is authorized to issue to an unspecified amount. This bill contains other related provisions and other current laws.	Senate Print	New - Recommend Oppose	The bill would expand the amount of HOV lane access decals for clean vehicles. 2014 saw the number of decals permitted, increase from 40,000 to 70,000. While we are supportive of clean vehicles, this bill has the potential to add thousands of more single occupancy vehicles to Bay Area HOV lanes, many of which are already near or at capacity. We would welcome an amendment to give local jurisdictions control over whether or not to allow clean vehicles in HOV lanes.

Total Measures: 13

Total Tracking Forms: 13

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

1455 Market Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, California 94103
415.522.4800 FAX 415.522.4829
info@sfcta.org www.sfcta.org

Memorandum

Date: 12.01.14 **RE:** Finance Committee
December 9, 2014

To: Finance Committee: Commissioners Cohen (Chair), Wiener (Vice Chair), Farrell, Tang and Avalos (Ex Officio)

From: Amber Crabbe – Assistant Deputy Director for Policy and Programming

Through: Tilly Chang – Executive Director

Subject: **ACTION** – Recommend Approval of the 2015 State and Federal Legislative Program

Summary

Every year, the Transportation Authority Board adopts a legislative program to guide the agency's transportation advocacy efforts at the state and federal levels. The proposed State and Federal Legislative Program reflects key principles, gathered from our common positions with other local transportation sales tax authorities around the state, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, as well as our understanding of the most pressing issues facing the region, San Francisco, and our partner agencies that deliver transportation in the city. The proposed program is presented in the form of principles, not specific bills or legislative initiatives, in order to allow staff the necessary flexibility to respond to legislative proposals and specific policy concerns that may arise over the course of the legislative session in Sacramento or Washington. Our 2015 Legislative Program continues many of the themes from the previous legislative sessions and emphasizes issues of stabilizing and protecting existing transportation funds, authorizing new transportation revenues, securing funding for San Francisco projects, advancing high-speed rail investment, supporting allocation of state cap-and-trade revenues for transportation, promoting Vision Zero safety goals, and aspiring to meet environmental and greenhouse gas reduction goals. **We are seeking a recommendation to approve the 2015 State and Federal Legislative Program.**

BACKGROUND

The state and federal legislative programs, adopted annually by the Transportation Authority Board, establish a general framework to guide our legislative and funding advocacy efforts at the state and federal levels. The purpose of the legislative program is to establish general policy guidance on state and federal legislative and funding issues in transportation. The proposed 2015 State and Federal Legislative Program reflects key principles, gathered from our common positions with other local transportation sales tax authorities around the state, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), as well as our understanding of the most pressing issues facing the region, San Francisco, and our partner agencies delivering transportation projects and services to San Francisco.

Transportation Authority staff and legislative advocacy consultants in Sacramento will use this program to communicate and plan strategy with the Mayor's Office, the legislative delegations in Sacramento and Washington, DC, the MTC, and other transportation agencies and advocates.

DISCUSSION

The proposed 2015 State and Federal Legislative Program, detailed in Attachment 1, is presented in the form of principles rather than specific bills or legislative initiatives, in order to allow staff the necessary flexibility to respond to legislative proposals and specific policy concerns that may arise over the course of the session. Throughout the state legislative session, which extends into the early autumn or later if

extraordinary sessions are necessary, we will be reporting on the status of bills that are of significance to the Transportation Authority, and developing recommendations for Transportation Authority positions, as appropriate.

In 2014, many important fiscal and policy agendas advanced which were consistent with the Transportation Authority's adopted State and Federal Legislative Program. The major emphasis in state transportation legislation was focused on cap-and-trade revenues, with the Legislature adopting an overall plan for revenue distribution. Since the framework was adopted, local public agencies have been participating in scoping exercises for the various new funding programs administered by an array of state agencies. While control over cap and trade revenues remains consolidated at the state level, in 2015 we will continue to advance the proposal of local control over revenues and will advocate that transportation get its fair share of the discretionary cap and trade revenue that will be programmed through the state budget process.

In 2014, another main legislative focus was our sponsorship of Assembly Bill (AB) 141 (Ammiano) that formed the Treasure Island Mobility Management Agency (TIMMA) and transferred the Transportation Authority's responsibilities for the future management of transportation on and off the island to the new agency. This legislation firewalled the Transportation Authority's revenue streams such as Prop K and Prop AA from the TIMMA-related activities and reduced associated liability.

Our 2015 State and Federal Legislative Program continues many of the themes from the previous legislative sessions and emphasizes issues of stabilizing and protecting existing transportation funds, authorizing new transportation revenues to be put into place at the local or regional level, advancing San Francisco's priority projects and programs, supporting allocation of state cap-and-trade revenues for transportation and direction of a significant portion of those funds to regional/local agencies that are implementing sustainable communities strategies, advancing high-speed rail early investment projects to bring service to the Transbay Transit Center, working to meet environmental and greenhouse gas reduction goals, and expanding the use of pricing and other innovative project delivery and financing approaches to accommodate the growth in transportation system demands in California.

New to the 2015 State and Federal Legislative Program is direct support for San Francisco's Vision Zero goals for street safety. While we do not intend to sponsor legislation, we will work with other San Francisco public agencies to support legislation required to implement and achieve Vision Zero safety goals, including legislation to permit the use of cameras for automated enforcement of traffic violations and legislation related to improving driver behavior through enhanced enforcement. We are also recommending including new language in support of the Marketplace Fairness Act which would apply state and local sales tax rates to online purchases to support local businesses and increase collection of Prop K sales tax revenue.

Attachment 1 explains in detail the Transportation Authority's proposed 2015 State and Federal Legislative Program.

We are seeking a recommendation to approve the 2015 State and Federal Legislative Program.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Recommend approval of the 2015 State and Federal Legislative Program.
2. Recommend approval of the 2015 State and Federal Legislative Program, with modifications.
3. Defer action, pending additional information or further staff analysis.

CAC POSITION

The CAC was briefed on this item at its December 3, 2014 meeting, and unanimously adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation.

FINANCIAL IMPACTS

There is no impact on the Transportation Authority's budget from the proposed action.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend approval of the 2015 State and Federal Legislative Program.

Attachment:

1. Draft 2015 State and Federal Legislative Program

Area	Recommended Action	Comments
State Legislative Program Elements		
1. Fiscal Year 2015/16 State Budget	Protect transportation funding from diversion to the General Fund or other non-transportation uses	Proposition 22 (2010) enacted substantial protections for transportation funding within the state budget process. However, there are still opportunities for the budget to divert specific transportation fund sources to the General Fund. We will advocate that funds that should be dedicated to transportation projects are not diverted to other state budget priorities. We would also support efforts to recover weight fee revenues for transportation.
	Support efforts to change allocation formulas for state transportation funds to recognize factors other than number of registered vehicles, lane miles, or residential population	Many state formula-based transportation funding programs allocate funds on the basis of resident population, lane miles, or number of registered vehicles. These formulas are often disadvantageous for San Francisco because they fail to account for the full demands placed on the city's transportation by the significant increase in daytime population with in-commuters. We will advocate for the use of factors that better tie transportation funding to the true demands placed on the system, such as daytime population or transit usage.
2. Cap and Trade Revenues	Support flexibility and allow local control of programming and allocation of cap and trade revenues and support efforts to dedicate a significant portion of cap and trade revenues to transportation, specifically to regional and local agencies that are implementing sustainable communities strategies	We will advocate that transportation projects are given highest priority in cap and trade revenue distribution and that revenues collected on transportation fuels be dedicated to transportation projects, consistent with the public's association of fuel fees and taxes with transportation improvements. While the general distribution of cap and trade revenue was legally established in 2014, 40% of the revenues will still be subject to programming by the Legislature. We will continue to advocate that cap and trade revenues are allocated through a process that is clear, streamlined, flexible, and effective. Specifically, where opportunities exist, we will advocate that revenues are distributed by formula to local and regional agencies and that revenues are allocated to the California High Speed Rail (HSR) project fund San Francisco Early Investment Program priorities such as Caltrain Electrification and the Caltrain Downtown Extension.

Area	Recommended Action	Comments
3. Transportation Policy Initiatives	Support efforts that would allow San Francisco to reform its accessible parking policies	Support the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA's) efforts to advance its policy objectives related to improving management of accessible parking to making spaces available to those who need them, consistent with future input and guidance from our Board of Commissioners. Support SFMTA's efforts to seek changes to state law if necessary.
	Support San Francisco's Vision Zero policy and other efforts to improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians	Vision Zero is San Francisco's policy commitment to eliminate all traffic-related fatalities by 2024. To achieve this safety goal, San Francisco will rely on engineering, education, enforcement, evaluation, and policy to create safe streets for all users, particularly pedestrians and bicyclists. While the state's new Active Transportation Program (ATP) funds both infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects such as education, outreach, and enforcement activities, it is a very competitive and administratively burdensome grant program and insufficient to meet the demand for these types of projects. We will work with the SFMTA, Department of Public Works, Department of Public Health and other project partners to identify and secure additional state and federal funding, and seek legislative reform to support strategies that may not currently be authorized by state law such as the use of cameras for automated enforcement (e.g. don't block the box, and photo-radar speed enforcement). Finally, every year the Legislature considers bills aimed at improving driver behavior and increasing enforcement, in particular around schools.
	Support the use of best practices for coordinating with Caltrans on locally-led projects on the state highway system	Support the Self-Help Counties Coalition effort and other Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Caltrans project initiation document (PID) process for local projects on the state highway system. Support the implementation of National Association of City Transportation Officials design guidelines and their integration into Caltrans's Highway Design Manual.

Area	Recommended Action	Comments
	Support efforts to implement high occupancy toll (HOT) lanes and other transportation demand management (TDM) strategies	HOT lanes are tolled highway lanes that provide free or reduced-cost access for high occupancy vehicles and allow single occupancy vehicles to pay to get out of congested general purpose lanes. Existing HOT laws limit the number of allowable HOT facilities and provide that no HOT facilities can be approved after January 1, 2012. We will support new legislation – like SB 983 (Hernandez) that was considered in 2014 – to lift these restrictions and expand the ability to use pricing and express lanes to better manage congestion on state highways. We will support new HOT legislation that promotes HOT facilities in the region that could both alleviate freeway congestion and generate revenue to support travel options in the corridor. We will also support efforts to allow more flexibility in implementing other TDM measures, like cordon pricing, trip capping, and incentives for time-of-day trip shifting.
	Support state pilot of a road usage charge	In 2014, SB 1077 (DeSaulnier) initiated a state road usage charge pilot, which would design and implement a program where drivers are charged per mile traveled. We will participate as much as possible in the pilot and advocate for a fair and sustainable program that addresses the decreasing real value of the state fuel tax and the equity issues associated with the rising adoption of electric vehicles, whose owners don't pay the fuel tax.
4. Increase Transportation Funding	Support a constitutional amendment to lower the 2/3 supermajority voter approval requirement for local transportation taxes	Support a state constitutional amendment to lower the voter approval requirement for special taxes dedicated to local transportation projects from 66.67% to 55% or a simple majority. Several constitutional amendments were introduced in 2014 to reduce the threshold for local transportation measures specifically or local revenue measures generally. Although regionally supported, none of these measures were ultimately enacted. In 2015, we will again advocate for lower voter approval thresholds for transportation and oppose unreasonable conditions or restrictions on local control over the use of revenues since the decreasing amount of state and federal funding for transportation make local funding measures even more critical in advancing transportation projects.

Area	Recommended Action	Comments
	Support state authorization to approve new local, regional, and state revenues for transportation	Support efforts to pursue new revenues for transportation at the local, regional, and state levels to help close the funding shortfalls across all modes of the transportation system, including both capital and operating needs. We are carefully monitoring a proposal for an increase in the state vehicle license fee to try to avoid negatively impacting San Francisco's ability to implement its own vehicle license fee increase, as approved in 2012 through Assembly Bill (AB) 1492 (Leno). Possible new local and regional revenue sources could include fuel fees, congestion reduction charges, road pricing, local sales tax cap increases, or other user fees. We will also support the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC's) proposal to seek authorization for a Regional Measure 3 bridge toll and work closely with MTC to support San Francisco's needs in the development of the expenditure plan.
	Increase local funding options to replace the loss of redevelopment funding	The dissolution of redevelopment agencies removed a key tool to fund new sustainable development and related transportation improvements in San Francisco. In 2014, SB 628 (Beall) lowered the voter threshold to 55% for enhanced infrastructure financing districts, but that still does not restore what was lost when redevelopment was dissolved. We will support additional efforts to revive the authority of local governments to use tax-increment financing in support of projects consistent with sustainable communities strategies.
	Increase state funding for affordable housing	We will support efforts to establish a new, dedicated state fund source for affordable housing. One possible source could be a real estate transaction charge.
5. Active Transportation Program (ATP) Implementation	Support ATP guidelines that are flexible and allow local control of programming and allocation and that focus on administrative efficiency and performance-based outcomes	The ATP was created by SB 99 and AB 101 to encourage active modes of transportation, including walking and bicycling, and to consolidate several related state grant programs into a single program under the control of the California Transportation Commission (CTC). The CTC worked with stakeholders throughout 2013 and 2014 to develop program guidelines, conduct the first call for projects (March 2014), and adopt the funding commitments (August and November 2014). During the process of evaluating the first ATP grant cycle, we will continue to advocate for a programming and allocation process that emphasizes flexibility and local/regional control since this approach makes the most sense for bicycle and pedestrian projects which are typically smaller and more localized than the larger projects of statewide significance that the CTC typically considers.

Area	Recommended Action	Comments
6. High Speed Rail (HSR)	Support the implementation of the memorandum of understanding for the HSR Early Investment Strategy for a Blended System on the Peninsula	In Spring 2012, the Transportation Authority, the California HSR Authority, MTC, and six other local and regional agencies signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) for the development of a blended HSR and electrified Caltrain system from San Francisco to San Jose on the Peninsula, including a terminus at the Transbay Transit Center. We will continue to work with our partner agencies to advocate that the HSR early investment projects are implemented in a manner consistent with the MOU. Each of the three Caltrain local partners (San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara) is committed to a $60 million contribution to the early investment projects, namely positive train control and electrification. However there is still a shortfall in the budgets for the Caltrain Electrification and Downtown Extension projects. As stated above, we will advocate for the State to dedicate cap and trade revenue to the Bay Area segment of the HSR project, including blended service in the Peninsula corridor, and to resolve outstanding legal issues surrounding the overall HSR project.
	Advocate that all HSR early investment projects are fully compatible with bringing service to the Transbay Terminal, northern terminus of California's HSR system	We will work with San Francisco and regional partners and the California High Speed Rail Authority to advocate that any blended system projects are compatible with and supportive of San Francisco's goals and priorities for land use and transportation developments along the corridor. We will continue to advocate for full funding of the Caltrain Downtown Extension and work with our regional partners to advance the Caltrain Modernization program.

Federal Legislative Program Elements		
7. Federal Appropriations	Advocate for New Starts and Small Starts funding appropriations for San Francisco projects	Because of the federal government's continuing inability to pass a multi-year transportation bill and the continued insolvency of the federal highway trust fund (HTF), there is a risk that federal capital funding, particularly New Starts, dedicated to projects in San Francisco might not be available when needed or expected. We will advocate that Congress approves annual New Starts appropriations consistent with the Full Funding Grant Agreement for the Central Subway and continues to allocate Small Starts funds for the Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit project as needed to support timely project delivery. We will also work with city and regional partners to identify the next project priorities for future New and Small Starts funding.
	Advocate for full appropriations for federal Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) programs	We will partner with other transportation stakeholders in the Bay Area and nationwide to advocate that Congress appropriates full funding, consistent with amounts detailed in MAP-21, for the remainder of federal Fiscal Year 2015 and federal Fiscal Year 2016 (assuming MAP-21 is extended).
8. New Federal Transportation Funding	Advocate for an increase in the 18.4 cent per gallon federal gasoline tax and/or other new fees to close the deficit in the federal Highway Trust Fund	The 18.4 cent per gallon federal gasoline tax has not been increased since 1993 and has lost over a third of its value in the subsequent two decades due to inflation and cost increases. The result has been a growing deficit in the federal HTF, the primary federal source of funding for not only roadway projects but also transit, pedestrian and bicycle projects. We will continue to advocate for increasing the federal gasoline tax or indexing it to inflation as the simplest ways to close the HTF funding deficit and provide critical, ongoing federal support for transportation. We will also support the study of alternate user fees such as road usage charges as future ways to reach a reliable increased level of funding so the federal government is paying its fair share.
	Advocate for federal funds for San Francisco's priority transportation projects	We will actively advocate for federal funding needs of all Proposition K-funded projects, consistent with the Expenditure Plan and San Francisco Transportation Plan priorities. We will work to advance projects like Geary Boulevard Bus Rapid Transit, Better Market Street, and the Caltrain Downtown Extension for future federal funding. These efforts will include advocating for guidelines for new programs such as the FTA's Core Capacity program to be favorable to San Francisco projects.

	Support passage of Marketplace Fairness Act to increase local sales tax revenue	We will support efforts to apply state and local sales tax rates to online purchases to capture the full range of economic activities, bolster local business, and increase collection of the Prop K transportation sales tax and other state transportation sales taxes.
	Support efforts to implement federal carbon pricing	There is a growing consensus that putting a price on carbon pollution has the potential to be the most effective way to fight global warming, and California is already leading the way with its cap and trade program. An effort to price carbon at the federal level has been endorsed by people across the political spectrum, including prominent conservatives and big businesses. We will work to support such efforts and promote transportation investments as part of the recommended expenditure plan.
9. Federal Transportation Reauthorization	Support development of the next federal surface transportation authorization law	The current federal surface transportation law, MAP-21, was approved in July 2012 and was continued through May 2015. While movement on a new reauthorization is uncertain given the current political climate, we will coordinate input from San Francisco project sponsors and the Mayor's Office and be actively involved in shaping the next surface transportation act through participation in policy development committees at the regional, state, and national levels, particularly through the Transportation Research Board, the American Public Transportation Association and other professional organizations that have proven track records of effectiveness advocating on behalf of transportation improvements.
	Support reinstatement of the federal pre-tax transit fringe benefit at equal levels to the parking expense pre-tax fringe benefit	As a part of the "fiscal cliff" bill approved by Congress in January 2013, the federal pre-tax fringe benefit for transit was raised to $240 per month, the same level as the fringe benefit for parking expenses. As of January 1, 2014 it reverted to $130 per month. We will advocate for a permanent solution that puts transit pre-tax benefits on par with parking benefits.

State and Federal Legislative Program Elements		
10. Pricing, Public-Private Partnerships, Design-Build, and Other Innovative Project Delivery and Financing Approaches	Support legislation authorizing and expanding the use of design-build and public private partnership (P3) project delivery strategies for transportation infrastructure	The costs of building, maintaining, and expanding our infrastructure continues to increase while state and federal fund sources are decreasing and/or suffering from unreliability. New funding and financing methods have become increasingly necessary given high demand for transportation projects – both state of good repair and new capacity to deal with growth – and the poor funding situation. We need a broader toolbox of project delivery and financing options to support more timely and cost effective delivery of projects. Local agencies should also have expanded options to use alternative delivery methods to manage risk and increase local control. We will advocate for further expansion of federal financing programs such as Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) to allow local jurisdictions to advance worthwhile transportation projects, improving mobility and creating jobs. We will coordinate with other stakeholders already working toward such legislation at the state and federal level for application of these methods to transit and roadway projects. This includes current state efforts to develop a Managed Lanes Master Plan and the Bay Area express lane network project underway through MTC.
	Support the use of pricing as a transportation demand management tool to increase person-capacity of roads and highways	
	Coordinate with the regional and state transportation agencies on enabling legislation to reauthorize publicly managed toll facilities	
11. Environmental Policies	Support legislation to further integrate state and federal environmental impact studies and streamline permitting by state regulatory agencies	While the Transportation Authority has been a leading advocate for new, cleaner transit technologies and the efficient use of transportation alternatives, compliance with both federal and state laws can result in duplicative environmental review processes increasing the cost and length of such projects. We will continue to advocate for more efficient environmental processes (both California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)) that reduce administrative inefficiencies without reducing scope or thoroughness of environmental review, resulting in projects being delivered sooner and at a lower cost.

	Support efforts to implement SB 743 and advance CEQA modernization	In 2013 Governor Brown signed SB 743 (Steinberg) into law, a groundbreaking reform to CEQA aimed at promoting greenhouse gas reduction, development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses. SB 743 reduced the analysis requirements for urban infill projects and allowed alternative traffic impact analysis measures. We and other city staff have been working at the state level for years on this effort and we anticipate these revised guidelines will allow us to put in place new measures that are consistent with San Francisco's transit-first policy and to evaluate the impact of future projects on all users of our transportation system, not just those driving cars. We will continue to work closely with the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, which is preparing guidelines for this reform.
12. Administration/ General	Oppose legislation and regulations adversely affecting our ability to efficiently and effectively contract for goods and services, conduct business and limit or transfer the risk of liability	General administrative issues arise every session that could affect the Transportation Authority's ability to operate efficiently. This element of the program would seek to protect the Transportation Authority from measures that would harm this ability and to improve the overall administrative efficiency of state and federal programs.
	Advocate for streamlining of individual administrative restrictions when multiple fund sources are used on a single project	

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

1455 Market Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, California 94103
415.522.4800 FAX 415.522.4829
info@sfcta.org www.sfcta.org

Memorandum

Date: 12.04.14 **RE:** Finance Committee
December 9, 2014

To: Finance Committee: Commissioners Cohen (Chair), Wiener (Vice Chair), Farrell, Tang and Avalos (Ex Officio)

From: David Uniman – Deputy Director for Planning

Through: Tilly Chang – Executive Director

Subject: **ACTION** – Recommend Authorizing the Executive Director to Execute a Memorandum of Agreement with the San Francisco Planning Department for the Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project Environmental Review Phase, in an Amount not to Exceed $139,276, and to Negotiate Agreement Payment Terms and Non-Material Agreement Terms and Conditions; and Assigning the Professional Services Contract with Jacobs Engineering Group to CirclePoint, Increasing the Amount of the Contract by $225,000, to a Total Amount Not to Exceed $4,409,489, for Environmental Analysis Services for the Geary BRT Project Environmental Impact Report/Statement, and Authorizing the Executive Director to Modify Non-Material Contract Terms and Conditions

Summary

In close collaboration with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), we are leading the environmental review phase for the Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project, which has developed a refined set of project alternatives, identified a Staff-Recommended Alternative, and documented the environmental analysis of those alternatives in an Administrative Draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement (EIR/S) that is being submitted for local and federal agency review before circulating to the public. In response to Transportation Authority Board and other input seeking faster delivery of benefits to the corridor, SFMTA staff is conducting conceptual planning for a potential Initial Construction Phase set of near-term improvements to be implemented before the full project will seek federal funds for construction. This month, the Plans and Programs Committee will consider SFMTA's Prop K request for $872,859 to cover near-term improvement planning, as well as prior SFMTA work to support the EIR/S. This new allocation would free up $389,927 for increased consultant and Transportation Authority staff costs resulting from inclusion of the near-term improvements in the EIR/S and an extended schedule. Relatedly, in order to more efficiently and cost effectively deliver the project, the technical consultant team previously led by Jacobs Engineering Group (Jacobs) will now be led by subconsultant CirclePoint for the remaining tasks. The consultant team needs an additional $225,000 to complete the environmental review phase. Lastly, we need to execute a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the San Francisco Planning Department (SF Planning) to support the EIR/S. This work is funded through a prior appropriation, but funds will pass directly from us rather than through the SFMTA. **We are seeking a recommendation to authorize the Executive Director to execute an MOA with SF Planning for the Geary BRT Project Environmental Review Phase, in an amount not to exceed $139,276, and to negotiate agreement payment terms and non-material agreement terms and conditions; and to assign the professional services contract with Jacobs to CirclePoint, increase the amount of the contract by $225,000, to a total amount not to exceed $4,409,489 for Environmental Analysis Services for the Geary BRT Project EIR/S, and to authorize the Executive Director to modify non-material contract terms and conditions.**

BACKGROUND

The Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project is a coordinated set of transit and pedestrian improvements along the 6.5-mile Geary corridor between the Transbay Transit Center and 48th Avenue.

It is a signature project in the voter-approved Prop K Expenditure Plan.

The Geary BRT Project is in its environmental review phase, which will culminate with publication of an Environmental Impact Report/Statement (EIR/S), a project approval and document certification action by the Transportation Authority Board, a project approval by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Board, and an action by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) completing the federal environmental review requirements. The project is a partnership between the Transportation Authority, which is leading the environmental review, and the SFMTA, which will lead the preliminary and detailed design phases and will be responsible for construction and operation of the facility.

After a year-long process including multiple rounds of project design, analysis, and community input, the Geary BRT Project arrived at a refined set of alternative project designs in Spring 2013. Analysis on these alternatives led to identification of a staff-recommended alternative design in Winter 2013/14. The team embarked on a major round of outreach in Spring 2014 to share the staff-recommended alternative and solicit feedback. Meanwhile, the team conducted environmental analyses for all alternatives, and in Summer 2014, compiled the analyses into an Administrative Draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement (ADEIR/S).

The purpose of this memorandum is to seek a motion of support for a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the Transportation Authority and SF Planning, and to assign the professional services contract with Jacobs Engineering Group to CirclePoint and amend the contract to complete the environmental review process.

DISCUSSION

Current Status and Schedule: The team is now revising the ADEIR/S in response to local agency review and comment, as part of our effort to conduct earlier and more in-depth inter-agency coordination than the Transportation Authority did during the Van Ness BRT environmental process. We expect this coordination to facilitate and speed the upcoming public circulation of the Geary draft EIR/S by avoiding delays from last-minute interagency issues. Agencies that have reviewed the draft include multiple divisions within the SFMTA, SF Planning, San Francisco Public Works (SFPW), the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, Golden Gate Transit, the San Francisco Department of Public Health, the Mayor's Office on Disability, the Bay Area Rapid Transit District, and the California Department of Transportation.

In response to Transportation Authority Board and other input seeking faster delivery of benefits to the corridor, SFMTA staff is conducting conceptual planning for a potential Initial Construction Phase set of near-term improvements (described further below) to be implemented before the full project will seek federal funds for construction. The project team has helped to develop these near-term improvements and to incorporate them into the ADEIR/S while concurrently responding to other local agency comments on the documents. When the edits are complete, we will submit the ADEIR/S to the FTA. Following incorporation of FTA's comments, we will release the public draft EIR/S.

Finally, some project design details have drawn community feedback and questions, for which we have been working on responses. These details include the pedestrian crossings at Webster Street, the design of the bus transition from side-lane to center-lane operation around Palm Avenue relating to accommodating vehicle left turns from Geary, and the complex interactions at Park Presidio Boulevard among stop locations, passenger transfers, traffic patterns, and pedestrian crossings. We anticipate that some of these project design details will require the closer attention of the detailed engineering design

phase to fully address, but we have developed options and identified constraints now to facilitate resolution.

Attachment 1 shows the project's schedule for the remaining steps in the environmental review process and the steps for the project's implementation, including the potential Initial Construction Phase (see below) and the full project.

Potential Initial Construction Phase Near-Term Improvements: The SFMTA, in coordination with Transportation Authority staff, has been conducting pre-development work to identify, determine the feasibility of, and then refine a near-term proposal for improvements in the Geary BRT corridor, so that they can be integrated into the full project's EIR/S and then quickly be advanced to construction. The near-term proposals' capital investments would be compatible with the Staff Recommended Alternative (SRA) as defined in the EIR/S, and would result in mainly permanent and some temporary investments on the corridor.

Because official action will not be taken to select the full project's Locally Preferred Alternative until the end of the environmental review process, the Initial Construction Phase proposal will remain preliminary until then, with the potential for further refinement as needed. However, the SFMTA's planning work has identified elements such as:

- Side-running bus lanes from Van Ness Avenue to Stanyan Avenue, colorized where pavement conditions allow
- Station and stop changes to improve bus operations, such as lengthening of 6 bus zones, installation or modification of approximately 10 bus bulbs, and shifting of 10 bus stops from the near side of an intersection to the far side, and consolidation of 10 selected local stops
- Traffic signal improvements at approximately 5 intersections, such as new signal lights and poles, for upgraded pedestrian signal equipment and smoother bus and traffic operations, including queue-jump installations at two intersections
- Installation of approximately 10-15 right-turn pockets to keep the bus lanes free of queued turning vehicles
- Pedestrian crossing bulb-outs at approximately 10 locations, as well as needed accompanying curb ramp upgrades

These Initial Construction Phase improvements respond to Board and public input asking for travel and other community benefits to be delivered to the corridor quickly and on a rolling basis, so that the community does not need to wait until the full BRT project, anticipated to be completed in Fiscal Year 2019/20, to begin enjoying improvements. The schedules for the Initial Construction Phase and full project are shown in Attachment 1, with that initial phase targeted for implementation in 2016. Attachment 2 provides a scope comparison of the various project phases.

While benefits from the full project include travel time savings of approximately 20% across the BRT segments of the corridor, or about 10 minutes per direction, in addition to a 20% improvement in reliability, and benefits to the streetscape environment and pedestrian safety at locations throughout the corridor, the agencies are implementing other immediate changes and developing the Initial Construction Phase to provide some of these benefits sooner. The Initial Construction Phase improvements, along with efforts already underway such as Transit Signal Priority, new replacement low-floor buses, and bus service adjustments, will provide 4-6 minutes in travel time savings, or about half that of the full project, in addition to increased service and reliability. The initial improvements also

improve pedestrian safety at key locations.

Costs and Funding: The cost estimate for the Geary BRT SRA, which has undergone multiple rounds of refinement with reviews of inputs by the SFMTA and the SFPW, is approximately $320 million in year-of-expenditure dollars, as shown in Attachment 3. The design and construction costs account for a comprehensive set of scope items, including some that are not required in order to simply provide a BRT facility but serve as overall street enhancements or address the needs of other infrastructure systems along the Geary corridor. Such items to accommodate or accompany BRT street design changes include street re-surfacing, needed underground sewer and water line utility re-locations and replacements, new street lights, new landscaping, new medians, upgraded traffic signal equipment, pedestrian bulb-outs and other crossing improvements, curb ramp retrofits, and parking meter adjustments.

The funding plan for the Geary BRT project, shown in Attachment 4, reflects the $320 million funding need, inclusive of engineering design. A funding gap exists that will require ongoing work to identify and commit sources toward fully funding the project. We are working with SFMTA and FTA to develop a Small Starts BRT project definition that will fit within FTA's maximum $250 million total cost for Small Starts. Given the corridor's high existing ridership, Geary BRT is expected to be very competitive.

The cost of the potential Initial Construction Phase near-term improvements, also shown in Attachment 3, is estimated at $15-20 million. SFMTA will continue to develop a funding plan for the Initial Construction Phase as it proceeds with planning and conceptual engineering work. Given the high degree of overlap with the Geary BRT improvements, the initial funding plan assumes $10 million in Prop K from the funding set aside for Geary BRT. Other potential sources to fill the estimated $5-$10 million gap include cap and trade, State Prop 1B, Prop K (not from BRT funds), Prop AA vehicle registration fee, and Props A (General Obligation Bond) and B approved this November.

Memorandum of Agreement: In its role as a Responsible Agency for environmental review, SF Planning is expending staff time toward generating an environmental document consistent with the city's approach to other environmental documents, including coordination with the project team on methodology issues for particular environmental technical studies such as visual impacts, transportation, air quality, noise, and cultural resources, as well as review of the document itself. The City Attorney's Office is also providing input on the legal aspects of the environmental review process, including review of the environmental document. Greater detail on the scope responsibilities for SF Planning, and the City Attorney's Office can be found in Attachment 5.

Resolution 14-52, adopted by the Transportation Authority Board in February 2014, authorized reimbursement of these two agencies for the aforementioned scope of work to be executed through a funding agreement with the SFMTA and to be funded through prior appropriations for Geary BRT environmental work. This month, the Plans and Programs Committee will consider a new SFMTA Prop K fund allocation request for $872,859 to cover near-term improvement planning and prior SFMTA work to support the EIR/S. Funding the expenses through a direct allocation to the SFMTA is administratively less burdensome. With the current SFMTA Prop K request, funds for SF Planning and the City Attorney's Office will flow directly from the Transportation Authority to SF Planning instead of through SFMTA, triggering the need for the subject MOA.

Table 1 below shows the agency budgets for the subject MOA, covering their participation in the development of the project's EIR/S.

Table 1. SF Planning and City Attorney's Office Budgets for Geary BRT Environmental Review

Agency	Staff Expenditures Reimbursable by the Transportation Authority
SF Planning	$30,352
City Attorney's Office	$99,840
Contingency	*$9,084*
Total	$139,276

Professional Services Contract Assignment and Amendment: In January 2008, through Resolution 08-42, the Transportation Authority awarded a contract to Jacobs Engineering Group (then Carter Burgess) in the amount of $1,800,000 to conduct environmental analysis of BRT on Geary Boulevard and to advance conceptual engineering designs. In December 2010, through Resolution 11-27, the Transportation Authority approved an increase of $1,054,565 to provide for additional identified scope areas. In July 2013, through Resolution 14-15, the Transportation Authority approved an increase of $1,329,924, with the contract term to set at Winter 2015.

As the BRT project has progressed from planning and analysis to environmental documentation, the needed expertise for leading the consultant team has correspondingly shifted. To maximize the efficiency of the team, a re-shuffled teaming structure is now needed, with one of the original team's subconsultants, CirclePoint, now taking the lead for the project's remaining tasks toward the completion of the environmental process. CirclePoint is the consultant team member with the expertise and responsibility for developing the EIR/S, conducting public outreach for circulation, and responding to public comments. To streamline the team and minimize project management costs, we are seeking approval to assign the original professional services contract's rights and obligations from Jacobs Engineering Group to CirclePoint, which would effectively end the practical involvement of Jacobs and shift the Transportation Authority's contractual relationship to CirclePoint for more efficient project administration and management. The original contract includes a term specifically allowing this action.

In addition, the project has responded to several unanticipated work items, including: additional analysis and other work relating to reviewing and helping to develop potential Initial Construction Phase near-term improvements and incorporating them into the EIR/S, additional rounds of cost estimate refinements; greater-than-anticipated work to coordinate with local agencies on the ADEIR/S, including responding to over 300 comments from a pre-ADEIR/S review of the transportation chapter by the SFMTA and over 550 comments from the local agency review of the ADEIR/S; and heavy re-working of several chapters in response to comments. The team has also experienced higher-than-anticipated project management costs, including that associated with the Initial Construction Phase near-term improvements, but also from Jacobs Engineering Group as the prime consultant.

The consultant team has reached a significant milestone, having developed the ADEIR/S for FTA review, and it estimates an additional $225,000 is needed to complete the environmental review phase including a Final EIR/S. This figure includes an assumption for a moderate amount of comments that

may be submitted and require responses during the public comment period, although some uncertainty is inherent. The proposed amendment, the scope and budget of which are provided in Attachment 6, would increase the total contract amount to $4,409,489.

The aforementioned SFMTA Prop K allocation request for $872,859 includes costs that were originally to be funded through an existing appropriation to the Transportation Authority. The SFMTA's current request enables us to free up $389,927 of the appropriation's funds originally budgeted for the SFMTA to be directed instead at absorbing additional project costs, including the increased consultant team budget.

The Jacobs Engineering Group has achieved 16% DBE participation to date, from six sub-consultants: women-owned firms Baseline Environmental Consulting and Pittman & Associates, Hispanic-owned firm Diaz Yourman & Associates, African American-owned firm Terry A. Hayes & Associates, and Asian Pacific American-owned firms M Lee Corporation and William Kanemoto Associates. M Lee Corporation is also based in San Francisco. The assignment of the Jacobs contract to Circle Point would not impact these subcontractor relationships.

We are seeking a recommendation to authorize the Executive Director to execute an MOA with SF Planning for the Geary BRT Project Environmental Review Phase, in an amount not to exceed $139,276, and to negotiate agreement payment terms and non-material agreement terms and conditions; and to assign the professional services contract with Jacobs to CirclePoint, to increase the amount of the contract by $225,000, to a total amount not to exceed $4,409,489 for Environmental Analysis Services for the Geary BRT Project EIR/S, and to authorize the Executive Director to modify non-material contract terms and conditions.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Recommend authorizing the Executive Director to execute an MOA with SF Planning for the Geary BRT Project Environmental Review Phase, in an amount not to exceed $139,276, and to negotiate agreement payment terms and non-material agreement terms and conditions; and assigning the professional services contract with Jacobs to CirclePoint, increasing the amount of the contract by $225,000, to a total amount not to exceed $4,409,489, for Environmental Analysis Services for the Geary BRT Project EIR/S, and authorizing the Executive Director to modify non-material contract terms and conditions, as requested.
2. Recommend authorizing the Executive Director to executie an MOA with SF Planning for the Geary BRT Project Environmental Review Phase, in an amount not to exceed $139,276, and to negotiate agreement payment terms and non-material agreement terms of conditions; and assigning the professional services contract with Jacobs to CirclePoint, increasing the amount of the contract by $225,000, to a total amount not to exceed $4,409,489, for Environmental Analysis Services for the Geary BRT Project EIR/S, and authorizing the Executive Director to modify non-material contract terms and conditions, with modifications.
3. Defer action, pending additional information or further staff analysis.

CAC POSITION

The CAC was briefed on this item at its December 3, 2014, meeting, and unanimously adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation.

FINANCIAL IMPACTS

The proposed MOA with SF Planning and the proposed professional services contract amendment with CirclePoint will be funded by Prop K funds previously appropriated through Resolution 14-17. This year's activity for the MOA was included in the Transportation Authority's adopted Fiscal Year 2014/15 budget. The proposed contract amendment will be included in the Transportation Authority's mid-year budget amendment.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend authorizing the Executive Director to execute an MOA with SF Planning for the Geary BRT Project Environmental Review Phase, in an amount not to exceed $139,276, and to negotiate agreement payment terms and non-material agreement terms and conditions; and assigning the professional services contract with Jacobs to CirclePoint, increasing the amount of the contract by $225,000, to a total amount not to exceed $4,409,489 for Environmental Analysis Services for the Geary BRT Project EIR/S, and authorizing the Executive Director to modify non-material contract terms and conditions.

Attachments (6):

1. Project Schedule
2. Geary Improvements Description and Checklist by Phase
3. Geary Cost Estimate by Element and Phase
4. Geary BRT Funding plan
5. Memorandum of Agreement Scope and Budget
6. Technical Consultant Contract Amendment Scope and Budget

Attachment 1. Geary BRT Project Environmental Review and Implementation Schedule

Timeline	Environmental Review Process	Initial Construction Phase (Phase 1)	Full Project (Phase 2)
Winter 2014/15	Release of Draft Environmental Document	Conceptual engineering completed	
Spring 2015	Public Comment Period	Detailed design initiated	Conceptual engineering initiated
Summer 2015	Response to Comments, Release of Final Environmental Document		
Fall 2015	Certification, Record of Decision		
Winter 2015/16		Detailed design completed Phase 1a Construction Initiated* (bus zone changes, right turn pockets, and transit-only lane installation)	Conceptual engineering completed Small Starts application submitted to Federal Transit Administration**
Spring 2016			Detailed design initiated**
Summer 2016			
Fall 2016		Phase 1b Construction Initiated* (bus bulbs, pedestrian bulbs, signal upgrades)	
…			
Winter 2017/18			Detailed design completed** Construction initiated**
…			
Winter 2019/20			Construction completed**

*pending phasing analysis to be completed during design, and pending city coordination opportunities

**pending funding, and pending analysis to be completed during conceptual engineering

Attachment 2. Geary Bus Rapid Transit Improvements Description and Checklist by Phase
November 21, 2014

Introduction

The SFMTA and SFCTA are proposing phased implementation of the Geary BRT project in order to expedite the delivery of transit improvements to the Geary corridor. The following project description materials describe the scope of the improvements, including a narrative description and a checklist table showing the scope elements to be included.

The cost estimates illustrate that the full project is estimated to cost $300-320M (above the $250M Small Starts Grant application cap), so we are working to identify what elements/segments would be included in the Geary BRT Small Starts application, and what might be constructed concurrently using other funds (including other federal funds). For this reason, we believe the best approach is to define the project comprehensively in the project's joint environmental document that is currently under development.

In addition to defining the project components for the Small Starts application, we are also working to implement an initial construction phase of near-term improvements (Phase 1) after the approval of the EIR/EIS. These improvements, which will result in some, but not all, of the travel time benefits associated with the full project, are consistent with the full project elements and could be implemented on a shorter timeline. We anticipate the near-term implementation occurring concurrently with the full-project design. The Phase 1 elements are estimated to cost approximately $15-20M, which is largely included within the cost of the full project[1].

[1] An exception is the bus lane colorization, which has a 3-to-5-year useful life and will need to be re-applied with the full project.

Project Scope Narrative

This narrative describes planned and completed bus, pedestrian, and street improvements to the Geary corridor. It describes three categories of improvements: baseline improvements recently completed or already underway, the full Bus Rapid Transit project, and the near-term improvements to be implemented after the environmental process.

Baseline Improvements

Some bus and pedestrian improvements are already funded and in-progress, including service plan improvements, Transit Signal Priority (using wireless technology), existing vehicle fleet replacement with new, 60-foot, articulated, low-floor, diesel-electric hybrid buses, and branding elements for buses and stations. Also, improvements have recently been completed to provide colorized bus lanes from Market Street to Van Ness Avenue.

Full Project: Staff-Recommended Alternative

A. Dedicated bus lanes with red colorization treatment. From Market Street to Van Ness Avenue, colorized bus lanes already exist. From Van Ness to Palm Avenue, the project would extend side-running bus lanes, with a few exceptions[2]. This includes resurfacing the bus lane in segments with poor pavement condition. From Palm Avenue to 27th Avenue, the project would provide center-running bus lanes. From 27th to 34th Avenue, the project would provide side-running bus lanes. For the center-running segment, this scope element includes new concrete pavement for the bus lanes, as well as two new, dual, landscaped medians, and necessary sewer relocation and replacement work.

B. Station and stop bus-operation improvements. Along the side-running segments of the corridor, this includes bus bulb-out installations or modifications at approximately 20 locations to facilitate bus vehicle maneuvers around bus stops and stations. The work here accounts for necessary relocations of water and sewer utilities, as well as concrete bus pads at each BRT stop. It also includes re-locations of approximately 10 stops from the near sides of intersections to the far side, for improved bus flows through traffic and to maximize the benefits of transit signal priority. This scope element also includes bus stop pattern changes such as removal of approximately 20 local stops and conversion of a few selected Limited/BRT stops to local stops.

C. Station and stop passenger amenities. This includes station and stop amenities such as shelters, real-time transit information, station communications, lighting, custom paving, and landscaping.

D. Bus service changes. The existing 38 Geary would continue to operate as local service, stopping at every stop. The existing 38 Limited would become the BRT service, stopping only at BRT stops. The BRT

[2] For a few blocks near the Masonic Avenue and Fillmore Street intersections, the buses would operate on narrow frontage roads adjacent to the grade-separated Geary tunnels at those locations; some blocks of the frontage roads lack sufficient width for a bus lane and the mixed-flow travel lane needed to provide access to adjacent land uses and side streets; in such cases, the buses will share the lane with mixed-flow traffic.

project would increase the amount of service provided by these lines to accommodate additional demand as is anticipated by ridership forecasts. The 38AX and 38BX express services, operating only in the peak-hour in the peak direction, would become one express line called the 38X, stopping at BRT stops along the Geary corridor west of Masonic and traveling along Pine and Bush to reach downtown destinations. Note that the SFMTA will make periodic and incremental service adjustments based on ridership trends; for the analysis, the project used a high-frequency service plan to respond to anticipated forecasted ridership increases.

E. Bus vehicle changes. New, low-floor, articulated 60-foot diesel hybrid-electric motorcoaches are anticipated in the baseline to replace the existing fleet, but up to 16 additional vehicles are accounted for in the project cost estimate to enable the proposed increase in service for the BRT project.

F. Traffic signal improvements and communications. The project will install upgraded and new equipment at approximately 50 intersections along the corridor, including new vehicle and pedestrian countdown signal heads, and new poles. These upgrades are needed for smoother bus and traffic operations, as well as for pedestrian crossing safety benefits. At six locations, signalized queue jumps would be provided for transit. At five currently unsignalized locations, the project would install new traffic signals. This scope element also includes installation of fiber optic cable to improve the reliability of traffic signal communications and facilitate real-time traffic monitoring.

G. Right-turn pockets. In side-running segments, at approximately 10-15 locations with heavy right-turning vehicle demand and high pedestrian crossing activity, the project will install right-turn pockets so that right-turning vehicles that are stopped to wait for pedestrians to cross can queue in a pocket adjacent to the side-running bus lane, leaving the bus lane clear for buses.

H. Other street improvements. This includes replacement street lighting to accompany the center-running bus lanes (existing lighting is located in the existing median), street re-surfacing wherever needed, adjusting parking meters to accommodate roadway design changes, and new landscaping on existing medians.

I. Pedestrian improvements. This includes installing approximately 60 pedestrian bulb-outs, enhanced approximately 5 new signalized pedestrian crossings, pedestrian crosswalk striping at approximately 70 intersections, approximately 120 curb ramp upgrades throughout the corridor where needed, and sidewalk repair near curbside stations where needed (pedestrian signal modifications at existing signalized intersections are accounted for under traffic signal improvements).

J. Other changes at key areas. Other improvements include street redesign between Masonic and Presidio to add a colorized bike lane making a key connection in the bicycle network. It also includes a road diet between Gough and Scott combined with street-level pedestrian crossing improvements and removal of existing pedestrian overcrossings in the Japantown area in part to enable provision of a bus lane in that location.

Near-Term Improvements – Potential Initial Construction Phase

A. Dedicated bus lanes. From Van Ness to Stanyan Avenue, the near-term improvements include side-running bus lanes, with a few exceptions.[3] Work would be limited to this segment of the corridor only. The near-term/initial construction phase cost estimate does not account for pavement resurfacing. Where feasible, the lanes will be delineated with red color treatment.

B. Station and stop bus-operation improvements. The near-term improvements include approximately 10 new bus bulb-out installations and modifications to approximately five existing bulbs. The work here accounts for necessary relocations of water and sewer utilities, as well as concrete bus pads at each BRT stop. The near-term improvements also lengthen six bus zones to facilitate vehicle maneuvers around bus stops and stations, as well as relocations of approximately 10 stops from the near side of intersections to the far side, for improved bus flows through traffic to maximize the benefit of transit signal priority. This scope element includes stop pattern changes such as removal of approximately 10 local stops and conversion of a few selected Limited/BRT stops to local stops.

F. Traffic signal improvements. The near-term improvements will install upgraded equipment at approximately 5 intersections along the corridor, including new vehicle and pedestrian countdown signal heads, and new poles. At most of these locations, complete upgrades are needed in order to install pedestrian countdown capability; at other locations, the upgrades support smoother bus and traffic operations. At two locations, signalized queue jumps would be provided for transit, and a new signal would be added at one location.

G. Right-turn pockets. At approximately 10-15 locations with heavy right-turning vehicle demand and high pedestrian crossing activity, where there will be side-running bus lanes, the project will install right-turn pockets so that right-turning vehicles that are stopped to wait for pedestrians to cross can queue in a pocket adjacent to the side-running bus lane, leaving the bus lane clear for buses.

I. Pedestrian improvements. This includes approximately 10 pedestrian bulb-outs, as well as needed accompanying curb ramp upgrades.

J. Other changes at key areas. Other improvements include a road diet between Gough and Scott to remove 2 travel lanes and striping to re-allocate that space to the median.

[3] For a few blocks near the Masonic Avenue and Fillmore Street intersections, the buses would operate on narrow frontage roads adjacent to the grade-separated Geary tunnels at those locations; some blocks of the frontage roads lack sufficient width for a bus lane and the mixed-flow travel lane needed to provide access to adjacent land uses and side streets; in such cases, the buses will share the lane with mixed-flow traffic.

Table 1. Geary Bus Rapid Transit Scope Checklist Table

	Element	Baseline	Initial Construction Phase [Phase 1]	Full Project after Initial Phase [Phase 2]
A	Dedicated colorized bus lanes	x [partial: Inner Geary red lanes]	x [partial: side lanes only, Van Ness to Stanyan, no re-surfacing]	x [includes center-running segment Palm to 27th]
B	Station/stop bus-operation improvements		x [partial: subset of all locations]	x
C	Station/stop passenger amenities	x [partial: shelters/ branding]		x
D	Bus service changes	x		x
E	Bus vehicle changes	x		x
F	Traffic signals and communications and Transit Signal Priority	x [partial: wireless TSP]	x [partial: subset of all locations]	x [includes fiber for improved life cycle/reliability, traffic monitoring]
G	Right turn pockets		x	
H	Street improvements			x
I	Pedestrian improvements		x [partial: subset of all bulb-out locations]	x [includes enhanced striping at all intersections]
J	Other changes at key areas		x [partial: includes Fillmore-area road diet]	x [includes Masonic-area bike lane and other street changes; includes Fillmore ped bridge removals and street-level crossings

Notes:

Baseline: improvements already in-progress, not included in Initial Construction Phase or Full Project

Initial Construction Phase [Phase 1]: improvements to be initiated immediately after environmental phase is completed; to be funded from local sources.

Attachment 3. Geary Cost Estimate by Element and Phase
Last Edited: November 26, 2014

	Element	I. Potential Intial Construction Phase [Phase 1]	II. Full Project After Initial Phase [Phase 2]	III. Total, Phase 1 + Phase 2	IV. Full Project [Single Phase]
A	Dedicated colorized bus lanes	$ 4,454,000	$ 80,242,000	$ 84,696,000	$ 80,242,000
B	Station/stop bus-operation improvements	$ 5,465,000	$ 48,355,000	$ 53,820,000	$ 53,818,000
C	Station/stop passenger amenities		$ 60,283,000	$ 60,283,000	$ 60,283,000
D	Bus service changes		*	*	*
E	Bus vehicle changes		$ 22,655,000	$ 22,655,000	$ 22,655,000
F	Traffic signals	$ 3,750,000	$ 33,674,000	$ 37,424,000	$ 37,424,000
G	Right turn pockets	$ 130,000	**	**	**
H	Other street improvements		$ 34,649,000	$ 34,649,000	$ 34,779,000
I	Pedestrian improvements	$ 2,200,000	$ 20,096,000	$ 22,296,000	$ 22,296,000
J	Other changes at key areas	$ 50,000	$ 4,854,000	$ 4,904,000	$ 4,854,000
	Total	$ 16,049,000	$ 304,808,000	$ 320,857,000	$ 316,351,000
	Environmental/planning phase cost			$ 7,346,000	$ 7,346,000
	Grand total			$ 328,203,000	$ 323,697,000

Notes

Costs for baseline improvements already in-progress or underway, such as Transit Signal Priority, are not included in these costs.

I. Potential Initial Construction Phase [Phase 1]: Near-term improvements consist of some permanent and some temporary improvements. Includes some BRT components and some related improvements.

II. Full Project After Initial Phase [Phase 2]: includes all improvements after near-term implementation, including BRT and related improvements.

* Service/operation cost is not included here.

** Right-turn pocket costs are accounted for under Element H.

III. Total Cost, Phase I + Phase 2 is the summation of columns I and II

IV. Total Cost [Single-Phase Project]: project is constructed as a single phase (e.g., no initial phase). Lower costs result from lack of need for temporary improvements:

In Row (A), dedicated bus lane initial phase and full project cost is additive because of brief life cycle.

In Row (J), other changes at key areas - near-term and full project cost is additive because near-term changes are temporary

			Project Phases[1]				
Source	**Type**	**Status**	**ENV, CER/PE**	**PS&E**	**CON**	**Total by Status**	**TOTAL**
5309 Small Starts[2]	Federal	Allocated				**$0**	**$75,000,000**
		Programmed				**$0**	
		Planned			$75,000,000	**$75,000,000**	
Prop K[3]	Local	Allocated	$7,346,113			**$7,346,113**	**$44,429,113**
		Programmed	$17,300,000	$14,500,000	$5,283,000	**$37,083,000**	
		Planned				**$0**	
TBD[4]	TBD	Allocated				**$0**	**$208,774,289**
		Programmed				**$0**	
		Planned	$6,956,217	$6,670,105	$195,147,967	**$208,774,289**	
	Totals	**Allocated**	**$7,346,113**	**$0**	**$0**	**$7,346,113**	**$328,203,402**
		Programmed	**$17,300,000**	**$14,500,000**	**$5,283,000**	**$37,083,000**	
		Planned	**$6,956,217**	**$6,670,105**	**$270,147,967**	**$283,774,289**	
			$31,602,330	**$21,170,105**	**$275,430,967**	**$328,203,402**	

[1] Acronyms used for project phases include: ENV - Environmental Documentation, CER/PE, Conceptual Engineering Report/Preliminary Engineering (30% Design), PS&E - Plans, Specifications & Estimates or Final Design, CON - Construction. The construction phase includes the incremental cost for procuring new BRT vehicles for the project.

[2] The Geary BRT project team plans to apply for Small Starts funds in early 2016. $75 million is the maximum amount of Small Starts funds available to a project.

[3] Resolution XX will reserve $10 million from current Geary BRT funding for design/construction of the Initial Construction Phase and will reserve all the remaining Prop K funds currently programmed to Geary BRT for the Full Project.

[4] Potential sources under consideration to fill the funding gap include additional sales tax, MTC Transit Performance Initiative funds, OneBayArea Grant, bridge tolls, other state or federal discretionary funds, and the Mayor's 2030 Transportation Task Force. The latter identified Geary BRT (listed as Geary Rapid Network Improvements) as one of the few named projects in its investment plan, with a $27 million investment. The Task Force also deemed Geary BRT to be eligible for a portion of the $58 million identified for the Transit Performance Initiative in the Task Force investment plan.

Attachment 5. San Francisco Planning Department and City Attorney's Office Memorandum of Agreement for the Geary Bus Rapid Transit Project Environmental Phase

Scope and Budget

Scope

Task 2.10.1 Project Management

This task provides for staff time spent addressing overall issues relating to the Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project and San Francisco Planning Department (SF Planning) and City Attorney's Office (CAO) involvement in creating the joint Environmental Impact Report/Statement (EIR/S).

Task 2.10.2 Understanding the Project

This task includes staff time spent becoming sufficiently familiar with the project's design to provide guidance on its environmental documentation, including the geographic scope, the study area's existing conditions, the nature of the proposed improvements, the project alternatives, and details such as the potential extent of excavation, proposed stop locations, bus service changes, on-street parking changes, changes to left turns, and potential construction methods and phasing.

Task 2.10.3 Meetings

This task includes up to six meetings to discuss the project's environmental analyses and documentation, with 2 hours for each meeting: one hour for the meeting, and one hour for any advanced preparation and/or follow-up.

Task 2.10.4 Assistance with Methodology

This task includes review of proposed methodologies and draft results for all Geary BRT technical studies, including analyses specifically for cultural resources, visual impacts, air quality, noise, energy, biology, transportation, land use, growth, and cumulative impacts.

Task 2.10.5 Assistance with Compliance with City Administrative Code Chapter 31

This task includes coordination with the Geary BRT project for compliance with San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 31 governing the city's procedures for carrying out environmental requirements for the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), specifically relating to the processes and procedures for environmental documentation and review.

Task 2.10.6 Review Administrative Draft and Final EIR/S

This task includes reviewing the full Administrative Draft EIR/S for consistency with relevant city policies and other environmental documents led by San Francisco. This review will include attention to, for each environmental technical analysis topic: the language describing the regulatory setting, including references to appropriate laws and regulations; the methodology for the technical analysis; the description of the environmental setting; and the environmental consequences, including the criteria used for identifying significant impacts under the CEQA and proposed mitigations, as well as the discussions of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) effects and avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures. It also includes input on the structure of the document and text edits as necessary. This task also includes reviewing

and providing input on responses to public comments received from the public comment period, as well as the Final EIR/S.

Task 2.10.7 Administrative Support

This task includes staff time spent supporting the administrative needs of the agencies' participation in the Geary environmental review process, including invoicing.

Budget Detail

Geary BRT Environmental Review - Planning Department Responsible Agency Cost Estimate

Task	Hours	Staff Classification	Rate (Hourly)	Subtotal
Task 2.10.1. Project Management	4	Viktoriya Wise, Deputy ERO	$140.00	$560.00
	12	Jessica Range, Plnr IV	$125.52	$1,506.24
	18	Rachel Schuett, Plnr III	$105.79	$1,904.22
Task 2.10.2. Understanding the Project	6	Jessica Range, Plnr IV	$125.52	$753.12
	8	Rachel Schuett, Plnr III	$105.79	$846.32
Task 2.10.3. Meetings	12	Jessica Range, Pnr IV	$125.52	$1,506.24
	12	Rachel Schuett, Plnr III	$105.79	$1,269.48
	2	Shelley Caltigerone, Pnr III	$105.79	$211.58
	2	Randall Dean, Plnr III	$115.00	$230.00
	8	City Attorney	$240.00	$1,920.00
Task 2.10.4. Assistance with Methodology	6	Jessica Range, Pnr IV	$125.52	$753.12
	8	Rachel Schuett, Plnr III	$105.79	$846.32
	2	Shelley Caltigerone, Pnr III	$105.79	$211.58
	2	Randall Dean, Plnr III	$115.00	$230.00
	8	City Attorney	$240.00	$1,920.00
Task 2.10.5. Assistance with Compliance with Chapter 31	4	Jessica Range, Plnr IV	$125.52	$502.08
	12	Rachel Schuett, Plnr III	$105.79	$1,269.48
Task 2.10.6. Review Administrative Draft EIR/S and Final EIR/S	40	Jessica Range, Plnr IV	$125.52	$5,020.80
	60	Rachel Schuett, Plnr III	$105.79	$6,347.40
	8	Shelley Caltigerone, Pnr III	$105.79	$846.32
	8	Randall Dean, Plnr III	$115.00	$920.00
	400	City Attorney	$240.00	$96,000.00
	4	Viktoriya Wise, Deputy ERO	$140.00	$560.00
Task 2.10.7. Admnistrative Support	8	Virnaliza Byrd, Planner Tech	$60.00	$480.00
Subtotal	**654**			**$126,614.30**
Contingency	**10%**			**$12,661.43**
Total				**$139,275.73**

* Assumed hours are based on limited role in reviewing and assiting as a CEQA responsible agency. Additional hours may be required if the level of effort exceeds that assumed in this estimate.

circlepoint

Revised 11/20/2014

SFCTA Geary BRT Project - Cost to Complete

The following is an outline of the major steps anticipated in completing the Draft ED (DED), associated public involvement, and Final ED/Record of Decision.

For budget purposes, Circlepoint assumes the above activities would be completed by November 2015 (or approximately 12 months of active time).

We further assume that Circlepoint will expend all remaining funds authorized towards completion of a revised DED incorporating agency review comments and discussing construction phasing. As of November 19, 2014, this work is substantially complete. We anticipate this work will be completed on or about December 12, 2014 and that no further analysis, subcontractor involvement, or substantive changes will be identified requiring revisions.

Task 1 – Meetings and Project Management

This task involves regular meetings with SFCTA staff to review project status, issues, schedule, and budget performance. This task also includes contract management activities including monthly progress reports.

Major Assumptions:

- *This task allows for approximately 4-6 hours of activity (meetings, management, etc) per month of for about 12 months.*

Task 2 – FTA Review and Revisions to DED

This task involves revising the DED based on comments from FTA and preparing the DED for publication.

Major Assumptions:

- *Edits will be primarily editorial in nature*
- *No subcontractor involvement needed to respond to FTA comments*
- *SFCTA/Parisi will address comments on transportation analysis/chapter*
- *Task includes reproduction costs associated with review process.*
    - *Costs of printing Draft EIS/EIR for public distribution is not included and assumed to be borne by SFCTA*

Task 3 – DED Public Hearing/Notification

Support one public hearing at a City-owned venue

Notification – develop postcard notice for corridor mailing (assumed to be up to 15,000 entries – and we assume SFCTA will pay for postage), provide content for SFCTA to email announcement, placement of notice in Examiner, Richmond Review (where timing permits) and Sing-Tao.

- Assume one consolidated set of comments on draft materials for a single review loop
- Assume SFCTA to pay for postage of postcard notice

Logistics – Assume venue is City-owned with all necessary equipment, except easels. Logistics to include development of logistics plan, setup and take down of equipment and refreshments.

Materials include sign-in sheet, name tags, comment sheet, optional speaker card, directional signs, and agenda (could also include fact sheets, copies of noticing materials, and other information as needed).

- Assume one consolidated set of comments on draft materials for a single review loop
- Assumes meeting materials in black and white, any production of color materials not included in this estimate

Attendance and Documentation – provide up to 2 staff and provide summary of outreach and transcript of comments.

- Provide one language interpreter per meeting
- Provide court reporter, assume total cost up to $500 for transcript

Necessary coordination to provide strategic and tactical support for public outreach activities. This includes attending up to 4 planning meetings, participating in material development and phone calls, emails as needed.

Task 4 - Third round of informational public meetings (between DEIR and FEIR, related to completion of LPA)

Notification – development of notice language (for SFCTA to send via email) and placement in Examiner, Richmond Review (where timing permits), and Sing-Tao.

- Assume one consolidated set of comments on draft materials for a single review loop

Logistics – secure venues selected by SFCTA, prepare logistics plan, set up and take down for meeting, provide necessary equipment and refreshments.

Materials include sign-in sheet, name tags, comment sheet, optional speaker card, directional signs, and agenda (could also include fact sheets, copies of noticing materials, and other information as needed).

- Assume one consolidated set of comments on draft materials for a single review loop
- Assumes meeting materials in black and white, any production of color materials not included in this estimate

Attendance and Documentation – provide up to 2 staff per meeting and provide high-level summary of outreach activities and input received.

- Provide one language interpreter per meeting.

Task 5 – Prepare Final ED, Record of Decision

This task involves preparing responses to comments received during the public review period, revisions to the DED as necessary, inclusion of Preferred Alternative, and preparation of Record of Decision for FTA approval and filing.

Major Assumptions:

- *The level of effort to prepare responses to comments and the Final ED is dependent on the number and complexity of comments received. The extent of public comment on a Draft ED is not predictable. The budget therefore includes a preliminary estimate of time to respond to comments. This preliminary estimate assumes no more than 340 hours of staff time or about $46,000 (200 hours associate, 100 hours Senior Project Manager, 40 hours Principal) as a placeholder budget. The preliminary budget also assumes about $12,000 in staff time to prepare/revise the ROD, though the extent of detail in the ROD is also not predictable. The remainder of the budget allowance in this task is anticipated for associated coordination, including meetings with FTA and SFCTA.*
- *No new analysis necessary to address comments received and the Preferred Alternative*
- *Preferred Alternative is substantially similar to the Staff Recommended Alternative*
- *Agency review comments (SFCTA, MTA, Planning , City Attorney) would be editorial in nature and do not require substantial revision of ED chapters or analysis.*
- *FTA review comments are editorial in nature and do not require substantial revision of ED chapters or analysis.*
- *SFCTA staff will take lead role in responding to comments related to transportation chapter.*
- *We assume the Final ED will be published and noticed more formally as part of the final certification and approval process. We have not specified any specific outreach tasks in support of this effort; however, if SFCTA anticipates needing support, these could be authorized out of contingency funds.*

Direct Costs

In order to assume prime contractor status, Circlepoint would need to provide insurance coverage commensurate with the terms of the prime contract, the terms of exceed Circlepoint's current coverage limits. We have obtained a preliminary estimate of the cost to increase our coverage to match the terms of the prime contract and have identified that cost estimate in our cost to complete. This estimate assumes 24 months of increased coverage specific to this project.

Contingency Fund

A contingency fund is proposed for use in addressing out-of-scope activities that may occur such as:

- Need for technical subcontractor assistance - can be applied flexibly (responding to comments, revising project plans, etc.)
- Revisions necessary to address more extensive FTA comments than assumed for Task 2.
- Additional outreach support or development of materials for noticing or meetings
- Additional public comments
- Substantive changes to the Final ED
- Other unforeseen needs.

Cost to Complete Budget

Assumed Balance Remaining as of 12/12/14	**$**	**0.00**
Task 1 - Meetings and Project management	**$**	**15,000**
Task 2 - FTA Review/CP revisions to publication	**$**	**18,500**
Task 3 - DEIR Hearing Notification	**$**	**12,600**
Task 4 - 3rd round hearings - LPA	**$**	**32,000**
Task 5 - FED - Responses to Comments Document/ROD - Allowance	**$**	**65,000**
Direct Costs (Insurance)	**$**	**7,000**
Subtotal - Tasks 1-5	**$**	**150,100**
Proposed Contingency	**$**	**74,900**
Grand Total: Tasks 1-5, Direct Costs + Contingency	**$**	**225,000**

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

1455 Market Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, California 94103
415.522.4800 FAX 415.522.4829
info@sfcta.org www.sfcta.org

Memorandum

Date: 12.04.14 **RE:** Finance Committee
December 9, 2014

To: Finance Committee: Commissioners Cohen (Chair), Wiener (Vice Chair), Farrell, Tang and Avalos (Ex Officio)

From: David Uniman – Deputy Director for Planning

Through: Tilly Chang – Executive Director

Subject: **ACTION** – Recommend Authorizing the Executive Director to Execute a Funding Agreement with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, in an Amount Not to Exceed $300,000, for the San Francisco Bay Area Core Capacity Transit Study, and Authorizing the Executive Director to Negotiate Agreement Payment Terms and Non-Material Agreement Terms and Conditions

Summary

The Transportation Authority is partnering with multiple agencies on the San Francisco Bay Area Transit Core Capacity Study (Study) led by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). The Study will identify short-, medium-, and long-term solutions to increase transit capacity in the Transbay and Muni Metro corridors. The Study budget includes $1 million in a federal Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Planning grant and $1 million in local match provided by the partner agencies of which the Transportation Authority's contribution is $300,000. The source of this funding was anticipated as part of a $450,000 Prop K appropriation that was approved through Resolution 15-09 in September 2014, which covered the Study's scope, schedule and budget. **We are seeking a recommendation to authorize the Executive Director to execute a funding agreement with the MTC, in an amount not to exceed $300,000, for the San Francisco Bay Area Core Capacity Transit Study, and to authorize the Executive Director to negotiate agreement payment terms and non-material agreement terms and conditions.**

BACKGROUND

The Transportation Authority is partnering with multiple agencies on the San Francisco Bay Area Transit Core Capacity Study (Study) led by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). The Study will identify short-, medium-, and long-term solutions to increase transit capacity in the Transbay and Muni Metro corridors. The Study budget includes $1 million in a federal Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Planning grant and $1 million in local match provided by the partner agencies of which the Transportation Authority's contribution is $300,000. The source of the Transportation Authority's contribution was anticipated as part of a $450,000 Prop K appropriation that was approved through Resolution 15-09 in September 2014 (and also included $150,000 to cover staff time in support of the effort).

The Study was identified as a critical need through analysis conducted as part of Plan Bay Area and the San Francisco Transportation Plan. Currently, there is no comprehensive, multi-stakeholder evaluation of need or agreement on a plan about how to enhance the current transit system capacity to handle growing demand in the two subject corridors – and how to phase projects across partnering agencies and operators. This effort is a high priority for each of the partner agencies as the transit capacity improvements are needed to accommodate land use changes already underway, as well as ones in the

pipeline. The timing of the study is set up to allow the core capacity needs to be defined and prioritized in order to be ready for the next Regional Transportation Plan update.

The purpose of this memorandum is to seek a recommendation to authorize the Executive Director to execute a funding agreement between MTC and the Transportation Authority to commit our contribution to the effort.

DISCUSSION

The participation of the MTC is critical to the Study's success. MTC is the lead agency, the recipient of the federal TIGER Planning grant, and the lead for consultant procurement and contracting. MTC intends to use the results of the Study to inform investment prioritization that will happen through the 2017 update to Plan Bay Area (the Regional Transportation Plan). The Transportation Authority's contribution to MTC will cover some of the $2 million in consultant budget set aside for the work. The expected funding contribution from each agency is shown below in Table 1. The Funding Agreement describes the scope, schedule, invoicing and reimbursement procedures and other terms of the agreement and is included as Attachment 1. MTC will execute separate funding agreements with each agency to commit their respective funding contributions.

Table 1: Funding Contributions to $2 Million Consultant Budget for Study*

Agency	Expected Funding Contribution
AC Transit	$50,000
BART	$100,000
Caltrain	TBD
MTC	$325,000
SFCTA	$300,000
SFMTA	$200,000
WETA	$25,000
U.S. DOT	$1,000,000
Total	$2,000,000

*does not include agency staff time contributions

The MTC and Transportation Authority, along with the other partner agencies (the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), the Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART), the Alameda Contra Costa County Transit District (AC Transit), the Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA), and Caltrain) have developed a Project Charter to define roles, responsibilities and governance of the project. Generally, each agency's role is reflective of expertise areas and overall agency roles. MTC and the Transportation Authority's roles are to provide regional/countywide planning, evaluation, and analytical support for the effort, while the participating transit operators' roles are to oversee consultant project development of ideas that affect their systems and provide mandatory design guidance standards to adhere to. All partners are expected to sign off on many interim milestones such as refined goals and objectives, concurrence that the evaluation process that is carried out is technically sound and transparent, and participate in stakeholder and community involvement activities. Each

agency will assign a staff lead to participate in a Project Management Team that will meet regularly to provide direction to the consultant team. A Technical Advisory Committee will also be established to seek input from a wide range of stakeholder agencies. In addition, the Project Management Team will provide regular updates to an Executive team that includes participation by the Executive Directors and General Managers of each of the Partners.

We are seeking a recommendation to authorize the Executive Director to execute a funding agreement with the MTC, in an amount not to exceed $300,000, for the San Francisco Bay Area Core Capacity Transit Study, and to authorize the Executive Director to negotiate agreement payment terms and non-material agreement terms and conditions.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Recommend authorizing the Executive Director to execute a funding agreement with the MTC, in an amount not to exceed $300,000, for the San Francisco Bay Area Core Capacity Transit Study, and authorizing the Executive Director to negotiate agreement payment terms and non-material agreement terms and conditions, as requested.
2. Recommend authorizing the Executive Director to execute a funding agreement with the MTC, in an amount not to exceed $300,000, for the San Francisco Bay Area Core Capacity Transit Study, and authorizing the Executive Director to negotiate agreement payment terms and non-material agreement terms and conditions, with modifications.
3. Defer action, pending additional information or further staff analysis.

CAC POSITION

The CAC was briefed on the substance of the Study's purpose, scope, schedule, and budget at its September 3, 2014 meeting as a part of the Prop K appropriation request to fund the Study, but due to an oversight, this action to authorize execution of the funding agreement was not concurrently included. Delaying the approval would prevent the Study from initiating in December as planned.

FINANCIAL IMPACTS

Budget for these activities will be funded from a $450,000 appropriation in Prop K approved through Resolution 15-09. The first year's activities will be included in the Transportation Authority's mid-year budget amendment, and sufficient funds will be included in future fiscal year budgets to cover the cost of this funding agreement.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend authorizing the Executive Director to execute a funding agreement with the MTC, in an amount not to exceed $300,000, for the San Francisco Bay Area Core Capacity Transit Study, and authorizing the Executive Director to negotiate agreement payment terms and non-material agreement terms and conditions.

Attachment:

1. Funding Agreement Between the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and San Francisco County Transportation Authority for San Francisco Bay Area Core Capacity Transit Study

FUNDING AGREEMENT
between METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
and SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY, for
SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA CORE CAPCITY CORE TRANSIT STUDY

THIS AGREEMENT is made and entered into as of the 3rd day of December 2014, by and between the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (herein referred to as "MTC") and the San Francisco County Transportation Authority, (herein referred to as "Transportation Authority"). MTC and Transportation Authority are together referred to as the "PARTIES."

RECITALS

WHEREAS, MTC is responsible for regularly updating the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), a comprehensive blueprint for the development of mass transit, highway, airport, seaport, railroad, bicycle and pedestrian facilities; and

WHEREAS, the San Francisco Bay Area Core Capacity Transit Study (herein called the "STUDY"), will implement planning and technical analyses required to evaluate and prioritize short-, medium-, and long-term transit investments for capital, policy and operating strategies to address existing and forecasted capacity constraints into Core San Francisco (as designated on the map in Attachment B, Core San Francisco Map), for inclusion in the next update of the RTP; and

WHEREAS, the STUDY will be led by MTC, in consultation and partnership with Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit), San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART), Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain), Transportation Authority, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA) ("STUDY Partners"). MTC and the STUDY Partners have outlined a strategy to perform the STUDY as part of a request for a regional planning grant from the United States Department of Transportation's (U.S. DOT) Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery ("TIGER") Discretionary Grant program; and

WHEREAS, Core San Francisco is served by two key corridors that will be the focus of this STUDY: the Transbay Corridor (including AC Transit, BART and WETA service) and the Muni Metro Corridor (as designated on Attachment B, Core San Francisco Map); and

WHEREAS, the STUDY will be undertaken in accordance with an Interagency Project

Charter ("CHARTER"), dated November 7, 2014, which contains, among other things, roles and responsibilities for the PARTIES; and

WHEREAS, MTC has committed funding of three hundred twenty five thousand dollars ($325,000) to hire one or more consultants ("CONSULTANT") to support the STUDY; and

WHEREAS, Transportation Authority has committed funding of three hundred thousand dollars ($300,000) for such purpose; and

WHEREAS, other STUDY Partners have committed funding totaling of three hundred seventy-five thousand dollars ($375,000), for a total initial CONSULTANT contract budget of one million dollars ($1,000,000); and

WHEREAS, the U.S. DOT has awarded MTC a TIGER regional planning grant of one million dollars ($1,000,000) to augment the initial CONSULTANT contract budget; and

WHEREAS, MTC, as lead agency for the STUDY, has received approval from its Administration Committee to enter into the initial CONSULTANT contract for the STUDY scope of work described in Attachment A, MTC Consultant Preliminary Scope of Work with Arup North America, Ltd., a CONSULTANT that was competitively procured by MTC (the "MTC CONSULTANT"); and

WHEREAS, tasks in Attachment A, MTC Consultant Preliminary Scope of Work that are designated "Optional" may be included as part of the contract with MTC CONSULTANT, or they may be implemented separately by one of the STUDY partners under separate consultant contracts;

NOW, THEREFORE, MTC and Transportation Authority, for good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are acknowledged, agree as follows:

1. SCOPE OF WORK

MTC agrees to engage MTC CONSULTANT to perform STUDY activities described in Attachment A, MTC Consultant Preliminary Scope of Work, attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference. MTC CONSULTANT's work will be performed under the direction of Carolyn Clevenger, the MTC Project Manager. MTC shall require MTC CONSULTANT to share proposed draft deliverables with all STUDY Partners for review and comment before finalizing such deliverables.

2. TERM OF AGREEMENT

The MTC CONSULTANT services funded by this Agreement shall commence on or

after November 1, 2014, and the MTC CONSULTANT's work is expected to be completed by March 31, 2017. Therefore, this Agreement shall terminate on March 31, 2017.

3. FUNDING AND METHOD OF PAYMENT

A. Compensation: Transportation Authority agrees to reimburse MTC with three hundred thousand dollars ($300,000) for the purpose of funding MTC CONSULTANT services to undertake the STUDY, as described in Attachment A, MTC Consultant Preliminary Scope of Work.

B. Disbursement: Transportation Authority agrees to make payments to MTC for work done on a reimbursable basis. Payments shall be made upon satisfactory completion by MTC CONSULTANT of work specified in MTC Task Orders.

Transportation Authority shall reimburse MTC for work upon submission by MTC of an acceptable invoice. Each invoice shall specify: (i) the tasks and or deliverables completed for which reimbursement is requested; and (ii) the amount of reimbursement requested from all STUDY Partners, including the amount paid by MTC.

Payments shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days of MTC's receipt of an acceptable invoice from MTC CONSULTANT. MTC shall submit invoices to Transportation Authority within five (5) calendar days of MTC's receipt of an acceptable invoice from MTC CONSULTANT. Transportation Authority shall make payments within twenty-five (25) calendar days of Transportation Authority's receipt of an acceptable invoice from MTC. MTC shall deliver or mail invoices to Transportation Authority, as follows:

Accounting Department
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
1455 Market Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
Email: ap@sfcta.org

C. Maximum Payment: Subject only to duly executed amendments, it is expressly understood and agreed that in no event will the total compensation to be paid to MTC under this Agreement exceed the sum of three hundred thousand dollars ($300,000) (the "Maximum Payment").

4. COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS

The PARTIES shall comply with any and all laws, statutes, ordinances, rules, regulations or requirements of the federal, state, or local government, and any agency thereof, which relate

to or in any manner affect the performance of this Agreement.

5. RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF FUNDS

MTC agrees to use funds received pursuant to this Agreement only for MTC CONSULTANT's work on the STUDY.

6. RETENTION OF RECORDS

The PARTIES agree to keep all records pertaining to the STUDY being funded for audit purposes for a minimum of three (3) years following the fiscal year of the last expenditure under this Agreement, in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

7. AUDITS

Further, MTC agrees to grant Transportation Authority and its authorized representatives access to MTC's books and records for the purpose of verifying that funds are properly accounted for and proceeds are expended in accordance with the terms of this Agreement. All documents shall be available for inspection at any time, during normal business hours, while STUDY is underway and for the retention period specified in Article 6 above.

8. DISPUTE RESOLUTION

In the event there is a dispute concerning the interpretation of this Agreement or any aspect of the STUDY that MTC and Transportation Authority are unable to resolve, either MTC or Transportation Authority may request that the Executive Team resolve the dispute. The Executive Team shall consist of seven members, namely the Executive Director or General Manager, as applicable, of each of the following agencies: AC Transit, BART, Caltrain, MTC, Transportation Authority, SFMTA and WETA.

9. AMENDMENTS

Any changes to this Agreement shall be incorporated in written amendments. All amendments shall be executed by the MTC Executive Director or a designated representative and the Transportation Authority Executive Director or a designated representative.

10. NOTICES

All notices or other communications to either party by the other shall be deemed given

when made in writing and delivered, mailed, emailed, or faxed to such party at their respective addresses as follows:

To MTC:	Attention: Carolyn Clevenger Metropolitan Transportation Commission 101 - 8th Street Oakland, CA 94607-4700 Phone: 510.817-5736 Fax: 510.817-5848 Email: cclevenger@mtc.ca.gov
To Transportation Authority:	Attention: Cynthia Fong San Francisco County Transportation Authority 1455 Market Street, 22nd Floor San Francisco, CA 94103 Phone: 415.522.4828 Fax: 415.522.4829 Email: Cynthia@sfcta.org

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Agreement has been executed by the parties hereto as of the day and year first written above.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
Steve Heminger, Executive Director	Tilly Chang, Executive Director

J:\CONTRACT\Contracts-New\CON 14-15\Core Capacity\Funding Agreements\FundingAgreement_TA-Final.docx

Attachment A

MTC CONSULTANT PRELIMINARY SCOPE OF WORK

MTC and the STUDY Partners (collectively referred to as "STUDY Team") shall engage MTC CONSULTANT to perform the services, including but not limited to those specified in this Attachment A, MTC Consultant Preliminary Scope of Work.

A. PUBLIC OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT

1. Public and Stakeholder Outreach

a) Public Outreach

An outreach strategy will be produced during STUDY initiation that describes outreach goals and objectives as well as a work plan to notify and seek input from stakeholders and members of the public over the course of the STUDY. The outreach strategy will build on lessons learned from past outreach successes and utilize existing stakeholder forums to the greatest extent possible.

The outreach strategy will include Title VI outreach and is expected to include in-person and online outreach techniques and opportunities provided in a number of languages to ensure a diverse range of opportunities for the public to participate in the project. Outreach will include engagement with key stakeholders such as business coalitions, advocacy groups, and business improvement districts, as well as general public meetings as appropriate.

While it will be further detailed as a part of outreach strategy development, generally, two outreach phases are envisioned:

i) Phase 1 will happen after completion of Task B3, and be focused on:
- Providing an overview of the purpose of the STUDY and the evaluation framework.
- Sharing the results of the existing and future needs analysis (Task B3), including capacity goals by corridor by time horizon.
- Summarizing projects/policies/operational strategies that have already been defined by corridor during predecessor planning efforts.
- Understanding the public's issues and comments around the various alternative investments to be evaluated.
- Seeking input on additional ideas that should be considered for development and evaluation.

ii) Phase 2 will happen after completion of Task B7 and be focused on:
- Sharing what was heard in Phase 1 and how it was used.
- Sharing the results of the evaluation and prioritization of high-performing concepts by time horizon.
- Seeking feedback on stakeholder preferences among these concepts.

b) Transit Agency Outreach

In addition to the STUDY Team, additional relevant public agencies will also be consulted at key points throughout the course of the STUDY. MTC will facilitate regular meetings with a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), expected to include participation from all STUDY Partners as well as other transit operators in the Core, County Congestion Management Agencies, City staff from local jurisdictions, local Federal Transit Administration staff, and the California Department of Transportation. This group will be consulted at key points throughout the course of the STUDY.

c) Local Government Outreach

At key points throughout the process, relevant staff from key local governments including in particular the Cities of Oakland and San Francisco will be engaged to ensure that potential modifications to service or new infrastructure investments generally align with their intended future land use visions. Elected officials from local governments will also be engaged through their participation in other Plan Bay Area activities; to ensure maximum efficiency, these efforts will be synchronized.

Deliverable(s): Public Outreach Plan, TAC meeting materials and summaries, Phase 1 and Phase 2 Outreach Materials and Summaries.

B. TRANSIT SYSTEMS AND OPERATIONS PLANNING

1. Project Start-up and Ongoing Management

Project start-up and ongoing management activities would include:

- Refining a work plan and budget by task.
- Regular coordination meetings among STUDY Team and MTC CONSULTANT.

Deliverable(s): Refined scope of work and budget.

2. Existing/Future Needs Synthesis and Identification

Together, the Transbay corridor and Muni Metro spine comprise the backbone of the Bay Area's core transit system. Plan Bay Area will sustainably manage future regional growth, but its increased travel demand is expected to fall particularly heavily on several downtown San Francisco transit stations, along the Transbay and Muni Metro Corridors. The key challenge addressed in the STUDY will be developing concepts to expand capacity on the very successful Transbay and SF Muni Metro trunk transit services that are currently operating at, near or over-capacity levels due to increasing ridership.

The main goal of this task is to establish target peak hour capacity goals for each of the STUDY Corridors and identify key transportation challenges facing the STUDY Area and Corridors. Sub-tasks include:

a) Establish project goals and objectives. The STUDY Team will work with project stakeholders to define the project goals and objectives. The goals and objectives will then be used to frame the Evaluation Criteria developed in Task B4.

b) Quantify existing and planned future capacity of those projects already in development by STUDY Corridor and Mode. Operators will be asked to confirm or update the latest assumptions. This effort will also include information about capacity provided by employer shuttles operating to/from/within the Core.

c) Market Demand Analysis by STUDY Corridor. This task will utilize Plan Bay Area land use to forecast travel demand by corridor for short- medium- and long-term horizon years. The analysis would include:
   - Identify the major travel markets for each corridor. For example, in the Transbay corridor, identifying the most common origins in the region to destinations in San Francisco, could inform new AC Transit bus routes that could serve origins and destinations not near existing BART stations in the shorter-term. Similarly, identifying these same Transbay travel markets could inform the ideal route for a second BART Transbay tube in the longer term.
   - Forecasting future travel within the region.
   - Determine the total number of forecast trips and peak period trips by all modes by corridor.
   - Using the results of the forecasts, a capacity target by corridor by travel market will be established.
   - Identification and analyses of regional policies that can encourage and support transit in corridors (e.g., parking pricing and congestion tolling.)

Deliverable(s): Technical memo(s) identifying (1) the STUDY goals and objectives, and (2) identifying and synthesizing future needs, quantification of existing and planned capacity by STUDY corridor and mode, and market demand analysis. Maps and extensive data shall support the technical memo(s.)

3. Identify Transportation Challenges Facing the STUDY Area and Corridors

a) Synthesize past studies/work to identify i) constraints/needs to maintaining/increasing capacity, and ii) capacity improvement concepts that have already been developed: Several past studies have been completed or are currently in progress that identify transit system needs and/or have developed capacity improvement concepts for some of the STUDY Corridors. With limited effort, this task would allow for a small level of effort to synthesize all relevant past work, including core maintenance/State of Good Repair needs that must be achieved to maintain existing capacity.

b) Identify key transportation challenges in the STUDY Area and Corridors. The challenges will include both current and future challenges to providing a reliable, efficient transit system to meet the projected demand. It is anticipated that the challenges will include but not be limited to capacity constraints, operational challenges, track and right of way limitations and vehicle constraints.

Deliverable(s): Technical memo(s) identifying key transportation challenges constraining the transit system in the STUDY Area and Corridors.

4. Evaluation Framework

An evaluation framework will be established to translate the STUDY's goals and objectives into qualitative and quantitative metrics that can be used to screen and prioritize strategies and identify appropriate methodologies for carrying out the evaluation. The evaluation framework will build off the robust project performance analysis, including project level benefit cost analysis, MTC conducts for the regional transportation plan, as well as project analysis frameworks used by the participating agencies in establishing their investment priorities. The evaluation criteria may include different metrics than the project evaluations done for Plan Bay Area given the more focused and localized nature of the STUDY. The STUDY Team is interested in innovative evaluation approaches that can inform prioritization of projects and policies based on their ability to provide additional transit capacity while advancing related goals, consistent with Plan Bay Area performance measures, and informed by implementation considerations such as timeframe and cost. The MTC CONSULTANT will be expected to develop final evaluation criteria used for project analysis and appropriate methodology that the MTC CONSULTANT is capable of carrying out for approval by the STUDY Team. Overall, the evaluation framework's primary goal should be the amount of peak transit capacity by corridor/mode and travel market.

Deliverable(s): Technical memo(s) detailing evaluation framework and methodology.

5. Develop Capacity Improvement Concepts

In this task, the MTC CONSULTANT will add to the existing improvement concept list synthesized in Task 4 to develop additional ways to achieve the targeted capacity by STUDY corridor, mode and time horizon. In this task, the transit operators (AC Transit, BART, SFMTA and WETA) will provide direction to CONSULTANT for development of improvement concepts specific to their systems in consideration of their agency-wide policies and other system plans and needs.

For the near future, additional capacity must come through efficient use of existing infrastructure – a strategy that is consistent with Plan Bay Area's "Fix-it First" investment strategy. BART is proceeding with several projects designed to enhance capacity of the existing system, including a new train control system and new increased capacity vehicles. The options to expand capacity in this corridor are complicated by the geography of the San Francisco Bay, and the constrained nature of the transit and highway infrastructure that cross it. Fixed links through this corridor are limited to BART's Transbay Tube, and the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge. While the primary focus is the flow through the corridor connecting San Francisco with the Inner East Bay, the Transbay Corridor is fed by major travel flows from many counties and travel markets to the north, east, and south. BART's ability to handle additional demand in the Transbay Corridor is contingent on major new investments and station modifications to the BART system, some of which are underway, and some of which are unfunded. Plan Bay Area also advances the BART Metro concept, which facilitates long-term land use changes primarily by providing a high-frequency, high capacity urban core rail trunk system, with the Transbay Corridor as the central linchpin of the core system.

The Muni Metro Corridor has been incrementally upgraded over the last 30-40 years. Entry and exit points to the Muni Metro Corridor suffer from poor reliability due to the merging/diverging of multiple rail lines and the transition from manual to automatic train control. Topographic barriers provide few options for direct routes heading into or out of the financial district on a mode other than light rail. The Muni Metro Corridor provides a high-frequency local rail system, which is the core of the transit system in San Francisco, but which is also in need of capacity and operational modifications.

Concepts are expected to include the following categories:

a) Rail Strategies
- Interventions to increase line capacity on existing lines (upgrades to train control system, increase/enhancement to rolling stock/facilities, junction modifications, station modifications, service design.)
- Interventions to increase speed/reliability of existing lines and operate different service patterns (e.g. tail tracks, crossovers, turn-backs, and portal improvements.)
- New lines (e.g. second Transbay Tube variations, new BART line in San Francisco extending from second Tube, Central Subway extension to Fisherman's Wharf.)
- Any rail capacity improvement strategies will consider all relevant aspects of capacity including line capacity, station capacity, station access considerations, rolling stock/facilities requirements and relevant operating plans changes.

b) Bus strategies
- New route structure to better serve demand in East Bay as well as potential expanded employment destinations beyond downtown San Francisco such as Mission Bay and San Francisco Civic Center.
- More frequent service in more high-density TOD corridors along with new vehicle fleet to increase per-trip capacity. Establishment of a transit network using Park & Rides to efficiently carry more riders, reduce travel time through neighborhoods, and consequently improve service frequencies.
- Priority treatments to provide speed and reliability including Bay Bridge contra-flow lane, transit-only lanes and transit priority on East Bay arterials and intersection treatments (signal priority and queue jumps.)
- Improved coordination and implementation with private shuttles.

c) Ferry strategies
- More frequent ferry service/additional ferry terminals.
- Improved multi-modal connectivity.

d) Policy/Operational
- Regional pick-up/drop-off within San Francisco.
- Coordinated marketing.
- Peak hour fare premiums.
- Fare coordination.
- Station-specific congestion pricing.
- Interagency fare coordination.
- Employer Transportation Demand Management engagement and coordination.

Deliverable(s): Capacity improvement concept descriptions and visuals for each corridor, mode, and time horizon.

6. Screen Capacity Improvement Concepts

Using the evaluation criteria identified in Task B4, the MTC CONSULTANT will screen the concepts developed in Task B5 and if applicable, refined in Task C1. Screening criteria will likely include: supports regional goals, potential implementation schedule, rough order of magnitude capital cost and change in operating cost, constructability and basic engineering feasibility. The goal is to reduce the conceptual alternatives to a more limited number for further project development. Preliminarily, five to ten concepts would advance to further project development.

Deliverable(s): Technical memo(s) detailing the results of the screening and recommending concepts for further analysis.

7. Evaluation, Prioritization, and Phasing of Capacity Improvements Concepts

Using the evaluation criteria identified in Task B4, the MTC CONSULTANT will conduct an evaluation of the concepts as refined in Task C2 (if completed). The goal is to prioritize the alternatives to a limited number for future project development and implementation work, and develop a preliminary recommendation for phasing by time horizon, and for inclusion in future updates of Plan Bay Area and agency planning efforts.

Projects or policies that can provide for short-term benefits may be advanced more quickly to develop interim improvement recommendations.

Potential alternatives include:

a) Transbay Corridor

The STUDY will take the next step toward defining what is needed for BART and for the other modal operators to serve additional demand in the Transbay Corridor, both through enhancements to the existing infrastructure, and major construction of new infrastructure. It is important for the region to identify and evaluate investment trade-offs by identifying the point at which current and proposed infrastructure enhancements would not be sufficient to handle future demand.

Alternatives may include:

- No project.
- Bus service and infrastructure improvements:
  - Contraflow lane for AM Peak (The contraflow lane alternative will need to build on the 2010 STUDY. Each alternative should be defined to a higher level of engineering - assumed to be approximately 5%);
  - Bus fleet with higher capacity;
  - Shift model of service to high density areas; and
  - Integrate Park and Ride service.
- BART capacity improvements to the existing system using the current tube.
- Expanded ferry system.

- BART West Oakland transfer station concept with SF shuttle trains (no through service).
- Second Transbay Tube variations (2-track and/or 4-track)

b) Muni Metro Corridor

The SFMTA and SFCTA are currently developing a strategy to increase the person carrying capacity of the current Metro rail system through removal of key bottlenecks and infrastructure expansion, called the San Francisco Rail Capacity Strategy (Rail Strategy). This strategy will produce project descriptions and conceptual engineering for near term projects (0-5 years) to provide additional capacity using existing infrastructure and concepts for medium and long term projects (5+ years) that would expand the SFMTA rail system to meet projected future demand. This STUDY will take the projects developed in the Rail Strategy and move them forward with additional planning and engineering work.

Alternatives may include:

- No project.
- Supplemental bus service.
- Station platform extensions.
- Portal area traffic control, transit only lanes, and Transit Signal Priority.
- Wayside and Automatic Train Control System upgrades.
- Three and four car trains with optimized interior configuration.
- Additional pocket and crossover tracks.
- Operating short lines and shuttles.

Deliverable(s): Technical memo(s) documenting evaluation methodology, recommended priorities, and recommendations for potentially phasing capacity improvements over time.

8. Implementation Strategy

In this task, the MTC CONSULTAN will communicate the results of the effort to develop regional consensus on prioritized alternatives for short, mid, and long-term improvements. An implementation strategy will be developed that references the relationship between/amongst alternatives. Prioritized alternatives will be used to aid as an advocacy platform for future funding programs, and to leverage existing funding sources.

Projects or policies that can provide for short-term benefits may be advanced more quickly to develop interim improvement recommendations.

a) Identify partnerships amongst agencies necessary for implementation.

b) Identify major roadblocks for implementation.

c) Develop project development and implementation plan, design and environmental phases, and project delivery methods.

d) Develop funding plan and strategy.

Deliverable(s): Technical memo(s) detailing an implementation strategy.

9. Draft and Final Report

The technical work completed will be summarized in a Draft Final Report. The report will be circulated for review and refined based on comments. This task also includes preparation of presentation materials and making presentations on the findings and recommendations to governing bodies of project team. A Final Report will be approved by the Agency Team.

Deliverable(s): Draft and Final Report, Summary Presentation.

C. TRANSIT SYSTEMS ENGINEERING AND DESIGN

Transit systems engineering and design tasks are optional tasks. These tasks may be incorporated into the overall work scope, or they may be implemented separately by the STUDY Partners as separate contracts or tasks under separate contracts.

1. Refine Capacity Improvement Concepts (*Optional - Operator-led)

Engineering and operations planning support for initial development of capacity improvement concepts. AC Transit, BART, SFMTA and WETA will manage CONSULTANT to develop initial capacity improvement concepts, in support of the conceptual planning work in Task B5.

Deliverable(s): Conceptual engineering drawings to a level appropriate for initial concept development (less than 1% design for most concepts.)

2. Project Development (*Optional - Operator-led)

For the subset of concepts identified in Task B6 for further project development, AC Transit, BART, SFMTA and WETA will manage CONSULTANT to conduct additional project development. Conceptual Engineering drawings to a level appropriate for evaluation and prioritization (up to 5% design for most concepts) will be developed.

Deliverable(s): 5% engineering drawings including horizontal and vertical alignments, typical cross-sections, service and operating parameters.

3. Refine Project Development (*Optional - Operator-led)

In this task, operators will guide CONSULTANT in additional scoping and project development of the highest prioritized projects identified in Task B7, including:

a) Advance project conceptual design.

b) Refine ridership estimates.

c) Develop initial environmental assessment. Prepare an initial checklist assessment of environmental issues likely to be raised in future CEQA and NEPA processes, at both the Program-level and the Project-level.

d) Develop an initial Title VI evaluation of the preferred alternatives. Analysis will comply with FTA Title VI Circular 4702.1B Service and Fare Equity, released on October 12, 2012.

e) Phasing plan for construction and fleet expansion. Develop a phasing plan for construction of any rail alternatives that proceeds in logical segment order and allows interim operability of project phases as they are completed.

f) Refine cost estimates. Cost estimates should be completed using a format and level of detail appropriate for application for entry into the FTA New Starts or Core Capacity process.

Deliverable(s): Technical memo(s) and visuals summarizing refined project concepts and evaluation work.

Attachment B

CORE SAN FRANCISCO MAP