



DRAFT MINUTES

PLANS AND PROGRAMS COMMITTEE

Tuesday, September 20, 2016

1. Roll Call

Chair Tang called the meeting to order at 10:33 a.m. The following members were:

Present at Roll Call: Commissioners Avalos, Farrell, Peskin and Tang (4)

Absent at Roll Call: Commissioner Breed (entered during Item 4) (1)

2. Citizens Advisory Committee Report – INFORMATION

Chris Waddling, Chair of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), reported that at the September 7 special meeting, the CAC unanimously approved Items 6 and 7. Regarding Item 5, the update on the Transbay Transit Center/Downtown Rail Extension (TTC/DTX), he said there were concerns regarding the high financing costs and the assumptions made regarding future bridge toll revenues, both of which were adequately addressed by Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA) staff. He said there were also questions around the design and layout of the train box, the final rail alignment, and how the Railyard Alternatives and I-280 Feasibility Study would impact the project, in addition to grade separation issues. Mr. Waddling said given the cost overruns of the project, he took objection to the \$160 million slotted for a pedestrian tunnel from the TTC to the Embarcadero BART station. He said even though this was part of the original plan, he thought the figure was excessive compared to a cheaper above ground option, especially given the high maintenance costs of a tunnel in terms of safety and cleaning. Regarding Item 7, he said the CAC mainly had questions on project specifics, such as the differences between rapid flashing beacons and high-intensity crosswalks, and on how electrifying Caltrain only between San Francisco and San Jose would impact travelers on the segment south of San Jose.

There was no public comment.

3. Approve the Minutes of the July 19, 2016 Meeting – ACTION

The minutes were approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Avalos, Farrell, Peskin and Tang (4)

Absent: Commissioner Breed (1)

4. Recommend Appointment of Two Members to the Citizens Advisory Committee – ACTION

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

Commissioner Avalos commented that he was able to meet with four candidates from District 11 regarding the vacancy and thanked all the applicants for their interest in serving on the CAC and providing a service to the city.

Chair Tang requested to hear from Santiago Lerma, who was seeking reinstatement to the CAC, as well as other applicants in attendance seeking appointment.

Santiago Lerma spoke to his interests and qualifications in being reinstated to the CAC. He said that he had worked on various election cycles over the past year and that due to the time constraints associated with campaigning had exceeded the allowable number of absences. Mr. Lerma said he had attained a job with more stability in terms of working hours and would now be able to meet the time commitments of the CAC going forward. Chair Tang asked why he would like to continue to serve on the CAC. Mr. Lerma responded that he would like to continue to represent the interests of District 9. He said that the Mission was the epicenter of changes in the city in terms of infrastructure and transportation, and that he had been a resident of the Mission for over 10 years and therefore had a lot of cultural and social competency that he could bring to the CAC.

Beth Hoffman, Adam Hugo-Holman, Shannon Wells-Mongiovi, and Matthew Stevens spoke to their interests and qualifications in being appointed to the CAC.

During public comment, Jacqueline Sachs said that she supported the appointment of a female member to the CAC.

Chris Waddling, Chair of the CAC, commented that he had a positive experience working with Mr. Lerma and supported his reinstatement.

Commissioner Avalos commented that for the candidates who would not be appointed there was also a CAC for the Balboa Park station area which would be considering several development and transportation projects.

Chair Tang commented that she supported reappointing Mr. Lerma to the CAC, and that Commissioner Campos also supported him continuing to represent District 9. She said that she could support any of the other applicants for the remaining vacancy to represent District 11, but would defer to Commissioner Avalos. She encouraged all the applicants to continue to pursue opportunities to be involved in their neighborhoods and around the city.

Commissioner Avalos moved to recommend reappointment of Santiago Lerma and appointment of Shannon Wells-Mongiovi, seconded by Commissioner Breed.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Avalos, Breed, Farrell, Peskin and Tang (5)

5. Major Capital Projects Update – Transbay Transit Center and Downtown Rail Extension – INFORMATION

Luis Zurinaga, Project Management Oversight Consultant for the Transportation Authority, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Tang asked Mr. Zurinaga to address the issues raised by the CAC regarding the cost increases, the design and layout of the train box, and the underground tunnel for pedestrians. Mr. Zurinaga responded that the BART underground connector was an element of the project that was strongly supported by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) because it provided regional connectivity for the project. He said it would also be an issue to have 1,000 people simultaneously off board on city streets, which would be the capacity for high-speed rail trains. Regarding the cost increases, Mr. Zurinaga stated that it was mostly due to the contingency escalation, the added throat structure, and the extension of the train box. He said that MTC thought the 3% escalation that the Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA) was using was too low

and so it was adjusted 5% based on their recommendation, and that the contingency was similarly increased based on MTC's recommendation, as well as a risk management assessment done by the Federal Transit Administration. Regarding the train box, Mr. Zurinaga stated that it would contain six tracks and three platforms, and that the plan was to have enough capacity for any train to use any track. He noted that some tracks would be designated for high-speed rail trains and others for Caltrain, but based on their agreement to have the same platform heights they would be able to share platforms, should the need arise.

Commissioner Peskin asked if the extension of the train box was lateral, and if so in what direction. Mr. Zurinaga responded that it would be extended in length and not laterally, and that it would extend the platform outside of the train box toward Main Street. He said this was added at the request of the California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) because they were planning to use two trains put together, which would amount to 16 train cars. He noted that the volume was not common in high-speed rail systems and that they wanted to make sure that the entire train would fit on the straight platform with no curvature. Commissioner Peskin asked if it would be dug below the existing bus facility or if it would be extended from underground. Mr. Zurinaga replied that it would be under the existing terminal, but one block away between Mission and Howard Streets.

Commissioner Peskin asked what the widening of the throat structure would entail. Mr. Zurinaga replied that this was also added at the request of the CHSRA and that it needed to be widened in order to accommodate a larger turning radius. He said that CHSRA believed that the turn was too tight and therefore the throat structure would need to be widened to accommodate that, and that more real estate would be necessary to achieve that. Commissioner Peskin said that there was a line item for property acquisition scheduled to happen in July 2017, and asked if that would entail the condemnation of additional properties by eminent domain. Mr. Zurinaga replied that was his understanding and that it would be property for the vent structures. Commissioner Peskin asked what the location was for those vent structures, to which Mr. Zurinaga replied they would be located on the corner of 3rd and Townsend Street.

Commissioner Peskin asked when high-speed rail was expected to arrive in San Francisco. Mr. Zurinaga replied that the CHSRA's Draft Business Plan originally had high-speed rail arriving in San Jose by 2025 and in San Francisco by 2029, but that the Transportation Authority and other City representatives provided comments on the business plan advocating that high-speed rail arrive in the city by 2025. He said the CHSRA's Final Business Plan acknowledged that arriving in San Francisco by 2025 would be best for the project, and said that TJPA was now trying to dovetail with that date by being ready to accept high-speed rail when it arrived in the city, thereby eliminating the need for temporary facilities and resulting in cost savings.

Commissioner Peskin asked when the cut and cover construction would commence at 2nd and Howard Streets. Mr. Zurinaga stated that there would be utility relocations as early as 2018, but that construction would not start until 2019. He noted that only a segment of 2nd Street, the part with the throat structure, would be cut and cover, while the rest of the alignment would be a mined tunnel similar to the Central Subway station at Chinatown.

Commissioner Peskin asked what the likelihood was of using the current proposed alignment. Mr. Zurinaga replied that it was hard to tell because the Railyard Alternatives and I-280 Feasibility (RAB) Study had not concluded, but that based on preliminary findings there were two alignments being considered. He said that the Pennsylvania alignment would connect to the Downtown Rail Extension as currently planned, while the 3rd Street alignment would not. He said the current

Pennsylvania alignment had advantages over 3rd Street in that it was a shorter route and was therefore cheaper, and that it could also be phased in that the Downtown Rail Extension could be built first. He said based on preliminary information there was a good chance that the current alignment would remain.

Commissioner Peskin asked why the CHSRA was insistent on widening the throat structure at Howard and 2nd Streets but was not as concerned with the similar tight turn from 7th Street onto Townsend Street. Mr. Zurinaga replied that at Howard and 2nd Streets the tracks would begin to fan out to create the six tracks that go into the station. Commissioner Peskin asked why that wasn't considered when that area was dug up, to which Mr. Zurinaga replied that the terminal ended just short of it and did not get there currently.

Commissioner Peskin asked if geotechnical investigations had been conducted in that area and what they showed. Mr. Zurinaga replied that the investigations were conducted in 2004 when the alignment was first approved.

Commissioner Peskin asked what the role of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB) was in the project. Mr. Zurinaga replied that Caltrain would be a user of the track and the terminal, but since they had not contributed much to construction TJPA had proposed that PCJPB pay a passenger facility charge or some sort of maintenance fee. Tilly Chang, Executive Director, added that the PCJPB also had a seat at the TJPA Board.

During public comment, Jim Haas urged the city to take more control over the Downtown Rail Extension project and the train tracks up to the county line. He noted that the project was approved 12 years ago based on work that was done almost 15 years ago, and noted that 15 years ago having the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) in Mission Bay was just an idea. He said Mission Bay was mostly empty at that time, and that the idea of operating trains on the surface over 16th Street did not cause much trouble but today it was a great concern for UCSF and others in the area. Mr. Haas added that many years ago there was a suggestion to dig a trench under 16th Street which would seriously impact Mission Bay and UCSF. He noted that he was now a member of the RAB Citizen Working Group which had met the previous night, and noted that somehow the RAB work was out of sync with the DTX work. Lastly he said that the action before the Committee had to be changed because it currently was not workable for Mission Bay.

6. Recommend Amendment of the Prop K Strategic Plan and the Guideways – Muni 5-Year Prioritization Program – ACTION

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Commissioner Farrell commented that his office had been working with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency on traffic calming on Euclid Avenue since 2012 and that it should be a priority to ensure that funds were allocated to the project before the end of the year. Ms. LaForte responded that some improvements were advancing with non-Prop K funds, but that staff would be looking out for a Euclid Avenue request.

Chair Tang asked about the status of unallocated funds in the category. Ms. LaForte responded that there was about \$30 million programmed in the category over the five-year programming cycle and that it was currently the beginning of year three. She said that there was a request for funds from the guideways category in the next item and two more requests expected in the next Board cycle, which indicated a ramping up of guideways projects. She said that additional

guideways projects had been delivered with non-Prop K fund sources, such as revenue bonds, that had strict timely use of funds requirements.

Chair Tang noted that the Muni Guideways category included a line item for the Rail Replacement Program and said that she had been waiting a significant time for rail replacement projects on the L Taraval and N Judah. She asked what had been the hold up on getting these rail replacement projects done. Matt Lee, Program Delivery Deputy at the SFMTA, replied that there had been an L Taraval project, but that the agency's goal was to only impact a street once with improvement projects, rather than inflicting repeated construction impacts, and that they found it was best to merge the Muni Forward and rail replacement projects. He said that the project was underway and there had recently been community meetings to determine features of the project and that it was scheduled to be completed in 2020. He said that a similar approach of merging Muni Forward and rail replacement projects would be used on the N Judah to minimize disturbances to residents and businesses, but that resources were focused on the L Taraval for the time being.

During public comment, Jacqueline Sachs said that she had been working on 5-Year Prioritization Programs for many years and that there had formerly been funding for light-rail on Geary Boulevard as well as for light-rail on Third Street. She said that the light-rail funding went to Third Street instead of Geary Boulevard and now there were no funds left for light-rail on Geary Boulevard. She added that the public wanted light-rail and not bus rapid transit on Geary Boulevard.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Avalos, Breed, Peskin and Tang (4)

Absent: Commissioner Farrell (1)

7. Recommend Allocation of \$20,888,900 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, for Fourteen Requests, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules – ACTION

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Tang asked how the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) decided to use a high intensity activated crosswalk (HAWK) signal versus other technologies, such as rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs). Matt Laskin with the SFMTA responded that a HAWK signal was a full phased signal whereas an RRFB was an enhanced sign. He said that RRFBs had been shown to be more effective than standard flashing crosswalk signs, and that the locations in the current request were prioritized through WalkFirst for improvements, but did not meet warrants for full signalization, which was the other alternative considered.

Chair Tang asked what was different that led to installation of HAWK signals on Sloat Boulevard. Mr. Laskin replied that those signals were installed at the recommendation of Caltrans and that SFMTA would prefer to install a full signal in other similar circumstances not on Caltrans facilities. He said that RRFBs were the most effective option for the locations included in the item.

Commissioner Peskin requested that the \$6.774 million for the Transbay Transit Center Downtown Extension be continued to a future Plans and Programs Committee meeting due to concerns that he raised during Item 5 and that he was hopeful that over the next few weeks there would be more clarity about any impacts that Transbay Transit Center construction was having on

the Millennium Tower. He said that staff had informed him that delaying the allocation by one month would not impede the ultimate progress of the project.

Mark Zabaneh, Interim Executive Director at the Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA), requested that Commissioner Peskin reconsider his request, noting that even a year delay on the project would cost as much as \$200 million in escalation. He said that the TJPA had done a lot of geotechnical work in the area and could make any necessary adjustments over the next few months. He said that the TJPA was trying to achieve 30% design so there was a long way to go before they were settled on an actual design.

Commissioner Peskin replied that his understanding was that the funding in question was a small part of the overall funding for DTX and was intended to leverage funds from other sources. He said it was important to show funding partners that San Francisco was committed to the project, but that a one-month delay would not disrupt the project or be seen as lessening the City's commitment. Mr. Zabaneh said that he disagreed and that this initial request for the design phase was important for developing a robust cost estimate and risk management plan for the project, which would allow for the adoption of a project budget. He said that they did not want to repeat what happened in Phase I, when there was not an adequate cost estimate and costs kept changing. He added that he feared losing momentum on the project.

Commissioner Peskin said that he wanted to go into Phase II with eyes wide open and that had he known some of the issues that would be encountered during Phase I he would have asked different questions at the time of their approval. He said, as an example, that the condemnation of 80 Natoma Street was projected to cost \$12 million, but ended up costing \$58 million and that Phase II of the project could involve condemning additional parcels.

Chair Tang asked what sort of delays might result from continuing this funding request. Mr. Zabaneh responded that now that construction was wrapping up on Phase I, TJPA's focus was shifting to Phase II and that reaching 30% design would inform which parcels would be needed for the project. He said that they thought they would need portions of certain parcels, but that they were not certain yet. He said that reaching 30% design would include completing right-of-way engineering, which would tell them exactly which parcels would be impacted and whether TJPA would need easements from them, or partial or full takes of the parcels. He said that Commissioner Peskin's questions would be answered by the 30% design work, and that he would be happy to brief the Board on TJPA's progress and noted that they would not be doing right-of-way acquisition until the middle of next year at the earliest.

Commissioner Breed said that with the significant cost overruns and management issues, there were issues around trust with how much money had been spent on the project. She asked about oversight and how, if these funds were advanced, they could be sure that it was properly spent and that the Transportation Authority would not be asked for additional funds in the future. She said that the mistakes made on the Transbay Transit Center project were especially frustrating because they were multi-million dollar mistakes. Mr. Zabaneh responded that this request would fund the work to develop a robust cost estimate that the Transportation Authority and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission would agree with. He said that TJPA had signed a partnership agreement with the Transportation Authority because a project of this size could not be delivered by just one agency.

Tilly Chang, Executive Director, stated that the Transportation Authority had established a strong oversight protocol, which was a lesson learned from earlier phases of the project, but also based

on positive experiences with the Central Subway and Caltrain Electrification projects. She said that with complex projects like this one, there would be additional effort to make sure that the entire Board was kept informed.

Commissioner Breed said that she appreciated the additional oversight and planned to hold staff accountable. She said that she was willing to support moving this funding forward, but that there would need to be more proactive reporting on the project on a step-by-step basis.

Chair Tang said that she appreciated Commissioner Peskin's concerns, but that in her opinion the requested funds were critical to develop project details that could answer his questions.

Commissioner Peskin said that with the backdrop of the Millennium Tower settling and tilting and allegations that dewatering for Transbay Transit Center construction exacerbated the settling, they should understand insofar as the liability for these issues was unresolved. He said that he supported the Transbay Transit Center and high-speed rail to Downtown San Francisco and he hoped the TJPA had no liability for Millennium Tower settling, but that he would like more answers over the next month before he agreed to advance funding.

Commissioner Avalos asked Commissioner Peskin if there was any information that could be provided between the committee meeting and the subsequent Transportation Authority Board meeting that could alleviate his concerns in advancing the funding. Commissioner Peskin asked Mr. Zabaneh when the next TJPA meeting was, to which Mr. Zabaneh replied October 13. Commissioner Peskin said that it would have to be after that meeting and therefore the information would not be available prior to the Transportation Authority Board meeting.

Mr. Zabaneh said that he would be happy to meet with Commissioner Peskin individually. He said it was important to maintain momentum on the project and develop the cost estimate. Regarding the Millennium Tower, he said that the sinking began prior to Transbay Transit Center construction and that the building was tilting away from the transit center.

Chair Tang said that she hoped Commissioner Peskin and Mr. Zabaneh could meet to further discuss these issues. She said that she felt comfortable moving forward with the funding request because it was just for design work that would be necessary for cost estimates and would help to make sure that they were moving forward with the best option for the project.

Commissioner Avalos said that he would agree to move forward with the request, but that he would be open to continuing funding for TJPA at the following Board meeting.

There was no public comment.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Avalos, Breed and Tang (3)

Nays: Commissioner Peskin (1)

Absent: Commissioner Avalos (1)

8. Plan Bay Area 2040 Draft Preferred Scenario – INFORMATION

Michelle Beaulieu, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

There was no public comment.

9. Introduction of New Items – INFORMATION

There was no public comment.

10. Public Comment

During public comment, Andrew Yip spoke about self-nature.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:12 p.m.