



TRANSBAY JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY

Maria Ayerdi • Executive Director

**TRANSBAY JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**MEETING MINUTES**

Tuesday, October 9, 2007  
Yerba Buena Center for the Arts  
701 Mission Street  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Conference Room  
San Francisco, CA

Meeting #007

5:30 p.m.

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Jim Lazarus, Chair  
Karen Knowles-Pearce, Vice Chair  
Andrew Baglino  
Adrian Brandt  
Richard Brooks  
Tracy Cramer  
Alfonso Felder  
Peter Hartman  
Adrienne Heim  
Michael Kiesling  
Shawn Leonard  
Jane Morrison  
Jul Lynn Parsons  
Norm Rolfe  
Dave Snyder

Executive Director  
Maria Ayerdi

201 Mission St. #1960  
San Francisco, California 94105  
415-597-4620  
415-597-4615 fax

## 1. Welcome & Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Jim Lazarus, Chair, at 5:35 pm. A quorum was formed by 9 of the 15 voting members as follows: Jim Lazarus, Karen Knowles-Pearce, Adrian Brandt, Tracy Cramer, Peter Hartman, Adrienne Heim, Shawn Leonard, Jul Lynn Parsons, and Norm Rolfe. Non-voting member Bob Beck was also present.

## 2. Approval of September 18, 2007 Meeting Minutes

Jim Lazarus made a motion to approve the Draft Meeting Minutes for the September 18, 2007 meeting and the motion was seconded by Karen Knowles-Pearce. A vote was called by voice and the motion was unanimously moved and carried.

### 2a. Motion to add an Agenda Item

A request was made by Jim Lazarus to add a "Staff Report" Agenda Item to the Agenda for future TJPA CAC meetings. The motion was moved by Shawn Leonard and seconded by Karen Knowles-Pearce. A vote was called by voice and the motion was moved and carried.

Bob Beck commented on the role of the TJPA CAC vs. the San Francisco Redevelopment CAC. He described the types of items that will be brought to the TJPA CAC in the future which include focus on the Transit Center, DTX, Temporary Terminal and Bus Storage, and how the CAC may advise and support the Transbay Transit Center Program. Two key areas are the design of the project, including operations and ridership, and strategies to close the funding gap.

The Redevelopment CAC's focus is primarily on the Zone 1 improvements including, housing, streetscapes in the redevelopment area etc. The Redevelopment Agency has planning authority over the Zone 1 improvements including the Temporary Terminal Project so there is a formally defined role & authority for both the Redevelopment Commission and CAC on those projects. Because there is some crossover, we will also present information that relates to the redevelopment area to the TJPA CAC to provide context for the overall Program.

Karen Knowles-Pearce asked what role the CAC could have regarding the funding gap, and Bob replied that a number of programs – congestion pricing, increased gas taxes, etc. – are under consideration in the State and the Region to support transit and transportation related programs. The CAC could get information out to other groups, the community at large, law makers etc. and build support for the inclusion of the Transbay Program in any funding programs that come forward.

Norm Rolfe asked if the DTX will go into Zone 1 and Zone 2 and Bob Beck replied that the DTX will be primarily outside of the redevelopment area. Norm also asked what had happened to 80 Natoma and what the purchase price was and Bob replied that the TJPA had purchased 80 Natoma and it will be a part of the Transit Center footprint. The cost was approximately \$58M.

Emilio Cruz noted that the CAC has the opportunity to be an advocate for the project.

Jul Lynn Parsons asked what "congestion pricing" is, and Bob Beck replied that it would create a zone in the downtown where vehicles would be charged a fee to enter. It is an idea to promote transit, ease congestion and raise funds for transit and transportation projects. If it became a reality, the Transit Center Program could compete for those funds.

Norm Rolfe suggested that the CAC members and TJPA look into and get literature regarding the Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA) plan regarding congestion pricing and Doyle Drive. He strongly urged the CAC members to talk to their federal representative, the Department of Transportation and Nancy Pelosi to make changes to the plan. Bob Beck responded that the TJPA is having conversations regarding this issue.

### **3. Overview of Transit Center District Plan Study Effort – Joshua Switzky, City Planning Department**

Mr. Switzky gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding the Transit Center District Plan which provided background and outlined the continuously evolving plans for San Francisco (City). In 1972 the Urban Design Plan was adopted, and in 1985 the Downtown Plan was adopted. These plans determined that the City should concentrate dense growth in the downtown area, be walkable and transit-oriented. The 1985 Downtown Plan determined that growth should be shifted from North of Market to South of Market, implemented height limits, formulated a transit plan, and recommend a program for housing around this area. The Rincon Hill area became a desirable housing area after the demolition of the Embarcadero Freeway and the Transbay Redevelopment Area will complement that development.

The Redevelopment Area is split between Zone 1 and Zone 2 with the Transbay Transit Center located in Zone 2. The Redevelopment Agency is responsible for oversight of Zone 1 and the San Francisco Planning Department has planning oversight of Zone 2. Although there are two separate zones and oversight agencies, the Transbay and Rincon Hill areas are being built out as one neighborhood with over 7,000 units of housing planned.

When the Downtown Plan was passed in 1985, the replacement of the Transit Center was not anticipated nor was the demolition of the Embarcadero Freeway. The Planning Department therefore thought that it was appropriate to reevaluate the planning controls around the center to respond to the investment that is being made in the transit center and the redevelopment area. In spring 2006, the Mayor formed an Interoffice Working Group to review the then current assumptions regarding the Transbay and to help identify ways to help fill the funding gap. Some of the conclusions that the working group arrived at were: not to put housing on top of the Transit Center building, a need for increased density in the downtown zone, and that the growth around the Transit Center should help fund the program.

In this last generation of growth in San Francisco, the City wants to remember its core values. Currently, the Planning Department is evaluating the form of the City's skyline and reviewing the transit core. They will also look at other proposed buildings in the area and continue emphasis on the transit core adopted in the 1985 Downtown Plan.

Tracy Cramer asked if the Planning Department is going to do a new EIR or go off of the old one. Mr. Switzky replied that they will need a new EIR in order to rezone, but the Tower would be included in the EIR for the area and therefore should not require a separate EIR.

The objectives of land use, urban form, and revenues to support the Transit Center will be reflected in the plan. There was a review of the timeline with the next public workshops being planned for mid-November and the EIR process to proceed concurrently.

Shawn Leonard asked who will cover the cost and Mr. Switzky responded that the EIR costs will be covered by the San Francisco Transportation Authority (TA), Planning Department, development fees, and other funding sources.

Shawn Leonard asked Mr. Switzky what he knows about the new Planning Department Director and his feelings toward the Transbay Center. Mr. Switzky replied that has not met with the new Planning Director, but that he has an urban design background and will arrive in January 2008. Dean Macris will be staying on with the Planning Department in an advisory role and his main interest will be the Transit Center Program.

Bob Beck commented that the work that is being done by the Planning Department will set the height and by extension the financial value of the Tower. There may be some overlap with other Zone 2 and Howard Street properties that can affect tax increment funding and the financial plan. Joshua Switzky informed that planning will take approximately 6 months (spring 2008) and then they will issue recommendations for the EIR phase. The planning controls will not be “firm” until the Board has adopted the EIR and the Mayor signs it which is anticipated for early 2009.

Peter Hartman asked what height is shown in the Pelli proposal. Bob Beck replied 1,200 feet including the wind turbines. If the EIR determines that the height needs to be reduced, we will have to see how that will impact the design.

Adrian Brandt asked when the height recommendation will be know and Joshua Switzky replied that after the EIR is complete the “maximum” allowable height will be known, but that buildings could be lower. Adrian commented that the maximum EIR then gets driven by the Planning Study conclusions.

Karen Knowles-Pearce asked what would happen if the height in the plan that was proposed is not approved. Emilio Cruz explained that in the Competition, we would have to evaluate independently what the value of the development would be at the lower height and attempt to negotiate an agreement with the developer at that height.

#### **4. Update on Downtown Extension (DTX) Preliminary Engineering – Bradford Townsend, DTX Project Manager**

A brief summary of the last update was given. The loop/tail track concepts were presented. The number of tracks and their configuration were outlined. The current configuration terminates the tracks at Beale Street.

Adrian Brandt asked if this would reduce the train speed. Bradford said no as the trains must stop at the station. Although the high speed rail trains would not have space to “overrun” the platform, the platforms will exceed the length of the Caltrain trains, and they should be able should not need to reduce speed.

Bradford then discussed the contract packaging strategy and how the TJPA intends to manage the DTX extension work. Bradford commented that we are not looking at grade separation as it is not required at this time. Caltrain is independently evaluating grade separation for their system. Bradford described three “advance contracts” that can be done before the completion of the design: Caltrain yard modifications, building demolition, and Townsend & 2<sup>nd</sup> Street utilities. The goals of the construction sequencing are to construct the DTX in the shortest possible timeframe, minimize escalation costs and minimize disruption to the Caltrain service.

An overview of the studies and reports regarding the RLPA progress was given. The Draft Fire Life Safety Report and the Draft Tunnel Study Report were highlighted.

Adrian Brandt asked if the size of the tunnel is known and Bradford replied that Caltrain will replace their fleet. The prevalent types of rolling stock have been evaluated in sizing the tunnel size so that it can accommodate the probable Caltrain and High Speed Rail equipment.

An overview of the coordination effort and DTX design assessment were given. TJPA has been reviewing of the design for statutory compliance, conformance with the current design criteria for High Speed Rail and consistency with practices around the world. The Cologne Station was cited as an example and comparisons between the Cologne Station and the plan for DTX were discussed. Bradford explained that although 1/4<sup>th</sup> of the length of the train will not be tangent with the platform face, there are various ways to deal with it. A consultant was hired to review the geometry. They concurred and made some recommendations. The consultant review found that although the design is not complete, it is consistent with prevailing design and operating standards around the world.

On going work was discussed and the 2008 objectives include working with funding agencies to secure funds to conduct environmental assessment for a loop project and initiate RLPA Preliminary Engineering Part II.

Peter Hartman asked about the planning for 4<sup>th</sup> & King Street. Bradford replied that it is outside of the TJPA's scope, but Caltrain will rely upon it for future operations. Emilio Cruz mentioned that SPUR will be doing a paper on it, and the Planning Department will be studying the area.

Adrian Brandt asked about the status of the loop. Bradford replied that the RLPA is now for a stub end rail configuration at the Transit Center. The loop tracks will be assessed environmentally as a separate project. When High Speed Rail comes, a tail track or loop may be required.

Karen Knowles-Pearce requested that copies of the presentations be sent to the CAC members. Bob Beck confirmed that they would be sent by E-mail.

## **5. Public Comment**

None

## **6. Next Meeting**

The next meeting is scheduled on Tuesday, November 13, 2007.

## **7. Adjourn**

A motion to adjourn was made by Adrian Brandt and seconded by Peter Hartman and passed. The meeting was adjourned by Vice Chair Knowles-Pearce at 7:10 pm.

The Ethics Commission of the City and County of San Francisco has asked us to remind individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Admin. Code Sections 16.520 - 16.534] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at 1390 Market Street, Suite 801, San Francisco, CA 94102, telephone (415) 554-9510, fax (415) 554-8757 and web site: [sfgov.org/ethics](http://sfgov.org/ethics).