



TRANSBAY JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY

**TRANSBAY JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**MEETING MINUTES**

Tuesday, April 14, 2009  
Transbay Joint Powers Authority  
201 Mission Street, Suite 2100  
San Francisco, CA

Meeting #018

5:30 p.m.

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Jim Lazarus, Chair  
Karen Knowles-Pearce, Vice Chair  
Andrew Brooks  
Michael Freeman  
Peter Hartman  
Adrienne Heim  
MaryClare M. James  
Marcus Krause  
David Milton  
Jane Morrison  
Jul Lynn Parsons  
Norm Rolfe  
Dave Snyder

Executive Director  
Maria Ayerdi-Kaplan

201 Mission St. #2100  
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 5:40 pm. Roll call was taken and a quorum was formed by 10 of 13 voting members as follows: Jim Lazarus, Karen Knowles-Pearce, Andrew Brooks, Michael Freeman, Peter Hartman, Marcus Krause, David Milton, Jane Morrison, Jul Lynn Parsons, and Norm Rolfe. Non-voting member Bob Beck was also present. During the course of the meeting the remaining members Adrienne Heim, MaryClare James, and Dave Snyder arrived for 100% participation.

Chair Lazarus congratulated and extended a welcome to the new and reappointed CAC members and thanked them for their willingness to serve.

#### **2. Approval of Amended November 18, 2008 Meeting Minutes**

Chair Lazarus stated that the Amended November 18, 2008 Meeting Minutes had been circulated and asked if there were comments or corrections. None were forthcoming. Karen Knowles-Pearce made a motion to approve the Amended Draft Meeting Minutes for the November 18, 2008 meeting and the motion was seconded by Michael Freeman. A vote was called by voice and the motion was unanimously moved and carried.

#### **3. Approval of January 13, 2009 Meeting Minutes**

Karen Knowles-Pearce made a motion to approve the Draft Meeting Minutes for the January 13, 2009 meeting and the motion was seconded by Michael Freeman. A vote was called by voice and the motion was unanimously moved and carried.

#### **4. Public Comment**

Chair Lazarus advised that a request had been made by a member of the public to move Agenda Item 8 – Public Comment forward. He asked if there was any comment or opposition to this request, there was none, and he introduced Joyce Roy. Ms. Roy commented that she is a long time Transbay activist and an architect by profession. She would like to see the history of the existing Transbay Terminal memorialized through a half day event held prior to the demolition of the existing Transbay Terminal. The event could include a PowerPoint presentation, tour, and an invitation to John King. She touched on the history of the structure including that the low ceilings heights may be disturbing to some, but they were designed so that you did not have to go far. Ms. Joyce distributed an article from the Heritage Newsletter and stressed that the building was once spectacular and hopes that the CAC members are interested in working on an event. Her E-mail address is [JoyceRoy@earthlink.net](mailto:JoyceRoy@earthlink.net).

Norm Rolfe suggested picking up movies and train schedules from when the Transbay Terminal was at its most active.

Joyce Roy would like to see a little museum space set aside in the new TTC to show the history of the existing Transbay Terminal and a provision that would help save some of the benches.

Chair Lazarus invited other public comment. There was none and Chair Lazarus closed public comment.

#### **5. Staff Report – Bob Beck**

Bob Beck welcomed the new and returning CAC members and mentioned that there are still two vacancies. The TJPA has contacted labor unions and has and will continue to do outreach for a daily Caltrain rider. If you know of anyone interested and has the background to fill either of these vacancies, please direct them to the TJPA website [www.transbaycenter.org](http://www.transbaycenter.org) for an Application.

The schematic design submittal was received on April 3, 2009. During the next couple of months the TJPA will be working on several issues and will be giving guidance to the Design Team. Since our last meeting, there have been lots of discussions regarding rail capacity and that issue will be discussed later. The design team has been very busy and looks forward to working with the CAC as things progress.

Karen Knowles-Pearce asked if there had been any significant impact to the design team due to the economy. Bob Beck replied that no, that everyone is still on board. There have been some favorable impacts. As an example, last June/July steel prices were \$5,500 per ton and now they are \$4,000 per ton. There has not been much change in labor costs; most of the savings has been on materials due to lower demand and fuel prices. The general contractor, Webcor/Obayashi, was approved at the March TJPA board meeting and will be working with the design team to validate the cost estimates.

Michael Freeman asked, although he assumes that Webcor has been engaged on a fee, if there is still a possibility of savings on subcontractors. Bob Beck agreed and explained Webcor/Obayashi bid a mark up on subcontractor costs and will be bidding the individual packages as the design is completed. The first packages that will be put out will be for the shoring wall, foundation, and utility relocation.

Chair Jim Lazarus asked where we are regarding Hines. Bob Beck replied that the TJPA met with them today and they are still on board. Jim asked about the impact if Hines was unable to commit to the building due to the world wide economy. Bob replied that we are counting on these funds for Phase 1 and if not, we would be faced with backfilling these funds. Jim then asked if there is a "drop dead" date. Bob explained that the date is at the end of the entitlement process. If we are successful in receiving stimulus funds to build from the bottom up, it would push out the date which we would need the Hines money as we would spend the stimulus funds first. Right now, the planning process is scheduled to be completed at the end of 2009, and payment from Hines is expected in 2010.

#### **6. Nomination and Election of Chair & Vice-Chair – Chair Lazarus**

Chair Lazarus called for nominations for the TJPA CAC Chair. Jane Morrison nominated Chair Lazarus and the nomination was seconded by Karen Knowles-Pearce. Chair Lazarus asked for further nominations. None were forthcoming and nominations were closed. A voice vote was taken and Jim Lazarus was unanimously reelected.

Chair Lazarus called for nominations for Vice-Chair. Michael Freeman nominated Karen Knowles-Pearce and Peter Hartman seconded the nomination. Chair Lazarus called for further nominations. Norm Rolfe nominated David Milton. Chair Lazarus called for a second to David Milton's nomination and there was none. Chair Lazarus called for further nominations for Vice-Chair, none were forthcoming and nominations were closed.

A voice vote was taken to elect the Vice-Chair and Karen Knowles-Pearce was reelected unanimously as Vice-Chair.

#### **7. DTX Design Update and American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) – Bob Beck**

The TJPA has had a great deal of activity and increased communication with Caltrain and the California High Speed Rail (CHSR) since our last meeting. A Memorandum Agreement was approved between the TJPA and CHSR agreeing to work together, share design information and so forth. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Caltrain was also approved. The difference between the two agreements is that the

Caltrain agreement calls for the two agencies to appoint a Program Director to act as point person for coordination along the Peninsula Corridor.

Mr. Beck provided a PowerPoint presentation which recapped the rail design activities from 2001 through 2008. The current rail design configuration was outlined which included 2-tracks leading to the DTX tunnel system, a Fourth and Townsend underground station, 3-track tunnel on Townsend and Second streets, 3 platforms and 6 tracks in the Transit Center, an at-grade rail car storage within the Caltrain yard, and deferment of the trail tracks until operationally required. The program schedule shows preliminary engineering continuing through the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter of 2010, final design award in the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter of 2010, and the initial construction package award in the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter of 2011. A Draft DTX Design Criteria was issued in August 2008. It was distributed to Caltrain, CHSRA, and stakeholders and comments were resolved and incorporated as necessary in a DTX Design Criteria Rev. A (controlled copy) issued January 2009. The TTC and the DTX design teams have coordinated closely regarding top of rail elevation, seismic compatibility and emergency ventilation designs.

On February 3, 2009, the TJPA received new operating expectations from CHSR including the following: all trains to the Bay Area will terminate at the Transbay Transit Center (TTC), the TTC should accommodate 12 trains per hour, train turn-around times would be 40 minutes per train with a 30 minute minimum dwell time, and the High-speed rail platforms should be fully-tangent with a minimum of 400 meters in length. Technical discussions between the TJPA, Caltrain and CHSR have taken place. The TJPA has evaluated what it would take to accommodate the requested changes and determined that it would include a 3 level train box (1 level passenger concourse and 2 levels of rail platform), and that the DTX rail extension would need to be split into two levels when coming into the TTC. The geometry was developed and it was determined that it could accommodate the requested changes, but would cost roughly an additional \$1 billion with \$500 million for the 2<sup>nd</sup> platform level and \$500 million for the bifurcated rail. There is an understanding from all parties that the TTC is the preferred destination for both Caltrain and High Speed Rail and that providing 2 levels of rail platforms is not cost effective or practical. We anticipate reaching a consensus in a very short time period endorsing the current TTC configuration and exploring alternative destinations or operational changes if more trains come in the peak hour.

Chair Lazarus asked if the TJPA has looked at an alternate adjacent second location. It had been suggested to him that an alternative may be to not locate the train box under 1<sup>st</sup> and Mission, but use the TTC as the front door and put the tracks and platform in at the Temporary Terminal site at Main and Beale streets. Bob replied that a number of ideas have been discussed and that one of the challenges to the Main and Beale location is that there is not enough room between the Bay Bridge and the 201 Mission Street building to accommodate the fully-tangent rail platform that CHSR requires.

Jane Morrison commented that it is terribly important to bring the people to the TTC so they can immediately connect with other major transportation modes, most of which are located downtown. When they have to get off at 4<sup>th</sup> and King, 20 – 30 minutes are added to their trip.

Bob Beck commented that there would be approximately 15,000 additional daily riders for Caltrain if the trains came into the TTC vs. 4<sup>th</sup> & Townsend and will be 1 million more riders for CHSR at the TTC vs. 4<sup>th</sup> & Townsend.

Norm Rolfe asked about the status of the loop. Bob replied that it is still being considered, but CHSR's 400 foot tangent requirement may make a loop on Main Street infeasible so other alignments may have to be considered as a loop is further evaluated.

Norm Rolfe asked what the people from DB Consult had to say about tangent vs. curvature and/or the differing platform height requirements. Bob replied that they did look at the platform curvature and the turn radii and said neither was unprecedented and that there is a trade off when building in urban area. CHSR is looking to achieve “no gap” between the train and platform without a mechanical device.

Norm Rolfe asked about platform heights and the difference between Caltrain and CHSR cars. Bob replied that this issue is currently being studied and a final decision has not been made. It is Caltrain’s decision what equipment they choose and their conversations with FRA will be important. Norm Rolfe asked about CPUC involvement, and Bob said CPUC would be involved, but that the FRA discussions about equipment would be first.

Norm Rolfe asked how realistic twelve trains an hour is. Bob replied that CHSR has provided the TJPA with some information including an operations plan showing 9 trains per hour, but that there are still questions about basis for such a frequent operating schedule including the low capacity utilization. Norm Rolfe commented that there is only one station in Japan that has this frequency and no others in Japan or Europe have that many. Bob agreed that this is consistent with our research and that one station is in Tokyo. Jane Morrison commented that it looks like it is unrealistic.

Chair Lazarus commented that it looks like almost all routes, with few exceptions, will come to San Francisco, illustrating the importance of San Francisco to CHSR’s operations. Peter Hartman commented that it sounds like CHSR is building for the long haul and asked if the capacity could grow. Bob replied that yes, that these are the things that could be done to increase capacity. One thing that is limiting capacity is the 40 minute turn-around, and they are looking at peak hour trains and the time leading up to and coming off of peak times. The difference between the 30 minutes minimum turnaround time and the scheduled 40 minute time is 10 minutes of recovery time. If the turn-around time can be reduced and operations can be optimized, capacity can be increased. Peter Hartman asked if it is known what will happen in San Diego and Anaheim. Bob replied that Anaheim had similarly received increased capacity requirements from CHSR.

Marcus Krause asked how many trains are planned for now, and Bob replied 6 trains per hour which was based on previous information provided by CHSR.

Karen Knowles-Pearce asked for the definition of “turn around” and if it meant physically turning the train around or reversing the train and going back the other way. Bob replied that the trains will have the ability to operate in both directions and that the “turn around” time is time between the train arriving at the station and departing the station. Karen commented that 40 minutes seems like a long time and asked why so long. Bob replied that it is a long time relative to other stations on the system – three minutes is the maximum dwell time for a run-through station – but CHSR expects Transbay to have more passengers than other stations and there will be some inspections, light cleaning, and stocking of food items required because the TTC is a terminal station.

Michael Freeman asked about the financing for Phase 2. Bob replied that significant funding is still needed to fully fund Phase 2 and that the TJPA anticipates that Federal funding will have to play a significant role. We are recognized as a CHSR project and expect to compete well for high speed rail funding in the Federal stimulus package. Michael asked about the CHSR funding plan, and Bob replied that they have the funds from last November’s \$9.9 billion general obligation bond measure, but their plan is to pursue an equal share in Federal funds and a private operating partner.

Adrienne Heim commented that San Jose's is expanding and asked if the ARRA requires a downtown station. Bob responded the bill is not that specific, and there are still on-going discussions around how fast a train must be to be considered as "high-speed rail." A Strategic Plan is expected to be issued by the FRA by Friday, April 17<sup>th</sup>, which should clarify some of these issues and the TJPA's chances of securing ARRA funding.

Bob Beck's final PowerPoint slide showed that ARRA provides \$8 billion for high speed and intercity rail; TJPA is pursuing ARRA funds for the train box; TTC is well positioned for ARRA funding; there are on-going conversations with MTC, Caltrain, CHSRA and Caltrans; and the FRA is to issue a Strategic Plan April 17<sup>th</sup> with applications due in June. Bob stated that California, Illinois, and Florida look to be front runners for HSR funds. The TTC is well positioned regarding shovel readiness for stimulus funds. MTC is facilitating the conversations that are taking place regarding taking a regional approach when going after stimulus funding. Caltrans will be preparing the State's official list of eligible high-speed rail projects.

Chair Lazarus asked if there were any further questions or comments and there were none.

#### **8. Schematic Design Update – Randy Volenec**

Randy Volenec with the design team of Pelli-Clarke-Pelli provided a PowerPoint presentation and gave an update on Schematic Design. Schematic Design has been submitted to the TJPA and upon receipt of comments, Design Development will proceed. The Temporary Terminal is scheduled to be complete in September making way for operators to move out of the Transbay Transit Center and demolition to commence.

Various street views of the TTC were shown. Underground easements are being sought to enable building of the train box (Minna & Natoma streets). Bob Beck commented the City will vacate and transfer title of the space where the Transit Center encroaches above or below the street to the TJPA instead of granting an easement, and that an Environmental Addendum was approved at the last TJPA board meeting specifically addressing the fact that the TJPA would be taking title to those spaces. The addendum also included a possible bridge over Beale Street being to access the Park. The bridge is one option being evaluated to give the public access to the Park from Beale Street.

It is planned to reverse traffic on Minna from West to East so that passengers can be dropped off on the right side of the street. Traffic will flow through the Transit Center on both First and Fremont Streets.

Architectural views of the various levels were shown. Retail space has been added on Beale Street and changes are being made on the second level of the TTC above the Grand Hall. Loading docks are being moved to take advantage of the view provided by the newly opened plaza at the 555 Mission Street building. A retail consultant has been engaged and believes that the Park will be important to the neighborhood as well as for the transit riders, and it is still being studied on how to make sure that it is attractive, available, and active as possible. The arrangement of the waiting area level above ground is evolving.

Chair Lazarus asked if the capacity for ticketing and loading on the rail levels had been looked at. Randy replied yes, and that it is likely to change as there are a number of studies regarding people movement. Bob Beck commented that there were some openings from the rail concourse to the rail platforms in the original scheme, but they have been filled in because they presented a number of problems for the design and construction of building systems and that rail concourse this space is still being

evaluated and revised. It was thought that CHSR would need a secure waiting area, but they have said it is not needed and therefore we can realize more use by comingling the Caltrain and CHSR waiting areas.

Views were shown of the light columns on the various levels. The desire is to bring as much light into the Grand Hall as possible and make the building and Grand Hall a very memorable space so people know that they have come to a special place.

Some structural changes were highlighted including areas where the baskets have been flattened. Not only does this change save money, but also provides an architectural answer to a situation where the building would be too close to other existing structures.

Under the section regarding Sustainability, currently the building is set to achieve LEED Silver, but Randy thinks we can get to LEED Gold. Gains in water management were discussed and the possibility of tying into a district heating and power system.

Andrew Brooks asked what was meant by district systems and Bob Beck replied that the Planning Department had mentioned that they see the Transbay neighborhood as an opportunity to develop a district heating and power system that would generate electricity and steam locally at very high efficiency to serve the neighborhood.

Views were shown of the proposed ventilation systems which included fully conditioned, partially conditioned and unconditioned naturally ventilated areas and natural ventilation was explained.

There are ongoing discussions with Planning regarding landscaping. Topics include areas under the bus ramps, parks, and tying the area together. An updated view of the roof Park was given showing multiple new access points from outside the building to encourage neighborhood use. An overview of possible park retail and activities was described.

Karen Knowles-Pearce asked if the glass is photovoltaic. Randy replied no, that it had been looked at but was not viable because of the location and it does not get good benefit from the sun.

Peter Hartman asked if the wind levels in the Park had been looked at and Randy replied that it has been looked at and the façade on the sides of the Park had been extended to baffle the wind and that wind simulations are being done. This issue is being looked at very carefully for several reasons including the location of air intakes and exhaust.

Norm Rolfe asked if the funiculars in the pictures were real funiculars and Randy replied yes. Norm asked who will pay for them and the maintenance. Randy replied that they were still looking at that issue.

Michael Freeman asked how many lanes there will be on First Street. Bob replied that there will be 4 lanes which are the same as today, but there will not be any parking. Michael asked who will do the permitting and Bob replied the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection will do plan check reviews and that because we are a regional authority, they will not actually issue a permit. We have the ability to self permit. Michael asked about fire permits, and Randy explained that there have been several meetings with the San Francisco Fire Department who will review the design and PCPA will design to meet their standards and codes.

Adrienne Heim asked about the issue of transients and preventing crime in the Park. Randy replied that there have been meetings with the San Francisco Police Department

looking at controlling access to Park, operations of the Park and Transit Center, and ways to design for this situation. We are looking at operations and the possibility of closing the Park at night and possibly moving the ACTransit late night service to the street level.

Chair Lazarus asked if there were comments for future agenda requests. There were none.

Chair Lazarus commented that regarding the Caltrain and CHSR long term capacity issue and functionality of the rail component, the biggest outstanding issue is that the various agencies are not speaking with one voice and need to hear from the train people to make sure that the building is a workable train station. Bob Beck replied that we are actively working towards that goal, and the MTC is working hard to drive people to have one voice. If we are not speaking with a unified voice we will not compete well with other parts of the country for ARRA funding.

MaryClare James was impressed with the Schematic Design presentation video, felt that it would get those members of the public who saw it excited about the project, and asked if it was on line. Rebecca Armenta of the TJPA commented that it is on U-tube and vimeo and provided the following link: [www.vimeo.com/3021119](http://www.vimeo.com/3021119). Randy Volenec mentioned that Fred Clarke of Pelli-Clarke-Pelli plans to give a presentation to the San Francisco Planning Department and the San Francisco Redevelopment Department. Both meetings are public and that would be another opportunity to see the video.

Chair Lazarus asked if there was any public comment and there was none.

Chair Lazarus asked if there was any further CAC member comment and there was none.

8. Chair Lazarus asked if there was a motion to adjourn the meeting. Jane Morrison made the motion to adjourn and it was seconded by Karen Knowles-Pearce. Chair Lazarus adjourned the meeting at 7:30.

## 5. Next Meeting

The next meeting is schedule on Tuesday, May 12, 2009.

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).





