



TRANSBAY JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY

**TRANSBAY JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**MEETING MINUTES**

Tuesday, December 8, 2009  
Transbay Joint Powers Authority  
201 Mission Street, Suite 2100  
San Francisco, CA

Meeting #024

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  
D'Arcy Myjer  
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. Call to Order

At 5:40 pm, there was an insufficient number of members present to form a quorum and, in the interest of time, Chair Lazarus deferred Agenda Item #2 (Approval of the November 10, 2009 Meeting Minutes) and asked Bob Beck to give his Staff Report off the record.

Bob Beck informed the CAC members that Norm Rolfe who not only is a CAC member, but has also been a long time Transbay supporter is quite ill. A card to wish him well and let him know that the CAC members miss him was circulated around the room. Bob then provided his Staff Report.

At 5:50 p.m., an additional CAC member arrived to form a quorum and the meeting was called to order. The meeting was attended by 8 of the current 14 voting members as follows: Jim Lazarus, Andrew Brooks, Michael Freeman, Peter Hartman, Adrienne Heim, Marcus Krause, David Milton, and Jul Lynn Parsons. Non-voting member Bob Beck was also present.

Chair Lazarus asked if CAC members or any member of the public had questions or comments regarding the Staff Report and there were none.

## 2. Approval of November 10, 2009 Meeting Minutes

Chair Lazarus asked if there were any corrections or comment on the Draft Meeting Minutes for the November 10, 2009 and there were none. Andrew Brooks made a motion to approve the November 10, 2009 Draft Meeting Minutes and the motion was seconded by Marcus Krause. A vote was called by voice and the motion was unanimously moved and carried.

## 3. Staff Report – Bob Beck

Mr. Beck provided the Staff Report earlier off the record.

## 4. Utility Relocation – Guy Hollins (Program Management/Program Controls)

Mr. Hollins provided an update on the utility relocation project including the following:

- Utility Investigation and Design – The shoring wall that will be built to facilitate the train box will extend into Minna and Natoma Streets and all utilities must be relocated. Utilities are being grouped into publically owned (example: sewer, water, etc) and privately owned (example: PG&E, AT&T, etc.) This distinction is important as TJPA is a public project and will have to pay the cost when we relocate publicly owned utilities. However, private utility owners will have to bear the cost of relocating their utilities for at least the first move.
- A lengthy 2-phase process was started in 2005-2006 to discover what is in the streets. In Phase 2, we have an opportunity to positively identify what is in the streets by cutting exploratory trenches and potholes. 4 of 5 trenches have been completed and he explained the process
- 50 potholes were used to make a detailed horizontal layout to specify specific depths and locate possible conflicts. Depth of sensitive utilities is important, especially regarding telecommunications facilities. Two major considerations and constraints are the number of major utility transmission routes and vehicle traffic. Utility service must be maintained throughout the duration of the job.
- Three Alternatives for relocating utilities which reside in the Transit Center footprint were considered as follows: Alternative 1 is to permanently clear all existing utilities from the Transit Center footprint, Alternative 2 is to temporarily relocate utilities within

- the affected areas, and Alternative 3 is to temporarily span utilities overhead (above building excavation zone). A blended solution will be used that would clear the footprint of “wet” utilities such as water and gas lines, temporarily span telecommunications overhead, temporarily relocate PG&E, and have a single relocation outside the shoring wall for utilities on Minna and Natoma.
- The process and sequencing of the utility relocation was discussed. Slides showed what the street above and trench below would look like at various stages and the completed configuration.
  - Design development was 30% completed in March 2009 and 50% complete in August 2009. It will be 90% complete in January 2010 and 100% complete in February 2010.
  - The utility relocation schedule is restrained by the start of demolition. It is anticipated that demolition and early phase utility relocation will start in the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter of 2010. We want to get the utilities out of the way for the shoring wall construction. Utility Relocation Phase 1 for the bulk of utility relocation work is scheduled for the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter of 2010 and shoring wall construction is scheduled for the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter of 2010.
  - The construction budget is \$47.3M of which new construction is \$11.9M and demolition is \$16.2M. Usually these figures would be flipped, but we will be demolishing just about every piece of infrastructure in the street in one way or another. We are also carrying a high number for contingencies as the streets of San Francisco are very dense with a lot of different utilities that are or we think are abandoned.
  - Mr. Hollins completed his presentation with an invitation for questions.

Andrew Brooks asked if any PG&E vaults have been identified as having PCB. Mr. Hollins responded that there have not been any discussions with PG&E about particular vaults or about PCB. Certain vault locations have been determined, but it has been left to private owners to determine needs regarding what will be new and what will remain primarily because it is their cost. All vaults within the Transbay footprint will be relocated.

Andrew Brooks asked if PG&E is going to maintain the three phase power for older elevators and support structures in high rises that run through the streets. Bob Beck replied that they are going to relocate facilities, but have not indicated any plans to change their distribution. Andrew mentioned that the elevators in the South of Market buildings run on DC and PG&E has always wanted to change it.

Michael Freeman commented that there was a period of time where each telecommunication company was running their own fiber through the streets and asked how you will identify who owns what and how you are going to get them to move it. Guy Hollins replied that the telecommunications companies work under a state franchise. When we started in 2005-2006, we sent out approximately 50 Notices of Intent letters. Large companies such as Qwest, AT&T, etc. have a good idea about what they have and we are looking to them identify their equipment and the equipment of smaller companies who lease from them. There has, however, been a lot of consolidation in the telecom industry, and we may find a duct or vault that no one has identified, but we have a process for identifying the owner in those events.

Marcus Krause asked if Mr. Hollins had said that the people with franchises will pay for relocation, and Mr. Hollins replied that they will pay for at least the first move. Mr. Krause asked if they will do it to our schedule. Mr. Hollins said that our consultant AECOM USA, Inc. will work with the private utility companies. We have identified the locations available for them and will monitor the work when it is done. We have been working with them and feel they will be able to meet our schedule goals. Mr. Krause asked about how much unknown utilities can hold up the project. Bob Beck replied that we should be able to deal with those types of incidents rather quickly. On many past

City projects, they have routinely been pretty good about identifying utilities as no utility provider wants an interruption in service. Guy Hollins added that there is a plan for a joint trench for use by both multiple utilities where we will build the trench and they will pull their cables. The utilities are very interested as both time and money are saved.

Peter Hartman commented that a district utility area had been previously mentioned and asked if the TJPA is involved. Bob Beck replied that TJPA has been following it. The San Francisco Planning Department, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, and the Department of Environment have a contract and a study is being done at this time. The impact will not be on our utility relocation work, but on the design of systems in the Transit Center. If the timing is right, we may be able to use some of it. The question is how large it will be and where will it be located.

Andrew Brooks asked if the lights go out or the internet goes down how our liability will be affected. Are the costs built in or how is the cost shared? Guy Hollins replied that there is an emergency plan in place including a call tree which will get the proper personnel on site quickly. Who pays for it will depend on the circumstances of the interruption. Bob Beck commented that typically, it falls between the contractor and the utility.

Chair Lazarus asked if there were any further questions or comments from CAC members or the public and there were none.

#### **5. Rail Update/Coordination with High Speed Rail (HSR) - (Derek Penrice, & Brian Dykes, and Bob Beck)**

Mr. Beck explained that this update will be given in 3 parts. Derek Penrice from the Program Management team will discuss technical coordination and feedback concerning identifying HSR station requirements, Brian Dykes from TJPA will give an update regarding the levels of coordination TJPA has been having with HSR and he (Bob) will provide some slides regarding the Beale Street alternative.

Part 1 - Mr. Penrice focused on the coordination with HSR relative to identifying their space requirements for their operation within the Transit Center. In early 2009, we asked if HSR had any station design guidelines that we could use to help us implement design of the Transit Center. In June of this year, HSR provided us with a technical memorandum TM 2.2.2 which is their programmatic station design guideline that will be used in every HSR station in the system and a supplement specific to the Transbay Transit Center (TTC). These documents identified a number of infrastructure, geometric, and system requirements. Functional requirements including facilities for command & control, passenger, train crew, and catering along with equipment & maintenance space were outlined. Some of questions as to how big, where, and what could be shared with Caltrain were answered and some not, therefore we made some assumptions and estimated the need to be 16,500 sq. ft. and asked for feedback. We have identified approximately 54,500 sq. ft. of space, but do not know if it is in the right location. Pelli-Clarke-Pelli Architects (PCPA) is developing layouts anticipated to be available in January 2010 and we will sit down with the 2 operators (HSR & Caltrain) for their feedback. This concluded his portion of the presentation and he invited questions.

David Milton asked how the space needed for maintenance became so large given that neither operator is going to do significant maintenance in San Francisco. Derek Penrice replied that there are all kinds of maintenance space will be needed including space for overhead catenary, signal systems, platform, and maintenance staff and cleaners. Bob Beck added because they will be turning the trains in San Francisco, they will clean them.

Adrienne Heim asked if this cleaning will be done in all stations and Derek replied it is only in San Francisco because San Francisco is the end of the line and they will require cleaning and catering services.

Part 2 - Brian Dykes explained that a technical working group system was set up where TJPA met with HSR consultants. The first Technical Working Group Meeting was held on June 23<sup>rd</sup> in which HSR explained how the process is organized, how feedback should be given, and points of contact were delegated. The second meeting was held on September 30<sup>th</sup> where HSR laid out their options for HSR between San Francisco and San Jose and asked for comments. We expect a meeting each quarter. A series of Open Houses were held. The San Francisco Open House was held on October 13<sup>th</sup>. A lot of public and technical comment was given to HSR and we are awaiting feedback from them. A policy working group meeting was held on October 16<sup>th</sup> to set up channels for contacts. On November 4<sup>th</sup> a meeting was held in Burlingame regarding "context sensitive" objections and possible solutions regarding the people who live in the project area. This is yet to be done in San Francisco. There have also been Town Hall Meetings held on the Peninsula mostly organized by either the cities or politicians to give the public a voice. TJPA has had engineering coordination meetings with HSR consultants Parsons Brinkerhoff and HNTB to facilitate two way communications, review issues, and coordinate solutions. TJPA has also written papers to show how TTC will work and other alternatives will not and believe that the message is starting to get through.

Jim Lazarus commented that one of the major issues that raised the alternatives to the Transbay site was the number of trains per hour that HSR felt would be needed to be accommodated in 25 years. What is the latest regarding that? Bob Beck replied that HSR has not produced a business plan or ridership figures to support these requirements. The eventual operations plan will be greatly influenced by the CHSRA's eventual operating partner, and HSR has started informal discussions with the French, Chinese, and Spanish regarding the operations aspect. The only operators that currently operate on that level are the Japanese in Tokyo. Brian Dykes commented that in March he gave a paper on the project in England and met with a number of operators who were all of the opinion that California would not operate the proposed number of trains in 50 years.

Jim Lazarus recalled that virtually every train coming over the Pacheco Pass would end up in San Francisco and asked if there was enough population for trains to go to different places. Brian replied that the plan is to have 1 express train from San Francisco to Los Angeles and the rest would be different varieties of stop patterns. The current operations plan shows 8 trains per hour. Bob added that there are a lot of operating alternatives that can be looked at and that there has not been a lot of work done to optimize the Operations Plan. The current Draft Operations Plan shows 8 not 12 trains per hour, and there is not a strong correlation between even 8 trains per hour and the ridership projections. The Operators Plan will need to go through several iterations and having an operating partner would help.

Andrew Brooks asked how the time HSR has spent on the peninsula routing and the Pacheco Pass vs. Altamont Pass alternatives affected TJPA. Brian responded that most of the work is not on the San Jose to San Francisco leg and that what could hurt us most is if an agreement on the peninsula is not reached, but I don't think that will happen.

Adrienne Heim asked if there had been any interviews or surveys from Europe of how people felt about similar projects initially that are relevant to what the people on the peninsula are going through. Brian replied that the question is "what can you live with" in a residential area. The situation of residences in Europe by the rail road tracks is

different. You have to look at the question in the context of what is here—which are low density, high value homes.

Michael Freeman asked if there will be enough revenue generated from the fares to cover the cost for operators who are in talks with HSR. Brian replied that it depends who you talk to, but the French seem to think it will.

Part 3 – Bob Beck discussed the Beale Street option. Mr. Beck showed the alignment from the HSR's alternative analysis document and how it is proposed to connect to the Transbay Transit Center. Advocates for the Beale Street option alternative have highlighted the ability to provide 12 platforms and claimed that it can be built at a lower cost. Bob Beck pointed out that, as was previously discussed, there has been no demonstration that 12 platforms will actually be needed. The development of the Beale Street option site infrastructure would cost several billion dollars more than the TTC. The volume of the below-grade excavation is three times that of the Transbay Transit Center and twice the volume than it would take to add an additional level to the TTC per our studies last spring. Therefore, the cost for the Beale Street option is definitely not less than the TTC.

The TJPA has looked at what it would take to build the HSR rail alignment. Our rail consultant Parsons laid out the required platform lengths, track mergers and minimum geometry and concluded that there were a number of negative impacts. Two residential towers, the Rincon Postal Annex (federally owned and could not be taken by Eminent Domain), and Bay Bridge supports would be impacted. When you add the cost of this structural alignment and any Caltrans requirements to safeguard the bridge structures the cost of this alignment is significantly higher. Bob Beck said he does not doubt that this alternative will be dropped through HSR's environmental process, but the hope is that it be dropped quickly as to not interfere with the Federal Railroad Administration's (FRA) funding decision. He invited questions.

Michael Freeman asked if you could build half of the Beale Street option tracks and facility and then build the other half later. Bob replied that HSR has not necessarily proposed this, but the Gensler group had proposed that you could build 6 tracks and 3 platforms and then come back and build the other half at another time. Mr. Freeman asked if in the TJPA you looked at the cost if it was built on a lesser scale. Mr. Beck said that they did not price building half of it and that they had some concerns about the idea of phasing it including disrupting neighborhoods twice and what to do with the area that was to be developed later. Mr. Freeman said he is trying to compare the cost of building 6 tracks now and 6 tracks in the future. Bob Beck replied that we didn't look at it that way and that the conflicts and cost are still considerably higher than the TTC even before building out the other half.

David Milton asked about the status of the link to BART. Bob replied that TJPA is talking to BART, and BART is analyzing capacity at the Embarcadero Station. Both the Montgomery and Embarcadero stations had been looked at and Embarcadero is the preferred station because it is a shorter distance to Embarcadero and there are significant conflicts with existing utilities between the Transit Center and the Montgomery BART Station. Mr. Milton observed that as of now there is no commitment to a connector and Mr. Beck agreed but it is still being actively pursued and would not be required until the rail extension was complete. Mr. Milton asked if there had been any discussions between TJPA and BART regarding who would bear the capital costs of a connector. Mr. Beck replied that at this time it is TJPA's expectation that we would build and bear the cost of the connector, but not the cost of any capacity improvements within the Embarcadero Station.

Chair Lazarus thanked the presenters and asked if there were any questions or comments from CAC members or the public on the presentation and there was none.

6. **Public Comment** - Chair Lazarus asked if there were any questions or comments from on matters not previously discussed. There was none.
7. **CAC Member Comments & Future Agenda Requests** – Chair Lazarus asked if there were any future agenda item requests. There were none.

Chair Lazarus asked that a schedule for the 2010 CAC meetings be prepared and distributed and to note if any meeting dates conflict with holidays.

Bob Beck mentioned that it is time to start thinking about CAC membership and that the new terms will start in April 2010. We will be notifying existing members whose terms will be expiring and request reapplication if you wish to continue your participation. A public announcement and request for applications will be sent in January.

#### 8. **Adjourn**

Chair Lazarus wished everyone a Happy Holidays and Happy New year and adjourned the meeting at 6:50 PM.

#### 9. **Next Meeting**

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, January 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).