



TRANSBAY JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY

**TRANSBAY JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, May 11, 2010
Transbay Joint Powers Authority
201 Mission Street, Suite 2100
San Francisco, CA

Meeting #027

5:30 p.m.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Jim Lazarus, Chair
Karen Knowles-Pearce, Vice Chair
Andrew Brooks
Anthony Dimas
Michael Freeman
Peter Hartman
MaryClare M. James
Marcus Krause
David Milton
Jane Morrison
D'Arcy Myjer
Ted Olsson
Jul Lynn Parsons
Dave Snyder
Pascale Soumoy

Executive Director
Maria Ayerdi-Kaplan

201 Mission St. #2100
San Francisco, California 94105
415-597-4620
415-597-4615 fax

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Jim Lazarus, Chair, at 5:35 pm. A quorum was formed and the meeting was attended by 13 of 15 voting members as follows: Jim Lazarus, Karen Knowles-Pearce, Andrew Brooks, Anthony Dimas, Michael Freeman, Peter Hartman, MaryClare James, Marcus Krause, David Milton, Jane Morrison, Ted Olsson, Dan Snyder and Pascale Soumoy. Non-voting member Bob Beck was also present. New Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) members were welcomed and introductions were made.

2. Approval of March 9, 2010 Meeting Minutes

Chair Lazarus asked if there were any corrections or comments to the March 9, 2010 Draft Meeting Minutes. There were none. Vice-Chair Karen Knowles-Pearce made a motion to approve the March 9, 2010 Draft Meeting Minutes and Michael Freeman seconded the motion. A vote was called by voice and the motion was unanimously moved and carried.

3. Staff Report – Bob Beck

Mr. Beck reported that California High Speed Rail (CHSR) concluded its Preliminary Alternatives Analysis for the peninsula corridor and has selected the Transbay Transit Center (TTC) as the San Francisco station location. Prior to the resolution of this matter, a measure was put on the San Francisco ballot to reinforce San Francisco's position that the TTC is the best and only CHSR San Francisco location, and this announcement came too late to remove it from the ballot. TJPA continues to coordinate with CHSR regarding layout and design of the rail components.

Pelli-Clarke-Pelli Architects (PCPA) has produced the 100% Design Development documents and TJPA will review and comment. PCPA and Webcor have independently completed cost estimates. Initially there was a 5% difference between the PCPA and Webcor estimates, but they are in the process of reconciling the differences in their estimates and the difference is now less than 1%. This is very good news as both firms estimate is in line with the TJPA budget. PCPA is finalizing the Shoring Wall and Excavation package and plans to give it to Webcor on 6/10/10. This package represents almost one quarter of the construction value of the TTC. Webcor has pre-qualified contractors for the Buttress/Shoring/Excavation contract. It is expected that this contract will be bid this summer and be taken to the TJPA Board of Directors in August 2010.

Jim Lazarus asked about the status of demolition. Bob responded that TJPA anticipates moving to the Temporary Terminal the first week of August and demolition will start right after the move. In conjunction with the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) grant, the FRA wants to adopt a Record of Decision (ROD) on our environmental document. This is in addition to the ROD that was previously approved by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

Anthony Dimas asked if the TJPA is considering using local business contractors. Bob replied that the TJPA has a Small Business program, but, under Federal guidelines, it is not geographically limited. One of the strategies to promote small business involvement is breaking up the contract packages where feasible. The utility work, for instance, has been broken up into 7 packages and prequalification was limited to small businesses.

Peter Hartman asked if there was news regarding the peninsula corridor and CHSR. Bob responded that there continue to be questions about the peninsula corridor and challenges to the environmental document and ridership studies as it relates to the selection of the Altamont Pass or Pacheco Pass alignment. The Transbay project, however, is independent of the CHSR environmental review and should not be affected by delays or challenges to that process. Whichever route is taken to arrive at San Francisco, the Transbay Transit Center has been designated as the station location. The ARRA grant for the construction of the train box will come directly to TJPA from the FRA and will not go through CHSR so our project should not be impacted by any constraints on CHSR expenditures.

Michael Freeman commented that a good report came out today regarding CHSR alternative alignments. It can be found on the CHSRA website.

Michael Freeman asked if the Webcor fee is fixed. Bob said that it is fixed, but that changes in scope would entail changes in the fee, and we are in the process of negotiating a change based on the addition of the train box.

4. Nomination and Election of Chair & Vice Chair

Chair Lazarus asked for nominations for TJPA CAC Chair. Jane Morrison nominated Jim Lazarus and Karen Knowles-Pearce seconded the nomination. Peter Hartman nominated Karen Knowles-Pearce for Vice-Chair and Andrew Brooks seconded the nomination. Chair Lazarus asked for further nominations. There were none. A vote was taken by voice and Chair Lazarus and Vice-Chair Knowles-Pearce were reelected by a unanimous vote.

5. Funding & Schedule Update (Nancy Whelan)

Ms. Whelan reported that TJPA received a letter from FRA on 3/29/10 committing the \$400 Million ARRA grant to the TJPA for the train box. Prior to that time, there had only been a press release stipulating that the funds would be reserved for the TJPA. A lot of work has gone into the environmental work in preparation for the ROD that Mr. Beck mentioned earlier. TJPA should know by this Friday if the environmental analysis will be approved by FRA and will be passed to the EPA for the 30 day posting period.

We are looking for an August 7th move into the Temporary Terminal. The TJPA Board of Directors is reviewing the budget, schedule, and revised design and the TJPA staff will request approval at the next TJPA Board of Directors meeting to be held this Thursday. Certification of funds is important as it is one of the elements TJPA must meet in the Lease and Use Agreement with AC Transit. TJPA will go to the AC Transit Board meeting tomorrow night. AC Transit has asked about land sales, market conditions and values.

Jim Lazarus explained to the new CAC members that tremendous hurdles have been overcome concerning the decision to build from the ground up, that the \$400 Million FRA grant is key to being able to build the train box in Phase 1, and how important Speaker Nancy Pelosi's efforts were to Secretary Ray LaHood's announcement that the \$400 Million ARRA grant would come directly to the TJPA.

Jane Morrison agreed that including the train box in the first phase is very important.

Michael Freeman asked if there is a contingency plan for the \$429 Million in land sale revenues until the real estate market comes back. Nancy Whelan replied there are contingency plans including looking for alternate sources of funding such as TIGER 2

Federal Grant, TIGGER 2, and Climate Initiative. Bob commented that the ARRA Grant pushes out the time that land sales will be necessary as the grant money would be used first. He also described the positive bidding climate and explained how it may positively impact the TJPA's funding needs. TJPA is doing its best to accurately estimate bid costs, but in the current marketplace, bids for comparable projects are coming in significantly lower than originally estimated. Other projects are experiencing receiving bids that are 14% - 62% below engineer estimates with the majority being 30% - 40% low. Since the Buttress/Shoring/Excavation package is a very large contract and will bid soon, TJPA should have an early indication of possible savings from bidding competition. Randy Volenec (PCPA) commented that they are very careful not reflect a low bid, but instead the average bid and to look at the marketplace. Jim Lazarus commented that Doyle Drive bids came in 30% - 60% under estimate. Bob added that the initial bid package is primarily civil work comparable to both the BART Warm Springs and Doyle Drive projects.

Chair Lazarus thanked Ms. Whelan for her presentation and asked if there were any questions or comments. There were none.

6. Bicycle Facilities & Design Considerations – Rich Coffin (ARUP)

Mr. Coffin provided a PowerPoint presentation giving an overview of the bicycle facility design. He highlighted the goal of providing bicycle access to the entire facility and planning for bicycle use growth. Mr. Coffin outlined circulation patterns within the City bicycle riders use to reach the Transbay Terminal (most currently down Market Street) and upcoming bicycle lane changes. He also reviewed current and anticipated future ridership planned for AC Transit and Caltrain. CHSR has not provided details of their plans regarding bicycles. He explained the plans for bike access and movement within the Transit Center (elevators, bike ramps, etc) including to the bus and to the train levels.

Marcus Krause voiced his concern that there will not be enough elevators for peak times in 2030. Randy Volenec replied that the stairs will incorporate a bike channel that will allow passengers to walk bikes up or down the stairs. A similar bike channel at the 16th and Mission BART station has been very successful. Ted Olsson asked if using an escalator like system to move bicycles had been considered, and Mr. Coffin answered that it is being looked at, but codes in the United States are challenging and clearances, particularly at the rail platform level, present an obstacle.

Mr. Coffin said that there would be 8 elevators and 2 stairs to the Bus Deck and during current peak time AC Transit has about 90 bikes per hour, but the bikes arrive in a distributed fashion with no more than two or three on an individual bus. Caltrain will be more of a challenge as one bike car can carry 40 bikes that will arrive at the same time. A bike ramp is being planned which will give more direct access to the train concourse level where a bicycle storage facility is planned. Mr. Coffin gave an overview of the bike ramp, explained some of the design challenges, and discussed outside access.

Dave Snyder recommended that part of Natoma coming in from 2nd Street be marked off for bikes to separate bicycle rides from pedestrians. Rich replied that they will look into the suggestion.

Dave Snyder and Ted Olsson voiced a concern about the width of the bike ramp. Ted Olsson also asked if any consideration had been given to providing electrical plug in stations for electric bikes. Rich agreed that it would be useful to consider and that the bike facility will most likely be leased to an operator. Pascale Soumoy asked if Segways had been considered. Rich replied that it had not been thought about and Jim Lazarus commented that he believes they are illegal on City sidewalks. Dave Snyder asked

about bike parking capacity and additional options. Bob Beck replied that there are contingencies for growth with possibilities on the ground and concourse levels.

Karen Knowles-Pearce asked if there is a concern that bike riders who do not take transit may park in the TTC Bike Facility and that possibly a rider would have to show their ticket for entrance. Rich advised they are still looking at models and Bob commented that perhaps by the time the facility is open something can be worked out with TransLink with transit riders possibly receiving a reduced rate for bicycle storage.

Dave Snyder asked about bike access directly to the bridge. Rich showed the current plan and said that they are working on it with Joshua Switzky in the San Francisco Planning Department and T.Y. Lin who is studying a possible bike ramp on the western span.

Chair Lazarus thanked Mr. Coffin for his presentation and asked if there were any further questions or comments from CAC members or the public and there were none.

7. Glazed Canopy Seismic Performance – Bob Beck

Mr. Beck provided a PowerPoint presentation discussing how the TTC glass would perform in an earthquake. Members of the design team from ARUP went to Haiti and Chile to study recent earthquake structure damage. They observed that, for the most part, glazing systems functioned well as long as the building's underlying structure functioned well.

TJPA is designing for an 8.0 earthquake and in such an event there would not be any loss of function due to structural damage, the building could remain operational during repairs, and there would not be any cracking or loss of glass. Mr. Beck explained how the glass is attached to the structure and supported, that movement would be experienced both laterally and longitudinally. The glazing system is not a continuous skin, but is made up of independent 85 foot sections around each basket column with a 6" gap allowing sections to move independently. Within the panels, the curved support structure and the spacing between individual panes would help dissipate forces during an event and prevent damage. Because of the heavy laminate being incorporated into the glass, it would still be held in the frame even if a pane were cracked or shattered.

Ted Olsson asked if you replaced 1 of the 4 panes of glass would you have to hold the other 3 in place and Bob replied yes.

Ted Olsson asked if photovoltaic panels had been considered. Bob said yes and we are monitoring new developments in the industry, but the TTC will not receive a lot of direct sun light.

Marcus Krause asked if there will be any film coating to reduce heat. Randy Volenec responded that a ceramic frit will be incorporated into the laminate layer of the glass which will reduce some solar loading, but that the skin is not an impermeable barrier and the natural ventilation forces will also help dissipate heat load. Insulated glass will be used where there is "conditioned space." The project is currently projected to comply with Gold LEED, and we are investigating what is needed to achieve a Platinum LEED rating.

Karen Knowles-Pearce asked about cleaning the glass. Randy Volenec replied that it will be unlikely to be an automated method, but they continue to look at alternatives. Bob commented that they are also looking at a coating or other ways for water to "sheet off".

Pascale Soumoy asked if there has been consideration what to do about birds. Randy replied that they have been looking into several bird control methods.

Chair Lazarus had to leave the meeting and requested that Vice-Chair Knowles-Pearce chair the remainder of the meeting. Vice-Chair Knowles-Pearce asked if there were any further questions or comments. There were none.

8. Public Comment

Vice-Chair Knowles-Pearce asked if there were any questions or comments from members of the public on matters not previously discussed.

Joyce Roy addressed the CAC and suggested an event to celebrate the existing Transbay Terminal before demolition. She commented on its significance and asked for volunteers to help work on such an event. She envisions a half day of tours, presentations, stories of the public's experiences, and a mini museum. She would like to have a first meeting this month. Vice-Chair Karen Knowles-Pearce suggested Ms. Roy send a notice with details to the CAC Secretary which would be forwarded to the CAC members. If any member is interested, they can contact Ms. Roy directly. Bob Beck also mentioned that he could put Ms. Roy in contact with Courtney Lodato of Singer Associates who is working on a groundbreaking ceremony.

9. CAC Member Comments & Future Agenda Requests

Vice-Chair Knowles-Pearce asked if there were any future comments or questions.

David Milton asked for a status of a connection to the BART Embarcadero Station. Bob Beck replied that TJPA continues to talk to BART. BART has concluded that, if a connection is built, it would be preferable to connect to the Embarcadero Station. BART had an independent study performed on a potential connector which concluded that a large number of people would use the connector to get to the north side of Market Street. These individuals would not use MUNI or BART, but would add to the congestion in the station. BART asked that we further study changes on the surface of Beale Street as a possible alternative to an underground connector. A connector would not be constructed until Phase 2 so there is ample opportunity to further evaluate the alternatives.

10. Adjourn

Vice-Chair Knowles-Pearce adjourned the meeting at 7:20 p.m.

11. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, June 8, 2010.

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.