



TRANSBAY JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY

**TRANSBAY JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**MEETING MINUTES**

Tuesday, October 12, 2010  
Transbay Joint Powers Authority  
201 Mission Street, Suite 2100  
San Francisco, CA

Meeting #031

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 phone  
415-597-4615 fax

## **1. Call to Order**

A quorum was formed by the attendance of 9 of 15 voting members as follows: Andrew Brooks, Anthony Dimas, Michael Freeman, Peter Hartman, MaryClare M. James, David Milton, Jul Lynn Parsons, Dave Snyder, and Pascale Soumoy. Non-voting member Bob Beck was also present.

Bob Beck announced that both Chair Lazarus and Vice-Chair Knowles-Pearce would not be attendance this evening. In Article 3 of the Bylaws of the Transbay Joint Powers Authority Citizens Advisory Committee it states that “in the absence of both the Chair and Vice-Chair, the members shall select by motion a member to preside over the meeting”. David Milton nominated Andrew Brooks to preside over the meeting as Acting-Chair and Anthony Dimas seconded the nomination. No further nominations were put forth. A vote was called by voice and Mr. Brooks was unanimously approved. Acting-Chair Brooks called the meeting to order at 5:40 PM.

## **2. Approval of September 14, 2010 Meeting Minutes**

Acting-Chair Brooks asked if there were any comments or corrections to the September 14, 2010 Draft Meeting Minutes. There were none. David Milton made a motion to approve the September 14, 2010 Draft Meeting Minutes and Anthony Dimas seconded the motion. A vote was called by voice and the motion was unanimously moved and carried.

## **3. Staff Report – Bob Beck (TJPA)**

Mr. Beck reported that the next construction bid would be taken to the TJPA Board of Directors this week. The estimate for this contract had been \$10.2 Million and it came in at \$4.8 Million with an average bid of \$5.8 Million reflecting the favorable construction climate. The next bid is a major bid for the Buttress/Shoring/Excavation and is due on November 9<sup>th</sup>. Demolition of the East Loop is complete. The demolition contractor has been doing abatement and salvage work in the Transbay Terminal. This work is expected to be complete in a week. McGuire and Hester mobilized on September 30<sup>th</sup> to build Phase 2 of the Temporary Terminal which is scheduled to be done by the end of November. TJPA has reviewed the comments it has received regarding Temporary Terminal operations and will add and relocate benches in Phase 2. At this time, there are no plans for restrooms at the Temporary Terminal, but TJPA will continue to review this issue. There have been conversations with the architect regarding canopy concerns. Video of the Temporary Terminal canopies taken earlier in the year when it had rained were reviewed and they appeared to perform adequately; however, not all canopies could be evaluated due to the angle and resolution of the video. TJPA will keep this concern under advisement.

Dave Snyder commented that it is unacceptable that there are no restrooms at the Temporary Terminal and requested a status regarding restrooms be presented at every CAC meeting. He feels that there has to be something that can be done.

Andrew Brooks requested that a status on the restrooms and canopies at the end of Phase 2. Bob Beck agreed that he will give an update every month or so.

A member of the public commented that they felt this should be put on the CAC meeting agendas and Bob Beck replied that he will schedule it for future meetings.

## **4. Update by CHSRA Peninsula Program Management Team (Dominic Spaethling)**

Scheduled as Item #5 and was moved to Item #4. Mr. Spaethling is the Regional Manager for the San Francisco (SF) to San Jose (SJ) corridor of the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) project.

He gave an update on the environmental process and the Supplemental Alternatives Analysis Report. The SF to SJ corridor is 50 miles of an 800 mile system. He reminded the CAC that SF to SJ has been a rail corridor for one hundred and fifty years, and CHSRA is prepared to reinvest in it. He discussed the synergy between CHSRA and Caltrain the electrification project. Environmental review started in 2009. CHSRA has had many technical working group meetings and received a lot of feedback. These meetings have reached over 1,500 people in the last year and a half. Some of the issues they have received comments on along the corridor include: property values, noise, vibration, elevated vs. below grade alternatives, existing baby bullet train service, and cost.

Mr. Spaethling discussed the variety of options that have been considered. The SF to SJ section has 46 at-grade crossings, and in many cases it makes more sense to move the railroad alignment rather than elevate or depress the roadway. Between April and August, they reviewed elevated, at-grade and below-grade rail alignments based on cost, constructability and engineering. They are still reviewing options, and additional public station workshops will be scheduled. He discussed the need for a storage facility and that various locations are being considered including the Port of San Francisco, San Francisco Airport, Brisbane/Bayshore, and other opportunities. Next steps include the completion of 15% engineering and the publication of the draft environmental document in December 2010.

David Milton asked if there is anything that this committee or individuals can do to give support to the CHSRA. Mr. Spaethling thanked Mr. Milton for his support, introduced their public relations representative Nicole Franklin, and said that any supportive letter would be greatly appreciated.

David Milton asked if there is a viable alternative to an aerial alignment in Millbrae. Mr. Spaethling replied that they are working with BART and the City of Millbrae. He described the right-of-way (ROW) constraints in the vicinity of the Millbrae station. They continue to look at alternatives configurations to provide the four required tracks including the possibility of stacking elevated tracks below grade tracks. David Milton asked the same question about Burlingame and Mr. Spaethling said that they are reviewing the issue and decided that it does not make sense to put the roadway under the railroad because of the major streets that directly parallel the rail alignment.

David Milton asked if there is a target date for the choice of a mid-peninsula HSR station. Mr. Spaethling advised that they expect feedback from the prospective City's where a station might be located and will review what the impact would be on over-all ridership. Peter Hartman asked about the effect of stops on the high speed line. Mr. Spaethling advised that they will operate at a top speed of 125 mile per hour in this corridor and would get from San Jose to San Francisco in one-half hour. There will be a mix of services including both long range and regional. Trains can be scheduled so that there will not be any overtakes on the Peninsula.

Michael Freeman asked with the budget range of \$43 Billion being based on surface, what these concessions would do to the cost. Mr. Spaethling advised that as the design assumptions change, the costs will naturally change as well. As we move forward, these kinds of issues are being raised throughout the State.

A member of the public, Jamie Whitaker, asked what will happen at 16<sup>th</sup> Street. Mr. Spaethling responded that initially they thought 16<sup>th</sup> Street would be depressed and that the rail alignment would stay at grade. They have heard concerns raised by the City and the community about that solution, but the solutions are limited by the 280 Freeway, sewer structures, and the relatively

short distance between that crossing and the existing Caltrain Station. It is challenging, and they continue to look at it.

Anthony Dimas said they had been talking about “trenches” with “cut”, but no “cover”. Is this correct? Mr. Spaethling agreed and said that they are trying to manage cost and to provide some cover without turning these areas into lengthy tunnels that would require ventilation and emergency exiting that would greatly increase costs. Mr. Dimas asked what measures would be taken so that no one drop or throw things into the right-of-way threatening or disrupting service. Mr. Spaethling said that the right-of-way will need to be entirely secured regardless of whether it is at-, above-, or below-grade and that fences would be a primary means of protecting the alignment.

Dave Snyder commented that it is important to keep 16<sup>th</sup> Street at-grade for the bicycle community and thinks that the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority (SFMTA) feels the same.

Acting-Chair Brooks asked if they had been meeting with the Mission Bay Citizens Advisory Committee, and Mr. Spaethling replied yes.

Dave Snyder asked if the CHSRA plans are compatible with potential rail such as Dumbarton, Super ACE, etc. Mr. Spaethling replied that they are definitely considering the Dumbarton and other lines in their evaluation.

A member of the public asked if the train riders’ quality of the ride has been considered and gave an example that inside of tunnels or trenches there are no views and therefore the ride can be boring if not claustrophobic. Mr. Spaethling said that there is a natural tendency to focus on those looking at the train rather than looking out of the train, but that both are important considerations.

Mr. Spaethling said that it is important to underscore the partnership between CHSRA, Caltrain, and the TJPA. Members of the CAC had asked for an E-mail address for CHSRA and Bob Beck agreed to provide it.

## **5. Planning Department Update on Transit Center District Plan (Joshua Switzky)**

Scheduled as Item #4 and moved to Item #5. Mr. Switzky gave an overview of the Transit Center District Plan area and provided additional background for the benefit of those new to the CAC. In its evaluation, the Planning Department has look at land use patterns, the skyline, and opportunities to generate additional funds to support the new area. The draft plan was released last November (November 19, 2009) and they have been diligently working to complete the draft environmental document that is expected to be published in March 2011. The plan includes the evaluation of the Transit Tower so that it will not have to do a separate environmental review. After the draft is published, there will be a comment period, responses, and the adoption process is estimated to extend into the late summer or fall of 2011. At this time, they have not published any changes or updates to the November 2009 document. The next milestone is publishing the draft and there will be announcements of public workshops.

The Plan is looking to strategically raise height limits in the Transit Center District up to 1,000 feet for the Transit Tower with the major changes in the ring of buildings around the Transbay Transit Center. Several slides were shown with the current and proposed skyline. There is a potential for build out of net 9.2 Million gsf of additional space most heavily weighted to office space.

The plan also is looking at broader urban design issues, and they are making revisions to widen sidewalks, eliminate on-street parking, and extend transit only lanes. There is a need to study parking, create a cap on residential parking and pursue congestion pricing.

Other ways to access City Park are being investigated including an open space at 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and Howard Street that is being viewed as a possible southern gateway to the Transit Center. Expansion of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Street historic area and a Sustainable Resource District to include a combined heat and power system and a recycled/non-potable water system were discussed. These improvements will enable the area to evolve, but come at a price. The lions' share is anticipated to come from a proposed Mello-Roos which is a voluntary special property tax that could provide up to \$500,000,000 for public improvements in the district, but additional studies need to be completed.

Michael Freeman asked what the anticipated time line is for the 9.2 Million gsf. Mr. Switzky replied that it is a twenty-five year plan and the economy will also determine how fast it is built out. Mr. Freeman also asked if the environmental study took the Transbay Transit Center (TTC) and CHSR into consideration. Mr. Switzky commented that the TTC is under construction and viewed as "background". HSR has been factored in and is considered background infrastructure and certain assumptions have been made using the best information that is available.

A member of the public commented that there are many large buildings that are empty and was concerned about building new buildings. Regarding the streetscape plan, she commented that many nice little stores are gone, and questioned the viability of ground level retail. Mr. Switzky agreed that her first point was a good one, but noted that the industry goes through cycles and that we are currently at a low point, but that the plan is for the next 25 years and the areas proposed for increased heights are some of the few sites remaining where these heights and densities are feasible.

Dave Snyder asked if there is "flexible" coding. Mr. Switzky replied that current zoning is very flexible. They do plan to restrict housing in the core buildings around the Transit Center to allow for job space and that there will be 8,000 new housing units built within blocks of the Transit Center between the redevelopment area and the Rincon Hill area.

Peter Hartman mentioned that he noticed that some hotel space in the zoning summary and asked if there were any proposals for hotels. Mr. Switzky said that a major hotel is being proposed on a very large site. Mr. Hartman said that he assumes there will be an opportunity to comment on the plan. Mr. Switzky replied that there will be opportunities to comment on the EIR at more formal venues and will be happy to receive comments at any time.

A member of the public asked if 8,000 housing units are put in will there also be schools, shopping, grocery stores, etc. Mr. Switzky replied that there is a plan for open space and for Folsom Street to provide retail stores. There are no new schools planned, however, they are in contact with the school district.

## **6. Public Comment**

Acting-Chair Brooks asked if there was any further public comment.

A member of the public, Jamie Whitaker, said that he thought the TJPA had done a great job on the Temporary Terminal. Another member of the public inquired about the piles of debris on Fremont/Folsom and on Beale whether the material could possibly be harmful and should be covered. Bob Beck replied that the material is concrete from the ramps that will be crushed and used in the basement of the new TTC for shoring walls. The material is non-hazardous, but the contractor is expected to keep it damp or covered to minimize airborne dust.

## **7. CAC Member Comments & Future Agenda Requests**

Acting-Chair Brooks requested that Temporary Terminal restrooms and shelters be included on

future agenda. Bob Beck advised that he plans to include the Temporary Terminal, bus ramp design and TTC rail level design at the next CAC meeting.

Anthony Dimas said that he had heard today that High Speed Rail was awarded \$235 Million and of that \$194 Million was to come to California. Bob Beck advised that he would try to find out how this money will be broken down.

## **8. Adjourn**

Acting-Chair Brooks asked if there was a motion to adjourn, Anthony Dimas made a motion to adjourn, and David Milton seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously by a voice vote. The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

## **10. Next Meeting**

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, November 9, 2010.

The Ethics Commission of the City and County of San Francisco has asked us to remind individuals that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [Campaign and Gov't Conduct Code, Article II, Chapter 1, § 2.100, et seq.) to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102, telephone (415) 252-3100, fax (415) 252-3124 and web site: [www.sfethics.org](http://www.sfethics.org).