



TRANSBAY JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY

**TRANSBAY JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, January 13, 2009
Transbay Joint Powers Authority
201 Mission Street, Suite 2100
San Francisco, CA

Meeting #017

5:30 p.m.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Jim Lazarus, Chair
Karen Knowles-Pearce, Vice Chair
Andrew Baglino
Adrian Brandt
Andrew Brooks
Richard Brooks
Michael Freeman
Peter Hartman
Adrienne Heim
Shawn Leonard
David Milton
Jane Morrison
Jul Lynn Parsons
Norm Rolfe

Executive Director
Maria Ayerdi - Kaplan

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

1. Informal Staff Report (Agenda Item 3) – Robert Beck

At 5:45 a quorum had not been achieved and Chair Lazarus asked Bob Beck to give an “informal” staff report. Mr. Beck’s report included:

- Reminder that the TJPA is recruiting CAC members for seats available due to term limit expiration and one vacant seat. He encouraged those members whose terms are expiring and are interested in continuing on the CAC to reapply. Also he asked that anyone present who is interested or who knows of anyone interested in CAC membership to either go to the TJPA website or contact the TJPA office for an application.
- Next week the TJPA will be going to Sacramento to discuss a Cooperative Agreement with California High Speed Rail (CHSR).
- Redevelopment has received and is reviewing proposals for Block 11 and will receive proposals for Block 8 which includes both low income and market value units later this month.
- One of the General Contractors who was preapproved has dissolved their joint venture and withdrawn from the competition. In order to have a competitive process, the time limit has been extended to mid-February and teams are able to provide pricing information along with the proposal. There has been additional interest shown beyond the prequalified teams.

Norm Rolf asked who the TJPA will be talking to at the CHSR next week. Bob Beck replied they will be talking to the staff. A discussion followed in which David Milton commented that Mehdi Morshed told him that it was not a question “if” the Transbay Transit Center (TTC) would be the northern terminus for CHSR, but “when”. Jim Lazarus commented that it is the will of the people of the State and City that the Transbay Transit Center be the terminus and that it will be OK.

2. Update from SF Planning on Transit Center District Plan (Agenda Item 4) – Joshua Switzky

As a quorum had not been reached, Chair Lazarus moved to Item 4 on the Agenda. Joshua Switzky from the San Francisco Planning Department provided a PowerPoint presentation. He advised that public workshops had been held in September 2008. No substantial revisions to height limits have been made from the last time he was before the CAC and the height limit for the Transit Tower continuing to be 1,000 feet.

Per Mr. Switzky, some of the new topics that we have been working on this fall have been zoning, building design, open space, historic, and sustainability. Some boundaries have been redefined to require developers to provide commercial space. Ground floor retail space will be encouraged as well as that large building spaces be active and light.

3. Call to Order (Agenda Item 1) – Chair Jim Lazarus

Mr. Switzky’s presentation was interrupted with the arrival of a CAC member and a quorum was formed. A CAC member roll call was taken with 8 of the 14 voting members present as follows: Andrew Brooks, Michael Freeman, Peter Hartman, Adrienne Heim, Jim Lazarus, Jane Morrison, David Milton, and Norm Rolfe. Non-voting member Bob Beck was also present. The meeting was called to order by Jim Lazarus, Chair, at 6:00 pm.

4. Resumption of SF Planning Update – Joshua Switzky

Mr. Switzky continued with his presentation and the information he gave included the following:

- Streetscape – A technical analysis which includes looking at widening sidewalks and setbacks is expected underway and is expected to be complete by the end of the month. A major increase in the number of pedestrians is expected throughout the district. There are few places in the City with new development to provide an opportunity to review setbacks.
- Urban Design – Planning is working on a design for a more “human scale” regarding set backs, preservation of “sky,” and flexible control regarding large buildings being proportional.
- Open Space – Planning is studying the possibility of relieving certain requirements on some buildings by connecting them to the Transit Center Park and/or the 2nd and Howard space. One goal is to provide an opportunity for the general public to enjoy and access the upper areas of the buildings so they may to enjoy the views of the City and Bay possibly through a restaurant or observation deck. Mid-block pedestrian connections and a recommendation that Shaw Alley be permanently closed to traffic are under review.
- Historic – The Historic District may be expanded and three additional buildings are being reviewed for landmark status. These buildings are the Marine Fireman’s Union Building, Planters Hotel, and Phillips Building.
- Sustainability – A great deal of work has been done since the last time we were here. Sustainability programs and objectives have taken on a “district-wide” level. Planning is exploring combining the heat and power for the Transbay Transit Center and the Redevelopment Area into a localized system that would be extremely efficient. A feasibility study has been commissioned which will take about 2 months. We are looking into a water district possibly with the PUC regarding recycling water to cut down on the portable water. Planning believes this may be a significant opportunity. Green Building Standards have been adopted in 2008 and we are looking at demanding “performance” standards. One more public workshop will be held in a month or two. Planning has not discussed the financial benefit of this program, but is working with the financial consultant during the next month or two and are looking at plan document release in April. It is taking a little longer than anticipated due to the transportation analysis and the financial information. An EIR is expected in late summer and adoption in about a year from now.

Mr. Switzky invited questions.

Norm Rolf asked if the heat and power plant would be steam powered. Mr. Switzky replied yes and that the City could work with PG&E if they are interested, but that there are many entities that could run it.

Peter Hartman asked how the 1,000 foot Transit Center Building height relates to the original Pelli proposal. Mr. Switzky replied that the 1,000 feet is “enclosed” space and does not include the spire. He feels that space can be made up on the lower floors and will talk to Pelli about redesigning the spire.

Jane Morrison asked if they were considering not making the building so tall. She was concerned about shadows. Mr. Switzky commented that they had received comments from both sides and that the shadows are a balancing act and he thinks they have it balanced.

Adrienne Heim asked if they had looked at the height of the MUNI bus lines. Josh Switzky answered that they had not looked at that.

Chair Lazarus asked if there were further questions or comment from the CAC members and there was none.

Chair Lazarus asked if there were questions or comments from the public and there was none.

5. Approval of November 18, 2008 Meeting Minutes (Agenda Item 2) – Chair Jim Lazarus

Chair Lazarus asked if there were any corrections or additions to the November 18, 2008 Draft Meeting Minutes and David Milton asked that the following be included: "David Milton inquired as to what TJPA can do to improve co-ordination with California High Speed Rail Authority given Judge Kopp's comments as reported in the examiner to the effect that High Speed Rail can continue to use 4th and Townsend as its terminus and does not need to come into the Transbay Transit Center." Chair Lazarus instructed that this comment be added to the Meeting Minutes and with that change called for the Meeting Minutes to be approved. David Milton made a motion to approve the Draft Meeting Minutes with the above mentioned addition and the motion was seconded by Peter Hartman. A vote was called by voice and the motion was unanimously moved and carried.

6. Bus Ramp Design Progress (Agenda Item 5) – Rich Coffin

Bob Beck said that the design team faced a challenge to evaluate and design an elevated bus deck with buses that circulate in a clockwise direction and that have to cross over themselves. He introduced Rich Coffin from ARUP who is on the design team.

Rich Coffin provided a presentation which showed the future bus ramp configuration. Their evaluation of the ramp included designing a ramp to access not only to the terminal, but also to the bus storage area; meeting Caltrans "life line" standards; having direct access to the bridge; and meeting traffic predictions for 2030 and 2050. They also considered site constraints, architectural issues and cost. The traffic studies for peak hours showed that in 2008 there are 90 buses per peak hour, in 2030 there will be 174 buses per peak hour, and in 2050 there will be 290 buses per peak hour. They are designing for the future. They are also looking at design possibilities for Golden Gate Transit to get to Fremont Street without going on to City streets and also taking into consideration how to handle errant motorists who may accidentally get onto the ramp. His presentation is modeled on the 2050 needs and shows the flow of traffic.

A member of the public asked if the existing Fremont ramp structure is going to stay and Mr. Coffin answered yes.

David Milton mentioned that SamTrans is not shown on the model and Mr. Coffin replied that he is only showing the bus ramp traffic and that SamTrans will only be on city streets and will not be on the bus ramp.

Michael Freeman commented that the ramps look narrow in certain areas and asked if there were contingencies for breakdowns. Mr. Coffin conceded that there were some areas that were narrow and space for buses to pull over was limited. He cautioned that the bus movement shown was for 2050, and the ramp design will continue to be refined.

7. Update on Project Phasing (Agenda Item 6) – Bob Beck

Mr. Beck provided a PowerPoint presentation. He reviewed the Phasing Plan that was adopted by the TJPA Board in June of 2006 and said that the plan had been reviewed in

the recent Concept Valuation with Pelli-Clarke-Pelli. The current plan has a Top-down Approach. It is important to be aware that the schedules for Phase 1 and Phase 2 are not sequential, but do overlap. This is often misunderstood. The phase distinction is for budgetary segmentation, not sequential. The Top-down Approach allows Temporary Terminal to close 12 months earlier than the Bottom-up Approach. Pelli-Clarke-Pelli revisited the Top-down Approach vs. the Bottom-up Approach which would build out the train level and complete the finishes later and found that the Bottom-up Approach is simpler, has less schedule and budget risks, provides greater structural and architectural design flexibility, allows for better organization of program spaces, reduces total construction cost, and allows for the option of going to a mat construction which could save approximately \$100 million. The cost to move to a Bottom-up Approach would add \$350 million to Phase 1. The TJPA has made it their highest priority to pursue the additional funding to make this change a reality. March is a decision point.

Jim Lazarus asked if the \$350 million additional funds needed for Phase 1 is all new money or if there is some money there. Bob Beck replied that a significant amount of money for Phase 2 has already been spent. The bulk of the money from land sale proceeds and tax increments is not available now and, because of the sequencing of the project, cannot be realized until the Temporary Terminal land is available for sale. The tax increment (TIFIA) has borrowing issues concerning confidence and possible negative amortization.

TJPA CAC Members made the following comments and replies:

- Jim Lazarus - It looks like the \$350 million will need to come from the State or Federal.
- Michael Freeman - The \$350 million cost would be a shift from Phase 2 to Phase 1.
- Jim Lazarus - It is critical for the train box to be built in Phase 1.
- Norm Rolf asked if there is a chance of getting money from the Obama Stimulus Plan. Jim Lazarus commented that the TJPA staff has sent in a proposal.
- Jane Morrison – The genesis of the Transbay Transit Center Program is the Caltrain extension and not merely a bus terminal.
- Michael Freeman – With the present economic slowdown, is there a chance to re-price or rebid? Bob Beck replied that the budget was updated last August regarding escalation and that we continue to monitor pricing. An example is that in 2008 there was a significant drop in the cost of steel. The Temporary Terminal received six bids and the low bid was approximately 15% below the estimate, showing that the market is very competitive and reflect the current state of the industry.
- David Milton – When will you talk to us again about the budget? Bob Beck replied that the escalation will be reviewed at the end of February and maybe we could come back to the CAC on that issue in March.
- Michael Freeman – Is it conceivable to do Phase 1 and Phase 2 at the same time? Bob Beck replied that we could do it if the funding was available.
- Bob Beck stated the Memorandum of Agreement being discussed between the TJPA and CHSR stipulates that CHSR will come into the TTC, lays out technical criteria, and commits the agencies to working together moving forward. There was a question if CHSR would provide financial support, and Bob replied that it is not addressed in this document, but there must be support and collaboration between Caltrain, CHSR, and the TJPA if we are to be successful in securing additional funding.

- Michael Freeman asked how many people a day would use the Transit Center. Bob Beck replied that in 2030 there would be about 100,000 people per day including CHSR.
- Michael Freeman asked if any thought had been given to a retail master lessee instead of leading space piecemeal. Bob Beck replied that it has been talked about and is worth continuing investigation.

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. David Milton made the motion to adjourn and it was seconded by Michael Freeman.

5. Next Meeting

The next meeting is schedule on Tuesday, February 10, 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.