

Van Ness BRT Community Advisory Committee**Thursday, January 24, 2019, 6:00 p.m.****One South Van Ness Avenue, 7th Floor, Union Square Conference Room**MINUTES

1. Call to Order at 6:01 p.m.
2. Public comment: Members of the public may address the Van Ness BRT Community Advisory Committee on matters that are within its jurisdiction and are not on today's calendar.
 - a. None heard.
3. Approval of minutes – [November 15.](#)
 - a. Approved by voice vote.
4. Presentation, discussion and possible action regarding update from SFMTA staff.
 - a. Project schedule.
 - i. 644 days behind schedule (December 2018 schedule from the contractor)
 1. Up from 609 days the contractor reported in November 2018
 - ii. Utility phase broken into 4 sub-phases
 1. Phase 1A started in 2016 – Expected completion spring 2019
 2. Phase 1B started in 2018 – Expected completion summer 2019
 3. Phase 1C is scheduled to start in spring 2019 – Expected completion September 2020
 4. Phase 1D is scheduled to start in summer 2019 - Expected completion August 2020
 - iii. Accelerating work where possible
 1. Procedural adjustments
 - a. Changing chlorination activity from 5 working to 7 calendar days
 - b. Water resequencing
 - c. Slip lining to reduce days of sewer work
 - d. Trolley wire installation after OCS pole installation
 - e. OCS duct bank installation independent of utility work
 - f. Seeking Caltrans permission for weekend daytime traffic lane shut downs
 - g. Special Traffic Permits to extend workhours
 - h. Advance identification of major conflicts
 - i. Updates of project design

- ii. Exploratory potholing
 - iii. Mapping subsurface conflicts
 - 2. Increasing staff capacity
 - a. 6-day work weeks
 - b. Strategic use of double shifts
 - c. Allocating more staff resources to project delivery
- b. Construction update.
 - i. Construction is approximately at 26% completion (25% in December)
 - 1. Updated calculation excludes administrative items, costs from unforeseen site conditions
 - 2. Would be change from 29% to 31% using previous calculation method
 - 3. Sewer installation 49% complete, (46% in December)
 - a. Resuming intensive night work
 - 4. Water main installation 38% complete (33% in December)
 - 5. Light pole installation – projected to begin late Spring 2019
 - ii. Project Budget \$309.378 million
 - iii. Owner-driven changes are within contingency
 - iv. Contractor has filed 3 certified claims
 - 1. Value of three claims is \$24,391,907
 - 2. Accounts for 279 days total of delay
 - a. Contractor is assessed liquidated damages for delay
 - 3. All claims rejected by owner, negotiations ongoing
 - v. Dispute Review Board established to resolve disputes before they escalate to claims.
- c. Update on neighboring projects.
 - i. Polk Streetscape Project
 - 1. Most construction work for the project has been completed.
 - 2. Crews are wrapping up work and performing final striping changes.
- d. Outreach update.
 - i. Business
 - 1. Partner with Office of Economic and Workforce Development to provide businesses support
 - 2. Van Ness Business Advisory Committee monthly meetings provide businesses project updates and address issues
 - 3. Monthly, public speaker series brings customers to corridor businesses
 - 4. Additional signs, banners and standalone signs installed
 - 5. Advertising space on Muni buses available to affected merchants

- ii. Recent milestones
 1. Replaced wayfinding signage.
 2. Installed additional temporary lighting in construction zones
 3. Newsletter mailed to ~34k project neighbors
 4. Van Ness Business Advisory Committee, December 20
 5. SF CTA Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting, January 23
 - iii. Upcoming milestones
 1. Meet the Expert: February 6, 6:00 p.m., Location TBD
 2. Van Ness Business Advisory Committee, February 21, 3:00 p.m., 1 South Van Ness Avenue, Civic Center Conference Room, 3rd Floor
 3. SFCTA Citizens Advisory Committee, February 27, 6:00 p.m., SFCTA, 1455 Market Street, 22nd Floor
 4. Recruiting for Van Ness BRT CAC and BAC
 - e. Discussion.
 - i. Bob Lockhart requested a description of water chlorination and water sequencing efforts.
 - ii. Anne Turner asked how many staff the contractor has and whether the contractor has moved to 6-day work week yet.
 1. The contractor is using a 5-day work week at present.
 - iii. Bob Anderson requested an update on the progress getting permission to work weekend days from Caltrans.
 - iv. Steve Pepple commented that construction feels light and quieter than expected and has heard similar sentiment from others who expect more work to be happening due to the schedule delays.
 - v. Steve Pepple commented that it is very dark at some bus stops, including the temporary bus stops near Clay, Washington and Jackson, stating that northbound is worse than southbound, but both could be improved.
 - vi. Adam Mayer confirmed that about 150 city staff work on the Van Ness Improvement Project across agencies.
 - vii. Alex Wilson requested and explanation about how a claim is certified.
 1. Explanation provided about how different levels of staff review claims. Dispute board utilized if necessary, but not all certified claims are binding.
- 5. Presentation, discussion and possible action regarding the public art component of the project.
 - a. Project includes public art component consistent with the SF's Art Enrichment Ordinance
 - b. Jorge Pardo proposal for sculptural light installation selected
 - i. Initial light sculpture proposal announced fall 2015

- ii. Proposal adjusted after public feedback
 - 1. Sculptural design
 - 2. Location
- c. Updated design and location proposed is Van Ness between Geary and O'Farrell
- d. SF Arts Commission is submitting an application to Caltrans for the art to be installed on its right of way and requests letters of support.
- e. Discussion.
 - i. Alex Wilson confirmed that a letter of support from the Van Ness BRT CAC would be for the art as shown in the presentation for the proposed location of Van Ness between Geary and O'Farrell.
 - ii. Bob Anderson questioned if the lower part of the art is also illuminated.
 - iii. Erica Murdock-Waters inquired about the platform space that would be taken from transportation purposes to be allocated to art.
 - iv. Bob Bardell requested a description of how customers would board buses with the art installed on the platforms.
- f. Motion to provide a letter of support for the art as described in the presentation at the proposed location of Van Ness between Geary and O'Farrell.
 - i. Discussion.
 - 1. Bob Bardell noted that the guard rail that will be installed on the platforms is not well-shown in the drawings and may have an impact on how the art displays. He also noted that the proposed location has entry to the platform at both ends, and thought that a location with a platform with only one entry may be more appropriate so that the placement of the art on the platform does not interfere with transportation operation.
 - 2. Erica Murdock-Waters cited potential personal safety concerns related to people loitering behind art.
 - 3. Alex Wilson suggested that perhaps the body could submit a broader letter of support for art on the corridor without being specific to what proposal and/or location was being supported, citing concerns about the Van Ness BRT CAC having to be accountable for its recommendation if issues, such as graffiti maintenance, are to arise. He wondered how much public input has been sought for the updated proposal.
 - 4. Adam Mayer stated that he finds the location of Van Ness between Geary and O'Farrell to be perfect as there is no current marker there.

5. Bob Anderson noted that he likes the style of art with lighting as it serves as a guide to a location, but thinks safety is a huge issue as it relates to blocked views and people hiding near the art. He also noted that public art may be destroyed.
 6. Bob Lockhart shared that he thought the proposed art was fun. He had shared an image of the proposal at a Muni bus stop to another customer and they also liked it. He shared it at a Homeowners' Association meeting and they thought it was okay.
 7. Randy Uang wanted to confirm that the art would not interfere with transportation operations.
 - ii. Motion does not pass in a voice vote.
 - iii. Motion to request San Francisco Arts Commission to present proposal at upcoming meeting to answer questions raised during discussion of previous motion.
 - iv. Motion passes in a voice vote.
6. Member comment: Members of the committee may address the Van Ness BRT Community Advisory Committee on matters that are within its jurisdiction and are not on today's calendar.
 - a. None heard.
7. Adjourned by a voice vote at 7:06 p.m.