



Van Ness BRT Community Advisory Committee

Thursday, June 22, 2017

6:00-7:30 p.m.

One South Van Ness, 7th floor, Union Square Conference Room

Minutes

1. Call to Order at 6:02 p.m.
2. Public comment (see policy on reverse): Members of the public may address the Van Ness BRT Community Advisory Committee on matters that are within their jurisdiction and are not on today's calendar.
 - a. None heard
3. Approval of minutes from May 25, 2017 by a voice vote.
4. SFMTA staff updates.
 - a. Project schedule.
 - i. Actualized shows a five month delay. The contractor will self-perform the utility work. The contractor is working on accelerating the work to make up the lost time.
 - ii. Member comment:
 1. Catherine Tran asked how many bids were received for utility work.
 - a. Staff is not sure how many bids were received for utility work. Proposals were much higher than the engineer's estimate and contractor opted to self-perform work.
 2. Catherine Tran asked if the work can be performed at cost.
 - a. Contractor will be held to negotiated maximum price for utility work.
 3. Bob Bardell asked in the work will require a contract modification.
 - a. The project may have to go to MTA Board due to contractor substitution.
 - b. Construction update.
 - i. Removal of the Overhead Contact System continues with the testing of coaches on the transverse overhead lines.
 - ii. Work on the western sidewalk for duct bank installation continues.
 - iii. Traffic control maintenance and construction site preparation for utility work has begun.
 - iv. Member comment:
 1. Bob Bardell asked what the dripline markings on the western sidewalk were for.
 - a. Part of the tree protection process is to identify the drip lines which is done with sidewalk markings.

2. Bob Bardell asked how the lanes will be adjusted for utility work.
 - a. Lanes will be moved to the center of the corridor when they finally make the lane switch-over for utility work to begin.
- c. Update on neighboring projects.
 - i. Polk Streetscape Project.
 1. Crews have completed water work on Chestnut between Van Ness and Polk and water bypass installation work at Polk and Francisco Street.
 2. Crews are performing side sewer replacement work on Polk Street from Francisco to Union.
 3. Crews will begin concrete base repair work on Polk from Francisco to Union next week.
5. Outreach update.
 - a. Recent public engagement activities.
 - i. Meet the Expert on the topic of SFMTA Project Delivery was held at Upcider June 7.
 - ii. Double parking campaign.
 1. Referring to this campaign now as the “Ride hailing PSA” to be more accurate.
 2. Received palm cards for distribution. Will deploy ambassadors to take orders for posters, table tents, and in-language palm cards in July.
 3. Member comment:
 - a. Joanna Gubman noted that Lyft doesn’t allow selection of pick-up location off Market Street, perhaps that can be done on Van Ness.
 - b. Catherine Tran noted that if ride hail companies continue to offer Van Ness as a pick-up location, perhaps legislative action can be taken.
 - c. Don Savoie noted that the Opera has a loading zone off Van Ness that could serve as a model for other businesses.
 - iii. Open for Business marketing program.
 1. Van Ness Business Advisory Committee asked Open for Business program to survey corridor merchants to determine what suite of services would be best to provide during construction.
 2. Open for Business team reviewed draft of the survey and received feedback from committee members.
 3. Committee members asked for deployment plan at its July 20 meeting.
 - b. Outreach Calendar.
 - i. Summer Van Ness Improvement Project newsletter will be distributed July/August.
6. Member comment. Members of the Community Advisory Committee may address the Van Ness BRT project staff on matters not on today’s calendar.

- a. Alex Wilson expressed concern about breaking ground without a full contract in place for utility work.
 - i. It is standard to sign Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC) contracts without all subcontractors in place. Several other parts of the project are also going to be bid out. This situation isn't anticipated with architectural or landscaping work that also needs to be bid-out. Engineer's estimate is included in the RFP. The city and contractor were unable to come to an agreement on price with the utility subcontractor. The city had the choice of scrapping entire project or cutting the utility subcontractor and bidding out that work. Once the work was bid out, bids were still too high. The contractor then repackaged the work into smaller subcontracts, and again bids came in very high. Walsh is now planning to perform the work with their own crews. Contractor has agreed to put on additional crews to accelerate that timeline.
- b. Catherine Tran asked if the Water Department has other commitments during the Van Ness Improvement Project construction timeline.
 - i. Water department has other commitments during the Van Ness construction timeline. It could redistribute crews at expense of other projects. Decision will be made at director level. Final water work is normally done with city crews. Walsh can accelerate but not sure if SFPUC has the capacity necessary to support the accelerated schedule.
- c. Bob Bardell explains that initial project was just going to be a BRT project. Now that it has become a utility project it has lengthened and introduced significant risks to the schedule causing delays.
- d. Bill Crissman asked if there is any chance of Walsh walking out on the job.
 - i. As long as contractor and project owner can work as a team and get contractor to break even, there should be no danger in either contractor nor owner to terminate the project contract. Partnering is critically important. There is always tension between contractor and owner.
- e. Alex Wilson asked if the project considered getting rid of the contractor and if Walsh was surprised by the outcome of the bidding process.
 - i. Van Ness team is working to stay in the black in the project and accelerate schedule. Walsh was surprised that there was only one bid when the utility work was re-bid. Situation with subcontractor is common when there are lots of construction jobs because contractors don't need to take risk.
- f. Bob Lockhart asked what utilities are included in underground work.
 - i. Underground work includes four utilities: Duct bank work that is conducted by the core team; emergency firefighting water system (AWSS) contract is set up; now working on sewer and water contracts.
- g. Alex Wilson asked what work was included in "architecture work."
 - i. Architecture work consists of railing and platform finishing – decorative pavers, reconstruction of historic poles and primarily platform work.
- h. Catherine Tran asked about the project contingency fund and who pays if the schedule slips.

- i. The project cost and schedule risk are absorbed by the contractor through the Construction Manager/General Contractor project delivery model used on this project.
 - i. Bob Lockhart asked if the other subcontracts are out to bid.
 - i. There will be at least three trenches dug for the utility work—one for the electrical duct bank that serves the overhead contact system and traffic lights on the west side of the street, and the others for the sewer, and water systems, on both sides of the street.
 - j. Steve Pepple representing SF Transit Riders asked if there will be coordination between Geary BRT and Van Ness BRT.
 - i. Geary BRT was approved and there is a shared intersection between the Geary and Van Ness projects. There is coordination between the two for construction and service. There is lots of coordination as some staff is shared. Service coordination includes platforms on Van Ness Avenue that will help facilitate transfers.
 - k. Don Savoie asked when this Van Ness BRT CAC was formed.
 - i. This Van Ness BRT CAC was formed in 2014.
7. Next meeting — Thursday, July 27, 6:00-7:30 p.m.
- a. August 24, 6:00-7:30 p.m.
 - b. September 28, 6:00-7:30 p.m.
8. Adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Every agenda shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to address the Committee on items of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee.

Public comment will be taken for each agenda item after discussion of the item by the Van Ness BRT CAC.

Privilege of Floor and Public Participation. The privilege of the floor shall be granted to any member of the public or officers of the City and County of San Francisco, or their duly authorized representatives for the purpose of commenting on any question before the Committee. Each person wishing to speak on an item at a regular or special meeting shall be permitted to be heard once per item for up to three minutes. The presiding officer shall be the judge of the pertinence of such comments, and have the power to limit this privilege if in the presiding officer's opinion the comments are not pertinent to the question before the Committee or the comments are merely reiterative of points made by previous speakers.

Presentations. After a presentation, the Van Ness BRT CAC Chair will ask committee members if they have any questions and then will open the meeting to public comment. When members of the public ask a question of the presenter, presenters should not respond, nor engage in any conversation. First, the commenter should finish their commentary. After which, if the Van Ness BRT CAC Chair or any committee member wants the presenter to respond to that question, the presenter will then respond to the Committee and not to the public.

MEMBER COMMENT

Every agenda shall provide an opportunity for members of the Committee to address project staff on items of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee.

Privilege of Floor and Public Participation. The privilege of the floor shall be granted to any member of the Committee. Each person wishing to speak shall be permitted to be heard for up to three minutes. The presiding officer shall be the judge of the pertinence of such comments, and have the power to limit this privilege if in the presiding officer's opinion the comments are not pertinent to the question before the Committee or the comments are merely reiterative of points made by previous speakers.