



SFMTA

Municipal
Transportation
Agency

Van Ness BRT Community Advisory Committee

Thursday, May 28, 2015

6:00-7:30pm

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

Minutes

1. Introductions: New Community Advisory Committee Member Mark Moreno. CAC still has vacancies; a CAC application packet will be shared with members via email so that they can share it with potential candidates.
2. SFMTA staff updates
 - a. FTA quarterly updates
 - i. The project risk manager recommended that the schedule risk contingency for the project be increased to 251 days
 - ii. Project schedule: Construction is scheduled to begin early 2016, fare service will begin in 2019. CM/GC should be awarded in June.
 - iii. Core Project Cost has increased \$12.8M:
 1. The primary driver of the cost increase is bus substitution for the 49 Line electric busses for the duration of the construction schedule
 2. Contingency adjustments for allocated contingency
 3. CM/GC preconstruction services
 4. Question about accuracy of project cost increase—Peter Gabancho to confirm the increase in cost by next month.
 - b. Caltrans
 - i. Boarding island railing has been resolved and can be seen in the renderings presented to CAC.
 - ii. Scheduling Traffic Management Plan (TMP) meeting and Construction Staging meeting with Caltrans
 - iii. Van Ness project team has not received feedback from Caltrans about CPMC construction closures in April. Caltrans has requested detailed designs of the Traffic Management for Van Ness Corridor Transit Improvement Project, SFMTA may provide template intersection but majority of that work would be provided by CM/GC
 - c. 95% Design package has been distributed
 - d. CM/GC Proposal process update:
 - i. Phase 1 selection process has been approved by the Executive Committee
 - ii. Oral presentations completed May 12

- iii. Letter of intent to enter negotiations sent to bidder
- iv. MTA Board to hear contract agreement in June so we will have information for the CAC about the CM/GC awardee at the June Van Ness BRT CAC meeting.
 - 1. Discussed confidentiality of CM/GC process; after CM/GC is awarded, information will be able to be provided including number of bidders
- e. SF Arts Commission update
 - i. Phase II approval received in May, included trees and railing
 - ii. Conditions for Phase III approval include a full-scale mock-up of the railing. There is concern at the Arts Commission about the railing on planter boxes, but those are outside of the scope of the project.
- f. Project Outreach
 - i. Presented project overview to Supervisor Yee's office, Supervisor Farrell's office, Congressional Staff working on Federal Transportation Funding legislation, 1500 Van Ness developers, SF Towers, Chamber of Commerce's District 3 Neighborhood Business Summit.
 - 1. Feedback from presentations has addressed familiar concerns about the project including concern about construction noise and dust. These presentations were ongoing while the construction impact interviews (next item on agenda) were going on. The conversations at presentations were similar conversations about construction impacts.
 - 2. Construction impacts were studied as a part of the Environmental Review and CAC can review them in Chapter 4.15, "Construction Impacts" (http://www.sfcta.org/sites/default/files/content/Planning/VanNess_BRT_EIR/FEIR-FEIS/Volume%20I/04_Van_Ness_BRT_Final_EIS_EIR_Chapter_4_Affected%20Environment-Env_Consequences_and_Avoid_Min_Mit_Measures.pdf, pp. 219-250.)
 - ii. Discussed possible intersections for 95% design renderings:
 - 1. Van Ness and Market
 - 2. Geary-O'Farrell
 - 3. Lombard, Mission
 - 4. Broadway
 - 5. City Hall, War Memorial
 - 6. Other intersection such as Pine, Washington or Clay?
 - 7. CAC additions
 - a. Hayes
 - b. Eddy
 - c. Bush
 - d. Pacific
 - iii. Discussed possibility of using video of construction to show progress. CAC will be informed of strategy used to inform public

visually of construction progress. CAC encouraged to share ideas with project staff.

- iv. Construction impact interviews initial report
 1. Staff is doing deeper analysis on data so that we can produce a report about this survey campaign
 2. The project fulfilled a couple goals:
 - a. Gather information from businesses and residents to assist with efforts to minimize construction impacts on project neighbors
 - b. Test new survey strategy to assist with minimizing impacts of construction
 3. Survey outreach and the survey methodology used multichannel engagement:
 - a. Mailer was sent to more than 2,000 project-fronting properties on Van Ness with URL to complete survey
 - b. Project website was updated including link to survey
 - c. Email was sent to project update list promoting survey with survey link
 - d. Door-to-door canvassing was done to complete surveys and leave behind a survey mailer
 - e. Survey data was collected:
 - i. Online
 - ii. In person through door-to-door canvassing
 - iii. By mail with the mailer leave-behind
 - iv. Telephone
 - v. Surveys were provided in English, Chinese and Spanish
 - vi. Data was collected in English and Chinese
 - f. Canvassing was done by team of communications staff at SFMTA and project staff from SFPUC.
 - i. Canvassers were assigned addresses to solicit surveys
 1. Canvassers provided 15 opportunities for properties to respond to survey
 - a. Overall response to through outreach was appreciative
 - b. Some properties declined to respond to survey
 - g. Survey raw data outcomes:
 - i. 85% of properties completed survey
 - ii. The survey collection was based on property, not individual. For multiunit residential properties, surveys were typically received from the building manager, superintendent, or a representative. Some multiunit properties had multiple surveys completed by multiple representatives there.

- iii. As a result of the canvassing, now have 170 (53%) new project email subscriptions. Some respondents were already subscribed to email update list and others preferred not to be subscribed
- iv. Of properties, 42.6% residential, 57.4% business
- v. When asked about preferred length of construction, shorter was preferred by 62%. This data will be valuable to share with policymakers when addressing construction impacts.
- vi. When asked about preferred times for quiet, about 40% agreed midnight to 6 a.m., every segment of the day was selected by about 30% of respondents; no perfect times for noise for everybody. Survey question illustrates challenge of coordinating construction.

- 3. Approval of March minutes by voice vote
- 4. Next meeting – June 25, 2015