



Memorandum

Date: 11.25.14 **RE:** Citizens Advisory Committee
 December 3, 2014

To: Citizens Advisory Committee

From: Anna LaForte – Deputy Director for Policy and Programming *all*
 David Uniman – Deputy Director for Planning *DUE*

Subject: **ACTION** – Adopt a Motion of Support for Allocating \$872,859 in Prop K Funds, With Conditions, to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency for Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Environmental Review and Initial Construction Phase Improvements Planning; for Authorizing the Executive Director to execute a Memorandum of Agreement with the San Francisco Planning Department for the Geary BRT Project Environmental Review Phase, in an Amount not to Exceed \$139,276, and to Negotiate Agreement Payment Terms and Non-Material Agreement Terms and Conditions; and for Assigning the Professional Services Contract with Jacobs Engineering Group to CirclePoint, Increasing the Amount of the Contract by \$225,000, to a Total Amount Not to Exceed \$4,409,489, for Environmental Analysis Services for the Geary BRT Project Environmental Impact Report/Statement, and Authorizing the Executive Director to Modify Non-Material Contract Terms and Conditions

Summary

In close collaboration with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), we are leading the environmental review phase for the Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project, which has developed a refined set of project alternatives, identified a Staff-Recommended Alternative, and documented the environmental analysis of those alternatives in an Administrative Draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement (EIR/S) that is being submitted for local and federal agency review before circulating to the public. In response to Transportation Authority Board and other input seeking faster delivery of benefits to the corridor, SFMTA staff is conducting conceptual planning for a potential Initial Construction Phase set of near-term improvements to be implemented before the full project will seek federal funds for construction. SFMTA's request for \$872,859 will cover near-term improvement planning, as well as prior SFMTA work to support the EIR/S. This new allocation frees up \$389,927 for increased consultant and Transportation Authority staff costs resulting from inclusion of the near-term improvements in the EIR/S and an extended schedule. Relatedly, in order to more efficiently and cost effectively deliver the project, the technical consultant team previously led by Jacobs Engineering Group (Jacobs) will now be led by subconsultant CirclePoint for the remaining tasks. The consultant team needs an additional \$225,000 to complete the environmental review phase. Lastly, we need to execute a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the San Francisco Planning Department (SF Planning) to support the EIR/S. This work is funded through the prior appropriation, but funds will pass directly from us rather than through the SFMTA. **We are seeking a motion of support for allocating \$872,859 in Prop K funds, with conditions, to the SFMTA for Geary BRT Environmental Review and Initial Construction Phase Improvements Planning; for authorizing the Executive Director to execute an MOA with SF Planning for the Geary BRT Project Environmental Review Phase, in an amount not to exceed \$139,276, and to negotiate agreement payment terms and non-material agreement terms and conditions; and for assigning the professional services contract with Jacobs to CirclePoint, increasing the amount of the contract by \$225,000, to a total amount not to exceed \$4,409,489 for Environmental Analysis Services for the Geary BRT Project EIR/S, and authorizing the Executive Director to modify non-material contract terms and conditions.**

BACKGROUND

The Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project is a coordinated set of transit and pedestrian improvements along the 6.5-mile Geary corridor between the Transbay Transit Center and 48th Avenue. It is a signature project in the voter-approved Prop K Expenditure Plan.

The Geary BRT Project is in its environmental review phase, which will culminate with publication of an Environmental Impact Report/Statement (EIR/S), a project approval and document certification action by the Transportation Authority Board, a project approval by the SFMTA Board, and an action by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) completing the federal environmental review requirements. The project is a partnership between the Transportation Authority, which is leading the environmental review, and the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), which will lead the preliminary and detailed design phases and will be responsible for construction and operation of the facility.

After a years-long process including multiple rounds of project design, analysis, and community input, the Geary BRT Project arrived at a refined set of alternative project designs in Spring 2013. Analysis on these alternatives led to identification of a staff-recommended alternative design in Winter 2013/14. The team embarked on a major round of outreach in Spring 2014 to share the staff-recommended alternative and solicit feedback. Meanwhile, the team conducted environmental analyses for all alternatives, and in Summer 2014, compiled the analyses into an Administrative Draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement (ADEIR/S).

The purpose of this memorandum is threefold: to present the SFMTA's request for \$872,859 in Prop K funds for the Geary BRT Environmental Review and Initial Construction Phase Improvements Planning; to discuss the need for an Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the Transportation Authority and SF Planning; and to present the request to assign the professional services contract with Jacobs Engineering Group to CirclePoint and amend the contract to complete the environmental review process, and to seek a motion of support for these actions.

DISCUSSION

Current Status and Schedule: The team is now revising the ADEIR/S in response to local agency review and comment, as part of our effort to conduct earlier and more in-depth inter-agency coordination than the Transportation Authority did during the Van Ness BRT environmental process. We expect this coordination to facilitate and speed the upcoming public circulation of the Geary draft EIR/S by avoiding delays from last-minute interagency issues. Agencies that have reviewed the draft include multiple divisions within the SFMTA, SF Planning, San Francisco Public Works (SFPW), the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, Golden Gate Transit, the San Francisco Department of Public Health, the Mayor's Office on Disability, the Bay Area Rapid Transit District, and the California Department of Transportation.

In response to Transportation Authority Board and other input seeking faster delivery of benefits to the corridor, SFMTA staff is conducting conceptual planning for a potential Initial Construction Phase set of near-term improvements (described further below) to be implemented before the full project will seek federal funds for construction. The project team has helped to develop these near-term improvements and to incorporate them into the ADEIR/S while concurrently responding to other local agency comments on the documents. When the edits are complete, we will submit the ADEIR/S to the FTA. Following incorporation of FTA's comments, we will release the public draft EIR/S.

Finally, some project design details have drawn community feedback and questions, for which we have been working on responses. These details include the pedestrian crossings at Webster Street, the design of the bus transition from side-lane to center-lane operation around Palm Avenue relating to accommodating vehicle left turns from Geary, and the complex interactions at Park Presidio Boulevard among stop locations, passenger transfers, traffic patterns, and pedestrian crossings. We anticipate that some of these project design details will require the closer attention of the detailed engineering design phase to fully address, but we have developed options and identified constraints now to facilitate resolution.

Attachment 1 shows the project's schedule for the remaining steps in the environmental review process and the steps for the project's implementation, including the potential Initial Construction Phase and the full project.

Potential Initial Construction Phase Near-Term Improvements: The SFMTA, in coordination with Transportation Authority staff, has been conducting pre-development work to identify, determine the feasibility of, and then refine a near-term proposal for improvements in the Geary BRT corridor, so that they can be integrated into the full project's EIR/S and then quickly be advanced to construction. The near-term proposals' capital investments would be compatible with the Staff Recommended Alternative (SRA) as defined in the EIR/S, and would result in mainly permanent and some temporary investments on the corridor.

Because official action will not be taken to select the full project's Locally Preferred Alternative until the end of the environmental review process, the Initial Construction Phase proposal will remain preliminary until then, with the potential for further refinement as needed. However, the SFMTA's planning work has identified elements such as:

- Side-running bus lanes from Van Ness Avenue to Stanyan Avenue, colorized where pavement conditions allow
- Station and stop changes to improve bus operations, such as lengthening of 6 bus zones, installation or modification of approximately 10 bus bulbs, and shifting of 10 bus stops from the near side of an intersection to the far side, and consolidation of 10 selected local stops
- Traffic signal improvements at approximately 5 intersections, such as new signal lights and poles, for upgraded pedestrian signal equipment and smoother bus and traffic operations, including queue-jump installations at two intersections
- Installation of approximately 10-15 right-turn pockets to keep the bus lanes free of queued turning vehicles
- Pedestrian crossing bulb-outs at approximately 10 locations, as well as needed accompanying curb ramp upgrades

These Initial Construction Phase improvements respond to Board and public input asking for travel and other community benefits to be delivered to the corridor quickly and on a rolling basis, so that the community does not need to wait until the full BRT project, anticipated to be completed in Fiscal Year 2019/20, to begin enjoying improvements. The schedules for the Initial Construction Phase and full project are shown in Attachment 1, with that initial phase targeted for implementation in 2016. Attachment 2 provides a scope comparison of the various project phases.

While benefits from the full project include travel time savings of approximately 20% across the BRT segments of the corridor, or about 10 minutes per direction, in addition to a 20% improvement in

reliability, and benefits to the streetscape environment and pedestrian safety at locations throughout the corridor, the agencies are implementing other immediate changes and developing the Initial Construction Phase to provide some of these benefits sooner. The Initial Construction Phase improvements, along with efforts already underway such as Transit Signal Priority, new replacement low-floor buses, and bus service adjustments, will provide 4-6 minutes in travel time savings, or about half that of the full project, in addition to increased service and reliability. The initial improvements also improve pedestrian safety at key locations.

Costs and Funding: The cost estimate for the Geary BRT SRA, which has undergone multiple rounds of refinement with reviews of inputs by the SFMTA and the SFPW, is approximately \$320 million in year-of-expenditure dollars, as shown in Attachment 3. The design and construction costs account for a comprehensive set of scope items, including some that are not required in order to simply provide a BRT facility but serve as overall street enhancements or address the needs of other infrastructure systems along the Geary corridor. Such items to accommodate or accompany BRT street design changes include street re-surfacing, needed underground sewer and water line utility re-locations and replacements, new street lights, new landscaping, new medians, upgraded traffic signal equipment, pedestrian bulb-outs and other crossing improvements, curb ramp retrofits, and parking meter adjustments.

The funding plan for the Geary BRT project, shown in Attachment 4, reflects the \$320 million funding need, inclusive of engineering design. A funding gap exists that will require ongoing work to identify and commit sources toward fully funding the project. We have recently amended the plan to include a revised total of \$44.4 million in Prop K funds, which is about \$14 million more than previously available. These funds were committed through the 2014 Prop K Strategic Plan and 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPP) updates. This programming was intended to fully fund the project through final design, with a small contribution toward construction.

The funding plan also includes \$75 million in FTA Small Starts funds, a national, competitive grant source to which the project will apply. We are working with SFMTA and FTA to develop a Small Starts BRT project definition that will fit within FTA's maximum \$250 million total cost for Small Starts. Given the corridor's high existing ridership, Geary BRT is expected to be very competitive. With SFMTA, we continue to refine the funding strategy and seek other funding to close the current gap, such as new transportation revenue measures being proposed for local voter consideration and other state and federal discretionary funds (e.g. cap and trade).

The cost of the potential Initial Construction Phase near-term improvements, also shown in Attachment 3, is estimated at \$15-20 million. SFMTA will continue to develop a funding plan for the Initial Construction Phase as it proceeds with planning and conceptual engineering work. Given the high degree of overlap with the Geary BRT improvements, the initial funding plan assumes \$10 million in Prop K from the funding set aside for Geary BRT. Other potential sources to fill the estimated \$5-\$10 million gap include cap and trade, State Prop 1B, Prop K (not from BRT funds), Prop AA vehicle registration fee, and Props A (General Obligation Bond) and B approved this November.

Prop K Allocation Request: SFMTA's request for \$872,859 in Prop K funds will cover near-term improvement planning, remaining SFMTA support through completion of the environmental phase, and prior SFMTA work to support the EIR/S estimated. SFMTA anticipates seeking allocation of design funds for the near-term proposal and the full BRT project concurrently in early 2015. The enclosed allocation request form contains further details on the scope, schedule and budget.

Of the total request, \$389,927 is intended to cover expenses already incurred by SFMTA to support the Geary BRT project. These SFMTA costs were originally to be funded through an existing appropriation

to the Transportation Authority. Funding these expenses through a direct allocation to the SFMTA is administratively less burdensome and frees up \$389,927 for increased consultant and Transportation Authority staff costs resulting from additional work relating to reviewing and helping to develop potential Initial Construction Phase near-term improvements and incorporating them into the EIR/S, additional rounds of cost estimate refinements; greater-than-anticipated work to coordinate with local agencies on the ADEIR/S, including responding to a significant number of comments from local agencies on the ADEIR/S.

Special Condition: In order to ensure that the full BRT project continues to move forward concurrently with the Initial Construction Phase near-term improvements, as a condition of this allocation, our recommendation includes re-directing \$10 million from current Geary BRT funding for design/construction of the Initial Phase and reserves all the remaining Prop K funds currently programmed to Geary BRT for the full project. This condition and a minor amendment to adjust programming phase are reflected in the 5YPP amendment attached to the enclosed allocation request form.

Memorandum of Agreement: In its role as a Responsible Agency for environmental review, SF Planning is expending staff time toward generating an environmental document consistent with the city's approach to other environmental documents, including coordination with the project team on methodology issues for particular environmental technical studies such as visual impacts, transportation, air quality, noise, and cultural resources, as well as review of the document itself. The City Attorney's Office is also providing input on the legal aspects of the environmental review process, including review of the environmental document. Greater detail on the scope responsibilities for SF Planning, and the City Attorney's Office can be found in Attachment 5.

Resolution 14-52, adopted by the Transportation Authority Board in February 2014, authorized reimbursement of these two agencies for the aforementioned scope of work to be executed through a funding agreement with the SFMTA and to be funded through prior appropriations for Geary BRT environmental work. With the SFMTA's current Prop K request, funds for SF Planning and the City Attorney's Office will flow directly from the Transportation Authority to SF Planning instead of through SFMTA, triggering the need for the subject MOA.

Table 1 below shows the agency budgets for the subject MOA, covering their participation in the development of the project's EIR/S.

Table 1. SF Planning and City Attorney's Office Budgets for Geary BRT Environmental Review

Agency	Staff Expenditures Reimbursable by the Transportation Authority
SF Planning	\$30,352
City Attorney's Office	\$99,840
<i>Contingency</i>	<i>\$9,084</i>
Total	\$139,276

Professional Services Contract Assignment and Amendment: In January 2008, through Resolution 08-42, the Transportation Authority awarded a contract to Jacobs Engineering Group (then Carter Burgess) in the amount of \$1,800,000 to conduct environmental analysis of BRT on Geary Boulevard and to advance conceptual engineering designs. In December 2010, through Resolution 11-27, the Transportation Authority approved an increase of \$1,054,565 to provide for additional identified scope areas. In July 2013, through Resolution 14-15, the Transportation Authority approved an increase of \$1,329,924, with the contract term to set at Winter 2015.

As the BRT project has progressed from planning and analysis to environmental documentation, the needed expertise for leading the consultant team has correspondingly shifted. To maximize the efficiency of the team, a re-shuffled teaming structure is now needed, with one of the original team's subconsultants, CirclePoint, now taking the lead for the project's remaining tasks toward the completion of the environmental process. CirclePoint is the consultant team member with the expertise and responsibility for developing the EIR/S, conducting public outreach for circulation, and responding to public comments. To streamline the team and minimize project management costs, we are seeking approval to assign the original professional services contract's rights and obligations from Jacobs Engineering Group to CirclePoint, which would effectively end the practical involvement of Jacobs and shift the Transportation Authority's contractual relationship to CirclePoint for more efficient project administration and management. The original contract includes a term specifically allowing this action.

In addition, the project has responded to several unanticipated work items, including: additional analysis and other work relating to reviewing and helping to develop potential Initial Construction Phase near-term improvements and incorporating them into the EIR/S, additional rounds of cost estimate refinements; greater-than-anticipated work to coordinate with local agencies on the ADEIR/S, including responding to over 300 comments from a pre-ADEIR/S review of the transportation chapter by the SFMTA and over 550 comments from the local agency review of the ADEIR/S; and heavy re-working of several chapters in response to comments. The team has also experienced higher-than-anticipated project management costs, including that associated with the Initial Construction Phase near-term improvements, but also from Jacobs Engineering Group as the prime consultant. The consultant team has reached a significant milestone, having developed the ADEIR/S for FTA review, and it estimates an additional \$225,000 is needed to complete the environmental review phase including a Final EIR/S. This figure includes an assumption for a moderate amount of comments that may be submitted and require responses during the public comment period, although some uncertainty is inherent. The proposed amendment, the scope and budget of which are provided in Attachment 6, would increase the total contract amount to \$4,409,489. The SFMTA's current request enables us to use some of the appropriation's funds originally budgeted for the SFMTA to be directed instead at absorbing additional project costs, including the increased consultant team budget.

The Jacobs Engineering Group has achieved 16% DBE participation to date, from seven subconsultants: women-owned firms Baseline Environmental Consulting and Pittman & Associates, Hispanic-owned firm Diaz Yourman & Associates, African American-owned firm Terry A. Hayes & Associates, and Asian Pacific American-owned firms M Lee Corporation and William Kanemoto Associates. M Lee Corporation is also based in San Francisco. The assignment of the Jacobs contract to Circle Point would not impact these subcontractor relationships.

We are seeking a motion of support for allocating \$872,859 in Prop K funds, with conditions, to the SFMTA for Geary BRT Environmental Review and Initial Construction Phase Improvements Planning; for authorizing the Executive Director to execute an MOA with SF Planning for the Geary BRT Project Environmental Review Phase, in an amount not to exceed

\$139,276, and to negotiate agreement payment terms and non-material agreement terms and conditions; and for assigning the professional services contract with Jacobs to CirclePoint, increasing the amount of the contract by \$225,000, to a total amount not to exceed \$4,409,489 for Environmental Analysis Services for the Geary BRT Project EIR/S, and authorizing the Executive Director to modify non-material contract terms and conditions.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Adopt a motion of support for allocating \$872,859 in Prop K funds, with conditions, to the SFMTA for Geary BRT Environmental Review and Initial Construction Phase Improvements Planning; for authorizing the Executive Director to execute an MOA with SF Planning for the Geary BRT Project Environmental Review Phase, in an amount not to exceed \$139,276, and to negotiate agreement payment terms and non-material agreement terms and conditions; and for assigning the professional services contract with Jacobs to CirclePoint and increasing the amount of the contract by \$225,000, to a total amount not to exceed \$4,409,489, for Environmental Analysis Services for the Geary BRT Project EIR/S, and authorizing the Executive Director to modify non-material contract terms and conditions, as requested.
2. Adopt a motion of support for allocating \$872,859 in Prop K funds, with conditions, to the SFMTA for Geary BRT Environmental Review and Initial Construction Phase Improvements Planning; for authorizing the Executive Director to execute an MOA with SF Planning for the Geary BRT Project Environmental Review Phase, in an amount not to exceed \$139,276, and to negotiate agreement payment terms and non-material agreement terms and conditions; and for assigning the professional services contract with Jacobs to CirclePoint and increasing the amount of the contract by \$225,000, to a total amount not to exceed \$4,409,489, for Environmental Analysis Services for the Geary BRT Project EIR/S, and authorizing the Executive Director to modify non-material contract terms and conditions, with modifications.
3. Defer action, pending additional information or further staff analysis.

FINANCIAL IMPACTS

This action would allocate \$872,859 in Fiscal Year 2014/15 Prop K funds. The allocation would be subject to the Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedule contained in the enclosed Allocation Request Form. The Prop K Capital Budget (Enclosure 2) shows the recommended cash flow distribution schedule for the subject request. Enclosure 3 contains a cash-flow-based summary table including the Prop K Fiscal Year 2014/15 allocations to date and the subject Prop K request. Sufficient funds are included in the adopted Fiscal Year 2014/15 budget to accommodate the recommendation allocation. Furthermore, sufficient funds will be included in future budgets to cover the recommended cash flow distribution for those respective fiscal years.

The proposed MOA with SF Planning and the proposed professional services contract amendment with CirclePoint will be funded by Prop K funds previously appropriated through Resolution 14-17. This year's activity for the MOA was included in the Transportation Authority's adopted Fiscal Year 2014/15 budget. The proposed contract amendment will be included in the Transportation Authority's mid-year budget amendment.

RECOMMENDATION

Adopt a motion of support for allocating \$872,859 in Prop K funds, with conditions, to the SFMTA for Geary BRT Environmental Review and Initial Construction Phase Improvements Planning; for

authorizing the Executive Director to execute an MOA with SF Planning for the Geary BRT Project Environmental Review Phase, in an amount not to exceed \$139,276, and to negotiate agreement payment terms and non-material agreement terms and conditions; and for assigning the professional services contract with Jacobs to CirclePoint and increasing the amount of the contract by \$225,000, to a total amount not to exceed \$4,409,489, for Environmental Analysis Services for the Geary BRT Project EIR/S, and authorizing the Executive Director to modify non-material contract terms and conditions.

Attachments (6):

1. Project Schedule
2. Geary Improvements Description and Checklist by Phase
3. Geary Cost Estimate by Element and Phase
4. Geary BRT Funding plan
5. Memorandum of Agreement Scope and Budget
6. Technical Consultant Contract Amendment Scope and Budget

Enclosures (3):

- A. Allocation Request Form
- B. Prop K Capital Budget
- C. Prop K Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution – Summary Table

Attachment 1. Geary BRT Project Environmental Review and Implementation Schedule

Timeline	Environmental Review Process	Initial Construction Phase (Phase 1)	Full Project (Phase 2)
Winter 2014/15	Release of Draft Environmental Document	Conceptual engineering completed	
Spring 2015	Public Comment Period	Detailed design initiated	Conceptual engineering initiated
Summer 2015	Response to Comments, Release of Final Environmental Document		
Fall 2015	Certification, Record of Decision		
Winter 2015/16		Detailed design completed Phase 1a Construction Initiated* (bus zone changes, right turn pockets, and transit-only lane installation)	Conceptual engineering completed Small Starts application submitted to Federal Transit Administration**
Spring 2016			Detailed design initiated**
Summer 2016			
Fall 2016		Phase 1b Construction Initiated* (bus bulbs, pedestrian bulbs, signal upgrades)	
...			
Winter 2017/18			Detailed design completed** Construction initiated**
...			
Winter 2019/20			Construction completed**

*pending phasing analysis to be completed during design, and pending city coordination opportunities

**pending funding, and pending analysis to be completed during conceptual engineering

Introduction

The SFMTA and SFCTA are proposing phased implementation of the Geary BRT project in order to expedite the delivery of transit improvements to the Geary corridor. The following project description materials describe the scope of the improvements, including a narrative description and a checklist table showing the scope elements to be included.

The cost estimates illustrate that the full project is estimated to cost \$300-320M (above the \$250M Small Starts Grant application cap), so we are working to identify what elements/segments would be included in the Geary BRT Small Starts application, and what might be constructed concurrently using other funds (including other federal funds). For this reason, we believe the best approach is to define the project comprehensively in the project's joint environmental document that is currently under development.

In addition to defining the project components for the Small Starts application, we are also working to implement an initial construction phase of near-term improvements (Phase 1) after the approval of the EIR/EIS. These improvements, which will result in some, but not all, of the travel time benefits associated with the full project, are consistent with the full project elements and could be implemented on a shorter timeline. We anticipate the near-term implementation occurring concurrently with the full-project design. The Phase 1 elements are estimated to cost approximately \$15-20M, which is largely included within the cost of the full project¹.

¹ An exception is the bus lane colorization, which has a 3-to-5-year useful life and will need to be re-applied with the full project.

Project Scope Narrative

This narrative describes planned and completed bus, pedestrian, and street improvements to the Geary corridor. It describes three categories of improvements: baseline improvements recently completed or already underway, the full Bus Rapid Transit project, and the near-term improvements to be implemented after the environmental process.

Baseline Improvements

Some bus and pedestrian improvements are already funded and in-progress, including service plan improvements, Transit Signal Priority (using wireless technology), existing vehicle fleet replacement with new, 60-foot, articulated, low-floor, diesel-electric hybrid buses, and branding elements for buses and stations. Also, improvements have recently been completed to provide colorized bus lanes from Market Street to Van Ness Avenue.

Full Project: Staff-Recommended Alternative

A. Dedicated bus lanes with red colorization treatment. From Market Street to Van Ness Avenue, colorized bus lanes already exist. From Van Ness to Palm Avenue, the project would extend side-running bus lanes, with a few exceptions². This includes resurfacing the bus lane in segments with poor pavement condition. From Palm Avenue to 27th Avenue, the project would provide center-running bus lanes. From 27th to 34th Avenue, the project would provide side-running bus lanes. For the center-running segment, this scope element includes new concrete pavement for the bus lanes, as well as two new, dual, landscaped medians, and necessary sewer relocation and replacement work.

B. Station and stop bus-operation improvements. Along the side-running segments of the corridor, this includes bus bulb-out installations or modifications at approximately 20 locations to facilitate bus vehicle maneuvers around bus stops and stations. The work here accounts for necessary relocations of water and sewer utilities, as well as concrete bus pads at each BRT stop. It also includes re-locations of approximately 10 stops from the near sides of intersections to the far side, for improved bus flows through traffic and to maximize the benefits of transit signal priority. This scope element also includes bus stop pattern changes such as removal of approximately 20 local stops and conversion of a few selected Limited/BRT stops to local stops.

C. Station and stop passenger amenities. This includes station and stop amenities such as shelters, real-time transit information, station communications, lighting, custom paving, and landscaping.

D. Bus service changes. The existing 38 Geary would continue to operate as local service, stopping at every stop. The existing 38 Limited would become the BRT service, stopping only at BRT stops. The BRT

² For a few blocks near the Masonic Avenue and Fillmore Street intersections, the buses would operate on narrow frontage roads adjacent to the grade-separated Geary tunnels at those locations; some blocks of the frontage roads lack sufficient width for a bus lane and the mixed-flow travel lane needed to provide access to adjacent land uses and side streets; in such cases, the buses will share the lane with mixed-flow traffic.

project would increase the amount of service provided by these lines to accommodate additional demand as is anticipated by ridership forecasts. The 38AX and 38BX express services, operating only in the peak-hour in the peak direction, would become one express line called the 38X, stopping at BRT stops along the Geary corridor west of Masonic and traveling along Pine and Bush to reach downtown destinations. Note that the SFMTA will make periodic and incremental service adjustments based on ridership trends; for the analysis, the project used a high-frequency service plan to respond to anticipated forecasted ridership increases.

E. Bus vehicle changes. New, low-floor, articulated 60-foot diesel hybrid-electric motorcoaches are anticipated in the baseline to replace the existing fleet, but up to 16 additional vehicles are accounted for in the project cost estimate to enable the proposed increase in service for the BRT project.

F. Traffic signal improvements and communications. The project will install upgraded and new equipment at approximately 50 intersections along the corridor, including new vehicle and pedestrian countdown signal heads, and new poles. These upgrades are needed for smoother bus and traffic operations, as well as for pedestrian crossing safety benefits. At six locations, signalized queue jumps would be provided for transit. At five currently unsignalized locations, the project would install new traffic signals. This scope element also includes installation of fiber optic cable to improve the reliability of traffic signal communications and facilitate real-time traffic monitoring.

G. Right-turn pockets. In side-running segments, at approximately 10-15 locations with heavy right-turning vehicle demand and high pedestrian crossing activity, the project will install right-turn pockets so that right-turning vehicles that are stopped to wait for pedestrians to cross can queue in a pocket adjacent to the side-running bus lane, leaving the bus lane clear for buses.

H. Other street improvements. This includes replacement street lighting to accompany the center-running bus lanes (existing lighting is located in the existing median), street re-surfacing wherever needed, adjusting parking meters to accommodate roadway design changes, and new landscaping on existing medians.

I. Pedestrian improvements. This includes installing approximately 60 pedestrian bulb-outs, enhanced approximately 5 new signalized pedestrian crossings, pedestrian crosswalk striping at approximately 70 intersections, approximately 120 curb ramp upgrades throughout the corridor where needed, and sidewalk repair near curbside stations where needed (pedestrian signal modifications at existing signalized intersections are accounted for under traffic signal improvements).

J. Other changes at key areas. Other improvements include street redesign between Masonic and Presidio to add a colorized bike lane making a key connection in the bicycle network. It also includes a road diet between Gough and Scott combined with street-level pedestrian crossing improvements and removal of existing pedestrian overcrossings in the Japantown area in part to enable provision of a bus lane in that location.

Near-Term Improvements – Potential Initial Construction Phase

A. Dedicated bus lanes. From Van Ness to Stanyan Avenue, the near-term improvements include side-running bus lanes, with a few exceptions.³ Work would be limited to this segment of the corridor only. The near-term/initial construction phase cost estimate does not account for pavement resurfacing. Where feasible, the lanes will be delineated with red color treatment.

B. Station and stop bus-operation improvements. The near-term improvements include approximately 10 new bus bulb-out installations and modifications to approximately five existing bulbs. The work here accounts for necessary relocations of water and sewer utilities, as well as concrete bus pads at each BRT stop. The near-term improvements also lengthen six bus zones to facilitate vehicle maneuvers around bus stops and stations, as well as relocations of approximately 10 stops from the near side of intersections to the far side, for improved bus flows through traffic to maximize the benefit of transit signal priority. This scope element includes stop pattern changes such as removal of approximately 10 local stops and conversion of a few selected Limited/BRT stops to local stops.

F. Traffic signal improvements. The near-term improvements will install upgraded equipment at approximately 5 intersections along the corridor, including new vehicle and pedestrian countdown signal heads, and new poles. At most of these locations, complete upgrades are needed in order to install pedestrian countdown capability; at other locations, the upgrades support smoother bus and traffic operations. At two locations, signalized queue jumps would be provided for transit, and a new signal would be added at one location.

G. Right-turn pockets. At approximately 10-15 locations with heavy right-turning vehicle demand and high pedestrian crossing activity, where there will be side-running bus lanes, the project will install right-turn pockets so that right-turning vehicles that are stopped to wait for pedestrians to cross can queue in a pocket adjacent to the side-running bus lane, leaving the bus lane clear for buses.

I. Pedestrian improvements. This includes approximately 10 pedestrian bulb-outs, as well as needed accompanying curb ramp upgrades.

J. Other changes at key areas. Other improvements include a road diet between Gough and Scott to remove 2 travel lanes and striping to re-allocate that space to the median.

³ For a few blocks near the Masonic Avenue and Fillmore Street intersections, the buses would operate on narrow frontage roads adjacent to the grade-separated Geary tunnels at those locations; some blocks of the frontage roads lack sufficient width for a bus lane and the mixed-flow travel lane needed to provide access to adjacent land uses and side streets; in such cases, the buses will share the lane with mixed-flow traffic.

Table 1. Geary Bus Rapid Transit Scope Checklist Table

	Element	Baseline	Initial Construction Phase [Phase 1]	Full Project after Initial Phase [Phase 2]
A	Dedicated colorized bus lanes	x [partial: Inner Geary red lanes]	x [partial: side lanes only, Van Ness to Stanyan, no re-surfacing]	x [includes center-running segment Palm to 27th]
B	Station/stop bus-operation improvements		x [partial: subset of all locations]	x
C	Station/stop passenger amenities	x [partial: shelters/branding]		x
D	Bus service changes	x		x
E	Bus vehicle changes	x		x
F	Traffic signals and communications and Transit Signal Priority	x [partial: wireless TSP]	x [partial: subset of all locations]	x [includes fiber for improved life cycle/reliability, traffic monitoring]
G	Right turn pockets		x	
H	Street improvements			x
I	Pedestrian improvements		x [partial: subset of all bulb-out locations]	x [includes enhanced striping at all intersections]
J	Other changes at key areas		x [partial: includes Fillmore-area road diet]	x [includes Masonic-area bike lane and other street changes; includes Fillmore ped bridge removals and street-level crossings]

Notes:

Baseline: improvements already in-progress, not included in Initial Construction Phase or Full Project

Initial Construction Phase [Phase 1]: improvements to be initiated immediately after environmental phase is completed; to be funded from local sources.

Attachment 3. Geary Cost Estimate by Element and Phase
Last Edited: November 26, 2014

	Element	I. Potential Initial Construction Phase [Phase 1]	II. Full Project After Initial Phase [Phase 2]	III. Total, Phase 1 + Phase 2	IV. Full Project [Single Phase]
A	Dedicated colorized bus lanes	\$ 4,454,000	\$ 80,242,000	\$ 84,696,000	\$ 80,242,000
B	Station/stop bus-operation improvements	\$ 5,465,000	\$ 48,355,000	\$ 53,820,000	\$ 53,818,000
C	Station/stop passenger amenities		\$ 60,283,000	\$ 60,283,000	\$ 60,283,000
D	Bus service changes		*	*	*
E	Bus vehicle changes		\$ 22,655,000	\$ 22,655,000	\$ 22,655,000
F	Traffic signals	\$ 3,750,000	\$ 33,674,000	\$ 37,424,000	\$ 37,424,000
G	Right turn pockets	\$ 130,000	**	**	**
H	Other street improvements		\$ 34,649,000	\$ 34,649,000	\$ 34,779,000
I	Pedestrian improvements	\$ 2,200,000	\$ 20,096,000	\$ 22,296,000	\$ 22,296,000
J	Other changes at key areas	\$ 50,000	\$ 4,854,000	\$ 4,904,000	\$ 4,854,000
	Total	\$ 16,049,000	\$ 304,808,000	\$ 320,857,000	\$ 316,351,000
	Environmental/planning phase cost			\$ 7,346,000	\$ 7,346,000
	Grand total			\$ 328,203,000	\$ 323,697,000

Notes

Costs for baseline improvements already in-progress or underway, such as Transit Signal Priority, are not included in these costs.

I. Potential Initial Construction Phase [Phase 1]: Near-term improvements consist of some permanent and some temporary improvements. Includes some BRT components and some related improvements.

II. Full Project After Initial Phase [Phase 2]: includes all improvements after near-term implementation, including BRT and related improvements.

* Service/operation cost is not included here.

** Right-turn pocket costs are accounted for under Element H.

III. Total Cost, Phase I + Phase 2 is the summation of columns I and II

IV. Total Cost [Single-Phase Project]: project is constructed as a single phase (e.g., no initial phase). Lower costs result from lack of need for temporary improvements:

In Row (A), dedicated bus lane initial phase and full project cost is additive because of brief life cycle.

In Row (J), other changes at key areas - near-term and full project cost is additive because near-term changes are temporary

Attachment 4

Geary Bus Rapid Transit Funding Plan Updated: November 2014

Source	Type	Status	Project Phases ¹			Total by Status	TOTAL
			ENV, CER/PE	PS&E	CON		
5309 Small Starts ²	Federal	Allocated				\$0	\$75,000,000
		Programmed				\$0	
		Planned			\$75,000,000	\$75,000,000	
Prop K ³	Local	Allocated	\$7,346,113			\$7,346,113	\$44,429,113
		Programmed	\$17,300,000	\$14,500,000	\$5,283,000	\$37,083,000	
		Planned				\$0	
TBD ⁴	TBD	Allocated				\$0	\$208,774,289
		Programmed				\$0	
		Planned	\$6,956,217	\$6,670,105	\$195,147,967	\$208,774,289	
	Totals	Allocated	\$7,346,113	\$0	\$0	\$7,346,113	\$328,203,402
		Programmed	\$17,300,000	\$14,500,000	\$5,283,000	\$37,083,000	
		Planned	\$6,956,217	\$6,670,105	\$270,147,967	\$283,774,289	
			\$31,602,330	\$21,170,105	\$275,430,967	\$328,203,402	

¹ Acronyms used for project phases include: ENV - Environmental Documentation, CER/PE, Conceptual Engineering Report/Preliminary Engineering (30% Design), PS&E - Plans, Specifications & Estimates or Final Design, CON - Construction. The construction phase includes the incremental cost for procuring new BRT vehicles for the project.

² The Geary BRT project team plans to apply for Small Starts funds in early 2016. \$75 million is the maximum amount of Small Starts funds available to a project.

³ Resolution XX will reserve \$10 million from current Geary BRT funding for design/construction of the Initial Construction Phase and will reserve all the remaining Prop K funds currently programmed to Geary BRT for the Full Project.

⁴ Potential sources under consideration to fill the funding gap include additional sales tax, MTC Transit Performance Initiative funds, OneBayArea Grant, bridge tolls, other state or federal discretionary funds, and the Mayor's 2030 Transportation Task Force. The latter identified Geary BRT (listed as Geary Rapid Network Improvements) as one of the few named projects in its investment plan, with a \$27 million investment. The Task Force also deemed Geary BRT to be eligible for a portion of the \$58 million identified for the Transit Performance Initiative in the Task Force investment plan.

Attachment 5. San Francisco Planning Department and City Attorney's Office

Memorandum of Agreement for the Geary Bus Rapid Transit Project Environmental Phase

Scope and Budget

Scope

Task 2.10.1 Project Management

This task provides for staff time spent addressing overall issues relating to the Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project and San Francisco Planning Department (SF Planning) and City Attorney's Office (CAO) involvement in creating the joint Environmental Impact Report/Statement (EIR/S).

Task 2.10.2 Understanding the Project

This task includes staff time spent becoming sufficiently familiar with the project's design to provide guidance on its environmental documentation, including the geographic scope, the study area's existing conditions, the nature of the proposed improvements, the project alternatives, and details such as the potential extent of excavation, proposed stop locations, bus service changes, on-street parking changes, changes to left turns, and potential construction methods and phasing.

Task 2.10.3 Meetings

This task includes up to six meetings to discuss the project's environmental analyses and documentation, with 2 hours for each meeting: one hour for the meeting, and one hour for any advanced preparation and/or follow-up.

Task 2.10.4 Assistance with Methodology

This task includes review of proposed methodologies and draft results for all Geary BRT technical studies, including analyses specifically for cultural resources, visual impacts, air quality, noise, energy, biology, transportation, land use, growth, and cumulative impacts.

Task 2.10.5 Assistance with Compliance with City Administrative Code Chapter 31

This task includes coordination with the Geary BRT project for compliance with San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 31 governing the city's procedures for carrying out environmental requirements for the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), specifically relating to the processes and procedures for environmental documentation and review.

Task 2.10.6 Review Administrative Draft and Final EIR/S

This task includes reviewing the full Administrative Draft EIR/S for consistency with relevant city policies and other environmental documents led by San Francisco. This review will include attention to, for each environmental technical analysis topic: the language describing the regulatory setting, including references to appropriate laws and regulations; the methodology for the technical analysis; the description of the environmental setting; and the environmental consequences, including the criteria used for identifying significant impacts under the CEQA and proposed mitigations, as well as the discussions of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) effects and avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures. It also includes input on the structure of the document and text edits as necessary. This task also includes reviewing

and providing input on responses to public comments received from the public comment period, as well as the Final EIR/S.

Task 2.10.7 Administrative Support

This task includes staff time spent supporting the administrative needs of the agencies' participation in the Geary environmental review process, including invoicing.

Budget Detail

Geary BRT Environmental Review - Planning Department Responsible Agency Cost Estimate				
Task	Hours	Staff Classification	Rate (Hourly)	Subtotal
Task 2.10.1. Project Management	4	Viktoriya Wise, Deputy ERO	\$140.00	\$560.00
	12	Jessica Range, Plnr IV	\$125.52	\$1,506.24
	18	Rachel Schuett, Plnr III	\$105.79	\$1,904.22
Task 2.10.2. Understanding the Project	6	Jessica Range, Plnr IV	\$125.52	\$753.12
	8	Rachel Schuett, Plnr III	\$105.79	\$846.32
Task 2.10.3. Meetings	12	Jessica Range, Pnr IV	\$125.52	\$1,506.24
	12	Rachel Schuett, Plnr III	\$105.79	\$1,269.48
	2	Shelley Caltigerone, Pnr III	\$105.79	\$211.58
	2	Randall Dean, Plnr III	\$115.00	\$230.00
	8	City Attorney	\$240.00	\$1,920.00
Task 2.10.4. Assistance with Methodology	6	Jessica Range, Pnr IV	\$125.52	\$753.12
	8	Rachel Schuett, Plnr III	\$105.79	\$846.32
	2	Shelley Caltigerone, Pnr III	\$105.79	\$211.58
	2	Randall Dean, Plnr III	\$115.00	\$230.00
	8	City Attorney	\$240.00	\$1,920.00
Task 2.10.5. Assistance with Compliance with Chapter 31	4	Jessica Range, Plnr IV	\$125.52	\$502.08
	12	Rachel Schuett, Plnr III	\$105.79	\$1,269.48
Task 2.10.6. Review Administrative Draft EIR/S and Final EIR/S	40	Jessica Range, Plnr IV	\$125.52	\$5,020.80
	60	Rachel Schuett, Plnr III	\$105.79	\$6,347.40
	8	Shelley Caltigerone, Pnr III	\$105.79	\$846.32
	8	Randall Dean, Plnr III	\$115.00	\$920.00
	400	City Attorney	\$240.00	\$96,000.00
	4	Viktoriya Wise, Deputy ERO	\$140.00	\$560.00
Task 2.10.7. Administrative Support	8	Virnaliza Byrd, Planner Tech	\$60.00	\$480.00
Subtotal	654			\$126,614.30
Contingency	10%			\$12,661.43
Total				\$139,275.73

* Assumed hours are based on limited role in reviewing and assisting as a CEQA responsible agency. Additional hours may be required if the level of effort exceeds that assumed in this estimate.

Attachment 6



Revised 11/20/2014

SFCTA Geary BRT Project - Cost to Complete

The following is an outline of the major steps anticipated in completing the Draft ED (DED), associated public involvement, and Final ED/Record of Decision.

For budget purposes, Circlepoint assumes the above activities would be completed by November 2015 (or approximately 12 months of active time).

We further assume that Circlepoint will expend all remaining funds authorized towards completion of a revised DED incorporating agency review comments and discussing construction phasing. As of November 19, 2014, this work is substantially complete. We anticipate this work will be completed on or about December 12, 2014 and that no further analysis, subcontractor involvement, or substantive changes will be identified requiring revisions.

Task 1 – Meetings and Project Management

This task involves regular meetings with SFCTA staff to review project status, issues, schedule, and budget performance. This task also includes contract management activities including monthly progress reports.

Major Assumptions:

- *This task allows for approximately 4-6 hours of activity (meetings, management, etc) per month of for about 12 months.*

Task 2 – FTA Review and Revisions to DED

This task involves revising the DED based on comments from FTA and preparing the DED for publication.

Major Assumptions:

- *Edits will be primarily editorial in nature*
- *No subcontractor involvement needed to respond to FTA comments*
- *SFCTA/Parisi will address comments on transportation analysis/chapter*
- *Task includes reproduction costs associated with review process.*
 - *Costs of printing Draft EIS/EIR for public distribution is not included and assumed to be borne by SFCTA*

Task 3 – DED Public Hearing/Notification

Support one public hearing at a City-owned venue

Notification – develop postcard notice for corridor mailing (assumed to be up to 15,000 entries – and we assume SFCTA will pay for postage), provide content for SFCTA to email announcement, placement of notice in Examiner, Richmond Review (where timing permits) and Sing-Tao.

- Assume one consolidated set of comments on draft materials for a single review loop
- Assume SFCTA to pay for postage of postcard notice

Logistics – Assume venue is City-owned with all necessary equipment, except easels. Logistics to include development of logistics plan, setup and take down of equipment and refreshments.

Materials include sign-in sheet, name tags, comment sheet, optional speaker card, directional signs, and agenda (could also include fact sheets, copies of noticing materials, and other information as needed).

- Assume one consolidated set of comments on draft materials for a single review loop
- Assumes meeting materials in black and white, any production of color materials not included in this estimate

Attendance and Documentation – provide up to 2 staff and provide summary of outreach and transcript of comments.

- Provide one language interpreter per meeting
- Provide court reporter, assume total cost up to \$500 for transcript

Necessary coordination to provide strategic and tactical support for public outreach activities. This includes attending up to 4 planning meetings, participating in material development and phone calls, emails as needed.

Task 4 - Third round of informational public meetings (between DEIR and FEIR, related to completion of LPA)

Notification – development of notice language (for SFCTA to send via email) and placement in Examiner, Richmond Review (where timing permits), and Sing-Tao.

- Assume one consolidated set of comments on draft materials for a single review loop

Logistics – secure venues selected by SFCTA, prepare logistics plan, set up and take down for meeting, provide necessary equipment and refreshments.

Materials include sign-in sheet, name tags, comment sheet, optional speaker card, directional signs, and agenda (could also include fact sheets, copies of noticing materials, and other information as needed).

- Assume one consolidated set of comments on draft materials for a single review loop
- Assumes meeting materials in black and white, any production of color materials not included in this estimate

Attendance and Documentation – provide up to 2 staff per meeting and provide high-level summary of outreach activities and input received.

- Provide one language interpreter per meeting.

Task 5 – Prepare Final ED, Record of Decision

This task involves preparing responses to comments received during the public review period, revisions to the DED as necessary, inclusion of Preferred Alternative, and preparation of Record of Decision for FTA approval and filing.

Major Assumptions:

- *The level of effort to prepare responses to comments and the Final ED is dependent on the number and complexity of comments received. The extent of public comment on a Draft ED is not predictable. The budget therefore includes a preliminary estimate of time to respond to comments. This preliminary estimate assumes no more than 340 hours of staff time or about \$46,000 (200 hours associate, 100 hours Senior Project Manager, 40 hours Principal) as a placeholder budget. The preliminary budget also assumes about \$12,000 in staff time to prepare/revise the ROD, though the extent of detail in the ROD is also not predictable. The remainder of the budget allowance in this task is anticipated for associated coordination, including meetings with FTA and SFCTA.*
- *No new analysis necessary to address comments received and the Preferred Alternative*
- *Preferred Alternative is substantially similar to the Staff Recommended Alternative*
- *Agency review comments (SFCTA, MTA, Planning, City Attorney) would be editorial in nature and do not require substantial revision of ED chapters or analysis.*
- *FTA review comments are editorial in nature and do not require substantial revision of ED chapters or analysis.*
- *SFCTA staff will take lead role in responding to comments related to transportation chapter.*
- *We assume the Final ED will be published and noticed more formally as part of the final certification and approval process. We have not specified any specific outreach tasks in support of this effort; however, if SFCTA anticipates needing support, these could be authorized out of contingency funds.*

Direct Costs

In order to assume prime contractor status, Circlepoint would need to provide insurance coverage commensurate with the terms of the prime contract, the terms of exceed Circlepoint's current coverage limits. We have obtained a preliminary estimate of the cost to increase our coverage to match the terms of the prime contract and have identified that cost estimate in our cost to complete. This estimate assumes 24 months of increased coverage specific to this project.

Contingency Fund

A contingency fund is proposed for use in addressing out-of-scope activities that may occur such as:

- Need for technical subcontractor assistance - can be applied flexibly (responding to comments, revising project plans, etc.)
- Revisions necessary to address more extensive FTA comments than assumed for Task 2.
- Additional outreach support or development of materials for noticing or meetings
- Additional public comments
- Substantive changes to the Final ED
- Other unforeseen needs.

Cost to Complete Budget

Assumed Balance Remaining as of 12/12/14	\$ 0.00
Task 1 - Meetings and Project management	\$ 15,000
Task 2 - FTA Review/CP revisions to publication	\$ 18,500
Task 3 - DEIR Hearing Notification	\$ 12,600
Task 4 - 3rd round hearings - LPA	\$ 32,000
Task 5 - FED - Responses to Comments Document/ROD - Allowance	\$ 65,000
Direct Costs (Insurance)	\$ 7,000
Subtotal - Tasks 1-5	\$ 150,100
Proposed Contingency	\$ 74,900
Grand Total: Tasks 1-5, Direct Costs + Contingency	\$ 225,000