



TRANSBAY JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY

**TRANSBAY JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, November 10, 2009
Transbay Joint Powers Authority
201 Mission Street, Suite 2100
San Francisco, CA

Meeting #023

5:30 p.m.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Jim Lazarus, Chair
Karen Knowles-Pearce, Vice Chair
Andrew Brooks
Michael Freeman
Peter Hartman
Adrienne Heim
MaryClare M. James
Marcus Krause
David Milton
Jane Morrison
D'Arcy Myjer
Jul Lynn Parsons
Norm Rolfe
Dave Snyder

Executive Director
Maria Ayerdi-Kaplan

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

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Jim Lazarus, Chair, at 5:45 pm. A quorum was formed and the meeting was attended by 10 of the current 14 voting members as follows: Jim Lazarus, Andrew Brooks, Michael Freeman, Peter Hartman, Adrienne Heim, MaryClare M. James, Marcus Krause, Jane Morrison, D'Arcy Myjer, and Jul Lynn Parsons. Non-voting member Bob Beck was also present.

2. Approval of September 8, 2009 Meeting Minutes

Chair Lazarus asked if there were any corrections or comment on the Draft Meeting Minutes for the September 8, 2009 meeting which had been provided for review and there were none. Marcus Krause made a motion to approve the September 8, 2009 Draft Meeting Minutes and the motion was seconded by D'Arcy Myjer. A vote was called by voice and the motion was unanimously moved and carried.

3. Staff Report – Bob Beck

Bob Beck advised that progress is being made on the Temporary Terminal and that paving began yesterday. Bids for demolition of the existing Transbay Terminal and ramp structures were received September 24th. The budget is \$18 million, and the low bid came in at \$10.5 million from Evans Brothers. At the time of the prior meeting, a decision on our application for \$400 million from Track 1 of the President's American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) high speed rail stimulus fund to build the rail levels of the new Transit Center was expected within a few weeks. Because of the volume of applications, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) has decided to evaluate the applications for Track 1 and Track 2 concurrently and have stated that they would issue decisions "this winter." The TJPA has sought clarification on the timing of a potential decision, and the FRA has indicated in subsequent statements that they hope to announce awards in January 2010.

This delay will impact the date that we will move out of the Transbay Terminal. Anticipating the funding decision in October, the TJPA had planned to the cost and budget picture at the November Board of Director Meeting and, with the board's approval, to move coordinate with operators on planning and outreach to riders with the intent to move into the Temporary Terminal in February 2010. Without certainty regarding the date of the FRA decision, outreach and some other activities will have to wait until after an FRA announcement.

Bob Beck reported that Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, Speaker Nancy Pelosi, Senator Dianne Feinstein, Senator Barbara Boxer, and Congresswoman Jackie Speier had all written letters to the Secretary of the U. S. Department of Transportation Ray LaHood supporting the Transbay application and thanked the CAC members who had contacted their legislative representatives and helped secure these letters of support.

Jim Lazarus commented that with the extension of the date of the FRA's announcement regarding Track 1 stimulus fund awards and with progress being made on the California High Speed Rail (CHSR) peninsula project, there is an opportunity for CHSR to drop the Main/Beale option. Bob Beck added that a scoping decision regarding EIR is suppose to be made in early December and that it would be helpful to the TJPA's application if CHSR dropped the Main/Beale alternative at that time. Bob Beck reported that the San Francisco Board of Supervisors was expected to take up a measure protesting the Main/Beale location and that the Transportation Authority is leading a discussion of City departments to sign a joint statement that the TJPA is the preferred location and rejecting other alternatives from further consideration. Bob Beck also reported that when

CHSR finalized their Track 2 application, it included the train box extension to Main Street from which one could infer as supporting of the TTC location and design.

Andrew Brooks commented he understands that Quentin Kopp is no longer Chair of the CHSRA, and Bob Beck advised that Curt Pringle who is Mayor of the City of Anaheim has held that position since around August 2009.

Chair Lazarus asked if there were any further questions or comments from CAC members or members of the public. There were none.

4. Transit Center Wayfinding Design – Kyle Elliott (WRNS Studio)

Mr. Kyle Elliott from WRNS, subconsultant to the Pelli-Clarke-Pelli Architects (PCPA) team, advised that the wayfinding design development is approximately one-half complete and provided a concept overview. WRNS is designing the transit and wayfinding signage within the building, on the roof garden, retail, and street level traffic so there will be a sense of continuity and cohesiveness of design tied to the City. The design strategy for wayfinding signage is one of “progressive disclosure” which reveals more information as one moves closer to and then into the Transit Center. The purpose is to not overwhelm the public and to keep the signage as succinct and simple as possible. The plan is to rely on international graphic icons instead of text wherever possible and would include both static and interactive signage.

He showed examples of a columnar pylon signs which would have a uniform, but distinct design, and be illuminated internally. He gave examples of various types of signage and reviewed the proposed locations for each. Bollard style fixtures that rise from the floor will be used for primary directional signage, but there will also be some blades signage that could be freestanding or mounted on walls or modular Kiosks that will include both interactive and static information. A narrative signage system is being planned for the roof garden.

D’Arcy Myjer asked how they will determine the number of kiosks needed, and Mr. Elliott replied that it will be similar to determining the density flow of escalators. The kiosks will be modular, can be ganged together for flexibility, and can have messages on both sides. We are in design with a range of possibilities, and the quantities and locations are not finalized.

Marcus Krause asked if instead of having one side of the kiosk interactive and the other static, could both be interactive and Mr. Elliott replied yes. Ideas about how the kiosks were to face and what type of information (static / interactive) would be on them was discussed.

Another type of signage planned is a classic suspended schedule board for the Grand Hall. Signage will be dynamic and therefore can accommodate changing schedule information and advertising. Mr. Elliot described the team’s efforts to develop fun and intuitive ways to convey wayfinding messages such as exit signage going up the side of an escalator. He described a distinctive “sushi roll” form that is being considered to mark points of access to the park. In the park it will be used to point out key attractions. He also described proposed signage standards for retail vendors to ensure a cohesive look and feel.

Jim Lazarus commented that the height of the “sushi roll” signs appear to be lower than an average human height and could possibly be blocked from view at peak times and might block the sidewalk, and asked if the designers had considered hanging them from the building. Mr. Elliott replied that the irregularity of the building (undulating walls) make

it difficult to mount suspended signage in many locations and explained that the “sushi rolls” would be placed as close to the curb as possible so they would not be hidden.

D’Arcy Myjer commented that on the park level you do not want so much signage as to lose the feeling of a park, and Mr. Elliott agreed.

Commenting on the concept of retail signage standards, Peter Hartman was concerned that they might bring too much conformity in the area, and that the result could appear sterile and mall-like. He felt that retail shops should be able to customize their signs to keep it lively, but within standards. Bob Beck replied we hope to draw people into Natoma as it is not a natural avenue for pedestrian traffic, and signage may play an important role in that effort. Mr. Hartman thought that prominently displayed signs at exit points inside the TTC telling what street you are on and signs indicating the direction (north/south/east/west) would be helpful. Mr. Elliott confirmed that there will be signs announcing the street at each exit and additional pylon signs outside reinforcing it.

Andrew Brooks voiced concern about having pylons in the street or on the curb and felt that because of its size and distinctive architecture, the TTC was not going to be hard to find. He was also concerned about signage that had words written sideways and felt that would be hard to read and could be a hazard as people angle their heads to read the information.

Jim Lazarus also felt that directional signage (north/south/east/west) would be helpful especially to those new to the City or when it is dark. He also asked if there would be signage in the park and near retail to show when trains and buses would be leaving. Mr. Elliott acknowledged that this was a good point and confirmed that there would be schedule information on all transit levels and at the park.

Andrew Brooks asked if there would be an audio or Public Address (PA) system component to the signage. Mr. Elliott advised that there will not be a PA system tied distinctly to signage and graphics, the PA system is separate, and his company is not involved in designing it. Also, they have been told by their ADA consultant that talking signs do not work in part because there is so much going on that the signs would be talking over each other.

Adrienne Heim ask that with relying on active displays, will there still be paper copies of maps so people can just take one and go. Mr. Elliott replied that there will be both information kiosks and paper, but it would have to be managed. Bob Beck commented that there may be an information kiosk with a live person in the grand hall.

A member of the public asked about removal of graffiti from signs. Mr. Elliott explained that the reason acrylic was chosen was because it can be buffed and sanded and look exactly the same. Andrew Brooks commented that in his experience in property management it is critical to remove graffiti within 8 hours and when you take a sign down to buff and sand it, it becomes nonfunctional. Mr. Elliott responded that he felt they would try to clean them first and if that did not work then they would take them down. Mr. Brooks recommended looking at products and materials you can clean with a quick turn around and the member of the public suggested making sure the cleaning solvent would not distort acrylic.

Chair Lazarus asked if there were any further questions or comments from CAC members or the public and there were none. Chair Lazarus thanked Mr. Elliott for his presentation.

5. Transit Center Bicycle Facilities – Rich Coffin – ARUP

Mr. Beck acknowledged Andrew Brooks' interest in coordinating the TJPA bicycle work with the MTA's work and advised he did invite MTA to present tonight, however they proposed that they come in the spring when they will be soliciting another round of input. Andrew Brooks agreed.

Mr. Beck introduced Rich Coffin from ARUP. Rich advised that they are also in the middle of design development and therefore what he was presenting reflected the team's current thinking, but was subject to change and feedback would be appreciated.

Mr. Coffin stated that the objectives for the Transbay bicycle facility is to provide safe convenient access to all modes of transit in a 5 level building with a minimum of problems between bikes and pedestrians. He gave an overview of the current volume of bike riders on each carrier, how bikes are transported on the various carriers, what areas the riders are coming from, and what routes they take in the City. Bike parking will be made available, and there may be opportunities for bike sharing or rentals. Eight elevators will go up to the bus deck and will to be shared with pedestrians. The East Bay Bicycle Coalition and other stakeholders provided input. They wanted a dedicated ramp, but it was not feasible given the height of the bus deck.

D'Arcy Myjer asked to confirm that there will be 8 elevators going to the bus deck with all to be shared by bicyclist and non-bicyclist. Rich said yes plus 2 freight elevators. Andrew Brooks cautioned that if elevators are out of service and bicyclist have to wait, that they will probably carry their bikes on their shoulders down the escalator. Rich advised that they are trying to balance the need and that they are looking at Shaw Alley as being a primary bike access point. There will be a stairwell with a bike channel to the bus deck at Shaw Alley. The bike channel allows riders to roll their bikes as they climb the stairs rather than carrying them.

Rich outlined the bike traffic flow up to the bus level and down to the train level and showed the concept for a bike ramp from Howard Street to the rail concourse level where a secure bike parking station is planned. The location of the Caltrain Bay Bridge bicycle shuttle drop off/pick up location has not been determine as there are advantages and disadvantages to different areas.

The greatest share of bicycle riders is expected amongst Caltrain riders. The estimated number of bikes on Caltrain is 650 per hour at peak time. One primary goal is to keep them separate from the core flow in the Grand Hall and other areas by focusing bicycle access at the western end of the Caltrain platform. An overview of the access points was given. There will be 2 elevators to the platform.

Tony Bruzzone of ARUP commented that they are designing the bus ramps that connects to the bridge and the right-of-way under the bus ramps could possibly be made into a pedestrian way and bicycle path with a signalized crossing connecting to planned bike ramp on Howard Street. Rich added that the location both bikes and taxis could exit and cross Howard Street with the light.

Rich showed the design concept for the bike ramp with a maximum grade of 8.8% with more gently graded recovery zone in the middle.

D'Arcy Myjer asked if they think people ride or walk their bikes out and Rich replied yes that they expect that 90-95% of people will ride their bikes out.

Marcus Krause asked how they would control speed and Rich replied it would be with the 8% grade, 2% flat zone and then 8%. Marcus commented that he presumed the speed control is more for going down then up, and Rich replied affirmatively and discussed the various means to slow bike traffic and the dismount zone for riders.

D'Arcy Myjer asked what if someone does not dismount and tries to ride all the way down to the train. Rich clarified that the ramp only goes down to the lower concourse and that they will still have to dismount to take the stairs or elevator to the platform. It is infeasible to have a ramp all the way down. D'Arcy asked if anything will force riders to dismount, and Rich replied that there will be doors that riders will have to pass through.

Mr. Coffin described the bike channel for walking bikes up the stairwell and showed images of the bike channel at the 24th and Mission BART station. He described that the channel is primarily assistance for riders climbing the stairs as it can be difficult to control the speed of a bike when using the channel to descend. MaryClare James asked if adding bumps to the channel surface would slow down and control bikes going down. Michael Freeman commented that he uses the bike channel to cross under the Golden Gate Bridge on the Marin side and uses his hand brake to slow the bike down so that it does not get away from him. Marcus Krause added that since many bike riders arrive shortly before their train departs they may not wait for an elevator, but would want to take their bikes down the stairs and it would be good if they could do so easily and safely. Rich Coffin said he would discuss the possibilities with the architectural team.

In Phase 1, the rail concourse will not be finished so the ramp and bike station will not be available, but bike parking is planned at grade level with racks that would also serve retail and the neighborhood. He showed a variety of designs and is looking to provide bike parking that is attractive, organized, and user friendly.

D'Arcy Myjer said that where he parks a bike they now hang the bikes by the front wheel and they can be packed more densely. Rich asked if this was outside, and D'Arcy replied that it was in a garage. Rich said that this type of parking was being considered in the Phase 2 bike station.

Jim Lazarus asked Bob Beck if there was any empty room inside during Phase 1 where a temporary indoor bike storage facility could be located. Bob replied that a retail area on Natoma would be a possibility. Jim Lazarus commented that maybe there could be a larger space downstairs on the train level. Bob said that one idea that is being considered is for parking to be a part of a retail program such as rentals or bike repair. Tony Bruzzone added that bike stations do not typically cover their costs from parking fees, but, if you combine it with a retail function (bike sales, rentals, repair etc.), those revenues can help support the bike station operation. Rich advised that this is still being reviewed and still to be determined would be if it was attended, unattended, only attended during peak hours, etc.

Chair Lazarus thanked Mr. Coffin and asked if there were any questions or comments from CAC members or the public on the presentation and there was none.

Adrienne Heim asked for an update on the artist selection process. Bob Beck replied that a number of artists were interviewed and some preliminary selections have been made. Various types of art are being considered, and he would schedule a presentation at an upcoming CAC meeting. MaryClare James mentioned that in an article in the San Francisco Examiner on September 25th apparently artist proposals are due early next year according to the Program Director of the San Francisco Arts Commission. Bob Beck replied that a number of artists are developing prototypes of their proposals. A presentation might be made before the submissions are due depicting existing pieces from the artists, but we would certainly bring the proposed pieces to the CAC for feedback.

6. Public Comment - Chair Lazarus asked if there were any further questions or comments from CAC members or the public. There was none.

7. CAC Member Comments & Future Agenda Requests – Chair Lazarus asked if there were any future agenda items.

Michael Freeman suggested the following:

- Utility and underground work sequencing including the impact on neighborhoods and traffic,
- Security risk assessment,
- Long term rail expansion opportunities after 2030, how it would be accomplished and if it is possible,
- Parking for construction workers, and
- Long-term parking for transit users.

Jim Lazarus raised the idea to extend the track in a loop and the need to coordinate with Redevelopment and future projects to preserve underground right-of-way and assure that it is possible to tunnel under anything that is built.

Peter Hartman asked if the California High Speed Rail Authority has or will have any requirements for parking that they will impose, regardless of location. Michael Freeman added that he would rather it was planned then just happen and overwhelm the neighborhoods.

Bob Beck commented that we would plan to cover these items in future presentations.

Chair Lazarus asked if there were any further items. There were none.

9. Adjourn

Chair Lazarus asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting, a motion to adjourn was made by Jane Morrison, and MaryClare James seconded the motion. A vote was called by voice and was unanimously approved. Chair Lazarus adjourned the meeting at 7:20 PM.

10. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled on Tuesday, December 8, 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.