

Edwin M. Lee | Mayor

Tom Nolan | Chairman

Jerry Lee | Vice-Chairman

Leona Bridges | Director

Cheryl Brinkman | Director

Malcolm Heinicke | Director

Bruce Oka | Director

Joél Ramos | Director

Edward D. Reiskin | Director of Transportation

August 18, 2011

Hon. Katherine Feinstein
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
Superior Court of California
County of San Francisco - Grand Jury
400 McAllister St., Rm. 008
San Francisco, CA 94102

SUBJECT: Response to the Civil Grand Jury's Report, "Central Subway
Too Much Money for Too Little Benefit," released on July 7, 2011

Dear Judge Feinstein:

Enclosed is the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA) response to the findings and recommendations made by the Civil Grand Jury in the above-titled report. While the SFMTA appreciates the Civil Grand Jury's interest in the Central Subway project, a common theme running throughout the recommendations and findings is that the Agency must make a choice between expanding the system to provide more service and preserving the existing system.

SFMTA's Municipal Railway ("Muni") is one of the most comprehensive transit systems in the United States. Preservation of its assets is essential, but the system endures because of its adaptability and its ability to grow and service emerging markets as the City has expanded. The choice is not between expansion and preservation. Any world class transportation system has to have the ability to reinvest in its core structure while expanding to meet existing and emerging customer demands. The SFMTA will continue to work diligently to ensure the Central Subway project comes to fruition while maintaining our current transit network.

Please contact Kathleen Sakelaris, Regulatory Affairs Manager, at 415.701.4339 if you require any further information.

Sincerely,



Edward D. Reiskin
Director of Transportation

Enclosure: SFMTA Response Table to the 2011 Civil Grand Jury Report

cc: Gary Giubbini, Civil Grand Jury

SFMTA Response Table to 2011 Civil Grand Jury Report Findings and Recommendations

| FINDINGS | RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: (1) Agree or (2) Disagree wholly or partially, with explanation | RECOMMENDATIONS | RESPONSE REQUIRED From the Agencies specified by the CGJ. | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| <p><u>Finding 1</u></p> <p>The Central Subway's financial planning appears seriously flawed.</p> <p>Cost estimates have risen 143% from 2003 to 2011.</p> | <p>Disagree wholly.</p> <p>The Central Subway must submit an annual financial report to be evaluated under the Federal New Starts Review program. Under this program, all aspects of the project are scrutinized by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), including the benefit-to-cost ratios, ridership, technical approach and financial capacity. In any large construction project, costs are continually refined as more detailed engineering work is completed. In addition, the prices of other components beyond the control of the SFMTA, such as materials, labor and real estate, also vary and can change over eight years.</p> | <p><u>Recommendation 1</u></p> <p>Given that San Francisco is responsible for any cost overrun of the Central Subway project, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) should hire an independent entity to investigate whether the \$1.578 billion budget is a realistic estimate.</p> | <p>SFMTA</p> | <p><u>4 – Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted.</u></p> <p>As was previously provided to the Civil Grand Jury (CGJ), independent, significant federal and local resources conduct oversight and continuous review of the project's estimated and actual costs to date.</p> <p>Foremost, the FTA's substantial professional oversight resources provide monthly assessments, suggestions and guidance to adhere to the \$1.578 billion budget. This national methodology is referred to as the "FTA New Starts Program" and provides a process by which the Central Subway has earned a medium-high overall New Starts national rating for four consecutive years. Specifically, the FTA's Project Management Oversight Consultant (PMOC) program assigns highly trained, expert project cost investigators with national experience to track and take part in each New Start project's development, often over a several-year period. This oversight follows prescribed national review standards. The PMOC carries out continuous oversight of cost records, cost estimates, cost controls, and costs to complete. The PMOC attends Project meetings on a continuous basis and assesses the capability and capacity to carry out the project by reviewing the project and Agency organization, the project's management plans, and procedures for executing a quality project, while maintaining schedule and budget. The New Starts methodology requires annual, quarterly and monthly reviews of costs, of potential cost increases and a review and decision process to reduce costs as appropriate during work in progress.</p> <p>In parallel, the FTA's independent Financial Management Oversight Consultant (FMOC) separately oversees the Central Subway and Agency's financial plans. The FMOC has produced detailed, rigorous reviews and recommendations to enhance these financial plans. In response to the PMOC and FMOC, the project has responded to and carried out the extensive suggestions and recommendations on a continuous and timely basis. The SFMTA also is subject to FTA-sponsored reviews of its federal grants management process and related systems and is required to address any findings from these reviews within set timeframes to avoid jeopardizing receipt of federal funds.</p> <p>Local sources provide additional independent oversight. The City Controller, who is responsible for the financial systems, procedures, internal controls and reports that impact the City's fiscal condition, conducts regular financial and performance audits of the project. In 2011, the Controller completed its first one-year audit of the CS project with minor findings that were all acted upon. The Project also receives the benefit of continuous oversight by the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA).</p> |

SFMTA Response Table to 2011 Civil Grand Jury Report Findings and Recommendations

| FINDINGS | RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: (1) Agree or (2) Disagree wholly or partially, with explanation | RECOMMENDATIONS | RESPONSE REQUIRED From the Agencies specified by the CGJ. | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| | | | | Finally, as shared with the CGJ previously, the Central Subway was also the focus of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors' 2010-11 one-year performance audit of the SFMTA's Capital Program. This independent, on-site audit involved numerous interviews and document reviews that exhaustively covered the Project's funding and expenditure plans. |
| <p><u>Finding 2</u></p> <p>Muni has done a very poor job of meeting, or even nearing, the requirements of Proposition E.</p> | <p>Disagree partially.</p> <p>The SFMTA has attempted to meet many of the service standards under Proposition E and we will continue working to improve Muni service.</p> | <p><u>Recommendation 2</u></p> <p>SFMTA should hire an independent auditor to conduct an analysis of whether its internal goals and the requirements in Proposition E are realistic, why Muni has been unable to meet them, and what should be done to improve Muni's service levels.</p> | SFMTA | <p><u>4 – Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted.</u></p> <p>Section 8A.107 of the City Charter already requires that the SFMTA contract on a biennial basis with a nationally recognized management or transportation consulting firm for an independent review of the extent to which the SFMTA has met, and is expected to meet, the goals, objectives, and performance standards it is required to adopt under Section 8A.103.</p> |
| <p><u>Finding 3</u></p> <p>Muni is not providing adequate service to its customers.</p> | <p>Disagree partially.</p> <p>SFMTA strives to provide excellent customer service. Muni has among the highest bus boardings per hour among major transit agencies in the country. We serve over 700,000 riders each weekday and provide more than 1,200 daily trips through the subway. Last year, the SFMTA reached the highest on-time performance in the</p> | <p><u>Recommendation 3</u></p> <p>Either the City and SFMTA need to increase Muni's funding, or the City and SFMTA need to lower their expectations for Muni's performance.</p> | SFMTA SFCTA Board of Supervisors Mayor | <p><u>2 – Will be Implemented in the Future</u></p> <p>As part of our Agency's efforts to improve Muni service, the SFMTA will continue to look at ways to improve efficiencies, decrease costs and increase funding. We are very committed to meeting the expectations of our customers for performance and will be evaluating the appropriateness of reporting criteria as outlined in the Charter.</p> |

SFMTA Response Table to 2011 Civil Grand Jury Report Findings and Recommendations

| FINDINGS | RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: (1) Agree or (2) Disagree wholly or partially, with explanation | RECOMMENDATIONS | RESPONSE REQUIRED From the Agencies specified by the CGJ. | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation | |
|-----------------|--|------------------------|---|---|--|
| | Agency's history for one quarter and the highest overall performance for a single year. The Agency is constantly seeking ways to improve service to customers, such as through the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP), a comprehensive review of SFMTA's Muni system to improve performance, and implementing the Nix pilot project, which relieves pressure from the N Judah, the busiest Light Rail line, and gives customers a faster alternative during peak hours. The Agency has also established a line-management center to help supervisors better assess daily needs with real-time information and make required adjustments. In addition, the Agency has instituted a number of upgrades to the Advanced Train Control System (ATCS), including improvements to the Vehicle On-Board Computer (VOBC). These changes have led to increased reliability of subway service. The SFMTA is also continually working on | | | | |

SFMTA Response Table to 2011 Civil Grand Jury Report Findings and Recommendations

| FINDINGS | RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: (1) Agree or (2) Disagree wholly or partially, with explanation | RECOMMENDATIONS | RESPONSE REQUIRED From the Agencies specified by the CGJ. | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | ways to improve on time performance, including expediting boarding procedures by fully integrating Clipper cards and exploring all door boarding methods. Despite its financial challenges, the SFMTA was able to partially restore service that was cut during the latest economic downturn. | | | |
| <p><u>Finding 4</u></p> <p>Muni has had financial troubles in recent years and, absent an unforeseen windfall, will continue to have financial troubles in the foreseeable future.</p> | <p>Agree. In addition to prior funding needs, Muni has recently been severely impacted by reduced transit funding from the State and decreased support from the City's General Fund, due to the recent recession.</p> | <p><u>Recommendation 4</u> (covers Findings 4 - 6)</p> <p>The SFMTA should hire an outside auditor to evaluate the potential gains in revenue brought by higher fares against the potential loss in total ridership due to such higher prices.</p> | <p>SFMTA SFCTA Board of Supervisors Mayor</p> | <p><u>4 - Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted.</u></p> <p>The SFMTA disagrees with this recommendation. The Agency fully understands the elasticity of fare increases on the system. There is a much stronger nexus between service reductions and impact to ridership, as opposed to fare increases, as has been confirmed by both the Transit Effectiveness Project and recent actions on service and fare changes. The Agency has conducted extensive research on its policies to identify the optimal scenario for maximum revenue generation. Given challenging economic times with limited funding for operations, the effect of fare increases on the system has been heavily weighed against service reduction in regards to ridership and resulting revenue impacts.</p> |
| <p><u>Finding 5</u></p> <p>Given the current and projected state of Muni's funding, difficult times lie ahead. This will impact the agency's ability to deliver the level of performance</p> | <p>Disagree partially. The SFMTA, along with numerous public transit agencies across the nation, is facing severe financial challenges, but we will continue our efforts to improve performance.</p> | | | |

SFMTA Response Table to 2011 Civil Grand Jury Report Findings and Recommendations

| FINDINGS | RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: (1) Agree or (2) Disagree wholly or partially, with explanation | RECOMMENDATIONS | RESPONSE REQUIRED From the Agencies specified by the CGJ. | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| demanded by the charter. | | | | |
| <u>Finding 6</u> Raising passenger fares can only have a minimal impact on Muni's financial shortfalls. | Agree. User fares and fees alone cannot address the funding shortfall. Passenger fares represent approximately 20% of Muni's total operating revenues. New revenue sources will need to be identified locally and regionally to fund transit operations. | | | |
| <u>Finding 7</u> New financial stresses are adding to Muni's already-existing financial troubles. These stresses will potentially worsen the state of Muni service. | Disagree partially. The SFMTA agrees that it is facing continued financial challenges. However, we are striving to reinvest in the system to ensure we are providing the best level of service possible through initiatives such as the TEP, the Nx pilot project and establishing the Line Management Center. In addition, in late 2012, a unified Transit Management Center is scheduled to come on-line and will unite in one location all of the SFMTA's emergency response teams and control centers, | <u>Recommendation 5</u> SFMTA should publicly explain if and when the remaining cuts to Muni service will be restored. | SFMTA | <u>2 - Will Be Implemented: in the Future</u> The SFMTA develops an annual service plan as part of the budget process and regularly reviews the performance of that plan, making adjustments based on ridership and other performance criteria. Restoration of the remaining service cuts will be addressed as part of that process. |

SFMTA Response Table to 2011 Civil Grand Jury Report Findings and Recommendations

| FINDINGS | RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: (1) Agree or (2) Disagree wholly or partially, with explanation | RECOMMENDATIONS | RESPONSE REQUIRED From the Agencies specified by the CGJ. | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| | including dispatch for Parking Control Officers and towing, SFgo, security monitoring and desks will be available for power control and SFPD. | | | |
| <p><u>Finding 8</u></p> <p>Maintenance of vehicles impacts the agency's ability to provide day-to-day service. Poorly maintained vehicles have negatively affected Muni's ability to operate as many vehicles as needed to meet peak demand.</p> | <p>Agree.</p> <p>The SFMTA agrees that maintenance of vehicles has a direct impact on the Agency's ability to provide day-to-day service.</p> | <p><u>Recommendation 6</u> (covers Findings 8 – 9)</p> <p>Maintenance should be given a higher priority in the budget than it currently is.</p> | SFMTA | <p><u>1 - Recommendation Implemented.</u></p> <p>Maintenance needs are evaluated and considered as part of every budget process and will be evaluated as part of the FY12/13 and FY13/14 budget cycle.</p> |
| <p><u>Finding 9</u></p> <p>As a result of forcing maintenance demands to compete with other system demands, maintenance has regularly been underfunded.</p> | <p>Disagree partially.</p> <p>Under any circumstances with a constrained budget and funding limits as discussed above, choices need to be made. Like transit agencies across the country, the SFMTA is facing a decline in transportation funding. The SFMTA will continue to work on an ongoing basis to secure the revenues needed to meet its maintenance needs.</p> | | | |

SFMTA Response Table to 2011 Civil Grand Jury Report Findings and Recommendations

| FINDINGS | RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: (1) Agree or (2) Disagree wholly or partially, with explanation | RECOMMENDATIONS | RESPONSE REQUIRED From the Agencies specified by the CGJ. | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| <p><u>Finding 10</u></p> <p>Stripping wrecked vehicles for parts is an inefficient way to save money. It would be cheaper to repair the wrecked vehicle and buy new parts for other vehicles than to buy a completely new vehicle to replace the cannibalized one.</p> | <p>Agree.</p> | <p><u>Recommendation 7</u></p> <p>Muni should end its practice of cannibalizing wrecked vehicles to repair other vehicles.</p> | <p>SFMTA</p> | <p><u>4 - Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted.</u></p> <p>The SFMTA has an existing policy prohibiting cannibalizing wrecked vehicles.</p> |
| <p><u>Finding 11</u></p> <p>Following the manufacturer's suggested preventive maintenance program is inadequate for maintaining Muni's fleet. This inadequate preventive maintenance negatively impacts Muni's ability to properly serve its riders.</p> | <p>Agree.</p> <p>The SFMTA has expanded its Preventative Maintenance Program beyond the Manufacturer's recommendations. We conduct inspections at more frequent mileage intervals and have expanded the scope of items checked as well.</p> | <p><u>Recommendation 8 (covers Findings 11-12)</u></p> <p>The Board of Supervisors, SFCTA, and SFMTA should determine how to fund adequate preventive maintenance and a targeted component rebuild program on an ongoing basis.</p> | <p>SFMTA SFCTA Board of Supervisors Mayor</p> | <p><u>4 - Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted.</u></p> <p>The SFMTA continues to work on an ongoing basis to secure the revenues needed to meet its preventive maintenance and other operating needs.</p> |

SFMTA Response Table to 2011 Civil Grand Jury Report Findings and Recommendations

| FINDINGS | RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: (1) Agree or (2) Disagree wholly or partially, with explanation | RECOMMENDATIONS | RESPONSE REQUIRED From the Agencies specified by the CGJ. | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation | |
|---|--|------------------------|---|---|--|
| <p><u>Finding 12</u> Mid-life overhauls are not enough to properly maintain Muni's fleet. Targeted component rebuilds are essential to their maintenance.</p> | <p>Agree. The SFMTA agrees that mid-life overhauls and targeted component rebuilds are essential to Muni's fleet maintenance. The SFMTA has an existing contract with the manufacturer of its current Light Rail Vehicles to complete an overhaul of key systems, such as doors and steps. This program will both improve reliability and extend the service life of the vehicles. In addition, all service delays caused by mechanical failures are reviewed on a daily basis. Based on this analysis, the SFMTA has designed and implemented a Component Rebuild Program for key systems such as brakes and Vehicle On-Board Computers (VOBC) that can be done in-house and yield improvements in service reliability.</p> | | | | |

SFMTA Response Table to 2011 Civil Grand Jury Report Findings and Recommendations

| FINDINGS | RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: (1) Agree or (2) Disagree wholly or partially, with explanation | RECOMMENDATIONS | RESPONSE REQUIRED From the Agencies specified by the CGJ. | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p><u>Finding 13</u></p> <p>While Muni has come close to or exceeded its goals for hours of bus use between failures, it is nowhere near achieving its goal for LRV hours. These failures, some due to a lack of maintenance, are impacting Muni's ability to deliver adequate service to its customers.</p> | <p>Agree.</p> | <p><u>Recommendation 9</u></p> <p>SFMTA should conduct a comparison of Muni's "mean time between failures" against other cities' to gauge the impact of Muni's current maintenance practices on its fleet. It should also take into account any unique aspects of San Francisco transit that might affect its "mean time between failures."</p> | <p>SFMTA</p> | <p><u>4 - Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted.</u></p> <p>This recommendation was implemented prior to the CGJ process. The SFMTA's Planning staff has been in the process of conducting a survey of a number of North American LRV agencies to gather information regarding their maintenance and procurement practices. Part I of the survey has been distributed and interviews are in the process of being scheduled. Interviews should be completed in Fall/Winter 2011 and information will be compiled thereafter.</p> |
| <p><u>Finding 14</u></p> <p>The SFMTA's inability to recognize the obvious need to allot time to train new operators causes this Jury to lose faith in the agency's ability to efficiently manage its own projects.</p> | <p>Wholly disagree. The SFMTA uses best practices to train its operators and will do so in advance of the Central Subway start-up.</p> | <p><u>Recommendation 10</u></p> <p>The SFMTA should explain when it plans to hire and train new operators to ensure a smooth rollout of the Central Subway.</p> | <p>SFMTA</p> | <p><u>2 - Will Be Implemented in the Future</u></p> <p>In 2011, the SFMTA produced an FTA approved T-Third-Central Subway Service Integration Plan that defines the service plans, levels of service, days and hours of operation and vehicles required for 2018 through 2025. This Plan will be the basis for preparing the T-Third Central Subway Start Up Plan (SUP) that will be completed as a working draft in the first quarter of 2014. The timing of training and selecting of operators for the integrated T-Third service will be finalized in the Start Up Plan. The SUP will present the Agency staffing plan and schedule to achieve new hires as needed, the projection of retirees, the operator sign-up process, the operator training period, the integrated service testing period and the formal final schedule cut that will assign vehicles, hours of service and personnel levels needed for the first year of revenue service.</p> |
| <p><u>Finding 15</u></p> <p>Using the numbers supplied by SFMTA, it</p> | <p>Disagree wholly.</p> <p>A sufficient number of LRVs are being procured to provide</p> | <p><u>Recommendation 11</u></p> <p>The SFMTA should look at the peak</p> | <p>SFMTA</p> | <p><u>2 - Will Be Implemented in the Future</u></p> |

SFMTA Response Table to 2011 Civil Grand Jury Report Findings and Recommendations

| FINDINGS | RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: (1) Agree or (2) Disagree wholly or partially, with explanation | RECOMMENDATIONS | RESPONSE REQUIRED From the Agencies specified by the CGJ. | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| appears that the problem of insufficient LRV fleet size experienced during the T-Third rollout will also plague the Central Subway rollout. This will translate to either a delayed opening or further diminished service on the other LRV lines. | reliable and timely service on the T Third line. Central Subway Transmittal 1476, dated April 22, 2011, provides further details. | demand for vehicles at the time it proposes to conduct new operator training and ensure that such training will not impact its ability to meet peak LRV demand. | | The SFMTA has a training process in place so that new operator training, for any reason, not just start-up of the T-Third with the Central Subway 1.7 mile extension, has no negative impact on peak LRV demand. |
| <u>Finding 16</u> There was an 18-month delay on finishing the 3-year T-Third project. This represents a 50% delay. With a commensurate or fractional delay on the 7-year Central Subway project, it will exceed current cost and contingency projections. | Disagree partially. Phase 2 is underway with plans in place to maintain cost and contingency projections. Please see response to Recommendation 12 for additional details, as well as the Agency response provided in the "Response to Follow-up Civil Grand Jury Questions," dated March 15, 2011. | <u>Recommendation 12 (covers Findings 16-20)</u> The SFMTA should explain what changes to the internal decision-approval processes have been put into practice to prevent the types of problems that affected the T-Third project. It should be noted that merely changing staff does not suffice to fix these problems. If such changes have yet to be made, the SFMTA should hire an external management | SFMTA | <u>4 – Recommendation Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted.</u> This Recommendation is not warranted because the action proposed by the CGJ has been actively underway before, during and after the CGJ Report. This recommendation was implemented in conjunction with the New Starts implementation program. The Phase 2 extension is expected to be completed on time because the implementation is based on resources, procedures and practices to select and manage the construction contracts and contractors that did not exist or were not available for Phase 1. Phase 2 is being managed using the New Starts Implementation Program. Phase 1 vs. Phase 2 processes include: construction management differences, the requirement that the Project own and operate a Project Management Plan and contractor selection differences. Further details are included in the "Response to Follow-up Civil Grand Jury Questions" dated March 15, 2011, which responded to this same concern. |

SFMTA Response Table to 2011 Civil Grand Jury Report Findings and Recommendations

| FINDINGS | RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: (1) Agree or (2) Disagree wholly or partially, with explanation | RECOMMENDATIONS | RESPONSE REQUIRED From the Agencies specified by the CGJ. | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| | | consultant to advise it on how best to change its processes. | | |
| <p><u>Finding 17</u></p> <p>Individuals will sometimes make poor decisions. However, a good management and implementation process will catch and correct these decisions. The SFMTA has not shown that it has corrected the internal management and implementation problems from the T-Third project which allowed poor decision-making to go undetected.</p> | <p>Disagree wholly.</p> <p>As stated in the response to Recommendation 12, changes have been made and processes are in place as part of the FTA's New Starts implementation program to successfully guide the Central Subway to completion.</p> | | | |
| <p><u>Finding 18</u></p> <p>Though there are some differences between the T-Third project and the Central Subway project, which suggest the latter might be better</p> | <p>Disagree partially.</p> <p>As stated in the response to Recommendation 12, the Central Subway project has established plans and processes as part of the FTA's New Starts implementation program, so there is guidance and federal</p> | | | |

SFMTA Response Table to 2011 Civil Grand Jury Report Findings and Recommendations

| FINDINGS | RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: (1) Agree or (2) Disagree wholly or partially, with explanation | RECOMMENDATIONS | RESPONSE REQUIRED From the Agencies specified by the CGJ. | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS: | |
|---|---|-----------------|--|--|---|
| | | | | 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action | 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe |
| | | | | 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation | 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation |
| managed, such as federal oversight, this will be a more complex, and therefore harder to manage project. | oversight to ensure the successful management of this project. | | | | |
| <u>Finding 19</u> The SFMTA has allocated an appropriate amount of the budget for the Central Subway project to cover contingencies and cost overruns. | Agree. | | | | |
| <u>Finding 20</u> The SFMTA is unreasonably optimistic that problems with the T-Third project will not reoccur during the Central Subway project. | Disagree wholly. As stated in the response to Recommendation 12, the Central Subway project has established plans and processes as part of the FTA's New Starts implementation program, so there is guidance and federal oversight to ensure that problems are identified quickly or avoided altogether. | | | | |

SFMTA Response Table to 2011 Civil Grand Jury Report Findings and Recommendations

| FINDINGS | RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: (1) Agree or (2) Disagree wholly or partially, with explanation | RECOMMENDATIONS | RESPONSE REQUIRED From the Agencies specified by the CGJ. | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| <p><u>Finding 21</u> Simply having various employees in a common organization or reporting structure does not mean that they necessarily communicate with each other.</p> | <p>Agree. The Central Subway development team uses the SFMTA's best practices to maintain and continue to enhance internal communication. As one example, previously presented to the CGJ, the team uses a SharePoint application to collaborate and maintain common documentation.</p> | | | |
| <p><u>Finding 22</u> Though the specific problems of interagency communication during the T-Third project can be avoided due to the creation of the SFMTA, the Central Subway's effect on a separate agency's system (BART) can pose new problems.</p> | <p>Disagree wholly. See Response to Recommendation 14 below.</p> | | | |
| <p><u>Finding 23</u> SFMTA appears to be adequately in touch with BART regarding</p> | <p>Agree.</p> | <p><u>Recommendation 13 (covers Findings 21-23)</u> The SFMTA should explain how its internal</p> | <p>SFMTA</p> | <p><u>1 – Recommendation Implemented.</u> The Central Subway Project relies on the involvement, cooperation and participation of a number of City, County, State and utility entities for design, design review and construction coordination. The participating agencies are listed in detail on pages 14-1 and 14-2 in the Project Management Plan</p> |

SFMTA Response Table to 2011 Civil Grand Jury Report Findings and Recommendations

| FINDINGS | RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: (1) Agree or (2) Disagree wholly or partially, with explanation | RECOMMENDATIONS | RESPONSE REQUIRED From the Agencies specified by the CGJ. | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| the Central Subway project. | | communication process will facilitate cooperation and discussion between various people and agencies involved in the Central Subway project. | | that was previously provided and discussed with the CGJ. Inter-agency agreements, developed with the participating entities, provide for planning, and plan review and construction coordination of work within their jurisdictions. Provisions for public works coordination, facilities coordination, right-of-way, traffic control, fire safety inspection and other impacts are agreed upon and documented in specific agreements. |
| <p><u>Finding 24</u></p> <p>It is imperative that the SFMTA ensure that all parties involved in the technical aspects of the Central Subway project have access to a unified, official Master Plan.</p> | Agree. | <p><u>Recommendation 14</u></p> <p>The SFMTA should maintain a single, unified Master Plan for the Central Subway project that can be accessed, though not changed, by all parties involved in the project.</p> | SFMTA | <p><u>4 – Recommendation Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted.</u></p> <p>This recommendation was actively underway prior to the CGJ process. An FTA required approved Program Management Plan (PMP) is a Master Plan for all aspects of project conduct and multiparty involvement and is already in use.</p> <p>The PMP includes continuous use of the Master Project Schedule (MPS) and presents all significant project activities and their interactions throughout the various phases to ultimately complete the entire project scope.</p> <p>The activities include: critical FTA submittals and milestones; design and construction contract selection processes and notices to proceed; real estate/right-of-way acquisitions; environmental and construction permits; impacted transit operation work-arounds; design deliverables; key equipment and vehicle procurements; construction operations; certification, startup and commissioning.</p> <p>With the establishment of a baseline schedule, Project Controls personnel conduct a monthly update that reflects the progress and any changes based on a prescribed procedure.</p> <p>The cost-loaded MPS is the vehicle for producing an up-to-date CSP cash flow curve. Project Controls conveys this information monthly to the SFMTA finance/grants staff to ensure that adequate project funding is maintained to address the project’s needs over the project life and thereby fulfilling the ongoing obligation by the SFMTA that, as the grantee, it can meet its capital, operating, and maintenance commitments each year, including providing an allowance for contingencies.</p> |

SFMTA Response Table to 2011 Civil Grand Jury Report Findings and Recommendations

| FINDINGS | RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: (1) Agree or (2) Disagree wholly or partially, with explanation | RECOMMENDATIONS | RESPONSE REQUIRED From the Agencies specified by the CGJ. | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p><u>Finding 25</u></p> <p>Though it may appear pedantic for this Jury to point out incorrect factual details published by the SFMTA, the Jury sees this as a symptom of a bigger problem. The Jury finds that the lack of care in its public communications can lead to a lack of confidence in the SFMTA's ability to accurately communicate both internally and with outside entities.</p> | <p>Disagree wholly.</p> <p>The SFMTA responds to hundreds of inquiries and presents new Central Subway information on a continuous daily, weekly and monthly basis across all media. Public documents are reviewed with careful attention to details and accuracy and routed for formal sign-off and approvals.</p> | <p><u>Recommendation 15</u></p> <p>All communications and publications regarding the Central Subway project should receive more accurate fact-checking.</p> | <p>SFMTA</p> | <p><u>4 - Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted</u></p> <p>The Central Subway has an existing comprehensive public outreach program that includes a robust social media program to inform the community in real time. All documentation is reviewed by professionals in the public communications field, who pay careful attention to the details and accuracy of the information that is being distributed.</p> |
| <p><u>Finding 26</u></p> <p>Direct connectivity from the T-Third line to the Muni Metro will be eliminated by the Central Subway alignment.</p> | <p>Disagree wholly.</p> <p>Finding 26 is incorrect. The Union Square/Market Street station has direct connectivity to the Powell Street Station. In addition, the Central Subway will provide a more direct path to activities in the vicinity of Union Square, Market Street and Stockton Street than the current roundabout alignment along the South Embarcadero and will</p> | <p><u>Recommendation 16</u></p> <p>The SFMTA should consider a realignment of the Central Subway which allows for a more direct connection to the Muni Metro.</p> | <p>SFMTA</p> | <p><u>4 - Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted and Not Reasonable.</u></p> <p>The Union Square/Market Street Station provides a direct, underground connection to the Powell Street Muni/BART Station via a modern, well-lit concourse. In addition, the north end of the station connects with the major shopping district at Union Square. The direct Muni to Muni connection is an estimated walk of 4.8 minutes from platform to platform.</p> |

SFMTA Response Table to 2011 Civil Grand Jury Report Findings and Recommendations

| FINDINGS | RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: (1) Agree or (2) Disagree wholly or partially, with explanation | RECOMMENDATIONS | RESPONSE REQUIRED From the Agencies specified by the CGJ. | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| | allow passengers to have a direct route back to Chinatown. | | | |
| <p><u>Finding 27</u></p> <p>If the design of the Union Square/Market Street station does not allow for future connectivity of a possible Geary LRV corridor, the SFMTA made a serious design error.</p> | <p>Agree.</p> <p>However, the design of Union Square/Market Street station does allow for future connectivity to a possibly Geary LRV corridor.</p> <p>See connectivity options in the response to Recommendation 17.</p> | <p><u>Recommendation 17</u></p> <p>The Union Square/Market Street station should be designed to allow a future Geary light rail vehicle line to access it.</p> | SFMTA | <p><u>1 – Recommendation Implemented</u></p> <p>From CS Transmittal No. 1403 dated February 18, 2011.</p> <p>Geary corridor cars would be able to use the Central Subway line for pull-in and pull-out to load a possible future Geary route for revenue service. Alternative concepts have been raised by the San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association and other stakeholders to improve the Geary corridor route concept by using Post Street as the preferred alignment. This route could provide an efficient transfer junction to the UMS station with a direct mezzanine passage between the T Third and the new subway line at Post and Stockton. The Post alignment could also provide a route to the Muni Metro system at the foot of Post and Market Street to the Montgomery Street Station to connect to the Muni Metro and possibly continue to the Transbay Terminal. This route would distribute the system access, capacity and mobility across the Central Business District instead of a single concentration of service at UMS.</p> |
| <p><u>Finding 28</u></p> <p>A route that benefits both the Chinatown community and the Financial District is preferable to one that only benefits Chinatown.</p> | <p>Disagree wholly.</p> <p>Based on community feedback and further engineering analysis, we reevaluated the initial proposed alignment along Third Street. The new alignment along Fourth Street was adopted by the SFMTA Board in 2005. The selected route will directly link major retail, BART/Muni, high density housing, Caltrain and Mission Bay residential, educational and office development. An alignment such</p> | <p><u>Recommendation 18</u></p> <p>The Central Subway should be redesigned to serve both the Financial District and Chinatown. If SFMTA thinks the current alignment already serves both neighborhoods, it should explain how.</p> | SFMTA | <p><u>4 - Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted and Not Reasonable</u></p> <p>After years of planning and analysis, it is not in the public's interest to re-route the Central Subway or implement other costly changes.</p> <p>The SFCTA identified the Third Street Corridor with an extension to Chinatown as a priority in the late 1980s. The need to better serve the Chinatown neighborhood was further necessitated by the 1989 Loma Pietà Earthquake. Since then, the City and the SFMTA have explored numerous alignment options for the Central Subway, conducted comprehensive public outreach and planning, and have coordinated with land use planning in conjunction with the City's General Plan, the Downtown Plan, the Chinatown Area Plan, the East Soma Area Plan and the pending Western Soma Area Plan.</p> <p>Based on the above extensive community feedback and preference and further engineering analysis, the initial proposed alignment along Third Street was re-evaluated. Recommendation #18 touches on the challenge inherent to all transit corridor assessments and commitments: a route that provides maximum access is often the most intrusive; a line that links many potential station sites may also be</p> |

SFMTA Response Table to 2011 Civil Grand Jury Report Findings and Recommendations

| FINDINGS | RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: (1) Agree or (2) Disagree wholly or partially, with explanation | RECOMMENDATIONS | RESPONSE REQUIRED From the Agencies specified by the CGJ. | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| | as that proposed by the Civil Grand Jury would be indirect and require multiple turns. | | | <p>the longest distance between the important sites. The new Fourth Street alignment, adopted by the SFMTA Board in 2005, required a supplemental Environmental Impact Study / Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) that was completed in 2008. That analysis confirmed the selected route would directly link major retail, BART/Muni, high density housing, Caltrain and Mission Bay residential, educational and offices development. Concurrently, enhancements to the financial District proceeded with the post-freeway Embarcadero public space and transit plans such as the emerging E line and the beginning of a new vision of Market Street – all of which are now underway.</p> <p>In November 2008, the Central Subway project received a Record of Decision (ROD) from the Federal Transit Administration. The ROD is required under the National Environmental Policy Act and represented the final environmental clearance for the project. Therefore, the SFMTA is implementing the route that was selected by public preference and received the approval of the SFMTA Board.</p> |
| <p><u>Finding 29</u> There does not seem to be an SFMTA plan to address the current problems on existing bus lines that travel the Stockton corridor. Presumably the quality of service will not improve between now and 2019.</p> | <p>Disagree wholly. The Transit Effectiveness Project includes recommendations to improve transit travel times for the 30 and 45 routes. The Columbus and Stockton segments of the routes are among the highest priority and design improvements will be cleared at the project level as part of the TEP EIR. Project improvements will include signal priority, traffic engineering changes to relieve bottlenecks and customer amenities such as ticket vending machines and improved signage.</p> | <p><u>Recommendation 19</u> The SFMTA should enact a plan to improve service on the Stockton corridor prior to completing the Central Subway.</p> | SFMTA | <p><u>4 - Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted and Not Reasonable</u> This Recommendation is not warranted because the action proposed by the CGJ has been actively underway before, during and after the CGJ Report. The Transit Effectiveness Project includes recommendations to improve transit travel times for the 30 and 45 routes. The Columbus and Stockton segments of the routes are among the highest priority and design improvements will be cleared at the project level as part of the TEP EIR.</p> |

SFMTA Response Table to 2011 Civil Grand Jury Report Findings and Recommendations

| FINDINGS | RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: (1) Agree or (2) Disagree wholly or partially, with explanation | RECOMMENDATIONS | RESPONSE REQUIRED From the Agencies specified by the CGJ. | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| <p><u>Finding 30</u> The transfer between the Union Square/Market Street station and Powell Street station is terrible. The 1,000 foot distance is an unreasonably long transfer, especially for the elderly and disabled.</p> | <p>Disagree wholly. The transfer will be a seamless, underground and direct transfer within a controlled transit environment with vertical circulation aided by escalators and elevators in both directions. This is an improvement over the current bus to rail transfer that is partially outside in an uncontrolled environment.</p> | <p><u>Recommendation 20</u> SFMTA needs to fix the transfer between the Central Subway and Muni Metro.</p> | SFMTA | <p><u>4 -Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted.</u> The comparable current connection is from the 30 Stockton and 45 Union trolley bus routes to the Powell or Montgomery Muni Metro stations. Essentially, there is no difference in travel distance for current Muni bus customers and future Central Subway customers. In fact, the transfer from Central Subway would be better in comparison – a seamless, underground, and direct transfer within a controlled transit environment with vertical circulation aided by escalators and elevators in both directions. The transfer distance between the T-Third Union Square/Market Street (UMS) Station and Powell Street Muni Metro Station is similar to the existing transfers between the closest southbound Bus Stop and Powell Street Station. The new northbound transfer distance is shorter than the current transfer from the Montgomery Muni Metro Station to the closest northbound bus stop. Figure 1 below presents the walking segments. See Figure 1 below.</p> |

SFMTA Response Table to 2011 Civil Grand Jury Report Findings and Recommendations

| FINDINGS | RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: (1) Agree or (2) Disagree wholly or partially, with explanation | RECOMMENDATIONS | RESPONSE REQUIRED From the Agencies specified by the CGJ. | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation |
|----------|--|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>Figure 1: Point-to-Point Walking Segments, UMS Station to Powell Street Station vs. Southbound Trolley Bus to Powell Street Station</p> <p>The map illustrates the walking segments from Union Square/Market St. Station to Powell Street Station. The walking path is shown in green, with segments A through F. Segment A is at the Platform Level, B is at the Concourse Level, C is at the Escalator/Stair, D is at the Concourse Level, E is at the Platform Level, and F is at the Platform Level. The current bus/subway transfer path is shown in orange dashed lines, starting from the bus stop at Fourth Street and ending at Powell Street Station. The map also shows the locations of O'Farrell Street, Ellis Street, and Market Street, and the BART/MUNI Powell St. Station.</p> |

SFMTA Response Table to 2011 Civil Grand Jury Report Findings and Recommendations

| FINDINGS | RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: (1) Agree or (2) Disagree wholly or partially, with explanation | RECOMMENDATIONS | RESPONSE REQUIRED From the Agencies specified by the CGJ. | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| <p><u>Finding 31</u> The “Union Square/Market Street” station is incorrectly named because it is not on Market Street.</p> | <p>Disagree wholly. The station has an exit on Market Street at Ellis and Market.</p> | <p><u>Recommendation 21</u> SFMTA should change the name of the “Union Square/Market Street” station to simply “Union Square” for an accurate description.</p> | <p>SFMTA</p> | <p><u>4 -Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted.</u> There will be two entrances for the Union Square/Market Street Station. These entrances will be located at Ellis and Market Streets and at Geary and Stockton Streets. The Central Subway will also directly connect from the current Powell Street Station to the Union Square/Market Street station at the concourse level underground.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p><u>Finding 32</u> The SFMTA has designed a subpar escalator system for all three underground stations because they lack redundancy.</p> | <p>Disagree wholly. The paths of travel for customers to transfer between lines and modes in each station include escalators and elevators that meet all applicable codes and passenger volume projections.</p> | <p><u>Recommendation 22</u> SFMTA should add escalator redundancy to all stations on the Central Subway.</p> | <p>SFMTA</p> | <p><u>4 -Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted and Not Reasonable</u> From CS Transmittal No. 1403 dated February 18, 2011. The following table shows how many escalators will be available in each of the three underground stations on the Central Subway line.</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 30%;"></th> <th style="width: 15%;">Union Square / Market Street Station (UMS)</th> <th style="width: 15%;">Chinatown Station (CTS)</th> <th style="width: 15%;">Moscone Station (MOS)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Subway Station Information</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Number of Escalators <i>(from platform to concourse)</i></td> <td>5</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Number of Escalators <i>(from concourse to surface)</i></td> <td>2 (Opposite Ends, both primarily up)</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Redundancy is available at all stations from platform to concourse and from concourse to surface. Additional information was provided in CS Transmittal No. 1571 dated May 22, 2011 regarding escalators and other paths of travel from the surface to the mezzanine. The Central Subway stations will provide assisted paths of travel via escalators and elevators between surface and concourse levels in addition to stairs. From the concourse paid area, there are another group of escalators and elevators</p> | | Union Square / Market Street Station (UMS) | Chinatown Station (CTS) | Moscone Station (MOS) | Subway Station Information | | | | Number of Escalators <i>(from platform to concourse)</i> | 5 | 2 | 2 | Number of Escalators <i>(from concourse to surface)</i> | 2 (Opposite Ends, both primarily up) | 2 | 2 |
| | Union Square / Market Street Station (UMS) | Chinatown Station (CTS) | Moscone Station (MOS) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subway Station Information | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Escalators <i>(from platform to concourse)</i> | 5 | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Escalators <i>(from concourse to surface)</i> | 2 (Opposite Ends, both primarily up) | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

SFMTA Response Table to 2011 Civil Grand Jury Report Findings and Recommendations

| FINDINGS | RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: (1) Agree or (2) Disagree wholly or partially, with explanation | RECOMMENDATIONS | RESPONSE REQUIRED From the Agencies specified by the CGJ. | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation |
|--|--|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | to the platform area below. The following is a detailed summary of the assisted paths of travel between surface and concourse level by station: Moscone: One escalator up, one escalator down in addition to two elevators. Union Square/Market Street: North and South Entrances will have one escalator up in addition to two elevators. Chinatown: One escalator up, one escalator down in addition to two elevators. |
| <u>Finding 33</u> It seems disingenuous that the SFMTA would point to the station design as the reason for not including moving sidewalks as they themselves designed the stations. Or, as a Central Subway manager attempted to explain, "Perceived design flaws were actually practical decisions." | Disagree wholly. A response to this Finding was also provided in Transmittal No. 1403 dated February 18, 2011. Moving walkways were not included in the design of UMS station for functional reasons. Moving walkways are most appropriate in long, straight sections of passageway with enough width to accommodate moving sections in both directions and enough room for a parallel, non-moving path. The geometry of the connection between UMS and Powell Stations does not favor this application without extensive modifications to Powell Station as well as increased excavation for UMS. Moving walkways are not typically used for underground connections, where space is more limited than in the | | SFMTA | |

SFMTA Response Table to 2011 Civil Grand Jury Report Findings and Recommendations

| FINDINGS | RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: (1) Agree or (2) Disagree wholly or partially, with explanation | RECOMMENDATIONS | RESPONSE REQUIRED From the Agencies specified by the CGJ. | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| | familiar application of long, above-ground hallways in airports. | | | |
| <p><u>Finding 34</u></p> <p>Though designing the Central Subway for hybrid boarding gives SFMTA the benefit of uniformity of its LRV fleet, this benefit is outweighed by the long-term benefit of beginning a transformation to a system using a dedicated level-boarding vehicle.</p> | Agree. | <p><u>Recommendation 23</u></p> <p>SFMTA should purchase dedicated level-boarding vehicles for the Central Subway.</p> | SFMTA | <p><u>3 - Requires Further Analysis</u></p> <p>This recommendation requires further analysis. The LRV Procurement Steering committee is now investigating a specification for the next procurement that may be dedicated level-boarding or another variation of flow/platform interface from the existing moveable steps. This analysis will be conducted by the Operations and Long Range Planning & Policy staff.</p> <p>This would include procurement of 23 LRVs by 2018. If the Executive Team agrees with the Committee's recommendation, a committee of key staff from planning, engineering, operations, maintenance, safety, accessible services and finance, representing disciplines involving vehicles, infrastructure and facilities, must be convened to analyze the issues involved with this recommendation. Staff would need to secure funding and then develop cost estimates and initial implementation schedule and a Conceptual Engineering Report for the system modifications to procure these LRVs.</p> |
| <p><u>Finding 35</u></p> <p>With proof-of-payment as the sole method of fare collection, there is no apparent justification for mezzanines in the Central Subway stations.</p> | <p>Disagree wholly.</p> <p>This finding was previously addressed in CS Transmittal No. 1294, January 21, 2011. The SFMTA uses proof-of-payment and has had Barrier Fee Fare Collection in the Muni Metro subway since the subway's inception in 1980. Please see responses to Finding 37 and Recommendation 24 for further details.</p> | <p><u>Recommendation 24</u></p> <p>The SFMTA should consider eliminating the mezzanines from the Central Subway station designs.</p> | SFMTA | <p><u>4 - Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted.</u></p> <p>The mezzanine level plays an important role in a transit station and should not be eliminated. The Union Square/Market Street Station's mezzanine level is needed to connect to the mezzanine level already present in the Powell Street Station (as well as all Market Street Muni Metro stations). In general, the mezzanine level provides the functionality of space desired in all subway stations as well as all mass transportation portals: arriving and departing passengers need a transition zone to wait, meet others, confirm time and direction information, to purchase tickets, to ask for assistance, etc. The mezzanine serves the important function of providing a transition zone outside of the passenger traffic area and away from arriving and departing vehicles. The mezzanine level also increases the efficiency of passenger movement, both the collection of passengers toward the service and distribution of passengers away from the service, by providing paths of travel independent of the surface sidewalk system. This benefit is also commonly desired in all mass</p> |

SFMTA Response Table to 2011 Civil Grand Jury Report Findings and Recommendations

| FINDINGS | RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: (1) Agree or (2) Disagree wholly or partially, with explanation | RECOMMENDATIONS | RESPONSE REQUIRED From the Agencies specified by the CGJ. | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation |
|---|---|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | transportation stations with high levels of passenger traffic, such as the Union Square/Market Street Station. Finally, the use of Barrier Fee Fare Collection is an important part of the Muni Metro system, similar to many other systems, so the mezzanine level is a crucial component of the customer flow through the station to process fare collection. |
| <u>Finding 36</u> Proof-of-payment is the preferred method of fare collection for the Central Subway. | Agree. However, the proof-of-payment system does not preclude having barriers at subway stations, including the Central Subway stations and Muni's existing underground stations. Barriers help clearly distinguish paid and non-paid areas and facilitate proof-of-payment enforcement. | | | |
| <u>Finding 37</u> The SFMTA has not established that the use of barriers for fare collection instead of proof-of-payment in the Central Subway will reduce fare evasion. | Disagree wholly. Muni's Metro station fare collection has used banks of traditional barrier fee entrance and exit fare gates since the subway opened in 1980. In the 1990s, proof-of-payment was also introduced on light rail vehicles, with a focus on stations/platforms outside of the Metro subway. This approach included all-door boarding at surface stops to speed up operations and make fare collection more efficient. Proof-of-payment at all light rail stops | | | |

SFMTA Response Table to 2011 Civil Grand Jury Report Findings and Recommendations

| FINDINGS | RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: (1) Agree or (2) Disagree wholly or partially, with explanation | RECOMMENDATIONS | RESPONSE REQUIRED From the Agencies specified by the CGJ. | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation | |
|-----------------|--|------------------------|---|---|--|
| | <p>and fare gates at the Metro stations, the busiest of the Muni Metro system, continues to be used. In the past year, the first-generation gates were replaced with gates designed around the Clipper smart card technology. The new gate-fare system provides better security, reduces evasion, gives a stronger visual guidance for customers and provides ridership data that was not previously available. It also makes it easier for fare inspectors to enforce proof-of-payment policies for the large volume of customers that are found in Muni Metro stations, as their current practice is to stand inside the fare gates and check proof-of-payment as customers are exiting the gates.</p> <p>Many large volume systems similar to Muni's employ proof-of-payment and barrier fee fare gates, e.g., Los Angeles, Montreal, and soon Vancouver, B.C. The combination of gates and fare inspection has cut the percentage of customers without valid proof-of-payment to 5 percent or under on Muni light rail, significantly better than on</p> | | | | |

SFMTA Response Table to 2011 Civil Grand Jury Report Findings and Recommendations

| FINDINGS | RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: (1) Agree or (2) Disagree wholly or partially, with explanation | RECOMMENDATIONS | RESPONSE REQUIRED From the Agencies specified by the CGJ. | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| | <p>routes without barrier fee fare gates.</p> <p>This explanation was provided in CS Transmittal No. 1294, January 21, 2011.</p> | | | |
| <p><u>Finding 38</u></p> <p>The SFMTA has not established that the use of barriers for fare collection provides a strong advantage in regard to giving passengers visual guidance.</p> | <p>Disagree wholly. Physical barriers make it easy for customers to distinguish which part of the stations are paid versus unpaid areas and where valid proof of payment is required. They also make it easier for fare inspectors to enforce proof-of-payment for the large volume of customers that are found in Muni Metro stations.</p> | <p><u>Recommendation 25 (covers Findings 36-38)</u></p> <p>The SFMTA should conduct an analysis of whether a proof-of-payment system is preferable to its planned hybrid fare collection system for the Central Subway.</p> | SFMTA | <p><u>4 -Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted.</u></p> <p>The SFMTA conducted a comprehensive proof-of-payment study in 2009 and found that fare evasion was 50 percent less in the light rail system than on the buses, thereby reinforcing the importance of maintaining proof-of-payment inspection and barrier fee fare collection.</p> |
| | | <p><u>Recommendation 26</u></p> <p>The SFMTA should redesign the Central Subway to better serve the San Francisco population.</p> | SFMTA | <p><u>4 -Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted.</u></p> <p>Background:</p> <p>The Southeastern area of the City has long been recognized as being underserved by high capacity transit. In the late 1980s an extensive planning process was undertaken by the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) to prioritize transit corridors in the City. Four corridors that needed enhanced transit service were identified, studied, and prioritized as follows: Third Street, Chinatown as an extension of the Third Street Corridor (now referred to as the Central Subway), Geary, and Van Ness. The prioritization was also influenced heavily by environmental justice considerations as a result of the low income and transit dependent nature of the communities served along the corridors. The disruption of access to Chinatown resulting from the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake was also a factor in the prioritization.</p> <p>A number of specific alignment options were considered for the Central Subway during the original environmental study including using Third Street, Fourth Street, Kearny Street and Stockton Street.</p> |

SFMTA Response Table to 2011 Civil Grand Jury Report Findings and Recommendations

| FINDINGS | RESPONSE TO FINDINGS: (1) Agree or (2) Disagree wholly or partially, with explanation | RECOMMENDATIONS | RESPONSE REQUIRED From the Agencies specified by the CGJ. | RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation |
|-----------------|---|------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>Extensive public outreach, planning, and decision making resulted in the current alignment extending from Fourth and King streets along Fourth and Stockton streets to Chinatown.</p> <p>Connecting Communities:</p> <p>Construction of the Central Subway has been developed in coordination with land use planning already adopted in the City’s General Plan, including the Downtown Plan, the Chinatown Area Plan, the East SoMa Area Plan, and the pending Western SoMa Area Plan.</p> <p>Moving Commuters:</p> <p>Within a half-mile of the Central Subway corridor the average population density is approximately 53,000 per square mile and the total number of jobs exceeds 215,000. The Central Subway Corridor is located between the regional job hubs of Mission Bay and downtown San Francisco, making it a logical location for new workspace uses. Additionally, work destinations are likely to increase usage of the Central Subway, as workplace transportation options are a significant factor shaping travel choice. A sample of companies already in the corridor include Twitter, Zynga, Salesforce.com, Yelp Inc., Ubisoft Entertainment SA and UStream Inc.– all national leaders in their class. The Wall Street Journal recently highlighted office space at 410 Townsend St. one block from the planned Central Subway stop at Brannan Street. Suffering 60% vacancy in late 2008, the 75,000 square foot building is now 100% full with internet start-ups. A San Francisco Chronicle article on August 20, 2010 describes high demand for space in SoMa by technology companies.</p> |