



London Breed, Mayor

Gwyneth Borden, Chair  
Amanda Eaken, Vice Chair  
Steve Heminger, Director

Fiona Hinze, Director  
Sharon Lai, Director  
Manny Yekutieli, Director

Jeffrey Tumlin, Director of Transportation

August 24, 2021

The Honorable Samuel K. Feng  
Presiding Judge, Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco  
400 McAllister Street, Room 008  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4512

Dear Judge Feng,

In accordance with Penal Code 933 and 933.05, the Board of Directors of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) responds to the 2020-2021 Civil Grand Jury Report, Van Ness Avenue: What Lies Beneath (Report). We would like to thank the members of the 2020-2021 Civil Grand Jury for their constructive feedback in the planning, design, construction, and project management of the Van Ness Improvement Project (Project).

The SFMTA Board of Directors appreciates the time the Civil Grand Jury spent looking into this Project and issuing the Report. We acknowledge the concerns about project delay and increased costs and their effect on our transportation system, residents, and business owners along the corridor, and on commuters. The Board takes this report seriously and recognizes that the City, including the agency and our contractor, could have applied better project controls and handled the project delivery issues more effectively. While the agency has implemented several lessons learned from the Project with good success in recent capital projects, we acknowledge that more work and effort are needed to improve project delivery, especially on major capital projects.

The SFMTA Board is committed to support the SFMTA staff to make necessary improvements in project delivery. We support and agree with the Report's recommendations to have better contractor evaluation and selection criteria in the future to improve this important partnership and to better achieve the desired project outcomes. To this end, at the August 17 Board Meeting, the Board approved the attached response to the Findings and Recommendations and gave direction to staff that there is an urgency for the SFMTA to take steps to make improvements in our project delivery process. The Board is looking forward to working with its staff to apply the lessons learned from this and other recent projects to improve its capital project delivery going forward.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Gwyneth Borden', written in a cursive style.

Gwyneth Borden  
Chair, SFMTA Board of Directors

CC: SFMTA Board of Directors  
Jeffrey Tumlin, Director of Transportation

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor San Francisco, CA 94103 SFMTA.com

311 Free language assistance / 免費語言協助 / Ayuda gratis con el idioma / Бесплатная помощь переводчиков / Trợ giúp Thông dịch Miễn phí / Assistance linguistique gratuite / 無料の言語支援 / Libreng tulong para sa wikang Filipino / 무료 언어 지원 / การช่วยเหลือทางด้านภาษาโดยไม่เสียค่าใช้จ่าย / خط المساعدة المجاني على الرقم

Report Title [Publication Date]	F#	Finding	Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date]	Finding Response (Agree/ Disagree)	Finding Response Text
Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	F1	The delays in completion of the Van Ness BRT Project were caused primarily by avoidable setbacks in replacement of the water and sewer infrastructure.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Disagree partially	Many of the initial delays on the Project occurred during construction of the underground phase of the Project; however, some of these delays were avoidable and some were unavoidable. The City and the contractor often share responsibility for delays, and some of the delays were due to third parties. Understanding the delay on this project involves looking at the contractor's initial claim for 279 days of delay and its pending claim for 344 delay days. As to the initial claim for 279 days, the parties agreed that 135 were compensable (City's responsibility) and 144 were noncompensable (not the City's sole responsibility). In other words, the contractor acknowledged that it shared responsibility for more than half of the delay days. As to the pending claim for 344 days, the contractor failed to provide the required scheduling analysis; thus, the City has been required to undertake its own analysis of the delay. This analysis is currently underway.

Report Title [Publication Date]	F#	Finding	Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date]	Finding Response (Agree/ Disagree)	Finding Response Text
Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	F2	The potential impact of utility replacement on the cost and duration of the overall project was given insufficient consideration in the initial planning process.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Disagree partially	The SFMTA gave significant consideration to the potential impacts of utility replacement during the planning process. The underground utility replacement activities and its associated risks were studied and reviewed in design and preconstruction phase based on the information available and the recommendations from consultants and the selected contractor. During the design phase, the City performed some potholing and coordinated with PG&E to relocate gas mains and an electrical ductbank. To minimize major traffic and operational impacts, the City included a standard requirement in the Specifications that the Contractor perform significant amounts of potholing 30 days in advance of any installation. The contract also included specific allowances to cover additional or unforeseen costs related to utility installation. In future contracts, the SFMTA agrees to consider applying more emphasis during the planning stage regarding the impacts of utility replacement.
Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	F3	The potential impact of utility replacement was known to City engineers to be a major risk, but was only considered a moderate risk and assigned no effective mitigation in the official risk register.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Disagree partially	The Contractor, City Staff, and an independent consultant cooperated in preparing the risk register and because of the mitigation measures being taken this was classified as a moderate risk. Several mitigation measures were included in the Specifications, such as requiring potholing 30 days in advance of the work, and providing the contractor with copies of deactivated utility drawings as reference documents. The Contractor failed to perform the required potholing in a timely fashion, at times attempting to dig potholes within hours of trenching to install utilities. Contractor's inability to properly anticipate/manage/mitigate utility issues during construction was the primary contributor to added contract costs and duration.

Report Title [Publication Date]	F#	Finding	Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date]	Finding Response (Agree/ Disagree)	Finding Response Text
Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	F4	Project timelines could not be estimated accurately because documents did not reflect the extent and location of underground utilities accurately.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Disagree partially	Project timelines for projects with extensive underground utilities are often difficult to estimate because no matter how extensive the pre-construction investigation, there will always be unknowns. Contractors experienced in such work know that they must often deal with the unexpected. The project timeline prepared during pre-construction was a product of City staff, Contractor, and an independent consulting team based on the best information available. As construction started, the project team realized that some third party utilities, such as PG&E, provided inaccurate or incomplete information on their existing utilities. The contract contained an action plan to instruct the contractor for dealing with unknown utilities, as well as contingency for differing site conditions. However, the Contractor did not take the lead in field investigation and coordination with third party utilities, although they were contractually obligated to do so as a CM/GC. The Contractor failed to perform the required potholing in a timely fashion per contract, at times attempting to dig potholes within hours of trenching to install utilities. Contractor's inability to properly anticipate/manage/mitigate utility issues during construction was the primary contributor to added contract costs and duration. Contractor's initial construction sequencing plan was also unrealistic. All these issues contributed to an inaccurate project timeline projection.
Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	F5	The evaluation rubric for preconstruction contract bids weighted cost too heavily, as compared to technical expertise, even after project-specific legislation allowed for a lower weight to be assigned to cost.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Agree	Such contracts should be evaluated using a best value rubric, with technical expertise weighted high. At the time, the Agency was unable to lower the points given to cost in the legislation submitted to the Board of Supervisors

Report Title [Publication Date]	F#	Finding	Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date]	Finding Response (Agree/ Disagree)	Finding Response Text
Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	F6	Practical work during preconstruction that could have derisked the subsequent construction phase of the project was insufficient.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Disagree partially	The majority of the utility conflicts that resulted in additional contract time were at intersections. Potholing within intersections typically requires the intersection to be closed in order to provide a safe barrier for the workers from traffic. Given that Van Ness Avenue is a State highway, this would have been extremely difficult to occur. Typically, this level of potholing is reserved for the construction phase when traffic can be effectively closed/diverted. Ground-penetrating radar (GPR) during the design phase had several issues with accuracy and reliability of the data. Recent improvements in GPR provide for a more reliable tool for future projects.
Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	F7	Review of preconstruction deliverables did not sufficiently measure the contractor's preparedness for construction, which resulted in both inaccurate cost estimates and timelines.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Disagree partially	It is correct that the contractor may not have adequately prepared itself for construction during the year-long preconstruction period. The timeline for underground work provided by the contractor's subcontractor during preconstruction did not align with the timeline provided by the subcontractor who eventually performed the work. It is unclear to what extent better preparedness by the contractor would have resulted in more accurate cost estimates and timelines. In addition, other key issues listed in F4 contributed to the challenge to forecast accurate cost estimates and timelines.

Report Title [Publication Date]	F#	Finding	Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date]	Finding Response (Agree/ Disagree)	Finding Response Text
Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	F8	The effectiveness of the CMGC contract was greatly reduced because the general contractor was brought into the design process too late.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Disagree partially	While it would have been better to have the contractor on board earlier in the design phase, the Contractor did have a year (during pre-construction) to review the construction documents, provide comments, and familiarize itself with the conditions along the corridor. The CMGC construction contract with the Guaranteed Maximum Price was issued by SFMTA with the Contractor's concerns and input addressed. Since the prime did not involve the subcontractors directly with the City in the preconstruction process the City may not have received the full benefit of the subs' technical expertise and local knowledge. Contractor did not make the best use of its subcontractors.
Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	F9	Underspecification in technical requirements led to additional costs for work that could have been predicted and included in the original contract.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Disagree partially	In an effort to continually improve our contract documents, we review the project specifications, in particular with multi-agency projects where various sets of specifications are merged. The Van Ness project also had the challenge of coordinating City specifications with Caltrans requirements. Specifically, in the case of the potholing and pedestrian control specifications, the contractor settled claims on these issues for less than 20% of its costs incurred, illustrating that its claim arising from purported ambiguity in the specifications had little merit. Moreover, Contractor had access to the specifications for many months during the pre-Construction period and did not request any clarification/changes at that time. Contractor raised issues with the technical requirements after the construction started.

Report Title [Publication Date]	F#	Finding	Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date]	Finding Response (Agree/ Disagree)	Finding Response Text
Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	F10	Contention over underspecified or unclear contract terms and technical requirements led to a deterioration in the relationship between the City and Walsh, the general contractor.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Disagree wholly	Language that was used in the contract was standard to all City contracts. The City worked diligently to enforce the contract in a fair and reasonable manner. The contractor did not raise any concerns about ambiguity or confusion during the year of pre-construction services or during negotiations. The CM/GC has the responsibility to raise and resolve such concerns during pre-construction. What actually led to deterioration in the relationship was the contractor's concerns about the bid for the utility work being substantially higher than originally estimated and thereby reducing its profit margin.
Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	F11	The removal of Synergy, the underground subcontractor, from the project, partially as a result of poor cost estimates, contributed to the deterioration of the relationship between Walsh, the general contractor, and the City.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Disagree wholly	The City supported the contractor's decision to remove its underground utility contractor, Synergy. The relationship only began to deteriorate when the contractor bid out Synergy's work and received a bid substantially more than Synergy's estimate. Over a year after Synergy was removed, Walsh filed a claim under penalty of perjury for \$11.9M arising from damages it purportedly incurred relating to Synergy's removal. That claim was resolved by the City paying Walsh nothing on this issue. The price difference was not due to poor cost estimating, but to unexpected market conditions.

Report Title [Publication Date]	F#	Finding	Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date]	Finding Response (Agree/ Disagree)	Finding Response Text
Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	F12	The contentious relationship between Walsh, the general contractor, and the City made it difficult to resolve problems as they arose, despite close collaboration being one of the potential advantages of the CMGC contract.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Disagree partially	Once the contractor realized that its guaranteed maximum price would not cover the cost of the utility work, the relationship became strained and the contractor became uncooperative. It appeared that the contractor was more focused on recovering the potential loss from the increased utility costs than performing a collaborative and successful project. To illustrate this, the contractor hired additional personnel to focus on claims, and used field staff to assist with the claims process rather than devoting resources to the project. The contractor's lack of experienced field staff required the City to hire a utility coordinator and other staff to facilitate the contractor's coordination with third party utilities and to resolve basic field issues. As a CM/GC, it was the contractor's responsibility to coordinate day-to-day activities with third party utilities. In spite of the challenging situation, field staff maintained a professional relationship.



Report Title [Publication Date]	F#	Finding	Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date]	Finding Response (Agree/ Disagree)	Finding Response Text
Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	F13	Lack of an in-the-field point of contact between Walsh and the City during early stages of construction led to delays and increased costs on the project.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Disagree wholly	The City's Resident Engineer (RE) was (and is) the point of contact with the contractor. The RE, who has been on the Project from the beginning, along with the owner's construction management team, have always been co-located with the contractor's team. Notably, the high turnover of the contractor's management team made it difficult to coordinate with the contractor, and necessitated the City bringing the contractor up to speed at various times (and likely contributed to the delay and increased costs on the Project). The contractor's unwillingness to pothole and perform other advance investigation in a timely fashion contributed more to delays in resolving field challenges than any lack of City staff. The CM/GC should lead the field fact-finding and discovery with very little owner assistance to resolve basic field issues and coordination matters. During the construction, City staff had to supplement the contractor's team directly, performing contractor work in support of the overall effort and mitigate potential delays.
Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	F14	Confusion related to the contractual requirements for pedestrian monitoring contributed to the deterioration of the relationship between Walsh, the general contractor, and the City.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Disagree partially	The City does not believe that the contractual requirements for pedestrian monitoring and flaggers are confusing. In the interest of public safety, the City agreed to reimburse Walsh for pedestrian monitors if (1) the contractor provided the flaggers required under the contract for pedestrian control and (2) the contractor provided advance notice to the City of the need for pedestrian monitors to support the flaggers at a particular location.

2020-21 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESPONSES TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Report Title [Publication Date]	R# [for F#]	Recommendation	Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date]	Recommendation Response (Implementation)	Recommendation Response Text
Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R1 [for F1, F2, F4, F6, F9]	By June 2022, the City should adopt a policy that all capital project feasibility plans include an itemized assessment of risks to project timelines and costs, which must be accompanied with specific procedures that will be undertaken to mitigate those risks early in the project.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Has been implemented	Project risk assessment and mitigation are long-standing practices that are implemented for major capital projects and projects of particular technical complexity as listed in Section 4 (Detailed Design Phase) of the MTA's Project Operations Manual (POM).
Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R2 [for F1, F2, F3, F4, F6, F9]	By June 2022, the City should adopt a policy that all capital project sponsors publish, before proceeding to the construction phase, an itemized assessment of derisking activities actually performed.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	Speaking for the Agency and not the City as a whole, the SFMTA believes that such information may allow bidders to take advantage of the bid process, as it could allow contractors to unbalance bids or give them an unfair advantage in negotiations.

2020-21 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESPONSES TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Report Title [Publication Date]	R# [for F#]	Recommendation	Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date]	Recommendation Response (Implementation)	Recommendation Response Text
Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R4 [for F1, F4, F6, F7]	The Board of Supervisors should direct all City departments to adopt a policy that all projects that involve underground work in the City’s main corridors include, as part of the design process, the use of exploratory potholing, or another equivalent industry best-practice to identify unknown underground obstructions adhering to CI/ASCE 38-02 (“Standard Guideline for the Collection and Depiction of Existing Subsurface Utility Data”) Quality Level A. This policy should take effect for all contracts signed after January 1, 2022, and the work should be required to be performed before final construction terms or prices are agreed to.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	Speaking for the Agency, and not the Board of Supervisors, the SFMTA believes that one policy for all projects, across all departments, is impractical. Each department must make a determination on a project-by-project basis based on the risk assessment. Currently, all major City projects that involve underground work in main corridors do incorporate potholing, or other equivalent appropriate industry practices to identify unknown underground obstructions. The City also works closely with private utilities (e.g., PG&E, Comcast, ATT) during design phase of major projects to account for their utilities, whether active, deactivated, or abandoned.
Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R5 [for F8, F10, F11, F12, F13]	By June 2022, and before entering into future CMGC relationships, the Board of Supervisors should direct all City departments to adopt, publish, and enforce in all future contracts industry-standard best practices for management of CMGC projects.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	"Best practices" are a list of general recommendations based on general industry practices. Speaking for the Agency, and not the Board of Supervisors, the SFMTA will review recommended best practices for future CM/GC projects and apply them, as applicable and as appropriate. It is up to the individual department to determine the applicability of "best practices" to their projects.

2020-21 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESPONSES TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Report Title [Publication Date]	R# [for F#]	Recommendation	Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date]	Recommendation Response (Implementation)	Recommendation Response Text
Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R6 [for F8]	The adopted CMGC management policy should specifically include the industry best practice of awarding the contract before project design continues past 30% completion.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	While it is optimal to bring in a CM/GC contractor on or before 30%, it is equally important to have a qualified, experienced contractor who is able to provide the required services. In the case of a horizontal CM/GC project, the technical capability and local experience of the contractor are also important.
Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R7 [for F5]	By June 2022, the Board of Supervisors should amend Section 6.68 of the Administrative Code to remove the mandatory cost criterion in awarding CMGC contracts.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Requires further analysis	The SFMTA agrees with this recommendation, but implementation of the recommendation resides with the Board of Supervisors.
Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R8 [for F7, F9, F10]	SFMTA should establish a policy for review of technical quality of preconstruction and design deliverables, to be used in all CMGC or design contracts signed after January 2022, including in-the-field validation of key assumptions of site conditions by City engineers.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	A more formalized process of reviewing and commenting on pre-construction deliverables would be beneficial in the future. The SFMTA will establish the policy for all future CMGC-type projects.
Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R9 [for F12, F13]	Beginning January 1, 2022, SFMTA should assign to every CMGC project a dedicated in-the-field contractor liaison to facilitate collaborative problem resolution, and sufficient support staff to monitor actual progress and site conditions.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Has been implemented	It is a long-standing practice in the City that a Resident Engineer is assigned prior to the start of construction on every capital project as the single point of contact with the contractor in the field. The Van Ness project includes a complete support staff of City employees (SFMTA, SFPUC, PW and consultants) to monitor actual progress and site conditions. Future CMGC projects will continue this practice.

2020-21 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESPONSES TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Report Title [Publication Date]	R# [for F#]	Recommendation	Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date]	Recommendation Response (Implementation)	Recommendation Response Text
Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R10 [for F1, F2, F6, F9]	By June 2022, the City should adopt a policy that any public communication about a planned or in-progress capital project that includes disruption of public services or right-of-way should include itemized assessments of risk to projected costs and duration.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	A majority of SFMTA projects are funded by the FTA, which requires the project to assess and monitor project risks in construction on a periodic basis. The department can provide a general list of project risks in public communications, to inform the public of the project status and projected substantial completion. Publishing itemized costs association with changes risk or project duration could negatively impact the bidding or negotiation process.
Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R11 [for F14]	Beginning immediately, and in all future capital or maintenance projects that require pedestrian monitors, the City should ensure that associated costs are either specifically included in the primary construction contract, or explicitly planned for and funded by the City, before construction begins.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Has been implemented	This recommendation has been implemented in the Van Ness BRT Project, and will continue to be implemented in the future for all contracts that require pedestrian monitors.