

**MINUTES**  
**Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee**  
**November 29, 2012**  
**Hearing Room 416 - City Hall**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102**

**1) Call to Order, Roll Call**

The meeting was called to order at 9:32 a.m. Maura Lane, Committee Assistant, called the roll. The following Committee members were present: Jonathan Alloy, Terrance Flanagan, Sanford Garfinkel, John Madden, Robert Muscat, Rebecca Rhine and Thea Selby (present at 9:55 a.m.). Corey Marshall was excused. Regina Callan was absent.

**2) Approval, with possible modification, of the minutes of the September 27th, 2012 meeting.**

The minutes were approved.

\*NOTE: Full recordings of Committee meetings are located at <http://www.sfcontroller.org/index.aspx?page=86> under "CGOBOC".

There was no public comment.

**3) Presentation from the City Services Auditor regarding the CSA 2013 Work Plan**

The CSA 2013 Work Plan was presented by Mark de la Rosa, Audits Manager, and Peg Stevenson, Director – CSA Performance.

CSA was created through an amendment to the Charter that was approved by the voters in November 2003. Under Charter Appendix F, CSA is mandated to:

- Evaluate quality and quantity of the City's services, compare, benchmark and provide public information;
- Serve as the City's internal auditor: conduct financial and performance audits;
- Measure the City's performance to standards for streets, parks and sidewalks;
- Evaluate city management and employment practices;
- Oversee contracting procedures and RFP standards; and,
- Operate the Whistleblower hotline, investigations, and website.

CSA is divided into two units:

- Audits: performance audits: compliance, management and construction; concession and financial audits; and, Whistleblower investigations.
- City Performance and Operations: financial and operational analysis; standards, performance measures and benchmarking; and technical assistance and professional contracting.

CSA's work is driven by: the Charter and Administrative Code requirements; limited risk analysis; the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, leadership and department requests; and bond and capital programs.

The funding for FY 2012-2013 is about \$12.5 million dollars or two-tenths of one percent of the City's budget. The budget includes 63 staff. At this time, there are 44 staff members but there is also aggressive recruitment underway. Examples of the departments contracting with CSA and the respective budgets were also reviewed. Total CSA resources total \$12,544,730.00.

Mr. De la Rosa reviewed FY 2012-2013 Audits ongoing programs. Continuous monitoring programs include: citywide cash transactions assessments, citywide construction close-out assessments, contract compliance audits, payroll audits and the Whistleblower Program. Other work includes: concession and compliance audits, financial statement reviews of the Treasurer's Office and field follow-ups on audit recommendations.

Ms. Stevenson reviewed FY 2012-2013 CSA Performance ongoing programs. These include:

- Performance Management (PM) Program: PM database (reports, training and updates), validation of measures and new quarterly city services and capital reports in FY12-13.
- Parks: inspections, analysis, and reporting
- Streets and sidewalks: analysis and reporting
- Citywide non-profit monitoring and accountability

Major projects for FY12-13 for CSA Performance include:

- Transit Effectiveness Project Implementation
- City-wide wellness project to improve employee health management and long-term city cost savings
- Public Health – moving to integrated delivery systems and planning for 2014 health reform
- City-wide health and human services model – forecasting San Francisco's clients, services, costs and revenue
- News/media/education – develop new formats to push out government data and increase transparency
- Information technology – city-wide cost effective purchasing for standard software licenses and systems
- Public Safety – reporting on the state realignment population now served in city jails and community programs

Major projects for FY12-13 for CSA Audits include:

- Performance audit of transit operator hiring, training and worker safety at San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA)
- Performance audit of the effectiveness of SFMTA's transit operator scheduling and timekeeping system (Trapeze)
- Performance audit of the Department of Public Health's decentralized purchasing

process

- Information technology audits
- Capital improvement audits: San Francisco General Hospital Rebuild, Public Utilities Commission's Water System Improvement Program , 2008 Parks Bond Change Orders, Central Subway Overhead Rates and Job Order Contract

There were various questions from the Committee regarding the depth of some of the work. Mr. Alloy wanted to know when the audits pertaining to bond projects would be completed. He wants to make sure arrangements are made to speak to these audits as they come up during the work plan. Mr. De la Rosa responded that a lot of the bond-related audits will be completed by the third quarter of 2013. Some will be completed around April/May 2013. ESER and the 2008 Clean and Safe Park Bond Projects are both scheduled for the March 2013 Committee meeting. General Hospital is scheduled for January 2013 which means the audit results won't be ready, at that time. Ben Rosenfield, Controller, recommended that- given there are projects on both sides of the CSA shop related to construction – it may be best to create a 1-page schedule that shows a summary of all the projects with completion dates. Updates can be provided to the Committee as things proceed. Mr. Alloy requested that findings, from the audits, be included in the March 2013 meeting.

Mr. Flanagan also had comments regarding the work plan. He expressed his appreciation that more benchmarking information will be released. He said he assumed the peer group will be the same and the measurements will be increasingly on the input/efficiency side rather than the output/customer service side. Ms. Stevenson said that CSA will be focusing more on efficiency but cannot promise the peer groups will be the same. It will depend on the function. For example, San Francisco General Hospital serves the entire county as an acute care hospital. The goal is to try and choose good comparables of similar size, pool (the entire public health population in the county) so the peers may not be the same, depending on the function. The idea will be to fit it to those that most closely match the jurisdictional coverage in size and scope of ours.

There were questions about the City non-profit monitoring. Mr. Flanagan urged everyone to read the article pertaining to this topic. It came out about a month ago. The CSA Audit deals with 126 non-profits. He wanted to know the actual number of non-profits with which the City has contracts. Ms. Stevenson responded that, although she wasn't entirely sure, she would guess that there are at least another 75 or 100 that aren't covered by this program and only have a contract with one agency. However; the same standards are used to monitor even if the non-profit isn't in the joint non-profit monitoring program.

Mr. Flanagan wanted to know about the source most of the funding for the non-profits and whether they are provided by the City. If the funding is provided by the City, he wanted to know if they are basically affiliates of the City. Ms. Stevenson responded that one of the standards that are present in the compliance is that the non-profit must have at least 15% of their funding coming from non-City sources. The notion is that overhead costs are spread out and if City funding or grants go away, the non-profit would not be entirely at risk. Most agencies do meet the minimum requirement but one or two do not. It is an on-going process to try and encourage non-profits to be good solid stable

providers to get there. One of the reasons for the program is that it represents the significant quality of the City's service delivery programs. One of the requirements is that the non-profit must have a financial statement (similar to a CAFR) in order to meet the City's compliance requirements. A financial statement is also a compliance requirement for other grant sources. Those without a financial statement are cited with a finding. Purchasing a financial statement audit can be a significant expense for a small non-profit but it is one of the City's requirements.

Mr. Flanagan also asked whether an analysis had ever been done to see if using non-profits is more efficient and economical than having the City itself provide the services and whether periodic evaluations are done. He also wanted to know if combining services has been considered. Ms. Stevenson responded that the subject comes up from time to time. She pointed to the practical matter that the non-profit hourly rate is a lot less than that of a City worker. Mr. Rosenfield said that some of the vast expenses within the non-profit provider pool include salary and benefits. He went on to say it is almost a universal truth in the non-profit community that hourly wage and benefit packages are lower than comparable City employees. Some of the most significant portions of what is purchased by the City from non-profit organizations are budgetary decisions made more than 20 years ago to rely on non-profits to provide significant parts of our Health and Human Services safety net services. These decisions were made during the Feinstein administration and prior to the time Feinstein was Mayor, largely for budgetary and service delivery reasons. Finances have been the driver for many of the choices regarding the usage of non-profit providers.

Ms. Stevenson added that consolidations and mergers have been encouraged. Sometimes a fiscal agency is appointed. At other times, there are mergers, especially in the health services delivery area.

There was an additional question about cash handling and whether the information is disseminated. There are about ten cash handling audits each year. Mr. Flanagan noted that all of the audits look similar. Mr. De la Rosa explained the process for selecting cash handling audits and how the audits are selected and reported with city-wide recommendations. Future work plans will be reviewed to make sure the same projects aren't being repeated and that recommendations are being implemented.

In response to the questions about why the other group(s) didn't digest the first audit and look for similar problems, Mr. Rosenfield noted the decentralization in the City of many things, including cash handling. There are more than 50 City departments and over 300 sites that are collecting or managing cash. While ten audits, on a rotating basis over the last two years, may sound like a lot (in terms of count), the same groups won't be touched every year. Sometimes there are comparable issues in agencies. Improving compliance through the program is the goal. A host of financial risks are taken into account, in the accounting operations division, to determine the level of review and control the Controller's Office may have over the accounting activities of other departments. Although it is a relatively new program, the goal is to continue to evaluate, improve and push out to the departments.

There was public comment from Derek Kerr, M.D. "The CSA collects \$12.5 million dollars of taxpayer money every year. How that money is allocated is not really explained in the work plan. What you get are words. It is qualitative. There is nothing quantitative. You can't tell which of these programs will be emphasized, how much will be invested, what is planned to be invested. It's sort of loose. In terms of oversight, I think it will be very difficult".

#### **4) Presentation from the City Services Auditor regarding the Whistleblower Program**

Steve Flaherty presented the Whistleblower Program Annual Report to the Committee.

The annual report covers the time period of July 2011 – June 2012. There were 344 complaints closed in FY 2011-12. There are 43 complaints open as of July 1, 2012.

The sources of complaints are multi-fold. Many (71%) complaints come from the web site. Phone and walk-ins constituted 11% and 10% respectively. Other complaint sources include letters (4%) and e-mails (4%).

Action taken in response to complaints include investigations (73%), closure due to lack of information (8%) and no action required (7%). Other actions include closure because the complaint is outside the Whistleblower's Program jurisdiction (7%). About 4% were referred to departments with Charter jurisdiction. Ms. Rhine asked for clarification of the difference between "no action required" and "outside the jurisdiction". Departments with Charter jurisdiction include the District Attorney's Office, the City Attorney's Office, the Ethics Commission and the Police Department.

The time it takes for complaints to be investigated and closed averages between 30 -90 days (100 or 29%). The majority of complaints are closed in less than 30 days (197 complaints or 57%).

Mr. Flaherty presented a summary of different complaints received during the year and the outcomes of investigations.

Retaliations against Whistleblowers are illegal. Based on information received from the Ethics Commission, 17 complaints were filed and closed in FY 2011-12.

Other changes implemented in FY 2011-12 include:

- Posting of quarterly newsletters on the Whistleblower Program's web site
- Updating of several pages on the program's web site
- Modifications to the Whistleblower Program's complaint tracking database
- Review of best practices of fraud hotlines in other jurisdictions.

There was discussion about Exhibits 6 and 7 (Sustained Complaint Allegations in FY 2011-12 (73 in total) and (Actions Taken on Sustained Complaints in FY2011-2012). Mr. Alloy inquired as to why exhibits 6 & 7 were not used in the presentation in that the information was more comprehensive. For example, 25 of the sustained allegations were due to the misuse of city vehicles, 22 were due to employee misconduct, 14 were a

combination of several issues, 11 were about service complaints and 1 was about the theft of time. Some complaints may involve multiple suspects or contain multiple allegations. This means it is possible for a complaint to have multiple dispositions.

Another question focused on the aggregate dollars returned to the City as a result of a Whistleblower complaint. Mr. Rosenfield noted that the Whistleblower quarterly reports that are now published now include summary complaint information on every sustained complaint of the program which is one of the more meaningful changes that have been made as part of the public reporting. The Program has tried, to the extent possible, to provide a dollar amount associated with the finding, but in many cases the information is not available. However; this information is included throughout the quarterly reports. The work, in the future, will focus on aggregating those dollars and reporting it, in some form.

Exhibit 5 (Age of 43 complaints filed at the beginning of FY2012-13) was clarified. Mr. Flaherty said investigating completion times can vary greatly depending on the complexity of the issues involved. Steps that influence the length of investigations include researching issues identified in the complaint, accumulating documentation from multiple sources, interviewing witnesses, and coordinating resources between departments.

Mr. Flaherty also provided clarification complaints not requiring any action and complaints that are outside of the Program's jurisdiction. Mr. Alloy asked that the disposition of aging complaints be provided in quarterly reports. Another new feature of the report is retaliation information from the Ethics Commission.

Mr. Madden and Ms. Callan are the Committee's liaisons to the Program. As such, they presented their observations about the Program. There were several meetings with the Whistleblower staff. There were candid, in-depth conversations about individual claims, reasons why some of the claims being closed more quickly than others. As specified by the Controller, in those cases, it is essentially something that is not within the control of the Controller's Office staff. It goes to another department to investigate, Human Resources may get involved, etc. Sometimes the departments don't assign the same priority that we would like to see assigned to the projects.

Mr. Madden expressed his opinion that the Whistleblower Program, as a sub-set of the Controller's audit function, has done something interesting work this year in updating the reporting system (the computer program that allows people to file complaints anonymously). There has also been work in outreach with other departments. An example would be the 311 Program which includes working with the 311 staff to clarify the differences between citizens reporting problems and genuine Whistleblower complaints. This education cuts down on the volume of reports received by the Whistleblower Program that genuinely belong elsewhere. The goal is to improve the complaints that are filed to focus on fraud, waste and abuse which is the design of the program.

As liaisons, Ms. Callan and Mr. Madden –have been able to have very candid conversations with the Whistleblower staff to examine the complaints in detail. The reporting to the Committee protects the confidentiality of both the person(s) making the

complaint and that of everyone else involved in the chain of the investigations. Confidentiality of all involved is very important because there may have been complaints when confidentiality has been accused. This is not the case with the Whistleblower Program. The professionalism and the integrity of the Whistleblower staff has been upheld at a variety of levels. Some of the goals for the program next year are to continue to meet with the various departments to increase awareness of the program, how it works and the need to work with them quickly to resolve the complaint. Quick and accurate resolution is to the advantage of the City and all involved.

In looking at comparable agencies, with comparable Whistleblower Programs, the staff is working on best practices and trying to integrate the best practices of the Fraud Examiners Association – a nationwide organization that deals with similar issues. On a personal note, it has been easy to schedule meetings with staff, to have candid discussions that are professional. Mr. Madden said the professionalism of the staff is encouraging. One of the things to recognize is the limitation of the Whistleblower Program scope. There may be abuses, fraud and other things that do not fit within the scope because it may be a criminal act that is under investigation by the District Attorney's office or another agency has purview and is investigating actively. It might be a grievance mechanism which is not contained within the Whistleblower Program itself. Grievance processes are regulated by the Department of Human Resources.

Ms. Selby she also found the meetings with staff to be helpful. She said there had been discussions about prioritization and whether cases were being prioritized according to either money or something else. She said that as she listened, it became clear to her that the staff is getting to all of the cases. At this point, it's not a matter of cases getting aside because of the small staff. Rather, the staff is able to cover all of the cases in the time period. The extended investigations that can take up to a year seem to have more to do with other departments and are not within the control of the Whistleblower staff.

Ms. Selby asked whether attempts had been made to survey people who had made complaints to get a sense of their satisfaction with the process, if not the outcome. Mr. Rosenfield responded that surveys have not been started as the staff works with the challenge of how a survey would be conducted and what to do with the data that is reported. It needs to be discussed in more depth.

There was public comment from Derek Kerr, M.D. and Hal Smith.

Dr. Kerr's comments are as follows: "A Whistleblower's complaint does not only go to this Whistleblower Program. A Whistleblower complaint can go to the employee's own department. It can go to the City Attorney or to the Ethics Commission. All of these are Whistleblower's complaints. It can even go to the media or a state agency. Those are Whistleblower complaints. The point I want to make is that this year's Whistleblower Report shows 17 retaliation cases over 9 months. All were dismissed. When Ethics Director St. Croix came before you last year, he said that retaliation cases amounted to "less than 20 in the 16 years we've been in business". The big discrepancy between the Controller's numbers and the Ethics count needs to be examined. More importantly, Mr. St. Croix admitted that none of the retaliation cases had been prosecuted. All were dismissed.

Last year's Civil Grand Jury looked at the Ethic's Commission's handling of 18 referrals from the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. All were dismissed. They concluded that the Commissioners had "abdicated their authority" due to the Director's "excessive influence".

In June, the Board's Budget and Legislative Analyst issued a report comparing the enforcement of ethics laws by our Ethics Commission versus the one in Los Angeles. In Los Angeles, 19% of investigations ended in dismissal. But – in San Francisco – 76% were dismissed, 4x more.

So, reports from the Controller, the Ethics Director, the Civil Grand Jury, Whistleblowers themselves, the Sunshine Task Force, and now, the Board's analyst show an astounding rate of complaint dismissals by Ethics. The City Charter authorizes this body to recommend City departments in need of comprehensive audits. Please consider an audit of Whistleblower retaliation complaints that are dismissed by the Ethics Commission".

Mr. Smith thanked Mr. Rosenfield and his staff. The report this year is better than it has been in the past. He thanked the Controller for the changes. In regard to a satisfaction report, Mr. Smith expressed his opinion that given a 30% drop in the number of complaints in the last few years, a satisfaction report would somehow indicate why the complaints are dropping. Maybe people are fearful of the whole process or maybe people think everything is wonderful, maybe there is less abuse/fraud and all those other things and the City is a panacea of greatness. He said a satisfaction survey would help. The information – emails that can go out to people is available. He said he didn't understand why a survey would be so hard to do.

In regard to prioritization, he liked the fact that all the complaints were getting handled. At the same time, it would be good to know how many of the complaints are high, medium and low risk. Another item that is not in the report is the role of the Committee as overseer of the Whistleblower Program and in the Annual Report. He expressed his opinion that this is an oversight that can easily be corrected. In the Committee's Annual Report to the Board of Supervisors, the two liaisons mentioned 311 as well as the delays in investigations. He said the same topics should also be in the Whistleblower's Report, that these are concerns that staff is working to resolve. He said there should also be a budget in the report. How much does it cost to run the Program? Does the citizen/tax payer get a bang for the buck with this particular program? He said he thinks the citizens does but does not know for sure because the figures aren't available. He said he's very concerned about what was said about the President's Program. It took 13 years to get the program through the bureaucrats and the legislative process. He said he'd been working on the Whistleblower Program for two years and only has eleven more years to see the program that he wants to see put in place. In closing, he referred to the "best in class service" saying that is so often used in some of the documents. He said he does not want a "best in class" system. He wants a "world class" system that takes up the government, the President's Program or other cities/organizations if they have good ideas. He wants to compare apples to apples, not oranges to tangerines. He'd also like the same things to be presented that are included in other reports.

A Whistleblower Program audit is scheduled to be completed by May 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2013.

**5) Presentation from various City departments regarding the Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bonds (ESER)**

Project updates were provided by Charles Higuera (Department of Public Works, ESER Project Manager), Samuel Chui, David Myerson (Public Utilities Commission) and Chris Iglesias. Mr. Iglesias was included to answer questions about local hire.

**Public Safety Building (PBS):** The Public Safety Building component includes the building itself which will house Police Headquarters, the Fire Station and the Police Station, as well as Fire Station #30. As of this reporting period, Mr. Chui said the Public Safety Building bid package #10 will be completed in July 2013. Fire Station #30 bid package #11 will be completed in September 2013. The Department of Building Inspection (DBI) is reviewing Permit Addendum #3 – Building Superstructure – and a separate building permit for FS #30 was submitted. The balance of 3 addenda and 3 additional permits will be submitted by December 2012. Of the 50 bid trade packages, 30 are in bid or in the process of award, with construction cost-to-date tracking at 2% below budget.

Mr. Higuera reviewed construction activities. There has been extensive work at the basement level that has been completed. This includes:

- Soil-mix shoring walls and tie-back installation
- Pile-driving and installation of pile cap plates and welded studs
- Mud slab pour; sub-grade waterproofing; protection slab pour; rebar installation
- Foundation (grade beams) at Level One
- Curtain wall glazing assembly and structural steel submittals review

Mr. Chui reviewed images of the project which included the project at various stages. The project is still tracking on schedule as of the third quarter ending September 30<sup>th</sup>. Final stages of the construction documents are in process as are permit reviews. Some parts of the project are a third of the way into construction. DPW is already working with design consultants and the Planning Department on furniture, fixtures and equipment as well as the procurement process.

Mr. Higuera reviewed the status of the Neighborhood Fire Station component of the project. The focused scope projects represent \$15.3 million dollars. The status update includes:

- Roofs: 11 roofs to be completed.
- Building Envelope: 15 stations need to be repainted.
- Windows: 15 stations to be refurbished
- Generators: 12 stations to receive a new generator

The comprehensive project represents \$4.1 million dollars. At Station #36 (109 Oak Street at Franklin):

- Design is ongoing by Paulett Taggart Architects, SF

- 50% of design development submittal is on schedule for Sept. 28, 2012
- 50% DD cost estimate tracking on budget
- 100% design development submittal scheduled to be received by November 30, 2012
- Civic Design Review Phase 1 and II approval received October 15, 2012

There are seismic projects that are basically replacement projects. These projects do not include the Fire Boat Station and are valued at \$19.4 million dollars.

- Station #16: 2251 Greenwich (at Fillmore/Steiner) – the concept phase was completed August 2012. Schematic design began, on schedule, October 2012 with the Department of Public Works BDC. Finally, 50% of the schematic design deliverable was received November 15, 2012.
- Station #5: 1301 Turk Street (at Webster Street) – The Concept phase was completed August 2012. Design is scheduled to begin, on schedule, on January 2, 2013.
- Station #9: 2245 Jerrold Street (at Napoleon Street) – Design is scheduled to begin, on schedule, in 2013.

Seismic Projects that include the Fire Boat Station amount to \$20.7 million dollars.

- Station #35, Piers 221/2 and 24 – Slab replacement work was completed on schedule in June 2012. Completion of the work meant that Fire Engine #35 was returned to the station. Pier Replacement and new station: The Project Review application was submitted to City Planning in June 2012. The response was received, on schedule, at the end of October 2012. The project team met with Supervisor Jane Kim on September 12, 2012. There was an Open House on October 3, 2012. A presentation was made to the Port Commission on November 13, 2012 about Warriors Arena.

The summary schedule was reviewed. It is on target.

David Myerson, Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS) Project Manager, reviewed the status of this part of the project.

The status of planning is as follows for AWSS Modernization:

- The AECOM/AGS Joint Venture draft project report has been submitted.
- AWSS pipe network improvements will begin once the Plan is accepted.

AWSS Core Facilities Design:

- Ashbury Tank, Jones Tank and Twin Peaks Reservoir: the id/award phase is scheduled to begin by March 2013.
- Pump Station #1: The design should be completed by May 2013. Per the Bond Report – Pump Controllers: replace the current controller to allow for individual autonomic and manual control of each pump. New engines will be needed to reasonable accomplish controller replacement. This was not in the original budget.
- Pump Station #2: CER has been submitted. Significant structural repairs are needed. Per the Bond Report – All the functioning mechanical equipment,

including: the pumps, diesel drives, valves and piping, will be removed and replaced with modern equipment. The bond funds are not sufficient for mechanical and electrical improvements. The use of operational funds is under consideration.

Mr. Myerson reviewed the cistern repair candidates as well as the location of the new cisterns. He also reviewed the schedule.

Mr. Higuera reviewed the budget and financing for the AWSS project. He responded to questions from the Committee about the Fire Boat Replacement and bond funds available to do the work that has been identified. Mr. Alloy and Mr. Muscat provided their liaison report. Ms. Selby reminded Mr. Higuera of the Committee's request for standardized reports such as project challenges as part of the Executive Summary and Gantt. Charts.

Mr. Iglesias, of the PUC, responded to questions about local hire. He said the goal is 20%. At the time of this meeting, local hire was at 12- 13% and is expected to go higher as more trades are brought on to the project. Mr. Chuo reviewed Local Business Enterprise Goals.

There was no public comment.

**6) Presentation from the 2011 Road Repaving and Street Safety Bond Program.**

The 2011 Road Repaving and Street Safety Bond is made up of five parts. The parts of the project are: the repaving and reconstruction of streets, the improvement of sidewalk and curb ramps accessibility, to seismically strengthen structures, to improve streetscapes (pedestrian signals, street and alleyway landscaping, bike safety) and the upgrading of transit street signals.

The overall project budget is \$248 million dollars. The allocation of the bond funds are as follows:

- \$149 million to repave and renew over 1300 street blocks – improving street condition from 64 to 66
- \$22 million to design and construct 1,700 curb ramps and repair 125,000 square feet of sidewalk maintained by the City
- \$7 million to seismically strengthen structures
- \$50 million to implement streetscape, pedestrian and bicycle safety features such as the installation of pedestrian countdown signals, accessible pedestrian, bike lanes and other improvements citywide
- \$20 million to upgrade and rehabilitate transit signals along key corridors which will result in speeding up average MUNI travel time along some of the routes by 8%.

John Thomas, Project Manager, said the first bond sale represented \$76.5 million dollars. The money was allocated as follows:

- Street resurfacing - \$44.1 million
- Curb ramps - \$8.8 million

- Sidewalks - \$5 million
- Structures - \$5.2 million
- Streetscape, pedestrian and bicycle - \$5.6 million
- Transit signal infrastructure - \$4.7million

Mr. Thomas also reviewed the uses of the remaining funds:

- Controller's Audit fund - \$0.1 million
- Reserve pending sale - \$2.3 million
- Cost of issuance - \$0.7 million
- Total par amount - \$76.5 million

### **Street Resurfacing - \$44.1 million**

Mr. Thomas said the projects are prioritized based on pavement condition index scores (PCI), street type and usage (functional classification and transit or bicycle route), equitable geographic distribution, and complaints. The proposed projects are subject to utility clearances.

During year one, the goal is to pave 350 blocks and design or construct over 600 curb ramps on those blocks. In summary:

- Design – one project over 13 city blocks
- Advertise/Award – 1 project over 30 blocks
- Construct – 14 projects over 333 blocks

As of September 30<sup>th</sup>, 84 blocks have been paved and 333 blocks have been awarded in contracts. Mr. Thomas said the challenges have been the coordination with utilities to meet the proposed paving schedule. The result is that candidate projects may be delayed or moved up in the schedule.

### **Curb Ramps - \$8.8 million**

Project selection will be based on the City's ADA Transition Plan. The Plan prioritizes curb ramps identified by residents with disabilities that serve civic buildings, transit stops, and places of public accommodation such as employers and commercial areas. The high priority areas are as follows:

- Planning Phase – 694 curb ramps
- In Design – 338 curb ramps
- In construction – 52 curb ramps
- Constructed – 311 curb ramps

The challenge to the program is that it is complaint driven. The locations are often the most challenging and, therefore, the most expensive to construct.

### **Sidewalks - \$5 million**

The goal of the Sidewalk Inspection and Repair Program (SIRP) are as follows:

- Inspect 200 square feet of the City's most heavily traveled corridors
- Repair 25,000 square feet of public sidewalks under contract
- FY 2011-12: inspected 205 blocks, repaired 171,350 square feet of sidewalk fronting 217 square blocks, of which 71, 872 square feet are fronting public

properties

**Accelerated Sidewalk Abatement Program (ASAP):**

This is a complaint driven inspection of damaged sidewalks around the City-maintained street trees, schools, city, state and federal buildings, and other public lands. The annual goal is to repair 17,000 square feet of damaged sidewalk.

- FY2011-12: inspected 196 public locations, repaired 42, 208 square feet of damaged sidewalks around 74 public locations

**Street Structures - \$5.2 million**

Projects are selected based on legal mandates, safety risks, the level of structural deterioration, usage frequency and locations on priority emergency access routes.

Mr. Thomas said the structural team has defined a program of repair for FY 2012-13 and has begun the design of repairs for:

- 22<sup>nd</sup> Street stairway
- Corbett Parcel Retaining Wall
- Alemany Boulevard Retaining Wall
- Filbert Street Stair

**Streetscape - \$5.6 million**

The Department of Public Works assembled a team to oversee project selection and implementation. The team includes representatives from the Department of Public Works, the Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and City Planning. Departments were asked to submit projects identified in community supported plans.

Once the list was created, the team prioritized the criteria in the Bond report. The draft prioritized list of projects was given to community groups for review and comment. The community groups included WalkSF, the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition and SF Beautiful. The proposed list was then reviewed and approved by each district Supervisor. Once completed, the Capital Planning Committee (CPC) proved the Streetscape Project List on July 16, 2012. Mr. Thomas reviewed projects that are in the construction and planning phases.

**Transit and Traffic Signals - \$4.7 million**

There are three parts to Transit and Traffic Signals – transit signal priority (TSP) Phase 1, new traffic signals and traffic signal infrastructure upgrades.

- Transit signal priority Phase 1 Update: In the construction phase, all 110 new traffic signal controllers and 55 of 110 cabinets have been delivered. In addition, 41 signals/cabinets have been installed in the field. The project team is on schedule to complete the work around the end of 2012.
- New Traffic Signals: 30% of the conceptual design work has begun. Completion is expected by the end of 2012.
- Traffic signal infrastructure upgrades: the design coordination with DPW has begun. The completion schedule will be synchronized with the DPW repaving schedule.

The Committee liaisons to this bond project are Ms. Selby and Mr. Flanagan. They shared their insights regarding the status of the project. Ms. Rhine asked about related maintenance costs. Mr. Madden also inquired about overhead costs charged to the bond fund.

There was no public comment.

**7) Opportunity for Committee members to comment on any matters within the Committee's jurisdiction**

a) Draft CGOBOC 2011 Annual Report: Mr. Alloy made a motion to include the following information in the draft annual report on page 8, at the conclusion of the Earthquake Safety section:

Recommendations:

The CGOBOC liaisons make the following recommendations regarding the ESER projects:

1. Improve evaluations of current conditions before scoping new work, to understand dependencies and underlying costs that affect the ability to execute planned tasks.
2. Maintain a significant goal for local hire and MBE participation in contracts, and look for ways to prepare packages that enable smaller and local firms to bid competitively.
3. Continue to phase work to expedite process and permit approvals, to meet or beat the schedule and budget targets.
4. Continue to engage affected communities on project plans (such as fire stations) and cooperate with public agencies on task coordination across programs (such as street repair).

The motion was unanimously approved by the Committee. Ms. Selby will incorporate the edits into the final report and submit for distribution to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Rosenfield will work with Supervisor Farrell to schedule presentation of the report before the full Board.

b) CGOBOC Consulting Contracts: Mr. Dela Rosa (CSA – Audits) explained to the Committee that the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) had to be reissued. The goal is to bring the contracts before the Committee at the first meeting of the year for approval and signatures.

c) Other Items: Mr. Alloy reminded Ms. Selby about the letter (discussed at September 2012 meeting) that she is to write and send to the Parks Commission. Mr. Garfinkel asked for clarification about graffiti removal per square foot in San Francisco. Mr. Rosenfield responded to questions from the Committee about metrics that can be applied to City Services in a standard way.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:58 a.m.