



July 27, 2013

SFMTA

Municipal Transportation Agency

Mr. Aaron Peskin
470 Columbus Avenue, Ste. 211
San Francisco CA 94133
aaron.peskin@earthlink.net

Re: The Central Subway Project in North Beach

Dear Mr. Peskin:

Thank you for your May 28 letter about the Central Subway Project. I appreciate your concern for the North Beach community and for the health of San Francisco's transportation network.

Regarding your concerns about the Central Subway Project's budget, schedule, and management structure, I would like to reassure you that we are indeed on time and within budget, and that we will continue to work closely with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and other stakeholders to move forward in a timely and cost-efficient manner. I am fully confident in our ability to construct the Central Subway, San Francisco's biggest public transit project in decades. This major infrastructure investment will significantly improve transportation in some of our most densely populated and fastest-growing neighborhoods, including SoMa, Union Square, Chinatown, and the neighborhoods along the 3rd Street corridor. It will greatly benefit our world-class, transit-first city. I look forward to its completion – the day the Central Subway opens, tens of thousands of San Franciscans will experience improved mobility and better transportation to work, home, commercial districts, and more.

Edwin M. Lee
Mayor

Tom Nolan
Chairman

Cheryl Brinkman
Vice-Chairman

Malcolm Heinicke
Director

Jerry Lee
Director

Joél Ramos
Director

Cristina Rubke
Director

Edward D. Reiskin
Director of
Transportation

Regarding the Pagoda Palace construction plan; as a public servant yourself, you surely understand that it is not possible to gain 100 percent community support in any matter that impacts the City. However, in the case of the Pagoda Palace, we have received strong and widespread support from a large number of stakeholders that includes community groups, business owners, residents, elected officials, City agencies and our funding partners. We are moving forward with this change based on extensive outreach and community backing. Although a small but vocal minority continues to oppose the new plan, I do not believe this is sufficient reason to abandon a course of action that so many in the community favor.

Regarding your views of Central Subway Program Director John Funghi, I am glad we can agree that he is unfailingly appropriate and respectful, even in the face of unfair and unsound personal attacks. Mr. Funghi has served as Program Director for the Central Subway Project since 2006, capably ushering this vitally important project from conceptual design into construction. During his 30-year career in construction, Mr. Funghi has overseen major infrastructure projects in Alaska, Hawaii and California. In so doing he has gained the expertise required to manage construction of the Central Subway. I have full confidence in his abilities and qualifications.

Finally, I would like to remind you that the Central Subway we are building has changed very little from the project you supported in 2008 as President of the Board of Supervisors. We have relocated the tunnel's endpoint from Columbus Avenue to the Pagoda Palace, but otherwise the project's alignment remains identical. I thank you for your important contribution to achieving this essential improvement to Muni.

One South Van Ness Ave.
Seventh Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

Tele: 415.701.4500
www.sfmta.com

On the following pages, I respond in detail to the points raised in your letter. I hope you find this information helpful, and that it allays your concerns.





- **FTA Environmental Clearance:** On May 10, 2013, the FTA issued a determination (see attached) confirming that no additional environmental review is needed under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for the SFMTA to move forward with relocating the tunnel boring machine (TBM) retrieval site to the Pagoda Palace.
- **Pagoda Palace TBM Retrieval Costs:** We do not anticipate the design, demolition, construction and related costs of relocating the TBM retrieval site to the Pagoda Palace to exceed the \$6 million approved by the SFMTA Board of Directors. We remain in negotiation with tunnel contractor Barnard Impregilo Healy Joint Venture (BIH) and are confident we will come to an agreement soon. Negotiation with the contractor is a normal part of this process, and it is common for initial estimates to be higher than the final cost agreement.
- **SFMTA Board's Knowledge of BIH's Initial Estimate:** BIH submitted its initial estimate for the Pagoda Palace work after the SFMTA Board approved relocating the retrieval shaft. Therefore, the SFMTA Board clearly did not know about BIH's initial estimate before approving the resolution to proceed with the Pagoda Palace plan. If we are unable to negotiate contracts to perform the required work within the expenditure authority approved by the Board of Directors, we will return to the Board for further guidance, but we do not anticipate this outcome.
- **Contract 1300 and Project Budget:** Regarding the cost of Contract 1300, which includes construction of the Central Subway's stations, tracks and operating systems, the award of this contract does not change the Central Subway Project's overall budget of \$1.578 billion.
- **Contingency Funds and Project Budget:** It is conjecture to say that the Project's contingency balance will be exhausted before the Project is completed. Although the FTA recommends – but does not require – a higher contingency balance at this point, we are confident that our current contingency levels are sufficient. Of the \$330 million in contingency funds included in the Project's \$1.578 billion budget, \$67.2 million remain unallocated.
- **Decision to Award Contract 1300:** Rebidding the stations, track and systems contract would not result in lower bids or decreased Project costs. In current market conditions, the bids we received for Contract 1300 were reasonable compared with other Bay Area construction projects. Tutor Perini's bid met bid solicitation requirements and exceeded Small Business Enterprise (SBE) goals.
- **Use of Contingency Funds for Pagoda Palace Construction:** At this time we await the FTA's decision on whether project contingency funds can be used to finance the cost of relocating the retrieval shaft. Because the work at the Pagoda Palace site is not within the scope of the Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) awarded by the FTA, we require FTA approval to finance the change in this way. However, the question of how to fund this change is separate from the question of whether the change requires additional review under CEQA and NEPA.



- **Use of SFMTA General Fund Reserves:** The Pagoda Palace retrieval site relocation plan represents a significant improvement over the original plan to remove the TBMs on Columbus Avenue. The amended plan will significantly reduce construction impacts in North Beach while leaving no physical impediments to a potential – but as yet unplanned – future extension of the T Third Line. It also enjoys broad community support, as detailed elsewhere in this letter. For these reasons, we believe it to be a reasonable investment of SFMTA reserves.
- **Pagoda Palace Construction Cost Estimates:** Our initial cost estimate for the Pagoda Palace option, presented at a community meeting on November 19, 2012, was \$6-8 million. A document summarizing the original estimated cost can be found online [here](#). In the Dec. 4, 2012, calendar item prepared for the SFMTA Board, the \$3 million amount listed includes only the costs of acquiring rights to use the property. On Feb. 19, 2013, the SFMTA Board approved construction costs of up to \$6 million to relocate the TBM retrieval site.
- **Potential Cost Increases – Pagoda Palace Construction:** The items your letter identified as potential cost increases are either already included in the cost estimate, are irrelevant to the scope of work, or would be covered by Project contingency funds in the event that we encounter them. Specifically:
 - **Damage to properties:** We are performing pre-construction surveys, installing monitoring equipment and performing ground-conditioning improvements to safeguard neighboring properties during construction. In addition, the contractor is required to carry insurance to cover unforeseen incidents should they occur.
 - **Hazardous materials, manmade buried structures and unanticipated geotechnical findings:** Based on soil borings and building conditions, there is no evidence of hazardous materials, manmade buried structures or unanticipated ground conditions on the Pagoda Palace site other than what is accounted for in the contract and design documents. Should we encounter any of the above, we will handle them according to all applicable federal, state and local regulations.
 - **Restrictions on work hours:** As with the rest of our construction projects, we will work with the contractor to complete construction in a timely manner and in respect of City regulations regarding construction hours and noise. We have accounted for these restrictions in our design documents and cost estimates.
 - **Compensation grouting:** Compensation grouting is underway or has been completed successfully in SoMa and Union Square, in high-traffic areas within feet of buildings. However, as with all Central Subway construction, if we encounter complications with compensation grouting in North Beach, we will follow established and contractual protocols to determine the amount of any cost increases and to decide who is responsible for incurring them.



- **Pagoda Palace Demolition Contract:** After determining that apparent low bidder Ace Drilling did not meet contract solicitation requirements, we awarded Contract 1277 (Pagoda Palace Demolition) to MH Construction. The award of this contract is consistent with our estimates for the total cost of the work at the Pagoda Palace site. Contract 1277's price proposal includes several elements of Pagoda Palace site construction, such as installation of ground improvements, which were not included in BIH's demolition proposal. For this reason, a direct comparison between BIH's demolition estimate (\$350,000) and MH Construction's bid on Contract 1277 (\$627,000) is inappropriate.
- **Central Subway Project Cost:** The initial estimate for the Central Subway Project's cost was developed in 2003, long before we completed environmental review. The estimate was based on an early conceptual engineering plan that had a different project alignment, tunneling method and completion date from what was eventually approved. From 2003 to 2008, the plan for the Central Subway evolved, and so did the Project's budget. Major factors impacting increases in the cost estimate include inflation, the selection of deep tunneling (using TBMs) over shallow tunneling (using cut-and-cover construction methods), and the addition of additional contingency funds. When the Board of Supervisors certified the Project's Final SEIS/SEIR in 2008, we estimated the cost would be \$1.235 billion. Since then, the cost estimate has increased by \$343 million as a result of three main factors: the addition of contingency funds as required by the FTA, inflation due to revised start and finish dates, and the refinement of project designs. For a number of reasons, it is common for cost estimates to increase as project plans develop and schedules change.
- **Ridership Projections:** The T Third Line is expected to become Muni's most heavily used light rail line soon after the Central Subway opens. By 2030, ridership on the T Third Line is projected to be about 20 percent higher than on the most heavily used existing Muni line, the N Judah Line. About 65,000 customers per day are projected to ride the T Third Line in 2030. For just the Central Subway portion of the T Third Line, ridership in 2030 is projected at 35,100 daily boardings. The San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) develops ridership projections using statistical models that incorporate a variety of data, including census information, economic and population projections, transit use predictions, and behavioral forecasting. As the data and modeling methods change, so do the ridership projections.
- **Impact on Muni O&M Expenses Compared to No Project Alternative:** In the 2008 Final SEIS/SEIR, we estimated that Muni's annual Operations and Maintenance (O&M) budget would be \$23.8 million less in 2030 with the Central Subway than without it. This does not imply that there would be no cost associated with operating the Central Subway. Therefore, the comparison between this number and the Central Subway's estimated O&M cost is inappropriate, and it is inaccurate to say that our annual O&M projections have increased by \$39 million.
- **Projected O&M Costs for Central Subway:** Although the above comparison is inappropriate, our estimates for the Central Subway's O&M costs have increased by \$6.4 million since 2009. This is due to a better understanding of projected transit



service needs and maintenance requirements along the T Third Line corridor. The new estimates are the result of a close collaboration with the Planning Department and the SFCTA, with whom we have worked to better understand and prepare for the growth expected in Mission Bay and the southeast quadrant of the City. The following factors have influenced the increase in O&M estimates: We now plan to run more T Third Line trains than initially planned, all trains will be two-car trains, and service will be increased during the a.m. and p.m. peak periods to better accommodate T Third Line customers. These changes will result in improved Muni service for customers traveling these busy corridors. The FTA has approved and thoroughly reviewed all changes to the proposed operating service plan. We will continue to work closely with our funding partners to refine these estimates as needed.

- **Program Management Contract:** The cost of the program management contract (\$147 million, or about 9 percent of the Central Subway's budget) is within the FTA's recommendations for a project of this size. This contract provides the program with specialized professional services authorized on an annual basis as approved by both the SFMTA Board and the Board of Supervisors.
- **John Funghi's Qualifications:** The following points respond to the personal attacks against Mr. Funghi included in your letter. As I stated in the introduction, I am fully confident in Mr. Funghi's abilities and qualifications.
 - **"John O. Funghi Construction":** Mr. Funghi maintains an active contractor's license and built his family's home in Burlingame. He does not operate a construction company on the San Francisco Peninsula. The California Contractors State License Board (CSLB) requires that a contractor provide a company name in order to be licensed. Mr. Funghi has registered under "John O. Funghi Construction" since becoming a licensed contractor in 1992.
 - **Engineering Classification:** Mr. Funghi is a Professional Civil Engineer licensed to practice in the State of California. The SFMTA does not require a Civil Service engineering classification for project management positions. Instead, we require a Project Management classification. Consistent with SFMTA policy, Mr. Funghi has a Project Management classification.
 - **Characterization of North Beach Construction Schedule:** Mr. Funghi was accurate in saying that construction on Columbus Avenue needed to begin in January 2013 in order to complete the retrieval shaft on time at the original location. Because construction was to take place within an active roadway that would have remained in service during construction, the original plan involved much more restrictive space constraints than work on the Pagoda Palace site and would have taken months longer to complete.
 - **Comments on Project Budget and Schedule:** Mr. Funghi was correct in stating that the project is on time and within budget. The Project's \$1.578 billion budget includes the contingency funds referenced in the Project Management Oversight Contractor (PMOC) report. Similarly, the schedule contingency is incorporated into the Project's overall schedule. At this point,



\$67.2 million in contingency funds are unallocated, and 4.7 months of schedule contingency remain. In addition, as requested by the PMOC, we have now completed the report on schedule contingencies.

- **Comments on Secant Pile Installation Method:** Mr. Funghi was correct in stating that secant pile installation is a “tried and true” method used worldwide to successfully and safely construct underground walls. However, that does not mean construction contractors never experience difficulties in the field. When complications arise, we work closely with BIH to find a solution that will maintain the overall project schedule. Should the complications result in cost increases, we follow established and contractual protocols in determining which party is responsible for payment.
- **Comments about PMOC Report:** When Mr. Funghi said the information in the Project Management Oversight Contractor’s report was “dated,” he was referring specifically to the information about secant pile installation. Since publication of the report, we have proactively addressed the secant pile complications.
- **Union Square/Market Street Station Entrance:** The connection between the Powell Street and Union Square/Market Street stations provides customers a convenient transfer between the two stations. Given significant physical space and design constraints, we were unable to directly connect the existing Powell Street Station platform to the future Union Square/Market Street Station platform. In spite of this limitation, customers will be able to transfer easily between the T Third Line and the Muni Metro lines in operation in the Market Street tunnel via a convenient underground concourse.
- **Secant Piles and Schedule:** At this point, secant pile installation at the Union Square/Market Street Station, although taking longer than anticipated, is not delaying the Project schedule as a whole. To avoid impacting the overall schedule, BIH needs to complete the secant piles by the time the first tunnel boring machine reaches Union Square several months from now. The secant piles are currently scheduled to be completed in late September, well in advance of the anticipated Market Street tunnel crossing.
- **Staff Hiring:** The Central Subway Project hires new staff as needed, with a focus on preserving resources. The Resident Engineers referenced in the PMOC report are for the recently awarded Contract 1300. We are in the process of hiring the appropriate construction management personnel. Our new Project Controls Manager started in April.
- **Contract 1300 Notice to Proceed:** We have followed industry best practices and adhered to federal regulations in bidding, awarding and issuing the Notice to Proceed (NTP) for Contract 1300.
- **SBE/DBE/LBE Participation:** The winning contractor, Tutor Perini, exceeded Contract 1300’s SBE goals, with 25 percent of the contract – \$213 million – set aside



for SBE firms. During the advertisement period, the SFMTA reached out to Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) and Local Business Enterprise (LBE) firms to inform them of contracting opportunities and educate stakeholders about the contracting process (see attached). However, although we strongly support and encourage local business participation in the Central Subway Project, the FTA forbids us from including geographic preferences in our contracts. For this reason, we could not set aside any portion of the contract for local firms. This would have been true also if we had bid the station contracts separately.

- **Community Meetings and North Beach Outreach:** Since beginning this process almost a year ago, we have communicated with the North Beach community frequently, thoroughly and openly. In cooperation with Supervisor David Chiu, we have hosted three community meetings to present the TBM options and the details of our construction plans. We have also created and distributed in-depth information describing the TBM options, the construction plan, our process in pursuing the Pagoda Palace change, and other factors of interest to North Beach. As a sample, you may find the following documents online: [TBM Options Overview](#), [SFMTA Board Calendar Item \(Dec. 4, 2012\)](#), [Memo on Pagoda Palace Option](#), [North Beach FAQs](#), [blog posts on Pagoda Palace progress](#).
- **Support for the Pagoda Palace Plan:** The primary reason we moved forward with the Pagoda Palace option is because of the strong support of the North Beach community. After presenting the five TBM options at a November 19, 2012, community meeting, we received formal expressions of support for the Pagoda Palace option from the North Beach Business Association, Russian Hill Neighbors, SPUR, the Chinatown Community Development Center, Mayor Lee, Supervisor Chiu, ROMA Design Group, Rose Pistola, and other stakeholders. Although we also received letters in opposition to the Pagoda Palace option, much of this opposition came from longtime opponents of the Central Subway Project as a whole. In evaluating the communications we received, we concluded that the community's preference was to remove the TBMs at the Pagoda Palace.
- **North Beach Tunnel Variant Background:** The plan for the Central Subway, including the segment of tunnel between Chinatown and North Beach, was developed over several years through a community-based process that included hundreds of community meetings; close collaboration with multiple federal, state and city agencies; and an extensive environmental review as required by law. The Final SEIS/SEIR, of which the Board of Supervisors by motion affirmed certification on Sept. 16, 2008, clearly describes in the executive summary and elsewhere that the tunnels would extend past the Chinatown Station to North Beach, ending on Columbus Avenue near Washington Square Park. The Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission, the SFMTA Board, and the FTA all approved this essential environmental document.
- **SPUR's Participation in Environmental Review:** SPUR is a respected member of San Francisco's public policy community, and we certainly value their evaluations of the issues that affect our city. However, SPUR's support for the North Beach Tunnel Variant and advocacy for a potential Phase 3 of the T Third Line do not in any way



establish a violation of CEQA or NEPA by the SFMTA. As described above, the plan to tunnel to North Beach was adopted only after a thorough public review, as required by law. The plan received the approval of all legally required public entities, including the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission, and the FTA. SPUR participated in this process by providing comments on environmental documents, as it was entitled to do.

- **Phase 3 Extension:** No plan currently exists to build T Third Line stations in North Beach. Should we pursue a Phase 3 of the T Third Line, we will develop the plan through a community-based process and in accordance with applicable laws.
- **TBM Alternatives:** In considering alternatives for the TBMs, we reviewed four options in addition to removing them at the Pagoda Palace site. We presented the options to the community at a well-attended meeting on Nov. 19, 2012. Our review of the options is available online [here](#). Since then, in detailed documents submitted to our Board of Directors and made available to the public, we have thoroughly explained our methodology for selecting and reviewing these options, and for moving forward with the Pagoda Palace plan. Those documents are online [here](#) and [here](#).
- **Other TBM Ideas:** This section responds to the three additional options for the TBMs that are mentioned in your letter. Regarding the first idea (removing the TBMs at the Chinatown Station site), we have thoroughly explained why this option is not practical at this point in the project. The option was reviewed in the Project's Final SEIS/SEIR, but at this point, removing the TBMs at the Chinatown Station would interfere with the station contractor's work and also require major contract revisions to both the tunnel and stations contracts. Regarding the suggestion to disassemble the TBMs and "back them out" through the 4th Street portal, this would require a very different process than what was undertaken in New York City. We are using different types of TBMs and different tunnel construction methods. Our TBMs construct a concrete tunnel lining as they move forward. This lining, which is of a smaller diameter than the cutter head and shield at the front of the TBMs, will create a barrier that will make it impossible to move the cutter head and shield backwards. In Manhattan, tunnels are bored through solid bedrock, so there is no concrete tunnel lining creating a barrier to backing up New York's TBMs. Regarding the suggestion to entomb the TBMs in concrete and abandon them, we did consider three options of this nature; however, we do not believe doing so to be a desired practice, and, as described above, the community supported removing the TBMs at the Pagoda Palace site. Because of the feedback we received from community stakeholders and our funding partners, we rejected the options to bury the TBMs.
- **Support for North Beach Businesses:** We have moved forward with the Pagoda Palace plan in direct response to and in partnership with the business owners and residents of North Beach. As we begin construction at the Pagoda Palace site, we will continue to communicate closely with neighboring businesses and provide assistance to them to the extent that we can. We have every interest in preserving and enhancing the vitality of North Beach and fully recognize the unique and special nature of this neighborhood.



Letter to Mr. Aaron Peskin
July 27, 2013
Page 9

In conclusion, I respectfully disagree with your assessment of the Central Subway Project, the Pagoda Palace plan, and John Funghi's qualifications. Contrary to what is stated in your letter, we have pursued the Pagoda Palace option with great respect for community concerns, environmental regulations and cost constraints. The new plan greatly reduces construction impacts in North Beach without significantly altering the Project that you supported as president of the Board of Supervisors in 2008.

I hope this letter provided clarity about the issues you raised. As we work to complete this major improvement to Muni, I remain hopeful that you will again recognize the merits of the project and help us move forward in a positive, constructive way.

Sincerely,

Edward D. Reiskin
Director of Transportation

Encls: FTA Letter on Retrieval Shaft Relocation
Summary of Contract 1300 SBE Outreach

cc: SFMTA Board of Directors
Roberta Boomer, SFMTA Board Secretary
Dennis Herrera, City Attorney
Peter Rogoff, FTA Administrator
Leslie Rodgers, FTA Regional Administrator
James Sampson, PMOC
Calvin L. Scovel III, Office of the Inspector General
Gabriel Metcalf, Executive Director, SPUR
Brett Gladstone, Esq.



U.S. Department
of Transportation
Federal Transit
Administration

REGION IX
Arizona, California,
Hawaii, Nevada, Guam
American Samoa,
Northern Mariana Islands

201 Mission Street
Suite 1650
San Francisco, CA 94105-1839
415-744-3133
415-744-2726 (fax)

MAY 10 2013

Mr. Edward Reiskin
Director of Transportation
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
City and County of San Francisco
One South Van Ness Ave, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Central Subway Project Tunnel Boring Machine
Retrieval Shaft Relocation

Dear Mr. Reiskin:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has completed its review of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA) submission, dated April 17, 2013, detailing the design change involving the relocation of the Tunnel Boring Machine retrieval and extraction site from Columbus Avenue in North Beach to 1731-1741 Powell Street (the Pagoda Theater) for the Central Subway Project (the "Project"). The Project was previously the subject of a Record of Decision dated November 26, 2008. In its letter, SFMTA indicated that neither the preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) nor an Environmental Assessment (EA) is necessary, in accordance with 23 CFR §§ 771.115, 771.119, and 771.130(c), for a design change for the Project.

Based on the environmental re-evaluation materials submitted and past experience with similar projects, FTA finds that the design changes: do not induce significant environmental impacts to planned growth or land use for the area; do not require the relocation of significant numbers of people; do not have a significant impact on natural, cultural, recreational, historical or other resource; do not involve significant air, noise, or water quality impacts; do not have significant impacts on travel patterns; do not result in a use or constructive use of historic or other resources within the meaning of Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act, 49 USC § 303; or do not otherwise, either individually or cumulatively, have any significant environmental impacts.

The FTA determines that the proposed changes are not substantial and with the mitigation specified in the re-evaluation materials, the changes will not cause significant environmental impacts that were not previously evaluated. Therefore, neither the preparation of a SEIS nor an EA is necessary.

If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Alexander Smith at (415) 744-2599.

Sincerely,

Leslie T. Rogers
Regional Administrator

Central Subway Small Business Performance

Contract 1300 Stations, Track and System

- SBE Goal: 20%
- Socially/economically disadvantaged employment opportunities program: \$ 1.5 million set aside
- Construction management trainee program: 40,000 hours
- Trucking/hauling: 50% set-aside
- City Build Program: 50% goal for new hires (each trade)
- Workforce Development Federal Employment Goals:
 - Goal for minority participation in each trade: 25.6%
 - Goal for female participation in each trade: 6.9%

Contract 1300 Outreach

2012

October: Contract 1300 was advertised on October 22, 2012

November: 180 SBE/LBE/DBE firms attended the meet and greet and pre-bid conference held on November 27, 2012

2013

January-March: An additional Small Business Enterprise Meet and Greet was hosted by SFMTA on January 9, 2013

A total of 147,872 communications were sent to SBE/DBE/LBE firms during the months of January, February and March 2013 highlighting Central Subway CN1300 outreach events, workshops, technical assistance and critical information.

Four outreach events were held with each of the respective prime bidding teams, including:

- | | |
|----------------|---------------|
| • Tutor Perini | 92 Attendees |
| • Kiewit | 148 Attendees |
| • Amoroso | 94 Attendees |
| • Skanska | 98 Attendees |

These outreach meetings included presentations by the respective prime bidding teams regarding their:

- Bidding procedures
- Bonding/insurance requirements
- Potential areas for subcontracting
- Contact information
- Information on how to become a part of their internal databases for current/future opportunities

A technical assistance workshop was held on February 14 to assist SBE/DBE/LBE firms in reviewing bid submission documentation to the SFMTA.

Bids opened: April 19, 2013

Organizational Partners/Resources

Outreach to key SBE/DBE/LBE business organizations/resource groups were a key part of the outreach in January, February and March. A total of 92 business organizations/resource agencies were targeted. A partial listing of these groups included:

- Asian American Architects Engineers (AAAE)
- Asian American Contractors Association (AACA)
- Asian Inc.
- Chinatown Community Development Center (CCDC)
- Chinese Chamber Of Commerce
- Chinese for Affirmative Action (CAA)
- Council Of Asian American Business Associations (CAABA)
- Economic Empowerment Fund
- Eddy Lau
- Ella Hill Hutch Community Center
- F.E. Jordan Associates
- Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights
- Mission Economic Development Assn. (MEDA)
- Mission Hiring Hall
- National Association Of Women Business Owners (NAWBO) - S.F. Chapter
- Oakland Black Board of Trade and Commerce
- San Francisco African American Chamber Of Commerce
- San Francisco General Services Agency Contract Monitoring Division
- San Francisco Hispanic Chamber Of Commerce
- Small Business Commission
- Tradeswomen, Inc.

Bid Results: April 19, 2013

- Tutor Perini \$840,067,000
- Amoroso, FCC, Southland JV \$867,777,000
- Skanska, Shimmick, Stacy & Witbeck JV \$945,881,700

Engineer's Estimate: \$720 million to 750 million

Low Bid: Tutor Perini Subcontractors

Business	Location	Amount	Certification
Landavazo Bros.	Hayward	\$7,677,000	DBE
Martinez Steel	Claremont	\$21,690,000	SBE
Wang Technology	San Francisco	\$9,400,000	DBE
Viking Drillers	West Sacramento	\$1,247,000	SBE
Valverde Construction	Santa Fe Springs	\$23,800,000	SBE
Con-Quest	San Francisco	\$17,321,000	LBE/SBE

Meridian Precast	Los Angeles	\$4,224,000	SBE
Waterproofing Express	Canoga Park	\$6,100,000	SBE
Sashco, Inc.	Ontario	\$17,041,000	SBE
Ironwood Commercial	Pleasant Hill	\$7,884,000	SBE
Top End Constructors	Sun Valley	\$3,042,000	SBE
Roadway Engineering	Ceres	\$36,715,000	SBE
Abbett Electrical	San Francisco	\$29,746,000	LBE/SBE
John Jackson Masonry	Sacramento	\$8,000,000	SBE
Quality Engineering	Oakland	\$7,600,000	SBE
G & C Equipment	Gardena	\$5,000,000	SBE
Cody Builders	Austin	\$9,467,000	DBE
Total		\$213,954,000	

Total San Francisco 3 firms

\$56,467,000

Firms that Tutor Perini received bids from:

Category	Bids Accepted From	Selected
QC oversight:	CM Pros Dabri, Inc. Inviro Survey Matriscope Engineering Laboratories, Inc. RES Engineers Signet Testing Labs The Their Group Yolanda's Construction Safety Environmental Consulting	Quality Engineering
Concrete:	K & G Concrete Pumping CalCon Pumping Empire Engineering Associated Concrete Pumping	Landavazo
Concrete Reinforcing:	Empire Engineering Ortiz Construction	Martinez Steel
Geotechnical Instrumentation:	Municon Consultants Analysis and Solutions Mei Wu Acoustics Wilson, Ihrig & Associates	Wang Technology
Transportation /Disposal	Lucky Madrid Team North All City Trucking Dillard Environmental Environmental Construction Foxcover Trucking	S&S Trucking

	Feeney Trucking	
Utilities	Azul Works Anvil Builders Synergy Project management Mitchell Engineering Pacific Engineering Con-Quest Contractors	Valverde Construction
Transportation/Track work	Mitchell Engineering NTK Construction	Con-Quest
Demo/Debris Recovery	Azul Works Synergy Project Management Cook Environmental Environmental Construction	TP Corp
Shotcrete	CalCon Pumping	Superior Gunitite
Masonry	Spencer Masonry	John Jackson Masonry
Structural Steel	Kwon Wo	Cody Builders
Steel/Fabrication	Kwon Wo Forem Metal Tom's Metal Specialties TLK Steel	T&M Manufacturing
Decorative Metal	Kwon Wo T&M Manufacturing	T&M Manufacturing
Thermal/Moisture Pro.	Alcala Company Blue Spader	Waterproofing Experts
Thermoplastic Roofing	Alcala Company Blue Spader	Waterproofing Experts
Flashing/Sheet Metal	Mauck Sheet Metal Alcala Company	Best
Metal Walls Panels	Mauck Sheet Metal	Environmental
Crystallized Glass Wall	John Jackson Masonry	Sashco
Metal Doors/Frames	Jonesmaterials, Inc MK Mill & Fixtures	TP Corp
Overhead Coiling Doors	McKendry Door Sales United California Glass	Smith Company

Overhead Bi-Fold Doors	The Door Company	TP Corp
Glazing	Sashco Valiant Glass	Sashco
Acoustical Vermiculite	Ironwood Commercial	Ironwood
Tiling	California Tile Installers Jones Tile/Superior	KZ Tile
Metal Ceiling Systems	Insulation, Acoustics, Drywall & Plastering	Best
Resinous Matrix Terrazzo	American Terrazzo Associated Terrazzo Jones Tile/Superior	Top End
Painting and Coating	AJS Painting	B&C/Jerry Thompson
Signage	Priority Architectural Industrial Signs A-Plus Signs, Inc.	LaHue Associates
Pest Control Devices	Bird Solutions Bird Away/Pigeons Away	TP Corp
Concrete Paving	Empire Engineering Oliver Transbay DeHaro Ramirez Group	Landavazo
Unit Pavers	European Paving	TP Corp
Planting	RMT Landscape Pacific Engineering Green Growth Industries	TP Corp
Fire Suppression	First Responder Fire Protection	Cosco
Plumbing	Dowdle & Sons	Dessert Mechanical
HVAC	CNS Mechanical	Dessert Mechanical
Electrical	Phoenix Electric	Abbet Electric Roadway Engineering