

**Members of the Board**

Jody Breckenridge, Chair  
Anthony J. Intintoli, Jr.  
Jeffrey DeIBono  
Timothy Donovan

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING**  
*Thursday September 4, 2014 at 1:00 p.m.*  
**San Francisco Bay Area**  
**Water Emergency Transportation Authority**  
9 Pier, Suite 111; San Francisco

*The full agenda packet is available for download at [sanfranciscobayferry.com/weta](http://sanfranciscobayferry.com/weta).*

**AGENDA**

- |   |                         |
|---|-------------------------|
| 1. <u>CALL TO ORDER – BOARD CHAIR</u>   | <i>Information</i>      |
| 2. <u>ROLL CALL/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE</u>  | <i>Information</i>      |
| 3. <u>REPORT OF BOARD CHAIR</u>   | <i>Information</i>      |
| 4. <u>REPORTS OF DIRECTORS</u>  | <i>Information</i>      |
| 5. <u>REPORTS OF STAFF</u>  | <i>Information</i>      |
| a. Executive Director's Report  |                         |
| b. Monthly Review of Financial Statements   |                         |
| c. Legislative Update   |                         |
| 6. <u>CONSENT CALENDAR</u>  | <i>Action</i>           |
| a. Minutes August 20, 2014  |                         |
| 7. <u>ADOPT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE RICHMOND FERRY TERMINAL PROJECT</u>                      | <i>Action</i>           |
| 8. <u>APPROVE FISCAL YEAR 2015-2020 FARE PROGRAM</u>  | <i>Action</i>           |
| 9. <u>DOWNTOWN SAN FRANCISCO FERRY TERMINAL EXPANSION PROJECT UPDATE</u>  | <i>Information</i>      |
| 10. <u>RECESS INTO CLOSED SESSION</u>   |                         |
| a. <u>CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATORS</u>   | <i>Action</i>           |
| Property: Ferry terminal related property   | <i>To Be Determined</i> |
| Agency negotiator: Nina Rannells, San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority   |                         |
| Negotiating parties: Blue and Gold Fleet  |                         |
| Under negotiation: Terms and conditions regarding ferry landing   |                         |
| 11. <u>REPORT OF ACTIVITY IN CLOSED SESSION</u>   | <i>Action</i>           |
| Chair will report any action taken in closed session that is subject to reporting at this time. Action may be taken on matters discussed in closed session. | <i>To Be Determined</i> |

**Water Emergency Transportation Authority**  
**September 4, 2014 Meeting of the Board of Directors**

---

**12. OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

**ADJOURNMENT**

This information will be made available in alternative formats upon request. To request an agenda in an alternative format, please contact the Board Secretary at least five (5) working days prior to the meeting to ensure availability.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS** The Water Emergency Transportation Authority welcomes comments from the public. Speakers' cards and a sign-up sheet are available. Please forward completed speaker cards and any reports/handouts to the Board Secretary.

Non-Agenda Items: A 15 minute period of public comment for non-agenda items will be held at the end of the meeting. Please indicate on your speaker card that you wish to speak on a non-agenda item. No action can be taken on any matter raised during the public comment period. Speakers will be allotted no more than three (3) minutes to speak and will be heard in the order of sign-up.

Agenda Items: Speakers on individual agenda items will be called in order of sign-up after the discussion of each agenda item and will be allotted no more than three (3) minutes to speak. You are encouraged to submit public comments in writing to be distributed to all Directors.

Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA) meetings are wheelchair accessible. Upon request WETA will provide written agenda materials in appropriate alternative formats to individuals with disabilities. Please send a written request to [contactus@watertransit.org](mailto:contactus@watertransit.org) or call (415) 291-3377 at least five (5) days before the meeting.

**Participation in a meeting may be available at one or more locations remote from the primary location of the meeting. See the header of this Agenda for possible teleconference locations. In such event, the teleconference location or locations will be fully accessible to members of the public. Members of the public who attend the meeting at a teleconference location will be able to hear the meeting and testify in accordance with applicable law and WETA policies.**

Under Cal. Gov't. Code sec. 84308, Directors are reminded that they must disclose on the record of the proceeding any contributions received from any party or participant in the proceeding in the amount of more than \$250 within the preceding 12 months. Further, no Director shall make, participate in making, or in any way attempt to influence the decision in the proceeding if the Director has willfully or knowingly received a contribution in an amount of more than \$250 within the preceding 12 months from a party or such party's agent, or from any participant or his or her agent, provided, however, that the Director knows or has reason to know that the participant has a financial interest in the decision. For further information, Directors are referred to Government Code section 84308 and to applicable regulations.

**M E M O R A N D U M**

TO: WETA Board Members

FROM: Nina Rannells, Executive Director

DATE: September 4, 2014

RE: Executive Director's Report

**PROJECT UPDATES**

**Ferry Terminal Refurbishment Projects** – This effort includes gangway rehabilitation and minor terminal facility improvement projects that support the continued safe operation of East Bay ferry terminals (Alameda Main Street, Harbor Bay, and Oakland Clay Street Jack London Square) and includes a variety of work ranging from pier piling replacement to repairing walkways and awnings.

The Board of Directors awarded a contract to Manson Construction Co. on March 31 to undertake the majority of the project work, including construction of improvements at Harbor Bay and Clay Street. Staff has executed a contract with Manson Construction Co. and issued a Notice to Proceed with design and construction of the project. Project design drawings for Harbor Bay and Clay Street are 100% complete.

**Regional Passenger Float Construction** – This project will construct a new regional spare float that can be utilized as a backup for the Vallejo terminal float as well as other terminal sites such as downtown San Francisco when the permanent terminal floats must undergo periodic dry-dock, inspection, and repair. This spare would support ongoing daily services and would be a valuable asset to have available for use in unplanned or emergency conditions. Ghirardelli Associates Inc. was selected as the project Construction Manager. Procurement of the passenger float construction contract was combined with the North Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility Project construction contract. The Request for Proposals for the project was released on February 28 and the construction contract was awarded to Dutra Construction on July 10, 2014. The contract was executed in July 2014. Final design work is underway with construction of the float anticipate to commence in December 2014.

**Bay Breeze Vessel Refurbishment** – The ferry vessel *Bay Breeze* has surpassed its economic mid-life. This project consists of converting the propulsion to a conventional propeller system, refurbishment of the passenger cabin, extensive hull work, major system renovation, and replacement of control systems and navigation electronics. In March 2013 the Board of Directors approved the contract award to Marine Group Boat Works. The *Bay Breeze* arrived at the Shipyard on April 18, 2013 and the project is near completion. Sea trials have been completed and the *Bay Breeze* returned to San Francisco on May 29. Outfitting, crew training and U.S.C.G. inspections have occurred. The project is complete and the *Bay Breeze* is in service.

**Vessel Replacement** –The *Encinal* and *Harbor Bay Express II* are included in the FY 2013/14 Capital Budget for replacement as they have reached the end of their useful lives (generally 25 years) and staff has secured funding commitments for replacement vessels. In December 2013, the Board of Directors approved the contract award to Aurora Marine Design (AMD) for vessel construction management services. A kickoff meeting was held in January to establish project requirements. As part of the bid document development, staff and AMD have met with major propulsion vendors to gain information to develop a database of powering options and emissions tier specifications. To ensure we are able to attract the greatest number of bidders, AMD has conducted surveys with relevant shipyards to determine which, if any, contract requirements are too restrictive which may prevent vendors from bidding on the projects. Staff and AMD have interviewed other water transit agencies for lessons learned from recent vessel

construction projects. Staff has met with Blue & Gold Fleet operations and engineering staff to receive input on vessel design and layout. The RFP vessel procurement package is being finalized.

**Clipper Fare Media Implementation** – Clipper is currently available as fare payment media for the Alameda/Oakland/South San Francisco, Alameda/Oakland/San Francisco, and Alameda Harbor Bay/San Francisco routes. Clipper will be available for the Vallejo ferry service in November 2014, pending Board approval of Clipper fares set forth in the proposed final FY 2015-2020 Fare Program.

Staff is also participating in a long-term strategic planning effort initiated by MTC and transit operators for the Clipper program. Items under consideration include potential changes to the contracting model and governance structure through which the current Clipper program is delivered. A regional recommendation is expected pending future discussions and development of a strategic plan.

**North Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility** – This project will construct a new ferry maintenance facility located at Building 165 on Mare Island in Vallejo in two phases. The landside phase includes site preparation and construction of a new fuel storage and delivery system along with warehouse and maintenance space. The waterside phase will construct a system of modular floats and piers, gangways, and over-the-water utilities. The existing ferry maintenance facility (Building 477) will be cleaned up as required prior to surrender to Lennar Mare Island, the property owner of the land portion of the project site.

The Board of Directors awarded the contract for the landside phase to West Bay Builders in summer 2013. The design/build team has submitted building permit materials to the City of Vallejo for review. The first building permit is anticipated to be issued in July 2014.

The NEPA environmental review work for the Navy waterside portion is underway on behalf of the Navy. The Navy must complete this documentation prior to entering into a lease with WETA to use the waterside portion of the site. The Draft NEPA Environmental Assessment (EA) was published for public and agency review on August 22, 2014. The review period extends for a 15-day period. After the review period closes, staff will coordinate with the Navy to address any comments received and finalize the NEPA documentation. All required permits for the waterside construction phase of the project have been received.

On August 24, 2014, the northern San Francisco Bay Area was struck by Magnitude 6.0 earthquake. The earthquake caused significant damage in southern Napa County and the City of Vallejo. Many buildings on Mare Island suffered significant damage. The landside portion of the maintenance facility project was damaged. Staff is working with the Design Build team and Lennar Mare Island to assess the damage and develop a work plan for repair.

**Central Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility** – This project will develop an operations and maintenance facility at Alameda Point to serve as the base for WETA's existing and future central bay ferry fleet. The proposed project would provide running maintenance services such as fueling, engine oil changes, concession supply, and light repair work for WETA vessels. The new facility will also serve as WETA's Operations Control Center for day-to-day management and oversight of service, crew, and facilities. In the event of a regional emergency, the facility would function as an Emergency Operations Center, serving passengers and sustaining water transit service for emergency response and recovery.

Staff is working with BCDC, the US Army Corps of Engineers, and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to secure the remaining permits required for the project. Staff is also working with the City of Alameda to finalize terms of a lease agreement for the project site, which will be presented to the Board for consideration at a future meeting.

**Richmond Ferry Service** – This service will provide an alternative transportation link between Richmond and downtown San Francisco. The conceptual design includes plans for replacement of an existing facility (float and gangway) and a phased parking plan.

The CEQA Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) was released on May 6. The Initial Study identified potentially significant effects; however, the implementation of mitigation measures identified in the IS/MND would reduce potentially significant effects to less-than-significant levels. In accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, a 30-day public and agency review period for the IS/MND commenced on May 6 and concluded on June 4. The WETA Board of Directors will consider Adoption of the MND at the September 2014 Board meeting. Staff is also working with City of Richmond staff to develop a Project Agreement that defines project service levels and identifies capital and operating funding through a project funding plan.

**Berkeley Ferry Service** – This service will provide an alternative transportation link between Berkeley and downtown San Francisco. The environmental and conceptual design work includes plans for shared use of an existing City owned parking lot at the terminal site between ferry and local restaurant (H<sup>s</sup> Lordships) patrons. City participation is required in order to move the project forward and reach agreement on a shared use concept. The project will require a conditional use permit reviewed by the City's Planning Commission, Zoning Adjustment Board, and City Council. Similar to Richmond, a Memorandum of Understanding defining the project and identifying funding sources will also be developed for adoption by the City Council and WETA Board.

The Final EIS/EIR was submitted to FTA review in early October 2012. The remaining activities include resolution of Section 7 consultation and Essential Fish Habitat Assessment with NOAA and NMFS. NOAA and NMFS will issue a Biological Opinion (BiOp) on the project. The BiOp is required prior to completion of the Final EIS/EIR.

**Treasure Island Service** – This project, which will be implemented by the Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA), the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (acting in its capacity as the Treasure Island Mobility Management Authority) and the prospective developer, will institute new ferry service to be operated by WETA between Treasure Island and downtown San Francisco in connection with the planned Treasure Island Development Project. The development agreement states that ferry operations would commence with the completion of the 50<sup>th</sup> residential unit.

WETA staff is working cooperatively with City staff on this City-led project and participating in regular meetings of the Technical Advisory Committee convened to update and further develop the Treasure Island Mobility Management Program. Staff expects to begin negotiation of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the City that would set forth the terms and conditions under which WETA would operate the future Treasure Island ferry service. The finalization and execution of an MOA for the Treasure Island service would be subject to future consideration by the WETA Board.

**Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project** – This project will expand berthing capacity at the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal in order to support new and existing ferry services to San Francisco as set forth in WETA's Implementation and Operations Plan. The proposed project would also include landside improvements needed to accommodate expected increases in ridership and to support emergency response capabilities. Upon request from the FTA, this project has been included in the Federal Infrastructure Projects Permitting Dashboard, an initiative of the Federal Transit Administration to expedite federal permitting processes for nationally or regionally significant projects.

A Notice of Availability for the Final EIS/EIR and FTA's Record of Decision will be published in the Federal Register on September 5, 2014. The WETA Board is anticipated to consider certification of the Final EIR at its regularly scheduled meeting in October. An item providing an informational update on this project is included in this month's Board meeting agenda.

**Hercules Environmental Review/Conceptual Design** – The Hercules Intermodal Transportation Terminal will bring together multiple modes of travel at a strategic waterfront location adjacent to future

development in Hercules. A ferry terminal is one component of the project, now considered in a later phase of implementation after the construction of parking and rail improvements. As planning and funding activities are underway for the Intermodal Transportation Center, the Contra Costa County Transportation Authority has developed a Financial Feasibility of Contra Costa Ferry Service Report (White Paper) to assess the feasibility and priority of new ferry services considered in Contra Costa County.

**Antioch, Martinez and Redwood City Ferry Service Projects** – These projects require conceptual design, project feasibility, and environmental review for potential future ferry services to the cities of Antioch, Martinez, and Redwood City. Draft site feasibility reports have been prepared and distributed to the cities for review. The feasibility reports were prepared to identify site constraints and design requirements to better understand project feasibility and cost. Staff is working with the Contra Costa County Transportation Authority, as the county transportation planning and funding authority, on determining next steps for the Contra Costa ferry services under development.

**Contra Costa County Ferry Subcommittee** – Staff is working with the Contra Costa County Transportation Authority (CCTA) and representatives from the cities of Antioch, Martinez, Hercules and Richmond to study implementation of ferry expansion services in Contra Costa County. A White Paper evaluating the financial feasibility of candidate Contra Costa County ferry services was recently completed in draft form. Results of this study will inform stakeholders on specific site and service details for discussion and development of a countywide approach to developing services and funding support. The subcommittee met in April 2014 to review the paper's final findings and discuss next steps for releasing the paper to the CCTA Board and general public. CCTA is leading this effort and the CCTA Board considered the findings of the White Paper at their meeting on June 18 and released the report to the public.

**Alameda Terminals Access Study** – Both ferry terminals in Alameda have experienced a surge in ridership beginning with the first BART strike in July 2013. As a result, parking at both terminals typically spills onto adjacent streets and informal parking lots. WETA will partner with the City of Alameda staff to prepare plans to address the immediate issue and identify long term solutions. Staff has secured the consultant services of Nelson Nygaard through its on-call planning agreement with KPFF, Inc. to support the project.

Staff has concluded its initial outreach efforts, including a series of public workshops, coordination with AC Transit, and an informational presentation to the City of Alameda's Transportation Commission. A draft study is being prepared and will be released for public comment this fall. The study will include preliminary access improvement recommendations and funding strategies for each terminal. Pending public comments received on the draft study, a final draft will be prepared and presented to the Board at a future meeting.

**Alameda Seaplane Lagoon** - The City of Alameda has proposed a new ferry terminal located on the Alameda Point property, the former Alameda Naval Air Station Base. WETA staff is meeting monthly with staff from the cities of Alameda and Oakland along with the Port of Oakland to prepare an operational study of Seaplane Lagoon. The goal of the study is to identify the range of service alternatives for ferry service in the central bay considering terminals at Seaplane Lagoon, Main Street and/or Clay Street in Oakland. The costs, service quality and ridership implications of each service scenario will be estimated. The operational study will ultimately feed into a concept engineering study that will estimate capital costs and permitting requirements for a new facility.

**Fare Policy Study** – The purpose of this study is to review WETA's fare schedule and policy and evaluate options for adopting a multi-year fare program. The study will consider modifications that would promote greater consistency among fare categories, fare products, and discount pricing available on WETA services. Additionally, the fare program will propose a mechanism by which future changes to WETA fares are made. WETA has enlisted CH2M Hill through its on-call planning agreement with Jacobs Engineering to provide consultant services to support the project.

The Board will consider an action item on this month's meeting agenda requesting approval of the proposed final FY 2015-2020 Fare Program developed and vetted with the public over the past several months. Pending approval by the Board, all changes outlined by the Fare Program for FY 2015 would be implemented in November 2014. The first year of the proposed five-year fare increase, which includes new fares for FY 2016, would be implemented in July 2015.

**Electronic Bicycle Locker Program** – This project would expand the availability of secure bicycle parking throughout the WETA system to promote bicycle access to ferry terminals and potentially reduce bicycle congestion on-board ferry vessels. WETA currently provides electronic bicycle lockers at its South San Francisco and Harbor Bay ferry terminals and intends to provide similar lockers at each of its origin terminals. In June 2014 WETA received a \$50,000 grant from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) Transportation Fund for Clean Air program for installation of electronic bicycle lockers at the Alameda Main Street and Vallejo ferry terminals.

#### **UPDATE ON RELEVANT PROJECTS IMPLEMENTED BY OTHER AGENCIES**

**Warriors Arena/Mission Bay Ferry Terminal** – The Golden State Warriors basketball team has identified a preferred arena site at the foot of 16<sup>th</sup> Street in the Mission Bay neighborhood of San Francisco. A Mission Bay ferry terminal has been identified in both WETA and City of San Francisco planning documents as a potential future infrastructure investment. WETA staff will continue to coordinate with the Warriors, the Port of San Francisco, and the City of San Francisco along with other relevant stakeholders to integrate the development of the project with existing and/or future WETA ferry services to San Francisco as opportunities present themselves.

**Vallejo Station** – Vallejo Station is a compact, transit-oriented mixed-use project in the City of Vallejo that includes two major transit elements – a bus transfer facility that consolidates local, regional, and commuter bus services and a 1,200 space parking garage for ferry patrons and the general public. The first phase of the Vallejo Station Parking Structure, which included a 750 space paid parking structure, was opened in October 2012. Construction of Phase 2 of this facility is dependent upon the City securing funding and the relocation of the U.S. Post Office.

#### **OPERATIONS REPORT**

The Monthly Operating Statistics Report for July 2014 is provided as Attachment 1.

## Attachment 1

### Monthly Operating Statistics Report July 14

			Alameda/ Oakland	Harbor Bay	South San Francisco	Vallejo*	Systemwide
Ridership	vs. last month	Total Passengers July 2014	98,329	22,110	8,042	89,074	217,555
		Total Passengers June 2014	84,052	20,467	7,740	80,885	193,144
		Percent change	16.99%	8.03%	3.90%	10.12%	12.64%
	vs. same month last year	Total Passengers July 2014	98,329	22,110	8,042	89,074	217,555
		Total Passengers July 2013 **	120,179	24,622	7,682	86,787	239,270
		Percent change	-18.18%	-10.20%	4.69%	2.64%	-9.08%
	vs. prior FY to date	Total Passengers Current FY To Date	98,329	22,110	8,042	89,074	217,555
		Total Passengers Last FY To Date	120,179	24,622	7,682	86,787	239,270
		Percent change	-18.18%	-10.20%	4.69%	2.64%	-9.08%
			Avg Weekday Ridership July 2014	3,092	1,005	366	3,120
Ops Stats	Passengers Per Hour		208	168	56	133	153
	Revenue Hours		472	132	144	670	1,418
	Revenue Miles		5,999	2,976	2,206	18,322	29,503

\* Vallejo ridership includes ferry + 3928 Route 200 bus passengers.

\*\* Includes ridership from BART strike July 1-5, 2013



MEMORANDUM

**TO: Board Members**

**FROM: Nina Rannells, Executive Director  
Lynne Yu, Manager, Finance & Grants**

**SUBJECT: Monthly Review of FY 2014/15 Financial Statements for One Month  
Ending July 31, 2014**

**Recommendation**

There is no recommendation associated with this informational item.

**Summary**

This report provides the attached FY 2014/15 Financial Statements for one month ending July 31, 2014.

**Operating Budget vs. Actual**

	Prior Actual *	Current Budget	Current Actual
<b>Revenues - Year To Date:</b>			
Fare Revenue	1,623,566	1,208,808	1,439,242
Local Bridge Toll Revenue	950,421	1,553,250	1,056,665
Other Revenue	-	-	500
<b>Total Operating Revenues</b>	<b>2,573,988</b>	<b>2,762,058</b>	<b>2,496,407</b>
<b>Expenses - Year To Date:</b>			
Planning & Administration	141,513	250,000	138,772
Ferry Services	2,432,475	2,512,058	2,357,635
<b>Total Operatings Expenses</b>	<b>2,573,988</b>	<b>2,762,058</b>	<b>2,496,407</b>
<b>System-Wide Farebox Recovery %</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>61%</b>

\* Prior Actual includes additional ferry services operated during the 7/1 to 7/4/2013 BART Strike.

**Capital Actual and % of Total Budget**

	YTD Actual	% of FY 2014/15 Budget
<b>Revenues:</b>		
Federal Funds	21,931	0.13%
State Funds	726,140	3.31%
Bridge Toll Revenues	7,655	0.14%
Other Local Funds	3,810	0.10%
<b>Total Capital Revenues</b>	<b>759,537</b>	<b>1.60%</b>
<b>Expenses:</b>		
<b>Total Capital Expenses</b>	<b>759,537</b>	<b>1.60%</b>

**Fiscal Impact**

There is no fiscal impact associated with this informational item.

\*\*\*END\*\*\*

**San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority**  
**FY 2014/15 Statement of Revenues and Expenses**  
**For One Month Ending 7/31/2014**

% of Year Elapsed 8.5%

	Current Month Jul-14	Year - To - Date			Total	
		FY2013/14 Actual	FY 2014/15 Budget	FY 2014/15 Actual	FY 2014/15 Budget	% of Budget
<b>OPERATING EXPENSES</b>						
<b><u>PLANNING &amp; GENERAL ADMIN:</u></b>						
Wages and Fringe Benefits	102,889	93,818	120,083	102,889	1,441,000	7.1%
Services	14,349	24,210	135,000	14,349	1,620,000	0.9%
Materials and Supplies	258	1,185	3,083	258	37,000	0.7%
Utilities	(265)	457	1,750	(265)	21,000	-1.3%
Insurance	18,335	16,370	1,583	18,335	19,000	96.5%
Miscellaneous	4,478	8,600	9,167	4,478	110,000	4.1%
Leases and Rentals	22,904	22,102	23,833	22,904	286,000	8.0%
Admin Overhead Expense Transfer	(24,177)	(25,229)	(44,500)	(24,177)	(534,000)	4.5%
<b>Sub-Total Planning &amp; Gen Admin</b>	<b>138,772</b>	<b>141,513</b>	<b>250,000</b>	<b>138,772</b>	<b>3,000,000</b>	<b>4.6%</b>
<b><u>FERRY OPERATIONS:</u></b>						
<b><u>Harbor Bay FerryService</u></b>						
Purchased Transportation	122,493	113,771	146,042	122,493	1,752,500	7.0%
Fuel - Diesel & Urea	42,336	46,756	49,300	42,336	591,600	7.2%
Other Direct Operating Expenses	26,596	24,990	52,808	26,596	633,700	4.2%
Admin Overhead Expense Transfer	4,506	5,260	9,750	4,506	117,000	3.9%
<b>Sub-Total Harbor Bay</b>	<b>195,930</b>	<b>190,777</b>	<b>257,900</b>	<b>195,930</b>	<b>3,094,800</b>	<b>6.3%</b>
<b>Farebox Recovery</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>40%</b>	
<b><u>Alameda/Oakland Ferry Service</u></b>						
Purchased Transportation	474,105	501,291	369,208	474,105	4,430,500	10.7%
Fuel - Diesel & Urea	151,795	162,999	153,925	151,795	1,847,100	8.2%
Other Direct Operating Expenses	67,339	119,555	103,083	67,339	1,237,000	5.4%
Admin Overhead Expense Transfer	9,357	9,266	17,417	9,357	209,000	4.5%
<b>Sub-Total Alameda/Oakland</b>	<b>702,595</b>	<b>793,111</b>	<b>643,633</b>	<b>702,595</b>	<b>7,723,600</b>	<b>9.1%</b>
<b>Farebox Recovery</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>56%</b>	
<b><u>Vallejo FerryService</u></b>						
Purchased Transportation	660,504	636,314	623,492	660,504	7,481,900	8.8%
Fuel - Diesel & Urea	455,549	479,672	531,250	455,549	6,375,000	7.1%
Other Direct Operating Expenses	89,810	81,360	132,475	89,810	1,589,700	5.6%
Admin Overhead Expense Transfer	4,538	5,326	6,083	4,538	73,000	6.2%
<b>Sub-Total Vallejo</b>	<b>1,210,401</b>	<b>1,202,672</b>	<b>1,293,300</b>	<b>1,210,401</b>	<b>15,519,600</b>	<b>7.8%</b>
<b>Farebox Recovery</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>54%</b>	
<b><u>South San Francisco FerryService</u></b>						
Purchased Transportation	152,728	160,492	181,150	152,728	2,173,800	7.0%
Fuel - Diesel & Urea	59,280	57,682	67,417	59,280	809,000	7.3%
Other Direct Operating Expenses	30,925	22,363	57,408	30,925	688,900	4.5%
Admin Overhead Expense Transfer	5,776	5,377	11,250	5,776	135,000	4.3%
<b>Sub-Total South San Francisco</b>	<b>248,709</b>	<b>245,914</b>	<b>317,225</b>	<b>248,709</b>	<b>3,806,700</b>	<b>6.5%</b>
<b>Farebox Recovery</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>14%</b>	
<b>Total Operating Expenses</b>	<b>2,496,407</b>	<b>2,573,988</b>	<b>2,762,058</b>	<b>2,496,407</b>	<b>33,144,700</b>	<b>7.5%</b>
<b>OPERATING REVENUES</b>						
Fare Revenue	1,439,242	1,623,566	1,208,808	1,439,242	14,505,700	9.9%
Local - Bridge Toll	1,056,665	950,421	1,553,250	1,056,665	18,639,000	5.7%
Local - Other Revenue	500	-	-	500	-	0%
<b>Total Operating Revenues</b>	<b>2,496,407</b>	<b>2,573,988</b>	<b>2,762,058</b>	<b>2,496,407</b>	<b>33,144,700</b>	<b>7.5%</b>

**San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority**  
**FY 2014/15 Statement of Revenues and Expenses**  
**For One Month Ending 7/31/2014**

Project Description	Current Month	Project Budget	Prior Year Actual	FY 2014/15 Budget <sup>2</sup>	FY 2014/15 Actual	Future Year	% of Total Project Budget
<b>CAPITAL EXPENSES</b>							
<b>FACILITIES:</b>							
<b>Maintenance and Operations Facilities</b>							
North Bay Operations & Maintenance Facility	706,853	28,500,000	5,132,061	19,130,939	706,853	4,237,000	20%
Central Bay Operations & Maintenance Facility	6,704	38,000,000	1,228,371	5,750,629	6,704	31,021,000	3%
<b>Float Rehabilitation</b>							
Regional Spare Float Replacement <sup>1</sup>	-	3,862,000	58,976	2,965,024	-	838,000	2%
<b>Gangway, Pier &amp; Terminal Improvement</b>							
Clipper Site preparation - Vallejo	-	300,000	148,695	151,305	-	-	50%
East Bay Ferry Terminal Refurbishment	22,163	2,595,400	341,509	2,253,891	22,163	-	14%
Electronic Bicycle Lockers	-	79,500	-	79,500	-	-	0%
Channel Dredging - Vallejo	869	1,200,000	-	75,000	869	1,125,000	0%
<b>FERRY VESSELS:</b>							
<b>Major Component Rehabilitation / Replacement</b>							
Vessel Engine Overhaul - Solano	-	2,000,000	699,042	1,240,958	-	60,000	35%
Major Component Rehab - Pisces	-	200,000	-	200,000	-	-	0%
<b>Vessel Mid-Life Repower/Refurbishment</b>							
Vessel Mid-Life Refurbishment - Bay Breeze	1,061	5,015,000	4,738,923	276,077	1,061	-	95%
Vessel Mid-Life Refurbishment - Peralta	-	5,260,000	-	1,010,000	-	4,250,000	0%
<b>Vessel Expansion/Replacement</b>							
Purchase Replacement Vessel - Express II & Encinal	10,582	33,500,000	50,568	9,949,432	10,582	23,500,000	0%
Purchase Replacement Vessel - Vallejo	-	20,000,000	-	200,000	-	19,800,000	0%
<b>CAPITAL EQUIPMENT / OTHER:</b>							
Purchase 18-Tone Crane Truck	-	175,000	-	175,000	-	-	0%
Purchase Work Skiff	-	100,000	-	100,000	-	-	0%
<b>SERVICE EXPANSION:</b>							
<b>Future Expansion Service Studies</b>							
Berkeley Terminal - Environ/Concept Design	1,199	2,335,000	2,183,016	151,984	1,199	-	94%
Antioch - Environ/Concept Design	218	812,500	146,198	25,002	218	641,300	18%
Martinez - Environ/Concept Design	-	812,500	164,894	25,006	-	622,600	20%
S.F. Berthing Expansion - Environ/Concept Design	3,868	3,300,000	2,581,846	718,154	3,868	-	78%
<b>Terminal/Berthing Expansion Construction</b>							
SSF Terminal Oyster Mitigation Study	-	275,000	83,330	191,670	-	-	30%
S.F. Berthing Expansion - Final Design	-	3,745,000	-	1,872,500	-	1,872,500	0%
Richmond Ferry Terminal	6,018	1,862,500	559,294	1,040,706	6,018	262,500	30%
<b>Total Capital Expenses</b>	<b>759,537</b>	<b>153,929,400</b>	<b>18,116,723</b>	<b>47,582,777</b>	<b>759,537</b>	<b>88,229,900</b>	
<b>CAPITAL REVENUES</b>							
Federal Funds	21,931	63,068,919	6,622,379	16,459,330	21,931	38,421,985	11%
State Funds	726,140	48,634,926	8,146,559	21,924,882	726,140	38,239,042	18%
Local - Bridge Toll	7,655	36,193,071	2,456,805	5,489,455	7,655	10,268,872	7%
Local - Alameda Sales Tax Measure B	3,810	4,682,484	890,980	3,659,111	3,810	-	19%
Local - San Francisco Sales Tax Prop K	-	1,300,000	-	-	-	1,300,000	0%
Local - Transportation Funds for Clean Air	-	50,000	-	50,000	-	-	0%
<b>Total Capital Revenues</b>	<b>759,537</b>	<b>153,929,400</b>	<b>18,116,723</b>	<b>47,582,777</b>	<b>759,537</b>	<b>88,229,900</b>	

<sup>1</sup> Board approved Project Budget increase of \$562,000, from \$3,300,000 to \$3,862,000, in July 2014.

<sup>2</sup> FY2014/15 Budget includes 1) adjustments to reflect actual FY2013/14 expenditures, and 2) carry over of projects not yet completed.

MEMORANDUM

---

**TO:** Board Members

**FROM:** Peter Friedmann, WETA Federal Legislative Representative  
Ray Bucheger, WETA Federal Legislative Representative

**SUBJECT:** WETA Federal Legislative Board Report – August 28, 2014

After a month-long August recess, Congress returns after Labor Day to a very full agenda. Unfortunately, Congress will only be in Session for three weeks in September, then will be in recess until after the midterm elections in November. There is an awful lot to do in those few weeks, including passing a budget to allow the federal government to continue functioning beyond September 30. Also urgent is the need to pass the so-called “tax extenders”, which include provisions ranging from commuter tax credit that will benefit many of WETA’s ferryboat riders, to international trade provisions that impact commerce moving through Bay Area ports.

***Reauthorizing MAP – 21: The Politics of Funding Transportation Infrastructure***

Of particular interest to WETA is the work being done amongst Members of Congress and in key Congressional Committees on the reauthorization of the transportation bill, also known as MAP – 21. MAP – 21 was set to expire at the end of September, but since our transportation funding mechanism, the federal Highway Trust Fund, funded by the per-gallon federal gasoline tax, is bankrupt, there was not even enough money in the trust fund to pay for maintaining existing highways, bridges and transit through the end of the current fiscal year. Congress had to step in and allocate additional funds, out of general Treasury revenues.

It is becoming painfully clear that as federal gas tax revenues continue to decline, a new funding source must be found. With the country becoming more urbanized, driving fewer miles on highways, in more efficient fuel efficient vehicles, and getting out of cars entirely to ride transit (including ferryboats), the current gasoline tax no longer generates sufficient revenue.

The problem is identifying a new funding source that is politically acceptable. Most experts agree that really the only way to achieve the required funding is to increase the federal gasoline tax by another \$.12 per gallon. A Republican senator and a Democratic senator have teamed up to offer exactly such a proposal. Three presidential commissions, and at least privately, most members of Congress, agree that increasing the gas tax must happen. However, most members of Congress, as well as the President, are unwilling to support this, and in fact clearly oppose such an increase, at least in the months leading up to the elections. In fact, there has been a lack of congressional and presidential courage in increasing the gas tax, ever since 1992. Other proposals have been floated, such as diverting customs duties on imports, to pay for freight transportation infrastructure.

***Congress Kicks the MAP-21 Can Down the Road***

In order to avoid facing making a decision, Congress did what it does so frequently – kicked the can down the road. So now, the federal Highway program is extended until May, 2015, to be funded by a patchwork of imagined future revenues. While increasing the gas tax will not occur during the brief September session, there is the possibility of that occurring during the lame-duck, after the November 4 elections. If such an increase were to be enacted, there would be adequate

funds for highways bridges and transit programs, including those which fund ferryboat Infrastructure.

***Substantive Work Continues – Efforts to Direct Additional Funding to Ferries***

Even though Congress is avoiding the funding question, work does continue on the substance of MAP – 21 such as developing a new funding mechanism for ferryboats. We continue to work with other ferry systems which are more passenger – centric, and thus are currently not receiving their fair share of ferryboat formula grants. The current FHWA administered ferry formula grant system gives preference to ferry systems which have long mileage of routes (such as the Alaska system with routes that are hundreds of miles long) or ferry systems that carry many vehicles (such as Washington State and Alaska). The lowest priority under this FHWA ferry grant program is given to systems which carry only passengers, on relatively short routes. Chief among these would be the Staten Island New York ferry and San Francisco ferries. We are working in concert with NYC to make this federal formula grant ferry program more equitable, and thus generate a more dependable revenue for WETA and other similarly situated systems.

Fortunately the other federal ferry program is not formula based, but need-based, managed by the Federal Transit Administration which we believe better understands the needs of congested urban areas for ferry transit service. WETA was been successful in obtaining a \$3 million grant earlier this year, under this FTA program.

Our objective is to significantly increase the funds available for this FTA program and to convert it into a formula program that would provide a counterbalance to the FHWA program, by prioritizing systems carrying passengers-only, in congested urban areas. This work will continue very actively in September and October, as Congress recognizes that MAP – 21 needs not only a dependable funding base , but substantive improvements.

\*\*\*END\*\*\*

**SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA WATER EMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**  
**MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING**

*(August 20, 2014)*

The Board of Directors of the San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority met in regular session at the WETA offices at Pier 9, Suite 111, San Francisco, CA.

**1. ROLL CALL AND CALL TO ORDER**

Acting Chair Anthony Intintoli called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. Other directors present were Director Jeff DelBono and Director Timothy Donovan. Chair Intintoli led the pledge of allegiance.

**2. REPORT OF BOARD CHAIR**

No report.

**3. REPORT OF DIRECTORS**

No reports.

**4. REPORTS OF STAFF**

Executive Director Nina Rannells referred the Board to her written report and offered to field questions.

Ms. Rannells then noted the return of the ferry *Bay Breeze* to service and introduced Todd Roberts of Marine Group, who performed its half-life refurbishment. Mr. Roberts presented WETA with a water-jet cut representation of *Bay Breeze* created using aluminum left over from the refurbishment project. He also thanked Manager of Operations Keith Stahnke and Charlie Walther of Walther Engineering for their oversight over the course of the project.

Director Donovan asked Mr. Stahnke a question regarding a comment about Aurora Marine Design's shipyard surveys in the report, asking for details on what contract requirements would be considered "too restrictive". Mr. Stahnke replied that certain requirements may be challenging for some shipyards to meet, citing an example that if WETA required that a shipyard demonstrate that they had built 20 similar vessels that few yards would be able meet that requirement and may limit the number of proposals WETA could anticipate receiving.

**5. PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED FINAL FY 2015-2020 FARE PROGRAM PURPOSE**

Chair Intintoli opened a Public Hearing for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2015-2020 Fare Program at 1:07 p.m. He asked that speakers clearly state their name and city of residence for the record and keep their comments to three minutes or less.

Senior Planner Michael Gougherty presented an overview of the 2015-2020 Fare Program. He noted that this was the last of five public hearings after a 60-day public outreach program which included distribution of notices onboard the ferries as well as on WETA's and San Francisco Bay Ferry's websites, social media, BayAlerts, and email lists, all encouraging riders to review the proposed program and provide comments. He noted that 46 comments had been received to date and that several changes had been made to the final proposed program as a result.

Chair Intintoli asked if it was correct that no fare changes would be implemented until July 1, 2015. Mr. Gougherty replied that no base fare increases would occur until that date but that on adoption of the fare program 1) the age for senior fares on the Harbor Bay service would increase from 62 to 65 to make the senior age consistent system-wide, and 2) other changes would result in fare decreases.

---

Chair Intintoli expressed concern regarding the change to the Harbor Bay senior category and asked if there was a way to make the change more gradual.

Chair Intintoli also asked about fees for school groups, noting that a \$2 fare was noted for the Alameda/Oakland service but not for the others. Mr. Gougherty said that this fare would be open to further definition at a later date. Manager of Planning and Development Kevin Connolly agreed that it would be discussed at a later date and that this fare program also omitted other special fares such as service to AT&T Park. Mr. Connolly said that any policies regarding the ballpark fares would be brought to the Board for discussion prior to any changes.

Director Donovan agreed that the Harbor Bay senior fare should be phased in over several years if possible. He then asked if school groups impacted commuter services. Manager of Public Information and Marketing Ernest Sanchez said that school groups could only reserve space after the morning commute and must depart on the 1:45 ferry from Pier 41.

Director Donovan then asked about transfers and asked if BART had been approached. Mr. Connolly replied no, stating that feeder services had been the primary objectives and that BART was largely a parallel service. Mr. Rannells added that it was her understanding that BART did not offer inter-agency transfer discounts, but that MTC would soon be looking at ways to improve inter-agency connectivity region-wide as part of the launch of the next iteration of Clipper. Mr. Connolly said that he looked forward to increased coordination with BART.

Chair Intintoli asked if the Vallejo monthly pass would continue to be usable on the Route 200 bus service. Mr. Gougherty said that it would be.

No public comments were offered and Chair Intintoli closed the hearing at 1:25 p.m.

## **6. CONSENT CALENDAR**

Director DelBono made a motion to approve the consent calendar which included:

- 1) The Board of Directors meeting minutes of July 10, 2014
- 2) Authorization of the Filing of Applications for Federal Transit Administration Formula Program Funds to Support Various Capital Projects
- 3) Authorization Execution of an Agreement with Solano County Transit for the Purpose of Receiving Public Transportation Modernization Improvement and Service Enhancement Account Funds

Director Donovan seconded the motion and the consent calendar carried unanimously.

Yeas: DelBono, Donovan, Intintoli. Nays: None.

## **7. ADOPT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE RICHMOND FERRY TERMINAL PROJECT**

Chair Intintoli noted that this item would be pulled from the agenda. Director DelBono made a motion to continue to the September meeting, Director Donovan seconded the motion.

Yeas: DelBono, Donovan, Intintoli. Nays: None.

## **8. APPROVE CONTRACT AWARD TO CS MARINE CONSTRUCTORS, INC. FOR MARINE CONSTRUCTION SERVICES FOR THE ALAMEDA MAIN STREET FERRY FLOAT RELOCATION PROJECT**

Operations Manager Keith Stahnke presented this item requesting that the Board approve a contract award to CS Marine Constructors, Inc. for marine construction services for the Alameda Main Street Float Relocation Project in an amount not to exceed \$58,500 and authorize the Executive Director to negotiate and execute an agreement and take any other related actions to support this work.

Director DelBono asked if WETA had utilized CS Marine's services previously. Mr. Stahnke said that they had and had performed satisfactorily. Director Donovan asked if Bay Ship & Yacht would be paying for the work. Mr. Stahnke said that they would be.

Chair Intintoli asked why Dutra's price proposal had been so different from the others. Mr. Stahnke replied that there was a narrow window available for the dredging work and that he believed Dutra would have had to delay other projects to meet WETA's schedule which may have impacted the proposal amount.

Director DelBono asked if WETA had utilized Power Engineering and Vortex Construction previously. Mr. Stahnke said that they had.

**Public Comment**

Veronica Sanchez of Masters, Mates & Pilots asked who would be doing tug work for CS Marine. Mr. Stahnke said that they did not specify in their proposal. Ms. Sanchez asked that they hire local union tugs to the extent possible.

Director Donovan made a motion to approve the item. Director DelBono seconded the motion and the item carried unanimously.

Yeas: DelBono, Donovan, Intintoli. Nays: None.

**9. APPROVE CONTRACT AWARD TO TOPPER INDUSTRIES, INC. FOR FABRICATION SERVICES FOR THE ALAMEDA MAIN STREET FERRY TERMINAL WALKWAYS AND RAMPS PROJECT**

Mr. Stahnke presented this item requesting that the Board approve a contract award to Topper Industries, Inc. for fabrication services for the Alameda Main Street Ferry Terminal Walkways and Ramps in an amount not to exceed \$252,545 and authorize the Executive Director to negotiate and execute an agreement and take any other related actions to support this work.

Director DelBono asked where the firm is located. Mr. Stahnke replied Washington State, and that the other bidder is located in Sacramento. He noted that prior to WETA, the firm had done work for the ferry services under the cities of Alameda and Vallejo. He noted that both proposals were from good firms and that the schedule was the key point in selecting Topper. Mr. Stahnke also noted that the walkways and ramps would be fabricated offsite and delivered for installation.

Director Donovan asked how many firms had been invited to propose. Administrative Analyst Scott Houston said in addition to posting on WETA's website and newspaper advertising that the RFP had been sent to over 1,100 firms and individuals on WETA's contract procurement list.

Director DelBono made a motion to approve the item. Director Donovan seconded the motion and the item carried unanimously.

Yeas: DelBono, Donovan, Intintoli. Nays: None.

**10. AUTHORIZE RELEASE OF A REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR THE MID-LIFE REFURBISHMENT OF THE PERALTA VESSEL**

Mr. Stahnke presented this item requesting that the Board authorize the release of Request for Proposals for the mid-life refurbishment of the *Peralta* Vessel. He noted that due to WETA's need for the vessel that the work would likely need to be split and completed over two off-seasons.

**Public Comment**

Jerry Bellows of the Maritime Administration asked if the cylinder head and all components were part of the overhaul. Mr. Stahnke replied yes. Mr. Bellows also asked how the work would be divided on the



engines if the project was split. Mr. Stahnke said that the entirety of the engine work occurred in the initial phase of the project over approximately 30-40 days.

Director Donovan made a motion to approve the item. Director DelBono seconded the motion and the item carried unanimously.

Yeas: DelBono, Donovan, Intintoli. Nays: None.

**11. APPROVE A SOLE SOURCE CONTRACT WITH CUMMINS NORTHWEST, LLC FOR MAJOR OVERHAUL OF THE PERALTA MAIN ENGINES**

Mr. Stahnke presented this item requesting that the Board approve a sole source contract with Cummins Northwest, LLC for the overhaul of the *Peralta* main engines in an amount not to exceed \$719,946 and authorize the Executive Director to negotiate and execute an agreement and take any other related actions to support this work.

Director DelBono asked what criteria were used for sole sourcing the engine overhaul contracts. Mr. Stahnke said that Cummins Northwest is the sole Cummins factory authorized dealership for the sales, parts and service of the *Peralta* engines in the Bay Area region.

Director Donovan asked if the \$719,946 was included in the budget for this work. Mr. Stahnke said that it was. Director Donovan then asked where *Peralta* would need to go for the work to be performed. Mr. Stahnke said that it would be subject to the results of the RFP. He noted that wherever the work would occur that the contract would require the engines be returned to the vessel.

Director DelBono made a motion to approve the item. Director Donovan seconded the motion and the item carried unanimously.

Yeas: DelBono, Donovan, Intintoli. Nays: None.

**12. APPROVE A SOLE SOURCE CONTRACT WITH VALLEY POWER SYSTEMS NORTH, INC. FOR INTERMEDIATE OVERHAUL OF THE GEMINI CLASS VESSELS MAIN ENGINES**

Mr. Stahnke presented this item requesting that the Board approve actions relative to the intermediate overhaul of main engines on the four Gemini Class Vessels including 1) Approval of the award of a sole source contract to Valley Power Systems North, Inc. in an amount not to exceed \$1,150,000 and authorization of the Executive Director to negotiate and execute an agreement for this work; and 2) Approval of a capital budget increase in the amount of \$660,000 to support overhaul of the main engines on all four Gemini class vessels.

Director Donovan asked why all of these engines would be overhauled by Valley Power. Mr. Stahnke noted that these engines were made by MTU and only one WETA vessel had a non-MTU engines, the *Peralta* addressed in the prior item.

Director Donovan made a motion to approve the item. Director DelBono seconded the motion and the item carried unanimously.

Yeas: DelBono, Donovan, Intintoli. Nays: None.

**13. AUTHORIZE RELEASE OF A REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR VESSEL REPLACEMENT CONSTRUCTION**

Mr. Stahnke presented this item requesting that the Board authorize the release of a Request for Proposals for vessel replacement construction for two WETA vessels.

Director DelBono asked if easier bike loading would be considered as part of the design. Mr. Stahnke said that it was a planned element of the design and that maximum aisle widths for efficient flow and shorter routes were under consideration.

---

Chair Intintoli asked what the definition of “legacy vessels” was. Mr. Stahnke said that it referred to the older Blue & Gold Fleet vessels and that the WETA vessels were considered to be relatively modern.

Director Donovan asked who would manufacture the engines. Mr. Stahnke replied that MTU and Cat were the most likely.

### **Public Comment**

Mr. Bellows asked if WETA would be looking at green trends in new vessel construction. Mr. Stahnke said that they would be where practical, adding that staff had considered LNG as a fuel option but that storage and delivery issues appeared not easily surmountable. He also noted that WETA had a mandate to achieve greater than 85% Tier II emission standards.

Director Donovan asked if there were Buy America requirements. Mr. Stahnke said that there were but that some items such as interior panels and seats could only be obtained from overseas suppliers.

Director DelBono made a motion to approve the item. Director Donovan seconded the motion and the item carried unanimously.

Yeas: DelBono, Donovan, Intintoli. Nays: None.

### **14. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Ross Woody of Vallejo asked when the *MV Vallejo* would be replaced, noting that it had been built in 1991. He added that given the lead times, the RFP schedule should begin now and that Vallejo riders were being left behind as a result of passengers avoiding the *Vallejo*.

Ms. Rannells replied that WETA was eager to replace the *Vallejo* and was aware of how customers felt about it. Mr. Stahnke said that at present that project was only partially funded but that WETA was moving closer to having funding in place. Mr. Woody said that that should be communicated to the ridership.

Mr. Woody commented on the fare policy, noting that riders who utilized the 10 ride punch cards would not see an increase until the fifth year. He said that what he didn't see was the farebox recovery for just Vallejo as opposed to WETA overall. Manager of Finance and Grants Lynne Yu said that would be included in the next meeting packet. Director DelBono said that he would also like to see farebox by route reported.

Mr. Woody said that his biggest concern was that last time Vallejo had a fare increase that there was a significant drop in ridership. Ms. Rannells replied the WETA was aware of that issue as it had subsidized the City of Vallejo's service in order to partially roll back the increase. She further explained that the proposed fare program calls for small, regular increases that allow for fare revenues to keep pace with cost inflation over time.

Chair Intintoli thanked Mr. Woody for his comments.

### **15. ADJOURNMENT**

All business having concluded, the meeting was adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Board Secretary

---

**MEMORANDUM**

---

**TO: Board Members**

**FROM: Nina Rannells, Executive Director**  
**Kevin Connolly, Manager, Planning & Development**  
**Chad Mason, Senior Planner**

**SUBJECT: Adopt Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Richmond Ferry Terminal Project**

**Recommendation**

Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Richmond Ferry Terminal Project.

**Background**

The Richmond service would provide a new ferry route between the Ford Peninsula in the City of Richmond and downtown San Francisco. The 2035 projected daily ridership for the Richmond service is up to 1,715 passenger trips (equals approximately 858 roundtrip passengers). The proposed terminal would be located at the southern point of the Ford Peninsula adjacent to the Ford Building and along an existing wharf, replacing an existing facility that consists of a gangway and passenger float. The terminal would include landings, a new gangway, passenger float, ramping system, and piles. Other project components include vehicle and bicycle parking and an access gate with informational signage. The project also includes public access improvements to the Bay Trail and construction of a new kayak launch in Marina Bay to replace an existing launch that is proposed to be removed as part of the project.

Pursuant to state and federal regulations, the Project must be approved under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) as a federally-financed project.

**Discussion**

WETA has assumed the lead agency role for approving the Richmond Ferry Terminal Project under CEQA and has conducted an Initial Study and prepared a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Project, which is available for review at WETA's administrative office located at Pier 9. The Initial Study identified potentially significant effects; however, the implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) would reduce potentially significant effects to less-than-significant levels.

On May 6, WETA submitted the IS/MND for the Richmond Ferry Terminal Project to the State Clearinghouse (SCH #2014052011) and circulated a Notice of Intent (NOI) to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration in accordance with CEQA guidelines. In addition, WETA posted multiple copies of the NOI at the project site, recorded the NOI at the

Contra Costa County Clerk-Recorder's Office, and posted the NOI and the entire CEQA IS/MND document on its website. A 30-day public and agency review period was held from May 6 through June 4.

WETA received a total of 11 comment letters during the public and agency review period. The commenters included six agencies, three organizations and two individuals. The comments addressed topics including but not limited to public access, aesthetics, biological resources, water quality, sea level rise, transportation/traffic, utilities, and project feasibility. The Final IS/MND includes the full text of all comments and WETA's responses to the comments.

Based on the CEQA Initial Study and the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration, staff has determined that there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant impact on the environment. Pursuant to CEQA guidelines, WETA has prepared a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for all measures required in the Project to mitigate or avoid significant environmental impacts. The Program identifies responsible monitoring parties and monitoring milestones for each mitigation measure. Among the mitigation measures that WETA will commit to implementing as part of the Project include modification of the construction schedule to control construction-related air quality impacts, adherence to specific work windows for in-water work to avoid impacts on special-status species and aquatic resources, measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and measures to reduce construction noise and vibration. The Program also includes a measure that requires contribution of WETA's fair share of funding towards improvements at the intersection of Harbor Way South and Wright Avenue, north of the proposed terminals site. A copy of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program is provided in **Attachment A** and includes a full list of all mitigation measures.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt both the Mitigated Negative Declaration and the Mitigation Monitoring and Report Program for the Richmond Ferry Terminal Project. Pending action by the Board to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, a Notice of Determination will be filed with the Office and Planning and Research and the Contra Costa County Clerk's office initiating a 30-day statute of limitations on court challenges to the approval of the Project under CEQA.

The Federal Transit Administration has assumed the lead agency role for approval of the Project under NEPA, which is anticipated to occur at a later date and is not subject to any action by WETA.

**Fiscal Impact**

There is no direct fiscal impact as a result of this action.

\*\*\*END\*\*\*

# **RICHMOND FERRY TERMINAL PROJECT**

## **Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

State Clearinghouse No. 2014052011

*Prepared for*  
**WETA**  
San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency  
Transportation Authority  
Pier 9, Suite 111  
The Embarcadero  
San Francisco, CA 94111

*Prepared by*  
**Atkins**  
322 Pine Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94104

**August 2014**



# Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

## INTRODUCTION

The Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the proposed San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority's (WETA) Richmond Ferry Terminal Project (proposed project) (State Clearinghouse No. 2014052011) identified mitigation measures to reduce the adverse effects of the proposed project in the areas of air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and transportation/traffic.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)<sup>1</sup> requires that agencies adopting IS/MNDs ascertain that feasible mitigation measures are implemented, subsequent to project approval. Specifically, the lead or responsible agency must adopt a reporting or monitoring program for mitigation measures incorporated into a project or imposed as conditions of approval. The program must be designed to ensure compliance during applicable project timing, e.g. design, construction, or operation (Public Resource Code Section 21081.6).

The MMRP will be used by the WETA staff responsible for ensuring compliance with mitigation measures associated with the proposed project. Monitoring will consist of review of appropriate documentation, such as plans or reports prepared by the party responsible for implementation or by field observation of the mitigation measure during implementation.

Table 1 (Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Matrix) identifies the mitigation measures by resource area. The table also provides the specific mitigation monitoring requirements, including implementation documentation, monitoring activity, timing and responsible monitoring party. Verification of compliance with each measure is to be indicated by signature of the mitigation monitor, together with date of verification.

---

<sup>1</sup> CEQA, *Public Resources Code* (PRC), Sections 21000 et al. (2014).

Table 1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Matrix					
Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Timing	Responsible Party	Compliance verification signature	Date
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>					
<p><b>MM-AIR-1</b> Implement recommended dust control measures. To reduce particulate matter emissions during project construction phases, the Project Sponsor shall require the construction contractors to comply with the dust control strategies developed by BAAQMD. The Project Sponsor shall include in construction contracts the following requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.</li> <li>All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.</li> <li>All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.</li> <li>All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.</li> <li>All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.</li> <li>Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure California Code of Regulations [CCR] Title 13, Section 2485). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.</li> <li>All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator.</li> <li>Post a publically visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.</li> </ol>	<p>Review and approve contract specifications and demolition, grading (landside activities) or dredging (marine activities), and building plans for inclusion of these measures.</p>	<p>Requirements included in construction procurement documents and final building permit plans.</p>	<p>WETA</p>		



<b>Table 1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Matrix</b>					
<i>Mitigation Measure</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Timing</i>	<i>Responsible Party</i>	<i>Compliance verification signature</i>	<i>Date</i>
<p><b>MM-AIR-2</b> All marine based equipment shall be equipped with 2006 or newer engine models or after market emission reduction features such that the equipment exhaust is equivalent to that of a 2006 or newer engine model.</p>	<p>Construction: Review and approve contract specifications and demolition, grading (landside activities) or dredging (marine activities), and building plans for inclusion of these measures.</p> <p>Operation: Review and approve contract specifications.</p>	<p>Construction: Requirements included in construction procurement documents and final building permit plans.</p> <p>Operation: Monitor during construction.</p>	WETA		
<p><b>MM-AIR-3</b> Land based construction activities cannot occur at the same time as marine based activities. The exception is that staging (i.e., brining equipment/supplies to the site in preparation of work commencing) may coincide with the previous construction phase. None of the marine based phases can overlap time frames.</p>	<p>Contractor shall submit construction schedule as evidence that the construction phases will not overlap.</p> <p>Review and approve contract specifications and demolition, grading and building plans for inclusion of these measures.</p>	<p>Requirements included in construction procurement documents and final building permit plans.</p>	WETA		

<b>Table 1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Matrix</b>					
<i>Mitigation Measure</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Timing</i>	<i>Responsible Party</i>	<i>Compliance verification signature</i>	<i>Date</i>
<p><b>MM-AIR-4</b> All land based equipment greater than 50 hp shall be rated USEPA Tier 2 or better if land based construction phases will occur simultaneously. Even with USEPA Tier 2 equipment only the following phases can overlap in the construction schedule:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Phases 1 and 2</li> <li>b. Phases 1 and 3</li> <li>c. Phases 1 and 4</li> <li>d. Phases 2 and 3</li> <li>e. Phases 2 and 4</li> </ul>	<p>Contractor shall submit construction schedule as evidence that the construction phases will not overlap.</p> <p>Review and approve contract specifications and demolition, grading and building plans for inclusion of these measures.</p>	<p>Requirements included in construction procurement documents and final building permit plans.</p>	WETA		
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>					
<p><b>MM-BIO-1</b> Reduce Noise Related Impacts on ESA Listed Fish Species and Marine Mammals During In-Water Work. WETA will implement measures to reduce impacts associated with in-water work activities to listed fish species. These measures will include, at a minimum, the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ In-water work activities will occur June 1 to November 30 (the dredging window in the Central Bay), outside the peak juvenile outmigration periods for ESA listed fish species.</li> <li>■ Bubble curtains will be used to attenuate pile driving sounds. Confined curtains will be used when feasible.</li> <li>■ A vibratory pile driver will be used when feasible. Geotechnical consultation would be necessary to determine if vibratory pile driving methods would meet applicable standards for pile installation.</li> <li>■ Sound levels will be monitored and a hydroacoustic monitoring plan developed to ensure sound level criteria meet agency standards. Real-time sound data will be used to adjust bubble curtains if necessary to minimize underwater noise from impact pile driving.</li> <li>■ As a performance standard, the selected measures will represent the best available technology that is economically achievable, and will achieve maximum feasible reduction in underwater sound pressure levels (SPLs) and/or related impacts on listed fish species.</li> </ul>	<p>Prior to issuance of permits to work in the marine environment, a construction plan must be submitted for review and approval. This plan shall include all proposed noise mitigation and monitoring.</p> <p>Review and approve contract specifications prior to issuance of permits to work in the marine environment for inclusion of these measures.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of permits to work in the marine environment.</p> <p>Requirements included in construction procurement documents and final building permit plans.</p>	WETA		

<b>Table 1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Matrix</b>					
<i>Mitigation Measure</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Timing</i>	<i>Responsible Party</i>	<i>Compliance verification signature</i>	<i>Date</i>
<p><b>MM-BIO-2</b> Conduct In-Water Construction Activities During the Dredging Window for the Central Bay to Avoid ESA Listed Fish Spawning and Migration Seasons. In water construction will be limited to the dredging window period (June 1 to November 30) to reduce the likelihood of adverse impacts on rearing juvenile steelhead, Chinook salmon, green sturgeon, and longfin smelt, and on adult fish spawning and migration, unless otherwise approved by appropriate resource agencies.</p>	<p>Contractor shall submit construction schedule as evidence of the lack of construction overlap with the dredging window.</p> <p>If construction occurs during dredging window, contractor shall present a survey report to the appropriate resource agencies to approve the proposed activity.</p>	<p>Requirements included in construction procurement documents and final building permit plans.</p> <p>As necessary pursuant to additional reports and approval by appropriate resource agencies, review and approve recommendations and any other relevant document per this mitigation.</p>	<p>WETA</p>		

<b>Table 1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Matrix</b>					
<i>Mitigation Measure</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Timing</i>	<i>Responsible Party</i>	<i>Compliance verification signature</i>	<i>Date</i>
<p><b>MM-BIO-3</b> Monitor for Turbidity during Dredging Activities. The San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) makes certain exceptions for dredging activities, and the typical Basin Plan standards for turbidity may not apply in the mixing zone of the dredging activities. However, outside of the mixing zone, which could be more than 500 feet, WETA or its contractor would monitor and ensure Basin Plan standards for turbidity are met. WETA would consult with the San Francisco RWQCB to determine if routine channel dredging within the Inner Richmond Harbor is exempted from turbidity monitoring requirements and to determine the extent of the mixing zone. If turbidity monitoring outside of the mixing zone is required, WETA or its contractor would conduct turbidity monitoring outside of the mixing area immediately prior to initiation of dredging activities to comply with Basin Plan standards. Basin Plan standards are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Where natural turbidity is between 0 and 5 Nephelometric Turbidity Units (NTUs), increases shall not exceed 1 NTU.</li> <li>■ Where natural turbidity is between 5 and 50 NTUs, increases shall not exceed 20 percent.</li> <li>■ Where natural turbidity is between 50 and 100 NTUs, increases shall not exceed 10 NTUs.</li> <li>■ Where natural turbidity is greater than 100 NTUs, increases shall not exceed 1 percent.</li> <li>■ The specific monitoring schedule including any additional timing information and quality assurance shall be determined by WETA in collaboration with the San Francisco RWQCB. In response to monitoring results, turbidity controls shall be implemented by WETA or its contractor to assure that the thresholds above are not exceeded. These may include one or more of the following:                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Use of a silt curtain to isolate turbidity (if site conditions allow)</li> <li>■ Use of operational controls, such as any of the following:                                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Increased cycle time / reduced bucket deployment (longer cycle times reduce the velocity of the ascending bucket through the water column, which reduces potential sediment wash from the bucket)</li> <li>&gt; Conduct dredging activities at low tide to minimize travel distance of the ascending bucket through the water column</li> <li>&gt; Use of an environmental bucket</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Prior to issuance of a dredging permit, WETA or contractor shall submit a plan for monitoring turbidity during dredging activities.</p> <p>Monitor for turbidity levels during dredging activities.</p>	<p>Requirements included in construction procurement documents and final building permit plans.</p> <p>Monitor for turbidity levels during dredging activities.</p>	<p>WETA, SF RWQCB</p>		

Table 1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Matrix					
Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Timing	Responsible Party	Compliance verification signature	Date
<p><b>MM-BIO-4</b> The Draft California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy (DCEMP) contains recommendations for conducting eelgrass bed surveys, avoidance measures for potential impacts from shading and turbidity, assessment of project impacts, and mitigation measures. An eelgrass survey for the project area shall be conducted no more than 60 days prior to the start of construction. If eelgrass is present, the survey shall evaluate the following five parameters identified for use in assessment of effects of actions on eelgrass. These parameters are (1) the spatial distribution of the bed; (2) the areal extent of the bed; (3) the percentage of bottom cover within the bed; (4) the turion density within the bed; and (5) where available, the occurrence frequency and distribution of eelgrass beds through time. When evaluated in association with reference area response, these metrics provide definition to the bed that allows for assessment of eelgrass change related to an action. Preparation of the Biological Assessment including consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and ensuing Biological Opinion will determine the extent and location of required off-site mitigation</p> <p>When impacts to eelgrass could occur, the project sponsor shall develop a mitigation plan following the procedures in the DCEMP. The project sponsor is solely responsible for achieving the mitigation target. The location of eelgrass mitigation shall be in areas of similar condition to those where the initial impact occurs. Factors such as distance from action, depth, sediment type, distance from ocean connection, water quality, and currents are among those that shall be considered in evaluating suitable sites and making an ultimate site selection for mitigation.</p> <p>If avoidance and minimization measures are not practical and impact to an existing eelgrass bed may occur, off-site mitigation is required at a 3.01:1 ratio (mitigation to impact) at an approved site. Techniques for eelgrass mitigation shall be consistent with the best available technology at the time of mitigation implementation and shall be tailored to the specific needs of the mitigation site.</p>	<p>Preparation of a survey for the presence of eelgrass.</p> <p>If mitigation is required, consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and their Biological Opinion regarding off-site mitigation will be required.</p>	<p>No more than 60 days prior to issuance of a permit for construction (including but not limited to dredging, demolition or building permits).</p> <p>Requirements included in construction procurement documents and final building permit plans.</p>	<p>WETA</p> <p>National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)</p>		

<b>Table 1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Matrix</b>					
<i>Mitigation Measure</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Timing</i>	<i>Responsible Party</i>	<i>Compliance verification signature</i>	<i>Date</i>
<p><b>MM-BIO-5</b> To avoid any direct impacts to raptors and/or any migratory birds, removal of habitat that supports active nests on the proposed area of disturbance shall occur outside of the breeding season for these species (February 1 to August 31). If trimming of trees or removal of shrubs on the proposed area of disturbance must occur during the breeding season, the project sponsor shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a preconstruction survey to determine the presence or absence of nesting birds on the proposed area of disturbance. The preconstruction survey shall be conducted within 10 calendar days prior to the start of construction activities (including removal of vegetation). The project sponsor shall submit the results of the preconstruction survey to CDFW for review and approval prior to initiating any construction activities. If nesting birds are detected, a letter report or mitigation plan as deemed appropriate by CDFW, shall be prepared and include proposed measures protocols to be implemented to ensure that disturbance of breeding activities is avoided. The report or mitigation plan shall be submitted to CDFW for review and approval.</p>	<p>Contractor shall submit construction schedule as evidence of the overlap of construction with breeding season.</p> <p>If construction occurs during relevant breeding, contractor shall present a survey report to California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) for approval prior to issuance of a demolition or grading/dredging permit. If nests are found, contractor shall submit plans identifying nest locations and limits of construction activities.</p>	<p>Requirements included in construction procurement documents and final building permit plans.</p> <p>During construction</p>	<p>California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)</p> <p>WETA</p>		

<b>Table 1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Matrix</b>					
<i>Mitigation Measure</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Timing</i>	<i>Responsible Party</i>	<i>Compliance verification signature</i>	<i>Date</i>
<p><b>MM-BIO-6</b> An Incidental Harassment Authorization from NMFS would be needed for pile driving and dredging activities, even though activities would not occur near known haul-out sites. To minimize harassment to marine mammals, the following avoidance measures are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Work shall occur only during daylight hours so that marine mammals are visible at all times during the pile installation and dredging activities.</li> <li>■ A safe zone shall be enforced during dredging and pile driving operations. A marine mammal monitor shall survey the area prior to the startup of pile driving equipment.</li> <li>■ Installation shall not begin until no marine mammals are sighted within a designated "safe zone" for at least 15 minutes prior to the initiation of the activity.</li> <li>■ For dredging and pile driving activities, the proposed safety zone shall be a radius of 1,000 feet from the dredging or pile location. At 1,000 feet, sound levels from dredging or pile driving are expected to be below 180 dB.</li> <li>■ Once activities begin, installation shall continue until completed. Before driving the next pile, the monitor shall again confirm that the safety zone is clear of marine mammals.</li> <li>■ The construction contractor shall establish daily "soft start" or "ramp up" procedures for pile-driving activities. This technique shall be used at the beginning of each piling installation to allow any marine mammal that may be in the area to leave before pile driving activities reach full energy. The contractor shall provide an initial three strikes at reduced energy (40 percent), followed by a 1-minute waiting period, then subsequent 3-strike sets.</li> <li>■ A qualified biological monitor shall visually survey the area one day prior to the start of dredging or dredging operations to establish a baseline.</li> </ul>	<p>Preparation of an Incidental Harassment Authorization from the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) prior to pile driving or dredging activities.</p>	<p>Requirements included in construction procurement documents and final building permit plans.</p> <p>Prior to and during in-water work.</p>	<p>National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)</p> <p>WETA</p>		

<b>Table 1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Matrix</b>					
<i>Mitigation Measure</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Timing</i>	<i>Responsible Party</i>	<i>Compliance verification signature</i>	<i>Date</i>
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>					
<p><b>MM-CUL-1</b> Mitigate Potential Disturbance for Significant Archeological Resources Identified During Construction. A qualified archeologist approved by WETA shall first determine whether a previously unidentified archeological resource uncovered during construction is a “unique archaeological resource” under 36 CFR 800, CEQA Section 15064.5, and/or Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. If the archeological resource is determined to be a “unique archaeological resource,” the archeologist shall formulate a mitigation plan that satisfies the requirements of, 36 CFR 800, CEQA Section 15064.5, and/or Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. Work in the vicinity of the find may resume at the completion of a mitigation plan or recovery of the resource.</p> <p>If the archeologist determines that the archaeological resource is not a unique archaeological resource, work will resume, and the archeologist may record the site and submit the recordation form to the California Historic Resources Information System Northwest Information Center.</p> <p>The archeologist shall prepare a report of the results of any study prepared as part of a mitigation plan, following accepted professional practice. Copies of the report shall be submitted to the City and to the California Historic Resources Information System Northwest Information Center.</p>	Retain qualified archaeological professional and complete documentation for recordation, as necessary.	<p>Requirements included in construction procurement documents and final building permit plans.</p> <p>Throughout ground disturbing activities, including within the marine environment.</p>	WETA or retained archaeologist		
<p><b>MM-CUL-2</b> Comply with State Regulations Regarding the Discovery of Human Remains at the Project Site. If human skeletal remains are uncovered during project construction, the project sponsor shall immediately halt work, contact the County coroner to evaluate the remains, and follow the procedures and protocols set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e)(1). If the County coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the project sponsor shall contact the NAHC, in accordance with Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, subdivision (c), and PRC Section 5097.98 (as amended by AB 2641). In accordance with PRC Section 5097.98, the project sponsor shall ensure that, according to generally accepted cultural or archeological standards or practices, the immediate vicinity of the Native American human remains is not damaged or disturbed by further development activity until the project sponsor has discussed and conferred, as prescribed in PRC Section 5097.98, with the most likely descendants regarding their recommendations, if applicable, taking into account the possibility of multiple human remains.</p>	Retain qualified archaeological professional and complete documentation for recordation, as necessary.	<p>Requirements included in construction procurement documents and final building permit plans.</p> <p>Throughout ground disturbing activities, including within the marine environment.</p>	WETA or retained archaeologist		



**Table 1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Matrix**

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Timing	Responsible Party	Compliance verification signature	Date
--------------------	-----------------	--------	-------------------	-----------------------------------	------

**GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

<p><b>MM-GHG-1</b> The proposed project shall implement a combination of the following measures, in whole or in part, such that project emissions are reduced by a minimum of 485.56 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e annually.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase the percent of biodiesel used in the ferry fuel mixture. Currently the fuel used is a B5 (5 percent biofuel) mixture which reduces ferry emission by 3.57 percent and overall project emissions by 10.8 percent over use of a 0 percent biodiesel fuel. The following table provides examples of emission reductions based on varying levels of biofuel in the fuel mix. Additional ferry reduction and additional project reduction refer to the increase over current 5 percent biofuel mix.</li> </ol> <table border="1" data-bbox="201 662 968 932"> <thead> <tr> <th>Biofuel (% in mixture)</th> <th>Total Emission Reduction (%)</th> <th>Additional Ferry Emission Reduction (%)</th> <th>Additional Project Emission Reduction (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>3.75</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>4.50</td> <td>0.75</td> <td>2.42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20</td> <td>15.00</td> <td>11.25</td> <td>36.31</td> </tr> <tr> <td>50</td> <td>37.50</td> <td>33.75</td> <td>108.93</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The 50 percent biodiesel results in a greater than 100 percent offset because total project reductions take into account the VMT emissions avoided by the implementation of the project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Install electrical charging stations in the parking lot. Implementation of charging stations will reduce transportation emissions based on the electrical vehicle population of the community and the number of available charging stations. In a commuter situation such as this, one car would occupy a charging station for the entire day. Based on the existing community a maximum of five charging stations have the potential to be occupied per day. Based on the average trip to the ferry terminal, a maximum annual metric ton CO<sub>2</sub>e reduction per charging station would be 0.089 for a total annual reduction assuming five stations of 0.44 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e.</li> <li>Install on-site solar through covering on-site parking with photovoltaic. Based on maximum parking lot coverage that results in the installation of an 809 kW capacity system,<sup>2</sup></li> </ol>	Biofuel (% in mixture)	Total Emission Reduction (%)	Additional Ferry Emission Reduction (%)	Additional Project Emission Reduction (%)	5	3.75	0	0	6	4.50	0.75	2.42	20	15.00	11.25	36.31	50	37.50	33.75	108.93	<p>Prior to start of service, WETA shall implement measures to reduce GHG emissions.</p>	<p>Prior to start of service.</p>	<p>WETA</p>		
Biofuel (% in mixture)	Total Emission Reduction (%)	Additional Ferry Emission Reduction (%)	Additional Project Emission Reduction (%)																						
5	3.75	0	0																						
6	4.50	0.75	2.42																						
20	15.00	11.25	36.31																						
50	37.50	33.75	108.93																						

<sup>2</sup> SunPower parking coverage, offset values and emission reductions are included in Appendix C.

<b>Table 1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Matrix</b>					
<i>Mitigation Measure</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Timing</i>	<i>Responsible Party</i>	<i>Compliance verification signature</i>	<i>Date</i>
<p>electricity offsets would be approximately 1.24 million kWh per year. This would result in a savings of 297.56 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e annually. GHG emissions savings will vary based on the final coverage design implemented. If this reduction measure is implemented final GHG emissions reductions shall be calculated based upon the actual system to be installed.</p> <p>4. If on-site emission reductions are not feasible or cannot be incorporated to a level that will reduce all remaining on-site emissions, then WETA shall offset all remaining project emissions. To the maximum extent feasible, as determined by WETA in conjunction with the BAAQMD, offsets shall be implemented locally. Implementation of this measure shall be completed by December 2015. Offsets may include, but are not limited to, the following (in order of preference):</p> <p>a. Funding of local projects, subject to review and approval by the BAAQMD that will result in real, permanent, verifiable, enforceable, and additional reduction in GHG emissions. If the BAAQMD or Contra Costa County develops a GHG mitigation fund, WETA may instead pay into this fund to offset GHG emission in excess of the significance thresholds.</p> <p>b. Purchase of carbon credits to offset emission below the significance threshold. Only carbon offset credits that are verified and registered with the Climate Action Reserve, or available through a County-approved local GHG mitigation bank or fund, may be used to offset project emission.</p>					
<b>NOISE</b>					
<p><b>MM-NOI-1</b> Notification of nearby property owners of project construction before construction begins. A notification packet will be sent to property owners identifying intended construction schedule, duration of noise-generating construction activities, and a telephone number hotline to use for communicating noise complaints.</p>	<p>Contractor shall submit to WETA evidence that they have properly notified nearby property owners prior to construction.</p>	<p>Requirements included in construction procurement documents and final building permit plans.</p> <p>Prior to start of construction.</p>	<p>WETA</p>		

<b>Table 1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Matrix</b>					
<i>Mitigation Measure</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Timing</i>	<i>Responsible Party</i>	<i>Compliance verification signature</i>	<i>Date</i>
MM-NOI-2 Use appropriate sound-control devices on construction equipment no less effective than those provided by the manufacturer. All equipment will be maintained to minimize noise generation and no equipment will have unmuffled exhausts.	Review and approve contract specifications for proposed construction equipment.	Requirements included in construction procurement documents and final building permit plans.  During construction.	WETA		
MM-NOI-3 To minimize effects of pile driving on nearby residents, WETA will restrict pile driving to between the hours of 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM to ensure that driving occurs when residents are most likely to be away from home or able to leave if necessary to avoid noise effects.	Contractor shall submit construction schedule as evidence that pile driving will only take place during the identified window.	Prior to issuance of a construction permit.  During construction.	WETA		
MM-NOI-4 WETA will ensure the contractor will use the best available technology to minimize noise from pile driving. This may include, but is not limited to pre-drilling pile holes, use of a vibratory hammer, and sound blankets installed around stationary equipment.	Contractor shall submit contract specifications regarding the type of equipment/chosen technology as evidence.	Requirements included in construction procurement documents and final building permit plans.  During construction.	WETA		
MM-NOI-5 Construction equipment generating the highest noise and vibration levels (pile driving) shall operate at the maximum distance feasible from sensitive receptors.	Contractor shall submit construction schedule, including a plan of the general locations of construction activities, as evidence.	Requirements included in construction procurement documents and final building permit plans.  During construction.	WETA		
MM-NOI-6 A preservation director shall be designated. This person's contact information shall be posted in a location near the project site that it is clearly visible to the nearby receptors most likely to be disturbed. The director shall manage complaints and concerns resulting from activities that cause vibration. The severity of the vibration concern shall be assessed by the director and, if necessary, evaluated by a qualified noise and vibration control consultant.	Identify a preservation director and necessary contact details; post this information at the project site.	Requirements included in construction procurement documents and final building permit plans.  During construction.	WETA		

<b>Table 1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Matrix</b>					
<i>Mitigation Measure</i>	<i>Action Required</i>	<i>Timing</i>	<i>Responsible Party</i>	<i>Compliance verification signature</i>	<i>Date</i>
MM-NOI-7 The preexisting condition of all buildings within a 50-foot radius and historical buildings within the immediate vicinity of proposed construction activities shall be recorded in the form of a preconstruction survey. The preconstruction survey shall determine conditions that exist before construction begins and shall be used to evaluate damage caused by construction activities. Fixtures and finishes within a 50-foot radius of construction activities susceptible to damage shall be documented (photographically and in writing) before construction. All buildings damaged shall be repaired to their preexisting conditions.	Preparation of an existing conditions noise study, prior to commencement of any construction-related activities.	Requirements included in construction procurement documents and final building permit plans.  Prior to and during construction.	WETA		
MM-NOI-8 On-site or adjacent historic features shall be covered or temporarily shored as necessary for protection from vibration, in consultation with the preservation director.	Preparation of a shoring plan by the contractor to be submitted and approved prior to issuance of a construction-related permit.	Prior to issuance of a permit for demolition, grading/dredging, or construction.	WETA		
<b>TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</b>					
MM-TRA-1 The project sponsor shall contribute the fair share amount of funding towards the signalization of the Harbour Way South/Wright Avenue intersection. Signalization of this intersection would improve operating conditions to acceptable levels (LOS A). Details on the actual improvements and determination of WETA's fair share contribution will be addressed in the Conditional Use Permit process and conditions of approval for the project. In addition to the fair-share contribution for signalization, physical measures such as crossing gates, other protective measures and directional and way-finding signage may be installed to reduce congestion.	Contribution of the fair share amount of funding towards signalization upon determination of the amount during the Conditional Use Permit process.	Prior to start of service if preparation of a signal warrant study and fair share contribution distribution has been undertaken by the City of Richmond. Otherwise, upon preparation of such studies.	WETA		
	Consideration and preliminary design of, as appropriate, physical measures such as crossing gates and directional and way-finding signage.	During final design of the project	WETA		

**MEMORANDUM**

---

**TO: Board Members**

**FROM: Nina Rannells, Executive Director**  
**Kevin Connolly, Manager, Planning & Development**  
**Mike Gougherty, Senior Planner**

**SUBJECT: Approve Fiscal Year 2015-2020 Fare Program**

**Recommendation**

Approve the Fiscal Year (FY) 2015-2020 Fare Program and authorize the Executive Director to take related actions necessary to implement the Fare Program.

**Background and Discussion**

The Board adopted a fare policy for WETA services in November 2011 that was designed to both support system cost recovery and promote system ridership. This policy encourages developing and maintaining a system of fares that maximizes ridership while maintaining adequate farebox recovery, allows for annual fare adjustments to promote financial sustainability and provides for frequent rider discounts to be offered through Clipper.

Staff began a study of WETA's fare structure and pricing in November 2013 in order to assess WETA's current fare structure for services and identify a program of changes to bring consistency to fare categories within the system, streamline fare media products offered, and establish a multi-year fare increase program to allow for small, regular increases to keep up with the cost inflation. Historically, fares have been increased infrequently and in large amounts, negatively impacting ridership. The last fare increase occurred in 2008.

The fare program modifications proposed as a result of this work achieve specific objectives consistent with WETA's fare policy and the overall objective of achieving fiscal sustainability and systemwide consistency. Specifically, these goals are:

- Standardize Fare Categories – Define a uniform set of fare categories and related eligibility criteria for all WETA services that are consistent with developing regional standards.
- Establish Common Fare Products – Identify a common set of fare products for all WETA services. Consider the elimination of certain products based on utilization, redundancy with other products, fraud vulnerability, ease of sale and distribution, and agency desire to promote use of Clipper.
- Promote Consistent Discount Pricing – Establish standard discount rates for fare categories and fare products offered by WETA, including frequent riders, youth, senior, disabled, and group fares/fare products.

- Provide a Multi-Year Fare Increase Program – Develop a planned set of regular fare increases over a multi-year period that will generally allow revenues to keep pace with the anticipated inflation of operating costs while minimizing impacts to ridership.

On May 8, 2014, the Board authorized staff to conduct outreach with riders and the general public on the initial proposed FY 2015-2020 Fare Program. On May 14, 2014, a summary of the proposed Fare Program was posted to the WETA website and noticed to riders for a 60-day public comment period. Additionally, staff hosted a series of public informational meetings in May and June throughout the San Francisco Bay Ferry service area, including locations in Oakland, Vallejo, Alameda and San Francisco to encourage riders to review the proposed Program and provide comments in-person. A total of 46 public comments on the initial proposal were submitted by 25 individuals and are summarized in **Attachment A**.

In consideration of the public comments received and on-going regional efforts with MTC and regional transit operators to standardize fare categories, three revisions were made to the initial proposed Fare Program including:

- 1) Interagency Transfer Discounts – WETA will pursue an agreement with Soltrans to allow the Vallejo Monthly Pass to remain valid for use on Soltrans Route 80, to the extent feasible.
- 2) Youth Fare Category – Consistent with on-going regional efforts to standardize fare categories, the proposed age threshold for Youth fares has been revised from 6-18 years of age to 5-18 years. The existing Youth age threshold for WETA services is 5-12 years, with the exception of Vallejo, which is 6-12 years.
- 3) Senior Fare Category – Consistent with on-going regional efforts to standardize fare categories, the proposed age threshold for Senior fares has been revised from 62+ to 65+ years, which is the current age threshold for all major transit operators in the Bay Area. The existing Senior age threshold for WETA services is 65+ years, with the exception of Harbor Bay, which is 62+ years.

On July 21, 2014, a proposed final Fare Program incorporating the above revisions was posted to the WETA website and noticed to riders. On August 20, 2014 a Public Hearing was held to receive comments on the proposed final Fare Program. A total of 13 public comments on the proposed final Fare Program were submitted in writing or provided at the Public Hearing by 6 individuals and are summarized in **Attachment A**.

In consideration of the public comments received in writing and provided during the Public Hearing, the proposed final Fare Program was revised to clarify the distinct fares and eligibility criteria for school groups. The final Fiscal Year 2015-2020 Fare Program proposed by staff for approval by the Board is provided as **Attachment B** to this memorandum. The final Fare Program is proposed in consideration of all comments received during the public outreach process and includes revisions made in response to these comments as deemed consistent with WETA's overall Fare Policy goals of promoting fiscal sustainability and systemwide consistency.

### **Schedule**

Pending approval by the Board, staff would begin implementation of the Fare Program according to the following timeline:

November 2014 –

- Launch Clipper for Vallejo service.
- Implement Fare Program modifications proposed for FY 2015 for all services.
- Discontinue sale of ticket book and monthly pass products for Alameda services.

January 2015 –

- Discontinue sale of ticket book and day pass products for Vallejo service.

July 2015 –

- Implement Fare Program modifications proposed for FY 2016 - year one of WETA's proposed five-year fare increase program.

While WETA would discontinue the sale of certain fare products for the Alameda services in November 2014 and for the Vallejo service in January 2015, those fare products that remaining in circulation after sales are discontinued would still be honored by WETA as valid fare payment.

### **Title VI Compliance**

Pursuant to the federal regulations contained in the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) Circular 4702.1B, "Title VI Requirements and Guidelines for Federal Transit Administration Recipients," Chapter IV Part 1b, since WETA operates less than 50 fixed route vehicles in peak service, WETA is not required to prepare a Title VI Fare Equity Analysis for this proposed fare increase.

Consistent with WETA's Title VI Limited English Proficiency Plan and process to solicit public comments, on May 14, 2014 WETA provided a notice to the public summarizing the fare increase proposal, noticing the May and June informational meetings and starting the 60-day public comment period. The notice was provided in English, Spanish and Chinese languages and posted on the agency's website, onboard vessels, at terminals, and sent via email to riders. Additionally, a notice regarding the August 20, 2014 public hearing and the availability of the Final Fare Program was posted on July 21, 2014 in the same manner as above and provided in English, Spanish and Chinese.

### **Environmental Clearance**

The approval of the proposed Fare Program is not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code, § 21080(b) (8; 14 C.C.R. § 15273).). The proposed Fare Program is for the purpose of meeting operating expenses, purchasing or leasing supplies, equipment or materials, meeting financial reserve requirements, and obtaining funds for capital projects necessary to maintain service within existing service areas.

### **Fiscal Impact**

It is estimated that implementation of the proposed fare program will generate \$1.1 million in additional fare revenue over the five-year period serving to off-set anticipated cost inflation and support service sustainability over this same period. Staff estimates that total ridership could decrease by 12,000 passenger trips per year, or an average decrease of 1% per year, as a result of implementing the proposed Fare Program.

\*\*\*END\*\*\*

**Attachment A**  
**Public Comments**



**Comments Received regarding "Initial Proposal Fare Program" as of 7/15/2014**

	<i>Alameda/Oakland to San Francisco</i>	<i>Vallejo to San Francisco</i>	<i>Alameda Harbor Bay to San Francisco</i>	<i>Alameda/Oakland to South San Francisco</i>	<i>General or Not Service Specific</i>	<i>Total</i>
<b>General Comments</b>						
Comments not related to fare increase		1				1
I am generally okay with the proposal		5			1	6
I oppose the fare increase proposal	1		1			2
Fares are already too high		2				2
Why increase fares when ridership is soaring?			1			1
It is helpful to know about fare increases ahead of time		1				1
I look forward to using Clipper		2				2
I have no plans to use Clipper					1	1
Monthly pass should be offered on Clipper		1				1
Don't reduce existing discount for pass or ticket books	4	1				5
Reduce discount for pass or ticket books on a graduated basis		1				1
Frequent riders should get similar discounts on all services				1		1
Don't penalize loyal commuters	2	1				3
Retain transfer discounts for paper ticket products		1				1
Don't eliminate ticket books	5	2				7
Raise the youth fare		1				1
Introduce a discount student fare		1				1
Regular riders should board before Giants riders		1				1
Are fares paying for WETA capital projects?		1				1
Is WETA trying to hide something?		1				1
Senior age should be same for Clipper and Cash fares				1		1
Reduce the senior age requirement		2				2
I will consider other commute options	1	1				2
Make ferry affordable for non-wealthy communities		1				1
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>46</b>

**Comments Received regarding "Proposed Final Fare Program" as of 8/20/2014**

	<i>Alameda/Oakland to San Francisco</i>	<i>Vallejo to San Francisco</i>	<i>Alameda Harbor Bay to San Francisco</i>	<i>Alameda/Oakland to South San Francisco</i>	<i>General or Not Service Specific</i>	<i>Total</i>
<b>General Comments</b>						
Comments not related to fare increase		1			1	2
I am generally okay with the proposal		1				1
I oppose the fare increase proposal		1				1
Thanks for keeping the Vallejo Monthly Pass		1				1
Don't reduce existing discount for pass or ticket books	1	1				2
What happens to unused ticket books?	1	1				2
Don't eliminate ticket books	1					1
Fares for riders using ticket books won't increase until 5th year		1				1
Consider farebox recovery when changing fares		1				1
Higher fares could result in less ridership		1				1
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>13</b>

**Attachment B**

**Final Fare Program for FY 2015-2020**

## Systemwide Fare Categories and Eligibility Criteria

### CURRENT

CATEGORY	AOSF	VALLEJO	HARBOR BAY	SSF	DISCOUNT
Adult	13-64	13-64	13-61	13-64	0%
Adult (Clipper Only)	13-64	N/A	13-64	13-64	0-25%
Youth	5-12	6-12	5-12	5-12	0-44%
Senior	65+	65+	62+	65+	42-50%
Disabled	RTC or Medicare Card required				42-50%
Children	Under 5	Under 6	Under 5	Under 5	100%
School/Group	Reserve	Reserve	N/A	Reserve	8-73%
Military	ID Required	N/A	ID Required	N/A	0-20%

### PROPOSED

CATEGORY	ALL WETA SERVICES	DISCOUNT
Adult	19-64	0%
Adult (Clipper Only)	19-64	25%
Youth	5-18	50%
Senior	65+	50%
Disabled	RTC or Medicare Card required	50%
School Groups	Students only, by reservation	66%
Children	Under 5	100%

## Alameda/Oakland <-> San Francisco Fare Structure

CURRENT		PROPOSED						
STANDARD FARES		STANDARD FARES - 2015		FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
Adult	\$6.25	Adult	\$6.25	\$6.40	\$6.60	\$6.80	\$7.00	\$7.20
Adult (Clipper Only)	\$4.75	Adult (Clipper Only)	\$4.75	\$4.80	\$5.00	\$5.10	\$5.30	\$5.40
Youth (5-12)	\$3.50	Youth (5-18)	\$3.50	\$3.20	\$3.30	\$3.40	\$3.50	\$3.60
Senior (62+), Disabled	\$3.10	Senior (65+), Disabled	\$3.10	\$3.20	\$3.30	\$3.40	\$3.50	\$3.60
School Groups	\$2.00	School Groups	\$2.00	\$2.10	\$2.20	\$2.20	\$2.30	\$2.40
Children (under 5)	FREE	Children (under 5)	FREE	FREE	FREE	FREE	FREE	FREE
Short Hop - Adult	\$1.50	Short Hop - Adult	\$1.50	\$1.50	\$1.60	\$1.60	\$1.70	\$1.70
Short Hop - Youth	\$1.50	Short Hop - Youth	\$1.50	\$0.70	\$0.80	\$0.80	\$0.80	\$0.80
Short Hop - Senior, Disa	\$0.75	Short Hop - Senior, Disa	\$0.75	\$0.70	\$0.80	\$0.80	\$0.80	\$0.80
Active Military	\$5.00	<del>Active Military</del>	<del>\$5.00</del>					
DISCOUNT FARE PRODUCTS		DISCOUNT FARE PRODUCTS - 2015		FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
10-Ticket Book	\$50.00	<del>10-Ticket Book</del>	<del>\$50.00</del>					
20-Ticket Book	\$90.00	<del>20-Ticket Book</del>	<del>\$90.00</del>					
40-Ticket Book	\$170.00	<del>40-Ticket Book</del>	<del>\$170.00</del>					

### Fare Categories

The Youth fare category is proposed to be changed from 5-12 years of age to 5-18 years. The Active Military fare category is proposed to be eliminated in favor of the Clipper discount fare.

### Fare Products

Youth, Senior, and Disabled fares shall be set at 50% of the base-level Adult fare and School Groups fares shall provide a discount of 66% off the base-level Adult fare. The Youth fare is proposed to be reduced from \$3.50 to \$3.10 and the Short Hop Youth fare reduced from \$1.50 to \$0.75. All multi-ride Ticket Books are proposed to be eliminated in favor of the Clipper discount fare.

### Multi-year Fare Increase

The base-level adult fare increase is calculated at 3% annually and rounded to the nearest dime to keep pace with inflation and operating cost increases. The first increase would take effect on July 1, 2015 (Fiscal Year 2016).

## Vallejo/Mare Island <-> San Francisco Fare Structure

CURRENT		PROPOSED						
STANDARD FARES		STANDARD FARES - 2015		FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
Adult	\$13.00	Adult	\$13.00	\$13.40	\$13.80	\$14.20	\$14.60	\$15.10
Adult (Clipper Only)	N/A	Adult (Clipper Only)	\$9.75	\$10.10	\$10.40	\$10.70	\$11.00	\$11.30
Youth (6-12)	\$6.50	Youth (5-18)	\$6.50	\$6.70	\$6.90	\$7.10	\$7.30	\$7.50
Senior (65+), Disabled	\$6.50	Senior (65+), Disabled	\$6.50	\$6.70	\$6.90	\$7.10	\$7.30	\$7.50
School Groups	N/A	School Groups	\$4.30	\$4.40	\$4.60	\$4.70	\$4.80	\$5.00
Children (under 6)	FREE	Children (under 5)	FREE	FREE	FREE	FREE	FREE	FREE
Adult Day Pass	\$24.00	Adult Day Pass	\$24.00					
Adult Group Day Pass	\$20.00	Adult Group Day Pass	\$20.00					
Adult Group 1-way	\$10.50	Adult Group 1-way	\$10.50					
Y/S/D Day Pass	\$13.00	Y/S/D Day Pass	\$13.00					
Y/S/D Group Day Pass	\$11.00	Y/S/D Group Day Pass	\$11.00					
Y/S/D Group 1-way	\$5.75	Y/S/D Group 1-way	\$5.75					
DISCOUNT FARE PRODUCTS		DISCOUNT FARE PRODUCTS - 2015		FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
Monthly Pass	\$290.00	Monthly Pass	\$290.00	\$307.00	\$326.00	\$345.00	\$366.00	\$388.00
Adult 10-Ride Card	\$103.00	Adult 10-Ride Card	\$103.00					
Y/S/D 10-Ride Card	\$65.00	Y/S/D 10-Ride Card	\$65.00					

### Fare Categories

The Youth fare category is proposed to be changed from 6-12 years of age to 5-18 years. A new School Groups fare category is introduced.

### Fare Products

Youth, Senior, and Disabled fares shall be set at 50% of the base-level Adult fare and School Groups fares shall provide a discount of 66% off the base-level Adult fare. The proposal eliminates Group Day Passes, Ticket Ride Cards and Day Passes in favor of a new Clipper discount fare, which is proposed to offer a 25% discount off the base-level Adult fare consistent with Clipper discounts provided on other WETA services. Instead of eliminating the Monthly Pass, as proposed for the other services, the proposal calls for a 6% annual increase in the cost of a Monthly Pass, which would result in a reduction of the estimated per trip discount from 44% to 35% by 2020.

### Multi-year Fare Increase

The base-level adult fare increase is calculated at 3% annually and rounded to the nearest dime to keep pace with inflation and operating cost increases. As mentioned above, the monthly pass is calculated to increase at 6% annually. The first increase would take effect on July 1, 2015 (Fiscal Year 2016).

## Harbor Bay <-> San Francisco Fare Structure

CURRENT		PROPOSED						
STANDARD FARES		STANDARD FARES - 2015		FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
Adult	\$6.50	Adult	\$6.50	\$6.70	\$6.90	\$7.10	\$7.30	\$7.50
Adult (Clipper Only)	\$5.00	Adult (Clipper Only)	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$5.20	\$5.30	\$5.50	\$5.60
Youth (5-12)	\$3.25	Youth (5-18)	\$3.25	\$3.30	\$3.40	\$3.50	\$3.60	\$3.70
Senior (62+), Disabled	\$3.75	Senior (65+), Disabled	\$3.75	\$3.30	\$3.40	\$3.50	\$3.60	\$3.70
School Groups	N/A	School Groups	\$2.10	\$2.20	\$2.30	\$2.30	\$2.40	\$2.50
Children (under 5)	FREE	Children (under 5)	FREE	FREE	FREE	FREE	FREE	FREE
Active Military	\$5.25	<del>Active Military</del>	<del>\$5.25</del>					
DISCOUNT FARE PRODUCTS		DISCOUNT FARE PRODUCTS - 2015		FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
10-Ticket Book	\$55.00	<del>10-Ticket Book</del>	<del>\$55.00</del>					
20-Ticket Book	\$100.00	<del>20-Ticket Book</del>	<del>\$100.00</del>					
Monthly Pass	\$185.00	<del>Monthly Pass</del>	<del>\$185.00</del>					

### Fare Categories

The Youth fare category is proposed to be changed from 5-12 years of age to 5-18 years. The Senior fare category is proposed to be changed from 62+ years of age to 65+ years to be consistent with other WETA services and other major Bay Area transit operators. The Active Military fare category is proposed to be eliminated in favor of the Clipper discount fare. A new School Groups fare categories is introduced.

### Fare Products

Youth, Senior, and Disabled fares shall be set at 50% of the base-level Adult fare and School Groups fares shall provide a discount of 66% off the base-level Adult fare. Multi-ride Ticket Books and Monthly Passes are proposed to be eliminated in favor of the Clipper discount fare.

### Multi-year Fare Increase

The base-level adult fare increase is calculated at 3% annually and rounded to the nearest dime to keep pace with inflation and operating cost increases. The first increase would take effect on July 1, 2015 (Fiscal Year 2016).

**South San Francisco/San Francisco <-> Alameda/Oakland  
Fare Structure**

CURRENT		PROPOSED						
STANDARD FARES		STANDARD FARES - 2015		FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
Adult	\$7.00	Adult	\$7.00	\$7.40	\$7.90	\$8.30	\$8.80	\$9.40
Adult (Clipper Only)	\$7.00	Adult (Clipper Only)	\$7.00	\$7.20	\$7.40	\$7.60	\$7.90	\$8.10
Youth (5-12)	\$3.50	Youth (5-18)	\$3.50	\$3.70	\$3.90	\$4.10	\$4.40	\$4.70
Senior (62+), Disabled	\$3.50	Senior (65+), Disabled	\$3.50	\$3.70	\$3.90	\$4.10	\$4.40	\$4.70
School Groups	\$2.00	School Groups	\$2.00	\$2.40	\$2.60	\$2.70	\$2.90	\$3.10
Children (under 5)	FREE	Children (under 5)	FREE	FREE	FREE	FREE	FREE	FREE
DISCOUNT FARE PRODUCTS		DISCOUNT FARE PRODUCTS - 2015		FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
N/A		N/A						

**Fare Categories**

The Youth fare category is proposed to be changed from 5-12 years of age to 5-18 years.

**Fare Products**

Youth, Senior, and Disabled fares shall be set at 50% of the base-level Adult fare and School Groups fares shall provide a discount of 66% off the base-level Adult fare. The School Groups fare will remain \$2.00 until FY 2016 when it will be increased to \$2.40.

**Multi-year Fare Increase**

The proposal for South San Francisco differs from other services in that it applies an annual increase to the Adult Clipper fare of 3% while imposing a cash surcharge for the base-level Adult fare that increases at 6% annually.

## **Inter-operator Transfer Discounts**

The following inter-operator transfer discounts will be offered exclusively through Clipper:

### **SF MUNI to/from WETA**

- WETA Adult passengers receive \$0.50 off SF MUNI Adult bus and light rail fares.
- SF MUNI Adult eCash bus and light rail riders receive \$0.50 off WETA Adult fares.
- Discounted SF MUNI Monthly Pass Sticker for Vallejo Monthly Pass holders will be discontinued after Clipper is implemented.

### **Soltrans to/from WETA**

- WETA passengers transfer to Soltrans local bus services free of charge.
- Soltrans local bus riders transferring to WETA are refunded the cost of their bus fare.
- Free transfers to Soltrans local buses for Vallejo Monthly Pass holders will be discontinued after Clipper is implemented.
- WETA will pursue an agreement with Soltrans to allow the Vallejo Monthly Pass to remain valid for use on Soltrans Route 80, to the extent feasible.

### **AC Transit to/from WETA** (tentative, subject to future agreement)

- WETA passengers transfer to AC Transit local bus services free of charge.
- AC Transit local bus riders transferring to WETA are refunded the cost of their bus fare.
- Transfer discounts for non-Clipper fares will be discontinued after Clipper transfers are implemented.

### **Golden Gate Bus/Ferry, SamTrans, BART, Caltrain to/from WETA** (TBD, subject to future agreement)



**MEMORANDUM**

---

**TO: Board Members**

**FROM: Nina Rannells, Executive Director**  
**Kevin Connolly, Manager, Planning & Development**  
**Mike Gougherty, Senior Planner**

**SUBJECT: Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project Update**

**Recommendation**

There is no action requested of the Board with this informational item.

**Discussion**

The Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion (DFTX) project is being developed by WETA to expand and improve facilities at the existing ferry terminal in downtown San Francisco. The project will include construction of up to three new ferry gates, landside pedestrian circulation improvements, installation of amenities such as weather-protected areas for queuing, and covering of the current "lagoon" area south of the Ferry Building to enhance WETA's emergency response capabilities.

The DFTX project is currently in the environmental review phase. As the federal and local Lead Agencies, respectively, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and WETA initiated preparation of a joint Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in 2011. To date, WETA has met regularly with project stakeholders, developed a conceptual design for the proposed project, completed the required NEPA/CEQA public scoping process and received comments on a Draft EIS/EIR.

A Final EIS/EIR addressing all comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR has been prepared and is now available for review and download from the WETA website. On September 5, a Notice of Availability will be published in the Federal Register indicating that FTA has authorized release of the Final EIS and issued its Record of Decision stating that the project has satisfied all NEPA and other relevant federal environmental review requirements. The WETA Board, acting as the local Lead Agency under CEQA, is expected to consider certification of the EIR and associated actions at its regularly scheduled meeting in October.

Upon completion of the CEQA and NEPA environmental review processes, WETA would advance design work for the project and initiate project permitting with the Bay Conservation and Development Commission, Army Corps of Engineers, and San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board. Additionally, WETA will begin discussions with the Port of San Francisco to draft an implementation plan for the project, which would be constructed on property within the jurisdiction of the Port.

**Fiscal Impact**

There is no fiscal impact associated with this informational item.

\*\*\*END\*\*\*