

**Members of the Board**

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

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING**

*Wednesday, August 20, 2014 at 1:00 p.m.*

**San Francisco Bay Area**

**Water Emergency Transportation Authority**  
9 Pier, Suite 111; San Francisco

**PLEASE NOTE: Wednesday, August 20**

*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>  | <b>Information</b>              |
| 2. <u>ROLL CALL/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE</u>   | <b>Information</b>              |
| 3. <u>REPORT OF BOARD CHAIR</u>  | <b>Information</b>              |
| 4. <u>REPORTS OF DIRECTORS</u>   | <b>Information</b>              |
| 5. <u>REPORTS OF STAFF</u>   | <b>Information</b>              |
| a. Executive Director's Report   |                                 |
| b. Monthly Review of Financial Statements  |                                 |
| c. Legislative Update  |                                 |
| 6. <u>PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED FINAL FY 2015-2020 FARE PROGRAM</u>   | <b>Timed Item<br/>1:00 p.m.</b> |
| 7. <u>CONSENT CALENDAR</u>   | <b>Action</b>                   |
| a. Minutes July 10, 2014   |                                 |
| b. Authorize the Filing of Applications for Federal Transit Administration<br>Formula Program Funds to Support Various Capital Projects  |                                 |
| c. Authorize Execution of an Agreement with Solano County Transit for the<br>Purpose of Receiving Public Transportation Modernization Improvement<br>and Service Enhancement Account Funds |                                 |
| 8. <u>ADOPT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION<br/>MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE RICHMOND FERRY<br/>TERMINAL PROJECT</u>   | <b>Action</b>                   |
| 9. <u>APPROVE CONTRACT AWARD TO CS MARINE CONSTRUCTORS, INC.<br/>FOR MARINE CONSTRUCTION SERVICES FOR THE ALAMEDA MAIN<br/>STREET FERRY FLOAT RELOCATION PROJECT</u>                       | <b>Action</b>                   |
| 10. <u>APPROVE CONTRACT AWARD TO TOPPER INDUSTRIES, INC. FOR<br/>FABRICATION SERVICES FOR THE ALAMEDA MAIN STREET FERRY<br/>TERMINAL WALKWAYS AND RAMPS PROJECT</u>                        | <b>Action</b>                   |
| 11. <u>AUTHORIZE RELEASE OF A REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR THE MID-</u>   | <b>Action</b>                   |

**Water Emergency Transportation Authority**  
**August 20, 2014 Meeting of the Board of Directors**

---

LIFE REFURBISHMENT OF THE PERALTA VESSEL

12. APPROVE A SOLE SOURCE CONTRACT WITH CUMMINS NORTHWEST, LLC FOR MAJOR OVERHAUL OF THE PERALTA MAIN ENGINES **Action**
13. APPROVE A SOLE SOURCE CONTRACT WITH VALLEY POWER SYSTEMS NORTH, INC. FOR INTERMEDIATE OVERHAUL OF THE GEMINI CLASS VESSELS MAIN ENGINES **Action**
14. AUTHORIZE RELEASE OF A REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR REPLACEMENT VESSEL CONSTRUCTION **Action**
15. OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS **Action**  
*To Be Determined*

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.

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: WETA Board Members

FROM: Nina Rannells, Executive Director

DATE: August 20, 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. The Request for Proposals for the project was released on February 28. Technical proposals were due on April 16. Price proposals were received on May 30.

**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. WETA is working with MTC to develop software programming and acquire equipment required to implement Clipper for the Vallejo ferry service. WETA completed Clipper site preparation activities at the Vallejo Ferry Terminal this month and will complete similar work at the North Bay Maintenance Facility in August 2014. Clipper will be available for the Vallejo ferry service in November 2014, pending Board approval of Clipper fares set forth in the proposed FY 2015-2020 Fare Program.

In addition, staff is 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 the 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. Release of the Draft NEPA Environmental Assessment (EA) is anticipated in August 2014. All required permits for the waterside construction phase of the project have been received.

**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, processes and 30% Plans, Specifications, and Engineering. 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 an upcoming 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. It is anticipated that the Final IS/MND will be brought to the Board for adoption at the August 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 Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development 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 and County of San Francisco staff on this City-led project. In August, staff met with County staff to review updated transportation assumptions for the Treasure Island Mobility Management Program.

**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 Final EIS/EIR is scheduled for release this summer, pending final review by FTA. FTA has informed WETA that it will be combining its Record of Decision with issuance of the Final EIS/R, which will expedite approval of the project under the National Environmental Protection Act.

**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.

In July, staff attended the City of Alameda's Transportation Commission meeting to discuss the study and preliminary access improvements under consideration at each terminal. Staff from AC Transit also attended the meeting to discuss options for implementing bus service at the Main St. terminal. Input received from the Commission, as well as riders and residents that attended the March and June public workshops or submitted comments via email will be considered as the draft study report is prepared and released for public review later this fall. Pending public comments received on the draft study, a final study that includes a set of recommended access improvements and funding strategies for each Alameda terminal will be prepared and presented to the Board.

**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.

On July 21, a proposed final Fiscal Year (FY) 2015-2020 Fare Program was made available for public review. The proposed final FY 2015-2020 Fare Program includes minor revisions to the initial proposed FY 2015-2020 Fare Program released for public comment on May 14. A Public Hearing to receive comments on the proposed final Fare Program has been scheduled and publicly noticed to be held during this month's Board meeting. Subject to comments provided during the Public Hearing, staff anticipates requesting Board approval of the proposed final Fare Program in September. 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.

### **OUTREACH, PUBLIC INFORMATION, AND MARKETING EFFORTS**

On July 11, Lauren Gularte attended the monthly regional Business Outreach Committee meeting.

On July 16, Lauren Gularte participated in an event hosted by the Business Outreach Committee to solicit information from Community Based Organizations on how to better serve their members.

On July 22, Nina Rannells and Kevin Connolly, along with representatives from other regional public transit operators and MTC, met with members of the United States Olympic Committee to begin discussions regarding the transportation planning element of a potential Bay Area bid for the 2024 Olympics.

On July 22, Keith Stahnke participated on the San Francisco Department of Emergency Management Services Fleet Week 2014 Table Top Exercise Design Team.

On July 29, Mike Gougherty attended the Northern California Chapter of the Professional Environmental Marketing Association (PEMA) luncheon in Oakland as a guest speaker on behalf of WETA.

On July 30, Kevin Connolly and Mike Gougherty attended the City of Alameda's Transportation Commission meeting to discuss WETA's Alameda Terminals Access Study.

MEMORANDUM

**TO: Board Members**

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

**SUBJECT: Monthly Review of FY 2013/14 Financial Statements for Twelve Months  
Ending June 30, 2014**

**Recommendation**

There is no recommendation associated with this informational item.

**Summary**

This report provides the attached FY 2013/14 Financial Statements for twelve months ending June 30, 2014.

**Operating Budget vs. Actual**

	Prior Actual	Current Budget	Current Actual
<b>Revenues - Year To Date:</b>			
Fare Revenue	10,501,990	10,570,800	13,117,525
Local Bridge Toll Revenue	15,918,882	20,200,500	14,942,410
Other Revenue	2,311	2,000	3,796
<b>Total Operating Revenues</b>	<b>26,423,183</b>	<b>30,773,300</b>	<b>28,063,730</b>
<b>Expenses - Year To Date:</b>			
Planning & Administration	2,610,227	3,000,000	2,189,315
Ferry Services	23,812,956	27,773,300	25,874,415
<b>Total Operatings Expenses</b>	<b>26,423,183</b>	<b>30,773,300</b>	<b>28,063,730</b>
<b>System-Wide Farebox Recovery %</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>51%</b>

**Capital Actual and % of Total Budget**

	YTD Actual	% of FY 2013/14 Budget
<b>Revenues:</b>		
Federal Funds	3,509,401	21.07%
State Funds	5,429,658	31.43%
Bridge Toll Revenues	336,706	14.71%
Local Funds	671,123	61.47%
<b>Total Capital Revenues</b>	<b>9,946,888</b>	<b>26.66%</b>
<b>Expenses:</b>		
<b>Total Capital Expenses</b>	<b>9,946,888</b>	<b>26.66%</b>

**Fiscal Impact**

There is no fiscal impact associated with this informational item.

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



**San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority**  
**FY 2013/14 Statement of Revenues and Expenses**  
**For Twelve Months Ending 6/30/2014**

% of Year Elapsed 100.0%

	Current Month	Prior Year Actual	2013/14 Budget	2013/14 Actual	% of Budget
<b>OPERATING EXPENSES</b>					
<b><u>PLANNING &amp; GENERAL ADMIN:</u></b>					
Wages and Fringe Benefits	92,616	1,233,170	1,411,000	1,147,055	81.3%
Services	213,380	1,229,092	1,515,000	831,150	54.9%
Materials and Supplies	17,961	55,678	111,000	51,453	46.4%
Utilities	3,042	13,147	18,000	14,673	81.5%
Insurance	443	(6,303)	35,000	16,813	48.0%
Miscellaneous	16,675	131,781	138,000	89,460	64.8%
Leases and Rentals	23,080	271,224	303,000	272,529	89.9%
Admin Overhead Expense Transfer	(48,422)	(317,561)	(531,000)	(233,817)	44.0%
<b>Sub-Total Planning &amp; Gen Admin</b>	<b>318,775</b>	<b>2,610,227</b>	<b>3,000,000</b>	<b>2,189,315</b>	<b>73.0%</b>
<b><u>FERRY OPERATIONS:</u></b>					
<b><u>Harbor Bay FerryService</u></b>					
Purchased Transportation	114,020	1,256,002	1,287,600	1,470,697	114.2%
Fuel - Diesel & Urea	38,179	453,284	553,000	476,788	86.2%
Other Direct Operating Expenses	58,264	345,404	633,900	375,050	59.2%
Admin Overhead Expense Transfer	10,994	40,632	116,000	52,821	45.5%
<b>Sub-Total Harbor Bay</b>	<b>221,457</b>	<b>2,095,322</b>	<b>2,590,500</b>	<b>2,375,356</b>	<b>91.7%</b>
<b><u>Alameda/Oakland Ferry Service</u></b>					
Purchased Transportation	1,008,155	3,893,337	3,888,600	4,953,078	127.4%
Fuel - Diesel & Urea	129,460	1,231,916	1,522,000	1,347,185	88.5%
Other Direct Operating Expenses	52,635	485,883	1,084,800	722,403	66.6%
Admin Overhead Expense Transfer	17,918	85,936	244,000	87,739	36.0%
<b>Sub-Total Alameda/Oakland</b>	<b>1,208,168</b>	<b>5,697,073</b>	<b>6,739,400</b>	<b>7,110,404</b>	<b>105.5%</b>
<b><u>Vallejo FerryService</u></b>					
Purchased Transportation	477,083	7,299,002	7,322,000	7,006,911	95.7%
Fuel - Diesel & Urea	469,122	4,691,631	5,996,800	4,958,699	82.7%
Other Direct Operating Expenses	225,250	1,258,182	1,486,300	1,261,332	84.9%
Admin Overhead Expense Transfer	8,510	140,841	60,000	40,402	67.3%
<b>Sub-Total Vallejo</b>	<b>1,179,965</b>	<b>13,389,657</b>	<b>14,865,100</b>	<b>13,267,345</b>	<b>89.3%</b>
<b><u>South San Francisco FerryService</u></b>					
Purchased Transportation	137,034	1,736,283	2,132,700	2,039,041	95.6%
Fuel - Diesel & Urea	50,762	550,910	708,600	642,648	90.7%
Other Direct Operating Expenses	46,668	293,560	626,000	386,765	61.8%
Admin Overhead Expense Transfer	11,000	50,151	111,000	52,855	47.6%
<b>Sub-Total South San Francisco</b>	<b>245,463</b>	<b>2,630,903</b>	<b>3,578,300</b>	<b>3,121,309</b>	<b>87.2%</b>
<b>Total Operating Expenses</b>	<b>3,173,827</b>	<b>26,423,183</b>	<b>30,773,300</b>	<b>28,063,730</b>	<b>91.2%</b>
<b>Total Capital Expenses</b>	<b>2,381,776</b>	<b>9,189,750</b>	<b>37,315,251</b>	<b>9,946,888</b>	<b>26.7%</b>
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>5,555,604</b>	<b>35,612,933</b>	<b>68,088,551</b>	<b>38,010,618</b>	<b>55.8%</b>
<b>OPERATING REVENUES</b>					
Fare Revenue	1,283,132	10,501,990	10,570,800	13,117,525	124.1%
Local - Bridge Toll	1,890,695	15,918,882	20,200,500	14,942,410	74.0%
Local - Other Revenue	-	2,310	2,000	3,796	189.8%
<b>Total Operating Revenues</b>	<b>3,173,827</b>	<b>26,423,183</b>	<b>30,773,300</b>	<b>28,063,730</b>	<b>91.2%</b>
<b>Total Capital Revenues</b>	<b>2,381,776</b>	<b>9,189,750</b>	<b>37,315,251</b>	<b>9,946,888</b>	<b>26.7%</b>
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>5,555,604</b>	<b>35,612,933</b>	<b>68,088,551</b>	<b>38,010,618</b>	<b>55.8%</b>

**San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority  
FY 2013/14 Statement of Capital Programs and Expenditures  
For Twelve Months Ending 6/30/2014**

Project Description	Current Month	Project Budget	Prior Year Actual	2013/14 Budget	2013/14 Actual	Future Year	% of Total Project Budget
<b>CAPITAL EXPENSES</b>							
<b><u>FACILITIES:</u></b>							
<b>Maintenance and Operations Facilities</b>							
North Bay Ops & Maint. Facility	1,175,237	25,500,000	1,128,552	13,601,448	3,963,500	10,770,000	20%
Central Bay Ops & Maint. Facility	619,930	4,952,500	907,554	4,044,946	1,272,903	-	44%
<b>Gangway, Pier &amp; Float Rehabilitation</b>							
Regional Spare Float Replacement	3,647	3,300,000	7,313	2,500,687	51,663	792,000	2%
East Bay Ferry Terminal Refurbishment	153,808	2,595,400	5,725	2,589,675	335,784	-	13%
<b>Terminal Improvement</b>							
Terminal Facility Improve - Alameda Terminals	-	250,000	55,463	194,537	9,233	-	26%
Clipper Site Preparation - Vallejo	68,095	300,000	-	300,000	148,695	-	50%
<b><u>FERRY VESSELS:</u></b>							
<b>Major Component Rehab/Replace</b>							
Vessel Engine Overhaul - Scorpio & Taurus	-	660,000	-	660,000	-	-	0%
Vessel Engine Overhaul - Solano	10,320	2,000,000	-	2,000,000	699,042	-	35%
Major Component Rehab - Gemini & Pisces	-	300,000	-	300,000	-	-	0%
Communications Equipment	-	182,000	43,143	138,857	-	-	24%
<b>Vessel Mid-Life Repower/Refurbishment</b>							
Vessel Mid-Life Refurbishment - Bay Breeze	317,783	5,015,000	1,685,427	3,329,573	3,053,495	-	94%
Vessel Mid-Life Refurbishment - Peralta	-	5,260,000	-	5,260,000	-	-	0%
<b>Vessel Expansion/Replacement</b>							
Purchase Replacement Vessel - Express II	8,229	15,000,000	-	25,000	22,989	14,975,000	0.2%
Purchase Replacement Vessel - Encinal	8,229	18,500,000	-	25,000	27,579	18,475,000	0.1%
<b><u>CAPITAL EQUIPMENT / OTHER:</u></b>							
Purchase 18-Tone Crane Truck	-	75,000	-	75,000	-	-	0%
Integration of Real-Time Transit Information	-	54,000	-	54,000	-	-	0%
<b><u>SERVICE EXPANSION:</u></b>							
<b>Future Expansion Service Studies</b>							
Berkeley Terminal - Environ/Concept Design	590	2,335,000	2,164,490	170,510	18,526	(0)	93%
Antioch - Environ/Concept Design	1,050	812,500	134,800	102,300	11,398	575,400	18%
Martinez - Environ/Concept Design	-	812,500	164,200	71,300	694	577,000	20%
S.F. Berthing Expansion - Environ/Concept Design	9,480	3,300,000	2,338,977	961,023	242,869	-	78%
<b>Terminal/Berthing Expansion Construction</b>							
SSF Terminal Oyster Mitigation Study	595	275,000	77,675	50,325	5,655	147,000	30%
Richmond Ferry Terminal	4,784	1,862,500	476,430	861,070	82,864	525,000	30%
<b>Total Capital Expenses</b>	<b>2,381,776</b>	<b>93,341,400</b>	<b>9,189,750</b>	<b>37,315,251</b>	<b>9,946,888</b>	<b>46,836,400</b>	
<b>CAPITAL REVENUES</b>							
Federal Funds	393,351	36,486,920	3,165,828	16,659,624	3,509,401	16,690,062	18%
State Funds	1,807,776	47,379,800	3,631,199	17,274,241	5,429,658	26,451,338	19%
Local - Bridge Toll	95,425	7,995,524	2,120,305	2,289,679	336,706	3,695,000	31%
Local - Alameda Sales Tax Measure B	85,224	1,241,256	229,090	897,171	661,890	-	72%
Local - Property Tax and Assessments	-	237,900	43,328	194,537	9,233	-	22%
<b>Total Capital Revenues</b>	<b>2,381,776</b>	<b>93,341,400</b>	<b>9,189,750</b>	<b>37,315,251</b>	<b>9,946,888</b>	<b>46,836,400</b>	

MEMORANDUM

---

**TO: Board Members**

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

**SUBJECT: WETA Federal Legislative Board Report – August 1, 2014**

Our efforts in Washington, D.C. on MAP-21 are focused on defending the new (and better) Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) formula that was created by the Boxer bill; and changing the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) program from a competitive grant program (which doesn't guarantee money for WETA – although we were successful in getting \$3 million from the last round of funding) to a passenger-focused formula program (that does guarantee money for WETA).

From a political perspective, WETA is in an interesting position on both of these priorities, especially in the Senate, given the fact that Senator Barbara Boxer is chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee (with jurisdiction over FHWA), and because of our passenger-only ferry coalition building with NYC (which has clout with Senator Chuck Schumer (D-NY) and Robert Menendez (R-NJ), senior members of the Banking Committee, with jurisdiction over FTA).

Congress has spent much the past few months focused on short-term funding to keep the Highway Trust Fund (HTF) from going bankrupt – the HTF provides funding for highway and transit programs. While Senator Boxer fought to have funding for the HTF to expire at the end of December (to force Congress to deal with the issue again during the post-election lame duck session of Congress, during which time Boxer and others on the Hill argued the politics would be such that a long-term deal could have been reached), Congress ultimately passed legislation to “patch” the HTF through the end of May. This means that substantive work on the transportation bill will be put off until after the election, at which point, the political landscape could be much different for WETA.

**What the Election *Could* Mean for WETA**

The political changes that we are watching out for next year include:

1. House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Highways and Transit Committee Chairman Tom Petri (R-WI) is retiring at the end of the year. As Chairman of the Subcommittee, Petri has direct jurisdiction over the highway and transit portions of the bill. It is possible that Rep Don Young (R-AK) could take over as Chairman of this key subcommittee, but even if he does not, Young will be well-positioned to fight to maintain the current FHWA formula (which benefits car ferries with long routes) and would likely fight against changes to the FTA program that would provide more funding to passenger-only systems such as WETA.
2. The top Democrat on the T&I Committee, Nick Rahall (D-WV) is in a tough re-election race and could lose his seat, which would mean that either Peter DeFazio (D-OR) or Eleanor Holmes Norton (D-DC) would be the chief Democrat negotiator on the bill. We have a very good relationship with Congressman DeFazio and his senior staff.
3. Control of the Senate could go either way in November. If the Republicans take over the majority, not only would Senator Boxer no longer be in charge of the process, the top Republican on the Committee in the new Congress would likely be Jim Inhofe (R-OK). This is notable for two reasons: 1) Sen David Vitter (R-LA) is currently the top Republican on EPW, he is the person with whom Boxer worked with on her bill, and he is the senior Republican that signed-off on the new, more passenger-friendly ferry formula; and 2) Inhofe is one of the primary reasons the FHWA formula ended up weighted so heavily towards cars last go-around. Furthermore, a Republican majority

would mean that Democratic Senators Schumer and Menendez (both are supporters of passenger-only systems) would have less clout on the Banking Committee.

### **Next Steps**

Regardless of the outcome of the election, there is recognition that if a long-term bill is not agreed to by May 31, that Presidential politics will make it difficult to reach an agreement later in 2015 or in 2016. This is why House and Senate leaders will waste no time to start working on a transportation bill in 2015. In fact, with the election in the rear-view mirror and the new political dynamic solidified, a lot of work could happen in late November and December. Either way, we will have a strategy ready to go for all political outcomes and will be prepared to engage the key players (whether they are “new” or not) as soon as discussions heat back up.

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

**MEMORANDUM**

---

**TO: Board Members**

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

**SUBJECT: Public Hearing on Proposed Final FY 2015-2020 Fare Program**

**Purpose**

Hold a Public Hearing to receive comments on the proposed final Fiscal Year (FY) 2015-2020 Fare Program. Speakers will be asked to clearly state their name and city of residence for the record and to keep their comments to 3 minutes or less. Once all public comments are received the hearing will be closed.

**Background**

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 of inflation. Historically, fares have been increased infrequently and in large amounts, negatively impact 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, the Board authorized staff to conduct outreach with riders on an initial proposed FY 2015-2020 Fare Program, including a Public Hearing in August 2014. On May 14, a summary of the initial 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 Alameda, Oakland, San Francisco, and Vallejo to encourage riders to review the proposed Program and provide comments in-person. A total of 46 public comments were submitted on the initial proposal 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, a proposed final Fare Program has been developed and is provided in **Attachment B**. The proposed final Fare Program includes the following revisions to the initial Fare Program proposed in May:

- 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 currently 65+ years, with the exception of Harbor Bay, which is 62+ years.

On July 21, a summary of the proposed final Fare Program was posted to the WETA website and a Notice of a Public Hearing on August 20 to receive comments on the Fare Program was circulated. As of August 13 a total of 9 public comments were submitted on the proposed final Fare Program and are summarized in **Attachment C**.

### ***Next Steps***

The Board is anticipated to consider approval of the proposed final Fare Program at its regularly scheduled meeting in September, subject to comments provided during the Public Hearing. 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.

### ***Fiscal Impact***

There is no fiscal impact associated with this item.

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

**Attachment A**  
**Public Comments on Initial Proposed Fare Program (released May 14, 2014)**

**Comments Received regarding "Initial Proposal Fare Program" as of 7/15/2014, 5:00 p.m.**

	<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>



**Attachment B**  
**Proposed Final Fare Program for FY 2015-2020**

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

CURRENT		PROPOSED						
STANDARD FARES		STANDARD FARES - FY 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)	\$3.10	\$3.20	\$3.30	\$3.40	\$3.50	\$3.60
Senior (65+), Disabled	\$3.10	Senior (65+), Disabled	\$3.10	\$3.20	\$3.30	\$3.40	\$3.50	\$3.60
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	\$0.75	\$0.75	\$0.80	\$0.80	\$0.80	\$0.80
Short Hop - S/D	\$0.75	Short Hop - S/D	\$0.75	\$0.75	\$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		FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
School Groups	\$2.00	School/Groups	Reserve	School/Group Fares by Advance Reservation Only				
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. 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 - FY 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
Children (under 6)	FREE	Children (under 5)	FREE	FREE	FREE	FREE	FREE	FREE
DISCOUNT FARE PRODUCTS		DISCOUNT FARE PRODUCTS		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
Group Day Pass - Y/S/D	\$11.00	School/Groups	Reserve	School/Group Fares by Advance Reservation Only				
Group Day Pass - Adult	\$20.00	<del>Group Day Pass - Y/S/D</del>	<del>\$11.00</del>					
10-Ride Card - Y/S/D	\$65.00	<del>Group Day Pass - Adult</del>	<del>\$20.00</del>					
10-Ride Card - Adult	\$103.00	<del>10-Ride Card - Y/S/D</del>	<del>\$65.00</del>					
Day Pass - Y/S/D	\$13.00	<del>10-Ride Card - Adult</del>	<del>\$103.00</del>					
Day Pass - Adult	\$24.00	<del>Day Pass - Y/S/D</del>	<del>\$13.00</del>					
		<del>Day Pass - Adult</del>	<del>\$24.00</del>					

### Fare Categories

The Youth fare category is proposed to be changed from 6-12 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. 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 - FY 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	\$3.25	\$3.30	\$3.40	\$3.50	\$3.60	\$3.70
Children (under 5)	FREE	Children (under 5)	FREE	FREE	FREE	FREE	FREE	FREE
Active Military	\$5.25	Active Military	\$5.25					
DISCOUNT FARE PRODUCTS		DISCOUNT FARE PRODUCTS		FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
10-Ticket Book	\$55.00	School/Groups	Reserve	School/Group Fares by Advance Reservation Only				
20-Ticket Book	\$100.00	<del>10-Ticket Book</del>	<del>\$55.00</del>					
Monthly Pass	\$185.00	<del>20-Ticket Book</del>	<del>\$100.00</del>					
		<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.

### Fare Products

Youth, Senior, and Disabled fares shall be set at 50% of 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 - FY 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 (65+), Disabled	\$3.50	Senior (65+), Disabled	\$3.50	\$3.70	\$3.90	\$4.10	\$4.40	\$4.70
Children (under 5)	FREE	Children (under 5)	FREE	FREE	FREE	FREE	FREE	FREE
DISCOUNT FARE PRODUCTS		DISCOUNT FARE PRODUCTS		FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
School Groups	\$2.00	School/Groups	Reserve	School/Group Fares by Advance Reservation Only				

**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.

**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, Caltrain to/from WETA** (TBD, subject to future agreement)

**Attachment C**  
**Public Comments on Proposed Final Fare Program (released July 21, 2014)**

**Comments Received regarding  
"Proposed Final Fare Program" as of  
8/13/2014, 5:00 p.m.**

	<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><u>General Comments</u></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
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>



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

*(July 10, 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**

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

**2. REPORT OF BOARD CHAIR**

No report.

**3. REPORT OF DIRECTORS**

Director DelBono noted that he had met with WETA staff regarding emergency response preparedness and that significant progress had been made. Director Donovan asked if San Francisco Fire Chief Joanne Hayes-White had been included in the meeting. Director DelBono said that he planned to meet with Chief Hayes-White in the near future.

**4. REPORTS OF STAFF**

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

Director Donovan asked if there were any updates regarding development on Treasure Island. Manager of Planning and Development Kevin Connolly replied that he had meet with City of San Francisco staff and representatives from the developer, Lennar Corporation. He said that WETA staff was working with both parties to update transportation assumptions, noting that service would be planned to begin with the completion of the 50<sup>th</sup> residential unit.

Chair Intintoli noted that he had received several positive comments regarding Senior Planner Chad Mason's presentation to the Sunset Rotary Club.

Director Donovan asked if there were any updates regarding the planned Warriors arena or service to the UCSF area. Mr. Connolly said that staff had participated in meetings with city staff and that service to Mission Bay was something WETA would continue to assess for the long term. He added that actual development of the arena may accelerate planning but that there was currently no funding for a Mission Bay project. Ms. Rannells added that WETA had an interest in the possibility of service to the area and that staff would continue to monitor development.

Chair Intintoli said that the Vallejo parking facility had been filling up on San Francisco Giants game days and that the Vallejo to AT&T Park ferries had been full as well. He added that there had been capacity issues on the return service and that fans using departures from the San Francisco Ferry Building had impacted commute runs. Ms. Rannells responded that WETA was aware that some fans chose to return to Vallejo from the Ferry Building and that there were contingencies in place to respond in the event that capacity issues arose.

**5. CONSENT CALENDAR**

Director Donovan made a motion to approve the consent calendar which included the Board of Directors meeting minutes of June 19, 2014.

---

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

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

**6. AWARD CONTRACT TO DUTRA CONSTRUCTION COMPANY FOR WATERSIDE CONSTRUCTION OF THE NORTH BAY OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE FACILITY AND REGIONAL SPARE FLOAT**

Mr. Mason presented this item requesting Board approval for the contract award for waterside construction of the North Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility and construction of the Regional Spare Float, including:

1. Approval of a contract award to Dutra Construction Co., Inc. for design-build construction in an amount not-to-exceed \$15,671,900;
2. Authorization of the Executive Director to negotiate and enter into a contract for this work and take any other related actions as may be necessary to support this work; and
3. Authorization of a budget increase to the Regional Spare Float Replacement project in the FY 2014/15 Capital Budget in the amount of \$562,000 to support contract award.

Director Donovan asked if WETA had previously utilized any of the firms who submitted proposals for this project. Mr. Mason replied that WETA had worked with both Dutra Construction and Manson Construction in the past and that both firms had performed without issue.

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.

**7. ESTABLISH A LEED CERTIFICATION GOAL FOR THE CENTRAL BAY OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE FACILITY PROJECT CONSTRUCTION**

Senior Planner Michael Gougherty presented this item requesting that the Board adopt a certification goal of LEED Silver for the Central Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility.

Director DelBono asked if the cost to increase the level of certification would be prohibitive. Mr. Gougherty explained that many of the points required to increase the certification level were not available for the maintenance facility and that LEED Silver was the most viable.

Director Donovan noted that the IBEW had built a Zero Net Energy center and that those principles could also be considered in the construction of the facility where applicable. He then suggested that the maintenance facility obtain a LEED certification level in such a way that it could later be increased if it became practical to do so.

Director Donovan made a motion to amend the item to read that WETA would “Adopt a certification goal of not less than LEED Silver for the Central Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility.”

Director DelBono made a motion to establish the goal as amended. Director Donovan seconded the motion and the item carried unanimously.

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

**8. OVERVIEW OF CONTRA COSTA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY STUDY ON THE FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY OF CONTRA COSTA FERRY SERVICE 2015 – 2024**

Ms. Connolly presented this informational item regarding the Contra Costa Transportation Authority's (CCTA) release of the *Financial Feasibility of Contra Costa Ferry Service, 2015 – 2024* white paper at its June 2014 meeting.

---

Ms. Rannells noted before the presentation commenced that the study was produced by the CCTA and not WETA, but that staff had provided time and information to the consultant in order to support the report analysis. Mr. Connolly added context to the scope of the study, stating that it had taken over 14 months to produce and commended the efforts of CCTA Program Manager Peter Engle.

Vice Chair Intintoli noted that the South San Francisco ridership projections appeared to be reasonably accurate. Mr. Connolly agreed that the ridership projections had held up well, noting that ridership forecasting is an inexact science. Ms. Rannells added that building ridership for any new service took time.

Vice Chair Intintoli emphasized that it was important to recognize that WETA was already subsidizing operations for its existing services and that it was up to the state and local governments to make an ongoing commitment to operations for any new services.

Director DelBono asked why some of the Contra Costa sites would require dredging. Mr. Connolly said that some of the terminals are, unavoidably, sited in shallow areas that would require ongoing dredging to support operations.

Ms. Rannells said that, at this point, operating funding is only available to support Richmond service; the most feasible of the Contra Costa services. Mr. Connolly added that the funding would ideally be sustained through a ramp-up period of ten years. Vice Chair Intintoli stated that economic prospects could change considerably in either direction in the four to five year construction window for building the service.

Director DelBono noted that San Francisco was not the only major destination to consider and suggested that WETA ask itself how it could provide service everywhere, specifically noting Redwood City and the South Bay. Vice Chair Intintoli suggested that this could be discussed further in a Board Retreat as it was part of a bigger picture. Director DelBono suggested that WETA consider looking at service to Alviso in the South Bay.

#### **Public Comment**

Dana Stoehr of Orton Entertainment, General Manager of the Craneway Pavilion at Ford Point, spoke in support of the CCTA's finding of Richmond as the most feasible Contra Costa service. She said that there were many companies and employees ready to utilize a Richmond service immediately for their commute as well as for special events at the Craneway Pavilion. She noted that there was easy access to the terminal site and plenty of parking. Ms. Stoehr added that she had many letters in support of a Richmond ferry service.

#### **Public Comment**

Richard Mazzera, General Manager of the restaurant Assemble at the Craneway Pavilion, said that Richmond was a great destination with residential areas nearby and an active business park. He added that the terminal location was already dredged and that Hornblower vessels demonstrated the feasibility of the terminal location as they had already serviced special events at the Pavilion.

#### **Public Comment**

Sherry McCoy, Vice Mayor, City of Hercules, questioned the accuracy of the numbers in the CCTA's study. She added that all of Contra Costa was looking for ferry service and asked how WETA would work with the cities to ensure the success of these services given the significant capital costs. She noted that funds should first be invested in the service that is most likely to succeed.

#### **Public Comment**

Peter Engle, CCTA, thanked WETA for their assistance with the study. He clarified that the Antioch/Martinez to San Francisco route would be 155 minutes each way. Mr. Engle said that the

---

CCTA had taken on this study in order to clarify and clear up public misinformation. He said that it took 15 months to complete because of the importance of creating a clear and consistent document. He said that he was not in the position to recommend anything but that the study gives the necessary information to the cities so that they can more accurately look at the services from an economic perspective, noting that it would be up to the WCCTAC/WETA to look at how Measure J would fund ferry service.

Chair Intintoli asked if Measure J provided emergency response funding. Mr. Engle replied no; that it was for long-term transportation projects.

#### **9. ALAMEDA TERMINAL ACCESS PLAN STATUS REPORT**

Mr. Connolly presented this informational item updating the Board on the Alameda Terminal Access Plan Study.

Chair Intintoli asked if it was feasible to relocate the dog park adjacent to the Main Street terminal. Mr. Connolly said that it would be up to the City, but that it could be done.

Director Donovan asked why the AC Transit bus serving the Main Street terminal had been stopped. Mr. Connolly said that it had experienced low ridership. Ms. Rannells added that it was discontinued a number of years ago, when the service was still under the City of Alameda, and that it had not been timed to meet the ferry schedule. Mr. Connolly noted that ferry ridership has doubled since the bus service had ended and that AC Transit was open to revisiting this route.

Director Donovan asked if stacked parking was a viable option. Mr. Connolly replied that part of the issue was that much of this parking was on city streets. Director DeBono asked if safety was a concern in the parking areas. Mr. Connolly said that this had been discussed at length with city staff and that as with the rest of the parking issues it was still a new issue for them.

#### **10. ADJOURNMENT**

All business having concluded, the meeting was adjourned at 2:13 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Board Secretary

---

MEMORANDUM

---

**TO: Board Members**

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

**SUBJECT: Authorize the Filing of Applications for Federal Transit Administration  
Formula Program Funds to Support Various Capital Projects**

**Recommendation**

Authorize the filing of applications for Fiscal Year (FY) 2014/15 and FY 2015/16 Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5307 Urbanized Area, Section 5337 State of Good Repair, and Section 5339 Bus & Bus Facilities funds to support various capital improvement projects, commit the necessary local match and assure completion of the projects.

**Background**

FTA Section 5307 Urbanized Area, Section 5337 State of Good Repair, and Section 5339 Bus & Bus Facilities (together referred to as FTA Formula Program) funds will be programmed by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to support the implementation of the Authority's capital improvement projects. Though Congress has not yet adopted authorizing legislation for the FY 2014/15 and FY 2015/16 programs, MTC anticipates the programs will be authorized by Federal authorizing legislation that succeeds the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (MAP-21) legislation enacted by Congress and signed into law in July 2012.

MTC is responsible for programming FTA Formula Program funds to eligible transit operators in the San Francisco Bay region through their Transit Capital Priorities (TCP) Process and Criteria programming guidelines. Under MTC's current policy, these funds, totaling approximately \$400 million annually for the region, are programmed for certain transit capital replacement and rehabilitation projects, preventative maintenance and ADA-related operating assistance. Once these funds are programmed by MTC and annual program funds are appropriated by Congress, individual project sponsors can secure these funds through grant applications and execution of a grant funding agreements directly with FTA.

**Discussion**

Consistent with MTC's TCP programming guidelines, staff recommends that the Authority apply for FTA Formula Program funds for the following eligible projects contained in the 10-Year Capital Program of the Authority's FY 2012 – FY 2021 Short Range Transit Plan:

1. Ferry Major Component Rehabilitation/Replacement
2. Ferry Propulsion Systems Repower/Refurbishment
3. Ferry Vessel Replacement
4. Ferry Fixed Guideway Connectors Rehabilitation/Replacement

Staff has begun preparation of the required grant materials and requests Board approval to submit the Authority's FY 2014/15 and FY 2015/16 FTA Formula Program of Projects to MTC and FTA. These projects are listed above and described in more detail in **Attachment A**. This programming process represents the first step in securing funds to support these necessary capital rehabilitation and replacement projects scheduled for implementation over the next several years.

**Fiscal Impact**

This item would provide up to \$20,304,000 in FY 2014/15 and FY 2015/16 FTA Formula Program funds to support the implementation of the various ferry capital improvement projects. These capital projects are included in the Authority's 10-Year Capital Program.

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

**Attachment A  
Program of Projects**

**FY2014/15 Transit Capital Priorities Projects**

<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Federal Funds Requested</b>	<b>Local Match</b>	<b>Total Project Cost</b>
Gemini - SCR Overhaul, Vessel Improvements and Dry Dock	This project will overhaul Gemini's Selective Catalyst Reduction (SCR) system, refresh and replace if necessary passenger cabin seatings and carpets while the vessel is in dry dock.	\$1,248,000	\$312,000	\$1,560,000
Pisces - SCR Overhaul, Vessel Improvements and Dry Dock	This project will overhaul Pisces' Selective Catalyst Reduction (SCR) system, refresh and replace if necessary passenger cabin seatings and carpets while the vessel is in dry dock.	\$1,248,000	\$312,000	\$1,560,000
Scorpio - SCR System Overhaul	This project will overhaul Scorpio's Selective Catalyst Reduction (SCR) system.	\$288,000	\$72,000	\$360,000
Taurus - SCR System Overhaul	This project will overhaul Taurus' Selective Catalyst Reduction (SCR) system.	\$288,000	\$72,000	\$360,000
M/V Intintoli - Propulsion System Upgrade	This project will replace the M/V Intintoli's existing MJP 750 Mk1 waterjet internals with new generation MJP 750 Mk2 impeller, hubs, stators. Upgrading to impeller will result in lower ongoing maintenance costs and improved fuel consumption.	\$1,920,000	\$480,000	\$2,400,000
M/V Intintoli - Vessel Improvements	This project will replace the M/V Intintoli's main engine outboard bearings, replace passenger cabin LED lighting, tables, replace restroom flooring, replace exterior seating, install new vertical bike storage systems and upgrade the fire alarm communication panel	\$368,000	\$92,000	\$460,000
M/V Solano - Vessel Improvements	This project will replace the M/V Solano's main engine outboard bearings, replace passenger cabin LED lighting and vinyl flooring, upgrade the fire alarm communication panel, replace bridge wing panels, replace HVAC condenser unit, replace exterior seating and install new vertical bike storage systems.	\$424,000	\$106,000	\$530,000
Vallejo Ferry Terminal - Replace Fendering, Hydraulics and Pump Out System	This project will replace the knee fendering on the float, hydraulics system, sewage pump out system and gangway float lights at the Vallejo ferry terminal.	\$376,000	\$94,000	\$470,000
	<b>Total FY 2014/15 TCP Projects</b>	<b>\$6,160,000</b>	<b>\$1,540,000</b>	<b>\$7,700,000</b>

**FY2015/16 Transit Capital Priorities Projects**

<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Federal Funds Requested</b>	<b>Local Match</b>	<b>Total Project Cost</b>
M/V Mare Island - Propulsion System Upgrade	This project will replace the M/V Mare Island's existing MJP 750 Mk1 waterjet internals with new generation MJP 750 Mk2 impeller, hubs, stators. Upgrading to impeller will result in lower ongoing maintenance costs and improved fuel consumption.	\$2,000,000	\$500,000	\$2,500,000
M/V Mare Island - Vessel Improvements	This project will replace the M/V Mare Island's main engine outboard bearings, replace passenger cabin LED lighting, tables, replace restroom flooring, replace exterior seating, install new vertical bike storage systems and upgrade the fire alarm communication panel	\$400,000	\$100,000	\$500,000
Scorpio - Vessel Improvements and Dry Dock	This project will refresh/replace the Scorpio's passenger cabin seatings and carpets while the vessel is in dry dock.	\$1,360,000	\$340,000	\$1,700,000
Taurus - Vessel Improvements and Dry Dock	This project will refresh/replace the Taurus' passenger cabin seatings and carpets while the vessel is in dry dock.	\$1,360,000	\$340,000	\$1,700,000
East Bay Ferry Terminals - Replace Fendering	This project will replace knee fenderings on the Oakland, Main Street and Harbor Bay ferry terminal floats.	\$80,000	\$20,000	\$100,000
Gemini & Pisces - Fuel Injector and Press Pump Overhaul	This project will overhaul the fuel injectors and press pump neck on the Gemini and Pisces at the 3,500 service hour interval.	\$120,000	\$30,000	\$150,000
Scorpio & Taurus - Fuel Injectors and Press Pump Overhaul	This project will overhaul the fuel injectors and press pump neck on the Scorpio and Taurus at the 3,500 service hour interval.	\$120,000	\$30,000	\$150,000
Peralta - Minor Engine Overhaul	This project will overhaul engine components at the 8,000 service hour interval.	\$96,000	\$24,000	\$120,000
Vessel Replacement - M/V Vallejo	This project will replace the M/V Vallejo as it will reach the end of its economic useful life in 2016. The proposed replacement vessel will have a passenger capacity of 345.	\$10,608,000	\$2,652,000	\$13,260,000
	<b>Total FY 2015/16 TCP Projects</b>	<b>\$14,144,000</b>	<b>\$3,536,000</b>	<b>\$17,680,000</b>

MEMORANDUM

---

**TO: Board Members**

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

**SUBJECT: Authorize Execution of an Agreement with Solano County Transit for the Purpose of Receiving Public Transportation Modernization Improvement and Service Enhancement Account Funds**

**Recommendation**

Authorize the Executive Director to enter into an agreement with Solano County Transit (SolTrans) for the purpose of receiving California Public Transportation Modernization Improvement and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) program funds in the amount of \$2,539,753 to support the North Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility.

**Background/Discussion**

In November 2006, California voters approved Proposition 1B (Prop 1B), the Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality and Port Security Bond Act of 2006. Prop 1B provides almost \$20 billion in State general obligation bond proceeds to fund approximately 14 different categories of transportation projects, including the PTMISEA program administered by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). PTMISEA program funds are allocated based on revenues reported on the FY 2004/05, FY 2005/06 and FY 2006/07 Transit Operators Financial Transactions and Compensation Report filed by transit operators to the State Controller's Office (SCO).

The Service Transfer Agreement between the City of Vallejo and WETA stipulates that grant funds available to the City for the transferred ferry system are to be transferred to WETA for use in supporting the system. A total of \$3,790,676 in PTMISEA funds that were originally generated by the City of Vallejo's (City) combined bus and ferry system, that is now operated individually by SolTrans (bus) and WETA (ferry), remains unclaimed. SolTrans and WETA staffs have agreed that these funds should be split 33% (or \$1,250,923) to SolTrans and 67% (or \$2,539,753) to WETA consistent with how funds were generated to the program.

Caltrans has determined SolTrans is the eligible recipient the City's unclaimed PTMISEA funds and SolTrans has agreed to submit an allocation request on behalf of WETA in order to obtain and pass through PTMISEA funds to WETA for the North Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility Project.

**Fiscal Impact**

This item provides \$2,539,753 in PTMISEA funds, to be secured by SolTrans on behalf of WETA, for the North Bay Operations and Maintenance Facility.

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



**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>a. 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>b. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.</li> <li>c. 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>d. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.</li> <li>e. 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>f. 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>g. 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>h. 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>	<p>WETA</p>		
<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>	<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-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>		

<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-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  
Keith Stahnke, Manager, Operations

**SUBJECT:** Approve Contract Award to CS Marine Constructors, Inc. for Marine Construction Services for the Alameda Main Street Ferry Float Relocation Project

**Recommendation**

Approve 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.

**Background/Discussion**

In the spring of 2013, Bay Ship & Yacht installed a large dry-dock immediately adjacent to the Main Street Ferry terminal. While vessels are still capable of landing at the Main Street Ferry Terminal, docking requires additional maneuvering and time to land. In response to this issue, staff has worked with Bay Ship & Yacht to prepare plans to relocate the Main Street float and gangways 100 feet to the west of their current location, which is expected to occur in the fall of this year. Bay Ship & Yacht has agreed to cover the costs associated with the float relocation.

The contracted work associated with the relocation includes:

- Removing four guide pilings
- Relocating float in new location
- Reinstalling four guide pilings

**Procurement Process:**

On July 24 WETA solicited quotes from five marine construction firms located in the Bay Area for the work associated with the relocation of the float. A pre-bid conference was held on-site at the Main Street Float with WETA, Bay Ship & Yacht and bidders in attendance on July 30. Proposals were due to WETA on or before August 12 at 2:00pm.

**Evaluation Process:**

A total of five proposals were received in response to the Request for Quotes.

The table below summarizes the prices for each submittal.

<b>FIRM</b>	<b>PRICE PROPOSAL</b>
Vortex Marine Construction, Inc.	\$79,299
The Dutra Group	\$250,000
Manson Construction	\$99,500
Power Engineering Construction	\$69,000
CS Marine Constructors, Inc.	\$58,500

As a result, staff recommends awarding a contract to CS Marine Constructors, Inc. for a not to exceed amount of \$58,500 to relocate the Alameda Main Street Float. If awarded, a Notice to Proceed will be issued, with the project expected to be completed by October 2014.

**Fiscal Impact**

The East Bay Ferry Terminal Improvement project is included in the FY 2014/15 Capital Budget at a total cost of \$432,000 for the Main Street ferry terminal and is funded with Alameda Transportation Sales Tax Measure B funds

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

**MEMORANDUM**

---

**TO: Board Members**

**FROM: Nina Rannells, Executive Director**  
**Keith Stahnke, Manager, Operations**

**SUBJECT: Approve Contract Award to Topper Industries, Inc. for Fabrication Services for the Alameda Main Street Ferry Terminal Walkways and Ramps Project**

**Recommendation**

Approve 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.

**Background/Discussion**

On May 8, the Board of Directors authorized the release of a Request for Proposals (RFP) for Main Street Alameda Ferry Terminal Walkways and Ramps. The scope of work for this project includes design, fabrication and delivery of aluminum walkways and adjustable ramps for the Main Street Ferry Terminal.

The Main Street Ferry Terminal Passenger Float is scheduled to be relocated 100 feet to the west of its current location in fall 2014. The new walkways and adjustable ramps will be installed in conjunction with the float relocation project (see Item 8) and will be fully compliant with accessibility requirements to provide safer and more efficient passenger boarding.

Relocation of the passenger float is required due to the mooring of Bay Ship & Yacht's dry-dock adjacent to the ferry terminal last year. Bay Ship & Yacht has agreed to cover the costs associated with the float relocation including the installation of the new walkways and ramping.

**Procurement Process:**

The RFP was released on June 20 to the construction industry. Notice of the availability of this RFP was sent to WETA's mailing list, noticed in a published newspaper, as well as posted on the Agency's website consistent with the Authority's Administrative Code.

Proposals were due to WETA on or before July 27.

A total of two proposals were received in response to the RFP. An evaluation team composed of WETA staff reviewed the proposals. Technical scores considered each proposer's overall understanding and management plan, references, experience and qualifications of its proposed team for the project. Sixty total possible points for technical proposal were available. The evaluation team made a determination of the competitive range of the proposals.

Once the technical scoring was completed the evaluation team evaluated the price proposals submitted within the competitive range. The Price Proposals were evaluated on a 40-point scale. This two-step process was used to make an award based on combined technical and price proposal score.

The table below summarizes the technical, price and combined scores for each submittal.

<b>Firm</b>	<b>Technical Score</b>	<b>Price Proposal Score</b>	<b>Combined Total Score</b>
Halsten	50	37.33	87.33
Topper Industries, Inc	59	40.00	99.00

Based on these results, the evaluation committee concluded that the proposal from Topper Industries Inc. is the “best value” submittal for this project. As a result, staff recommends awarding a contract to Topper Industries, Inc. to provide the walkways and ramps fabrication work for this project in an amount not to exceed \$252,545, which includes a 15% contingency.

If awarded, a Notice to Proceed will be issued, with the project expected to be completed by October 2014.

**Fiscal Impact**

The East Bay Ferry Terminal Improvement project is included in the FY 2014/15 Capital Budget at a total cost of \$432,000 for the Main Street ferry terminal and is funded with Alameda Transportation Sales Tax Measure B funds.

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

MEMORANDUM

---

**TO:** Board Members

**FROM:** Nina Rannells, Executive Director  
Keith Stahnke, Manager, Operations

**SUBJECT:** Authorize Release of a Request for Proposals for the Mid-life Refurbishment of the *Peralta* Vessel

**Recommendation**

Authorize the release of Request for Proposals (RFP) for the mid-life refurbishment of the *Peralta* Vessel.

**Background**

The ferry vessel *Peralta* was acquired by WETA from the City of Alameda in April 2011 through the transition of the Alameda Oakland Ferry Service to WETA. Built in 2001 by Nichols Brothers Boat Builders, the *Peralta* has been in service for 13 years and has reached its economic mid-life. In order to provide for continued safe and reliable operation, the vessel needs major refurbishment. A vessel mid-life repower/refurbishment project generally consists of replacing or overhauling the main engines, refurbishment of the passenger cabin, hull work, major system renovation, and replacement of control systems and navigation electronics.

The proposed scope of work included in the *Peralta* mid-life refurbishment includes cabin and major system renovation. The passenger cabin will be renovated with fresh paint and deck coverings. The existing vessel seating will be reupholstered or refinished. Heads and galley will have new finishes and decks. Navigation electronics will be replaced with new equipment. Propeller, shafts and bearings will be replaced. The main engines will be removed for major overhauls to be completed under a separate contract. The *Peralta* refurbishment project will extend the useful life of the vessel to the expected full 25 years. Project challenges include completing the required work by May 1, 2015 to ensure that the *Peralta* is available for summer 2015. Work not completed in time may mean elements of the project will need to occur in winter 2015/16.

The total *Peralta* mid-life project budget is \$5,260,000, which includes all work (including main engine overhauls to be completed under separate contract), management, legal and contingency. Staff has worked to secure federal grant commitments over the past few years in anticipation of this needed project which is included in the FY 2014/15 capital budget. Staff anticipates being in a position to return to the Board with a recommendation for contract award for this work in early fall 2014. The project is expected to be complete by June 2015.

**Fiscal Impact**

There is no fiscal impact associated with the release of this RFP.

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

MEMORANDUM

---

**TO: Board Members**

**FROM: Nina Rannells, Executive Director  
Keith Stahnke, Manager, Operations**

**SUBJECT: Approve a Sole Source Contract with Cummins Northwest, LLC for Major Overhaul of the Peralta Main Engines**

**Recommendation**

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.

**Background/Discussion**

The main engines on the *Peralta* have been in service since 2008 and will reach the 20,000 hour Out of Frame overhaul service interval in FY 2014/15. This capital maintenance is required to ensure reliable operation of the engines. For this work the engines will be removed from the vessel and delivered to Cummins West facility in Bakersfield, CA. The scope of work required includes the removal and replacement of the following engine subcomponents:

- Turbochargers
- Cylinder Heads and Kits
- Rod Bearing Sets and Connecting Rods
- Main Bearings
- Camshafts
- Fuel Pumps
- Raw Water and Jacket Water Pumps
- Vibration Damper
- Starters
- Sensors and Thermostats
- Oil and Coolant
- Gaskets and Seals

A contingency of 15% is included in the project budget for additional travel expenses that are not known at this time or in the event any unexpected adverse conditions are found.

**Sole Source Discussion**

Staff is recommending a sole source contract for this procurement in order to address the need to utilize Cummins factory parts as well as the need for parts installation to be completed by a factory-authorized dealership in order to obtain a warranty on parts and labor. Given the costs involved, using a factory authorized dealership to install the manufacturer's parts significantly reduces financial risk to WETA in undertaking this project.



After researching the engine supply and parts industry, staff has concluded that there are no known aftermarket parts manufacturers for these engines and confirmed that Cummins factory parts are the only parts available for these engines. Additionally, because Cummins does not allow competition between its factory authorized dealerships, Cummins Northwest is the sole Cummins factory authorized dealership for the sales, parts and service of Cummins QSK50 series engines in the Bay Area region.

Cummins Northwest is well qualified to complete this work as it has provided on-going service and repair for *Peralta's* main engines since 2001. Cummins Northwest also provides sales and service to the Golden Gate Ferry vessels.

Staff has reviewed the price quote provided by Cummins Northwest for this work and has determined that it is fair and reasonable compared to the Authority's internal estimates and to similar work performed by other engine distributors.

In accordance with the above analysis, staff has determined that this procurement meets the requirements for sole source procurement under federal regulations and as set forth in WETA's Administrative Code Section 502.2(E), which authorizes the agency to procure goods and services without competition under limited circumstances. Subdivision (E) of this provision allows the agency to procure items non-competitively when there is only a single source of supply available, or only one contractor is qualified to provide the service or product. Because Cummins Northwest is uniquely able to provide and warranty the necessary work, a competitive bidding process would serve no useful purpose for this procurement.

**Fiscal Impact**

The Mid-Life Refurbishment of the *Peralta* is included in the FY 2014/15 Capital Budget at a cost of \$5,260,000 and is funded with a combination of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grant funds and Bridge Toll revenues.

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

**MEMORANDUM**

---

**TO: Board Members**

**FROM: Nina Rannells, Executive Director**  
**Keith Stahnke, Manager, Operations**

**SUBJECT: Approve a Sole Source Contract with Valley Power Systems North, Inc. for Intermediate Overhaul of the Gemini Class Vessels Main Engines**

**Recommendation**

Approve the following actions relative to Intermediate Overhaul of Main Engines on the four Gemini Class Vessels:

1. Approve the award of a Sole Source Contract to Valley Power Systems North, Inc. (VPSNI) in an amount not to exceed \$1,150,000, and authorize the Executive Director to negotiate and execute an agreement for this work; and
2. Approve a capital budget increase in the amount of \$660,000 to support overhaul of the main engines on all four Gemini class vessels.

**Background/Discussion**

The main engines on the four Gemini class vessels have been in service since 2008/2009. All of these vessels will reach the 7,000 hour intermediate overhaul service interval in FY 2014/15. This preventive maintenance is required to ensure reliable operation of the engines. The scope of work required at this time includes the removal and replacement of the following engine subcomponents:

- Turbochargers
- Injector Fuel Pumps
- Injector Nozzles
- Injector Lines
- Sea Water Pump
- Fresh Water Pump
- Oil Cooler
- Fuel Cooler Plates
- Heat Exchanger Plates
- Starter
- Fuel injectors and Lines
- Fuel Filters
- Oil Filters
- Oil and Coolant
- Gaskets and Seals

In addition, some cylinder heads will be removed and inspected and all cylinder chambers will be inspected with an endoscope. After complete assembly fluid installation and tune up, engines will be started and sea trial tested.

A contingency of 15% is included in the project budget in the event any unexpected adverse conditions are found.

**Sole Source Discussion**

Staff is recommending a sole source contract for this procurement in order to address the need to utilize MTU factory parts as well as the need for parts installation to be completed by a factory-authorized dealership in order to obtain a warranty on parts and labor. Given the costs involved, using a factory authorized dealership to install the manufacturer's parts significantly reduces financial risk to WETA in undertaking this project.

After researching the engine supply and parts industry, staff has concluded that there are no known aftermarket parts manufacturers for these engines and confirmed that MTU factory parts are the only parts available for these engines. Additionally, because MTU does not allow competition between its factory authorized dealerships, VPSNI is the sole MTU factory authorized dealership for the sales, parts and service of MTU Series 2000 engines in the Bay Area region.

VPSNI is well qualified to complete this work as it overhauled the *Encinal's* main engines in 2013 and *Solano's* main engines in 2014 and has provided ongoing service and repair. VPSNI performs engine service to the majority of WETA's vessels and also provides sales and service to the Golden Gate Ferry vessels.

Staff has reviewed the price quote provided by VPSNI for this work and has determined that it is fair and reasonable compared to the WETA's internal estimates and to similar work performed by other engine distributors.

In accordance with the above analysis, staff has determined that this procurement meets the requirement for sole source procurement under federal regulations and as set forth in the WETA's Administrative Code Section 502.2(E), which authorizes the agency to procure goods and services without competition under limited circumstances. Subdivision (E) of this provision allows the agency to procure items non-competitively when there is only a single source of supply available, or only one contractor is qualified to provide the service or product. Because VPSNI is uniquely able to provide and warranty the necessary work, a competitive bidding process would serve no useful purpose for this procurement.

**Fiscal Impact**

The project to overhaul the main engines on two Gemini class vessels is included in the FY 2014/15 Capital Budget at a cost of \$660,000. A capital budget increase in the amount of \$660,000 is required to support the engine work on two additional vessels (for a total of four) at the proposed total budget of \$1,320,000. The proposed budget would be funded with a combination of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grant funds and AB664 Net Toll revenues secured to support vessel work.

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

MEMORANDUM

---

**TO:** Board Members

**FROM:** Nina Rannells, Executive Director  
Keith Stahnke, Manager, Operations

**SUBJECT:** Authorize Release of a Request for Proposals for Vessel Replacement Construction

**Recommendation**

Authorize the release of a Request for Proposals (RFP) for Vessel Replacement Construction for the procurement of two replacement vessels.

**Discussion/Background**

The Authority owns and utilizes a fleet of 12 vessels to operate its four service routes including Alameda/Oakland to San Francisco, Alameda/Oakland to South San Francisco, Alameda Harbor Bay to San Francisco and Vallejo to San Francisco services. This fleet effectively consists of two sub-fleets including four 34-knot vessels operated in the north bay Vallejo service and eight 25-knot vessels that are operated in the central bay Alameda/Oakland, Harbor Bay and South San Francisco services. While there is some interchangeability of these vessels between the north and central bay services, vessels can generally be categorized into these two sub-fleets based upon the operating speed required to meet the service schedules. A full fleet roster is provided as **Attachment A** to this report.

Two of the eight central bay vessels, the *Encinal* and *Harbor Bay Express II*, are included in the FY 2014/15 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. The *Encinal* is a 395 passenger vessel generally utilized in the operation of the Alameda/Oakland service. It has met the regional replacement age of 25 years, qualifying it for federal (80%) capital replacement funds from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. The 149 passenger *Express II*, which was retired early and sold when it was transferred to WETA due to its poor condition and the high cost of rehabilitation, is also in need of replacement in order to bring the WETA fleet back up to its full roster of 12 vessels. Given the current ridership demand and steady growth in the central bay ferry services, it is staff's assessment that these vessels should be replaced with 27-knot, 400 passenger vessels.

On December 13, 2013 the Board approved a contract with Aurora Marine Design for construction management services to assist staff with the vessel procurement and construction for the Vessel Replacement Project.

Project development included extensive outreach to:

- Naval architects and shipyards reviewing recent similar vessel construction projects
- Propulsion systems manufacturers for latest developments in marine engines and emissions systems equipment

- Other agencies that are in the process of constructing new vessels or conducting extensive vessel repair work, including King County Transit and Golden Gate Ferry who were consulted for best practices in procurement and project management
- Meetings with U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office
- Vessel crews from the Blue and Gold Fleet, including Inlandboatmen's Union Deckhands, Masters, Mates, & Pilots Union Captains and Engineers provided vessel layout and specifications feedback and improvements.

A summary of the vessel requirement analysis conducted for this RFP is provided as **Attachment B** to this report.

This RFP will solicit proposals from qualified small passenger vessel builders to provide two vessels meeting the required vessel design specifications. Once the best qualified proposer is identified, staff will return to the Board to propose a contract award for this project.

**Fiscal Impact**

There is no fiscal impact associated with the release of this RFP.

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

## Attachment A

### WETA Vessel Fleet

August 2014

Vessel	Year Built	Passenger Capacity	Service Speed (knots)
Peralta	2001	326	26
Encinal	1985	395	23
Bay Breeze	1994	250	26
Gemini	2008	149	26
Pisces	2009	149	26
Scorpio	2009	199	26
Taurus	2010	199	26
Vallejo	1991	267	34
Intintoli	1996	349	34
Mare Island	1996	330	34
Solano	2004	320	34
Express II*	1995	149	28

\* Retired in 2012

WETA 400

Vessel Requirements Analysis  
&  
RFP Process  
Summary

Shaun Green  
7 August, 2014

## 1. OVERVIEW

The San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA) intends to procure two (2) passenger only 46 CFR Subchapter "K" aluminum catamarans for ferry service on San Francisco Bay Ferry routes – primarily between downtown San Francisco and Oakland, Alameda and Harbor Bay.

WETA's initial vessel requirements were for 400 passengers, 100 bicycles and a 30 Kt service speed. Additional research was conducted in the form of interviews, trade studies, parametric analysis and vendor meetings to validate and/or further develop these requirements. This document summarizes the research conducted to determine the key vessel parameters.

## 2. TRADE STUDIES & INVESTIGATIONS

The following focus areas were chosen

### 2.1. Route Redundancy

The vessels are designed for operation on the inner harbor routes, however, their potential utility as backup vessels for Vallejo (or future routes such as Berkeley) was investigated to determine if additional capability should be specified. The speed (and corresponding power), schedule, draft and requirements were reviewed to determine the extent of the required vessel upgrades. Making the vessels a viable substitute for the Vallejo route would require considerably more power to maintain schedule. The Berkeley / Richmond route has wake and draft concerns.

#### CONCLUSION:

Each of the routes has very specific requirements that would require unacceptable compromises, significant additional operating costs and risk to satisfy. The vessel should be optimized for the inner harbor routes only. The proposed vessels used on the Vallejo route will have a transit time of 60-65 minutes.

### 2.2. Speed and Route

Operating profile models were built for the most common routes to evaluate the impact of vessel speed on the schedule. Due to the short trip durations and limited high speed operations, reducing the vessel speed from 30Kts to 27Kts added a mere 1.6 minutes to the SFO-Alameda-Oakland round trip and 3.1 minutes to the SFO-Harbor bay round trip. This was deemed insignificant in terms of schedule impact but the lower speed greatly reduced the power requirements and will therefore reduce maintenance and operating costs. See Appendix A for detailed analysis report.

#### CONCLUSION:



Reducing the service speed will allow the use of smaller, economical propulsion engines without having any significant impact on the schedule.

### **2.3. Vessel Performance Parametrics**

A parametric study was undertaken to determine the likely WETA 400 particulars and performance characteristics. A vessel database was developed comprised of vessels that fell within the following criteria:

- Aluminum
- Catamaran
- Passenger Ferry
- Propeller or Waterjet propulsion
- 300-600 passengers
- 0-20 years old (with emphasis on newer vessels)

Recently constructed passenger ferries have higher passenger densities and tend to operate at lower speeds. The current trend is toward propeller driven vessels.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

Based on the Parametric study results, a two deck, twin engine, propeller driven vessel of approx. 135' length with 3700-4000 total installed hp should meet the route requirements.

### **2.4. Two Engine vs. Four Engine Configuration**

The benefits of a two engine vs four engine vessel were investigated. The only benefit associated with the increased initial investment, ongoing maintenance, space constraints and fuel costs associated with a four engine vessel is redundancy.

A meeting was conducted with the Local USCG Sector inspection personnel to determine if a four engine vessel could continue to operate commercially with one engine temporarily out of service. The outcome was:

- The current leadership would likely agree to continued operation on three engine under conservative conditions.
- USCG will not commit to standing letter as administration changes and the local sector has power to decide if this is acceptable at any given time
- Golden Gate operates a vessel under a standing waiver letter which, although grandfathered in, is difficult to enforce even in today's USCG climate without a disruption to the service.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

The redundancy benefits of a four engine vessel are increasingly difficult to realize and would not guarantee uninterrupted service. The increased costs and weight would be more detrimental to the daily operation of the vessel. A two engine vessel is the more desirable option.

## **2.5. Propulsion**

The originally proposed service speed of 30 Kts coincides with the top end of propeller applicability and the low end of waterjet applicability for this type of vessel. Naval Architects, Propeller manufacturers, waterjet manufacturers, engine OEMs and propulsion integrators were consulted to determine the risks associated with each.

### **CONCLUSION:**

The increased efficiency of a propeller vessel is desirable. Adequate maneuverability has been achieved on other propeller driven vessels in the fleet on this route. Mitigation of propeller induced vibrations and damage will be achieved by reducing the service speed to 27 Kts.

## **2.6. Emissions**

WETAs emissions mandates are more restrictive than the incoming Tier 4 regulations. Meetings were held with engine OEMs and an SCR manufacturer. The consensus is that a SCR system will be required. Previous SCR systems have experienced reliability issues so this is a valid concern.

### **CONCLUSION:**

The emissions targets are achievable by calculation. The OEMs are forming strategic alliances with SCR manufacturers and this system would ideally be supplied by the OEM as part of their propulsion package to mitigate risk.

## **2.7. Bicycles**

The 100 bicycle storage goal is very aggressive and consumes a tremendous amount of deck space. The logistics of loading and offloading 100 passengers with bicycles will likely exceed the 6 minute turnaround target. Several arrangements were investigated including hanging storage, inside storage, covered and partially covered exterior storage.

### **CONCLUSION:**

To achieve a reasonable turnaround time on the short duration inner harbor routes a minimum threshold target of 50 bicycles was proposed with an objective of 100 bicycles. Our studies indicate storage for between 50-70 bicycles should be achievable and manageable. Consideration should be given to flex space where additional racks could be installed if the need arises.

### **3. SIMILAR VESSELS & PARENT CRAFT**

Research was undertaken to identify recently constructed vessels of similar characteristics that could be evaluated. There has been very little lightweight passenger ferry construction activity in the US recently, however a number of similar vessels, primarily Australian designed and built, have been placed into service within the past 5 years. All but one of these vessels are propeller driven and all are high capacity, lightweight vessels with much lower power requirements than legacy ferries.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

The expertise exists in engineering and fabrication to construct a vessel that meets our progressive specifications. As with any lightweight vessel, particular attention must be paid to structural detailing and weight control. It will be imperative that the selected builder or team have a proven track record in constructing these types of vessels.

### **4. CONTRACTING**

#### **4.1. Contracting Approach**

Several contracting approaches were investigated to ensure the greatest number of qualified respondents. This analysis is provided in Appendix C. King County recently contracted a pair of similar vessel using a 2 stage RFQ-RFP approach whereby qualified respondents were selected in the initial stage. Only these qualified bidders were invited to submit a proposal. The total contract value was specified in the RFP, therefore all bidders submitted conforming bids. The vessels are under construction and feedback has been positive.

A modified 2 step approach was chosen to ensure FTA compliance

#### **4.2. Buy America**

Buy America compliance data from recent ferry refurbishments and new construction was gathered and used to construct a Buy America compliance matrix. It appears the propeller vessel can meet the Buy America requirements whereas a waterjet powered vessel would be challenging.

### **5. CONCEPT GENERAL ARRANGEMENT**

As the new vessel will carry a larger number of bicycles than any comparable ferry we were able to identify, a concept General Arrangement drawing was developed to verify our vessel size assumptions. This drawing was also used to encourage input from the vessel operators and maintenance personnel.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

The vessel parameters and owners requirements described in the bid documents are achievable

