

**MONTHLY MONITORING REPORT**  
**February 2022**

**Central Subway Project**  
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency  
San Francisco, CA  
**FINAL**

Draft Report delivered to FTA on March 11, 2022  
Final Report delivered to FTA on March 17, 2022

PMOC Contract No.: 69319519D000016  
Task Order No.: 69319520F300115  
Requisition/Reference No.: FTA-TPM20-20-0234  
OPs Referenced: 02, 24, 25, and 26  
CLIN 0002

**David Evans and Associates, Inc.**  
Eric Chang, Task Order Manager  
Voice: (917) 868-3867; Email: [ehch@deainc.com](mailto:ehch@deainc.com)  
Project Time: 07/30/2020 through 07/29/2023

## **REPORT FORMAT AND FOCUS**

This report is submitted in compliance with the terms of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Contract #69319519D000016, Task Order #69319520F300115. Its purpose is to provide information and data to assist FTA as it continually monitors the management capability and capacity of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) (the Project Sponsor) to execute the project efficiently and effectively. This report covers the project management activities on the Central Subway Project (CSP) managed by SFMTA and financed by the FTA Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA). The cost and schedule information in this report was extracted from SFMTA’s January 2022 Monthly Progress Report, except where noted. The report has been organized to comply with the requirements of updated Oversight Procedure 25—Recurring Oversight and Related Reports dated July 2020.

## **THIRD-PARTY DISCLAIMER**

This report and all subsidiary reports are prepared solely for FTA. This report should not be relied upon by any party, except FTA or the Project Sponsor, in accordance with the purposes as described below.

For projects funded through the FTA FFGA program, FTA and its Project Management Oversight Contractor (PMOC) use a risk-based assessment process to review and validate a Project Sponsor’s budget and schedule. This risk-based assessment process is a tool for analyzing project development and management. Moreover, the assessment process is iterative in nature; any results of an FTA or PMOC risk-based assessment represent a “snapshot in time” for a particular project under the conditions known at that same point in time. The status of any assessment may be altered at any time by new information, changes in circumstances, or further developments in the project, including any specific measures a Project Sponsor may take to mitigate the risks to project costs, budget, and schedule, or the strategy a Project Sponsor may develop for project execution. Therefore, the information in the monthly reports will change from month to month, based on relevant factors for the month and/or previous months.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ..... 1

    1.1. Project Description ..... 1

    1.2. Project Status ..... 1

    1.3. Key Indicators Dashboard ..... 5

    1.4. Core Accountability Items..... 5

2. OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS.....6

    2.1. Summary of Monitoring Activities..... 6

    2.2. Oversight Triggers..... 7

    2.3. Project Management Plan and Sub-plans ..... 7

    2.4. Management Capacity and Capability..... 7

    2.5. National Environmental Policy Act Process and Environmental Mitigation ..... 7

    2.6. Project Delivery Method and Procurement ..... 7

    2.7. Design..... 7

    2.8. Value Engineering and Constructability Reviews..... 7

    2.9. Real Estate Acquisition and Relocation ..... 7

    2.10. Third-Party Agreements and Utilities..... 8

    2.11. Construction..... 8

    2.12. Vehicle Technology and Procurement ..... 10

    2.13. Project Cost..... 10

    2.14. Project Schedule ..... 14

    2.15. Project Risk..... 17

    2.16. Quality Assurance/Quality Control ..... 18

    2.17. Safety and Security ..... 19

    2.18. Americans with Disabilities Act..... 19

    2.19. Buy America..... 19

    2.20. Start-up, Commissioning, Testing ..... 20

ATTACHMENT A – LIST OF ACRONYMS ..... 21

ATTACHMENT B – SAFETY AND SECURITY CHECKLIST ..... 24

ATTACHMENT C – TOP 5 PROJECT RISKS ..... 28

ATTACHMENT D – AWARDED CONTRACTS ..... 29

ATTACHMENT E – PROJECT MILESTONES/KEY EVENTS ..... 33

ATTACHMENT F – PROJECT MAP ..... 34

**LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1 – Major Issues and/or Concerns.....4

Table 2 – Key Indicators Dashboard .....5

Table 3 – Core Accountability Items .....6

Table 4 – Forecast Construction Completion Dates for CSP Work Packages .....9

Table 5 – Budget and Contingency Status for Central Subway Project<sup>1</sup> .....13

Table 6 – Project Funding (as of December 2021) .....14

Table 7 – Construction Safety Data .....19

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### 1.1. Project Description

The Central Subway Project (CSP) involves construction of a 1.7-mile extension of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) (the Project Sponsor) T Third Line along 4th Street and beneath Stockton Street in downtown San Francisco. The CSP is Phase 2 of SFMTA's T Third Line Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project. The CSP will extend the T Third Line from the 4th Street Caltrain Station to Chinatown, providing a direct rapid transit link from the Bayshore and Mission Bay areas to South of Market, Union Square, and downtown. Four new stations are being constructed as part of the project: an at-grade station at 4th and Brannan streets and three underground stations at Yerba Buena/Moscone Center (YBM) Station, Union Square/Market Street (UMS) Station, and Chinatown (CTS) Station. Four light rail vehicles (LRVs) are included in the budget for the CSP as part of a larger procurement that will expand the LRV fleet and includes options for replacement of the entire fleet. Average weekday riders are projected to be 43,521 in 2030. The Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) project cost is \$1.578 billion.

### 1.2. Project Status

- Scope: There have been no changes in project scope.
- Schedule: Substantial completion of the contract was originally scheduled for February 10, 2018, but the latest master program schedule update shows substantial completion still occurring *during the first quarter of 2022, which is more than 1,400 days later than the original substantial completion date*. SFMTA's most recent update of the master program schedule forecasts a Revenue Service Date (RSD) of September 9, 2022, which is a three-month delay from the RSD stated in the prior monitoring report.
- Cost: Currently, SFMTA estimates the Estimate at Completion (EAC) to remain the same as the prior reporting period, at \$1.891 billion, or approximately \$313 million greater than the current budget. This EAC will be revised to \$1.931 billion to reflect additional costs to compensate contractors and their subcontractors for direct costs and delay impacts of the additional work performed under change orders. The Project Management Oversight Contractor (PMOC) will update relevant financial tables and provide additional details as SFMTA makes them available.
- Significant Project Activities and/or Key Milestones:
  - SFMTA submitted an updated draft letter in April 2021 to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) proposing a revised FFGA RSD and a revised EAC. The proposed RSD indicates an early RSD of March 31, 2022, and a late RSD of June 20, 2022, which provides a schedule float of about three months. In addition, the updated project EAC is \$1.891 billion. SFMTA submitted the updated EAC in the FTA's Standard Cost Category (SCC) format in May

2021. The PMOC reviewed SFMTA's EAC and RSD, and shared the results of the review and its recommendations with SFMTA. It was the PMOC's opinion that SFMTA should develop a detailed Critical Path Method (CPM) schedule to include activities and sequences of system integration, start-up testing, and operational readiness. SFMTA developed the CPM schedule and submitted it to the PMOC in August 2021. FTA shared the PMOC's review comments on the CPM schedule with SFMTA in September 2021. A PMOC/SFMTA schedule assessment workshop *was held* during the week of November 15, 2021. During the workshop, SFMTA shared the most current schedule, which includes an updated RSD in September 2022, a date that represents a three-month delay from the previous RSD projection. SFMTA indicated that the delay primarily is due to the delay of Automated Train Control System (ATCS) testing. SFMTA *submitted* an updated schedule in January 2022 that incorporated discussions/comments from the November 2021 workshop with the FTA and PMOC and *provided the schedule information that the PMOC had requested*. The current RSD of September 9, 2022 is optimistic based on PMOC's preliminary review. *During February 2022, the PMOC provided FTA with its draft assessment of the CSP's remaining scope and the forecast RSD. FTA provided the draft to SFMTA, and it is currently reviewed by SFMTA.*

- SFMTA's Board approved authorization for the additional funds required to complete the project in March 2021. The total project cost is estimated at \$1.891 billion, compared with the original FFGA budget of \$1.578 billion. The board authorized the additional funds of \$184.6 million to bridge the funding gap between the original FFGA budget and the cost estimate. SFMTA stated that the SFMTA Board approved an additional \$40 million in January 2022 to cover the additional project cost. With this approval, the total project cost is currently at \$1.931 billion. The PMOC requested the breakdown of the current project cost of \$1.931 billion in SCC format and backup information for the additional cost. *The PMOC will perform a cost assessment once the PMOC receives this information in March 2022. The current project cost does not account for the COVID-19 claims that contractor submitted.*
- SFMTA reached a global settlement in March 2021 with the prime contractor, Tutor Perini Corporation (TPC). SFMTA indicated that the substantial completion of TPC's scope of work was in March 2021. As part of the global settlement, SFMTA and TPC reached an agreement that, unless a federal program is available to compensate for the COVID-19-related impacts, there will be no funds, because no local funds will be used to pay for the pandemic-related impacts.
- SFMTA indicated that since increasing numbers of SFMTA staff have taken the COVID-19 vaccine, COVID-19 cases have dwindled, and there have been

no significant impacts on the project. SFMTA continues to implement safety protocol measures to minimize impacts related to COVID-19. In January 2022, SFMTA reported that minor COVID-19 impacts occurred that affected the trackwork punch list items. SFMTA is reviewing COVID-19-related claims submitted from the contractors.

- SFMTA indicated that, starting on April 1, 2021, the Operational Group would, as part of the acceptance process, verify trackwork, clearance, and the dynamic envelope. SFMTA expected to start running the test train in April 2021. However, SFMTA indicated in May 2021 that, due to the modified substantial completion date, the acceptance process of systems by the Operational Group is taking longer than expected. It is the PMOC's opinion that SFMTA should include the acceptance process in the schedule in order to assess the impacts of this process on start-up and testing, as well as on the RSD. As of July 2021, train testing is underway. SFMTA indicated that an additional 25 staff were hired in August 2021 to support the operational readiness process. However, SFMTA stated that approximately 100 operators were not vaccinated as of the City of San Francisco's vaccine mandate deadline of November 1, 2021, which will potentially negatively impact the availability of resources needed to support the CSP operational readiness process. During the schedule assessment workshop in November 2021, SFMTA indicated that it will put a plan in place to ensure that the resources and training required for revenue service are available at the RSD. *SFMTA is developing the plan, and it will be available in March 2022.*
- FTA informed SFMTA that the PMOC planned to start the Oversight Procedure (OP) 54 (Readiness for Service) review in April 2021. A list of documents required for the OP 54 review was transmitted to SFMTA. SFMTA submitted the documents required for the OP 54 review. An OP 54 review status meeting was held in June 2021. The PMOC submitted the draft spot report for the OP 54 Part 1 review in August 2021. SFMTA and the PMOC met in August 2021 to discuss the PMOC's findings and recommendations. On October 15, 2021, SFMTA responded to the PMOC's OP 54 Part 1 review, and the PMOC reviewed and discussed SFMTA's responses during the on-site visit the week of November 15, 2021. The PMOC also reviewed security-sensitive documents.
- As part of the global settlement, TPC has supplemented the electrical specialty subcontractor (Abbett) with additional resources. Progress on the traction power and Overhead Catenary System (OCS) work has greatly improved. Work related to OCS and traction power is continuing after the initial early substantial completion date of March 31, 2021. The contractors are working on additional days with extended shifts. However, SFMTA indicated that the contractors are experiencing material shortages for the OCS work. It was the

opinion of the PMOC that, due to the effects of COVID-19, the material shortages could become a critical issue if SFMTA did not resolve the issues in a timely matter. SFMTA indicated that the issues related to material shortages were resolved in May 2021. As of October 2021, Abbett has completed the OCS work in the tunnel and continues on the remaining OCS work. Significant signal work remains to be completed. It is the PMOC's opinion that the lack of completion of the OCS work for the entire alignment will delay progress on systems integration and testing. In addition, the PMOC continues to express concerns regarding ongoing water intrusion issues at stations, especially in systems rooms. SFMTA currently projects that the completion of signal installation will occur in March 2022; completion at that date poses significant challenges to completing the support systems integration that is required for revenue service. In December 2021, SFMTA concluded the water intrusion assessment for the YBM Traction Power Room floor. As of January 2022, the OCS and signal installation is ongoing, but there have been delays related to the procurement of OCS equipment. Water issues for the YBM Traction Power Room are critical to the advancement of the systems integration. It is the PMOC's opinion that if OCS/signal work and the resolution of water issues are not complete by April 2022, it will negatively impact the RSD of September 2022. SFMTA stated that TPC's targeted final completion date is June 2022. *As of February 2022, SFMTA stated that OCS/signal work and the resolution of water intrusion issues are scheduled to be completed by the end of April 2022.*

- Major Issues and/or Concerns:

**Table 1 – Major Issues and/or Concerns**

<b>Issue/Concern</b>	Potential delays associated with systems integration/testing and operational readiness
Date Identified	July 2021
Status	Ongoing
Project Sponsor Action	SFMTA is proactively coordinating integration and testing of various systems. In addition, SFMTA is developing a staffing plan for resources needed to support revenue service.
PMOC Recommendation	The PMOC recommends that SFMTA develop a detailed CPM schedule and use it as a tool to manage the process of systems integration/testing and operational readiness.
<b>Issue/Concern</b>	Resource availability of the electrical specialty subcontractor (Abbett) continues to be a major concern. SFMTA stated that resources required from Abbett to complete the OCS work on schedule are significantly lacking. SFMTA stated that, because the OCS work is on the critical path, a decision to resolve the issue needs to be made soon to prevent delays to the CSP schedule. Based on the current burn rate of payments to the contractor and the remaining contract value, Abbett needs to provide two or three times more resources than it is currently providing in order to meet the schedule.
Date Identified	June 2020



Status	Ongoing
Project Sponsor Action	TPC has supplemented the electrical specialty subcontractor (Abbett) with additional resources. Progress on the traction power and OCS work has greatly improved.
PMOC Recommendation	The PMOC recommends continued monitoring of Abbett's progress.

### 1.3. Key Indicators Dashboard

Table 2 – Key Indicators Dashboard

<b>Project Sponsor:</b>	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency				
<b>Project Name:</b>	Central Subway Project				
<b>Date:</b>	February 28, 2022				
<b>Project Detail</b>					
<b>Oversight Frequency:</b>	<b>Monthly</b>				
Element	Status			Prior Status	Issue or Concern
	●	●	●		
	G	Y	R		
<b>PMP</b>		●		●	The Project Management Plan (PMP) was last updated in April 2019. It is recommended that SFMTA update the PMP as soon as possible to include project impacts resulting from COVID-19 restrictions, which should include protocols and transition in preparation for revenue service.
<b>MCC</b>			●	●	With respect to Management Capacity and Capability (MCC), resource availability for the electrical specialty subcontractor continues to be an issue that is impacting the construction progress on the critical path. In addition, resources needed to support RSD are also critical.
<b>Cost*</b>			●	●	SFMTA is updating the CSP EAC to include the reallocation of project funds, the global settlement, and COVID-19 impacts.
<b>Schedule</b>			●	●	COVID-19 impacts and a specialty subcontractor's resource availability are impacting the critical path work. In addition, water issues at YBM and installation of signals and OCS for the Surface, Track, and Systems work package are critical for SFMTA to achieve the target RSD.
<b>Quality</b>	●			●	None.
<b>Safety</b>	●			●	None.
<b>Risk</b>			●	●	COVID-19-related issues and upcoming system integration/operational readiness are major risks.
<b>Legend</b>					
<b>Green</b>	Satisfactory: No Corrective Action necessary.				
<b>Yellow</b>	Caution: Risk/Issues exist. Corrective Action may be necessary.				
<b>Red</b>	Elevated for immediate Corrective Action: Significant risk to the health of the project.				

\*Note: With regard to cost, the colors indicate the following status:  
 Yellow – Forecast cost exceeds the project budget by up to 3%.  
 Red – Forecast cost exceeds the project budget by more than 5%.

### 1.4. Core Accountability Items

Table 3 shows the core accountability items for the project, including the current status of the project and the major issues and how they are being addressed.

**Table 3 – Core Accountability Items**

		<b>Original (Grant)</b>	<b>Current Forecast*</b>	<b>PMOC Assessment of Current Forecast</b>
<b>Cost</b>	Capital Cost Estimate	\$1,578,300,000	\$1,891,000,000	Unacceptable
<b>Contingency</b>	Unallocated Contingency	\$74,722,000	\$801,869	Unacceptable
	Total Contingency	\$185,500,000	\$18,801,869	Unacceptable
<b>Schedule</b>	Revenue Service Date	12/26/2018	09/09/2022 (SFMTA forecast)	Optimistic
<b>Project Progress</b>			<b>Amount (\$)</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	Actual cost of all eligible expenditures completed to date		\$1,879,366,238	>100%
<b>Planned Cost to Date</b>	Actual value of work completed to date		\$1,593,491,019	>100%
<b>Contract Status</b>			<b>Amount (\$)</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
<b>Total Contracts Awarded</b>	Value of all contracts (design, support, construction, equipment) awarded; 0% of total value to be awarded		\$1,510,671,335	100%
<b>Construction Contracts Awarded</b>	Value of construction contracts awarded; 0% of total construction value to be awarded		\$1,139,532,783	100%
<b>Physical Construction Completed</b>	Earned value of physical construction (infrastructure) completed; % of total construction value completed		\$1,302,231,060	95.85%
<b>Rolling Stock Vehicle Status</b>	<b>Date Awarded</b>	<b>No. Ordered</b>	<b>No. Delivered</b>	
	2017	24	24	
<b>Next Quarterly Progress Review Meeting Date:</b>	March 8, 2022			

Source: SFMTA CSP Monthly Progress Reports for *December 2021 and January 2022*.

\*The EAC will be revised to \$1.931 billion. The PMOC will update relevant financial tables and provide additional details as SFMTA makes them available.

## 2. OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS

### 2.1. Summary of Monitoring Activities

- February 2022 – Weekly Schedule Review Meeting and Monthly PMOC/SFMTA Meeting
- This report reflects financial information SFMTA provided *in January 2022* (financial cutoff date of *December 31, 2021*) and information obtained in the above-referenced meetings.

Note: Items that have changed from the previous month's report are indicated in italics. Other information is unchanged.

## **2.2. Oversight Triggers**

## **2.3. Project Management Plan and Sub-plans**

SFMTA delivered an update of the Project Management Plan (PMP) in April 2019. FTA did not request a comprehensive review of the PMP by the PMOC.

## **2.4. Management Capacity and Capability**

### **2.4.1. Agency Staff**

SFMTA appointed a permanent program director for the CSP in July 2019. Transition from the acting director began the week of July 15, 2019. The permanent program director attended the SFMTA Quarterly Progress Review Meeting (QPRM) held on August 8, 2019. In November 2019, SFMTA appointed a permanent Director of Transportation, who started in his position on December 16, 2019.

### **2.4.2. Contractor Staff**

There were no changes in the contractor's management staff.

## **2.5. National Environmental Policy Act Process and Environmental Mitigation**

The PMOC received the First Quarter 2018 Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program update from SFMTA on July 10, 2018. The PMOC's review of the report indicates that SFMTA continues to meet its commitments for monitoring and mitigation of project impacts.

## **2.6. Project Delivery Method and Procurement**

The project delivery method is Design-Bid-Build.

## **2.7. Design**

Design is complete.

## **2.8. Value Engineering and Constructability Reviews**

All contracts are under construction.

## **2.9. Real Estate Acquisition and Relocation**

SFMTA has acquired all project right-of-way, and all commercial and residential relocations are complete.

SFMTA submitted the Real Estate Acquisition Management Plan (RAMP) Revision 5, dated September 26, 2013, to FTA on November 19, 2013. SFMTA has acquired all required real estate for the project in accordance with the RAMP.

## **2.10. Third-Party Agreements and Utilities**

### **2.10.1. Bay Area Rapid Transit**

There are no updates to report related to Bay Area Rapid Transit.

### **2.10.2. California Public Utilities Commission**

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) is participating in the various safety meetings, including the Safety and Security Certification Review Committee (SSCRC) and Fire and Life Safety Committee (FLSC) meetings. Representatives of the CPUC also regularly attend the SFMTA/FTA QPRMs. The FLSC is working to approve items on the certifiable items list for the Stations and STS contract. SFMTA has expressed concern that CPUC may have insufficient staff to witness the required safety tests for CSP, which could further delay the RSD. This potential risk is being monitored in the risk register, and mitigation strategies have been identified.

### **2.10.3. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission**

There are no updates to report.

### **2.10.4. San Francisco Department of Public Works**

The San Francisco Department of Public Works (SFDPW) inspects completed street and sidewalk facilities that the contractor has proposed to release to the city. SFDPW develops punch lists of required repairs that the contractor must complete before acceptance of the streets and sidewalks. SFMTA is following the SFDPW guidelines.

### **2.10.5. San Francisco Parks and Recreation Department**

There are no updates to report.

### **2.10.6. Private Property Owners**

All real estate acquisitions are complete. There will be a need to extend the duration of some of the licenses for compensation grouting. A number of private property owners and businesses have issued claims for damage associated with the project construction. The builder's insurance policies maintained by the contractor cover the costs associated with these claims, and the contractor has demonstrated improved responsiveness to damage claims that are associated with ongoing construction work.

## **2.11. Construction**

**Contract 1250 (UR #1).** This completed contract relocated utilities within the footprint of the proposed YBM.

**Contract 1251 (UR #2).** This completed contract included the relocation of utility lines within the footprint of the proposed UMS and temporarily rerouted existing trolley coach lines around the construction zone.

**Contract 1252 Tunnel.** This completed contract included the construction of 1.5 miles of twin tunnels excavated by tunnel boring machines and construction of the tunnel portal, retrieval shaft, and five cross-passages. Final completion has been achieved, and final contract closeout is finished. SFMTA presented the final cost data for the contract at the August 2018 QPRM. Not including costs of extra work paid from non-project sources, the final cost of the CSP tunneling work was \$233,511,253, but the most current EAC for this work is \$234,967,069. When SFMTA reconciles the final contract cost with the program budget, about \$1.4 million in additional unallocated contingency should be available as a result of the final cost of the tunneling work being well below the current allocated budget for the work. The amount of \$1.4 million has already been transferred to unallocated contingency.

**Contract 1300 (Combination of UMS, CTS, and YBM stations, and Surface, Track, and Systems (STS)).** This contract includes the construction of three underground stations, one surface station, all surface works required for the installation of LRT between 4th and King streets and the tunnel portal, and all LRT track and systems components.

Table 4 shows the December 2021 forecast dates for completion of construction for each work package.

**Table 4 – Forecast Construction Completion Dates for CSP Work Packages**

<b>Work Package</b>	<b><i>December 2021 Forecast Construction Completion Date</i></b>
1253 – Union Square/Market Street Station	07/05/2022
1254 – Chinatown Station	07/05/2022
1255 – Yerba Buena/Moscone Center Station	07/05/2022
1256 – Surface, Track, and Systems	07/05/2022

Source: SFMTA CSP Monthly Progress Report for *December 2021*.

**UMS:** The contractor continued the installation of fare gates. The contractor continued installing blue light fixtures and preparing for state inspection of elevators. General cleaning of areas continued. The contractor began installing the waterproofing system on scallop walls and installing door sweeps. The contractor *continued* installing and connecting the software to the EOP panel.

**CTS:** The contractor continued testing the elevators and escalators, and the *fire alarm system components*. *The contractor continued installing metal art panels at the south wall of the upper mezzanine level and the north wall of the concourse level. Testing of the security system continued. The contractor completed fire piping relocation at the surface level. The street work and the monitoring and surveying are ongoing. The contractor continued installing the glass fiber reinforced concrete panels at the surface and plaza levels. The train testing at the crossover cavern and the train platform continued.*

**YBM:** The contractor continued installing the door, directional suspended signage, and interior panels. The contractor *continued installing emergency blue light phones (also referred to as “ETs”) at all levels. The contractor completed traction power gear and Smart Automation Certification Alliance testing, Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) testing for elevators, room pressure tests, and Daiken testing of reworked systems.*

STS: The contractor completed *the installation of cross bonds for the CTS crossover. The contractor continued installing the OCS for streetlights, trolley, and light rail. The installation of ATCS and radio system testing continued. The contractor continued construction of the 4th Street/Brannan Street platform.*

### **Systems and Track**

Work on track had been suspended pending delivery of new track to replace the nonconforming track supplied by the contractor. The track was delivered at the end of October 2019 and was stored on 4th Street. Installation of the replacement track was completed during the first quarter of 2021. SFMTA retained ownership of the nonconforming rail and is working with project representatives for the Sacramento Streetcar project to potentially transfer ownership of the rail for use on that project. The contractor continued platform construction at 4th Street and Brannan Street. It continued installation of traction power conduit and other electrical conduit inside the tunnel for CCTV, telephone, tunnel lighting, and tunnel electrical power. The contractor continued traction power cable installation, terminations, and installation of cross bonds throughout the tunnel. It continued testing of the ATCS and the radio system. The contractor continued fiber system installation and terminations in communications rooms (SFDT) and continued Fire Department Connection installation near the 4th Street portal.

### **Tunnel Work**

The electrical subcontractor is nearing completion on installing conduits and OCS support equipment, and pulling and terminating cable in the tunnels.

## **2.12. Vehicle Technology and Procurement**

The four LRVs for the CSP have been delivered and accepted by SFMTA. An additional 24 LRVs for near-term fleet expansion (four for service to the new Warriors Arena) and 151 LRVs for fleet replacement are in various stages of production and delivery. SFMTA has identified which of the new cars are considered to be funded by the CSP and will provide information on the date they are placed into revenue service for ongoing tracking of these assets in which the federal government has a financial interest.

## **2.13. Project Cost**

### **2.13.1. Project Cost Control Systems**

SFMTA continues to maintain the Trend Log and logs of Change Order Requests (CORs), Proposed Contract Changes (PCCs), Notices of Potential Claim (NOPCs), and Certified Claims for Contract 1300 using CM13. The Trend Log includes all potential changes in contract value, including items that, in the opinion of the CSP staff, are not merited and new items for which merit has not been determined. The contract change management log includes CORs that have been determined to have merit as well as agency-initiated PCCs that are progressing through negotiations toward a Contract Modification (CMod). The NOPC Log and the Certified Claims Log include CORs rejected by SFMTA for which the contractor expects to submit or has submitted a claim.

### 2.13.2. Project Cost

SFMTA reported that the project EAC will be revised to increase by approximately \$40 million, from \$1.891 billion to \$1.931 billion. On January 13, 2022, as part of the SFMTA Board authorization, CMod 143 (also known as Omnibus No. 3) in the amount of \$27.9 million was approved to compensate contractors and their subcontractors for direct costs and the delay impacts of the additional work performed under change orders. The PMOC will update the relevant financial tables and provide additional details as SFMTA makes them available. The PMOC requested the breakdown of the current project cost of \$1.931 billion in SCC format and backup information for the additional cost. The PMOC will perform a cost assessment once the PMOC receives this information.

*SFMTA modified its project cost reporting schedule for some of the categories below. Some categories are updated only on a quarterly basis. The PMOC will continue to update the amounts accordingly. Please note the data dates: The data date for the amounts listed below is December 31, 2021, except for the amount for Actual Cost (AC), which represents data from January 2022.*

The EAC will be revised to \$1.931 billion. The PMOC will update relevant financial tables and provide additional details as SFMTA makes them available.

EAC: \$1.891 billion

Total contingency: \$18.8 million (minimum contingency is \$25 million)

SFMTA reported the following amounts:

Actual Cost (AC): \$1,877,366,238

Current funding level: \$1,900,275,322

Earned Value (EV): \$1,503,432,135

Cost Performance Index (CPI): 0.80

SFMTA is reporting the CPI as a measure of cost efficiency on the project. It is the ratio of EV to AC. A CPI equal to or greater than 1.0 indicates a cost underrun, and a CPI of less than 1.0 indicates a trend towards a cost overrun. The PMOC recommends that SFMTA update the CPI to reflect the EAC based on the current project cost and schedule projections, including outstanding claims and COVID-19 impacts.

### 2.13.3. Project Cost Trends

SFMTA tracks potential changes in project cost, calling these potential changes “trends.” Trends include all potential changes in a contract’s value. As the status of an identified trend changes, it may become a contract modification, or CMod; it may become an item that is paid on a force account basis; or it may be denied/closed with no impact to the project cost. Extra cost items identified by the Contract 1300 contractor that CSP management concludes have no merit are carried in the total trend amount at a lower value than the contractor’s estimate of extra costs, and the value reflects SFMTA’s assessment of the likelihood that the change would ultimately be approved through the contract dispute resolution process.

Table 5 shows the overall budget, trends, and contingency status for the entire CSP program. Note that the values in Table 5 reflect the project status as of the end of *January 2022*, as reported in SFMTA's latest CSP Monthly Progress Report. Claims and denied CORs are not included in the cost forecast in Table 5.

#### **2.13.4. Change Order Control**

SFMTA is maintaining its management tools for tracking potential contract changes, such as executed change orders for Contract 1300. *As of the January 2022 reporting period, SFMTA reports the value of the approved changes at \$380.2 million, which is part of the current project cost of \$1.931 billion. The value of potential changes is currently \$628.1 thousand. The \$628.1 thousand represents the value of potential changes for Contract 1300, as summarized below:*

- *1253 Union Square/Market Street Station – \$164.3 thousand*
- *1254 Chinatown Station – \$261.6 thousand*
- *1255 Yerba Buena/Moscone Center Station – \$154.8 thousand*
- *1256 Surface, Track, and Systems – \$47.4 thousand*

#### **2.13.5. Cost Contingency**

The total available contingency (approved contingency less approved contract changes) reported in *January 2022* remains at \$18.8 million, which is below the minimum required contingency of \$25 million. It is the PMOC's opinion that SFMTA should report to FTA any reserves that can be used for the CSP.



**Table 5 – Budget and Contingency Status for Central Subway Project<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Data reported in SFMTA’s *January 2022 CSP Monthly Progress Report* (reformatted by the PMOC).

COST ELEMENT	CONTRACT COST					CONTINGENCY					BUDGET	VARIANCE
	ORIGINAL CONTRACT VALUE / September 2013 SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET	APPROVED CHANGES	CURRENT CONTRACT VALUE	POTENTIAL CHANGES	ESTIMATE AT COMPLETION (EAC)	ORIGINAL CONTINGENCY / Sep 2013 SUPPLEMENTAL CONTINGENCY (Include CN 1250 & CN1251)	CONTINGENCY ADJUSTMENT TRANSFERS	REVISED AUTHORIZED CONTINGENCY (Include CN1250 & CN1251)	REMAINING CONTINGENCY AFTER APPROVED CHANGES DEDUCTED [h - b]	REMAINING CONTINGENCY AFTER POTENTIAL CHANGES DEDUCTED [i - d]	ORIGINAL CONTRACT VALUE + REVISED AUTHORIZED CONTINGENCY [a + h]	BUDGET - ESTIMATE AT COMPLETE [j - e]
	a	b	[a + b] c	d	[c + d] e	f	g	[f + g] h	i	j	j	k
<b>SCC 10-50 CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT PACKAGES</b>												
1250 UTILITY RELOCATION PACKAGE #1	9,273,939	2,694,211	11,968,150		11,968,150	1,953,377	740,634	2,694,211			11,968,150	
Contract 1250 Department of Technology	166,756		166,756		166,756						166,756	
1251 UTILITY RELOCATION PACKAGE #2	16,832,550	3,836,531	20,669,081		20,669,081	5,367,297	(1,530,766)	3,836,531				
Contract 1251 Department of Technology	75,615		75,615		75,615						75,615	
1252 GUIDEWAY TUNNEL STATIONS	233,584,015	(72,762)	233,511,253	-	233,511,253	23,658,464	(23,731,226)	(72,763)				(1)
1300 1253 UNION SQUARE/MARKET ST STATION [UMS]	839,676,400	304,970,114	1,144,646,514	628,105	1,145,274,619	20,000,000	280,369,599	290,869,599	(14,100,515)	(14,728,632)		(14,728,620)
1254 CHINA TOWN STATION [CTS]	294,030,590	20,744,337	314,774,927	164,303	314,939,230	5,000,000	15,000,000	20,000,000	(744,337)	(9,255,663)		(908,640)
1255 YERBA BUENA/ MOSCONE STATION [YBM]	247,567,810	157,529,850	405,097,660	261,557	405,359,217	5,000,000	139,679,388	144,679,388	(12,850,462)	(12,850,462)		(13,112,019)
1256 SURFACE TRACKWORK & SYSTEMS [STS]	158,089,000	4,889,959	162,978,959	154,795	163,133,754	5,000,000	10,000,000	15,000,000	10,110,041	10,110,041	3,089,000	9,955,246
OTHER	139,989,000	121,805,969	261,794,969	47,449	261,842,418	5,000,000	115,690,211	111,190,211	(10,615,779)	(10,615,779)	251,179,211	(10,663,207)
39,923,508	23,775,304	63,698,812		63,698,812	63,698,812	2,056,645	10,560,000	26,958,595	16	16	66,882,103	(6,316,709)
SCC 10 - 50 Construction Sub-total	1,139,522,783	335,203,399	1,474,726,181	628,105	1,475,354,286	53,035,782	266,408,441	324,286,173			1,463,818,956	(21,045,329)
<b>SCC 60-80 SOFT COSTS PACKAGES</b>												
60 ROW, LAND, EXISTING IMPROVEMENTS	36,511,799	(4,265,478)	32,246,321		32,246,321	1,000,000	(1,000,000)	0			32,246,321	0
70 VEHICLES	24,108,712	(7,308,712)	16,800,000		16,800,000	2,276,941	(7,076,941)	(4,800,000)			12,000,000	(4,800,000)
80 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	310,518,041	56,410,151	366,928,192		366,928,192	18,221,079	(16,862,657)	1,358,422			368,286,614	1,358,422
SCC 60 - 80 Construction Sub-total	371,138,552	44,835,961	415,974,513	0	415,974,513	21,498,020	(24,939,598)	(3,441,578)			412,532,935	(3,441,578)
SCC 90 UNALLOCATED CONTINGENCY						3,845,945	(261,295,781)	(257,449,836)	23,923,431	23,923,431	23,923,431	23,923,431
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,510,671,335</b>	<b>380,039,360</b>	<b>1,890,710,694</b>	<b>628,105</b>	<b>1,891,338,799</b>	<b>78,379,747</b>	<b>(19,826,938)</b>	<b>63,394,759</b>	<b>3,804,634</b>	<b>3,804,634</b>	<b>1,900,275,322</b>	<b>8,936,523</b>

SCC Breakdown of Forecast Construction Costs Not Available

### 2.13.6. Funding

Table 6 shows federal, state, and local project funding and expenditures for the CSP.

**Table 6 – Project Funding (as of January 2022)**

<b>Funding Available Table</b>		
	<b>Funding</b>	
	<b>Committed Funding Sources</b>	<b>Total Awarded Funds to Date</b>
<b>Federal</b>		
Sect. 5309-NS	\$942,200	\$965,321
Sect. 5307-OBAG	\$15,980	\$15,980
CMAQ	\$41,025	\$41,025
<b>Federal Subtotal</b>	<b>\$999,205</b>	<b>\$1,022,326</b>
<b>State</b>		
TCRP	\$14,000	\$14,000
State RIP	\$12,498	\$12,498
Prop. 1B (I-Bond)	\$308,601	\$312,236
Prop. 1A (HSR-Bond)	\$61,308	\$61,308
<b>State Subtotal</b>	<b>\$396,407</b>	<b>\$400,042</b>
<b>Local</b>		
LCTOP	\$4,000	\$4,000
Operating	\$4,970	\$311,424
MTA	\$0	\$475
Prop. B Pop Baseline	\$26,985	\$20,125
Prop. K	\$143,542	\$138,692
TSF Transit	\$3,191	\$3,191
<b>Local Subtotal</b>	<b>\$182,688</b>	<b>\$477,907</b>
<b>CPT 544 Total</b>	<b>\$1,578,300</b>	<b>\$1,900,275</b>

Source: SFMTA CSP Monthly Progress Report for *January 2022*.

### 2.14. Project Schedule

As of the end of December 2021, SFMTA reports a projected RSD of September 9, 2022. SFMTA provided the schedule information that the PMOC had requested. The current RSD of September 9, 2022, is optimistic based on PMOC's preliminary review.

The critical path for the construction work still flows through the STS installation; start-up; and testing, commissioning, and pre-revenue activities.

Project schedule data (as of the end of December 2021) is as follows:

The project's EV is \$1,503,432,135, and its Planned Value (PV) is \$1,593,491,019. The project's Schedule Performance Index (SPI) is 0.94. SPI is a measure of schedule efficiency on a project. It is the ratio of EV to PV. An SPI equal to or greater than 1.0 indicates more work was completed than planned, and a value of less than 1.0 indicates less work was completed than planned. An SPI equal to or greater than 0.9 reflects satisfactory performance, considering the margin of error in estimating both EV and PV.

### 2.14.1. Schedule Contingency

All contingency in the schedule has been consumed, and there are more than 48 months of negative float from the baseline schedule. SFMTA submitted an FFGA Schedule Extension letter to the FTA on December 6, 2018, with a request to extend the FFGA RSD to May 26, 2020, and FTA issued an approval letter on February 27, 2019. The schedule that SFMTA submitted, dated May 2021, forecasted an RSD of May 5, 2022. In April 2021, SFMTA issued a revised FFGA Schedule Extension Letter requesting an additional extension for an early RSD of March 31, 2022, and a late RSD of June 20, 2022. As of the date of the latest schedule data (September 30, 2021), SFMTA is reporting *September 9, 2022*, as the RSD.

### 2.14.2. Critical Path Summary

#### Baseline Schedule:

CTS Install Guidewalls, Slurry Walls, and Install Surface Deck – Complete

CTS Excavate Headhouse and Bracing – Complete

CTS Sequential Excavation Method and Install Supports – Complete

CTS Headhouse Structural Concrete/Remove Bracing – Underway

CTS Install Mechanical/Electrical/Plumbing Equipment – Installation is expected to be completed in the next three months at the headhouse surface, plaza, and roof levels.

CTS Start-up and Testing – Testing of traction power and train control components started in April 2021.

CTS P-1254R Commissioning of Station – Ongoing

Safety and Security Certification/Pre-revenue Activities – Safety and security certification/pre-revenue service activities started in June 2021 and are forecasted to be complete on March 30, 2022.

RSD on December 26, 2018 – Currently forecast for *September 9, 2022*.

#### Current Schedule Critical Path Activities:

Install OCS – Remove/install cross spans in Brannan and Townsend streets

Install OCS – Install OCS trolley wire from Townsend Street to 5th Street

Prepare/Submit: Sub-systems Maintainability Analysis – Surface signaling system

Install OCS – Install OCS trolley wire in 4th and Townsend streets

Install OCS – Install OCS trolley wire in 5th Street from Brannan Street to 4th Street

Startup and Testing – Tunnel and ATCS

Safety and Security Certification and Pre-Revenue Activities

### 2.14.3. Three-month Look-ahead

The following activities are planned over the next three months:

**Contract 1300**

## UMS P-1253:

- Completion of:
  - Cleaning of the station
  - Installation of ticket vending machine and fare gates
  - Waterproofing of the scallop walls
  - Revision of the Fire Smoke Dampers (FSD) layout at the platform level
  - Installation of lights at Sector 6
  - Installation of additional lights at the Elevators 1 and 2 landing on the concourse level
  - Revision of the drain layout at Stair 4 on the platform strut level
- Continued installation, start-up, and testing of:
  - Overhead plumbing, fire protection piping, overhead fixtures, and electrical
  - Access controls
  - Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) and emergency ventilation
  - Power and lighting
  - Fire alarm/Public Address/security systems

## CTS P-1254R:

- Obtaining of San Francisco Department of Building Inspection final sign-offs
- Obtaining of San Francisco Fire Department final sign-offs
- Obtaining of Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) certifications
- Continued installation of street traffic signal poles, pull boxes, and control box at the intersection of Stockton and Washington streets
- Abandonment of dewatering wells on Stockton Street
- Completion of cavern grouting to embed the waterproof membrane
- Completion of the safety certification checklist field items

## YBM P-1255:

- Completion of:
  - Installation of the archeological display at the concourse level
  - Interior finishes on the mezzanine
  - Installation of sculptures at the surface level

- Station agent booth interior finishes
- Traction power gear testing
- Traction power Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition, also known as SCADA, testing
- The deluge spray pattern demonstration with the San Francisco Fire Department
- Termination of wiring for blue light emergency phones
- Metal cladding installation at Escalators 1, 2, and 3
- Heat recovery coils and air balance
- Daiken test for reworked systems
- Testing of elevator and escalator functionality
- Room pressure testing
- Emergency phones at all levels

STS P-1256:

- Completion of installation of streetlights
- Continuation of OCS support/wire installation on the surface
- Continuation of platform construction at 4th Street and Brannan Street
- Continuation of surface signaling work on 4th Street
- Continuation of traffic signaling work on 4th Street
- Continuation of surface signaling fabrication and testing for the 4th Street/King Street and Bluxome Street crossover
- Continuation of OCS, track, and miscellaneous punch list work

## 2.15. Project Risk

SFMTA conducts monthly meetings to review the status of identified risks, monitor the implementation of mitigation measures, identify new risks, and evaluate the probability and potential impacts of existing and newly identified risks. The current major risks to the project address the potential for further delays to the construction of the stations, which cannot be mitigated or recovered, resulting in further delays to the RSD. At the monthly risk mitigation meeting, these and other major remaining project risks were evaluated.

The PMOC noted the following significant items of discussion at the risk mitigation meeting:

- Risk 265 – COVID-19 restrictions directly impact the progress of the work, resulting in increased cost and schedule delays.
- Risk 205 – Prolonged time to execute CMods creates additional cost and causes conflict between Resident Engineers and the contractor: TPC is now refusing to progress work

that includes changes to the contract documents without an executed CMod, which may delay future work. SFMTA noted that its standard procedures for making contract modifications lead to delays in execution of all changes.

- Risk 257 – System test integration between components does not work.
- The risk mitigation meeting included routine updates to previously identified risks. Risks associated with underground mining at CTS are nearing retirement, pending completion of the final lining of the platform and cross-cut caverns.
- CSP’s quality manager noted that there has been an increase in Non-conformance Notices (NCNs), which are issued when the contractor fails to issue a Contractor Non-conformance Report (CNCR).
- Initial ratings were developed for a new risk that had been identified at previous risk mitigation meetings:
  - Systems elements not working properly – This risk is rated high for probability and cost impact, and medium for schedule impact, resulting in an overall rating of 8.

**The PMOC continues to encourage SFMTA to identify new risks associated with COVID-19-related impacts and with the system integration/testing and operational readiness, along with the risks related to a specialty subcontractor’s resource availability, as the major risks associated with civil work and related differing site conditions are being retired. In addition, if mitigation of water issues in YBM and installation of OCS and signal work (including procurement of OCS equipment) is not completed by spring of 2022, it will negatively impact the RSD. In January 2022, SFMTA finalized the technical solution for the water issues and is currently implementing the solution.**

SFMTA has been applying updated schedule risks to a Monte Carlo analysis of the program schedule in order to establish a range of likely construction completion dates and RSDs. SFMTA has issued a revised FFGA Schedule Extension Letter requesting an extension of the RSD. SFMTA currently forecasts the RSD to be *September 9, 2022*.

## **2.16. Quality Assurance/Quality Control**

### **2.16.1. Quality Assurance/Quality Control Plan Implementation**

According to planning for quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC), the Contract 1300 contractor’s staff includes a Contractor’s Quality Manager (CQM), who reports to the contractor’s management at an organizational level superior to the contractor’s Project Manager. The CQM is provided by a subcontractor. The reporting structure is designed to provide the CQM with direct access to the contractor’s Principal Officers. A CNCR Log for identifying, correcting, documenting, and controlling non-conformances is maintained by the contractor and reviewed at weekly status meetings for each work package. For any work that is the subject of a Corrective Action Request, subsequent work activities are not allowed to progress until the conditions that are averse to quality are corrected. If the contractor does not issue a CNCR, SFMTA may issue an NCN, in which SFMTA’s QA staff identifies the nonconforming work.

In January 2022, TPC's Quality Manager had filed 603 CNCRs. During this period, two new CNCRs were opened, three were dispositioned, and four were closed. Twenty-two CNCRs are currently posted to the CNCR Log as OPEN. The Quality Engineer has issued 57 NCNs.

## 2.17. Safety and Security

### 2.17.1. Safety and Security Management Plan

An updated Safety and Security Management Plan (SSMP) Revision 2, dated February 2, 2014, was submitted to FTA on May 2, 2014. The SSMP outlines the plans needed prior to revenue operations. These plans include the Rail Activation Plan (RAP), the System Integration Test Plan, the Safety and Security Certification Plan (SSCP), and the Pre-Revenue Operations and Start-up Plan. SFMTA has completed the SSCP, which is being used to guide safety certification activities. The initial draft of the RAP was completed along with the latest update of the PMP. SFMTA has hired a Start-up and Testing Manager for the CSP program.

### 2.17.2. Fire and Life Safety/Safety and Security Issues

The Construction Specification Conformance Checklists have been completed and approved for all construction packages. In September 2013, the CPUC staff began attending monthly as-built meetings to review the completed items. All items related to the tunnel construction have been certified and accepted by SFMTA's safety staff.

### 2.17.3. Construction Safety

No recordable incidents were reported in *January 2022*. The performance metrics relating to accidents per working hour remain well within the OSHA goals for similar construction. The current incident statistics (through September 30, 2021) for the project are shown in Table 7, as well as where they are not applicable (NA).

**Table 7 – Construction Safety Data**

Through <i>September 30, 2021</i>	Number of Incidents	Incident Rate <sup>1</sup>	Goal
<b>Contract 1300</b>			
OSHA Recordable Accidents	47	1.09	<3.4
Job Transfer/Restricted Duty Incidents	0	0.00	NA
Lost Time Incidents	11	0.25	<1.6
Total Incidents	58	1.34	NA
Hours Worked	8,654,940		

<sup>1</sup> OSHA incident rate = incidents x 200,000/hours worked.

## 2.18. Americans with Disabilities Act

There are no Americans with Disabilities Act issues for the project at this time.

## 2.19. Buy America

There are no Buy America issues.

## **2.20. Start-up, Commissioning, Testing**

SFMTA submitted a draft of the RAP in April 2019. A conference call was held in June 2019 between SFMTA and the PMOC's System Integration Manager, as part of the monthly recurring call, to discuss the required documentation for OP 54 (Readiness for Revenue Operations).



**ATTACHMENT A – LIST OF ACRONYMS**

AC	Actual Cost
ATCS	Automated Train Control System
BRT	Bus Rapid Transit
CCTV	Closed Circuit Television
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CLIN	Contract Line Item Number
CMGC	Construction Manager/General Contractor
CMod	Contract Modification
CNCR	Contractor Non-conformance Report
COR	Change Order Request
CPI	Cost Performance Index
CPM	Critical Path Method
CPUC	California Public Utilities Commission
CQM	Contractor's Quality Manager
CSP	Central Subway Project
CSSP	Construction Safety and Security Plan
CTS	Chinatown Station
DBE	Disadvantaged Business Enterprise
DBOM	Design, Build, Operate, and Maintain
DF	Designated Function
EAC	Estimate at Completion
EV	Earned Value
FD	Final Design
FFGA	Full Funding Grant Agreement
FLSC	Fire and Life Safety Committee
FRA	Federal Railroad Administration
FSD	Fire Smoke Damper
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
HVAC	Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning
LRT	Light Rail Transit

LRV	Light Rail Vehicle
MCC	Management Capacity and Capability
NA	Not Applicable
NCN	Non-conformance Notice
NOPC	Notice of Potential Claim
NTP	Notice to Proceed
OCS	Overhead Catenary System
OP	Oversight Procedure
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
PCC	Proposed Contract Change
PE	Preliminary Engineering
PMOC	Project Management Oversight Contractor
PMP	Project Management Plan
PV	Planned Value
QA/QC	Quality Assurance/Quality Control
QPRM	Quarterly Progress Review Meeting
RAMP	Real Estate Acquisition Management Plan
RAP	Rail Activation Plan
ROD	Record of Decision
RSD	Revenue Service Date
SBE	Small Business Enterprise
SCADA	Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition
SCC	Standard Cost Category
SEPP	Security and Emergency Preparedness Plan
SFDPW	San Francisco Department of Public Works
SFMTA	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
SPI	Schedule Performance Index
SSCP	Safety and Security Certification Plan
SSCRC	Safety and Security Certification Review Committee
SSMP	Safety and Security Management Plan
SSPP	System Safety Program Plan

STS            Surface, Track, and Systems  
TPC            Tutor Perini Corporation  
UMS            Union Square/Market Street Station  
YBM            Yerba Buena/Moscone Center Station

**ATTACHMENT B – SAFETY AND SECURITY CHECKLIST**

<b>Project Overview</b>			
Project Mode (Rail, Bus, BRT, Multimode)	Light Rail Transit		
Project Phase (Project Development, Engineering, Construction, Start-up)	Construction		
Project Delivery Method (Design/Build, DBOM, CMGC, etc.)	Design-Bid-Build		
<b>Project Plans</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Review by FTA</b>	<b>Status</b>
Safety and Security Management Plan (SSMP)	2014	2011	Revision 1 Update submitted to FTA on February 23, 2011. Not submitted to Federal Railroad Administration (FRA). Revision 2 submitted to FTA on May 2, 2014.
Safety and Security Certification Plan (SSCP)	2011		SSCP was revised in October 2011. Revision 1 was developed in November 2011. Not submitted to FRA.
System Safety Program Plan (SSPP)	2009	2009	SSPP dated 03/13/2009 was submitted to FTA on 07/31/2009. Not submitted to FRA.
System Security Plan or Security and Emergency Preparedness Plan (SEPP)	2009		Not submitted to FTA. Not submitted to FRA.
Construction Safety and Security Plan (CSSP)	2012		Health and Safety. Construction Safety Standards Revision 3, 06/27/2012.
<b>Area of Focus</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>Notes/Status</b>	
<b>Safety and Security Authority</b>			
Is the project sponsor subject to 49 CFR Part 659 state safety oversight requirements?	Y		
Has the state designated an oversight agency as per 49 CFR Part 659.9?	Y	California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) Consumer Protection & Safety Division 505 Van Ness Avenue San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 703-1017 phone (415) 703-1758 fax Point of contact: Arun Mehta	
Has the oversight agency reviewed and approved the project sponsor’s Security Plan or SSPP as per 49 CFR Part 659.17?	Y	SFMTA currently operates its LRT system in compliance with an SSPP approved by the CPUC. These plans will be revised, as required, to incorporate the addition of the CSP during the late construction and early testing phase and submitted to the CPUC for approval prior to the planned start of revenue operations.	
Did the oversight agency participate in the last Quarterly Review Meeting?	N		
Has the project sponsor submitted its safety certification plan to the oversight agency?	Y	SFMTA submitted the SSCP to CPUC staff for review and Commission approval during the preliminary engineering phase. The plan was approved in March 2009. The SSCP that was revised in November 2011 was submitted to the CPUC and was approved.	

		CPUC attends monthly certification review meetings conducted by SFMTA.
Has the project sponsor implemented security directives issues by the Department Homeland Security and/or Transportation Security Administration?	NA	Currently, there are no Transportation Security Administration directives or programs applicable to the project. If any arise during the course of the project, the activities to comply will be developed and shown on a revision of the project safety and security activities schedule.
<b>SSMP Monitoring</b>		
Is the SSMP project-specific, clearly demonstrating the scope of safety and security activities for this project?	Y	The PMOC reviewed the CSP SSMP and provided a spot report to FTA in May 2011. FTA approved the CSP SSMP on May 16, 2011. A follow-up Adherence Audit was conducted September 14 through 16, 2011. The audit found that CSP is conducting its activities in accordance with the SSMP.
Does the project sponsor review the SSMP and related project plans to determine if updates are necessary?	Y	SSMP Revision 2 was submitted to FTA on May 2, 2014.
Does the project sponsor implement a process through which the Designated Function (DF) for Safety and DF for Security are integrated into the overall project management team? Please specify.	Y	Safety and security are under the direction of the SFMTA Safety and Security Manager and supplemented by Project Management/Construction Management consultant staff, including a Safety and Security Certification professional who has been dedicated to supervising project safety and security certification.
Does the project sponsor maintain a regularly scheduled report on the status of safety and security activities?	Y	Safety and security certification status and activities are reported in the weekly construction progress meetings and the CSP Monthly Progress Report.
Has the project sponsor established staffing requirements, procedures, and authority for safety and security activities throughout all project phases?	Y	
Does the project sponsor update the safety and security responsibility matrix/organizational chart as necessary?	Y	The PMOC found the revised matrix in the SSMP, Rev. 1, dated February 8, 2011, to be compliant.
Has the project sponsor allocated sufficient resources to oversee or carry out safety and security activities?	Y	
Has the project sponsor developed hazard and vulnerability analysis techniques, including specific types of analysis to be performed during different project phases?	Y	CSP has prepared a Preliminary Hazard Analysis Report, Rev. 0, dated April 23, 2009. Corrective actions and analysis for different project phases have been identified in the report.
Does the project sponsor implement regularly scheduled meetings to track to resolution any identified hazards and/or vulnerabilities?	Y	
Does the project sponsor monitor the progress of safety and security activities throughout all project phases? Please describe briefly.	Y	Safety and security is an ongoing agenda item for the current construction contract (Contract 1300) work package status meetings. The status of safety and security certifications is reviewed at weekly project management meetings.
Does the project sponsor ensure the conduct of preliminary hazard and vulnerability analyses? Please specify the analyses conducted.	Y	
Has the project sponsor ensured the development of safety design criteria?	Y	Design is complete and construction is underway.

Has the project sponsor ensured the development of security design criteria?	Y	Design is complete and construction is underway.
Has the project sponsor ensured conformance with safety and security requirements in design?	Y	Certification checklists have been developed. Certification is achieved through monthly meetings. Design is complete and construction is underway.
Has the project sponsor verified construction specifications conformance?	Y	This is ongoing as construction progresses, and conformance is verified through the safety and security certification process.
Has the project sponsor identified safety and security critical tests to be performed prior to passenger operations?	N	These tests are currently being developed.
Has the project sponsor verified conformance with safety and security requirements during testing, inspection, and start-up phases?	N	Project is in construction, and the RSD is about 7 months in the future.
Has the project sponsor evaluated change orders, design waivers, or test variances for potential hazards and/or vulnerabilities?	Y	
Has the project sponsor ensured the performance of safety and security analyses for proposed workarounds?	NA	Currently no workarounds have been identified.
Has the project sponsor demonstrated through meetings or other methods, the integration of safety and security in the following? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activation Plan and Procedures</li> <li>• Integrated Test Plan and Procedures</li> <li>• Operations and Maintenance Plan</li> <li>• Emergency Operations Plan</li> </ul>	In Process	The second draft of the Rail Activation Plan (RAP) has been completed. An Integration Matrix has been implemented for all disciplines and includes safety and security concerns. Project Sponsor has hired a Start-up and Testing Manager who will develop the plans and procedures. Hiring of this role is a critical activity.
Has the project sponsor issued final safety and security certification?	N	Project is in the construction phase.
Has the project sponsor issued the final safety and security verification report?	N	Project is in the construction phase.
<b>Construction Safety</b>		
Does the project sponsor have a documented/implemented Contractor Safety Program with which it expects to comply?	Y	Health and Safety Construction Safety Standards, Revision 3, dated 06/27/2012.
Does the project sponsor's contractor(s) have a documented companywide safety and security program plan?	Y	
Does the project sponsor's contractor(s) have a site-specific safety and security program plan?	Y	The remaining active contractor has a plan. Contract documents require that the contractor follows an Environmental Health and Safety Program, specific to the contract work.
How do the project sponsor's OSHA statistics compare to the national average for the same type of work?	Y	Provided in the CSP Monthly Progress Report. Statistics remain favorable compared to national averages and project safety goals.
If the comparison is not favorable, what actions are being taken by the project sponsor to improve its safety record?	NA	Statistics are favorable. No action needed.
<b>Federal Railroad Administration</b>		
If shared track, has the project sponsor submitted its waiver request application to FRA? (Please identify specific regulations for which waivers are being requested.)	NA	No shared track. No waivers are anticipated.

If shared corridor: has the project sponsor specified specific measures to address shared corridor safety concerns?	NA	This is not a shared corridor.
Is the Collision Hazard Analysis underway?	NA	
Other FRA required Hazard Analysis – Fencing, etc.?	NA	
Does the project have Quiet Zones?	N	
Does FRA attend the Quarterly Review Meetings?	N	

## **ATTACHMENT C – TOP 5 PROJECT RISKS**

### **Top Risks Discussed:**

Risk 267 – Potential water leaks at UMS.

Risk 265 – COVID-19 directly impacts the progress of the work, resulting in increased cost and schedule delays.

Risk 255 – Water leaks at YBM. As of June 2021, water leaks continue at YBM despite ongoing repair activities. Most of the leaks are at the interface between the station box and the headhouse. Thus far, the schedule impacts of the leaks have been minor, but SFMTA expects to be liable for the costs of the repairs. SFMTA has spent \$500,000 to \$800,000 on leak mitigation work. SFMTA has received one finding from a third-party evaluation of the reasons for the leaks and is starting work to mitigate the impacts of the leaks. The findings of the leak evaluation indicate that the design did not provide a complete “bathtub” that would keep groundwater out of the structure.

Risk 266 – Outstanding submittals and resubmissions related to safety and security certification requirements are not being addressed.

Risk 257 – System test integration between components does not work.



### ATTACHMENT D – AWARDED CONTRACTS

The following sections provide the status of ongoing contracts associated with the CSP. Note that SFMTA updates the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) participation percentages quarterly. The current values are through December 2021.

<b>Contract No.</b>	<b>1250</b>	
<b>Contract Description:</b>	<b>UR #1 (Yerba Buena/Moscone Center Station [YBM])</b>	
<b>Status:</b>	Completed June 2011.	
<b>Cost:</b>	Original Contract Value	\$9,273,939
	Approved Change Orders	\$2,694,211
	Final Contract Value	\$11,968,150
	Expended to Date	\$11,968,150
	% Expended	100%
	Small Business Enterprise (SBE) Participation	97%
<b>Schedule:</b>	Notice to Proceed (NTP) issued January 2010. Substantial completion in June 2011.	
<b>Issues or Concerns:</b>		

<b>Contract No.</b>	<b>1251</b>	
<b>Contract Description:</b>	<b>UR #2 (Union Square/Market Street Station [UMS])</b>	
<b>Status:</b>	Work is complete.	
<b>Cost:</b>	Original Contract Value	\$16,832,550
	Approved Change Orders	\$3,836,531
	Final Contract Value	\$20,669,081
	Expended to Date	\$20,794,581
	% Expended	100%
	SBE Participation	87.4%
<b>Schedule:</b>	NTP issued January 2011. Substantial completion in August 2012.	
<b>Issues or Concerns:</b>	Final total cost claim by contractor has been settled.	

<b>Contract No.</b>	<b>1252</b>	
<b>Contract Description:</b>	<b>Tunnels</b>	
<b>Status:</b>	Final completion achieved. Financial closeout underway. Final contract cost to be lower than reported here.	
<b>Cost:</b>	Original Contract Value	\$233.58 million
	Approved Change Orders	\$7.83 million
	Current Contract Value	\$241.41 million
	Expended to Date	\$233.59 million; \$6.2 million paid from non-project funds
	% Expended	96.8%
	SBE Participation	5.8%
<b>Schedule:</b>	Final completion achieved May 15, 2015.	
<b>Issues or Concerns:</b>	None.	

<b>Contract No.</b>	<b>1277</b>	
<b>Contract Description:</b>	<b>Pagoda Palace Demolition</b>	
<b>Status:</b>	Construction is complete; contract is in closeout.	
<b>Cost:</b>	Original Contract Value	\$498,995
	Approved Change Orders	\$149,981
	Current Contract Value	\$648,976
	Expended to Date	\$648,976
	% Expended	100%
	SBE Participation	100%
<b>Schedule:</b>	Complete.	
<b>Issues or Concerns:</b>	None.	

<b>Contract No.</b>	<b>1300</b>	
<b>Contract Description:</b>	<b>Three subway stations (YBM, UMS, and CTS) and Surface, Track, and Systems (STS)</b>	
<b>Status:</b>	Mass excavation complete at one station and well underway at two other stations.	
<b>Cost:</b>	Original Contract Value	\$839.68 million
	Approved Change Orders	\$303.7 million
	Current Contract Value (budget)	\$1.144 billion
	Expended to Date	\$1.138 billion
	% Expended	<98.8%
	SBE Participation	22.9%
<b>Schedule:</b>	NTP issued June 17, 2013. Substantial Completion was planned for February 2018 and is currently forecast for January 2022.	
<b>Issues or Concerns:</b>	The work on this contract is behind schedule.	

<b>Contract No.</b>	<b>CS-155-1</b>	
<b>Contract Description:</b>	<b>Design Package 1 for Contracts 1250, 1251, and 1252; Prime PB/Telemon</b>	
<b>Status:</b>	Design is complete. Construction support is nearly complete for Contract 1252.	
<b>Cost:</b>	Original Contract Value	\$5,795,000 (includes exercised options)
	Approved Change Orders	\$2,145,159
	Current Contract Value	\$7,940,159
	Expended to Date	\$7,904,713
	% Expended	99.6%
	SBE Participation	30.2%
<b>Schedule:</b>	Complete.	
<b>Issues or Concerns:</b>		

<b>Contract No.</b>	<b>CS-155-2</b>	
<b>Contract Description:</b>	<b>Design Package 2 for UMS, CTS, and YBM; Prime: CSDG</b>	
<b>Status:</b>	Designs are complete for all of the station contracts. Construction support of Contract 1300 is underway.	
<b>Cost:</b>	Original Contract Value	\$39,949,948
	Approved Change Orders	\$7,950,658
	Current Contract Value	\$47,900,606
	Expended to Date	\$42,196,304
	% Expended	88.1%
	SBE Participation	31.6%
<b>Schedule:</b>		
<b>Issues or Concerns:</b>		

<b>Contract No.</b>	<b>CS-155-3</b>	
<b>Contract Description:</b>	<b>Design Package 3 for STS; Prime: HNTB-B&amp;C</b>	
<b>Status:</b>	Design is complete. Construction support of Contract 1300 is underway.	
<b>Cost:</b>	Original Contract Value	\$16,864,250
	Approved Change Orders	\$1,637,474
	Current Contract Value	\$18,501,724
	Expended to Date	\$15,275,838
	% Expended	82.6%
	SBE Participation	25.9%
<b>Schedule:</b>		
<b>Issues or Concerns:</b>		

<b>Contract No.</b>	<b>CS-149</b>	
<b>Contract Description:</b>	<b>Central Subway Partnership (Project Manager/Construction Manager)</b>	
<b>Status:</b>	Work is ongoing.	
<b>Cost:</b>	Original Contract Value	\$85,139,092
	Approved Change Orders	\$0
	Current Contract Value	\$85,139,092
	Expended to Date	\$72,666,838
	% Expended	85.4%
	SBE Participation	32.4%
<b>Schedule:</b>		
<b>Issues or Concerns:</b>		

<b>Contract No.</b>	<b>CS 156</b>	
<b>Contract Description:</b>	<b>Project Controls Consultant</b>	
<b>Status:</b>	Work is ongoing.	
<b>Cost:</b>	Base Contract Value	\$17,112,873
	Approved Change Orders	\$0
	Current Contract Value	\$17,112,873
	Expended to Date	\$10,081,808
	% Expended	58.9%
	SBE Participation	30.0%
<b>Schedule:</b>		
<b>Issues or Concerns:</b>		

**ATTACHMENT E – PROJECT MILESTONES/KEY EVENTS**

(P = Planned Date, A = Actual Date, F = Forecast Date)	
Preliminary Engineering (PE):	Authorized in July 2002 (A)
Record of Decision (ROD):	Issued November 26, 2008 (A)
Final Design (FD):	Authorized in January 2010 (A)
FFGA Request:	Submitted in September 2011 (A)
FFGA Executed:	October 11, 2012 (A)
Groundbreaking: (Utility Relocation Contract)	February 9, 2010 (A)
Tunnel Excavation Complete (hole through):	June 2, 2014 (southbound); June 11, 2014 (northbound) (A)
Cross-passages Complete:	December 20, 2014 (P); April 15, 2015 (A)
Tunneling Substantial Completion:	April 15, 2015 (A)
Station Construction NTP:	June 17, 2013 (A)
Station Construction Substantial Completion:	February 24, 2018 (P); June 30, 2022 (F)
RSD:	December 26, 2018 (P); September 9, 2022 (F)

Schedule contingency management criteria were developed from the FTA Risk Assessment before entry into FD. Minimum schedule contingency levels at various project milestones or “hold points” were agreed to with SFMTA at Risk Workshop #4, which was held in 2009. The FTA-recommended schedule contingency for the current stage of the project is four months.

# ATTACHMENT F – PROJECT MAP

