

MONTHLY MONITORING REPORT
December 2017

Central Subway Project
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA)
San Francisco, CA

Draft Report Delivered to FTA on January 12, 2018
Revised Final Report Delivered to FTA on January 19, 2017

PMOC Contract No.: DTFT6014D00010
Task Order No. 5
Project No.: FTA-13-0294

Work Order Number: 002
OPs Referenced: 01 and 25
CLIN 0002B

David Evans and Associates, Inc.
Bill Byrne, Task Order Manager
Voice – (303) 828-8626; Email – bbyrne@deainc.com
Time on project: 3.5 years

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Project Description

The Central Subway Project (CSP) involves construction of a 1.7-mile extension of Muni's T Third Line along 4th Street and Stockton Street in downtown San Francisco. The CSP is Phase 2 of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA) T Third Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project. Phase 1 of the project constructed a 5.1-mile LRT line along the densely populated 3rd Street corridor. Revenue service commenced on the T Third Line in April 2007. 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), Union Square/Market Street (UMS), and Chinatown (CTS). 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 boardings are projected to be 43,521 in 2030.

Project Status

The project has been under construction since February 2010. *At the end of November 2017, the project was 72.9% complete based on expenditures.* There is one active construction contract: 1300 Stations and Systems/Trackwork, *which was 63.41% complete based on incurred cost at the end of November.* Substantial completion of this contract was originally scheduled for February 2018, but the latest master program schedule update forecasts substantial completion on June 26, 2019, a delay of 502 days. SFMTA's latest update of the construction schedule indicates a forecast Revenue Service Date (RSD) of November 29, 2019. This is 338 days later than the required RSD of December 26, 2018 in the Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) and unchanged for the past seven reporting periods.

CTS is the only station where mass excavation and the primary structural support system are incomplete. *A cavern for crossover tracks south of the station and excavation of the headhouse to its invert level remain to be completed. **When these activities are complete, the required cost and schedule contingencies for the project should be reevaluated.*** *The last portion of the Sequential Excavation Method (SEM) mining at CTS is now forecast to be complete in mid-February, about two weeks later than previously forecast. Further delays to the overall project were avoided by advancing other work ahead of the previous schedule.*

SFMTA has been using a Dispute Review Board (DRB) to address claims by the contractor for additional costs and delays. The DRB returned an opinion on the contractor's claim of 86 days of compensable time for delays to the start of building demolition at CTS. *However, the DRB withdrew this opinion pending consideration of the possible schedule impacts of other issues at CTS. **In the opinion of the Project Management Oversight Contractor (PMOC), it is unfortunate***

that the DRB withdrew its opinion, as this will prolong the resolution of schedule-related issues. Regardless, SFMTA and the contractor should continue to use the DRB process to resolve contract disputes as it is the best available tool for independent review of the issues.

SFMTA reported that the CSP Program Director will be leaving the project on February 1, 2018. The Resident Engineer (RE) for UMS has already left the project and has been replaced by an acting RE. Turnover in staff in key management positions will create a challenge for resolution of outstanding schedule and cost issues between SFMTA and the contractor. Additionally, staffing limitations and issues with the City's new financial management system are making it difficult for SFMTA to execute contract changes that are not in dispute.

Table 1 - Core Accountability Items

Project Status: (as of November 30, 2017)		Original at FFGA:	Current Estimate:
Cost	Cost Estimate	\$1,578,300,000	\$1,578,300,000
Contingency	Unallocated Contingency	\$74,722,000	\$9,005,903
	Total Contingency (Including Approved Contract Changes)	\$185,500,000	\$74,176,637
Schedule	Revenue Service Date	12/26/2018	12/10/2019 (SFMTA forecast)
Total Project Percent Complete	Based on Expenditures	72.94%	
	Based on Earned Value	73.37%	
Major Issues	Status	Comments/Planned Action	
Schedule Contingency	Delays have not increased in the past seven months.	SFMTA to identify range of potential RSDs based on remaining schedule risks. Required contingency should be reevaluated when CTS excavation is complete.	
Cost Contingency	The current Total Contingency is \$74.2 million.	The contingency appears adequate for the current level of project completion. Required contingency should be reevaluated when CTS excavation is complete.	
Technical Capacity and Capability	The Program Director will leave the project in February 2018. The RE for UMS has left the project.	SFMTA should immediately prepare a plan for filling key positions. The PMOC will monitor the agency's progress in recruitment and hiring of needed staff.	
Date of Next Quarterly Meeting:		February 7, 2018	

Earned Value (EV): \$1,158,066,262, an increase of \$9.04 million from October.

Planned Value (PV): \$1,468,383,718, a planned increase of \$5.51 million from October.

Actual Cost (AC): \$1,151,241,688, an increase of \$11.72 million from October.

Cost Performance Index (CPI): 1.01, indicating that the value of completed work is consistent with the incurred cost.

Schedule Performance Index (SPI): 0.79, indicating that the amount of work completed is far less than planned and the project is well behind schedule.

Contingency

Cost Contingency

The total available contingency (approved contingency less approved contract changes) as of November 30, 2017 was \$74,176,637, which is above the minimum required contingency of \$60 million. SFMTA's latest trend summary report estimates a total potential additional cost increase of \$51.59 million, which is \$23.65 million less than the available contingency.

Schedule Contingency

All contingency in the schedule has been consumed, and there is nearly 12 months of negative float. SFMTA has completed an initial assessment of schedule risk *and initial SFMTA results indicate a high probability that the RSD will be on or before December 10, 2019.*

PMOC Observations, Opinions, and Concerns

A reevaluation of required cost and schedule contingencies should be undertaken following completion of excavation and the primary structural support systems at CTS.

The PMOC notes that the REs and contract management staff appear unable to keep up with the high volume of contract changes while managing ongoing construction. Issues with a new financial management system are exacerbating contract management challenges. The imminent departure of the Program Director and turnover in the RE staff for the stations contract add to the challenge of maintaining progress while addressing contractual issues with the contractor. The PMOC recommends that SFMTA immediately develop a plan to replace key project management staff positions for CSP and work with the City to address problems in contract management associated with the switch to a new financial management system.

The SFMTA CSP Quality Manager has identified schedule recovery efforts as a cause for added pressure on RE and design staff to meet the quality needs of the project. Construction and/or design issues have resulted in a need to repair groundwater leaks at YBM that may be partially due to issues with quality control. The PMOC recommends that the CSP Management Team assess the impacts that schedule acceleration may be having on the quality program for the project and make any adjustments needed to assure that quality is not compromised.

The PMOC notes that the potential cost increases for the project in SFMTA's trend summary report remained relatively stable from December 2017 to January 2018. However, the PMOC notes that project management costs will likely increase due to the extended duration of the project and these costs are not included in SFMTA's current forecast. Nonetheless, the forecasts for total potential cost increases remain well below the available cost contingency.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. PROJECT STATUS 1

B. PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLAN AND SUB-PLAN IMPLEMENTATION..... 4

C. PROJECT MANAGEMENT CAPABILITY AND CAPACITY 5

D. PROJECT COST STATUS 6

E. PROJECT SCHEDULE STATUS 13

F. QUALITY ASSURANCE AND QUALITY CONTROL 18

G. AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA) COMPLIANCE 19

H. SAFETY AND SECURITY 19

I. PROJECT RISK, RISK MANAGEMENT, AND RISK MITIGATION..... 20

J. ACTION ITEMS..... 21

TABLE OF TABLES

TABLE 1 - CORE ACCOUNTABILITY ITEMS ES ii

TABLE 2 - CONTRACT, BUDGET, AND TRENDS FOR ACTIVE CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS¹ 8

TABLE 3 - BUDGET AND CONTINGENCY STATUS FOR CENTRAL SUBWAY PROJECT..... 9

TABLE 4 - PROJECT FUNDING 13

TABLE 5 - INTERIM BHAGS FOR CONSTRUCTION PROGRESS 14

TABLE 6 - SCHEDULE MILESTONES 16

TABLE 7 - CONSTRUCTION SAFETY DATA..... 20

TABLE 8 - SFMTA ACTION ITEMS FOR CENTRAL SUBWAY PROJECT 22

TABLE 9 – ACTIVE PMOC RECOMMENDATIONS 23

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A. LIST OF ACRONYMS A-23

APPENDIX B. SAFETY AND SECURITY CHECKLIST B-1

APPENDIX C. PROJECT MAP AND OVERVIEW..... C-1

APPENDIX D. TOP PROJECT RISKS..... D-1

APPENDIX E. ROADMAP TO REVENUE OPERATIONS E-1

APPENDIX F. LESSONS LEARNED F-1

APPENDIX G. CONTRACT STATUS G-1

A. PROJECT STATUS

Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA)

The FFGA was signed on October 11, 2012.

Design

Design is complete.

Construction

Contract 1250 (UR #1). This completed contract relocated utilities within the footprint of the proposed Yerba Buena/Moscone Center (YBM) Station.

Contract 1251 (UR #2). This completed contract included the relocation of utility lines within the footprint of the proposed Union Square/Market Street (UMS) Station 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 financial close out is underway. *Two additional contract modifications addressing scope changes and resolution of cost impacts to the city are ready for processing. The cost and schedule impacts to station construction of voids around the tunnel liner in the Chinatown (CTS) station area remain to be resolved. The tunnel contractor and tunnel designer have been tasked with preparing white papers identifying the possible causes of these voids. These white papers have not been completed and are overdue. If the voids are determined to have been caused by non-conforming work by the tunnel contractor, that contractor may be responsible for any extra costs of excavation of the station and crossover caverns at CTS. In the opinion of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) program manager, these issues will not be resolved quickly.*

It appears likely that this contract will close out with a final cost less than \$2 million over the original contract value, with change orders of less than 1% of the contract amount, which is very good cost control performance compared to typical infrastructure projects.

Contract 1300 (Combination of UMS, CTS, YBM, and STS). This contract includes the construction of three underground stations, one surface station, all surface works required for the installation of Light Rail Transit (LRT) between 4th and King streets and the tunnel portal, and all LRT track and systems components. *As of the end of November 2017, the construction of the Stations and Surface, Track, and Systems Contract was 63.41% complete based on cost and 65.24% complete based on the value of completed construction.*

The contractor and SFMTA have been establishing “Big Hairy Audacious Goals” (BHAGs) as a means of encouraging focus and collaboration between the contractor and agency project team members to maintain and enhance schedule performance. The BHAGs are established for critical path and other important activities in the schedule and are defined so as to be difficult to achieve. Thus far, few of the identified BHAGs have been achieved and there is little evidence that the

BHAGs have been effective in arresting schedule delays. See Table 5 on Page 14 for the current status of BHAGs. The following paragraphs describe ongoing work for each construction package.

Union Square/Market Street Station (UMS): Plumbing work is underway at the concourse level of the Union Square entrance, elevators have been rough installed, and work on assembly of the escalator is underway. Work on the vent shaft walls continues in this area. Encasement of permanent walers and struts is continuing in the north concourse and in the station box. Scallop walls are being poured on either side of the station box. At the surface on Stockton Street, the Winter Walk has been removed and work hours have returned to normal. Work on the emergency exit stairs at O'Farrell Street was delayed and is now expected to continue through January. Final street and sidewalk finishing at Ellis Street was completed except for final placement of conduits for traffic signals at Ellis and Market Streets. Completion of the conduit work is awaiting fabrication of a new traffic signal controller.

Chinatown Station (CTS): At CTS, cleanup and smoothing continues in the platform cavern north and south and the crosscut cavern. Excavation of the center drift of the crossover cavern will continue through January, with the invert scheduled to be complete February 1. Demolition of the crossover cavern temporary sidewalls and other final Sequential Excavation Method (SEM) work is scheduled to be complete February 15. In the headhouse, temporary struts and walers at level 6 were completed, and excavation to temporary strut level 7 is underway. SFMTA's latest schedule indicates that 11 days of schedule delay were recovered in December by advancing the start of some activities.

Yerba Buena/Moscone Station (YBM): Utility work is continuing at the 4th and Howard and 4th and Folsom street intersections. Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) power boxes will be set at 4th and Howard streets in January, along with conduit work to connect the power to the station. Construction of emergency stair 4 at 4th and Howard streets extended into January and is now forecast to be complete by the end of the month. Finishing and Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing (M/E/P) work continues in the station box at all three levels, and at the lowest level of the headhouse. Installation of elevators 1 and 2 is underway. The mezzanine level deck of the headhouse was completed, and preparations for placement of the headhouse roof deck will start in late January.

Surface, Track, and Systems (STS): Final street and sidewalk paving is complete along 4th Street between King Street and Brannan Street and from Brannan Street to Bryant Street. Street and sidewalk work at the Brannan Street intersection can be completed once a MUNI power ductbank is placed at the intersection. At Bryant Street, water utility and Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS) work is scheduled to be complete in January, which would allow street and sidewalk completion to follow in February. The track slab has been completed between King and Townsend streets, and final track pavement around the track will be completed in mid-January. The universal crossover between Townsend and Bluxome streets was completed January 5. The track slab and surrounding pavement in this area are scheduled to be poured at the end of January. Track is scheduled to be constructed across the Bryant Street intersection of 4th Street during the long weekend of Martin Luther King Day. Several utility conflicts need to be addressed before track

work can be installed at the Brannan Street intersection. Work on the surface station at 4th and Brannan streets is continuing.

In the tunnel section of the project, work continues in both tunnels to install the track between YBM and UMS. *The look ahead schedule now indicates that rail will be installed through UMS starting in late January.*

Third Party Agreements Including Utilities, Railroads, Other Agencies, Etc.

Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)

SFMTA has received comments on the shop drawings for installation of escalators and elevators at the Ellis Street annex after the contractor paid the required BART permit fees. Work in this area can now proceed.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

SFMTA needs an Encroachment Permit to install electrical and traffic signal equipment at the I-280 off ramp. SFMTA delivered the permit application materials to Caltrans and is working to address Caltrans' comments on the application.

CPUC

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/Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Quarterly Progress Review Meetings (QPRM), although CPUC was not represented at the November 16, 2017 QPRM. The FLSC is working to approve items on the certifiable items list for the Stations Contract. Rail crossing permits from CPUC are required for the at-grade portion of the project alignment. CPUC has provided the permits but they will need to be extended as the permits call for the crossings to be in operation before the scheduled completion of the Central Subway Project (CSP).

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC)

Coordination is ongoing for the installation of new water and sewer facilities along 4th Street.

San Francisco Department of Public Works (SFPDW)

SFPDW also inspects completed street and sidewalk facilities that the contractor has proposed to release to the City. SFPDW develops punch lists of required repairs that must be completed by the contractor prior to acceptance of the streets and sidewalks.

San Francisco Parks and Recreation Department

No updates to report.

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.

Status of Vehicle Design, Procurement, Testing, and Integration

Vehicle design and fabrication is underway by Siemens Corporation for four Light Rail Vehicles (LRVs) for the Central Subway, 24 LRVs for near-term fleet expansion (4 for service to the new Warriors Arena), and 151 LRVs for fleet replacement. Options for up to 85 additional vehicles are available for fleet expansion. *SFMTA had received eight cars as of November 30, 2017.* SFMTA announced that the first vehicle has been certified by CPUC and that vehicle was placed into revenue service as a one-car consist on November 18, 2017. SFMTA has been requested to identify which of the new cars will be assigned as being funded by the CSP and will provide information on the vehicles for ongoing tracking of these assets in which the federal government has a financial interest.

Real Estate

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

Labor Relations and Policies

Appendix G of the Project Monthly Report details the Small Business Enterprise (SBE) goals and actual participation on each contract as of September 30, 2017. SFMTA contract goals range from 6% to 30% on each of the contracts. The majority of the contracts have met these goals to date.

Compliance with Applicable Statutes, Regulations, Guidance, and FTA Agreements

The 1300 contractor had previously raised the possibility of Buy America compliance issues with cooling equipment for the three underground stations. In the case of the cooling equipment, the contract specifications for the Variable Refrigerant Flow (VRF) cooling units identify four manufacturers that are all foreign, and the contractor has not been able to identify a domestic supplier that can meet the specifications. SFMTA has indicated that it intends to seek a waiver of Buy America requirements for this equipment, citing examples from other FTA-funded projects where waivers were granted by FTA for similar equipment.

B. PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLAN AND SUB-PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

Project Management Plan (PMP)

SFMTA delivered an update of the PMP in April 2017 *and expects to provide an updated PMP to FTA in April 2018.*

Environmental Assessment/Mitigation Plan/Archaeological Plans

The Project Management Oversight Contractor (PMOC) received the Second Quarter 2017 Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP) update from SFMTA on October 26, 2017. *The PMOC reviewed this document and identified minor inconsistencies regarding the current status of some monitoring items and the timing of future project development steps due to construction delays. The PMOC will forward recommendations to address these inconsistencies to SFMTA for incorporation into the next MMRP update.*

Real Estate Acquisition Management Plan (RAMP)

SFMTA submitted 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.

Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Program Plan

See section F.

Safety and Security Management Plan (SSMP)

See section H.

Risk and Contingency Management Plan (RCMP)

See section I.

C. PROJECT MANAGEMENT CAPABILITY AND CAPACITY

Agency Staff

SFMTA has been recruiting for several open positions and reported that a new cost estimator and a new claims manager joined the project in November. *In December, SFMTA announced that the CSP Program Director, John Funghi, will be leaving the project in February 2018. SFMTA also announced that the acting UMS Resident Engineer (RE) left the project at the end of November 2017. Turnover in key project management staff positions will make it challenging to resolve outstanding contractual issues between SFMTA and the contractor while effectively managing ongoing construction. In the opinion of the PMOC, SFMTA should prepare and implement a plan to fill critical project management positions immediately.*

The PMOC has been reporting for several months that the REs have been challenged to address the high volume of open contractor change requests requiring merit determination, completion of negotiations for merited changes, and completion of the necessary paperwork to execute changes that have been negotiated. No contract modifications have been issued since September 2017, despite the fact that hundreds of trend items have been determined to have merit and should be advancing to the contract modification stage. SFMTA reported that both the agency and contractor had been focusing on preparations for Dispute Review Board (DRB) hearings and had been unable to address other more routine contract issues. This is further evidence that both the contractor and SFMTA have insufficient staff resources to address the large number of contract issues affecting the project. The PMOC recommends that SFMTA

evaluate the current and future staffing levels and expertise required to address outstanding contract issues while effectively managing ongoing construction and preparing for systems testing and start-up activities. SFMTA reported that it is continuing recruitment efforts for the project start-up and testing manager position as well as starting the recruitment process for the other open management positions. SFMTA further reported that execution of agreed contract changes has been hampered by difficulties associated with the City of San Francisco's change to a new financial accounting system. Budgets for CSP project components are not accurately reflected in the new system, causing difficulties in implementing contract changes. The PMOC will continue to monitor the SFMTA's progress in clearing the backlog of pending change orders.

The 1300 Contract provides for a DRB as a resource for helping to achieve resolution of contract disputes. SFMTA and the contractor have been presenting unresolved issues to the DRB as a means to help achieve resolution. The DRB has begun to issue opinions regarding the merit and quantum of contractor requested changes that are under dispute and/or the subject of claims.

Contractor Staff

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

D. PROJECT COST STATUS

Project Cost Control Systems

SFMTA continued to maintain the Trend Log and logs of Change Order Requests (COR), Proposed Contract Changes (PCC), Notices of Potential Claims (NOPC) 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 Claim Log include CORs rejected by SFMTA for which the contractor expects to submit or has submitted a claim. **The PMOC, recommends that the trend log tracking should include the amount of time that has passed from the initial identification of the trend.**

The most recent versions of the Trend Log and Trend Summary documents are dated January 3, 2018. The Trend Summary indicates that 75 contract modifications had been executed for the 1300 Contract. The total value of executed CMods was \$8,121,714 (no change since September). The NOPC log, also dated January 3, 2018, indicates that there are now 76 open potential claims (unchanged since November) and four claims that have been settled/closed. The Claim Log shows that 58 of these potential claims have been certified and submitted by the contractor and two have been resolved and will be addressed through contract modifications. The submitted claims total \$24.40 million in extra costs, which is unchanged from November.

Note that Tables 2 and 3 reflect the project status as of the end of November 2017 as reported in SFMTA's latest Monthly Progress Report (MPR), and show substantially different values for potential contract changes because of the differing time period and because pending contract

changes in Tables 2 and 3 include only SFMTA-initiated PCCs and contractor CORs that have been determined to have merit. Claims and denied CORs are not included in the cost forecast in Tables 2 and 3.

Project Cost (as of November 30, 2017)

Cost estimate: \$1.5783 billion.

Total contingency: \$74.18 million (minimum contingency is \$60 million), *reduced slightly from October.*

Actual Cost (AC): \$1,151,241,688, *an increase of \$11.72 million from October (72.94% of the total project budget).*

Current funding level: \$1,479,780,000 (93.6% of the total project budget).

Earned Value (EV): \$1,158,066,262, *an increase of \$9.04 million from October (73.37% of project value earned).*

Cost Performance Index (CPI): 1.01.

CPI is a measure of cost efficiency on a project. It is the ratio of EV to AC. A CPI equal to or greater than 1.0 indicates a cost underrun, and a value of less than 1.0 indicates a trend towards a cost overrun. A value of 0.9 or greater is considered acceptable, considering the margin of error in estimating the value of completed work.

Project Cost Trends

SFMTA tracks potential changes in project cost, calling these potential changes “trends.” Trends include all potential changes in the contract value. As the status of an identified trend changes, it may become a contract modification, 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 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, with the value reflecting SFMTA’s assessment of the likelihood that the change would ultimately be approved through the contract dispute resolution process.

Table 2 summarizes the trends for the two construction contracts that have not attained financial close out. The remaining contingency, less identified trends, represents about 54% of the potential left to spend for Contract 1252. SFMTA’s latest forecast for close out of Contract 1252 indicates that additional credits will be extended by the contractor leading to a reduction in final contract value. **It appears likely that additional contingency from Contract 1252 will be available for reallocation to unallocated contingency.**

*In the November MPR, SFMTA estimates the total cost impact of potential contract changes at \$25.35 million, compared with \$24.17 million in October, an increase of \$1.18 million. After potential changes were accounted for, \$6.55 million in allocated contingency remained for Contract 1300 at the end of October. **The resulting contingency of 2.1% of potential remaining spending after potential changes are accounted for is likely insufficient, and additional contingency will probably need to be allocated to this contract prior to completion. The***

available unallocated contingency and excess contingency for other elements of the program are likely sufficient to allow on-budget completion of the CSP.

Table 3 shows the overall budget, trends, and contingency status for the entire Central Subway program. *The Budget Forecast Variance, which reflects the total remaining contingency after the cost of trends is accounted for, is 12.9% of the potential remaining spending. In the opinion of the PMOC, this contingency should be sufficient to provide reasonable confidence in an on-budget completion of the project.*

Table 2 - Contract, Budget, and Trends for Active Construction Projects¹

	1252 – Tunnel	1300 Stations, STS
Original Contract	233,584,015	839,676,400
Approved Contingency	2,329,485	40,000,000
Extra Budget for Non-Project Costs	6,173,508	
Approved Budget	235,913,500	879,676,400
Approved Changes	1,494,770	8,121,713
Current Contract (1252 does not include non-project costs)	235,078,785	847,798,113
Remaining Contingency	834,715	31,878,287
Potential Changes (PCCs and merited CORs)	20,000	25,328,850
Estimate at Completion	235,098,785	873,126,963
Contingency Less Trends	814,715	6,549,437
Spent to Date	233,589,322	557,765,748
Potential Left to Spend	1,509,463	315,361,215
Contingency Less Trends as % of Potential Cost to Complete	54.0%	2.1%

¹ As reported in the November 2017 Central Subway Project Monthly Progress Report – SFMTA (adjusted and reformatted by the PMOC).

Table 3 - Budget and Contingency Status for Central Subway Project

SFMTA Central Subway Project, Budget, Costs and EAC by SCC November 30, 2017		FFGA Budget	Budget Transfers	Current Budget	Change	Base Budget	Contingency	Expenditures to Date		Remaining Budget	Cost to Complete	Estimate at Completion	Budget Forecast
		\$	\$	= Committed \$	%	\$	\$	\$	%	\$	\$	\$	\$
10	Guideway and Track Elements	315,926,081	(30,698,202)	285,227,879	-10%			254,666,424	89%	30,561,455			
10.02	Guideway: At Grade, Semi-exclusive	2,395,143	464,857	2,860,000	19%			1,536,250	54%	1,323,750			
10.06	Guideway: Underground cut and cover	74,407,195	(4,590,788)	69,816,407	-6%			63,284,677	91%	6,531,730			
10.07	Guideway: Underground tunnel	224,933,257	(23,592,511)	201,340,746	-10%			181,603,981	90%	19,736,765			
10.09	Track: Direct fixation	7,293,157	(532,068)	6,761,089	-7%			5,622,916	83%	1,138,173			
10.10	Track: Embedded	1,601,763	(1,601,763)	-	-100%			-	0%	-			
10.12	Track: Special	5,295,566	(845,929)	4,449,637	-16%			2,618,600	59%	1,831,037			
20	Stations, Stops, Terminals, Intermodal	432,698,735	153,963,624	586,662,359	36%			366,244,372	62%	220,417,987			
20.01	At-grade station	774,913	6,827,944	7,602,857	881%			1,658,488	22%	5,944,369			
20.02	Aerial station, stop, shelter, mall, terminal, platform		2,901,013	2,901,013	NA			-	0%	2,901,013			
20.03	Underground station	412,084,888	142,371,764	554,456,652	35%			359,351,013	65%	195,105,639			
20.07	Elevators, escalators	19,838,934	1,862,903	21,701,837	9%			5,234,871	24%	16,466,966			
40	Sitework and Special Conditions	232,551,627	(17,860,689)	214,690,938	-8%			203,466,142	95%	11,224,796			
40.01	Demolition, clearing, earthwork	8,887,028	3,468,587	12,355,615	39%			12,078,515	98%	277,100			
40.02	Site utilities, utility relocation	29,562,587	31,257,647	60,820,234	106%			67,014,764	110%	(6,194,530)			
40.03	Haz. Material, contam'd soli removal, ground water treatment	2,957,442	4,576,686	7,534,128	155%			5,469,151	73%	2,064,977			
40.04	Environmental mitigation	3,146,216	(2,023,317)	1,122,899	-64%			687,590	61%	435,309			
40.05	Site structures, including retaining walls, sound walls	2,894,074	(187,643)	2,706,431	-6%			2,706,431	100%	-			
40.06	Pedestrian and bike access and accommodation, landscaping	14,393,910	(4,602,915)	9,790,995	-32%			3,017,424	31%	6,773,571			
40.07	Automobile, van, bus accessways, including roads and parking lots	11,919,550	(5,340,451)	6,579,099	-45%			4,746,093	72%	1,832,996			
40.08	Temporary facilities and other construction indirect costs	158,790,820	(45,009,283)	113,781,537	-28%			107,746,174	95%	6,035,363			
50	Systems	108,429,774	(13,087,948)	95,341,826	-12%			29,993,467	31%	65,348,307			
50.01	Train control and signals	37,447,116	(9,319,177)	28,127,939	-25%			7,459,819	27%	20,668,120			
50.02	Traffic signals and crossing protection	3,013,232	9,549,297	12,562,529	317%			10,892,540	87%	1,669,989			
50.03	Traction power supply	20,379,634	1,085,439	21,465,073	5%			9,538,250	44%	11,926,823			
50.04	Traction power distribution	16,239,951	(3,798,838)	12,441,113	-23%			1,681,354	14%	10,759,759			
50.05	Communications	28,545,305	(16,514,719)	12,030,586	-58%			421,503	4%	11,609,083			
50.06	Fare collection system and equipment	2,804,536	3,295,464	6,100,000	118%			-	0%	6,100,000			
50.07	Central Control		2,614,586	2,614,586	NA			1	0%	2,614,585			
Subtotal (10 - 50)		1,089,606,217	92,316,785	1,181,923,002	8%	1,148,050,000	33,873,002	854,370,405	72%	327,552,597	319,028,446	1,173,398,851	8,524,151
60	ROW, Land, Existing Improvements	37,398,029	(5,151,708)	32,246,321	-14%			30,732,020	95%	1,514,301	1,514,301	32,246,321	-
60.01	Purchase or lease of real estate	33,798,029	(3,732,219)	30,065,810	-11%	30,065,810	-	28,322,590	94%	1,743,220	1,514,301	29,836,891	228,919
60.02	Relocation of existing households and businesses	3,600,000	(1,419,489)	2,180,511	-39%	2,180,511	-	2,409,430	110%	(228,919)	-	2,409,430	(228,919)
70	Vehicles	26,385,653	-	26,385,653	0%	13,309,000	13,076,653	10,598,347	40%	15,787,306	2,710,653	13,309,000	13,076,653
70.01	Light Rail Vehicles	26,385,653	-	26,385,653	0%	13,309,000	13,076,653	10,598,347	40%	15,787,306	2,710,653	13,309,000	13,076,653
80	Professional Services	361,568,360	(32,829,239)	328,739,121	-9%	310,518,042	18,221,079	255,540,917	78%	73,198,204	54,977,125	310,518,042	18,221,079
80.01	Preliminary Engineering	46,317,094	(114,420)	46,202,674	0%	46,202,674	-	46,202,675	100%	(1)	-	46,202,675	(1)
80.02	Final Design	86,053,240	(24,734,909)	61,318,331	-29%	61,318,331	-	61,199,308	100%	119,023	-	61,318,331	-
80.03	Project Management for Design and Construction	191,025,800	(88,107,410)	102,918,390	-46%	89,012,545	13,905,845	69,145,340	67%	33,773,050	24,962,270	94,107,610	8,810,780
80.04	Construction Administration and Management	15,495,521	78,558,172	94,053,693	507%	91,096,881	2,956,812	67,304,817	72%	26,748,876	18,696,998	86,001,815	8,051,878
80.05	Professional Liability and Other Non-Construction Insurance	6,800,000	-	6,800,000	0%	6,800,000	-	6,340,196	93%	459,804	78,823	6,419,019	380,981
80.06	Legal, Permits, Review Fees by Other Agencies	7,242,340	970,264	8,212,604	13%	8,212,604	-	4,497,714	55%	3,714,890	3,254,766	7,752,480	460,124
80.07	Surveys, Testing, Investigation, Inspection	234,036	699,064	933,100	299%	933,100	-	850,867	91%	82,233	29,955	880,822	52,278
80.08	Start up	8,400,329	(100,000)	8,300,329	-1%	6,941,907	1,358,422	-	0%	8,300,329	7,835,290	7,835,290	465,039
Subtotal (10 - 80)		1,514,958,258	54,335,839	1,569,294,097	4%	1,504,123,363	65,170,734	1,151,241,689	73%	418,052,408	378,230,525	1,529,472,214	39,821,883
90	Unallocated Contingency	63,341,742	(54,335,839)	9,005,903	-86%	-	9,005,903	-	0%	9,005,903	-	9,005,903	-
Total Project Costs (10 - 100)		1,578,300,000	-	1,578,300,000	0%		74,176,637	1,151,241,689	73%	427,058,311	378,230,525	1,529,472,214	48,827,786

SCC Breakdown of Forecast Construction Costs Not Available

²Data reported in the November 2017 Central Subway Project Monthly Progress Report – SFMTA (adjusted and reformatted by the PMOC).

Change Order Control

SFMTA continues to estimate that CMods with a net increase in contract value of only \$20,000 will be executed as part of contract close out for the 1252 Contract. Based on the expected final contract value, change orders for the base work are forecast to represent less than 1% of the original contract amount. **This represents exceptionally good change order control compared to typical infrastructure projects.**

SFMTA is maintaining its management tools for tracking potential contract changes for the 1300 Contract. *The latest CN1300 Trend Summary is dated January 3, 2018.* This report shows that 75 contract modifications have been approved for a net increase in the contract value of \$8,121,714, which is unchanged from December. *CORs (generated by the contractor) that have been determined to have merit and PCCs (generated by SFMTA) have a combined potential cost impact of \$24.98 million in increased contract value, an increase of \$600,000 since December 6, 2017. SFMTA expects to settle the outstanding CORs for less than the overall cost currently claimed by the contractor.* SFMTA also expects to receive \$6.00 million in non-project funds to cover the cost of these pending contract changes. *The net impact of the CORs and PCCs on the potential project cost is \$18.98 million.*

An additional 726 items are being tracked in the Trend Log. Of these, SFMTA judged 352 items to be without merit and denied them. A further 286 items have been voided and are carried at no cost. There are 73 items covered by certified claims and NOPCs by the contractor (\$25.35 million total exposure, no change from last month), and 15 items are “open” or “new” and awaiting a determination of merit.

*The potential exposure of the project to additional costs from the denied items, NOPCs, claims, and open items is \$33.29 million, which, when added to the \$18.98 million in increased project costs from merited contract changes, yields a possible exposure of the project to additional costs for the 1300 Contract of \$52.27 million. This compares to the remaining contingency for the project of \$74.18 million. **In the opinion of the PMOC, the available cost contingency for the CSP remains sufficient to address potential cost increases.***

The Trend Log shows the following trend items with potential cost increases in excess of \$250,000:

1. # 24 - Change to grade 50 steel from specified grade 70 steel (due to availability issues) - \$572,884
2. # 36 - Extra trucking costs for contaminated soil at CTS - \$2,274,225
3. # 39 - Harder rock than anticipated for CTS slurry wall excavation - \$1,880,379
4. # 61 - Delays to installation of tangent piles at UMS - \$1,082,380
5. # 160 - Conflicting duct bank at UMS - \$581,837
6. # 176 - UMS Garage underpinning requirements - \$732,157
7. # 192 - 12-inch waterline at UMS, added scope - \$336,236
8. # 239 - Changes in construction sequence for UMS Garage - \$500,000

9. # 246 - UMS art glass installation requirements - \$690,017
10. # 272 - Obstructions to jet grout placement at UMS - \$2,060,001
11. # 341 - Change in track switch machine manufacturer at STS - \$347,670
12. # 399 - Additional monitoring instruments at CTS - \$429,777
13. # 466 - Extra work to prepare existing tunnel - \$431,423
14. # 498 - Additional traffic control requirements at 4th and King - \$500,001
15. # 524 - Changed requirements for pre-loading of UMS concourse level struts - \$1,319,593
16. # 526 - Incomplete interface design at STS - \$300,001
17. # 528 - Additional traffic control requirements for STS work package - \$1,032,302
18. # 537 - Cost of changes to the design of CTS to accommodate the plaza requested by the community - \$4,500,001 (paid from non-project funds)
19. # 543 - Change in construction sequence at CTS - \$250,001
20. # 580 - Missing conduit between manholes at UMS - \$250,001
21. # 636 - Changes in emergency vent design (all stations) - \$500,001
22. # 644 - Contractor-claimed change in contract requirements for pre-loading permanent struts at UMS - \$1,853,352
23. # 695 - Change in scope for slip-lining of 78-inch sewer on 4th Street - \$795,499 (increased from \$793,433)
24. # 715 - Soil nail and shotcrete wall changes in Union Square Garage - \$1,365,378
25. # 840 - Change in drain piping details at UMS - \$332,252
26. # 942 - Change in automatic train control system for reverse running - \$400,000
27. # 968 - Design changes for UMS vertical drainage slots - \$603,910
28. # 1022 - Claim for extra costs and time due to extremely hard ground claimed by Tutor Perini Corporation (TPC) during the coring for the SEM mining work - \$862,720
29. # 1032 - Escalator raceways at UMS - \$492,065
30. # 1099 - Extra costs for SEM excavation at CTS due to tunnel segments being 5 feet long - \$4,404,329
31. # 1117 - Extra costs due to concrete obstruction at CTS south platform cavern - \$583,623
32. # 1175 - Time impacts due to power pole conflict during demolition at CTS - \$3,516,164
33. # 1211 - Time impacts from extended submittal reviews and substitution request procedures - \$3,021,262

34. # 1217 - Claimed delays to SEM work at the platform invert due to compensation grout exclusion zone requirements in the contract specifications - \$900,889
35. # 1276 - Estimated extra costs of proposed scope increase to provide sidewalk bulb-outs at 4th and Bryant and 4th and Harrison - \$1,500,000 (paid from non-project funds)
36. # 1299 - Claimed extra costs for a schedule delay to the train control subcontract - \$2,000,001
37. # 1311 - Claimed extra costs for delays to the CTS south platform center drift excavation due to restrictions caused by compensation grouting - \$675,952
38. # 1373 - Extra costs for jet grouting complications at Macy's basement at UMS - \$500,001
39. # 1374 - Extra costs to provide painted sheet metal enclosure for YBM light fixtures - \$457,813 (increased from \$443,720)
40. # 1378 - General claimed extra costs for SEM work at CTS - \$5,457,322
41. # 1424 - Extra work due to changes in form-savers and couplers at roof to wall connection at YBM - \$250,001
42. # 1479 - Large volume of water inflow at end of probe - \$300,000

The PMOC notes that there were no new trends with costs in excess of \$250,000 in the current month.

In addition to these large potential cost increases, the Trend Log includes the following major cost savings:

1. Deletion of compensation grouting bid items at YBM - (\$1,833,869)
2. Deletion of the Air Replenishment System (ARS) - (\$4,689,000)
3. Replace specified Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) equipment with alternate for all stations - (\$1,600,000)

Funding

Federal, state, and local project funding and expenditures are shown in Table 4. The awarded funding now represents 93.8% of the project budget.

Table 4 - Project Funding

Source	Committed (\$1,000)	Awarded (\$1,000)
<u>Federal</u>		
New Starts	942,200	919,182
Congestion Mitigation	41,025	41,025
<i>Federal Subtotal</i>	983,225	960,207
<u>State</u>		
TCRP	14,000	14,000
State RIP	88,000	12,498
Prop. 1B / PTMISEA	307,792	307,792
Prop. 1A / HSR	61,308	61,308
<i>State Subtotal</i>	471,100	395,598
<u>Local</u>		
Prop. K Sales Tax	123,975	123,975
<i>Local Subtotal</i>	123,975	123,975
Project Total:	1,578,300	1,479,780

E. PROJECT SCHEDULE STATUS

SFMTA prepared an update of the master program schedule in November representing progress on the project through October 2017. SFMTA continues to reject schedule updates from the contractor. SFMTA has directed the contractor to make corrections to the schedule logic, but the contractor has not complied with this direction.

As of the end of November 2017, the project was 349 days late, based on the projected Revenue Service Date (RSD) of December 10, 2019. The projected substantial completion date for the 1300 Contract remained June 26, 2019, which is 502 days later than the original date (February 9, 2018). There have been no changes to these milestone dates over the past seven schedule updates. Excavation work at CTS has been progressing relatively well, with completion of the crossover cavern now forecast for mid-February. Although this is two weeks later than forecast last month, other work on the project critical path was advanced ahead of schedule, resulting in no change to the overall completion date for the project.

Major delay claims and NOPCs by TPC for CTS and the other work packages are pending resolution. SFMTA and TPC have been addressing the claims through the DRB process. The schedule for installation and testing of the train control system is the subject of major delay claims that may impact the project critical path. SFMTA has requested an updated schedule from the train control supplier, which has not been received.

*SFMTA reported that the DRB has withdrawn its opinion regarding the contractor's claim for compensable time at the start of demolition at the CTS headhouse site pending review of materials related to a subsequent schedule dispute that may be related. **In the opinion of the PMOC, it is unfortunate that the DRB has rescinded its opinion, as this will prolong the time required to settle the claim.***

The critical path for the construction work continues to flow through the construction of CTS, but analysis by the PMOC indicates that there are other lines of work that are influencing the RSD for the project. Schedule risks related to CTS work and the other near-critical lines of work may further extend the project completion date. SFMTA is conducting a risk assessment of the schedule to establish a range of possible construction completion dates and start dates for revenue service. SFMTA will also identify mitigation measures to reduce the potential effects of the major risks.

SFMTA and TPC have been establishing BHAGs as a way to focus the project team's attention on advancing project work and to encourage teamwork among SFMTA and TPC staff to removing barriers to completion of the work.

Table 5 shows the latest BHAGs and the status for each work package in the 1300 Contract.

Table 5 - Interim BHAGs for Construction Progress

Milestone	Target Date	Actual Date	Status
CTS Complete crossover cavern	January 31, 2018	TBD	<i>Currently forecast to be complete February 15, 2018</i>
UMS Complete utilities and street restoration in Ellis Street	October 1, 2017	<i>TBD</i>	<i>Work currently scheduled to be complete in January 2018</i>
Complete utilities in Geary Street and O'Farrell Street	November 21, 2017	<i>11/21/2017</i>	<i>O'Farrell work complete, Geary Street targeted for completion in January 2018</i>
BART Powell Street elevator ready to install	September 1, 2017	<i>TBD</i>	<i>Late, no work scheduled in January. BART approval of installation achieved</i>
YBM Escalators ready to install	December 1, 2017	<i>11/28/2017</i>	<i>Escalators delivered. Work continuing through January 2018</i>
Complete utilities at Folsom Street	December 15, 2017	<i>TBD</i>	<i>Construction progressing slowly</i>
Complete utilities at Howard Street	Delayed to April 1, 2018	<i>TBD</i>	
Complete headhouse roof slab	February 1, 2018	<i>TBD</i>	
STS Complete all utility work along 4th Street	<i>Delayed to December 31 from November 30</i>	TBD	<i>In progress, utility conflicts are being resolved</i>
Complete track installation on 4th Street	<i>December 31, 2017</i>	TBD	<i>Utility conflicts delaying portions of the work</i>

TBD: To Be Determined

In the opinion of the PMOC, setting of BHAGs has limited effectiveness, in part due to the inconsistent treatment of BHAGs by the RE teams for the work packages. BHAGs are actively discussed at few work package status meetings. The PMOC recommends that the status of BHAGs should be discussed at each work package status meeting in order to improve the effectiveness of the goals in advancing critical project work.

The PMOC and SFMTA convened a schedule workshop on July 26 and 27, 2017 with the objective of agreeing on an approach to establishing a reliable forecast of the project RSD. The PMOC issued a report documenting the results of the workshop and identifying action items relative to the schedule. SFMTA and the PMOC reviewed the status of the action items on October 17. The remaining open action items include:

1. Review and confirm schedule for procurement of Advanced Train Control System (ATCS) hardware, software, and testing. The ATCS supplier is preparing an update of its schedule, which is pending. The master schedule will be updated when the revised ATCS schedule is received
2. Define the scope and confirm the schedule for Building Systems Start-up and Testing at each station. Determine if some of the work can start sooner than indicated in the current schedule. SFMTA is working with TPC to justify the durations of this work at each station. TPC is resisting changing the durations. In the PMOC's opinion, much of the work that would be in this activity will be completed under other activities in the schedule. If this is the case, when the work packages reach these tasks, there will be little to do and the durations will be much shorter than indicated in the schedule. SFMTA has requested that TPC provide more detail for the building start-up and testing activities.
3. Conduct a risk assessment to identify a reasonable range for the RSD recognizing the schedule risks. SFMTA has developed the summary level schedule and has initiated the Monte Carlo schedule analysis. *The initial findings indicate that due to critical path work being advanced ahead of schedule, the current forecast date of December 10, 2019 for RSD is highly likely to be achieved. SFMTA continues to review and refine the Monte Carlo analysis.*
4. If SFMTA intends to pursue a Revenue Service Demonstration, prepare a plan that identifies the work that must be complete in order to start such a demonstration. Identify a range of dates by which the required work is likely to be complete. SFMTA does intend to pursue a Revenue Service Demonstration and is identifying what work will need to be complete, including staff training, to implement such a demonstration. SFMTA has initiated discussion with Muni operations on the requirements for the potential demonstration.

The PMOC supports SFMTA's planned approach to identifying a range for the RSD for the project.

Project Schedule Data

Earned Value (EV): \$1,158,066,262, an increase of \$9.04 million from October.

Planned Value (PV): \$1,468,383,718, a planned increase of \$5.51 million from October. The PMOC notes that because the baseline schedule projected Substantial Completion in February 2018, the planned earned value for each month going forward will be declining. Actual earned value each month should greatly exceed the planned earned value for the month for the remainder of the project.

Schedule Performance Index (SPI): 0.79. SPI is a measure of schedule efficiency on a project. It is the ratio of earned value to planned value. 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. A value of equal to or greater than 0.9 reflects satisfactory performance, considering the margin of error in estimating both earned value and planned value. The current value of 0.79 indicates that the project is significantly behind schedule.

Table 6 shows the status of the schedule milestones established for the project.

Table 6 - Schedule Milestones

(P = Planned Date, A = Actual Date, F = Forecast Date)	
Preliminary Engineering (PE):	Authorized in July 2002 (A)
Record of Decision:	Issued November 26, 2008 (A)
Final Design (FD):	Authorized in January 2010 (A)
FFGA Request:	Submitted September 2011 (A)
FFGA Executed:	October 11, 2012 (A)
Ground Breaking: (Utility Relocation Contract)	February 9, 2010 (A)
Tunnel excavation complete (hole through):	June 2, 2014 (SB); June 11, 2014 (NB) (A)
Cross passages complete:	December 20, 2014 (P); April 15, 2015 (A)
Tunneling substantial completion:	April 15, 2015 (A)
Station construction Notice to Proceed (NTP):	June 17, 2013 (A)
Station construction substantial completion:	February 24, 2018 (P); June 26, 2019 (F)
RSD:	December 26, 2018 (P); December 10, 2019 (F)

Schedule Contingency Management criteria were developed from the FTA Risk Assessment prior to entry into Final Design (FD). Minimum schedule contingency levels at various project milestones or “Hold Points” were agreed to with SFMTA at Risk Workshop #4, held in 2009. The FTA recommended schedule contingency for the current stage of the project is 6.0 months. As noted above, the current schedule reflects nearly 12 months of negative buffer float.

Critical Path Summary (*Baseline Schedule*)

CTS Install Guidewalls, Slurry Walls, and Install Surface Deck (complete)

CTS Excavate Headhouse and Bracing (complete)

CTS SEM and Install Supports (underway)

CTS Headhouse Structural Concrete/Remove Bracing

CTS Install M/E/P Equipment

CTS Start-up and Testing

CTS P-1254R Commissioning of Station

Safety and Security Certification/Pre-Revenue Activities

RSD on December 26, 2018 (currently forecast December 10, 2019)

Three Month Look-ahead

The following activities are planned over the next three months:

1300 Contract

UMS

- Complete utility placement, backfill, and paving of Geary Street
- Complete emergency exit stairs at O'Farrell Street
- Continue exterior finishing work at the plaza level of the Union Square Garage and the north entrance
- Continue below-grade construction in the north concourse fan plant
- Continue encasement of permanent walers and placement of interior walls in the main station box
- Install elevator in the BART annex
- Continue construction of interior walls in the south concourse
- Decommission the Winter Walk after the holiday construction moratorium

CTS

- Complete excavation of the crossover cavern
- Clean up platform, cross-cut, and crossover caverns and prepare for installation of final lining
- *Continue excavation and placement of temporary supports in the headhouse; complete excavation to the invert level of the headhouse*
- *Start construction of final lining for emergency exit at north end of station*

YBM

- Install mechanical and electrical equipment at the invert level of the headhouse
- Remove temporary struts and shoring at the mezzanine level of the headhouse
- Construct columns for support of the headhouse roof deck
- *Install shoring and complete placement of the headhouse roof deck*
- Continue construction of stairs within the station box and emergency egress stairs

- Continue M/E/P rough-in and interior work mezzanine and concourse levels
- Continue finishes work at the platform level
- Continue utility work at 4th and Howard Street and 4th and Folsom Street intersections above the station box
- Install escalators and elevators

STS

- Complete utility work and street restoration along 4th Street
- Complete construction of the trackway and installation of track along 4th Street
- Install track from YBM through UMS and on toward CTS
- Construction tunnel walkways
- Continue construction of surface level station

The PMOC expects to attend the following meetings:

- Weekly Management (February 5, March 8, and April 2, 2018)
- Weekly Contract 1300 Construction Progress Meetings (February 6/7, March 9/10, and April 2/3, 2018)
- Weekly Configuration Management Board (CMB) (February 7, March 10, and April 5, 2018)
- CSP PMOC Status Meetings (February 6, March 9, and April 3, 2018)
- CSP Risk Management Meeting (March 6, and April 3, 2018)
- FTA/QPRM (February 7, 2018)

F. QUALITY ASSURANCE AND QUALITY CONTROL

QA/QC Plan Implementation

The 1300 contractor's staff includes a Contractor's Quality Manager (CQM), who reports to the Contractor's Management at an organization level superior to the contractor's Project Manager. The CQM is provided by a subcontractor. The reporting structure is to provide the CQM with direct access to the contractor's Principal Officers. A Contractor Non-conformance Report (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. Subsequent work may not progress for work that is the subject of a Corrective Action Request (CAR) until conditions averse to quality are corrected. In the event that the contractor does not issue a CNCR, SFMTA may issue a Non-conformance Notice (NCN) where non-conforming work is identified by SFMTA's quality assurance staff.

The quality concerns for the 1300 Stations Contract identified in the SFMTA November monthly report included issues identified in the previous month including:

- As is typical to similar projects, work performed prior to receipt of approval status of required submittals/Requests for Information (RFI) remains a potential area of concern.
- Also as is typical, timely identification and response to construction problems such as too little concrete cover for reinforcing steel due to close proximity of adjacent objects remains a challenge.
- Schedule compression demands are disrupting RE and design staff priorities.

The PMOC followed up with the SFMTA Quality Assurance Manager (QAM) regarding the last comment. The QAM explained that the pressure to accelerate work in order to recover schedule delays was putting pressure on SFMTA field construction staff and the design team to respond quickly to submittals and RFIs and to approve planned concrete placements with limited time for reviews. Contractor submittals and other materials needed for concrete placements are being completed late, resulting in compressed time for reviews in order to avoid holding up work. The QAM expressed the opinion that the quality of completed work has not yet been compromised, but risks are increased due to the schedule pressure.

*Subsequent discussions regarding the possible causes for water intrusion in the YBM station box revealed that non-conforming work may have occurred due to the failure of the contractor's Quality Control process and the SMTA Quality Assurance process to identify missing elements in the construction. **The PMOC recommends that the CSP management team assess the impact that schedule acceleration may be having on the quality program and make necessary adjustments to assure the effectiveness of the quality program.***

As of January 2, 2018, TPC's Quality Manager had filed 335 CNCRs (eight new since the last report). Eight new items were under review, 11 other items had responses identified but not yet approved, the proposed responses to 15 items were disapproved, and 22 items had approved responses that were not yet implemented. In addition, 241 items were closed (one more than in December) and 38 items had been voided.

G. AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA) COMPLIANCE

There are no ADA issues for the project at this time.

H. SAFETY AND SECURITY

Safety and Security Management Plan

An updated 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 with the latest update of the PMP. The System Integration Test Plan and the Pre-Revenue Operations and Start-up Plan are expected to be provided with the next PMP update.

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. The certification work started to address the station construction items in 2016. *As of January 2, 2017, 204 of the 1660 items on the Safety and Security Conformance Checklist were approved, with 79 new approvals in the past month. Twenty-one items required follow-up responses from the SFMTA construction team.* The San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD) regularly attends the now combined FLSC and SSCRC meetings. The SFFD will continue to coordinate with the Stations Construction Project to identify issues of importance during construction.

Construction Safety

The 1300 Contract is maintaining an excellent safety record, with a total of six recordable and four lost time incidents since the project start. *No recordable incidents occurred in the month of November 2017.* The performance metrics relating to accidents per working hour are well below the OSHA goals for similar construction. The current accident records for the 1300 Contract are shown in Table 7.

Table 7 - Construction Safety Data

<i>Through November 2017</i>	No. of Incidents	Incident Rate ¹	Goal
1300 Contract			
OSHA Recordable Accidents	6	0.43	<3.4
Job Transfer/Restricted Duty Incidents	0	0	NA
Lost Time Incidents	1	0.07	<1.6
Total Incidents	7	0.50	NA
Hours Worked	2,817,564		

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

I. PROJECT RISK, RISK MANAGEMENT, AND RISK MITIGATION

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 Risk Mitigation meeting on January 4, 2018, these and other major remaining project risks were evaluated. The outcome of the risk meeting is documented in Appendix D.*

The primary risk updates identified for further evaluation, definition, and rating at the next risk meeting include the pending retirement of risk 248, which is the potential for the production rate for SEM excavation at CTS to be lower than planned. With SEM work expected to be complete in

February 2018, this risk can be retired soon. A new risk related to the possibility of ineffective coordination of finishes and M/E/P work in the stations, resulting in delays, has been identified and needs to be further defined and assessed.

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 revenue service dates. The initial results of the Monte Carlo analysis indicated that the current forecast RSD of December 10, 2019 has a high probability of being achieved or bettered due to critical path work that has been started prior to the date indicated in the latest schedule forecast. **The PMOC recommends that the baseline schedule for the Monte Carlo assessment be updated to reflect the time-saving measures that have already been implemented.** SFMTA is continuing to evaluate and refine the schedule risk analysis.

In the opinion of the PMOC, SFMTA is taking an appropriate approach to identifying and quantifying the potential impacts of the remaining schedule risks to the project. The outcome of the SFMTA risk assessment is expected to be a range of likely RSDs for the project.

J. ACTION ITEMS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Table 8 on the following page shows the current action items for SFMTA. Table 9 provides a summary of the currently active PMOC recommendations.

Table 9 – Active PMOC Recommendations

Number	Date Identified	Recommendation
1	12/27/2017	SFMTA and the contractor should continue to use the DRB process as a tool to resolve contract disputes.
2	12/27/2017	Required cost and schedule contingencies should be reevaluated when CTS excavation is complete.
3	12/27/2017	SFMTA should further define the requirements for a possible “Revenue Service Demonstration,” which could involve opening a portion of the line early. The definition of requirements will help to confirm the feasibility and timing of the proposed demonstration.
4	12/27/2017	The CSP Management Team should assess the impacts that schedule acceleration may be having on the quality program for the project and make any necessary adjustments needed to assure that quality is not compromised.
5	12/27/2017	The status of BHAGs should be discussed at each work package status meeting in order to improve the effectiveness of the goals in advancing critical project work.
6	12/27/2017	The trend log tracking should include the amount of time that has passed from the initial identification of the trend.
7	1/10/2018	<i>SFMTA should immediately prepare a plan for filling key positions, including the Program Director and Resident Engineer openings. The PMOC will monitor the agency’s progress in recruitment and hiring of needed staff.</i>
8	1/10/2018	<i>The baseline schedule for the Monte Carlo risk assessment should be updated to include any time-saving measures that have been implemented, thereby adjusting the baseline RSD date.</i>
9	1/10/2018	<i>SFMTA should evaluate the current and future staffing levels and expertise required to address outstanding contract issues while effectively managing ongoing construction and preparing for systems testing and start-up activities.</i>
10	1/10/2018	<i>SFMTA should work with the City to address problems in contract management associated with the switch to a new financial management system.</i>
11	1/10/2018	<i>SFMTA should now focus on updating the risks and mitigation strategies to reflect the transition of the work from excavation and major structural supports to mechanical, electrical, plumbing and systems installation and testing.</i>

APPENDIX A. LIST OF ACRONYMS

AC	Actual Cost
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
APTA	American Public Transportation Association
ARS	Air Replenishment System
ATCS	Advanced Train Control System
AWSS	Auxiliary Water Supply System
BART	Bay Area Rapid Transit
BCE	Baseline Cost Estimate
BHAG	Big Hairy Audacious Goal
BRT	Bus Rapid Transit
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CCTV	Closed Circuit Television
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CLIN	Contract Line Item Number
CM	Construction Management
CMB	Configuration Management Board
CMod	Contract Modification
CNCR	Contractor Non-Conformance Report
COR	Change Order Request
CPI	Cost Performance Index
CPUC	California Public Utilities Commission
CQM	Contractor's Quality Manager
CSP	Central Subway Project
CTS	Chinatown Station
DF	Designated Function
DRB	Dispute Review Board
EV	Earned Value
FD	Final Design
FEIR	Final Environmental Impact Report
FEIS	Final Environmental Impact Statement
FFGA	Full Funding Grant Agreement
FLSC	Fire and Life Safety Committee
FMP	Fleet Management Plan
FRA	Federal Railroad Administration
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
IRP	Independent Review Panel
LONP	Letter of No Prejudice
LRT	Light Rail Transit

LRV	Light Rail Vehicle
M/E/P	Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing
MMRP	Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPS	Master Project Schedule
MRP	Monthly Progress Report
Muni	Common Public Reference to SFMTA
NCN	Non-conformance Notice
NCR	Non-conformance Report
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NOPC	Notice of Potential Claim
NTP	Notice to Proceed
O&M	Operations & Maintenance
OHA	Operational Hazard Analysis
OP	Oversight Procedure
PCC	Proposed Contract Changes
PE	Preliminary Engineering
PG&E	Pacific Gas and Electric Company
PHA	Preliminary Hazard Analysis
PMOC	Project Management Oversight Contractor
PMP	Project Management Plan
PTMISEA	Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account
PV	Planned Value
QA/QC	Quality Assurance/Quality Control
QAM	Quality Assurance Manager
QPRM	Quarterly Progress Review Meeting
QTR	Quarter
RAMP	Real Estate Acquisition Management Plan
RAP	Rail Activation Plan
RCMP	Risk and Contingency Management Plan
RE	Resident Engineer
RFI	Request for Information
ROD	Record of Decision
RSD	Revenue Service Date
SBE	Small Business Enterprise
SCIL	Safety Certifiable Item List
SCP	Safety Certification Plan
SEIS	Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement
SEM	Sequential Excavation Method

SEPP	Security and Emergency Preparedness Plan
SFDPW	San Francisco Department of Public Works
SFFD	San Francisco Fire Department
SFMTA	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
SFPUC	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
SIT	Systems Integration Test
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
SPI	Schedule Performance Index
SSCP	Safety and Security Certification Plan
SSCRC	Safety and Security Certification Review Committee
SSCVR	Safety and Security Certification Verification Report
SSMP	Safety and Security Management Plan
SSO	State Safety Oversight
SSP	System Security Plan
SSPP	System Safety Program Plan
STS	Surface, Track, and Systems
TBD	To Be Determined
TBM	Tunnel Boring Machine
TPC	Tutor Perini Corporation
TSA	Transportation Security Administration
TVA	Threat and Vulnerability Analysis
U.S.C.	United States Code
UMS	Union Square/Market Street Station
VRF	Variable Refrigerant Flow
YBM	Yerba Buena/Moscone Center Station
YOE	Year of Expenditure

APPENDIX B. SAFETY AND SECURITY CHECKLIST

Central Subway Project Overview			
Project mode (Rail, Bus, BRT, Multimode)	Light Rail Transit		
Project phase (Preliminary Engineering, Design, Construction, or Start-up)	Construction		
Project Delivery Method (Design/Build, Design/Build/Operate/Maintain, CM/GC, etc.)	Design-Bid-Build		
Project Plans	<i>Version</i>	<i>Review by FTA/FRA</i>	Status
Safety and Security Management Plan	2014	2011	Revision 1 Update submitted to FTA 02/25/2011. Not submitted to FRA. Revision 2 submitted to FTA on May 2, 2014.
Safety and Security Certification Plan (SSCP)	2011		SSCP was revised 10/2011. Revision 1 was developed in November 2011. Not submitted to FRA.
System Safety Program Plan (SSPP)	2009	2009	SSPP dated 03/13/2009 submitted to FTA 07/31/2009. Not submitted to FRA.
System Security Plan (SSP) or Security and Emergency Preparedness Plan (SEPP)	2009		Not submitted to FTA. Not submitted to FRA.
Construction Safety and Security Plan	2012		Health and Safety. Construction Safety Standards Revision 3, June 27, 2012.
Safety and Security Authority	<i>Y/N</i>		Notes/Status
Is the grantee subject to 49 CFR Part 659 state safety oversight requirements?	Y		
Has the state designated an oversight agency as per 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

Central Subway Project Overview			
Project mode (Rail, Bus, BRT, Multimode)	Light Rail Transit		
Project phase (Preliminary Engineering, Design, Construction, or Start-up)	Construction		
Project Delivery Method (Design/Build, Design/Build/Operate/Maintain, CM/GC, etc.)	Design-Bid-Build		
Project Plans	<i>Version</i>	<i>Review by FTA/FRA</i>	Status
Has the oversight agency reviewed and approved the grantee's SSPP as per 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.
Has the oversight agency reviewed and approved the grantee's Security Plan or SEPP as per Part 659.21?	Y		See above.
Did the oversight agency participate in the last Quarterly Program Review Meeting?	Y		
Has the grantee submitted its safety certification plan (SCP) 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 revised in November 2011 was submitted to the CPUC and was approved. CPUC attends monthly certification review meetings conducted by SFMTA.
Has the grantee implemented security directives issues by the Department Homeland Security, Transportation Security Administration?	N/A		Currently, there are no TSA 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.

Central Subway Project Overview			
Project mode (Rail, Bus, BRT, Multimode)	Light Rail Transit		
Project phase (Preliminary Engineering, Design, Construction, or Start-up)	Construction		
Project Delivery Method (Design/Build, Design/Build/Operate/Maintain, CM/GC, etc.)	Design-Bid-Build		
Project Plans	<i>Version</i>	<i>Review by FTA/FRA</i>	Status
SSMP Monitoring			
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 14-16, 2011. The audit found that CSP is conducting its activities in accordance with the SSMP.	
Grantee reviews 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 grantee 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 supervise project Safety and Security Certification.	
Does the grantee 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 grantee established staffing requirements, procedures, and authority for safety and security activities throughout all project phases?	Y		
Does the grantee update the safety and security responsibility matrix/organizational chart as necessary?	Y	The PMOC found the revised matrix in the SSMP, Rev. 1, 02/08/11, to be compliant.	
Has the grantee allocated sufficient resources to oversee or carry out safety and security activities?	Y		

Central Subway Project Overview			
Project mode (Rail, Bus, BRT, Multimode)	Light Rail Transit		
Project phase (Preliminary Engineering, Design, Construction, or Start-up)	Construction		
Project Delivery Method (Design/Build, Design/Build/Operate/Maintain, CM/GC, etc.)	Design-Bid-Build		
Project Plans	<i>Version</i>	<i>Review by FTA/FRA</i>	Status
Has the grantee 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, April 23, 2009. Corrective actions and analysis for different project phases have been identified in the report.
Does the grantee implement regularly scheduled meetings to track to resolution any identified hazards and/or vulnerabilities?	Y		
Does the grantee 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 (1300) work package status meetings. The status of safety and security certifications is reviewed at weekly project management meetings.
Does the grantee ensure the conduct of preliminary hazard and vulnerability analyses? Please specify analyses conducted.	Y		
Has the grantee ensured the development of safety design criteria?	Y		Design is complete and construction is underway.
Has the grantee ensured the development of security design criteria?	Y		Design is complete and construction is underway.
Has the grantee 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.

Central Subway Project Overview			
Project mode (Rail, Bus, BRT, Multimode)	Light Rail Transit		
Project phase (Preliminary Engineering, Design, Construction, or Start-up)	Construction		
Project Delivery Method (Design/Build, Design/Build/Operate/Maintain, CM/GC, etc.)	Design-Bid-Build		
Project Plans	<i>Version</i>	<i>Review by FTA/FRA</i>	Status
Has the grantee verified conformance with safety and security requirements in equipment and materials procurement?	Y		Safety and Security Conformance checklists have been prepared for each of the construction contracts. All certifiable elements of the Tunnel work have been certified and accepted by SFMTA Safety. Certification reviews are underway for the stations contract.
Has the grantee verified construction specification conformance?	Y		This is on-going as construction progresses and verified through the Safety and Security Certification process
Has the grantee identified safety and security critical tests to be performed prior to passenger operations?	N		Currently being developed.
Has the grantee verified conformance with safety and security requirements during testing, inspection, and start-up phases?	N		Project is in construction, with RSD about 2 years in the future.
Does the grantee evaluate change orders, design waivers, or test variances for potential hazards and/or vulnerabilities?	Y		
Has the grantee ensured the performance of safety and security analyses for proposed work-arounds?	N/A		Currently no work-arounds have been identified.

Central Subway Project Overview		
Project mode (Rail, Bus, BRT, Multimode)	Light Rail Transit	
Project phase (Preliminary Engineering, Design, Construction, or Start-up)	Construction	
Project Delivery Method (Design/Build, Design/Build/Operate/Maintain, CM/GC, etc.)	Design-Bid-Build	
Project Plans	<i>Version</i>	<i>Review by FTA/FRA</i>
Has the grantee demonstrated through meetings or other methods, the integration of safety and security in the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Activation Plan and Procedures <input type="checkbox"/> Integrated Test Plan and Procedures <input type="checkbox"/> Operations and Maintenance Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Emergency Operations Plan	<i>In Process</i>	Second draft of Rail Activation Plan has been completed. An Integration Matrix has been implemented for all disciplines including safety and security concerns.
Has the grantee issued final safety and security certification?	N	Project is in the construction phase.
Has the grantee issued the final safety and security verification report?	N	Project is in the construction phase.
Construction Safety		
Does the grantee have a documented/implemented Contractor Safety Program with which it expects contractors to comply?	Y	Health and Safety Construction Safety Standards Revision 3, June 27, 2012.
Does the grantee's contractor(s) have a documented companywide safety and security program plan?	Y	
Does the grantee'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.
Provide the grantee's OSHA statistics compared to the national average for the same type of work?	Y	Provided in the Central Subway Monthly Progress Report.

Central Subway Project Overview		
Project mode (Rail, Bus, BRT, Multimode)	Light Rail Transit	
Project phase (Preliminary Engineering, Design, Construction, or Start-up)	Construction	
Project Delivery Method (Design/Build, Design/Build/Operate/Maintain, CM/GC, etc.)	Design-Bid-Build	
Project Plans	<i>Version</i>	<i>Review by FTA/FRA</i> Status
If the comparison is not favorable, what actions are being taken by the grantee to improve its safety record?	N/A	Statistics are favorable. No action needed.
Does the grantee conduct site audits of the contractor’s performance versus required safety/security procedures?	Y	Safety walks are routinely conducted at each construction site.
Federal Railroad Administration		
If shared track: has grantee submitted its waiver request application to FRA? (Please identify specific regulations for which waivers are being requested.)	N/A	No shared track. No waivers are anticipated.
If shared corridor: has grantee specified specific measures to address shared corridor safety concerns?	N/A	
Is the CHA underway?	N/A	
Other FRA required Hazard Analysis – Fencing, etc.?	N/A	
Does the project have Quiet Zones?	N	
Does FRA attend the Quarterly Review Meetings?	N	

N/A = Not applicable.

APPENDIX C. PROJECT MAP AND OVERVIEW

CENTRAL SUBWAY PROJECT: Project Overview and Map

Date:	<i>January 12, 2017</i>
Project Name:	Central Subway Project (CSP) New Starts Light Rail Transit
Grantee:	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA)
FTA Regional contact:	Mr. Jeffrey S. Davis
FTA Headquarters contact:	Ms. Kim Nguyen

Scope

Description:	The CSP will extend the Third Street Light Rail line from the Caltrain station at Fourth and King streets to Chinatown. It was incorporated in the FEIS/FEIR on the Third Street Light Rail project published in December 1998, but FTA did not include the CSP in the Record of Decision (ROD) issued in March 1999. A ROD for the CSP, however, was issued by FTA on November 26, 2008, and the U.S. Department of Transportation and FTA determined that the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 were satisfied for the CSP. The environmental record for the CSP is included in the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS), Volume II, dated July 11, 2008 and the Final SEIS, Volume I, dated September 23, 2008. These documents present the detailed statement required by NEPA and U.S.C. 5324 (b). SFMTA requested authority to enter Preliminary Engineering (PE) in March 2002 and submitted a Project Management Plan (PMP) in June 2002. FTA approved entry into PE in July 2002. Approval to enter Final Design (FD) was granted by FTA on January 7, 2010. The Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) was signed on October 11, 2012.
Guideway:	The length of the CSP will be 1.7 miles of double-tracked line.
Stations:	The CSP includes three subway stations and one surface station.
Additional Facilities:	The CSP does not include any ancillary facilities.
Vehicles:	The CSP Service Plan dated October 2009 clarified that four vehicles will be required.
Ridership:	43,521 Average Weekday Boardings are projected in 2030.

Schedule

07/02	Approval Entry to PE	2016	Estimated Rev Ops at Entry to PE
01/10	Approval Entry to FD	2018	Estimated Rev Ops at Entry to FD
10/11/12	FFGA	2018	Estimated Rev Ops at FFGA
12/10/2019			Revenue Operations Date at date of this report

73.4% *Percent Complete Based on Progress (November 2017 data)*

Cost

\$764 million	Total Project Cost (\$YOE) at Approval Entry to PE
\$1,578 million	Total Project Cost (\$YOE) at Approval Entry to FD
\$1,578 million	Total Project Cost (\$YOE) at FFGA signed
\$TBD million	Total Project Cost (\$YOE) at Revenue Operations\$1,578 million Total Project Cost (\$YOE) at date of this report including \$0.00 in Finance Charges
<i>\$1,151.2 million</i>	Amount of Expenditures at date of this report from Total Project Budget of \$1,578 million
72.9%	Percent Complete based on Expenditures at date of this report
\$9.00 million	Unallocated Contingency remaining
<i>\$74.18 million</i>	Total Project Contingency (allocated and unallocated contingency as reported by CSP)
\$60 million	Minimum Total Project Contingency revised on September 5, 2012 PMOC review of Contingency Management Plan

	AT HOLD POINTS	QTR	Minimum Contingency Levels	Revised Levels
1A	Hold Point 1a – Tunnels 100% designed February 2011 (Actual)	1Q11	280	280
1B	Hold Point 1b – CTS 100% designed June 2012 (Actual)	4Q11	250	240
1C	Hold Point 1c – 40% Bid (Tunnel and CTS)	2Q12	225	200
1D	Hold Point 1d – FFGA Award October 2012 (Actual)	3Q12	-	180
2	Hold Point 2 – Commence CTS / UMS construction (Actual June 17, 2013)	2Q13	160	160
3	Hold Point 3 – Demobilize Tunnels (Actual April 15, 2015)	2Q15	140	140
4	Hold Point 4 – Stations to platform levels (CTS / YBM) November 2016	4Q16	60	60
5	Hold Point 5 – Complete CTS / Tunnels systems inst. April 2018	2Q18	25	25
RSD	PMOC / FTA RSD	4Q19		
CURRENT TOTAL CONTINGENCY \$74.18 Million				



APPENDIX D. TOP PROJECT RISKS

Top risks were discussed at the January risk meeting as noted below.

Top Risks Discussed in the Previous Month:

Risk 248 – *Production rate for CTS SEM mining is lower than planned, resulting in further delays to critical path work. CTS mining work is now forecast to be complete in mid-February, which is two weeks later than the completion date in the current program schedule. However, other critical work that was forecast to start after completion of the SEM work has been started early. The net impact of these two conditions appears to be a new savings of a few weeks in completion of the project. This risk can be retired once the SEM is actually complete in February. The project critical path should also be reassessed based on the status of ongoing work at the time that the SEM work is completed.*

Risk 240 – *Unresolved assignment of responsibility for schedule delays may lead to increased costs for the program. This risk continues to be a concern. The DRB process is being used to help resolve issues regarding responsibilities for delays. However the DRB has decided to re-evaluate opinions it has already issued based on potential influences of other issues on the delays that were addressed in the original opinion. In the opinion of the PMOC, the decision by the DRB to re-open issues that it had issued opinions on is unfortunate.*

Risk 251 – *Activities required to complete the project scope are not identified in the schedule, resulting in the time required to complete the project being longer than currently forecast. Thus far, although TPC has been identifying additional activities in its schedule updates, none of the added activities have resulted in further delays to the forecast completion date.*

Risk 234 and 52 – *Unacceptable settlement occurs due to SEM mining at CTS, causing damage to buildings or utilities. These risks can be retired when the SEM work is complete and sufficient time has passed to allow the surrounding ground to respond to the excavation. Thus far, compensation grouting has been effective in returning the adjacent buildings to elevations that are within the establishes tolerances.*

Risk 249 – *Unable to re-sequence work that is currently shown as finish to start, resulting in an inability to recover from delays. Thus far TPC has been able to offset recent delays by starting critical work early. This has prevented further schedule slippage but has not allowed all of the accumulated delay to be recovered.*

Risk 253 – *Insufficient resources are available to complete the work as planned. There is a concern that the primary electrical subcontractor may not have sufficient manpower to complete the scheduled work. No mitigations for this potential shortfall in staff resources have been identified. The PMOC, recommends that SFMTA request that TPC take action to assure adequate labor resources are available to complete all of the scheduled work.*

Risk 238 – *Quality program is ineffective in processing non-conformance items causing schedule impacts. In the opinion of the PMOC, this risk may be an increasing concern based on quality*

problems that have occurred with waterproofing at YBM. The SFMTA QAM is preparing a report on the status of the quality program and any required adjustments to procedures and/or resources.

Risk 205 – Prolonged time to execute contract modifications may lead to poor relations between the REs and the contractor. Execution of CMods is being impacted by the City's change to a new financial management system. There is an increasing backlog of contract changes waiting for execution.

Risk 229 and 230 – Risk that contractor and SFMTA systems testing and commissioning will take longer than currently planned. SFMTA is preparing a more detailed testing and commissioning plan, to include identification of required testing and the responsibilities for witnessing and approving the tests. This will be part of the updated Rail Activation Plan to be included in the updated PMP. SFMTA is working to bring on a testing and commissioning manager to lead this effort.

Risk 99 – Breakdown in relationships between SFMTA and contractors results in increased claims and delays to the schedule. The relationship between TPC and SFMTA is strained. Executive partnering and DRB are being used to help resolve disputes. The effectiveness of these strategies is in question. SFMTA continues to assert that the contractor is effectively progressing the work despite the seriousness of the disputes that have yet to be resolved.

Risk 246 – Design changes not being captured in as-built records for the work. SFMTA believes that it has an effective process to capture design changes and include them in the as-built records for the project.

Risk 46 – Public complaints regarding construction impacts result in unanticipated restrictions on working hours and/or work processes at CTS. SFMTA has a very effective public and business outreach team and process. Few complaints have been received regarding CTS work in the past few months. The noisiest and most disruptive work will be completed with the end of excavation and removal of the excavation spoils in early 2018.

The PMOC recommends that SFMTA focus on updating the risks and mitigation strategies to reflect the transition of the work from excavation and major structural supports to mechanical, electrical, plumbing (M/E/P) and systems installation and testing.

Discussion to begin identifying additional specific schedule risks, including poor coordination of finishing and M/E/P work at the stations followed the review of existing risks. Additionally, some risks are nearing retirement due to the impending completion of excavation work at CTS. More detail will be developed at the next risk mitigation meeting.

APPENDIX E. ROADMAP TO REVENUE OPERATIONS

Roadmap to Revenue Operations - Central Subway Project, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency – DRAFT				
Description	Estimated Start Date	Estimated Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Notes
Testing				
Finalize/update Systems Integration Test (SIT) Plan	TBD	TBD	TBD	Project is in construction, with RSD <i>about 2 years</i> in the future.
Prepare Schedule for Testing	1/1/2017	3/1/2017	3/21/2017	Initial testing, commissioning, and start-up schedule has been completed.
Finalize Test Procedures	TBD	TBD	TBD	Project is in construction, with RSD <i>about 2 years</i> in the future.
Conduct System Integrated Testing with trains, including procedures and reports	TBD	TBD	TBD	Project is in construction, with RSD <i>about 2 years</i> in the future.
Complete Testing Reports	TBD	TBD	TBD	Project is in construction, with RSD <i>about 2 years</i> in the future.
Operating Plan, Rules, and Training				
Finalize Operating Plan	TBD	TBD	TBD	Project is in construction, with RSD <i>about 2 years</i> in the future.
Finalize/revise SOPs, manuals, and rulebook as applicable	TBD	TBD	TBD	Project is in construction, with RSD <i>about 2 years</i> in the future.
Operations Manuals	TBD	TBD	TBD	Project is in construction, with RSD <i>about 2 years</i> in the future.
Staffing and Operations Plan	TBD	TBD	TBD	Project is in construction, with RSD <i>about 2 years</i> in the future.
Training of O&M personnel	TBD	TBD	TBD	Project is in construction, with RSD <i>about 2 years</i> in the future.
Emergency response plan, training, and drills	TBD	TBD	TBD	Project is in construction, with RSD <i>about 2 years</i> in the future.
Vehicle Maintenance Plan, Equipment, Facilities, and Training				
Rail Fleet Management Plan	TBD	TBD	TBD	

Roadmap to Revenue Operations - Central Subway Project, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency – DRAFT				
Description	Estimated Start Date	Estimated Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Notes
Maintenance Schedules and Procedures	TBD	TBD	TBD	The LRV fleet is being replaced and expanded through a separate project. The CSP requires an expansion of the fleet of four vehicles.
Spare Parts Requirements	TBD	TBD	TBD	The LRV fleet is being replaced and expanded through a separate project. The CSP requires an expansion of the fleet of four vehicles.
Maintenance Manuals	TBD	TBD	TBD	The LRV fleet is being replaced and expanded through a separate project. The CSP requires an expansion of the fleet of four vehicles.
Maintenance Training	TBD	TBD	TBD	The LRV fleet is being replaced and expanded through a separate project. The CSP requires an expansion of the fleet of four vehicles.
Facility and Right-of-way Maintenance Plan, Equipment, Facilities, and Training				
Maintenance Schedules and Procedures	TBD	TBD	TBD	Project is in construction, with RSD <i>about 2 years</i> in the future.
Spare Parts Requirements	TBD	TBD	TBD	Project is in construction, with RSD <i>about 2 years</i> in the future.
Maintenance Manuals	TBD	TBD	TBD	Project is in construction, with RSD <i>about 2 years</i> in the future.
Maintenance Training	TBD	TBD	TBD	Project is in construction, with RSD <i>about 2 years</i> in the future.
Pre-Revenue Operations				
Finalize and/or update RAP and/or Pre-Revenue Operations Plan	4/2/2015	4/2017	4/27/2017	The second draft with additional detail and a schedule for testing and pre-revenue activities was submitted with the 2017 update of the PMP.
Implement Rail Activation Committee	TBD	TBD	TBD	Project is in construction, with RSD <i>about 2 years</i> in the future.
Shadow operations	NA	NA	NA	Project will be operated by the established MUNI operations division.

Roadmap to Revenue Operations - Central Subway Project, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency – DRAFT				
Description	Estimated Start Date	Estimated Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Notes
Develop/revise SSPP & Security Plan (approved by State Safety Oversight (SSO))	<i>Ongoing</i>	10/31/2015	10/31/2015	CPUC triennial review conducted in October 2015 concluded that SFMTA “has a comprehensive System Safety Program Plan (SSPP) and has made significant progress in executing that plan.”
FTA Office of Safety & Security Readiness Review	TBD	TBD	TBD	Project is in construction, with RSD <i>about 2 years</i> in the future.
PMOC OP-54 Readiness for Revenue Operations Review Report, Phase I	TBD	TBD	TBD	Project is in construction, with RSD <i>about 2 years</i> in the future.
Conduct Operational Hazard Analysis (OHA) and resolve other hazards/vulnerabilities	TBD	TBD	TBD	Project is in construction, with RSD <i>about 2 years</i> in the future.
Pre-Revenue Operations	TBD	TBD	TBD	Project is in construction, with RSD <i>about 2 years</i> in the future.
Public Outreach				
Develop Safety Outreach Plan	TBD	TBD	TBD	Project is in construction, with RSD <i>about 2 years</i> in the future.
Provide Community Outreach	TBD	TBD	TBD	Project is in construction, with RSD <i>about 2 years</i> in the future.
Grand Opening Plan	TBD	TBD	TBD	Project is in construction, with RSD <i>about 2 years</i> in the future.
Construction Close Out				
Close Out of Non-Conformance Reports	Ongoing	09/24/2019	TBD	NCRs are tracked and closed prior to follow-on work. Final closure of NCRs expected as of final completion date of 1300 Contract.
Punch List Complete	12/17/2018	09/24/2019	TBD	Punch list completion expected at final completion of 1300 Contract.
Certificates of Occupancy/Substantial Completion	TBD	06/26/2019	TBD	

Roadmap to Revenue Operations - Central Subway Project, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency – DRAFT				
Description	Estimated Start Date	Estimated Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Notes
<i>Safety, Security, and Fire-life Safety Certifications</i>				
Update/Finalize SSMP			2/18/2014	Revision 2 completed.
Finalize and/or update SCIL and SSCP			10/10/2008	Revision 0.
Implement Safety and Security Certification Committee			8/1/2010	Committee meets monthly to review certifiable items.
Implement Fire Life Safety Committee			8/1/2010	
Preliminary Hazard Analysis (PHA)				Need dates.
Threat and Vulnerability Analysis (TVA)				Need dates.
Design Criteria Reflecting Safety and Security Requirements	NA	NA	NA	Design is complete and construction is underway.
Review status of quality non-conformances	Ongoing	09/24/2019	TBD	
Close Out of non-safety critical items	Ongoing	Ongoing	TBD	
Close Out of safety critical items	Ongoing	Ongoing	TBD	
Complete Safety & Security Certification Verification Report (SSCVR)	TBD	10/11/2019		60 days before RSD - Check against latest regulations.
Document Workarounds/Open Items List	TBD	TBD	TBD	
Verify emergency drills, tabletops, training, etc. are completed	TBD	TBD	TBD	
SSO final certification/signature	TBD	11/19/2019		21 days before RSD - Check against latest regulations.
<i>Third Party and Agency Agreements</i>				
Third Party/Agency Agreements Necessary for Revenue Service	TBD	TBD	TBD	Project is in construction, with RSD <i>about 2 years</i> in the future.
Third Party/Agency Approvals Necessary for Revenue Service	TBD	TBD	TBD	Project is in construction, with RSD <i>about 2 years</i> in the future.

Roadmap to Revenue Operations - Central Subway Project, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency – DRAFT				
Description	Estimated Start Date	Estimated Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Notes
<i>Revenue Service</i>				
Target Revenue Service Date	-	12/10/2019		Current forecast RSD. Recovery schedule to be prepared.
FFGA Revenue Service Date	-	12/23/2018		

APPENDIX F. LESSONS LEARNED

LL#	Date	Phase	Category	Subject	Lesson Learned
1	09-30-10	FD	Management	Consultant Contracts	The project must have a full understanding of the agency and other approving governmental authorities to avoid delay of contract approval and consequential delay of the Master Project Schedule (MPS).
2	09-30-10	FD	Cost	Staffing Plan	The project staffing plan needs to be formulated during PE and updated at least quarterly during FD to manage Standard Cost Category 80 costs and monitor design production.
3	09-30-10	FD	Scope	Letter of No Prejudice (LONP)	A defined scope of grantee and PMOC responsibilities needs to be provided for content and acceptability of LONP requests.
4	09-30-10	FD	Management	SSMP	FD consultants should be trained, shortly after mobilization, in the format and their responsibility regarding the System Safety Consultant.
5	10-30-10	FD	Cost	Baseline Cost Estimate (BCE) Update	The BCE should be updated with current costs as soon as they are known by the project to allow mitigation of cost contingency usage.
6	02-21-12	FD	Management	Program Controls	Program Controls system/software selected for use for the duration of the project should be in place and functional prior to approval to enter FD. Doing so will avoid a transition during FD that could create a lag in timely reporting of cost and schedule status.
7	02-21-12	FD	Management	Risk Mitigation	Oversight Procedure (OP) 40 needs to be revised to establish minimum requirements for secondary mitigation at different phases of the project, similar to those for cost and schedule contingency. The PMOC recommends 5% of project cost at Entry into FD and 3% at execution of an FFGA.
8	02-21-12	FD	Scope	Third Party Agreements	All third party agreements need to be identified as soon as possible, but no later than 65% design completion. This includes leases, both temporary and permanent; MOUs; and licenses, specifically for preconstruction property surveys and settlement monitoring instruments (especially important for underground construction). These third party agreements need to be secured no

LL#	Date	Phase	Category	Subject	Lesson Learned
					later than the advertisement date of the construction that they affect. Third party agreements need to be tracked by the project continuously, reported monthly, and updated in a third party agreement matrix submitted quarterly to FTA.
9	02-21-12	FD	Cost	Cost Estimating Procedures	During the preliminary design phase, the project should establish the cost estimating procedures, format, and software to be used by all estimating entities for the entire duration of the project.
10	02-21-12	FD	Cost	Allocated Cost Contingency	In the BCE submitted to FTA for Entry into FD, the project should identify percentages of allocated cost contingency contained in the BCE that are apportioned for design risk, market risk, and construction risk.
11	02-28-12	FD	QA	Design Management Action Log	Design Management should develop a matrix as a tracking tool to document, track, and close out known elements that are missing from design submission packages.
12	08-15-12	FD	Environmental Mitigations	MMRP	Numerous mitigations identified in the MMRP are to be handled by incorporating specific design details and/or statements in the contract drawings and technical specifications. The grantee should note on the MMRP the relevant drawings and/or technical specifications.
13	08-31-12	FD	Management	Risk Contingency Levels and Hold Points	It became apparent, during the monitoring of the cost contingency drawdown curve for the project that the contingency levels and hold points no longer represented the current stage of project development and risk reduction/contingency usage related to project development. The project advanced through 100% project design; however, the project did not receive credit for the cost contingency usage established by the risk model. The PMOC recognized this deficiency and participated with the grantee in developing a cost contingency drawdown that reflects current project development and reduced risk.
14	06-30-13	Const.	Management	Change Order Process	Perform an audit of the project's procedures related to Change Orders and processing. The project should train staff and inform contractor of their obligations in the process.

LL#	Date	Phase	Category	Subject	Lesson Learned
15	1-30-14	Const.	Management	Independent Review Panel (IRP) Decision-makers	At the request of SFMTA, the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) formed a panel of geotechnical and tunnel experts to perform a peer review of the BART Undercrossing. Prior to crossing under the BART tunnels, the Independent Review Panel (IRP), contractor, SFMTA, and BART representatives convened at predetermined tunnel boring machine (TBM) locations to discuss the TBM progress and determine whether the tunneling should proceed. It is critical that decision makers from each organization attend these meetings. It was noted that BART Senior Management did not attend and instead deferred decisions to lower level staff.
16	6-30-14	Const.	Bid documents	Pre-Classification for Soil and Groundwater Disposal	Soils and groundwater generated from construction activities should be pre-classified with appropriate sampling and testing required by potential disposal facilities. Coordinate with the disposal facilities to get materials accepted.
17	4-10-15	Const.	Quality Control/Safety	Monitoring of Soil Conditions during Underground Construction	There was a breach of the excavation of frozen ground during construction of a cross passage between the twin bored tunnels followed by water and soil flowing into the tunnels, resulting in subsidence of the ground above and damage to underground utilities. Apparently the flow of materials into the tunnels went on for quite some time before the problem was detected and actions could be taken to arrest the flow. The construction site was not staffed when the breach started and there was no external warning system in place to notify the contractor or the agency of the condition. Lesson: When the safety and structural integrity of a construction site depends on maintain soil conditions with the use of mechanical systems, the site should be continuously staffed or monitoring devices at the site should be continuously monitored from a remote location to assure that the expected soil conditions are maintained.

LL#	Date	Phase	Category	Subject	Lesson Learned
18	4-10-15	Const.	Environmental	Archeological Data Recovery Protocols	Sensitive archeological materials were uncovered during the excavation of the roof area at YBM. The Program Manager took immediate action to notify the appropriate state officials and implemented protocols for protection of the materials. The most likely descendent of the remains was quickly identified and a representative was engaged and brought to the site to supervise the ongoing excavation. Lesson: Pre-planning and quick action to involve the appropriate parties resulted in satisfactory handling of the artifacts with minimal delays to the construction schedule.
19	5-11-15	Const.	Quality Control	Use of Latest Design Information for Field Inspection	After two roof pours were completed, it was discovered that required reinforcing steel was missing. Changes to the arrangement of the reinforcing steels were made as part of the submittal review and response process. Notes from the designer were included on the approved shop drawings but not in the contract design drawings. Field inspectors were using only the design drawings to confirm the proper installation of reinforcing steel prior to concrete placement. Lesson: A process should be established to assure that the latest design information, including submittals and related designer notes, is available in the field and used to inspect reinforcing steel prior to concrete placement.

LL#	Date	Phase	Category	Subject	Lesson Learned
20	9-28-15	Const.	Schedule	Maintenance of Updated Construction Schedule and Master Program Schedule	<p>SFMTA was unable to obtain an acceptable baseline schedule from the station construction contractor for over a year. Then, SFMTA could not obtain acceptable updated status schedules from the contractor for another 8 months. As a result, the construction status and completion date could not be accurately determined for the first 20 months of the contract. This made schedule control impossible. SFMTA finally created its own schedule updates for the first 12 months of the construction contract using the pay applications and 4-week look-ahead schedules from the contractor.</p> <p>Lesson learned – owners should aggressively assert the need for accurate schedule updates from contractors and should withhold payment if such updates are included in the contract terms or specifications and are not forthcoming. If schedule updates are not received within the first few months of the project, the owner should create its own updates for the purpose of progress monitoring and schedule control.</p>

LL#	Date	Phase	Category	Subject	Lesson Learned
21	11-30-15	Const.	Construction Planning	Installation of Special Trackwork in Operating Systems	SFMTA needed to install special trackwork to provide the connection to the new alignment for Central Subway portion the T Third LRT line. The original plan was to install the special trackwork at the intersection in eight extended weekend shutdowns. Working with the contractor, the plan was revised to accomplish the necessary trackwork installations in two shutdowns. After considering the outcome of the first shutdown, where a portion of the special trackwork did not fit properly and needed adjustment during the shutdown, SFMTA decided to pre-assemble the second, more complex, special trackwork assembly at an off-site facility. The assembly was completed and the resulting track was surveyed to confirm the geometry and to assure that the assembly would fit into the existing field conditions. While conducting the assembly and disassembly of the track components, the contractor identified an approach that would reduce the time required to reassemble the trackwork in the field. Lesson: Effective pre-planning and mock-up assembly of complex trackwork, may allow the final assembly to be completed without the need for field adjustments and in less time than planned. This approach can mitigate the risks associated with the installation of complex custom track components in an operating transit line.
22	3-1-17	Const.	Legal/Claims	Preparation for Mediation	A contractor for advance utility relocation issued a multi-million-dollar claim for extra costs due to delays and unforeseen conditions. SFMTA believed the claim had no justification. After several years, the claim was referred for mediation prior to going to trial. The contractor made a very compelling presentation regarding the extra costs. However, due to careful preparation by SFMTA management, the agency was able to provide specific and detailed rebuttals to the contractor's major arguments. The mediation resulted in a settlement for less than 15% of the original claim amount. SFMTA chose to accept the settlement amount, recognizing that the costs to pursue the claim in court would likely exceed the settlement value. Lesson: Careful record keeping and

LL#	Date	Phase	Category	Subject	Lesson Learned
					preparation for dispute resolution can limit agency exposure to costs related to claims.
23	1-10-18	Design and Procurement	Claims	Quality Control of As-built Data for Procurement	<p>The Central Subway had three major construction phases: Utility Relocation, Tunneling, and Stations/Track/Systems. Inaccurate as-built information from earlier construction phases has led to claims for differing site conditions during the construction of Stations/Track/Systems phase. For example, during the final design phase for the tunnel work, SFMTA agreed to a proposed change to tunnel segments defined in the preliminary engineering phase. The length of tunnel segments was changed from 4 feet to 5 feet except in areas with tight curves. The approved change in segment length was not captured in the final design documents for the stations contract, even though the change in tunnel design was made prior to completion of the station contract documents. When the stations contractor encountered 5' long segments while mining for the platform and crossover caverns at the Chinatown Station, he issued a change order request to account for extra costs due to the need to change the excavation approach to handle the longer tunnel segments. The current claimed extra cost is \$4.4 million. Lesson: Procedures should be established to ensure that approved design changes during construction of early phases of complex projects are accurately reflected in contract documents for follow-on construction phases. PMOC oversight should confirm that procedures are in place to capture changes in design during construction and to assure that changes are reflected in follow-on construction contract procurement documents.</p>

APPENDIX G. CONTRACT STATUS

The following sections provide the status of ongoing contracts associated with the CSP. Note that the DBE participation percentages are updated by SFMTA on a quarterly basis. The current values are through *September 30, 2017*.

Contract No.	1250	
Contract Description:	UR #1 (YBM)	
Status:	Completed June 2011.	
Cost:	Original Contract Value	\$9,273,939
	Approved Change Orders	\$2,694,211
	Current Contract Value	\$11,968,150
	Expended to Date	\$11,968,150
	% Expended	100%
	SBE Participation	97%
Schedule:	NTP issued January 2010. Substantial completion in June 2011.	
Issues or Concerns:		
Contract No.	1251	
Contract Description:	UR #2 (UMS)	
Status:	Work is complete.	
Cost:	Original Contract Value	\$16,832,550
	Approved Change Orders	\$3,962,031
	Current Contract Value	\$20,794,581
	Expended to Date	\$20,794,581
	% Expended	100%
	SBE Participation	87%
Schedule:	NTP issued January 2011. Substantial completion in August 2012.	
Issues or Concerns:	Final total cost claim by contractor has been settled.	
Contract No.	1252	
Contract Description:	Tunnels	
Status:	Final completion achieved. Financial close out underway.	
Cost:	Original Contract Value	\$233.58 million
	Approved Change Orders	\$8.26 million
	Current Contract Value	\$241.84 million
	Expended to Date	\$233.59 million; \$6.2 million is paid from non-project funds
	% Expended	96.6%
	SBE Participation	5.8%
Schedule:	Final completion achieved May 15, 2015.	
Issues or Concerns:	None.	

Contract No.	1277	
Contract Description:	Pagoda Palace Demolition	
Status:	Construction is complete; contract is in close out.	
Cost:	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%
Schedule:		
Issues or Concerns:	None.	

Contract No.	1300	
Contract Description:	Three subway stations (YBM, UMS, and CTS) and STS	
Status:	Mass excavation complete at one station and well underway at two other stations.	
Cost:	Original Contract Value	\$839.68 million
	Approved Change Orders	\$7.73 million
	Current Contract Value	\$847.40 million
	Expended to Date	\$535.92 million
	% Expended	63.2%
	SBE Participation	19.2%
Schedule:	NTP issued June 17, 2013. Substantial Completion planned February 2018 and forecast June 2019.	
Issues or Concerns:	The work on this contract is behind schedule.	

Contract No.	CS-155-1	
Contract Description:	Design Package 1 for Contracts 1250, 1251, and 1252. PB/Telemon	
Status:	Design is complete. Construction support is nearly complete for Contract 1252.	
Cost:	Original Contract Value	\$5,795,000 (includes exercised options)
	Approved Change Orders	\$2,145,159
	Current Contract Value	\$7,940,159
	Expended to Date	\$7,937,601
	% Expended	100.0%
	SBE Participation	30.2%
Schedule:		
Issues or Concerns:		

Contract No.	CS-155-2	
Contract Description:	Design Package 2 for UMS, CTS, and YBM. CSDG prime	
Status:	Designs are complete for all of the station contracts. Construction support of Contract 1300 is underway.	
Cost:	Original Contract Value	\$35,428,038
	Approved Change Orders	\$1,626,722
	Current Contract Value	\$37,054,760
	Expended to Date	\$36,629,789
	% Expended	98.9%
	SBE Participation	35.5%
Schedule:		
Issues or Concerns:		

Contract No.	CS-155-3	
Contract Description:	Design Package 3 for STS. HNTB-B&C Prime	
Status:	Design is complete. Construction support of Contract 1300 is underway.	
Cost:	Original Contract Value	\$16,822,238
	Approved Change Orders	\$312,814
	Current Contract Value	\$17,232,252
	Expended to Date	\$14,570,305
	% Expended	84.6%
	SBE Participation	26.4%
Schedule:		
Issues or Concerns:		

Contract No.	CS-149	
Contract Description:	Central Subway Partnership (Project Manager/Construction Manager)	
Status:	On-going.	
Cost:	Original Contract Value	\$85,139,092
	Approved Change Orders	\$0
	Current Contract Value	\$85,139,092
	Expended to Date	\$62,684,498
	% Expended	73.6%
	SBE Participation	32.6%
Schedule:		
Issues or Concerns:		

Contract No.	CS 156	
Contract Description:	Project Controls Consultant	
Status:	On-going.	
Cost:	Base Contract Value	\$17,112,873
	Approved Change Orders	\$0
	Current Contract Value	\$17,112,873
	Expended to Date	\$9,846,888
	% Expended	57.5%
	SBE Participation	29.2%
Schedule:		
Issues or Concerns:		