City Council Update on the Planning Study for the South Linden Avenue and Scott Street Caltrain Grade Separation Project

Michael Kato, P.E.
Public Works Department
October 9, 2018
Rail Crossings

**At-Grade:**
Road and train tracks are at the same elevation.

**Grade Separated:**
Road and train tracks are at different elevations.
Benefits of Grade Separated Crossings

- Improved traffic flow on the roadway
- Increased safety for vehicles, pedestrians and bicycles
- Quiet Zone

Value of these benefits will increase as train traffic increases on the corridor.
Grade Separations:
• Benefit the roadway users more than the trains.
• Typically initiated by local agencies, not by Caltrain

This project:
• Initiated in September 2013.
• Joint grant application by San Bruno and South San Francisco
• San Bruno sought grade separation without elimination of vehicle connection at Scott Street.
Planning Study:
• Funded by Measure A grant from SMCTA
• Memorandum Of Understanding signed in April 2016
• Project Development Team formed in January 2018

Project Development Team Members:
• City of San Bruno
• City of South San Francisco
• Caltrain
• Apex Strategies
• AECOM
Project Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT TIMELINE</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Design and Alternatives</td>
<td>2 years upon funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Documents</td>
<td>3 years upon completion of Preliminary Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>3 years upon completion of Environmental Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>3 years upon completion of Environmental Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>5 years upon funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scott St. Caltrain Crossing
Scott St. Caltrain Crossing
Project Location

- Colma Creek
- Rail Crossover
- I-380
- City of South San Francisco
- City of San Bruno
- South Linden Ave.
- Scott St.

LEGEND
- Caltrain Tracks
- Colma Creek
- I-380
- City Limits

To San Francisco
To San Jose

1850 feet
Four Alternatives to Evaluate

Alt 1: Hybrid - Track Raise/Road Lower

Alt 2: Hybrid - Road Raise/Track Lower

Alt 3: Road Under

Alt 4: Road Over

Elevation of existing crossing
Raising or Lowering the Road Affects Nearby Properties

AT-GRADE CROSSING

GRADE SEPARATED CROSSING
Property Impacts at Scott Street (Alt 1)
Property Impacts at S. Linden Ave (Alt 1)
Three Options for Scott Street

1. Scott Street is grade separated and remains open to vehicles.

2. Scott Street is grade separated and closed to vehicles. Pedestrian and bicycle crossing can be provided.

3. Scott Street remains an at-grade crossing.
Three Options for Scott Street

Scott Street is grade separated and remains open to vehicles.

Pros
• Gain benefits of grade separation.

Cons
• Properties near the crossing affected by changes to roadway elevation.
Scott Street is grade separated and closed to vehicles.

**Pros**
- Gain benefits of grade separation for pedestrians and bicycles.
- Properties near the crossing not affected by changes to roadway elevation.

**Cons**
- Vehicles no longer able to cross tracks at Scott Street.
Three Options for Scott Street

Scott Street remains an at-grade crossing.

Pros
• Crossing remains open to vehicles.
• Properties near the crossing not affected by changes to roadway elevation.

Cons
• No benefits gained from grade separation.
Three Options for Scott Street

Scott Street remains an at-grade crossing.

Additional Considerations:
• From August 5, 2003 to August 5, 2013 there were 6 collisions between trains and vehicles or trains and pedestrians
• Calendar years 2014, 2015, and 2016 saw no collisions involving trains
• It may be possible to improve the gate system
  • Could enhance safety
  • Might enable Quiet Zone
• Grade separations provide the highest level of safety and better chance for a Quiet Zone
• Increased train traffic will mean more potential conflicts between roadway traffic and trains
Three Options for Scott Street

Scott Street remains an at-grade crossing.

Additional Considerations (Continued):
• Increased train traffic will mean more disruptions to roadway traffic
• Lose our opportunity for a joint project
• Funding could be harder to find
• Design options could be more limited in future
• San Bruno’s choice could also negatively affect funding and design options for South Linden Avenue.
• Cumulative construction costs and impacts could also be greater if the two projects are constructed separately rather than together.
Four Alternatives to Evaluate

Alt 1: Hybrid - Track Raise/Road Lower

Alt 2: Hybrid - Road Raise/Track Lower

Alt 3: Road Under

Alt 4: Road Over

Elevation of existing crossing
Alternative 1: Hybrid Track Raised and Road Lowered

South Linden Ave: Track Raised and Road Lowered

Scott Street: Ped/Bike Underpass. No Cars.
Alternative 2: Hybrid Road Raised and Track Lowered

South Linden Ave: Road Raised and Track Lowered

Scott Street: Ped/Bike Overpass (or Underpass). No Cars.
Alternative 3: Track At-Grade and Road Lowered

South Linden Ave: Track At-Grade and Road Lowered

Scott Street: Ped/Bike Underpass (or Overpass). No Cars.
Alternative 4: Track At-Grade and Road Raised

South Linden Ave: Track At-Grade and Road Raised

Scott Street: Ped/Bike Overpass (or Underpass). No Cars.
Pedestrian Underpasses
Pedestrian Overpasses
Community Engagement

2018
- COM
- CC
- Stakeholder Meetings

2019
- COM
- CC
- Stakeholder Meetings

Website, Factsheet and Outreach Support

COM: Combined City Community Meeting (2, with South San Francisco and San Bruno)
CC: City Council Meeting (3 each per city)
COM: Single City Community Meeting (1 each per city)
★: Recommended Alternative—Advance to Environmental Clearance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 16, 2018</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Community Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 9, 2018 (Tonight)</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; City Council Briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late November/Early December 2018</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Community Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; City Council Briefing/Study Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2019</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Community Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2019</td>
<td>Seek City Council Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First Community Meeting – August 16, 2018

• Held at the South San Francisco Conference Center

• Four San Bruno residents attended.

• There was a presentation about the project.
  • The four alternatives were discussed.
  • In all cases it was assumed Scott Street would close to vehicles.

• Question & Answer period.

• Feedback from attendees was recorded.
Feedback from residents about Scott Street
• Not overly concerned about closing crossing to vehicles.
• Clean and safe.
• One resident preferred lowering tracks due to visual and noise impacts.

Overall residents preferred a pedestrian/bicycle overpass.
Provide Feedback on Scott Street Options

Grade Separate for Pedestrians/Bikes. Closed to vehicles.

Grade Separate for all modes.

Remain at-grade
Crestmoor Neighborhood Reconstruction

Project Status Update
City of San Bruno City Council
October 9, 2018

Harry Burrowes, Project Manager – Crestmoor Reconstruction Project
Keith DeMartini – Finance Director
Agenda

• Overview of PG&E Trust
  - Components
  - Expenditures
• Reconstruction Projects
  - Completed Projects
  - Current Projects
• Remaining Items to Complete
• Strategies to Address the Budget Shortfall
History

• **September 9, 2010** - PG&E gas pipeline explosion and fire
• **Fall/Spring 2011** - Immediate cleanup and reconstruction
• **March 2011** - Trust Fund ($50 Million) established for City’s use for immediate and long term impacts of explosion and fire
• **December 2011** - City Council confirmed extent and scope of neighborhood reconstruction
• **March 2012** – City and PG&E agree to $70 Million settlement (for establishment of San Bruno Community Foundation)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Percent of Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction &amp; Maintenance Costs</td>
<td>68.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular and Contract Staff Time</td>
<td>15.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services – Federal &amp; State Proceedings</td>
<td>12.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waived Fees</td>
<td>1.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E Trust &amp; Trustee Costs</td>
<td>0.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Loss</td>
<td>0.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Support &amp; Outreach</td>
<td>0.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno Community Foundation</td>
<td>0.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>100 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Completed Projects

- Crestmoor Canyon Retaining Wall & Slope Repairs
- Phase I Sewer Main Replacement
- Phase I Water System Improvements
- Phase II Underground Utility Replacement
- Phase III Underground Utility Replacement
- Upper Sanitary Sewer Lateral Replacement Project

Current Projects

- Phase IV Street Improvements
- Earl Glenview Park
- Crestmoor Canyon Replanting
Phase I Water & Sewer Reconstruction
Phases II & III Utility Replacement
Upper Sanitary Sewer Lateral Replacement
Phase IV Street Improvements Project
Earl-Glenview Park

Park Completion
Late October 2018
Crestmoor Canyon
Upper Slope Slope Planting
Outstanding Items

- **Phase IV Street Improvements** - Decorative intersections, signing and striping, cleanup
- **Earl Glenview Park** – Turf and planting, Crestmoor Canyon landscaping and fencing
- **Upper Lateral Program** – Homeowner reimbursements for surface restoration work (driveways, etc.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Expenditures to Date (thru August 2018)</th>
<th>Estimated Costs to Complete</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular and Contract Staff Time</td>
<td>$ 7,720,551</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 7,720,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Support &amp; Outreach</td>
<td>$ 216,212</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 216,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services – Federal &amp; State Proceedings</td>
<td>$ 6,451,040</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 6,451,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction &amp; Maintenance Costs</td>
<td>$ 30,594,470</td>
<td>$ 4,816,804</td>
<td>$ 35,411,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waived Fees</td>
<td>$ 816,231</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 816,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E Trust &amp; Trustee Costs</td>
<td>$ 375,953</td>
<td>$ 60,000</td>
<td>$ 435,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno Community Foundation</td>
<td>$ 55,253</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 55,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Transfer Loss</td>
<td>$ 299,864</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 299,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 46,529,574</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 4,876,804</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 51,406,378</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Keith DeMartini – Finance Director

Strategies to Cover Budget Shortfall
# Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>$50,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Projected Costs</td>
<td>51,406,378 est.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Budget Shortfall</td>
<td>($ 1,406,378)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Budget Balancing Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Information</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund 004 (Fire Station 52)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund 190 (Staff Costs on Reserve)</td>
<td>722,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund 190 &amp; 136 (Remaining Funds and Emergency Disaster Reserve Funds)</td>
<td>584,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Budget Shortfall</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategies to Cover Budget Shortfall

• Capital Improvement/One-Time Initiative Reserve Fund (Fund 004)
  • $100,000 of staff and consultant costs related to Fire Station 52

• Emergency Disaster Recovery Fund (Fund 190)
  • $722,000 of staff costs paid by the trust that was put on reserve
  • Upon project close-out, a final fund reconciliation will be conducted. Any remaining cash will be used to cover the shortfall and close the fund.

• Emergency Disaster Reserve Fund (Fund 136)
  • The remaining costs will be paid from this fund but will likely be reimbursed from legal proceedings
Questions & Feedback
San Bruno Municipal Code Revision Process
Summary of Topics

- Why should the Municipal Code be updated?
- How will the Municipal Code be updated?
- Detailed review of Title 1 and Title 2 (Chapter 2.04)
- Next steps
Why Should the Municipal Code be Updated?

- Currently eleven titles plus zoning code
- Zoning code to be separately amended
  - City Council study sessions
  - Planning Commission review and recommendation to City Council
- Titles 1-11 adopted in 1980s
- Some sections could be obsolete, outdated, internally inconsistent
- New ordinances adopted
How will the Municipal Code be Updated?

- Use Quality Code Publishing for initial review of all Titles
  - To be completed by end of 2018
  - Advance review of Title 1 and Chapter 2.04 already completed
- Review and recommend ordinance amendments to Titles in sequence; approximately 24-36 month process
- Evaluate proposed amendments with staff and outside legal counsel
- Three-step process for City Council ordinance review
  - Discussion and Direction
  - Introduction
  - Adoption
Detailed Review of Title 1 (General Provisions)

- 1.16: Delete reference to City jail
- 1.24.020: Amendment to be consistent with state law re: claims
- 1.28.010: Maximum fine for misdemeanor: $1,000; new fines for building and health/safety code violations
- 1.28.040: Delete section authorizing citizens to issue citations
- 1.32.030: Change appeal time to 10 days for consistency
- 1.32.040: Allow appeals to be heard at special meetings
- 1.35.010 and 1.35.020: Add PRA response costs to developer indemnity sections
Detailed Review of Title 2 (Administration and Personnel) Chapter 2.04

- 2.04.040: Amendments for consistency with state law regarding special meeting notice
- 2.04.080: Amendments for consistency with state law regarding closed sessions
- 2.04.100: Amendments for consistency with state law regarding elections
  - Allows special City Council meeting to declare election results
  - Aligns City Council meeting with completion of County canvass of results
Detailed Review of Title 2 (Administration and Personnel) Chapter 2.04 (cont.)

- 2.04.110: Selection of vice-mayor
  - Current process: rotation, councilmembers who have not served as mayor or vice mayor, or who otherwise served least recently
  - Most other cities: council exercises discretion annually to appoint

Alternatives
  - Make no changes
  - Decide annually
Detailed Review of Title 2 (Administration and Personnel) Chapter 2.04 (cont.)

- Adopt different rotation system
  - Example: City Council tenure
  - Timing: new ordinance effective 12-13, after 12-11 City Council meeting
    - Use current rotation to appoint 2019 vice mayor, new rotation effective 2020
    - Or: special meeting to introduce before 10-17
Next Steps

- Provide direction regarding Title 1 and Title 2 (Chapter 2.04)
- Confirm process and schedule to complete review of remaining Titles
- Questions?