Letter of Transmittal

TO: Toll Bridge Program Oversight Committee (TBPOC)  
DATE: April 29, 2014

FR: Program Management Team (PMT)

RE: TBPOC Meeting Materials Packet – May 6, 2014

Herewith is the TBPOC Meeting Materials Packet for the May 6th meeting. The packet includes memoranda and reports that will be presented at the meeting. A Table of Contents is provided following the Agenda to help locate specific topics.
# Final Agenda

## TBPOC Regular Meeting

**May 6, 2014**

*Executive Session: 10:00am – 11:00am*

*Regular Session: 11:00am – 1:00pm*

**325 Burma Road, Oakland, CA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Desired Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. EXECUTIVE SESSION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. SAS Outstanding Change Order Negotiations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Risk Register Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. CHAIR’S REPORT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. TBPOC Public Meeting Procedures</td>
<td>S. Heminger, BATA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Bridge Issue Memo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. CONSENT CALENDAR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. TBPOC Conference Call/ Meeting Minutes</td>
<td>A. Fremier, BATA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. TBPOC April 11 Minutes*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. TBPOC April 24 Minutes*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. PROGRESS REPORTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. TBPOC Briefing, Risk Management Results First Quarter 2014*</td>
<td>R. Foley, CT</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 2014 First Quarter Project Progress and Financial Update *</td>
<td>P. Lee, BATA</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. PROGRAM ISSUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Architectural Items Update*</td>
<td>C. Endress, BATA</td>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Gateway Park Update*</td>
<td>A. Fremier, BATA</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND BAY BRIDGE UPDATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. SAS Update</td>
<td>B. Casey, CT</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Anchor Rod Testing *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. OTHER BUSINESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Report on matters discussed and actions taken at Urgent Meeting</td>
<td>S. Heminger, BATA</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Report on matters discussed and actions taken during Executive Session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Next TBPOC Meeting:
June 4, 2014, 10:00am – 1:00pm
325 Burma Road, Oakland CA

* Attachments
**Attachments to be sent under separate cover
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ITEM 1: EXECUTIVE SESSION

a. SAS Outstanding Change Order Negotiations

b. Risk Register Summary
ITEM 2: CHAIR’S REPORT

a. TBPOC Public Meeting Procedures

b. Bridge Issue Memo
Agreement To Supplement and To Amend the
Agreement on Committee Procedures
for the Toll Bridge Program Oversight Committee

The Members of the Toll Bridge Program Oversight Committee agree to
supplement and to amend the Agreement on Committee Procedures for the Toll Bridge
Program Oversight Committee, dated November 9, 2005 (together with this supplement
and amendment, “Agreement”), with the following (which may be referred to herein as a
“supplement and amendment”):

I. INTRODUCTION

The Toll Bridge Program Oversight Committee (“POC”) was established by the
Bay Area Toll Authority (“BATA”) and the California Department of Transportation
(“Caltrans”), as required by Assembly Bill 144, an urgency measure enacted by the
Legislature in 2005. The POC is directed by law to provide oversight over the Benicia-
Martinez Bridge, the Antioch Bridge, and the Dumbarton Bridge projects, and the state
toll bridge seismic retrofit program projects (collectively, the “Project”). (Sts & Hwys C.
§§30952.05, subd. (c) and 188.61, subd. (c).) Caltrans’ primary role is to oversee
construction of the project. BATA’s primary role is to fund the construction of the
project.

Pursuant to Assembly Bill 144, the membership of the POC consists of the
Executive Director of BATA, the Director of Caltrans, and the Executive Director of the
California Transportation Commission (“CTC”). The chairmanship of the POC
alters between the Executive Director of BATA and the Director of Caltrans.

The POC’s responsibilities include, but are not limited to, reviewing bid
specifications and documents, reviewing and approving significant change orders and
claims, and keeping the Legislature and the California Transportation Commission
informed of project progress and status.

While the POC has made public various documents and information pertaining to
the project and to its actions and decisions, the POC considers it to be in the public
interest to establish a more formal framework governing its meetings that recognizes
the public’s desire that, to the extent possible, the POC’s actions and decisions occur in a
public setting, as well as the public’s desire to be kept informed of the POC’s activities
and decisions. In directing the establishment of the POC, the Legislature stated that the
POC was not a “state body” within the meaning of the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act
nor a “local agency” within the meaning of the Brown Act. (Sts & Hwys C. §30952.1,
subd. (e)). Notwithstanding that legislative statement, the POC interprets the law as
providing the POC with the discretion to adopt its own policy making its operations
public, to the extent doing so is in the public interest, in a manner that recognizes the
unusual nature of the POC and the unique role it plays in providing oversight over a
complex project.
The POC also recognizes that, as is also the case with existing open government laws, while the default position should be in favor of transparency, there are some matters with respect to which taking action in the public view would not be in the public interest. For instance, when Caltrans is negotiating a change order or responding to a construction claim, the POC may advise Caltrans as to negotiating strategy and monetary risks. Making this information public prior to final execution of the change order or final resolution of the claim would undermine Caltrans’ negotiating position. Recognizing the public’s right to be informed, as soon as possible after a change order is executed or a claim resolution is reached and no later than the next Regular Meeting, the POC will inform the public of any cost or schedule implications.

On the other hand, issues involving the structural integrity of the bridges that are within the POC’s purview are matters about which the public is entitled to know. It is the POC’s intent to keep the public fully informed as to such matters, and to discuss these matters during meetings open to the public.

However, there are circumstances in which it might not be in the public interest to discuss matters that touch upon sensitive contractual matters in a public setting. These circumstances could include, for example, a discussion of possible litigation or potential security measures to protect the bridges.

Guided by this perspective and philosophy, the POC intends this agreement to serve as a framework that provides as much transparency as possible while being tailored to fit the unusual nature of the POC’s operations and the exigencies with which it is often confronted.

The POC generally meets on a monthly basis. On occasion, it meets on very short notice, via telephone conference call, when a matter must be dealt with urgently and cannot await discussion and action at the monthly meeting. For instance, section 30925.05, subdivision (e)(8), provides that Caltrans shall “quickly” provide information to the POC regarding unexpected events that will affect “the project’s overall budget and schedule.” Such events may lead to a need for a contract change order to an existing contract that must be resolved quickly in order to avoid delay and delay costs.

II. DEFINITIONS

For purposes of this Agreement, the following terms have the indicated meanings:

1. “Agreement on Committee Procedures” refers to the Agreement on Committee Procedures for the Toll Bridge Program Oversight Committee, dated November 9, 2005.

2. “Approved Agenda” means an agenda that has been reviewed by all members of the POC and which has been approved by a majority of the members of the POC.

3. “Designated Meeting Location” and “Designated Location of Meeting” refer to the location of a regular or urgent meeting as designated in the notice of meeting.
4. “Executive Session” means a meeting of the members of the POC from which members of the public are excluded.

5. “Regular Meeting” refers to a meeting such as the monthly meeting. It does not refer to an “Urgent Meeting.”

6. “Urgent Meeting” refers to a meeting at which the POC considers or takes action on a matter which, because of its nature, cannot be postponed until the next regular meeting.

III. PROCEDURES

1. Types of Meetings

Each meeting of the POC shall be either a Regular Meeting or an Urgent Meeting.

Each Regular Meeting will be held according to a POC-approved schedule which shall be posted on the website. The date, time, and Designated Location of each Regular Meeting shall be determined following consultation with and among all members of the POC.

In the event a matter must be discussed or an action must be taken urgently and without delay, an Urgent Meeting may be held, in person or by telephone or other electronic means, as soon as possible, taking into account the schedules of each of the members of the POC. A Designated Location shall be established for each Urgent Meeting. The POC shall postpone to the next Regular Meeting the discussion or the decision pertaining to a matter on an Urgent Meeting Agenda if the POC determines that the matter need not be dealt with urgently.

2. Meetings Open to the Public

Regular Meetings and Urgent Meetings of the POC shall be open to the public. Members of the public may attend such meetings at the Designated Location.

However, if the POC determines that discussion or action on a particular matter is not in the public interest, as described below under “Public Interest Exception,” that matter shall be considered during an Executive Session.

3. Notice of Meetings

Notice of each Regular Meeting shall be given to each member of the POC, in writing or via e-mail, and shall be posted at least 5 days prior to the Regular Meeting on the project website at http://baybridgeinfo.org/.

Notice of each Urgent Meeting shall be given to each member of the POC, in writing or via e-mail, and shall be posted as soon as possible and, in any event, prior to the Urgent Meeting on the project website at http://baybridgeinfo.org/.
4. Agenda

The agenda for each Regular Meeting of the POC shall be given to each member of the POC, in writing or via e-mail, and shall be posted on the internet at least 5 days prior to such meeting. A brief description of each agenda item shall be included.

The agenda for each Regular Meeting shall contain the following standing agenda items: “Report on matters discussed and actions taken at Urgent Meetings,” and “Report on matters discussed and actions taken during Executive Sessions.

The agenda for each Urgent Meeting of the POC shall be given to each member of the POC, in writing or via e-mail, and shall be posted on the internet as soon as possible and, in any event, prior to such meeting. A brief description of each agenda item shall be included.

When a matter requiring discussion or action by the POC at its next meeting arises after the agenda for such meeting has been posted, the new matter may be added to the agenda. A brief description of such matter will be added to the agenda as soon as possible. The revised agenda shall be posted on the internet prior to the meeting if possible. An announcement shall be made at the beginning of the meeting that an item has been added to the agenda along with an explanation as to why notice could not be given sooner.

5. Public Comment

Members of the general public who are present at a Regular Meeting or Urgent Meeting of the POC may comment on an agenda item during the discussion and prior to the decision on an item on the agenda. The POC may limit each speaker’s time and the total time for public comment if it appears to the POC that it is reasonable to do so. If time permits, the POC may also provide the public an opportunity to make general public comment.

6. Recess of Meeting and Postponement of Agenda Item

When necessary, as determined by the POC, meetings may be recessed and continued to a later day, if need be, in order to discuss any matter on the agenda. In such cases, a public announcement shall be made prior to recessing the meeting, and a notice shall be posted on the internet, giving the date, time, and Designated Location at which such meeting shall be resumed.
7. Participation of POC Members by Telephonic or Electronic Means

A member of the POC may participate in any meeting by telephone or through the use of any other electronic means. At regular meetings, at least one member of the POC shall be present at the designated location.

The means used to link a member or members participating by telephone or other electronic means shall be so that all persons present can hear the member or members, and so that the member or members can hear all persons present at the Designated Location. At least one staff person shall be physically present at the Designated Location to connect the persons present there with the member or members participating by telephone or other electronic means.

A remote location from which a member of the POC is participating through telephone or other electronic means shall not be considered a Designated Location.

8. Report of Discussion and Actions

Discussions and actions taken during Executive Sessions or Urgent Meetings shall be reported publicly at the next Regular Meeting, subject to the provisions below under “Public Interest Exception.” The report for any matter shall include a brief, general description of the matter, a description of any decision or action that was taken, and, if a vote of the POC was taken, the vote of each member of the POC.

9. Public Interest Exception

It is the intention of the POC to provide transparency of its operations, including its decisions and actions. Doing so is generally in the public interest. However, in some instances it may not be in the public interest to disclose certain information immediately. If the POC determines that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information, the information shall not be disclosed.

In the event the POC withholds information from the public pursuant to this provision, it shall withhold only that portion of the information that it determines is necessary to withhold in order to serve the public interest. Moreover, when an event occurs or situation changes so that withholding the information is no longer in the public interest, the information shall be made public as soon as possible and as directed by the POC, and no later than at the next Regular Meeting of the POC.

The POC may meet in Executive Session concerning any matter if the POC determines that the public interest is better served by doing so. If the POC determines by majority vote that the public interest in considering the matter in Executive Session outweighs the public interest in doing so in a meeting that is open to the public, the matter will be considered in Executive Session. Apart from POC members, those persons whose presence the POC in its sole discretion determines is necessary in order to discuss the matters may also be present for an Executive Session. If the POC determines that the public interest in withholding an oral report of all or certain aspects of the discussion or actions taken in Executive Session outweighs the public interest in disclosing such
information, the report of discussion and action at the next Regular Meeting will be limited accordingly.

This provision applies to all other provisions in the Agreement.

10. Record of Meetings

Caltrans will be the custodian of the POC’s minutes.

11. Deletion of Provision Pertaining to Actions without Meetings

Section II (F), at page 3 of the Agreement on Committee Procedures, pertaining to actions without a meeting, is hereby deleted.

12. Conflicts between a provision in this agreement and the Agreement on Committee Procedures

In case of any conflict between a provision contained in this supplement and amendment and the Agreement on Committee Procedures for the Toll Bridge Program Oversight Committee, dated November 9, 2005, prior to its amendment by this document, the terms in this supplement and amendment shall control.

13. Effectiveness

This supplement and amendment shall take effect immediately from and after its execution by the Members of the POC.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Members of the Toll Bridge Program Oversight Committee hereto have agreed to this Agreement on the date opposite their respective names.

Malcolm Dougherty, Director
California Department of Transportation

Date: 4/24/2014

Steve Heminger, Executive Director
Bay Area Toll Authority

Date: 4/24/14

Andre Boutros, Executive Director
California Transportation Commission

Date: 4/24/2014
TO: Toll Bridge Program Oversight Committee (TBPOC)  DATE: April 29, 2014

FR: Andrew Fremier, Deputy Executive Director, Operations, BATA/MTC

RE: Agenda No. - 3a1

Item: Consent Calendar

TBPOC Conference Call/Meeting Minutes

April 11, 2014 Meeting Minutes

______________________________________________________________

Recommendation: APPROVAL

Cost: NA

Schedule Impacts: NA

Discussion:
The Program Management Team has reviewed and requests TBPOC approval of the
April 11, 2014 Meeting Minutes.

Attachment(s):
April 11, 2014 Meeting Minutes
**TBPOC MEETING MINUTES**  
April 11, 2014, 1:30pm – 4:30pm  
1120 N Street, Sacramento CA  
TBPOC/PMT Pre-meeting: 1:30pm – 2:30pm  
TBPOC Meeting: 2:30pm – 4:30pm

**Attendees:** TBPOC Members: Steve Heminger (Chair), Malcolm Dougherty, and Andre Boutros  
PMT Members: Tony Anziano, Andrew Fremier, and Stephen Maller  
Participants: Ade Akinsanya, Ali Banani, Bill Casey, Michele DiFrancia, Rich Foley, Andrew Gordon, Beatriz Lacson, Richard Land, Peter Lee, Brian Maroney, Dina Noel, and Bijan Sartipi

Convened: 2:25 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. **CHAIR’S REPORT**  
  - The Chair noted the following:  
    1. We received the TRANNY Award for Special Project of the Year.  
    2. How do we handle the various artist requests received for pieces of bridge salvaged steel.  
    o Discussion items included: Interested parties (artists, Director of Oakland Museum, Gateway Park, etc.); way to support interested parties’ activities; context of what is being asked for; lead abatement issues. |  
  - The PMT to develop a plan on how to respond to the artists’ salvage requests. |
| 2. **CONSENT CALENDAR**  
  a. TBPOC Conference Call/Meeting Minutes  
    1. TBPOC February 28, 2014 Minutes  
    2. TBPOC March 4, 2014 Minutes  
    3. TBPOC March 13, 2014 Minutes  
  b. Contract Change Orders (CCOs)  
    1. YBITS2 CCO 601-S0 (W4 Substation & Navigational System Upgrades – West Span), $1,981,762 |  
  - The TBPOC **APPROVED** the Consent Calendar, as presented. |
2. YBITS1 CCO 911-S1 (Furnish & Install CCTV Security Camera Wireless Communication Backbone, Networking & Video Management System), $600,000
3. YBITS1 CCO 6-S1 (Night & Weekend Shift Safety Officers), $276,930
4. OTD2 CCO 120-S1 (Post-SSO Corridor-Wide Lane Closures), $750,000

3. PROGRESS REPORTS
   a. TBSRP Capital Outlay Support (COS) Proposed FY 2014-15 Budget Request
      • A. Banani explained the following slides that reflect the reductions made on the proposed budget request:
        o FY 14-15 Proposed Budget
        o FY 14/15 Budget Breakdown,
        o FY 14/15 Planned Dollars – By Contract,
        o FY 14/15 Planned Dollars – By Division,
        o SAS – FY 14/15 Workplan Detail
        o FY 13/14 & FY 14/15 FTE Projection by Division,
        o FY 13/14 & FY 14/15 FTE Projection by Contract;
        o East Span CO & COS Cash flow, (includes Risk) Expenditures thru December 2013,
        o Impacts on East Span Cost Budget – Post AB 144 Legislation as of March 2014.
      He requested TBPOC approval of a proposed FY 2014-15 COS budget request of $38.4 million for the program.
      o Discussion items included: What size staff is required to now run the program given that it is winding down and more the size of a project, reductions in A&E; construction cost vs. demolition cost; cost of oversight; impact of ramp-down delay; budget adjustment that needs to happen.

   • The TBPOC APPROVED the proposed FY 2014-15 COS budget of $38.4 million by a 2 to 1 vote (the Chair dissented).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| b. TBSRP Budget Change  
- P. Lee presented, for TBPOC approval, the revisions to the SFOBB East Span Project budget, the changes for which would come from the existing program contingency. Capital outlay changes to the YBI Detour, Cantilever Dismantling, and Oakland Touchdown No.1 contracts were summarized.  
  - A handout (Program Schedule, BAMC COS Work-up) was distributed for reference and discussion.  
  - The TBPOC **APPROVED** the following capital outlay revisions:  
    - a. YBI Detour Contract: $7.16 million;  
    - b. Cantilever Dismantling Contract: $7.38 million; and  
    - c. Oakland Touchdown No.1 Contract: $290,000.  
  - The TBPOC also **APPROVED** an increase of $84.4 million to the TBSRP capital outlay support (COS) total budget from $1221.6 million to $1306 million. | • The TBPOC **APPROVED** the following capital outlay revisions:  
  - a. YBI Detour Contract: $7.16 million;  
  - b. Cantilever Dismantling Contract: $7.38 million; and  
  - c. Oakland Touchdown No.1 Contract: $290,000.  
  The TBPOC also **APPROVED** an increase of $84.4 million to the TBSRP capital outlay support (COS) total budget from $1221.6 million to $1306 million. |
| 4. **SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND BAY BRIDGE UPDATES**  
  a. SAS Update  
    1. Anchor Rod Testing/E2 Shear Key Anchorage  
      - B. Casey gave an update—the anchor rod tests are continuing in various stages of completion; E2 shear key work is substantially complete.  
      - Discussion items included:  
        - Promised report to the public on test results after a year’s time coming up;  
        - Anchor Rod CCO tracking status;  
        - COS for A&E; need for an executive report on the bolts.  
    2. Closeout Strategy  
      - The TBPOC and PMT discussed the ABF closeout strategy. | • Although presented as an Information item, the TBPOC **APPROVED** $800,000 to modify test rigs 1-4, procure equipment, and perform 4 tests on the 2013 rods.  
• B. Maroney to provide to the TBPOC an interim executive report on the bolts.  
• Staff to schedule a TBPOC meeting with ABF on May 15, 2014.  
• The PMT to submit a recommendation to the TBPOC regarding the resolution of open issues.  
• Staff to finalize the maintenance letter before the next TBPOC meeting on May 6. |
| b. Bridge Maintenance  
- The Chair noted that draft version 2 of the maintenance letter is circulating, which should be wrapped up in April before the next TBPOC meeting. |
5. OTHER BUSINESS
   a. TBPOC Public Meeting Policy
      • The Chair reported that CTC has developed a draft document that provides for most of the TBPOC meetings to be public and others in executive session.
      o S. Maller distributed draft copies of the “Agreement to Supplement and To Amend the Agreement on Committee Procedures for the Toll Bridge Program Oversight Committee”.
      o Discussion items included: Public meeting notices, how to release agenda, PIO role, website use; procedures headed for approval; first TBPOC public meeting (May 6).

   Farewell to R. Land on His Retirement
   • The Chair expressed the Committee’s appreciation for R. Land’s steadiness, good counsel and ability to stay calm during difficult times. He called him “a hero sent to the scene” when the bolts failed.
      o A plaque was presented to R. Land in recognition of his invaluable service to the Program.

   • Staff to schedule a conference call before the first TBPOC public meeting on May 6 to adopt the “Agreement to Supplement and To Amend the Agreement on Committee Procedures for the Toll Bridge Program Oversight Committee”.

Adjourned: 4:00 PM
TBPOC MEETING MINUTES
April 11, 2014, 2:30pm – 4:30pm

APPROVED BY:

______________________________
STEVE HEMINGER, TBPOC Chair
Executive Director, Bay Area Toll Authority

______________________________
ANDRE BOUTROS
Executive Director, California Transportation Commission

______________________________
MALCOLM DOUGHERTY
Director, California Department of Transportation

Date

Date

Date
Memorandum

TO: Toll Bridge Program Oversight Committee (TBPOC)  DATE: April 29, 2014

FR: Andrew Fremier, Deputy Executive Director, Operations, BATA/MTC

RE: Agenda No. - 3a2
Item- Consent Calendar
      TBPOC Conference Call/Meeting Minutes
      April 24, 2014 Conference Call Minutes

________________________________________________________

Recommendation:
APPROVAL

Cost:
NA

Schedule Impacts:
NA

Discussion:
The Program Management Team has reviewed and requests TBPOC approval of the April 24, 2014 Conference Call Minutes.

Attachment(s):
April 24, 2014 Conference Call Minutes
CONFERENCE CALL MINUTES
April 24, 2014, 3:00 PM – 4:00 PM

Attendees: TBPOC Members: Steve Heminger (Chair), Malcolm Dougherty, and Andre Boutros
PMT Members: Tony Anziano, Andrew Fremier, and Stephen Maller
Participants: Michele DiFrancia, Andrew Gordon, Beatriz Lacson, Peter Lee, Dina Noel, George Spanos, and Adrienne Weil

Convened: 3:00 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. CHAIR’S REPORT | • None given.  
• The Chair suggested discussing the bridge maintenance memo under Other Business. |
| 2. PROGRAM UPDATES | • The TBPOC APPROVED the “Agreement To Supplement and To Amend the Agreement on Committee Procedures for the Toll Bridge Program Oversight Committee”, as amended.  
• CTC to revise, print, sign and forward the agreement to the other members for their signature today.  
• Staff to add this item to the TBPOC May 6 agenda under the Chair’s Report. |
| a. TBPOC Public Meetings |  
• A. Boutros noted that a revised “Agreement To Supplement and To Amend the Agreement on Committee Procedures for the Toll Bridge Program Oversight Committee”—which incorporates comments from the Department, BATA and Agency—was sent out to the participants shortly before this teleconference. He summarized the rationale for these revisions and pointed to the section on page 2 of the agreement he was referring to. He thanked Adrienne Weil (BATA Counsel) and George Spanos (CTC Counsel) for putting this document together.  
• The TBPOC agreed to insert “by Agency” and “potential contractual matters” in specified sections on page 2, and replace the word “website” with |
3. OTHER BUSINESS

a. Bridge Maintenance

- T. Anziano indicated that the maintenance memo will be finalized prior to the TBPOC May 6 meeting.
  - Discussion items included: Availability of letter for posting to the website five days prior to the May 6 meeting; need for posting (not required, can deliver day of meeting); IBTTA peer review, TBPOC’s role, suggested handling; inclusion in the May 6 agenda.

- The next and first TBPOC public meeting is on May 6, 2014, 10:00AM – 1:00PM, at Pier 7.
  - Discussion items included: Venues for the Executive Session and Regular Meeting; transit accessibility to Pier 7; public/media attendees and accommodations.

- M. Dougherty to notify M. DeSaulnier and B. Lowenthal about the forthcoming TBPOC public meeting.
- A. Gordon to send out advisory thereafter, no later than Tuesday morning, April 29.
- Staff to add the maintenance document to the BATA Oversight Committee May meeting.
- Staff to add the maintenance document to the TBPOC May 6 meeting as an information item.
- PMT to determine the seating arrangement for the TBPOC Regular Meeting.

Adjourned: 3:49PM
TBPOC CONFERENCE CALL MINUTES
April 24, 2014, 3:00 PM – 4:00 PM

APPROVED BY:

______________________________
STEVE HEMINGER, TBPOC Chair
Executive Director, Bay Area Toll Authority

______________________________
ANDRE BOUTROS
Executive Director, California Transportation Commission

______________________________
MALCOLM DOUGHERTY
Director, California Department of Transportation

Item3a2_TBPOC_042414_CCMi06May14
TO: Toll Bridge Program Oversight Committee (TBPOC)  DATE: April 29, 2014
FR: Rich Foley, Risk Manager, Caltrans
RE: Agenda No. - 4a  
Item- Progress Reports  
TBPOC Briefing, Risk Management Results  
First Quarter 2014

Recommendation:  
For Information Only

Cost:  
NA

Schedule Impacts:  
NA

Discussion:  
Included in this package is the TBPOC Briefing, Risk Management Results, First Quarter 2014.

Attachment(s):  
TBPOC Briefing, Risk Management Results, First Quarter 2014
$3 million increase in forecast this quarter – Essentially No Change

- **$31.8 million Increase in Capital Outlay Forecast**
  1. **$31.2M increase in Estimates for Dismantling Projects**
     - Cost associated with removal of Piers E2 & Piers 19 to 22 were added to the budget
     - Includes $12.8M increase to accelerate the Cantilever Dismantling
  2. Off-set for the most part by Reduction in Risk on the SAS contract ($25M)

- **$84.4 million Increase in Capital Outlay Support Forecast**
  1. **$75.2M increase to Work Plan**
  2. **$8.9M Risk to Work Plan**

- **$112.9 million reduction in risk this quarter**
  1. Risk essentially moved from the risk side of the ledger to the forecast
## Q1 RMC Results

April 19, 2014

### 50% Probable Risk Management Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1 2014</th>
<th>Q4 2013</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine Structures Dismantling</td>
<td>25,476,000</td>
<td>28,927,000</td>
<td>(3,451,000)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504' &amp; 288' Steel Structures Dismantling</td>
<td>39,028,000</td>
<td>39,968,000</td>
<td>(940,000)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantilever Dismantling</td>
<td>14,910,000</td>
<td>19,893,000</td>
<td>(4,983,000)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTD2 Eastbound</td>
<td>4,966,000</td>
<td>4,731,000</td>
<td>235,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTD Detour</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>(150,000)</td>
<td>(67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Anchor Suspension</td>
<td>48,417,000</td>
<td>73,384,000</td>
<td>(24,967,000)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBI#1 Mainline Structures</td>
<td>1,167,000</td>
<td>133,000</td>
<td>1,034,000</td>
<td>777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBI#2 Post Traffic Switch</td>
<td>42,302,000</td>
<td>42,834,000</td>
<td>(532,000)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total East Span</strong></td>
<td>176,341,000</td>
<td>210,095,000</td>
<td>(33,754,000)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program-level risks (not in a contract)</td>
<td>11,659,000</td>
<td>15,587,000</td>
<td>(3,928,000)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Outlay Risk</strong></td>
<td>188,000,000</td>
<td>225,682,000</td>
<td>(37,682,000)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COS Risks *</td>
<td>8,900,000</td>
<td>84,100,000</td>
<td>(75,200,000)</td>
<td>(89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Risk</strong></td>
<td>196,900,000</td>
<td>309,782,000</td>
<td>(112,882,000)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw on Program Contingency</td>
<td>95,800,000</td>
<td>191,282,000</td>
<td>(95,482,000)</td>
<td>(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Contingency</td>
<td>101,100,000</td>
<td>118,500,000</td>
<td>(17,400,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Contingency Balance</td>
<td>89,510,000</td>
<td>188,280,000</td>
<td>(98,770,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Contingency</strong></td>
<td>190,610,000</td>
<td>306,780,000</td>
<td>(116,170,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note COS Risk reflects the new Budget approved by the TBPOC in April 2014*
## COS Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>50% Probable COS Differential ($M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q1 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBI Detour</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBITS #1</td>
<td>(0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBITS #2</td>
<td>(4.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTD #2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTD Detour</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program-level</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total East Span</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Approach</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antioch</td>
<td>(7.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumbarton</td>
<td>(10.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total COS Risk</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* COS Cost Differential is measured from the current COS Budget
Q1 Draw

Potential Draw on Program Contingency

Q4 2013 Program Contingency Balance $188 Million

Q1 2014 Draw $96 Million

Q4 2013 Draw $191 Million

Q1 2014 Program Contingency Balance $90 Million

Draw ($M) vs. Probability of Greater Draw
## 50% Probable Risk vs. Available Contingency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OTD1 Westbound</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2/T1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Approach</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submarine Cable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTD2 Eastbound</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTD Detour</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Anchor Suspension</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBI#1 Mainline Structures</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBI#2 Post Traffic Switch</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBI#3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Span Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>96.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program-level risks (not in a contract)</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COS Risks</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-way and Mitigation</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program-wide</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Structures Dismantling</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>-3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504' &amp; 288' Steel Structures Dismantling</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>-3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantilever Dismantling</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demolition Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>79.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>196.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>101.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Draw on Program Contingency</strong></td>
<td><strong>95.8</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Contingency Balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>89.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Risk Management
Memorandum

TO: Toll Bridge Program Oversight Committee (TBPOC)

DATE: April 29, 2014

FR: Peter Lee, Principal, BATA

RE: Agenda No. - 4b
    Progress Reports
    Item- 2014 First Quarter Project Progress and Financial Update

Recommendation:
APPROVAL

Cost:
NA

Schedule Impacts:
NA

Discussion:
The 2014 First Quarter Project Progress and Financial Update will be provided at the TBPOC May 6 meeting for approval. As of now, the report does not yet include cost and forecast figures or a risk management update.

Attachment(s):
NA
Memorandum

TO: Toll Bridge Oversight Committee (TBPOC)    DATE: April 29, 2014
FR: Clive Endress, New East Span Architectural Coordinator
RE: Agenda No. -   5a
     Item – Program Issues
     Architectural Items Update

Recommendation:
APPROVAL

Discussion:
Attached are two architectural items for approval. Both elements are necessary to the design success of the New East Span. Bridgeheads were last presented March 7th, 2013; The SAS West Belvedere Cantilever Beam is a new item. The items are listed as follows:

1. YBI Bridgeheads
2. SAS West Belvedere Cantilever Beams

1. YBI Bridgeheads

![Proposed Bridgeheads Design](image_url)
Background:
The bridgeheads are an architectural feature that provide a logical transition from the modern winged form of the new bridge to the concrete box girder form of the viaduct section at the tunnel portal. In addition, they tie the bridge to the island visually and reinforce the tunnel portal geometry. Staff has presented the bridgeheads concept to the extended architectural review team who support the concept.

Status:
Staff is performing preliminary engineering on the bridgeheads concept and continues to look at construction alternatives to build these elements as efficiently and as cost effective as possible.

Architectural Recommendation:
Continue with the design of the bridgeheads with the goal of constructing the bridgeheads in mid - 2016.

PMT Recommendation:
PMT supports design.

Cost Impact:
- Capital Outlay Support (COS) Cost: $465K
- Capital Outlay Construction Cost: $5.5-9.3M

There is a range of cost for this item varying from $6 million to $9.8 million depending on whether the work is accomplished by CCO, a separate PS&E, or a combination of both.

Schedule Impacts:
TBD
Memorandum

Current Design – Without Bridgeheads

Proposed Design – With Bridgeheads
2. SAS West Belvedere Cantilever Beams

Background:
The west bicycle path belvedere was of particular interest to EDAP during the early design of the bridge because of its unique location on the SAS. The architectural team had always proposed a cantilever beam solution consistent with forms used throughout the length of bikepath structure (see above). The current design does not reflect that vision.

Status:
TYLin has completed the design. The design still requires Headquarters’ Structures plan check and Construction, shop drawings and fabrication. It is anticipated this work will be accomplished as part of a CCO to YBITS II.

Architectural Recommendation:
Proceed with plan as a CCO to YBITS II.

PMT Recommendation:
PMT supports design.

Cost Impact:
- Capital Outlay Support (COS) Cost: $500K
- Capital Outlay Construction Cost: $600K
Memorandum

Schedule Impacts:
None

Current Design (in YBITS II)

Proposed Design
Memorandum

TO: Toll Bridge Oversight Committee (TBPOC)       DATE: April 29, 2014

FR: Andrew Fremier, Deputy Executive Director, BATA

RE: Agenda No. - 5b
    Item – Program Issues
    Gateway Park Update

Recommendation:
APPROVAL

Cost Impact:
N/A

Schedule Impact:
None

Discussion:
The PMT recommends that the TBPOC not move forward with the Salvage of two 288 Foot Truss Spans of the Original East Span.

On March 4, 2014, the TBPOC approved the following related to Gateway Park:
1) Continued Analysis of two 288 Foot Truss Spans: Analysis should address cost, operations and maintenance, and effect of sea level rise on the salvage and reuse of two 288 sections of the original Bay Bridge.

Following this approval, the Gateway Park project team produced a report, “Salvage of 288 Foot Truss Spans of Original SFOBB East Spans” (Attachment 1). This report evaluates a preliminary concept for lowering two 288-foot truss spans of the original East Span and salvaging the two spans for use as a pedestrian promenade in the future Gateway Park. The report evaluates the concepts for lowering the trusses and estimates construction quantities and preliminary costs for the work. The report also includes operations and maintenance estimates, addresses sea level rise, and includes drawings that depict the conceptual method for lowering the truss spans, including a suggested construction sequence for each option.
Memorandum

Construction, operations and maintenance costs estimates for lowering and salvaging the spans have been developed based on the following design issues and assumptions:

1. It has been assumed that two truss spans are to be salvaged. The truss lowering concept and the other design assumptions may also be applied to the salvage of one or three truss spans.
2. The upper roadway deck will be removed, including cross-beams and stringers, for environmental and architectural reasons.
3. The lower roadway deck will be removed for environmental reasons (chemical contamination of the concrete). The lower deck will be replaced with a lightweight concrete, or similar deck.
4. The minimum elevation of the current truss is at elevation 16.75 (+/-) at the east abutment (Pier E23), which is about 10 feet above MHHW. The truss will be lowered by three feet to elevation 13.75 (+/-). At this elevation the trusses will have an estimated 2.25 feet of freeboard above the water, after considering such factors as:
   a. Highest Astronomical Tide
   b. El Nino effect (1 foot rise)
   c. Sea Level Rise (1 foot)
   d. Wave action (1.5 feet)
5. The trusses at Piers E21 and E22 will be lowered to the same elevation as at Pier E23.
6. The pedestrian deck will be elevated above the ground and water level. Ramps or elevator access will need to be provided for ADA compliance. A lower platform is envisioned at the western end of the structure (Pier E21). This platform could be supported from the existing pier.
7. In order to ensure an adequate future useful life for the salvaged spans, the structures to remain will be cleaned of all lead paint and repainted. Steel that is corroded will be load rated, and repaired as required.
8. Items 4 and 5 above comprise the preferred configuration, Option 1. As an alternative to Option 1, Option 2 would lower the trusses to elevation 16.75 feet. Option 2 would require no lowering of the truss at Pier E23.
9. An additional alternative, Option 3, would be not to lower the truss and to perform the other rehabilitation with the truss in its current position.
## Summary Costs: Option 1, Option 2 and Option 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3 (leave as is)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition of existing structures</td>
<td>$1.6 million</td>
<td>$1.5 million</td>
<td>$1.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint removal and recoating</td>
<td>$1.5 million</td>
<td>$1.5 million</td>
<td>$1.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowering the truss spans</td>
<td>$2.2 million</td>
<td>$1.8 million</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of new deck</td>
<td>$1.4 million</td>
<td>$1.4 million</td>
<td>$1.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL OF BRIDGE ITEMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6.7 million</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6.2 million</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4.4 million</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead, Mobilization, Supplementary Work, Contingencies, and Escalation</td>
<td>$6.7 million</td>
<td>$6.2 million</td>
<td>$4.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13.4 million</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12.4 million</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8.8 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: These values are only preliminary. Due to the special conditions of the proposed work, a more detailed estimate based on actual construction staging should be performed.*

The report estimates Operations and Maintenance costs for the salvaged truss spans assuming a 5 year and 25 year repair and repainting schedule. The annual cost of the combined 5 and 25 year repair and repainting is estimated to be in the order of $300,000. To address sea level rise of one foot in 50 years, the report recommends raising the truss structure one foot or more after about 50 years. For Option 2, the raising of the truss would not be needed for the foreseeable future.

**Attachment(s):**
Salvage of 288 Foot Truss Spans of Original East Span Report
April 3, 2014

SALVAGE OF 288 FOOT TRUSS SPANS OF ORIGINAL SFOBB EAST SPANS

This report is prepared in order to evaluate a preliminary concept for lowering two 288-foot truss spans of the original SFOBB east spans, in order to establish a budget for salvaging these two spans for use as a pedestrian promenade in the future Gateway Park. The scope of this effort is to develop a concept for lowering the trusses and to estimate construction quantities and preliminary costs for the work. In order to perform this in a manner consistent with the overall project, a review of the as-built condition was done and concepts were discussed the Caltrans Estimating Group.

The following design issues and assumptions are made:

1) It has been assumed that two truss spans are to be salvaged. The truss lowering concept and the other design assumptions may also be applied to the salvage of one or three truss spans.
2) The upper roadway deck will be removed, including cross-beams and stringers, for environmental and architectural reasons.
3) The lower roadway deck will be removed for environmental reasons (chemical contamination of the concrete). The lower deck will be replaced with a lightweight concrete, or similar deck.
4) The minimum elevation of the current truss is at elevation 16.75 (+/-) at the east abutment (Pier E23), which is about 10 feet above MHHW. The truss will be lowered by three feet to elevation 13.75 (+/-). At this elevation the trusses will have an estimated 2.25 feet of freeboard above the water, after considering such factors as:
   a) Highest Astronomical Tide
   b) El Nino effect (1 foot rise)
   c) Sea Level Rise (1 foot)
   d) Wave action (1.5 feet)
5) The trusses at Piers E21 and E22 will be lowered to the same elevation as at Pier E23.
6) The pedestrian deck will be elevated above the ground and water level. Ramps or elevator access will need to be provided for ADA compliance. A lower platform is envisioned at the western end of the structure (Pier E21). This platform could be supported from the existing pier.
7) In order to ensure an adequate future useful life for the salvaged spans, the structures to remain will be cleaned of all lead paint and repainted. Steel that is corroded will be load rated, and repaired as required.
8) Items 4 and 5 above comprise the preferred configuration, Option 1. As an alternative to Option 1, Option 2 would lower the trusses to elevation 16.75 feet. Option 2 would require no lowering of the truss at Pier E23.
9) An additional alternative, Option 3, would be not to lower the truss and to perform the other rehabilitation with the truss in its current position.

The attached drawings depict the conceptual method for lowering the truss spans, including a suggested construction sequence for each option. Conceptual designs of the temporary works have been made, based on the as-built structural plans.
In evaluating the above, preliminary construction quantities have been estimated for the following phases of the potential work:

1. Demolition of existing structures
2. Paint removal and recoating
3. Lowering of the truss spans and reconstruction of the bearing pedestals

No quantity estimates have been made for access structures to the east or for the lower platform to the west of the truss spans. No estimate of necessary repairs to the steel trusses has been made.

Using unit costs provided by Caltrans Estimating Group, the following preliminary values have been determined:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower to Elevation 13.75</td>
<td>$1.6 million</td>
<td>$1.5 million</td>
<td>$1.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint removal and recoating</td>
<td>$1.5 million</td>
<td>$1.5 million</td>
<td>$1.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowering the truss spans</td>
<td>$2.2 million</td>
<td>$1.8 million</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of new deck</td>
<td>$1.4 million</td>
<td>$1.4 million</td>
<td>$1.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal of Bridge Items</td>
<td>$6.7 million</td>
<td>$6.2 million</td>
<td>$4.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead, Mobilization,</td>
<td>$6.7 million</td>
<td>$6.2 million</td>
<td>$4.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies, Escalation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal of Construction Costs</td>
<td>$13.4 million</td>
<td>$12.4 million</td>
<td>$8.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay Support @ 30%</td>
<td>$4 million</td>
<td>$3.7 million</td>
<td>$2.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for Budgeting</td>
<td>$17 million</td>
<td>$16 million</td>
<td>$11 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noted that some of the above costs can be credited from the upcoming demolition contract for the truss spans.

The detailed breakdown of Caltrans’ Construction cost estimate for Option 2 is attached. Allowing for overhead, mobilization, supplementary work, contingencies, escalation, and COS, a final value in the order of $16 million is recommended for budgeting purposes.

Based on the same unit costs and multipliers, a total cost for Option 1 is $1 million more than Option 2. A total cost of $17 million is recommended for budgeting purposes.

With the elimination of the truss lowering cost the total cost for Option 3 is $11 for budgeting purposes.
It is noted that these values are only preliminary. Due to the special conditions of the proposed work, a more detailed estimate based on actual construction staging should be performed.

**Future Maintenance**

Future operation and maintenance would include inspection and maintenance touch-up painting every five years at an estimated cost of $200,000. A thorough cleaning and painting is recommended every 25 years at a cost of $1.5 million, similar to the original cost of painting. At the time of repainting an allowance should be made to repair any structural steel that may have corroded. Based on the unit costs provided in the attached cost breakdown, and assuming 5% of the structural steel will be removed and replaced every 25 years, the estimated cost is $750,000. Based on the above, the annual cost of the combined 5 and 25 year repair and repainting is in the order of $300,000.

The paint system should be similar to that used on the new San Francisco Oakland Bay Bridge, consisting of an inorganic zinc primer, and a top coat of polysiloxane and acrylic. It is expected that such a system will protect against corrosion during the twenty-five year painting cycle.

Assuming moderate to light pedestrian loading and adequate maintenance painting and repair, the life expectancy of the bridge is indefinite.

**Sea Level Rise**

For an estimated sea level rise of 1 foot in 50 years, the bridge should be raised by one foot or more after about 50 years. This effort will be much less than the currently proposed lowering, as no foundation demolition will be needed. The trusses can be jacked up and blocked for the addition of new pedestals and bearings.

It is noted that for Options 2 and 3 the raising of the truss would not be needed for the foreseeable future.
Option 1 - Level Deck, Hold E23 Elevation

288'

Pedestrian Eye Elevation (57.4)
Top of Rail/Bike Rider Eye Height (55.9)
Bike Path Surface (51.4)

Top of Structure (57.4)

Bottom Deck (Walk Surface) (27.0)
Bottom of the Structure (16.8)
Design Water Level (12.0)

Pedestrian Eye Elevation (52.1)
Top of Rail/Bike Rider Eye Height (50.6)
Bike Path Surface (46.1)

Pedestrian Eye Elevation (46.9)
Top of Rail/Bike Rider Eye Height (45.4)
Bike Path Surface (40.9)

57.4
55.9
51.4

East Span Bike/Ped Path

27.0
16.8
12.0

Existing West Span 288

27.0
16.8
12.0
Memorandum

TO: Toll Bridge Program Oversight Committee (TBPOC)  

DATE: April 29, 2014

FR: Bill Casey, Construction Manager, Caltrans

RE: Agenda No. - 6a1  
   Item- San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge Updates  
   Anchor Rod Testing

Recommendation:  
For Information Only

Cost Impact:  
N/A

Schedule Impact:  
N/A

Discussion:

Anchor Rod Testing Program:

The A354 Grade BD anchor rod testing program for the 18 locations on the SAS Structure is made up of six different test groups:

- Test I  Field “in-situ” Hardness Tests
- Test II  Laboratory Tests on Anchor Rod Tails and Spares
- Test III Laboratory Tests on Full Size Anchor Rods
- Test IV Stress Corrosion Tests (Townsend Test)
- Test V Incremental Step Loading Technique Tests (Raymond Test)
- Test VI Test V Verification Test (Gorman Test)

Tests I, II, & III are substantially complete.

Test IV tests have been performed on 13 A354 Grade BD anchor rods as follows:

- Test Rigs 1 thru 4: 4 ea. Pier E2 2010 anchor rods, ID #2
  - Testing and post mortem examination has been performed with the draft report in comment stage.
- Test Rig 5: 1 ea. Pier E2 Bearing Bolts – Top Housing (B1, B2, B3, B4), ID #4
  - Testing has been performed with post mortem examination in progress.
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- Test Rig 6: 1 ea. Tower Anchorage Anchor Bolts (75 Dia. Anchor Bolt), ID #12
  - Testing has been performed with post mortem examination in progress.
- Test Rig 7: 1 ea. Tower Saddle Tie Rod, ID #8
  - Testing has been performed with post mortem examination in progress.
  - It is noted that due to the limitations of the jacking equipment, this rod was not able to be tensioned to failure.
- Test Rigs 8 thru 11: 4 ea. PWS Anchor Rods (Main Cable), ID #7
  - Testing has been performed on all 4 rods with post mortem examination in progress.
- Test Rigs 12 and 13: 2008 Anchor Bolts - 2 ea. Shear Key Anchor Bolts – Bottom (S1/S2), ID #1
  - Test rigs 10 and 11 were modified for use as test rigs 12 and 13.
  - Testing began April 3, 2014 with both rods breaking at the 0.70 Fu stage of loading. Post mortem examination is in progress.

The remaining Type IV tests are:

- 2013 Anchor Bolts - 4 ea. E2 2013 Replacement Rods (CCO 312). ID #18
  - Test rigs 1 thru 4 will be modified for use. The 2013 anchor bolts have been delivered. Rig modifications and material procurement are in progress. The projected start of the test is June 1st.

The Test V tests are in progress at L. Raymond & Associates (LRA). These tests began in September 2013 and are expected to complete in June 2014 with a final report in the 3rd/4th quarter of 2014.

As for Test VI, planning and equipment procurement efforts are ongoing with the first of the tests in progress.

Attachment(s):
N/A
ITEM 7: OTHER BUSINESS

a. Report on matters discussed and actions taken at Urgent Meeting

b. Report on matters discussed and actions taken during Executive Session
ITEM 8: GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT