# Community Advisory Committee Meeting Notice 

## Date: Wednesday, October 27, 2021; 6:00 p.m. <br> Location: <br> Watch: https://bit.Iy/3tQEzF7

PUBLIC COMMENT CALL-IN: 1 (415) 655-0001; Access Code: 24959506798 \# \#
To make public comment on an item, when the item is called, dial '*3' to be added to the queue to speak. Do not press *3 again or you will be removed from the queue. When the system says your line is unmuted, the live operator will advise that you will be allowed 2 minutes to speak. When your 2 minutes are up, we will move on to the next caller. Calls will be taken in the order in which they are received.

Members: John Larson (Chair), David Klein (Vice Chair), Nancy Buffum, Rosa Chen, Robert Gower, Jerry Levine, Stephanie Liu, Kevin Ortiz, Peter Tannen, Danielle Thoe, and Sophia Tupuola

## Remote Access to Information and Participation:

This meeting will be held remotely and will allow for remote public comment pursuant to AB 361, which amended the Brown Act to include Government Code Section 54953(e) and empowers local legislative bodies to convene by teleconferencing technology during a proclaimed state of emergency under the State Emergency Services Act so long as certain conditions are met.

Members of the public are encouraged to watch SF Cable Channel 26 or visit the SFGovTV website (www.sfgovtv.org) to stream the live meetings or watch them on demand. Written public comment may be submitted prior to the meeting by emailing the Clerk of the Transportation Authority at clerk@sfcta.org or sending written comments to Clerk of the Transportation Authority, 1455 Market Street, 22nd Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103. Written comments received by 8 a.m. on the day of the meeting will be distributed to Board members before the meeting begins
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Community Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda

## 1. Call to Order

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

## Consent Agenda

3. Approve the Minutes of the September 22, 2021 Meeting - ACTION*
4. Community Advisory Committee Vacancy - INFORMATION

The Board will consider recommending appointment of one member to the Community Advisory
Committee (CAC) at a future meeting. The vacancy is the result of the upcoming term expiration of Danielle Thoe (District 6 representative) at the end of October. Neither staff nor CAC members of Danielle Thoe (District 6 representative) at the end of October. Neither staff nor CAC mem through the Transportation Authority's website at www.sfcta.org/cac.

## End of Consent Agenda

5. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the 2021 Prop K Strategic Plan and Amend 11 5-

Year Prioritization Programs - ACTION*
6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate $\$ 4,935,710$ in Prop K Funds and $\$ 4,794,258$ in

Prop AA Funds, with Conditions, and Appropriate $\$ 320,000$ in Prop K funds for Five Requests - ACTION*
Projects: Prop K - BART: Accessibility Improvement Program: Public Address System and Hearing Loop ( $\$ 1,100,000$ ). SFMTA: Bus Transit Signal Priority ( $\$ 1,350,883$ ), Mission/Geneva Safety ( $\$ 1,391,000$ ). SFPW: Mission and Geneva Pavement Reconstruction ( $\$ 1,093,827$ ). SFCTA: Ocean Avenue Action Plan [NTIP Planning] (\$275,000). Prop AA - SFPW: Mission and Geneva Pavement Reconstruction ( $\$ 4,794,258$ ).

## 7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Amend the Geary Bus Rapid Transit Phase 2 Conceptual <br> Engineering Report Project to Revise the Scope and De-obligate $\$ 1,892$, 152 of \$6,319,470 in Prop K Funds - ACTION*

8. State and Federal Legislation Update - INFORMATION*
9. Progress Update on the Caltrain $22^{\text {nd }}$ Street Station Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Access Improvements Feasibility Study and the San Francisco Planning Department Southeast Rail Station Study Caltrain Update - INFORMATION*
10. 101 Mobility Action Plan Update - INFORMATION*

## Other Items

11. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

During this segment of the meeting, CAC members may make comments on items not specifically listed above, or introduce or request items for future consideration.
12. Public Comment
13. Adjournment

[^0]Next Meeting: December 1, 2021

The Hearing Room at the Transportation Authority is wheelchair accessible. To request sign language interpreters, readers, large print agendas or other accommodations, please contact the Clerk of the Transportation Authority at (415) 522-4800. Requests made at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting will help to ensure availability. Attendees at all public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical-based products.

If any materials related to an item on this agenda have been distributed to the Community Advisory Committee after distribution of the meeting packet, those materials are available for public inspection at the Transportation Authority at 1455 Market Street, Floor 22, San Francisco, CA 94103, during normal office hours.

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign \& Governmental Conduct Code Sec. 2.100] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the San Francisco Ethics Commission at 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102; (415) 252-3100; www.sfethics.org.
[ this page intentionally left blank ]
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## DRAFT MINUTES

## Community Advisory Committee

Wednesday, September 22, 2021

## 1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Larson called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.
Present at Roll: Rosa Chen, David Klein, John Larson, Jerry Levine, Kevin Ortiz, Stephanie Liu, Peter Tannen, Danielle Thoe, and Sophia Tupuola (9)
Absent at Roll: Nancy Buffum, Robert Gower (2)

## 2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Larson reported that next month, public outreach will be conducted for the Planning Department's Southeast Caltrain Stations Study and the Transportation Authority's Pennsylvania Avenue Extension project. He said the City and County, in partnership with Caltrain, are studying options for building a new Caltrain tunnel under Pennsylvania Avenue, rebuilding the 22nd Street Station, and building a new Caltrain station in the Bayview. He shared that the first round of joint public workshops for these coordinated studies will be held virtually next month on Thursday, October 7 at 6:00 p.m. and Saturday, October 9 at 12:00 p.m. Both dates would cover the same information and will have Cantonese and Spanish interpretation available, he shared. Additionally, Chair Larson shared that a second round of meeting were planned for November 4 and 6 and more project information could be found at sfplanning.org/SERSS. He said that staff anticipates presenting on both of the efforts to the CAC in the coming months.

Chair Larson invited member Rosa Chen who sits on the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee to provide an update. Ms. Chen reported on their first meeting was focused on equity, and Transportation Authority staff presented an equity presentation which highlighted transportation disparities across the city. She shared that the assessment looked at equity priority communities in particular which are communities on a higher proportion of low income residents and communities of color. She said city agencies need to be intentional about community-based planning to identify the investments that will best serve communities in need. Ms. Chen shared that their next meeting will be held Thursday, September 23, and they will begin discussions on their investment recommendations for the new expenditure plan.
With respect to Assembly Bill 43 (Friedman), Chair Larson shared that the bill passed the legislature on September 16. He added that the Governor has 30 days to sign, veto or allow the bill to become law. He shared that staff will agendize an update on the bill at an upcoming meeting assuming it becomes law.
There was no public comment.
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## Consent Agenda

3. Approve the Minutes of the September 1, 2021 Meeting - ACTION
4. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve San Francisco's Program of Projects for the 2022 Regional Transportation Improvement Program - ACTION
5. Adopt a Motion of Support to Execute Contract Renewals and Options for Various Annual Professional Services in an Amount Not to Exceed \$725,000 - ACTION

Peter Tannen asked how the phases were determined for the Communications Based Train Control System.

Mark Hansen, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), replied that the phases were chosen to determine the best way to move forward with the project. He said the train control upgrade program would replace the aging train control system in the Market Street subway, add train control to the new Central Subway, and expand train control operations to Muni Metro on surface streets. He said the phases were determined to pilot the system on the surface in phase 1, bring train control into the subway in phase 2, and then expand train control on the surface routes in the subsequent phases. Phase 1 was selected because it would bring benefits to the TThird line most immediately and to the Bayview and Visitacion Valley.
During public comment, Edward Mason referred to the communications based train control map and said it showed the J Church line operating to the Embarcadero. He said the J Church line had been truncated at Market Street temporarily. He said the J Church should be restored and not wait until 2025 or 2027 for access to the Embarcadero. He said there was enough information to support the number of trains in the subway post-pandemic.

Jerry Levine motioned to approve the consent agenda, seconded by Peter Tannen.
The consent agenda was approved by the following vote:
Ayes: Chen, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Tannen, Thoe, Tupuola (9)
Absent: Buffum, Gower (2)

## End of Consent Agenda

6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate $\$ 985,700$ in Prop K Funds and $\$ \mathbf{2 2 0 , 0 0 0}$ in Prop AA Funds, with Conditions, and Appropriate \$100,000 in Prop K funds for Four Requests - ACTION
Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming presented the item per the staff memorandum.

There was no public comment.
Danielle Thoe motioned to approve the item, seconded by David Klein.
The item was approved by the following vote:
Ayes: Chen, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Tannen, Thoe, Tupuola (9)
Absent: Buffum, Gower (2)
7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve the 2022 Prop AA Vehicle Registration Fee Strategic Plan Policies and Screening and Prioritization Criteria and Amend the 2017 Prop AA Strategic Plan - ACTION

Mike Pickford, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item.
Chair Larson noted that the proposal to reprogram funds from the Fillmore paving project to the Mission and Geneva project would double the amount of Prop AA funds programmed to the project and said they obviously underestimated the cost in the past. He asked if the cost of the project had doubled or if the Transportation Authority would just be putting the money that was not needed for Fillmore toward the Mission and Geneva project.
Mr. Pickford replied that staff does not expect the Fillmore project to move forward this year, so the amount of funds programmed to that project is the amount of funds under consideration for reprogramming.

Oscar Quintanilla, Principal Capital Finance Analyst with San Francisco Public Works (SFPW), said that costs for the Mission and Geneva paving project had increased because SFPW added blocks to the project on Geneva Avenue to better coordinate with SFMTA's Mission/Geneva Safety Project. He said that the project was programmed five years in advance and this was an example of things changing over time. He said the original cost estimate was around $\$ 6$ million and that it is now close to $\$ 11$ million, so while the proposal is to add Prop AA funds, Mr. Quintanilla said SFPW would also add other funds, such as gas tax funds. He said that SFPW's fund sources were dedicated to paving and that there would be funds available to backfill the Fillmore project when it is ready to advance.
During public comment Edward Mason said, related to the SFMTA Transit Stop Enhancement Phase 2 project, that he did not understand what was meant by "more legible signage". He asked if the project would improve signage for the 14R Mission Rapid bus at the Daly City BART station. He said there is currently just a yellow stripe on the pavement to indicate the stop location and that it was very difficult to figure out. He said that Sam Trans had easy to understand signage at the station.

Mr. Pickford responded that Phase 1 of the Transit Stop project was currently underway and would be improving signage along the 14/14R route.
Sean Kennedy, Transit Planning Manager with SFMTA, said that the Transit Stop Enhancement program would replace signs on the 14/14R route. He said that SFMTA had approximately 3,600 stops, many with only a yellow paint stripe indicating their location and about $1 / 3$ without a shelter. He said this project would result in all stops having a flag-style sign and that signs would be color coded to indicate whether the route is a frequent route. He said there would also be a small solar-powered light on the sign to help riders find the stop and read the sign.
Peter Tannen motioned to approve the item, seconded by David Klein.
Ayes: Chen, Klein, Larson, Levine, Liu, Ortiz, Tannen, Thoe, Tupuola (9)
Absent: Buffum, Gower (2)
8. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Transportation Recovery Plan: 2022 Muni Service Network - INFORMATION
CAC member Pete Tannen observed that even as someone with a transportation planning background, he found the slide deck for this item to be a bit overwhelming and it was hard to put everything all together. He wondered how members of the public would be able to digest the information and requested that the presenters keep that in mind.

Chair Larson echoed Mr. Tannen's comments and suggested the CAC could be a test case for improving the communications on this topic to the public going forward.

Sean Kennedy, Transit Planning Manager with SFMTA presented the item.
David Klein asked how it's possible that the system is able to support itself financially if there is $50 \%$ ridership and they are expecting to be at over $80 \%$ of service with the increase.

Sean Kennedy replied that this reflects their best understanding of where the trends are going and what the City Controller's office is telling them of what they can expect from the taxpayers. He said the agency's Chief Financial Officer is confident that they can sustain a $85 \%$ pre-pandemic level of service without having to raise fares. He said they don't want to just be a the $85 \%$ level and they know that even $100 \%$ pre-pandemic service levels in many ways was unacceptable, and they are hoping and pushing with funding partners to get up to $110-120 \%$ of pre-pandemic service levels within the next year or two.
Jerry Levine said in District 2, the 43 line is a particular concern especially the north end of the route and said he understands that it will be extended into the Presidio. He asked if there was any way to determine what the scheduling would be as far as the length of time it is going to run throughout the day and the various scenarios.
Mr. Kennedy said during the pandemic they cut the span of service to end at 10 p.m. and as of April they have extended 16 lines to midnight. He said he would need to verify if line 43 was extended until midnight and would follow back up with Mr. Levine.

Mr. Levine asked how that relates to pre-pandemic service.
Mr. Kennedy they would run it at a 12 -minute headway until the end of service which is a little better than it was pre-pandemic.
Sophia Tupuola asked if SFMTA was making an extra effort to equitably engage communities of concern in District 10, suggesting they send paper surveys and asking what they are doing to ensure their survey response rate reflects the diverse population in the city.
Mr. Kennedy responded that at the SFMTA Board meeting they discussed the 2600 survey responses received and questioned if it reflected their ridership. He said the survey was going to run another 2 weeks, and in a couple of days, Mr. Kennedy said SFMTA would have analyzed the responses looking at neighborhood, race, gender, etc. to see where they have received insufficient responses and then focus their efforts there. He said they are working with community based organizations to push out paper survey at neighborhood events, at pop up open houses, and a busy bus stops while riders wait for the bus.
Ms. Tupuola said she would love to see the data on survey response rates for lowincome riders and communities of concern.
Peter Tannen thanked Mr. Kennedy for a good presentation and then shared concerns on the J Church line not running downtown, and asked that based on the community input received, is there any chance that the J Church downtown service would be restored.

Mr. Kennedy replied that the $J$ is definitely on the table as something that may go back in the subway depending on community feedback. He said they have seen some good results on the technical side in terms of performance, but on the non-technical side,
they want to find out how the transfer is working/isn't working for passengers. He said they have already made changes based on feedback and in August, they doubled service in the subway, which should have helped, and on October 2 they will add 20\% more service to the J line. Mr. Kennedy said those changes will make the J line go from a 12 -minute headway to a 10 minute headway and would help reduce the transfer time. He said they would like to survey subway riders that include J line and $M$ line riders to see how they feel about the service changes.
Danielle Thoe said when talking about all-day lines she noticed that Mr. Kennedy didn't mention lines such as the $7 R$ and 38 X and ask if that was because there were not the focus right now. She also asked what is SFMTA considering in the event of pandemic spikes.
With respect to the express lanes Mr. Kennedy said they are not the focus right now but rather the focus is on the all-day services and said if the lines for example the 21 line, it would come back at its mid-day frequency and not its peak frequency. He said they are not adding back any expresses such as the 7 X right now because the financial district is not yet coming back. He said they will monitor and have contingency plans in the event downtown activity starts picking up quickly, but said it is likely around 3-4 years until demand in the downtown area is back up. He said right now the travel patterns have changed and they don't know how long they will last, and people are using transit to go within their neighborhoods, not to go downtown, so express services are not something they are looking at currently. With respect to contingency plans for the pandemic, Mr. Sean said they do have what they have done over the last year and a half that they can draw on if needed.

Kevin Ortiz agreed that the pre-pandemic services were not up to par for what they should have for their transportation system. He said he would love to see ways where they can make improvements with the routes that they currently have operating. He said he would also like to see how they can improve ways to not have communities fighting to get lines back, such as the M line returning 8 days before school started at San Francisco State, and said he wants to make sure the community engagement processes would be easier moving forward. Mr. Ortiz said he would also like to see ways they can refine the lines they have currently such as the 22 and 55 . He said the 55 was created a couple years ago to service the Dogpatch neighborhood, but if they are talking about improving the 22 line in general, he said he would like to find a way to combine the two lines to create a loop around.

Mr. Kennedy said the big issue there is the modal difference as the 22 is a trolley line and the 55 is a motorcoach. He said the trolley extension into Mission Bay was a 15-year-old idea and it had been a major capital project that they have finally finished. He said when they flipped the 22 , they needed to cover Dogpatch with a service to replace it, so that's where the 55 line came in. He said when you look at what the 22 use to do versus what the 55 does now, there are significant changes based on community feedback and further growth that is happening on $3^{\text {rd }}$ Street. He said he understood Mr. Ortiz's overall point that combining lines where it makes sense is the way of the future.
Mr. Tannen said that he realized the 76 line is a low priority line, but he didn't see it mentioned in the presentation.
Mr. Kennedy said they put it in the express bucket and though it does not fall in the category of a normal express service, they are just not bringing it back at present due to demand issues.

Mr. Levine asked how the funding from the American Recovery Act impacted their thinking on the various scenarios.
Mr. Kennedy said they have received a lot of money from federal funds which has helped them get to $75 \%$. He said without it they would have been much worse off. He said they are not going to direct all the funds into service and put out $100 \%$ service, because a year from now the money would dry up which would result in lay offs.
Mr. Levine agreed and said they took the right approach in dealing with the federal infusion of funds.

Chair Larson asked in terms of the parking revenue, whether the shared streets program would have a measurable impact on parking revenue going forward.
Mr. Kennedy replied that it was having an impact, but he would defer to his SFMTA colleagues for a more detailed response.

Chair Larson also asked how the ridership was going on the 58 line.
Mr. Kennedy said that considering the 58 is a brand new line and that it normally takes qwhile for new routes to catch on, add the fact that we are in a pandemic, ridership has been fair given the situation.
During public comment a caller said they were concerned about the lack of a clear and transparent public process on whether the temporary forced transfer on the J line at Market Street should be made permanent. They shared that pre-pandemic their family would ride the $J$ line to and from work and it was one of the deciding factors when purchasing their home where they did. They suggested that the forced transfer issues be severed from the 2022 service plan and Muni provide full transparency for any future proposals and a chance at public comment.

Edward Mason said the J Church shut down issues were deemed temporary to cause the forced transfer to Market Street and yet had evolved into a permanent recommendation with enhanced streetscape of Church Street between Market and $15^{\text {th }}$. He said the walking transfer to the subway requires crossing the northbound $J$ track which is located in the crosswalk and the tracks are especially slippery during rainy weather which is a safety hazard. Mr. Mason said the needs of the young and able body patrons for speed is what seems to be driving the recommendations and the elderly and disabled and inclement weather are not considered. He urged restoration of the $J$ line to its basic service.

A caller said they agree with the observation that the reduction in the number of trains using the metro tunnel right now eliminated any rationale to remove the J Church from the subway.
A J Church rider said that the 2-minute time savings that would be implemented October 2 would not cut it. They said as a senior citizen with a sprained ankle, it will not save them any time, sharing that it took 57 minutes to get from $24^{\text {th }}$ and Church Street to City Hall.

## 9. Progress Report for Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project - INFORMATION

Siew Chin Yeong, Director of Capital Programs and Construction, SFMTA presented the item.
Jerry Levine requested a full comprehensive accounting of all of the business interactions and impacts on small businesses from the Van Ness BRT project. He said
he was hoping that the report could be presented to the CAC. Mr. Levine added that he walks along corridor and would like an accounting for what Muni has done or not done, and what can be done to save businesses.
Peter Gabancho, project manager with SFMTA mentioned that we need to get that information from Mayor's Office of Economic Development. He said they are directly providing business support, and they have been working with them and will reach out to the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) and get that information.

Peter Tannen asked about the schedule, which indicates that revenue operation will be in third quarter of 2022. He said the progress report mentioned that the original BRT start date was late and the project was almost 3 years behind schedule.

Ms. Yeong replied that their current projection is substantial completion by end of year and then the contractor will start preparing for the testing and training program. She said they expect to finish training and testing of the BRT system in Spring 2022. In terms of construction, she added that they anticipate reaching substantial completion in December 2021.
Mr. Gabancho replied that from discussion with construction team, the project will not go past late March or April of next calendar year.
David Klein commented that every time the project comes before them, it has a lack of details. He said the presentation does not give a sense of breath or depth of the work involved. He continued by saying that it did not allow the team to shine or showcase how much was invested in the project; that the presentation showed work but neither the impact nor effectiveness of the work, nor how it impacts the constituents.
Ms. Yeong replied that they will keep that comment in mind when preparing the next presentation and will come back with more details.
Danielle Thoe echoed Mr. Klein's comment that details are lacking. She said it was inexcusable that potholing work hadn't been done early on in project development. Ms. Thoe said that the presentation mentioned changes and lessons learned applied to Geary BRT project and said she did not know what was meant by that. She added that completely changing Geary BRT scope from center-running to curb-running was something she didn't agree with especially without detail and she said she would like to know what coordination had been going on. With regard to Better Market Street which is another major street, she asked what the specific changes were when determining underground utilities. She said that while Better Market Street on its face is a transportation project, it is truly an infrastructure project on many levels and asked if they could talk about what has been going on in terms of contracting.
Ms. Yeong replied that some key learnings related to risk identification and mitigation. With respect to Geary BRT, she shared that a lesson learned was to identify risk and impact to businesses and communities, and to decide what to do to provide the best outcome to transit operation and to minimize impacts to business and communities. With regard to potholing, she said Van Ness BRT had performed potholing but they should have done early in the project. Ms. Yeong shared that at time of the contract, they were relying on contractor to do a lot of potholing before construction began. For Van Ness BRT they applied lessons to the Taraval and 22 Fillmore project. She said Taraval was a big contract, based on the lessons learned, SFMTA paused the design phase and talked to San Francisco Water Power Sewer (SFPUC) and PG\&E and conducted physical potholing with SFPUC and PG\&E. This led to the decision to split
the contract into Segment A and Segment B to give PG\&E more opportunity to relocate utilities. Taraval Segment A came out on schedule and on budget.
There was no public comment.
Chair Larson thanked SFMTA staff for the presentation and requested that they incorporate impacts on businesses in corridor and coordinate with OEWD for the next project update to the CAC.
10. Update on the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee and Outreach Efforts for Development of a New Expenditure Plan - INFORMATION

Michelle Beaulieu, Principal Transportation Planner, Government Relations, presented the item.
Mr. Levine commented that he anticipated that the missing EPAC representative from District 2, shown on the presentation, will be appointed in early October to complete the EPAC roster.
Ms. Beaulieu responded that staff have been working with district offices to fill the seats.
There was no public comment.

## Other Items

## 11. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

Chair Larson thanked Vice Chair Klein for presiding over the September 1 CAC meeting and providing a CAC report at the September 14 Transportation Board meeting.
There was no public comment.
12. Public Comment

During public comment, Edward Mason provided an updated on corporate Commuter buses sharing that the buses are nowhere near passenger capacity and have a negative impact to the environment.

## 13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

## Memorandum

## AGENDA ITEM 5

DATE: October 22, 2021

## TO: Transportation Authority Board

FROM: Anna LaForte - Deputy Director for Policy and Programming
SUBJECT: 11/9/2021 Board Meeting: Adopt the 2021 Prop K Strategic Plan and Amend 11 5-Year Prioritization Programs

## RECOMMENDATION $\square$ Information $\boxtimes$ Action

Fund Allocation- Adopt the 2021 Prop K Strategic Plan
$\boxtimes$ Fund Programming
- Amend 11 5-Year Prioritization Programs (5YPPs)


## SUMMARY

The Prop K Strategic Plan is the 30-year financial plan for the sales tax. We typically update the plan every 5 years along with updates to the 5YPPs that establish the next 5 years of projects to be funded. We are in the middle of the 2019 5YPP period covering Fiscal Years (FYs) 2019/20-2023/24. This midcycle 2021 Strategic Plan update was triggered by the COVID19 pandemic that has hit San Francisco's sales tax revenues particularly hard. It helps ensure that we can meet our existing financial obligations and support new allocations as we lower revenues by $3.9 \%$ or $\$ 129$ million through the end of the plan period (FY 2033/34), with revenues down the most in the near term. We are pleased that despite lower revenues we can maintain current programming levels across all categories through FY 2024/25. We worked with project sponsors to revise reimbursement schedules to reflect current project delivery schedules, resulting in less debt and lower financing costs. We are also releasing the capital reserve from the past 3 years. The net impact is a reduction of only $\$ 20$ million for projects over the plan period. We are not proposing updates to Strategic Plan Policies, nor did we conduct a wholesale call for projects as we would for a full 5YPP update. We are, however, recommending a targeted set of programming updates to fund several new projects, increase funds for several existing projects, and advance funds for paratransit, Downtown Rail Extension, and new traffic signals. Related 5YPP amendments are summarized in Attachment 2 and detailed in Enclosure 2.

## BACKGROUND

In November 2003, nearly 75\% of San Francisco voters approved Prop K, extending the existing half-cent local transportation sales tax and adopting a new 30-year Expenditure Plan. The Prop K Expenditure Plan describes the types of projects that are eligible for funds, including both specific projects (e.g. Central Subway) and programmatic (i.e., non-project specific) categories. It also establishes limits on sales tax funding by Expenditure Plan line item and sets expectations for leveraging of sales tax funds with other federal, state and local dollars to fully fund the Expenditure Plan programs and projects. The Expenditure Plan estimates that $\$ 2.35$ billion (in 2003 \$'s) in local transportation sales tax revenue will be made available to projects over the 30-year program; however, it does not specify how much sales tax funds any given project would receive by year. The Expenditure Plan requires that the Transportation Authority develop and adopt periodic updates to the Strategic Plan and 5YPPs to guide the implementation of the program while supporting transparency and accountability.

The Prop K Strategic Plan sets policy for administration of the program to ensure prudent stewardship of taxpayer funds. It also reconciles the timing of expected sales tax revenues with the schedule for when project sponsors need those revenues and provides a solid financial basis for the issuance of debt needed to accelerate the delivery of projects and their associated benefits to the public. The 5YPPs identify the specific projects that will be funded with Prop K.

We last updated the Prop K Strategic Plan in fall 2018. Since that time, the COVID-19 pandemic has significantly impacted San Francisco's sales tax receipts. In FY 2018/19 (the last full year before the pandemic), Prop K sales tax receipts totaled approximately $\$ 115.7$ million. Sales tax revenues for FY 2019/20 (stay at home orders issued in March 2020) and FY 2020/21 (first full FY of the pandemic) dropped to $\$ 99.3$ million and $\$ 86.5$ million respectively, about a 25\% drop since FY 2018/19.

## DISCUSSION

Given reductions in Prop K sales tax revenues due to the global health pandemic, we initiated a mid-cycle update to the Prop K Strategic Plan to ensure there are sufficient funds to cover existing debt and grant obligations and to be confident that we can support future allocations. This update also allows us to ensure we have a bridge in funding for programmatic categories that are running out of funds in the next few years such as Paratransit and Traffic Calming, as we seek to reauthorize the sales tax in 2022.
Reauthorization would continue the existing local sales tax for transportation for another 30 years and replenish funds available for ongoing programs, as well as add new types of projects that could be funded with the sales tax.
The 2021 Strategic Plan includes a true-up of actual revenues, expenditures, and financing costs for FYs 2018/19-2020/21 since the 2019 Strategic Plan was completed. The update also incorporates revised cash flow reimbursement schedules for many existing allocations and programmed, but unallocated funds to reflect delayed project delivery and/or
reimbursement schedules, which cumulatively push out or delay Strategic Plan expenditures. The update also includes the addition of loans to cover cash flows for the Yerba Buena Island Southgate Road Realignment and West Side Bridges Seismic Retrofit projects totaling \$164.5 million while we await reimbursements from federal and state grants and the Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA), on whose behalf we are leading these projects. We will recoup the full cost of the loans from TIDA including associated financing costs and interest earnings to keep the Prop K program whole.

We are pleased to be able to announce that despite lower projected revenues, the total funds available to projects is very similar to the amount in the 2019 Strategic Plan ( $\$ 2.52$ billion vs. $\$ 2.54$ billion or about $\$ 20$ million less). This is mainly the result of lower finance costs and releasing the capital reserve for $\mathrm{FYs} 2018 / 19$ through 2020/21. This allowed us to maintain current programming levels across all categories through FY 2024/25 ensuring bridge funding for ongoing programs. While we are targeting the June 2022 election for sales tax reauthorization, we wanted to ensure bridge funding through 2024 in case the ballot measure is delayed or doesn't achieve the required $2 / 3$ voter approval the first time.
As part of the proposed 2021 Strategic Plan, we are also recommending a targeted set of programming updates to reflect updated priorities, and to position projects for discretionary funding.
Below are additional highlights of what is included in the proposed 2021 Strategic Plan.
Lower Sales Tax Revenue Projections. To assist with development of our revenue forecasts, we contracted with MuniServices, economic consultants with expertise in sales taxes. The revised sales tax projections shown take into consideration several factors including but not limited to employment, disposable income, tourism and visitor expenditures, and inflation. As shown in the 30-Year Revenue Projections (Year of Expenditures or YOE\$s) chart in Attachment 1 (slide 8), we estimate sales tax revenue to be about $3.9 \%$ or $\$ 128.8$ million lower over the 30-year Expenditure Plan period, for a total of $\$ 3.17$ billion versus the $\$ 3.30$ billion in the 2019 Strategic Plan. The revised revenue projections reflect a return to prepandemic annual revenues of $\$ 115$ million in FY 2023/24.
Delayed Project Reimbursement Schedules. When the Board allocates sales tax funds to a project, the approval action includes a cash flow reimbursement schedule for the project based on the proposed project schedule. This is one of the key tools we have for minimizing financing costs and maximizing funds available for projects. As part of the 2021 Strategic Plan development, we have worked closely with project sponsors to update cash reimbursement schedules based on updated project delivery schedules for both existing grants and for projects with programmed but unallocated funds. This has resulted in lower anticipated debt needs and associated finance costs for the overall Prop K program which helps mitigate the impacts of lower sales tax revenues on projects.

Less Debt and Lower Financing Costs. The Strategic Plan provides the first cut at what the program's debt needs could be if project sponsors requested allocation of funds, and delivered projects and requested reimbursement at the schedules anticipated in the Strategic Plan and 5YPPs. In general, sponsors are more optimistic or aggressive in the cash need assumptions than we see in reality (see Attachment 1, slides 10-11). In the 2021 Strategic

Plan, we estimate a total long-term debt need of $\$ 620$ million, including the $\$ 248$ million revenue bond issued in 2017. This compares to the $\$ 719$ million in debt anticipated in the 2019 Strategic Plan. Similarly, estimated financing costs are down to $\$ 274$ million, which is $\$ 48$ million less than the $\$ 322$ million anticipated in the 2019 Strategic Plan. This reduction is primarily the result of project sponsors being slower to request allocations and reimbursements, and proactive cash and debt management by Transportation Authority staff.

It is important to note that the Strategic Plan uses conservative assumptions for financing cost to ensure we have sufficient funds to cover project needs and debt service costs. Based on 30 -years of experience administering the sales tax, we expect actual financing costs to be significantly lower than what's shown in the 2021 update.
5YPP Amendments. As summarized in Attachment 2 and detailed in Enclosure 2, the 2021 Strategic Plan and associated amendments to 11 5YPPs include updates to the programming and reimbursement schedules for existing projects in the current 5YPP period (FYs 2019/20$2023 / 24)$. We have also proposed a minor, targeted programming refresh to reflect current project priorities and to position projects for discretionary funding, as follows:

- Added New Projects. We are recommending 5YPP amendments to add several new projects with funds deobligated from projects completed under budget, or funds reprogrammed from other projects. New projects include Muni Communication Based Train Control ( $\$ 18,850,785$ ), Mission Geneva Pavement Renovation ( $\$ 1,093,827$ ), Junipero Serra Blvd Pavement Renovation ( $\$ 4,397,129$ ), BART Tunnel Waterproofing M-Line Project ( $\$ 1,269,471$ ), Candlestick Active Mobility \& Transit Crossing ( $\$ 1,260,728$ ), and Geary-19th Avenue Corridor Rail Strategy and Planning (West Side Rail) (\$3,527,710).

In addition, we are recommending reprogramming about $\$ 23$ million from the Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2) to 5 Fulton Transit Improvements ( $\$ 1,950,000$ ), 14 Downtown Mission Transit Improvements ( $\$ 12,554,233$ ), 30 Stockton Transit Improvements ( $\$ 2,495,767$ ), and Muni Forward ( $\$ 3,184,360$ ) and transit enhancements ( $\$ 2.75$ million) placeholders. The proposed amendment would leave $\$ 10$ million in Prop K funds programmed for the Geary Boulevard Improvement Project for a side-running alignment, which has a significantly lower cost than the center-running project alignment (see separate agenda item).
For more detail on scope, schedule, budget, cost and funding for new projects, see project information forms in Enclosure 1.

- Increased Funding for Existing Projects. Our recommendation includes increasing the amount of Prop $K$ funds on the following projects in the amounts shown: Application-Based Traffic Calming Program (\$898,360), Muni Metro East Expansion ( $\$ 4,240,948$ ), Muni Vehicle Mid-Life Overhauls (\$12,309,576), Paratransit ( $\$ 9,320,970$ ), BART Accessibility Improvement Program ( $\$ 400,000$ ), BART Elevator Renovation Program ( $\$ 500,000$ ), Sunset Boulevard Pavement Renovation ( $\$ 100,000$ ), and Traffic Signal Upgrade Contract $35(\$ 5,345,910)$.
- Advanced Funds to Meet Time Sensitive Funding Needs. There are three projects for which we recommend advancing funds from the outyears of the Prop K program to the near term. These include:
- Paratransit operations to advance funds to FYs 2022/23-2024/25 to increase programming from $\$ 10.1$ million to $\$ 13.3$ million during these years to provide near-term funding stability for the program;
- Downtown Rail Extension to advance funds to FYs 2021/22-2023/24 to make $\$ 19.5 \mathrm{M}$ available to support time sensitive project development activities while the project seeks entry into the Federal Transit Administration's Capital Investment Grant program; and
- New Signals Contract 66 to advance funds to FY 2022/23 to make $\$ 3.45$ million available to fully fund the construction phase of the project which was relying on Transportation Network Company (TNC) tax revenues which have been also hit hard by the pandemic and are unlikely to be available for this project when needed.


## FINANCIAL IMPACT

The Prop K Strategic Plan is an important long-range financial planning tool for the Transportation Authority as it forecasts sales tax revenues and expenditures, and estimates financing needs to ensure that sufficient funds are available when needed to deliver projects. Adoption of the 2021 Strategic Plan and associated 5YPP amendments will program funds to specific projects by fiscal year. There is no impact of the recommended action on the agency's adopted FY 2021/22 budget since actual allocation of funds is subject to separate approval action by the Board.

## CAC POSITION

The CAC will consider this item at its October 27, 2021 meeting.

## SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

- Attachment 1-2021 Strategic Plan Presentation
- Attachment 2 - Summary of Changes by Expenditure Plan Line item
- Attachment 3 - Planned Allocations and Financing Costs by Expenditure Plan Line Item (YOE \$s)
- Attachment 4 - Planned Cash Flow and Financing Costs by Expenditure Plan Line Item (YOE \$s)
- Enclosure 1 - Proposed 5YPP Amendments and Project Information Forms
- Enclosure 2 - Strategic Plan Policies
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## 2021 Prop K Strategic Plan Update

San Francisco
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Authority
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## Prop K Expenditure Plan

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

## What does it do?

- Identifies eligible project types
- Identifies eligible project sponsors
- Sets maximum amount of sales tax funding for each program/project
- Allows for financing
- Establishes other administration requirements

In 2003, nearly 75\% of SF votes approved the Prop K Expenditure Plan and extended the existing half-cent sales tax to fund the plan investments.

## Prop K Expenditure Plan

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

## Other administration requirements include:

- Development of a Strategic Plan, a 30-year financial plan for the sales tax
- Prioritization process for programmatic categories to identify projects to fund (i.e. 5-Year Prioritization Programs or 5YPPS)


## Prop K Strategic Plan

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

The Strategic Plan is the primary tool that guides the implementation of 30-year Expenditure Plan

Specifically, the Strategic Plan

- Establishes policies for administration of program
- Forecasts sales tax revenue over 30 years
- Assigns Prop K funds to programs and projects by fiscal year
- Forecasts expenditures by fiscal year
- Estimates financing needs

It is typically updated every 5 years along with 5YPP updates

## 2021

## Strategic Plan Mid-Cycle Update

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

## Why Now?

$\checkmark$ Respond to the COVID-19 pandemic and its impacts to sales tax revenue
$\checkmark$ Bridge to reauthorization for programs running out of funds
$\checkmark$ Minor, targeted programming refresh to reflect current project priorities and to position projects for discretionary funding

## 2021

## Strategic Plan Update

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

## This is not a full update, but a targeted effort to:

- Update our sales tax revenue projections
- "True-up" of revenues, expenditures, and financing costs based on actuals for FYs 2018/19-2020/21
- Update cash reimbursement schedules based on updated project delivery schedules, etc.
- Update programming for current priorities
- Does not include: changes to Strategic Plan policies or full 5YPP updates


## 30-Year Revenue Projections (YOE\$s)

| ITEM | 2019 STRATEGIC PLAN | 2021 | STRATEGIC PLAN |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total Sales Tax Revenues | $\mathbf{\$ 3 . 3 B}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 3 . 1 7 B}$ |  |
| Difference (\$) from 2019 Strategic Plan | - | $-\$ 128.8 \mathrm{M}$ |  |
| Difference (\%) from 2019 Strategic Plan | - | $-3.9 \%$ |  |
| Current 5-Year Period (19/20-23/24) Revenues | $\mathbf{\$ 5 7 5 M}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 5 0 4 M}$ |  |
| Difference (\$) from 2019 Strategic Plan | - | $-\$ 71 \mathrm{M}$ |  |
| Difference (\%) from 2019 Strategic Plan | - | $-\mathbf{- 1 2 . 3 \%}$ |  |
| Average Growth Rate (03/04 - 33/34) | $\mathbf{3 . 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 1 \%}$ |  |
| Return to FY18/19 Level (~\$115M) | - | FY2023/24 |  |

## 30-Year Revenue Projections (YOE\$s)



## Prop K Capital Program Overview

San Francisco
County Transportation Authority

Millions (Year of Expenditure \$'s)


## ABOUT 83\% OF THE \$444 MILLION NOT YET REIMBURSED IS DUE TO THE FOLLOWING TYPES OF PROJECTS:

- Muni Light Rail Vehicles (\$175M)
- Muni Guideways (\$31M)
- Muni Motor Coaches and Trolleybuses (\$27M)
- Caltrain State of Good Repair (\$22M)
- Muni Vehicle Rehabs/Overhauls (\$21M)
- Traffic Calming (\$21M)
- Bicycle (\$20M)
- Bus Rapid Transit (\$18M)
- Muni Facilities Improvements (\$16M)
- Signals (\$15M)


## Programming and Allocations

Millions (Year of Expenditure \$'s)


## Planned vs. Actual Reimbursements

Millions (Year of Expenditure \$'s)


## Strategic Plan Debt Assumptions (in millions YOE\$s)

The Strategic Plan takes a conservative approach towards debt to ensure funds are there if needed. Based on historic trends, actual debt needs will be much lower than shown.

| CATEGORIES | 2005 SP | 2009 SP <br> UPDATE | 2014 SP <br> UPDATE | 2019 SP <br> UPDATE | 2021 SP <br> UPDATE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total estimated bond principle <br> over 30-year plan period | $\$ 1,025$ | $\$ 843$ | $\$ 676$ | $\$ 7191$ | $\$ 620^{1}$ |
| Total estimated financing costs ${ }^{2}$ | $\$ 758$ | $\$ 859$ | $\$ 296$ | $\$ 322$ | $\$ 274$ |

1 Includes 2017 sales tax revenue bond for $\$ 248$ million in principle and assumes one or more bonds in the future
2 Includes short term (revolving credit agreement) and long term (bond) interest costs, and $\$ 82.3$ million in financing costs

## 30-Year Revenues and Expenditures Comparison

San Francisco
County Transportation Authority

| REVENUES (IN MILLIONS YOE\$) | 2021 STRATEGIC PLAN | 2019 STRATEGIC PLAN | CHANGE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sales Tax Revenue | 3,169.9 | 3,298.7 | (128.8) |
| Investment Income | 53.9 | 45.7 | 8.3 |
| Exchanges \& Loans | 184.1 | 19.6 | 164.5 |
| Long Term Bond Proceeds | 620.1 | 718.6 | (98.5) |
| TOTAL | 4,028.0 | 4,082.5 | (54.5) |
| EXPENDITURES (IN MILLIONS YOE\$) | 2021 STRATEGIC PLAN | 2019 STRATEGIC PLAN | CHANGE |
| Planning, Programming, Project Delivery Oversight, \& Admin | 188.2 | 194.4 | (6.2) |
| Exchanges \& Loans | 183.5 | 19.0 | 164.5 |
| Funds Available for Projects | 2,519.8 | 2,540.3 | (20.5) |
| Financing Costs | 274.1 | 322.2 | (48.2) |
| Capital Reserve | 242.3 | 288.0 | (45.6) |
| Long Term Bond Debt Service | 620.1 | 718.6 | (98.5) |
| TOTAL | 4,028.0 | 4,082.5 | (54.5) |

Note: Amounts may change slightly as we finalize the draft 2021 Strategic Plan.

## Programming Highlights

## Increased funding

- Application-Based Traffic Calming Program
- BART Priorities
- Muni Metro East Expansion
- Muni Vehicle Mid-life Overhauls
- Paratransit


## Advanced funds

- Downtown Rail Extension
- New Signals Contract 66

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

## New

## Programming Highlights

## Added new projects

- Candlestick Active Mobility \& Transit Crossing
- Mission Geneva Pavement Renovation
- Muni Communications Based Train Control
- Muni Forward projects (5 Fulton, 30 Stockton, 14 Downtown Mission)
- West Side Rail Planning


## Thank you

tachment 2

| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { EP } \\ \text { No. } \end{array}$ | EP Line Item | Description of Changes | Last Year of Funding in 2019 SP | Last Year of Funding in 2021 SP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Bus Rapid Transit/Muni Metro Network | 5YPP Amendment to reprogram $\$ 20.1 \mathrm{M}$ from the Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2) and \$93,049 in deobligated funds from projects completed under budget, to four MuniForward projects in FY2021/22: 5-Fulton Transit Improvements, 14-Downtown Mission Transit Improvements, 30-Stockton Transit Improvements, and a MuniForward Placeholder. <br> The proposed amendment would leave $\$ 10 \mathrm{M}$ in Prop K funds programmed for the Geary Boulevard Improvement Project. The SFMTA is requesting to update the scope of the project to a side-running alignment, which has a lower cost than the centerrunning BRT alignment. The reduction in Prop K funds is commensurate with the reduced project cost. <br> See enclosed Project Information Forms for details. | FY2021/22 | FY2022/23 |
| 2 | Third Street Light Rail (Phase 1) |  | FY2023/24 | FY2023/24 |
| 3 | Central Subway (Third Street Light Rail Phase 2) |  | FY2018/19 | FY2018/19 |
| 4 | Geary Light Rail |  | Priority 3 Funds Only | Priority 3 Funds Only |
| 5 | Downtown Extension to a Rebuilt Transbay Terminal | Advancing funds from the outyears to FY2021/22-2023/24 to make $\$ 19.5 \mathrm{M}$ available to support time sensitive project development activities. Includes $\$ 16.7 \mathrm{M}$ for Downtown Extension while the project seeks entry into the FTA Capital Investment Grant program, \$500,000 for 4th/King Street Station Railyards planning and oversight, and $\$ 2.5 \mathrm{M}$ in planning funds for Pennsylvania Avenue Extension. | 2033/34 | FY2023/24 |
| 6 | Electrification |  | FY2016/17 | FY2016/17 |
| 7 | Capital Improvement Program |  | FY2020/21 | FY2021/22 |
| 8 | BART Station Access, Safety and Capacity | 5YPP Amendment to reprogram $\$ 400,000$ from BART Station Wayfinding to the construction phase of the BART Accessibility Improvement Program in FY2021/22, increasing Prop K funds to $\$ 1.1 \mathrm{M}$ for construction and allowing BART to increase the scope of the project. See enclosed Project Information Form for details. <br> BART Station Wayfinding work in San Francisco includes wayfinding signage at the Glen Park station, which was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 2019. BART anticipates additional time will be needed to implement wayfinding work at the station to comply with potential National Register requirements. | FY2028/29 | FY2027/28 |
| 9 | Ferry |  | FY2027/28 | FY2023/24 |


| $\begin{gathered} \text { EP } \\ \text { No. } \end{gathered}$ | EP Line Item | Description of Changes | Last Year of Funding in 2019 SP | Last Year of Funding in 2021 SP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | Lines/Motor Coach |  | FY2032/33 | FY2031/32 |
| 11 | F-Line Extension to Fort Mason |  | FY2032/33 | FY2031/32 |
| 12 | Purchase/Rehab Historic Street Cars |  | FY2031/32 | FY2029/30 |
| 13 | Balboa Park BART/MUNI Station Access |  | FY2030/31 | FY2029/30 |
| 14 | Relocation of Paul St to Oakdale-Caltrain Station |  | FY2032/33 | FY2031/32 |
| 15 | Purchase Additional Light Rail Vehicles |  | FY2019/20 | FY2019/20 |
| 16 | Other Transit Enhancements | 5YPP Amendment to reprogram a total of \$3,527,710, including \$1,749,358 in deobligated funds from Geneva Harney BRT environmental phase, which is not advancing as originally approved and instead advancing in a phased approach, and \$1,778,352 from Muni Subway Expansion (19th Ave M-line) programming, to Geary19th Avenue Corridor Rail Strategy and Planning (West Side Rail) in Fiscal Years 2021/22 and 2022/23. <br> 5YPP Amendment to reprogram $\$ 2.75 \mathrm{M}$ from the Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2) to Transit Enhancements Placeholder in FY2022/23. <br> 5YPP Amendment to reprogram \$500,000 from the Market St. / Balboa Park New Elevator Master Plan to the Elevator Renovation Program in FY2021/22, increasing Prop K funds to $\$ 1.29 \mathrm{M}$ total for construction (including funds programmed in the BART Facility category) and allowing BART to increase the scope of the project. <br> The Market St. /Balboa Park New Elevator Master Plan is going to be a joint study of SFMTA and BART. SFMTA is not able to advance the study at this time due to agency financial constraints, and BART is requesting to reprogram the Prop K funds to shovelready elevator renovations. <br> See enclosed Project Information Forms for details. | FY2021/22 | FY2021/22 |
| 17B | New and Renovated Vehicles BART |  | FY2032/33 | FY2031/32 |
| 17M | New and Renovated Vehicles MUNI | 5YPP Amendment to reprogram \$12,309,576 in funds deobligated from projects completed under budget to the Mid-Life Overhauls Placeholder, increasing placeholder funds from $\$ 2,035,607$ to $\$ 14,345,183$ in FY2021/22. See enclosed Project Information Form for details. | FY2020/21 | FY2022/23 |

2021 Prop K Strategic Plan Update - Summary of Changes

| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { EP } \\ \text { No. } \end{array}$ | EP Line Item | Description of Changes | Last Year of Funding in 2019 SP | Last Year of Funding in 2021 SP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17P | New and Renovated Vehicles Caltrain |  | FY2020/21 | FY2021/22 |
| 17 U | New and Renovated Vehicles Discretionary |  | FY2019/20 | FY2019/20 |
| 18 | Trolleybus wheelchair-lift O\&M |  | Completed | Completed |
| 19 | F-Line O\&M |  | Completed | Completed |
| 20B | Rehab/Upgrades Existing facilities-BART |  | FY2032/33 | FY2030/31 |
| 20M | Rehab/Upgrades Existing facilities-MUNI | 5YPP Amendment to reprogram $\$ 4,240,948$ in funds deobligated from projects completed under budget to the Muni Metro East Expansion project, increasing the Prop K funds from from $\$ 2,800,000$ to $\$ 7,040,948$ in $\mathrm{FYs} 2021 / 22$ and 2022/23. See enclosed Project Information Form for details. | FY2022/23 | FY2022/23 |
| 20P | Rehab/Upgrades Existing facilities-Caltrain |  | FY2020/21 | FY2021/22 |
| $20 \cup$ | Rehab/Upgrades Existing facilities-Discretionary |  | FY2032/33 | FY2031/32 |
| 21 | Muni MMX O\&M |  | Completed | Completed |
| 22B | Guideways-BART | 5YPP Amendment to reprogram a total of $\$ 1,269,471$, including $\$ 1.2 \mathrm{M}$ in funds from Traction Power Substation Replacement construction and $\$ 69,471$ in funds deobligated from projects completed under budget, to the Tunnel Waterproofing M Line project in FY2021/22. See enclosed Project Information Form for details. <br> The Traction Power Substation Replacement project would retain \$1.5M in Prop K funds for design in FY2021/22. The construction phase will be funded by non-Prop K sources. | FY2032/33 | FY2031/32 |
| 22M | Guideways-MUNI | 5YPP Amendment to reprogram a total of $\$ 18,850,785$, including $\$ 6,452,901$ in deobligated funds from projects completed under budget and \$12,397,884 from multiple project placeholders to the planning phase of Communications Based Train Control in FY2021/22. See enclosed Project Information Form for details. <br> Some of the projects for which these placeholder funds were intended were done inhouse with non-Prop K funds. Also, priority was reduced for several traction power projects, and SFMTA has not identified new cable car infrastructure projects to advance with these funds. | FY2031/32 | FY2030/31 |


| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { EP } \\ \text { No. } \end{array}$ | EP Line Item | Description of Changes | Last Year of Funding in 2019 SP | Last Year of Funding in 2021 SP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22P | Guideways-Caltrain |  | FY2021/22 | FY2021/22 |
| 224 | Guideways-Discretionary |  | FY2031/32 | FY2030/31 |
| 23 | Paratransit | Reprogram $\$ 6,372,336$ in deobligated funds and advance $\$ 2,948,634$ from outyears to FYs 2022/23-2024/25 to increase programming from $\$ 10.1 \mathrm{M}$ to $\$ 13.3 \mathrm{M}$ for the next three fiscals years to provide near-term funding stability for the paratransit program. | FY2025/26 | FY2024/25 |
| 24 | Golden Gate Bridge South Access (Doyle Drive) |  | FY2017/18 | FY2017/18 |
| 25 | Bernal Heights Street System Upgrading |  | Completed | Completed |
| 26 | Great Highway Erosion Repair | Reprogram \$1,339,769 from projects completed under budget to the Great Highway Roadway Improvements placeholder in FY2025/26. See enclosed Project Information Form for details. | FY2019/20 | FY2025/26 |
| 27 | Visitacion Valley Watershed | 5YPP Amendment to reprogram $\$ 1,260,728$ in deobligated funds from the GenevaHarney BRT environmental phase, which is not advancing as originally approved and instead advancing in a phased approach, to the Candlestick Active Mobility \& Transit Crossing project. See enclosed Project Information Form for details. | FY2032/33 | FY2031/32 |
| 28 | Illinois Street Bridge |  | Completed | Completed |
| 29 | Golden Gate Park/SR1Traffic Study |  | Completed | Completed |
| 30 | Other Upgrades to Major Arterials |  | FY2020/21 | FY2021/22 |
| 31 | New Signals and Signs | Advancing funds to FY2022/23 to make an additional $\$ 3.45 \mathrm{M}$ available to fully fund New Signal Contract 66 construction. This would increase programming to $\$ 6.75 \mathrm{M}$ and fill a gap in the funding plan due to lower than anticipated TNC Tax revenues. See enclosed Project Information Form for details. | FY2032/33 | FY2028/29 |
| 32 | Advanced Technology and Information Systems (SFgo) |  | FY2032/33 | FY2031/32 |


| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { EP } \\ \text { No. } \end{array}$ | EP Line Item | Description of Changes | Last Year of Funding in 2019 SP | Last Year of Funding in 2021 SP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 33 | Signals and Signs | 5YPP Amendment to reprogram a total of $\$ 5,345,910$, including $\$ 997,819$ in funds deobligated from projects completed under budget and reprogram a total of $\$ 4,348,09$ from multiple project placeholders (see below) to the Traffic Signal Upgrade Contract 35, increasing the Prop K funds from $\$ 1,758,000$ to $\$ 7,103,910$. See enclosed Project Information Form for details. <br> The funds will be reprogrammed from the following project placeholders: Traffic Signal Conduits (City Coordination Opportunities) in FYs 2020/21 and 2021/22 which did not advance as anticipated due to limited coordination opportunities with repaving projects; Traffic Sign Replacement in FYs 2020/21 and 2021/22 which are delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic; and 3rd Street Traffic Detection Phase 3 and a portion of the Contract 36 construction funds, both of which will be funded by non-Prop K sources. | FY2032/33 | FY2031/32 |
| 34 | Street Resurfacing, Rehabilitation, and Maintenance | 5YPP amendment as follows: <br> -add Junipero Serra Blvd Pavement Renovation with $\$ 4,397,129$ for construction in FY2021/22. Funding available from \$1,397,129 in funds reprogrammed from 23rd St, Dolores St, York St, and Hampshire St Pavement Renovation which cost less than anticipated, $\$ 2,927,331$ reprogrammed from Claremont, Juanita, and Yerba Buena Pavement Renovation which will proceed in Spring 2022 with non-Prop K sources (e.g. gas tax or general obligation bond funds), and \$72,669 from McAllister St, 20th St, and 24th St Pavement (see below) <br> -add Mission St and Geneva Ave Improvement Project and reprogram \$1,093,827 in funds deobligated from projects completed under budget to the project's construction phase in FY2021/22 <br> -delay Sunset Blvd Pavement Renovation from FY2021/22 to FY2022/23 and slightly increase funding from $\$ 3 \mathrm{M}$ to $\$ 3.1 \mathrm{M}$ with $\$ 100,000$ reprogrammed from McAllister, 20th St, and 24th St Pavement Renovation <br> -delay McAllister St, 20th St, and 24th St Pavement Renovation from FY 2022/23 to 2023/24 and slightly reduce funding to $\$ 2,927,331$ (a decrease of $\$ 172,669$ ). Project remains fully funded. <br> See enclosed Project Information Forms for details. | FY2029/30 | FY2028/29 |
| 35 | Street Repair and Cleaning Equipment |  | FY2032/33 | FY2031/32 |
| 36 | Embarcadero Roadway Incremental O\&M |  | Completed | Completed |
| 37 | Pedestrian and Bicycle <br> Facility Maintenance |  | FY2032/33 | FY2030/31 |


| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { EP } \\ \text { No. } \end{array}$ | EP Line Item | Description of Changes | Last Year of Funding in 2019 SP | Last Year of Funding in 2021 SP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 38 | Traffic Calming | 5YPP Amendment to reprogram $\$ 898,360$ in funds deobligated from projects completed under budget to the Application Based Traffic Calming Program, increasing the Prop K funds from from \$1,200,000 to \$2,098,360 in FY2022/23 to meet increased demands on the program. See enclosed Project Information Form for details. | FY2025/26 | FY2023/24 |
| 39 | Bicycle Circulation and Safety |  | FY2025/26 | FY2023/24 |
| 40 | Pedestrian Circulation and Safety |  | FY2027/28 | FY2026/27 |
| 41 | Curb Ramps |  | FY2032/33 | FY2031/32 |
| 42 | Tree Planting and Maintenance |  | FY2032/33 | FY2031/32 |
| 43 | Transportation Demand Management / Parking Management |  | FY2028/29 | FY2027/28 |
| 44 | Transportation/Land Use Coordination |  | FY2027/28 | FY2025/26 |

${ }^{1}$ Updates to programming and cash flow schedules resulting in slower reimbursement are not reflected here.
22021 Strategic Plan Update has resulted in eliminating the last year(s) of funding for certain categories due to the impacts of lower revenues over the 30-year plan period.







| 2021 Prop K Strategic Plan <br> Attachment 3. Programming and Finance Costs By Expenditure Plan Line Item (YOE \$'s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | uns |  | Total Progemming | Frince coats | ${ }^{\text {Fraosos }}$ | Fr2000 | ${ }^{\text {mpossos }}$ | ${ }^{\text {Frasober }}$ | ${ }^{\text {m2077 }}$ | $\mathrm{mroses}^{\text {a }}$ | ${ }^{\text {Fraos\% }}$ | m20011 | m2011/2 | ${ }^{\text {m202213 }}$ | ${ }^{\text {r2033/4 }}$ | ${ }^{2} 201415$ | ${ }^{\text {m20 }}$ S 516 | ${ }^{\text {m200647 }}$ | ${ }^{\text {r207718 }}$ | ${ }^{\text {m20as, }}$ |
| TOTAL STREETS AND TRAFFIC SAFEI | 66,987 | ${ }^{5.47 \%}$ | ${ }^{\text {Programming }}$ S ${ }^{\text {S }}$ | ${ }^{605}, 04$ | 2,832 | 26,33,9920 | 28,49,8, | 13,473,500 | 27,81,0920 | 17,45, 1007 | 83,75.502 | 6,962, | 14,228,601 |  | 1, 1,35, | 5,24, | 5 49,47, 35 | , 2.25 | S $31,319,382$ |  |
| TRANSPORTATIONSSTTEMS MANAGEMENT/TTRATEGICINTITATVES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | s ${ }^{13,50,904}$ | 7.00\% | Programming $\$$ <br> Finance Costs $\$$ <br> Total $\$$ |  |  |  |  | $410.000 / 5$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 177,31 / 31 \\ \hline 17,33 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | ${ }^{180,208} / 5$ |  | ${ }^{26,6,27 / 5}$ s |  | 1,055,150 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 5 | s ${ }^{5}$ | ${ }_{5}^{5} 587$ | 5 $\quad 1,2050000$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 410,009 |  |  |  | 180,208 / | S 26,6010 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 223,627 / |  | 1.055,150 | 449,87 | 180,646 | 57,000 | 1,205,00 |
|  | ${ }^{20,529,647}$ | ${ }^{7.328}$ |  |  |  | \% ${ }_{\text {s }}$ | $\begin{gathered} 230,000 / \frac{5}{5} \\ \hline 200,000 \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} 30,3,555 \\ \hline 30,5355 \\ \hline \end{aligned} \frac{5}{5}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 34,0,053 / \frac{5}{5} \\ & \hline 34,0,053 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 195,203 \\ \hline 195,203 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{232,827287}$ | ${ }_{60,080}^{60,083}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT/STRATEGIC INITIATIVES | 34,60,550 | 7.198 | Progamming ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 478,849 \\ \hline 6,569 \\ \hline 485,418 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $1,030,387$ $\$$ <br> $\cdot$ $\$$ <br> $1,030,387$ $\$$ |  | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline 809,827 \\ \hline \cdot \\ \hline 809,827 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | ${ }_{\text {1, } 1,895,083}$ |
|  |  |  | Finance Costs $\$$ $2,449,488$ $\$$ <br> Total $\$$ $32,774,066$ $\$$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total strategic plan | 5 2,730,223,199 | 7.768 |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r\|rr\|l} \hline 2 & \$ & 176,166,341 & \$ \\ \hline & \$ & 507,033 & \$ \\ \hline 2 & \$ & 176,673,374 & \$ \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 77,424,537 \\ \hline 2,275,612 \\ \hline 79,700,149 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 61,031,872 \\ \hline 2,371,443 \\ \hline 63,403,315 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|rr\|r} \hline \$ & 110,573,674 & \$ \\ \hline \$ & 1,674,600 & \$ \\ \hline \$ & 112,248,274 & \$ \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r\|r} \hline 54,295,217 & \\ \hline 995,931 & \\ \hline 55,291,148 & \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lr\|l} \hline \$ & 203,819,851 & \$ \\ \hline \$ & 687,444 & \$ \\ \hline \$ & 204,507,295 & \$ \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|r\|l\|} \hline 69,626,543 & \$ \\ \hline 649,872 & \$ \\ \hline 70,276,415 & \$ \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline \\ \hline \end{array} \mathbf{2 2 7 , 5 5 9 , 8 8 9} \left\lvert\, \begin{array}{rr\|} \hline & 692,050 \\ \hline & 228,251,940 \\ \hline \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{array}{rr\|r\|} \hline \$ & 188,685,950 & \$ \\ \hline \$ & 423,110 & \$ \\ \hline \$ & 189,109,060 & \$ \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|lr\|} \hline \$ & 126,071,910 \\ \hline \$ & 606,816 \\ \hline \$ & 126,678,726 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|rr\|} \hline \$ & 104,250,341 \\ \hline \$ & 2,003,160 \\ \hline \$ & 106,253,501 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 85,256,183 \\ \hline 5,364,280 \\ \hline 90,620,463 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |





|  | r209920 | ${ }^{2} 202021$ | ${ }^{2021212}$ | ${ }^{\text {r2022as }}$ | ${ }^{\text {m20224 }}$ | ${ }^{\text {r2020245 }}$ | ${ }_{\text {r202326 }}$ | ${ }_{\text {r202827 }}$ | m20278 | ${ }^{202029} 9$ | ${ }^{\text {r202990 }}$ | ${ }^{\text {r20003 }}$ | ${ }^{\text {2020132 }}$ | ${ }_{\text {r203233 }}$ | r203384 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STREETS ANO TRAFFIC SAFEETY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 822,681 | 700,78 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  | 68, 855 | $960,931{ }^{\text {/ }}$ | 78,78 | 613,46 | ${ }_{47,817}{ }^{\text {/ }}$ | 324,999 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 822,681 | 700,788 | [27, [77) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 688,585 | 96,931/ ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }_{78,788}$ | 61, 4,66 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 476,877 5 | ${ }^{324,989}$ | 14,8,870 |  | 5 | - |  | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | s |
|  |  |  |  |  | s | . ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | s | s . ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | s - ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }^{5}$. | ${ }_{5}$ | . | - ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  | s |
| $26{ }^{26}$ Great Higway E Esosion Repar | 1,29,834 | (1,253,327] |  | 259 |  |  | 1,33, | 5 |  |  |  | s | 5. |  |  |
|  | 1,229,8 | (1,25, 2927) ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  | ¢ 259,119 |  | s ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 1,3,9,788 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  | ${ }^{12,164} 12,54{ }^{\text {12, }}$ | 8,077 ${ }_{\text {8,077 }}$ | 退, 3,132 | $5 \quad 15$ | - |  | 5 |
| $2{ }^{\text {Vstatacoin valey Watessted }}$ | ${ }^{(1,260,285]}$ |  | 1,900,000 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 3,366,000 | $\frac{5}{5}_{5}^{4,000,000}{ }^{5}$ | 200,771/ ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 5 70,7717 <br> $s_{5}^{5}$  | 5 70,777 | ${ }_{\substack{74,9733 \\ 10,785}}^{5}$ |  | sccis | sccel |  |  | s |
|  | \% ${ }^{(1,260,788)}$ |  | \% ${ }^{\frac{1}{5}}$ | $\frac{5}{5}$ 3,36,000 | s | ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | $\frac{5}{5}$ 70,717 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }^{5}$ | ${ }^{1044,1515}$ | ${ }^{\text {784,995 }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{28}$ winosistreet trise |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | s s | s s | 5 \% ${ }^{5}$ |  | ${ }^{5}$ |  | 5 | 5 | - ${ }^{5}$ |  | s |
|  | s : |  |  |  |  |  | $5_{5}$ | ${ }_{5}^{5} \quad:{ }^{\text {s }}$ |  |  | 5 | 5 - |  |  | s |
|  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{5}^{5} \quad{ }^{5}$ | s | ${ }_{5}^{5}$ |  | s : ${ }^{5}$ |  |  | ${ }_{5}^{5}$ | $3:$ |  | s |
|  | (101,120) | 587,341 | ${ }^{831,264} \mathbf{8}$ | 3, 930 | 57 5707 | 47.216 | $\stackrel{41,674}{ }{ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }_{60,688}$ | ${ }_{31,37}$ |  | ${ }_{18,89}$ | ${ }_{10,27}$ |  |  | s |
|  | s (100, 126) | 587,341 | 885,20 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 3,880 | \% 55,07\% | 47,216 s | S 41,674 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 5 36,688 ${ }^{\text {S }}$ | 31,377 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 25,437 | ${ }_{\text {18,991 }}^{18,9}$ | ${ }^{10,227}$ ! | - |  | s |
| Toat Nee and Upgsadest Steets | (132,200 | (66,0511) | 2,731,264 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 3,65, 119 | 5 4,000,000 5 | 20177715 | $5^{2,041,855}$ [ | 701,7715 |  | ${ }_{74,4,37}$ | 857,08 | $5{ }_{5}^{5} \quad 903,237$ | 95, 9 ,27 |  |  |
|  | (132,200) | ${ }^{1666}$ | ${ }^{2,758,9600^{2}}$ |  |  | ${ }_{74,9,931}^{4,5}$ |  |  |  | ${ }_{8}^{43,7,609}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 31 Vees Strans and sisps | 310,606 | (472,755) ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 3,426,086 ${ }^{\text {, }}$ | 6,750,000 | ${ }_{152}^{1 / 7]^{5}}$ | ${ }^{441,149} 15$ | 1.602.216 ${ }^{\text {20, }}$ | 1,59,354] ${ }^{\text {, }}$ | ${ }^{1,776,080}$ | 1,788,046 |  | 51,10 |  |  | 5 |
|  | s ${ }^{5}$ | [472,755] ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | S ${ }_{5}^{\text {s, } 32,108}$ | s 152,47 <br> 5 152,47 |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{2,077,225}$ | ${ }_{220,002}^{202}$ | S ${ }^{5}$ | ${ }_{2}^{29,2020}$ s |  | 5 |
|  | 2,320,000 |  | 66, 167 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 1,065,452 | 5 742,061 | 88,392 ${ }^{\text {5 }}$ | ${ }_{88,392}$ / | ${ }_{12}^{12,64}$ | 845,482 | ${ }^{881,771}$ | 976,78 | 1,03, 1,36 | 1,065,454 |  |  |
|  | \% $2,320,000$ |  | 667,167 ¢ | 1,40, 4,52 | \% ${ }_{5}^{5}$ |  |  | \% 837,785 |  | ${ }_{\text {90, }}^{6,5050}$ |  | S ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |
|  | 1,542,380 | [37.566) | 14,60,428 | ${ }^{850,000}$ | [5 1,152,000 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 4,970,774 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $5{ }^{5,987,500} 5$ | ${ }^{5} 4,126,332$ | 4,299,005 5 | 4,480,6,63 | 4,987, 58 | $5{ }_{5}^{5,24,8,84}$ | 5,444,728 ${ }^{\text {S }}$ |  |  |
|  | 1,542, | 178,55 | 14,0,0,42 | 850,0 | 1,152,000 | 5,02, 254 ¢ | 4,005,279 | \% $4,234,12$ ¢ | 4,40, 360 ¢ | 4,582,966 | 5,977,588 | 5,443,275 | 5,587,932 ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |  | s |
| $34 \begin{aligned} & \text { Street Resurfacing, Rehabilitation, and } \\ & \text { Maintenance } \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{5}^{5} 5$ | ${ }^{(1,566,388)}$ | ${ }_{5}^{5,963,507}$ [ | 3,100,000 | ${ }^{5}$ 2, 2,97731 | 2,405,144 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 5 $4,033,566$ [ | $54.306,477$ | 4,94,004 | 4,885,655 |  |  |  |  | s |
|  | ${ }_{5}^{5,9757,8,87}$ |  |  | $\frac{3}{3,37,29}$ | 926,969 | 3, $30,120{ }^{\text {3 }}$ |  |  | 9,660,764 5 |  |  |  | ${ }^{281,277^{281,67]} \text { S }}$ |  |  |
| 35 Street Reair and cleanns Equipment | 1,25,966 | 877,34 ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 90,990 | 977,35 | 97,976 | 1,075,218 ${ }^{\text {5 }}$ | s 1,049,218 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ¢ $1,088,886$ ] | 1,130,39 | 1,177,07] | 1,302, 52 | 1,372,921 | 1,422,601 1 |  | 5 |
|  | 5 1, 1, 65,966 | 877,364 | s 90,990 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  |  |  |  | \% ${ }_{5}^{\text {s }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $36 \text { Embarcadero Roadway Incremental O\&M }$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{5}^{5}$ | s |  |  |  | s $\quad$ : |  |  | s |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | s. 552,659 | ${ }^{884,631}$ |  |  |  | ${ }_{6}^{65,58885} 5$ | 5 76,061 <br> $s_{5}$ 45,570 | 5 7977 785 |  | ${ }_{\substack{86,30 \\ 46,920}}$ | 5 | s ${ }_{5}^{913,955}$ | ${ }_{4,298}{ }^{\text {c }}$ |  | s |
|  | 552,65 | 884,632 | 1,017, 288 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 884,759 | ¢ 863,366 ¢ | 71, 8,87 / ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }_{81,4,31 / 5}$ | 84,2,361/s | 87,028 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 93,260 | 1,013,999 | 98,700 | 4,3,88 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  | 5 |
| ${ }_{38}$ Traftic Caming | $5_{5}^{11,940,988}$ | 10,709,107 | 10,982,383 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | $4.008,360$ | \% 4,130,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 11,90 |  | 10,928,38 |  |  | ${ }^{807,488} \frac{5}{50,48} 5$ |  |  | 65, 6 659,95 ${ }^{5}$ |  |  | 377,711 | ${ }^{28,1,688}{ }^{28,688}$ S |  |  |
| 39 Bircte Criculutoro and Statey | ${ }_{5}^{5} 1,339,45$ | 1,850,53] | 4,87, 273 19 | 4,599,788 | $\left.\|l\| l\|l\| l\right\|_{5} ^{2,487,788}$ | ${ }^{178,36615} 3$ |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  | s |
|  | 5 1,3 <br> 5 $1,39,955$ | ${ }_{1,580,523}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | ${ }_{5}^{5} 4.895,949$ | ${ }_{4}^{42725,471}$ |  | 550,358 s | ${ }^{5}$ | 5 ${ }^{327,984}$ | 29,009 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 251,329 | ${ }_{20}^{20,5633}$ |  | 10, 10,120 ¢ |  | 5 |
| 40 Pedestrian Circulation and Safety | 1,43,200 | 2,16,507 | 4,90,64 ${ }^{\text {5 }}$ |  |  | 776,162 / ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 81,094 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }_{84,3,054}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | s |
|  | \% ${ }^{5}$ | ${ }^{\frac{5}{5}} \quad 2,164,5075$ |  | 5 10,295 <br> 108,295  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{138,83 \\ 138,83}}^{10,3}$ | ${ }_{5}^{5}$ | . |  | 5 |
| ${ }^{4}$ Curb Ramps |  |  | 2,563,028 | 2,344,747 | [5 1,362,469 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{42}$ Tree Pinating and maninemance |  | ${ }_{1,483,936}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | s |  |  | 12,960 | S 33.2995 | ${ }_{\text {S }}^{\text {S3,091/ }}$ | \% 51.73 s | 5-4.887/ |  | , 48.70 |  | S |  |  | s |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $2,200,642\}$ |  |  |


|  | ${ }^{\text {m201920 }}$ | ${ }^{\text {m202021 }}$ | ${ }^{1202172}$ | ${ }^{\text {m20272 }}$ | ${ }^{\text {m202244 }}$ | ${ }^{\text {r202425 }}$ | ${ }^{\text {r202356 }}$ | ${ }^{\text {F202027 }}$ | ${ }^{\text {marzres }}$ | ${ }^{\text {m20ar29 }}$ | ${ }^{\text {m202930 }}$ | ${ }^{\text {m20003 }}$ | ${ }^{\text {r201312 }}$ | ${ }^{\text {m202733 }}$ | ${ }^{\text {r2013as }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total streets and traffic safet | ${ }^{\frac{5}{2}}$ | (1,506,385 5 | 5, $5.866,739$ |  | 20,85,044 | s $\frac{15,99,444}{}$ |  |  |  | $\frac{17,74,095}{2,759,58}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {12, }}^{1,84,120}$ |  |  |  |
| TRANSPORTATION SYTEMS MANAGEMENT/STRAT ${ }^{\text {S }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5 5850.000 S | 700,007 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 1,68,6,6015 | 1,010,000 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 105.009 | ${ }^{391,577}$ | ${ }_{4}^{412,020} 5$ | ${ }^{431,002}$ / | ${ }_{452,610} 18$. |  | $5^{5}$ - ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |  |  | 5 |
|  | \% ${ }^{5}$ | 790,000 s |  | ${ }_{1,077,888}^{1,088}$ | 223,739 | ¢ $50.6,275$ | 552,071 ${ }^{\text {[1, }}$ | 545,597 ¢ | 57, 11828 | ${ }_{10,1,04}^{1024}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {co, }}^{60.862}$ | ${ }^{332,5959}$ / ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  | 5 |
|  | $15 \quad 605,788$ | 1,472,427 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 2,337, 148 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 2,250,000 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 20,00/ | 5 473,22/5 | 57,977/5 |  |  |  | ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  |  |  | 5 |
|  | $\frac{5}{5} \quad 60,527$ | 1.472,42 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  | ${ }_{2,30,3,399}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | ${ }_{4}^{26,6,704}$ |  | 215,983 ${ }^{93,9,95}$ |  | ${ }^{16,5919}{ }^{16,519}$ |  |  | 70,268 | ${ }_{\text {l }}^{7,7828}$ |  | s |
| TOTAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT/STRATEGIC INITIATIVES |  | 5 $2,262,42$ / ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 4,023,758 | 3,260,000 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }^{355.00]}$ | 5 86,4097 | 5 98,997/5 | ${ }_{431,000}$ | ${ }_{42,6,610}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 328,889 | 30,770 | ${ }^{284,377}$ s | ${ }^{29,929}{ }^{\text {229 }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }_{5}{ }^{5}$ | 2, 26,492 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 4,065,34 5 | 3,42, 278 | 10,44 | 7,194,466 5 | [,318,86 ${ }^{5}$ | 13,170 |  |  | 5 19,483 5 | 13, 130 | ${ }_{40,376}^{4}$ |  |  |
| Total strategic plan |  | ${ }_{5}^{5,3,87,4,48} 5$ | ${ }_{5}^{14,293,964 / 5}$ | $\frac{74,26,520}{12,522^{5} 5}$ | St,00,966 | ${ }^{5} 40,4,4,4,387$ | ${ }^{5} 30,5,53,265$ | 32,03,488 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{5}$ |
|  | ${ }^{\frac{5}{5}}$ | ¢ $57,262,399$ |  |  | 2, | s $22,6,50,5,4377$ | 5 $51,063,9,98$ ¢ | ${ }_{5} 5$, | ${ }^{5} 50,44,8,889$ | ${ }_{5} 5$ |  | 3, $3,9,96,067$ |  | 2, $2,04,144$ | ${ }^{5}$ |



|  | cepe | Toal ${ }_{\text {Lumalible }}$ | comem |  | manoses |  | mam | massos | Frasos 7 | ${ }^{\text {maoros }}$ | mroses | mº\%\% | ${ }^{2000011}$ | m201/12 | r20213 | \%2013,4 | ${ }^{\text {m2014 }}$ S | ${ }_{\text {m20354, }}$ | ${ }^{2004047}$ | mov718 | ${ }^{200}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ${ }_{115,712,555}$ | ${ }_{6}^{6.338}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6,959,900 |
|  |  | 9,52, 0 ,5 |  |  |  |  | 50,15,999 | ${ }^{25,336,365}$ | 22,00, 597 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 30,12, 641 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 2,212,388 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,09, 582 |  |  | 327,95 |
|  |  |  |  | Total ${ }^{\text {c }}$ \% $9,152,085$ s |  |  |  | ${ }^{5} 25,3,36,3,55$ s | 5 22,001,599 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 30,129,641 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 2, 2212,398 |  | $5^{594,672}$ |  |  |  |  | 2,029,582 |  |  | 327,75 |
|  | 3Central Subway (Third Street Light Rail <br> Phase 2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,477,53] ${ }^{\text {5 }}$ | 1251,7 | 2,825,488 | 8,41, 8 , 6 | 45, 3 4, 8 , ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $56,32,241$ | 1,771,139 | $4,202,95$ | 4,450,56 | 550,181 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{1,4,77,53} \times \frac{5}{s}$ | $\frac{5}{5}$ (25, 1756$)$ | 2,825,488 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 8,41, 8.80 ¢ ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }_{45,03,4,82}$ | 56,32, 244 | 1,77,139 | 4,202,955 | 4,450,599 | $540.181 /{ }^{\text {s }}$ |  |  |
|  | $4{ }_{4}^{\text {Ceny LIStrant }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Toal ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 55 | 277,266,78 | ${ }^{14.6 \%}$ | Proseming |  |  | 300,000 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }_{5}^{537.784 .007}{ }_{5}$ |  |  | ${ }^{5}$ |  |  | $\xrightarrow{7.075 .000}$ | cince |  |  | ${ }^{27,525,33^{2} / 5}$ |  | (11,12,8901 | ¢, 4 |
|  |  | 20,20,n |  |  |  |  | 30,000 's | 3,4,08,977 | ${ }^{2.007,459}$ S |  | ${ }_{5} \frac{42,45,25}{}$ | ${ }_{\text {l }}$ | s $19,9,90,711$ ¢ | 7,68,999 | 1,35, 2,05 ¢ |  | 17, 1780,023 [ | 27, [85,627 ${ }^{20,5}$ |  | 12, 12, 6, 27 | ${ }_{\text {2 }}^{2,2,4,9,83}$ |
|  | ${ }^{6}$ Eectrifataton | 23,92,373 | $21.24 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3,352,40 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 2,082,981 | ${ }^{1,228,284}$ [ ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {4, }}^{4.212,283}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{5}$ | s | s . ${ }^{5}$ |  |  | 3,352,430 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 2,082,931 | $1,28,284$ | 5,775,765 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 4,39,724 | S ${ }^{5}$ |
|  | 7 Coptal lmporement Progesm | 23,212,498 | ${ }^{11.33 \%}$ |  |  |  | ${ }^{40,67]^{5}}$ | ${ }^{18,664} /{ }^{\text {a }}$ | ${ }^{724,019}$ | ${ }^{1,422,5626}$ | ${ }_{5}^{5}$ | ${ }_{5}^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\underbrace{13,628} 1.14]_{5}^{5}$ | ${ }^{197,185}$ [5] ${ }^{5}$ | 2, $2.51,3,313$ | ${ }^{2,274,7,50}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40,677 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | ${ }^{18,664}$ [5 | 124,099 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1,442,562 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }^{\frac{5}{5}}$ | s ${ }^{1,30,9,488}$ |  | ${ }^{5}$ | 45, 532] ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 275, 257 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {4, } 4,744}$ ]s | 197,185 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 2,53,699 | ${ }_{\text {, }}^{2,3,50,257}$ |
|  |  | S 10,731,466 | 10.18 |  |  |  | ${ }^{189,942}$ ] |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{s}^{5}$ | ${ }_{5}^{5}$ | ${ }_{5}^{5} \quad 0.0755^{\text {s }}$ | $\underbrace{\substack{\text { c }}}_{\substack{30,953 \\ 2,877}}$ | ${ }_{\substack{3,510 \\ 999 \\ 99 \\ 5}}^{5}$ | 21,566 | ${ }^{51,270} /{ }^{5}$ | ${ }^{66,045}{ }^{5} 5$ | ${ }^{687,456}$ | $\underset{\substack{2,20,468 \\ 39,60}}{2,60}$ |
|  |  |  |  | Total ¢ $10.5099,69$ ] |  |  | 189,922 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  | 1,68,383 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 588,07/ ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 5 60,887 | S 22,000 | $5{ }^{11,065}$ | \% ${ }^{6,135}$ / | 30, 300 / | 37,509 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 21,566 9 | 51,20 /s | 66,045 5 | 687,45 | 2,24, 128 |
|  | , Ferry | 22,412 |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{7,294} /{ }^{\text {c }}$ |  | 27,973 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  | ${ }^{1,353}$ |  |  |  | ${ }^{86} 4,50$ | $435,500 / 5$ |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{880,000}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7,294 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | \% | 27,973 s |  | ${ }^{1,3,53}$, |  |  |  | 86,500 | 435,500 |  |  |  |  | 880,00 |
|  |  |  | $0.24 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |  | s ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | s | s : ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | \% ${ }^{5}$ | - | .s | . ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |
|  | 11 FLLime Seresiono to fort mason |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ${ }^{1,336,265}$ | 4.118 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $13 \text { Balboa Park BART/MUNI Station Access }$ | s 9,27, 97 | 5.008 |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{[3,3,28]}$ [5 | 5 ${ }_{5} 88,313$ | 281,688 ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ | 173,5 |  | 30, ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 69,459 ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ | ${ }^{127,163}$ | ${ }^{208,629}$ s | $76,997{ }_{5}^{5}$ | ${ }^{799,00}$ | ${ }^{7,38}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 26,750 s | ${ }_{\text {[3, } 3,282]}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 3,3,313 | ${ }^{5}$ 201,688 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | s 173,50/ | 6,500] ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 30,897/5 | 6,459 / | ${ }^{127,63}$ [ ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | ${ }^{20,629}$ | $76,997 / \mathrm{s}$ | 79 | 7,399 |
|  |  | 8,8,87 | 0.35\% |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{3,365}$ [ ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | s $\quad$ s |  |  |  |  | 43.488 | ${ }^{188,174}$ / ${ }^{5}$ | ${ }^{122,671}$ / ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }_{53,066}{ }^{\text {s }}$ | 94.220 | ${ }^{2,4,966}{ }^{\text {s }}$ | 27, | 34,244 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3,365 s |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{43,485}$ /5 | 18,174 | 122.671/ ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ | 5,5406 ¢ | 94,22 | 24,396 | 27,966 | 3, 3,24 |
|  | 15 Perrchase Adstitional Lestrail venicies | 5,53,955 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{4}^{4.877}{ }^{5}$ |  |  | 1,76,385 | 1,329,0, | (1,50,0000 |
|  |  |  |  | $5,42,3,35$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 954 |  | 1,76,385 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 1,38,24 | 66,933 |
|  | 16 Other Trasist Emancemens |  |  | ${ }^{\text {Progeraminges }}$ S 11.247, ,58 |  |  | (22,30] | 2,429 | $5{ }^{6,664}$ | ${ }^{1.856 / 5}$ | ${ }^{28,677}$ | 130,000 | [5,102 | 329.06 | 239,03 | 11.28 | 25,198 | 131,288 | 20, ,41 |  | 45,184 |
|  |  |  |  | (eate |  |  | ${ }^{123,3}$ | ¢ 2,429 s | $5 \quad 6.664$ 1 | ${ }_{5}^{5} \quad 1.856$ \% ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | $5^{288,627}$ | 5 130,000 | s 156,102 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 329.098 s | 23,903/s | ${ }^{1,288}$ /s | 254, 98 ¢ | ${ }^{31,288}$ [5 | 20,4919 | 10,728 | 45,184 |
|  | Tout Trasit E Emanemenens (10.6) |  | 4.548 |  |  |  | ${ }^{23,3}$ | ${ }_{5}^{5,795}$ / ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }^{3,4414}$ / ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }^{(31,455]}$ / ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }_{5}^{5}$ 326,9. | ${ }^{411,688}$ | ${ }^{329}$ | ${ }^{48,364}$ | 811,94 | 208,25 | 426,70 | ${ }^{434,087} / 5$ | 2,559,97/ ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }_{\text {2, } 250,112}^{2,819}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{(23,30]}$ ) ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 5,795 s | 3,444 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  | S 36,900 ¢ | s 41,688 | 329,602 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 488,344 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 81,974 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 20, 285 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }^{46,720}$ ¢ | 43, 8,87 / ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 2,759,977 | 2,29,931 | ${ }^{1,7,9,9,90}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\because{ }^{\text {\% }}$ | ${ }_{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |
|  |  |  | 9.428 |  |  |  | ${ }^{1,214,347}$ | 25,1829 | 7,080,702 | 11,58,180 5 | 5 3,008,03 | 6,633,571 | 5 9,33,767 | 3,270,30 | 5,986,674 | 10,006,573 | 3,94,4,60 | 26,52, 499 | 50,134,499 | 3, 3 ,09,766 | , $2.80,926$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{1}^{1,24,3,37}$ 's | $25,1,29$ s | 7,080,02 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 1, 1,54,880 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }_{5}{ }_{5}$ 3,008,03 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | ${ }^{5} 6.603,507{ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | $\left.{ }_{5}{ }^{3} 3,270,730\right] 5$ | 5,464,644 ${ }^{\text {5 }}$ | 16,04,5,53] ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 3,941,460 | 26,52,499 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 50,13, $1897{ }^{\text {s }}$ | 37,003,66 |  |
|  | 1170 | 5 23,633,73 | ${ }^{8.448}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{5}^{5}$ |  |  | 1,205,599 |  | ${ }^{297,509} / 5$ | 793,90 | 6,975 | 14,4,62 ${ }^{\text {5 }}$ |  | 3,20,885 |
|  |  |  |  | Toual 1 ¢ $2,6,6,5,388$ |  |  | $\left.{ }^{(0,494}\right]^{5}$ | 56,000 s |  | $4,786{ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }^{5}$ [,176,299 | ${ }_{5}^{5} 560,987$ ] | $5^{573}$ | 1,205 | 130 | 995 | ${ }^{793,979}$ [ | 69 | ${ }_{144,362}$ / ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 1,90,8,86 | 3,120,85, |
|  | 170 | ${ }_{82,781,135}$ | 1.02x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Total s 9 9,07, ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Vehicles Subtotal | 581,38,944 | ${ }^{10.288}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|lr\|} \hline \text { Programming } & \$ & 520,524,979 \\ \hline \text { Finance Costs } & \$ & 59,757,312 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Is |  | 5 5.976.81] ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 16,34,082 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 4,75,367] | ${ }^{26.662,255}$ / ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 50.279,211 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 3, 8 ,7,4,62 | $\frac{35,52,851}{22,464}$ |
|  |  |  |  | Toat |  |  |  |  |  | [1,58,966 5 | 5 (188,32/ | s $7,194,495$ | 5 $9,44,234$ | 5 4.46 .595 | 5 5,976,8715 | [ $16,34,0827$ | [,73, 6 / | 26,62,235 5 | 50,279,211 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  | 264 |

Atachment 4. Cash Flow and Finance Costs By By Expendiure Plan Line Item (YOE S's)




|  | Tapatame | \% | Tatame | momeme | manea | meness | masase | mexaror | manom | manem | manom | monen | menta | manza | пепз, | mowes | masts | mous, | manrus | mater |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| urfarem |  | s,mx | , | 3,65, +00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{129,98}$ |  |  | 418,97 |  |
| Tuswnememesmer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{12,45854}$ |  | ${ }^{13,24.456}$ | ${ }_{12,48374}$ |  |  |
|  | - 10,50,904 | roox | Remememe |  |  | ${ }^{6,58}=$ | $22,3,244{ }^{5}$ |  | s, |  |  | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline 183,213 \\ \cdot \\ \hline 183,213 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|c:c\|c\|} \hline 654 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 227,029 \\ \hline \cdot \\ \hline 227,029 \end{array}$ |
|  | ${ }^{20,92,4,47}$ | ${ }^{2,38}$ | negammis | Is ${ }^{13,10,2,42}$ |  | 13,900 | ${ }^{19,9000} 5$ | 328.0015 |  | [5 $5^{32,95}$ | ${ }^{5}$ 3, $3,46{ }^{\text {s }}$ | \%.351 |  | \%1,5915 | ร5,901 | 82, 451 | 8, 8 ,373 ${ }^{5}$ | [1,5, 135 | , | 吅 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12,000 | \% $23.000 / 5$ | ${ }^{\text {\% }}$,, so | \% ${ }^{3} 8$ | \% 3a, 468 | ${ }^{3}$ |  | 83,5 | \% 55,een | \% 824.54 ! |  | ${ }^{5}$ | \% 69,98 | , |
|  |  | ${ }^{2,18}$ | cemememe | $\begin{array}{r\|} \hline 30,324,579 \\ \hline 2,449,488 \\ \hline 32,774,066 \end{array}$ | ! : |  |  |  | $\frac{27,359}{23,35]}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | , 18.046 | 83,74 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Orims suraces mum | 2,70,2, 19 | ${ }^{2,88}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



|  | ${ }_{\text {m20920 }}$ | mporas | m202122 | ${ }_{\text {mpor23 }}$ | ${ }^{\text {mpo3ns }}$ | m20245 | ${ }_{\text {mposs }}$ | ${ }_{\text {r2020627 }}$ | mpor7s | m20359 | ¢20980 | ${ }_{\text {m2003 }}$ | ${ }_{\text {max } 132}$ | ${ }_{\text {m20233 }}$ | m2033s ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Trilepous sheectarar:ifitoam |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{5}^{5} \quad$. |  | s |  |  |  |  | . |  |
| F-Line oem |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $5^{5}$ | s | $5^{5}$ |  | ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | s |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vencices | ¢ 15.974 .900 |  |  | S 8 8,956,955 |  |  |  |  |  | [ ${ }^{5}$ |  |  | ${ }_{5}^{5}$ | 1,76,994 | ${ }_{4,482,251}$ |
|  | $16,24,233$ | $16,14,4,48$ | 82,56,5,52] | $59,535,088$ | n, 2,72,3,16 | 22,55,933 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 7, 280,477 | S $6,681,93$ ] | s $5.758,40$ | 5 5,09,104 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  | ${ }^{5} 5,5,58,788^{5}$ |  |  | 4,482,251 |
| $20 B$ Rehab/Upgrades Existing facilities-BART <br>   | s ${ }^{11,067}$ |  |  | 600,000 | ${ }^{190,0001}$ | ${ }_{6}^{66,989} 6$ | $\underset{\substack{7,7,681 \\ 5,981}}{\substack{\text { c }}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\frac{5}{5} \quad 11,067$ |  |  | 60, 381 | 9,6,60] | ciones | cis, |  |  |  | ${ }_{98,182} 9$ | ${ }_{9}^{9,268}$ | ${ }_{\text {c, }}^{5,381}$ |  |  |
|  |  | 5, 5 27,4747 | [ |  |  |  | 873,320 | ${ }_{5}^{5} \quad 783,364{ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  | 19,680 |  |  |
|  | 2,082,705 | 5,557,629 | S 11,60,435 | S $4.016,0615$ | $5^{4,54,180}$ | s $2,657,686$ | ${ }^{5} 887,30{ }^{\text {c }}$ | $5^{5} 783,34$ / | \% 60,940 | $55^{50,588}{ }^{5}$ | ${ }^{5} 4885959$ |  | 19,600 5 |  |  |
|  | ${ }_{\substack{\text { n2, } 1202 \\ 27,148}}^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  | $l l l_{\text {s }}^{5}$ | ${ }_{87,422}{ }^{\text {s }}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 17,988 |  |  |
|  | 99,20 | 585,75 | s 1.44, 090 | S 342,129 | \% 118,36 ¢ | s 97,747 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | $5^{58} 88,42{ }^{8}$ |  | s 69,039 | $5{ }_{5}^{58,89}{ }^{5}$ | 548.23 [ | $5{ }^{55,106}$ / | 17,958 |  |  |
| 20.2 |  |  | ${ }_{5}^{5,34,403}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{51,27271 \\ 8,22}}^{\substack{\text { S }}}$ |  |  | $\left[\begin{array}{ll}5 \\ \hline\end{array}\right.$ |  |  | Sos,099 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 5,35,8,889 | S 510,844 |  | 55,499 ${ }^{\text {d, }}$ | 39,969 |  | 5 $42,2,58$ |  | 488,399 | ' 517,188 ] | 551,066 |  |  |
| Fsatites sulutaal | 270,9\% | 5,3,4,41 | 17,96,466 | $4,721,71^{18}$ | 3,62,462 | ¢ $2,295,046$ [ | 458,921 | 5 475,676 | [ 495,102 | [ 515,46 | $50.3,399$ | 52, 162 | $5^{5}$ 523,412 |  |  |
|  | ${ }_{2,189,24}^{218,24}$ | ${ }^{5}$ |  | ${ }_{5}^{5}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {chem }}$ |  |  | ${ }^{\text {che }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{21}$ manimax oen |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Toal Factities | 1,970.87] | s $5.384,46$ | 17,96,4,465 | S $4,721,78$ | 3.682,421 | S 2.2950 .046 s | ${ }_{485,822^{1}}$ | $5^{5} 475.676$ | \% ${ }^{\text {s59, } 102}$ | \% 515,46 | ${ }_{50}^{50,399}$ | S 592,162 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 52,412 |  |  |
|  | 2,8,8,241 |  | (8,50, 422 | 5 5,47, 5 S5 |  | s ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  |  | s $1,276,10$ |  | ${ }_{\text {chen }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| $22 \mathrm{Guideways-BART}$ | (7,421) |  | 200,000 | 1,550,000 | $1.019,41$ | [s 37, 288 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 280,277 | $5^{5} \quad 28,88888^{5}$ | [ $\quad 30,90$ | /5 34,755 s | 34,951 | 36, 126/s | 80, 809 |  |  |
|  | (0,427) |  | 20,000 | 1,550,0 |  |  |  |  | ¢ ${ }_{\text {s }}$ |  |  | 38,901 | ${ }_{4}^{41,585}$ |  |  |
| $22 \times$ | 17,19, 127 | s 4.012,566 | 10,022,621 | 1,279,929 | 25,21,360 | ${ }^{23,112,2378}$ | 10,620,13615 | 10,7685,568 | 10,988,727 | ${ }^{11,409,575}$ | [2,159,544] | ${ }^{11,1858,2785}$ |  |  |  |
|  | 17,19,912] | 4, 012,546 | 10,02, 2621 | s $17,279,929$ | 25,75, 5 , 4 9 | s 24.2 20,5020 | 1, $1,23,997$ ! | S $11,982,231$ ¢ | s $1.2080,109$ | s $12.580,0,35$ | 1, $13,45,473$ S | 1,3,3,363 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | i, |  |  |
| 228 Gesidemesc.atrain | 749,499 | ${ }^{4919,077}$ | ${ }^{1,412,685}$ | ${ }_{5} 2.2,76,3625$ | 113,50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | , | ${ }_{5}^{24,5,683}$ | ${ }_{1}^{15562,292}$ |  | ${ }^{477} 5$ | St ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }^{36,448} 3$ | 5 23,95 <br> 5  <br> 183,55  | [ |  | ${ }^{15,775}{ }^{15,745}$ S |  | ${ }^{68,745}$ |  |  |
| 220 |  | 1,26,708 | 9,539,187 | 7,965,125 | 5,688.600 | ¢ $1.762,899$ | ${ }^{1,236,2215}$ | 5 ${ }_{5}^{1,295,364}$ | s ${ }^{1,2155,901}$ | $5_{5}^{5} 1.265,5377^{5}$ | 1,400,649 | ,476,199 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1,236,7] | 9,539,187 | ${ }_{5} \quad 7.955,125$ |  | 's $1.9727,679$ ¢ |  |  |  |  | s ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | S ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  |  |  |
| Toal Guidemens | 5 $17.86,1,209$ | ${ }_{5,740,262}$ | 27,24,4,93 | 5 29,12, 2799 | 3, $3,83,185$ | ${ }_{5}^{25,52,8,8,4}$ | 12,13,6,555 | Is $12,3,35,70$ | 12,766,43 | 12,998, 3 | 1, $1,992,254$ s | 13,662,464 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | ${ }^{381,095}$ |  |  |
|  |  | 's $5.74,4,689$ | ${ }^{\text {s }}$ S $27,34,780$ | ${ }_{5}{ }_{5} 2,4041,484$ | ${ }^{5}$ S $3,0,04,4021$ |  | S ${ }^{13,726,5070}$ | S ${ }^{13,58,2,474}$ | so |  |  | S ${ }^{15,5,50,976}$ |  |  |  |
|  | 5 5 3 ,00, 2,26 | 27,32,785 | 126,135,699 | $5123,999,921$ | 100,38,3600 | 43,27,699 | 13,36, 829 | 1,59,3,36 | 13,74,203 |  | $15.088,3915$ | 14,56,5877 | 8,582,944 |  |  |
|  |  | \% 679 | S $2,190,046$ | St, 5 | S $10,042,3955$ | ${ }^{5}$ | Stioreme |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{1,76,994} 1$ |  |
| -rat rensis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4,7,8,2,261 | 5 36,029,40 | 175,805,923 | 147,460.096 |  | ${ }^{6,6,47,9,93}$ / |  |  | 5,128,9898 |  |  |  | ${ }^{6,187,515}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  | ${ }^{5}$ | St, $\frac{5}{5}$ | S $116,7025.55$ | S ${ }_{\text {S }}^{5}$ |  | s ${ }^{5}$ | ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\frac{1}{5}}$ |
|  | 10,67,477 | 5 6,13,951 | 9,590,03 | $5 \frac{12,57,010}{}$ | ${ }_{13,30,000}$ | 13,30,000 | 3,325,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | , $1.198,465$ | s ${ }_{\text {c/i20,52 }}$ | 899,744 | $\frac{1,67,077}{142757}$ | 2, 29215238 | ${ }_{\text {L }}^{2,92,8,86}$ | ${ }_{\text {2, } 278,463}$ | ${ }^{254.4500}$ | 2,256,284 | ,1922, 13 | 127094 | , 1400,690 | ${ }^{1,2117288}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL PARATRANSIT | \% ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ${ }_{\text {chem }}{ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }_{\text {c }}^{5}$ | ${ }^{5}$ | ${ }^{5}$ | ${ }^{5} 4$. | ${ }^{5}$ | ${ }_{5}{ }_{5}$ | St | ${ }_{\text {s }}{ }_{5}$ | ${ }_{5}{ }_{5}$ |  |  |  |  |


|  | ${ }^{\text {m20920 }}$ | manozar | ma02122 | ${ }^{\text {m20223 }}$ | m20214 | mpouns | ${ }_{\text {mposs }}$ | ${ }_{\text {m20687 }}$ | mpor7s | ${ }^{\text {m2023929 }}$ | п20980 | ${ }^{\text {m2003 }}$ | meno3x | ${ }^{2022} 33$ | ${ }^{\text {m2033 }}$ a |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | coin |  | $\substack { 25,280 \\ \begin{subarray}{c}{47,67 \\ 72,07{ 2 5 , 2 8 0 \\ \begin{subarray} { c } { 4 7 , 6 7 \\ 7 2 , 0 7 } } \end{subarray}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{5}$ |
| 25 Bernal Heights Street System Upgrading $\$$ <br>   $\$$ <br>    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | s |
|  | $5{ }^{5} 85,353$ |  |  | \% 129,560 | 129 |  |  | , 1,3997788 | 12,16 | 07 | 312 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 35,333 | 27,46 | 108,483 | 129,560 | 129,59 |  |  | 1,355,486 | 2, 2,14 + | 8.077 ¢ | ${ }^{3,132}$ [ ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| $2 7 \longdiv { \text { vistacoion viley Weerestred } }$ |  |  | 950,00 | 2,64,000 | $51.68,000$ | 2,201,771 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 2,451,777 ${ }_{\text {s }}^{5}$ | ${ }^{1,5451,717} 11.3$ |  |  |  | [ | $\underbrace{5}_{\substack{93,927] \\ 51,593}}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  | 950,00 | S 2.688,00 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | s 1,68,000 | ${ }_{5} 2,200,771{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 17 's | 1,46,033 | 754,515 | 784,095 | 870,68] 5 | 5 9525,57 [ | 98, 5, 515 |  | s |
| 28 Uiniois street Brise |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }^{129,418}$ | 45.43 | , |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . 277 [ ${ }^{\text {5 }}$ |  |  | s |
|  | 129,48 | 452,34 ! | 1, 1,4,7,62] | 3,980 ¢ | 57,07 | 47,26 \% | 41,674 / | 36,688 | 3,1,37 | ${ }_{25,477}^{2,5}$ | 8,891 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 5 $10,27{ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |
| Total New and Upgraded Streets | 164,771 | 479,900 | ${ }^{2.844,233}$ 26,96 | $\left.s_{5}^{5} 2.777,560\right]$ | $\underbrace{}_{\substack{1,877,589 \\ 57,707}}$ | ${ }^{2,2017,717} 4$ | ${ }^{2,451,71717}$ | \|ccel | $\underset{\substack{743,933 \\ 53,69}}{ }$ |  |  | 5 | $\underset{\substack{935,927 \\ 5,593 \\ \hline}}{5}$ |  | s |
|  | 16,771 | 479,900 |  | ${ }_{5}^{5}$ |  | ${ }_{5}^{5} \frac{4,2,426,5}{}$ |  |  |  |  | [ | [ |  |  |  |
|  | 4,871,241 | ${ }^{847,60}$ |  | ${ }^{1,773,0.038} 3$ | ${ }_{\text {a }}^{3.5050 .000}$ | ${ }^{2,691,199} 1$ |  |  | ${ }^{1.776 .089}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }_{4,877,241}$ | ${ }_{84,67}{ }^{\circ}$ | ${ }_{\text {L }}^{2,20,9,977}$ | ${ }_{5}^{5}$ | , $1,52,5147$ |  | ${ }^{208,88,774} 5$ |  | (er | ${ }^{20.077,239}{ }^{205}$ | ${ }^{228,6027}$ S | Still ${ }^{5}$ | ${ }^{20,2020} 5$ |  | s |
| $32 \begin{aligned} & \text { Advanced Technology and Information } \\ & \text { Systems (SFgo) }\end{aligned}$ | 616,521 | Q,457 | $2,77,41$ | 2,339,577 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | ${ }_{1}^{1,457,777} 1$ | ${ }^{\text {88, } 2927}$ | ${ }^{888,3971}$ | ${ }_{\substack{812,94 \\ 2094}}$ |  | ${ }^{881,771}$ | ${ }_{967,789}^{96} 5$ | s ${ }_{5}^{1,031,136]}$ s | 1,065,4545 ${ }^{\text {5 }}$ |  |  |
|  | $5{ }^{6} 61,521$ | $1,29,457$ | 2,77, /41 | 2,39,557 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 1,974,924 | 921,000 9 | 925,072 ${ }^{20.05}$ | ${ }^{83} 87,75$ | ${ }^{869,983}$ | 90,650 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | (1,59,418 |  |  |
| $33 \text { Signals and Signs }$ | $5.502,992$ | 4,681,755 | 6,29,908 | 8,004,483 | 6,484,819 | 6,708,40] | 3,987,500 ${ }^{\text {S }}$ | 4,126,322 | 4,299,005 | 4,480,633 ${ }^{\text {5 }}$ | 4,967,088] |  | 5,44,728] ${ }^{\text {S }}$ |  |  |
|  | 5,02,992 | 4,681,755 | 6,29,908 | 8,304,43] ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 6,484,899 |  | ${ }_{5}{ }_{5}^{4,0,0,2797}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | s $4,234,12$ | s $4,401,360$ | ${ }^{5}$ 4,582,966 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  | ${ }_{5} 5,44427275$ | 5,8,7,927 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  | ${ }^{5}$ |
| $\square$ | , 7,785,423 |  | ${ }_{6}^{6,720,6,68}$ |  |  |  |  | 4,90,407 |  | ${ }_{\substack{4,855,625 \\ 4,012315}}^{5}$ | 25,993 | ${ }_{99,786}$ | 28, 8,67 |  | s |
|  | ${ }_{\text {8, } 205,4969}$ |  |  | 8, 172,26 ¢ ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | ${ }_{6} 8.59,54.54$ ¢ |  | 5, 542,537 |  | 5,9, | 825,93] ${ }^{\text {82, }}$ | ${ }_{5}^{53,73,786}$ | ${ }_{\text {cher }}^{28,627}$ |  |  |
| 35 Street Repair and Cleaning Equipment | 371,922 | 267,80 | ${ }^{3}, 042,349$ | 90, 169 / | 960,69 | ${ }^{1,564,2065}$, | 1,0492,218 ${ }^{\text {27es }}$ | ${ }^{1,086,886}$ | 1,100,399 | 1,177,007] | 1,302,52] ${ }^{\text {[ }}$ |  | ${ }^{1,422,601}$ ] |  | s |
|  | 37,952 | 26,860 | 3,042,39 | 80,169 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 90, 229 |  |  | s ${ }^{\frac{1}{19,06,240}}$ | ${ }^{1+1,96.688}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| $36 \text { Embarcadero Roadway Incremental O\&M }$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | s |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $37 \begin{aligned} & \text { Pedestrian and Bicycle Facility } \\ & \text { Maintenance }\end{aligned}$ | 131,001 | ${ }^{1,000,264}$ | ${ }_{1}^{1,989,211}$ | ${ }^{1,1,657.797}$ | ${ }_{\substack{888,143 \\ 50,23}}^{\substack{3}}$ |  |  |  | ${ }^{81,1450}$ | ${ }^{886,3000} 5$ |  | ${ }_{\substack{19,975 \\ 67.724}}^{5}$ |  |  | s |
|  | 131,00 | 1,050,264 | ${ }^{\frac{5}{5}}$ |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{878,088}^{4.488}$ |  |  | \% ${ }^{5}$ | ${ }_{4}^{4,9888} 5$ |  |  |
| ${ }_{38}$ Trafic caming | ${ }^{2,3,54,455}$ |  | 10,76, ,277 |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {cose }}^{\substack{450,00}}$ |  |  |  | 377,71 |  |  |  |
|  | 2,354,455 | s $7,0,8,872$ | \% $10,76,277$ | ${ }_{5} 15,4,4,251$ ¢ | ${ }_{8}^{8,22,6,60}$ | 4,729,988 | 2662,31]s | s ${ }^{1,183,889}$ | 65,795 | 56,9,93] | 480,999 ${ }^{\text {den }}$ | ${ }^{5}$ s-37,711] | ${ }^{281,687 \text { ] }}$ |  | s |
| 39 Bicycle Circulation and Safety |  |  |  |  | 2,730,660 | 3,60,001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | s |
|  | ${ }^{1,224}$ | S66,17 | ${ }_{5,12,72127}^{19,}$ |  |  | 3, 317.99 .929 |  | S ${ }^{\frac{1}{5}}$ | ${ }^{29,1,09}$ 29, |  |  | ${ }^{16,534}{ }^{\text {di,53 }}$ | (0, |  |  |
| Pedestrian Circulation and Safety |  | ${ }^{2,682,251}$ | ${ }_{\substack{3,58,775 \\ 27.09}}$ |  | ${ }^{3,66,983}$ |  | ${ }^{818,094}{ }^{\text {P2, }}$ S | ${ }^{83,3,54}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | s |
|  | 106,288 | $2.622,251$ | 3,60,866 | 2,96,8,86 | 3,45,297 | 1,01,0,03 ${ }^{\text {l }}$ | 1,06, ${ }^{\text {a } 54}$ | 1,096,7 | 218,901 | ${ }_{\text {18,709 }} 8$ | ${ }_{13,833} 18$ s |  |  |  |  |
| 41 Curb Rams | 228,965 |  | 2,32,0,38 | ${ }^{1,862,533}$ | 2,024,956 | 2.006.0951 | 1,920.033 ${ }^{\text {2, }}$ | 1,1250,23 |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{1,472.51515}{ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | s |
|  | 28,965 | 12,80 | 2,382, ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1,882,5 | $2.024,95$ | 2,40,555 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | ${ }_{5}{ }_{5}$ | ${ }^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | ${ }^{1,9,97,37}$ | ${ }_{1,245,477}$ | [,33,900 s |  | [,587,769 ${ }^{\text {P }}$ |  | 3 |
|  | 2,195,044 | ${ }^{1,683,888}$ | 2,655,200 | ${ }^{1.545,980} 1200$ | ${ }_{1}^{1,52,3,306}$ | ${ }^{1,94,4,500}$ s |  | 5 ${ }_{5}$ | ${ }^{1.602,9313}$ | $5_{5}^{1,670.5837}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | ${ }^{1,551,800}$, 6 | ${ }^{5} 1.954,864$ ] | 2.018, 1515 |  | s |
|  | $\frac{5}{5} 2,950,04$ |  | 2,65,200 | ${ }_{1,561,90}$ |  |  | ${ }_{s}^{5}$ |  |  |  | ${ }^{1,91,3,077}$ ¢ ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  | (e) |  | s |


|  | ${ }^{\text {¢20920 }}$ | mp2021 | m202122 | ${ }_{\text {mpor23 }}$ | m202244 | mpouns | ${ }^{\text {m203256 }}$ | m202627 | ma0278 | $\mathrm{m}_{20239}$ | пго9по | ${ }^{\text {m2003 }}$ | ${ }^{2012132}$ | m20233 | ${ }^{2} 203384$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Saftr |  | 2,5,574 | S0,6, | 4, 9 |  | -3.0.0.0.59 | 2, | ${ }^{19,55,683}$ | ${ }^{\frac{1}{17,0,7,965}}$ | ${ }^{\frac{17,7,7,095}{2}}$ | $\frac{12,26}{2,285}$ |  | $\frac{1,35}{2,689}$ |  |  |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | ${ }_{5}^{5} 5$ | ${ }^{5} 5$ |  | ${ }_{\text {che }}^{3,5654,366}$ |  | $\frac{3,23,23}{2,80,26}$ | ${ }^{3,0,06,7828}$ | ${ }^{2,5,56,687}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\frac{22,288}{}$ |  |  |  |  | 54,5,37 | 570,82 | 10,024 101024 101 | ${ }_{8}^{8,0,075}$ | $\substack{6,0,62 \\ 60820}$ | 32.55 |  |  |
|  | [5 1,69,989 | 66,924 | 2,87, 815 | 2,059,3,5 | -1,87,000 |  | 682,971 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1,669,99 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 66,9,24 |  | ${ }_{\text {2, } 11,9,759}$ | ${ }^{23,2,7,04}$ |  | ${ }^{2159,98} 8$ | ${ }_{\text {che }}^{19,7773}$ | , 16.5 ,59,59 |  | ${ }_{\text {cosem }}^{10,085}$ | ${ }^{70.268}{ }^{0.268}$ | ${ }_{1,782}{ }^{\text {s }}$ |  |  |
| - | 5 [ $1.83,168$ [ | 1.091,991 | 6.08,9,911 | 3,273,421 | 5 2.715 .000 | $1.204,809$ | 1,04,997 | ${ }^{43}, 000$ | ${ }^{425,60} 10$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\frac{5}{5} \quad 1,883,168$ | 1,091,991s | ${ }_{\text {6, } 149,987}^{6,87}$ | ${ }^{1 / 2454,280}$ | 355.44, | ${ }^{1350,046}$ | \% | ${ }^{306,10} 10$ | ${ }^{2} 73,3,371$ | ${ }_{\text {20, }}^{29,29}$ | 19,8,83 | ${ }^{13,1,130}{ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |  |  |
| Total stmantecc pan | 5 59,46,566 | 6, $6,835,194$ / | $5242,169,18$ | $5213,137,85$ | ${ }^{174,4,70,34}$ | $5_{1}^{144,2,27,83}$ | ${ }_{5}^{46,311,69}$ | 35,46,641 | ${ }_{3}^{32,625,573}$ | 33,31, 2 22 | 20,820,072 | $22.815,594 / 5$ | 2,546,849 ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |  |  |
|  | $\frac{5}{5} 8$ | ${ }^{5,0,74,4,45}$ ! | 5 $28.8,3,5,597$ | 5 226,06, 68 | \% 19,0,0,571 | ${ }^{133,84,4,700}$ | ${ }_{5} 6$ | 54,76, 894 | S $50,054,889$ | 4, $4,59,929$ | S $2,16,7,80$ | 39,921,067 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $\frac{3,50,3,472}{3}$ | ${ }^{2,204,14}$ |  |
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## Memorandum

## AGENDA ITEM 6

DATE: October 20, 2021
TO: Transportation Authority Board
FROM: Anna LaForte - Deputy Director for Policy and Programming
SUBJECT: 11/09/2021 Board Meeting: Allocate \$4,935,710 in Prop K Funds and \$4,794,258 in Prop AA Funds, with Conditions, and Appropriate \$275,000 in Prop K funds for Five Requests

## RECOMMENDATION $\square$ Information $\boxtimes$ Action <br> Allocate $\$ 1,100,000$ in Prop K funds to the Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) for:

1. Accessibility Improvement Program: Public Address System and Hearing Loop

Allocate $\$ 2,741,883$ in Prop K funds to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) for:
2. Bus Transit Signal Priority $(\$ 1,350,883)$
3. Mission / Geneva Safety $(\$ 1,391,000)$

Allocate $\$ 1,093,827$ in Prop K funds and $\$ 4,794,258$ in Prop AA funds to San Francisco Public Works (SFPW) for:
4. Mission and Geneva Pavement Reconstruction

Appropriate $\$ 275,000$ in Prop K funds for:
5. Ocean Avenue Action Plan [NTIP Planning]

## SUMMARY

Attachment 1 lists the requests, including phase(s) of work and supervisorial district(s). Attachment 2 provides brief descriptions of the projects. Attachment 3 contains the staff recommendations. Project sponsors will attend the meeting to answer any questions the Board may have.

## DISCUSSION

Attachment 1 summarizes the subject allocation requests, including information on proposed leveraging (e.g. stretching Prop K sales tax dollars further by matching them with other fund sources) compared with the leveraging assumptions in the Prop K Expenditure Plan. Attachment 2 includes brief project descriptions. Attachment 3 summarizes the staff recommendations for each request, highlighting special conditions and other items of
interest. An Allocation Request Form for each project is enclosed, with more detailed information on scope, schedule, budget, funding, deliverables and special conditions.

## FINANCIAL IMPACT

The recommended action would allocate and appropriate $\$ 10,004,968$ in Prop K and Prop AA funds. The allocations and appropriation would be subject to the Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules contained in the enclosed Allocation Request Forms.

Attachment 4 shows the Prop K and Prop AA Fiscal Year 2021/22 allocations and appropriations approved to date, with associated annual cash flow commitments as well as the recommended allocation and cash flow amounts that are the subject of this memorandum.

Sufficient funds are included in the Fiscal Year 2021/22 annual budget. Furthermore, sufficient funds will be included in future budgets to cover the recommended cash flow distributions for those respective fiscal years.

## CAC POSITION

The CAC will consider this item at its October 27, 2021 meeting.

## SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

- Attachment 1 - Summary of Requests
- Attachment 2 - Project Descriptions
- Attachment 3 - Staff Recommendations
- Attachment 4 - Prop K and Prop AA Allocation Summaries - FY 2021/22
- Enclosure - Allocation Request Forms (5)


Footnotes
${ }^{1}$ "EP Line No./Category" is either the Prop K Expenditure Plan line number referenced in the 2019 Prop K Strategic Plan or the Prop AA Expenditure Plan category referenced in the 2017 Prop AA Strategic Plan, including: Street Repair and Reconstruction (Street), Pedestrian Safety (Ped), and Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements (Transit) or the Traffic Congestion Mitigation Tax (TNC Tax) category referenced in the Program Guidelines.
2 Acronyms: BAKI' (Bay Area Kapıd Iransit District); SFCI'A (Iransportation Authority); SFMT'A (San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency); SFPW (San Francisco Public ${ }_{3}$ Works)
"Expected Leveraging By EP Line" is calculated by dividing the total non-Prop K funds expected to be available for a given Prop K Expenditure Plan line item (e.g. Pedestrian Circulation and Safety) by the total expected funding for that Prop K Expenditure Plan line item over the 30 -year Expenditure Plan period. For example, expected leveraging of $90 \%$ indicates that on average non-Prop K funds should cover $90 \%$ of the total costs for all projects in that category, and Prop K should cover only $10 \%$.
${ }^{4}$ "Actual Leveraging by Project Phase" is calculated by dividing the total non-Prop K or non-Prop AA funds in the funding plan by the total cost for the requested phase or phases. If the percentage in the "Actual Leveraging" column is lower than in the "Expected Leveraging" column, the request (indicated by yellow highlighting) is leveraging fewer non-Prop K dollars than assumed in the Expenditure Plan. A project that is well leveraged overall may have lower-than-expected leveraging for an individual or partial phase.

| EP Line No./ Category | Project <br> Sponsor | Project Name | Prop K Funds Requested | Prop AA Funds Requested | Project Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 | BART | Accessibility Improvement Program: Public Address System and Hearing Loop | \$ 1,100,000 | \$ | This project is part of BART's Accessibility Improvement Program, which has prioritized accessibility improvements based on community input. Rquested funds will be used to upgrade the current public address system at the BART/Muni Powell Street Station and install hearing loops at all of San Francisco's stations to transmit audio signals from agent booths to hearing aids. These elements will improve customer experience, safety, and accessibility, particularly for people with hearing loss. BART expects the project will be open for use by Fall 2023. |
| 32 | SFMTA | Bus Transit Signal Priority | \$ 1,350,883 | \$ | Requested funds will be used to repair and replace the existing transit signal priority (TSP) equipment on buses and at signalized intersections along Muni routes at locations where the equipment (e.g. radios, signal controllers and networking equipment) is nearing the end of its useful life. Funds will also be used to procure extended warranties where necessary to ensure that existing equipment continues functioning. The scope includes installing new TSP equipment at intersections that were "skipped" when a corridor was equipped with TSP. It also includes network optimization at intersections already equipped with TSP equipment to maximize the benefit from each installation. SFMTA estimates the requested funds will be sufficient to activate 5 to 20 new intersections, depending on the condition of the existing signal infrastructure. All improvements funded by the subject request will be in service by December 2024. <br> TSP installations started citywide in 2012 with a goal of fully equipping every transit vehicle and every signalized intersection on a Muni bus route with TSP, approximately 600 intersections in all. To date SFMTA has equipped about 450 intersections with TSP, including all the Muni Rapid route corridors. TSP equipment has also been installed on all Muni buses and light rail vehicles currently approved for service. TSP is used to extend green lights or to bring up green lights earlier to prioritize transit vehicles as they approach intersections, thus improving transit travel times. TSP installations update traffic signal timing to the latest standards and enable remote monitoring of the effectiveness of the TSP network to facilitate adjustments and repairs. |

Attachment 2: Brief Project Descriptions ${ }^{1}$


[^1]| EP Line No./ <br> Category | Project Sponsor | Project Name | Prop K Funds <br> Recommended |  | Prop | AA Funds mmended | Recommendations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 | BART | Accessibility Improvement Program: Public Address System and Hearing Loop | \$ | 1,100,000 | \$ | - | Special Condition: The recommended allocation is contingent upon approval of the 2021 Prop K Strategic Plan Update and corresponding 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPP) amendments, which is the subject of a prior item on this meeting agenda. |
| 32 | SFMTA | Bus Transit Signal Priority |  | 1,350,883 | \$ | - | Deliverable: SFMTA shall provide a before/after study evaluating the effectivess of the improvements funded by this project. |
| 34, Street | SFPW | Mission and Geneva Pavement Reconstruction |  | 1,093,827 |  | 4,794,258 | Special Condition: The recommended allocation of Prop K funds is contingent upon approval of the 2021 Prop K Strategic Plan Update and corresponding 5YPP amendments, which is the subject of a prior item on this meeting agenda. |
| 40 | SFMTA | Mission / Geneva Safety Project |  | 1,391,000 | \$ | - |  |
| 44 | SFCTA | Ocean Avenue Action Plan [NTIP Planning] | \$ | 275,000 | \$ | - | Special Condition: This appropriation requires a waiver of Prop K policy to allow retroactive expenditures starting $7 / 1 / 2021$. At Commissioner Melgar's request, we already convened a community-based task force to help inform the scope of work for the Action Plan and this request. |
|  |  | TOTAL | \$ | 5,210,710 |  | 4,794,258 |  |

${ }^{1}$ See Attachment 1 for footnotes.

| PROP K SALES TAX |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FY2021/22 |  | Total |  | Y 2021/22 |  | Y 2022/23 |  | 2023/24 | FY 2024/25 |  | FY 2025/26 |  |
| Prior Allocations | \$ | 28,426,465 | \$ | 16,776,381 | \$ | 9,951,732 | \$ | 1,598,352 | \$ | 100,000 | \$ | - |
| Current Request(s) | \$ | 5,210,710 | \$ | 150,000 | \$ | 975,295 | \$ | 1,150,294 | \$ | 2,051,909 | \$ | 883,212 |
| New Total Allocations | \$ | 33,637,175 | \$ | 16,926,381 | \$ | 10,927,027 | \$ | 2,748,646 | \$ | 2,151,909 | \$ | 883,212 |

The above table shows maximum annual cash flow for all FY 2021/22 allocations and appropriations approved to date, along with the current recommended allocation(s) and appropriation.


Prop K Investments To Date


| PROP AA VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEE <br> FY2021/22 <br> Total |  |  | FY 2021/22 |  | FY 2022/23 |  | FY 2023/24 |  | FY 2024/25 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | FY 2025/26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prior Allocations | \$ | 1,556,928 |  |  | \$ | 1,427,428 | \$ | 129,500 | \$ | - |  |  | \$ | - |
| Current Request(s) | \$ | 4,794,258 | \$ | - | \$ | 883,214 | \$ | 2,060,829 | \$ | 1,850,215 | \$ | - |
| New Total Allocations | \$ | 6,351,186 | \$ | 1,427,428 | \$ | 1,012,714 | \$ | 2,060,829 |  | 1,850,215 | \$ | - |

The above table shows total cash flow for all FY 2021/22 allocations approved to date, along with the current recommended allocation(s).

Investment Commitments, per Prop AA
Expenditure Plan


Prop AA Investments To Date
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## Memorandum

## AGENDA ITEM 7

DATE: October 22, 2021

## TO: Transportation Authority Board

FROM: Anna LaForte - Deputy Director for Policy and Programming
SUBJECT: 11/09/21 Board Meeting: Amendment of the Geary Bus Rapid Transit Phase 2 Conceptual Engineering Report Project to Revise the Scope and De-obligate $\$ 1,892,152$ of $\$ 6,319,470$ in Prop K Funds

| RECOMMENDATION $\square$ Information $\triangle$ Action | $\square$ Fund Allocation |
| :---: | :---: |
| San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's | $\square$ Fund Programming |
| (SFMTA's) Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Phase 2 Conceptual | $\square$ Policy/Legislation |
| Engineering Report (CER) project to revise the scope and deobligate $\$ 1,892$, 152 of $\$ 6,319,470$ in Prop K funds | $\square$ Plan/Study |
| SUMMARY | $\square$ Capital Project Oversight/Delivery |
| In July 2015 the Transportation Authority allocated \$6,319,470 | $\square$ Budget/Finance |
| in Prop K funds to the SFMTA to produce the Geary BRT Phase 2 CER. The Geary BRT Project is being designed and delivered | $\square$ Contract/Agreement |
| in two phases. Geary BRT Phase 2 covers Geary Boulevard between Stanyan Street and 34th Avenue and was originally designed with a center-running transitway between Arguello | 区 Other: Grant Amendment |
| Boulevard and 28th Avenue. SFMTA now recommends siderunning transit lanes throughout the Geary BRT project limits. |  |
| Due to this change, SFMTA is requesting to amend the scope of work for the Prop K grant to reflect a lower level of effort scope of work needed to complete the CER for the side- |  |
| same main activities, but with reduced effort due to a less complex design. The scope also includes two additional |  |
| rounds of public outreach to get feedback on the revised |  |
| complete updated environmental project approvals. SFMTA |  |
| has already spent $\$ 2,659,371$ of the original grant, proposes to retain $\$ 1,767,946$ to complete the scope and deobligate |  |
| $\$ 1,892,153$ which is no longer needed. Attachment 1 describes the proposed amended project and the staff |  |

## BACKGROUND

The Geary BRT Project is a major transit and safety project. Its two main goals are to improve transit speed and reliability for the more than 56,000 daily riders (pre-COVID) of the 38 Geary lines and to improve pedestrian safety along Geary Boulevard, part of San Francisco's Vision Zero High Injury Network. The project is being designed and delivered in two phases.

Phase 1 of Geary BRT, located on Geary and O'Farrell between Stanyan and Market streets, includes side-running bus lanes and is called the Geary Rapid Project. SFMTA completed the first set of transit and safety treatments for the Geary Rapid Project in 2018. Major upgrades and coordinated utility work began in early 2019 and continued through 2021. Construction on the Geary Rapid Project is now substantially complete, was completed on time and on budget and has had minimal construction impacts to adjacent residences and businesses.

Phase 2 of Geary BRT, located on Geary Boulevard between Stanyan Street and 34th Avenue, is called the Geary Boulevard Improvement Project. The Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) selected during the Geary BRT environmental process included a center-running transitway on Geary Boulevard between Arguello Boulevard and 28th Avenue and side-running bus lanes elsewhere on the corridor. SFMTA now recommends pursuing side-running transit lanes throughout the entirety of the Geary BRT project limits, including in the Phase 2 section originally planned for the center-running transitway. The new proposal is similar in scope and project definition to the Alternative 2 (Side-lane bus rapid transit) project alternative documented in the Geary BRT Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

While Phase 2 of Geary BRT has not yet been implemented, SFMTA installed Temporary Emergency Transit Lanes (TETLs) along segments of Geary Boulevard in winter 2020-21. The lanes are located in the eastbound direction from 33rd to 28th avenues, 27th to 24th avenues and 16 th Avenue to Stanyan Street and in the westbound direction from Stanyan Street to 15th Avenue, 24th to 25th avenues and 27th to 32 nd avenues. These temporary transit lanes proved effective and popular and were made permanent by the SFMTA Board of Directors on July 20, 2021.

SFMTA's evaluation of side-running transit lanes along Geary Boulevard (Geary BRT Phase 1 and Geary TETLs) has indicated positive and cost-effective transit travel time and reliability improvements, with minimal impacts to vehicle traffic. In addition, SFMTA has identified other potential benefits of implementing side-running bus lanes throughout the Phase 2 segment of the corridor.

- Accelerate transit and safety benefits - A side-running project can provide tangible improvements in stages, allowing more benefits to transit and safety to begin sooner. Preliminary transit lanes, bus stop changes, and safety improvements could be implemented over the course of a few weeks in 2022, while capital transit and safety improvements like bus bulbs and pedestrian bulbs would follow a couple years later.
- Limit construction disruption - A side-running project limits and focuses curb and median construction at spot locations where items like bus or pedestrian bulbs would be installed.
- Preserve the most transit operational flexibility and preserves local stops - With a siderunning alternative, both Rapid and local service can remain.
- Improve cost effectiveness of transit travel time and reliability benefits - A siderunning alternative is expected to cost about $\$ 50$ million, whereas the center-running alternative is anticipated to cost at least $\$ 235$ million. According to environmental stage analysis, center-running and side-running alternatives would deliver similar transit travel time savings and reliability improvements, provided a level of parking removal (up to 90 spaces) and configuration as described in the EIR/S.
- Avoids center median tree removal - Little to no tree removal is anticipated for a siderunning project.


## DISCUSSION

Based on this change in direction, the SFMTA is requesting that the scope of work for the Geary BRT Phase 2 CER Project as approved by the Transportation Authority through Resolution 16-06, be updated to reflect the lower level of effort needed to complete the CER phase of the side-running project. The Transportation Authority served as the environmental lead for the original environmental clearance for the Geary BRT project. Going forward, SFMTA will serve in this capacity and direct the needed environmental work for required California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) environmental updates associated with the current change in direction. Reflecting the lower level of effort, SFMTA proposes to deobligate $\$ 1,892,152$ of the original $\$ 6,319,470$ allocated.

The proposed amended scope includes three primary activities: CER Design Package, Outreach, and Approvals.

- CER Design Package - This is the main deliverable of this phase of work and will include cost estimate, schedule, and planned delivery approach. The scope of the design package includes concrete work, traffic signal updates and improvements, continuous side-running transit lanes, a curb plan, bus stop optimizations and improvements, and pedestrian safety upgrades.
- Outreach - SFMTA will conduct three rounds of outreach including the current outreach (funded by non-Prop K sources) on the recommended change to siderunning bus lanes that began in September 2021. This round of outreach activities included flyers posted along the corridor, pop-up in person outreach, an online story map open house, participation in the Richmond Autumn Moon Festival, and a virtual community meeting. SFMTA also distributed multi-lingual mailers via mail to
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properties within 1-2 blocks of the project area and via meal deliveries for low-income seniors at several senior centers. SFMTA will conduct two more rounds of outreach in early 2022 and Summer 2022 and anticipates similar outreach techniques as used in the first round.

- Approvals - SFMTA will lead the preparation of updated CEQA and NEPA environmental documentation. SFMTA will seek required policy actions by the Transportation Authority and SFMTA boards following updated CEQA documentation. SFMTA will also pursue an amended Federal Transit Administration Record of Decision and SFMTA parking and traffic legislation.

SFMTA is not currently seeking policy actions by the SFMTA or Transportation Authority Boards to approve the side running alternative for Geary BRT Phase 2. SFMTA will seek those actions in 2022 after developing a detailed project definition and completing updated CEQA documentation.

The SFMTA's proposed amended scope, schedule and budget is described in detail in Attachment 1.

## FINANCIAL IMPACT

The recommended action would not allocate any additional funds beyond those funds previously allocated in July 2015. Sufficient funds are included in the Fiscal Year 2021/22 budget to accommodate the revised cash flow for the project shown in Attachment 1.

## CAC POSITION

The CAC will consider this item at its October 27, 2021 meeting.

## SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

- Attachment 1 - Allocation Request Form for Amendment


# San Francisco County Transportation Authority Allocation Request Form 

| FY of Allocation Action: | FY2021/22 |
| ---: | :--- |
| Project Name: | Geary BRT Phase 2 CER (Geary Boulevard Improvement Project) [Amendment] |
| Grant Recipient: | San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency |

EXPENDITURE PLAN INFORMATION

| PROP K Expenditure Plans | Rapid Bus Network |
| ---: | :--- |
| Current PROP K Request: | $\$ 4,427,317$ |
| Supervisorial Districts | District 01, District 02 |

## REQUEST

## Brief Project Description

Implement transit and safety improvements to reduce travel time and improve reliability for the 38 Geary lines from Stanyan to 34th Avenue. Improvements would include new side-running transit-only lanes and enhancements to existing transit lanes, transit bulbs and pedestrian safety improvements, updated transit signal priority, and optimized transit stop placements.

## Detailed Scope, Project Benefits and Community Outreach

See attached word document

## Project Location

Geary Boulevard between Stanyan Street and 34th Avenue

## Project Phase(s)

Design Engineering (PS\&E)

5YPP/STRATEGIC PLAN INFORMATION

| Type of Project in the Prop K 5YPP/Prop <br> AA Strategic Plan? | Named Project |
| ---: | :--- |
| Is requested amount greater than the <br> amount programmed in the relevant <br> 5YPP or Strategic Plan? | Less than or Equal to Programmed Amount |
| Prop K 5YPP Amount: | $\$ 4,427,317$ |

## Geary BRT Phase 2 (Geary Boulevard Improvement Project)

Conceptual Engineering Report Phase Scope of Work - Amendment

10/21/2021

## Background

The Geary Bus Rapid Transit Project is a major transit and safety project. It's two main goals are to:

- Improve transit speed and reliability for the $>56,000$ daily riders (pre-COVID) of the 38 Geary lines
- Improve pedestrian safety along Geary Boulevard, part of San Francisco’s Vision Zero Network and a street where people walking are eight times more likely to be seriously injured by a collision with a vehicle

The project is a partnership between the SFCTA and the SFMTA. It completed environmental clearance in 2018 and is being designed and delivered in two phases as shown in Figure 1 below. The second phase is called the Geary Boulevard Improvement Project and is the subject of this funding request. The project boundaries are on Geary Boulevard between Stanyan Street and 34th Avenue.

## Updated Scope for New Side-Running Design

Evaluation results of side-running transit lanes along Geary Boulevard (Geary BRT Phase 1 and Geary Temporary Emergency Transit Lanes) have indicated positive and cost-effective transit travel time and reliability improvements, with minimal impacts to vehicle traffic. In addition, Geary BRT Phase 1 (the Geary Rapid Project) is poised to be complete on time on budget in September 2021 and has had minimal construction impacts to adjacent residences and businesses. As a result, the SFMTA is now recommending pursuing side-running transit lanes throughout the entirety of the Geary Bus Rapid Transit Project limits, including in the Phase 2 limits (Stanyan to $34^{\text {th }}$ Avenue). This would include side-running transit lanes along Geary Boulevard between Arguello and $28^{\text {th }}$ Avenue that was envisioned as a center-running transitway in the Locally Preferred Alternative selected at the conclusion of the environmental process.

Based on this change in direction, the SFMTA is requesting that the Scope of Work for the CER Phase of Geary BRT Phase 2 (SFCTA Resolution 16-06, Project Number 101-907053) be updated to reflect a scope of work that is a lower level of effort needed to complete the CER Phase of the side-running project. The amended scope includes the same main activities, but at a reduced level of effort due to a less complex design. In addition, the scope includes additional work needed to complete updated environmental project approvals to reflect the new updated side-running design. Reflecting the lower level of effort, SFMTA proposes to deobligate $\$ 1,892,153$ of the original $\$ 6,319,470$ allocated.

## 1. CER Design Package

The CER Design Package will be the main deliverable of this phase of work, which confirms the scope of work to be pursued in the detailed design phase, as well as provides a draft cost estimate, schedule, and planned delivery approach. While the scope of work will build on the scope of work defined as Alternative 2 in the Geary BRT environmental documents, it will be refined in parallel with Task 2 Outreach activities defined below. In particular, the environmental document did not produce a detailed curb plan that is a key component that the CER Phase outreach is designed to develop in partnership with key stakeholders.

The scope of work is expected to include:
a. Concrete Workfor bus bulbs (approx. 7), pedestrian bulbs (approx. 32), enhanced center median refuges (approx. 30), and upgrading curb ramps to ADA standards (approx. 14).
b. Traffic Signal Upgrades and Improvements including replacing old traffic signals at the end of their useful life (approx. 13 signals), signal upgrades such as adding mast arms, as well as upgrading the existing wireless Transit Signal Priority technology to more reliable fiber-optic technology from Stanyan Street to 25th Ave.
c. Transit Lanes to provide continuous dedicated transit lanes adjacent to the parking lane wherever feasible. This includes conversion of angled parking to parallel parking along Geary Boulevard through the Central Richmond, in order to maintain two general purpose travel lanes per direction plus provide a transit lane. In general, converting from angled parking to parallel parking reduces parking by $1-2$ spaces per block face (and additional proposed improvements such as bus and pedestrian bulbs may also decrease available parking on blocks where they are recommended).
d. Curb Plan to update curb designations to reflect existing needs and new curb management tools. SFMTA staff conducted a loading survey in Summer 2021 to understand adjacent merchants curb needs. Using this input as well as professional expertise, SFMTA staff will recommend designations for the affected curb within the project limits including commercial yellow loading zones, passenger loading zones, green short-term parking zones, and blue ADA parking zones. This curb plan will consider how any new Shared Space parklets affect curb space needs on affected blocks. In addition, new 5 minute general purpose loading zones that were piloted as a part of the Shared Spaces program will allow more flexibility for short-term pick-up and drop-off activities that could help address curb needs generated by food delivery services, Transportation Network Companies, and other short-term pick-up and drop-off needs.

A Draft Curb Plan will be developed and shared for input during Outreach Round 2 (Task 2) and then refined as a Final Curb Plan that will be used to write the parking and traffic legislation (Task 3).
e. Bus Stop Optimization and Improvements (zone lengthening, stop removal and re-location) at approximately 13 bus stops. SFMTA staff will recommend locations where transit performance may benefit by re-locating bus stops from near-side to far-side, eliminating closely spaced stops, and lengthening substandard bus stop zones. These recommendations will be refined with input from community stakeholders including a survey targeted to transit riders implemented as a part of Outreach Round 1 as well as with direct outreach to stakeholders immediately adjacent to affected bus stops (Task 2). In addition, bus stop amenity upgrades could include new shelters, bike racks, and decorative treatments.
f. Pedestrian Safety Upgrades including daylighting, installation of Leading Pedestrian Intervals, and signal re-timing for slower walk speeds

Deliverables: Conceptual Engineering Report, conceptual engineering drawings, internal and inter-agency design review TASC materials and process

## 2. Outreach

In order to support the design work under Task 1 CER Design Package, outreach will be conducted to inform key design questions as well as continue ongoing community dialogue as follows.
a. Round 1: occurred in September 2021 (funded by other agency funding sources prior to completing this scope of work update). This round of outreach included a multi-lingual mailer to properties within 1-2 blocks of the project area, flyers posted at key locations along the corridor, pop-up in person outreach, an online open house using a StoryMaps website, participation in the Richmond Autumn Moon Festival, a virtual community meeting, and multi-lingual surveys distributed via meal deliveries for low-income seniors at several senior centers. Key areas of input sought included: stakeholder level of support for new side-running configuration recommendation, proposed bus stop consolidations and removals, and block-specific feedback on existing transit/parking/loading/safety challenges to inform draft project design
b. Round 2. anticipated in early 2022. This round of outreach would share a full draft block-by-block design for stakeholder input. The outreach methods will be finalized in late 2021 but are generally expected to include similar techniques to Outreach Round 1.
c. Round 3: anticipated in 2022. This round of outreach would inform stakeholders of how the design being brought to the SFMTA Board for potential action was
informed by stakeholder feedback and share the opportunity to provide public comment to the SFMTA Board. Outreach methods would include a multi-lingual mailer and flyers posted throughout the corridor to advertise the policy-making meetings where feedback can be shared with decision-makers.
d. Direct stakeholder outreach. throughout the entire planning process, direct stakeholder outreach will be conducted as needed to resolve location-specific design questions. This would include outreach to properties immediately adjacent to proposed bus stop re-locations, as well as ongoing direct outreach to key stakeholders.
e. Ongoing Geary CAC meetings. Since 2017, the SFMTA has staffed a Geary Community Advisory Committee as a successor the SFCTA-convened CAC that met during the planning and environmental phases. The Geary CAC has provided advice and input to the SFMTA on both phases of the Geary Bus Rapid Transit Project. The CAC is envisioned to continue meeting through completion of both phases of the project and this item provides for ongoing staffing of the body during the CER phase.

## Deliverables:

- Three rounds of outreach, meeting notes from stakeholder meetings, Geary CAC presentation materials and minutes
- Provide draft designs to SFCTA and District Supervisor with sufficient time for feedback prior to public outreach round 2 , including benefits and impacts,
- Provide revised designs, summary of outreach feedback, and articulation of any changes to SFCTA and District Supervisor with sufficient time for feedback following public outreach round 2 , but before handoff to environmental consultants, including benefits and impacts.


## 3. Approvals

Needed local and federal approvals will be obtained including:
a. Environmental approvals. Policy actions would be needed by both the SFCTA and SFMTA Board to confirm selection of a new locally preferred alternative consistent with the side-running alternative. In addition, coordination with the Federal Transit Administration would be needed to obtain an amended Record of Decision (ROD). SFCTA previously acted as the lead agency for environmental approvals, but SFMTA will now take over this role. SFMTA expects to complete environmental analysis in Spring 2022 and anticipates FTA issuing an Amended ROD in Fall 2023.
b. Parking and traffic legislation. SFMTA staff will prepare needed documentation, noticing, and presentation materials to seek parking and traffic legislation of the project.

Deliverables: SFCTA and SFMTA LPA re-selection resolutions, FTA Amended Record of Decision, SFMTA parking and traffic legislation.

## Deliverables and Tentative Interim Deliverables Schedule

There are several unknowns beyond the SFMTA staff team's control that could affect the schedule, but the below summarizes potential dates for interim deliverables leading to completion of this phase of work.

- Late 2021: Draft block-by-block design
- Early 2022: Outreach Round 2
- Early Spring 2022: Revised block-by-block design based on Outreach Round 2 feedback for initiating environmental review documentation
- Late Spring 2022: Finalized environmental analysis, TASC process
- Summer 2022: Outreach Round 3, SFCTA and SFMTA Board actions, Final CER package
- Fall 2023: FTA Amended ROD


## Type of Environmental Clearance Required

Because of the recommendation to pursue a side-running transit lane design instead of a center-running design, it is anticipated that additional policy actions will be required at the SFCTA and SFMTA Boards to select a new Locally Preferred Alternative and adopt new CEQA Findings; and that the Federal Transit Administration will need to issue an amended ROD. Whereas SFCTA has acted as the environmental lead agency up to this point, SFMTA will now assume the role of lead agency. After the SFMTA finalizes the recommended scope, the SFMTA will work with its consultants to document the scope determine what additional documentation is needed to proceed. Because the EIR/EIS evaluated a side-running alternative (Alternative 2) to the same level of detail as the Locally Preferred Alternative, and the final scope is expected to be substantially similar to the already-evaluated side-running alternative, it is expected that the level of analysis and documentation needed will be minor. While there is some risk that the time it will take to complete needed policy actions may take longer than anticipated, the project schedule can proceed with some design at-risk activities in parallel, following a similar approach to the Geary Rapid Project.

## San Francisco County Transportation Authority Allocation Request Form

| FY of Allocation Action: | FY2021/22 |
| ---: | :--- |
| Project Name: | Geary BRT Phase 2 CER (Geary Boulevard Improvement Project) [Amendment] |
| Grant Recipient: | San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency |

## ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE

| Environmental Type: | EIR/EIS |
| :--- | :--- |

## PROJECT DELIVERY MILESTONES

| Phase | Start |  | End |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Quarter | Calendar Year | Quarter | Calendar Year |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering (PLAN) | Apr-May-Jun | 2007 | Apr-May-Jun | 2008 |
| Environmental Studies (PA\&ED) | Jul-Aug-Sep | 2011 | Oct-Nov-Dec | 2023 |
| Right of Way |  |  |  |  |
| Design Engineering (PS\&E) | Jul-Aug-Sep | 2021 | Jan-Feb-Mar | 2024 |
| Advertise Construction | Jan-Feb-Mar | 2024 |  |  |
| Start Construction (e.g. Award Contract) | Apr-May-Jun | 2022 |  |  |
| Operations (OP) |  |  |  |  |
| Open for Use |  |  | Apr-May-Jun | 2025 |
| Project Completion (means last eligible expenditure) |  |  | Apr-May-Jun | 2026 |

## SCHEDULE DETAILS

## Community Outreach:

MTA currently anticipates 3 rounds of outreach to support this phase of work in Fall 2021, late 2021, and Spring 2022 as further described in the attached Scope of Work Task 2.

Start Construction begins before Advertise Construction because initial Quick Build installation of transit lanes, stop changes, and some safety improvements would be done by SFMTA Shops. (Quick Build design: 5/2022, construction 6/2022-10/2022)

Advertise Construction begins before Design Engineering concludes because work would be delivered via two construction contracts. See "Draft schedule by project sub-phase" in the attached scope for details.

Project Coordination: There is potential for SFPUC water and sewer and SFPW paving to be coordinated with this project, which could affect the draft schedule milestones shown above, depending on their staffing and funding availability. See "Draft schedule by project sub-phase".

Project Delivery: Two separate contracts are planned to be issued, one for underground utilities (including conduits for fiber-optic cables) and a separate one for surface work, in order to control costs and quality. This means detailed design would continue while the first contract is being advertised. SFMTA to lead remaining environmental work, which is reflected here but not on the Funding Plan/ Cash Flow tables.

## San Francisco County Transportation Authority Allocation Request Form

| FY of Allocation Action: | FY2021/22 |
| ---: | :--- |
| Project Name: | Geary BRT Phase 2 CER (Geary Boulevard Improvement Project) [Amendment] |
| Grant Recipient: | San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency |

## FUNDING PLAN - FOR CURRENT REQUEST

| Fund Source | Planned | Programmed | Allocated | Project Total |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| EP-101: Rapid Bus Network | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 4,427,317$ | $\$ 4,427,317$ |
| Phases In Current Request Total: | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 4,427,317$ | $\$ 4,427,317$ |

FUNDING PLAN - ENTIRE PROJECT (ALL PHASES)

| Fund Source | Planned | Programmed | Allocated | Project Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| PROP K | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 10,000,000$ | $\$ 9,177,081$ | $\$ 19,177,081$ |
| Congestion Management Agency Planning <br> Funds | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 237,754$ | $\$ 237,754$ |
| Local Funds (e.g. 2015 Prop A General <br> Obligation Bonds) | $\$ 3,655,000$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 3,655,000$ |
| TBD (e.g. OBAG, TPI [LCTOP], TIRCP, AHSC, <br> Local [Prop B General Funds]) | $\$ 33,335,000$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 33,335,000$ |
| Funding Plan for Entire Project Total: | $\$ 36,990,000$ | $\$ 10,000,000$ | $\$ 9,414,835$ | $\$ 56,404,835$ |

## COST SUMMARY

| Phase | Total Cost | PROP K <br> Current <br> Request | Source of Cost Estimate |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering | $\$ 390,000$ |  | Actual |
| Environmental Studies | $\$ 4,597,518$ |  | Actual |
| Right of Way | $\$ 0$ |  |  |
| Design Engineering | $\$ 9,082,317$ | $\$ 4,427,317$ | Based on previous projects, including Geary BRT Phase 1. Includes <br> previous expenditures and estimate cost to complete |
| Construction | $\$ 42,335,000$ |  | Based on previous projects, including Geary BRT Phase 1 |
| Operations | $\$ 0$ |  |  |
|  | $\$ 56,404,835$ | $\$ 4,427,317$ |  |


| \% Complete of Design: | $5.0 \%$ |
| ---: | :--- |
| As of Date: | $08 / 26 / 2021$ |

Geary Phase 2-CER Budget updated for side-running
8/27/2021


# San Francisco County Transportation Authority Allocation Request Form 

| FY of Allocation Action: | FY2021/22 |
| ---: | :--- |
| Project Name: | Geary BRT Phase 2 CER (Geary Boulevard Improvement Project) [Amendment] |
| Grant Recipient: | San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency |

SFCTA RECOMMENDATION

| Resolution Number: |  | Resolution Date: |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total PROP K Requested: | $\$ 4,427,317$ | Total PROP K Recommended | $\$ 1,767,946$ |


| SGA Projec Number | 101-907053 |  | Name: |  | Geary BRT Phase 2 CER (Geary Boulevard Improvement Project) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sponsor | San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency |  | Expiration Date: |  | 09/30/2024 |  |  |
| Phase | Design Engineering |  | Fundshare: |  | 100.0\% |  |  |
| Cash Flow Distribution Schedule by Fiscal Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fund Source | FY 2021/22 | FY 2022/23 | FY 2023/24 | FY 2024/25 |  | FY 2025/26 | Total |
| PROP K EP-101 | \$1,767,946 | \$0 | \$0 |  | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,767,946 |

## Deliverables

1. Monthly progress reports shall include \% complete of the funded phase, \% complete by task, work performed in the prior month, work anticipated to be performed in the upcoming month, and any issues that may impact schedule, in addition to all other requirements described in the Standard Grant Agreement.
2. Monthly progress reports shall include a summary of outreach performed the prior month (including meetings of the Geary CAC) and feedback received.
3. Monthly progress reports shall include a summary of coordination efforts other City agencies regarding delivery of the project, including on potential sewer and water upgrades, and re-paving, and shall describe the delivery plan once it is finalized.
4. Prior to conducting public outreach round 2 (anticipated January 2022) SFMTA staff shall provide the following to Transportation Authority staff with sufficient time for review and comment: draft project designs on a block-by-block basis; preliminary assessment of benefits and impacts; cost estimate and funding plan; and draft outreach materials for public outreach round 2.
5. Upon completion of public outreach round 2 and prior to conducting supplemental environmental review for the project (anticipated Spring 2022) SFMTA staff shall provide the following to Transportation Authority staff with sufficient time for review and comment: summary of feedback received during outreach round 2 and how the SFMTA is addressing that feedback, as appropriate; revised project designs on a block-by-block basis with a description of changes made in response to public outreach; updated assessment of benefits and impacts; cost estimate and funding plan; and draft outreach materials for public outreach round 3.
6. Upon completion of public outreach round 3 and prior to initiating Transportation Authority Board consideration and legislative approval process (anticipated Summer 2022) SFMTA staff shall provide the following to Transportation Authority staff with sufficient time for review and comment: draft designs with corresponding benefits and impacts; cost estimate and funding plan; and draft final assessment of benefits and impacts and draft environmental findings for revised locally preferred alternative.
7. Upon completion, provide Conceptual Engineering Report, conceptual engineering drawings, internal and interagency design review TASC materials and process
8. Upon completion, Sponsor shall provide an updated scope, schedule, budget, and funding plan for design and construction. This deliverable may be met with an allocation request for design and quick-build construction.

## Notes

1. Funds were allocated through Board approval of Resolution 2016-006 in July 2015.
2. This amendment allows up to $\$ 100,000$ in retroactive expenditures against the existing grant dating back to $9 / 1 / 2021$ for SFPW base maps. Charges between 12/31/2019 (the original fund expiration date) and 9/1/2021 are not eligible for reimbursement from this grant.

| Metric | PROP K | TNC TAX | PROP AA |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Actual Leveraging - Current Request | $0.0 \%$ | No TNC TAX | No PROP AA |
| Actual Leveraging - This Project | $66.0 \%$ | No TNC TAX | No PROP AA |

## San Francisco County Transportation Authority Allocation Request Form

| FY of Allocation Action: | FY2021/22 |
| ---: | :--- |
| Project Name: | Geary BRT Phase 2 CER (Geary Boulevard Improvement Project) [Amendment] |
| Grant Recipient: | San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency |

## EXPENDITURE PLAN SUMMARY

## Current PROP K Request: $\$ 4,427,317$

1) The requested sales tax and/or vehicle registration fee revenues will be used to supplement and under no circumstance replace existing local revenues used for transportation purposes.

| Initials of sponsor staff member verifying the above statement: |
| :---: |
| $L B$ |

## CONTACT INFORMATION

|  | Project Manager | Grants Manager |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Name: | Daniel Mackowski | Joel C Goldberg |
| Title: | Project Manager | Grants Procurement Manager |
| Phone: | $(415) 646-2572$ | $(415) 646-2520$ |
| Email: | daniel.mackowski@sfmta.com | joel.goldberg@sfmta.com |

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority 

## State Legislation - October 2021

(Updated October 13, 2021)
To view documents associated with the bill, click the bill number link.
Table 1 shows the status of all bills on which the Board has taken a position this session. September 10 was the last day for each house to pass bills., and October 10 was the last day for the Governor to sign or veto bills passed by the Legislature. Bills that have become law are listed as 'Chaptered' in Table 1. The legislature has adjourned for the year and will reconvene on January 3, 2022.

Table 1. Bill Status for Active Positions Taken in the 2021-22 Session
Updates to bills since the last Board meeting are italicized.

| Adopted Positions | Bill \# Author | Bill Title | Update to Bill Status ${ }^{1}$ (as of 10/13/2021) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Support | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{AB} 43 \\ & \text { Friedman } \mathrm{D} \end{aligned}$ | Traffic safety: expanded authority to reduce speed limits. <br> Authorizes local jurisdictions or the state to further reduce speed limits than currently allowable, when justified. | Chaptered |
|  | AB 117 <br> Boerner Horvath D | Air Quality Improvement Program: electric bicycles. <br> Makes electric bicycles eligible to receive funding from the Air Quality Improvement Program. | Dead |
|  | AB 455 <br> Wicks D <br> Coauthors: <br> Chiu D <br> Wiener D | Bay Bridge Fast Forward Program. <br> Authorizes the Bay Area Toll Authority to designate transitonly traffic lanes on the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge. | Two-Year Bill |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AB 550 } \\ & \text { Chiu D } \end{aligned}$ | Vehicles: speed safety system pilot program. <br> Authorizes speed safety camera pilot program, subject to conditions, in San Francisco and four other cities. | Dead |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { AB } 917 \\ \text { Bloom D } \end{array}$ | Vehicles: video imaging of parking violations. <br> Authorizes the use of forward-facing cameras on buses to enforce parking violations in transit-only lanes and in bus stops statewide. | Chaptered |
|  | $\frac{\mathrm{AB} 1238}{\text { Ting D }}$ | Pedestrian access. <br> Removes prohibition on pedestrians entering the roadway outside of a crosswalk, as long as no immediate hazard exists. | Vetoed |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { AB } 1499 \\ & \text { Daly D } \end{aligned}$ | Transportation: design-build: highways. <br> Extends expiration of authority to use design-build method of contract procurement from January 1, 2024 to January 1, 2034. | Chaptered |


|  | $\underline{\text { SB } 339}$ Wiener D | Vehicles: road usage charge pilot program. <br> Extends the California Road Usage Charge Technical Advisory <br> Committee and require the implementation of a pilot program <br> to identify and evaluate issues related to the collection of <br> revenue for a road charge program. | Chaptered |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Oppose <br> Unless <br> Amended | $\frac{\text { AB 859 }}{\text { lrwin D }}$ | Mobility devices: personal information. <br> Restricts a public agency's authority to collect anything but <br> anonymized, aggregated, deidentified data from shared <br> bicycles, scooters, transportation network companies, and <br> autonomous vehicles. | Dead |
| Oppose | AB 5 <br> Fong R | Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund: High Speed Rail Authority: <br> K-12 education: transfer and loan. <br> Suspends appropriation of cap and trade funds to the HSRA <br> for two years and transfers moneys collected for use on K-12 <br> education. | Two-Year Bill |

${ }^{1}$ Under this column, "Chaptered" means the bill is now law, "Dead" means the bill is no longer viable this session, and "Enrolled" means it has passed both Houses of the Legislature. "Two-year" bills have not met the required legislative deadlines and will not be moving forward this year but can be reconsidered in the second year of the session which begins in December 2021. Bill status at a House's "Desk" means it is pending referral to a Committee.

## Memorandum

## AGENDA ITEM 9

DATE: October 20, 2021

## TO: Transportation Authority Board

FROM: Rachel Hiatt - Acting Deputy Director for Planning
Eric Cordoba - Deputy Director for Capital Projects
SUBJECT: 10/26/21 Board Meeting: Progress Update on the Caltrain $22^{\text {nd }}$ Street Station Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Access Improvements Feasibility Study and the San Francisco Planning Department Southeast Rail Station Study

## RECOMMENDATION $\triangle$ Information $\square$ Action

None. This is an information item.

## SUMMARY

The Transportation Authority, Caltrain, and the City are collaborating on a program of planning studies and capital development for the Caltrain corridor within San Francisco. The Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project (PCEP) will fully electrify the railroad between San Francisco and San Jose by 2024. The Transportation Authority is one of six agencies working together to advance the Downtown Rail Extension (DTX) project. The DTX is planned to be in service by the early 2030s and will extend Caltrain and future California High-Speed Rail (HSR) into the Salesforce Transit Center. The Transportation Authority is currently leading pre-environmental planning studies for the Pennsylvania Avenue Extension (PAX), which will continue the DTX's tunneled alignment further south, to eliminate remaining at-grade rail crossings in the city. The PAX project could necessitate the reconstruction or relocation of the $22^{\text {nd }}$ Street Station in the future. The San Francisco Planning Department is currently leading the Southeast Rail Station Study (SERSS), which is investigating options for future station locations in Southeast San Francisco, including a new station in the Bayview, to replace the Paul Avenue station which was closed in 2005. Caltrain is currently developing design concepts for ADA improvements at the existing $22^{\text {nd }}$ Street Station, through the 22 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Street Station ADA Access Improvements Feasibility Study (22 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Street Station ADA Access Study). The Planning Department, Caltrain, and the Transportation Authority are co-hosting a two-round series of virtual public outreach meetings this fall to gather public input on these related efforts.

> The second round of public meetings will be held on November 4 and November 6. At the October 26 Transportation Authority Board meeting, staff from Caltrain and the Planning Department will present on the $22^{\text {nd }}$ Street Station ADA Access Study and SERSS, respectively.

## BACKGROUND

Caltrain is one of the busiest commuter rail systems in the country, and demand is expected to grow in future years. Prior to the pandemic, Caltrain served more than 65,000 weekday passengers. There are several active projects and studies that will change the Caltrain corridor to support future growth, increase train service, and improve access to Caltrain in San Francisco.

An increase in Caltrain service and future high-speed rail service will bring more service to the corridor, improving connections between San Francisco, the South Bay, and Southern California. Adopted in 2019, the Caltrain Business Plan's 2040 Service Vision includes increased service from five trains to eight trains per hour in each direction during peak periods. In the future, HSR will share the Caltrain corridor along the Peninsula, in a "blended" service configuration. With the introduction of HSR, there would be up to 12 trains per hour in each direction.

Caltrain is currently delivering PCEP, which will fully electrify the railroad between San Francisco and San Jose. PCEP is scheduled to be completed in 2024. Caltrain staff provided a status update on PCEP at the July 13, 2021, meeting of the Transportation Authority Board.

The Transportation Authority is one of six agencies working together to prepare the DTX project for procurement and construction. The DTX will construct a new tunnel to extend Caltrain and future HSR from the current Caltrain terminus at $4^{\text {th }}$ and King streets to the Salesforce Transit Center in downtown San Francisco. The DTX will also construct a new underground station at $4^{\text {th }}$ and Townsend streets and fit out the existing underground train station box below the Transit Center. The DTX is led by the Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA) and is planned to be in service in the early 2030s.

In 2018, the San Francisco Planning Department, in partnership with the Transportation Authority and other agencies, concluded the Railyard Alignment and Benefits (RAB) Study. The RAB Study established the City's preferred alignment for the Caltrain/HSR corridor, with this alignment including the PAX tunnel that would extend south from the planned DTX alignment, beneath Seventh Street and Pennsylvania Avenue. PAX will eliminate conflicts between rail and other road users at the existing at-grade rail crossings at $16^{\text {th }}$ Street and Mission Bay Drive. The Transportation Authority is currently leading pre-environmental phase planning and design studies of the PAX project. We provided a progress update at the Board's June 8, 2021, meeting, and we plan to bring the final report of the current PAX study phase to the Board for approval in early 2022.

The PAX project may require the relocation or reconfiguration of the existing $22^{\text {nd }}$ Street Caltrain Station. The San Francisco Planning Department is currently leading SERSS, to examine potential locations for rail stations within San Francisco between $4^{\text {th }}$ and King/Townsend and Bayshore Station.
The $22^{\text {nd }}$ Street Station is served by 84 weekday trains and, prior to the pandemic, had approximately 1,900 daily riders - placing the station among the top ten Caltrain stations by ridership. Currently, the station can only be accessed via stairs from $22^{\text {nd }}$ Street and lowa Street for southbound and northbound service, respectively. There are no ramps, elevators, or escalators to reach the platforms. Caltrain is currently leading the $22^{\text {nd }}$ Street Station ADA Access Study, which has developed conceptual design alternatives for street-to-platform ADA improvements at the existing station. The alternatives identified in the Study could potentially be implemented in the near- to medium-term.

## DISCUSSION

At the October 26 Transportation Authority Board meeting, staff from Caltrain and the Planning Department will present on the $22^{\text {nd }}$ Street Station ADA Access Study and SERSS, respectively.

Caltrain 22 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Street Station ADA Access Study. In November 2019, the Transportation Authority Board allocated $\$ 350,000$ in Prop K sales tax funds to Caltrain for the $22^{\text {nd }}$ Street Station ADA Access Study.

The $22^{\text {nd }}$ Street Station ADA Access Study has developed and evaluated alternative design concepts for providing an accessible street-to-platform connection for station users. Caltrain has conducted stakeholder outreach in the community and identified a draft recommended alternative, which will be presented to the Caltrain Board later this year. Caltrain will prepare a final report for the Study, which will be presented to the Transportation Authority Board for approval in early 2022. Following the conclusion of the Study, next steps in advancing the recommended alternative would include further design work, additional stakeholder outreach, and the development of a funding plan.

The Caltrain staff presentation regarding the $22^{\text {nd }}$ Street Station ADA Access Study is provided as Attachment \#1 to this memorandum.

Southeast Rail Station Study. In October 2018, the Transportation Authority allocated $\$ 160,000$ in Prop K sales tax funds to the San Francisco Planning Department to conduct a study of potential design concepts for reconfiguration or replacement of the existing $22^{\text {nd }}$ Street Station. Prop K funds leveraged a Priority Development Area grant from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). The Study's scope was subsequently expanded beyond the $22^{\text {nd }}$ Street Station zone to include consideration of potential station locations between $4^{\text {th }}$ and King/Townsend and Bayshore Station. As such, the initiative was renamed as SERSS and has examined potential station options both in the $22^{\text {nd }}$ Street area and within the Bayview.

Depending on the eventual design and alignment of PAX alignment, the $22^{\text {nd }}$ Street station could require re-design or replacement. Options for a new station in the vicinity of the current station include re-building a station at $22^{\text {nd }}$ Street, a new underground station near Mariposa Street (within the PAX alignment), or a new above-grade station at Cesar Chavez Street.

SERSS is also prioritizing the restoration of Caltrain service to the Bayview. The Paul Avenue Caltrain Station was closed in 2005. A series of planning studies since that time has identified the priority for a new Caltrain station in the Bayview, with these previous studies generally focusing on a potential site at Oakdale Avenue. The Transportation Authority's Caltrain Oakdale Ridership Study, which was completed in 2014, established the ridership potential for a station at this location. There have been a number of subsequent changes to land uses and other factors, including the development of a new site for the Southeast Community Facility at Evans Avenue. In this context, SERSS is conducting an overall assessment of potential station locations in the Bayview, including Oakdale as well as Williams and Evans avenues. Key evaluation considerations include technical feasibility, ridership potential, land use context, multimodal access, cost, and other factors.

SERSS will be completed in early 2022, and the Study's final report will be presented to the Transportation Authority Board. We expect that SERSS will confirm the need for two Caltrain stations between $4^{\text {th }}$ and Townsend and Bayshore. The Study will also recommend that detailed planning and design for a new station in the Bayview proceed in the immediateterm, independent of longer-term planning for the PAX project. A new at-grade Caltrain station in the Bayview has an estimated capital cost of approximately $\$ 100$ million. A funding plan will be prepared through the next phase of project development work.

The Planning Department staff presentation regarding SERSS is provided as Attachment \#2 to this memorandum.

Fall 2021 Public Outreach. The Planning Department, Caltrain, and the Transportation Authority are collaborating on a series of virtual public outreach meetings to inform and engage the public on these related efforts. The primary focus of these meetings is the SERSS initiative, as information-sharing on the other concurrent efforts including PAX. The first round of public meetings was held earlier in October and focused on project background, purpose, and related studies. In-meeting Spanish and Cantonese translation was provided and utilized at the first round of workshops.

A second round of virtual workshops will be held on November 4 and November 6. The second round of meetings will focus on a review and discussion of the potential rail station locations, in order to hear community feedback and concerns. More information and registration for the upcoming outreach is available at www.sfplanning.org/SERSS.

## CAC POSITION

The CAC will be briefed on this item at its October 27, 2021, meeting.

## FINANCIAL IMPACT

None. This is an information item.

## SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

- Attachment 1: Caltrain Presentation $-22^{\text {nd }}$ Street Station ADA Access Study
- Attachment 2: Planning Department Presentation - Southeast Rail Station Study



## Cal trait

22nd St Station ADA Access Improvement Feasibility Study SFCTA Update

## Context

- When PCJPB purchased the Caltrain right of way, it inherited several stations which were not wheelchair accessible
- Today, the Caltrain system as a whole is accessible to riders with disabilities
- 22nd Street Station is currently only accessible via stairs
- Riders unable to use stairs must instead use $4^{\text {th }} \&$ King or Bayshore
- The current station configuration is highly constrained



## Study Overview

- Project kicked off in February 2020 at the request of Supervisor Walton
- Funding for the Study was provided by Prop K
- Scope is focused on determining the feasibility of street-toplatform ADA access improvements at $22^{\text {nd }}$ St Station
- Recommendations must be contextualized within the findings of Southeastern San Francisco Rail Station Study (SERSS) and PAX
- Study identified feasible ramp and elevator alternatives for each platform, then analyzed constructability, implementation timeline, costs and funding opportunities


## Outreach Participants

- Study Community Stakeholder Group:
- San Francisco Mayor's Office on Disability
- Green Benefit District
- Dogpatch Neighborhood Association
- Potrero Boosters
- Additional Outreach:
- Caltrain Accessibility Advisory Committee
- SFMTA Multimodal Accessibility Advisory Committee
- Senior and Disability Action
- Lighthouse for the Blind


## Stakeholder Feedback

- Ramps yield better overall user experience than elevators (cleaner, more secure, and more reliable)
- Elevators create substantial maintenance issues
- Long ramps are acceptable, but slopes should be decreased where possible
- The Study's alternatives are acceptable interim solutions, but a station rebuild/relocation is preferred in the long term


## Draft Recommended Alternative



## Caltrain

## Next Steps

- Present to JPB Board (November 4)
- Finalize report (anticipated November 2021) and present to SFCTA Board for approval (early 2022)
- In order to advance the recommended alternative:
- Secure funding
- Conduct additional outreach
- Advance designs through 100\% engineering (estimated 2.5 years* from initiation of next design phase through construction and project close out)
*Estimate based on planning-level analysis (<15\% design) and may be subject to change as engineering work progresses


## QUESTIONS?



# Southeast Rail Station Study (gers) Update 

- Study Overview
- Station Options
- Public Outreach


## Study Overview

- The City is planning for the future of rail in the southeastern part of San Francisco.
- We want to restore regional rail access to the Bayview-Hunters Point communities.
- The Pennsylvania Avenue Extension (PAX) tunnel could require the redesign or relocation of $22^{\text {nd }}$ Street Station.
- Starting in 2020, the Planning Department and partner agencies conducted a planning study to determine what station locations could address these needs.
- We recommend that the City plan for two Caltrain stations in this area in the future:
- A station at or near the existing $22^{\text {nd }}$ Street Station
- A new station in the Bayview



## Potential Station Locations

Bayview - Station Options

MAP LEGEND
( Station Options

## Pennsylvania Avenue Tunnel (PAX)



- Multiple alternatives for PAX being studied, with range of implications for $22^{\text {nd }}$ Street Station
- Alternative Shown: Medium-Length Alignment

Oakdale - Context


Draft 08 September 2021 VIA

Planning New Southeast Caltrain Stations


San Francisco, in partnership with Caltrain, The City is conducting a series of is looking at options for building a tunnel community meetings for you to explore under Pennsylvania Avenue, rebuilding the 22nd Street Station, and building a the station options under consideration, provide feedback, voice concerns, and new station in the Bayview. ask questions directly to the project team.

It is highly encouraged that participants attend one event from each round to understand the full project scope. Cantonese and Spanish interpretation will be available. Slides will be available in Chinese and Spanish.

```
Round 1:
Project Basics
Gace
< Thursday October 7 at 6 PM
    Both dates will cover the same info
Learn about the study's goals and
background with a comprehensive look
at the areas under review - including
the 22nd Street Station area and the
Bayview District.
```

Round 2:
Conversations About Locations
Cole
Thursday November 4 at 6 PM
Saturday Nover Saturday November 6 at 12 PM
Both dates will cover the same info

Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of each site and engineering limitations. From connectivity to job access, we want to hear about your priorities for the new stations.

To learn more, visit sfplanning.org/serss or email CPC.SERSS@sfgov.org


Planfining

## Public Outreach

Round 1 Public Workshops:

- Thursday, $10 / 7$ at 6 pm
- Saturday, 10/9 at 12 pm

Outreach consisted of poster, door hangers, CBO engagement, and social media.

Website, email, and phone number launched; introduction video for Study website prepared.

Interpretation in Cantonese and Spanish was offered and utilized during the both virtual workshops.

Three presenters - Planning Department, Caltrain, and SFCTA.

Workshop recordings made and posted, including in translation.


## Key Dates

## October

- 10/7 - ConnectSF at Planning Commission
- 10/20 - Caltrain CAC
- 10/21 - Planning Commission
- 10/26 - SFCTA Board
- 10/27 - SFCTA CAC


## November - Virtual Public Workshops Round 2

- Thursday 11/4-6:00 p.m.
- Saturday 11/6-12:00 noon

More information at www.sfplanning.org/SERSS

# Questions or comments? 

www.sfplanning.org/SERSS<br>CPC.SERSS@sfgov.org
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## Memorandum

## AGENDA ITEM 10

DATE: October 20, 2021
TO: Transportation Authority Board
FROM: Tilly Chang - Executive Director
SUBJECT: 10/26/21 Board Meeting: 101 Mobility Action Plan Update

## RECOMMENDATION $\boxtimes$ Information $\square$ Action

$\square$ Fund Allocation

None. This is an information item.
$\square$ Fund ProgrammingPolicy/Legislation
$\boxtimes$ Plan/StudyCapital Project Oversight/DeliveryBudget/Finance toolkit. The recommended actions will improve travel time reliability, expand the use of high-occupancy options like buses and carpooling, and foster healthy and sustainable communities along the U.S. 101 corridor.

Contract/AgreementOther: $\qquad$
The 101 MAP effort engaged public agencies, major employers, community organizations and the general public to identify complementary strategies to managed lanes and public transit services that are planned or being constructed for the US101 corridor. The 101 MAP recommends a structure for agency collaboration on TDM actions along the corridor. It also builds on planned infrastructure and mobility improvements and identifies near-term policies, programs, and technological solutions that address unreliable access and mobility challenges for travelers today. Implementation of the MAP will require regional coordination across jurisdictional, county, and transit service area lines.

The project began in Winter 2018 and was completed in July 2021.

## BACKGROUND

The U.S. 101 is an essential link in our region, connecting and supporting economic activity between San Francisco, the Peninsula, and Silicon Valley. It is also one of the most congested corridors in the region according to MTC's Vital Signs. New high occupancy vehicle (HOV) or
carpool lanes or express lanes are planned to extend existing lanes in Santa Clara and San Mateo counties to form a continuous facility along the entire corridor for buses and carpools.

San Mateo county agencies are building 22 miles of express lanes from Redwood City to l-380 which will open in late 2022. The City/County Associates of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) is also studying managed lane options for the 4 mile segment from I-380 to the San Francisco County line, an effort which we are coordinating with as we lead our own managed lanes and express bus study on U.S. 101 to I-280N from the San Francisco/San Mateo county line to King Street.

In 2019, Sam Trans brought together representatives from the Transportation Authority, City/County Associates of Governments of San Mateo County, San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans), San Mateo County Transportation Authority, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), Transform, and Caltrans to develop the 101 MAP. The purpose of the 101 MAP is to outline mobility actions and implementation considerations around equity, costs, and policy and technology needs to complement planned managed lanes / express lanes and other planned transit improvements on US-101 and along the corridor.

## DISCUSSION

The mobility actions outlined in the 101 MAP aim to address the following challenges:

1. Making trips on U.S. 101 is currently unpredictable. Travelers driving on northbound on U.S. 101 must add 40-55\% more time to arrive at their destination predictably.
2. U.S. 101 is not moving as many people as it could. At the peak hour, $78 \%$ of vehicles on U.S. 101 are carrying only one person.
3. Worsening congestion reduces access to jobs and other places. Commuters experience nearly twice as much delay on the corridor today as in 1998.
4. U.S. 101 causes disproportionate public health burdens and mobility constraints for nearby communities.
5. Some groups are more vulnerable to these problems, such as shift-based and hourlywage workers, low-income households, and parents and caregivers.
The mobility actions identified in the report are non-infrastructure policies and programs that can be used to strengthen the benefits of planned capital projects along the corridor.
Examples of planned capital projects include new express lanes, interchange modifications, transit improvements (SF Muni 15-Hunters Point Bayview Express, Caltrain electrification and modernization, and SamTrans Express Bus and Real Bus Speed and Reliability studies).

The U.S. 101 MAP project team developed a vision for the ideal U.S. 101 corridor as one that serves the region equitably and identified three project goals: 1) offers reliable travel times; 2) prioritizes high-capacity mobility options such as buses and carpools; and 3 ) fosters healthy
and sustainable communities nearby. The 101 MAP project team engaged with a broad set of stakeholders across several transportation agencies, commute organizations, employers, the public, and advocacy, policy, and multijurisdictional government agencies to identify a set of non-infrastructure, TDM policies or programs in support of these goals.

At the completion of the first phase of work, the 101 MAP project developed a set of nearly 60 mobility actions that could maximize the benefits of planned infrastructure and projects on the U.S. 101 corridor. The 101 MAP scores each action based on its potential to meet the project goals and related performance metrics. With a focus towards implementation, the project also identifies a set of equity actions and determined the overall readiness of each action. Equity actions are identified for each mobility action, providing guidance to implementing entities to ensure actions advance equity along the corridor. The 101 MAP also assesses each action's overall readiness from a policy and technological perspective, onetime and/or ongoing costs, and identification of potential implementing agencies or entities.

The mobility actions outlined in the 101 MAP serve as resources for transit agencies, cities, county agencies, project developers, private employers, and other entities to:

- Integrate 101 MAP actions into complementary planning and capital projects, such as the Transportation Authority's US101/I-280 managed lanes/express bus project;
- Package recommended 101 MAP mobility actions with infrastructure projects to be more competitive for funding opportunities;
- Match mobility actions with project goals and resources available at the start of projects; and
- Implement TDM and mobility actions equitably.

We and our city partners are undertaking or plan to incorporate many of the recommended mobility actions through our current US101/I-280 Managed Lanes and Express Bus environmental planning study and other TDM efforts including: inclusive public engagement, TOD planning/parking management, development trip caps and mandated transit passes, employer commuter programs, first/last mile active transportation connections and improvements, and piloting a mobility wallet to integrate fares/tolls and affordability discounts. Other strategies that are being advanced by San Mateo or Santa Clara agencies or employers include carpool incentive programs, new and expanded Transportation Management Associations (TMAs), traveler perks and incentives for non-drive-alone-trips, expanding paid parking, and increasing shuttle service to regional transit and employment destinations. Several of these strategies present opportunities for joint planning, advocacy and funding / grant seeking efforts.

The 101 Mobility Action Plan is enclosed. A set of interactive appendices are available at www. 101 mobilityactionplan.com/downloads.
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## FINANCIAL IMPACT

None. This is an information item.

## SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

Enclosure: 101 Mobility Action Plan (without appendices)


[^0]:    *Additional Materials

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ See Attachment 1 for footnotes.

