San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

1455 Market Street, 22ND Floor, San Francisco, California 94103 415-522-4800 info@sfcta.org www.sfcta.org

AGENDA

Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee
Meeting Notice

Date: Thursday, December 9, 2021; 6:00 – 8:00 p.m.

Location: Join Zoom Meeting

https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86914160746

Meeting ID: 869 1416 0746

One tap mobile
+16699006833,,86914160746# US (San Jose)
+12532158782,, 86914160746# US (Tacoma)

Dial by your location
+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)
+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)
+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)
+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)
+1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)
+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)
877 853 5247 US Toll-free
888 788 0099 US Toll-free
833 548 0276 US Toll-free
833 548 0282 US Toll-free

Meeting ID: 869 1416 0746

Find your local number: https://us02web.zoom.us/u/kdudNEY4Lx

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.

Comment during the meeting: EPAC members and members of the public participating by Zoom wishing to speak should use the "raise hand" feature or dial *9. When called upon, unmute yourself or dial *6. In order to get the full Zoom experience, please make sure your application is up to date.

San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

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 Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee members before the meeting begins.

Staff will present the proposed revised schedule targeting a potential November 2022 ballot measure in June 2022, and a slightly revised revenue 30-year sales tax revenue forecast reflecting the schedule shift. Staff will also present a contextual overview of the preliminary draft Expenditure Plan including information the EPAC has requested such as total funding need, leveraging assumptions, nexus to the equity assessment, and whether a program funds maintenance, enhancement, or expansion of the existing transportation network. This information is intended to support the tradeoff discussions that the EPAC began at the last meeting and will continue at the December 9 meeting. Staff will share some possible scenarios for Priority 1 (lowest funding level) and Priority 2 (next highest funding level) revenues to address input received thus far from the EPAC, agencies and other outreach feedback.

During this segment of the meeting, members of the public may make comments on items under the purview of the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee that are not otherwise listed on this agenda.

*Additional Materials

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.

If any materials related to an item on this agenda have been distributed to the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee after distribution of the meeting packet, those materials will be 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.

Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC)

Meeting #7

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

December 9, 2021

Using Zoom

EPAC members: Update your name and follow with “EPAC”

e.g. Michelle Beaulieu, EPAC

Having Trouble?

Send chat (Chats only go to project team.)

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Agenda

1. Roll Call
2. EPAC Chair's Remarks
3. Meeting #6 Recap, Minutes, and Follow-Ups
4. Draft Expenditure Plan Discussion
5. Public Comment
6. Adjournment

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Agenda Item1.

Roll Call

San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

December 9, 2021

Roll Call & Introductions

EPAC Members Roll Call: please say "here"

If on a computer, press UNMUTE

If on phone:

*6 to unmute

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Agenda Item 2.

EPAC Chair's Remarks

San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

December 9, 2021

Agenda Item 3.

Meeting #6 Recap, Minutes & Follow-Ups

San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

December 9, 2021

Relative funding levels for different programs

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

What have we heard from EPAC members so far?

There is some interest in increasing funding for:

1. Paratransit
2. Curb Ramps
3. Street Trees
4. Safer Streets including Traffic Signal Maintenance
5. BART
6. Transportation Demand Management
7. Community-Based Planning
8. Ferry

Eligibility of different types of projects

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

What have we heard from EPAC members so far?

There is some interest in making these project types eligible for sales tax funding:

1. Pedestrian lighting as a stand-alone investment (currently only eligible as part of larger corridor projects)
2. Alleyway improvements
3. Transit education (similar to bike/pedestrian education)

Policies (e.g. administration, prioritization)

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

What have we heard from EPAC members so far?

1. Equity is important to the project selection process
   a. Needs to be clearly defined and included in scoring criteria
   b. Equity priority community investments should be balanced with investments across the entire city
2. Outreach is important to the project selection process
3. Consider less emphasis on downtown-focused investments in the first few years

Holistic Look at the Draft Expenditure Plan

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

What have we heard from EPAC members so far?

- Need to look at the Expenditure Plan holistically
- Looking for a framework for decision-making
- Want more information about funding context (including the new Federal IIJA funding)

Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

The bipartisan infrastructure bill (IIJA) signed by President Biden on November 15, includes:

- **$477 billion:** Five-year surface transportation reauthorization (a 56% increase over the prior five years)
- **$157 billion:** One-time stimulus transportation funding, to be distributed to over two dozen grant programs over five years
- **$339 billion:** Additional funding for ports and waterways, airports, resilience, and other infrastructure

Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

The IIJA provides significant funding for transportation through a number of different programs:

- New and expanded **competitive grant programs**
- **Transit formula funding** over the next five years
- Flexible **highway formula funding** over the next five years (transit and bike/pedestrian projects are eligible for most of this)

Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

MTC estimates that the 9-county region will receive approximately **$1.1 billion* in additional transit formula funding** over the next five years.

These funds are primarily for transit maintenance and repair.

Funding Program	5-year funding increase regionally (estimate)	Project types eligible
Transit State of Good Repair formula funds	$700 million	Transit capital asset maintenance, rehabilitation and repair, principally fleet and fixed guideway replacement and rehab. Administered through MTC's regional Transit Capital Priorities Program.
Transit Urbanized Area formula funds	$400 million	Transit capital improvements. Administered through MTC's regional Transit Capital Priorities Program.
Other transit formula funds	$100 million	Varies/TBD

**Sums may not total due to rounding*

Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

MTC estimates that the region will receive approximately **$230 million* in additional flexible highway formula funding** over the next five years.

Funding Program	5-year funding increase regionally (estimate)	Project types eligible
Surface Transportation Program	$130 million	Flexible funds for a wide range of capital projects administered by MTC through various programs, e.g.: bike and pedestrian projects; transit performance; streets and highways safety/performance; transportation demand management; and climate initiatives
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)	$1 million	
Transportation Alternatives Program	$32 million	Bike and pedestrian projects. Administered by MTC through the regional Active Transportation Program.
Carbon Reduction Program (new)	$71 million	New Program. Eligible project types include: public transit, high occupancy vehicle projects, and congestion pricing.

**Sums may not total due to rounding*

Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

While this funding is incredibly helpful, it **does not close existing funding gaps** for any type of project from transit facilities rehabilitation projects to Vision Zero street safety investments to street resurfacing.

Sales tax helps provide **require local match funding**, for example:

- Transit formula funds typically require a 20% non-federal match
- New Starts or Core Capacity grants require 50% non-federal funding

Local planning funding made available early in project development serve as critical **seed funding** to help set SF projects up to be competitive for grant programs.

Questions?

San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

1455 Market Street, 22ND Floor, San Francisco, California 94103 415-522-4800 info@sfcta.org www.sfcta.org

DRAFT MINUTES

Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee

Thursday, November 18, 2021

1. **Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m.

Present at Roll Call: Members: Rosa Chen, Anni Chung, Zack Deutsch-Gross, Jessie Fernandez, Mel Flores, Amandeep Jawa, Jessica Lum, Jodie Medeiros, Susan Murphy, Calvin Quick, Pi Ra, Maurice Rivers, Eric Rozell, Earl Shaddix, Sujata Srivastava, Tracey Sylvester (for Maryo Morgannam), Wesley Tam, Joan Van Rijn, Christopher White (19)

Absent at Roll Call: Jay Bain, Majeid Crawford, Rodney Fong, Sharky Laguana, Aaron P. Leifer (joined after roll call), Maryo Mogannam (alternate Tracely Sylvester present), Maelig Morvan, Yensing Sihapanya, Kim Tavaglione (arrived during Item 4) (9)

2. **EPAC Chair's Remarks**

Chair Jawa noted that President Biden signed the $1.2 trillion federal Infrastructure Investment Act, of $497 billion is for transportation, and of this amount, draft estimates for California include $30 billion for roads and bridge repair throughout the state and $9.5 billion for public transit improvements including for Muni, BART and Caltrain, in addition to many competitive programs for a wide variety of transportation projects.

Chair Jawa also noted that the Transportation Authority was shifting the sales tax expenditure plan reauthorization efforts to focus on the November 2022 election rather than June 2022 due to a statewide initiative for a constitutional amendment that just received state approval to gather signatures. He said the initiative would, among many other things, void the sales tax measure if approved by voters at the June 2022 election since the initiative would require any proposed tax seeking voter approval be consolidated with a regularly scheduled general election for members of the governing body of the local government, with few exceptions. He said the initiative would apply retroactively to any tax adopted after October 1, 2021, meaning the sales tax measure would need to be on a November even-numbered year ballot. He said that staff had been advised that the measure may qualify for and meet the simple majority threshold for passage at the November 2022 ballot and therefore rather than risk voiding a measure approved in June 2022 and needing to go back to the voters a second time, staff would refocus efforts on November 2022. He said that the updated timeline anticipates an EPAC recommendation in February 2022 so staff would be polling EPAC members regarding additional meetings in January and February.

Finally, he introduced the meeting's agenda as the first to discuss the tradeoffs involved in deciding the expenditure plan funding levels.

3. **Meeting #5 Recap, Minutes and Follow-Ups – INFORMATION**

Michelle Beaulieu, SFCTA, presented the item.

There were no questions from the committee.

4. Funding Trade-Offs: Paratransit and Other Programs – INFORMATION*

Michelle Beaulieu, SFCTA, and Annette Williams, Accessible Services Program Manager, SFMTA, presented the item.

A member asked what the average on-time performance of the paratransit program had been prior to the pandemic.

Ms. Williams answered that it had varied from the high 80% range to the low 90% range. She clarified that a trip was considered on-time if departure was no more than 5 minutes early and arrival was no more than 15 minutes late.

The member asked about the program's average passenger trip time.

Ms. Williams answered that the program's goal was for trip times to be less than that of the equivalent fixed route.

The member commented that the proportion of the Asian population using paratransit seemed low compared to the proportion of city residents.

Ms. Williams said SFMTA had not collected race or ethnicity data on paratransit program services except for its new Essential Trip Card program, for which passenger demographics were close to the ratios for the city as a whole.

A member asked about the proportion of registered paratransit users vs. active users.

Ms. Williams answered that the program had approximately 11,000 registered users, of which 5,000-6,000 were active users of paratransit taxis and about 2,500 were active users of the accessible van service.

Michelle Beaulieu said SFMTA had provided more detailed information, which staff would share with EPAC.

A member asked how the cost of paratransit services compared to the cost of services offered by Transportation Network Companies (TNCs) such as Uber and Lyft.

Ms. Williams answered that TNCs didn't have many accessible vehicles and their accessible services tended to be less reliable. She said TNCs were not open with their data and the cost of services could not be readily compared, but she said that SFMTA had not ruled out paratransit contracts with TNCs. She said the paratransit program was able to meet its current needs using taxis and these contracts helped support the taxi industry, which had suffered from the rise of TNCs. Ms. Williams pointed out that the labor environment for TNCs was quite volatile, and time would tell if they remained a viable option for accessible services.

A member asked if the proposed levels of sales tax programming would be sufficient to support the program.

Ms. Williams answered that the proposed sales tax funding could provide about 40% of the cost of the program, whereas she hoped that sales tax could provide about 50% of total funding.

A member asked why the Free Muni program didn't apply to qualified paratransit riders.

Ms. Williams said paratransit was an expensive program and free fares would likely increase demand and make fully funding the program even more difficult. She estimated that the cost of adding another rider is in the range of $50 per trip for a taxi ride. She pointed out that paratransit fares in San Francisco were less than half the

San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

cost allowed under federal law.

A member asked if the program conducted user satisfaction surveys and if so, if they were conducted in multiple languages.

Ms. Williams answered that user satisfaction surveys were conducted annually (with a year off during the COVID pandemic), by phone and in multiple languages. She said phone surveys had greater accuracy and said the results of the most recent survey had been shared with Transportation Authority staff. [The San Francisco Paratransit Brokerage 2019 Customer Satisfaction Survey is posted in the November 18 EPAC meeting materials under Item 4 – Attachment 1 Paratransit Questions and Answers.]

Michelle Beaulieu then presented three options included in the agenda materials for paratransit funding levels in response to a desire for increased funding for the program expressed by EPAC members.

- Option A: Maintain paratransit funding at 8.6% of Priority 1 funding
- Option B: $12 million/year for 20 years from Priority 1 funds with about 3 additional years from Priority 2 funds
- Option C: $12 million/year for 18 years from Priority 1 funds with about 7 additional years from Priority 2 funds

A member asked how the future needs of the program would change, for instance whether the Essential Trip Card (ETC) program would continue after the pandemic and how demand was expected to change.

Ms. Williams responded that demand had been stable for several years but said the population of people 85+ years of age was projected to grow by 30% between 2020 and 2030. She said the ETC program would continue through Fiscal Year 2022. She said ETC was helpful for transitioning to full fixed route service because it provided a ride home even if off-peak service had not yet been restored. She said there were no plans for eliminating programs such as the Shop-a-Round or Van-Go shuttles.

Ms. Beaulieu pointed out that the cost of the paratransit program had grown over time as a faster rate than sales tax funds.

A member commented that program costs had been fairly stable until 2015 and asked why they began to rise at that time.

Ms. Williams answered that driver salaries were the main factor, as they had been increased to keep up with the Bay Area cost of living. She noted that the chart of program costs included in the meeting materials showed approved budgets, whereas actual program costs had come in substantially below budget most years since 2015.

A member commented that local sales tax funding for paratransit had never met the need and as a result the program was losing drivers to Muni, which paid better, and the paratransit program was unable to expand group van service sufficiently to meet needs. They asked what had been the paratransit share of the Prop B sales tax expenditure plan approved in 1989.

Ms. Williams replied that 8% of the Prop B revenues had been programmed for paratransit.

A member asked which fund categories had been reduced to provide the increased paratransit funding levels proposed in Options 2 and 3 and asked why those categories were proposed for reductions.

Ms. Beaulieu answered that the proposed increases drew from other large transit categories. She said the transit maintenance and core capacity programs were scalable and had opportunities to leverage outside funding, but that it was still a tradeoff.

Maria Lombardo added that EPAC could propose reductions to different or additional categories as well and the options were just illustrative to support discussion.

The member asked for clarification about the likelihood that the Priority 1 revenue projections would come to fruition.

Ms. Beaulieu answered that full funding of Priority 1 programs was not guaranteed, noting that Prop K revenues had fallen short of Priority 1 targets and no Priority 2 funds had been allocated. However, she said the revenue forecasts for the new expenditure plan were more conservative.

A member commented that Priority 2 and Priority 3 funding likely was wishful thinking.

A member said they would prioritize preservation of existing transit systems over system expansion.

Another member asked how the proposed reductions had been distributed between the Muni - Vehicles, Facilities and Guideways rehabilitation and replacement categories.

Ms. Beaulieu answered that the exact ratio would have to be worked out with SFMTA if this option were chosen. She asked if EPAC members had suggestions for other categories to reduce to shift funds to paratransit.

The member commented that transit rehabilitation and replacement was costly but necessary.

A member commented that new paratransit funds were not included in the recent federal infrastructure funding bill, whereas said the bill did increase funding for transit capital projects, potentially increasing leverage opportunities for transit rehabilitation. They expressed support for Option B.

Ms. Beaulieu said it was possible that the federal infrastructure bill would make new paratransit operating funds available. She emphasized that the Priority 1 forecast was the most conservative.

Two members expressed agreement that EPAC should take potential federal funding into account in prioritizing local sales tax funds and said the EPAC should get that information before going forward with its recommendations.

Ms. Beaulieu said staff would provide information on other fund sources at EPAC's next meeting.

Chief Deputy Maria Lombardo, SFCTA, pointed out that the federal infrastructure bill had been signed just that week, but said it appeared that the bulk of the transportation funds would be distributed via existing formula fund programs, which are primarily for maintenance and rehabilitation types of projects. She emphasized that those programs required matching funds from local sources such as sales tax.

A member suggested that EPAC consider reductions in sales tax funding for big infrastructure projects such as DTX where sales tax reductions might be sustained without killing the projects.

Staff conducted a Zoom poll of EPAC members, meeting participants, and members of the public in the Zoom meeting to ascertain preferences regarding the options staff had presented for increasing paratransit funding. Options B and C each drew support from approximately 40% of participants in the poll, including committee members and other meeting participants. There were 25 responses to the poll and not all persons present participated in the poll.

A member said they voted for a write-in option for increasing Priority 1 funds for paratransit over the Option B level.

A member said they voted for a write-in option because they needed information on leverage opportunities in other categories before deciding how paratransit funding should be increased.

A member said they voted for a write-in option in support of funding for free fares for Muni.

Ms. Lombardo commented that in staff's view, Priority 2 funds were not really wishful thinking but a plausible outcome because both the Priority 1 and Priority 2 level forecasts were more conservative revenue forecasts than the Prop K expenditure plan had been.

A member asked when Priority 2 funds would be available if revenues came in above Priority 1 levels.

Ms. Lombardo answered that they would not be available in Year 1 and said revenues and programming for the 30-year Expenditure Plan period would be re-evaluated at least every five years. She speculated that it probably wouldn't be sooner than mid-way through the plan and would depend on when revenue forecasts showed revenues exceeding the Priority 1 projections.

A member pointed out that neither Prop B nor Prop K had achieved their Priority 1 forecasts, and that paratransit funding had run out well before end of the expenditure plan period.

Ms. Beaulieu noted that paratransit was not the only program for which funds ran out early.

Ms. Lombardo added that Prop K funding for all of the major capital projects (except DTX) had ended because they were complete. She said a longer expenditure plan period increases bonding capacity and provides the flexibility to advance funds to meet pressing needs.

Staff conducted a second Zoom poll of EPAC members to gauge interest in increasing funding for additional programs: curb ramps, street trees, safer streets including traffic signals maintenance, transportation demand management, community-based planning, BART, Ferry, or other.

A member said the EPAC needed more contextual information to make decisions about reprioritizing funds among the expenditure plan categories.

Another member agreed about the need for context and asked if the EPAC could consider raising the sales tax.

Ms. Beaulieu said the EPAC's role was to advise on a new expenditure plan for the existing half-cent sales tax, and that another effort would have to be undertaken if there was a desire to increase the sales tax, which would need to be approved by the voters along with an expenditure plan for the use of those revenues.

A member said a framework for prioritizing category funding levels should allow comparison among categories on issues such as leveraging, equity, and whether funding was for rehabilitation or expansion. They said meaningful choices were difficult when considering programs individually.

Chair Jawa summarized some of the EPAC's comments and asked staff to come back with more context and a more comprehensive or holistic approach to making Expenditure Plan tradeoffs.

5. What We've Heard: Community Engagement Update – INFORMATION*

Kaley Lyons, SFCTA, presented the item.

A member commented that it can be difficult to reach equity priority populations and said they hoped outreach was reaching these populations. They also said online poll participants were not reflective of the demographics of San Francisco.

Ms. Lyons said the Transportation Authority was trying to balance online input with interviews of community-based organizations and focus groups in Equity Priority Areas, in order to reach these communities.

Michelle Beaulieu said the reauthorization team would continue to visit additional neighborhoods and events to gather diverse input.

Chair Jawa reiterated that the EPAC schedule was being revised since the ballot measure was now targeting June instead of November 2022 and announced that there wouldn't be an additional December 2nd meeting of the EPAC as had been proposed previously.

6. Public Comment

Cathy DeLuca, with the Community Living Campaign, expressed support for the paratransit program, and said they worked on a daily basis with users of the Essential Trip Card program. They said many people who qualified for the program weren't being served and said it should be expanded. They also supported the expansion of the Free Muni program to include paratransit.

Edward Mason expressed disappointment about absenteeism at EPAC meetings. He said the paratransit funding discussion should consider the potential elimination of fixed-route lines as part of the proposed 5-minute network, which could increase demand for paratransit services for people who can't walk the extra distance to the 5-minute network. They suggested eliminating sales tax funding for street trees to allow increased paratransit funding.

An EPAC member said the expenditure plan should ensure that programs such as curb ramps should be based on equity maps showing historically under-served neighborhoods.

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:02 p.m.

Attachment 1 - Overview of IIJA

Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act Summary
October 28, 2021

As early as this week, Congress is expected to pass the *Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act*, or IIJA (H.R. 3684), a roughly $1 trillion transportation, water, broadband and electric grid infrastructure bill that's intended to deliver on a portion of President Biden's jobs, climate and equity agenda. It is widely expected that the IIJA will be supplemented by a "Build Back Better" spending package expected to be slightly below $2 trillion. A summary of the infrastructure bill follows.

The IIIJA would invest nearly $1 trillion in transportation, water, broadband, and power infrastructure as well as resilience investments. Of this amount, approximately $550 billion would be *new* spending (the nearly $1 trillion dollar amount reflects the cost to also maintain existing spending levels for certain infrastructure, including surface transportation and water). Total spending amounts by infrastructure category are detailed in the chart below.

Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act Spending Categories
($ in Billions)

Infrastructure Category	**Funding Amount**
Surface Transportation	$639
FAST Act Reauthorization	*$477*
IIJ Act Stimulus (supplemental spending)	*$157*
Electric & Low Emission School Buses	*$5*
Airports	$25
Ports and Waterways	$17
Water Infrastructure	$91
Broadband	$65
Power Infrastructure	$65
Resilience, Western Water Storage and Environmental Remediation	$71
Transportation Total	**$681**
Other Infrastructure Total	**$292**
Total	**$973**

Source: MTC analysis of H.R 3684, Eno Transportation Weekly and White House Fact Sheet

Transportation - $681 billion

Transportation infrastructure is by far the largest component of the infrastructure bill. Regarding surface transportation, the bill combines a roughly $475 billion five-year surface transportation reauthorization—a 56 percent increase above Congress's last five-year transportation bill, the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act—with approximately $157 billion in supplemental one-time stimulus funding to be distributed to more than two dozen grant programs over five years. We estimate that the bill would provide about $4.5 billion in "guaranteed" funding for the Bay Area via the highway and transit formula funds that MTC distributes. We also expect Bay Area projects to receive a share of the state's $4.25 billion in bridge repair funds and dedicated resources for zero emission vehicle charging and resilience projects. Attachment A provides a more detailed overview of the surface transportation provisions of the bill.

The most unprecedented element of the deal is in the scale of new discretionary grants that would be administered by the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT); the bill would authorize approximately $140 billion in competitive grant funding that could help fund Bay Area surface transportation priorities). See page 3 of Attachment A for additional details on the discretionary grants.

The bill would also provide funding for airports, ports and waterways, as shown in the chart on Page 1.

Water Infrastructure

Water infrastructure would be funded at approximately $91 billion and—similar to surface transportation—includes a reauthorization of drinking and wastewater funding ($36 billion) and provides supplemental one-time stimulus funding to targeted programs. Nearly $53 billion would be distributed through the existing drinking water and clean water state revolving loan funds ($26.4 billion each) which provide grants to states for loans supporting water infrastructure and water quality improvement projects. An additional $15 billion would be available for lead pipe replacement (to be administered through drinking water state revolving loan funds) and $10 billion to address emerging pollutants. The remaining funding would be distributed through various other programs.

Broadband/High-Speed Internet

The IIJA provides $65 billion to help build out broadband infrastructure, assist states with developing and implementing digital equity plans, and to subsidize the cost of Internet service for low-income households. Of the funding, $42.5 billion would be reserved for a U.S. Department of Commerce broadband buildout grant program for states. Each state would receive a minimum of $100 million; remaining grant funding would be determined via a formula based on each state's proportionate number of underserved and high-cost locations. Another significant component of the broadband proposal is a $30/month voucher low-income families may use for Internet service ($14.2 billion cost). This subsidy builds on the existing Emergency Broadband Benefit established during the pandemic, removing any sunset date for the benefit and expanding eligibility to more low-income households. An estimated 10.6 million Californians would be eligible for the benefit, according to a White House fact sheet.

Power Infrastructure and Clean Energy

The IIJA includes $65 billion to upgrade power infrastructure and increase energy efficiency, creates a new Grid Deployment Authority, and invests in clean energy research and technology. Investments of interest include: $5 billion in grants to states, grid operators, and other entities to harden the electric grid against extreme weather events, $5 billion for demonstration projects aimed at hardening and enhancing grid resilience, $3 billion for the Smart Grid Investment Matching Grant Program with expanded eligibilities to include improvements that increase flexibility in responding to natural disasters and fluctuating demand , $8 billion to establish at least four regional clean hydrogen hubs, $550 million for the Energy Efficiency and

Conservation Block Grant Program to support state and local governments in investing in energy efficiency and conservation projects and $225 million for a Department of Energy competitive grant program for states or regional partnerships to update their building energy codes.

Resilience, Western Water Storage, Environmental Remediation

The bill would provide about $71 billion for resilience, western water storage and remediation, including funding for wildfire resilience, flood mitigation, and ecosystem restoration. Regarding wildfires, the bill includes $3.3 billion for wildfire risk reduction efforts, including controlled burns, community wildfire defense grants, and funds to boost federal firefighter salaries. The bill would additionally provide $2 billion for federal ecological restoration projects to support fuel reduction. Other investments of interest:

- $3.5 billion to supplement the Weatherization Assistance Program that reduces energy costs for low-income households[1]
- $1 billion is provided for the Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA)'s Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) grants
- $1 billion for a new grant program for states and local governments to develop and implement cybersecurity plans
- $24 million for San Francisco Bay restoration (funds will go to EPA) and $132 million for the National Estuary Program, of which **an *estimated* $4.5 million would come directly to the San Francisco Estuary Partnership** over five years ($900,000/year). This would more than double the Partnership's current annual federal funding of approximately $700,000.
- $17 billion for Army Corps of Engineers flood mitigation and waterways management planning and projects, including $11.6 billion for construction (intended to support both unfunded projects in the Army Corps pipeline and new construction).[2]
- More than $8 billion for water storage, recycling, and ecosystem restoration intended to help make California and other western states more resilient to drought
- $1.2 billion over five years for brownfield remediation
- $3.5 billion for superfund remediation

[1] Weatherization funding could also be categorized under "power infrastructure and clean energy" funding.
[2] Based on external infrastructure bill analyses, staff attributed Army Corps funding to the "resilience" category, though a portion of the $17 billion most likely accounts for a significant amount of the "ports and waterways" funding listed in the chart on Page 1.

Summary of Surface Transportation Provisions of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act

DRAFT

October 28, 2021

This writeup provides highlights of the transportation aspects of the Investment and Jobs (IIJA) Act (IIJA), with a focus on Bay Area impacts.

Investment and Jobs Act vs. FAST Act Comparison Chart

	FAST Act (FY 2016-2020)	IIJ Act (FY 2022-2026) *(Senate passed)*	% Increase
Surface Transportation Authorization[i]	$ 305 billion	$ 477 billion	56%
One-time General Fund advance appropriation) [ii]	-	$ 157 billion	N/A
Total	**$ 305 billion**	**$ 634 billion**	**108%**

Bay Area Highway and Transit Formula Funding Increase

The IIJA would substantially boost the Bay Area transit formula resources that MTC distributes, and the Bay Area would receive a lesser but not insignificant boost in flexible highway funds. Initial estimates are below and are subject to change.

Bay Area Transit

The IIJA would provide the Bay Area $3.4 billion in transit formula funds over five years vs. the $2.3 billion in Federal Transit Administration (FTA) formula funds over the FAST Act period. This increase would be a result of both a big boost in the federal transit formula funding from the Highway Trust Fund (HTF)—a big win for the long-term as it would be very unusual for HTF-funded federal transit (and highway) program funding levels to fall below this new baseline after five years at this funding level—and because of additional one-time supplemental stimulus funding to the Section 5337 State of Good Repair program, which we advocated for along with our large transit system partners across the country.

Bay Area Transit Formula Fund Estimate

	FAST Act (FY 2016-2020)[1]	IIJ Act (FY 2022-2026)[2]	5-Year Funding Increase
State of Good Repair	$1.1 billion	$1.7 billion	$0.7 billion
Urbanized Area	$1.1 billion	$1.5 billion	$0.4 billion
Other	$0.1 billion	$0.2 billion	$0.1 billion
Total	**$2.3 billion**	**$3.4 billion**	**$1.1 billion**

Note: Sums may not total due to rounding.
1. Amounts include FAST Act authorized funding plus Federal Transit Administration (FTA) supplemental appropriations from FY 2018, FY 2019 and FY 2020.
2. Amounts reflect IIJ transportation authorization and supplemental advance appropriations.

Bay Area Flexible Highway, Climate and Bike/Ped Formula Funding
The IIJA would increase five-year funding totals for flexible highway program funding in the Bay Area from $0.8 billion to $1.1 billion. Note that much of this increase is due to the new, highly flexible Carbon Reduction formula program, which the Senate funded at the expense of increasing the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program. Like CMAQ, the Carbon Reduction Program has broad eligibilities including public transit, high occupancy vehicle projects and congestion pricing. See chart below:

Bay Area Highway Formula Fund Estimate

	FAST Act (FY 2016-2020)*	**IIJ Act (FY 2022-2026)**	**5-Year Funding Increase**
Surface Transportation Program	$473 million	$603 million	$130 million
CMAQ	$367 million	$368 million	$1 million
Transportation Alternatives Program[1]	$38 million	$70 million	$32 million
Carbon Reduction Program *(new)*	-	$71 million	$71 million
Total	**$878 million**	**$1.1 billion**	**$234 million**

1. Amount reflects only those program funds suballocated to the Bay Area for the regional ATP program; does not include the Bay Area's share of the states "any area" funds

Encouragingly, metropolitan planning resources that come directly to MTC would increase as well, with the Metropolitan Planning program increasing by about 30 percent overall compared to FAST Act levels (FAST Act FY 2016-2020 vs. proposed FY 2022-2026 funding).

California Funding for Bridges, Resilience and Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure
The State of California would receive a **much larger** increase in formula funds (proportionately and dollar amount) compared to the suballocated formula programs, including five-year totals of approximately $4.2 billion from a flexible new bridge repair formula program ($27.5 billion nationwide) and approximately $380 million for electric vehicle charging infrastructure. Additionally, California would receive over the five year timeframe roughly $2.6 billion in funding that could be used for resilience-focused investments, $630 million from a new resilience-focused formula program for states and up to $1.9 billion of the state's anticipated $12.8 billion in National Highway Performance Program (NHPP) highway funding (highway and bridge resilience would be newly eligible for up to 15 percent of NHPP funding). We expect there will be legislation at the state level to implement these new programs, providing an opportunity to advocate for an approach that maximizes funding for the Bay Area.

Additionally, California's Trade Corridors Enhancements Program and "any area" Active Transportation Program would both be expected grow in accordance with the funding increases proposed for the federal freight formula program and federal Transportation Alternatives Program since state law directs these federal funds to these programs.

Opportunity for Bay Area Projects to Compete for more than $100 billion in Discretionary Grants
Bay Area projects (large and small) could also receive substantial direct federal investment via funding for existing and new discretionary grant programs. In addition to huge dollar amounts,

the focus of the grant programs reflects many of the Plan Bay Area 2050 priorities and in general the selection criteria are Bay Area/large metro-friendly (ex: points for national and regional economic benefits). Grant programs of interest are listed below.

We have identified approximately $140 billion in grant funding that could fund Bay Area priority projects. Of this, roughly $100 billion is "guaranteed" funding—i.e., grants are either funded from the Highway Trust Fund (HTF) or one-time supplemental general fund stimulus (upfront stimulus)—while the approximately $40 billion in non-stimulus general fund authorizations (GF) are much less certain as they are subject to annual appropriations. Of note, the IIJA authorizes tens of billions of dollars for additional grants for programs that are either targeted to non-Bay Area geographies or target projects that typically fall outside the scope of Plan Bay Area 2050 investment priorities (such as wildlife crossings).

Transit, Bridge, Climate, Rail, Safety, and Priority Project Discretionary Grant Programs

(Note: National five-year totals. Fund sources listed to provide indication as to level of certainty that the funding will be made available.)

Highway and Bridge

- Bridge Investment Program - $15.8 billion for a new bridge program
  - $9.2 billion in upfront stimulus funding, plus $3.3 billion guaranteed from the reauthorization (HTF) and $3.3 billion in general funds subject to annual appropriations
  - Program would provide multi-year grants for major bridge improvements, like full funding grant agreements for bridges. BATA bridges and Golden Gate Bridge could apply. Smaller projects could be funded too.
- Charging and Fueling Infrastructure Grants (alternative fuel vehicles) - $2.5 billion (HTF)
- Rural Surface Transportation Grant Program - $2 billion (HTF)
  - Grants for highway and bridge improvement, freight and safety projects in urbanized areas less than 200,000 in population. Travel demand management projects are also eligible.
  - States, regional transportation planning organizations, local governments, and multijurisdictional groups may apply.

Transit and Intercity Passenger Rail

- Capital Investment Grants - $23 billion
  - $8 billion in one-time upfront stimulus funding plus $15 billion subject to appropriation (vs. $12 billion in the FAST Act).
  - Program funds transit modernization and expansion projects
- Federal-State Partnership for Intercity Passenger Rail – $43.5 billion total; Up to $19.5 billion eligible to be spent outside of the Northeast Corridor.
  - $36 billion in upfront funding, of which at least $12 billion may be spent outside the Northeast Corridor; $7.5 billion in additional funds subject to annual appropriations, of which not less than $3.4 billion must be spent outside the Northeast Corridor)
  - Expanded eligibilities to allow program to fund new and expanded intercity rail (e.g., California High Speed Rail), in addition to the program's historic focus on Amtrak and other intercity rail service's state of good repair

- Consolidated Rail Infrastructure and Safety Improvements (CRISI) - $10 billion
    - $5 billion in upfront stimulus funding and $5 billion subject to annual appropriations
    - Program funds rail safety, efficiency and reliability improvements. Examples of eligible projects include capital projects to reduce congestion and facilitate ridership growth and highway-rail grade crossing improvements.
- Railroad Crossing Elimination Program - $5.5 billion
    - New program funded at $3 billion in upfront stimulus funding and $2.5 billion subject to annual appropriations
    - Supplements the longstanding Rail-Highway Grade Crossing program funding that is distributed to states via formula, funded through the HTF at $1.2 billion (FAST Act funded the program at $1.1 billion).
- Low- and Zero-Emission Bus Program (transit) – $5.6 billion
    - $375 million guaranteed from the reauthorization (HTF) and $5.25 billion in upfront stimulus
- ADA Accessibility Improvements for Legacy Rail Systems - $1.75 billion (upfront stimulus) *(new program)*
- Competitive Grants for Rail Vehicle Replacement - $1.5 billion (HTF)
- Electric or Low-Emission Ferry Program - $500 million
    - $250 million in upfront stimulus funding, plus $250 million subject to annual appropriations

Multimodal Mobility, Economy, Safety, and Climate Programs

- National Infrastructure Project Assistance - $15 billion
    - $5 billion in upfront stimulus funding and $10 billion subject to annual appropriations
    - Program would provide multiyear grant agreements for large projects
    - Multimodal eligibility, including for integrated intercity and commuter rail projects, as advocated by MTC and national partners
- Local and Regional Project Assistance - $15 billion
    - $7.5 billion in upfront stimulus funding plus $7.5 billion subject to annual appropriations
    - Authorizes RAISE (BUILD/TIGER)
- INFRA (multimodal freight program) - $8 billion
    - $4.8 billion from the HTF and $3.2 billion in upfront stimulus appropriations
- Safe Streets and Roads for All - $6 billion
    - $5 billion in one-time upfront stimulus funding, $1 billion subject to annual appropriations
    - Grants for local jurisdictions and metropolitan planning organizations to develop and implement Vision Zero safety plans
- Port Infrastructure Development Program - $2.25 billion in upfront stimulus
    - Existing program to fund projects that improve safety, efficiency, or reliability of goods moving into and out of ports. IIJA funds may also be used for port resiliency, greenhouse gas emissions reductions, and air quality improvements.
- PROTECT resilience grants - $1.4 billion (HTF)
    - States, locals, metropolitan planning organizations, and other transportation authorities may apply.
- Reconnecting Communities - $1 billion
    - $500 million from the HTF, $500 million in upfront stimulus

   - Grants may fund planning and construction to remove or retrofit highways and restore community connectivity
- SMART (Strengthening Mobility and Revolutionizing Transportation Grant Program) - $1 billion
   - $500 million in upfront stimulus; $500 million subject to annual appropriations
   - Eligible projects include automated and connected vehicle infrastructure deployment, transit signal prioritization, and other technology-related transportation system improvements
- Intelligent Transportation Systems Program - $550 million (HTF)
   - Existing grant program funded at 10 percent more per year than under the FAST Act.
- Reduce Truck Emissions at Port Facilities - $400 million
   - $250 million from the HTF; $150 million in upfront stimulus
   - New grant program to fund projects that reduce idling and emissions from port facilities, including port electrification projects.
- Congestion Relief Program - $250 million (HTF)
   - New flexible major metro congestion reduction program. Eligibilities are broad and allow for congestion pricing on existing Interstate highways

Notes: FTA ferry program could receive an additional $1.25 billion over five years, subject to inclusion in a technical corrections bill, and Capital Corridor projects could benefit from IIJA's historic investments in Amtrak.

---

[i] Transportation authorization bill funding reflects both Highway Trust Fund (HTF) amounts—which are essentially "guaranteed"—in addition to those funding amounts authorized but subject to the uncertainty of the annual appropriations process. The FAST Act's $305 billion price tag reflected $282 in HTF proceeds and only $23 billion in general funds while the IIJA would provide $383 billion in HTF funding, with $94 billion subject to annual appropriations.

[ii] Chart does not yet reflect the FY 2018 through FY 2020 Highway Improvement Program and Transit Infrastructure Grants, which supplemented highway and transit funding.

San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

1455 Market Street, 22ND Floor, San Francisco, California 94103 415-522-4800 info@sfcta.org www.sfcta.org

Attachment 3.

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA's) Paratransit Program

Questions & Answers Part 2

As requested by some of the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC) members, we are sharing questions asked by some EPAC members about the SFMTA's paratransit program along with the responses so that they are available as reference to the entire EPAC. This Questions & Answers Part 2 adds on to Questions & Answers Part 1 which was included in the November 18, 2021 EPAC meeting materials. SFMTA and Transportation Authority staff compiled the responses.

In addition, below are links to other information related to the SFMTA's paratransit program that have previously been shared with the EPAC.

- Paratransit EPAC Presentation from 9/23/2021
- Paratransit Demographics Factsheet
- Paratransit Prop K Fact Sheet
- Draft Paratransit Sales Tax Program Description
- Paratransit Questions and Answers Part 1

1. **What percentage of paratransit requests are responded to within the designated time frame (one hour before/one hour after)?**

The Americans with Disabilities Act allows for service providers to trip time negotiate a requested pick-up time up to one hour either side of the request, or if an appointment (drop-off) time is specified, up to one hour before the projected necessary pick-up time to meet the requested drop-off time. A requested trip that cannot be scheduled within either of these timeframes must be counted and reported as a denial. And under the agreement between the SFMTA and Transdev, denials are prohibited. Also, under the agreement, the operating (transit) division retains the call-center responsibilities and ride requests are made by riders calling the reservations call center. Transdev has reported zero denials. 100% of trips are scheduled within the prescribed timeframes.

As for on-time performance, below is the on-time performance for the SF Access service:

SF Access	FY18/19	FY19/20	FY20/21
On-time (five minutes before to 15 minute after)	79.19%	92.57%	98.64%
16-30 minutes late	10.96%	4.98%	1.04%
16-30 minutes late - no transport/missed	0.92%	0.39%	0.09%
31-60 minutes late	6.90%	1.70%	0.17%
31-60 minutes late - no transport/missed	0.96%	0.21%	0.02%
60+ minutes late - transported	0.80%	0.12%	0.01%
60+ minutes late - no transport	0.29%	0.03%	0.01%

San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

2. **What metrics are used to measure reliability?**

Among the metrics used to measure reliability are on-time performance as well as complaints per 1,000 trips.

3. **What is the contractor's operator retention?**

Transdev Operations experienced no operator layoffs as a direct impact of the pandemic although starting February 2020, trip demand was reduced significantly. Nevertheless, many operators' scheduled work hours were reduced, or operators were assigned alternate duties. We did experience natural attrition as drivers left the ranks through late Spring 2021, and no efforts were made to replace them as trip demand remained depressed. This makes it difficult to say that driver turnover has been typical, but we continue to analyze the data for a true comparison to our turnover rate before the impacts brought on by pandemic. For now, we can say that driver positions retained during the past 20 months is 65%.

4. **What is the operator's dispatcher retention? If this is poor, why?**

Similarly, Transdev experienced dispatcher attrition over the past 20 months. Dispatcher positions were allowed to reduce by four positions to better balance the number of dispatchers needed to the reduced trip demand. The retention experience over the past 20 months for dispatchers has been at 72%. Transdev has now started back filling dispatcher positions, anticipating higher trip demand.

5. **Who performs the paratransit program oversight? How often is this done? Is this a public document?**

SFMTA Accessible Services oversees the Paratransit contract with Transdev. SFMTA staff regularly meets with Transdev to discuss service quality issues. In addition, SFMTA and Transdev staff are in constant communication regarding program policies and administration/operations. In addition, the SFMTA Quality Assurance team provides additional oversight over the maintenance activities. SFMTA also staffs an advisory committee, the Paratransit Coordinating Council, which is comprised of Paratransit consumers, social service agencies serving seniors and persons with disabilities, and other stakeholders to provide input from the user perspective on the SF Paratransit program. In addition, every three years, the Federal Transit Administration conducts a review of the city's ADA Paratransit program to ensure compliance with all federal regulations.

San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

6. **Does the contractor or SFMTA conduct customer surveys on the existing service? Is this done in multiple languages? Which ones? Can we review these surveys and responses?**

Yes, SFMTA does an annual customer satisfaction survey with our Paratransit riders every year. The most recent survey results from the 2019 customer survey were included in the November 18, 2021 EPAC meeting materials . We did not do in in 2020 and 2021 during the pandemic but intend to conduct one in Spring 2022. The survey is conducted in multiple languages, including English, Chinese, Russian, Spanish, Vietnamese, and Tagalog. Attached is a copy of the 2019 survey and results.

7. **What % of registered qualified paratransit users are active users?**

An active rider is defined as an individual who has taken a trip within the past 12 months. It's important to keep in mind that some customers have not been active riders during the pandemic. As of September 2021:

Registered Paratransit riders: 11,724

Active Taxi: 5,310

Active SF Access riders: 2,429

8. **How are the Van-Go and Shop Around van service be financed?**

These services are eligible for Sales Tax funding within the Paratransit category of the current Prop K Expenditure Plan.

9. **In the presentation there was no mention of Essential Trip Card, Van Gough and Food Shopping programs. Do they qualify under EPAC guidelines?**

Yes, they are eligible as part of the Paratransit category in the preliminary draft New Expenditure Plan. [Note that these programs were included in the paratransit presentation on September 23, 2021 as well as the follow-up paratransit presentation on November 18, 2021.]

10. **In the last 10 years, what has been the annual number of San Francisco paratransit trips provided?**

San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

Fiscal Year	Total Passenger Trips Provided
FY 12/13	777,324
FY 13/14	771,175
FY 14/15	780,405
FY 15/16	774,572
FY 16/17	751,166
FY 17/18	720,807
FY 18/19	588,244
FY 19/20	387,136
FY 20/21	

11. In the last 10 years, what has been the annual number of San Francisco paratransit trips provided per mode within the ¾ miles BART service area in San Francisco?

We don't tabulate trips within the BART service area on a regular basis but had a study done to determine their percentage share of the overall paratransit trips performed in SF and we apply that percentage (approximately 8%) to the budget each year.

12. What % of the cost of those trips was paid by BART?

BART pays for approximatey 8% of all SF Paratransit trips. Funding sources that are available to both agencies are also accounted for.

13. Is BART paying for its share of Paratransit responsibility?

Yes, BART has paid their share each year.

[this page intentionally left blank]

Agenda Item 4.

Draft Expenditure Plan Discussion

San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

December 9, 2021

New Expenditure Plan Schedule

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

DEC | JAN | FEB | MAR | APR | MAY | JUN | JUL | AUG | SEP

New Expenditure Plan Outreach & Engagement

Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee

By the end of February 2021:
EPAC recommends new Expenditure Plan

By the end of March 2021:
SFCTA Board adopts new Expenditure Plan

By the end of April 2021:
MTC approves new Expenditure Plan

SF BOS Places Measure on Ballot

November 8, 2022 Election →

SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION PLAN 2050

SFTP 2050 Outreach & Engagement

SFTP 2050 Adoption in Fall 2022

EPAC Meeting Dates

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Remaining EPAC meetings will be held virtually via Zoom from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m.

- January 13
- January 27
- February 10
- February 24 (only if needed)

Meeting materials will be posted at https://www.sfcta.org/ExpenditurePlan

Draft Expenditure Plan: Updated Revenues

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Priority Funding Level	Total Revenues
Priority 1	$2,378 million
Priority 2	+$220 million
Priority 3 - tentative	TBD

Due to the shift to target the June 2022 election rather than November 2022, our **revenue forecast has been revised** slightly ….

…the new 30-year sales tax collection period starts 3 months later: April 1, 2023 – March 31, 2053.

Draft Expenditure Plan

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Staff is preparing a Summary Table to guide EPAC tradeoff discussions. The table will include:

- Total funding need for each program
- Anticipated available funding (all sources) for each program, based on the 30-year revenue forecast
  - Incorporates assumptions about future funding, including discretionary grants as well as future agency-controlled funds.

Draft Expenditure Plan

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Summary Table includes (continued):

- Remaining <u>funding gap</u> after potential sales tax and other available funds
- Description of <u>leveraging potential</u> based on past performance and project eligibility
- Additional notes about <u>project funding and benefits</u> of a sales tax investment

Draft Expenditure Plan

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Summary Table includes (continued):

- Nexus to the equity assessment
- Whether a program funds maintenance, enhancement, or expansion of the existing transportation networks

Questions?

Attachment 1
Draft Revised Milestone Schedule for Development of a New Expenditure Plan*

Dates	Milestone
February 10, 2022	**Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee Meeting**: approve final Expenditure Plan
March 8, 2022	**Transportation Authority Board Meeting**: public hearing on draft Expenditure Plan and first approval action
March 22, 2022	**Transportation Authority Board Meeting:** final approval action on Expenditure Plan
April 8, 2022	**MTC Planning Committee Meeting**: reviews/recommends the Expenditure Plan consistency finding
April 27, 2022	**MTC Commission Meeting**: approves consistency finding
May – June	**Board of Supervisors** approves the Expenditure Plan and submits to Elections Commission for inclusion of the ordinance on the November 2022 ballot

**Updated to reflect a potential November 2022 ballot measure. Dates are subject to change. For the most current meeting information, see www.sfcta.org/events.*

 Attachment 2

Draft San Francisco New Transportation Expenditure Plan
Half-Cent Sales Tax Revenue Forecast

REVISED 12/2/2021

	Conservative scenario				**Optimistic scenario**			
Fiscal Year	**Revenue Forecast YOE$**	**% change**	**Revenue Forecast in 2020$*** **	**Notes**	**Revenue Forecast YOE$**	**% change**	**Revenue Forecast in 2020$*** **	**Notes**
FY2022/23*	$ 27,055,500		$ 25,502,404	*partial year, corresponds to $108,222,000	$ 27,055,500		$ 25,502,404	*partial year, corresponds to $108,222,000
FY2023/24	$ 117,299,000	N/A	$ 107,345,202		$ 117,299,000	N/A	$ 107,345,202	
FY2024/25	$ 125,051,000	6.6%	$ 111,106,194		$ 125,051,000	6.6%	$ 111,106,194	
FY2025/26	$ 130,890,000	4.7%	$ 112,906,864		$ 130,890,000	4.7%	$ 112,906,864	FYs 22/23 - 25/26 are consistent w/ new forecast in the Prop K Strategic Plan update
FY2026/27	$ 133,221,645	1.8%	$ 111,571,031		$ 134,044,449	2.4%	$ 112,260,116	
FY2027/28	$ 135,594,826	1.8%	$ 110,251,002		$ 137,274,920	2.4%	$ 111,617,072	
FY2028/29	$ 138,010,282	1.8%	$ 108,946,591		$ 140,583,246	2.4%	$ 110,977,712	
FY2029/30	$ 140,468,767	1.8%	$ 107,657,613		$ 143,971,302	2.4%	$ 110,342,015	
FY2030/31	$ 142,971,046	1.8%	$ 106,383,885		$ 147,441,010	2.4%	$ 109,709,959	
FY2031/32	$ 145,517,900	1.8%	$ 105,125,227		$ 150,994,339	2.4%	$ 109,081,523	
FY2032/33	$ 148,110,124	1.8%	$ 103,881,461		$ 154,633,302	2.4%	$ 108,456,687	
FY2033/34	$ 150,748,525	1.8%	$ 102,652,410	FYs 22/23 - 33/34 are consistent w/ new forecast in the Prop K Strategic Plan update	$ 158,359,965	2.4%	$ 107,835,430	
FY2034/35	$ 153,433,925	1.8%	$ 101,437,900		$ 162,176,440	2.4%	$ 107,217,732	
FY2035/36	$ 156,167,163	1.8%	$ 100,237,760		$ 166,084,892	2.4%	$ 106,603,572	
FY2036/37	$ 158,949,090	1.8%	$ 99,051,818		$ 170,087,538	2.4%	$ 105,992,931	
FY2037/38	$ 161,780,574	1.8%	$ 97,879,908		$ 174,186,648	2.4%	$ 105,385,787	
FY2038/39	$ 164,662,497	1.8%	$ 96,721,863		$ 178,384,546	2.4%	$ 104,782,120	
FY2039/40	$ 167,595,758	1.8%	$ 95,577,519		$ 182,683,614	2.4%	$ 104,181,912	
FY2040/41	$ 170,581,272	1.8%	$ 94,446,714		$ 187,086,289	2.4%	$ 103,585,142	
FY2041/42	$ 173,619,969	1.8%	$ 93,329,289		$ 191,595,068	2.4%	$ 102,991,790	
FY2042/43	$ 176,712,796	1.8%	$ 92,225,083		$ 196,212,509	2.4%	$ 102,401,837	
FY2043/44	$ 179,860,719	1.8%	$ 91,133,942		$ 200,941,231	2.4%	$ 101,815,264	
FY2044/45	$ 183,064,718	1.8%	$ 90,055,711		$ 205,783,915	2.4%	$ 101,232,050	
FY2045/46	$ 186,325,792	1.8%	$ 88,990,236		$ 210,743,307	2.4%	$ 100,652,177	
FY2046/47	$ 189,644,958	1.8%	$ 87,937,367		$ 215,822,221	2.4%	$ 100,075,626	
FY2047/48	$ 193,023,251	1.8%	$ 86,896,955		$ 221,023,536	2.4%	$ 99,502,377	
FY2048/49	$ 196,461,724	1.8%	$ 85,868,853		$ 226,350,203	2.4%	$ 98,932,412	
FY2049/50	$ 199,961,450	1.8%	$ 84,852,914		$ 231,805,243	2.4%	$ 98,365,712	
FY2050/51	$ 203,523,519	1.8%	$ 83,848,995		$ 237,391,750	2.4%	$ 97,802,258	
FY2051/52	$ 207,149,041	1.8%	$ 82,856,954		$ 243,112,891	2.4%	$ 97,242,031	
FY2052/53**	$ 158,129,361		$ 61,407,487	**partial year, corresponds to $210,839,148	$ 186,728,934		$ 72,513,760	**partial year, corresponds to $248,971,911
Total	**$ 4,915,586,196**		**$ 2,928,087,151**		**$ 5,355,798,807**		**$ 3,148,417,667**	
Existing Sales Tax Commitments****			$ (550,000,000)				$ (550,000,000)	
Total Revenue Forecast for the New Expenditure Plan:			**$ 2,378,087,151**				**$ 2,598,417,667**	

***New measure goes into effect 4/1/2023; includes Q4 revenues from FY22/23 only**

**New EP covers 30 years ending 3/31/2053; includes Q1, 2, 3 revenues from FY 2052/53 only

***Uses 3% inflation to de-escalate to 2020$. Actual average CPI increase 2003-2020 in the Bay Area has been 2.49%

****Existing Sales Tax Commitments include: repayment of a 2017 bond; oustanding grant repayments; other grant awards and/or financing costs incurred before January 1, 2023

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

NEW TRANSPORTATION EXPENDITURE PLAN FOR SAN FRANCISCO

Preliminary Draft, Revised 10/4/2021

NEW EP CATEGORY - SUBCATEGORY - PROGRAM	MAXIMUM FUNDING (2020 MILLIONS$*)	PERCENT OF TOTAL**
Major Transit Projects	**$556.5**	**23.3%**
Muni Reliability and Efficiency Improvements	$110.0	4.6%
Muni Rail Core Capacity	$57.0	2.4%
BART Core Capacity	$50.0	2.1%
Caltrain Service Vision: Capital System Capacity Investments	$10.0	0.4%
Caltrain Downtown Rail Extension and Pennsylvania Alignment	$329.5	13.8%
Transit Maintenance & Enhancements	**$1,049.0**	**43.9%**
Maintenance, Rehabilitation and Replacement	**$936.8**	**39.2%**
Muni — Vehicles	$453.7	19.0%
Muni — Facilities	$118.5	5.0%
Muni — Guideways	$238.8	10.0%
BART	$21.3	0.9%
Caltrain	$100.0	4.2%
Ferry	$4.5	0.2%
Transit Enhancements	**$112.2**	**4.7%**
Transit Enhancements	$38.2	1.6%
BART Station Access, Safety and Capacity	$9.3	0.4%
New Bayview Caltrain Station	$27.7	1.2%
Mission Bay Ferry Landing	$7.0	0.3%
Next Generation Transit Investments	$30.0	1.3%
Paratransit	**$205.4**	**8.6%**
Streets and Freeways	**$440.4**	**18.4%**
Maintenance, Rehabilitation and Replacement	**$122.7**	**5.1%**
Street Resurfacing, Rehabilitation and Maintenance	$105.0	4.4%
Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Maintenance	$17.7	0.7%
Safe and Complete Streets	**$274.7**	**11.5%**
Safer Streets (signals, traffic calming, bikes and peds)	$226.9	9.5%
Curb Ramps	$23.9	1.0%
Tree Planting	$23.9	1.0%
Freeway Safety and Operational Improvements	**$43.0**	**1.8%**
Vision Zero Ramps	$8.0	0.3%
Managed Lanes and Express Bus	$15.0	0.6%
Transformative Freeway & Major Street Projects	$20.0	0.8%
Transportation System Development & Management	**$162.0**	**6.8%**
Transportation Demand Management	**$30.0**	**1.3%**
Transportation, Land Use and Community Coordination	**$132.0**	**5.5%**
Neighborhood Transportation Program	$40.0	1.7%
Equity Priority Transportation Program	$40.0	1.7%
Development Oriented Transportation	$42.0	1.8%
Citywide / Modal Planning	$10.0	0.4%
Total Draft Expenditure Plan	**$2.413 billion**	**101.1%**
Total Draft Revenue Forecast	**$2.383 billion**	

* All funding amounts are in millions of 2020 dollars.

** EP percentages are based on a percent of the conservative 30-year revenue forecast. We may add additional funding based on a more optimistic forecast.

*** EP percentages do not add up to 100% of the conservative 30-year revenue forecast in this preliminary draft, and totals may not add up due to rounding errors.

[this page intentionally left blank]

Agenda Item 5.

Public Comment

San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

Public Comment

Please raise your hand:

Computer: press REACTIONS, and choose Raise Hand

Phone: dial *9

Once called on, unmute yourself:

Computer: choose UNMUTE

Phone: dial *6

San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority