



AGENDA

Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee Meeting Notice

Date: Thursday, January 13, 2022; 6:00 – 8:00 p.m.

Location: Join Zoom Meeting <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88205813686>
Meeting ID: 882 0581 3686
One tap mobile:
+19292056099,,88205813686# US (New York)
+13017158592,,88205813686# US (Washington DC)
Dial by your location
+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)
+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)
+1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)
+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)
+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)
+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)
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: 882 0581 3686
Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/u/kelKqkZXJq>

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.

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.

<u>Agenda</u>	Page
1. Roll Call	3
2. EPAC Chair's Remarks - INFORMATION	8
3. Meeting #7 Recap, Minutes and Follow-ups - INFORMATION*	11
4. Draft Expenditure Plan Discussion - INFORMATION*	23
<p>A complete draft Expenditure Plan is included in the agenda materials in three pieces for ease of reference to support the EPAC's continuing tradeoff discussions: Attachment 1 - Draft Expenditure Plan policies, Attachment 2 - Draft Expenditure Plan Summary Table showing amounts recommended by program for Priority 1 (most conservative revenue forecast) (revised October 4, 2021), and Attachment 3 - Draft Description of Programs. At this meeting, we propose to focus discussion on three potential scenarios (Attachment 4) for recommended Priority 1 and Priority 2 funding levels to seek further EPAC input with the aim of narrowing this down to 1 to 2 scenarios to bring back to the next EPAC meeting. The scenarios were developed by staff considering EPAC and agency input. As requested by the EPAC, a context table providing additional background information and staff rationale for the funding levels is included as Attachment 5. We also propose to spend some time reviewing the draft Expenditure Plan policies, with a particular focus on the prioritization process proposed to identify the specific projects to be funded from each program, after voter-approval of the Expenditure Plan.</p>	
5. Public Comment	59
<p>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.</p>	
6. Adjournment	

***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 #8



San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

January 13, 2022

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 #7 Recap, Minutes and Follow-ups
4. Draft Expenditure Plan Discussion
 - 3 Funding Scenarios
 - Policies
5. Public Comment
6. Adjournment



San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

Agenda Item 1.

Roll Call



**San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority**

January 13, 2022

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

January 13, 2022

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

[this page intentionally left blank]

Agenda Item 3.

Meeting #7 Recap, Minutes and Follow-Ups



San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

January 13, 2022



- January 13 – Draft Complete Expenditure Plan: Program Descriptions, Policies and Funding Levels
3 Scenarios for Funding Levels (Priority 1 & 2)
Policies: Focus on Project Prioritization Process
- January 27 – Outreach and Engagement Update
1-2 Revised Funding Levels Scenario(s)
Continued: Policies and Program Descriptions
- February 10 – Approve Final Complete Expenditure Plan
- February 24 – *tentative only if needed*

Questions?



**San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority**



DRAFT MINUTES

Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee

Thursday, December 9, 2021

1. Call to Order

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

Present at Roll Call: Members: Jay Bain, Majeid Crawford, Cathy DeLuca (for Pi Ra), Zack Deutsch-Gross, Jesse Fernandez, Amandeep Jawa, Aaron Leifer, Jessica Lum, Jodie Medeiros, Melvin Parham (for Susan Murphy), Calvin Quick, Eric Rozell, Yensing Sihapanya, Sujata Srivastava, Wesley Tam, Joan Van Rijn, Christopher White (17)

Absent at Roll Call: Rosa Chen, Anni Chung (arrived during Item 3), Mel Flores (arrived during Item 3), Rodney Fong, Sharky Laguana, Susan Murphy, Maryo Mogannam, Maelig Morvan, Pi Ra, Maurice Rivers (arrived during Item 4), Earl Shaddix, Kim Tavaglione (12)

2. EPAC Chair's Remarks

Chair Jawa noted that at Tuesday's Board meeting, the Transportation Authority Board approved the new November 2022 election target. He also noted that the EPAC would review the revised schedule during the meeting, including 3 more meetings, and thanked EPAC members for their continued service, having heard affirmatively from almost everyone that they would continue to serve on the EPAC into 2022. Chair Jawa provided a recap of where we've been and noted that staff would provide additional information on the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA). He said that at the last EPAC meeting, the EPAC started tradeoff discussions for paratransit operations. Chair Jawa also noted the desire for a more comprehensive roadmap for decision-making and said he hoped to consider leveraging and other factors at tonight's meeting.

There was no member or public comment.

3. Meeting #6 Recap, Minutes and Follow-Ups - INFORMATION*

Michelle Beaulieu, SFCTA, presented the item.

A member asked if seed funding could cover pilot programs.

Michelle Beaulieu responded that pilots were eligible in the draft Expenditure Plan and that seed funding could be considered for that use.

A member said that the new carbon reduction program identified three types of programs and asked if these were confirmed or if they could be expanded.

Ms. Beaulieu responded that they were examples and not meant to include the full range of what was eligible.

A member said that the new pots of funding would not close existing funding gaps, but asked if it could be used to help prioritize local funding, i.e. use federal dollars for x, and local dollars for y.



Ms. Beaulieu responded in the affirmative and said that she would share table showing estimated leveraging ability. She said that the leveraging information had not changed recommendations in the draft Expenditure Plan because it was a small percent of the need for varying programs.

Maria Lombardo said that the new buckets of funding would be helpful but noted that funding was always nuanced and projects need to be ready to compete for federal funding and local dollars would help to get projects ready to compete.

A member commented that there was no 'free' money, but the ability to leverage more was what they were most interested in.

There was no public comment.

4. Draft Expenditure Plan Discussion - INFORMATION*

Michelle Beaulieu, SFCTA, presented the item.

Chair Jawa asked, in regard to the schedule, if the EPAC should have everything nailed down by January 27th with only final details left for the February 10th meeting.

Ms. Beaulieu confirmed that was the goal. Ms. Beaulieu shared a work-in-progress context table that staff was preparing for an upcoming meeting.

A member asked on the table shown if the column for draft potential future funds showed future funds other than sales tax.

Ms. Beaulieu confirmed.

Ms. Lombardo added that some columns in the table were necessarily simplified for ease of use and said that the predominant improvement to the program was the basis for the classification use for columns such as maintain, enhance, and expand.

A member asked for more clarification on maintain, enhance, expand - and asked who/how determined the identification.

Ms. Beaulieu responded that it was based on the benefit of the program investment. She said, for example, that 'maintain' represented replacing assets already in place and 'enhance' represented improving the user experience but not expanding miles of rail.

A member said that they understood how high leveraging made a case for additional funding, but asked if lower leveraging would make a good case for that as well.

Ms. Beaulieu agreed and said that we want the sales tax to leverage funding, but there were some projects that were important to complete even where leveraging wasn't possible and added that it may be cheaper or easier to fully fund some projects at the local level.

A member asked for understanding of ridership and greenhouse gas emissions reductions when thinking about the projects and said nothing tangible was included.

Ms. Beaulieu responded that information was available for some projects, but not all and said staff would look to project sponsors to get information, which may be added later. She noted most of the plan was made up of programs so this information would be hard to produce except for the few examples of projects named in program descriptions.

Chair Jawa agreed that ridership and greenhouse gas emissions data was a great idea.



Chair Jawa asked about the potential ridership at a Bayview Caltrain Station and said that he rarely saw people getting on Caltrain at the Paul Avenue station.

Ms. Beaulieu responded that there was an ongoing study to determine a precise location for the station.

Ms. Lombardo said that ridership numbers were available from a Transportation Authority study completed a while ago and staff would check with the Planning Department regarding ridership information available from the ongoing study.

A member contrasted the Bayview Caltrain Station with the Mission Bay Ferry Landing and said it felt as though the Mission Bay Ferry Landing was for privileged people that do not want to drive over the bridge and would rather take a ferry. She said there did not seem to be many equity considerations related to that project.

Ms. Lombardo said staff would follow up to see if there was a plan to serve Treasure Island, an Equity Priority Community.

A member asked if there was an estimate for how many people would be served by the ferry landing for sporting events in the area to better understand overall usage.

Ms. Beaulieu responded that staff would look into that to see if information was broken out in that manner.

A member asked if analysis of projected private vehicle traffic was used to show the ferry landing could replace a certain number of vehicle trips and if we could use driving behavior to see what routes were being taken and what mode shifts were happening.

Kaley Lyons said the SF Port has estimated capacity at 6,000 passengers per day and said she would follow up with the Port for additional information.

A member noted that ferries provide transportation redundancy and could help people get across the bay in an emergency.

A member asked if the term pedestrian and bicycle facilities differed from capital infrastructure.

Ms. Beaulieu responded that facilities were sidewalks, bike lanes, and quick builds, among others, and include capital infrastructure but it was just a different term used.

Ms. Lombardo said there was not a perfect division of project types. She said in the current (Prop K) measure, best practices for facility maintenance dealt with the new paint on the street. She said this was previously primarily restriping, but with an explosion of quick-build projects, additional maintenance such as safe hit posts were needed. She said SFMTA would be developing a capital management approach to deal with pedestrian and bicycle maintenance in the future.

A member asked for clarification on no funding gap shown for street resurfacing.

Ms. Beaulieu responded that not all money dedicated to street resurfacing, but staff think there would be enough money to maintain existing assets.

Ms. Lombardo said that the remaining funding gap was zeroed out because the cost shown was to maintain the current level of Pavement Condition Index (PCI). She said staff would make sure that when they complete the context table it will reflect what it would take to get to the ideal state of good repair, consistent with Plan Bay Area.



A member said the Safer Streets subcategory seemed to include many disparate programs. They said there was a huge amount of need and a massive funding gap shown on the table. They asked if it was possible to break down the subcategory to make it more comprehensible, including the range for leveraging ability.

Ms. Beaulieu said that the current Prop K Expenditure Plan includes a number of smaller subcategories and staff combined several in the draft new Expenditure Plan to provide flexibility and understanding that projects tap into multiple buckets. She said many projects have several different types of components and combining the programs into one subcategory would make administration more streamlined.

Ms. Lombardo added that staff could provide more backup information on individual pieces, but confirmed the rationale for putting them into one bucket. She added that staff would be vetting the needs numbers for all categories.

A member said Safer Streets had a huge funding gap compared to other programs, which was especially relevant to funding needs. They asked what the gap represents.

Ms. Beaulieu responded that staff would help break down the needs number.

The member said that Ms. Beaulieu's comment that the Transformative Freeways program was primarily for planning and public engagement was very helpful and asked that type of information be made available to EPAC members.

Ms. Lombardo said the final table would be updated to include that type of information.

A member said they were glad for more information on equity benefits identification for each program and said otherwise someone looking at this may see the Equity Priority Transportation Program and think that was the only program serving Equity Priority Communities.

Chair Jawa said that information related to greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) helps him to frame all the issues and said that equity was a north star, and GHG reduction was another and would like to see additional information related to GHG.

Ms. Beaulieu said the information was available for some projects but getting GHG information for programs would be more difficult.

Chair Jawa asked that when staff completes the context table, that staff include a "version" and last revised date at the top of the table since it would presumably be updated by staff.

A member said that the equity tags were representing the equity potential but may not be the actual project. They said when the discussion on category rules (policies?) happens, they would like to link equity to execution of projects. They asked that as staff looks at putting rules on funding, they consider making an equity analysis nexus to execution of project in some way.

Ms. Beaulieu said this would be discussed in relation to the policies included in the new Expenditure Plan, including equity consideration in administering the funding. She said that each program was different so the staff recommendation was to maintain flexibility within the prioritization process to apply to each program as appropriate. She said this was one place to include equity and that more information would be provided regarding the 5 year prioritization process (5YPP) as well.



Ms. Lombardo said that for GHG, there were some specific projects with that information but staff could also look at the city's Climate Action Plan, which may have a proxy for GHG reduction that could be used for this effort.

A member asked if there were comments made when Prop K was being developed regarding equity and if there were specific kinds of recommendations made that staff feel could help resolve those issues. She asked if it was possible to tell if this draft Expenditure Plan addressed those issues.

Ms. Lombardo said that the Prop K Expenditure Plan development was part of the San Francisco Transportation Plan (SFTP) update and geographic equity analysis was part of that plan. She said key findings then were around transit access, and that bicycle and pedestrian projects did not have a strong project pipeline and had worse performance. She said equity at that time (2003) was less about Equity Priority Communities and more about geographic equity and that it did not come up as much in EPAC then. She added that through the 5YPP process the Neighborhood Transportation Program was created to help develop project pipelines in each supervisorial district and emphasized the importance of planning for projects in order to be competitive for additional outside funding.

The member asked when the EPAC would talk about the criteria to look at for prioritization, including equity. They said there were many projects ready to build because planning already happened. They expressed concern and said they did not want to make the same mistakes as Prop K and would like to solve issues so this Expenditure Plan reflected all of San Francisco and the needs of all residents.

Ms. Lombardo said this would be the topic of upcoming EPAC meetings and urged the EPAC to keep in mind that this would be a 30 year plan so it needed to be flexible to adapt to things that come up. She added that quick build projects did not exist when Prop K was approved, but Prop K was flexible enough to accommodate funding for quick builds.

The member agreed with the need for flexibility but said they wanted to be careful.

A member asked how the equity benefits for proposed programs could be more concrete and substantive. They commented that in the prior presentation on equity findings, there may be some conflation in broad categories. They gave an example that while Chinatown was on the map as an Equity Priority Community, there were many affluent financial district folks who lived nearby as well. They asked what it meant to check the equity box, did it address transportation costs or investment in transit that disproportionately benefits low-income housing. They asked how to advance equity in planning and said that investments did not reduce transportation costs in Equity Priority Communities. They asked if staff had information they had heard from community organizations that work with equity populations and asked that it be included here for more dimension. They also asked about income per capita said they would like finer grained details to make sure the Expenditure Plan was delivered in an equitable way.

Ms. Beaulieu said that staff would give more consideration to the information related to equity.

Ms. Lombardo agreed with the comment that equity flags were representative of a program's potential. She said that equity could be incorporated in many ways, including outreach to communities now and in how funding decisions would be made, including requiring projects to have robust community engagement.



A member said they run a nonprofit for low income families and they would like to see Census data. They said Mission Bay wasn't a neighborhood 15 years ago and asked what the focus was, whether that was reducing congestion of a new neighborhood or something else. They said there were goals, but they would like to see the data-driven impact and what was actually serving people of color.

Ms. Beaulieu said that this could potentially be done for projects, but that it was trickier with programs and work would be done in the prioritization process for project selection. She said the equity analysis for reauthorization was available online and that it included a map of Equity Priority Communities based on census data and would look for other helpful maps to pull from.

A member said the table showed two programs with major funding gaps: Safer Streets and Muni Facilities Maintenance. They asked about the implications of these gaps.

Ms. Beaulieu said that staff could help contextualize this and for Safer Streets it would help to break it down by mode. She said the category included a lot, such as redesigning of every street in San Francisco which had a very high cost. She said this was different than street resurfacing which included a cap at 75 PCI, for example. She said some funding for Muni facilities would also be included in the GO Bond proposal which was included in the draft potential funding sources.

Ms. Lombardo said SFMTA's prior presentation on facility maintenance would provide some context and that staff was working with SFMTA to look for new funding, including a potential new regional revenue measure. She said there were shortfalls for all categories.

Chair Jawa said it would be helpful to see the remaining funding gap as a percent instead of a number and to show what was recommended as a percent of what was asked for.

Ms. Beaulieu said that potential future funds were aspirational numbers and not secured or definite, with limitations on funding. She said a program showing a funding gap of \$0 did not mean it was fully funded. She said, for example, DTX had a funding plan that included a large federal grant TJPA had not yet applied for and was not definite. She said staff would add percent to provide context.

A member asked if the funding for the Pennsylvania Alignment (PAX) was only for planning and said leveraging for planning funds only would theoretically be lower.

Ms. Beaulieu said the total funding need was the total DTX cost + planning/early phases of PAX. She said staff would add a note about lower leveraging ability for planning.

A member said that transportation had been a tool to uplift privileged classes and harm non-privileged with aggressive projects, such as what happened in the Fillmore, Japantown, and bulldozing Geary. They said what equity looked like for communities harmed by decades of pain was different than what was being presented and said that what equity looked like moving forward was different for those historically harmed. They appreciated the powerful comments made about making the new Expenditure Plan equitable and said they would go back to organizations and community members and get their thoughts on how to add equity here. They said this was almost status quo and that it was difficult to change but that everyone wanted to try. They said they were not landing anywhere but were hoping for clarity over the next few meetings.



Chair Jawa thanked the member for their valuable perspective, acknowledged that it was hard for people to overcome their own background and biases and hoped the member would continue to bring ideas.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked how accurate revenue forecasts were for Prop B and Prop K. He said there was mention about the “last mile” which conflicts with Muni indicating the city was about 98% covered within ¼ mile. He asked where developer fees were and said growth was not funding growth and that expansion should be paid for by developers. He said Prop E maintains street trees and that a future proposition should be used for street tree planting. He said it was not mandated by complete streets policy and that it was up to local jurisdictions. He said there were greater needs than trees, and we don’t have the full costs of trees. He also said curb ramps allocations to San Francisco Public Works should be conditioned and that cracks were developing soon after new curb ramps were put into place. He said that regarding climate change, the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) noted climate impacts for any item going to their Board for approval and the Transportation Authority should adopt something similar.

5. Public Comment

During public comment, Roland Lebrun said that anything VTA includes about the climate was made up.

Edward Mason said he would be interested in seeing the context table.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

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

[this page intentionally left blank]



San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

Agenda Item 4.

Draft Expenditure Plan Discussion



San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

Agenda Item 4a.

Draft Expenditure Plan: 3 Scenarios



San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

Preliminary Draft / Prop K Comparison



San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

25

Investment Type	Prop K Priority 1	Draft New EP Priority 1	Change
Transit Maintenance	40.0%	40.5%	=
Major Transit Improvements & Enhancements	26.0%	27.4%	↑
Safe & Complete Streets	10.5%	11.5%	↑
Streets Maintenance (includes signals and signs)	10.6%	8.9%	↓
Paratransit	8.6%	8.6%	=
Transportation Demand Management, Citywide & Neighborhood Planning	1.2%	2.4%	↑
Freeway Safety, Operations, Redesign (planning)	3.4%	1.8%	↓

Prop K percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding errors. Preliminary Draft EP does not sum to 100%.

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 our shift from targeting the June 2022 election to November 2022, our **revenue forecast has been revised** slightly given the new 30-year sales tax collection period (3 months later, now April 1, 2023 – March 31, 2053)

- Staff has drafted three revised Scenarios for the Draft Expenditure Plan using the REVISED revenue forecasts
- The EPAC can modify them—these are meant to be a starting point
- The following slides describe how the Scenarios are changed from the Preliminary Draft Expenditure Plan

Draft Expenditure Plan Scenarios:

Priority 1 Funding



Scenario A

- **More** for Paratransit (18 years), Curb Ramps, and Safer Streets
- **Less** for Muni Maintenance, Muni Core Capacity, Transportation Demand Management and Development Oriented Transportation

Scenario B

- **Most** for Paratransit (20 years) and Safer Streets
- **More** for Curb Ramps and BART Core Capacity
- **Less** for Muni Maintenance, BART Maintenance*, Transportation Demand Management, Muni Core Capacity, Development Oriented Transportation, Next Generation Transit and Transit Enhancements

Scenario C

- **Most** for BART Core Capacity
- **More** for Paratransit (18 years), Curb Ramps, and Safer Streets
- **Less** for Muni Maintenance, BART Maintenance*, Transportation Demand Management, Muni Core Capacity, Development Oriented Transportation, Next Generation Transit, and Transit Enhancements

ordered from most funding to least

**Scenarios B & C zero out BART Maintenance*

Draft Expenditure Plan Scenarios: Priority 2 Funding



San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

Scenario A

- Paratransit
- Muni Maintenance
- Safer Streets
- BART Core Capacity
- Street Resurfacing
- Curb Ramps
- Street Trees

Scenario B

- Muni Maintenance
- Paratransit
- Safer Streets
- BART Core Capacity
- Curb Ramps
- Street Resurfacing
- Transit Enhancements
- Ferry Maintenance
- Street Trees
- Transportation Demand Management

Scenario C

- Muni Maintenance
- Paratransit
- Safer Streets
- Street Resurfacing
- Development Oriented Transportation
- Transportation Demand Management
- Next Generation Transit

ordered from most funding to least

Draft Expenditure Plan: Scenario A



Increase Priority 1 funding for:

- Paratransit (~18 years, \$12 million/year, \$220 million total)
- Safer Streets (additional \$10 million)
- Curb Ramps (return to Prop K annual funding levels, additional \$6 million)

Decrease Priority 1 funding for:

- Muni Maintenance (\$20 million)
- Muni Core Capacity (\$7 million)
- Transportation Demand Management (\$2 million)
- Development Oriented Transportation (\$2 million)

Use Priority 2 to fund:

- Paratransit (~7 years, \$80 million)
- Muni Maintenance (\$45 million)
- Safer Streets (\$40 million)
- BART Core Capacity (\$20 million)
- Street Resurfacing (\$20 million)
- Curb Ramps (\$10 million)
- Street Trees (\$5 million)

Draft Expenditure Plan: Scenario B



San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

Increase Priority 1 funding for:

- Paratransit (~20 years, \$12 million/year, \$240 million total)
- BART Core Capacity (additional \$31.16 million, incl. \$21.6 million from BART Maintenance)
- Safer Streets (additional \$20 million)
- Curb Ramps (return to Prop K annual funding levels, additional \$6 million)

Decrease Priority 1 funding for:

- Muni Maintenance (\$40 million)
- BART Maintenance (\$21.6 million)
- Transportation Demand Management (\$10 million)
- Muni Core Capacity (\$7 million)
- Development Oriented Transportation (\$7 million)
- Next Generation Transit (\$5 million)
- Transit Enhancements (\$2 million)

Use Priority 2 to fund:

- Muni Maintenance (\$75 million)
- Paratransit (~3 years, \$40 million)
- Safer Streets (\$40 million)
- BART Core Capacity (\$20 million)
- Curb Ramps (\$10 million)
- Street Resurfacing (\$10 million)
- Transit Enhancements (\$10 million)
- Ferry Maintenance (\$5 million)
- Street Trees (\$5 million)
- Transportation Demand Management (\$5 million)

Draft Expenditure Plan: Scenario C



Increase Priority 1 funding for:

- Paratransit (~18 years, \$12 million/year, \$220 million total)
- BART Core Capacity (additional \$50 million, incl. \$21.6 million from BART Maintenance)
- Safer Streets (additional \$10 million)
- Curb Ramps (return to Prop K annual funding levels, additional \$6 million)

Decrease Priority 1 funding for:

- Muni Maintenance (\$25 million)
- BART Maintenance (\$21.16 million)
- Development Oriented Transportation (\$12 million)
- Transportation Demand Management (\$8.84 million)
- Muni Core Capacity (\$7 million)
- Next Generation Transit (\$5 million)
- Transit Enhancements (\$2 million)

Use Priority 2 to fund:

- Muni Maintenance (\$90 million)
- Paratransit (~6 additional years, \$70 million)
- Safer Streets (\$30 million)
- Street Resurfacing (\$10 million)
- Development Oriented Transportation (\$10 million)
- Transportation Demand Management (\$5 million)
- Next Generation Transit (\$5 million)

Draft Expenditure Plan Scenarios



San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

			DRAFT Scenario A		DRAFT Scenario B		DRAFT Scenario C	
DRAFT Expenditure Plan Programs	Eligible Agencies	Preliminary Draft EP*	Priority 1	Priority 2	Priority 1	Priority 2	Priority 1	Priority 2
MAJOR TRANSIT PROJECTS								
Muni Bus Reliability and Efficiency Improvements	SFMTA	\$110.0	\$110.00		\$110.00		\$110.00	
Muni Rail Core Capacity, e.g. Train Control	SFMTA	\$57.0	\$50.00		\$50.00		\$50.00	
BART Core Capacity	BART	\$50.0	\$50.00	\$20.00	\$81.16	\$20.00	\$100.00	
Caltrain Service Vision: Capital System Capacity Investments	PCJPB	\$10.0	\$10.00		\$10.00		\$10.00	
Caltrain Downtown Rail Extension and Pennsylvania Alignment	TJPA SFCTA	\$329.5	\$326.00		\$326.00		\$326.00	
TRANSIT MAINTENANCE & ENHANCEMENTS								
Muni - Vehicles Maintenance	SFMTA	\$452.8	\$441.82	\$15.00	\$441.82	\$15.00	\$441.82	\$40.00
Muni - Facilities Maintenance	SFMTA	\$118.2	\$117.95		\$117.95	\$5.00	\$117.95	\$30.00
Muni - Guideways Maintenance	SFMTA	\$238.3	\$201.60	\$30.00	\$181.60	\$55.00	\$196.60	\$20.00
BART Maintenance	BART	\$21.2	\$21.16		\$0.00		\$0.00	
Caltrain Maintenance	PCJPB	\$100.0	\$100.00		\$100.00		\$100.00	
Ferry Maintenance	Port of SF GGBHTD	\$4.5	\$4.52		\$4.52	\$5.00	\$4.52	
Transit Enhancements	BART PCJPB SFMTA TIMMA	\$38.1	\$38.05		\$36.05	\$10.00	\$36.05	

Discussion Questions

What programs do you think are most important to **increase** funding for?

Which programs do you think are ok to **decrease** funding for?

What is most important for Priority 2 funding?



San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

DRAFT New Expenditure Plan Text Excluding Summary Table and Description of Programs

1. Introduction

- A. Summary.** The New Expenditure Plan identifies transportation improvements to be funded from the extension of the existing half-cent transportation sales tax. The programs included in the Expenditure Plan are designed to be implemented over the next 30 years. The New Expenditure Plan includes investments in five major categories: Major Transit Projects, Transit Maintenance & Enhancements, Paratransit, Streets & Freeways, and Transportation System Development & Management.
- B. Context.** The New Expenditure Plan for the use of Prop **TBD** funds was developed by the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC), established by the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (Transportation Authority) Board, with technical assistance provided by the Transportation Authority and other transportation agencies. The roster of EPAC members is provided in Attachment 1. The Expenditure Plan was recommended by the Transportation Authority Board on [date].

Guided by the EPAC, equity has been at the forefront of the process to develop the New Expenditure Plan, the investments included within, as well as how it will be administered.

Half of the EPAC is comprised of representatives from Equity Priority Communities (EPCs), including organizations that serve EPCs. The process to develop the New Expenditure Plan included robust outreach and engagement in multiple languages, with a focus on reaching EPCs and populations that do not typically engage in transportation planning.

Investments are designed to fill gaps identified in an equity analysis conducted at the beginning of the process and include improvements to travel time and accessibility, traffic safety, and public health, as well as addressing transportation costs and supporting community-based planning, including a focus on EPCs.

Administration of the New Expenditure Plan will include a transparent and accountable process, and equity requirements have been built into administration. More details on administration are included in Section 5. Implementation Provisions.

By providing the required local match, Prop **TBD** is intended to leverage about \$**X** billion in federal, state, regional and other local funding for transportation projects in San Francisco.

The New Expenditure Plan is a list of transportation programs describing the types of transportation investments that will be given priority for Prop **TBD** funding. As such the New Expenditure Plan shall be amended into the Capital Improvement Program of the Congestion Management Program, developed pursuant to section 65089 of the California Government Code. These programs are intended to help implement the long-range vision for the development and improvement of San Francisco's transportation system, as articulated in the San Francisco Transportation Plan (SFTP) 2050.

Agenda Item #4**Attachment 1 - Draft Expenditure Plan Policies**

v.4 Last Revised: 1/10/2022

The SFTP is the City's blueprint to guide the development of transportation funding priorities and policy. The SFTP is a living document, updated on a quadrennial basis to identify and address changing needs and regional trends and align them with available funding.

- C. Goals.** The purpose of the New Expenditure Plan is to implement the priorities of the SFTP 2050 through investment in projects and programs that include planning, maintenance and rehabilitation of, and improvements to the city's multi-modal transportation system. The SFTP 2050 is part of the ConnectSF initiative, a multi-agency collaborative process to build an effective, equitable and sustainable transportation system for San Francisco's future. The goals of ConnectSF and of the SFTP 2050 are:
- **Equity.** San Francisco is an inclusive, diverse, and equitable city that offers high-quality, affordable access to desired goods, services, activities, and destinations.
 - **Economic Vitality.** To support a thriving economy, people and businesses easily access key destinations for jobs and commerce in established and growing neighborhoods both within San Francisco and the region.
 - **Environmental Sustainability.** The transportation and land use system support a healthy, resilient environment and sustainable choices for future generations.
 - **Safety and Livability.** People have attractive and safe travel options that improve public health, support livable neighborhoods, and address the needs of all users.
 - **Accountability and Engagement.** San Francisco agencies, the broader community, and elected officials work together to understand the City's transportation needs and deliver projects, programs, and services in a clear, concise, and timely fashion.
- D. Structure.** The New Expenditure Plan is organized into five sections.

Section 1: Introduction provides background on the Plan's goals and development. Section 2: General Provisions provides further context on the Plan's policies and administration. Section 3: Expenditure Plan Summary Table summarizes the Plan's investment detail (e.g. recommended funding distribution) by category, sub-category and program. Section 4: Description of Programs contains descriptions of the programs (organized by category and subcategory), and the types of projects that are eligible for funding under each of them. Section 5: Implementation Provisions describes the process for prioritizing and allocating funds following adoption of the Plan.

2. General Provisions

- A. Sales Tax Revenues.** The New Expenditure Plan shall supersede the Proposition K Expenditure Plan, adopted in 2003, as of the operative date of the Ordinance, pursuant to Section 131105 of the California Public Utilities Code. The existing one-half percent local sales tax dedicated to transportation improvements (approved in November 2003 as Proposition K) shall be continued for the duration of the New Expenditure Plan.

Agenda Item #4
Attachment 1 - Draft Expenditure Plan Policies

v.4 Last Revised: 1/10/2022

Revenues are estimated under **three** scenarios over the 30-year period of the New Expenditure Plan. The conservative projection puts the total revenue level at \$**X** billion (2020 dollars). This scenario reflects an average growth rate of **X**%, and an inflation-based discount rate of **X**%. **[PENDING: MORE DETAIL FOR PRIORITY 1, 2, AND IF THE EPAC ADDS IT, PRIORITY 3 LEVEL REVENUE FORECAST].**

B. Restriction of Funds. Sales tax revenues shall be spent on capital projects rather than to fund operations and maintenance of existing transportation services, unless otherwise explicitly specified in the Section 4. Description of Programs. In accordance with enabling legislation and adopted principles, sales tax revenues generated pursuant to this plan shall be subject to the following restrictions:

i. No Substitution.

- a. Sales tax revenues shall be used to supplement and under no circumstance replace existing local revenues used for transportation purposes.
- b. Proceeds from the sale or liquidation of capital assets funded with sales tax revenues shall be returned to the Transportation Authority (in proportion to the contribution of sales tax revenues to the total original cost of the asset), for re-allocation to eligible expenses within the program from which funds were expended for the original investment.

ii. No Expenditures Outside San Francisco. Unless otherwise explicitly specified in Section 4. Description of Programs, no sales tax funds shall be spent outside the limits of the City and County of San Francisco except for cases that satisfy all of the following conditions:

- a. **Quantifiable Benefit.** The proposed project is eligible to be funded with the sales tax consistent with the Expenditure Plan, and planning or other studies, developed in order to enable its implementation, demonstrate that there will be a quantifiable benefit to the City and County's transportation program from the expenditure of funds beyond the City and County line. A quantifiable benefit is defined as a measurable increase in the cost effectiveness of a project or group of transportation projects and or services at least partially funded with sales tax funds, located along the corridor or in the immediate geographic area of the City and County where the project in question is proposed to occur.
- b. **Expenses Matched by Other Counties.** The proposed expense is matched by funding from the county where the expenditure of sales tax funds is proposed to be made.

Should transportation projects or services contemplated in the plan require the participation of multiple counties for any phase of project planning or implementation, the Transportation Authority shall work cooperatively with the affected county or counties to ensure successful project implementation.

iii. Funding Caps for Legacy Projects. Projects carried forward from the Prop K Expenditure Plan as legacy projects shall be eligible to receive Priority 1 funds

Agenda Item #4
Attachment 1 - Draft Expenditure Plan Policies

v.4 Last Revised: 1/10/2022

from the designated programs, not to exceed the unallocated amounts programmed in the 2021 Prop K Strategic Plan.

- C. Successor Program.** The New Expenditure Plan shall supersede the Proposition K Expenditure Plan, adopted in 2003, as of the operative date of the Ordinance, pursuant to Section 131105 of the California Public Utilities Code. As such it will bear responsibility for any outstanding debt incurred by the Proposition K program, and for reimbursement of eligible costs for outstanding balances on Proposition K grants. All assets of the Proposition K program shall become Prop TBD program assets.
 - D. Bonding Authority.** The Transportation Authority shall be authorized to issue, from time to time, limited tax bonds in a total outstanding aggregate amount not to exceed [TO UPDATE \$1.88 billion], payable from the sales tax revenues generated pursuant to this plan. The Transportation Authority's bonding capacity shall be separate and distinct from that of the City and County of San Francisco.
 - E. Administration by the San Francisco County Transportation Authority.** The San Francisco County Transportation Authority, which currently allocates, administers, and oversees the expenditure of the existing Prop K sales tax for transportation, shall allocate, administer and oversee the expenditure of the Prop TBD sales tax funds.
 - F. Support of Adjacent Counties.** It is deemed unnecessary to seek the support of adjacent counties by requesting them to develop their own Transportation Expenditure Plans because San Mateo, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin and San Mateo Counties have already adopted Transportation Expenditure Plans.
 - G. Environmental Review.** Environmental reporting, review and approval procedures as provided for under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and/or the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and other applicable laws shall be carried out as a prerequisite to the implementation of any project to be funded partially or entirely with sales tax funds. No definite commitment to any activity or project is made by the adoption of the Expenditure Plan. The Expenditure Plan establishes a funding mechanism for transportation improvements which does not involve any commitment to any specific project which may result in a potentially significant physical impact on the environment. The Expenditure Plan also does not limit the discretion of agencies proposing to carry out eligible projects to select a no action or a no project alternative.
3. **Expenditure Plan Summary Table.** Table 1 below summarizes the half-cent sales tax revenue proposed allocations by category, subcategory, and program in constant 2020 dollars. The New Expenditure Plan is fiscally constrained to the total funding expected to be available for each category (e.g., percent of revenues designated for each category) and by the funding caps established for each program. The financial constraint is further detailed within each program through the specification of funding priority levels (Priorities 1, 2 and [TBD 3]) (See Section 4 Description of Programs).

There are five categories, identified with capital letters (A through E [FORMATTED TABLE PENDING]). The first subdivision level under each category is known as a subcategory. Subcategories are indicated with lower case Roman numerals. The level below a subcategory is known as a program. This Expenditure Plan identifies eligible expenditures through a set of programs that guides the types of transportation projects that will be funded by the sales tax. The programs are set up to address allocation of funds to multi-year programs for a given

Agenda Item #4
Attachment 1 - Draft Expenditure Plan Policies

v.4 Last Revised: 1/10/2022

purpose, such as street resurfacing or street safety improvements, for which not all specific project locations or improvements can be anticipated or identified at the time of adoption of the Expenditure Plan. This provides certainty about the types of investments that will be made balanced with the flexibility needed for a 30-year plan.

Adoption of an ordinance to continue the existing half-cent sales tax is necessary in order to fund the programs listed in Table 1. The tax shall be continued for the period of implementation of the New Expenditure Plan

TABLE 1. New Expenditure Plan Summary Table

[TO BE INSERTED. FOR NOW SEE AGENDA ITEM 4, ATTACHMENT 2 - DRAFT EXPENDITURE PLAN SUMMARY TABLE]

4. **Description of Programs.** This section contains descriptions of the categories, subcategories, and programs in the New Expenditure Plan and the types of projects that are eligible for funding under each of them. It also identifies the sponsoring agency or agencies for each program. The Total Funding figures correspond to the Total Expected Funding column in the Expenditure Plan Summary Table provided in Section 3, above. The percentage allocation of sales tax funds to each of the major categories is as follows: **Major Transit Projects - XX.X%, Transit Maintenance & Enhancements XX.X%, Paratransit - X.X%, Streets and Freeways - X.X%, and Transportation System Development & Management - X.X%.**

[TO BE INSERTED. FOR NOW SEE AGENDA ITEM 4, ATTACHMENT 3 - DRAFT DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAMS]

5. **Implementation Provisions.**
 - A. **Strategic Plan.** Subsequent to voter approval of the Expenditure Plan, the Transportation Authority shall prepare a 30-year Strategic Plan that will serve as the primary financial tool for administering the sales tax. It shall include policies to guide day-to-day program administration consistent with the Expenditure Plan; updated sales tax revenue projections; proposed sales tax expenditures by category, sub-category and program; and any associated financing needed to ensure funds are available to reimburse eligible expenditures. The Strategic Plan shall be prepared in concert with development of 5-Year Prioritization Programs (see Section 5.B.). The Transportation Authority Board shall adopt the Strategic Plan and updates thereof at least every 5 years.
 - B. **Prioritization Process.** Prior to allocation of sales tax funds from any program, the Transportation Authority shall prepare, in close consultation with all other affected planning and implementation agencies, a 5-year prioritized program of projects or 5YPP including budget, scope and schedule consistent with the Strategic Plan, for review and adoption by the Transportation Authority Board. For programs with only one eligible sponsoring agency, the Transportation Authority may designate that agency as the agency that is to prepare the 5YPP. The proposed projects shall be consistent with the San Francisco Transportation Plan and with the City's General Plan.

The 5YPPs shall at a minimum address, the following factors:

Agenda Item #4**Attachment 1 - Draft Expenditure Plan Policies**

v.4 Last Revised: 1/10/2022

1. Project readiness, including schedule for completion of environmental and design phases; well-documented preliminary cost estimates; documented community support as appropriate.
2. Funding plan, including sources other than the sales tax.
3. Compatibility with existing and planned land uses, and with adopted standards for urban design and for the provision of pedestrian amenities; and supportiveness of planned growth in transit-friendly housing, employment and services.
4. How the project would advance equity or seek to mitigate any impacts on equity.
5. Project benefits including but not limited to how the project advances the goals of San Francisco Transportation Plan.
6. A prioritization mechanism to rank projects within the 5YPP, that includes at a minimum, the following required criteria:
 - a. Relative level of need or urgency
 - b. Cost-effectiveness
 - c. A fair geographic distribution that takes into account the various needs of San Francisco's neighborhoods.
 - d. Level and diversity of community support. Projects with clear and diverse community support and/or identified through a community-based planning process will be prioritized. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.
 - e. Benefit to disadvantaged populations, whether the project is directly located in an Equity Priority Community or can demonstrate benefits to disadvantaged populations.

The Transportation Authority and any appropriate designated agencies shall conduct the required public outreach and engagement to ensure an inclusive planning process for the development of the 5YPPs, as well as General Plan referral or referral to any City Department or Commission as required. The Transportation Authority working with eligible sponsoring agencies shall also identify appropriate performance measures, such as increased system connectivity, increased transit ridership (net new riders), reductions in travel time for existing riders, and increased use of alternatives to the single-occupant automobile, along with a timeline for assessing the performance measures to inform the next 5YPP updates, which shall be at least every 5 years concurrent with Strategic Plan updates. These performance measures shall be consistent with Congestion Management Program requirements and guidelines issued by the Transportation Authority.

Designated agencies shall be eligible for planning funds from the relevant Expenditure Plan programs for the purpose of completing the development of the 5YPP. Sponsoring agencies will be encouraged to explore alternative and non-traditional methods for project and service delivery where they offer opportunities for increased cost-effectiveness and/or shortened project delivery timelines.

Agenda Item #4
Attachment 1 - Draft Expenditure Plan Policies

v.4 Last Revised: 1/10/2022

As part of the Strategic Plan development process, the Transportation Authority shall adopt, issue and update detailed guidelines for the development of 5YPPs.

- C. Project Delivery Oversight.** The Transportation Authority Board shall adopt project delivery oversight guidelines for major capital projects to be funded by the sales tax. The guidelines shall consider the total cost and complexity of a project in setting the definition of a major capital project. Objectives of these guidelines shall include supporting the cost effective and timely delivery of projects funded wholly or in part by the sales tax. Transportation Authority staff shall prepare a report at least annually, to the Transportation Authority Board, to communicate the status of these projects.
- D. Funding Priority Levels.** Each New Expenditure Plan program shall be funded using sales tax revenue up to the total amount for that program in Priority 1. If, after funding all Priority 1 programs in a subcategory, the latest Strategic Plan forecasts available revenues in excess of Priority 1 levels, the Transportation Authority Board may allow programming of Priority 2 revenues within the subcategory, subject to the category percentage caps and program dollar amount caps for Priority 2 established in the New Expenditure Plan. [TBD if EPAC Recommends Priority 3. After funding at least 80% of Priority 2 program dollar amounts, the Transportation Authority Board may program Priority 3 requests, if the latest Strategic Plan forecasts revenues beyond the total Priority 2 level.]
- E. Cost Savings and Remaining Funds.** If the eligible sponsoring agency or agencies complete delivery of an Expenditure Plan program or project or determine that they will no longer pursue implementation of the program or project with sales tax funds, the Transportation Authority Board may use any remaining sales tax funds in that program to fund one or more other Expenditure Plan programs in the same category that would otherwise be in compliance with the prioritization provisions set forth in Sections 5.B. and 5.D. To do so, the Transportation Authority Board must first hold a public hearing on the matter and then not sooner than 30 days after the hearing, the Transportation Authority Board may, by a 2/3 vote, direct all or a portion of the remaining funds to one or more Expenditure Plan programs.

Agenda Item #4
Attachment 1 - Draft Expenditure Plan Policies

v.4 Last Revised: 1/10/2022

Attachment 1. Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee Roster

Amandeep Jawa, Chair	Advocacy: Environment
Anni Chung, Vice Chair	Advocacy: Seniors and People with Disabilities
Jay Bain	Neighborhoods/Communities
Rosa Chen	Equity Priority Community/Community Advisory Committee
Majeid Crawford	Equity Priority Community
Zack Deutsch-Gross	Advocacy: Transit
Jessie Fernandez	Advocacy: Equity
Mel Flores	Equity Priority Community
Rodney Fong	Business/Civic: Large Business
Sharky Laguana	Business/Civic: Small Business
Aaron P. Leifer	Neighborhood/Community
Jessica Lum	Business/Civic: Tourism/Visitors
Jodie Medeiros	Advocacy: Walk
Maryo Mogannam	Business/Civic: Small Business
Maelig Morvan	Neighborhood/Community
Susan Murphy	Equity Priority Community
Calvin Quick	Advocacy: Youth
Pi Ra	Advocacy: Seniors and People with Disabilities
Maurice Rivers	Equity Priority Community
Eric Rozell	Equity Priority Community
Earl Shaddix	Equity Priority Community
Yensing Sihapanya	Equity Priority Community
Sujata Srivastava	Business/Civic: Civic
Wesley Tam	Neighborhood/Community
Kim Tavaglione	Business/Civic: Labor
Joan Van Rijn	Neighborhood/Community
Chris White	Advocacy: Bike
Cassandra Costello	Alternate: Business/Civic: Tourism/Visitors
Cathy de Luca	Alternate: Advocacy: Seniors and People with Disabilities
Daniel Herzstein	Alternate: Business/Civic: Large Business
Sasha Hirji	Alternate: Advocacy: Youth
Melvin Parham	Alternate: Equity Priority Community
Maribel Ramirez	Alternate: Equity Priority Community



NEW EP CATEGORY - SUBCATEGORY - PROGRAM	MAXIMUM FUNDING (2020 MILLION\$*)	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.



Attachment 3 DRAFT New Expenditure Plan Program Descriptions

The Transportation Authority has developed draft program descriptions for all programs and projects included in the preliminary draft New Expenditure Plan. This language defines the types of projects eligible in each proposed New Expenditure Plan program, and names a sponsor agency or agencies who will be eligible to receive funding from the program. The final language will include the recommended sales tax funding amounts, including funding from the conservative forecast (referred to as Priority 1) and, as recommended, funding from the more optimistic forecast (referred to as Priority 2).

This initial draft language was prepared with sponsor agency input using:

- The Transportation Authority's Needs Assessment developed for the ConnectSF and the San Francisco Transportation Plan 2050, including funding and program needs from all the transportation agencies serving San Francisco; and
- Proposition K sales tax program descriptions, updated to reflect lessons learned and to address the current needs of the sponsor agencies.

Please note the proposed New Expenditure Plan descriptions reference dollar amounts in 2020 \$s.

MAJOR TRANSIT PROJECTS

1. Muni Reliability and Efficiency Improvements

Programmatic improvements that improve the reliability and speed of Muni bus and rail service. Eligible project types include: transit-only lanes; curb bulb-outs at Muni stops; traffic signal modifications; deployment of transit signal priority devices; relocation and upgrade of Muni stops; and other street design changes (e.g. highly visible crosswalks, median island refuges) to reduce delay for transit and enhance pedestrian safety. Includes \$10M in legacy funding for Geary Rapid Improvements Phase 2. Includes project development and capital costs. Sponsor Agency: SFMTA. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$110M.

2. Muni Rail Core Capacity

Programmatic improvements that increase the reliability and capacity of Muni's rail system by supporting longer and more frequent trains. High priority shall be given to installation of a next generation communications-based train control system for the Muni surface and subway rail network. Engineering improvements may include lengthening existing platforms to accommodate 3 and 4-car light rail trains in the Muni Metro Tunnel between West Portal and Embarcadero stations, and 3-car trains on the N Judah line. Upgrades to switches, crossovers, and other components to increase subway reliability and throughput, and modifications to subway portals to minimize conflicts. Purchase of additional light rail vehicles to increase the fleet's overall capacity and new/upgraded maintenance and/or storage facilities to house additional vehicles. Includes project development and capital costs. Sponsor Agency: SFMTA. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$57M.

3. BART Core Capacity

Improvements that will allow BART to operate up to 30 ten-car trains per hour in each direction through the existing Transbay Tube (an increase from the current capacity of 23 trains per hour). Eligible project types include: new (additional) rail cars; a new communications-based train control system; a new rail car storage yard at the Hayward Maintenance Complex; and additional traction

power substations to provide the power needed for more frequent service. Includes project development and capital costs. As a prerequisite to allocation of funds, the Transportation Authority Board shall consider whether Alameda and Contra Costa Counties have contributed a commensurate amount to the BART Core Capacity Program. Sponsor Agency: BART. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$50M.

4. Caltrain Service Vision: Capital System Capacity Investments

Capital improvements that will allow Caltrain service up to operate eight trains per direction per hour consistent with the Caltrain Business Plan Service Vision. Eligible project types include but are not limited to additional fleet, level boarding at station platforms, additional train storage, track work and station improvements. Includes planning, project development, and capital costs. Sponsor Agency: PCJPB. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$10M.

5. Caltrain Downtown Rail Extension and Pennsylvania Alignment

Caltrain Downtown Rail Extension: The underground extension of the Caltrain commuter rail system from the current Caltrain San Francisco terminus into the Salesforce Transit Center. Project designed to accommodate blended service with future California High-Speed Rail. Includes a new station at 4th and Townsend streets. Project includes \$19.5 million in legacy funding.

Pennsylvania Alignment: Below-grade rail alignment extending south from the planned Downtown Rail Extension. Project will serve the Caltrain commuter rail system and future California High-Speed Rail service. Pennsylvania Alignment will separate rail from surface-level conflicts with street users at 16th Street and Mission Bay Drive. A minimum of \$10 million will be available for the Pennsylvania Alignment.

Includes project development and capital costs. Sponsor Agencies: TJPA, SFCTA. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$329.5M.

TRANSIT MAINTENANCE & ENHANCEMENTS

Maintenance, Rehabilitation and Replacement Sub-Category

- 1. Muni - Vehicles.** Programmatic improvements for upgrade, rehabilitation and replacement of transit vehicles, spare parts and on-board equipment. Eligible project types include: rail car, trolley coach and motor coach renovation and replacement of buses with zero emission vehicles. With respect to the latter, additional vehicles may be added to the fleet to maintain current fleet passenger capacity (e.g., if electric buses have lower passenger capacity). Includes project development and capital costs. Sponsor Agency: SFMTA. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$452.8M.
- 2. Muni - Facilities.** Programmatic improvements for upgrade, rehabilitation and replacement of transit facilities and facilities-related equipment. Eligible project types include: rehabilitation, upgrades and/or replacement of existing facilities for maintenance and operations, including equipment and upgrades to support the electrification of the Muni motor coach fleet and to improve resilience to climate change. Rehabilitation, upgrades and renovation for rail stations including, but not limited to platform edge tiles, elevators, escalators, and faregates. Includes project development and capital costs. Sponsor Agency: SFMTA. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$118.2M.



3. **Muni - Guideways.** Programmatic improvements for upgrade, rehabilitation and replacement of transit guideways and associated equipment. The intent is to implement transit priority and reliability improvements whenever rehabilitation, upgrade or replacement projects are undertaken. Eligible project types include, but are not limited to rehabilitation, upgrades and/or replacement of existing rail, overhead trolley wires, signals, traction power stations, and automatic train control systems, as well as upgrades to improve resilience to climate change. Includes project development and capital costs. Sponsor Agency: SFMTA. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$238.3M.
4. **BART.** Programmatic improvements for the upgrade, rehabilitation and replacement of BART's capital assets. Eligible project types include, but are not limited to the upgrade, rehabilitation and replacement of: transit vehicles and on-board equipment; transit stations including platform edge tiles, elevators, escalators, and faregates; transit facilities and facilities related equipment; and guideways such as rail, train control, traction power, and related equipment. Facilities and guideways improvements may include upgrades to improve resilience to climate change. Includes project development and capital costs. Sponsor Agency: BART. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$21.2M.
5. **Caltrain.** Provides San Francisco's local match contribution for the Caltrain capital program, on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco until sales tax funds run out. Programmatic improvements such as the upgrade, rehabilitation and replacement of transit vehicles, spare parts and on-board equipment; transit facilities (including stations) and facilities related equipment; and guideways such as rail, signals, communications, traction power equipment, and the overhead contact system. Facilities and guideways improvements may include upgrades to improve resilience to climate change. Service planning and capital planning efforts are also eligible. Includes project development and capital costs. Sponsor Agency: PCJPB. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$100M.
6. **Ferry.** Programmatic improvements for the upgrade, rehabilitation and replacement of landside ferry facilities, passenger-serving facilities, and facilities-related equipment. May also include improvements to San Francisco ferry terminals to accommodate increases in ferry ridership, electrification and to improve resilience to climate change. Includes project development and capital costs. Sponsor Agencies: Port of SF, GGBHTD. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$4.5M.

Transit Enhancements Sub-Category

1. **Transit Enhancements.** Customer-facing programmatic improvements that promote system connectivity, accessibility, and reliability and improve transit service experience for riders. These are meant to be smaller to mid-sized projects that produce benefits directly experienced by transit riders. Eligible projects may include but are not limited to bus stop improvements (with priority for those serving disadvantaged communities); wayfinding; real-time information; new (additional) elevators or escalators; multimodal station access and safety improvements; bicycle parking/storage; ; purchase and rehab of historic streetcars; purchase of motor coaches and paratransit expansion vehicles. Includes project development and capital costs. Sponsor Agencies: SFMTA, BART, PCJPB, TIMMA. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$38.1M.
2. **BART Station Access, Safety and Capacity.** Improvements to stations and other facilities owned or operated by BART within San Francisco to enhance passenger safety, accessibility and

capacity, (e.g. additional elevators, staircases), improved signage and security, real time traveler information, intermodal access improvements (including improved access for passengers transferring from other transit services or bicycles), replacement and upgrade of existing escalators, elevators and faregates, and street level plaza improvements. Includes project development and capital costs. Sponsor Agencies: BART, SFMTA. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$9.3M.

3. **Bayview Caltrain Station.** Construction of a new or relocated Caltrain station in the Bayview. Includes \$4.73M in legacy funding for the Quint-Jerrold Connector Road, which will restore access eliminated by the construction of a Caltrain berm. Includes project development and capital costs. Sponsor Agencies: SFCTA, PCJPB, SFMTA, SFPW. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$27.7M.
4. **Mission Bay Ferry Landing.** A new ferry landing serving the Mission Bay neighborhood to enable regional ferry service. Includes capital costs. Sponsor Agency: Port of SF. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$7M.
5. **Next Generation Transit Investments.** Planning and project development for major transit capital projects that promote system connectivity and accessibility, close service gaps, and improve and expand transit service levels. By funding planning, outreach and early project development, the intent is to set these projects up to be competitive for discretionary funds to complete project development and implementation. Eligible projects may include but are not limited to a 19th Avenue/Geary subway, extending the Central Subway, Link21 (including a potential second transbay tube), local and regional express bus network development **and transit technology systems**. Sponsor Agencies: SFCTA; SFMTA; BART; PCJPB. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$30M.

PARATRANSIT

1. **Paratransit.** Continued support for paratransit door-to-door van, taxi and other transportation services for seniors and people with disabilities who are unable to use fixed route transit service. Includes operations support, replacement of accessible vans, and replacement and upgrades of supporting equipment such as debit card systems. Sponsor Agency: SFMTA. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$204.9M.

STREETS AND FREEWAYS

Maintenance, Rehabilitation and Replacement Sub-Category

1. **Street Resurfacing, Rehabilitation and Maintenance.**
Repaving and reconstruction of city streets to prevent deterioration of the roadway system, based on an industry-standard pavement management system designed to inform cost effective roadway maintenance. May include sidewalk rehabilitation and curb ramps and elements to improve resilience to climate change Includes project development and capital costs. Sponsor Agency: SFPW. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$88M.
Replacement of street repair and cleaning equipment according to industry standards, such as but not limited to, asphalt pavers, dump trucks, sweepers, and front-end loaders. Includes capital costs only. Sponsor Agency: SFPW. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$17M.
2. **Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Maintenance.** Public sidewalk repair and reconstruction citywide. Maintenance of additional pedestrian facility improvements including stairways,



retaining walls, guardrails and rockfall barriers. Maintenance of pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements including but not limited to safe hit posts, painted safety zones, green bike lanes, and crosswalks. Rehabilitation of other bicycle facilities such as paths. Includes project development and capital costs. Sponsor Agencies: SFMTA, SFPW. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$17.6M.

Safe and Complete Streets Sub-Category

1. **Safer and Complete Streets.** Programmatic improvements to the transportation system to make it safer for all users and help achieve the City's Vision Zero goals. Projects may include:
 - Traffic calming to reduce vehicular speeds and improve safety; new or improved pedestrian safety measures such as ladder crosswalks, corner bulb-outs and pedestrian islands in the medians of major thoroughfares; new and upgraded bike lanes and paths; traffic striping and channelization; bicycle and personal mobility device parking facilities such as bike/scooter racks and lockers. Quick builds (e.g. paint and safe-hit posts), pilots, permanent improvements, intersection redesigns and larger corridor projects are eligible. Landscaping may be included as a minor element of a larger safety project.
 - Installation, maintenance and upgrade of traffic signs and signals (including for pedestrians and bicyclists); red light enforcement cameras; and closed-circuit TV and communications systems (e.g. Variable Message Signs) for incident and special event traffic management.
 - Multi-modal street improvements to improve pedestrian, bicycle, transit and vehicle circulation and connectivity. Includes traffic signal improvements, signage and striping,
 - Bicycle, pedestrian and Vision Zero outreach and education programs such as Safe Routes to School; development of neighborhood and school area safety plans.

Includes project development and capital costs. Sponsor Agencies: SFMTA, SFPW, SFCTA. A minimum of \$90M will be available to the SFMTA for the maintenance and upgrade of traffic signals. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$226.4M.

2. **Curb Ramps.** Construction of new Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant curb ramps and related roadway work to permit ease of movement. Reconstruction of existing ramps. Includes project development and capital costs. Sponsor Agency: SFPW. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$23.8M.
3. **Tree Planting.** Planting of new street trees in public rights-of-way throughout the city. Sponsor Agency: SFPW. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$23.8M.

Freeway Safety and Operational Improvements Sub-Category

1. **Vision Zero Ramps.** Programmatic improvements to benefit all users of intersections where freeway on- and off-ramps intersect with city streets to support the City's Vision Zero policy to eliminate traffic deaths. Eligible project types include: new or improved pedestrian safety measures such as ladder crosswalks and pedestrian signals, corner bulb-outs, and new traffic signs and signals. Includes planning, project development and capital costs. Sponsor Agencies: SFMTA, SFCTA. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$8M.
2. **Managed Lanes and Express Bus.** Programmatic improvements to San Francisco's freeways to improve transit speeds (e.g. express bus) and reliability, and promote carpooling.



Improvements may include high occupancy vehicle lanes, ramp re-striping or re-designs, signs and signalization, purchase of buses to support increased Muni bus operations on improved facilities, and if express lanes are proposed, tolling system and funding of an affordability program. Includes project development and capital costs. Sponsor Agencies: SFCTA, SFMTA. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$15M.

3. **Transformative Freeway & Major Street Projects.** Planning and project development for transformative multi-modal improvements that are designed to improve safety, enhance multi-modal connectivity, and/or reconnect communities and repair the harm created by past freeway and street projects. By funding planning, outreach and early project development, the intent is to set these projects up to be competitive for discretionary funds to complete project development and implementation. Eligible project types may include, but are not limited to new grade-separated crossings for people walking and biking; restoring connections within communities divided by infrastructure (e.g. Geary underpass, pedestrian/bike freeway overcrossings); and simplifying freeway interchanges (e.g. Alemany Maze and US 101/Cesar Chavez "Hairball"). May include projects to improve resilience to climate change. Sponsor Agencies: SFCTA, SFMTA, SFPW, Planning. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$20M.

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & MANAGEMENT

Transportation Demand Management Sub-Category

1. **Transportation Demand Management.** Transportation Demand Management (TDM) improvements intended to shift trips to sustainable modes like transit, biking and walking and shift travel to less congested times. Develop and support continued TDM and parking requirements for large employers, special event sites, and schools and universities. Eligible project types also include TDM education, marketing, incentives, pricing, technology, policy development, pilots, and evaluation. Hardware, software, and equipment needed to implement pricing, incentives and affordability projects are eligible. Examples of eligible projects include new solutions or technologies for first-last mile connections or special trip markets; intermodal integration of customer-facing technology (e.g. travel information and payment systems); and new fare payment concepts for mode shift or congestion management. Includes planning, project development and capital costs. Sponsor Agencies: SFCTA, SFE, SFMTA, BART, PCJPB, TIMMA. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$30M.

Transportation, Land Use and Community Coordination Sub-Category

1. **Neighborhood Transportation Program.** The Neighborhood Transportation Program (NTP) funds community-based neighborhood-scale transportation improvements. The NTP has a planning component to fund community-based planning efforts in each Supervisorial district, and a capital component intended to provide local match to help advance and implement capital investment and pilot recommendations stemming from NTP and other community-based planning efforts. Eligible project types are those that are eligible for other Expenditure Plan programs and result in public-facing benefits. Additional project types include: transportation policy studies, pilots and projects to address climate change and (access) gaps (in equitable access). Includes planning, project development and capital costs. Sponsor Agencies: SFCTA, SFMTA, SFPW, Planning. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$40M.
2. **Equity Priority Transportation Program.** The Equity Priority Transportation Program (EPTP) funds equity priority community-based projects in underserved neighborhoods and areas with



vulnerable populations (e.g. low income communities, seniors, children, and/or people with disabilities) as well as citywide equity evaluations and planning efforts. The EPTP has a planning component to fund community-based planning efforts, and a capital component to provide local match funds to help advance and implement capital investment and pilot recommendations stemming from community-based planning and equity assessments.

Eligible project types are those that are eligible for other Expenditure Plan programs, as well as projects that help reduce disparities and gaps in equitable access (physical, geographic, affordability) to jobs and key services. Includes planning, project development and capital costs. Sponsor Agencies: SFCTA, SFMTA, SFPW, Planning. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$40M.

3. **Development-Oriented Transportation.** The Development-Oriented Transportation Program funds community-based planning to identify transportation improvements that support increased housing density in existing, primarily low-density neighborhoods of the city, as well as project development and implementation. Projects supporting development in adopted Priority Development Areas will be prioritized. Includes \$2M in legacy funding for the Bayshore Caltrain Pedestrian Connection. Includes planning, project development and capital costs. Sponsor Agencies: SFMTA, SFCTA, BART, PCJPB, Planning, SFPW. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$42M.
4. **Citywide/Modal Planning.** Citywide and network-wide transportation studies and planning such as updates to the Countywide Transportation Plan or long-range modal studies. Plans and studies that focus on countywide and/or network wide needs will be prioritized, but corridor-scale studies may be considered. Includes planning. Sponsor Agencies: SFCTA, SFMTA, Planning. Total Funding: TBD; EP: \$10M.

Acronyms

BART – San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District; EP – Expenditure Plan; GGHBTD – Golden Gate Bridge, Highway & Transportation District; N/A – Not Applicable; PCJPB – Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board or Caltrain; Planning – San Francisco Planning Department; Port of SF – Port of San Francisco; SFCTA – San Francisco County Transportation Authority; SFE – San Francisco Department of Environment; SFMTA – San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency; SFPW – San Francisco Public Works; TBD – To Be Determined; TIMMA – Treasure Island Mobility Management Agency; TJPA – Transbay Joint Powers Authority

Amounts in millions of 2020 \$\$

			DRAFT Scenario A		DRAFT Scenario B		DRAFT Scenario C	
DRAFT Expenditure Plan Programs	Eligible Agencies	Preliminary Draft EP*	Priority 1	Priority 2	Priority 1	Priority 2	Priority 1	Priority 2
MAJOR TRANSIT PROJECTS								
Muni Bus Reliability and Efficiency Improvements	SFMTA	\$110.0	\$110.00		\$110.00		\$110.00	
Muni Rail Core Capacity, e.g. Train Control	SFMTA	\$57.0	\$50.00		\$50.00		\$50.00	
BART Core Capacity	BART	\$50.0	\$50.00	\$20.00	\$81.16	\$20.00	\$100.00	
Caltrain Service Vision: Capital System Capacity Investments	PCJPB	\$10.0	\$10.00		\$10.00		\$10.00	
Caltrain Downtown Rail Extension and Pennsylvania Alignment	TJPA SFCTA	\$329.5	\$326.00		\$326.00		\$326.00	
TRANSIT MAINTENANCE & ENHANCEMENTS								
Muni - Vehicles Maintenance	SFMTA	\$452.8	\$441.82	\$15.00	\$441.82	\$15.00	\$441.82	\$40.00
Muni - Facilities Maintenance	SFMTA	\$118.2	\$117.95		\$117.95	\$5.00	\$117.95	\$30.00
Muni - Guideways Maintenance	SFMTA	\$238.3	\$201.60	\$30.00	\$181.60	\$55.00	\$196.60	\$20.00
BART Maintenance	BART	\$21.2	\$21.16		\$0.00		\$0.00	
Caltrain Maintenance	PCJPB	\$100.0	\$100.00		\$100.00		\$100.00	
Ferry Maintenance	Port of SF GGBHTD	\$4.5	\$4.52		\$4.52	\$5.00	\$4.52	
Transit Enhancements	BART PCJPB SFMTA TIMMA	\$38.1	\$38.05		\$36.05	\$10.00	\$36.05	
BART Station Access, Safety and Capacity	BART SFMTA	\$9.3	\$9.27		\$9.27		\$9.27	
Bayview Caltrain Station	PCJPB SFCTA SFMTA SFPW	\$27.7	\$27.73		\$27.73		\$27.73	
Mission Bay Ferry Landing	Port of SF	\$7.0	\$7.00		\$7.00		\$7.00	
Next Generation Transit Investments	BART PCJPB SFCTA SFMTA	\$30.0	\$30.00		\$25.00		\$25.00	\$5.00
PARATRANSIT								
Paratransit	SFMTA	\$204.9	\$220.00	\$80.00	\$240.00	\$40.00	\$220.00	\$70.00
STREETS & FREEWAYS								
Street Resurfacing, Rehabilitation and Maintenance	SFPW	\$105.0	\$104.78	\$20.00	\$104.78	\$10.00	\$104.78	\$10.00
Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Maintenance	SFMTA SFPW	\$17.6	\$17.60		\$17.60		\$17.60	
Safe and Complete Streets	SFCTA SFMTA SFPW	\$226.4	\$235.91	\$40.00	\$245.91	\$40.00	\$235.91	\$30.00
Curb Ramps	SFPW	\$23.8	\$29.83	\$10.00	\$29.83	\$10.00	\$29.83	
Tree Planting	SFPW	\$23.8	\$23.78	\$5.00	\$23.78	\$5.00	\$23.78	
Vision Zero Ramps	SFCTA SFMTA	\$8.0	\$8.00		\$8.00		\$8.00	
Managed Lanes and Express Bus	SFCTA SFMTA	\$15.0	\$15.00		\$15.00		\$15.00	
Transformative Freeway & Major Street Projects	Planning SFCTA SFMTA SFPW	\$20.0	\$20.00		\$20.00		\$20.00	
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & MANAGEMENT								
Transportation Demand Management	BART PCJPB SFCTA SFE SFMTA TIMMA	\$30.0	\$28.00		\$20.00	\$5.00	\$21.16	\$5.00
Neighborhood Transportation Program	Planning SFPW SFCTA SFMTA	\$40.0	\$40.00		\$40.00		\$40.00	
Equity Priority Transportation Program	Planning SFPW SFCTA SFMTA	\$40.0	\$40.00		\$40.00		\$40.00	

Development Oriented Transportation	BART PCJPB Planning SFPW SFCTA SFMTA	\$42.0	\$40.00		\$35.00		\$30.00	\$10.00
Citywide / Modal Planning	Planning SFCTA SFMTA	\$10.0	\$10.00		\$10.00		\$10.00	
			\$2,378.00	\$220.00	\$2,378.00	\$220.00	\$2,378.00	\$220.00

The above 3 scenarios are intended to support EPAC tradeoff discussions regarding the distribution of sales tax funds to programs in the New Expenditure Plan. Scenarios A, B, and C include both Priority 1 (the most conservative forecast) and Priority 2 (a modestly more optimistic forecast). The EPAC may choose one of these scenarios or create its own (hybrid).

Red highlight shows programs that have less Priority 1 funding in a given scenario compared to the preliminary draft EP or Expenditure Plan (last revised 10/4/2021).

Green highlight shows programs that have more Priority 1 funding in a given scenario compared to the preliminary draft EP or Expenditure Plan (last revised 10/4/2021).

Gold highlight shows staff proposals for Priority 2 funding based on EPAC and agency input.

Attachment 5 - DRAFT Expenditure Plan Context Table
As of January 7, 2022

		Dollar amounts in millions of 2020 \$ - Columns B-F looks at 30-year totals for costs and funding.										
	Column A *see notes on each column at bottom	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
#	New Expenditure Plan Program	Draft Expenditure Plan Priority 1 Funding	Draft Potential Future Funds	Total Funding Need	Remaining Funding Gap (Assuming Sales Tax + Potential Future Funds)	% Funded (Assuming Sales Tax+Potential Future Funds)	Leveraging Ability	Funding Notes	Program Benefits	Equity Analysis Nexus Equity Assessment Report Equity Assessment Presentation	Maintain/ Enhance/Expand/ Operate	Reference Links
	Major Transit Projects											
1	Muni Reliability and Efficiency Improvements	\$110.00	\$978.30	\$1,088.30	\$0	100%	High - State Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program; Regional transit performance funds, Federal Small Starts	Sales tax funds would provide local match to competitive programs and/or early planning funds to make projects more competitive.	Transit Reliability, travel time savings and traffic safety. E.g., Muni Forward program improvements have demonstrated time savings of 10% or more, and increased ridership by 14% on Rapid lines from 2016-2018. As congestion increases in areas where transit does not have priority measures in place, transit service becomes slower and more expensive to operate while maintaining service levels.	Invest in transit reliability and accessibility	Enhance, Expand	Major Transit Projects Presentation
2	Muni Rail Core Capacity	\$57.00	\$663.00	\$720.00	\$0	100%	High - Federal Core Capacity; State Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program; Regional programs	Program is still in project-definition phase beyond new train control system. Sales tax would serve as seed funding for project development and as local match for competitive grants like the FTA Capital Investment Grant Program, or state Transit and Intercity Rail Program.	Upgrades such as a new train control system will improve safety and reliability and allow four-car trains, addressing crowding and congestion.	Invest in transit reliability and accessibility	Expand	Major Transit Projects Presentation
3	BART Core Capacity	\$50.00	\$3,436.40	\$3,536.40	\$50	99%	High - Federal Core Capacity; State Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program; BART funds and other counties' contributions	Project has received significant funding already (> \$1B from federal/state competitive funds). BART is asking SF, Alameda, & Contra Costa counties for \$100 million each to purchase additional BART cars to reduce crowding and provide more capacity for passengers. VTA has programmed \$120 million for additional BART cars as part of the BART to San Jose extension agreement.	Would allow BART to increase the number of trains from 23 trains/hour to 29 10-car trains/hour moving through the transbay tube at rush hour, reducing crowding and increasing rider capacity, and improving transit connections in San Francisco. Forecast total GHG reductions over the lifetime of the Program are 6,767,159 MTCO2e with the following equivalencies: •Over 700 million gallons of gasoline •Over 7 billion pounds of coal •Nearly 800 thousand homes' energy use for 1 year •Over 15 million barrels of oil Forecast 35% increase in ridership (151,172 riders) year one following implementation.	Invest in transit reliability and accessibility	Expand	Major Transit Projects Presentation BART Factsheets (4)
4	Caltrain Enhanced Service: Capital Capacity Improvements	\$10.00	\$0.00	\$1,211.00	\$1,201	1%	High - Federal Core Capacity; State Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program; other counties' contributions	Funding plan TBD. Sales tax funds would serve as seed money and local match to discretionary grants, and investments from other Caltrain counties.	Supports increase in post-electrification train service from 6 trains per hour during peak periods to 8 trains per hour, consistent with Caltrain Business Plan.	Invest in transit reliability and accessibility	Expand	Major Transit Projects Presentation
5	Caltrain Downtown Rail Extension (DTX) and Pennsylvania Alignment (PAX)	\$329.50	\$4,700.50	\$5,030.00	\$0	100%	DTX: High - Federal New Starts; State gas tax; local development district and land sales PAX: Low - other local funds and limited planning discretionary funding	Of Total Funding Need shown, DTX is \$5B total cost. EP only includes modest seed money for PAX. Leveraging/Time Sensitivity: DTX is seeking a \$1.5-2.5 billion federal New Starts grant, which cannot exceed 60% of the funding plan. Project just accepted into New Starts pipeline by FTA and will need to show increasing levels of funding commitments by certain deadlines to stay in the New Start pipeline. \$30 million is shown for PAX planning/environmental only. Total project cost is estimated to be \$1.8-3.0 billion, with cost range reflecting options for PAX extent and station construction.	Creates an essential link in the region and state's rail network, providing a one-seat ride from the Peninsula into downtown San Francisco, providing access to the Salesforce Transit Center, the planned northern terminus of California High Speed Rail. Improves transit reliability and helps relieve congestion in 101/280 corridor.	Invest in transit reliability and accessibility	Expand	Major Transit Projects Presentation
	Transit Maintenance & Enhancements											
6	Muni Vehicles Maintenance, Rehabilitation and Replacement	\$452.80	\$4,388.10	\$7,062.60	\$2,222	69%	High - primarily federal transit formula funds	Not eligible for GO Bond. Federal funding distributed through the regional Transit Capital Priorities program requires at least 30% local funds match. The is one of most financed programs in Prop K sales tax and has supported replacement of Muni's entire rubber tire fleet and the in progress replacement of the Breda light rail vehicles.	Properly maintaining and replacing vehicles before the end of their useful life is essential to provide reliable transit service. Older vehicles typically breakdown more often and can lead to increased operating and matinenance costs.	Invest in transit reliability and accessibility	Maintain	Maintenance: Muni, BART, and Caltrain Presentation
7	Muni Facilities Maintenance, Rehabilitation and Replacement	\$118.20	\$684.30	\$4,660.80	\$3,858	17%	Low to Moderate - primarily other local funds; potential for development agreements	Difficult to fund; few discretionary funding options. Transit maintenance needs are so high in Bay Area, particularly in SF- Oakland urbanized area, that federal transit formula monies primarily fund only vehicles and guideways (e.g tracks, overhead wire) and don't get to facilities or other needs. For this reason, SFMTA is including facilities in their 2022 GO Bond proposal.	Includes both stations and maintenance facilities, where vehicle maintenance takes place. Maintaining and replacing facilities maintains safe working conditions, ensures sufficient resources for vehicle maintenance, and prepares the City to transition to electric buses.	Invest in transit reliability and accessibility	Maintain	Maintenance: Muni, BART, and Caltrain Presentation
8	Muni Guideways Maintenance, Rehabilitation and Replacement	\$238.30	\$2,037.40	\$2,546.80	\$271	89%	High - Federal transit formula funds, state funds	Sales tax is a key source of local match. Guideways are funded through a mix of federal and state funds which require at least 20% non-federal match.	Well maintained guideways (e.g. overhead wires and tracks), are essential for providing safe and reliable transit service. Guideway repair and maintenance keeps the buses and trains moving.	Invest in transit reliability and accessibility	Maintain	Maintenance: Muni, BART, and Caltrain Presentation

Attachment 5 - DRAFT Expenditure Plan Context Table
As of January 7, 2022

		Dollar amounts in millions of 2020 \$ - Columns B-F looks at 30-year totals for costs and funding.										
	Column A *see notes on each column at bottom	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
#	New Expenditure Plan Program	Draft Expenditure Plan Priority 1 Funding	Draft Potential Future Funds	Total Funding Need	Remaining Funding Gap (Assuming Sales Tax + Potential Future Funds)	% Funded (Assuming Sales Tax+Potential Future Funds)	Leveraging Ability	Funding Notes	Program Benefits	Equity Analysis Nexus Equity Assessment Report Equity Assessment Presentation	Maintain/ Enhance/Expand/ Operate	Reference Links
9	BART Maintenance, Rehabilitation and Replacement	\$21.20	\$354.30	\$957.54	\$582	39%	High - Federal formula funds; BART Measure RR Bond funds; and other funds	BART is requesting additional funding from the sales tax to help fund various projects (see program benefits column). The \$3.5B Measure RR BART Bond passed in 2016 was primarily focused on maintenance, rehabilitation and replacement, but there remains a significant funding gap systemwide.	A well maintained system, is necessary to support safe and reliable transit service. Currently, BART is modernizing their train control system; retrofitting existing fare gates; and modernizing elevators across the system. Elevator Modernization will improve the cleanliness, reliability and availability of elevators at San Francisco BART stations. These elevators are especially crucial to provide access to the stations for disabled riders, cyclists, families with strollers and travelers with luggage.	Invest in transit reliability and accessibility	Maintain	Maintenance: Muni, BART, and Caltrain Presentation
10	Caltrain Maintenance, Rehabilitation and Replacement	\$100.00	\$450.30	\$956.87	\$407	58%	High - Federal formula funds; other county contributions; Caltrain sales tax	Local match contributions to Caltrain's capital maintenance program from San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties help leverage state and federal funding. All three members share equally in these costs, estimated by Caltrain to be \$5-\$7.5M per year per county. The sales tax would fund up to 20 years of member contributions for San Francisco, relieving SFMTA (a member of the Caltrain Joint Powers Board) from making this contribution. Note Caltrain Measure RR 1/8-cent sales tax is primarily needed to cover Caltrain operations.	A well maintained system, is necessary to support safe and reliable transit service.	Invest in transit reliability and accessibility	Maintain	Maintenance: Muni, BART, and Caltrain Presentation
11	Ferry Maintenance, Rehabilitation and Replacement	\$4.50	\$9.30	\$36.50	\$23	38%	High - Federal funds; Regional bridge tolls (Regional Measure 3)	Sales tax provides some local match to more directly weigh in on priority projects. Regional Measure 3 (RM3) bridge toll will be a key source if it clears legal hurdles.	A well maintained system, is necessary to support safe and reliable transit service.	Invest in transit reliability and accessibility	Maintain	
12	Transit Enhancements	\$38.10	\$741.40	\$1,545.40	\$766	50%	Moderate to High - State and federal competitive grants; regional funding	A wide variety of improvement types are eligible for funding in this category. Some will be more competitive than others for matching dollars.	Connectivity, accessibility, and reliability improvements focused on customer experience. Examples include bus stop improvements, wayfinding, station access improvements, among others.	Invest in transit reliability and accessibility	Enhance	Transit Enhancements Presentation
13	BART Station Access, Safety and Capacity	\$9.30	\$158.40	\$249.89	\$82	67%	Moderate to High - State and federal competitive grants; regional funding; BART capital funds	These project types are also eligible under other programs such as BART maintenance and Transit Enhancements.	Improve BART stations/facilities within San Francisco to enhance passenger safety, accessibility and capacity, improve signage and security, real time traveler information, and provide intermodal access improvements.	Invest in transit reliability and accessibility; improve traffic safety	Enhance, Expand	Transit Enhancements Presentation
14	Bayview Caltrain Station	\$27.70	\$72.30	\$100.00	\$0	100%	Moderate to High - State and federal competitive grants; regional fund programs	Project is still in early planning stages. Sales tax is proposed as key seed money to advance this equity project and position it to compete well for discretionary funds.	Would support a new or relocated Caltrain station in the Bayview, as well as fund the legacy Quint-Jerrold Connector Road project to restore access that was eliminated by construction of a Caltrain berm.	Invest in transit reliability and accessibility; restore access in an Equity Priority Community	Expand	Transit Enhancements Presentation
												Southeast Rail Station Study (New Bayview Catrain Station) Presentation
15	Mission Bay Ferry Landing	\$7.00	\$46.80	\$58.80	\$5	91%	Moderate to High - other local funds; developer agreements; regional bridge toll funds; potentially federal funding	Project is in final design and will be ready to enter the construction phase in summer 2022 if fully funded. Port is seeking to close \$12M funding gap to fully fund project. Port is requesting increasing sales tax funding from \$7M to \$12M to avoid having to seek federal funds. That requires NEPA clearance and other federal requirements that increase costs and timeline to deliver the project.	Would provide regional ferry service to/from Mission Bay and surrounding neighborhoods, providing congestion relief, helping to alleviate regional transit overcrowding, and improving transportation resiliency. Project development documents project 366,000 annual weekday riders (2020) and an additional 124,900 annual riders for events at the Chase Center. Estimated total GHG emission reduction (MTCO ₂ e): 73,596. Estimated passenger VMT reduction (miles): 13,351,500.	Invest in transit accessibility	Expand	Transit Enhancements Presentation
												Mission Bay Ferry Landing Factsheet
16	Next Generation Transit Investments	\$30.00	\$60.00	\$90.00	\$0	100%	Low to Moderate - state and regional planning grants; potential to serve as seed funding for major transit capital projects down the line; ultimate projects will have high leveraging	Sales tax funds are proposed as seed funding for planning, early project development and environmental studies to position these projects to compete well for discretionary funding. Program need is sized to match assumed available revenues. Leveraging is expected to be low to moderate for these difficult to fund early phases, but high for design and construction.	Plans for major transit projects that promote system connectivity and accessibility, close service gaps, and improve and expand transit service levels. Some major transit projects may include: Geary/19th Ave Subway (preliminary capital cost estimate: \$20 billion +/- 25%); Central Subway Extension to North Beach/Fisherman's Wharf (preliminary capital cost estimate: \$1.6 billion+/- 25%) or Link21 including a new transbay tube (preliminary capital cost estimate: \$28.8 billion)	Invest in transit reliability and accessibility	Expand	Next Generation Transit Investments Presentation
												Link21 Factsheet

Attachment 5 - DRAFT Expenditure Plan Context Table
As of January 7, 2022

		Dollar amounts in millions of 2020 \$ - Columns B-F looks at 30-year totals for costs and funding.										
	Column A *see notes on each column at bottom	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
#	New Expenditure Plan Program	Draft Expenditure Plan Priority 1 Funding	Draft Potential Future Funds	Total Funding Need	Remaining Funding Gap (Assuming Sales Tax + Potential Future Funds)	% Funded (Assuming Sales Tax+Potential Future Funds)	Leveraging Ability	Funding Notes	Program Benefits	Equity Analysis Nexus Equity Assessment Report Equity Assessment Presentation	Maintain/ Enhance/Expand/ Operate	Reference Links
	Paratransit											
17	Paratransit	\$204.90	\$1,065.10	\$1,270.00	\$0	100%	Moderate - SFMTA operating budget and sales tax are major funding source; discretionary options very limited	Paratransit is the only operating program in the Expenditure Plan. Primary funding sources for paratransit are the SFMTA Operating Budget, the sales tax, with smaller amounts from BART, federal and state funding. Key funding challenges: costs grow faster than revenues and growth in demand is anticipated. Total cost is updated to reflect SFMTA's limited projected increase in service demand and small cost increases that exceed inflation. Note paratransit vehicles and facilities are eligible under Muni Vehicles and Muni Maintenance above.	Provides accessible transportation options for seniors and people with disabilities.	Invest in transit accessibility for seniors and people with disabilities	Operate	Paratransit Presentation Prop K Paratransit Factsheet Paratransit User Demographics Factsheet Paratransit Questions & Answers Paratransit Questions & Answers Part 2
	Streets & Freeways											
18	Street Resurfacing, Rehabilitation and Maintenance	\$105.00	\$1,879.00	\$6,818.00	\$4,834	29%	High - State Gas Tax	The Street Resurfacing Program funding need is to achieve a state of good repair Pavement Condition Index (PCI) 83 in 2035, and maintain PCI 83 through the end of the plan period. The current draft Expenditure Plan proposes to maintain the PCI at 75, which is consistent with the planned level of investment in the City's Capital Plan.	Smooth streets are important for all modes: taking transit, biking, walking, and driving	Improve traffic safety	Maintain	Maintenance: Streets, Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Presentation
19	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Maintenance	\$17.60	\$65.60	\$253.50	\$170	33%	Low - few discretionary funding options; not much dedicated funding	As SFMTA expands and enhances the active transportation network, the need for maintenance funds will grow. Sales tax provides some intial bridge funding for this need (particularly replacement of quick-build painted bike lanes and flexible hit posts) while SFMTA develops a long-term asset management approach for these improvements. SFPW relies on State Transportation Development Act and sales tax for sidewalk repair.	Well maintained pedestrian and bicycle networks are critical to ensure safety and to encourage mode shift.	Improve traffic safety	Maintain	Maintenance: Streets, Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Presentation
20	Safe and Complete Streets	\$226.40	\$767.90	\$8,481.99	\$7,488	12%	Low to High -varies investment type. Transit signal maintenance has few dedicated funding sources while projects like bike lanes and pedestrian improvements are eligible for many competitive grants like the state and regional Active Transportation Programs.	Staff and SFMTA are proposing to earmark \$90 million of this program for Transit Signal Maintenance, given the limited other sources dedicated to that program and its importance for traffic safety. Sales tax provides key local match for this program overall, often acts as seed money to set projects up for competitive grants or to meet readiness requirements of GO Bonds. As a source of local funds, sales tax allows expedited delivery of smaller projects vs. the slower and more costly project delivery associated with projects that receive federal funds.	Improves traffic safety for all modes (e.g. signals, traffic calming), with a particular focus on pedestrian and bicycle safety. Encourages mode shift by improving and expanding active network. Supports safety education and Safe Routes to School efforts.	Improve traffic safety; address public health; support mode shift; solutions for first/last mile connections to transit; invest in active transportation network to help people get around affordably	Enhance, Maintain	Safe & Complete Streets Presentation
21	Curb Ramps	\$23.80	\$114.00	\$458.00	\$320	30%	Low - few dedicated (State Transportation Development Act) or discretionary funding sources	Additional ~\$6-7 million needed to bring the program up to recent Prop K funding levels. Note this program is for repairing and installing new curb ramps that are stand alone rather than incorporated into a larger project like a street resurfacing or Muni Forward project.	Critical to providing access for persons with disabilities such as vision impairment and wheelchair users, seniors, families with strollers, etc. Connecting the path of travel improves accessibility and encourages the use of alternate modes of transportation.	Invest in accessibility improvements (particularly helpful for seniors and persons with disabilities)	Enhance	Safe & Complete Streets Presentation
22	Tree Planting	\$23.80	\$29.00	\$231.00	\$178	23%	Low - few dedicated funding sources	An additional \$10-15 million needed to bring the program back to recent Prop K annual funding levels. Until the recent passage of Prop E to fund street tree maintenance, Prop K sales tax was used half for tree maintenance and half for planting new treets. Since Prop E passage, SFPW has used it only for planting new trees, which is the proposal for the new EP.	Trees contribute to a more walkable, livable and sustainable city. Trees provide traffic calming, shade for pedestrians, and support clean air and climate change resilience.	Address public health	Enhance	Safe & Complete Streets Presentation Street Tree Planting Strategy
23	Vision Zero Ramps	\$8.00	\$19.50	\$27.50	\$0	100%	Moderate - Active Transportation, Prop AA, other competitive programs	Sales tax provides early planning and project development funds and local match to implement.Program includes remaining freeway ramp locations in SoMa, as well as additional locations across the city.	Freeway ramps often create safety concerns for people walking, biking, and driving and can be difficult to fix because they require coordination with Caltrans.	Improve traffic safety	Enhance	Freeway Safety & Operational Improvements Presentation

Attachment 5 - DRAFT Expenditure Plan Context Table
As of January 7, 2022

		Dollar amounts in millions of 2020 \$ - Columns B-F looks at 30-year totals for costs and funding.										
	Column A *see notes on each column at bottom	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
#	New Expenditure Plan Program	Draft Expenditure Plan Priority 1 Funding	Draft Potential Future Funds	Total Funding Need	Remaining Funding Gap (Assuming Sales Tax + Potential Future Funds)	% Funded (Assuming Sales Tax+Potential Future Funds)	Leveraging Ability	Funding Notes	Program Benefits	Equity Analysis Nexus Equity Assessment Report Equity Assessment Presentation	Maintain/ Enhance/Expand/ Operate	Reference Links
24	Managed Lanes and Express Bus	\$15.00	\$196.00	\$300.00	\$89	70%	Moderate to High - Solutions for Congested Corridors, federal competitive programs, RM3 (bridge tolls)	Concepts for carpool lanes and express buses on SF's freeway system would be competitive for state Solutions for Congested Corridors funding. They are in the early stages and would require local dollars as seed funding to advance project readiness and enhance competitiveness.	Support mode shift to sustainable modes like transit to increase person throughput on crowded freeways. Provide faster and more reliable travel times for transit and carpoolers.	Support mode shift; invest in transit reliability and accessibility; manage congestion on our streets and freeways	Enhance	Freeway Safety & Operational Improvements Presentation
25	Transformative Freeway & Major Street Projects	\$20.00	\$204.10	\$224.10	\$0	100%	Low to Moderate - state & federal planning grants; potential to serve as seed funding for major capital projects down the line; ultimate projects will have high leveraging	Program need is sized to match assumed available revenues. Sales tax funds are proposed as seed funding for planning, early project development and environmental studies to position these projects to compete well for discretionary funding. Leveraging is expected to be low for these difficult to fund early phases, but moderate to high for later project phases depending on the specific projects that emerge.	Reconnect communities and repair harms created by past freeway and street projects. Projects would improve traffic safety, and support mode shift (e.g. by enabling safer, more convenient pedestrian and bike travel). This early funding will help set up projects to be competitive for discretionary funding for implementation.	Repair past harms/reconnect communities; improve traffic safety; support mode shift	Enhance	Transformative Freeway Projects Presentation
	Transportation System Development & Management											
26	Transportation Demand Management	\$30.00	\$1,523.10	\$1,665.46	\$112	93%	Moderate - federal funding, state and regional air quality improvement grants; certain projects generate revenue such as pricing programs	re majority of revenue from pricing programs like the Treasure Island Mobility Management Program or a potential Downtown Congestion Pricing Program. Both would require early start-up funding before they could be implemented. Other TDM projects are also eligible for certain air quality improvement grants. It is getting easier to seek funds to test a new program, particularly featuring new technology, that appears to be cost effective. It remains difficult to fund ongoing programs. Proposed program includes funding for evaluation and pilots to test the effectiveness of new ideas and inform future investments.	Typically low or lower cost improvements that encourage mode shift to sustainable modes and/or to different times of day when there is less traffic congestion and/or transit overcrowding, and in doing so, can help manage congestion.	Support mode shift; solutions for first/last mile connections to transit; lead with equity in planning for demand management; manage congestion on our streets/freeways/transit (crowding)	Enhance	Transportation Demand Management Presentation Bicycle Education Program Evaluation Safe Routes to School Evaluation
27	Neighborhood Transportation Program	\$40.00	\$145.20	\$185.23	\$0	100%	Planning element: Moderate - limited competitive planning grants; Capital projects - low to high depending on project type	Program need sized to available revenues. Types of funds to be leveraged will vary based on specific project types.	Supports community-based planning efforts and capital funding in each Supervisorial district to help advance priorities identified during the community planning process. Also includes capital funding to help advance priorities identified during the community planning process.	Support community-based planning	Enhance, Expand	Transportation, Land Use and Community Coordination Presentation Prop K Neighborhood Transportation Program (NTP) Guidelines NTP Projects Completed and Underway
28	Equity Priority Transportation Program	\$40.00	\$145.20	\$185.23	\$0	100%	Planning element: Moderate - limited competitive planning grants; Capital projects - low to high depending on project type	Program need sized to available revenues. Types of funds to be leveraged will vary based on specific project types.	Supports community-based planning in underserved neighborhoods and areas with vulnerable populations as well as equity evaluations/planning throughout the city. Also includes capital funding to help advance priorities identified during the community planning process.	Support community-based planning specifically in Equity Priority Communities; funding for equity studies	Enhance, Expand	Transportation, Land Use and Community Coordination Presentation
29	Development Oriented Transportation	\$42.00	\$237.70	\$279.73	\$0	100%	Planning element: Moderate - limited competitive planning grants; Capital projects - low to high depending on project type	Program need sized to available revenues. Types of funds to be leveraged will vary based on specific project types.	Supports new housing through community-based planning to identify transportation investments that support increased housing in existing low-density areas of the city. Also includes capital funding to help advance priorities identified during the community planning process.	Support community-based planning; manage congestion on our streets and freeways; solutions for first/last mile connections to transit; invest in transit	Enhance, Expand	Transportation, Land Use and Community Coordination Presentation
30	Citywide and Modal Planning	\$10.00	\$21.20	\$31.20	\$0	100%	Low to Moderate - limited competitive planning grants, other local funding sources	Program need sized to available revenues.	Supports multimodal transportation planning, including citywide and network-wide studies.	Addresses all Equity Analysis Recommendations	Maintain, Enhance, Expand	Transportation, Land Use and Community Coordination Presentation
	Total Funding	\$2,410.10	\$25,193.40	\$50,261.84	\$22,658.34							

Attachment 5 - DRAFT Expenditure Plan Context Table
As of January 7, 2022

		Dollar amounts in millions of 2020 \$ - Columns B-F looks at 30-year totals for costs and funding.										
	Column A *see notes on each column at bottom	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
#	New Expenditure Plan Program	Draft Expenditure Plan Priority 1 Funding	Draft Potential Future Funds	Total Funding Need	Remaining Funding Gap (Assuming Sales Tax + Potential Future Funds)	% Funded (Assuming Sales Tax+Potential Future Funds)	Leveraging Ability	Funding Notes	Program Benefits	Equity Analysis Nexus Equity Assessment Report Equity Assessment Presentation	Maintain/ Enhance/Expand/ Operate	Reference Links
NOTES												
	Based on the Preliminary Draft New Expenditure Plan, revised 10.4.2021.	Based on the Preliminary Draft New Expenditure Plan, revised 10.4.2021.	Draft Potential Future Funds is based on the Transportation Authority's estimate of federal, state, regional and other local funds beyond the half-cent transportation sales tax, that may be available to fund this program over the 30-year life of the New Expenditure Plan. This forecast is based on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Plan Bay Area 2050 revenue projections. The amount is indicative of the potential leveraging for each program based on our current understanding of	Total Funding Need represents unconstrained (i.e., not limited by funding availability or ability to deliver) for the program over the 30-year Expenditure Plan period based on sponsor input. There are a few programs such as the Neighborhood Transportation Program where Total Funding Need has been set to match anticipated revenues (sales tax plus Draft Potential Future Funds). These programs are called out in Funding Notes.	Funding Gap is what remains after subtracting Draft Priority 1 Sales Tax Funding and Draft Potential Future Funds from Total Funding Need.	Percent funded is the sum of Draft Priority 1 Sales Tax Funding and Draft Potential Future Funds divided by Total Funding Need. The % Funded is based on assumptions of revenues that may be available to the program over the 30-year Expenditure Plan period and does not signify that all funds have been secured. See Note for Column C about Potential Future Funds.	High, Moderate, Low are used to indicate the overall leveraging potential of the program based on eligibility of known funding sources. Even within a program certain project types and project development phases such as planning and environmental clearance may not leverage funds as well as others. This column provides an example of some of the funding sources leveraged by each program. It is not meant to be an exhaustive list.	Funding Notes provides information on the role the sales tax plays for each program and other information as relevant such as notes about total project cost, other funds secured, and additional information to explain leveraging assumptions.	This column highlights the primary types of benefits of each program. Per the EPAC's request, where information is readily available and relevant to the program, we will seek to quantify benefits focusing on Greenhouse Gas Reduction (GHG) and ridership as requested by the EPAC. The benefits description is usually qualitative since the Expenditure Plan is primarily composed of programs describing eligible types of projects that may be funded over the 30-year plan period rather than specific projects.	This column links the program benefits to the needs identified in the Equity Assessment for a New Sales Tax Expenditure Plan presented to the EPAC on 9.9.2021. This equity "tag" is indicative of the potential equity benefits of projects funded by the various programs.	This column indicates the main type of improvement funded by the program where maintain refers to maintenance, repair and rehabilitation of transportation infrastructure; enhance indicates improvements that enhance the customer experience without significant capacity expansion; expand are improvements with the primary focus on increasing the capacity of the transportation system such as buying additional buses or building new rail lines. The only operations program is paratransit, which supports SFMTA paratransit (e.g. door-to-door van and taxi	Links include presentations and materials from prior EPAC meetings as well as other materials that support this Context Table.

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

[this page intentionally left blank]



San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

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