



**San Francisco  
County Transportation  
Authority**

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

# AGENDA

## San Francisco County Transportation Authority Meeting Notice

**Date:** Tuesday, April 12, 2022; 10:00 a.m.

**Location:** Legislative Chamber, Room 250, City Hall (In-Person Meeting)

Watch SF Cable Channel 26

Watch [www.sfgovtv.org](http://www.sfgovtv.org)

**PUBLIC COMMENT CALL-IN:** 1 (415) 655-0001; Access Code: 2495 225 7076 # #

To make public comment on an item via the public comment call-in line, when the item is called, dial '\*3' to be added to the queue to speak. Do not press \*3 again or you will be removed from the queue. When the system says your line is unmuted, the live operator will advise that you will be allowed 2 minutes to speak. When your 2 minutes are up, we will move on to the next caller. Calls will be taken in the order in which they are received.

**Commissioners:** Mandelman (Chair), Peskin (Vice Chair), Chan, Haney, Mar, Melgar, Preston, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, and Walton

**Clerk:** Angela Tsao

### **Remote Access to Information and Participation:**

This meeting will be held in person at the location listed above. As authorized by California Government Code Section 54953(e), it is possible that some members of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority Board may attend this meeting remotely. In that event, those members will participate by teleconferencing. Members of the public may attend the meeting to observe and provide public comment at the physical meeting location listed above or may watch SF Cable Channel 26 or may visit the SFGovTV website ([www.sfgovtv.org](http://www.sfgovtv.org)) to stream the live meeting or may watch them on demand.

Members of the public may comment on the meeting during public comment periods in person or remotely. In-person public comment will be taken first; remote public comment will be taken after.

Written public comment may be submitted prior to the meeting by emailing the Clerk of the Transportation Authority at [clerk@sfcta.org](mailto: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 5 p.m. on the day before the meeting will be distributed to Board members before the meeting begins.



	Page
1. Roll Call	
2. <b>[Final Approval on First Appearance]</b> Approve the Resolution making findings to allow teleconferenced meetings under California Government Code Section 54953(e) – <b>ACTION*</b>	5
3. Community Advisory Committee Report – <b>INFORMATION*</b>	9
4. Approve the Minutes of the March 22, 2022 Meeting – <b>ACTION*</b>	17
 <b><u>Consent Agenda</u></b>	
5. <b>[FINAL APPROVAL]</b> Release \$1,200,000 of Prop K Funds Held on Reserve for the Geary Bus Rapid Transit Phase 2 Conceptual Engineering Report – <b>ACTION*</b>	23
6. <b>[FINAL APPROVAL]</b> Amend the Adopted Fiscal Year 2021/22 Budget to Increase Revenues by \$1.7 Million, Decrease Expenditures by \$13.3 Million and Decrease Other Financing Sources by \$50.0 Million for a Total Net Decrease in Fund Balance of \$34.7 Million – <b>ACTION*</b>	69
 <b><u>End of Consent Agenda</u></b>	
7. Appoint One Member to the Community Advisory Committee – <b>ACTION*</b>	89
8. Approve the 2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan and 5-Year Prioritization Programs (5YPPS) and Amend the Prop K Bus Rapid Transit/Transit Preferential Streets/Muni Metro Network and Transit Enhancements 5YPPs – <b>ACTION*</b>	95
9. Allocate \$645,108 and Appropriate \$557,156 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, for Two Requests – <b>ACTION*</b>	137
 <b>Projects:</b> Multi-Agency: Geary/19th Ave Subway Strategic Case (SFCTA: \$557,156; SFMTA \$170,367; SF Planning \$74,741). SFMTA: Bicycle Facility Maintenance (\$400,000).	
 <b><u>Other Items</u></b>	
10. Introduction of New Items – <b>INFORMATION</b>	
During this segment of the meeting, Commissioners may make comments on items not specifically listed above or introduce or request items for future consideration.	
11. Public Comment	
12. Adjournment	

\*Additional Materials

---

Items considered for final approval by the Board shall be noticed as such with **[Final Approval]** preceding the item title.

The meeting proceedings can be viewed live or on demand after the meeting at [www.sfgovtv.org](http://www.sfgovtv.org). To know the exact cablecast times for weekend viewing, please call SFGovTV at (415) 554-4188 on Friday when the cablecast times have been determined.



**San Francisco  
County Transportation  
Authority**

Board Meeting Agenda

Page 3 of 3

The Legislative Chamber (Room 250) and the Committee Room (Room 263) in City Hall are wheelchair accessible. Meetings are real-time captioned and are cablecast open-captioned on SFGovTV, the Government Channel 26. Assistive listening devices for the Legislative Chamber and the Committee Room are available upon request at the Clerk of the Board's Office, Room 244. To request sign language interpreters, readers, large print agendas, or other accommodations, please contact the Clerk of the Transportation Authority at (415) 522-4800. Requests made at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting will help to ensure availability. Attendees at all public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical-based products.

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

Written public comment may be submitted prior to the meeting by emailing the Clerk of the Transportation Authority at [clerk@sfcta.org](mailto: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 5 p.m. on the day before the meeting will be distributed to Board members before the meeting begins.

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](http://www.sfethics.org).

[ this page intentionally left blank ]



San Francisco  
County Transportation  
Authority



RESOLUTION MAKING FINDINGS TO ALLOW TELECONFERENCED MEETINGS  
UNDER CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54953(e)

WHEREAS, California Government Code Section 54953(e) 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; and

WHEREAS, In March, 2020, the Governor of the State of California proclaimed a state of emergency in California in connection with the Coronavirus Disease 2019 ("COVID-19") pandemic, and that state of emergency remains in effect; and

WHEREAS, On February 25, 2020, the Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco (the "City") declared a local emergency, and on March 6, 2020 the City's Health Officer declared a local health emergency, and both those declarations also remain in effect; and

WHEREAS, On September 16, 2021, the Governor signed AB 361, a bill that amends the Brown Act to allow local legislative bodies to continue to meet by teleconferencing during a state of emergency without complying with restrictions in State law that would otherwise apply, provided that the legislative bodies make certain findings at least once every 30 days; and

WHEREAS, While Federal, State, and local health officials emphasize the critical importance of vaccination and consistent mask-wearing, regardless of vaccination status, to prevent the spread of COVID-19, and the City's Health Officer has issued at least one order (Health Officer Order No. C19-07y, available online at [www.sfdph.org/healthorders](http://www.sfdph.org/healthorders)) and one directive (Health Officer Directive No. 2020-33i, available online at [www.sfdph.org/directives](http://www.sfdph.org/directives)) that continue to recommend measures to promote safety for indoor gatherings, such as vaccination, masking, improved ventilation, and other measures, in certain contexts; and



WHEREAS, The California Department of Industrial Relations Division of Occupational Safety and Health ("Cal/OSHA") has promulgated Section 3205 of Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations, which requires most employers in California, including in the City, to train and instruct employees about measures that can decrease the spread of COVID-19; and

WHEREAS, Without limiting any requirements under applicable federal, state, or local pandemic-related rules, orders, or directives, the City's Department of Public Health, in coordination with the City's Health Officer, has advised that for group gatherings indoors, such as meetings of boards and commissions, people can increase safety and greatly reduce risks to the health and safety of attendees from COVID-19 by maximizing ventilation, wearing well-fitting masks regardless of vaccination status (and as required for unvaccinated people by the State of California's indoor masking order), encouraging vaccination (including a booster as soon as eligible), staying home when sick or when experiencing any COVID-19 symptom discouraging consumption of food or beverages in the meeting, following good hand hygiene practices, and making informed choices when gathering with people who vaccination status is not known; and

WHEREAS, The San Francisco County Transportation Authority Board began meeting in person on April 12, 2022, allowing members to participate by teleconferencing from a separate location for COVID-related health reasons and providing members of the public an opportunity to observe and provide public comment either in person or remotely; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That San Francisco County Transportation Authority Board finds as follows:

1. As described above, the State of California and the City remain in a state of emergency due to the COVID-19 pandemic. At this meeting, San Francisco County Transportation Authority Board has considered the circumstances of the state of



emergency.

2. As described above, because of the COVID-19 pandemic, conducting meetings of this body and its committees in person without allowing certain members of this body to attend remotely would present imminent risks to the health or safety of certain attendees due to COVID-19, and the state of emergency continues to directly impact the ability of members to meet safely in person; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That for at least the next 30 days, the San Francisco County Transportation Authority Board will hold in-person meetings, with some members possibly appearing remotely. If all members of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority Board are unable to attend in person for COVID-related health reasons, then the San Francisco County Transportation Authority Board will hold the meeting remotely without providing an in-person meeting location. The Community Advisory Committee ("CAC") will continue to hold meetings exclusively by teleconferencing technology (and not by any in-person meetings or any other meetings with public access to the places where any legislative body member is present for the meeting). All meetings of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority Board and its committees will provide an opportunity for members of the public to address this body and its committees and will otherwise occur in a manner that protects the statutory and constitutional rights of parties and the members of the public attending the meeting via teleconferencing; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the Clerk of the Transportation Authority is directed to place a resolution substantially similar to this resolution on the agenda of a future meeting of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority Board within the next 30 days. If the San Francisco County Transportation Authority Board does not meet within the next 30 days, the Clerk is directed to place such a resolution on the agenda of the next meeting of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority Board.

[ this page intentionally left blank ]



San Francisco  
County Transportation  
Authority



# ***DRAFT MINUTES***

## **Community Advisory Committee**

**Wednesday, March 23, 2022**

### **1. Call to Order**

Chair Larson called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Present at Roll: Nancy Buffum, Rosa Chen, Robert Gower, David Klein, John Larson, Jerry Levine, Kevin Ortiz, Eric Rozell, and Kat Siegal (9)

Absent at Roll: Peter Tannen (entered during Item 5) and Sophia Tupuola (2)

### **2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION**

Chair Larson acknowledged CAC member Peter Tannen, representative for District 8, who was reappointed at the March 22 Transportation Authority Board meeting and had previously told fellow CAC members he would continue to serve on the CAC until a new representative for District 8 could be found. He encouraged any interested District 8 residents watching or listening to the meeting to submit an application to be on the CAC via the Transportation Authority website at [www.sfcta.org](http://www.sfcta.org).

Chair Larson noted that CAC members should have received a copy of the Executive Director's Report presented at the March 22 Transportation Authority Board meeting and encouraged fellow members to read it as it provided short and informative updates. He spoke on the Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and Infrastructure Improvements project, which was nearing completion, including construction of the center running red transit lanes, boarding islands, streetlights, and utilities; with replacement of underground utilities and safety features such as pedestrian signals, upgraded traffic signals, and lighting soon to be completed as well. Chair Larson announced the ribbon cutting ceremony would be held on April 1 at 9:15 a.m. at the War Memorial building and members of the public may register to attend at [sfmta.com](http://sfmta.com). The Chair also noted that the Transportation Authority had contributed \$45 million in Prop K funds towards all phases of the project and led planning and environmental work for this first center running BRT project for the city, with a lot of input from the CAC over time. He congratulated the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority (SFMTA) and partner agencies on the upcoming start of service.

Chair Larson announced that at its March 22 meeting, the Board endorsed the 2022 Expenditure Plan for the half-cent transportation sales tax as recommended by the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC). He thanked members Rosa Chen and Eric Rozell for serving on that body, as well as staff, for the EPAC's hard work on the proposed program. He said the Metropolitan Transportation Commission was next to review the proposal before the Board of Supervisors could act to include the Expenditure Plan and a continuation of the half-cent sales tax to fund it on the November 2022 ballot.

Chair Larson also announced that outreach for the San Francisco Transportation Plan (SFTP) would soon begin, with an online survey conducted in English, Spanish, Chinese,



Filipino, and Russian. He said that staff was offering presentations to community and neighborhood groups citywide and hosting a town hall on Thursday, April 28. He asked members of the public to contact the Transportation Authority if there was an interested in receiving a presentation and noted that more information on the SFTP could be found at [sfcta.org/sftp](http://sfcta.org/sftp).

There was no public comment.

### **Consent Agenda**

#### **3. Approve the Minutes of the February 23, 2022 Meetings - ACTION**

Nancy Buffum motioned to approve the item, seconded by Jerry Levine.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Buffum, Chen, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Ortiz, Rozell, Siegal (9)

Absent: Tannen, Tupuola (2)

#### **4. Community Advisory Committee Vacancy - INFORMATION**

Chair Larson announced the term expiration for his seat, representing District 7.

There was no public comment for either item.

### **End of Consent Agenda**

#### **5. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Subway Renewal Overview - INFORMATION**

Julie Kirschbaum, Director of Transit with SFMTA, presented the item.

Vice Chair David Klein asked if any of the plan had to do with expanding, or strictly focused on improving and ensuring quality of service. Director Kirschbaum answered that the agency was looking to expand capacity but not to make the tunnel longer. She explained that in the Core Capacity planning study, there was some money to do technical work for the surface portion of the M Ocean View line, from West Portal to San Francisco State University, with a goal to have a high capacity corridor to run a four-car train much less impeded. Mr. Klein asked if this would increase frequency. Director Kirschbaum responded in the affirmative.

Chair Larson observed when there was a time the train control computer was new. He asked about the state of good repair and why it was such a challenge. Director Kirschbaum answered that it may have been because the agency didn't start the repairs sooner and some systems they were now playing catch on maintenance. She said the new train control system was set up to receive automatic updates to its software. She also explained that lifecycle management involves anticipating at the beginning of asset replacement what is needed to keep a system in a state of good repair and she did not believe that happened for a lot of the subway work.

Member Kat Siegal asked if the pillars of the Muni Metro Modernization plan would be executed sequentially or in parallel, and if it was overall a 10-year plan or just the subway modernization as a 10-year plan. Director Kirschbaum answered that it was concurrent work with the 10 years reflecting the overall program. She expounded that she believed in a continuous delivery model, referencing the vehicles and surface rail corridors as examples of continuous improvement within the 10-year time frame.



During public comment, Edward Mason asked if there was a project management software program that would be used on the project. He also asked if there was a subway project manager to coordinate and manage the system replacements. Mr. Mason continued that for Core Capacity he saw that as something that would require forced transfers for the J Church, K Ingleside, and L Taraval lines in the future, and expressed apprehension about the effect on seniors' mobility.

After public comment, Chair Larson asked Director Kirschbaum if she could address the public comment questions on the project management staff, software, and forced transfers. Director Kirschbaum responded that she believed her agency used P6 software, an industry standard, to manage the projects, but said she could follow up to confirm. She said there needed to be a deeper dive into the sequencing and scheduling work Mr. Mason was referring to in his comments. She also clarified that Core Capacity was a Federal Transit Administration grant program, and it did not imply a specific service plan. She continued that as an agency, from a technical standpoint, they believed the most reliable, highest capacity plan was to run very frequent trunk service with transfer service but no decisions had been made in that regard.

Member Jerry Levine commented that the need for increased capacity was predicated on substantial increases in ridership and asked if that was what ridership projections showed. Director Kirschbaum answered that state of good repair investments were needed regardless of future ridership levels to ensure safety and continuity in subway service. Regarding future service demand, she said SFMTA used multiple scenarios in its decision making and attempted to build options into its improvement programs. She said as an example, SFMTA's full light rail fleet expansion program was based on the expectation of growth in demand but included contractual off-ramps in case ridership growth was less than expected.

**6. Adopt a Motion of Support to Approve the 2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan and 5-Year Prioritization Programs (5YPPS) and Amend the Prop K Bus Rapid Transit/Transit Preferential Streets/Muni Metro Network and Transit Enhancements 5YPPs - ACTION**

Mike Pickford, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked regarding the Salesforce Transit Center Wayfinding project how we got into the situation of needing to replace the kiosks. He asked who was responsible for the original kiosks and how much they cost. He asked whether it was the original prime contractor, Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA), or a subcontractor that developed the original wayfinding. He said that already needing to replace wayfinding kiosks at a cost of almost \$2 million caused him to shake his heads and he thought the TJPA should bear the responsibility to pay for fixing the wayfinding system.

After public comment, David Klein motioned to approve the item, seconded by Kat Siegal.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Buffum, Chen, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Ortiz, Rozell, Siegal, Tannen (10)

Absent: Tupuola (1)



**7. Adopt a Motion of Support to Allocate \$645,108 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, and Appropriate \$557,156 for Two Requests- ACTION**

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy & Programming, and Andrew Heidel, Principal Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Member Eric Rozell asked for details on the way SFMTA prioritized locations for bike facility maintenance.

Ms. LaForte answered that because the program had no backlog, SFMTA hadn't needed to prioritize and had been able to address requests as they were submitted or identified by SFMTA staff in the field.

Kat Siegel commented that plastic delineators seemed fragile and vulnerable to damage by vehicles. She asked if SFMTA had considered other barrier materials. Matt Lasky, Project Manager with SFMTA, said SFMTA used delineators a great deal because they were quick and easy to install and therefore relatively inexpensive. He said SFMTA had experimented with a number of different materials and concluded that bike lane buffers offering the most protection were concrete barriers, but that those were more expensive and required more time for design.

Chair Larson asked which kinds of bike facilities were included in the bicycle facility maintenance program, for example, he asked if generic bike lanes (i.e., without green paint) would be included, observing that it seemed to him that many of those lanes needed substantial work. Mr. Lasky answered affirmatively that regular bike lanes would be included, as well as painted lanes paint and delineated buffers.

During public comment, Edward Mason noted that others had made public comments at SFMTA meetings stating that Richmond residents had voted for BART many years ago but have yet to see any direct BART service, and asked why the project limits for the Geary/19th Avenue Subway Strategic Case study do not extend the full length of Geary Boulevard. He said the turn onto 19th Avenue would mean much of the Richmond would remain underserved by rail transit.

After public comment, Chair Larson and David Klein asked staff to respond to Mr. Mason's question.

Mr. Heidel said the study limits were recommendations from the City's ConnectSF strategic planning effort but said the location of the subway's turn to south was still on the table. He explained that input from transit operations staff was that terminating the subway at the beach would be difficult due to lack of room for a turnaround or a maintenance area. Additionally, he noted this and future studies would need to examine and balance the needs of both passenger demand as well as operations, particularly as it relates to tying this project into the rest of the regional rail system.

David Klein motioned to approve the item, seconded by Eric Rozell.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Buffum, Chen, Gower, Klein, Larson, Levine, Ortiz, Rozell, Siegal, Tannen (10)

Absent: Tupuola (1)

**8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Release \$1,200,000 of Prop K Funds Held on Reserve for the Geary Bus Rapid Transit Phase 2 Conceptual Engineering Report - ACTION**



Dan Tischler, Principal Transportation Modeler, and Daniel Mackowski, Streets Division Project Manager with SFMTA, presented the item.

Member Jerry Levine asked about how infrastructure on Geary Boulevard differs from Van Ness Avenue. Mr. Mackowski responded by saying that Geary Boulevard is newer than Van Ness Avenue but is still old and has aging utilities. The proposed work on Geary Boulevard would be minor compared to the Van Ness infrastructure work and would have less risk. However, he said that the sewers and water lines under Geary are about 100 years old and probably need replacement. He noted that the SFMTA is currently in discussion about coordinating improvements with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission.

Mr. Levine asked if local residents could park at late hour meters and not be ticketed. Mr. Mackowski responded that there is not overlap between the area proposed for extended meter hours and the current residential parking permit area. He said the meters would be a tool for businesses because they encourage parking space turnover.

Member Nancy Buffum asked a question about schools and safe street crossings and how SFMTA did outreach to schools, youth, and families with children. Mr. Mackowski responded that SFMTA did not do much specific outreach to children, but they sent information to school principals who would pass the information along to neighborhood families.

Member Buffum followed up by saying that some parent groups may offer a better way to reach parents. Mr. Mackowski agreed that this was a good idea and said he would relay this input to the outreach lead for follow-up.

Member David Klein asked if SFMTA would get rid of the red wave design for the bus stops and the glass station advertisement signs that they were often broken. Mr. Mackowski responded by noting that Clear Channel media company was responsible and that their contract continued for a few more years. He said that these issues raised by Mr. Klein will be considered at contract renewal.

Mr. Klein asked if the project would deliver capacity improvement, if travel time savings could be reinvested in route frequency, and about the timeframe of the travel time improvements. Mr. Mackowski responded by describing SFMTA's travel time analysis. He said SFMTA developed estimates of travel time savings relative to pre-COVID conditions and relative to current conditions after the implementation of the now permanent temporary emergency transit lanes (TETLs) on sections of the project corridor. He continued by saying that SFMTA's analysis showed that the TETLs delivered less than half of the overall project benefits relative to pre-COVID conditions and that the proposed project would deliver the majority of total travel time benefits.

Mr. Klein asked about community pushback. Mr. Mackowski responded by describing issues raised by community stakeholders to date. He said one of these concerns was that the project would not deliver much benefit to areas west of 25th Avenue. Mr. Mackowski described a walking tour with District 1 Supervisor Connie Chan and SFMTA Director of Transportation Jeffrey Tumlin that occurred the previous week. He said that during the walking tour, they spoke with people in the field and listened to concerns with SFMTA in feedback gathering mode.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked if there were any provisions on casino buses. Mr. Mason had seen casino buses occupying Muni bus stops at 9th and Geary Boulevard and asked if commuter buses and casino buses were going to be in the bus



lanes. Mr. Mason suggested that there may be congestion in the lanes because of these buses.

After public comment, Chair Larson asked for clarification about whether shuttle buses and casino buses being allowed to use Geary Boulevard bus lanes.

Mr. Mackowski responded by saying that San Francisco had different types of bus lanes. He explained that Haight Street and Van Ness Avenue were Muni only for technical reasons; and side running lanes were generally bus/taxi only. He continued to explain that California vehicle code defined a bus as any vehicle with 10 or more passengers and all buses were legal in the lanes, but they are not allowed to stop in the lane or block bus lanes. He said with newly passed legislation, Muni could take pictures and ticket vehicles blocking the lanes. Mr. Mackowski said he would flag 9th Avenue and Geary Boulevard for enforcement staff. He said SFMTA had done a study on the non-transit buses in transit lanes, and found that it is rare for buses to actually be delayed by commuter buses, and said SFMTA saw these lanes as super carpool lanes for any vehicles with lots of passengers.

Kat Siegal motioned to approve the item, seconded by David Klein.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Buffum, Chen, Gower, Klein, Larson, Ortiz, Rozell, Siegal, Tannen (9)

Absent: Levine, Tupuola (2)

**9. Adopt a Motion of Support to Amend the Adopted Fiscal Year 2021/22 Budget to Increase Revenues by \$1.7 Million, Decrease Expenditures by \$13.3 Million and Decrease Other Financing Sources by \$50.0 Million for a Total Net Decrease in Fund Balance of \$34.7 Million - ACTION**

Cynthia Fong, Deputy Director for Administration and Finance, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Chair Larson asked for clarification on the decreases, that the expenditures were mostly because of delays, except for Vision Zero in which different funding sources were sought. Ms. Fong confirmed that this was accurate.

There was no public comment.

Chair Larson motioned to approve the item, seconded by Robert Gower.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Buffum, Chen, Gower, Klein, Larson, Ortiz, Rozell, Siegal, Tannen (9)

Absent: Levine, Tupuola (2)

Chair Larson commented that he was impressed with how fiscally well managed the agency was and appreciated staff's clear explanations of the budget.

**10. San Francisco County Transportation Authority Public Engagement Methodology - INFORMATION**

Eric Young, Director of Communications, presented the item.

Member Kevin Ortiz thanked staff for the presentation and asked how the agency identified stakeholders, and ensured that contacts lists are up to date. Mr. Young answered that the agency had just implemented Salesforce to improve tracking of



contact lists. He said that with new contacts, staff may monitor news coverage mentioning community representatives, engage in communities, interact with Supervisors' offices, get input from CAC members, and use other means to keep lists up to date. Mr. Ortiz suggested that staff periodically contact Supervisors' offices to help keep contacts up to date on the lists.

Mr. Ortiz also asked how focus group participants were identified, ensuring diversity minimums were met and that different communities were represented. Mr. Young answered that it depended on the type of focus group conducted with each group being unique and ensuring that there was deep engagement with members of a particular community. He described some of the factors considered such as language spoken, ethnic background, residential location, work location, and commute habits.

Mr. Ortiz asked what languages and how many the Transportation Authority translated to ensure language access was always a consideration in communications and outreach. Mr. Young answered the typical languages were Spanish, Chinese, and Filipino, which was standard across City and County of San Francisco agencies. He said there were other instances when more languages were translated beyond the standard set.

Mr. Ortiz asked if the agency had categorical lists that were specifically tailored to specific constituencies by organization or community. Director Young confirmed that this was the case.

Chair Larson noted that the Geary corridor project offered outreach materials translated in Russian and believed anything in the Tenderloin might prompt translation into Vietnamese and some other Southeast Asian languages as well.

Member Nancy Buffum reiterated her comment on the Geary Bus Rapid Transit item that when seeking broad-based input, that staff ensuring that families with children and teenage children were considered as an important community for input - one which was frequently overlooked and had a more difficult time attending outreach events than other people. Mr. Young agreed that this was another community to be considered.

Mr. Ortiz said he would like to see a concrete outreach plan for larger projects, and it would be helpful for the CAC to see that ahead of time, so they could provide input.

There was no public comment.

### **Other Items**

#### **11. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION**

Member Robert Gower commented that he often saw car collisions on the island of the inbound J Church stop in his neighborhood, sometimes with the vehicle completely flipped as a result of hitting the island. He said that he often heard from people who witnessed these incidents that they did not know how to effectively communicate their concerns or requests to city agencies to prevent these collisions from reoccurring. Mr. Gower said he also read an article from the San Francisco Chronicle calling the city's traffic calming efforts useless, indicating a strong disconnect between community concern and what the city is doing in response. He continued that SFMTA's traffic calming program seemed inaccessible and the contact was a 311 email address, which seemed like a black hole. Mr. Gower suggested there should be a resource for the public to effectively relay information and receive a response from the appropriate agencies rather than having to contact several different agencies or resort to enacting their own solutions. He expressed a desire to see engagement happen in a more



comprehensive way enabling the public to relay suggestions with dedicated responses and requested a presentation on existing resources and how the process could be streamlined for effective response from agency staff.

Member Nancy Buffum requested an update on the future of slow streets, particularly with a focus on John F. Kennedy Drive, so that the CAC could provide input on before any decisions were made. Chair Larson agreed.

Member Peter Tannen asked if there were any plans to resume in-person CAC meetings. Chair Larson answered that there was discussion about how emergency orders may or may not affect the flexibility of the group meeting in person and CAC members would be polled on their preferences.

Chair Larson requested an update on the Caltrain station in southeast San Francisco, regarding the diversion lane near Oakdale and Evans avenues. He also asked about the opening of central subway. The Chair said these could be brief informational items, perhaps under the umbrella of the ConnectSF program.

There was no public comment.

**12. Public Comment**

There was no general public comment.

**13. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:28 p.m.



# DRAFT MINUTES

## San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Tuesday, March 22, 2022

### 1. Roll Call

Chair Mandelman called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

**Present at Roll Call:** Commissioners Haney, Mar, Mandelman, Peskin, Preston, Stefani, and Walton (7)

**Absent at Roll Call:** Commissioners Chan (entered during Item 2), Melgar (entered during Item 3), Ronen (entered during Item 3), and Safai (entered during Item 3) (4)

### 2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Mandelman noted that there were positive developments on the federal transportation front this month, including the passage of the annual federal appropriations bill last week. He said the agency was grateful that Senator Feinstein was able to secure \$2 million for the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) to help to maintain cable car service, and \$2 million for the BART faregate program. The Chair also thanked United States House of Representatives Speaker Nancy Pelosi for her support in helping secure the \$3.4 million grant awarded to the Water Emergency Transit Authority (WETA) to build an electric ferry to serve the growing Treasure Island and Mission Bay neighborhoods, noting that the Transportation Authority was excited for the project to showcase the Bay Area's first electric ferry service in 2025.

Chair Mandelman also shared that Muni and other Bay Area transit operators received more than \$500 million from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) as part of the \$2.2 billion in the American Rescue Plan Additional Assistance grant funding for transit operators across the country, which represented an unprecedented share of funding for the region. He thanked the FTA and the Bay Area delegation for these critical operating grant awards, including \$271 million for BART, \$115 million for Muni, \$39 million for Caltrain, and \$25 million for WETA. The Chair continued that the funds would allow the operators to provide local and regional transit service and welcome back commuters in the recovery from the pandemic.

Chair Mandelman said he was also glad to report that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) will be considering inclusion of the Caltrain Downtown Rail Extension in the draft of its infrastructure bill advocacy platform, after Mayor Breed, Commissioner Ronen, and Chair Mandelman advocated for it to be endorsed by the region for state and federal funds. He thanked Commissioner Ronen for working with regional colleagues at MTC to form a consensus around the draft Bay Area bipartisan infrastructure law priority projects list recommended by staff, a promising development for the Downtown Rail Extension project. Chair Mandelman concluded by saying he looked forward to continuing the agency's advocacy for federal funding



for this and other important regional transit projects benefiting communities throughout the Bay Area.

There was no public comment.

**3. Executive Director's Report - INFORMATION**

Tilly Chang, Executive Director, presented the item.

Commissioner Walton thanked Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board Directors Monique Zmuda and Steve Heminger for their work on Caltrain governance, as well as Chair Mandelman and Vice Chair Peskin for all their work and time spent at the meetings on governance and supporting Caltrain as a real system. He continued there was much more work to do but appreciated all his colleagues efforts on this topic, including Director Chang.

There was no public comment.

**4. Approve the Minutes of the March 8, 2022 Meeting - ACTION\***

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Preston moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Commissioner Chan.

The minutes were approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Haney, Mar, Mandelman, Melgar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, and Walton (11)

Absent: none (0)

**Consent Agenda**

**5. [Final Approval] Appoint Peter Tannen to the Community Advisory Committee - ACTION\***

**6. [Final Approval] Endorse the 2022 Expenditure Plan for the Reauthorization of the Local Sales Tax for Transportation - ACTION\***

**7. [Final Approval] State and Federal Legislation Update - ACTION\***

Support: Assembly Bill (AB) 2197 (Mullin) and AB 2336 (Ting and Friedman)

**8. [Final Approval] Allocate \$1,791,758 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, and Appropriate \$150,000 for Three Requests - ACTION\***

Projects: SFMTA: Muni Metro Core Capacity Study (\$1,000,000), 20 MPH Speed Limit Reductions (\$750,000), Bike to Work Day 2022 (\$41,758). SFCTA: Muni Metro Core Capacity Study - Project Support and Technical Oversight (\$150,000).

Chair Mandelman severed the Item 8 Bike to Work Day allocation for separate vote.

Commissioner Walton moved to approve the consent agenda with the exception of the Bike to Work Day 2022 allocation under Item 8, seconded by Commissioner Ronen.

The motion was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Haney, Mar, Mandelman, Melgar, Peskin, Preston,



Ronen, Safai, Stefani, and Walton (11)

Absent: none (0)

Commissioner Melgar moved to approve the severed Item 8 Bike to Work Day allocation, seconded by Commissioner Mar.

Vice Chair Peskin reiterated his concern stated at the prior Board meeting about funding an organization - here, the San Francisco Bike Coalition, which was also involved in the endorsement process of supervisorial candidates, noting he raised similar concerns about a previous past contract the agency held with an outreach company that was simultaneously a lobbyist of the Board and agency. He continued that he found it troubling that an organization with the power of endorsement was also a recipient of taxpayer funds. Vice Chair Peskin stated his intent to dissent again.

The severed Item 8 Bike to Work Day allocation was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Haney, Mar, Mandelman, Melgar, Preston, Ronen, Stefani, and Walton (9)

Absent: Commissioners Peskin and Safai (2)

### **End of Consent Agenda**

**9. Release \$1,200,000 of Prop K Funds Held on Reserve for the Geary Bus Rapid Transit Phase 2 Conceptual Engineering Report - ACTION**

Dan Tischler, Principal Transportation Modeler, and Daniel Mackowski, Streets Division Project Manager with SFMTA, presented the item.

Commissioner Chan thanked both Transportation Authority and SFMTA staff for working with the District 1 office to ensure consistent and transparent outreach to the community. She said she appreciated the suggestion by Transportation Authority staff to review the design block-by-block, and thanked SFMTA for agreeing to the suggestion and making block-by-block design materials available. Commissioner Chan thanked Mr. Mackowski and SFMTA Director Jeffrey Tumlin for spending time with the District office in talking to merchants along the corridor. She emphasized the importance of outreach, talking to merchants, neighbors, and those impacted by the project. Commissioner Chan also said she appreciated the points that Mr. Mackowski highlighted about working with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission during the planning phase to ensure that the construction phase will proceed in a coordinated fashion, which she said was the right approach to streamline and be efficient with capital improvements. Commissioner Chan also said she appreciated staff learning from Phase 1 (the Geary Rapid Project) to provide business support to merchants along Geary Boulevard in the Richmond district and looked forward to seeing those conversations take place. She urged colleagues to support the item.

During public comment, Aleta Dupree expressed support for the project to be extended to its second phase because the route was a very long and slow run. She said that it would benefit not only the Geary neighborhood but the city and the region, since, as a regional user, she has used the Geary route to get to a number of places including the Land's End area.

After public comment, Commissioner Chan moved to approve the item, seconded by



Commissioner Walton.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Haney, Mar, Mandelman, Melgar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, and Walton (11)

Absent: none (0)

**10. Amend the Adopted Fiscal Year 2021/22 Budget to Increase Revenues by \$1.7 Million, Decrease Expenditures by \$13.3 Million and Decrease Other Financing Sources by \$50.0 Million for a Total Net Decrease in Fund Balance of \$34.7 Million - ACTION**

Cynthia Fong, Deputy Director for Administration and Finance, presented the item.

Commissioner Chan appreciated all the work that Ms. Fong and Transportation Authority staff did in managing the budget during such a hard time and ensuring that the agency finances were in a good position.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Chan moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Preston.

The item was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Haney, Mar, Mandelman, Melgar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, and Walton (11)

Absent: none (0)

**11. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Subway Renewal Overview - INFORMATION**

Julie Kirschbaum, Director of Transit with SFMTA, and Charles Drane, Acting Chief Maintenance Officer with SFMTA, presented the item.

Commissioner Mar commented that Muni subway renewal was crucial to restoring public trust and increasing ridership. Noting that the program's projected funding need jumped in 2023 (increasing thereafter), he asked if funding had been secured for projects planned through 2023.

Director Kirschbaum answered that the early-year program costs were primarily driven by the Communications-Based Train Control project, which is substantially funded in the SFMTA capital investment program. She said she would get back to the Board with an accurate assessment of the program's funding gaps, noting that funding gaps were more significant in the later years of the program.

Chair Mandelman said he was glad to see that SFMTA had done this long-term assessment of subway needs. He commented that subway performance appeared to have deteriorated in recent months and asked if the Subway Renewal program would implement the kinds of improvements that would address issues such as passenger wait times.

Director Kirschbaum answered that the high levels of service reliability in Fall 2021 were attributable to both temporary service reductions and recently completed reliability improvements. She said reliability had degraded in recent months somewhat as ridership increased. She noted that SFMTA had increased shuttle service



between West Portal and Embarcadero. She added that some user experience issues are due to arrival prediction providing inaccurate information, adding that SFMTA was near completion on improvements to some of those systems.

During public comment, Aleta Dupree commented that redundancy was key to reliable subway service. She said Muni should have the same reliability standards as air travel, which has excellent safety and reliability through redundant and precise systems and maintenance procedures.

After public comment, Chair Mandelman asked to what extent subway reliability was related to SFMTA's human resources challenges.

Director Kirschbaum answered that train operators were not in short supply because they are promoted from the ranks of the larger pool of bus operators. She said, however, that SFMTA was having tremendous difficulty maintaining staff levels in Muni's Maintenance of Way group, which is critical for infrastructure reliability. She said SFMTA had some successes, such as when it was able to quickly mobilize track repair crews during the Market Street closure. She said staffing a full complement of rail operations supervisors had been difficult, particularly during the COVID Omicron wave, but that SFMTA had made good progress with approximately 100 new hires and 30 more hires scheduled for Spring 2022.

## **Other Items**

### **12. Introduction of New Items - INFORMATION**

Vice Chair Peskin requested that staff prepare an item for next Board meeting to authorize a Request For Proposal for an independent economic analysis on the Treasure Island tolling proposal as requested by the Treasure Island Organizing Committee. Chair Mandelman asked Director Chang how the item would fit with staff preparations.

Director Chang noted that current thinking was that the best forum for the next discussion on the Treasure Island tolling policy and affordability program would be at the Treasure Island Mobility Management Agency (TIMMA) Board, and the plan had been to propose an information item in late April or May to provide context and a comprehensive update to the entire TIMMA Board. She said staff could address the economic impact question, along with a other background and proposal information at that meeting, and said she would seek TIMMA Board Chair Haney's guidance, as well as at the Board's guidance.

Chair Mandelman asked if Vice Chair Peskin's request was time sensitive, required it to be heard at the next meeting as opposed to a later meeting, and whether this could go to TIMMA. Vice Chair Peskin asked about having a joint meeting with TIMMA in April. Director Chang answered that staff decided against it having a joint board meeting and opted for presenting an informational item to the TIMMA Board on its own, so that TIMMA could hold Chair and Vice Chair elections, which was meant to take place at the first TIMMA Board convening of the year, as well as to hear an informational update before an action item was brought forward.

Vice Chair Peskin responded that it was standard practice for the Transportation Authority to commission these types of informational items, whether it concerned the SFMTA or other bodies, but was happy to work with the TIMMA Board Chair to figure



out the best approach.

There was no public comment.

**13. Public Comment**

During general public comment, Aleta Dupree asked the Board to think of the population that uses or aspires to use the San Francisco transportation system, and not to see difference as an impediment in rendering testimony to the Board. She wanted the safest and most equitable system as possible and to be able to approach the system with just as much welcome as anybody else, despite being different. She asked that the Board fund a system that would welcome all, as long as people paid their fares and respected the rules of conduct.

**14. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:36 a.m.



RESOLUTION RELEASING \$1,200,000 OF PROP K FUNDS HELD ON RESERVE FOR THE  
GEARY BUS RAPID TRANSIT PHASE 2 CONCEPTUAL ENGINEERING REPORT

WHEREAS, In July 2015 through Resolution 16-06, the Transportation Authority allocated \$6,319,470 in Prop K funds to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) for the Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Phase 2 Conceptual Engineering Report (CER) to advance a BRT project on Geary Boulevard between Stanyan Street and 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue, including a center-running transitway between Arguello Boulevard and 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue and side-running bus lanes elsewhere; and

WHEREAS, The SFMTA now proposes an amended scope of work for the project, including implementing side-running bus lanes throughout the entire Geary BRT Phase 2 corridor extents from Stanyan Street to 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue; and

WHEREAS, In December 2021 through Resolution 22-19, the Board approved an amendment of the project scope and reduced the Prop K allocation from \$6,319,470 to \$4,427,317 to reflect a lower level of effort scope of work needed to complete the CER for the side-running project and of this amount, held \$1,200,000 on reserve, to be released by the Board pending agreement between Commissioner Chan's office, Transportation Authority staff, and SFMTA staff on the proposed draft project designs on a block-by-block basis, and review of preliminary assessment of benefits and impacts, cost estimate and funding plan, and draft outreach materials for public outreach round 2; and

WHEREAS, SFMTA staff have developed and provided draft project designs on a block-by-block basis, a preliminary assessment of benefits and impacts, a cost estimate and funding plan, and draft outreach materials for public outreach round 2, and coordinated with Commissioner Chan's office and Transportation Authority staff to reach agreement on the proposed draft project designs, and requested release of the \$1,200,000 in Prop K funds on reserve and Transportation Authority staff recommended releasing the funds on reserve; and

WHEREAS, There are sufficient funds in the Capital Expenditures line item of the Transportation Authority's adopted Fiscal Year 2021/22 budget to cover the proposed actions; and

WHEREAS, At its March 23, 2022 meeting, the Community Advisory Committee discussed the proposed release of \$1,200,000 in Prop K funds for the SFMTA's Geary BRT



Phase 2 CER and unanimously adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation;  
now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority hereby releases \$1,200,000 of Prop K  
funds currently on reserve for the SFMTA's Geary BRT Phase 2 CER.



## Memorandum

### AGENDA ITEM 9

**DATE:** March 17, 2022

**TO:** Transportation Authority Board

**FROM:** Anna LaForte – Deputy Director for Policy and Programming

**SUBJECT:** 03/22/2022 Board Meeting: Release \$1,200,000 of Prop K Funds Held on Reserve for the Geary Bus Rapid Transit Phase 2 Conceptual Engineering Report

#### **RECOMMENDATION** ☐ Information ☒ Action

Release \$1,200,000 of Prop K project funds held on reserve for the Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Phase 2 Conceptual Engineering Report (CER).

#### **SUMMARY**

In July 2015 through Resolution 16-06, the Transportation Authority allocated \$6,319,470 in Prop K funds to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) for the Geary BRT Phase 2 CER. Geary BRT Phase 2 covers Geary Boulevard between Stanyan Street and 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue and was originally designed with a center-running transitway between Arguello Boulevard and 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The SFMTA now recommends side-running transit lanes throughout the project limits. In December 2021 through Resolution 22-18, the Transportation Authority approved an amendment of the project scope and reduced the grant amount to \$4,427,317 to reflect a lower level of effort scope of work needed to complete the CER for the side-running project. Of this amount, the Board held \$1,200,000 on reserve, to be released by the Board pending agreement between Commissioner Chan's office, Transportation Authority staff, and SFMTA staff on the proposed draft project designs on a block-by-block basis (Attachment 1), review of cost estimate (Attachment 2) and funding plan, preliminary assessment of benefits and impacts (Attachment 4), and draft materials for public outreach round 2. We recommend release of the funds since the SFMTA has provided the requested materials and reached agreement with Commissioner Chan's office and Transportation Authority staff on the draft block-by-block project designs in preparation for outreach round 2 which began in early March. SFMTA staff will provide a project update at the March 22 Board meeting.

- ☐ Fund Allocation
- ☐ Fund Programming
- ☐ Policy/Legislation
- ☐ Plan/Study
- ☐ Capital Project Oversight/Delivery
- ☐ Budget/Finance
- ☐ Contract/Agreement
- ☐ Other: Grant Amendment



## **BACKGROUND**

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

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

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

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

## **DISCUSSION**

As noted above, the SFMTA is requesting and we are recommending release of the \$1,200,000 in Prop K funds held on reserve for Geary BRT Phase 2 since all the conditions on the release of the funds have been met. SFMTA staff have provided materials and coordinated with the District 1 Supervisor's office and Transportation Authority staff in advance of commencing outreach round 2. A discussion of the draft project design drawings (Attachment 1), project cost estimate (Attachment 2) and funding plan (Attachment 3), outreach round 2, and preliminary benefits and impacts (Attachment 4) is provided below.



**Draft project designs on a block-by-block basis.** Proposed block-by-block project designs show existing conditions and the current SFMTA project proposal for Geary Boulevard between 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Stanyan Street. Like EIR Alternative 2, the current project proposal includes side running bus lanes between approximately 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and Stanyan Street. A few of the notable changes in the current project proposal relative to EIR Alternative 2 include the following:

- Western extent of the bus lanes is now at 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue westbound and 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue eastbound instead of 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue in EIR Alternative 2.
- The current project proposal retains the 38R Geary Rapid bus stops at 20th Avenue and removes the local bus stops at 12th Avenue.
- The current proposal would optimize the location of 11 bus stops so they are on the far side of the intersection and ensure all bus stop lengths meet current standards.
- The current proposal includes eight right-turn pockets to improve transit reliability by reducing right-turn conflicts.
- The current project proposal would result in a lower net loss of parking than the EIR LPA, which would remove approximately 60 spaces, and the EIR Alternative 2, which would remove 140 spaces. The current project proposal would remove approximately 80 parking spaces along Geary Boulevard but SFMTA also proposes adding 30 parking spaces on side streets by converting parallel parking to angled parking, which would result in a net reduction of 50 parking spaces. The current proposal also includes an updated color curb plan based on merchant loading data and extended meter hours to improve parking availability.
- The current project proposal would remove eastbound or westbound left turns at ten intersections. Intersections that currently allow left turns in both directions would offer a single eastbound or westbound left turn.
- The current project proposal adds expanded pedestrian median refuges at 24 intersections. EIR Alternative 2 did not propose any new median refuges.
- The number and location of pedestrian bulbouts has changed from the EIR Alternative 2. The total count of pedestrian bulbs has decreased from 33 in EIR Alternative 2 to 23 in the current SFMTA proposal. SFMTA staff analyzed ten years of historic collision data and has proposed pedestrian bulbs at all intersections with documented crash history during that period. SFMTA has identified an additional 19 locations without crash records over the past ten years where pedestrian bulbs could be added to the corridor, subject to funding availability, without significant impacts to parking.

**Cost estimate and funding plan.** Attachment 2 includes the SFMTA's draft project cost estimate and Attachment 3 includes the draft funding plan as it was included in the Allocation



Request Form for the Geary BRT Phase 2 CER (Geary Boulevard Improvement Project) [Amendment] approved in December 2021. SFMTA currently estimates a total project cost of \$48.9 million. The Transportation Authority has programmed \$10 million in Prop K funds to the project that would potentially leverage Prop A General Obligation bond funds, General Funds, and other potential state and federal grants such as Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, One Bay Area Grant (Cycle 3), Low Carbon Transit Operations Program, and Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities.

**Review of preliminary assessment of benefits and impacts.** The Geary BRT EIR included traffic and transit travel time analysis for baseline and project conditions in year 2020 and 2035. SFMTA staff have prepared preliminary analysis of the potential transit travel time benefits of Geary BRT Phase 2 relative to current post-TETL conditions. SFMTA estimates that the proposed project could reduce PM peak period travel times on Geary buses by about two-and-a-half minutes between 34th Avenue and Stanyan Street (average of eastbound and westbound 38 and 38R services) when compared with current conditions. These travel time savings would be realized in addition to early travel benefits related to the now-permanent TETLs. Compared to current conditions the EIR LPA could save approximately three minutes of travel time and EIR Alternative 2 would save about one minute and forty seconds. This means that the proposed project could perform better than EIR Alternative 2 and deliver more than 80% of the travel time savings of the EIR LPA. Attachment 5 contains a summary of current transit travel times after the implementation of the TETLs, estimated travel time benefits of the current project proposal, and an inventory of project definition changes relative to EIR Alternative 2.

**Draft outreach round 2 materials.** SFMTA staff shared draft outreach materials for outreach round 2 with Supervisor Chan's office and Transportation Authority staff. The outreach materials include mailers, posters, newspaper advertisements, surveys, boards for public events, and website content. The materials are available in English, Chinese, and Russian. Outreach activities are currently underway and include a pop-up event on Geary Boulevard, an unstaffed information display and in-person survey opportunity, virtual office hours, outreach to community groups, and individual responses to email and hotline inquiries.

## **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

The recommended action would release \$1.2 million in Prop K funds held in reserve that were previously allocated in July 2015. Sufficient funds are included in the Fiscal Year 2021/22 annual budget to cover the recommended action. Furthermore, sufficient funds will be included in future budgets to cover the cash flow distributions as approved in December 2021 through Resolution 22-18, for those respective fiscal years.



## **CAC POSITION**

The CAC will consider this item at its March 23, 2022 meeting before the Board considers final approval on April 12, 2022.

## **SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS**

- Attachment 1 - Draft project drawings
- Attachment 2 - SFMTA project cost estimate
- Attachment 3- Allocation Request Form for the Geary BRT Phase 2 CER (Geary Boulevard Improvement Project) [Amendment] approved December 2021
- Attachment 4 - Preliminary benefits and impacts



## Project Timeline



# Share your feedback about proposed transit and safety improvements

## Welcome! Goals of this open house:

The Geary Boulevard Improvement Project is the second phase of improvements on Geary Boulevard, proposed between 34th Avenue and Stanyan Street to improve Muni's 38 Geary bus service and address traffic safety.

In fall 2021 we asked neighbors about their priorities for Geary. Thanks to input from over 600 community members, the SFMTA has used this feedback to draft the detailed project design. Now we'd like to hear what you think about the details. Review these project materials and take a short survey to let us know what you think about these proposed changes.

We'll use your input to help create the final project proposal, to be considered for approval later in 2022 by the SFMTA Board of Directors.

## Overview of project proposals:

- Installing transit lanes between 28th and 15th avenues. To make room, angled parking would be converted to parallel parking.
- Relocating 11 bus stops and removing two closely-spaced stops to improve transit performance.
- Traffic signal upgrades, new bus bulb-outs and lengthening bus zones that are too short to accommodate two buses.
- Safety improvements, including pedestrian bulb-outs, daylighting, expanded median refuges and left-turn restrictions at key intersections.

To offset the loss of about two parking spaces per block face on average, we're proposing to increase parking spaces on side streets and make curb space changes to accommodate merchant needs, including evening and Sunday metering in Central Richmond.





## Legend

- **38 Geary bus stop: no changes**  
38Geary公車站: 沒有變動  
Остановка автобуса № 38 Geary: без изменений 38R
- R **38R Geary Rapid bus stop: no changes**  
38RGeary快車公車站: 沒有變動  
Остановка автобуса № 38R Geary Rapid: без изменений
- ⊗ **Bus stop proposed for removal**  
擬取消公車站  
Автобусная остановка, которую предлагается удалить
- ⊗→● **Proposed 38 Geary bus stop relocation**  
擬遷移 38 Geary 公車站  
Предлагаемый перенос остановки для автобусов 38 Geary
- ⊗→R **Proposed 38R Geary Rapid bus stop relocation**  
擬遷移 38R Geary Rapid 公車站  
Предлагаемый перенос остановки для автобусов 38R Geary Rapid

## Bus Stop Changes 調整巴士站

Изменения Касательно Автобусных Остановок

Some changes to bus stops on Geary Boulevard are being proposed to improve the speed, reliability and convenience of your trip on the 38 Geary and 38R Geary Rapid.

A majority of respondents who completed the fall 2021 survey said they support all of the proposed bus stop changes. The SFMTA is recommending to maintain most of the original proposals. However, the bus stop relocation at 25th Avenue outbound has been dropped based on feedback from neighboring stakeholders.

## Proposed changes:

- Moving bus stops from the nearside of intersections to the far side, so buses don't get stopped at red lights as often
- Removing closely-spaced stops at 12th Ave to improve travel time reliability
- Adding bus bulb-outs to the Park Presidio stops. Would require turn restrictions from Geary onto Funston and 14th avenues (learn more at [SFMTA.com/ParkPresidioSurvey](https://www.sfmta.com/ParkPresidioSurvey))

# Geary Boulevard Improvement Project



## Geary Boulevard Improvement Project Proposals

Geary 街 交通改善工程提案 / Предложения в рамках проекта модернизации Geary

- Existing side-running transit lanes / 現有側邊行駛公交車道 / Существующие боковые полосы для движения общественного транспорта
- New side-running transit lanes / 新的側邊行駛公車專用道 / Новые боковые полосы для движения общественного транспорта
- New bus bulb-out (sidewalk extension at bus stop) / 在公車站增設人行道拓寬 / Новое расширение тротуара на автобусных остановках
- ◆ New pedestrian bulb-out (sidewalk extension at intersection) / 在十字路口增設人行道拓寬 / Новое расширение тротуара на перекрестке (для пешеходов)
- ↗ New turn restriction from Geary / Geary 街 新設轉彎限制 / Новое ограничение поворота (движение от Geary)
- ↖ Existing left-turn okay from Geary / 許可 Geary 街 現有的左轉 / Существующий поворот налево (движение от Geary одобрен)




## Proposed Transit and Safety Improvements

The diagram above illustrates proposed changes, including new transit lanes, pedestrian bulb-outs (sidewalk extensions at intersection corners) and left-turn restrictions to improve safety. All project intersections would receive standard treatments such as daylighting, expanded median refuges and longer pedestrian walk times. To improve parking availability along the merchant corridor in Central Richmond, the meter hours on Geary Boulevard (14th to 28th avenues) are proposed to be extended to 10:00 p.m. and also include Sundays from noon to 6:00 p.m.


Construction would be coordinated with utility upgrades, as many sewer and water pipes under Geary are over 100 years old.



EXISTING CONDITIONS




PROJECT PROPOSALS (Outreach Round 2)




SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- Dedicated red transit-only lanes east of 33rd Ave
- Pedestrian bulbouts at the corners of 30th Ave
- Restriction of the left-turn from eastbound Geary onto 33rd Ave
- Traffic safety treatments including daylighting and leading pedestrian signals


LEGEND



## EXISTING CONDITIONS




## PROJECT PROPOSALS (Outreach Round 2)




## SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- New dedicated red transit-only lanes
  - Extension of the 28th Ave local bus zones
  - Pedestrian bulbouts at the corners of 30th, 29th, 28th and 27th avenues
  - Restriction of the left-turns from eastbound Geary onto 27th Ave and westbound Geary onto 26th Ave
  - Updated parking and loading regulations east of 28th Ave based on merchant and survey feedback\*
  - New angled parking on 29th and 26th avenues, north of Geary
  - Traffic safety treatments including expanded median refuges, day lighting and leading pedestrian signals
- \*proposal includes extended parking meter hours on Geary to add evenings (6-10pm) and Sundays (noon-6pm), without parking time-limits in the new time bands


## LEGEND



EXISTING CONDITIONS




PROJECT PROPOSALS (Outreach Round 2)




SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- New dedicated red transit-only lanes
  - Relocation of the inbound 25th Ave Rapid stop across the street, with new widened sidewalks
  - Relocation of the 22nd/23rd Ave local stops across the street
  - Pedestrian bulbouts at the corners of 25th and 22nd avenues
  - Restriction of the left-turns from westbound Geary onto 26th and 22nd avenues
  - Updated parking and loading regulations based on merchant and survey feedback\*
  - New angled parking on 24th and 23rd avenues, north of Geary
  - Traffic safety treatments including expanded median refuges, daylighting and leading pedestrian signals
- \*proposal includes extended parking meter hours on Geary to add evenings (6-10pm) and Sundays (noon-6pm), without parking time-limits in the new time bands


LEGEND



## EXISTING CONDITIONS




## PROJECT PROPOSALS (Outreach Round 2)




## SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- New dedicated red transit-only lanes
  - Relocation of the 20th Ave Rapid stops across the street, with new widened sidewalks
  - Relocation of the 17th Ave local stops across the street
  - Restriction of the left-turns from westbound Geary onto 19th Ave and eastbound Geary onto 18th Ave
  - Updated parking and loading regulations based on merchant and survey feedback\*
  - New angled parking on 19th and 17th avenues, south of Geary, and on 18th Ave, north of Geary
  - Traffic safety treatments including expanded median refuges, day lighting and leading pedestrian signals
- \*proposal includes extended parking meter hours on Geary to add evenings (6-10pm) and Sundays (noon-6pm), without parking time-limits in the new time bands


## LEGEND



EXISTING CONDITIONS




PROJECT PROPOSALS (Outreach Round 2)




SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- New dedicated red transit-only lanes
  - Relocation of the inbound Park Presidio Rapid stop across the street
  - Sidewalk extensions at Park Presidio northwest and southeast corners that restrict right-turns from Geary onto 14th Ave northbound and Funston Ave southbound
  - Removal of the 12th Ave local stops
  - Pedestrian bulbouts at the corners of 12th and 11th avenues
  - Restriction of the left-turns from westbound Geary onto 12th Ave and eastbound Geary onto 11th Ave
  - Updated parking and loading regulations based on merchant and survey feedback\*
  - New angled parking on 14th Ave, north of Geary, and Funston Ave, south of Geary
  - Traffic safety treatments including expanded median refuges, day lighting and leading pedestrian signals
- \*proposal includes extended parking meter hours on Geary to add evenings (6-10pm) and Sundays (noon-6pm), without parking time-limits in the new time bands*


LEGEND



## EXISTING CONDITIONS




## PROJECT PROPOSALS (Outreach Round 2)




### SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- Dedicated red transit-only lanes
- Pedestrian bulbout at the corner of 11th Ave
- Restriction of the left-turn from eastbound Geary onto 8th Ave
- Traffic safety treatments including expanded median refuges, daylighting and leading pedestrian signals


### LEGEND



EXISTING CONDITIONS




PROJECT PROPOSALS (Outreach Round 2)




SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- Dedicated red transit-only lanes
- Relocation of the 6th Ave Rapid stops across the street, with new widened sidewalks
- Relocation of the outbound 3rd Ave local stop across the street
- Pedestrian bulbouts at the corners of 6th, 4th and 3rd avenues
- Restriction of the left-turn from westbound Geary onto 4th Ave
- Traffic safety treatments including expanded median refuges, daylighting and leading pedestrian signals


LEGEND



## EXISTING CONDITIONS




## PROJECT PROPOSALS (Outreach Round 2)



### SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- Dedicated red transit-only lanes
- Extension of the inbound Arguello Rapid stop, with new widened sidewalks
- Updated parking and loading regulations at Stanyan Street
- Traffic safety treatments including expanded median refuges, day lighting and leading pedestrian signals

### LEGEND



Item	Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Extension
DPW Design and Construction					
Transit and Pedestrian Bulbs					
1.a	New 130-foot Transit Bulb (Sidewalk Extension)	5	EA	\$ 330,000	\$ 1,650,000
1.b	New 120-foot Transit Bulb with Raised Crosswalk	2	EA	\$ 390,000	\$ 780,000
2	Extend Transit Bulb		EA	\$ 170,000	\$ -
3	New Transit Island		EA	\$ 110,000	\$ -
4	New 100' Concrete Bus Pad		EA	\$ 60,000	\$ -
5.a	New Single Pedestrian Bulb (specific locations pending updated analysis)	32	EA	\$ 90,000	\$ 2,880,000
5.b	New Dual Pedestrian Bulb		EA	\$ 110,000	\$ -
5.c	New Mid-Block 20-foot Pedestrian Bulb		EA	\$ 100,000	\$ -
5.d	Median Thumbnail Upgrade	30	EA	\$ 30,000	\$ 900,000
5.e	Curb Ramp Upgrades to ADA Standards	14	EA	\$ 60,000	\$ 840,000
6	Miscellaneous Concrete Improvements		LS	\$ -	\$ -
7	Remove Transit Bulb		EA	\$ 170,000	\$ -
8	Remove Pedestrian Bulb		EA	\$ 60,000	\$ -
Traffic Signals					
9	New Traffic Signal		EA	\$ 400,000	\$ -
10	Signal Upgrade	12	EA	\$ 450,000	\$ 5,400,000
11	Signal Modification (add mast arms)	1	EA	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000
12	Fiber Optic Conduits and Cables (Stanyan-25th Ave)	1	LS	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 2,500,000
Streetscaping					
13	Streetscaping on Transit Bulbs	7	EA	\$ 20,000	\$ 140,000
MTA Design and Installation		\$ 15,190,000			
Transit Stop Improvements					
14	Stop Change	13	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ 70,000
15	Miscellaneous Work (benches, bike racks, trenching for shelter power, etc)	1	LS	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000
Traffic Improvements					
16	Transit-Only Lane (red)	182,600	SQ FT	\$ 25	\$ 4,570,000
17	Remove Red Transit-Only Lane		SQ FT	\$ 5	\$ -
18	Parking Configuration Changes	13	BLK	\$ 15,000	\$ 200,000
19	Turn Pocket or Turn Restriction		EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
20	OCS Modifications		LS	\$ -	\$ -
Bike and Pedestrian Improvements					
21	Bike Lane		BLK	\$ 100,000	\$ -
22	Daylighting & LPI/Signal Timing	35	INT	\$ 5,000	\$ 180,000
Soft Costs		\$ 20,310,000			
PLN	Environmental Review				\$ -
PE	MTA: Outreach (Labor and Collateral) and Conceptual Design	8%	of all hard costs		\$ 1,630,000
PE	PW: Notice of Intent (NOI) and Control Drawings	2%	of PW hard costs		\$ 310,000
DD	MTA: Design Support and Review	10%	of all hard costs		\$ 2,040,000
DD	PW: Detailed Design (100% PS&E Package) and Advertisement	16%	of PW hard costs		\$ 2,440,000
DD	Fees: City Attorney Office, Sidewalk Legislation, General Plan Referral	35	intersections	\$ 5,000	\$ 175,000
CON	MTA: Engineering Support	3%	of all hard costs		\$ 610,000
CON	PW: Engineering Support and Administration	20%	of PW hard costs		\$ 3,040,000
CON	Construction Mitigation Program	0.7%	of total project budget		\$ 340,000
CON	Art Enrichment Allowance		LS	2% of hard	\$ 310,000
CON	MTA: Transit Support		LS	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000
		TOTAL COST			\$ 31,310,000
Transit Cost Estimate: \$18,100,000		Contingency (35%)			\$ 10,960,000
Pedestrian Safety Cost Estimate: \$11,560,000		Subtotal			\$ 42,270,000
Signals + Fiber Cost Estimate: \$19,270,000		Inflation (5% /year for 3 years)*			\$ 6,660,000
Total Project Cost: \$48,930,000		MUNI FORWARD ESTIMATE			\$ 48,930,000

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority Allocation Request Form

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

## EXPENDITURE PLAN INFORMATION

<b>PROP K Expenditure Plans</b>	Rapid Bus Network
<b>Current PROP K Request:</b>	\$4,427,317
<b>Supervisory Districts</b>	District 01, District 02

## REQUEST

### Brief Project Description

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

### Detailed Scope, Project Benefits and Community Outreach

See attached word document

### Project Location

Geary Boulevard between Stanyan Street and 34th Avenue

### Project Phase(s)

Design Engineering (PS&E)

## 5YPP/STRATEGIC PLAN INFORMATION

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

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

Conceptual Engineering Report Phase Scope of Work - Amendment

10/21/2021

### **Background**

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

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

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

### **Updated Scope for New Side-Running Design**

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

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

## 1. CER Design Package

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

The scope of work is expected to include:

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

A Draft Curb Plan will be developed and shared for input during Outreach Round 2 (Task 2) and then refined as a Final Curb Plan that will be used to write the parking and traffic legislation (Task 3).

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

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

## 2. Outreach

In order to support the design work under Task 1 CER Design Package, outreach will be conducted to inform key design questions as well as continue ongoing community dialogue as follows.

- a. ***Round 1:*** occurred in September 2021 (funded by other agency funding sources prior to completing this scope of work update). This round of outreach included a multi-lingual mailer to properties within 1-2 blocks of the project area, flyers posted at key locations along the corridor, pop-up in person outreach, an online open house using a StoryMaps website, participation in the Richmond Autumn Moon Festival, a virtual community meeting, and multi-lingual surveys distributed via meal deliveries for low-income seniors at several senior centers. Key areas of input sought included: stakeholder level of support for new side-running configuration recommendation, proposed bus stop consolidations and removals, and block-specific feedback on existing transit/parking/loading/safety challenges to inform draft project design
- b. ***Round 2:*** anticipated in early 2022. This round of outreach would share a full draft block-by-block design for stakeholder input. The outreach methods will be finalized in late 2021 but are generally expected to include similar techniques to Outreach Round 1.
- c. ***Round 3:*** anticipated in 2022. This round of outreach would inform stakeholders of how the design being brought to the SFMTA Board for potential action was

informed by stakeholder feedback and share the opportunity to provide public comment to the SFMTA Board. Outreach methods would include a multi-lingual mailer and flyers posted throughout the corridor to advertise the policy-making meetings where feedback can be shared with decision-makers.

- d. ***Direct stakeholder outreach.*** throughout the entire planning process, direct stakeholder outreach will be conducted as needed to resolve location-specific design questions. This would include outreach to properties immediately adjacent to proposed bus stop re-locations, as well as ongoing direct outreach to key stakeholders.
- e. ***Ongoing Geary CAC meetings.*** Since 2017, the SFMTA has staffed a Geary Community Advisory Committee as a successor the SFCTA-convened CAC that met during the planning and environmental phases. The Geary CAC has provided advice and input to the SFMTA on both phases of the Geary Bus Rapid Transit Project. The CAC is envisioned to continue meeting through completion of both phases of the project and this item provides for ongoing staffing of the body during the CER phase.

***Deliverables:***

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

### 3. Approvals

Needed local and federal approvals will be obtained including:

- a. ***Environmental approvals.*** Policy actions would be needed by both the SFCTA and SFMTA Board to confirm selection of a new locally preferred alternative consistent with the side-running alternative. In addition, coordination with the Federal Transit Administration would be needed to obtain an amended Record of Decision (ROD). SFCTA previously acted as the lead agency for environmental approvals, but SFMTA will now take over this role. SFMTA expects to complete environmental analysis in Spring 2022 and anticipates FTA issuing an Amended ROD in Fall 2023.

- b. ***Parking and traffic legislation.*** SFMTA staff will prepare needed documentation, noticing, and presentation materials to seek parking and traffic legislation of the project.

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

### **Deliverables and Tentative Interim Deliverables Schedule**

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

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

### **Type of Environmental Clearance Required**

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

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority Allocation Request Form

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

## ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE

<b>Environmental Type:</b>	EIR/EIS
----------------------------	---------

## PROJECT DELIVERY MILESTONES

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

## SCHEDULE DETAILS

### Community Outreach:

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

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

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

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

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

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority Allocation Request Form

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

## FUNDING PLAN - FOR CURRENT REQUEST

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

## FUNDING PLAN - ENTIRE PROJECT (ALL PHASES)

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

## COST SUMMARY

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

<b>% Complete of Design:</b>	5.0%
<b>As of Date:</b>	08/26/2021

<b>Expected Useful Life:</b>	30 Years
------------------------------	----------

**Geary Phase 2 - CER Budget updated for side-running**

8/27/2021

		Rate	Hrs	ETC		Notes/assumptions
				Cost		
<b>Streets Labor</b>	5502 PM1 - Liz Brisson	\$ 195	560	\$ 109,296		PM for environmental and legislation
	5502 PM1 - Dan Mackowski	\$ 195	1200	\$ 234,206		PM for implementation and PE
	TP2 - David Sindel	\$ 141	1040	\$ 146,242		Planner supporting environmental, legislation, outreach tasks
	9172 Manager 2 - Francesca Napolitan	\$ 186	160	\$ 29,688		Will supervise preparation of curb plan
	5277 Planner 1 - Tracy Minicucci	\$ 118	400	\$ 47,163		Will prepare curb plan
	Sr Engineer	\$ 241	80	\$ 19,253		Will provide senior engineer review as-needed
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>\$ 585,848</b>		
<b>Comms Labor</b>	1314 Public Relations Officer	\$ 194	960	\$ 186,203		Lead for developing and implementing public outreach activities
	5320 Illustrator and Art Designer	\$ 170	120	\$ 20,373		Will prepare graphic design materials as needed
	1312 Public Information Officer	\$ 165	480	\$ 79,367		Will provide outreach support to 1314 PRO
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>\$ 285,943</b>		
<b>Direct costs/ professional services</b>	Env consultant			\$ 200,000		Conservative estimate, could decrease depending on scale of env work needed TBD after finalizing draft final scope
	Comms Direct Costs			\$ 130,000		Based on previous projects
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>\$ 330,000</b>		
<b>Public Works CER Funding</b>				\$ 404,384		SFPW time to prepare scope documents and preliminary base map before detailed design
<b>Environmental Review Team Labor</b>	5290 Transit Planner 4	\$ 192	10	\$ 1,921		
	5289 Transit Planner 3	\$ 164	40	\$ 6,560		
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>\$ 8,481</b>		
<b>City Atty</b>				\$ 25,000		CAO review, based on previous projects
<b>Contingency</b>				\$ 61,764		5% of estimated costs
<b>Total for side-running CER</b>				<b>\$ 1,701,419.76</b>		
<b>Expenditure to date</b>				<b>\$ 2,725,897.65</b>		
<b>Original grant</b>				<b>\$ 6,319,470.00</b>		
<b>Amount to de-obligate</b>				<b>\$ 1,892,152.59</b>		

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority Allocation Request Form

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

## SFCTA RECOMMENDATION

<b>Resolution Number:</b>		<b>Resolution Date:</b>	
<b>Total PROP K Requested:</b>	\$4,427,317	<b>Total PROP K Recommended</b>	\$1,767,946

<b>SGA Project Number:</b>	101-907053	<b>Name:</b>	Geary BRT Phase 2 CER (Geary Boulevard Improvement Project)
<b>Sponsor:</b>	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency	<b>Expiration Date:</b>	09/30/2024
<b>Phase:</b>	Design Engineering	<b>Fundshare:</b>	100.0%

### Cash Flow Distribution Schedule by Fiscal Year

Fund Source	FY 2021/22	FY 2022/23	FY 2023/24	FY 2024/25	FY 2025/26	Total
PROP K EP-101	\$1,767,946	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,767,946

### Deliverables

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

7. Upon completion, provide Conceptual Engineering Report, conceptual engineering drawings, internal and inter-agency design review TASC materials and process

8. Upon completion, Sponsor shall provide an updated scope, schedule, budget, and funding plan for design and construction. This deliverable may be met with an allocation request for design and quick-build construction.

#### Special Conditions

1. \$1,200,000 of the remaining project funding (\$1,767,946) is on reserve, to be released by the Board, pending agreement between the District 1 Supervisor's Office, Transportation Authority staff, and SFMTA staff on the proposed draft project designs on a block-by-block basis, and review of preliminary assessment of benefits and impacts, cost estimate and funding plan, and draft outreach materials for public outreach round 2

#### Notes

1. Funds were allocated through Board approval of Resolution 2016-006 in July 2015.

2. This amendment allows up to \$100,000 in retroactive expenditures against the existing grant dating back to 9/1/2021 for SFPW base maps. Charges between 12/31/2019 (the original fund expiration date) and 9/1/2021 are not eligible for reimbursement from this grant.

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

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority Allocation Request Form

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

## EXPENDITURE PLAN SUMMARY

<b>Current PROP K Request:</b>	\$4,427,317
--------------------------------	-------------

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

Initials of sponsor staff member verifying the above statement:
LB

## CONTACT INFORMATION

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

**Geary Boulevard Improvement Project**  
**Preliminary Assessment of Benefits and Impacts**  
**Transit Travel Time**

**Table 1. Observed Geary Corridor Bus Travel Times**

**50th Percentile Travel Times, PM Peak Period, 33rd Avenue to Arguello Street**

ROUTE	DIRECTION	Pre-COVID	COVID, after TETL	
		Jan/Feb 2020	Jan/Feb 2021	Mar/Apr 2021
38 Geary	EB	15:38	14:39	14:24
	WB	15:43	14:52	14:26
38R Geary	EB	12:03	11:53	11:43
	WB	12:44	12:06	11:41
<b>38/38R</b>	<b>Both</b>	<b>14:02</b>	<b>13:22</b>	<b>13:04</b>

Source: SFMTA, 38 Geary Temporary Emergency Transit Lanes Project Evaluation Report, May 2021

**Table 2. Geary Corridor Bus Travel Time Reduction Compared with Port-TETL Conditions**

**PM Peak Period, 34th Avenue to Stanyan Street**

SCENARIO	ROUTE	DIRECTION	TRAVEL TIME REDUCTION FROM CURRENT CONDITIONS, INCLUDING TETL (TTRP METHODOLOGY)		
			LPA	ALTERNATIVE 2	SFMTA PROJECT PROPOSAL
Opening Year	38 Geary	EB	04:31	01:30	03:05
		WB	04:06	01:30	02:32
	38R Geary	EB	01:37	01:50	02:29
		WB	01:32	01:50	01:47
<b>Average</b>	<b>38/38R</b>	<b>Both</b>	<b>02:57</b>	<b>01:40</b>	<b>02:28</b>

Source: Fehr & Peers and SFCTA, 2014. FEIS Table 3.3-6 updated by SFMTA and SFCTA, 2022.

**Geary Boulevard Improvement Project**  
**Preliminary Assessment of Benefits and Impacts**  
**Parking Impacts**

**Table 3. Change in Area-wide Public Parking Supply in the Geary Corridor, by Alternative and Corridor Segment**

CORRIDOR SEGMENT	ESTIMATE D PUBLIC PARKING SPACES IN AREA	AREA-WIDE PUBLIC PARKING SUPPLY (WITH % CHANGE)		
		CENTER RUNNING (Hybrid in FEIS)	SIDE RUNNING (Alt. 2 in FEIS)	SIDE UPDATE (Current Proposal)
34th Avenue –25th Avenue	1,000	960 (-4%)	950 (-6%)	980 (-2%)
25th Avenue –Park Presidio	1,430	1,410 (-1%)	1,380 (-4%)	1,390 (-3%)
Park Presidio –Palm/Jordan	1,750	1,750 (0%)	1,710 (-2%)	1,730 (-1%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,180</b>	<b>4,120</b>	<b>4,040</b>	<b>4,100</b>
Side-street additions		0	0	30
Total parking change		4,120	4,040	4,130

*Note: SFCTA rounded to nearest ten. Not all numbers sum correctly due to rounding.*

**Geary Boulevard Improvement Project**  
**Preliminary Assessment of Benefits and Impacts**  
**Bus Stops and Transit Lanes**

Intersection/Block	FEIS Alternative 2		MTA Proposal (2022)		Changes	
	Bus Stops	Transit Lanes	Bus Stops	Transit Lanes	Bus Stops	Transit Lanes
West of 34th Ave		None		None		
34th Ave (to 33rd)	OB NS full-block BZ	IB & OB		None		Remove bus lane
33rd Ave (to 32nd)	IB NS full-block BZ	IB & OB	OB FS 90' BZ & IB NS 85' BZ	IB		Remove OB bus lane
32nd Ave (to 31st)	IB FS full-block BZ (layover)	IB & OB	IB FS full-block BZ (layover)	IB & OB		
					Remove layover extension	
31st Ave (to 30th)	IB FS BZ (layover)	IB & OB		IB & OB		
30th Ave (to 29th)	OB NS BZ & IB NS BZ	IB & OB	OB NS 100' BZ & IB NS 100' BZ	IB & OB		
29th Ave (to 28th)		IB & OB		IB & OB		
28th Ave (to 27th)	OB NS BZ & IB NS BZ	IB & OB	OB NS 78' BZ & IB NS 100' BZ	IB & OB		
27th Ave (to 26th)		IB & OB		IB & OB		
26th Ave (to 25th)	OB NS full-block BB	IB & OB		IB & OB		
25th Ave (to 24th)	IB NS full-block BB	IB & OB	OB NS 88' BB & IB FS 136' BB	IB & OB		
24th Ave (to 23rd)		IB & OB		IB & OB		
23rd Ave (to 22nd)	IB NS BZ	IB & OB	IB FS 90' BZ	IB & OB		
22nd Ave (to 21st)	OB NS BZ	IB & OB	OB FS 88' BZ	IB & OB		
21st Ave (to 20th)		IB & OB		IB & OB		
					Retain Rapid service	
20th Ave (to 19th)	OB NS BZ & IB NS BZ (local-only)	IB & OB	OB FS 140' BB & IB FS 146' BB	IB & OB		
19th Ave (to 18th)		IB & OB		IB & OB		
18th Ave (to 17th)		IB & OB		IB & OB		
17th Ave (to 16th)	OB NS BZ & IB NS BZ	IB & OB	OB FS 100' BZ & IB NS 103' BZ	IB & OB		
16th Ave (to 15th)		IB & OB		IB & OB		
15th Ave (to 14th)	OB NS full-block BB	IB & OB		IB & OB		

**Geary Boulevard Improvement Project**  
**Preliminary Assessment of Benefits and Impacts**  
**Bus Stops and Transit Lanes**

Intersection/Block	FEIS Alternative 2		MTA Proposal (2022)		Changes	
	Bus Stops	Transit Lanes	Bus Stops	Transit Lanes	Bus Stops	Transit Lanes
14th Ave (to PP)	IB NS full-block BB	IB & OB		IB & OB		
Park Presidio (to Funston)		IB & OB	OB FS 118' BB & IB FS 120' BB	IB & OB		
Funston Ave (to 12th)		IB & OB		IB & OB		
12th Ave (to 11th)	OB NS BZ & IB NS BZ	IB & OB		IB & OB	Remove local stops	
11th Ave (to 10th)		IB & OB		IB & OB		
10th Ave (to 9th)		IB & OB		IB & OB		
9th Ave (to 8th)	OB FS BZ & IB FS BZ	IB & OB	OB FS 104' BZ & IB FS 80' BZ	IB & OB		
8th Ave (to 7th)		IB & OB		IB & OB		
7th Ave (to 6th)		IB & OB		IB & OB		
6th Ave (to 5th)	OB NS full-block BB & IB NS full-block BB	IB & OB	OB FS 132' BB & IB FS 148' BB	IB & OB		
5th Ave (to 4th)		IB & OB		IB & OB		
4th Ave (to 3rd)	IB NS BZ	IB & OB		IB & OB		
3rd Ave (to 2nd)	OB NS BZ	IB & OB	OB FS 108' BZ & IB NS 117' BZ	IB & OB		
2nd Ave (to Arguello)	OB NS full-block BB	IB & OB		IB & OB		
Arguello Blvd (to Palm)	IB NS full-block BB	IB & OB	OB FS 151' BB & IB FS 132' BB	IB & OB		
Palm Ave (to Stanyan)		IB & OB		IB & OB		
Stanyan St (to east)	IB NS BZ	IB & OB	IB NS 92' BZ	IB & OB		

**Legend**

	Added proposal in Side relative to Alt2
	Less proposed scope than Alt2
	Slightly different but substantially similar
	Installed since EIR/S

**Geary Boulevard Improvement Project**  
**Preliminary Assessment of Benefits and Impacts**  
**Parking**

Intersection/Block	FEIS Alternative 2	MTA Proposal (2022)	Changes
West of 34th Ave	Parallel	Parallel	
34th Ave (to 33rd)	None	Parallel	
33rd Ave (to 32nd)	Parallel	Parallel	
32nd Ave (to 31st)	Parallel	Parallel	
31st Ave (to 30th)	Parallel	Parallel	
30th Ave (to 29th)	Parallel	Parallel	
29th Ave (to 28th)	Parallel	Angled north. Geary parallel	
28th Ave (to 27th)	Parallel	Parallel	
27th Ave (to 26th)	Parallel	Parallel	
26th Ave (to 25th)	Parallel	Angled north. Geary parallel	
25th Ave (to 24th)	Parallel	Parallel	
24th Ave (to 23rd)	Parallel	Angled north. Geary parallel	
23rd Ave (to 22nd)	Parallel	Angled north. Geary parallel	
22nd Ave (to 21st)	Parallel	Parallel	
21st Ave (to 20th)	Parallel	Parallel	
20th Ave (to 19th)	Parallel	Parallel	
19th Ave (to 18th)	Parallel	Angled south. Geary parallel	
18th Ave (to 17th)	Parallel	Angled north. Geary parallel	
17th Ave (to 16th)	Parallel	Angled south. Geary parallel	
16th Ave (to 15th)	Parallel	Parallel	
15th Ave (to 14th)	Parallel	Parallel	
14th Ave (to PP)	None	Angled north. Geary none	
Park Presidio (to Funston)	None	None	
Funston Ave (to 12th)	Parallel	Angled south. Geary parallel	
12th Ave (to 11th)	Parallel	Parallel	
11th Ave (to 10th)	Parallel	Parallel	
10th Ave (to 9th)	Parallel	Parallel	
9th Ave (to 8th)	Parallel	Parallel	

**Geary Boulevard Improvement Project**  
**Preliminary Assessment of Benefits and Impacts**  
**Parking**

Intersection/Block	FEIS Alternative 2	MTA Proposal (2022)	Changes
8th Ave (to 7th)	Parallel	Parallel	
7th Ave (to 6th)	Parallel	Parallel	
6th Ave (to 5th)	Parallel	Parallel	
5th Ave (to 4th)	Parallel	Parallel	
4th Ave (to 3rd)	Parallel	Parallel	
3rd Ave (to 2nd)	Parallel	Parallel	
2nd Ave (to Arguello)	Parallel	Parallel	
Arguello Blvd (to Palm)	Parallel	Parallel	
Palm Ave (to Stanyan)	Parallel	Parallel	
Stanyan St (to east)	Parallel	Parallel	

**Legend**

	Added proposal in Side relative to Alt2
	Less proposed scope than Alt2
	Slightly different but substantially similar
	Installed since EIR/S

**Geary Boulevard Improvement Project**  
**Preliminary Assessment of Benefits and Impacts**  
**Turn Restrictions and Turn Pockets**

Intersection/Block	FEIS Alternative 2		MTA Proposal (2022)		Changes	
	Turn Restriction	Turn Pocket	Turn Restriction	Turn Pocket	Turn Restriction	Turn Pocket
West of 34th Ave						
34th Ave (to 33rd)				NB/SB ALL		
33rd Ave (to 32nd)		WBLT extend	EBLT	EBRT		
32nd Ave (to 31st)						
31st Ave (to 30th)						
30th Ave (to 29th)						
29th Ave (to 28th)						
28th Ave (to 27th)				EB/WBRT		
27th Ave (to 26th)			EBLT			
26th Ave (to 25th)			WBLT			
25th Ave (to 24th)						
24th Ave (to 23rd)						
23rd Ave (to 22nd)				NB/SB ALL		
22nd Ave (to 21st)			WBLT			
21st Ave (to 20th)						
20th Ave (to 19th)						
19th Ave (to 18th)			WBLT			
18th Ave (to 17th)			EBLT			
17th Ave (to 16th)						
16th Ave (to 15th)						
15th Ave (to 14th)				EB/WBRT, NB/SB ALL		
14th Ave (to PP)		WBRT	WBRT			
Park Presidio (to Funston)		EB/WBRT		EB/WBRT		
Funston Ave (to 12th)		EBRT	EBRT			
12th Ave (to 11th)			WBLT			
11th Ave (to 10th)			EBLT			

**Geary Boulevard Improvement Project**  
**Preliminary Assessment of Benefits and Impacts**  
**Turn Restrictions and Turn Pockets**

Intersection/Block	FEIS Alternative 2		MTA Proposal (2022)		Changes	
	Turn Restriction	Turn Pocket	Turn Restriction	Turn Pocket	Turn Restriction	Turn Pocket
10th Ave (to 9th)						
9th Ave (to 8th)				EBRT		
8th Ave (to 7th)			EBLT	NB/SB ALL		
7th Ave (to 6th)			WBLT existing			
6th Ave (to 5th)						
5th Ave (to 4th)						
4th Ave (to 3rd)			WBLT			
3rd Ave (to 2nd)			EBLT existing			
2nd Ave (to Arguello)						
Arguello Blvd (to Palm)						
Palm Ave (to Stanyan)						
Stanyan St (to east)				EBRT		
<b>Count</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6</b>

**Legend**

	Added proposal in Side relative to Alt2
	Less proposed scope than Alt2
	Slightly different but substantially similar
	Installed since EIR/S

**Geary Boulevard Improvement Project**  
**Preliminary Assessment of Benefits and Impacts**  
**Median Refuges**

Intersection/Block	FEIS Alternative 2	MTA Proposal (2022)	Changes
West of 34th Ave		Existing	
34th Ave (to 33rd)		Existing	
33rd Ave (to 32nd)		Existing	
32nd Ave (to 31st)		Existing	
31st Ave (to 30th)			
30th Ave (to 29th)			
29th Ave (to 28th)		Refuges	
28th Ave (to 27th)		Refuges	
27th Ave (to 26th)		West refuge	
26th Ave (to 25th)		East median	
25th Ave (to 24th)		Refuges	
24th Ave (to 23rd)		Refuges	
23rd Ave (to 22nd)			
22nd Ave (to 21st)		East refuge	
21st Ave (to 20th)		Refuges	
20th Ave (to 19th)		Refuges	
19th Ave (to 18th)		East refuge	
18th Ave (to 17th)		West median	
17th Ave (to 16th)		Refuges	
16th Ave (to 15th)		Refuges	
15th Ave (to 14th)			
14th Ave (to PP)			
Park Presidio (to Funston)		East, south & west refuges	
Funston Ave (to 12th)			
12th Ave (to 11th)		East refuge	
11th Ave (to 10th)		West refuge	
10th Ave (to 9th)		Refuges	
9th Ave (to 8th)		Refuges	

**Geary Boulevard Improvement Project**  
**Preliminary Assessment of Benefits and Impacts**  
**Median Refuges**

Intersection/Block	FEIS Alternative 2	MTA Proposal (2022)	Changes
8th Ave (to 7th)	Existing	West refuge	
7th Ave (to 6th)		East median	
6th Ave (to 5th)		Existing	
5th Ave (to 4th)		Refuges	
4th Ave (to 3rd)		East refuge	
3rd Ave (to 2nd)		West refuge	
2nd Ave (to Arguello)		Refuges	
Arguello Blvd (to Palm)		Existing	
Palm Ave (to Stanyan)		Existing	
Stanyan St (to east)			

**Legend**

	Added proposal in Side relative to Alt2
	Less proposed scope than Alt2
	Slightly different but substantially similar
	Installed since EIR/S

## Geary Boulevard Improvement Project Preliminary Assessment of Benefits and Impacts Pedestrian Bulbouts

[illegible]

**Geary Boulevard Improvement Project**  
**Preliminary Assessment of Benefits and Impacts**  
**Pedestrian Bulbouts**

Intersection/Block	FEIS Alternative 2				MTA Proposal (2022)				Changes			
	NW	NE	SE	SW	NW	NE	SE	SW	NW	NE	SE	SW
9th Ave (to 8th)		G		G								
8th Ave (to 7th)												
7th Ave (to 6th)		G	T									
6th Ave (to 5th)	G	T	G	T	T	G	T	GS				
5th Ave (to 4th)	T			G								
4th Ave (to 3rd)					GS	G	GS	G				
3rd Ave (to 2nd)	G		G	G		G						
2nd Ave (to Arguello)		T	T									
Arguello Blvd (to Palm)	T	Ex		T	Ex	Ex	T	Ex				
Palm Ave (to Stanyan)	Ex				Ex							
Stanyan St (to east)												
<b>Count</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>-5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>-5</b>	<b>-1</b>

**Legend**

Added proposal in Side relative to Alt2	T	Transit bulb serves as ped bulb
Less proposed scope than Alt2	G	Ped bulb on Geary
Slightly different but substantially similar	S	Ped bulb on side street
Installed since EIR/S	GS	Ped bulb on Geary and side street
	RC	Raised crosswalk
	Ex	Existing

[ this page intentionally left blank ]



San Francisco  
County Transportation  
Authority



RESOLUTION AMENDING THE ADOPTED FISCAL YEAR 2021/22 BUDGET TO INCREASE REVENUES BY \$1.7 MILLION, DECREASE EXPENDITURES BY \$13.3 MILLION AND DECREASE OTHER FINANCING SOURCES BY \$50.0 MILLION FOR A TOTAL NET DECREASE IN FUND BALANCE OF \$34.7 MILLION

WHEREAS, In June 2021, through approval of Resolution 21-56, the Transportation Authority adopted the Fiscal Year (FY) 2021/22 Annual Budget and Work Program; and

WHEREAS, The Transportation Authority's Fiscal Policy allows for the amendment of the adopted budget during the fiscal year to reflect actual revenues and expenditures incurred; and

WHEREAS, Revenue and expenditure revisions are related to the Traffic Congestion Mitigation Tax (TNC Tax) Revenues, interest income, program revenues, and capital project costs reported in the Sales Tax Program (Prop K), Congestion Management Agency Programs, Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program (TFCA), Vehicle Registration Fee for Transportation Improvements Program (Prop AA), and the TNC Tax Program; and

WHEREAS, Major changes in revenues due to additional funding include the following: Downtown Rail Extension Program's FTA Project Development Process and 4<sup>th</sup> and King Railyards Preliminary Business Case Process, Golden Gate Park Equity Study, Capital Project Delivery Best Practices, District 7 Ocean Avenue Mobility Action Plan, District 6 Treasure Island Supplemental Transportation Study, Muni Metro Core Capacity Study - Project Support and Technical Oversight, Priority Conservation Area Program and Senate Bill 1 Local Partnership Program (SB1 LPP) for Yerba Buena Island Multi-Use Path, Infill Infrastructure Grant Program for Yerba Buena Island Hillcrest Road Widening Design, and SB1 LPP for I-280 Southbound Ocean Avenue Off-Ramp Realignment Project; and major changes in revenues due to increase in revenue estimates include the following: TNC Tax Revenue, and Interstate 80/YBI Interchange Improvement Project and Yerba Buena Bridge Structures (YBI Projects) - Southgate Road Realignment Improvements; and



WHEREAS, Major changes in expenditures due to project delays and/or project sponsors' prioritizing reimbursement from other fund sources include the following projects: Prop K projects, Prop AA projects, TFCA projects, TNC Tax SFMTA's Vision Zero Quick-Build Program, and YBI Projects – Pier E2 and Torpedo Building Rehabilitation; and

WHEREAS, Administrative operating costs, debt service costs and other financing sources also need to be updated from the original estimates contained in the adopted FY 2021/22 budget; and

WHEREAS, At its March 23, 2021 meeting, the Community Advisory Committee was briefed on the proposed budget amendment and unanimously adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority's adopted FY 2021/22 budget is hereby amended to increase revenues by \$1.7 million, decrease expenditures by \$13.3 million, and decrease other financing sources by \$50.0 million, for a total net decrease in fund balance of \$34.7 million, as shown in Attachment 1.

Attachment:

1. Proposed Fiscal Year 2021/22 Budget Amendment



**San Francisco  
County Transportation  
Authority**

**Attachment 1  
Proposed Fiscal Year 2021/22 Budget Amendment**

<b>Proposed Budget Amendment by Fund</b>							
	Sales Tax Program	Congestion Management Agency Programs	Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program	Vehicle Registration Fee for Transportation Improvements Program	Treasure Island Mobility Management Agency Program	Traffic Congestion Mitigation Tax Program	<b>Budget Amendment Fiscal Year 2021/22</b>
<b>Revenues:</b>							
Sales Tax Revenues	\$ 92,879,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 92,879,800
Vehicle Registration Fee	-	-	-	4,834,049	-	-	4,834,049
Traffic Congestion Mitigation Tax	-	-	-	-	-	5,880,000	5,880,000
Interest Income	296,145	-	868	900	-	26,848	324,761
Program Revenues	-	20,561,738	672,708	-	2,770,723	-	24,005,169
Other Revenues	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>93,175,945</b>	<b>20,561,738</b>	<b>673,576</b>	<b>4,834,949</b>	<b>2,770,723</b>	<b>5,906,848</b>	<b>127,923,779</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>							
Capital Project Costs	136,587,261	28,500,946	1,060,567	8,953,445	1,821,094	1,700,000	178,623,313
Administrative Operating Costs	7,234,698	3,595,082	42,044	241,702	1,015,028	176,400	12,304,954
Debt Service Costs	21,722,350	-	-	-	-	-	21,722,350
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>165,544,309</b>	<b>32,096,028</b>	<b>1,102,611</b>	<b>9,195,147</b>	<b>2,836,122</b>	<b>1,876,400</b>	<b>212,650,617</b>
<b>Other Financing Sources (Uses):</b>	<b>38,400,311</b>	<b>11,534,290</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>65,399</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>50,000,000</b>
<b>Net change in Fund Balance</b>	<b>\$ (33,968,053)</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ (429,035)</b>	<b>\$ (4,360,198)</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 4,030,448</b>	<b>\$ (34,726,838)</b>
Budgetary Fund Balance, as of July 1	\$ 59,972,084	\$ -	\$ 777,219	\$ 14,834,640	\$ -	\$ 5,377,923	\$ 80,961,866
Budgetary Fund Balance, as of June 30	<u>\$ 26,004,031</u>	<u>\$ -</u>	<u>\$ 348,184</u>	<u>\$ 10,474,442</u>	<u>\$ -</u>	<u>\$ 9,408,371</u>	<u>\$ 46,235,028</u>



## Memorandum

### AGENDA ITEM 10

**DATE:** March 17, 2022

**TO:** Transportation Authority Board

**FROM:** Cynthia Fong - Deputy Director for Finance and Administration

**SUBJECT:** 3/22/22 Board Meeting: Amend the Adopted Fiscal Year 2021/22 Budget to Increase Revenues by \$1.7 Million, Decrease Expenditures by \$13.3 Million and Decrease Other Financing Sources by \$50.0 Million for a Total Net Decrease in Fund Balance of \$34.7 Million

#### **RECOMMENDATION** ☐ Information ☒ Action

Amend the adopted Fiscal Year (FY) 2021/22 budget to increase revenues by \$1.7 million, decrease expenditures by \$13.3 million and decrease other financing sources by \$50.0 million for a total net decrease in fund balance of \$34.7 million.

#### **SUMMARY**

Every year we present the Board with any adjustments to the adopted annual budget. This revision is an opportunity to take stock of changes in revenue trends, recognize grants or other funds that are obtained subsequent to the original approval of the annual budget, and adjust for unforeseen expenditures. In June 2021, through Resolution 21-56, the Board adopted the FY 2021/22 Annual Budget and Work Program.

The effect of the amendment on the adopted FY 2021/22 Budget in the aggregate line item format specified in the Fiscal Policy is shown in Attachments 1 and 3. A comparison of revenues and expenditures to prior year actual and adopted budgeted numbers is presented in Attachment 2. The detailed budget explanations by line item with variances over 5% are included in Attachment 4.

- ☐ Fund Allocation
- ☐ Fund Programming
- ☐ Policy/Legislation
- ☐ Plan/Study
- ☐ Capital Project Oversight/Delivery
- ☒ Budget/Finance
- ☐ Contract/Agreement
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_



## **BACKGROUND**

The budget revision is an opportunity for us to revise revenue projections and expenditure line items to reflect new information or requirements identified in the months elapsed since the adoption of the annual budget. Our Fiscal Policy allows for the amendment of the adopted budget during the fiscal year to reflect actual revenues and expenditures incurred. The revisions typically take place after completion of the annual fiscal audit, which certifies actual expenditures and carryover revenues.

## **DISCUSSION**

The proposed budget amendment reflects an increase of \$1.7 million in revenues, a decrease of \$13.3 million in expenditures, and a decrease of \$50.0 million in other financing sources for a total net decrease of \$34.7 million in fund balance. These revisions include carryover revenues and expenditures from the prior period. Detailed budget revisions for the Treasure Island Mobility Management Agency (TIMMA) will be presented as a separate item to a future TIMMA Committee and TIMMA Board.

Revenue and expenditure revisions are related to the increase in Traffic Congestion Mitigation Tax (TNC Tax) revenues, federal and state program revenues, and capital project costs reported in the Congestion Management Agency Program, and decrease in interest income, regional and other program revenues, and several capital project costs reported in the Sales Tax Program, Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program (TFCA), Vehicle Registration Fee for Transportation Improvements Program (Prop AA), and Traffic Congestion Mitigation Tax (TNC Tax) Program. Major changes in revenue and expenditure line items, which are detailed in Attachment 4, include the following:

- **New Prop K Appropriation Funding**
  - Downtown Rail Extension Program's Federal Transit Administration Project Development Process and 4<sup>th</sup> and King Railyards Preliminary Business Case Process
  - Golden Gate Park Equity Study
  - Capital Project Delivery Best Practices
  - District 7 Ocean Avenue Mobility Action Plan
  - District 6 Treasure Island Supplemental Transportation Study
  - Muni Metro Core Capacity Study - Project Support and Technical Oversight (pending)
- **New Federal and State Funding**
  - Priority Conservation Area Program and Senate Bill 1 Local Partnership Program (SB1 LPP) for Yerba Buena Island Multi-Use Path



- Infill Infrastructure Grant Program for Yerba Buena Island Hillcrest Road Widening Design
- SB1 LPP for I-280 Southbound Ocean Avenue Off-Ramp Realignment Project
- **Increase in Revenue Estimates**
  - TNC Tax
  - Interstate 80/YBI Interchange Improvement Project and Yerba Buena Bridge Structures (YBI Projects) – Southgate Road Realignment Improvements
- **Project Delays and/or Prioritizing Reimbursement from Other Fund Sources**
  - Prop K Projects (various projects detailed in Attachment 4, page 5)
  - Prop AA Projects (various projects detailed in Attachment 4, page 7)
  - TFCA Projects (various projects detailed in Attachment 4, page 6)
  - TNC Tax SFMTA's Vision Zero Quick-Build Program
  - YBI Projects – Pier E2 and Torpedo Building Rehabilitation

Additionally, administrative operating costs, debt service costs and other financing sources need to be updated from the original estimates contained in the adopted FY 2021/22 budget:

- increased administrative operating costs for computer network system upgrades; and
- decreased debt service costs due to lower interest expenses related to the Revolving Credit Agreement; and
- decreased anticipated drawdown on the Revolving Credit Agreement partially due to a higher ending fund balance in FY 2021/22 and Sales Tax Program capital expenditures coming in \$14.1 million lower than anticipated in FY 2021/22.

## **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

The proposed amendment to the FY 2021/22 budget would increase revenues by \$1.7 million, decrease expenditures by \$13.3 million, and decrease other financing sources by \$50.0 million, for a total net decrease in fund balance of \$34.7 million, as described above.

## **CAC POSITION**

The Community Advisory Committee (CAC) will consider this item at its March 23, 2022 meeting.



## **SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS**

- Attachment 1 - Proposed Budget Amendment
- Attachment 2 - Proposed Budget Amendment - Comparison of Revenues and Expenditures
- Attachment 3 - Proposed Budget Amendment - Line Item Detail
- Attachment 4 -Budget Amendment Explanations



<b>Proposed Budget Amendment by Fund</b>							
	Sales Tax Program	Congestion Management Agency Programs	Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program	Vehicle Registration Fee for Transportation Improvements Program	Treasure Island Mobility Management Agency Program	Traffic Congestion Mitigation Tax Program	<b>Budget Amendment Fiscal Year 2021/22</b>
<b>Revenues:</b>							
Sales Tax Revenues	\$ 92,879,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 92,879,800
Vehicle Registration Fee	-	-	-	4,834,049	-	-	4,834,049
Traffic Congestion Mitigation Tax	-	-	-	-	-	5,880,000	5,880,000
Interest Income	296,145	-	868	900	-	26,848	324,761
Program Revenues	-	20,561,738	672,708	-	2,770,723	-	24,005,169
Other Revenues	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>93,175,945</b>	<b>20,561,738</b>	<b>673,576</b>	<b>4,834,949</b>	<b>2,770,723</b>	<b>5,906,848</b>	<b>127,923,779</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>							
Capital Project Costs	136,587,261	28,500,946	1,060,567	8,953,445	1,821,094	1,700,000	178,623,313
Administrative Operating Costs	7,234,698	3,595,082	42,044	241,702	1,015,028	176,400	12,304,954
Debt Service Costs	21,722,350	-	-	-	-	-	21,722,350
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>165,544,309</b>	<b>32,096,028</b>	<b>1,102,611</b>	<b>9,195,147</b>	<b>2,836,122</b>	<b>1,876,400</b>	<b>212,650,617</b>
<b>Other Financing Sources (Uses):</b>	<b>38,400,311</b>	<b>11,534,290</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>65,399</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>50,000,000</b>
<b>Net change in Fund Balance</b>	<b>\$ (33,968,053)</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ (429,035)</b>	<b>\$ (4,360,198)</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 4,030,448</b>	<b>\$ (34,726,838)</b>
Budgetary Fund Balance, as of July 1	\$ 59,972,084	\$ -	\$ 777,219	\$ 14,834,640	\$ -	\$ 5,377,923	\$ 80,961,866
Budgetary Fund Balance, as of June 30	\$ 26,004,031	\$ -	\$ 348,184	\$ 10,474,442	\$ -	\$ 9,408,371	\$ 46,235,028



**San Francisco  
County Transportation  
Authority**

**Attachment 2  
Proposed Fiscal Year 2021/22 Budget Amendment  
Comparison of Revenues and Expenditures**

Category	Fiscal Year 2020/21 Actual	Fiscal Year 2021/22 Adopted Budget	Proposed Fiscal Year 2021/22 Budget Amendment	Variance from Fiscal Year 2021/22 Adopted Budget	% Variance
Sales Tax Revenues	\$ 86,530,445	\$ 92,879,800	<b>\$ 92,879,800</b>	\$ -	0.0%
Vehicle Registration Fee	5,513,643	4,834,049	<b>4,834,049</b>	-	0.0%
Traffic Congestion Mitigation Tax	5,625,880	4,199,300	<b>5,880,000</b>	1,680,700	40.0%
Interest Income	19,960	633,670	<b>324,761</b>	(308,909)	-48.7%
Program Revenues					
Federal	6,868,989	8,629,623	<b>10,290,316</b>	1,660,693	19.2%
State	125,865	3,587,961	<b>5,066,932</b>	1,478,971	41.2%
Regional and other	4,792,608	11,457,233	<b>8,647,921</b>	(2,809,312)	-24.5%
Other Revenues	35,328	46,500	<b>-</b>	(46,500)	-100.0%
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>109,512,718</b>	<b>126,268,136</b>	<b>127,923,779</b>	<b>1,655,643</b>	<b>1.3%</b>
Capital Project Costs	105,080,558	191,441,807	<b>178,623,313</b>	(12,818,494)	-6.7%
Administrative Operating Costs					
Personnel expenditures	7,087,755	9,226,939	<b>8,997,784</b>	(229,155)	-2.5%
Non-Personnel expenditures	2,556,765	3,098,252	<b>3,307,170</b>	208,918	6.7%
Debt Service Costs	21,681,509	22,192,850	<b>21,722,350</b>	(470,500)	-2.1%
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>136,406,587</b>	<b>225,959,848</b>	<b>212,650,617</b>	<b>(13,309,231)</b>	<b>-5.9%</b>
<b>Other Financing Sources (Uses)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>100,000,000</b>	<b>50,000,000</b>	<b>(50,000,000)</b>	<b>-50.0%</b>
<b>Net change in Fund Balance</b>	<b>\$ (26,893,869)</b>	<b>\$ 308,288</b>	<b>\$ (34,726,838)</b>	<b>\$ (35,035,126)</b>	<b>-11364.4%</b>
<b>Budgetary Fund Balance, as of July 1</b>	<b>\$ 107,855,735</b>	<b>\$ 80,961,866</b>	<b>\$ 80,961,866</b>		
<b>Budgetary Fund Balance, as of June 30</b>	<b>\$ 80,961,866</b>	<b>\$ 81,270,154</b>	<b>\$ 46,235,028</b>		



	Proposed Budget Amendment by Fund						Proposed Fiscal Year 2021/22 Budget Amendment
	Sales Tax Program	Congestion Management Agency Programs	Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program	Vehicle Registration Fee for Transportation Improvements Program	Treasure Island Mobility Management Agency Program	Traffic Congestion Mitigation Tax Program	
<b>Revenues:</b>							
Sales Tax Revenues	\$ 92,879,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 92,879,800
Vehicle Registration Fee	-	-	-	4,834,049	-	-	4,834,049
Traffic Congestion Mitigation Tax	-	-	-	-	-	5,880,000	5,880,000
Interest Income	296,145	-	868	900	-	26,848	324,761
<b>Program Revenues</b>							
<b>Federal</b>							
Advanced Transportation and Congestion Management Technologies Deployment	-	-	-	-	982,750	-	982,750
Innovative Deployments to Enhance Arterials Shared Automated Vehicle	-	-	-	-	16,930	-	16,930
Highway Bridge Program - I-80/Yerba Buena Island (YBI) Interchange Improvement	-	7,211,027	-	-	-	-	7,211,027
Highway Bridge Program - YBI Bridge Structures	-	562,163	-	-	-	-	562,163
Priority Conservation Area Program - YBI Multi-Use Pathway	-	305,446	-	-	-	-	305,446
Surface Transportation Program 3% Revenue and Augmentation	-	1,212,000	-	-	-	-	1,212,000
<b>State</b>							
Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities - I/80 YBI Interchange Improvement Project	-	3,430,743	-	-	-	-	3,430,743
Planning, Programming & Monitoring SB45 Funds	-	311,655	-	-	-	-	311,655
Infill Infrastructure Grant Program - Hillcrest Road Widening Project	-	204,157	-	-	-	-	204,157
Senate Bill 1 Local Partnership Program - I-280 SB Ocean Ave Off-Ramp Realignment Project	-	122,865	-	-	-	-	122,865
Senate Bill 1 Local Partnership Program - YBI Multi-Use Pathway Project	-	39,574	-	-	-	-	39,574
Seismic Retrofit Proposition 1B - I/80 YBI Interchange Improvement Project	-	805,765	-	-	-	-	805,765
Seismic Retrofit Proposition 1B - YBI Bridge Structures	-	30,354	-	-	-	-	30,354
Sustainable Communities - School Access Plan	-	121,819	-	-	-	-	121,819
<b>Regional and other</b>							
BATA - I-80/YBI Interchange Improvement	-	5,728,853	-	-	-	-	5,728,853
SFPW - Octavia Improvements Study	-	24,369	-	-	-	-	24,369
SFMTA - Lake Merced Pedestrian Safety	-	3,102	-	-	-	-	3,102
SFMTA - School Access Plan	-	19,502	-	-	-	-	19,502
SFMTA - Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program	-	41,964	-	-	-	-	41,964
SF Planning - Housing Element	-	26,100	-	-	-	-	26,100
SFMTA - Travel Demand Modeling Assistance	-	75,000	-	-	-	-	75,000
TIDA - Treasure Island Mobility Management Agency	-	-	-	-	1,771,043	-	1,771,043
TIDA - YBI Interchange Improvement & Bridge Structures	-	285,280	-	-	-	-	285,280
Vehicle Registration Fee Revenues (TFCA)	-	-	672,708	-	-	-	672,708
<b>Other Revenues</b>							
Sublease of Office Space	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>\$ 93,175,945</b>	<b>\$ 20,561,738</b>	<b>\$ 673,576</b>	<b>\$ 4,834,949</b>	<b>\$ 2,770,723</b>	<b>\$ 5,906,848</b>	<b>\$ 127,923,779</b>



**Attachment 3**  
**Proposed Fiscal Year 2021/22 Budget Amendment**  
**Line Item Detail**


	Proposed Budget Amendment by Fund						Proposed Fiscal Year 2021/22 Budget Amendment
	Sales Tax Program	Congestion Management Agency Programs	Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program	Vehicle Registration Fee for Transportation Improvements Program	Treasure Island Mobility Management Agency Program	Traffic Congestion Mitigation Tax Program	
<b>Expenditures:</b>							
Capital Project Costs							
Individual Project Grants, Programs & Initiatives	\$ 134,500,000	\$ -	\$ 1,060,567	\$ 8,953,445	\$ -	\$ 1,700,000	\$ 146,214,012
Technical Professional Services	2,087,261	28,500,946	-	-	1,821,094	-	32,409,301
Administrative Operating Costs							
Personnel Expenditures							
Salaries	2,730,685	2,404,141	28,664	164,782	529,644	116,853	5,974,769
Fringe Benefits	1,274,684	1,122,253	13,380	76,920	247,238	54,547	2,789,022
Pay for Performance	233,993	-	-	-	-	-	233,993
Non-personnel Expenditures							
Administrative Operations	2,720,336	68,688	-	-	231,946	5,000	3,025,970
Equipment, Furniture & Fixtures	215,000	-	-	-	-	-	215,000
Commissioner-Related Expenses	60,000	-	-	-	6,200	-	66,200
Debt Service Costs							
Fiscal Charges	207,000	-	-	-	-	-	207,000
Interest Expenses	7,805,350	-	-	-	-	-	7,805,350
Bond Principal Payment	13,710,000	-	-	-	-	-	13,710,000
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$ 165,544,309</b>	<b>\$ 32,096,028</b>	<b>\$ 1,102,611</b>	<b>\$ 9,195,147</b>	<b>\$ 2,836,122</b>	<b>\$ 1,876,400</b>	<b>\$ 212,650,617</b>
<b>Other Financing Sources (Uses):</b>							
Transfers in - Prop K Match to Grant Funding	-	11,534,290	-	-	65,399	-	11,599,689
Transfers out - Prop K Match to Grant Funding	(11,599,689)	-	-	-	-	-	(11,599,689)
Draw on Revolving Credit Agreement	50,000,000	-	-	-	-	-	50,000,000
<b>Total Other Financing Sources (Uses)</b>	<b>38,400,311</b>	<b>11,534,290</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>65,399</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>50,000,000</b>
<b>Net change in Fund Balance</b>	<b>\$ (33,968,053)</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ (429,035)</b>	<b>\$ (4,360,198)</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 4,030,448</b>	<b>\$ (34,726,838)</b>
Budgetary Fund Balance, as of July 1	\$ 59,972,084	\$ -	\$ 777,219	\$ 14,834,640	\$ -	\$ 5,377,923	\$ 80,961,866
<b>Budgetary Fund Balance, as of June 30</b>	<b>\$ 26,004,031</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 348,184</b>	<b>\$ 10,474,442</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 9,408,371</b>	<b>\$ 46,235,028</b>
Fund Reserved for Program and Operating Contingency	\$ 9,287,980	\$ -	\$ 67,271	\$ 483,405	\$ -	\$ 588,000	\$ 10,426,656

## Attachment 4

### Fiscal Year 2021/22 Budget Amendment Explanations

TOTAL REVENUES		
Adopted Budget	Proposed Budget Amendment	Variance
\$126,268,136	\$127,923,779	\$1,655,643

The following chart shows the comparative composition of revenues for the proposed amended and adopted Fiscal Year (FY) 2021/22 budget.



Traffic Congestion Mitigation Tax (TNC Tax) Revenues		
Adopted Budget	Proposed Budget Amendment	Variance
\$4,199,300	\$5,880,000	\$1,680,700

In November 2019, San Francisco voters approved measure Proposition D, also known as the TNC Tax, enabling the City to impose a 1.5% business tax on shared rides and 3.25% business tax on private rides for fares originating in San Francisco and charged by commercial ride-share and driverless-vehicle companies until November 5, 2045. The Transportation Authority receives 50% of the revenues

## Attachment 4

### Fiscal Year 2021/22 Budget Amendment Explanations

for capital projects that promote users' safety in the public right-of-way in support of the City's Vision Zero policy. The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) receives the other 50% of revenues. The City began collecting TNC Tax revenues on January 1, 2020.

Based on continuous discussions and coordination with the City's Controller's Office and the SFMTA, we anticipate TNC Tax revenues to increase by \$1.7 million, or 40%, in FY 2021/22 as compared to the adopted budget. This is due to relaxation of COVID pandemic protocols and increased mobility and activity. TNC Tax revenues are aligned with the City's Controller's Office estimates for economic recovery.

Interest Income		
Adopted Budget	Proposed Budget Amendment	Variance
\$633,670	\$324,761	\$(308,909)

Most of our investable assets are deposited in the City's Treasury Pool (Pool). The level of our deposits held in the Pool during the year depends on the volume and timing of Prop K capital project reimbursement requests. Our cash balance consists largely of allocated Prop K funds, which are invested until invoices are received and sponsors are reimbursed.

Total Interest Income is projected to decrease by \$308,909, or 48.7%, for FY 2021/22. Our adopted budget anticipated a drawdown of \$100 million from the Revolving Credit Agreement during the middle of this fiscal year in which interest would have been collected from the increased cash balance in the Pool. However, based on updated capital expenditure projections from project sponsors, we anticipate a drawdown of \$50 million towards the end of the fiscal year. Also, interest rates have declined from 0.6% assumed in the adopted budget to 0.5% over the past eight months in the Pool.

Federal Program Revenues		
Adopted Budget	Proposed Budget Amendment	Variance
\$8,629,623	\$10,290,316	\$1,660,693

Federal Program Revenues are expected to increase by \$1.7 million, or 19.2%, as compared to the adopted budget. This is primarily due to an increase of \$1.5 million in federal Highway Bridge Program funding for the Southgate Road Realignment Improvements Project (Southgate), or Phase 2 of the Interstate-80/Yerba Buena Island Interchange Improvement Project, and Yerba Buena Bridge Structures (YBI Projects) with construction activities underway for the Southgate project. The construction is expected to be completed by June 2022 with some closeout costs in the following year. Revenue estimates are also updated to reflect additional funding of \$180,000 for the federal Surface Transportation Program through the Safe & Seamless Quick-Strike Program.

**Attachment 4**  
**Fiscal Year 2021/22 Budget Amendment Explanations**

State Program Revenues		
Adopted Budget	Proposed Budget Amendment	Variance
\$3,587,961	\$5,066,932	\$1,478,971

State Program Revenues are expected to increase by \$1.5 million, or 41.2%, as compared to the adopted budget. This is mainly due to an increase of \$757,894 in Seismic Retrofit Proposition 1B funding for the YBI Projects, which provides matching funds to the federal Highway Bridge Program funding as mentioned above. Revenue estimates are also updated to reflect completion of funding from the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities for the Southgate project, increasing revenues by \$450,498. Furthermore, new funding of \$366,596 for the first year of activities related to the Hillcrest Road Widening Project through the Infill Infrastructure Grant Program, I-280 Southbound Ocean Avenue Off-Ramp Realignment Project and Yerba Buena Island (YBI) Multi-Use Pathway Project funded by Senate Bill 1 Local Partnership Program are also included in this budget amendment. This increase is also offset by a decrease of \$107,515 in Planning, Programming and Monitoring SB45 Funds which will be deferred to FY 2022/23 for continued project delivery support and oversight activities.

Regional and Other Program Revenues		
Adopted Budget	Proposed Budget Amendment	Variance
\$11,457,233	\$8,647,921	\$(2,809,312)

Regional and Other Program Revenues are expected to decrease by \$2.8 million, or 24.5%, as compared to the adopted budget. This is mainly due to a \$1.5 million reduction of regional revenue from the Bay Area Toll Authority for work related to the Southgate project that is federal and state reimbursable. In addition, \$1.2 million of funding from the Bay Area Toll Authority for the Torpedo Building Rehabilitation work of the Southgate project in FY 2021/22 has been deferred to the next fiscal year due to a shift in schedule. The revised schedule shows design services now to be completed in the third quarter of FY 2022/23 with construction to be completed in Fall/Winter 2023. Also, \$204,231 of regional revenues from the Bay Area Toll Authority has been deferred to the next fiscal year for the new YBI Landing and Public Pier (Pier E2). Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Pier E2 has not been opened to the public. Therefore, there has been minimal maintenance work required at Pier E2 and it may not be opened to the public until April 2022, and at that time, it is planned to only be open on weekends until late May or early June 2022 when it will be fully opened. This decrease is also offset by \$58,064 in new and increased funding for travel demand model services provided to the City agencies in support of various projects.


**Attachment 4**  
**Fiscal Year 2021/22 Budget Amendment Explanations**

Other Revenues		
Adopted Budget	Proposed Budget Amendment	Variance
\$46,500	\$0	\$(46,500)

Other Revenues are expected to decrease by \$46,500, or 100%, as compared to the adopted budget. In FY 2021/22, we are no longer subleasing our office space.

TOTAL EXPENDITURES		
Adopted Budget	Proposed Budget Amendment	Variance
\$225,959,848	\$212,650,617	\$(13,309,231)

The following chart shows the comparative composition of expenditures for the proposed amended and adopted FY 2021/22 budget.



**Attachment 4**  
**Fiscal Year 2021/22 Budget Amendment Explanations**

<b>Capital Project Costs</b>		
<b>Adopted Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Budget Amendment</b>	<b>Variance</b>
\$191,441,807	\$178,623,313	\$(12,818,494)

Capital Project Costs in FY 2021/22 are budgeted to decrease from the adopted FY 2021/22 budget by \$12.8 million, or 6.7%, which is primarily due to anticipated higher capital costs from the CMA program, as well as lower capital costs from the Sales Tax, TFCA, Prop AA, TNC Tax programs. Costs by Program Fund are detailed below.

<b>Capital Project Costs - Sales Tax Program</b>		
<b>Adopted Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Budget Amendment</b>	<b>Variance</b>
\$150,674,687	\$136,587,261	\$(14,087,426)

Capital Project Costs for the Sales Tax Program in FY 2021/22 are budgeted to decrease by \$14.1 million, or 9.3%, as compared to the adopted budget. This is primarily based on the cash flow amendments approved in Fall 2021 as part of the process to update the Prop K Strategic Plan. The main drivers of reductions in Capital Project Costs, totaling \$15.5 million, include reductions associated with the Breda Light Rail Vehicle Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning Refurbishments; 16<sup>th</sup> Street Transit Enhancements Phase 2; 6<sup>th</sup> Street Pedestrian Safety; Caltrain Electrification; Upper Market Street Safety Improvements; and Radio Communications System & CAD Replacement. Additionally, this amended budget includes a partial de-obligation of funds for the Geary Bus Rapid Transit - Phase 2 design.

Also, in July 2021, through Resolution 22-04, the Board approved a Prop K appropriation of \$180,000 for the Capital Project Delivery Best Practices effort, all of which is included in this proposed FY 2021/22 budget amendment. This effort is intended to review current city experience/lessons learned and industry best practices for large scale/complex capital project delivery, oversight, and management to improve overall project delivery performance of transportation capital projects. In December 2021, through Resolution 22-20, the Board approved a Prop K appropriation of \$3.5 million for Downtown Rail Extension program oversight and technical support for the Federal Transit Administration project development process and for the 4<sup>th</sup> and King Railyards Preliminary Business Case process. Also in December 2021, through Resolution 22-17, the Board approved a Prop K appropriation of \$275,000 for the District 7 Ocean Avenue Mobility Action Plan project to prioritize and identify funding for previously identified transportation improvements, as well as new ideas to address the corridor's key mobility issues. Lastly, there is an appropriation request pending before the Board for the Muni Metro Core Capacity Study - Project Support and Technical Oversight. These new efforts will increase Sales Tax Program Capital Projects Costs by \$764,188 in this fiscal year. The decrease in Sales Tax Program Capital Project Costs is also offset by \$469,904 related to Downtown Extension Rail Program Oversight and Project Development Support that was deferred from FY 2020/21 to FY 2021/22.

**Attachment 4**  
**Fiscal Year 2021/22 Budget Amendment Explanations**

<b>Capital Project Costs - Congestion Management Agency (CMA) Programs</b>		
<b>Adopted Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Budget Amendment</b>	<b>Variance</b>
\$22,422,367	\$28,500,946	\$6,078,579

Capital Project Costs for CMA Programs in FY 2021/22 are budgeted to increase by \$6.1 million, or 27.1%, as compared to the adopted budget. This increase is mainly due to approximately \$6.4 million of construction activities related to the Southgate project that was deferred from FY 2020/21. The construction is on schedule and expected to be completed by June 2022 with some closeout costs in the following year. In addition, \$155,248 of transportation planning and outreach consultant services related to the San Francisco Transportation Plan was also deferred from FY 2020/21 to FY 2021/22. We also have increased and initiated new efforts during the year, including Golden Gate Park Equity Study, I-280 Northbound Geneva Avenue Off-Ramp Modification Feasibility Study, and District 6 Treasure Island Supplemental Transportation Study projects, which are funded by Prop K appropriations and increase CMA Capital Project Costs by \$273,550. In addition, we anticipate an increase of \$100,000 of CMA Capital Project Costs for the YBI Multi-Use Path project which would be funded by the Priority Conservation Area Program and Senate Bill 1 Local Partnership Program and \$150,000 for the YBI Hillcrest Road Widening Design project which would be funded by the Infill Infrastructure Grant Program.

This increase is also offset by a decrease of \$1.0 million in Capital Project Costs for the Torpedo Building Rehabilitation work of the Southgate project in FY 2021/22 has been deferred to the next fiscal year due to a shift in schedule as mentioned above.

<b>Capital Project Costs - TFCA Program</b>		
<b>Adopted Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Budget Amendment</b>	<b>Variance</b>
\$1,385,939	\$1,060,567	\$(325,372)

Capital Project Costs for the TFCA Program in FY 2021/22 are expected to decrease by \$325,372, or 23.5%, as compared to the adopted budget. The TFCA capital project costs include new FY 2021/22 projects that were approved by the Board in June 2021, carryover prior year projects with multi-year schedules and other projects that were not completed as anticipated in FY 2020/21. For FY 2021/22, we expect to see a decrease due to lower than expected expenditure for new projects that were approved in 2021, a higher share of spending in FY 2020/21 by SFMTA's Short-Term Bike Parking project, and slower than anticipated expenditures for an electric vehicle charger project that is delayed due to EVgo, the project sponsor, not being able to reach an agreement to implement chargers at the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art. A substitute charger location is being identified by EVgo.

**Attachment 4**  
**Fiscal Year 2021/22 Budget Amendment Explanations**

<b>Capital Project Costs - Prop AA Program</b>		
<b>Adopted Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Budget Amendment</b>	<b>Variance</b>
\$11,162,165	\$8,953,445	\$(2,208,720)

Capital Project Costs for the Prop AA Program in FY 2021/22 are expected to decrease by \$2,208,720, or 19.8%, as compared to the adopted budget. The Prop AA capital project costs include FY 2021/22 projects programmed in the Prop AA Strategic Plan as amended in June 2020, carryover prior-year projects with multi-year schedules, and projects that were not completed as anticipated by the end of FY 2020/21. The largest capital project expenditures include San Francisco Public Works' (SFPW) Western Addition Pedestrian Lighting, Geary Boulevard Pavement Renovation, Richmond Residential Streets Pavement Renovation, and 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, Dolores Street, York Street, Hampshire Street Pavement Renovation projects, and SFMTA's Muni Metro Station Enhancements Phase 1 and L-Taraval Transit Enhancements (Segment B) project, which together account for more than 70% of the FY 2021/22 budget amount.

We expect to see a decrease in capital cost expenditures primarily due to the four SFPW projects and two SFMTA projects, noted above, that were delayed and are not expected to incur or request reimbursements in FY 2021/22 as we had initially anticipated. This effect is partially offset by a significant increase in anticipated expenditures for the Muni Metro Station Enhancements Phase 1 project, which is anticipated to be open for use by June 2022.

<b>Capital Project Costs - TNC Tax Program</b>		
<b>Adopted Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Budget Amendment</b>	<b>Variance</b>
\$4,005,686	\$1,700,000	\$(2,305,686)

Capital Project Costs for the TNC Tax Program in FY 2021/22 are expected to decrease by \$2.3 million, or 57.6%, as compared to the adopted budget. The funds have been allocated to SFMTA's Vision Zero Quick-Build Program and while the projects are progressing on-time, SFMTA has been billing to other local fund sources, including Prop B General Funds and Prop K, for early planning work and outreach.

<b>Administrative Operating Costs - Non-Personnel Expenditures</b>		
<b>Adopted Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Budget Amendment</b>	<b>Variance</b>
\$3,098,252	\$3,307,170	\$208,918

**Attachment 4**  
**Fiscal Year 2021/22 Budget Amendment Explanations**

Non-Personnel Expenditures in FY 2021/22 are expected to increase by \$208,918, or 6.7%, as compared to the adopted budget. This increase is primarily due to increased project-related legal costs as well as increased costs related to computer network system upgrades.

<b>OTHER FINANCING SOURCES (USES) - DRAW ON REVOLVING CREDIT AGREEMENT</b>		
<b>Adopted Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Budget Amendment</b>	<b>Variance</b>
\$100,000,000	\$50,000,000	\$(50,000,000)

The estimated level of sales tax capital expenditures for FY 2021/22 may trigger the need to drawdown up to \$50 million from the Revolving Credit Agreement which is \$50 million less than what we had anticipated during the adoption of the budget. This decrease is partially due to a higher ending fund balance in FY 2020/21 and Sales Tax Program capital expenditures coming in \$14.1 million lower than anticipated in FY 2021/22. We will continue to monitor capital spending closely during the remainder of the year through a combination of cash flow needs for allocation reimbursements, progress reports and conversations with project sponsors, particularly our largest grant recipient, the SFMTA.

[ this page intentionally left blank ]



San Francisco  
County Transportation  
Authority



RESOLUTION APPOINTING ONE MEMBER TO THE COMMUNITY ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE OF THE SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

WHEREAS, Section 131265(d) of the California Public Utilities Code, as implemented by Section 5.2(a) of the Administrative Code of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority, requires the appointment of a Community Advisory Committee (CAC) consisting of eleven members; and

WHEREAS, There is one open seat on the CAC resulting from a member's term expiration; and

WHEREAS, At its April 12, 2022, meeting, the Board reviewed and considered all applicants' qualifications and experience and recommended appointing one member to serve on the CAC for a period of two years; now therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Board hereby appoints one member to serve on the CAC of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority for a two-year term; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Executive Director is authorized to communicate this information to all interested parties.



## Memorandum

### AGENDA ITEM 7

**DATE:** April 8, 2022  
**TO:** Transportation Authority Board  
**FROM:** Maria Lombardo – Chief Deputy Director  
**SUBJECT:** 04/12/2022 Board Meeting: Appoint One Member to the Community Advisory Committee

#### **RECOMMENDATION** ☐ Information ☒ Action

Neither staff nor Community Advisory Committee (CAC) members make recommendations regarding CAC appointments.

#### **SUMMARY**

There are two open seats on the 11-member CAC, with one requiring Board action at this time. The vacancies are a result of the term expiration of John Larson (District 7 representative), and the resignation of Sophia Tupuola (District 10 representative) due a need to spend more time tending to family and other commitments. The District 10 office is currently recruiting and evaluating potential candidates. We will agendize an item to fill the District 10 vacancy at a future meeting. There are currently 16 applicants to consider for the open seat (Attachment 2).

- ☐ Fund Allocation
- ☐ Fund Programming
- ☐ Policy/Legislation
- ☐ Plan/Study
- ☐ Capital Project Oversight/Delivery
- ☐ Budget/Finance
- ☐ Contract/Agreement
- ☒ Other: CAC Appointment

### **BACKGROUND**

The Transportation Authority has an 11-member CAC and members serve two-year terms. Per the Transportation Authority's Administrative Code, the Board appoints individuals to fill open CAC seats. Neither staff nor the CAC make recommendations on CAC appointments, but we maintain a database of applications for CAC membership. Attachment 1 is a tabular summary of the current CAC composition, showing ethnicity, gender, neighborhood of residence, and affiliation. Attachment 2 provides similar information on current applicants, sorted by last name.



## **DISCUSSION**

The selection of each member is approved at-large by the Board; however traditionally the Board has had a practice of ensuring that there is one resident of each supervisorial district on the CAC. Per Section 5.2(a) of the Administrative Code, the CAC:

“...shall include representatives from various segments of the community, such as public policy organizations, labor, business, seniors, people with disabilities, environmentalists, and the neighborhoods, and reflect broad transportation interests. The committee is also intended to reflect the racial and gender diversity of San Francisco residents.”

An applicant must be a San Francisco resident to be considered eligible for appointment. Applicants are asked to provide residential location and areas of interest but provide ethnicity and gender information on a voluntary basis. CAC applications are distributed and accepted on a continuous basis. CAC applications were solicited through the Transportation Authority's website, Commissioners' offices, and email blasts to community-based organizations, advocacy groups, business organizations, as well as at public meetings attended by Transportation Authority staff or hosted by the Transportation Authority. Applications can be submitted through the Transportation Authority's website at [www.sfcta.org/cac](http://www.sfcta.org/cac).

All applicants have been advised that they need to appear in person before the Board in order to be appointed, unless they have previously appeared. If a candidate is unable to appear before the Board on the first appearance, they may appear at the following Board meeting in order to be eligible for appointment. An asterisk following the candidate's name in Attachment 2 indicates that the applicant has not previously appeared before the Board.

## **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

The requested action would not have an impact on the proposed amended Fiscal Year 2021/22 budget.

## **CAC POSITION**

None. The CAC does not make recommendations on the appointment of CAC members.

## **SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS**

- Attachment 1 - Matrix of CAC Members
- Attachment 2 - Matrix of CAC Applicants
- Enclosure 1 - CAC Applications

## COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Name	Gender	Ethnicity*	District	Neighborhood	Affiliation	First Appointed	Term Expiration
John Larson, Chair	M	NP	7	Miraloma Park	Environment, Neighborhood, Public Policy	Mar 2014	Mar 2022
Nancy Buffum	F	C	4	Sunset	Business, Disabled, Environment, Labor, Neighborhood, Public Policy, Seniors	Sept 2020	Sept 2022
Robert Gower	M	C	11	Mission Terrace	Disabled, Environment, Neighborhood, Public Policy, Seniors	Sept 2018	Sept 2022
David Klein, Vice-Chair	M	C	1	Outer Richmond	Environment, Labor, Neighborhood, Public Policy, Seniors	Sept 2018	Sept 2022
Jerry Levine	M	C	2	Cow Hollow	Business, Neighborhood, Public Policy	Nov 2018	Nov 2022
Sophia Tupuola	F	NH	10	Bayview Hunters Point	Business, Disabled, Environment, Labor, Neighborhood, Public Policy, Seniors	Mar 2019	Mar 2023
Rosa Chen	F	A	3	Chinatown	Business, Disabled, Environment, Neighborhood, Public Policy, Seniors	Mar 2021	Mar 2023
Kevin Ortiz	M	H/L	9	Mission	Neighborhood, Public Policy	Dec 2019	Dec 2023
Eric Rozell	M	C	6	Tenderloin	Disabled, Neighborhood, Seniors	Jan 2022	Jan 2024
Kat Siegal	F	C	5	NP	NP	Feb 2022	Feb 2024
Peter Tannen	M	C	8	Inner Mission	Environmental, Neighborhood, Public Policy	Feb 2008	Feb 2024

\*A – Asian | AA – African American | AI – American Indian or Alaska Native | C – Caucasian | H/L – Hispanic or Latino | NH – Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | NP – Not Provided (Voluntary Information)

COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE APPLICANTS <sup>1</sup>

	Name	Gender	Ethnicity	District	Neighborhood	Affiliation/Interest
1	Sauod Alzahrani	M	ME	6	N/A	Business, Disabled, Environment, Labor, Neighborhood, Public Policy, Senior, and Social and Racial Injustice
2	Christine Auwarter*	F	C	5	Western Addition / Inner Richmond	Disabled, Environment, Social and Racial Injustice, Neighborhood, Public Policy
3	Tre Ely	M	AA	6	SOMA	Business, Environment, Homelessness, Public Policy, Social and Racial Injustice
4	Lun Esex*	M	NP	5	Haight-Ashbury	Business, Disabled, Environment, Social and Racial Injustice, Labor, Neighborhood, Public Policy, Senior
5	Matthew Gerson*	M	C	5	Lower Haight	Environment, Social and Racial Injustice, Neighborhood, Public Policy
6	Genna Gores	F	C	5	NOPA	Environment, Social and Racial Injustice, Labor, Neighborhood, Public Policy
7	Kay Hones*	F	C	5	Mission	Disabled, Environment, Social and Racial Injustice, Labor, Neighborhood, Public Policy, Senior, Youth
8	Sarah Katz-Hyman*	F	C	5	Alamo Square	Environment, Social and Racial Injustice, Neighborhood
9	John Larson	M	C	7	Miraloma Park	Environment; Social and Racial Justice; Neighborhood; Public Policy
10	Kimra McPherson*	F	C	5	Inner Sunset	Neighborhood
12	Evan Oravec*	M	NP	5	Haight- Ashbury	Disabled, Environment, Social and Racial Injustice, Labor, Neighborhood, Public Policy, Senior
13	Peter Sengh*	M	A	6	East Cut	Business, Environment, Neighborhood, Public Policy, Senior
14	Ronaldo Smith*	M	C	6	SOMA	Environment, Neighborhood
15	Prodan Statev	M	C	6	East Cut	Business, Labor, Neighborhood, Public Policy
16	Tony Wessling	M	C	3	North Beach/Russian Hill	Business, Disabled, Environment, Labor, Neighborhood, Public Policy, Senior

\*Applicant has not appeared before the Board | A - Asian | AA - African American | AI - American Indian or Alaska Native | C - Caucasian | H/L - Hispanic or Latino | NH - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | NP - Not Provided (Voluntary Information) | ME - Middle Eastern

[ this page intentionally left blank ]



San Francisco  
County Transportation  
Authority



RESOLUTION APPROVING THE 2022 PROP AA STRATEGIC PLAN AND 5-YEAR PRIORITIZATION PROGRAMS (5YPPS) AND AMENDING THE PROP K BUS RAPID TRANSIT/TRANSIT PREFERENTIAL STREETS/MUNI METRO NETWORK AND TRANSIT ENHANCEMENTS 5YPPS.

WHEREAS, In November 2010, San Francisco voters approved Proposition AA (Prop AA), authorizing the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (Transportation Authority) to collect an additional \$10 annual vehicle registration fee on motor vehicles registered in San Francisco and to use the proceeds to fund transportation projects identified in the Expenditure Plan; and

WHEREAS, The Prop AA Expenditure Plan identifies eligible expenditures in three programmatic categories: Street Repair and Reconstruction; Pedestrian Safety; and Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements and mandates the percentage of revenues that shall be allocated to each category over the life of the Expenditure Plan; and

WHEREAS, The Prop AA Expenditure Plan requires development of a Strategic Plan to guide the implementation of the program, and specifies that the Strategic Plan include a detailed 5-year prioritized program of projects (5YPP) for each of the Expenditure Plan categories as a prerequisite for allocation of funds; and

WHEREAS, In May 2017, through Resolution 17-45, the Transportation Authority adopted the 2017 Prop AA Strategic Plan and 5YPPs, which included programming of \$20.8 million in Prop AA funds to 12 projects in the first five years (i.e., Fiscal Years 2017/18 to 2021/22) and a set of policies for administering the program; and

WHEREAS, In October 2021, through Resolution 22-13, the Transportation Authority approved the 2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan Policies and Screening and Prioritization Criteria (see enclosure) to guide development of the 2022 Strategic Plan and the 2022 5YPPs, which will cover Fiscal Years 2022/23 to 2026/27; and

WHEREAS, In November, 2021, the Transportation Authority issued a competitive call for projects and by the January 18, 2022 deadline received 16 applications from 4 agencies requesting approximately \$31.5 million in Prop AA funds compared to the \$23,489,965 available (Attachment 1); and



WHEREAS, Staff evaluated the projects using the Board-adopted screening and prioritization criteria; and

WHEREAS, As summarized in Attachment 2, the staff recommendation is to program \$23,489,965 in Prop AA funds and \$1 million in Prop K funds to fully fund ten projects and partially fund five projects; and

WHEREAS, The staff recommendation to program \$1 million in Prop K funds to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA's) M Ocean View Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements project, requires an amendment of the Prop K Bus Rapid Transit/Transit Preferential Streets/Muni Metro Network and Transit Enhancements 5YPPs to reprogram a total of \$1 million in Prop K funds to this project as shown in Attachment 3; and

WHEREAS, Additional detail on scope, schedule, cost, funding, cash flow reimbursement schedules and special conditions are included in the Project Information Forms (see Enclosure); and

WHEREAS, At its March 23, 2022 meeting, the Community Advisory Committee was briefed on the proposed 2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan and 5YPPs and adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority hereby approves the enclosed 2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan and 5YPPs; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority hereby amends the Prop K Bus Rapid Transit/Transit Preferential Streets/Muni Metro Network and Transit Enhancements 5YPPs, as detailed in Attachment 3.

Attachments:

1. Summary of Applications Received
2. Programming Recommendations
3. Prop K 5YPP Amendments

Enclosure: Draft 2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan

**Attachment 1.**  
**2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan**  
**Summary of Applications Received**

**Street Repair and Reconstruction Category**

#	Sponsor <sup>1</sup>	Project Name <sup>2</sup>	Brief Project Description	District(s)	Phase(s)	Total Project Cost	Prop AA Requested	Fiscal Year Funds Needed
1	SFPW	Hunters Point, Central Waterfront and Potrero Hill Area Streets Pavement Renovation	The project scope includes demolition, grinding and paving of 35 blocks, curb ramps reconstruction and localized base repair. The average Pavement Condition Index (PCI) score within the project limits is mid 40's. Construction planned for Spring 2023 through Fall 2024.	10	Construction	\$3,900,000	\$2,882,492	FY 2022/23
2	SFPW	8th St, Clay St and Levenworth St Pavement Renovation	The project scope includes demolition, grinding and paving of 35 blocks, curb ramps reconstruction and localized base repair. The average PCI score within the project limits is mid 50's. Construction planned for Spring 2024 through Fall 2025.	3, 6	Construction	\$3,850,000	\$2,360,572	FY 2023/24
3	SFPW	Brotherhood Way, Holloway Ave and Lake Merced Blvd Pavement Renovation	The project scope includes demolition, grinding and paving of 44 blocks, curb ramps reconstruction and localized base repair. The average PCI score within the project limits is low 60's. Construction planned for Spring 2025 through Fall 2026.	7, 11	Construction	\$4,840,000	\$2,360,572	FY 2024/25
4	SFPW	Front St, Sansome St, 1st St and Montgomery St Pavement Renovation	The project scope includes demolition, grinding and paving of 38 blocks, curb ramps reconstruction and localized base repair. The average PCI score within the project limits is mid 50's. Construction planned for Winter 2026 through Summer 2027.	3, 6	Construction	\$4,180,000	\$2,360,572	FY 2025/26
5	SFPW	Fillmore St Pavement Renovation	The project scope includes demolition, grinding and paving of 46 blocks, curb ramps reconstruction and localized base repair. The average PCI score within the project limits is high 50's. Construction planned for Spring 2027 to early 2029. This project is being coordinated with the 22 Fillmore Muni Forward project, which is currently in the planning phase.	2, 5, 8	Construction	\$5,060,000	\$2,360,572	FY 2026/27
<b>Street Repair and Reconstruction Category Subtotal</b>						<b>\$ 21,830,000</b>	<b>\$ 12,324,780</b>	

**Attachment 1.**  
**2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan**  
**Summary of Applications Received**

**Pedestrian Safety Category**

#	Sponsor <sup>1</sup>	Project Name <sup>2</sup>	Brief Project Description	District(s)	Phase(s)	Total Project Cost	Prop AA Requested	Fiscal Year Funds Needed
6	SFPW	Innes Avenue Sidewalk Improvements	Pedestrian safety and accessibility improvements along Innes Avenue, between Aurelious Walker and Donahue Street. Improvements include 6 ADA compliant curb ramps, 400 feet of new rockslide catchment fence, and nearly 450 linear feet of new sidewalk, the majority of which is entirely missing. Design is planned for Summer 2022 through Summer 2023 and construction Fall 2023 through Fall 2024.	10	Design, Construction	\$956,100	\$851,000	FY 2022/23 FY 2023/24
7	SFPW	Japantown Buchanan Mall Improvements	This project will implement improvements to the Japantown Buchanan Mall, a culturally significant public plaza on Buchanan Street, between Post and Sutter streets in the cultural heart of Japantown. Improvements include repaving the uneven walkways, new curb ramps, new trees, landscaping with culturally relevant plants, enhancing the existing historic public art, and installing new energy efficient pedestrian lighting. Project has received a \$5 million state grant from the California Natural Resources Agency. Design is planned for early 2023 through early 2024 and construction Spring 2024 through Spring 2025.	5	Design, Construction	\$7,700,000	\$1,350,000	FY 2022/23 FY 2023/24
8	SFPW	Oakdale Lighting Improvements Project Phase 1	Installation of approximately 50 new pedestrian-scale street lights on Oakdale, between 3rd and Phelps streets to improve pedestrian safety and comfort along this important thoroughfare. Improving lighting along Oakdale Avenue was the highest-ranked community priority in the Bayview Community Based Transportation Plan (CBTP). Design is planned for early 2023 through Fall 2023 and construction would take place Summer 2024 through early 2025.	10	Design, Construction	\$1,974,000	\$1,974,000	FY 2022/23 FY 2023/24
9	SFMTA	Central Embarcadero Safety Project	This project will expand a two-way, water-side protected bikeway from Folsom to Bryant streets and construct additional multi-modal safety and signal upgrades for The Embarcadero corridor between Broadway and Bryant Street. Pedestrian safety benefits include reducing conflicts with other modes and shortening crossing distances. Construction would begin in early 2024 and be completed in early 2025.	3	Construction	\$8,600,000	\$1,000,000	FY 2023/24

**Attachment 1.**  
**2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan**  
**Summary of Applications Received**

#	Sponsor <sup>1</sup>	Project Name <sup>2</sup>	Brief Project Description	District(s)	Phase(s)	Total Project Cost	Prop AA Requested	Fiscal Year Funds Needed
10	SFMTA	Howard Streetscape Pedestrian Safety Project	Pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements targeted to areas with most vulnerable residents, including seniors and children. Project is intended to: reduce vehicle lanes from three to two to shorten crossing distances and minimize conflicts with other modes; replace the existing bicycle lane with a two-way protected bikeway; additional pedestrian and bicycle safety infrastructure including raised crosswalks, pedestrian bulb-outs, protected intersections, traffic signals with separate bicycle and vehicle phases; and, new energy-efficient pedestrian-scale lighting. Construction would begin in Spring 2024 and be complete in Spring 2026.	6	Construction	\$47,941,000	\$1,000,000	FY 2024/25
11	SFMTA	Southern Embarcadero Safety Project	This project includes traffic, parking, and signal and utility upgrades to extend the waterside two-way protected bikeway from Bryant to Townsend streets along The Embarcadero. Potential project elements include new traffic signals, shorter pedestrian crossings with ADA curb ramp upgrades, additional on-street vehicle loading zones, northbound left-turn restrictions (at Townsend and Brannan streets), and revised median and promenade curblines. The project is being coordinated with adjacent development projects at Piers 30/32 and 38/40, and the SF Port's Waterfront Resiliency Program.	3	Construction	\$5,000,000	\$1,000,000	FY 2025/26
12	SFMTA	Bayview Community Multimodal Corridor	The Bayview Community Multimodal Corridor safety project implements one of the high priority recommendations from the Bayview CBTP. This project will improve pedestrian crossings on 3rd Street (locations anticipated to be at Revere, Thomas, and McKinnon avenues) and restrict left turns at those locations to discourage traffic into the neighborhood. The project also includes improve a north-south route that is parallel to 3rd Street to serve people walking and biking by slowing traffic with speed humps and raised intersections at three raised intersections adjacent to KC Jones and Youngblood-Coleman Playgrounds. Construction is expected to begin in early 2026 and be complete by the end of 2027. SFMTA is also expecting to separately use programmed Prop K funds to implement bulbouts at five intersections along this route, which are currently being designed.	10	Construction	\$19,290,990	\$1,000,000	FY 2026/27
<b>Pedestrian Safety Category Subtotal</b>						<b>\$91,462,090</b>	<b>\$ 8,175,000</b>	

**Attachment 1.**  
**2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan**  
**Summary of Applications Received**

**Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements Category**

#	Sponsor <sup>1</sup>	Project Name <sup>2</sup>	Brief Project Description	District(s)	Phase(s)	Total Project Cost	Prop AA Requested	Fiscal Year Funds Needed
13	TJPA	Salesforce Transit Center Wayfinding Phase 1	Requested funds will upgrade the Salesforce Transit Center's wayfinding system. This funding would improve commuter and visitor experiences by connecting them quickly and more efficiently to their transit connections and to the public open space and activities provided at the Center's rooftop park. Prop AA funds would fund installation of 10 interactive kiosks, supplementing an earlier phase of wayfinding improvements. This project was recommended by TJPA's 2019 Wayfinding Gap Analysis and is consistent with recommendations of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Blue Ribbon Transit Recovery Task Force. Construction will start in Fall 2022 and be complete by the end of 2022.	6	Construction	\$1,361,700	\$300,000	FY 2022/23
14	SFMTA	M Oceanview Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements	Transit reliability, travel time and pedestrian safety improvements through implementation of various transit priority enhancements along the M line corridor from the intersection of Junipero Serra Boulevard and 19th Avenue to the Balboa Park Station. Scope will include traffic signals, transit stop placement optimization, pedestrian improvements (e.g. extended passenger boarding islands), and other improvements. Project is fully funded for construction with a \$20 million state grant from the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program. Design is planned for Summer 2023 through Spring 2025, with construction planned for Fall 2025 to Summer 2027.	7, 11	Design	\$26,675,258	\$2,000,000	FY 2022/23
15	SFMTA	29 Sunset Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements	Transit reliability, transit travel time and pedestrian safety improvements from the intersection of Lincoln and Bowley in the Richmond district to the intersection of 19th and Holloway avenues. Scope will include transit-only lanes, transit priority signals, transit stop placement optimization and pedestrian improvements. Design is planned for Summer 2022 through Spring 2025 and construction is planned for Spring 2026 through Winter 2028.	1, 2, 4, 7	Design, Construction	\$22,595,696	\$3,000,000	FY 2023/24, FY 2025/26

**Attachment 1.**  
**2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan**  
**Summary of Applications Received**

#	Sponsor <sup>1</sup>	Project Name <sup>2</sup>	Brief Project Description	District(s)	Phase(s)	Total Project Cost	Prop AA Requested	Fiscal Year Funds Needed
16	BART	Elevator Modernization Project, Phase 1.3, Powell Street and Civic Center/UN Plaza Stations	Modernize and renovate two elevators (one street level and one platform level) at the Powell Street Station and one elevator (platform level) at the Civic Center Station. All three elevators are shared for use between BART and Muni. Project benefits include improved accessibility, improved customer experience, and increased reliability. Construction is planned for Fall 2025 through Fall 2027.	3, 6	Construction	\$16,087,500	\$5,741,270	FY 2024/25
<b>Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements Category Subtotal</b>						<b>\$66,720,154</b>	<b>\$ 11,041,270</b>	
						<b>Total Project Cost</b>	<b>Total Prop AA Requested</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>						<b>\$ 180,012,244</b>	<b>\$ 31,541,050</b>	

<sup>1</sup> Projects are not listed in priority order. Projects are sorted by category, then fiscal year in which Prop AA funds are needed, then by Sponsor, then by Project Name.

<sup>2</sup> Sponsor abbreviations include San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART), San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), San Francisco Public Works (SFPW), and Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA).

**Attachment 2.**  
**2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan**  
**Draft Programming Recommendations<sup>1</sup>**

**Street Repair and Reconstruction Category**

Score	Project Name	Sponsor <sup>2</sup>	Phase(s)	Total Project Cost	Prop AA Requested	Recommended Prop AA Programming	Notes
7.8	Hunters Point, Central Waterfront and Potrero Hill Area Streets Pavement Renovation	SFPW	Construction	\$3,900,000	\$2,882,492	\$2,882,492	Recommend amount requested.
7.7	Fillmore St Pavement Renovation	SFPW	Construction	\$5,060,000	\$2,360,572	\$2,360,572	Recommend amount requested.
6.1	Brotherhood Way, Holloway Ave and Lake Merced Blvd Pavement Renovation	SFPW	Construction	\$4,840,000	\$2,360,572	\$2,360,572	Recommend amount requested.
6.1	Front St, Sansome St, 1st St and Montgomery St Pavement Renovation	SFPW	Construction	\$4,180,000	\$2,360,572	\$1,860,572	Recommend \$500,000 less than requested to allow us to partially fund Japantown Buchanan Mall Improvements. Recommendation is supported by SFPW. SFPW will identify other funds to fully fund this project.
6.0	8th St, Clay St and Levenworth St Pavement Renovation	SFPW	Construction	\$3,850,000	\$2,360,572	\$2,360,572	Recommend amount requested.
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>\$21,830,000</b>	<b>\$12,324,780</b>	<b>\$11,824,780</b>	
<b>Street Repair and Reconstruction Category Target Programming Amount</b>						<b>\$12,324,780</b>	

**Attachment 2.**  
**2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan**  
**Draft Programming Recommendations<sup>1</sup>**

**Pedestrian Safety Category**

Score	Project Name	Sponsor <sup>2</sup>	Phase(s)	Total Project Cost	Prop AA Requested	Recommended Prop AA Programming	Notes
15.3	Howard Streetscape Pedestrian Safety Project	SFMTA	Construction	\$47,941,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	<b>Recommend amount requested.</b>
13.1	Central Embarcadero Safety Project	SFMTA	Construction	\$8,600,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	<b>Recommend amount requested.</b>
12.0	Bayview Community Multimodal Corridor Project	SFMTA	Construction	\$19,290,990	\$1,000,000	\$598,915	<b>Recommend partial funding.</b> Although this is higher scoring than other projects, since funds are not needed until FY 26/27, we are recommending partial funding to fund projects that are ready to advance sooner. This project is expected to be very competitive for state and federal funding sources, such as the state Active Transportation Program. This project could also compete for future Prop AA funds available through a mid-cycle call for projects or the next Strategic Plan update.
11.7	Innes Avenue Sidewalk Improvements	SFPW	Design, Construction	\$1,248,900	\$851,000	\$851,000	<b>Recommend amount requested.</b>
11.5	Oakdale Lighting Improvements Project Phase 1	SFPW	Design, Construction	\$1,974,000	\$1,974,000	\$1,974,000	<b>Recommend amount requested.</b> This project scored lower than other projects, however, Prop AA is one of the few funding sources available for stand alone pedestrian-scale lighting projects. The project is ready to proceed once funds are available.
10.5	Japantown Buchanan Mall Improvements	SFPW	Design, Construction	\$7,700,000	\$1,350,000	\$500,000	<b>Recommend partial funding</b> for pedestrian safety elements, including pedestrian-scale lighting, curb ramps, and sidewalk improvements. SFPW supports using \$500,000 from the Street Repair and Reconstruction category to make funds available for this project since paving has other funding options while there are limited funding opportunities for improvements to the Japantown Mall.

Score	Project Name	Sponsor <sup>2</sup>	Phase(s)	Total Project Cost	Prop AA Requested	Recommended Prop AA Programming	Notes
10.5	Southern Embarcadero Safety Project	SFMTA	Construction	\$5,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$0	<b>Not recommended for Prop AA funds</b> at this time. This project demonstrated lower readiness than other projects. This project could compete for future Prop AA funds available through a mid-cycle call for projects, the next Strategic Plan update or other funds sources since funds are not needed until FY 2025/26..
			<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 91,754,890</b>	<b>\$8,175,000</b>	<b>\$5,923,915</b>	
			<b>Pedestrian Safety Category Target Programming Amount</b>			<b>\$5,423,915</b>	

Attachment 2.  
2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan  
Draft Programming Recommendations<sup>1</sup>

**Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements Category**

Score	Project Name	Sponsor <sup>2</sup>	Phase(s)	Total Project Cost	Prop AA Requested	Recommended Prop AA Programming	Notes
13.2	Elevator Modernization Project, Phase 1.3, Powell Street and Civic Center/UN Plaza Stations	BART	Construction	\$16,087,500	\$5,741,270	\$3,441,270	<p><b>Recommend partial funding</b> to support a greater geographic spread of Prop AA projects. BART has agreed to request \$1,290,000 in programmed Prop K funds for this scope to supplement Prop AA. Prop AA funds shall be considered as counting evenly towards BART and SFMTA's fifty-fifty share of the overall project cost.</p> <p><b>Special Condition:</b> Prior to allocation of Prop AA funds, BART and SFMTA shall confirm that the agencies are in agreement on cost sharing and funding strategy for the project, as well as overall scope and schedule.</p>
13.1	M Oceanview Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements	SFMTA	Design	\$26,675,258	\$2,000,000	\$1,000,000	<p><b>Recommend fully funding with a combination of \$1 million in Prop AA funds and \$1 million in Prop K funds</b> in order to fund a wider geographic spread of Prop AA projects. The recommendation includes concurrent amendment of the Prop K Bus Rapid Transit/Transit Preferential Streets/Muni Metro Network and Transit Enhancements 5-Year Prioritization Programs to reprogram funds from Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program (NTIP) placeholders to this project. With this amendment, we continue to have enough NTIP funds programmed to fulfill the commitments to each district. Recommended funds leverage a \$20 million state grant for construction.</p>

Attachment 2.  
2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan  
Draft Programming Recommendations<sup>1</sup>

Score	Project Name	Sponsor <sup>2</sup>	Phase(s)	Total Project Cost	Prop AA Requested	Recommended Prop AA Programming	Notes
12.6	29 Sunset Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements	SFMTA	Design, Construction	\$22,595,696	\$3,000,000	\$1,000,000	<b>Recommend full funding for the design phase.</b> We are not recommending funding for construction at this time due to the need to strengthen the funding plan, which contains a large proportion of to be determined sources. We expect this project will be very competitive for federal and state grants.
9.4	Salesforce Transit Center Wayfinding Phase 1	TJPA	Construction	\$1,361,700	\$300,000	\$300,000	<b>Recommend amount requested.</b>
Subtotal				\$66,720,154	\$11,041,270	\$5,741,270	
Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements Category Target Programming Amount						\$5,741,270	

	Total Project Cost	Prop AA Requested	Recommended Prop AA Programming
TOTAL	\$ 180,305,044	\$ 31,541,050	\$ 23,489,965
TOTAL Available			\$23,489,965

<sup>1</sup> Projects are sorted by evaluation score from highest ranked to lowest. Total possible score varies by category.

<sup>2</sup> Sponsor abbreviations include San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART), San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), San Francisco Public Works (SFPW), and Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA).

**2019 Prop K 5-Year Project List (FY 2019/20 - FY 2023/24)**  
**Bus Rapid Transit/Transit Preferential Streets/Muni Metro Network Category (EP 1)**  
**Programming and Allocations to Date**  
 Pending April 26, 2022 Board

Agency	Project Name	Phase	Status	Fiscal Year					Total
				2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	
Carry Forward From 2014 5YPP									
SFMTA	Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2)	PS&E	Programmed						\$0
Any Eligible	Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program (NTIP) <sup>2</sup>	PS&E, CON	Pending			\$0			\$0
SFMTA	Muni Forward M Oceanview Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements <sup>2</sup>	PS&E	Pending				\$300,000		\$300,000
Transit Rapid Network - Bus Rapid Transit									
SFMTA	Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2)	PS&E	Programmed						\$0
SFMTA	Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2)	CON	Programmed			\$0			\$0
SFMTA	Muni Forward Placeholder <sup>1</sup>	Any	Programmed			\$3,184,360			\$3,184,360
SFMTA	Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2) <sup>1</sup>	PS&E	Programmed			\$1,000,000			\$1,000,000
SFMTA	Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2) - Quick Build <sup>1</sup>	CON	Programmed			\$675,000			\$675,000
SFMTA	Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2) <sup>1</sup>	CON	Programmed				\$8,325,000		\$8,325,000
SFMTA	5 Fulton Transit Improvements <sup>1</sup>	CON	Programmed			\$1,950,000			\$1,950,000
SFMTA	14 Downtown Mission Transit Improvements <sup>1</sup>	CON	Programmed			\$12,554,233			\$12,554,233
SFMTA	30 Stockton Transit Improvements <sup>1</sup>	CON	Programmed			\$2,495,767			\$2,495,767
Total Programmed in 2019 5YPP				\$0	\$0	\$21,859,360	\$8,625,000	\$0	\$30,484,360
Total Allocated and Pending				\$0	\$0	\$0	\$300,000	\$0	\$300,000
Total Unallocated				\$0	\$0	\$21,859,360	\$8,325,000	\$0	\$30,184,360
Total Programmed in 2021 Strategic Plan				\$0	\$0	\$22,159,360	\$8,325,000	\$0	\$30,484,360
Deobligated Funds						\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Cumulative Remaining Programming Capacity				\$0	\$0	\$300,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Pending Allocation/Appropriation									
Board Approved Allocation/Appropriation									

**FOOTNOTES:**

<sup>1</sup> 2021 Strategic Plan Update and corresponding 5YPP amendment to reprogram \$20,091,311 in FY2019/20 Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2) funds to other Muni Forward projects in FY2021/22 and to update the phases and cash flow for the \$10M that will remain programmed to the Geary project to reflect the updated project cost and schedule.

Add \$3,184,360 for MuniForward - Placeholder in FY2021/22

Add \$1,950,000 for 5 Fulton Transit Improvements construction in FY2021/22.

Add \$12,554,233 for 14 Downtown Mission Transit Improvements construction in FY2021/22.

Add \$2,495,767 for 30 Stockton Transit Improvements construction in FY2021/22.

Reduce Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2) by \$20,091,311, leaving \$1M programmed for design and \$675,000 programmed for Quick Build construction in FY2021/22, and \$8,325,000 programmed for full project construction in FY2022/23.

Reprogram \$93,049 in deobligated funds from projects completed under budget to Muni Forward projects in FY2021/22

<sup>2</sup> Planned 5YPP amendment to fully fund design of Muni Forward M Oceanview Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements Project (Resolution 22-xx 4/26/2022)

NTIP Placeholder (carryover): Reduce from \$300,000 to \$0 in FY2021/22.

Muni Forward M Oceanview Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements: Program project with \$300,000 in FY2022/23 with 100% cash flow in FY2022/23.

**2019 Prop K 5-Year Project List (FY 2019/20 - FY 2023/24)**  
**Bus Rapid Transit/Transit Preferential Streets/Muni Metro Network Category (EP 1)**  
**Cash Flow (Maximum Annual Reimbursement)**  
 Pending April 26, 2022 Board

Project Name	Phase	Fiscal Year							Total
		2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	
Carry Forward From 2014 5YPP									
Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2)	PS&E	\$0	\$0	\$0					\$0
Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program (NTIP) <sup>2</sup>	PS&E, CON			\$0					\$0
Muni Forward M Oceanview Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements <sup>2</sup>	PS&E				\$300,000				\$300,000
Transit Rapid Network - Bus Rapid Transit									
Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2)	PS&E			\$0	\$0				\$0
Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2)	CON				\$0				\$0
Muni Forward Placeholder <sup>1</sup>	Any				\$1,592,180	\$1,592,180			\$3,184,360
Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2) <sup>1</sup>	PS&E			\$0	\$500,000	\$500,000			\$1,000,000
Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2) - Quick Build <sup>1</sup>	CON				\$675,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$675,000
Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2) <sup>1</sup>	CON					\$880,000	\$5,300,000	\$2,145,000	\$8,325,000
5 Fulton Transit Improvements <sup>1</sup>	CON					\$1,950,000			\$1,950,000
14 Downtown Mission Transit Improvements <sup>1</sup>	CON				\$5,485,000	\$5,485,000	\$1,584,233		\$12,554,233
30 Stockton Transit Improvements <sup>1</sup>	CON			\$800,000	\$1,695,767				\$2,495,767
Cash Flow Programmed in 2019 5YPP		\$0	\$0	\$800,000	\$10,247,947	\$10,407,180	\$6,884,233	\$2,145,000	\$30,484,360
Total Cash Flow Allocated and Pending		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$300,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$300,000
Total Cash Flow Unallocated		\$0	\$0	\$800,000	\$9,947,947	\$10,407,180	\$6,884,233	\$2,145,000	\$30,184,360
Total Cash Flow in 2021 Strategic Plan		\$0	\$0	\$1,100,000	\$9,947,947	\$10,407,180	\$6,884,233	\$2,145,000	\$30,484,360
Deobligated Funds		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Cumulative Remaining Cash Flow Capacity		\$0	\$0	\$300,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Pending Allocation/Appropriation									
Board Approved Allocation/Appropriation									



**FOOTNOTES:**

- <sup>1</sup> Strategic Plan and 5YPP amendments to accommodate allocation of \$965,948 for Muni Subway Expansion Project Development (Resolution 20-009, 09/24/2019).  
Muni Subway Expansion (19th Ave M-line): Reduced by \$965,948 in FY2020/21 planning funds from \$2,744,300 to \$1,778,352  
Muni Subway Expansion Project Development: Added project with \$965,948 in FY2019/20 and advanced cash flow from FY2021/22 to FYs 2019/20 and 2020/21.
- <sup>2</sup> Strategic Plan and 5YPP amendments to the Purchase Additional Light Rail Vehicles category (EP-15) to accommodate allocation of \$96,661 for Light Rail Vehicle Procurement (Resolution 20-040, 4/14/2020).  
Light Rail Vehicle Procurement: Advance \$96,661 in cash flow from FY2023/24 to FY2021/22; funds must be used for LRV fleet expansion, which will be complete in FY2021/22.
- <sup>3</sup> 2021 Strategic Plan Update and corresponding 5YPP amendment to delay programming and cash flow to reflect updated project delivery schedule (Resolution 22-020 12/7/2021).
- <sup>4</sup> 5YPP amendment to reprogram \$2,750,000 from Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2) to Transit Enhancements - Placeholder in FY2021/22.
- <sup>5</sup> 5YPP amendment to reprogram \$500,000 from Market St. / Balboa Park New Elevator Master Plan to the Elevator Renovation Program in FY2021/22
- <sup>6</sup> 5YPP amendment to accommodate funding for Geary-19th Avenue Corridor Rail Strategy and Planning (West Side Rail)  
Muni Subway Expansion Project Development: Reduce \$1,778,352 to \$0 in FY2020/21  
Reprogram \$1,749,358 in deobligated funds from Geneva Harney BRT environmental phase  
Geary-19th Avenue Corridor Rail Strategy and Planning (West Side Rail): Add project with \$1,500,000 in FY2021/22 and \$2,027,710 in FY2022/23 planning funds.
- <sup>7</sup> 5YPP amendment to accommodate funding for Muni Metro Core Capacity Study (Resolution 22-040 3/22/2022)  
Geary-19th Avenue Corridor Rail Strategy and Planning (West Side Rail): Reduced by \$184,052 from \$1,500,000 to \$1,315,948.  
Cumulative Remaining Programming Capacity: Reduced from \$965,948 to \$0; these funds were deobligated from Muni Subway Expansion Project Development. consistent w  
Muni Metro Core Capacity Study: Add project with \$1,150,000 in FY2021/22.
- <sup>8</sup> 5YPP amendment to accommodate Geary/19th Ave Subway Strategic Case (Resolution 22-0XX, xx/xx/xxxx)  
Geary-19th Avenue Corridor Rail Strategy and Planning (West Side Rail): Reduced by \$801,716 from \$1,315,948 to \$514,232.  
Geary/19th Ave Subway Strategic Case: Added project with \$801,716 in FY2021/22.
- <sup>9</sup> Planned 5YPP amendment to fully fund design of Muni Forward M Oceanview Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements Project  
NTIP Placeholder (carryover): Reduce from \$1,000,000 to \$300,000 in FY2021/22.  
Muni Forward M Oceanview Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements: Program project with \$700,000 in FY2023/24.



## Memorandum

### AGENDA ITEM 8

**DATE:** March 24, 2022

**TO:** Transportation Authority Board

**FROM:** Anna LaForte – Deputy Director for Policy and Programming

**SUBJECT:** 4/12/2022 Board Meeting: Approve the 2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan and 5-Year Prioritization Programs (5YPPs) and Amend the Prop K Bus Rapid Transit/Transit Preferential Streets/Muni Metro Network and Transit Enhancements 5YPPs

#### RECOMMENDATION ☐ Information ☒ Action

- Approve the 2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan and 5YPPs
- Amend the Prop K Bus Rapid Transit/Transit Preferential Streets/Muni Metro Network and Transit Enhancements 5YPPs

#### SUMMARY

In November 2021, we issued the 2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan call for projects to program funds for the next 5-year period covering Fiscal Years (FYs) 2022/23 to 2026/27. By the January 18<sup>th</sup> deadline, we received 16 applications from 4 sponsors requesting about \$31.5 million compared to the \$23.5 million available. We evaluated the applications using Board-adopted program-wide prioritization criteria, such as project readiness, community support, geographic equity, and construction coordination opportunities, and category specific criteria, such as whether projects seeking funds from the Pedestrian Safety category are located on the Vision Zero High Injury Network or directly improve access to transit or schools. Our recommendation is to program \$23,489,965 in Prop AA funds and \$1 million in Prop K funds to fully fund ten projects and partially fund five projects as detailed in Attachment 4. Our recommendation includes two concurrent Prop K 5YPP amendments to reprogram the aforementioned \$1 million to the M Ocean View Transit project to fully fund the design phase as described below and in Attachment 6.

- ☐ Fund Allocation
- ☒ Fund Programming
- ☐ Policy/Legislation
- ☐ Plan/Study
- ☐ Capital Project Oversight/Delivery
- ☐ Budget/Finance
- ☐ Contract/Agreement
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_



## **BACKGROUND**

In November 2010, San Francisco voters approved Prop AA, authorizing the Transportation Authority to collect an additional \$10 vehicle registration fee on motor vehicles registered in San Francisco to fund transportation improvements in the following three categories, with revenues split as indicated by the percentages: Street Repair and Reconstruction – 50%, Pedestrian Safety – 25%, and Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements – 25%. Given its small size – less than \$5 million in annual revenues, one of Prop AA’s guiding principles is to focus on small, high-impact projects that will provide tangible benefits to the public in the short-term. Thus, Prop AA only funds design and construction phases of projects and places a strong emphasis on timely use of funds. Correspondingly, Prop AA Strategic Plan policies allow for periodic calls for projects to reprogram cost savings or funds from programmed projects that failed to request funds in a timely manner. Only public agencies are eligible to apply for Prop AA funds.

The Prop AA Expenditure Plan requires development of a Strategic Plan to guide the implementation of the program and specifies that the Strategic Plan include a 5YPP for each of the Expenditure Plan categories as a prerequisite for allocation of funds. The intent of the 5YPP requirement is to provide the Board, the public, and Prop AA project sponsors with a clear understanding of how projects are prioritized for funding. The 2022 Strategic Plan will be the third since inception of the Prop AA program.

## **DISCUSSION**

Call for Projects and Funds Available. On November 9, 2021, we issued a call for projects to program \$23,489,965 in Prop AA vehicle registration fee revenues to projects in the 5-year period covering FYs 2022/23 to 2026/27. The funds available estimate was based primarily on new revenues forecast at about \$4.83 million per year, which will result in approximately \$23.5 million in funds available in the 5YPP period, net of five percent for administrative expenses. Prop AA revenues are dependent on the number of vehicles registered in San Francisco and have been stable over the last five years. In addition to new revenues, we are recommending programming \$524,156 in deobligated funds from projects completed under budget and \$4,075 in interest earnings.

Attachment 1 provides details on the funds available (Table 1), as well as the programming targets (Table 3) for distributing the \$23.5 million across the three Prop AA programmatic categories as established in the Expenditure Plan.

By the January 18, 2022, deadline we had received 16 applications from four agencies requesting approximately \$31.5 million in Prop AA funds. Attachment 2 summarizes the applications received.

**Draft Programming Recommendations.** We developed the draft programming recommendations based upon the project information submitted in response to the Prop AA



call for projects, application of the Board-adopted screening and prioritization criteria, and follow-up communications with sponsors to clarify and seek additional project information as needed. We first screened project submissions for eligibility and determined that all 16 projects were eligible for Prop AA funding. We then evaluated the projects using program-wide prioritization criteria and category specific criteria. Descriptions of the evaluation criteria and the project scores are detailed in Attachment 3.

As detailed in Attachment 4, our recommendation is to program \$23,489,965 in Prop AA funds and \$1 million in Prop K funds to fully fund ten projects and partially fund five projects. Attachment 5 shows the proposed Strategic Plan programming and cash flow for the next five years.

Unless noted otherwise below, we recommended funding projects in score order until the funds available were depleted, with a priority on projects and project phases that are ready to advance sooner. Our recommendations for each category are described below.

**Street Repair and Reconstruction Category (\$11,824,780).** Recommended programming includes fully funding four projects and partially funding one San Francisco Public Works (SFPW) pavement renovation projects. The projects recommended for full funding are: Hunters Point, Central Waterfront and Potrero Hill Area Streets Pavement Renovation; 8th St, Clay St and Leavenworth St Pavement Renovation; Brotherhood Way, Holloway Ave and Lake Merced Blvd Pavement Renovation; and Fillmore St Pavement Renovation.

After discussion with SFPW staff, we are recommending \$500,000 less than requested for the Front St, Sansome St, 1st St and Montgomery St Pavement Renovation project to allow us to partially fund Japantown Buchanan Mall Improvements in the Pedestrian Safety category. SFPW supports this recommendation since paving has other funding options while there are limited funding opportunities for improvements to the Japantown Mall, especially the pedestrian lighting component. Prop AA funds would also provide local match to a \$5 million California Natural Resources Agency grant. This recommendation results in a very modest shift in the percent of funds programmed and allocated for Fiscal Years 2012/13 through 2026/27 in the Street Repair and Reconstruction Category from 50% to 49.3% and the Pedestrian Safety category from 25% to 25.7%.

**Pedestrian Safety Category (\$5,923,915).** Recommended programming includes fully funding SFPW's requests for Oakdale Lighting Improvements Project Phase 1 and Innes Avenue Sidewalk Improvements, and SFMTA's Central Embarcadero Safety and Howard Streetscape Pedestrian Safety Project projects.

As mentioned above, we are recommending partial funding for SFPW's request for Japantown Buchanan Mall Improvements to help fund the pedestrian safety elements of the scope. We also recommend partial funding for the SFMTA's Bayview Community Multimodal Corridor Project, which doesn't need funds until FY 2026/27, so that we can recommend partial funding for lower scoring projects that are ready to advance sooner. The project is



expected to be very competitive for state and federal funding sources, such as the state Active Transportation Program, and could also compete for future Prop AA funds available through a mid-cycle call for projects or the next Strategic Plan update.

We are not recommending funds for the Southern Embarcadero Safety Project which doesn't need construction funds until FY 2025/26. The project could compete for future Prop AA funds available through a mid-cycle call for projects or the next Strategic Plan update, or for other funding sources, as well.

**Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements Category (\$5,741,270).** Our recommendation includes fully funding Transbay Joint Powers Authority's request for Salesforce Transit Center Wayfinding Phase 1. We are also recommending full funding for the design phase of the SFMTA's 29 Sunset Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements project. We are not recommending funding for construction at this time due to the need to strengthen the funding plan, which contains a large proportion of to be determined sources. We expect this project will be very competitive for federal and state grants.

We are recommending partial funding for BART's Elevator Modernization Project, Phase 1.3, Powell Street and Civic Center/UN Plaza Stations to support a greater geographic spread of Prop AA projects. BART and SFMTA are splitting the \$16 million project cost evenly. The recommended Prop AA funds will be considered as counting equally toward BART and SFMTA's fifty-fifty share of the project cost. We have included a special condition on this recommendation that requires BART and SFMTA to confirm that the agencies are in agreement on cost sharing and funding strategy for the project prior to requesting allocation of funds.

For the M Ocean View Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements project, we are recommending fully funding the request with Prop AA and Prop K funds, which requires an amendment of the Prop K Bus Rapid Transit/Transit Preferential Streets/Muni Metro Network Category and Transit Enhancements 5YPPs to reprogram a total of \$1 million in Prop K funds to this project. Attachment 6 provides detail on the recommended Prop K 5YPP amendments.

## **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

The recommended action would not have an impact on the adopted Fiscal Year 2021/22 budget. Allocations of the aforementioned Prop AA and Prop K funds would be the subject of future Board actions.

## **CAC POSITION**

The CAC was briefed on this item at its March 23, 2022 meeting and unanimously adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation.



## **SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS**

- Attachment 1 - Summary of Funds Available
- Attachment 2 - Summary of Applications Received
- Attachment 3 - Evaluation Scores
- Attachment 4 - Programming Recommendations
- Attachment 5 - Proposed 5-Year Prioritized Program of Projects - Programming and Cash Flow
- Attachment 6 - Prop K 5YPP Amendments
- Enclosure 1 - Draft 2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan
  - Strategic Plan Policies
  - Screening and Prioritization Criteria
  - Proposed 5-Year Prioritized Program of Projects
  - Prop AA Project Information Forms (15)

Attachment 1.  
Prop AA Vehicle Registration Fee  
Summary of Funds Available

<b>Table 1. Summary of Prop AA Funds Available for FYs 2022/23-2026/27</b>	
2022 Strategic Plan (FY2022/23 - FY2026/27) - Estimated New Revenues Available for Projects (Net 5% administration costs)	<b>\$ 22,961,734</b>
Interest Earnings	<b>\$ 4,075</b>
Deobligated Funds	<b>\$ 524,156</b>
2022 Strategic Plan Update/ 5-Year Prioritization Programs - Total Estimated Funds Available for Projects	<b>\$ 23,489,965</b>

<b>Table 2. Program Inception Through FY 2021/22 - Programmed and Allocated Funds by Category</b> (Includes actual revenues April 2011 - June 2021 and projected revenues July 2021 - June 2022)			
<b>Category</b>	<b>Target % Allocation of Funds per Prop AA Expenditure Plan</b>	<b>Actual Programming and Allocations (as of December 2021, net of deobligations)</b>	<b>Actual % of Funds Programmed and Allocated</b>
Street Repair and Reconstruction	50%	\$ 25,203,314	48.9%
Pedestrian Safety	25%	\$ 13,340,132	25.9%
Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements	25%	\$ 13,022,777	25.3%
Total Programmed and Allocated	100%	\$ 51,566,223	100%

<b>Table 3. 2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan (FYs 2022/23-2026/27) - Funds Available by Category</b>		
<b>Category</b>	<b>Target % Allocation of Funds per Prop AA Expenditure Plan</b>	<b>Programming Target in 2022 Strategic Plan</b>
Street Repair and Reconstruction	50%	\$ 12,324,780
Pedestrian Safety	25%	\$ 5,423,915
Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements	25%	\$ 5,741,270
Total Estimated Funds Available for Programming	100%	\$ 23,489,965

**Attachment 2.**  
**2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan**  
**Summary of Applications Received**

**Street Repair and Reconstruction Category**

#	Sponsor <sup>1</sup>	Project Name <sup>2</sup>	Brief Project Description	District(s)	Phase(s)	Total Project Cost	Prop AA Requested	Fiscal Year Funds Needed
1	SFPW	Hunters Point, Central Waterfront and Potrero Hill Area Streets Pavement Renovation	The project scope includes demolition, grinding and paving of 35 blocks, curb ramps reconstruction and localized base repair. The average Pavement Condition Index (PCI) score within the project limits is mid 40's. Construction planned for Spring 2023 through Fall 2024.	10	Construction	\$3,900,000	\$2,882,492	FY 2022/23
2	SFPW	8th St, Clay St and Levenworth St Pavement Renovation	The project scope includes demolition, grinding and paving of 35 blocks, curb ramps reconstruction and localized base repair. The average PCI score within the project limits is mid 50's. Construction planned for Spring 2024 through Fall 2025.	3, 6	Construction	\$3,850,000	\$2,360,572	FY 2023/24
3	SFPW	Brotherhood Way, Holloway Ave and Lake Merced Blvd Pavement Renovation	The project scope includes demolition, grinding and paving of 44 blocks, curb ramps reconstruction and localized base repair. The average PCI score within the project limits is low 60's. Construction planned for Spring 2025 through Fall 2026.	7, 11	Construction	\$4,840,000	\$2,360,572	FY 2024/25
4	SFPW	Front St, Sansome St, 1st St and Montgomery St Pavement Renovation	The project scope includes demolition, grinding and paving of 38 blocks, curb ramps reconstruction and localized base repair. The average PCI score within the project limits is mid 50's. Construction planned for Winter 2026 through Summer 2027.	3, 6	Construction	\$4,180,000	\$2,360,572	FY 2025/26
5	SFPW	Fillmore St Pavement Renovation	The project scope includes demolition, grinding and paving of 46 blocks, curb ramps reconstruction and localized base repair. The average PCI score within the project limits is high 50's. Construction planned for Spring 2027 to early 2029. This project is being coordinated with the 22 Fillmore Muni Forward project, which is currently in the planning phase.	2, 5, 8	Construction	\$5,060,000	\$2,360,572	FY 2026/27
<b>Street Repair and Reconstruction Category Subtotal</b>						<b>\$ 21,830,000</b>	<b>\$ 12,324,780</b>	

**Attachment 2.**  
**2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan**  
**Summary of Applications Received**

**Pedestrian Safety Category**

#	Sponsor <sup>1</sup>	Project Name <sup>2</sup>	Brief Project Description	District(s)	Phase(s)	Total Project Cost	Prop AA Requested	Fiscal Year Funds Needed
6	SFPW	Innes Avenue Sidewalk Improvements	Pedestrian safety and accessibility improvements along Innes Avenue, between Aurelious Walker and Donahue Street. Improvements include 6 ADA compliant curb ramps, 400 feet of new rockslide catchment fence, and nearly 450 linear feet of new sidewalk, the majority of which is entirely missing. Design is planned for Summer 2022 through Summer 2023 and construction Fall 2023 through Fall 2024.	10	Design, Construction	\$956,100	\$851,000	FY 2022/23 FY 2023/24
7	SFPW	Japantown Buchanan Mall Improvements	This project will implement improvements to the Japantown Buchanan Mall, a culturally significant public plaza on Buchanan Street, between Post and Sutter streets in the cultural heart of Japantown. Improvements include repaving the uneven walkways, new curb ramps, new trees, landscaping with culturally relevant plants, enhancing the existing historic public art, and installing new energy efficient pedestrian lighting. Project has received a \$5 million state grant from the California Natural Resources Agency. Design is planned for early 2023 through early 2024 and construction Spring 2024 through Spring 2025.	5	Design, Construction	\$7,700,000	\$1,350,000	FY 2022/23 FY 2023/24
8	SFPW	Oakdale Lighting Improvements Project Phase 1	Installation of approximately 50 new pedestrian-scale street lights on Oakdale, between 3rd and Phelps streets to improve pedestrian safety and comfort along this important thoroughfare. Improving lighting along Oakdale Avenue was the highest-ranked community priority in the Bayview Community Based Transportation Plan (CBTP). Design is planned for early 2023 through Fall 2023 and construction would take place Summer 2024 through early 2025.	10	Design, Construction	\$1,974,000	\$1,974,000	FY 2022/23 FY 2023/24
9	SFMTA	Central Embarcadero Safety Project	This project will expand a two-way, water-side protected bikeway from Folsom to Bryant streets and construct additional multi-modal safety and signal upgrades for The Embarcadero corridor between Broadway and Bryant Street. Pedestrian safety benefits include reducing conflicts with other modes and shortening crossing distances. Construction would begin in early 2024 and be completed in early 2025.	3	Construction	\$8,600,000	\$1,000,000	FY 2023/24

**Attachment 2.**  
**2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan**  
**Summary of Applications Received**

#	Sponsor <sup>1</sup>	Project Name <sup>2</sup>	Brief Project Description	District(s)	Phase(s)	Total Project Cost	Prop AA Requested	Fiscal Year Funds Needed
10	SFMTA	Howard Streetscape Pedestrian Safety Project	Pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements targeted to areas with most vulnerable residents, including seniors and children. Project is intended to: reduce vehicle lanes from three to two to shorten crossing distances and minimize conflicts with other modes; replace the existing bicycle lane with a two-way protected bikeway; additional pedestrian and bicycle safety infrastructure including raised crosswalks, pedestrian bulb-outs, protected intersections, traffic signals with separate bicycle and vehicle phases; and, new energy-efficient pedestrian-scale lighting. Construction would begin in Spring 2024 and be complete in Spring 2026.	6	Construction	\$47,941,000	\$1,000,000	FY 2024/25
11	SFMTA	Southern Embarcadero Safety Project	This project includes traffic, parking, and signal and utility upgrades to extend the waterside two-way protected bikeway from Bryant to Townsend streets along The Embarcadero. Potential project elements include new traffic signals, shorter pedestrian crossings with ADA curb ramp upgrades, additional on-street vehicle loading zones, northbound left-turn restrictions (at Townsend and Brannan streets), and revised median and promenade curblines. The project is being coordinated with adjacent development projects at Piers 30/32 and 38/40, and the SF Port's Waterfront Resiliency Program.	3	Construction	\$5,000,000	\$1,000,000	FY 2025/26
12	SFMTA	Bayview Community Multimodal Corridor	The Bayview Community Multimodal Corridor safety project implements one of the high priority recommendations from the Bayview CBTP. This project will improve pedestrian crossings on 3rd Street (locations anticipated to be at Revere, Thomas, and McKinnon avenues) and restrict left turns at those locations to discourage traffic into the neighborhood. The project also includes improve a north-south route that is parallel to 3rd Street to serve people walking and biking by slowing traffic with speed humps and raised intersections at three raised intersections adjacent to KC Jones and Youngblood-Coleman Playgrounds. Construction is expected to begin in early 2026 and be complete by the end of 2027. SFMTA is also expecting to separately use programmed Prop K funds to implement bulbouts at five intersections along this route, which are currently being designed.	10	Construction	\$19,290,990	\$1,000,000	FY 2026/27
<b>Pedestrian Safety Category Subtotal</b>						<b>\$91,462,090</b>	<b>\$ 8,175,000</b>	

**Attachment 2.**  
**2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan**  
**Summary of Applications Received**

**Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements Category**

#	Sponsor <sup>1</sup>	Project Name <sup>2</sup>	Brief Project Description	District(s)	Phase(s)	Total Project Cost	Prop AA Requested	Fiscal Year Funds Needed
13	TJPA	Salesforce Transit Center Wayfinding Phase 1	Requested funds will upgrade the Salesforce Transit Center's wayfinding system. This funding would improve commuter and visitor experiences by connecting them quickly and more efficiently to their transit connections and to the public open space and activities provided at the Center's rooftop park. Prop AA funds would fund installation of 10 interactive kiosks, supplementing an earlier phase of wayfinding improvements. This project was recommended by TJPA's 2019 Wayfinding Gap Analysis and is consistent with recommendations of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Blue Ribbon Transit Recovery Task Force. Construction will start in Fall 2022 and be complete by the end of 2022.	6	Construction	\$1,361,700	\$300,000	FY 2022/23
14	SFMTA	M Oceanview Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements	Transit reliability, travel time and pedestrian safety improvements through implementation of various transit priority enhancements along the M line corridor from the intersection of Junipero Serra Boulevard and 19th Avenue to the Balboa Park Station. Scope will include traffic signals, transit stop placement optimization, pedestrian improvements (e.g. extended passenger boarding islands), and other improvements. Project is fully funded for construction with a \$20 million state grant from the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program. Design is planned for Summer 2023 through Spring 2025, with construction planned for Fall 2025 to Summer 2027.	7, 11	Design	\$26,675,258	\$2,000,000	FY 2022/23
15	SFMTA	29 Sunset Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements	Transit reliability, transit travel time and pedestrian safety improvements from the intersection of Lincoln and Bowley in the Richmond district to the intersection of 19th and Holloway avenues. Scope will include transit-only lanes, transit priority signals, transit stop placement optimization and pedestrian improvements. Design is planned for Summer 2022 through Spring 2025 and construction is planned for Spring 2026 through Winter 2028.	1, 2, 4, 7	Design, Construction	\$22,595,696	\$3,000,000	FY 2023/24, FY 2025/26

**Attachment 2.**  
**2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan**  
**Summary of Applications Received**

#	Sponsor <sup>1</sup>	Project Name <sup>2</sup>	Brief Project Description	District(s)	Phase(s)	Total Project Cost	Prop AA Requested	Fiscal Year Funds Needed
16	BART	Elevator Modernization Project, Phase 1.3, Powell Street and Civic Center/UN Plaza Stations	Modernize and renovate two elevators (one street level and one platform level) at the Powell Street Station and one elevator (platform level) at the Civic Center Station. All three elevators are shared for use between BART and Muni. Project benefits include improved accessibility, improved customer experience, and increased reliability. Construction is planned for Fall 2025 through Fall 2027.	3, 6	Construction	\$16,087,500	\$5,741,270	FY 2024/25
<b>Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements Category Subtotal</b>						<b>\$66,720,154</b>	<b>\$ 11,041,270</b>	
						<b>Total Project Cost</b>	<b>Total Prop AA Requested</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>						<b>\$ 180,012,244</b>	<b>\$ 31,541,050</b>	

<sup>1</sup> Projects are not listed in priority order. Projects are sorted by category, then fiscal year in which Prop AA funds are needed, then by Sponsor, then by Project Name.

<sup>2</sup> Sponsor abbreviations include San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART), San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), San Francisco Public Works (SFPW), and Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA).

Attachment 3  
Prop AA Project Submissions Evaluation - Street Repair and Reconstruction

Projects	General Prioritization					Street Repair and Reconstruction Prioritization							Total
	Level of Need			Fund Leveraging		Delivery Track Record	Pavement Mgmt System	Bicycle and Transit Networks	Complete Streets Elements				
	Project Readiness	Safety Issues	Const. Coord.	Community Support	Benefits Equity Priority Comms.					Leveraging	No other sources		
Hunters Point, Central Waterfront and Potrero Hill Area Streets Pavement Renovation	2.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.3	2.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.8	0.0	7.8	
Fillmore St Pavement Renovation	1.0	0.0	0.7	0.7	0.4	1.8	0.0	0.7	1.0	1.0	0.4	7.7	
Brotherhood Way, Holloway Ave and Lake Merced Blvd Pavement Renovation	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	1.8	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.0	6.1	
Front St, Sansome St, 1st St and Montgomery St Pavement Renovation	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	1.8	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.8	0.0	6.1	
8th St, Clay St and Levenworth St Pavement Renovation	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	1.8	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.8	0.0	6.0	
Total Possible Score	3	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	15	
Project Scoring Key: Projects were assessed using Transportation Authority Board adopted general and category specific prioritization criteria. Neither the general prioritization criteria nor the category specific criteria were weighted. In general, the more criteria a project satisfied and the better it met them, the higher a project was ranked when staff developed recommendations.													
Project Readiness: Highest possible score was 3. Transportation Authority staff assessed whether a project would be able to be implemented within twelve months of allocation based on the year of request. If Transportation Authority staff were confident a project could progress in that timeframe, it was given a score of 3. Projects requesting funds that did not have some level of community outreach or design complete were given lower scores.													
Project Level of Need - Safety Issues: Highest possible score was 1. Transportation Authority staff assessed whether a project addressed a known safety issue. Projects received a score of 0 if the proposed improvement (e.g. paving, no enhancements) did not address a known safety issue.													
Project Level of Need - Construction Coordination: Highest possible score was 1. Transportation Authority staff assessed whether a project was being actively coordinated with a construction project. Projects received a score of 0 if they were not trying to take advantage of time sensitive construction coordination opportunities.													
Project Community Support: Highest possible score was 2. Projects with clear and diverse community support as evidenced by letters of support or other information in the applications and/or developed out of a community-based planning process (e.g. community-based transportation plan, Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program effort) received points from this criterion.													
Benefits Equity Priority Communities: Highest possible score was 1. Projects clearly intended to benefit an Equity Priority Community, whether geographically located within such a community or serving the population of an Equity Priority Community, received points from this criterion.													
Fund Leveraging: Highest possible score was 2. Transportation Authority staff assessed whether a project demonstrated leveraging of Prop AA funds. Projects that were able to demonstrate at least 20% leveraging received 2 points. Projects that could demonstrate leveraging less than 20% received 1 point. Projects that could not demonstrate leveraging received a score of 0.													
Fund Leveraging - No Other Sources: Highest possible score was 1. Transportation Authority staff assessed whether a project would compete poorly to receive Prop K or other discretionary funds. (e.g. Project has no/few funding options.) These projects received a score of 1.													
Project Delivery Track Record: Highest possible score was 1. Transportation Authority staff considered the project sponsor past delivery track record of Transportation Authority-programmed funds or capital projects funded by other means for new/infrequent project sponsors.													
Pavement Management System: Highest possible score was 1. Transportation Authority staff assessed whether the project was based on an industry-standard pavement management system designed to inform cost effective roadway maintenance.													
Bicycle and Transit Networks: Highest possible score was 1. Transportation Authority staff assessed whether the project would improve streets located on San Francisco’s bicycle and transit networks.													
Complete Streets Elements: Highest possible score was 1. Transportation Authority staff assessed whether the project includes at least a minimal level of enhancement over previous conditions and that directly benefit multiple system users regardless of fund source.													

**Attachment 3**  
**Prop AA Project Submissions Evaluation - Pedestrian Safety**

General Prioritization														Pedestrian Prioritization			
Projects	Level of Need			Community Support	Benefits Equity Priority Comms.	Fund Leveraging			Delivery Track Record	Reduce Hazards	Vision Zero Network	SWITRS	Improve Transit & School Access	Total			
	Readiness	Safety Issues	CON Coord.			Leveraging	No other sources										
Howard Streetscape Pedestrian Safety Project	2.0	1.0	0.5	2.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	0.8	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	15.3				
Central Embarcadero Safety Project	1.8	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.5	1.0	0.0	0.8	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	13.1				
Bayview Community Multimodal Corridor Project	1.7	1.0	0.0	2.0	1.0	1.5	0.0	1.0	2.0	0.5	0.0	1.3	12.0				
Innes Avenue Sidewalk Improvements	2.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.2	1.0	2.0	0.5	0.0	2.0	11.7				
Oakdale Lighting Improvements Project Phase 1	2.0	0.7	0.0	2.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.8	0.0	1.0	2.0	11.5				
Japantown Buchanan Mall Improvements	1.8	0.5	0.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	1.0	0.7	0.5	1.0	1.0	10.5				
Southern Embarcadero Safety Project	1.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.8	1.7	1.0	1.0	1.0	10.5				
Total Possible Score	3	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	2	19				
Project Scoring Key: Projects were assessed using Transportation Authority Board adopted general and category specific prioritization criteria. Neither the general prioritization criteria nor the category specific criteria were weighted. In general, the more criteria a project satisfied and the better it met them, the higher a project was ranked when staff developed recommendations.																	
Project Readiness: Highest possible score was 3. Transportation Authority staff assessed whether a project would be able to be implemented within twelve months of allocation based on the year of request. If Transportation Authority staff were confident a project could progress in that timeframe, it was given a score of 3. Projects requesting funds that did not have some level of community outreach or design complete were given lower scores.																	
Project Level of Need - Safety Issues: Highest possible score was 1. Transportation Authority staff assessed whether a project addressed a known safety issue. Projects received a score of 0 if the proposed improvement (e.g. paving, no enhancements) did not address a known safety issue.																	
Project Level of Need - Construction Coordination: Highest possible score was 1. Transportation Authority staff assessed whether a project was being actively coordinated with a construction project. Projects received a score of 0 if they were not trying to take advantage of time sensitive construction coordination opportunities.																	
Project Community Support: Highest possible score was 2. Projects with clear and diverse community support as evidenced by letters of support or other information in the applications and/or developed out of a community-based planning process (e.g. community-based transportation plan, Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program effort) received points from this criterion.																	
Benefits Equity Priority Communities: Highest possible score was 1. Projects clearly intended to benefit an Equity Priority Community, whether geographically located within such a community or serving the population of an Equity Priority Community, received points from this criterion.																	
Fund Leveraging: Highest possible score was 2. Transportation Authority staff assessed whether a project demonstrated leveraging of Prop AA funds. Projects that were able to demonstrate at least 20% leveraging received 2 points. Projects that could demonstrate leveraging less than 20% received 1 point. Projects that could not demonstrate leveraging received a score of 0.																	
Fund Leveraging - No Other Sources: Highest possible score was 1. Transportation Authority staff assessed whether a project would compete poorly to receive Prop K or other discretionary funds. (e.g. Project has no/few funding options.) These projects received a score of 1.																	
Project Delivery Track Record: Highest possible score was 1. Transportation Authority staff considered the project sponsor past delivery track record of Transportation Authority-programmed funds or capital projects funded by other means for new/infrequent project sponsors.																	
Reduce Hazards: Transportation Authority staff assessed whether the project proposed improvements that would shorten crossing distances, minimize conflicts with other modes, and reduce pedestrian hazards.																	
Vision Zero High Injury Network: Highest possible score was 1. Transportation Authority staff assessed whether the project was located along the Vision Zero High Injury Network. Projects that were located along the network received 1 point Projects that were only partially located on the network received 0.5.																	
California Highway Patrol, Statewide Integrated Traffic Reporting System (SWITRS) 2012 to 2017: Transportation Authority staff analyzed the number of pedestrian injuries/collisions using SWITRS. Scores are calculated based on the total number of collisions for all intersections in the project scope divided by the total number of intersections. Projects with an average of 1 to 2 collisions per intersection received 1 point. Projects with more than 2 collisions per intersection received 2 points.																	
Improve Transit and School Access: Highest possible score was 2. Transportation Authority staff assessed whether the project would improve access to transit and/or schools. Projects could receive a point for addressing each.																	

Attachment 3  
Prop AA Project Submissions Evaluation - Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvement

Projects	General Prioritization					Transit Prioritization							
	Level of Need			Fund Leveraging		Leveraging	No other sources	Delivery Track Record	Support Rapid Transit	Accessibility, Reliability, Connectivity	TDM	Safety	Total
	Readiness	Safety Issues	CON Coord.	Community Support	Benefits Equity Priority Comms.								
Elevator Modernization Project, Phase 1.3, Powell Street and Civic Center/UN Plaza Stations	2.3	1.0	0.7	1.5	1.0	2.0	0.0	0.7	1.0	2.0	0.0	1.0	13.2
M-Oceanview Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements	2.3	1.0	0.0	1.3	1.0	2.0	0.0	0.4	1.0	3.0	0.0	1.0	13.0
29 Sunset Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements	2.0	1.0	0.0	1.2	1.0	2.0	0.0	0.4	1.0	3.0	0.0	1.0	12.6
Salesforce Transit Center Wayfinding Phase 1	3.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.7	0.3	0.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	0.2	9.4
Total Possible Score	3	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	3	3	1	20
Project Scoring Key: Projects were assessed using Transportation Authority Board adopted general and category specific prioritization criteria. Neither the general prioritization criteria nor the category specific criteria were weighted. In general, the more criteria a project satisfied and the better it met them, the higher a project was ranked when staff developed recommendations.													
Project Readiness: Highest possible score was 3. Transportation Authority staff assessed whether a project would be able to be implemented within twelve months of allocation based on the year of request. If Transportation Authority staff were confident a project could progress in that timeframe, it was given a score of 3. Projects requesting funds that did not have some level of community outreach or design complete were													
Project Level of Need - Safety Issues: Highest possible score was 1. Transportation Authority staff assessed whether a project addressed a known safety issue. Projects received a score of 0 if the proposed improvement (e.g. paving, no enhancements) did not address a known safety issue.													
Project Level of Need - Construction Coordination: Highest possible score was 1. Transportation Authority staff assessed whether a project was being actively coordinated with a construction project. Projects received a score of 0 if they were not trying to take advantage of time sensitive construction coordination opportunities.													
Project Community Support: Highest possible score was 2. Projects with clear and diverse community support as evidenced by letters of support or other information in the applications and/or developed out of a community-based planning process (e.g. community-based transportation plan, Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program effort) received points from this criterion.													
Benefits Equity Priority Communities: Highest possible score was 1. Projects clearly intended to benefit an Equity Priority Community, whether geographically located within such a community or serving the population of an Equity Priority Community, received points from this criterion.													
Fund Leveraging: Highest possible score was 2. Transportation Authority staff assessed whether a project demonstrated leveraging of Prop AA funds. Projects that were able to demonstrate at least 20% leveraging received 2 points. Projects that could demonstrate leveraging less than 20% received 1 point. Projects that could not demonstrate leveraging received a score of 0.													
Fund Leveraging - No Other Sources: Highest possible score was 1. Transportation Authority staff assessed whether a project would compete poorly to receive Prop K or other discretionary funds. (e.g. Project has no/few funding options.) These projects received a score of 1.													
Project Delivery Track Record: Highest possible score was 1. Transportation Authority staff considered the project sponsor past delivery track record of Transportation Authority-programmed funds or capital projects funded by other means for new/infrequent project sponsors.													
Support Rapid Transit: Highest possible score was 1. Transportation Authority staff assessed whether the project supported existing or proposed rapid transit.													
Increase Accessibility, Reliability, and Connectivity: Highest possible score was 3. Transportation Authority staff assessed whether the project increased accessibility, reliability, and/or connectivity. A project could receive a point for each.													
Transportation Demand Management: Highest possible score was 3. Transportation Authority staff assessed whether the project was a TDM project and awarded one point, if so. Staff awarded a second point to TDM projects directed at relieving documented congestion or transit crowding issues on one or more specific corridors. Staff awarded a third point to TDM projects based on model projects that have previously been successfully implemented with documented effectiveness.													
Safety Issues: Highest possible score was 1. Transportation Authority staff assessed whether a project addressed a known safety issue. Projects received a score of 0 if the proposed improvement did not address a documented safety issue.													

Score	Project Name	Sponsor <sup>2</sup>	Phase(s)	Total Project Cost	Prop AA Requested	Recommended Prop AA Programming	Notes
7.8	Hunters Point, Central Waterfront and Potrero Hill Area Streets Pavement Renovation	SFPW	Construction	\$3,900,000	\$2,882,492	\$2,882,492	Recommend amount requested.
7.7	Fillmore St Pavement Renovation	SFPW	Construction	\$5,060,000	\$2,360,572	\$2,360,572	Recommend amount requested.
6.1	Brotherhood Way, Holloway Ave and Lake Merced Blvd Pavement Renovation	SFPW	Construction	\$4,840,000	\$2,360,572	\$2,360,572	Recommend amount requested.
6.1	Front St, Sansome St, 1st St and Montgomery St Pavement Renovation	SFPW	Construction	\$4,180,000	\$2,360,572	\$1,860,572	Recommend \$500,000 less than requested to allow us to partially fund Japantown Buchanan Mall Improvements. Recommendation is supported by SFPW. SFPW will identify other funds to fully fund this project.
6.0	8th St, Clay St and Levenworth St Pavement Renovation	SFPW	Construction	\$3,850,000	\$2,360,572	\$2,360,572	Recommend amount requested.
	Subtotal			\$21,830,000	\$12,324,780	\$11,824,780	
	Street Repair and Reconstruction Category Target Programming Amount					\$12,324,780	

Attachment 4.  
2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan  
Draft Programming Recommendations<sup>1</sup>

**Pedestrian Safety Category**

Score	Project Name	Sponsor <sup>2</sup>	Phase(s)	Total Project Cost	Prop AA Requested	Recommended Prop AA Programming	Notes
15.3	Howard Streetscape Pedestrian Safety Project	SFMTA	Construction	\$47,941,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	<b>Recommend amount requested.</b>
13.1	Central Embarcadero Safety Project	SFMTA	Construction	\$8,600,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	<b>Recommend amount requested.</b>
12.0	Bayview Community Multimodal Corridor Project	SFMTA	Construction	\$19,290,990	\$1,000,000	\$598,915	<b>Recommend partial funding.</b> Although this is higher scoring than other projects, since funds are not needed until FY 26/27, we are recommending partial funding to fund projects that are ready to advance sooner. This project is expected to be very competitive for state and federal funding sources, such as the state Active Transportation Program. This project could also compete for future Prop AA funds available through a mid-cycle call for projects or the next Strategic Plan update.
11.7	Innes Avenue Sidewalk Improvements	SFPW	Design, Construction	\$1,248,900	\$851,000	\$851,000	<b>Recommend amount requested.</b>
11.5	Oakdale Lighting Improvements Project Phase 1	SFPW	Design, Construction	\$1,974,000	\$1,974,000	\$1,974,000	<b>Recommend amount requested.</b> This project scored lower than other projects, however, Prop AA is one of the few funding sources available for stand alone pedestrian-scale lighting projects. The project is ready to proceed once funds are available.
10.5	Japantown Buchanan Mall Improvements	SFPW	Design, Construction	\$7,700,000	\$1,350,000	\$500,000	<b>Recommend partial funding</b> for pedestrian safety elements, including pedestrian-scale lighting, curb ramps, and sidewalk improvements. SFPW supports using \$500,000 from the Street Repair and Reconstruction category to make funds available for this project since paving has other funding options while there are limited funding opportunities for improvements to the Japantown Mall.

Score	Project Name	Sponsor <sup>2</sup>	Phase(s)	Total Project Cost	Prop AA Requested	Recommended Prop AA Programming	Notes
10.5	Southern Embarcadero Safety Project	SFMTA	Construction	\$5,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$0	<b>Not recommended for Prop AA funds</b> at this time. This project demonstrated lower readiness than other projects. This project could compete for future Prop AA funds available through a mid-cycle call for projects, the next Strategic Plan update or other funds sources since funds are not needed until FY 2025/26..
			Subtotal	\$ 91,754,890	\$8,175,000	\$5,923,915	
			Pedestrian Safety Category Target Programming Amount			\$5,423,915	

Attachment 4.  
2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan  
Draft Programming Recommendations<sup>1</sup>

**Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements Category**

Score	Project Name	Sponsor <sup>2</sup>	Phase(s)	Total Project Cost	Prop AA Requested	Recommended Prop AA Programming	Notes
13.2	Elevator Modernization Project, Phase 1.3, Powell Street and Civic Center/UN Plaza Stations	BART	Construction	\$16,087,500	\$5,741,270	\$3,441,270	<p><b>Recommend partial funding</b> to support a greater geographic spread of Prop AA projects. BART has agreed to request \$1,290,000 in programmed Prop K funds for this scope to supplement Prop AA. Prop AA funds shall be considered as counting evenly towards BART and SFMTA's fifty-fifty share of the overall project cost.</p> <p><b>Special Condition:</b> Prior to allocation of Prop AA funds, BART and SFMTA shall confirm that the agencies are in agreement on cost sharing and funding strategy for the project, as well as overall scope and schedule.</p>
13.1	M Oceanview Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements	SFMTA	Design	\$26,675,258	\$2,000,000	\$1,000,000	<p><b>Recommend fully funding with a combination of \$1 million in Prop AA funds and \$1 million in Prop K funds</b> in order to fund a wider geographic spread of Prop AA projects. The recommendation includes concurrent amendment of the Prop K Bus Rapid Transit/Transit Preferential Streets/Muni Metro Network and Transit Enhancements 5-Year Prioritization Programs to reprogram funds from Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program (NTIP) placeholders to this project. With this amendment, we continue to have enough NTIP funds programmed to fulfill the commitments to each district. Recommended funds leverage a \$20 million state grant for construction.</p>

**Attachment 4.**  
**2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan**  
**Draft Programming Recommendations<sup>1</sup>**

Score	Project Name	Sponsor <sup>2</sup>	Phase(s)	Total Project Cost	Prop AA Requested	Recommended Prop AA Programming	Notes
12.6	29 Sunset Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements	SFMTA	Design, Construction	\$22,595,696	\$3,000,000	\$1,000,000	<b>Recommend full funding for the design phase.</b> We are not recommending funding for construction at this time due to the need to strengthen the funding plan, which contains a large proportion of to be determined sources. We expect this project will be very competitive for federal and state grants.
9.4	Salesforce Transit Center Wayfinding Phase 1	TJPA	Construction	\$1,361,700	\$300,000	\$300,000	<b>Recommend amount requested.</b>
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>\$66,720,154</b>	<b>\$11,041,270</b>	<b>\$5,741,270</b>	
<b>Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements Category Target Programming Amount</b>						<b>\$5,741,270</b>	

	Total Project Cost	Prop AA Requested	Recommended Prop AA Programming
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 180,305,044</b>	<b>\$ 31,541,050</b>	<b>\$ 23,489,965</b>
<b>TOTAL Available</b>			<b>\$23,489,965</b>

<sup>1</sup> Projects are sorted by evaluation score from highest ranked to lowest. Total possible score varies by category.

<sup>2</sup> Sponsor abbreviations include San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART), San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), San Francisco Public Works (SFPW), and Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA).

**Attachment 5.**  
**2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan**  
**Programming and Allocations**  
 Pending Approval 4/26/2022

Project Name	Sponsor	Phase	Fiscal Year 2022/23	Fiscal Year 2023/24	Fiscal Year 2024/25	Fiscal Year 2025/26	Fiscal Year 2026/27	5-Year Total
<b>Street Repair and Reconstruction</b>								
<b>Target Funds Available in Category</b>			<b>\$ 2,686,679</b>	<b>\$ 2,409,525</b>	<b>\$ 2,409,525</b>	<b>\$ 2,409,525</b>	<b>\$ 2,409,525</b>	<b>\$ 12,324,780</b>
Hunters Point, Central Waterfront and Potrero Hill Area Streets Pavement Renovation	SFPW	Construction	\$ 2,882,492					\$ 2,882,492
8th St, Clay St and Levenworth St Pavement Renovation	SFPW	Construction		\$ 2,360,572				\$ 2,360,572
Brotherhood Way, Holloway Ave and Lake Merced Blvd Pavement Renovation	SFPW	Construction			\$ 2,360,572			\$ 2,360,572
Front St, Sansome St, 1st St and Montgomery St Pavement Renovation	SFPW	Construction				\$ 1,860,572		\$ 1,860,572
Fillmore St Pavement Renovation	SFPW	Construction					\$ 2,360,572	\$ 2,360,572
<b>Subtotal Programmed to Category (% all time)</b>			<b>\$ 2,882,492</b>	<b>\$ 2,360,572</b>	<b>\$ 2,360,572</b>	<b>\$ 1,860,572</b>	<b>\$ 2,360,572</b>	<b>\$ 11,824,780</b>
<b>Cumulative Remaining Capacity</b>			<b>\$ (195,813)</b>	<b>\$ (146,860)</b>	<b>\$ (97,906)</b>	<b>\$ 451,047</b>	<b>\$ 500,000</b>	<b>\$ 500,000</b>
<b>Pedestrian Safety</b>								
<b>Target Funds Available in Category</b>			<b>\$ 1,182,359</b>	<b>\$ 1,060,389</b>	<b>\$ 1,060,389</b>	<b>\$ 1,060,389</b>	<b>\$ 1,060,389</b>	<b>\$ 5,423,915</b>
Japantown Buchanan Mall Improvements	SFPW	Design	\$ 100,000					\$ 100,000
Japantown Buchanan Mall Improvements	SFPW	Construction		\$ 400,000				\$ 400,000
Oakdale Lighting Improvements Project Phase 1	SFPW	Design	\$ 324,000					\$ 324,000
Oakdale Lighting Improvements Project Phase 1	SFPW	Construction		\$ 1,650,000				\$ 1,650,000
Innes Avenue Sidewalk Improvements	SFPW	Design	\$ 179,000					\$ 179,000
Innes Avenue Sidewalk Improvements	SFPW	Construction		\$ 672,000				\$ 672,000
Central Embarcadero Safety Project	SFMTA	Construction		\$ 1,000,000				\$ 1,000,000
Howard Streetscape Pedestrian Safety Project	SFMTA	Construction		\$ 1,000,000				\$ 1,000,000
Bayview Community Multimodal Corridor Project	SFMTA	Construction					\$ 598,915	\$ 598,915
<b>Subtotal Programmed to Category (% all time)</b>			<b>\$ 603,000</b>	<b>\$ 4,722,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 598,915</b>	<b>\$ 5,923,915</b>
<b>Cumulative Remaining Capacity</b>			<b>\$ 579,359</b>	<b>\$ (3,082,252)</b>	<b>\$ (2,021,863)</b>	<b>\$ (961,474)</b>	<b>\$ (500,000)</b>	<b>\$ (500,000)</b>
<b>Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements</b>								
<b>Target Funds Available in Category</b>			<b>\$ 1,251,540</b>	<b>\$ 1,122,433</b>	<b>\$ 1,122,433</b>	<b>\$ 1,122,433</b>	<b>\$ 1,122,433</b>	<b>\$ 5,741,270</b>
M Ocean View Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements	SFMTA	Design	\$ 1,000,000					\$ 1,000,000
29 Sunset Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements	SFMTA	Design	\$ 1,000,000					\$ 1,000,000
Elevator Modernization Project, Phase 1.3, Powell Street and Civic Center/UN Plaza Stations	BART	Construction				\$ 3,441,270		\$ 3,441,270
Salesforce Transit Center Wayfinding Phase 1	TJPA	Construction	\$ 300,000					\$ 300,000
<b>Subtotal Programmed to Category (% all time)</b>			<b>\$ 2,300,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 3,441,270</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 5,741,270</b>
<b>Cumulative Remaining Capacity</b>			<b>\$ (1,048,460)</b>	<b>\$ 73,972</b>	<b>\$ 1,196,405</b>	<b>\$ (1,122,433)</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>
<b>Total Available Funds</b>			<b>\$ 5,120,578</b>	<b>\$ 4,592,347</b>	<b>\$ 4,592,347</b>	<b>\$ 4,592,347</b>	<b>\$ 4,592,347</b>	<b>\$ 23,489,965</b>
<b>Total Programmed</b>			<b>\$ 5,785,492</b>	<b>\$ 7,082,572</b>	<b>\$ 2,360,572</b>	<b>\$ 5,301,842</b>	<b>\$ 2,959,487</b>	<b>\$ 23,489,965</b>
<b>Cumulative Remaining Capacity</b>			<b>\$ (664,914)</b>	<b>\$ (3,155,139)</b>	<b>\$ (923,365)</b>	<b>\$ (1,632,860)</b>	<b>\$ (0)</b>	

Allocated



Pending Action



Notes

## 2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan

## Cash Flow

Pending Approval 4/26/2022

Project Name	Phase	Fiscal Year 2022/23	Fiscal Year 2023/24	Fiscal Year 2024/25	Fiscal Year 2025/26	Fiscal Year 2026/27	Fiscal Year 2027/28	Fiscal Year 2028/29	Total
<b>Street Repair and Reconstruction</b>									
Target Funds Available in Category		\$ 2,686,679	\$ 2,409,525	\$ 2,409,525	\$ 2,409,525	\$ 2,409,525	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,324,780
Hunters Point, Central Waterfront and Potrero Hill Area Streets Pavement Renovation	Construction	\$ 288,249	\$ 1,441,246	\$ 1,152,997					\$ 2,882,492
8th St, Clay St and Levenworth St Pavement Renovation	Construction		\$ 236,057	\$ 1,180,286	\$ 944,229				\$ 2,360,572
Brotherhood Way, Holloway Ave and Lake Merced Blvd Pavement Renovation	Construction			\$236,057	\$1,180,286	\$ 944,229			\$ 2,360,572
Front St, Sansome St, 1st St and Montgomery St Pavement Renovation	Construction				\$ 95,072	\$ 1,470,429	\$ 295,071		\$ 1,860,572
Fillmore St Pavement Renovation	Construction						\$ 1,180,286	\$ 1,180,286	\$ 2,360,572
Cash Flow Subtotal		\$ 288,249	\$ 1,677,303	\$ 2,569,340	\$ 2,219,587	\$ 2,414,658	\$ 1,475,357	\$ 1,180,286	\$ 11,824,780
Cumulative Remaining Capacity		\$ 2,398,430	\$ 3,130,652	\$ 2,970,838	\$ 3,160,776	\$ 3,155,643	\$ 1,680,286	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000
<b>Pedestrian Safety</b>									
Target Funds Available in Category		\$ 1,182,359	\$ 1,060,389	\$ 1,060,389	\$ 1,060,389	\$ 1,060,389	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,423,915
Japantown Buchanan Mall Improvements	Design	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000						\$ 100,000
Japantown Buchanan Mall Improvements	Construction		\$ 100,000	\$ 300,000					\$ 400,000
Oakdale Lighting Improvements Project Phase 1	Design	\$ 259,200	\$ 64,800						\$ 324,000
Oakdale Lighting Improvements Project Phase 1	Construction		\$ 412,500	\$ 1,237,500					\$ 1,650,000
Innes Avenue Sidewalk Improvements	Design	\$ 149,000	\$ 30,000						\$ 179,000
Innes Avenue Sidewalk Improvements	Construction		\$ 336,000	\$ 336,000					\$ 672,000
Central Embarcadero Safety Project	Construction		\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000					\$ 1,000,000
Howard Streetscape Pedestrian Safety Project	Construction			\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000				\$ 1,000,000
Bayview Community Multimodal Corridor Project	Construction					\$ 299,458	\$ 299,457		\$ 598,915
Cash Flow Subtotal		\$ 458,200	\$ 1,493,300	\$ 2,873,500	\$ 500,000	\$ 299,458	\$ 299,457	\$ -	\$ 5,923,915
Cumulative Remaining Capacity		\$ 724,159	\$ 291,248	\$ (1,521,863)	\$ (961,474)	\$ (200,543)	\$ (500,000)	\$ (500,000)	\$ (500,000)
<b>Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements</b>									
Target Funds Available in Category		\$ 1,251,540	\$ 1,122,433	\$ 1,122,433	\$ 1,122,433	\$ 1,122,433	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,741,270
M Ocean View Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements	Design	\$ 340,000	\$ 660,000						\$ 1,000,000
29 Sunset Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements	Design		\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000					\$ 1,000,000
Elevator Modernization Project, Phase 1.3, Powell Street and Civic Center/UN Plaza Stations	Construction				\$ 1,720,635	\$ 1,720,635			\$ 3,441,270
Salesforce Transit Center Wayfinding Phase 1	Construction	\$ 300,000							\$ 300,000
Cash Flow Subtotal		\$ 640,000	\$ 1,160,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 1,720,635	\$ 1,720,635	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,741,270
Cumulative Remaining Capacity		\$ 611,540	\$ 573,972	\$ 1,196,405	\$ 598,202	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Total Available Funds		\$ 5,120,578	\$ 4,592,347	\$ 4,592,347	\$ 4,592,347	\$ 4,592,347			\$ 23,489,965
Total Cashflow		\$ 1,386,449	\$ 4,330,603	\$ 5,942,840	\$ 4,440,222	\$ 4,434,751	\$ 1,774,814	\$ 1,180,286	\$ 23,489,965
Cumulative Remaining Capacity		\$ 3,734,129	\$ 3,995,873	\$ 2,645,379	\$ 2,797,504	\$ 2,955,100	\$ 1,180,286	\$ (0)	

## Attachment 6.

**2019 Prop K 5-Year Project List (FY 2019/20 - FY 2023/24)**  
**Bus Rapid Transit/Transit Preferential Streets/Muni Metro Network Category (EP 1)**  
**Programming and Allocations to Date**  
 Pending April 26, 2022 Board

Agency	Project Name	Phase	Status	Fiscal Year					Total
				2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	
Carry Forward From 2014 5YPP									
SFMTA	Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2)	PS&E	Programmed						\$0
Any Eligible	Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program (NTIP) <sup>2</sup>	PS&E, CON	Pending			\$0			\$0
SFMTA	Muni Forward M Oceanview Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements <sup>2</sup>	PS&E	Pending				\$300,000		\$300,000
Transit Rapid Network - Bus Rapid Transit									
SFMTA	Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2)	PS&E	Programmed						\$0
SFMTA	Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2)	CON	Programmed			\$0			\$0
SFMTA	Muni Forward Placeholder <sup>1</sup>	Any	Programmed			\$3,184,360			\$3,184,360
SFMTA	Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2) <sup>1</sup>	PS&E	Programmed			\$1,000,000			\$1,000,000
SFMTA	Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2) - Quick Build <sup>1</sup>	CON	Programmed			\$675,000			\$675,000
SFMTA	Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2) <sup>1</sup>	CON	Programmed				\$8,325,000		\$8,325,000
SFMTA	5 Fulton Transit Improvements <sup>1</sup>	CON	Programmed			\$1,950,000			\$1,950,000
SFMTA	14 Downtown Mission Transit Improvements <sup>1</sup>	CON	Programmed			\$12,554,233			\$12,554,233
SFMTA	30 Stockton Transit Improvements <sup>1</sup>	CON	Programmed			\$2,495,767			\$2,495,767
Total Programmed in 2019 5YPP				\$0	\$0	\$21,859,360	\$8,625,000	\$0	\$30,484,360
Total Allocated and Pending				\$0	\$0	\$0	\$300,000	\$0	\$300,000
Total Unallocated				\$0	\$0	\$21,859,360	\$8,325,000	\$0	\$30,184,360
Total Programmed in 2021 Strategic Plan				\$0	\$0	\$22,159,360	\$8,325,000	\$0	\$30,484,360
Deobligated Funds						\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Cumulative Remaining Programming Capacity				\$0	\$0	\$300,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Pending Allocation/Appropriation									
Board Approved Allocation/Appropriation									

**FOOTNOTES:**

<sup>1</sup> 2021 Strategic Plan Update and corresponding 5YPP amendment to reprogram \$20,091,311 in FY2019/20 Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2) funds to other Muni Forward projects in FY2021/22 and to update the phases and cash flow for the \$10M that will remain programmed to the Geary project to reflect the updated project cost and schedule.

Add \$3,184,360 for MuniForward - Placeholder in FY2021/22

Add \$1,950,000 for 5 Fulton Transit Improvements construction in FY2021/22.

Add \$12,554,233 for 14 Downtown Mission Transit Improvements construction in FY2021/22.

Add \$2,495,767 for 30 Stockton Transit Improvements construction in FY2021/22.

Reduce Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2) by \$20,091,311, leaving \$1M programmed for design and \$675,000 programmed for Quick Build construction in FY2021/22, and \$8,325,000 programmed for full project construction in FY2022/23.

Reprogram \$93,049 in deobligated funds from projects completed under budget to Muni Forward projects in FY2021/22

<sup>2</sup> Planned 5YPP amendment to fully fund design of Muni Forward M Oceanview Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements Project (Resolution 22-xx 4/26/2022)

NTIP Placeholder (carryover): Reduce from \$300,000 to \$0 in FY2021/22.

Muni Forward M Oceanview Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements: Program project with \$300,000 in FY2022/23 with 100% cash flow in FY2022/23.

**2019 Prop K 5-Year Project List (FY 2019/20 - FY 2023/24)**  
**Bus Rapid Transit/Transit Preferential Streets/Muni Metro Network Category (EP 1)**  
**Cash Flow (Maximum Annual Reimbursement)**  
 Pending April 26, 2022 Board

Project Name	Phase	Fiscal Year							Total
		2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	
Carry Forward From 2014 5YPP									
Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2)	PS&E	\$0	\$0	\$0					\$0
Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program (NTIP) <sup>2</sup>	PS&E, CON			\$0					\$0
Muni Forward M Oceanview Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements <sup>2</sup>	PS&E				\$300,000				\$300,000
Transit Rapid Network - Bus Rapid Transit									
Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2)	PS&E			\$0	\$0				\$0
Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2)	CON				\$0				\$0
Muni Forward Placeholder <sup>1</sup>	Any				\$1,592,180	\$1,592,180			\$3,184,360
Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2) <sup>1</sup>	PS&E			\$0	\$500,000	\$500,000			\$1,000,000
Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2) - Quick Build <sup>1</sup>	CON				\$675,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$675,000
Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2) <sup>1</sup>	CON					\$880,000	\$5,300,000	\$2,145,000	\$8,325,000
5 Fulton Transit Improvements <sup>1</sup>	CON					\$1,950,000			\$1,950,000
14 Downtown Mission Transit Improvements <sup>1</sup>	CON				\$5,485,000	\$5,485,000	\$1,584,233		\$12,554,233
30 Stockton Transit Improvements <sup>1</sup>	CON			\$800,000	\$1,695,767				\$2,495,767
Cash Flow Programmed in 2019 5YPP		\$0	\$0	\$800,000	\$10,247,947	\$10,407,180	\$6,884,233	\$2,145,000	\$30,484,360
Total Cash Flow Allocated and Pending		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$300,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$300,000
Total Cash Flow Unallocated		\$0	\$0	\$800,000	\$9,947,947	\$10,407,180	\$6,884,233	\$2,145,000	\$30,184,360
Total Cash Flow in 2021 Strategic Plan		\$0	\$0	\$1,100,000	\$9,947,947	\$10,407,180	\$6,884,233	\$2,145,000	\$30,484,360
Deobligated Funds		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Cumulative Remaining Cash Flow Capacity		\$0	\$0	\$300,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Pending Allocation/Appropriation									
Board Approved Allocation/Appropriation									

**2019 Prop K 5-Year Project List (FY 2019/20 - FY 2023/24)**  
**Transit Enhancements - (EPs 10-16)**  
**Programming and Allocations to Date**  
 Pending April 26, 2022 Board

Other Transit Enhancements (EP 16)									
Carry Forward From 2014 5YPP									
Any Eligible	NTIP Placeholder <sup>3,9</sup>	Any	Programmed			\$300,000			\$300,000
SFMTA	M Oceanview Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements <sup>9</sup>	PS&E	Pending				\$700,000		\$700,000
	Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2) <sup>4</sup>	CON	Programmed			\$0			\$0
TBD	Transit Enhancements - Placeholder <sup>4</sup>	CON	Programmed			\$2,750,000			\$2,750,000
BART	Market St. / Balboa Park New Elevator Master Plan <sup>5</sup>	PLAN/ CER	Programmed						\$0
BART	Elevator Renovation Program <sup>5</sup>	PS&E	Programmed			\$500,000			\$500,000
SFMTA	Muni Subway Expansion (19th Ave M-line) <sup>1,6</sup>	PLAN/ CER	Programmed						\$0
SFCTA, SFMTA	Geary-19th Avenue Corridor Rail Strategy and Planning (West Side Rail) <sup>6,7</sup>	PLAN/ CER	Planned			\$514,232			\$514,232
SFCTA, SFMTA	Geary-19th Avenue Corridor Rail Strategy and Planning (West Side Rail) <sup>6</sup>	PLAN/ CER	Planned				\$2,027,710		\$2,027,710
SFMTA	Muni Subway Expansion Project Development <sup>1,7</sup>	PLAN/ CER	Allocated	\$965,948					\$965,948
SFMTA, SFCTA	Muni Metro Core Capacity Study <sup>7</sup>	PLAN/ CER	Pending (Prior)			\$1,150,000			\$1,150,000
SFCTA, SFMTA, SF Planning	Geary/19th Ave Subway Strategic Case <sup>8</sup>	PLAN/ CER	Pending (Prior)			\$801,716			\$801,716
Total Programmed in 2019 5YPP				\$965,948	\$0	\$6,015,948	\$2,727,710	\$0	\$9,709,606
Total Allocated and Pending				\$965,948	\$0	\$1,951,716	\$700,000	\$0	\$3,617,664
Total Unallocated				\$0	\$0	\$4,064,232	\$2,027,710	\$0	\$6,091,942
Total Programmed in 2021 Strategic Plan				\$965,948	\$0	\$5,750,000	\$2,027,710	\$0	\$8,743,658
Deobligated Funds						\$965,948	\$0	\$0	\$965,948
Cumulative Remaining Programming Capacity				\$0	\$0	\$700,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Pending Allocation/Appropriation									
Board Approved Allocation/Appropriation									

**FOOTNOTES:**

- <sup>1</sup> Strategic Plan and 5YPP amendments to accommodate allocation of \$965,948 for Muni Subway Expansion Project Development (Resolution 20-009, 09/24/2019).  
Muni Subway Expansion (19th Ave M-line): Reduced by \$965,948 in FY2020/21 planning funds from \$2,744,300 to \$1,778,352  
Muni Subway Expansion Project Development: Added project with \$965,948 in FY2019/20 and advanced cash flow from FY2021/22 to FYs 2019/20 and 2020/21.  
Strategic Plan and 5YPP amendments to the purchase Additional Light Rail Vehicles category (LR-15) to accommodate allocation of \$20,000 for Light Rail Vehicle
- <sup>2</sup> Program revenue reduction of \$20,000 in cash flow from FY2023/24 to FY2021/22; funds must be used for LRV fleet expansion, which will be complete in FY2031/32
- <sup>3</sup> Strategic Plan Update and corresponding 5YPP amendment to delay programming and cash flow to reflect updated project delivery schedule (Resolution 22-020 12/7/2021)
- <sup>4</sup> 5YPP amendment to reprogram \$2,750,000 from Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2) to Transit Enhancements - Placeholder in FY2021/22.
- <sup>5</sup> 5YPP amendment to reprogram \$500,000 from Market St. / Balboa Park New Elevator Master Plan to the Elevator Renovation Program in FY2021/22
- <sup>6</sup> 5YPP amendment to accommodate funding for Geary-19th Avenue Corridor Rail Strategy and Planning (West Side Rail)  
Muni Subway Expansion Project Development: Reduce \$1,778,352 to \$0 in FY2020/21  
Reprogram \$1,749,358 in deobligated funds from Geneva Harney BRT environmental phase  
Geary-19th Avenue Corridor Rail Strategy and Planning (West Side Rail): Add project with \$1,500,000 in FY2021/22 and \$2,027,710 in FY2022/23 planning funds.
- <sup>7</sup> 5YPP amendment to accommodate funding for Muni Metro Core Capacity Study (Resolution 22-0XX, xx/xx/xxxx)  
Geary-19th Avenue Corridor Rail Strategy and Planning (West Side Rail): Reduced by \$184,052 from \$1,500,000 to \$1,315,948.  
Cumulative Remaining Programming Capacity: Reduced from \$965,948 to \$0; these funds were deobligated from Muni Subway Expansion Project Development consistent  
Muni Metro Core Capacity Study: Add project with \$1,150,000 in FY2021/22.
- <sup>8</sup> 5YPP amendment to accommodate Geary/19th Ave Subway Strategic Case (Resolution 22-0XX, xx/xx/xxxx)  
Geary-19th Avenue Corridor Rail Strategy and Planning (West Side Rail): Reduced by \$801,716 from \$1,315,948 to \$514,232.  
Geary/19th Ave Subway Strategic Case: Added project with \$801,716 in FY2021/22.
- <sup>9</sup> Planned 5YPP amendment to fully fund design of Muni Forward M Oceanview Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements Project  
NTIP Placeholder (carryover): Reduce from \$1,000,000 to \$300,000 in FY2021/22.  
Muni Forward M Oceanview Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements: Program project with \$700,000 in FY2023/24.

## 2019 Prop K 5-Year Project List (FY 2019/20 - FY 2023/24)

## Other Transit Enhancements - (EP-16)

## Cash Flow (Maximum Annual Reimbursement)

Pending April 26, 2022 Board

Other Transit Enhancements (EP 16)								
Carry Forward From 2014 5YPP								
NTIP Placeholder <sup>3,9</sup>	Any	\$0	\$0	\$300,000				\$300,000
M Oceanview Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements <sup>9</sup>	PS&E				\$40,000	\$660,000		\$700,000
Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2) <sup>4</sup>	CON			\$0				\$0
Transit Enhancements - Placeholder <sup>4</sup>	CON				\$1,375,000	\$1,375,000		\$2,750,000
Market St. / Balboa Park New Elevator Master Plan <sup>5</sup>	PLAN/ CER	\$0	\$0					\$0
Elevator Renovation Program <sup>5</sup>	PS&E				\$500,000			\$500,000
Muni Subway Expansion (19th Ave M-line) <sup>1,6</sup>	PLAN/ CER			\$0	\$0			\$0
Geary-19th Avenue Corridor Rail Strategy and Planning (West Side Rail) <sup>6,7</sup>	PLAN/ CER			\$500,000	\$14,232	\$0	\$0	\$514,232
Geary-19th Avenue Corridor Rail Strategy and Planning (West Side Rail) <sup>6</sup>	PLAN/ CER			\$0	\$200,000	\$1,100,000	\$727,710	\$2,027,710
Muni Subway Expansion Project Development <sup>1,7</sup>	PLAN/ CER	\$482,974	\$482,974					\$965,948
Muni Metro Core Capacity Study <sup>7</sup>	PLAN/ CER			\$250,000	\$615,000	\$285,000		\$1,150,000
Geary/19th Ave Subway Strategic Case <sup>8</sup>	PLAN/ CER			\$100,000	\$701,716			\$801,716
<b>Cash Flow Programmed in 2019 5YPP</b>		\$482,974	\$482,974	\$1,150,000	\$3,445,948	\$3,420,000	\$727,710	\$9,709,606
<b>Total Cash Flow Allocated and Pending</b>		\$482,974	\$482,974	\$350,000	\$1,356,716	\$945,000	\$0	\$3,617,664
<b>Total Cash Flow Unallocated</b>		\$0	\$0	\$800,000	\$2,089,232	\$2,475,000	\$727,710	\$6,091,942
<b>Total Cash Flow in 2021 Strategic Plan</b>		\$482,974	\$482,974	\$1,600,000	\$2,975,000	\$2,475,000	\$727,710	\$8,743,658
<b>Deobligated Funds</b>		\$0	\$0	\$965,948	\$0	\$0		\$965,948
<b>Cumulative Remaining Cash Flow Capacity</b>		\$0	\$0	\$1,415,948	\$945,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Pending Allocation/Appropriation								
Board Approved Allocation/Appropriation								



RESOLUTION ALLOCATING \$645,108 AND APPROPRIATING \$557,156 IN PROP K FUNDS,  
WITH CONDITIONS, FOR TWO REQUESTS

WHEREAS, The Transportation Authority received two requests for a total of \$1,202,264 in Prop K local transportation sales tax funds, as summarized in Attachments 1 and 2 and detailed in the attached allocation request forms; and

WHEREAS, The requests seek funds from the Transit Enhancements and Pedestrian and Bicycle Facility Maintenance categories of the Prop K Expenditure Plan; and

WHEREAS, As required by the voter-approved Expenditure Plans, the Transportation Authority Board has adopted a Prop K 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPP) for each of the aforementioned Expenditure Plan programmatic categories; and

WHEREAS, One of the two requests is consistent with the 5YPP for its Expenditure Plan category; and

WHEREAS, The request for the Geary/19th Ave Subway Strategic Case requires amendment of the Transit Enhancements 5YPP as detailed in the attached allocation request form; and

WHEREAS, After reviewing the requests, Transportation Authority staff recommended allocating a total of \$645,108 in Prop K funds and appropriating \$557,156, with conditions, for two requests, as described in Attachment 3 and detailed in the attached allocation request forms, which include staff recommendations for Prop K allocation and appropriation amounts, required deliverables, timely use of funds requirements, special conditions, and Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules; and

WHEREAS, There are sufficient funds in the Capital Expenditures line item of the Transportation Authority's amended Fiscal Year 2021/22 budget to cover the proposed actions; and

WHEREAS, At its March 23, 2022 meeting, the Community Advisory Committee was briefed on the subject request and unanimously adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority hereby amends the Prop K Transit Enhancements 5YPP, as detailed in the attached allocation request form; and be it further



RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority hereby allocates \$645,108 and appropriates \$557,156 in Prop K funds, with conditions, for two requests, as summarized in Attachment 3 and detailed in the attached allocation request forms; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority finds the allocation of these funds to be in conformance with the priorities, policies, funding levels, and prioritization methodologies established in the Prop K Expenditure Plan, the Prop K Strategic Plan and the relevant 5YPPs; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority hereby authorizes the actual expenditure (cash reimbursement) of funds for these activities to take place subject to the Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules detailed in the attached allocation request forms; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Capital Expenditures line item for subsequent fiscal year annual budgets shall reflect the maximum reimbursement schedule amounts adopted and the Transportation Authority does not guarantee reimbursement levels higher than those adopted; and be it further

RESOLVED, That as a condition of this authorization for expenditure, the Executive Director shall impose such terms and conditions as are necessary for the project sponsors to comply with applicable law and adopted Transportation Authority policies and execute Standard Grant Agreements to that effect; and be it further

RESOLVED, That as a condition of this authorization for expenditure, the project sponsors shall provide the Transportation Authority with any other information it may request regarding the use of the funds hereby authorized; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Capital Improvement Program of the Congestion Management Program, the Prop K Strategic Plan and the relevant 5YPPs are hereby amended, as appropriate.

**Attachments:**

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

## Attachment 1: Summary of Requests Received

						Leveraging		Phase(s) Requested	District(s)
Source	EP Line No./ Category <sup>1</sup>	Project Sponsor <sup>2</sup>	Project Name	Current Prop K Request	Total Cost for Requested Phase(s)	Expected Leveraging by EP Line <sup>3</sup>	Actual Leveraging by Project Phase(s) <sup>4</sup>		
Prop K	16	SFCTA, SFMTA, SF Planning	Geary/19th Ave Subway Strategic Case	\$ 802,264	\$ 802,264	74%	0%	Planning	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11
Prop K	37	SFMTA	Bicycle Facility Maintenance	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	48%	0%	Construction	Citywide
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>\$ 1,202,264</b>	<b>\$ 1,202,264</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>0%</b>		

## Footnotes

<sup>1</sup> "EP Line No./Category" is either the Prop K Expenditure Plan line number referenced in the 2021 Prop K Strategic Plan or the Prop AA Expenditure Plan category referenced in the 2017 Prop AA Strategic Plan, including: Street Repair and Reconstruction (Street), Pedestrian Safety (Ped), and Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements (Transit) or the Traffic Congestion Mitigation Tax (TNC Tax) category referenced in the Program Guidelines.

<sup>2</sup> Acronyms: SFCTA (San Francisco County Transportation Authority); SFMTA (San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency); SF Planning (San Francisco Planning Department)

<sup>3</sup> "Expected Leveraging By EP Line" is calculated by dividing the total non-Prop K funds expected to be available for a given Prop K Expenditure Plan line item (e.g. Pedestrian Circulation and Safety) by the total expected funding for that Prop K Expenditure Plan line item over the 30-year Expenditure Plan period. For example, expected leveraging of 90% indicates that on average non-Prop K funds should cover 90% of the total costs for all projects in that category, and Prop K should cover only 10%.

<sup>4</sup> "Actual Leveraging by Project Phase" is calculated by dividing the total non-Prop K, non-Prop AA, or non-TNC Tax funds in the funding plan by the total cost for the requested phase or phases. If the percentage in the "Actual Leveraging" column is lower than in the "Expected Leveraging" column, the request (indicated by yellow highlighting) is leveraging fewer non-Prop K dollars than assumed in the Expenditure Plan. A project that is well leveraged overall may have lower-than-expected leveraging for an individual or partial phase.

Attachment 2: Brief Project Descriptions <sup>1</sup>

EP Line No./ Category	Project Sponsor	Project Name	Prop K Funds Requested	Project Description
16	SFCTA, SFMTA, SF Planning	Geary/19th Ave Subway Strategic Case	\$ 802,264	The ConnectSF Transit Investment Strategy identifies a rail subway along the Geary and 19th Avenue corridors as a long-term transit expansion priority for San Francisco and the region. Planning and development of the Geary-19th Avenue Subway will be a multi-phase process, occurring over a period of years. This request supports the first phase of work, known as the Strategic Case. The Strategic Case will be a joint initiative of SFCTA and SFMTA, in collaboration with the SF Planning Department. <u>Request includes an appropriation of \$557,156 as well as allocations of \$170,367 and \$74,741 for SFMTA and SF Planning, respectively.</u> The purpose of the Strategic Case phase is to establish the worthiness of the project and to identify the building blocks needed to deliver the project, including future scopes of work, roles and responsibilities, and key analysis questions that must be addressed. This study will produce two key deliverables: a public-facing documentation of the key benefits of and issues to be addressed in the planning, design, and implementation of a rail investment in the Geary-19th Avenue corridor, and an internal scoping document that details the scope of work for alternatives analysis, refinement, and selection, including roles and responsibilities. This study is expected to occur over 12 to 18 months, with a final report presented to the Board for approval in mid-2023.
37	SFMTA	Bicycle Facility Maintenance	\$ 400,000	Requested funds will be used to maintain bicycle facilities to preserve their safety features. The SFMTA Paint Shop will repaint bicycle lanes using green epoxy and repaint bike box/mixed zone facilities using green thermoplastic treatment. SFMTA will also use the funds to replace plastic lane delineators along buffered bikeways. SFMTA prioritizes bicycle facility maintenance based upon field review by Livable Streets and Shops staff, public requests specifically on the protected bikeway network, and where quick build projects are implemented. Requests for maintenance may be made by calling 311 or at SF311.org. SFMTA expects to utilize requested funds by December 2024.
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$1,202,264</b>	

<sup>1</sup> See Attachment 1 for footnotes.

Attachment 3: Staff Recommendations <sup>1</sup>

SHEET



EP Line No./ Category	Project Sponsor	Project Name	Prop K Funds Recommended	Recommendations
16	SFCTA, SFMTA, SF Planning	Geary/19th Ave Subway Strategic Case	\$ 802,264	<b>5YPP amendment.</b> Recommendation requires a Transit Enhancements 5YPP amendment to reprogram \$801,716 to the subject project from the placeholder for Geary-19th Avenue Corridor Rail Strategy and Planning (West Side Rail) .
37	SFMTA	Bicycle Facility Maintenance	\$ 400,000	
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$ 1,202,264</b>	

<sup>1</sup> See Attachment 1 for footnotes.

Attachment 4.  
Prop K Allocation Summary - FY2021/22

PROP K SALES TAX						
FY2021/22	Total	FY 2021/22	FY 2022/23	FY 2023/24	FY 2024/25	FY 2025/26
Prior Allocations	\$ 51,358,576	\$ 17,478,139	\$ 21,316,684	\$ 9,378,632	\$ 2,301,909	\$ 883,212
Current Request(s)	\$ 1,202,264	\$ 100,068	\$ 752,196	\$ 310,000	\$ 40,000	\$ -
New Total Allocations	\$ 52,560,840	\$ 17,578,207	\$ 22,068,880	\$ 9,688,632	\$ 2,341,909	\$ 883,212

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



## San Francisco County Transportation Authority Allocation Request Form

<b>FY of Allocation Action:</b>	FY2021/22
<b>Project Name:</b>	Geary/19th Ave Subway Strategic Case
<b>Grant Recipient:</b>	San Francisco County Transportation Authority

### EXPENDITURE PLAN INFORMATION

<b>PROP K Expenditure Plans</b>	Other Transit Enhancements
<b>Current PROP K Request:</b>	\$802,264
<b>Supervisory Districts</b>	District 01, District 02, District 03, District 04, District 05, District 06, District 07, District 11

### REQUEST

#### Brief Project Description

The ConnectSF Transit Investment Strategy identifies a rail subway along the Geary and 19th Avenue corridors as a long-term transit expansion priority for San Francisco and the region. Planning and development of the Geary-19th Avenue Subway will be a multi-phase process, occurring over a period of years. This request supports the first phase of work, known as the Strategic Case. The purpose of the Strategic Case phase is to establish the worthiness of the Project and to identify the building blocks needed to deliver the project.

#### Detailed Scope, Project Benefits and Community Outreach

See attached.

#### Project Location

Geary Corridor from Market Street to a point between Divisadero and Park Presidio, south to Judah/19th, south along 19th Ave corridor to Daly City BART

#### Project Phase(s)

Planning/Conceptual Engineering (PLAN)

**5YPP/STRATEGIC PLAN INFORMATION**

<b>Type of Project in the Prop K 5YPP/Prop AA Strategic Plan?</b>	Project Drawn from Placeholder
<b>Is requested amount greater than the amount programmed in the relevant 5YPP or Strategic Plan?</b>	Greater than Programmed Amount
<b>Prop K 5YPP Amount:</b>	\$0

**Justification for Necessary Amendment**

Request includes a 5YPP amendment to reprogram \$801,716 to the subject project from the placeholder for Geary-19th Avenue Corridor Rail Strategy and Planning (West Side Rail) in the Transit Enhancements category of the Prop K Expenditure Plan.

## **Geary/19th Avenue Subway Strategic Case**

### **DRAFT Scope of Work**

**Revised: March 17, 2022**

#### **Background**

The ConnectSF Transit Strategy identifies a rail subway along the Geary and 19th Avenue corridors as a long-term transit expansion priority for San Francisco and the region.

Planning and development of the Geary-19th Avenue Subway (the Project) will be a multi-phase process, occurring over a period of years. At the May 25, 2021, meeting of the SFCTA Board, Commissioner Melgar requested that staff prepare a West Side Subway Strategy, with the goal of better connecting the west side to major transportation corridors in San Francisco and the region.

This document summarizes the activities planned for the first phase of planning and development for the Project. This phase is referred to as the Strategic Case.

#### **Strategic Case: Purpose and Objectives**

The purpose of the Strategic Case phase is to establish the worthiness of the Project and to identify the building blocks of Project success. Specific objectives for this phase are to:

- Confirm the Project technical concepts to be advanced into Alternatives Analysis;
- Describe the broad benefits, costs, and rationale for the Project;
- Identify the constituent pieces of an eventual strategy to deliver the Project, including outreach, funding, system integration, supportive policies, etc.;
- Undertake initial technical coordination and policy engagement with local and regional partner agencies;
- Develop the work program and governance for the subsequent Alternatives Study phase.

#### **Agency Roles and Timeframe**

The Strategic Case will be a joint initiative of SFCTA and SFMTA, in collaboration with the SF Planning Department. SFCTA will serve as overall technical and management lead for the Strategic Case phase.

Given the Project's interrelationship with the Link21 program, this Strategic Case scope of work will target completion in alignment to Link21 Stage Gate 2, so that the subsequent Alternatives Study can proceed in coordination with Link21's timeline.

#### **Task 1 - Project Management**

Task 1 provides for overall project management and coordination for this phase.

##### **1.1 Project Administration (*Lead: SFCTA*)**

Consultant task order preparation and management, work plan scope/schedule/budget development and tracking. Hosting and documentation of project coordination meetings: internal between SFMTA/SFCTA staff, and consultant progress meetings.

### 1.2 Strategic Case Phase Charter (*Lead: Joint SFMTA/SFCTA*)

Joint SFMTA/SFCTA development of a charter outlining the RASCI (Responsible, Accountable, Supporting, Consulted and Informed) matrix, including responsibilities of each agency, and key parameters for decision-making and working together. Hold a workshop with the consultant team to help finalize the scope/work plan for this study.

### 1.3 Alternatives Study Preparation (*Lead: Joint SFCTA/SFMTA*)

Preparation for next phase of project development, the Alternatives Study phase. Development of Task 1.3 during the Strategic Case phase will include: preparation of draft Project Charter for the Alternatives Study phase, describing agency roles, management structure, executive governance, and decision processes; and development of a preliminary draft scope of work for the Alternatives Study phase, including draft scope for procuring consultant support in the Alternatives Study phase.

#### *Deliverables:*

- Strategic Case Charter
- Strategic Case Work Plan and Schedule
- Alternatives Study Draft Project Charter
- Alternatives Study Draft Scope of Work

## **Task 2 - Initial Planning and Technical Exploration**

This Task encompasses technical work and planning in support of the key output deliverables prepared in Task 4.

### 2.1 Define project parameters, benefits, and costs (*Lead: SFCTA*)

Develop a set of land use, funding, and project assumptions/scenarios for internal sketch-planning purposes. Describe project costs and benefits at a high level, using internal assumptions of potential alignment, cost, and project features.

### 2.2 Initial Planning Framework (*Lead: SFCTA*)

Prepare a high-level planning and evaluation framework, including statement of project goals and objectives. The planning framework will be refined through Task 3.1.

### 2.3 Update ridership modeling (*Lead: SFCTA*)

Building off of the planning-level alignment assumptions drawn from the ConnectSF Transit Corridor Study, which have already been vetted with regional partners, develop initial demand and ridership forecasts for various investment options in the corridor as identified in Task 2.1.

### 2.4 Identify and describe strategy considerations (*Lead: SFCTA, except where noted*)

Focus will be to identify key questions and confirm broad technical concepts to be considered in project development (likely to be underground BART, standard gauge, Muni rail). Pose and outline questions to be answered in subsequent phases of work and develop approach to making inter-related/linked decisions later. The overarching goal in this phase is to identify and explore the building blocks of an eventual integrated strategy for Project viability, fundability, and deliverability. Detailed strategy development and scenario planning would occur in the subsequent Alternatives Study.

Key strategic considerations to describe and preliminarily explore include:

- Strategic risk assessment (risks that could keep project from advancing into subsequent phases of work)

- Initial land use planning assessment and anti-displacement approach (Lead: Planning Department)
  - Land Use Assessment to include:
    - Completion and delivery of new Land Use Allocation (LUA) based on adopted PBA 2050 and draft Housing Element as a baseline for modeling.
    - LUA TAZ-level household and job growth projection data for 2050 and potential intervening analysis years
    - Identification of key land use questions, challenges and opportunities, including:
      - Relative soft site and opportunities for housing, TOD and other future land use considerations for all corridors under consideration, especially in addition to growth already identified in HE/LUA 2050, including implications for stations and support facilities.
      - [This Strategic Case phase Assessment will **not** include actual development of sketch rezoning scenarios, or value capture analysis based on either existing projected growth or additional scenarios].
  - Stabilization & Anti-Displacement Approach to include:
    - Inventory of existing strategies currently employed in SF
    - Identification of potential additional best practices and strategies potentially applicable to this project
    - Inventory of strategies to mitigate construction-related impacts on businesses
    - Summary of key questions, opportunities and challenges
- Existing system constraints/connectivity to be addressed, including consideration of Link21 options and implications for the Project and strategy
- Initial overview of design/operations/maintenance requirements, including yard access (i.e. a list of things that the project must do or have, such as a transfer point on Market Street to the existing BART line)
- Local and regional access benefits and constraints
- Cost/benefit initial assessment
- Financial feasibility and funding options
- Involving and building interest and participation among other jurisdictions, such as San Mateo County

A set of concise technical memoranda and/or appendices will be prepared as needed through Task 2.4, as components of Task 4 deliverables.

*Deliverables:*

- Planning/Evaluation Framework
- Demand Forecasts
- 2050 Land Use Allocation, including TAZ-level household and job growth projections
- Land Use Planning Strategic Assessment, including Anti-Displacement Approach Summary

### Task 3 – Partner Engagement and Public Outreach

This Task provides for engagement and coordination with partner agencies, as well as a limited initial round of public engagement.

SFMTA will lead engagement with other City departments. SFCTA will lead engagement with other jurisdictions (e.g. San Mateo CCAG, Daly City, etc.), Caltrans, and MTC. SFCTA and SFMTA will co-lead engagement with transit operators (BART/CCJPA, Caltrain, Samtrans).

#### 3.1 Project/Partner Coordination and Outreach

##### 3.1.1 Agency Engagement (*Lead: Joint SFMTA/SFCTA*)

Initial round of in-reach with key agencies with jurisdiction, such as other City departments. Goal is to determine interests, needs, and hopefully identify potential project champions. Feedback will be used to help develop the preliminary P&N, and to inform alternatives development in the subsequent Alternatives Study. Develop framework for periodic engagement and involvement of agencies.

##### 3.1.2 Technical, Project, and Policy Coordination (*Lead: Joint SFMTA/SFCTA*)

Additional/focused technical and project coordination as needed to support the Strategic Case phase – e.g., coordination with Link21 project development process.

#### 3.2 Public and Stakeholder Engagement

##### 3.2.1 Public Outreach (*Lead: Joint SFMTA/SFCTA*)

One round of light touch goals and objectives public outreach. The goal is to gauge community interest and, if positive, help make the case to policymakers to support the project. The community feedback will also help build the preliminary Purpose and Need, and will help establish community and stakeholder relationships.

##### 3.2.2 Outreach Summary Writeup/Section (*Lead: Outreach Consultants*)

Documents outreach done in Task 3.3.1, including overview of feedback and how it was incorporated.

#### *Deliverables:*

- Public Outreach Plan
- Public Outreach Summary Report

### Task 4 – Strategic Case Phase Documentation

Task 4 is organized around the two key deliverables for the Strategic Case phase: 1) an external-facing Strategic Case for the Project, which will define the project rationale, goals, and case elements; and 2) a Strategy Groundwork document, which will organize and describe the building blocks of an eventual comprehensive strategy to plan, fund, and deliver the Project.

#### 4.1 Strategic Case Document

#### 4.1.1 Preliminary Purpose and Need Statement (*Lead: Joint SFCTA/SFMTA*)

Draws heavily on Tasks 2.1 and 2.2 to confirm the core “must have” goals for the project, which will be used to develop and screen alternatives in the subsequent Alternatives Study.

#### 4.1.2 Project Benefits (*Lead: SFCTA*)

Compiled analysis/documentation of the benefits of the Project, drawing from Task 2.2, in a way that conveys clear, compelling benefits to the public and that is contextualized with respect to Project costs.

#### 4.1.3 Strategic Case Document (*Lead: SFCTA*)

Prepare a public-facing deliverable to serve as the Strategic Case, including chapters/sections on key case elements – e.g., economic, financial, implementation, policy, etc. – drawing primarily on work developed through other Tasks.

### 4.2 Strategy Groundwork Document

#### 4.2.1 Planning and Policy Evaluation Framework Writeup/Section (*Lead: SFCTA*)

Adds technical detail to the Initial Planning Framework (Task 2.1) and Preliminary Purpose and Need Statement (Task 3.1.1), introducing potential quantitative and qualitative metrics or accounts for future development and screening of alternatives

#### 4.2.2 Financial Feasibility Strategy Paper (*Lead: SFCTA*)

Strategy paper assessing possible avenues for securing project funding, addressing the unique challenge of finding sources for such a large financial need. Innovative strategies such as land banking, P3, value capture, and others should be explored. Funding is a key feasibility question for the Project, which is why this is elevated as a core deliverable for this Strategic Case phase.

#### 4.2.3 Strategy Groundwork Document (*Lead: SFCTA*)

Prepare technical summary document of project strategy, including strategic and technical questions to be addressed in subsequent phases. Document the technical analysis, outcomes, questions, and areas for further study from Task 2, includes a section on public outreach results from Task 3.

#### *Deliverables:*

- Strategic Case, including need for investment, potential benefits, potential risks, and other factors identified in the Initial Planning Framework and subsequent technical work
- Strategy Groundwork Document, documenting the outcomes and decisions from this phase of work and detailing strategic and technical questions to be addressed in future phases

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority Allocation Request Form

<b>FY of Allocation Action:</b>	FY2021/22
<b>Project Name:</b>	Geary/19th Ave Subway Strategic Case
<b>Grant Recipient:</b>	San Francisco County Transportation Authority

## ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE

<b>Environmental Type:</b>	N/A
----------------------------	-----

## PROJECT DELIVERY MILESTONES

Phase	Start		End	
	Quarter	Calendar Year	Quarter	Calendar Year
Planning/Conceptual Engineering (PLAN)	Apr-May-Jun	2022	Oct-Nov-Dec	2023
Environmental Studies (PA&ED)				
Right of Way				
Design Engineering (PS&E)				
Advertise Construction				
Start Construction (e.g. Award Contract)				
Operations (OP)				
Open for Use				
Project Completion (means last eligible expenditure)				

## SCHEDULE DETAILS

### Task Schedule

Task 1 (Project Management): 4/2022-12/2023

Task 2 (Initial Planning & Technical Exploration): 6/2022-6/2023

Task 3 (Partner Engagement & Public Outreach): 12/2022-6/2023

- Outreach: Jan - March 2023

- Ongoing availability of staff to standing community meetings

Task 4 (Strategic Case Phase Documentation): 3/2023-10/2023

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority Allocation Request Form

<b>FY of Allocation Action:</b>	FY2021/22
<b>Project Name:</b>	Geary/19th Ave Subway Strategic Case
<b>Grant Recipient:</b>	San Francisco County Transportation Authority

## FUNDING PLAN - FOR CURRENT REQUEST

Fund Source	Planned	Programmed	Allocated	Project Total
EP-116: Other Transit Enhancements	\$802,264	\$0	\$0	\$802,264
<b>Phases In Current Request Total:</b>	\$802,264	\$0	\$0	\$802,264

## COST SUMMARY

Phase	Total Cost	PROP K - Current Request	Source of Cost Estimate
Planning/Conceptual Engineering	\$802,264	\$802,264	Planning-level cost estimation based on scope of work
Environmental Studies	\$0		
Right of Way	\$0		
Design Engineering	\$0		
Construction	\$0		
Operations	\$0		
Total:	\$802,264	\$802,264	

<b>% Complete of Design:</b>	0.0%
<b>As of Date:</b>	01/01/2022
<b>Expected Useful Life:</b>	N/A

**Geary/19th Strategic Case**  
**Appropriation Budget**  
**20-month period (5/2022-12/2023)**

Task	Scope	Total Cost	SFCTA Staff	SFCTA Consultant Cost	SFMTA	SF Planning
<b>1</b>	<b>Project Management</b>		332	240	192	72
		<b>\$185,813</b>	<b>\$72,676</b>	<b>\$56,000</b>	<b>\$41,057</b>	<b>\$16,080</b>
1.1	Project Administration	\$92,349	\$50,749	\$41,600	\$23,972	\$5,360
1.2	Project Charter	\$16,563	\$9,363	\$7,200	\$5,100	\$1,787
1.3	Alts Study Scoping	\$19,765	\$12,565	\$7,200	\$11,986	\$8,933
<b>2</b>	<b>Planning &amp; Technical Exploration</b>		440	366	264	212
		<b>\$282,687</b>	<b>\$100,254</b>	<b>\$84,550</b>	<b>\$55,115</b>	<b>\$42,768</b>
2.1	Parameters, Benefits, Costs	\$35,669	\$13,169	\$22,500	\$11,769	\$1,787
2.2	Planning/Evaluation Framework	\$19,901	\$8,651	\$11,250	\$9,982	\$1,787
2.3	Ridership Modeling	\$38,421	\$31,921	\$6,500	\$3,313	\$1,787
2.4	Strategy Considerations	\$90,813	\$46,513	\$44,300	\$30,050	\$37,408
<b>3</b>	<b>Partner Engagement &amp; Public Outreach</b>		212	344	224	48
		<b>\$169,005</b>	<b>\$42,521</b>	<b>\$70,400</b>	<b>\$45,365</b>	<b>\$10,720</b>
3.1	Partner Engagement	\$35,963	\$20,663	\$15,300	\$28,117	\$7,146
3.2	Public Outreach	\$76,957	\$21,857	\$55,100	\$17,247	\$3,573
<b>4</b>	<b>Strategic Case Phase Documentation</b>		168	400	136	24
		<b>\$164,759</b>	<b>\$38,755</b>	<b>\$92,000</b>	<b>\$28,831</b>	<b>\$5,173</b>
4.1	Strategic Case Document	\$65,377	\$19,377	\$46,000	\$12,749	\$1,787
4.2	Strategy Groundwork Document	\$65,377	\$19,377	\$46,000	\$16,082	\$3,387
Subtotal Hours			1152	1350	816	356
Subtotals Cost			<b>\$254,206</b>	<b>\$302,950</b>	<b>\$170,368</b>	<b>\$74,740</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>		<b>\$802,264</b>				

**Geary/19th Strategic Case**  
**Appropriation Budget**  
**20-month period (5/2022-12/2023)**

		SFCTA						SFCTA Consultant Hours		
		\$277	\$284	\$209	\$187	\$218	\$105	\$350	\$275	\$175
Task	Scope	Deputy Directors	Rail Program Manager	Director Comms	Principal Planner	Principal Modeler	Comms Coord	Project Principal	Project Manager	Technical Staff
<b>1</b>	<b>Project Management</b>	12	96	0	220	4	0	16	112	112
		\$3,345	\$27,242	\$0	\$41,217	\$873	\$0	\$5,600	\$30,800	\$19,600
1.1	Project Administration		60		180		0	16	80	80
1.2	Project Charter		16		20				16	16
1.3	Alts Study Scoping		20		20	4			16	16
<b>2</b>	<b>Planning &amp; Technical Exploration</b>	60	92	0	168	120	0	8	191	167
		\$16,490	\$26,107	\$0	\$31,475	\$26,183	\$0	\$2,800	\$52,525	\$29,225
2.1	Parameters, Benefits, Costs		20		40				50	50
2.2	Planning/Evaluation Framework		12		28				25	25
2.3	Ridership Modeling					120			16	12
2.4	Strategy Considerations		60		100			8	100	80
<b>3</b>	<b>Partner Engagement &amp; Public Outreach</b>	0	52	8	112	8	32	24	60	260
		\$0	\$14,756	\$1,669	\$20,983	\$1,746	\$3,367	\$8,400	\$16,500	\$45,500
3.1	Partner Engagement		20		80			8	20	40
3.2	Public Outreach		32	8	32	8	32	16	40	220
<b>4</b>	<b>Strategic Case Phase Documentation</b>	36	48	4	48	16	16	80	80	240
		\$10,132	\$13,621	\$835	\$8,993	\$3,491	\$1,683	\$28,000	\$22,000	\$42,000
4.1	Strategic Case Document		24	2	24	8	8	40	40	120
4.2	Strategy Groundwork Document		24	2	24	8	8	40	40	120

**Geary/19th Strategic Case  
Appropriation Budget**

20-month period (5/2022-12/2023)		SFMTA							SF Planning Staff			SF Planning Consultant
Task	Scope	\$223	\$191	\$164	\$274	\$209	\$201	\$149	\$223	\$191	\$164	\$200
		5290 Planner (Manager)	5289 Planner (Senior)	5288 Planner	5211 Engineer Manager	5207 Engineer Staff	5408 Outreach Manager	1312 Outreach Staff	5290 Planner (Manager)	5289 Planner (Senior)	5288 Planner	Technical Staff
1	Project Management	136	56	0	0	0	0	0	72	0	0	0
		\$30,372	\$10,685	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$16,080	\$0	\$0	\$0
1.1	Project Administration	80	32						24	0	0	0
1.2	Project Charter	16	8						8	0	0	0
1.3	Alts Study Scoping	40	16						40	0	0	0
2	Planning & Technical Exploration	160	64	32	4	4	0	0	44	40	8	120
		\$35,732	\$12,211	\$5,239	\$1,098	\$835	\$0	\$0	\$9,826	\$7,632	\$1,310	\$24,000
2.1	Parameters, Benefits, Costs	40	8	8					8	0	0	0
2.2	Planning/Evaluation Framework	32	8	8					8	0	0	0
2.3	Ridership Modeling	8	8						8	0	0	0
2.4	Strategy Considerations	80	40	16	4	4			20	40	8	120
3	Partner Engagement & Public Outreach	112	72	16	0	0	8	16	48	0	0	0
		\$25,013	\$13,737	\$2,619	\$0	\$0	\$1,606	\$2,389	\$10,720	\$0	\$0	\$0
3.1	Partner Engagement	80	40	16					32	0	0	0
3.2	Public Outreach	32	32				8	16	16	0	0	0
4	Strategic Case Phase Documentation	80	40	0	4	4	4	4	16	0	0	8
		\$17,866	\$7,632	\$0	\$1,098	\$835	\$803	\$597	\$3,573	\$0	\$0	\$1,600
4.1	Strategic Case Document	40	20						8	0	0	0
4.2	Strategy Groundwork Document	40	20		4	4	4	4	8	0	0	8

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority Allocation Request Form

<b>FY of Allocation Action:</b>	FY2021/22
<b>Project Name:</b>	Geary/19th Ave Subway Strategic Case
<b>Grant Recipient:</b>	San Francisco County Transportation Authority

## SFCTA RECOMMENDATION

<b>Resolution Number:</b>		<b>Resolution Date:</b>	
<b>Total PROP K Requested:</b>	\$802,264	<b>Total PROP K Recommended</b>	\$802,264

<b>SGA Project Number:</b>		<b>Name:</b>	Geary/19th Ave Subway Strategic Case - SFCTA
<b>Sponsor:</b>	San Francisco County Transportation Authority	<b>Expiration Date:</b>	06/30/2024
<b>Phase:</b>	Planning/Conceptual Engineering	<b>Fundshare:</b>	100.0%

### Cash Flow Distribution Schedule by Fiscal Year

Fund Source	FY 2021/22	FY 2022/23	FY 2023/24	FY 2024/25	FY 2025/26	Total
PROP K EP-116	\$69,495	\$386,778	\$100,883	\$0	\$0	\$557,156

### Deliverables

1. Quarterly progress reports (QPRs) shall include % complete of the funded phase, % complete by task, work performed in the prior quarter, work anticipated to be performed in the upcoming quarter, a summary of outreach performed including feedback received, and any issues that may impact schedule, in addition to all other requirements described in the Standard Grant Agreement.

2. Upon completion of Task 1.3, Alternatives Study Preparation (anticipated by June 2022), provide Alternatives Study Draft Scope of Work.

3. Upon completion of Task 2, Initial Planning and Technical Exploration (anticipated June 2023), provide Land Use Planning Strategic Assessment.

4. At start of Task 3, Partner Engagement and Public Outreach (anticipated December 2022), provide the Public Outreach Plan.

5. Upon completion of Task 3 (anticipated June 2023), provide Public Outreach Summary Report.

6. Upon completion of Task 4 (anticipated October 2023), provide Draft Strategic Case and Strategy Groundwork documents, and present them to the CAC and Board for approval.

### Special Conditions

1. The recommended appropriation is contingent upon amendment of the Prop K Transit Enhancements 5YPP. See attached 5YPP amendment for details.

<b>SGA Project Number:</b>		<b>Name:</b>	Geary/19th Ave Subway Strategic Case - SFMTA			
<b>Sponsor:</b>	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency		<b>Expiration Date:</b>	06/30/2024		
<b>Phase:</b>	Planning/Conceptual Engineering		<b>Fundshare:</b>	100.0%		
<b>Cash Flow Distribution Schedule by Fiscal Year</b>						
<b>Fund Source</b>	<b>FY 2021/22</b>	<b>FY 2022/23</b>	<b>FY 2023/24</b>	<b>FY 2024/25</b>	<b>FY 2025/26</b>	<b>Total</b>
PROP K EP-116	\$21,250	\$100,000	\$49,117	\$0	\$0	\$170,367
<b>Deliverables</b>						
1. SFMTA staff shall provide quarterly progress reports describing work performed in the prior quarter, work anticipated to be performed in the upcoming quarter and any issues that may impact schedule, in addition to all other requirements described in the Standard Grant Agreement.						
<b>Special Conditions</b>						
1. The recommended allocation is contingent upon amendment of the Prop K Transit Enhancements 5YPP. See attached 5YPP amendment for details.						

<b>SGA Project Number:</b>		<b>Name:</b>	Geary/19th Ave Subway Strategic Case - SF Planning			
<b>Sponsor:</b>	Department of City Planning		<b>Expiration Date:</b>	06/30/2024		
<b>Phase:</b>	Planning/Conceptual Engineering		<b>Fundshare:</b>	100.0%		
<b>Cash Flow Distribution Schedule by Fiscal Year</b>						
<b>Fund Source</b>	<b>FY 2021/22</b>	<b>FY 2022/23</b>	<b>FY 2023/24</b>	<b>FY 2024/25</b>	<b>FY 2025/26</b>	<b>Total</b>
PROP K EP-116	\$9,323	\$65,418	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$74,741
<b>Deliverables</b>						
1. Planning Department staff shall provide quarterly progress reports describing work performed in the prior quarter, work anticipated to be performed in the upcoming quarter, and any issues that may impact schedule, in addition to all other requirements described in the Standard Grant Agreement.						
2. At least 3 months prior to completion of Task 2 (anticipated by June 2023) the Planning Department will develop an Initial Land Use Planning Assessment and Anti-Displacement Approach and submit it to the Transportation Authority project manager.						
<b>Special Conditions</b>						
1. The recommended allocation is contingent upon amendment of the Prop K Transit Enhancements 5YPP. See attached 5YPP amendment for details.						

<b>Metric</b>	<b>PROP K</b>	<b>TNC TAX</b>	<b>PROP AA</b>
Actual Leveraging - Current Request	0.0%	No TNC TAX	No PROP AA
Actual Leveraging - This Project	0.0%	No TNC TAX	No PROP AA

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority Allocation Request Form

<b>FY of Allocation Action:</b>	FY2021/22
<b>Project Name:</b>	Geary/19th Ave Subway Strategic Case
<b>Grant Recipient:</b>	San Francisco County Transportation Authority

## EXPENDITURE PLAN SUMMARY

<b>Current PROP K Request:</b>	\$802,264
--------------------------------	-----------

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

Initials of sponsor staff member verifying the above statement:
AH

## CONTACT INFORMATION

	Project Manager	Grants Manager
<b>Name:</b>	Andrew Heidel	Anna LaForte
<b>Title:</b>	Principal Transportation Planner	Deputy Director for Policy & Programming
<b>Phone:</b>	(415) 701-4803	(415) 522-4805
<b>Email:</b>	andrew.heidel@sfcta.org	anna.laforte@sfcta.org

**2019 Prop K 5-Year Project List (FY 2019/20 - FY 2023/24)**  
**Other Transit Enhancements - (EP-16)**  
**Programming and Allocations to Date**  
 Pending April 26, 2022 Board

Other Transit Enhancements (EP 16)									
Carry Forward From 2014 5YPP									
Any Eligible	NTIP Placeholder <sup>3,9</sup>	Any	Programmed			\$300,000			\$300,000
SFMTA	M Oceanview Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements <sup>9</sup>	PS&E	Pending				\$700,000		\$700,000
SFMTA	Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2) <sup>4</sup>	CON	Programmed			\$0			\$0
TBD	Transit Enhancements - Placeholder <sup>4</sup>	CON	Programmed			\$2,750,000			\$2,750,000
BART	Market St. / Balboa Park New Elevator Master Plan <sup>5</sup>	PLAN/ CER	Programmed						\$0
BART	Elevator Renovation Program <sup>5</sup>	PS&E	Programmed			\$500,000			\$500,000
SFMTA	Muni Subway Expansion (19th Ave M-line) <sup>1,6</sup>	PLAN/ CER	Programmed						\$0
SFCTA, SFMTA	Geary-19th Avenue Corridor Rail Strategy and Planning (West Side Rail) <sup>6,7</sup>	PLAN/ CER	Planned			\$514,232			\$514,232
SFCTA, SFMTA	Geary-19th Avenue Corridor Rail Strategy and Planning (West Side Rail) <sup>6</sup>	PLAN/ CER	Planned				\$2,027,710		\$2,027,710
SFMTA	Muni Subway Expansion Project Development <sup>1,7</sup>	PLAN/ CER	Allocated	\$965,948					\$965,948
SFMTA, SFCTA	Muni Metro Core Capacity Study <sup>7</sup>	PLAN/ CER	Pending (Prior)			\$1,150,000			\$1,150,000
SFCTA, SFMTA, SF Planning	Geary/19th Ave Subway Strategic Case <sup>8</sup>	PLAN/ CER	Pending			\$801,716			\$801,716
Total Programmed in 2019 5YPP				\$965,948	\$0	\$6,015,948	\$2,727,710	\$0	\$9,709,606
Total Allocated and Pending				\$965,948	\$0	\$1,951,716	\$700,000	\$0	\$3,617,664
Total Unallocated				\$0	\$0	\$4,064,232	\$2,027,710	\$0	\$6,091,942
Total Programmed in 2021 Strategic Plan				\$965,948	\$0	\$5,750,000	\$2,027,710	\$0	\$8,743,658
Deobligated Funds						\$965,948	\$0	\$0	\$965,948
Cumulative Remaining Programming Capacity				\$0	\$0	\$700,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Pending Allocation/Appropriation									
Board Approved Allocation/Appropriation									

**FOOTNOTES:**

- <sup>1</sup> Strategic Plan and 5YPP amendments to accommodate allocation of \$965,948 for Muni Subway Expansion Project Development (Resolution 20-009, 09/24/2019).  
Muni Subway Expansion (19th Ave M-line): Reduced by \$965,948 in FY2020/21 planning funds from \$2,744,300 to \$1,778,352  
Muni Subway Expansion Project Development: Added project with \$965,948 in FY2019/20 and advanced cash flow from FY2021/22 to FYs 2019/20 and 2020/21.  
Strategic Plan and 5YPP amendments to the purchase Additional Light Rail Vehicles category (LR-15) to accommodate allocation of \$20,000 for Light Rail Vehicle
- <sup>2</sup> Program revenue reduction of \$20,000 in cash flow from FY2023/24 to FY2021/22; funds must be used for LRV fleet expansion, which will be complete in FY2031/32
- <sup>3</sup> Strategic Plan Update and corresponding 5YPP amendment to delay programming and cash flow to reflect updated project delivery schedule (Resolution 22-020 12/7/2021)
- <sup>4</sup> 5YPP amendment to reprogram \$2,750,000 from Geary Boulevard Improvement Project (Geary BRT Phase 2) to Transit Enhancements - Placeholder in FY2021/22.
- <sup>5</sup> 5YPP amendment to reprogram \$500,000 from Market St. / Balboa Park New Elevator Master Plan to the Elevator Renovation Program in FY2021/22
- <sup>6</sup> 5YPP amendment to accommodate funding for Geary-19th Avenue Corridor Rail Strategy and Planning (West Side Rail)  
Muni Subway Expansion Project Development: Reduce \$1,778,352 to \$0 in FY2020/21  
Reprogram \$1,749,358 in deobligated funds from Geneva Harney BRT environmental phase  
Geary-19th Avenue Corridor Rail Strategy and Planning (West Side Rail): Add project with \$1,500,000 in FY2021/22 and \$2,027,710 in FY2022/23 planning funds.
- <sup>7</sup> 5YPP amendment to accommodate funding for Muni Metro Core Capacity Study (Resolution 22-0XX, xx/xx/xxxx)  
Geary-19th Avenue Corridor Rail Strategy and Planning (West Side Rail): Reduced by \$184,052 from \$1,500,000 to \$1,315,948.  
Cumulative Remaining Programming Capacity: Reduced from \$965,948 to \$0; these funds were deobligated from Muni Subway Expansion Project Development consistent  
Muni Metro Core Capacity Study: Add project with \$1,150,000 in FY2021/22.
- <sup>8</sup> 5YPP amendment to accommodate Geary/19th Ave Subway Strategic Case (Resolution 22-0XX, xx/xx/xxxx)  
Geary-19th Avenue Corridor Rail Strategy and Planning (West Side Rail): Reduced by \$801,716 from \$1,315,948 to \$514,232.  
Geary/19th Ave Subway Strategic Case: Added project with \$801,716 in FY2021/22.
- <sup>9</sup> Planned 5YPP amendment to fully fund design of Muni Forward M Oceanview Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements Project  
NTIP Placeholder (carryover): Reduce from \$1,000,000 to \$300,000 in FY2021/22.  
Muni Forward M Oceanview Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements: Program project with \$700,000 in FY2023/24.

[ this page intentionally left blank ]



San Francisco  
County Transportation  
Authority

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority

## Allocation Request Form

<b>FY of Allocation Action:</b>	FY2021/22
<b>Project Name:</b>	Bicycle Facility Maintenance
<b>Grant Recipient:</b>	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

### EXPENDITURE PLAN INFORMATION

<b>PROP K Expenditure Plans</b>	Pedestrian & Bicycle Facility Maintenance
<b>Current PROP K Request:</b>	\$400,000
<b>Supervisory District</b>	Citywide

### REQUEST

#### Brief Project Description

Maintain bicycle facilities to preserve their safety features. SFMTA will repaint bicycle lanes using green epoxy and repaint bike box/ mixed zone markings using green thermoplastic treatment. Additionally, plastic traffic channelizers along buffered bikeways will be replaced.

#### Detailed Scope, Project Benefits and Community Outreach


The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency requests \$400,000 to maintain bicycle facilities that are in poor condition citywide. The scope will focus on restriping existing bicycle facilities, including green bicycle lanes, green bicycle boxes and replacing traffic delineators that buffer bike lanes from vehicle traffic lanes. The SFMTA continues to expand the protected bike lane network through streetscape projects and quick-build projects, and the Prop K funds from this project will be used to purchase delineators and to replace them based on where SFMTA field staff and the public identify a need.

Bicycle lanes will be repainted using green epoxy and bike box/mixed zone facilities will be repainted using green thermoplastic treatment. While a more durable material, green thermoplastic is considerably more expensive than the green epoxy. Thus, the epoxy is a more efficient material to use for larger surfaces such as the length of a bicycle lane.

Replacing delineators and maintaining existing bike boxes and green lane markers are essential aspects of Vision Zero, a San Francisco policy that has set goals of eliminating all traffic deaths by 2024.

SFMTA will prioritize bicycle facility maintenance based upon field review by Livable Streets and Shops staff, public requests specifically on the protected bikeway network, and where quick build projects are implemented to ensure that delineators are in good condition and continue to separate bicyclists from vehicle traffic lanes. Requests for maintenance may be made to the SF311 Customer Service Center by calling 311, through sf311.org or through the SF311 app available on smartphones.


# San Francisco Bikeway Network



3/8/2022, 5:23:18 PM

Bikeway Network

- Separated Bikeway
- Bike Lane
- Neighborhood
- Bike Route
- Bike Path
- Green Wave Street (Timed for 13 MPH)



Project Location

Citywide

Project Phase(s)

Construction (CON)

5YPP/STRATEGIC PLAN INFORMATION

Type of Project in the Prop K 5YPP/Prop AA Strategic Plan?	Named Project
Is requested amount greater than the amount programmed in the relevant 5YPP or Strategic Plan?	Less than or Equal to Programmed Amount
Prop K 5YPP Amount:	\$400,000

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority Allocation Request Form

<b>FY of Allocation Action:</b>	FY2021/22
<b>Project Name:</b>	Bicycle Facility Maintenance
<b>Grant Recipient:</b>	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

## ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE

<b>Environmental Type:</b>	Categorically Exempt
----------------------------	----------------------

## PROJECT DELIVERY MILESTONES

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

## SCHEDULE DETAILS

Design work scheduled above refers to SFMTA engineering support during construction.

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority Allocation Request Form

<b>FY of Allocation Action:</b>	FY2021/22
<b>Project Name:</b>	Bicycle Facility Maintenance
<b>Grant Recipient:</b>	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

## FUNDING PLAN - FOR CURRENT REQUEST

Fund Source	Planned	Programmed	Allocated	Project Total
EP-137: Pedestrian & Bicycle Facility Maintenance	\$0	\$400,000	\$0	\$400,000
<b>Phases In Current Request Total:</b>	\$0	\$400,000	\$0	\$400,000

## COST SUMMARY

Phase	Total Cost	PROP K - Current Request	Source of Cost Estimate
Planning/Conceptual Engineering	\$0		
Environmental Studies	\$0		
Right of Way	\$0		
Design Engineering	\$0		
Construction	\$400,000	\$400,000	Previous work
Operations	\$0		
Total:	\$400,000	\$400,000	

<b>% Complete of Design:</b>	0.0%
<b>As of Date:</b>	02/08/2022
<b>Expected Useful Life:</b>	10 Years

## Transportation Authority Allocation Request Form

### Major Line Item Budget - Bicycle Facility Maintenance 2022

Item	Amount
Design Engineering (SFMTA)	\$85,000
Construction - Materials (SFMTA)	\$99,500
Construction - Labor (SFMTA Paint Shop)	\$215,000
City Attorney Office Fees	\$500
<b>Project Total</b>	<b>\$400,000</b>

### Unit Costs - Materials + Installation

Material	Quantity	Cost
12" Crosswalk Lines / Stop Bars	Lin Ft	\$8.57
4" Broken White or Yellow	Lin Ft	\$2.44
4" Solid White or Yellow	Lin Ft	\$4.29
6" Broken White	Lin Ft	\$3.53
6" Solid White	Lin Ft	\$5.36
8" Broken White or Yellow	Lin Ft	\$4.83
8" Solid White or Yellow	Lin Ft	\$6.29
Raised Pavement Markers (White or Yellow)	Each	\$19.65
Green Thermoplastic Markings	Sq Ft	\$21.45
Traffic Lane Delineators	Each	\$150.00

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority Allocation Request Form

<b>FY of Allocation Action:</b>	FY2021/22
<b>Project Name:</b>	Bicycle Facility Maintenance
<b>Grant Recipient:</b>	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

## SFCTA RECOMMENDATION

<b>Resolution Number:</b>		<b>Resolution Date:</b>	
<b>Total PROP K Requested:</b>	\$400,000	<b>Total PROP K Recommended</b>	\$400,000

<b>SGA Project Number:</b>		<b>Name:</b>	Bicycle Facility Maintenance
<b>Sponsor:</b>	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency	<b>Expiration Date:</b>	12/31/2025
<b>Phase:</b>	Construction	<b>Fundshare:</b>	100.0%

### Cash Flow Distribution Schedule by Fiscal Year

Fund Source	FY 2021/22	FY 2022/23	FY 2023/24	FY 2024/25	FY 2025/26	Total
PROP K EP-137	\$0	\$200,000	\$160,000	\$40,000	\$0	\$400,000

### Deliverables

1. Quarterly progress reports (QPRs) shall report on the locations where maintenance was performed, and the types and quantities of bicycle facility improvements (i.e., number of delineators, miles of lane, number of bike boxes) that the SFMTA has maintained using Prop K funds during the preceding quarter, the locations that SFMTA will maintain in the upcoming quarter, 2-3 photos of existing conditions, work being performed and/or of completed, in addition to the standard requirements for QPRs (see Standard Grant Agreement for details).

Metric	PROP K	TNC TAX	PROP AA
Actual Leveraging - Current Request	0.0%	No TNC TAX	No PROP AA
Actual Leveraging - This Project	0.0%	No TNC TAX	No PROP AA

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority Allocation Request Form

<b>FY of Allocation Action:</b>	FY2021/22
<b>Project Name:</b>	Bicycle Facility Maintenance
<b>Grant Recipient:</b>	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

## EXPENDITURE PLAN SUMMARY

<b>Current PROP K Request:</b>	\$400,000
--------------------------------	-----------

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

Initials of sponsor staff member verifying the above statement:

ML

## CONTACT INFORMATION

	Project Manager	Grants Manager
<b>Name:</b>	Matt Lasky	Joel C Goldberg
<b>Title:</b>	Project Manager	Grants Procurement Manager
<b>Phone:</b>	(415) 646-2265	(415) 646-2520
<b>Email:</b>	matt.lasky@sfmta.com	joel.goldberg@sfmta.com



## Memorandum

### AGENDA ITEM 9

**DATE:** March 24, 2022  
**TO:** Transportation Authority Board  
**FROM:** Anna LaForte - Deputy Director for Policy and Programming  
**SUBJECT:** 4/12/2022 Board Meeting: Allocate \$645,108 and Appropriate \$557,156 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, for Two Requests

<p><b>RECOMMENDATION</b>    <input type="checkbox"/> Information    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Action</p> <p>Allocate \$400,000 in Prop K funds to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bicycle Facility Maintenance</li> </ol> <p>Appropriate and Allocate \$802,264, with conditions for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Geary/19th Ave Subway Strategic Case (SFCTA: \$557,156; SFMTA: \$170,367; SF Planning: \$74,741)</li> </ol> <p><b>SUMMARY</b></p> <p>Attachment 1 lists the requests, including phase(s) of work and supervisorial district(s). Attachment 2 provides brief descriptions of the projects. Attachment 3 contains the staff recommendations. Project sponsors will attend the meeting to answer any questions the Board may have.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fund Allocation</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fund Programming</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Policy/Legislation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Plan/Study</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Capital Project Oversight/Delivery</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Budget/Finance</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Contract/Agreement</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p>
--	--

### DISCUSSION

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



## **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

The recommended action would allocate and appropriate \$1,202,264 in Prop K funds. The allocations and appropriation would be subject to the Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules contained in the enclosed Allocation Request Forms.

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

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

## **CAC POSITION**

The CAC considered this item at its March 23, 2022 meeting and unanimously adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation.

## **SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS**

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