

Draft 2009 Strategic Plan

Appendix C. Expenditure Plan Line Item Summary (YOE \$'s)

The text descriptions for the projects that require a 5YPP (struck through herein) will be updated in the fall upon the adoption of the 5YPPs and the amended 2009 Strategic Plan.

A. TRANSIT

I. Major Capital Projects

a. MUNI

| | | | | | |
|-----------|----------|---|-----------------|--|---------------|
| EP | 1 | Bus Rapid Transit/Transit Preferential Streets/MUNI Metro Network | | | |
| | | Funds are identified for four major subcategories within this EP line item: a) Bus Rapid Transit System Development policy and marketing studies and launch activities to correspond with initial phase of Van Ness BRT project; also included is a Transit Preferential Streets Master Plan to identify major needs by corridor; b) Van Ness, Geary and Potrero BRT planning, design and implementation funds; c) Transit Preferential Streets small and spot improvements program and (4) transit preferential corridor projects including projects in Market Street, 19th Avenue and Outer Mission corridors. Funding amounts and the timing of those funds have been coordinated with Muni with the final implementing agency decision to be determined as part of the 5 Year Prioritization Program approvals. | | | |
| | | | Programming | | \$74,222,088 |
| | | | Finance Cost | | \$51,365,066 |
| | | | TOTAL | | \$125,587,153 |
| | | | Available Funds | | \$127,615,778 |
| | | | Difference | | \$2,028,625 |

| | | | | | |
|-----------|----------|--|-----------------|--|--------------|
| EP | 2 | 3rd Street Light Rail (Phase 1) | | | |
| | | This project is grandfathered in its entirety from Prop B and is therefore not subject to finance costs. 3rd Street Light Rail was opened for public use in June 2007. The major remaining element of the project, the Muni Metro East Maintenance Facility (MME), was opened in September 2008. The remainder of the Third Street funds, \$5.92 million, is dedicated to the Southern Terminal (Segment S) and will be available in FY 2013/14. | | | |
| | | | Programming | | \$96,852,085 |
| | | | Finance Cost | | \$0 |
| | | | TOTAL | | \$96,852,085 |
| | | | Available Funds | | \$96,852,085 |
| | | | Difference | | \$0 |

| | | | | | |
|-----------|----------|---|-----------------|--|---------------|
| EP | 3 | Central Subway (3rd St. Light Rail - Phase 2) | | | |
| | | This project is grandfathered in its entirety from Prop B and is therefore not subject to finance costs. See Appendix D for detailed project description and progress report. The Expenditure Plan makes \$126 million available for this project line. In order to help MTA meet timely use of funds deadlines, \$2.025 million in CMAQ funds were programmed to the project, and an equivalent amount of Prop K funds were used to pay for three separate Regional Bike and Pedestrian Program (RBPP) projects (Res. 09-25). A combination of project delays and MTA's use of other funds to keep the project moving resulted in allocation on of only \$11.86 million of the \$40.843 million programmed to the project in the first six years of the 2005 Strategic Plan. As described in Appendix D. The FTA, together with the project team and the Authority, completed a nine-month risk assessment evaluation of the project in April 2009, which analyzed and evaluated in detail technical, schedule, commercial, and external aspects of the project from a risk and probability perspective. As a result of this review, FTA recommended that additional cost and schedule reserve contingency be added to ensure the project's success. Specifically, this review resulted in a revised project budget of \$1.578 billion compared to the original \$1.3 billion. The 2009 Strategic Plan pushes out the Central Subway programming several years to match the new schedule, contributing to a decrease in program wide interest costs. | | | |
| | | | Programming | | \$126,000,000 |
| | | | Finance Cost | | \$0 |
| | | | TOTAL | | \$126,000,000 |
| | | | Available Funds | | \$126,000,000 |
| | | | Difference | | \$0 |

| Phase | Fiscal Year | Prop K Amount (millions) | Notes |
|----------------|-------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| PE | FY 2005-06 | \$11.86 | Done |
| | FY 2008-09 | \$0.86 | CMAQ Swap |
| | FY 2009-10 | \$0.53 | CMAQ Swap |
| | FY 2009-10 | \$0.63 | CMAQ Swap |
| PS&E, ROW, CON | FY 2009-10 | \$29.96 | Planned |
| ROW, CON | FY 2010-11 | \$25.00 | Planned |
| ROW, CON | FY 2011-12 | \$20.00 | Planned |
| CON | FY 2013-14 | \$40.15 | Planned |

Draft 2009 Strategic Plan

Appendix C. Expenditure Plan Line Item Summary (YOE \$'s)

| | | | | | |
|-----------|----------|-------------------------|---|-----------------|-----|
| EP | 4 | Geary Light Rail | <p>As funding for the Geary LRT was clearly designated as solely a Priority 3 level of funding, no funding is programmed at this time for the Geary LRT. The Strategic Plan will be update no later than every four years and the funding assumptions will be revisited at that time, to determine if additional revenues can be made available. Both Priority 1 and Priority 2 programming levels must reach 100% before Priority 3 funds can be programmed.</p> | | |
| | | | | Programming | \$0 |
| | | | | Finance Cost | \$0 |
| | | | | TOTAL | \$0 |
| | | | | Available Funds | \$0 |
| | | | | Difference | \$0 |

b. Caltrain

| | | | | | |
|-----------|----------|--|--|-----------------|---------------|
| EP | 5 | Downtown Extension to a Rebuilt Transbay Terminal | <p>See Appendix D for detailed project description, schedule, funding plan and progress report. Since the adoption of the 2005 Strategic Plan, the project was split into two phases. Phase 1 includes the construction of the Transbay Transit Center, and Phase 2 includes construction of the Caltrain Downtown Extension. To date, most of the Prop K funds have been allocated to Phase 1, as it is proceeding before Phase 2. Due to delays in the availability of cash flow from other fund sources, more Prop K was allocated for the PA&ED phase of the project than anticipated in the 2005 Strategic Plan, and less on the PS&E phase. The last Prop K allocation for Phase 1 of the project is proposed for the design phase in FY 2009/10, with the remaining funds reserved for the construction phase of Phase 2. Expenditure of Prop K allocations has occurred more slowly than assumed in the 2005 Strategic Plan that results in a less aggressive cash flow for the project, which reduces finance costs, and allows more</p> | | |
| | | | | Programming | \$174,534,186 |
| | | | | Finance Cost | \$130,734,133 |
| | | | | TOTAL | \$305,268,319 |
| | | | | Available Funds | \$305,789,016 |
| | | | | Difference | \$520,697 |

| Phase | Fiscal Year | Prop K Amount (millions) | Notes |
|-----------------|-------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| Phase 1 - ROW | FY 2004-05 | \$16.13 | Done |
| Phase 1 - PA&ED | FY 2004-05 | \$4.23 | Done |
| Phase 1 - ROW | FY 2005-06 | \$12.88 | Done |
| Phase 1 - PA&ED | FY 2006-07 | \$14.83 | Allocated |
| Phase 2 - PA&ED | FY 2007-08 | \$18.35 | Allocated |
| Phase 1 - ROW | FY 2007-08 | \$23.49 | Allocated |
| Phase 1 - PA&ED | FY 2007-08 | \$12.99 | Allocated |
| Phase 1 - ENV | FY 2007-08 | \$1.20 | Allocated |
| Phase 1 - PA&ED | FY 2008-09 | \$12.81 | Allocated |
| Phase 1 - CON | FY 2008-09 | \$12.30 | Allocated |
| Phase 1 - PS&E | FY 2009-10 | \$18.20 | Planned |
| Phase 2 - CON | FY 2033/34 | \$26.96 | Planned |

| | | | | | |
|-----------|----------|------------------------|---|-----------------|--------------|
| EP | 6 | Electrification | <p>See Appendix D for detailed project description, schedule, funding plan and progress report. Prop K has \$25 million programmed to the Electrification project, this makes up a large portion of the \$60 million that San Francisco is expected to contribute to the project. The 2005 Strategic Plan programmed about \$4 million to electrification through Fiscal Year 2008/09. Caltrain did not request any of these funds using instead \$4 million in RTIP funds, programmed by the Authority to the project.</p> | | |
| | | | | Programming | \$23,128,788 |
| | | | | Finance Cost | \$2,586,234 |
| | | | | TOTAL | \$25,715,022 |
| | | | | Available Funds | \$26,372,212 |
| | | | | Difference | \$657,190 |

Draft 2009 Strategic Plan

Appendix C. Expenditure Plan Line Item Summary (YOE \$'s)

| | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|--------------|
| EP 7 Caltrain Capital Improvement Program | <p>Caltrain's utilization of sales tax funding is primarily dedicated to matching federal funds that come through the FTA's Formula Programs, particularly the Section 5309 Fixed Guideway program. Caltrain relies on non-federal funds from all three joint powers: San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara. To the extent Caltrain can use funds from the other two counties, it is working towards that goal. Nevertheless, they predict a high early need for sales tax from San Francisco. Final appropriation levels from the Reauthorization of TEA-21 and from annual Congressional actions will determine exact levels of matching funds needed. Prior to incurring debt finance costs, at the time of allocation, Caltrain will review its funding availability to determine if the borrowing of funding capacity from another EP line item will enable them to reduce the need to incur debt costs.</p> | Programming | \$16,480,541 |
| | | Finance Cost | \$9,000,145 |
| | | TOTAL | \$25,480,686 |
| | | Available Funds | \$25,600,343 |
| | | Difference | \$119,657 |

c. BART Station Access, Safety and Capacity

| | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|--------------|
| EP 8 BART Station Access, Safety and Capacity | <p>BART has several critical projects it is seeking funds for from this EP line item. The 16th Street Plaza improvements project was originally a STIP project, as was the Talking Signs project. These were both subject to an AB 3090 Agreement approved by the Authority Board in March 2004, dedicating Prop K sales tax funds in lieu of STIP funds. BART is seeking funds for these projects as well as funds for the 24th Street plaza remodel and several smaller projects in the next 5 years.</p> | Programming | \$7,402,775 |
| | | Finance Cost | \$4,149,539 |
| | | TOTAL | \$11,552,315 |
| | | Available Funds | \$11,835,334 |
| | | Difference | \$283,020 |

d. Ferry

| | | | |
|-------------------|---|-----------------|-------------|
| EP 9 Ferry | <p>Prop K funding allocations for the Downtown Ferry Terminal are heavily leveraged with other fund sources. This includes RM2, GGB capital funds, and Port funds. The immediate need of the Port is for development of a public involvement plan and the first phase of facility planning necessary for improvements to the Port's intermodal terminal at the Embarcadero.</p> | Programming | \$4,160,107 |
| | | Finance Cost | \$1,458,451 |
| | | TOTAL | \$5,618,558 |
| | | Available Funds | \$5,660,377 |
| | | Difference | \$41,819 |

II. Transit Enhancements

The next six EP line items (10-16), under the subcategory of Transit Enhancements, do not have Priority 1 funding called out in the Expenditure Plan. Rather, funding can be moved if need be from one line item to another. While this is not being proposed in this Strategic Plan, the direct transfer or the loaning of capacity from one line item to another may be considered in the future to minimize financing costs within this subcategory.

| | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|--------------|
| EP 10 MUNI Extension of Trolleybus Lines | <p>Programming is for the Mission Bay Loop, which is a proposed enhancement to the 3rd Street Light Rail line, that is scheduled to go into revenue service in November 2005. The MB Loop is a turning loop needed to accommodate the full service plan for the two phases of the Third Street Light Rail Line, which will ultimately consist of a long line service for the entire corridor, and a short line service operating between Chinatown and Mission Bay. The short line service will need to use the MB loop as a terminus and turnback facility. Muni intends to design the project and receive consensus on its layout and features as part of development in the area; Prop K design funding is programmed in FY 2007/08. Funding is also be programmed for the future construction of the line.</p> | Programming | \$8,280,751 |
| | | Finance Cost | \$1,470,513 |
| | | TOTAL | \$9,751,264 |
| | | Available Funds | \$10,000,277 |
| | | Difference | \$249,013 |

| | | | |
|---|---|-----------------|-------------|
| EP 11 F-Line Extension to Fort Mason | <p>Muni and the National Park Service (NPS) plan to follow up on the technical feasibility study that was recently completed on a proposed extension of historic streetcar service to Fort Mason. NPS will begin environmental review for this project in FY 2005-06. The environmental review will further develop the conceptual designs looked at in the feasibility study, assess potential impacts from the project, address connectivity to other transit lines, and provide a refined cost analysis. The National Park Service is the lead agency for the environmental work, which will be done in concert with Muni, the Authority, and the Presidio Trust, as well as other affected City departments. The programming of remaining Prop K funds will be determined after the environmental work is completed and a complete funding package for the project is identified.</p> | Programming | \$4,158,738 |
| | | Finance Cost | \$957,053 |
| | | TOTAL | \$5,115,791 |
| | | Available Funds | \$5,263,304 |
| | | Difference | \$147,513 |

| | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|-------------|
| EP 12 Purchase/Rehab Historic Street Cars | <p>Muni will be considering expansion of the historic light rail vehicle fleet in concert with a proposed extension of historic streetcar service to Fort Mason. Until the completion of the environmental documentation and a future Conceptual Engineering Report for the historic streetcar extension is complete, the funding available in this EP line item, a maximum of \$7.2 million, is programmed as a placeholder in the outer years of the Strategic Plan.</p> | Programming | \$1,441,609 |
| | | Finance Cost | \$0 |
| | | TOTAL | \$1,441,609 |
| | | Available Funds | \$1,473,725 |
| | | Difference | \$32,116 |

Draft 2009 Strategic Plan

Appendix C. Expenditure Plan Line Item Summary (YOE \$'s)

| | | | | |
|-----------|-----------|--|---|--|
| EP | 13 | Balboa Park BART/MUNI Station Access A variety of projects are proposed for the Balboa Park Station area. Following up on a Better Neighborhoods planning study performed by the Planning Department in 2002, multiple agencies and city departments including the Authority are coming together to develop a conceptual engineering report (CER) for implementation of the items in the planning study, including transit-oriented development, improvements to transit access, pedestrian circulation, and other elements. Prop K funds will be programmed to the CER in FY 2005-06 and 2006-07. Implementation is expected to occur over 10-15 years. Short-term improvements will also be funded from this EP line item. Muni will upgrade the wayside ADA boarding ramp for the J and K lines in the Muni portion of the station. These necessary improvements are being funded next year; the project is ready for construction and awaiting construction funding. Funds are also programmed for pedestrian and wheelchair access improvements from Ocean Avenue into the station in the next five years. | Programming Finance Cost TOTAL Available Funds Difference | \$9,563,706 \$340,572 \$9,904,278 \$10,231,863 \$327,585 |
| EP | 14 | Caltrain Relocation of Paul Street to Oakdale A Design Feasibility Assessment and Station Concept Report was completed in January 2005, and adopted by the Authority Board in February 2005. The next phase of work will be the ridership analysis, analysis of system impacts and further design and environmental studies, scheduled for FY 2005-06 and FY 2006-07. | Programming Finance Cost TOTAL Available Funds Difference | \$5,488,559 \$2,751,650 \$8,240,209 \$8,347,600 \$107,391 |
| EP | 15 | Purchase Additional Light Rail Vehicles MUNI has indicated that their most immediate need for the purchase of additional LRT vehicles for new or expanded service is for the start-up of the 3rd Street Light Rail service, to begin in November 2005. The vehicles for this expanded service are programmed as part of the 3rd Street project, and the vehicles required for the Central Subway will be funded as part of that project. The Prop K funds in this EP line item will be needed for future service growth along the 3rd St Corridor as the Mission Bay development matures and ridership builds in the corridor. Thus, these funds are being programmed as a placeholder later in the Strategic Plan for Muni's future needs. | Programming Finance Cost TOTAL Available Funds Difference | \$5,963,880 \$0 \$5,963,880 \$6,105,432 \$141,552 |
| EP | 16 | Other Transit Enhancements BART's needs in this EP line item are for the design work associated with the Embarcadero and Civic center cross-platform projects. Construction funds for these projects come from Regional Measure 2. MUNI's needs in this EP line item are for funds to install ticket vending machines (TVMs) in the 3rd Street LRT Corridor, and provide matching funds for the 3rd Street Corridor's Mission Bay Loop. The original funding for the TVM's, totaling \$3 million, were not included in the Authority adopted 3rd Street LRT Corridor budget, as MUNI wished to fund the 3rd Street vending machines as part of a future larger fare collection equipment contract, enabling economies of scale as well as consistency with the remainder of Muni's system. These Prop K funds will pay for the 3rd Street portion of the contract. Caltrain's needs are for a conceptual study of access improvements for all users to San Francisco Caltrain stations. NOTE: Individual projects within the subcategory of Transit Enhancements could theoretically trigger debt by needing their funds all at once, instead of a "pro-rata share" of funds available over time. As the Expenditure Plan intent was to allow funds to flow between these projects, we are aggregating EP 10 through EP 16, so as not to trigger debt finance costs for any given project. Note that there is \$48 million remaining to be programmed to specific projects in all 7 Transit Enhancement EP line items. For this Strategic Plan, funds are being programmed as placeholders in a manner so as not to trigger any debt finance costs. | Programming Finance Cost TOTAL Available Funds Difference | \$11,196,110 \$2,226,947 \$13,423,057 \$13,895,122 \$472,065 |

Draft 2009 Strategic Plan

Appendix C. Expenditure Plan Line Item Summary (YOE \$'s)

III. System Maintenance and Renovation

a. Vehicles

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|-------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|--------------|
| <p>EP 17 Vehicles</p> <p>The EP line item Vehicles contains capital funding as well as incremental operations and maintenance for two grandfathered projects: the F-Line Historic Streetcar Operations and Maintenance and Trolleybus-wheelchair lifts. The EP line item Vehicles has more assigned funding in the original Expenditure Plan than any other EP line item. Totalling \$500 million in Priority 1 funds, the eligible sponsors are Muni, BART, and Caltrain. The Strategic Plan reflects the minimum amounts guaranteed in the Expenditure Plan for each sponsor in the line item. There is also an amount undesignated to any of the eligible sponsors:</p> <p>17M Muni: \$387 M 17B BART: \$9.9 M 17P Caltrain: \$19.8 M 17U Undesignated: \$82 M, to be assigned by the Authority Board</p> <p>This is insufficient Prop K funding in Muni's vehicle category to match federal funds likely to be available. To optimize the leveraging of federal funds, a programming strategy is being adopted that aggregates Muni's three EP line items of Vehicles, Facilities, and Guideways, as a way to address the higher needs in the Vehicle EP line item. While Muni has some funding capacity in the Guideway EP line item, their needs in the Vehicles and Facilities EP line items are significantly greater than the available funds. Rather than have Muni borrow funds for vehicle needs, they can use the capacity in the Guideway EP line item so as not to incur debt finance costs. This capacity does not mean Muni can exceed their overall 90% P1 cap. Rather, it is a "loan" of capacity in a given year so as not to trigger borrowing and debt finance costs.</p> <p>Even after applying this approach to reduce debt financing costs, Muni still does not have sufficient funds to program all of its non-federal match needs. Muni reaches its programming cap at about Year 27. Being able to exhibit a solid match strategy through Year 20 is beneficial, in order to meet the Financial Capacity Assessment required by FTA. The Authority will consider utilizing Undesignated Vehicle funds to cover the shortfall in the outer years of the Strategic Plan. This will be considered in future Strategic Plans if it becomes necessary to avoid debt costs, and to enable the capturing of federal funds.</p> <p>Caltrain is requesting a modest amount of programming in the Vehicle category in the early years of the SP as a match to federal funds primarily, programming totaling less than their pro-rata share of funds. Caltrain has requested, however, four years of programming in FY 2009-10 thru FY 2011-12 which exceeds their pro-rata share, resulting in a modest amount of finance costs. Caltrain has a major vehicle replacement cycle beginning in FY 2013-14 that funds are being reserved for.</p> <p>BART has requested only one project for programming under this EP line item, which is the San Francisco share of the cost of modifications to car interiors.</p> <p>Note that Undesignated funds are available for future vehicle needs to be prioritized by the Authority. A suitable use of the U funds would be to help a project sponsor avoid incurring borrowing costs in order to meet vehicle funding needs. For example, before Muni incurs debt finance costs, which may result from borrowing as early as FY 2005-06 to meet its programmed needs, the Authority would consider one of two options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A - Allocate Undesignated funds to cover Muni's need so as to avoid additional debt issuance; or B - Loan Undesignated funds to Muni to avoid debt issuance for vehicles, with a condition that funds available in Muni's Vehicles EP line item be reprogrammed to the Undesignated EP line item when Muni has them available within its pro-rata share. <p>All Undesignated funds will be held without specific programming to allow these or other future needs to be addressed.</p> | <table> <tr> <td>Programming</td> <td>\$614,402,772</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Finance Cost</td> <td>\$1,473,685</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>\$615,876,458</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Available Funds</td> <td>\$641,140,639</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Difference</td> <td>\$25,264,181</td> </tr> </table> | Programming | \$614,402,772 | Finance Cost | \$1,473,685 | TOTAL | \$615,876,458 | Available Funds | \$641,140,639 | Difference | \$25,264,181 |
| Programming | \$614,402,772 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Finance Cost | \$1,473,685 | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$615,876,458 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Available Funds | \$641,140,639 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Difference | \$25,264,181 | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------|-------------|--------------|-----|-------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|------------|-----|
| <p>EP 18 Trolley Operations and Maintenance (O&M)</p> <p>See description under EP 19.</p> <p>This is the only Operation and Maintenance Project with funds remaining for allocation. They are the result of partial de-obligations of prior allocations.</p> | <table> <tr> <td>Programming</td> <td>\$2,520,679</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Finance Cost</td> <td>\$0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>\$2,520,679</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Available Funds</td> <td>\$2,520,679</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Difference</td> <td>\$0</td> </tr> </table> | Programming | \$2,520,679 | Finance Cost | \$0 | TOTAL | \$2,520,679 | Available Funds | \$2,520,679 | Difference | \$0 |
| Programming | \$2,520,679 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Finance Cost | \$0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$2,520,679 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Available Funds | \$2,520,679 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Difference | \$0 | | | | | | | | | | |

Draft 2009 Strategic Plan

Appendix C. Expenditure Plan Line Item Summary (YOE \$'s)

| | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------|
| EP 19 F-Line Operations & Maintenance | | |
| EP 18 and 19 are treated similarly, since they are both Prop B items grandfathered into Prop K. The Expenditure Plan provides specific guidance regarding their programming: | | |
| “Funds for operations an maintenance shall be limited exclusively to incremental costs associated with the operation of new transportation services and/or facilities, as specified in this plan....the funding eligibility for incremental operating and maintenance costs shall decrease linearly from 100% on the first year of operation to 0% on year 10.....starting with the amount shown in the 2003 Strategic Plan Update for Prop B for fiscal year 2003/04.” These projects are grandfathered in their entirety from Prop B and are therefore not subject to finance costs. | | |
| | Programming | \$5,168,000 |
| | Finance Cost | \$0 |
| | TOTAL | \$5,168,000 |
| | Available Funds | \$5,097,240 |
| | Difference | (\$70,760) |
| Based on current revenue projections, there is insufficient funding to allow any of the O&M's to be reduced by 10% per year for 10 years. Based on current revenue projections, there are no new revenues available for programming to O&M projects. If in the next Strategic Plan, revenue projections warrant additional funding to be programmed, programming will pick up where it left off under this Strategic Plan. | | |

b. Facilities

| | | |
|---|-----------------|---------------|
| EP 20 Facilities | | |
| Muni has a significant need for funds in this line item, primarily because federal funds are being prioritized regionally to other higher scoring projects, and also because of the intense competition for rapidly dwindling State funds. Muni has requested early programming of facilities funds in the Strategic Plan. The Islais Creek Maintenance facility will replace the existing Kirkland diesel bus facility at North Point and Stockton streets. A crucial project for Muni to meet its clean air requirements, Islais Creek will be a new operating and maintenance facility to serve the new alternative fuel buses. The Islais Creek facility will ideally be available soon after Muni receives final delivery on its hybrid vehicles at the end of 2006. | | |
| | Programming | \$67,400,688 |
| | Finance Cost | \$39,932,114 |
| | TOTAL | \$107,332,802 |
| | Available Funds | \$108,962,262 |
| | Difference | \$1,629,460 |
| The early programming of an extensive amount of funds in this element to the Islais Creek facility create the potential for substantial debt financing costs. Similar to the Vehicle EP line item, Muni's three EP line items of Vehicles, Facilities, and Guideways will be aggregated as a way to address the higher needs in the Facilities line item. While Muni has some funding capacity in the Guideway line item, its needs in the Vehicles & Facilities line items are significantly greater than the available funds. Rather than have Muni borrow funds for facility needs, they can use the capacity in the Guideway element so as not to incur debt finance costs. This capacity does not mean Muni can exceed their overall 90% P1 cap. Rather, it is a "loan" of capacity in a given year so as not to trigger borrowing and debt finance costs. | | |
| Caltrain's programming for this EP line item is almost entirely as a match to other fund sources in FY 2005/06 for the Lenzen Maintenance Facility in San Jose. | | |
| BART has a very small amount of funding available in this EP line item, with the 90% P1 cap at only \$1.5 million, or about \$45,000 per year. At BART's request, all funding is programmed in the first four years of the Strategic Plan, for ready-to-go projects, and serving as match to federal funds. | | |

| | | |
|--|-----------------|--------------|
| EP 21 Muni Metro Extension Operations & Maintenance | | |
| This EP line item, the Muni Metro Extension incremental operations and maintenance, is treated similarly to the other O&M entries (Trolley and F-Line) as they are grandfathered from Proposition B and are described very specifically in the EP regarding programming. As described in the EP, | | |
| “Funds for operations and maintenance shall be limited exclusively to incremental costs associated with the operation of new transportation services and/or facilities, as specified in this plan. The funding eligibility for incremental operating and maintenance costs shall decrease linearly from 100% on the first year of operation to 0% on year 10...starting with the amount shown in the 2003 Strategic Plan Update for Prop B for fiscal year 2003/04.” | | |
| This project is grandfathered in its entirety from Prop B and is therefore not subject to finance costs. | | |
| Based on current revenue projections, there is insufficient funding to allow any of the O&M's to be reduced by 10% per year for 10 years. Based on current revenue projections, there are no new revenues available for programming to O&M projects. If in the next Strategic Plan, revenue projections warrant additional funding to be programmed, programming will pick up where it left off under this Strategic Plan. | | |
| | Programming | \$16,781,000 |
| | Finance Cost | \$0 |
| | TOTAL | \$16,781,000 |
| | Available Funds | \$16,556,153 |
| | Difference | (\$224,847) |

Draft 2009 Strategic Plan

Appendix C. Expenditure Plan Line Item Summary (YOE \$'s)

c. Guideways

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|---|--|-------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|--------------|
| EP 22 Guideways | <p>Most of Muni's funding in this EP line item serves as the required match to federal funds, FTA Section 5309 Fixed Guideway funds. While the federal match need is spread throughout the 30-year program, Muni has a significant project need not covered by federal funds in the early years of the Strategic Plan, with their Radio Communication System replacement. Totalling \$72 million in Prop K need, this project meets an FCC requirement that all transit operators switch to a new radio frequency and meet minimum standards for their service. The system must be in place by 2012.</p> <p>There is programming capacity remaining in this line item, but MUNI has elected to reserve it as a strategy to reduce debt costs in its Vehicles and Facilities line items.</p> <p>The funds programmed to Caltrain are dedicated as the non-federal match to FTA Section 5309 Fixed Guideway funds. The programmed amount is slightly more than Caltrain's pro-rata share in the early years of the Strategic Plan, triggering a modest amount of interest.</p> <p>BART did not request programming in this EP line item. The pro-rata share is programmed annually as a placeholder per their request, generating no finance costs.</p> | <table> <tr> <td>Programming</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$319,235,777</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Finance Cost</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$63,908,391</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$383,144,168</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Available Funds</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$394,554,023</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Difference</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$11,409,855</td> </tr> </table> | Programming | \$319,235,777 | Finance Cost | \$63,908,391 | TOTAL | \$383,144,168 | Available Funds | \$394,554,023 | Difference | \$11,409,855 |
| Programming | \$319,235,777 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Finance Cost | \$63,908,391 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$383,144,168 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Available Funds | \$394,554,023 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Difference | \$11,409,855 | | | | | | | | | | | |

B. PARATRANSIT

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|-------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-----------|
| EP 23 Paratransit | <p>In the 2005 Strategic Plan, the Authority Board made a commitment to allocate to paratransit the funding level equal to what they received under the last year of Prop B. This was consistent with an approach of "continued support" outlined in the Expenditure Plan. In order to reduce finance costs and enable Prop K funding to be available as long as practical, the Strategic Plan assumes annual programming of \$9,670,000, not allowing it to escalate. As of the 2009 Strategic Plan update, the last full year of Prop K funding for this category will be FY 2019/20, with partial funding in FY 2020/21.</p> | <table> <tr> <td>Programming</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$161,295,600</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Finance Cost</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$97,701,191</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$258,996,791</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Available Funds</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$259,734,129</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Difference</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$737,337</td> </tr> </table> | Programming | \$161,295,600 | Finance Cost | \$97,701,191 | TOTAL | \$258,996,791 | Available Funds | \$259,734,129 | Difference | \$737,337 |
| Programming | \$161,295,600 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Finance Cost | \$97,701,191 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$258,996,791 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Available Funds | \$259,734,129 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Difference | \$737,337 | | | | | | | | | | | |

C. Streets and Traffic Safety

I. Major Capital Projects

a. Golden Gate Bridge South Access (Doyle Drive)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-----------|
| EP 24 Golden Gate Bridge South Access (Doyle Drive) | <p>See Appendix D for detailed schedule, funding plan, project description and progress report. To take full opportunity of available federal stimulus funds and to reduce project cost, the project schedule was accelerated by 22 months. As a result, Prop K funds will be needed earlier for the construction phase of the project than originally assumed in the 2005 Strategic Plan, increasing finance costs and decreasing the overall amount of Prop K funds available to the project.</p> | <table> <tr> <td>Programming</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$56,066,085</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Finance Cost</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$45,361,438</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$101,427,523</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Available Funds</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$101,886,790</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Difference</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$459,267</td> </tr> </table> | Programming | \$56,066,085 | Finance Cost | \$45,361,438 | TOTAL | \$101,427,523 | Available Funds | \$101,886,790 | Difference | \$459,267 |
| Programming | \$56,066,085 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Finance Cost | \$45,361,438 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$101,427,523 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Available Funds | \$101,886,790 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Difference | \$459,267 | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Phase | Fiscal Year | Prop K Amount (millions) | Notes |
|-------------------|-------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| PA&ED | FY 2003-04 | \$2.95 | Allocated |
| PA&ED | FY 2004-05 | \$3.05 | Allocated |
| PA&ED, PS&E | FY 2006-07 | \$1.38 | Allocated |
| PS&E | FY 2007-08 | \$2.97 | Allocated |
| Urban Partnership | FY 2007-08 | \$0.04 | DONE |
| ROW | FY 2008-09 | \$6.00 | Allocated |
| CON | FY 2010-11 | \$26.96 | Planned |

Draft 2009 Strategic Plan

Appendix C. Expenditure Plan Line Item Summary (YOE \$'s)

b. New and Upgraded Streets

| | | | |
|--------------|--|-----------------|--------------|
| EP 25 | Bernal Heights Street System Upgrade This project is grandfathered in its entirety from Prop B and is therefore not subject to finance costs. The project provides various street improvements in the Bernal Heights area. All Prop K funds have been allocated already, and the Department of Public Works anticipates completing the project by the end of 2010. | Programming | \$2,552,000 |
| | | Finance Cost | \$0 |
| | | TOTAL | \$2,552,000 |
| | | Available Funds | \$2,552,000 |
| | | Difference | \$0 |
| EP 26 | Great Highway Erosion Repair This project is being recommended for programming in FY 2007-08 thru FY 2009-10. The project will stabilize those portions of the roadway damaged by wave action, improving access for bicyclists and pedestrians. The project cannot be delivered relying solely on its pro-rata share of \$50,000 annually, and so generates debt finance costs due to needing its funding all at once. | Programming | \$2,402,637 |
| | | Finance Cost | \$0 |
| | | TOTAL | \$2,402,637 |
| | | Available Funds | \$2,611,492 |
| | | Difference | \$208,855 |
| EP 27 | Visitacion Valley Watershed Planning funds are included next year, FY 2005-06, for the Bi-County Study Update, to identify needed transportation improvements to support planned development in San Francisco and San Mateo County, along with planning funds for a Visitacion Valley Watershed Neighborhood Transportation Plan. Both plans will identify a recommended set of short and medium term capital improvement projects. The highest priority projects, including those with the best funding plans, will then receive funds for design, environmental clearance and implementation. Planned improvements will receive Design funding in the next two years, FY 2005-06 and FY 2006-07. Construction funding will start to be available in FY 2006-07 and continue until the project's 90% P1 cap is reached. | Programming | \$18,476,119 |
| | | Finance Cost | \$181,460 |
| | | TOTAL | \$18,657,579 |
| | | Available Funds | \$19,296,741 |
| | | Difference | \$639,162 |
| EP 28 | Illinois Street Bridge This project is grandfathered in its entirety from Prop B and is therefore not subject to finance costs. The full \$2 million in Prop K funds were allocated to this project in FY 2004/05. Construction of the new Illinois Street Bridge was completed in June 2009. | Programming | \$2,000,000 |
| | | Finance Cost | \$0 |
| | | TOTAL | \$2,000,000 |
| | | Available Funds | \$2,000,000 |
| | | Difference | \$0 |
| EP 29 | Golden Gate Park SR1 Traffic Study The funding for this EP line item has not been assigned to a specifically scoped project. The small amount available, \$180,000, is being programmed as a placeholder until such time as an exact scope is determined for its use. | Programming | \$251,013 |
| | | Finance Cost | \$0 |
| | | TOTAL | \$251,013 |
| | | Available Funds | \$257,290 |
| | | Difference | \$6,277 |
| EP 30 | Other Upgrades to Major Arterials This EP line item has the following eligible sponsors: DPW, DPT, MUNI, Caltrans, and the Authority. No decision has been made on how to spend these funds. In accordance with previous Undesignated (U) categories, placeholder amounts are programmed. Funds could be made available under the following circumstances: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Authority could consider an allocation of Undesignated funds to other projects in the New and Upgraded Streets EP line item of the Expenditure Plan to cover sponsors' needs so as to avoid debt issuance. • Rather than an actual allocation, the Authority Board could consider "loaning" undesignated funds to the sponsor to prevent debt issuance for their project, with an agreement that funds be returned when the sponsor has them available within their pro-rata share. The undesignated funding will be programmed as a placeholder to allow future needs to be addressed. | Programming | \$4,044,789 |
| | | Finance Cost | \$414,048 |
| | | TOTAL | \$4,458,837 |
| | | Available Funds | \$4,573,328 |
| | | Difference | \$114,490 |

Draft 2009 Strategic Plan

Appendix C. Expenditure Plan Line Item Summary (YOE \$'s)

II. System Operations, Safety, and Maintenance

a. New Signals and Signs

| | | |
|--|-----------------|--------------|
| EP 31 New Signals and Signs | | |
| This EP line item will fund project development and capital costs for new traffic signs and signals, including pedestrian and bicycle signals, implementation of transit priority systems on select corridors, and new pavement markings such as raised flashing pavement reflectors and transit lane markings. Signs installed within this EP line item include signs required by national or state mandate or additional signs required due to the implementation of improvements under another EP line item (e.g. new guide signs). Programming is in accordance with the pro-rata share. | | |
| | Programming | \$41,373,387 |
| | Finance Cost | \$3,377,091 |
| | TOTAL | \$44,750,478 |
| | Available Funds | \$46,440,822 |
| | Difference | \$1,690,345 |

b. Advanced Technology and Information Systems

| | | |
|---|-----------------|--------------|
| EP 32 Advanced Technology and Information Systems (SFgo) | | |
| Funding programmed for SFgo will support advanced technology and information systems to better manage roadway operations for transit, traffic, cyclists, and pedestrians. Improvements include interconnect and traffic signal controller technology and related communications systems to enable transit and emergency vehicle priority, dissemination of real time information to transit passengers, and management of vehicular flows and signalization to enhance bicycle and pedestrian safety. Programming is in accordance with the pro-rata share. | | |
| | Programming | \$20,179,623 |
| | Finance Cost | \$1,134,734 |
| | TOTAL | \$21,314,358 |
| | Available Funds | \$22,255,574 |
| | Difference | \$941,217 |

III. System Maintenance and Renovation

a. Signals and Signs

| | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| EP 33 Signals and Signs | | |
| Projects funded in this EP line item include upgrades and maintenance of traffic signs, signals, and new pavement markers. Project development and capital costs for implementation of transit preemption (and priority) systems on select corridors, new mast arms, LED signals, conduits, wiring, pedestrian signals, left turn signals bicycle and pedestrian route signs and signals, striping and channelization to improve safety are eligible expenditures. Programming is in accordance with the pro-rata share. | | |
| | Programming | \$102,559,268 |
| | Finance Cost | \$6,376,843 |
| | TOTAL | \$108,936,111 |
| | Available Funds | \$113,078,900 |
| | Difference | \$4,142,789 |

b. Street Resurfacing, Rehabilitation, and Maintenance

| | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| EP 34 Street Resurfacing, Rehabilitation, and Maintenance | | |
| Improvements in this EP line item include repaving and reconstruction of city streets to prevent deterioration of the roadway system, based on an industry standard pavement management system designed to inform cost effective roadway maintenance. Individual projects may include sidewalk rehabilitation, curb ramps and landscaping, subject to approved prioritization program. Funds will be advanced beyond the pro-rata share through FY 2006/07. This is to enable a continuing level of street resurfacing activities. Beginning in FY 2007/08, programming of Prop K funds will be significantly reduced, as the current Governor's budget calls for the reinstatement of Prop 42 funds for Local Streets and Roads purposes to cities and counties, including a share to San Francisco. Simultaneously, federal funds will be made available through the region for street resurfacing purposes. | | |
| | Programming | \$93,551,330 |
| | Finance Cost | \$56,319,511 |
| | TOTAL | \$149,870,841 |
| | Available Funds | \$152,186,961 |
| | Difference | \$2,316,120 |

| | | |
|--|-----------------|--------------|
| EP 35 Street Repair and Cleaning Equipment | | |
| This EP line item will fund capital costs for the replacement of street repair and cleaning equipment according to industry standards, including but not limited to, asphalt pavers, dump trucks, sweepers, and front-end loaders. Programming is in accordance with the pro-rata share. | | |
| | Programming | \$26,703,030 |
| | Finance Cost | \$1,025,555 |
| | TOTAL | \$27,728,585 |
| | Available Funds | \$29,331,046 |
| | Difference | \$1,602,460 |

Draft 2009 Strategic Plan

Appendix C. Expenditure Plan Line Item Summary (YOE \$'s)

| | | | |
|--------------|--|-----------------|-------------|
| EP 36 | Embarcadero Roadway Incremental Operations and Maintenance | Programming | \$2,149,942 |
| | This element of the EP, the Embarcadero incremental operations and maintenance, is treated similarly to the other O&M entries as they are grandfathered from Proposition B and are described very specifically in the EP regarding programming. As described in the EP, | Finance Cost | \$0 |
| | “ Funds for operations an maintenance shall be limited exclusively to incremental costs associated with the operation of new transportation services and/or facilities, as specified in this plan. The funding eligibility for incremental operating and maintenance costs shall decrease linearly from 100% on the first year of operation to 0% on year 10.....starting with the amount shown in the 2003 Strategic Plan Update for Prop B for fiscal year 2003/04.” | TOTAL | \$2,149,942 |
| | This project is grandfathered in its entirety from Prop B and is therefore not subject to finance costs. | Available Funds | \$2,121,184 |
| | Based on current revenue projections, there is insufficient funding to allow any of the O&M's to be reduced by 10% per year for 10 years. Based on current revenue projections, there are no new revenues available for programming to O&M projects. If in the next Strategic Plan, revenue projections warrant additional funding to be programmed, programming will pick up where it left off under this Strategic Plan. | Difference | (\$28,758) |

c. Pedestrian and Bicycle Facility Maintenance

| | | | |
|--------------|--|-----------------|--------------|
| EP 37 | Pedestrian and Bicycle Facility Maintenance | Programming | \$18,933,675 |
| | This EP line item includes project development and capital costs for public sidewalk repair and reconstruction, upgrades of substandard bicycle lanes, rehabilitation of bicycle paths, and reconstruction of MUNI passenger boarding islands. Specific attention will be given to repairing sidewalks to permit east-of-movement for the mobility impaired. Programming is in accordance with the pro-rata share. | Finance Cost | \$2,614,962 |
| | | TOTAL | \$21,548,637 |
| | | Available Funds | \$22,384,219 |
| | | Difference | \$835,582 |

IV. Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements

a. Traffic Calming

| | | | |
|--------------|---|-----------------|--------------|
| EP 38 | Traffic Calming | Programming | \$75,489,750 |
| | Traffic calming is a program that supports improvements to neighborhood streets to make them more livable and safe for all users. Although many individual elements of traffic calming strategies are also described under EP lines 39 and 40 below, improvements funded in this EP line item should specifically reduce auto traffic speeds and improve bicycle and pedestrian circulation and safety in city neighborhoods. Components of these comprehensive strategies include sidewalk widening, streetscape upgrades including landscaping, speed humps, corner bulb-outs, ladder crosswalks and pedestrian signals, and development of neighborhood and school area safety plans citywide. Programming is in accordance with the pro-rata share. | Finance Cost | \$0 |
| | | TOTAL | \$75,489,750 |
| | | Available Funds | \$78,216,122 |
| | | Difference | \$2,726,372 |

b. Bicycle Circulation and Safety

| | | | |
|--------------|---|-----------------|--------------|
| EP 39 | Bicycle Circulation/Safety | Programming | \$25,125,833 |
| | The bicycle circulation and safety program enhances the transportation system's usability and safety for bicycles. This will be accomplished through infrastructure improvements, supporting bicycle parking facilities, and public outreach and education programs. Possible projects include new bike lanes and paths, installing bike racks and lockers, and bicycle safety education programs. All improvements must be consistent with the city's bicycle plan. Programming is in accordance with the pro-rata share. \$20,000 is being included in this FY 2004-05 to complete funding for improvements stemming from the Market Street Corridor Study. | Finance Cost | \$9,661,497 |
| | | TOTAL | \$34,787,331 |
| | | Available Funds | \$35,506,003 |
| | | Difference | \$718,672 |

c. Pedestrian Circulation and Safety

| | | | |
|--------------|--|-----------------|--------------|
| EP 40 | Pedestrian Circulation/Safety | Programming | \$26,944,100 |
| | Projects funded in this EP line item will improve the safety and usability of city streets for pedestrians. Once a Pedestrian Master Plan is complete, improvements should occur in the order recommended by that plan. Possible projects include sidewalk bulb-outs, sidewalk widening, pedestrian islands, pedestrian countdown signals, striping ladder crosswalks, flashing placement reflectors on crosswalks, and improved pedestrian circulation around BART and Caltrain stations. Programming is in accordance with the pro-rata share. | Finance Cost | \$2,432,453 |
| | | TOTAL | \$29,376,553 |
| | | Available Funds | \$30,617,495 |
| | | Difference | \$1,240,942 |

Draft 2009 Strategic Plan

Appendix C. Expenditure Plan Line Item Summary (YOE \$'s)

d. Curb Ramps

| | | | |
|-------------------------|--|-----------------|---------------------|
| EP 41 Curb Ramps | The curb ramp program funds construction of new wheelchair curb ramps, reconstruction of existing curb ramps, and related roadway work to permit east of movement for the mobility impaired. Curb ramp construction and reconstruction should be consistent with and support a citywide transition plan to bring San Francisco into full ADA compliance. Eligible costs include project development and capital costs. Programming is in accordance with the pro-rata share. | Programming | \$28,358,425 |
| | | Finance Cost | \$195,029 |
| | | TOTAL | \$28,553,454 |
| | | Available Funds | \$30,360,205 |
| | | Difference | \$1,806,751 |

e. Tree Planting and Maintenance

| | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|---------------------|
| EP 42 Tree Planting and Maintenance | Projects in this EP line item will include both planting new street trees and maintaining existing trees in public rights-of-way throughout the city. Programming continues the commitment initiated under Prop B and is in accordance with the pro-rata share. | Programming | \$37,118,436 |
| | | Finance Cost | \$3,028,791 |
| | | TOTAL | \$40,147,228 |
| | | Available Funds | \$42,195,539 |
| | | Difference | \$2,048,312 |

D. Transportation System Management/Strategic Initiatives

I. Transportation Demand Management/Parking Management

| | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|---------------------|
| EP 43 Transportation Demand Management/Parking Management | Funding for TDM/PM activities will be subdivided into three categories: 1) Citywide Transportation Demand Management. Planning and implementation of programs to encourage trip reduction and promotion of alternative modes for workers, students, visitors and other individuals; 2) Modal Plans. Planning funds for the policy content of mode-specific plans or plan updates including the Pedestrian Master Plan and a Transit Network Study; and 3) Pricing and Parking Management. Planning and implementation funds for projects that rationalize the pricing of auto use, especially parking, parking management plans and pilots to support activities under D.1. Citywide TDM and EP line item D.ii. Land Use/Transportation Coordination are included. Also included are a congestion pricing policy initiative and study of citywide parking policy reform. | Programming | \$14,119,498 |
| | | Finance Cost | \$266,736 |
| | | TOTAL | \$14,386,234 |
| | | Available Funds | \$14,922,813 |
| | | Difference | \$536,579 |

II. Transportation/Land Use Coordination

| | | | |
|---|---|-----------------|---------------------|
| EP 44 Transportation/Land Use Coordination | The Transportation/Land Use Coordination Program will fund three distinct project and program types: 1) Capital Match for TLC/HIP. Planning and capital match funds for TLC/HIP and other capital grant proposals that support transit-oriented development, bicycle and pedestrian transportation; 2) Neighborhood Transportation Planning. Planning funds for neighborhood transportation planning efforts. Projects may be initiated by community organizations though they will require an eligible sponsoring agency to apply for D2 grant funds; and 3) Major Transit Investments. Planning and implementation funds for transit corridor focused planning efforts aimed at developing opportunities for land use planning and joint development along corridors which are the focus of major transit investment or infill development. | Programming | \$20,477,574 |
| | | Finance Cost | \$1,455,814 |
| | | TOTAL | \$21,933,388 |
| | | Available Funds | \$22,641,509 |
| | | Difference | \$708,121 |

Total Strategic Plan

| | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------------|
| | Programming | \$2,374,554,955 |
| | Finance Cost | \$543,901,647 |
| | TOTAL | \$2,918,456,602 |
| | Available Funds | \$2,985,043,627 |
| | Difference | \$66,587,025 |