File No. 120907

Committee Item No. 3
Board Item No. _____

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Budget and Finance Committee **Date** 10/03/2012

Board of Supervisors Meeting **Date** _____

Cmte	Board	
☐	☐	Motion
☒	☐	Resolution
☐	☐	Ordinance
☐	☐	Legislative Digest
☒	☐	Budget and Legislative Analyst Report
☐	☐	Legislative Analyst Report
☐	☐	Youth Commission Report
☐	☐	Introduction Form (for hearings)
☒	☐	Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report
☐	☐	MOU
☒	☐	Grant Information Form
☒	☐	Grant Budget
☐	☐	Subcontract Budget
☒	☐	Contract/Agreement
☐	☐	Form 126 – Ethics Commission
☐	☐	Award Letter
☒	☐	Application
☐	☐	Public Correspondence

OTHER **(Use back side if additional space is needed)**

☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	

Completed by: Victor Young **Date** September 28, 2012
Completed by: Victor Young **Date** _____

[Accept and Expend Grant - South of Market Alleyways Improvement Project - $1,381,000]

Resolution authorizing the Department of Public Works to accept and expend a federal grant in the amount of $1,381,000 from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission for the South of Market Alleyways Improvement Project.

WHEREAS, The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the designated recipient for federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) and/or Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) funds for the San Francisco Bay Area; and

WHEREAS, MTC Resolution No. 3925 established a Congestion Management Agency (CMA) Block Grant program which delegated program management and project selection to the county congestion management agencies for three programs: the county Transportation for Livable Communities Program, the Regional Bicycle Program, and the Local Streets and Roads Shortfall Program, which are all funded with federal STP and CMAQ funds for FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12; and

WHEREAS, The San Francisco County Transportation Agency (SFCTA), which is the CMA for San Francisco County, solicited applications for $11,700,000 in federal funds under the CMA Block Grant program; and

WHEREAS, The San Francisco Redevelopment Agency applied to SFCTA and received approval for $1,381,000 in federal CMAQ funds under the CMA Block Grant program for South of Market Alleyways Improvement Project; and

WHEREAS; The CMAQ funds under the CMA Block Grant program require a 20% local match; and

WHEREAS, Resolution #103-2010, approved by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commission in August, 2010, assured that the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency would provide $959,400 in non-federal matching funds, thus creating an enforceable obligation under ABx26; and,

WHEREAS, With the dissolution of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in February 2012, all expenditures considered necessary to meet enforceable obligations are payable through the Successor Agency; and,

WHEREAS, Through Resolution #11-12, passed by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in January 2012, the City and County of San Francisco became the successor agency to the Redevelopment Agency and shall manage the Agency's remaining non-affordable housing assets; and,

WHEREAS, The Successor Agency has requested to transfer responsibility for the project, as well as all grant funds and the required matching funds to the Department of Public Works (DPW), including project management, accounting, programming and reporting, as recorded in the Memorandum of Understanding between DPW and the Successor Agency, dated June 25, 2012, on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. ; and ,

WHEREAS, The DPW is a sponsor of transportation projects eligible for CMAQ funds; and,

WHEREAS, The grant does not require an ASO amendment; and,

WHEREAS, The grant budget does not include indirect costs; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the San Francisco Board of Supervisors authorizes the Director of Public Works or his/her designee to accept and expend a $1,381,000 federal grant from MTC for the South of Market Alleyways Improvement Project; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That Director of Public Works or his/her designee is authorized to execute all documents pertaining to the project with Caltrans.

Recommended:

Mohammed Nuru

Approved: _____

Mayor

Approved: _____

Controller

Item 3 File 12-0907	Department: Public Works (DPW)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Legislative Objectives

- The proposed resolution would authorize the Department of Public Works (DPW) to accept and expend a grant in the amount of $1,381,000 from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for the South of Market (SOMA) Alleyways Improvement Project, with $959,400 in matching funds provided by the Successor Agency, the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency.

Key Points

- The MTC has previously awarded $11,738,880 in Congestion Management Agency Block Grant funding in FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12 to the City and County of San Francisco, of which $1,381,000 is allocated to the SOMA Alleyways Improvement Project. The SOMA Alleyways Improvement Project is for the construction of pedestrian and traffic improvements to Minna, Natoma, Clementina, Tehama, Shipley and Clara Streets between Fifth and Sixth Streets in order to make the streets safer for pedestrians and bicycles.
- In 2010 the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commission approved matching funds of $959,400, or 41 percent of the total SOMA Alleyways Improvement Project cost of $2,340,400. Of the $959,400 in matching funds, the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency paid $98,942 to DPW in 2010 for completion of design and construction documents for the SOMA Alleyways Improvement Project, resulting in a balance of $860,458. When the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency was dissolved on February 1, 2012, $860,458 became an enforceable obligation of the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, and has been recognized as such by the State Oversight Board and the State Department of Finance. On June 25, 2012, the Successor Agency, responsible for implementing enforceable obligations which were in place prior to the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency's dissolution and for all of the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency's non-housing assets, and DPW signed a Memorandum of Understanding approving the transfer of the balance of $860,458 to DPW.

Fiscal Analysis

- The source of the $959,400 in matching funds for the SOMA Alleyways Improvement Project is tax-increment bonds previously issued by the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency.
- On September 5, 2012, the Successor Agency transferred $848,000 to DPW. Therefore, the Successor Agency has provided a total of $946,942 ($98,942 plus $848,000), or 98.7 percent, of the $959,400 in matching funds. The balance of matching funds, $12,458 ($959,400 less $946,942), remains outstanding due to an administrative delay but is expected to be paid to DPW within the next month from 2008 Series A tax-exempt bond proceeds.

Recommendations

- Approve the proposed resolution.

MANDATE STATEMENT / BACKGROUND

Mandate Statement

In accordance with Administrative Code Section 10.170-1, the acceptance and expenditure of Federal, State, or other grant funds in the amount of $100,000 or more is subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors.

Background

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission[1] (MTC) established a Congestion Management Agency Block Grant program, in which 50 percent of funds would be allocated in FY 2010-11 and the other 50 percent in FY 2011-12 across three programs, (a) the Transportation for Livable Communities County Share (TLC) Program, (b) the Regional Bicycle Program[2], and (c) the Local Streets and Roads Program[3]. The TLC Program supports community-based transportation projects that help rejuvenate downtown areas, commercial cores, neighborhoods, and transit corridors by enhancing their amenities and ambiance. MTC allocated approximately $11,738,880 in Congestion Management Agency Block Grant funding to the City and County of San Francisco, with approximately $2,990,400 available for the TLC Program. The MTC delegated program management and project selection to the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA).

According to Ms. Ananda Hirsch, Transportation Finance Analyst for the Department of Public Works (DPW), the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency applied for and received a TLC Program grant of $1,381,000 for the South of Market (SOMA) Alleyways Improvement Project on July 28, 2010,which required 20 percent matching funds equal to $276,200.

On August 3, 2010, the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commission approved a resolution stating that the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency would provide $959,400 in matching funds, or 41 percent of the total project cost of $2,340,400 (Resolution No. 103-2010).

On December 7, 2010, the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commission approved an agreement with DPW for completion of design and construction documents for the SOMA Alleyways Improvement Project in an amount not to exceed $266,200. DPW has prepared all design and construction drawings and received $98,942 from the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency for that work on March 22, 2010.

With the dissolution of the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency effective February 1, 2012, all expenditures considered necessary to meet enforceable obligations must be paid through the Successor Agency[4]. According to Ms. Sally Oerth, Deputy Director of the Successor Agency, the remaining $860,458 in matching funds ($959,400 less $98,942) are considered to be

[1] The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the transportation planning, coordinating and financing agency for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area.
[2] The Regional Bike Program focuses on bicycle projects that result in additional bicycle route mileage.
[3] The Local Streets and Roads Program focuses on pavement rehabilitation.
[4] The Successor Agency, established by State law on December 29, 2011, is currently responsible for implementing enforceable obligations which were in place prior to the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency's dissolution and for all of the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency's non-housing assets.

an enforceable obligation and have been recognized as such by the State Oversight Board and the State Department of Finance[5].

On June 25, 2012, the Successor Agency and DPW signed a Memorandum of Understanding approving the transfer of all $860,458 in remaining SOMA Alleyways Improvement Project matching funds and implementation responsibility to DPW. Ms. Hirsch advises that, on September 5, 2012, the Successor Agency transferred $848,000 of the remaining funds still owed to DPW. Therefore, the Successor Agency has provided a total of $946,942, or 98.7 percent, of the required $959,400 in matching funds ($98,942 plus $848,000). The balance of matching funds, $12,458 ($959,400 less $946,942), remains outstanding.

DETAILS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The proposed resolution would authorize the Department of Public Works (DPW) to accept and expend a grant in the amount of $1,381,000 from the MTC for the SOMA Alleyways Improvement Project, with $959,400 in matching funds to be provided to DPW by the Successor Agency, the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency.

The SOMA Alleyways Improvement Project includes the creation of safer pedestrian spaces in underutilized alleys that connect major commercial corridors. The project will improve the appearance of the alleyways and slow vehicle traffic in order to make the streets safer for pedestrians and bicycles. Enhancements will be made on Minna, Natoma, Clementina, Tehama, Shipley and Clara Streets between Fifth and Sixth Streets. Specific improvements will include (a) new street trees, (b) new street lights, and (c) special roadway paving, raised crosswalks, and chicanes[6].

Ms. Hirsch advises that a construction contractor has not been selected yet and the competitive bidding process has not yet begun. The construction contract is expected to be advertised in March, 2013 and to be awarded by August, 2013. The project is currently estimated to be completed in July, 2014.

FISCAL ANALYSIS

Ms. Hirsch advises that $1,381,000 available under the MTC grant, together with the $959,400 in matching funds from the Successor Agency would be used to complete the $2,340,400 SOMA Alleyways Project. Table 1 below summarizes the $2,340,400 SOMA Alleyways Improvement Project budget.

[5] All enforceable obligations are listed on Recognized Obligation Payment Schedules (ROPS), which are issued every six months and require final approval of the State Oversight Board and State Department of Finance. The $860,458 in matching funds were listed on the January – June 2012 and the July – December 2012 ROPS.

[6] A chicane is an artificial feature creating extra turns in a road to slow traffic for safety.

Table 1: SOMA Alleyways Project Budget

Engineering and Design	$256,400
Construction Management and Support	318,400
Construction	1,604,600
Contingency (10% of Construction)	161,000
Total	**$2,340,400**

Source of $959,400 Matching Funds is Tax Increment Bonds Previously Issued by the Former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

According to Ms. Hirsch, the source of the $959,400 in matching funds for the SOMA Alleyways project is tax-increment bonds previously issued by the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. Table 2 below summarizes the various issuances of the Redevelopment Agency's tax increment bonds which comprise the sources of the $959,400 in matching funds.

Table 2: Summary of Sources of $959,400 in Matching Funds

Bond Issuance	Amount	Amount Paid to DPW by the Successor Agency	Balance Still Owed to DPW by the Successor Agency
2007 Series A Taxable Bond Proceeds	$98,942	$98,942	$0
2008 Series A Tax Exempt Bond Proceeds	160,458	148,000*	12,458
2009 Series F Tax Exempt Bond Proceeds	500,000	500,000*	0
2009 Series B Tax Exempt Bond Proceeds	200,000	200,000*	0
Total	**$959,400**	**$946,942**	**$12,458**

*Total of $848,000.

As previously discussed, Ms. Hirsch advises that, on September 5, 2012, the Successor Agency transferred $848,000 to DPW. Therefore, as shown above in Table 2, the Successor Agency has provided a total of $946,942, or 98.7 percent, of the required $959,400 in matching funds ($98,942 plus $848,000). The balance of matching funds, $12,458 ($959,400 less $946,942), remains outstanding due to an administrative delay but is expected to be paid to DPW within the next month from 2008 Series A tax-exempt bond proceeds.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Approve the proposed resolution.

City and County of San Francisco

San Fra sco Department of Public Works
Office of the Director
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 348
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-6920 ■ www.sfdpw.org

Edwin M. Lee, Mayor
Mohammed Nuru, Director

TO: **Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors**

FROM: **Mohammed Nuru, Director of Public Works** MCN

DATE: **August 23, 2012**

SUBJECT: **Accept and Expend Resolution for South of Market Alleyways Improvement Project**

GRANT TITLE: **Federal Transportation for Livable Communities funds**

Attached please find the original and 4 copies of each of the following:

_X_ Proposed grant resolution; original signed by Department, Mayor, Controller

_X__ Grant information form, including disability checklist

_X__ Grant budget

_X__ Grant application

_X__ Grant award letter from funding agency

_X_ Other (Explain): MOU Between DPW and successor to SFRA.

Special Timeline Requirements:

None

Departmental representative to receive a copy of the adopted resolution:
Name: Ananda Hirsch **Phone:** 415.558.4034

Interoffice Mail Address: DPW, IDC 30 Van Ness Ave, 5th Floor

Certified copy required Yes ☐ **No** ☒

South of Market Alleyways Improvement Project

Summary

The proposed resolution will authorize the Department of Public Work (DPW) to accept and expend $1,381,000 in federal grant funds originally awarded to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency for the South of Market (SOMA) Alleyways Improvement Project. The source of the grant is $1,381,000 in Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement grant funds matched by $959,000 in former Redevelopment Agency tax-exempt bond proceeds. DPW was originally slated to implement this project, and would, with the passage of this resolution, take over responsibility for managing the grant award and matching funds.

Background

For fiscal years 2010-11 and 2011-12, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission established a Congestion Management Agency Block Grant program which delegated program management and project selection to the county congestion management agencies for three programs, including the Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program. Working with the local congestion management agency, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency applied for and received a TLC grant of $1,381,000 for the SOMA Alleyways Improvement Project.

In August 2010, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commission passed a resolution stating that the Agency would provide $959,400 matching funds, thus creating an enforceable obligation under ABx26. With the dissolution of the Redevelopment Agency, all expenditures considered necessary to meet enforceable obligations are payable through the Successor Agency. In June 2012, the Successor Agency and DPW signed a Memorandum of Understanding transferring all project funds and implementation responsibility to DPW.

Project Description

The SOMA Alleyways Improvement Project will create safer pedestrian spaces in underutilized alleys that connect major commercial corridors. The project will improve the appearance of the alleyways, improve the quality of life for residents and visitors, and slow automobile traffic in order to make the streets safer for pedestrians and bicycles. Enhancements will be made on Minna, Natoma, Clementina, Tehama, Shipley and Clara Streets between Fifth to Sixth Streets. Improvements will include: new street trees, new street lights, special roadway paving, raised crosswalks, chicanes (alternating-side-of-street parking), and art enrichment.

The total cost of the project is $2,340,000. The preliminary engineering phase will be covered by tax-exempt bond proceeds from the Successor Agency at a cost of $269,200. The construction work will be funded by the $1,381,000 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement grant that is the subject of this resolution, and an additional $689,800 in tax-exempt bond proceeds from the Successor Agency.

Questions about the grant can be directed to Ananda Hirsch, Transportation Finance Analyst, 558-4034.

File Number: _____
(Provided by Clerk of Board of Supervisors)

Grant Information Form
(Effective March 2005)

Purpose: Accompanies proposed Board of Supervisors resolutions authorizing a Department to accept and expend grant funds.

The following describes the grant referred to in the accompanying resolution:

1. Grant Title: South of Market Alleyways Improvement Project

2. Department: Public Works

3. Contact Person: Ananda Hirsch Telephone: (415) 558-4034

4. Grant Approval Status (check one):

[X] Approved by funding agency [ ] Not yet approved

5. Amount of Grant Funding Approved or Applied for: $ 1,381,000

6a. Matching Funds Required: $ 959,400
b. Source(s) of matching funds (if applicable): Taxable bond proceeds from the successor agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

7a. Grant Source Agency: Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)

8. Proposed Grant Project Summary: Make streetscape improvements to six alleyways in the South of Market neighborhood.

9. Grant Project Schedule, as allowed in approval documents, or as proposed:

Start-Date: September 2012 End-Date: December 2013

10a. Amount budgeted for contractual services: $1,381,100

b. Will contractual services be put out to bid? Yes

c. If so, will contract services help to further the goals of the department's MBE/WBE requirements? Yes.

d. Is this likely to be a one-time or ongoing request for contracting out? One-time

11a. Does the budget include indirect costs? [ ] Yes [X] No

b1. If yes, how much? $
b2. How was the amount calculated?

c. If no, why are indirect costs not included?
[] Not allowed by granting agency [ ] To maximize use of grant funds on direct services
[X] Other (please explain): All indirect costs will be covered by the local matching funds, as the grant funds will be used only for the construction contract.

c2. If no indirect costs are included, what would have been the indirect costs? Grant funds aren't being used for indirect costs in order to maximize use for direct services.

12. Any other significant grant requirements or comments:

****Disability Access Checklist*****

13. This Grant is intended for activities at (check all that apply):

[X] Existing Site(s)
[ ] Rehabilitated Site(s)
[ ] New Site(s)

[ ] Existing Structure(s)
[ ] Rehabilitated Structure(s)
[ ] New Structure(s)

[X] Existing Program(s) or Service(s)
[ ] New Program(s) or Service(s)

14. The Departmental ADA Coordinator and/or the Mayor's Office on Disability have reviewed the proposal and concluded that the project as proposed will be in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and all other Federal, State and local access laws and regulations and will allow the full inclusion of persons with disabilities, or will require unreasonable hardship exceptions, as described in the comments section:

Comments:

Departmental or Mayor's Office of Disability Reviewer:__Kevin Jensen_
(Name)

(Signature)

Date Reviewed: 8/22/2012

Department Approval: Mohammed Nuru (Name) Director, Department of Public Works (Title)

(Signature)

South of Market Alleyways Improvement Project
Congestion Management Agency Block Grant Budget Summary

Sources		Amount
Congestion Management Agency Block Grant	$	1,381,000
Local Match (Former Redevelopment Agency Funds)	$	959,000
TOTAL COST	**$**	**2,340,000**

Uses		Amount
Preliminary Engineering	$	269,200
Construction Phase & Contingency	$	2,070,800
TOTAL COST	**$**	**2,340,000**

TLC Capital Grant Applications

Project Name: South of Market Alleyways Improvements, Phase 2

Sponsor: San Francisco, City and County

Status: Submitted

Part 1 - GENERAL INFORMATION

Lead Applicant

1a **City**

San Francisco

1b **County**

San Francisco

Contact #1:

1c **first name**

Mike

1d **last name**

Grisso

1e **email**

mike.grisso@sfgov.org

1f **phone**

415-749-2510

Contact #2:

1g **first name**

Kevin

1h **last name**

Masuda

1i **email**

kevin.masuda@sfgov.org

1j **phone**

415-749-2508

If awarded, Who will be the day to day project manger (Public Works)?

1k	**first name**
	Kevin
1l	**last name**
	Masuda
1m	**email**
	kevin.masuda@sfgov.org
1n	**phone**
	415-749-2508
1o	**Project Description/Scope of Work**
	Streetscape and pedestrian improvements including raised crosswalks, new trees, new street lighting, traffic chicanes, and "street print" textured asphalt paving.
1p	**Name of Priority Development Area in which project is located?**
	Eastern Neighborhoods
1q	**Local Stakeholders and Community Partners (attach letters of support if applicable at the end of the application)**
	South of Market Project Area Committee, SPUR, San Francisco County Transportation Authority, Great Streets
1r	**Total Grant Request from MTC**
	1,380,600
1s	**Local Match (cash) 20% required**
	959,400
1t	**Source of Local Matching Funds**
	Tax Increment
1u	**Total Project Cost**
	2,340,000
1v	**Project Soft Costs**
	574,000
1w	**Project Hard Costs**
	1,766,000
1x	**Non Participatory Match**
	50,000

Part 2 - BASIC ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

Project sponsors must answer yes to all questions/statements to be eligible to receive TLC funding.

2a **Project is located within a planned or potential Priority Development Area?**

Yes

2b **Funding request is under $6 million?**

Yes

2c **Project sponsor assures that a local cash match of at least 20 percent of the total project cost is committed?**

Yes

2d **If new housing is proposed within 1/4 mile radius of project, are townhomes units habitable (accessible bedroom) by persons with disabilities and accessible to transit within ½ mile?**

Yes

Part 3 - TYPE OF TLC FUNDING REQUEST

3a **Please select one of the following project types:**

Streetscape Improvement

3b ***If one of these projects, have local funds been identified for a funding exchange?**

No

3c **Describe your funding plan**

The plan is to improve the character of the streets, encourage pedestrian safety and calm traffic in an incremental manner. The San Francisco Redevelopment Agency has worked closely with the neighborhood on improving the main corridor of 6th Street in two phases ending in 2007. The next area to be improved are the alleyways, with construction begining in April 2010. The next phase of alleyway improvements are scalable and can be completed in one or two phases. However, to minimize disruptions to the neighborhood, it is recommended to pursue the remaining alleyways in one construction contract.

Funding is now in place for approximately one third of the project.

Part 4 - AREA PLACE TYPE

4a **Area Place Type, please select one.**

Urban Neighborhood

Part 5 - LOCATION OF PROJECT

5a **Is your project in a Planned PDA?**

Yes

5b **If yes, which PDA?**

Eastern Neighborhoods

5c **What is the name of the adopted plan and when was it adopted ?**

South of Market Redevelopment Plan, adopted in 2005.

5d **If no, which Potential PDA?**

5e Are any land use plans currently underway?

No

5f What type of plan is underway and when will it be completed?

Part 6 – PROJECT IMPACT - 70 POINTS TOTAL

Housing Impact

What is the jurisdiction's current Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) allocation for housing?

6a-1 low

5,535

6a-2 very low

6,589

6a-3 moderate

6,754

6a-4 above moderate

12,315

How many existing affordable housing units located within the quarter-mile radius around the project?

6a-5 low

1,100

6a-6 very low

359

6a-7 moderate

89

6a-8 above moderate

3,355

How many affordable housing units are zoned within the quarter-mile radius around the project?

6a-9 low

0

6a-10 very low

0

6a-11 moderate

0

6a-12 above moderate

0

6a-13 **What applicable zoning codes affect the project area:**

2,176 total number of units is the project area development potential.

The City of San Francisco has updated its Inclusionary Affordable Housing Ordinance in 2006. The Ordinance requires 15% inclusionary housing for developments of 5 or more units. Ownership opportunities are for people within 80-120% of the area median, and 60% for rental opportunities.

In lieu fees may be paid to develop equivalent off-site housing. The fee is determined by a formula using the required number of units x affordibility gap x adjustment factor.

C-3-G,C-3-R,C-3-S,M-1,MUG,MUO,MUR,NCT,P,RC-4,RED,RSD,SLI,SLR

How many building permits or full entitlements have been issued in the ¼ mile project area since January 1, 2000 for:

2000-2006

6a-14 **Low**

50

6a-15 **Very Low**

222

6a-16 **moderate**

31

6a-17 **above moderate**

836

2007- present

6a-18 **Low**

0

6a-19 **Very Low**

137

6a-20 **moderate**

58

6a-21 **above moderate**

216

6a-22 **Describe any policies or programs the local jurisdiction has employed to ensure construction of planned affordable housing in the project area.**

The City of San Francisco has a variety of policies to help meet our affordable housing goals, including the following:

- Inclusionary housing that requires 15-20% of all new units are affordable
- Expedited permit review for affordable housing projects
- Redevelopment Agency Tax Increment districts dedicate 50% of income to affordable housing

· San Francisco pursues all Federal, State, and regional affordable housing dollars.

In the next section check the following essential services (Existing and Planned) located within a quarter-mile radius around your project:

6a-23 Existing

Child Care
Community/civic center/social service
Grocery Store
Pocket park or playground
Health club facility/outdoor recreation facility
Hardware Store
Laundry/dry cleaner
Hair Salon/Barber
Medical Offices
Pharmacy
Place of Worship
School
Senior Care Facility

6a-24 Proposed (eligible under current zoning?)

Police/Fire
Bank/Credit Union
Child Care
Community/civic center/social service
Grocery Store
Pocket park or playground
Health club facility/outdoor recreation facility
Hardware Store
Laundry/dry cleaner
Hair Salon/Barber
Library
Medical Offices
Pharmacy
Place of Worship
School
Senior Care Facility
Post Office

6a-25 Explaination of existing and proposed land uses.

The area is a very dense residential neighborhood, with neighborhood retail and some light industrial uses concentrated along Fifth, Sixth, Mission, Howard and Folsom Streets. Sixth Street is dominated by single-room occupancy hotels, while the alleys are primarily composed of three to four story apartments and

condominiums. The alleys also contain a small amount of retail and light industrial uses. Since 1996, there have been approximately 1,300 new housing units developed within the project area (600 market-rate units and 700 affordable housing units). A major residential project with 448 new units has been approved on Fifth and Folsom Streets along Clementina Alley in the Project Area. Through the Redevelopment Agency's economic revitalization program, Sixth Street has improved significantly. Since 2004, more than 20 new retail businesses have opened on Sixth Street with facade and tenant improvement grants from the Redevelopment Agency. The Redevelopment Agency also funded new sidewalks, street lights and street trees that were completed on Sixth Street in 2006 and continues to fund sidewalk cleaning, graffiti removal, and social service outreach officers on Sixth Street to help revitalize the corridor. A new fire station has been proposed on Folsom Street between Fifth and Sixth Streets in the Project Area. A new police substation has been proposed on Sixth Street between Market and Mission Streets in the Project Area.

Presence of certified California Department of Housing and Community Development element - 5 points

6b-1 **Has the City submitted their 2008 housing element to the California Department of Housing and Community Development for certification?**

No

6b-2 **If yes, date it was certified?**

Not Applicable

6b-3 **If no, when will it be submitted?**

The City completed a preliminary draft of the 2009 Housing Element in June 2009, and submitted that draft to the Department of Housing and Community Development for informal review**. Feedback on this preliminary draft was generally positive, and the City

Jobs in Proximity to Housing and Transit - 10 points

6c-1 **How many jobs are located within the ¼ mile in the project area?**

22,700

6c-2 **How many jobs are located within ¼ mile of transit in the project area?**

22,700

6c-3 **What are the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) zoning requirements for office and commercial development in the project area? (Please explain your calculation.)**

There are 14 different land uses zoned within the project area. Below are the maximum respective FAR ratios:

C-3-G - 6:1
C-3-R - 6:1
C-3-S - 6:1
M-1 - 5:1
MUG - 6:1
MUO - 6:1
MUR - 6:1
NCT - 3.6:1
RC-4 - 4.8:1
RED - 1:1
RSD - 1.8:1

SLI - 2.5:1
SLR - 2.5:1

The weighted average of the areas represented by each land use zone appears to be between 3 and 5 to one, conservatively.

Improvements to transportation choices and reduced VMT vehicle trips.

Transit:

6d-1 **Describe how your project or elements within your project area improve transit access and increase current or future transit ridership?**

The alleyways in the South of Market neighborhood are a hidden treasure, accommodating mostly residential uses, but also a wide range of commercial and light industrial space, on pedestrian-scale streets running between major transit corridors. Unfortunately, these alleyways are also dangerous and unfriendly to pedestrians and bicyclists. Cars travel down the alleys at very high speeds. The sidewalks are often cracked and there is very poor lighting. By improving these alleyways with new sidewalks, street trees and street lights and adding traffic-calming features such as raised crosswalks, chicanes and textured paving, the alleys will be able to serve as important connections between transit, residents and businesses. New sidewalks, new trees and new lighting will improve the appearance of the alleyways and encourage pedestrian use. Traffic chicanes, raised crosswalks and textured paving will slow down cars, thus also encouraging pedestrians and bicyclists. By making the alleyways friendly to pedestrians and bicyclists, these connections will increase transit ridership on adjacent transit corridors.
The improvements were developed by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, in partnership with the San Francisco Department of Public Works and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, through a series of public workshops, a design charette sponsored by AIA San Francisco, and several meetings of the South of Market Project Area Committee.

6d-2 **What are the current transit headways during peak hours (7am-10am, 3pm-7pm) in the project area? Include bus, bus rapid transit, ferry, light rail and rail (BART, Caltrain, Amtrack, ACE)?**

BART am peak = 30 trains

MUNI bus service has a combined daily passenger rate of 14,000 passengers per day getting on or off the bus within the project area:

Line #12 - 6,928 trips, 452 on/off peak
Line #14 - 32,849 trips, 3,075 on/off
Line #19 - 9,232 trips, 1,450 on/off
Line #27 - 7,415 trips, 1,728 on/off
Line #30 - 22,124 trips, 2,630 on/off
Line #31 - 9,036 trips, 387 on/off
Line #45 - 12,086 trips, 1,208 on/off
Line #47 - 12,792 trips, 539 on/off

No data for Golden Gate Transit or Samtrans. However, this 1/4 mile radius around the project contains many nodes, transfer points, and destinations for people taking public transit during the morning and evening peak commute hours.

Pedestrian:

6d-3 **Describe how your project or elements within your project area reduce or improve walking distance between housing, transit and jobs and essential services, such as shopping, schools and mixed-use development?**

The alleyways in the South of Market neighborhood serve as important connections between adjacent

commercial corridors. The alleyways themselves are primarily residential, with transit, jobs and services concentrated on the adjacent corridors. The neighborhood includes virtually all essentially services, including shopping, an elementary school, and proposed fire and police stations. However, as described above, the alleyways are also dangerous and unfriendly to pedestrians and bicyclists. These important connections are extremely underutilized, with many people choosing to drive rather than use transit and walk along the alleyways. The goal of the improvements is to make the alleyways friendly for pedestrians and bicyclists by slowing down auto traffic and improving the appearance of the alleyways. The improvements were developed by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, in partnership with the San Francisco Department of Public Works and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, through a series of public workshops, a design charette sponsored by AIA San Francisco, and several meetings of the South of Market Project Area Committee. The 2000 Census counts 5,716 residents within the Project Area. Combined with over 22,000 workers, an estimated 4,000 pedestrian tips will occur in the alleyways to access housing, essential services, transit and jobs.

6d-4 **Are more than 25% of the street blocks in the project area exceed 500 ft. in length?**

Yes

6d-5 **Are primary corridors in the project area fully served by continuously-paved ADA-compliant sidewalks with a min. width of 5 ft?**

Yes

6d-6 **Do primary corridors in the project area allow for safe pedestrian crossing arterials and is adequate lighting provided to accommodate ped. use after dark?**

Yes

6d-7 **Do transit facilities in the project area contain waiting facilities that are lighted and provide overhead shelter from the elements?**

Yes

Bicycle:

6d-8 **Describe how your project or elements within your project area improve bicycle access to transit and jobs and essential services?**

San Francisco has made great progress in improving bicycle access along major corridors, including the corridors adjacent to the South of Market alleyways proposed for improvement under this project. However, the alleyways themselves have not been thus improved. The alleyways in the South of Market neighborhood serve as important connections between adjacent commercial corridors for both pedestrians and bicyclists. However, as described above, the alleyways are also dangerous and unfriendly. The same deficiencies that reduce pedestrian access also affect bicycles access. Cars travelling at high speeds down the alleyways discourage bicyclists from utilizing these important connections. The goal of the improvements is to make the alleyways friendly for pedestrians and bicyclists by slowing down auto traffic and improving the appearance of the alleyways with new sidewalks, street trees and street lights. Making the alleyways friendly to pedestrians and bicyclists will improve bicycle access to transit, jobs, and essential services.
The improvements were developed by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, in partnership with the San Francisco Department of Public Works and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, through a series of public workshops, a design charette sponsored by AIA San Francisco, and several meetings of the South of Market Project Area Committee.

6d-9 **Is your project area part of local or countywide bike plan?**

No

6d-10 **If so, explain how it is addressed in your project.**

6d-11 **Do transit facilities have bike access and provide secure bike storage facilities in the project area?**

Yes

6d-12 **Does the local transit service allow bike conveyance on-board?**

Yes

Consistency with MTC Design Guidelines (15 points)

Street Design Guideline Best Practice

6d-13 **Travel Lane Width**

does not apply

6d-14 **Bicycle Lane Width (Class II)**

does not apply

6d-15 **Sharrows (Class III)**

does not apply

6d-16 **Medians**

does not apply

6d-17 **On Street Parking**

does not apply

6d-18 **Mid Block Crossings**

does not apply

6d-19 **Pedestrian Refuge Island**

does not apply

6d-20 **Mid Block Bus Stops**

does not apply

6d-21 **Sidewalk Width**

meets min. requirement

6d-22 **Street Trees**

meets best practice

6d-23 **Sidewalk Planters**

does not apply

6d-24 **Street Planters**

does not apply

6d-25 **Street Furniture and Fixtures**

does not apply

6d-26 **Bike Racks/Storage**

does not apply

6d-27 **Vehicle Speed**

meets best practice

Intersection Guidelines

6d-28 **Curb Return Radii**

exceeds

6d-29 **Audible Signals**

does not apply

6d-30 **Pedestrian Treatments at Intersections**

does not apply

6d-31 **Curb Extensions (Bulb Outs)**

does not apply

6d-32 **Bike Lane Treatment at Intersections**

does not apply

6d-33 **Bus Stops at Intersections**

does not apply

6d-34 **Bus Bulb Out**

does not apply

Storm Water Management

6d-35 **On Site run-off collection**

does not apply

6d-36 **Street Trees**

meets best practice

6d-37 **Rain Gardens/ Street Planters**

does not apply

6d-38 **Permeable Paving Materials**

does not apply

6d-39 **Median Bio Filtration Swale**

does not apply

Urban Paths

6d-40 **Class 1 Bike/Ped. Multi-Use Path**

does not apply

6d-41 **List each principle that met the mininum or was not applicable, describe the reason why?**

Existing sidewalk width for the alleyways are 5' to 6' - widening will severly impact the travelled way.
Curb return radii at raised crosswalks are non-existent. Automobiles will need to slow as if entering a driveway when entering a raised crosswalk.
No crosswalks will be constructed at the intersection of alleyways and the major corridors at 5th Street and 6th Street.

6d-42 **For Non-Streetscape Projects: Describe the general streetscape conditions in your project area and describe how they align with MTC's Design Principles. If there are inconsistencies with MTC's Design Principles, please indicate any design policies at the local jurisdiction that address streetscape improvements.**

Part 7 –PARKING MANAGEMENT

7a **Does the project area incorporate innovative parking management strategies, such as pricing, unbundling or cash-out, shared parking, shuttles, car-sharing, TransLink® for TOD or EcoPass, etc.**

Yes

7b **Describe**

Yes. The project area is covered under a recent General Plan amendment called the East SOMA Area Plan. This Area Plan has the policies for unbundling parking from the cost of housing, car-sharing, shuttle and delivery services, TDM incentives, and smart parking technologies. The policies are listed as follows:

POLICY 4.3.3
Make the cost of parking visible to users, by requiring parking to be rented, leased or sold separately from residential and commercial space for all new major development.

POLICY 4.8.1
Continue to require car-sharing arrangements in new residential and commercial developments, as well as any new parking garages.

POLICY 4.8.2
Require large retail establishments, particularly supermarkets, to provide shuttle and delivery services to customers.

POLICY 4.8.3
Develop a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program for the Eastern Neighborhoods that provides information and incentives for employees, visitors and residents to use alternative transportation modes and travel times.

POLICY 4.9.2
Decrease auto congestion through implementation of Intelligent Traffic Management Systems (ITMS) strategies such as smart parking technology, progressive metering of traffic signals and the SFMTA "SFGO" program.

7c **What is the current parking requirement for the project area?**

The parking requirement is now a maximum requirement rather than a minimum requirement.

Residential units have a maximum of 1:1 parking ratio and for some types of development there are no parking requirements.

Office space for design professionals is 1 space per 1,000 square feet of occupied space, provided there is 5,000 square feet minimum. For other office uses, it is 1 space per 500 square feet, for spaces above 5,000 square feet.

Retail spaces vary the same as office spaces from 1 per 500 to 1 per 1,000 square feet for spaces above 5,000 square feet.
Following are parking requirement policies in the East SOMA Area Plan:

POLICY 4.3.1
For new residential development, provide flexibility by eliminating minimum off-street parking requirements and establishing reasonable parking caps.

POLICY 4.3.2
For new non-residential development, provide flexibility by eliminating minimum off-street parking requirements and establishing caps generally equal to the previous minimum requirements. For office uses in East SoMa, parking requirements should be commensurate with general downtown parking standards.

POLICY 4.3.3
Make the cost of parking visible to users, by requiring parking to be rented, leased or sold separately from residential and commercial space for all new major development.

POLICY 4.3.4
Encourage, or require where appropriate, innovative parking arrangements that make efficient use of space, particularly where cars will not be used on a daily basis.

POLICY 4.3.5
Permit construction of new parking garages in Mixed Use districts only if they are part of shared parking arrangements that efficiently use space, are appropriately designed, and reduce the overall need for off-street parking in the area.

POLICY 4.3.6
Reconsider and revise the way that on-street parking is managed in both commercial and residential districts in order to more efficiently use street parking space and increase turnover and parking availability.

7d **For projects requesting funds for parking structures - describe your analysis of the costs and benefits of the parking structure versus the parking management strategies described above, or other locally appropriate transportation demand management strategies. MTC funding of parking structures requires implementation of best practice parking strategies, e.g. shared use, pricing, etc.**

Part 8 - ACCESSIBILITY

8a **How many new housing units (including townhomes) in the project area will incorporate universal design, or are habitable by persons with mobility limitations (e.g. have accessible bathrooms and bedrooms, or can be converted through universal design)**

8b **Is there an adopted local policy to incorporate universal design in new housing developments in the project area?**

Yes

8c **If yes, what is the policy?**

New affordable housing in projects are required to have at least 5% of the units accessible with 2% accessible to the hearing and visually-impaired. New affordable projects in San Francisco are often 100% adaptable.

8d **Describe the path of access to and from transit and essential services within a ½ mile from existing and planned Transit-Oriented Development housing units in the project area. Description should include width of sidewalks, presence of curb cuts, physical barriers that would prevent persons with mobility limitations from access and enhancements that would facilitate access.**

The sidewalks in the surrounding project area are also devoid of physical barriers. Alleyways are generally 5'-6' wide, while the main corridors are 10'-12' wide. There are no known Transit-Oriented Developments.

8e **1D. Do housing developments in the project area comply with the Fair Housing Act?**

Yes

Part 9 -GREEN HOUSE GAS REDUCTION/ GREEN BUILDING PRACTICE

9a **Has your local jurisdiction adopted green building standards for new development?**

Yes

9b **If yes, what green standard was adopted and when? i.e. LEEDS, Build It GREEN**

Locally-written codification of "Green Building Ordinance" as Chapter 13C of the San Francisco Building Code was adopted in 2008. The Green Building Ordinance mandates LEED for large-scale projects, and offers option of GreenPoint Rating (from Build It GREEN) or LEED for mid- and small-scale residential projects (see specifics below).

What level of standard is required for the following catagories? e.g. LEEDS Platnum, Gold, or Silver

9c **New Construction?**

A. New Large Commercial Buildings >25,000 sf or over 75 ft in height (offices, hotels, etc.)

9d **Remodel?**

No requirements except as in 9e

9e **Retrofits?**

Large Commercial Interiors & Major Alterations (25,000 sf and over)

9f **List proposed buildings within a ¼ mile radius of your site and their LEEDS Certification standard or other "green" building or site standards have been utilized in the project area?**

Plaza Apartments, LEED Silver, 6th/Howard Streets; Federal Offiice Building at 7th/Mission designed to be highly sustainable.

9g **Has your jurisdiction adopted any storm water runoff or water recycling standards for new development?**

Yes

9h **Describe:**

The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission has adopted the San Francisco Stormwater Design Guidelines, a document that contains stormwater management requirements for all developments and redevelopments disturbing 5,000 square feet or more of the ground surface. The document emphasizes multi-purpose, green stormwater infrastructure, which not only manages stormwater but also contributes to the creation of a greener streetscape, enhanced wildlife habitat, and enhanced watershed function. The San Francisco Stormwater Design Guidelines is paired with the Stormwater Management Ordinance, which establishes an administrative structure for compliance with stormwater management requirements, inspection of

constructed facilities, and enforcement in cases of violation. This ordinance is currently before the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. The Stormwater Design Guidelines and the Stormwater Management Ordinance require the use of green infrastructure or low impact design whenever feasible.

San Francisco's 1991 Reclaimed Water Use Ordinances 390-91, 391-91 (amended in 1994 by Ordinance 393-94), and 175-91 require development of a plan for expanding recycled water use, dual-plumbing systems in certain new construction and building remodels, and requires recycled water use (or other non-potable water source) for soil compaction and dust control.

9i **Does the project area contain toxic air contaminant sources such as freeways or industry, or are any located within a 1000 foot radius of your project area?**

Yes

9j **If yes, describe any efforts in the project area to minimize or reduce exposure to toxic air contaminants, such as indoor air quality control, etc.**

San Francisco Health Code Article 38 (Air Quality Assessment And Ventilation Requirement For Urban Infill Residential Developments) requires the City to develop and maintain a Potential Roadway Exposure Zone map. New development located within such zones that have been determined to have a PM 2.5 concentration at the proposed site greater than 0.2 ug/m3 attributable to Local Roadway Traffic Sources are required to provide a ventilation system that would be capable of removing >80% of ambient PM 2.5 from habitable areas of dwelling units. The City requires that sponsors of new developments take the following actions to avoid health impacts to residents when they propose to place new residential uses near freeways and other busy roadways:

Assessment of air pollution from traffic, using modeling tools, at project sites

Design of the building or ventilation systems to preserve good indoor air quality.

Part 10 - COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT/SUPPORT

10a **Please describe how the local community has been involved in the planning process that has led to the plan associated with the project area or PDA**

Since 1997, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency has worked closely with the South of Market Project Area Committee ("PAC") on the Redevelopment Plan for the South of Market Redevelopment Project Area ("Redevelopment Plan"). The PAC is composed of 22 elected members. Each member of the PAC represents a particular stakeholder category: 1) Residential Tenants (7 members); 2) Residential Owner-Occupants (2 members); 3) Business Owners (6 members); 4) Community-Based Organizations (6 members). The PAC is charged with advising the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency on all matters related to the Redevelopment Plan, as well as providing a forum for the neighborhood to discuss other issues.
The PAC holds monthly general meetings and several bi-monthly subcommittee meetings to discuss specific issues. The PAC maintains an office in the South of Market Project Area with two full-time staff and a website containing a wide range of information on the Redevelopment Plan and the neighborhood. The PAC also publishes a quarterly newsletter to keep the neighborhood informed of its activities.
The PAC worked closely on the Redevelopment Plan and voted to endorse the final document before it was considered for approval by the San Francisco Redevelopment Commission and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Since the Redevelopment Plan was adopted, the PAC has continued to advise the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency on the implementation of the Redevelopment Plan.

10b **List key stakeholders that have participated in the planning process for the project and/or the plan associated with the project area or PDA.**

Members of the South of Market Project Area Committee ("PAC") include or have included: 1) Residents of Sixth Street and the South of Market Redevelopment Project Area, including both tenants and condominium

owners; 2) Property and business owners, including retail and wholesale businesses and residential and commercial property owners; 3) Community-based organizations, including the South of Market Health Center, South of Market Community Action Network, Senior Action Network, and Bindlestiff Studio.
In addition to the PAC, the members of which are elected from within the South of Market Project Area, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency has worked closely with many other residents, businesses and nonprofit organizations in the neighborhood, including Passion Café, Miss Saigon, Mission Cleaners, Hospitality House, and the Bayanihan Community Center.
The PAC and other residents, businesses and community organizations strongly support the proposed alleyway improvements project. The PAC has reviewed and approved the conceptual designs for the alleyways and has placed a high priority on continuing the improvements throughout the entire South of Market Redevelopment Project Area.

10c **List any opposition to the project or development in the project area and how it was overcome or negotiated?**

There has not been any opposition to the alleyway improvement project. During the planning process for the Redevelopment Plan for the South of Market Redevelopment Project Area ("Redevelopment Plan"), there was opposition to the proposed eminent domain provisions of the Redevelopment Plan. This opposition was overcome by placing severe restrictions on the use of eminent domain by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. Since the Redevelopment Plan was adopted, only one property has been acquired through eminent domain. That property, which was acquired in 2009, had been abandoned and in constant disrepair since 1988. There was strong support on the South of Market Project Area Committee and in the neighborhood for the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency to acquire the property and return it to productive use. The property will be redeveloped as affordable family housing, with construction anticipated to begin in 2011.

Part 11 - LOCAL MATCH

11a **Is there a financial cash commitment over the required 20% match**

Yes

11b **If yes, what is the amount?**

959,400

11c **what is the percentage of the total project cost?**

41

Part 12 - PROJECT READINESS CRITERIA-

a. Streetscape Projects

Project Schedule:

12a-1 **Will this project be obligated (receive E76 for Construction from Caltrans) by April 30, 2011?**

Yes

12a-2 **Will this project be obligated (receive E76 for Construction from Caltrans) by April 30, 2012?**

No

Local Planning:

12a-3 **List all affected departments and contacts within the local jurisdiction, transit agency or other public agency(ies) that been involved in the development of or, has reviewed the project? ie. Fire Department, Public Works**

Department of Public Works - Charles Yu (415-554-8268 charles.yu@sfdpw.org), Jasmine Kaw (415-558 4484 jasmine.kaw@sfdpw.org), Municipal Transportation Authority - Dan Provence (415-701-4448 , Public Utilities Commission - Raul Mosuela (415- 227-8506 RMosuela@sfwater.org), City Planning - Josh Switzky (415-575-6815 joshua.switzky@sfgov.org), Corey Teague (415-575-9081 corey.teague@sfgov.org)

Legislative Approvals:

12a-4 **A Board approved 'Resolution of Local Support' is due to MTC by July 31, 2010. Indicate the date Board approval is anticipated?**

May 18, 2010

12a-5 **List any pending lawsuits related to this project?**

None known.

Environmental Approvals:

12a-6 **When will your project complete the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)?**

July 2010

12a-7 **When will your project complete the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)?**

December 2010

12a-8 **Is your project already federalized?**

No

12a-9 **List any significant Environmental issues that could delay the obligation of these funds? Ie. hazardous materials on site, wetlands, native burial grounds nearby etc...**

None known.

12a-10 **Is your project area included in an adopted Environmental Impact Statement or Report?**

Yes

12a-11 **Date adopted and list major findings?**

The Eastern Neighborhoods Plans, East SOMA Area Plan adopted January 2009.

Impacts Cannot Be Avoided
Impact - Loss of PDR land supply, building space, and jobs
Intersection Level of Service (LOS) Failures
MUNI Service
Material Impairment to Historic Architectural Resources
Shadow on Existing Parks and Open Spaces

Impacts that Can Be Avoided
Delays at Unsignalized Intersections
Construction Noise, Pile-driving
Construction Noise, Site Specific Noise Reduction Measures
Interior Noise Levels
Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses
Siting of Noise-Generating Uses
Open Spaces in Noisy Environments
Construction Air Quality

Air Quality for Sensitive Land Uses
Siting of Uses that Emit Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM)
Siting of Uses that Emit Other Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs)
Soils Disturbing Activities on Properties with Previous Studies
Soils Disturbing Activities on Properties with No Previous Studies
Hazardous Materials during Construction

Preliminary Engineering and Technical Feasibility:

12a-12 **Is there a utility relocation/upgrade phase located within the project area?**

No

12a-13 **If so, how is it being coordinated with this project?**

12a-14 **Is your project entirely with the local agency's Right of Way, confirmed with a site survey?**

Yes

12a-15 **Will additional ROW need to be acquired? If so, when?**

No.

12a-16 **List the project's existing condition data? Surveys, aerial photos, existing condition plans?**

A workshop presentation conducted by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency and City Department of Public Works summarizes the existing conditions and captures community input obtained through a series of outreach meetings and an AIA sponsered charrette. This presentation is attached.

12a-17 **Have project feasibility studies been completed? e.g. Traffic studies for bike lane accommodation.**

No

12a-18 **List what type, when?**

12a-19 **Does your project have 35% drawings completed?**

Yes

12a-20 **If not, describe what the current level of design completed? When will 35% drawings be completed?**

12a-21 **Has your project completed 60% drawings?**

No

12a-22 **Has your project completed 90% drawings?**

No

12a-23 **Has your project completed 100% drawings?**

No

12a-24 **Is your project located on a State Highway Route?**

No

12a-25 **If so, explain your design exceptions and whether or not you have coordinated with Caltrans on these issues.**

Financial Feasibility:

12a-26 **With the TLC funds requested in this grant proposal, is this project fully funded, or is a phase of the project fully funded?**

Yes

12a-27 **If not, what is the funding gap?**

12a-28 **Can your project be Phased?**

Yes

12a-29 **If so, describe the scope of the distinct phases.**

The streetscape improvements for each alley segment can be implemented a la carte. In order to obtain economies of scale and minimize construction impacts, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency is pursuing the overall alleyways improvements in phases.

Project Delivery Capacity:

Please answer the following questions previous cycles of TLC projects or other federalized projects:

12a-30 **Environmental issues that resulted in significant delay or failed obligation?**

No

12a-31 **100% PS& E Package submitted after the regional deadline?**

No

12a-32 **Obligation after regional deadline due to insufficient information submitted in the 100% PS& E Package to Caltrans Local Assistance?**

No

12a-33 **Significant scope difference between project application proposal and delivered project? ie. omitted bike lanes or crosswalks**

No

12a-34 **Is your jurisdictions Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE)/ Underrepresented Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (UDBE) goals are up to date?**

Yes

12a-35 **If not when will it be updated?**

b. Non-transportation Infrastructure Improvements

12b-1 **Describe other funding and sources that will contribute to this improvement?**

12b-2 **What is the density? Units per acre?**

12b-3 **Has the improvement been designed and engineered? If so, what percent of design is it at?**

12b-4 **Describe the improvement and how it relates to the project area?**

12b-5 **What relevant permits have been approved?**

c. Tranportation Demand Management

12c-1 **Describe your TDM, outline your program, how many will it serve?**

12c-2	**What is the estimate of proposed outcomes?**
12c-3	**Detail the project's Parking Management Program, include resulting parking ratios.**
12c-4	**Parking Structures: Describe and Attach Parking Demand Analysis at the end of online application**
12c-5	**# Proposed Parking Spaces, # of replacement spaces, shared use?, priced?, unbundled?**

d. Land Banking

12d-1	**Will this funding be for the acquisition of land?**
	No
12d-2	**Will funding for the assembly of land for this site be completed with the funds requested? If not, please explain.**
12d-3	**Will this funding pay for a portion of the entitlement process? If so, what part?**
12d-4	**Describe the zoning for these parcels.**
12d-5	**Describe the project that will be developed on the land and entitlement status?**
12d-6	**Are there any environmental factors that could delay entitlements of the properties?**
12d-7	**Are there any lawsuit related to the land or proposed project?**
12d-8	**Is CEQA completed for this project?**
	No

Attachments

Location plan	Location.pdf
Land use housing plan	housing-services-zoning.pdf
Land use transportation plan	transit_opps.pdf
Land use pedestrian plan	bikes-peds-connections.pdf
Construction plan	1731N_-_SOMA_Alleyway_Improvements_Phase_2_-_30_submittal_final_.pdf
Sections	sections.pdf
Elevations	
Renderings	
Existing conditions	Existing_Conditions_2010-0504.pdf
Parking demand study	

Engineers estimate	ALLEY_ESTIMATE.pdf
Project schedule	Alleyways_schedule.pdf
Letters of support	Letters_of_Support.pdf

City and County of San Francisco

San Francisco Department of Public Works
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 348
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-6900 ■ www.sfdpw.org

Edwin M. Lee, Mayor
Mohammed Nuru, Director

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: Ananda Hirsch, Transportation Finance Analyst

DATE: August 23, 2012

SUBJECT: Grant Award for South of Market Alleyways Improvement Project

The attached pages from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission list the Transportation For Livable Communities Grant Award Recipients from July 2010, including San Francisco's South of Market Alleyways Improvement Project. Please consider this document as evidence of grant award.

Transportation for Livable Communities Grant Award Recipients, July 28, 2010

Project Title	City	Description	Amount (in thousands)
Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program			
San Francisco South of Market Alleyways Improvement, Phase 2	San Francisco	Streetscape and pedestrian improvements including raised crosswalks, new trees, new street lighting, traffic chicanes, and "street print" textured asphalt paving.	$ 1,381
Union City Intermodal Station East Plaza	Union City	Design and construction of a loop road (drop-off and pick-up) and plaza. This will be the pedestrian gateway from transit oriented development to the BART station, passenger rail, and bus.	$ 4,450
Berkeley Downtown BART Plaza and Transit Area Improvements	Berkeley	A new, larger bus transit shelter with improved lighting and seating; ADA curb ramps; reconfigured bike parking to improve accessibility and security; design and construction of a canopy over one BART secondary entry; design development of improvements to the BART Rotunda; and public art.	$ 1,805
Richmond Nevin Avenue Improvements	Richmond	Pedestrian and bicycle-oriented streetscape	$ 2,654
San Leandro BART-Downtown Pedestrian Interface Improvements	San Leandro	Construct San Leandro Blvd Streetscape from Williams St. to Davis Street including pedestrian crossings, traffic signals, street lights. Construct bike racks, pedestrian crossings, wayfinding and bus shelter on E 14th St and Downtown Area.	$ 4,610
SF 24th Street/Mission BART Plaza and Pedestrian Improvements	San Francisco	Improve conditions for pedestrians and transit users at the 24th/Mission BART station and on adjacent streets, including safety improvements and enhanced bus operations.	$ 2,109
SF Market and Haight Street Transit and Pedestrian Improvements	San Francisco	The project will convert Haight St. between Laguna and Market to two-way for transit operations, this includes work on the overhead wires, traffic signals, and streetscape/ pedestrian improvements.	$ 2,800
SF Phelan Public Plaza and Transit-Oriented Development	San Francisco	Construction of a new public plaza and the re-configuration of a multi-line transit turn-around and terminal to free up city-owned land for a mixed-use affordable housing development (to be developed separately) and public plaza. Construct new driveway, drop off, layover and pickup areas, new pedestrian sidewalks, two new boarding islands, drainage and storm sewer system, new fence, new lighting and bus shelters, and traffic striping and signalization.	$ 1,120
San Mateo Delaware Street Bike Path and Streetscape	San Mateo	Narrowing Delaware St. from 4 to 3 lanes between Charles and Garvey way; from 4 to 2 lanes between Garvey way and 16th Avenue; and addition of Class II bike lane extending between Charles and Guilford. In addition, pedestrian enhancements, widening sidewalks, a planted buffer and aesthetic improvements to the fencing on Delaware at its bridged crossing of the 16th Avenue Channel will also be included.	$ 605

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

THIS MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING ("MOU"), dated June 25, 2012, is by and between DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS ("DPW") and THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ("Successor Agency"), both part of the CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, a municipal corporation of the State of California, acting by and through its OFFICE OF THE CITY ADMINISTRATOR.

A. PURPOSE:

The purpose of this Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") between DPW and the Successor Agency is to describe the work to be performed by DPW in exchange for funds transferred by the Successor Agency. DPW will cause to be completed the South of Market Alleyways Improvements Project, Phase 2 (the "Project") in exchange for matching funds from the Successor Agency and a grant from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission ("MTC"), Transportation for Livable Communities ("TLC") program.

This Project will create safer pedestrian spaces in underutilized alleys that connect major commercial corridors. The Project will improve the appearance of the alleyways, improve the quality of life for residents and visitors, and slow automobile traffic in order to make the streets safer for pedestrians and bicycles. Phase 1 included new street trees, new street lights, special roadway paving, raised crosswalks, chicanes (alternating-side-of-street parking), and art enrichment on the alleyways between Mission, Folsom, Sixth and Seventh Streets. Phase 2 will implement similar treatments to Minna, Natoma, Clementina, Tehama, Shipley and Clara Streets between Fifth to Sixth Streets.

B. BACKGROUND:

On April 22, 2010, staff of the former Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco ("Redevelopment Agency") submitted an application to the MTC for a grant from the TLC Program. The program is funded through the federal government's Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program ("CMAQ") and administered regionally by MTC. As the congestion management agency for San Francisco, the San Francisco County Transportation Authority ("SFCTA") is responsible for coordinating the City's grant applications to MTC. After considering the program objectives, the Redevelopment Agency submitted an application for the Project for preliminary consideration to SFCTA in January 2010.

SFCTA placed the Project on the priority list to represent San Francisco County as an applicant for the grant funds. On April 22, 2010, Redevelopment Agency staff submitted the completed TLC application to the MTC requesting $1.38 Million to be matched by $959,400 of local funds. In July 2010 MTC approved the request and required a commitment of funds by the Redevelopment Agency Commission. On August 3, 2010, the Redevelopment Agency Commission adopted Resolution No. 103-2010 committing

the Redevelopment Agency to provide $959,400 in non-federal matching funds and its intent to comply with the requirements of the TLC program.

With the dissolution of the Redevelopment Agency on February 1, 2012, all expenditures considered necessary to meet enforceable obligations are payable through the Successor Agency, subject to review and approval by the Successor Agency's Oversight Board. The Successor Agency's Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule ("ROPS") for the period of January 1, 2012 – June 30, 2012 lists the payment of the matching funds to DPW. The ROPS was approved by the Oversight Board and subsequently the State Department of Finance. The source of funds for the matching portion of the grant is tax-exempt bond proceeds.

C. STATEMENT OF MUTUAL BENEFIT AND INTERESTS:

Given that this Project was selected as one of three projects to compete for federal funds it is in the City's best interest to complete the Project as intended. Prior to dissolution of redevelopment agencies across the State, pursuant to ABX26, it was the intent of the Agency to contract with DPW to perform the work outlined below. The Agency has an enforceable obligation to effectuate its obligations as included in the grant application and the Redevelopment Agency Resolution No. 103-2010.

D. SCOPE OF SERVICES:

DPW will provide construction documents, contract administration, construction management and project closeout for the South of Market Alleyway Improvements Project, Phase 2. DPW will complete the Project as planned and designed and within the time set by the MTC. This Project is on the MTC calendar to begin construction in 2013.

E. DETAILS OF PAYMENT:

The Successor Agency shall pay DPW a total aggregate amount not to exceed $959,400. DPW has already been paid $98,942 by the former Redevelopment Agency for design services, and this MOU is for payment of $860,458, for a total amount of $959,400. The funds shall be used as the matching funds for the $1.38 million MTC TLC grant received by the Redevelopment Agency and DPW in July 2010. Upon receipt of the remaining matching funds, DPW will obligate and expend the MTC TLC funds for the construction phase, and commence and complete the Project.

The total estimated budget for the South of Market Alleyway Improvements Project, Phase 2, as presented to MTC, is detailed below:

PROJECT BUDGETED ITEMS	BUDGET	
Engineering and Design	$	256,400
Construction management and support	$	318,000
Construction (Matching Funds)	$	224,000
Construction (Grant Funds)	$	1,380,600
Contingency	$	161,000
Total Project Budget	**$**	**2,340,000**

The Redevelopment Agency Commission approved a letter agreement with DPW for design, permitting, and construction management of the Project for $266,200 on December 7, 2010. DPW has prepared 100% construction drawings and has been paid $98,942 from the Redevelopment Agency in accordance with this letter agreement. The letter agreement has since expired; however, DPW is still owed $167,258 for services rendered under this letter agreement. In order to reach the $959,400 matching requirement, a total of $860,458 must be transferred to DPW to avoid the risk of losing the MTC grant and to complete the Project. Upon execution of this MOU, the Successor Agency shall transfer the lump sum balance of the matching funds in the amount of $860,458 to DPW.

F. INSURANCE

The parties acknowledge and agree that the City and County of San Francisco ("City") self-insures in the areas of general liability, automobile liability and workers' compensation and that such self-insurance shall cover any losses, claims or damages incurred by the City, including the Successor Agency, directly or indirectly arising out of or connected with DPW's performance of this MOU, and any of DPW's activities related to this MOU, excluding the willful misconduct or gross negligence of the person or entity seeking to be defended, indemnified or held harmless. However, at its sole discretion City may purchase a policy of insurance to cover against any potential exposure to loss under this Agreement. DPW shall require any subcontractors to maintain insurance in compliance with City Policy.

G. EFFECTIVE DATE

This MOU shall be effective on the date first stated above.

BY SIGNATURE BELOW, THE PARTIES CERTIFY THAT THE INDIVIDUALS LISTED IN THE DOCUMENT AS REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MOU AAND ARE AUTHORIZED TO ACT IN THEIR RESPECTIVE AREAS FOR MATTERS RELATED TO THIS AGREEMENT:

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
AS SUCCESSOR TO THE
REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

By: _____
Tiffany Bohee
Redevelopment Division Director

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

By: _____
Mohammed Nuru
Director, Department of Public Works