

File No. 150896

Committee Item No. \_\_\_\_\_  
Board Item No. 27

## COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

### AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: \_\_\_\_\_  
Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date: September 15, 2015

#### Cmte Board.

- |                          |                                     |  |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Motion                                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Resolution                                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Ordinance                                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Legislative Digest                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Budget and Legislative Analyst Report        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Youth Commission Report                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Introduction Form                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | MOU  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Grant Information Form                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Grant Budget                                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Subcontract Budget                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Contract/Agreement                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Form 126 – Ethics Commission                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Award Letter                                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Application                                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Public Correspondence                        |

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

- |                          |                                     |  |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Attachment A - Mission-San Jose Corridor PDA Map</u>    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Attachment B - Letter to ABAG - December 17, 2010</u>   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Attachment C - SFCTA Reso No. 14-07 - July 25, 2013</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Attachment D - SFCTA TIGS Executive Summary - 2013</u>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Attachment E - ABAG Letter - August 10, 2015</u>        |

Completed by: John Carroll  
Completed by: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: September 10, 2015  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

1 [Application to Amend San Francisco's Priority Development Area Designation]

2  
3 **Resolution reaffirming existing Priority Development Areas and authorizing the**  
4 **Planning Department to apply on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco for**  
5 **amendments to the Priority Development Area Designation by the Association of Bay**  
6 **Area Governments.**

7  
8 WHEREAS, The Association of Bay Area Governments (hereinafter "ABAG") and the  
9 Metropolitan Transportation Commission (hereinafter "MTC") in coordination with the Bay  
10 Area Air Quality Management District (hereinafter "BAAQMD") and Bay Conservation and  
11 Development Commission (hereinafter "BCDC") (collectively, the "Regional Agencies") have  
12 adopted Plan Bay Area as the Sustainable Communities Strategy for the San Francisco Bay  
13 Area region; and

14 WHEREAS, Plan Bay Area's goals support a future regional development pattern that  
15 is compact and connected; and

16 WHEREAS, The Regional Agencies seek local government partners to create a  
17 specific and shared concept of where growth can be accommodated (Priority Development  
18 Areas) and what areas need protection (Priority Conservation Areas) in the region; and

19 WHEREAS, A Priority Development Area must meet all of the following criteria: (a)  
20 within an existing community, (b) near existing or planned fixed transit (or served by  
21 comparable bus service) and (c) is planned, or is planning, for more housing; and

22 WHEREAS, Local governments in the nine county San Francisco Bay Area are eligible  
23 to apply for designation of an area within their community as a priority development area; and

1           WHEREAS, The Regional Agencies are committed to securing incentives and  
2 providing technical assistance to designated priority development areas so that positive  
3 change can be achieved in communities working to advance focused growth; and

4           WHEREAS, San Francisco originally designated Priority Development Areas in 2007  
5 through Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 483-07 on file with the Clerk of the Board in File  
6 No. 071176; and

7           WHEREAS, The original Priority Development Areas included The Bayview/ Hunters  
8 Point Project Area; Shipyard/Candlestick Point Project Area; Balboa Park Mission Bay Project  
9 Area; Market-Octavia; Transbay Project Area; The Mission District; The South of Market; The  
10 Central Waterfront; Potrero Hill and Showplace Square; Treasure Island; Visitation  
11 Valley/Executive Park; Downtown; and various Port of San Francisco properties along the  
12 eastern and southeastern waterfront; and

13           WHEREAS, In 2008 San Francisco amended the City and County's Priority  
14 Development Areas through Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 455-08 on file with the Clerk  
15 of the Board in File No. 081281 to include the 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue Corridor; and

16           WHEREAS, The Mission-San Jose Corridor has been identified as a "Mixed Use  
17 Corridor Priority Development Area" in public documents since at least December 17, 2010, in  
18 a letter to ABAG that was jointly signed by the directors of the San Francisco Planning  
19 Department, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency and the San Francisco  
20 County Transportation Authority as shown in Exhibit B of Board of Supervisors File  
21 No. 150896; and

22           WHEREAS, The San Francisco County Transportation Authority's governing board  
23 consists of the eleven members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, sitting as  
24 commissioners of the Transportation Authority; and  
25

1           WHEREAS, On July 23, 2013, the San Francisco County Transportation Authority  
2 adopted the "San Francisco Transportation Investment and Growth Strategy" through  
3 Resolution No. 14-07; and

4           WHEREAS, Both SFCTA Board Resolution No. 14-07 and the Executive Summary of  
5 the "San Francisco Transportation Investment and Growth Strategy" are available respectively  
6 as Exhibit C and D of Board of Supervisors File No. 150896; and

7           WHEREAS, The Executive Summary of the "San Francisco Transportation Investment  
8 and Growth Strategy" states that since the "original PDA designations, a number of planning  
9 efforts have been adopted or initiated that impact PDA boundaries; and

10           WHEREAS, To ensure that San Francisco's PDAs closely resemble the planning  
11 efforts that they are a reflection of, the TIGS proposes several small changes to PDA  
12 boundaries;" and

13           WHEREAS, The map shown on page E-2 of this Executive Summary shows the  
14 Mission-San Jose Corridor; and


15           WHEREAS, The City & County of San Francisco believed the San Francisco County  
16 Transportation Authority Board action adopting the "San Francisco Transportation Investment  
17 and Growth Strategy" through Resolution No. 14-07 had been sufficient to enable ABAG to  
18 designate the Mission-San Jose Corridor as a Priority Development Area; and

19           WHEREAS, On August 10, 2015, ABAG requested an official resolution from the City  
20 and County of San Francisco's Board of Supervisors; and


21           WHEREAS, The August 10, 2015, letter from ABAG is available as Exhibit E of Board  
22 of Supervisors File No. 150896; now, therefore, be it

1           RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco  
2 authorizes the Planning Department to submit an application to officially designate the  
3 Mission-San Jose Corridor as a Priority Development Area, as shown in Attachment B of  
4 Board File Number 150896 on file with the Clerk of the Board within San Francisco and  
5 reaffirms the additional areas and Priority Development Area boundaries in San Francisco  
6 already designated as Priority Development Areas, as shown on the Map included as Exhibit  
7 A in Board of Supervisors File No. 150896.

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25



Mission-San Jose Corridor PDA  
SAN FRANCISCO





December 17, 2010

Marisa Raya, Regional Planner  
Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG)  
101 Eighth St.  
Oakland, CA 94607

Subject: SCS Vision Scenario Place Types and Policies: San Francisco Input

Dear Marisa:

On behalf of the City and County of San Francisco, we thank you for the opportunity to provide input into the development of the "Vision Scenario" for the Bay Area's first Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). We have developed the information ABAG requested regarding our vision for sustainable growth, including the "Place Types" that most accurately describe the San Francisco-designated Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and the policies, incentives, and implementation strategies that will be necessary to achieve our vision.

San Francisco is planning to accommodate more than 60,000 new households in PDAs by 2035. This represents the placement of over 90% of our county growth targets (from Projections 2009) within PDAs. This is significant as the next closest county achieves only ~40% of new households in PDAs<sup>1</sup>. However, our willingness to plan for this growth cannot be taken for granted and, in order to be realized, must be accompanied by regional resources for core infrastructure investment and supportive policy reform. As ABAG and MTC work to develop the "Vision" scenario and initiate regional funding policy discussions in early 2011, we hope the discussion will be guided by the following principles:

- 1. Maintenance resources should be prioritized for jurisdictions that are currently accommodating regional growth and travel in an equitable and sustainable manner; and that demonstrate progress toward meeting RHINA affordable housing targets.**
- 2. Expansion resources should be prioritized for jurisdictions that are proactively planning to accommodate expected growth – and particularly affordable housing — between 2010 and 2035, in a sustainable and cost-effective manner;**
- 3. Discretionary resources should be prioritized for projects that reduce regional greenhouse gas emissions equitably and cost-effectively over their life cycle; and for projects that serve TOD that includes affordable housing.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Based on PDA Assessment data reported at 9/2010 RAWG

Below, we provide the requested input on San Francisco's vision for growth.

### **Place Types**

We confirm the current Place Type designation for the majority of San Francisco's PDAs, as noted below.

- Regional Centers: Downtown Neighborhoods, Transbay Terminal/Transit Center District
- Urban Neighborhoods: Market & Octavia, Eastern Neighborhoods, Bayview/Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point, Mission Bay
- Transit Neighborhoods: Balboa Park, San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area (includes the Executive Park/ Visitacion Valley/ Schlage Lock Plan Areas)
- Transit Town Center: 19th Avenue Corridor
- Mixed Use Corridor: Mission-San Jose Corridor

While the current Place Type categories adequately capture residential developments, we view the lack of a Place Type category that will accommodate significant job centers outside of the Regional, City and Suburban Center types as a constraint. For example, there is no good fit for the Port of San Francisco, whose land use plan focuses on job development, due to state restrictions on development on port land.

San Francisco's PDAs generally fall on the high end of unit targets and new projected density compared to the available Place Types. The current Place Type definitions fail to capture the high proportion of jobs to housing units that many of San Francisco's PDAs offer. We request that ABAG staff notify us if these differences will be material for any uses of the place type designations in the SCS planning process or for any other purposes.

### **Policies and Incentives**

The policies and incentives listed in the Policies and Place Types Form are all needed to some extent to support the overall level of growth in each of our Planned and Potential PDAs (except for funding to acquire open space). The policy areas of particular importance to San Francisco include:

- Enhanced funding for regional core transportation and non-transportation infrastructure such as water, sewer, utilities, and parks;
- Funding for affordable housing;
- Increased maintenance funding;
- Adequate provision of water treatment and water supply;
- Parking pricing policy;
- Improvements to school quality.



### **Implementation Strategies**

Many of the implementation strategies listed in the Policies and Place Types Form have already been put to use in San Francisco, including:

- Zoning for increased densities and/or mix of uses;
- Provision of affordable housing through zoning;
- Funding affordable housing development;
- Retention of existing affordable units; and
- Implementation of community impact fees, commercial linkage fees.

Implementation strategies needed to support growth of particular importance to San Francisco include:

- Major regional transit capital improvements beyond Resolution 3434;
- Transit capital improvements to bring fleets, guideways and facilities to a state of good repair;
- Non-motorized and alternative mode infrastructure investments such as walking and bicycle facilities. Bicycling alone has grown 58% in the last three years in San Francisco;
- Transportation demand management strategies such as parking management, ridesharing, virtual commuting and congestion pricing;
- Value capture/redevelopment infrastructure improvement;
- Increased transit service frequencies for core trunk lines serving PDAs;
- Improvements in non-auto access to schools, job centers, and other major destinations; and
- Utility and other infrastructure improvements, including adequate provision of water and sewer.

### **Accommodation of Growth**

San Francisco's Adopted and Planned PDAs collectively accommodate over 63,000 new housing units, and 136,000 new jobs. Healthy absorption of the city's existing vacancies in PDAs like Downtown provides the opportunity for another 23,000 or more jobs. However, new growth in San Francisco is not confined to PDAs. The city includes numerous small-scale infill opportunity sites close to transit throughout all of its neighborhoods. Such sites outside of Priority Development Areas could accommodate another 17,000 new housing units, distributed reasonably evenly throughout the city. Cumulatively, San Francisco's PDAs and other opportunities yield the potential for over 85,000 housing units and almost 160,000 more jobs, more growth than is likely to be projected for San Francisco under the SCS P2011 Projections.

The ABAG-highlighted "Other Significant Areas" do not represent particular places that should be considered within the SCS process, and the city is not proposing any new PDAs. The lion's share of city's growth will continue to be focused in its PDAs, including new plans (such as the Western SOMA Plan under development, and the pending initiation of a plan for the Central Subway alignment, within the Downtown and Eastern Neighborhood PDAs); and growth opportunities will

be pursued as appropriate at smaller scale infill opportunities along transit lines outside of the PDAs.

How people commute to work has dramatic implications for the region's overall sustainability. In major downtowns like San Francisco and Oakland, a high percentage of workers commute by means other than automobile; outside of these areas, the percentage of workers that do not drive to work is insignificant. Increasing workplace development capacity in major centers, as opposed to other localities in the region, will go further to support both local and regional goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

However, with the limited information available, San Francisco cannot volunteer to accept more growth. While more funding, incentives and policy support would inevitably increase the City's ability to accommodate and to manage growth, there is no way for the City to make a fair estimate of "how much" more growth would require, nor any way for us to assess how that growth could fit within the fabric of our city.

While San Francisco has pioneered transit supportive development over the past few decades, we are at our limit in terms of transit's ability to carry more people in the peak period without significant new right-of-way, fleet and facility expansion. Our transit state of good repair backlog is over \$2 billion just to maintain current service levels let alone the additional service levels from the expected growth, and similar backlogs exist for the regional transit service providers who serve San Francisco, such as BART and Caltrain. These core capital capacity constraints are regional in nature and will need a regional focus on resource prioritization for these PDAs to be successfully implemented. In addition, San Francisco needs over \$750 million to bring our local streets to a state of good repair, and many PDAs have significant non-transportation infrastructure investment needs as well, lacking the community assets necessary to make them complete communities.

San Francisco uses the strategies noted above to create and preserve affordable housing. Yet despite a deep commitment to mixed-income communities, the City has been unable to achieve more than a third (34%) of our RHNA affordable housing target. In the absence of additional resources for affordable housing, the City will be unable to accommodate equitable and sustainable growth at projected levels. Under the current RHNA for San Francisco, more than 60% of our projected housing need requires subsidy. San Francisco is making tremendous efforts and is succeeding in its efforts to bring affordable units into production. However, without financial support we will not have the ability to keep up with the mandated RHNAs.

We are further challenged by needing to pace growth with new investment. While San Francisco's planning efforts aim to combine changes in zoning with proposals for new infrastructure investment, we continually face resistance from neighborhoods who are skeptical that needed infrastructure will come. There is a very real threat of neighborhood demand for legislation that meters growth according to infrastructure provision, thereby restricting zoning changes and any development under those zoning changes, until after the infrastructure is in place.


In sum, the region cannot assume, or take for granted, San Francisco's growth plans. We need support and incentives, in order to realize our vision. In doing so, San Francisco is poised to help the region realize our shared region for a more sustainable Bay Area. We hope this input is helpful in shaping the SCS "Vision" scenario. We look forward to continuing our collaboration and to

participate in the SCS/RHINA/RTP planning process.


Sincerely,



John Rahaim  
Planning Director, San Francisco Planning Department




Nathaniel P. Ford, Sr.  
Executive Director/CEO San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency



José Luis Moscovich  
Executive Director, San Francisco County Transportation Authority

cc: Com. Alioto-Pier, Avalos, Campos, Chiu, Chu, Daly, Dufty, Elbsernd, Mar, Maxwell, Mirkarimi  
S. Heminger, D. Kimsey, MTC  
E. Rapport, K. Kirkey, ABAG  
B. Strong, Capital Planning  
M. Lee-Skowronek, Caltrain  
B. Garcia, DPH  
V. Menotti, BART  
E. Reiskin, DPW  
N. Kirschner-Rodriguez, Mayor's Office  
M. Yarne, MOEWD  
D. Shoemaker, MOH  
M. Nutter, SFE  
T. Papandreou, B. Yee, SFMTA  
F. Blackwell, SFRA  
E. Harrington, PUC  
TC, MBL, ALA, RH, AC, ZB, LB, Chron, File: SCS

**SAN FRANCISCO**  
Priority Development Areas





RESOLUTION APPROVING SAN FRANCISCO'S TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY

WHEREAS, Priority Development Areas (PDAs) are locally-identified infill development opportunity areas near transit within the 9-county Bay Area region; and

WHEREAS, San Francisco has identified twelve PDAs that were first approved by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2007 and were updated in 2008; and

WHEREAS, The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) approved Project Selection Policies and Programming (Cycle 2 Policies) for projects to be funded with Cycle 2 federal Surface Transportation Program and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program funds over a four-year cycle; and

WHEREAS, The Cycle 2 Policies created the OneBayArea Block grant (OBAG) program of which San Francisco's share is \$38.8 million; and

WHEREAS, The Cycle 2 Policies include continued investment in the PDA Planning program, of which San Francisco's share is \$2.38 million to be administered by the San Francisco Planning Department; and

WHEREAS, The Cycle 2 Policies include a new requirement that congestion management agencies (CMAs) must prepare a PDA Investment and Growth strategy to: 1) support and encourage development in the region's PDAs through transportation funding sources including OBAG and PDA Planning funds and 2) report on progress in implementing housing element objectives and identifying current local housing policies that encourage affordable housing production and/or community stabilization; and

WHEREAS, As San Francisco's CMA, the Authority has prepared San Francisco's Transportation Investment and Growth Strategy (TIGS)(also known as the PDA Investment and



Growth Strategy) in partnership with the Planning Department and other city agencies to fulfill all PDA Investment and Growth Strategy requirements; and

WHEREAS, Both the Plans and Programs Committee and the Citizens Advisory Committee were briefed on the new requirement and the Authority's approach to developing the TIGS at their respective April 2013 meetings; and

WHEREAS, A draft TIGS report was prepared and circulated for review among partner city agencies including the San Francisco Planning Department, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, the Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce and Development, the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, and the San Francisco Port, and all comments received were incorporated and addressed; and

WHEREAS, At its June 26, 2013 meeting, the Citizens Advisory Committee considered the final draft TIGS and unanimously adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation; and

WHEREAS, At its July 16, 2013 meeting, the Plans and Programs Committee reviewed the subject item and unanimously recommended approval of the staff recommendation; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Authority hereby adopts San Francisco's TIGS; and be it further

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

Enclosure:

1. San Francisco's Transportation Investment and Growth Strategy



The foregoing Resolution was approved and adopted by the San Francisco County Transportation Authority at a regularly scheduled meeting thereof, this 23rd day of July, 2013, by the following votes:

**Ayes:** Commissioners Avalos, Breed, Campos, Chiu, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Wiener and Yee (10)

**Nays:** (0)

**Absent:** Commissioner Tang (1)

*John Avalos* 7-25-13

John Avalos  
Chairperson

Date

ATTEST:

*Maria Lombardo* 7-25-13

Maria Lombardo  
Interim Executive Director

Date



San Francisco County Transportation Authority

# **SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**

**Approved by the Authority Board: July 23, 2013  
Resolution 14-07**



**July 2013**

Prepared by the San Francisco County Transportation Authority in conjunction with the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office of Housing, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, the Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development, the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, and the Port of San Francisco. Consulting staff assistance was provided by Nelson \Nygaard. The work was funded through Prop K sales tax and Congestion Management Agency Surface Transportation Program Planning funds.



**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

**Table of Contents**

<b>E</b>	<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>1-1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>San Francisco’s Priority Development and Priority Conservation Area Overview</b> .....	<b>2-1</b>
	Overview of San Francisco’s Priority Development Areas .....	2-1
	PDA History and Proposed Boundary Changes .....	2-3
	Capacity within San Francisco’s PDAs .....	2-5
	Complete Communities Infrastructure.....	2-7
	Overview of San Francisco’s PCAs.....	2-9
<b>3</b>	<b>Priority Development Area Needs</b> .....	<b>3-1</b>
	Overview of Needs.....	3-1
	Citywide Needs and Projects Serving Multiple PDAs.....	3-2
	Needs by PDA.....	3-5
<b>4</b>	<b>Affordable Housing Policies and Production</b> .....	<b>4-1</b>
	Legal Anti-Displacement Protections.....	4-1
	Affordable Housing Policies and Investments .....	4-3
	Affordable Housing Production .....	4-5
<b>5</b>	<b>Informing Transportation Funding Decisions</b> .....	<b>5-1</b>
	PDA Comparison.....	5-1
	Process for Prioritizing Funds.....	5-7
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusion and Next Steps</b> .....	<b>6-1</b>

**Appendix A** Guidance from Metropolitan Transportation Commission

**Appendix B** Evaluation Criteria Used By Authority During Current OBAG Cycle

**Table of Figures**

Figure E-1	San Francisco’s Priority Development Areas .....	2
Figure E-2	San Francisco’s Priority Conservation Areas .....	2
Figure E-3	Major Projects Serving Multiple PDAs (in millions of year of expenditure dollars) ....	4
Figure E-4	San Francisco’s RHNA Allocation vs. Local Projections .....	6
Figure E-5	Affordable Housing Pipeline Projects and PDAs.....	6
Figure E-6	Comparison of PDAs in Level of Housing and Job Growth.....	6
Figure E-7	Overlap of PDAs and MTC Communities of Concern.....	7
Figure E-8	Draft Projects Identified for PDA Planning Funds in San Francisco .....	8
Figure E-9	Projects Approved for OBAG Funding in San Francisco.....	9
Figure 2-1	List of PDAs, Place Types, Related Plans and Planning Status .....	2-2
Figure 2-2	Map of PDAs (original boundaries).....	2-3
Figure 2-3	Proposed PDA Boundaries Map .....	2-5
Figure 2-4	Housing and Job Growth Capacity and Projections by PDA .....	2-8
Figure 3-1	Major Projects Serving Multiple PDAs .....	3-4
Figure 4-1	Affordable Housing Pipeline Projects (green dots) and PDAs.....	4-6
Figure 4-2	San Francisco’s RHNA Allocation vs. Local Projections .....	4-7
Figure 5-1	Level of Housing and Job Growth by PDA Thresholds.....	5-2

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
 San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Figure 5-2 Comparison of PDAs in Level of Housing and Job Growth..... 5-2

Figure 5-3: Overlap of PDAs and MTC Communities of Concern..... 5-3

Figure 5-4 San Francisco Planning Department Analysis of Economically Disadvantaged  
 Communities for Green Connections ..... 5-4

Figure 5-5 Location within Community of Concern, MTC Designations and Planning Department  
 Analysis of Economically Disadvantaged Communities..... 5-5

Figure 5-6 CARE Communities in San Francisco ..... 5-5

Figure 5-6 Affordable Housing Preservation and Production Policies..... 5-6

Figure 5-7 Overlap with CARE Communities Ratings..... 5-6

Figure 5-8 Pace of Growth..... 5-7

Figure 5-8 Draft Projects Identified for PDA Planning Funds in San Francisco ..... 5-9

Figure 5-9 Projects Approved for OBAG Funding in San Francisco..... 5-10

Figure 6-1 Follow-Up Tasks and Responsibilities Identified through the TIGS ..... 6-1

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **Background**

In its role as Congestion Management Agency (CMA), the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (Authority) has prepared a Transportation Investment and Growth Strategy (TIGS) as required by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) as a part of the OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) framework for distribution of federal transportation funds between Fiscal Years 2012-13 and 2015-16. Given new requirements of Senate Bill 375 to focus on reducing greenhouse gas emissions through more coordinated land use and transportation planning, the funding framework places a particular emphasis on supporting Priority Development Areas (PDAs), areas that local jurisdictions have identified as ideal for infill transit-oriented growth. The framework includes a block grant, to be administered by CMAs, that provides federal transportation dollars to support a variety of purposes ranging from street resurfacing to bicycle and pedestrian improvements. While the block grant provides capital funds for implementation of transportation projects, the same funding framework also funds the PDA Planning program, to be administered by the San Francisco Planning Department (SF Planning) in San Francisco that supports planning activities that can include transportation project development or prioritization as well as land use planning.


To ensure that each county has a priority-setting process for both these fund sources that will support their county's PDAs, MTC is requiring each CMA to prepare a TIGS (referred to as a PDA Growth and Investment Strategy in the region). The TIGS must also report on jurisdictions' progress in achieving affordable housing production and preservation goals as required in the Regional Housing Needs Allocation process.

### **San Francisco's Priority Development Areas**

San Francisco has identified twelve PDAs, generally in the eastern part of San Francisco, and generally locations that have been comprehensively planned for as a part of an Area Plan process. Collectively, San Francisco's PDAs make up approximately 25% of San Francisco's land area and have the capacity to take on approximately 80% of the housing growth and 60% of the job growth that has been forecast in San Francisco as a part of the Plan Bay Area process (or about 80,000 housing units out of 92,000 and 143,000 jobs out of 191,000).

San Francisco's PDAs were first identified and approved by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2007 and were updated in 2008 to add the 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue corridor where the Parkmerced development has been planned. Since these original PDA designations, a number of planning efforts have been adopted or initiated that impact PDA boundaries. To ensure that San Francisco's PDAs closely resemble the planning efforts that they are a reflection of, the TIGS proposes several small changes to PDA boundaries. Figure E-1, a map of San Francisco's PDAs, shows these new boundaries.


**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
 San Francisco County Transportation Authority



**Figure E-1 San Francisco's Priority Development Areas**

**San Francisco's Priority Conservation Areas**

San Francisco has also identified four Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs) as shown in Figure E-2. PCAs are locally-identified locations in urgent need of preservation. The OBAG framework also creates a funding program to support PCAs, which will include \$5 million administered through a competitive grant program that San Francisco's PCAs would be eligible for. Two of San Francisco's PCAs were nominated by a non-profit organization, the California



**Figure E-2 San Francisco's Priority Conservation Areas**

## SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Native Plant Society (Sutro Tower, Inc., and Bayview Hill Radio Property) and two were nominated by SF Planning (the Aquavista/Twin Peaks site, and the Paulo/Phelps open space). Since designation of these PCAs in 2007, some sites are no longer seen as in critical need of preservation, and the relevant City agencies and private entities (most likely SF Planning, the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department, and the California Native Plants Society) should coordinate to clarify priorities in advance of the call for projects for this upcoming funding source.

### Needs of Priority Development Areas

San Francisco has identified overarching citywide transportation needs that color the needs related to growth within PDAs. These foundational needs include: a backlog of roads in need of resurfacing, transit capital in need of rehabilitation or replacement, a transportation network that is burdened by traffic congestion, significant transit crowding and transit reliability issues, and cycling and pedestrian facilities that lack the level of safety or attractiveness needed for many San Franciscans to choose to travel by these modes.

Beyond such foundational needs are needs more specific to the geography of particular PDAs. Some PDAs represent locations where plans have been approved for entirely new neighborhoods replacing former industrial areas that have gone into disuse (e.g. Treasure Island, Mission Bay, or Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyards). The approach to addressing transportation for these PDAs has required planning a multi-modal sustainable transportation system, essentially from scratch, including entirely new street grids. Other PDAs are existing dynamic neighborhoods with existing transportation needs, but with plans to grow upwards or fill in with higher density housing and office space (e.g. Transbay Center, Market/Octavia or Eastern Neighborhoods). In these PDAs, the challenge is more about how to retrofit existing streets to rebalance the distribution of right-of-way among the different modes of transportation, and identifying strategic investments that can both address existing needs as well as future needs created by new development.

The Authority polled agencies that have expertise in each PDA to identify the latest information related to each PDA's transportation needs. Altogether, the amount of needs identified on this list total \$4.1 billion, although in some cases not all needs are documented or cost estimates for documented needs do not yet exist. Among the largest costs for each of the PDAs is the cost of street grids, which, while in many cases is mostly or entirely funded by developers, shortfalls do exist. For the four PDAs that represent Master Development by one developer (Mission Bay, Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyards, Treasure Island, Parkmerced), \$1.4 billion out of \$1.7 billion of development-supporting transportation improvements identified are committed through Development Agreement contributions. In other Area Plans, forecasts regarding expected revenue relative to need do not exist, but mechanisms such as development impact fees to support community facilities have been established, or increases in general fund revenue due to increased tax base are expected to also contribute to funding these improvements. In many cases cost estimates for project needs have not yet been produced so are not included in the \$4.1 billion figure.

In addition to transportation needs, planning efforts in each of the PDAs have aimed to create complete neighborhoods. Each adopted plan for growth includes a community improvements program or similar implementation program which identifies transportation, open space, recreational, and public realm amenities planned for the area over a 20-year period.

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

**Figure E-3 Major Projects Serving Multiple PDAs (In millions of year of expenditure dollars)**

	19 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	Balboa Park	Bayview/Hunters Point	Downtown-Van Ness-Geary	Eastern Neighborhoods	Market/Octavia	Mission Bay	Mission-San Jose	Port of San Francisco	SF/San Mateo Bi-County	Transbay Terminal	Treasure Island
Better Market Street (\$210)				X	X	X					X	
Bi-County Program (Geneva-Harney BRT, Geneva Ave ext., Bayshore intermodal terminal, Candlestick interchange) (\$548)		X	X							X		
Bicycling improvements (\$500)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Caltrain Electrification and Service Frequency Improvements (\$1,456)			X	X	X					X	X	
Central Subway (\$1,580)				X	X		X			X	X	
Downtown Congestion Pricing (NE Cordon) (\$100 up-front, \$60-80 annual net revenue)				X	X	X	X		X		X	
Downtown Extension of Caltrain, Transbay Transit Center Phase 2 (\$2,596)			X	X	X		X			X		
Geary BRT (\$180)				X	X						X	
Pedestrian improvements (\$363)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Transit Effectiveness Project (\$190)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Transbay Transit Center Phase 1 (\$1,590)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Van Ness BRT (\$130)				X	X							
West-side Grade-Separated M-Ocean View on 19 <sup>th</sup> Avenue (TBD)	X			X		X						
*Note all costs use Year of Expenditure Costs as shown in Plan Bay Area except Bicycling improvements and pedestrian improvements, where the need number is based on the SFMTA's Bicycle and Pedestrian strategies, respectively.												

**Affordable Housing Policies and Production**

Housing costs in San Francisco are amongst the highest in the nation. City agencies, particularly the Planning Department and the Mayor's Office of Housing, have for decades made affordable housing a top policy priority. San Francisco has developed a comprehensive set of policies and programs designed to build and protect affordable housing. Policies are of two major types: (1) legal protections that serve to prevent the loss of affordable housing stock and to reduce

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

displacement of low-income individuals, and (2) City investments in affordable housing development and preservation. The former category includes:

- San Francisco's Rent Ordinance that institutes rent control on housing constructed before June 1979 and requires "just cause" for landlords to evict tenants;
- Restrictions on converting various types of housing to other types including conversion of rental units to condominiums, conversion of Single Room Occupancy to other types of housing, and conversion of existing residences to student housing; and
- Prohibitions on housing demolition except under special circumstances and when replacement projects will result in significant increase in unit affordability.


The latter category includes:

- City investments in affordable multifamily development that provides public financing to non-profit affordable housing developers;
- San Francisco's Inclusionary Housing policy that requires developers of housing projects of at least 10 units to either construct 12% of housing units as affordable units on-site, 20% as affordable offsite within one mile, or pay an affordable housing fee calculated as the difference between real development costs and affordable sale prices for 20% of the number of units to be developed;
- The City's Acquisition/Rehabilitation program that provides financial incentives to affordable housing developers to purchase and rehabilitate existing apartment buildings and single room occupancy units in exchange for affordability restrictions into the future;
- Investments to preserve existing deed-restricted housing such as the HOPE SF initiative to demolish and rebuild the distressed public housing sites at Hunters View, Alice Griffith, Potrero, and Sunnydale;
- City-administered loan programs for low-/moderate- income first-time homebuyers to provide down-payment and mortgage assistance; and
- Proposition C, approved by San Francisco voters in November 2012 that created the Affordable Housing Trust that will eventually support \$50.8 million per year in affordable housing investment over its 30-year life. The fund will provide approximately \$1.2 billion in affordable housing subsidy and serve as a replacement for the loss of funding for affordable housing that was previously available through tax increment financing administered by Redevelopment Agencies before they were dissolved.

Figure E-4 shows the existing pipeline of affordable units under construction (1,375) and in pre-construction planning (7,169).

Even with Prop C funding for affordable housing development, the City is projected to fall short of its 2014-2022 RHNA as shown in Figure E-5. Approximately \$3 billion in additional funding would be needed in order for San Francisco to produce the entire allocation of very low, low, and moderate income units assigned to San Francisco by ABAG through the RHNA process.

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority



**Figure E-5 Affordable Housing Pipeline Projects and PDAs**

**Figure E-4 San Francisco's RHNA Allocation vs. Local Projections**

	RHNA Allocation (2014-2022)	Local Projection
Very Low	6,207	3,800
Low	4,619	2,400
Moderate	5,437	

**Informing Transportation Funding Decisions**

The TIGS is an opportunity to think strategically about how to use two types of funding to meet the transportation needs of San Francisco's PDAs: PDA Planning funds and OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) capital funds. Guidance from MTC indicates a specific set of factors that should be considered in establishing local funding priorities that PDAs can be compared against including:

- **Location in high-impact areas** where significant housing and job growth is expected. Figure E-6 compares PDAs on this criterion, designating them as low, medium, or high based on the amount of growth that has been planned for.


**Figure E-6 Comparison of PDAs in Level of Housing and Job Growth**

	19 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	Balboa Park	Bayview/Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point	Downtown-Van Ness-Geary	Eastern Neighborhoods	Market/Octavia	Mission Bay	Mission-San Jose*	Port of San Francisco	SF/San Mateo BI-County	Transbay Terminal	Treasure Island
Amount of Housing Growth	Med	Low	High	High	High	Med	Med	Low	Med	Med	Med	High
Amount of Job Growth	Low	Low	Med	High	High	Low	Med	Low	High	Low	High	Low



**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

- Overlap with a Community of Concern.** Figure E-7 indicates where San Francisco's Communities of Concern as defined by MTC are, relative to PDAs. In San Francisco, local knowledge and analysis to identify disadvantaged communities does not entirely overlap with these designations (some of these discrepancies include Mission Bay and Presidio Terrace which are considered a Community of Concern based on MTC's definition, and the HOPE SF Potrero and Sunnydale sites which are not considered Communities of Concern based on MTC's definition). MTC gives discretion to localities to define local Communities of Concern. San Francisco agencies should coordinate to agree upon a consistent definition to use locally that address these discrepancies.



**Figure E-7 Overlap of PDAs and MTC Communities of Concern**

- Locations with affordable housing preservation and creation strategies.** As described above, the City has notable affordable housing preservation and creation strategies that apply to all of the City's PDAs. Yet, within San Francisco, PDAs differ in terms of whether the mandatory inclusionary requirements are exceeded. Some PDAs significantly exceed the 12% minimum inclusionary requirement, with the Bayview/Hunters Point and Transbay Center District Plan PDAs both anticipated to result in more than 30% of housing units as affordable by plan build-out.
- Overlap with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE) program.** Projects that employ best management practices to mitigate particulate matter and toxic air contaminants and are within CARE communities are to be prioritized for OBAG funding. In San Francisco, the entire eastern half of the City is a CARE community, containing all of San Francisco's PDAs besides the 19th Avenue Corridor.
- Pace of growth,** which, while not discussed in the MTC OBAG criteria, is another useful way to compare PDAs. In some cases new houses and jobs are already under construction or have been built, while in other cases, ground has not yet broken or may not for some time. Because some types of transportation improvements would not make sense to implement before new land uses move forward, the Planning Department will undertake an annual analysis of recent housing and jobs activity by PDA based on its consolidated pipeline<sup>1</sup> in order to provide a point of comparison on this factor.

---

<sup>1</sup> The San Francisco consolidated pipeline consists of development projects that would add residential units or commercial space, applications for which have been formally submitted to the Planning Department or the Department of Building Inspection (DBI). Pipeline projects are at various stages of development: from applications having been filed to entitlements secured; from building permits approved and issued to projects under construction. The pipeline includes only those projects with a land use or building permit application. It does not include projects undergoing preliminary Planning Department project review or projections based on area plan analysis. Projects vary in size from single units to larger multi-year development programs undergoing environmental review.

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

While all of the above criteria were used to inform prioritization of projects for both fund sources, there are additional expectations San Francisco has developed regarding the process to prioritize each of these fund sources. PDA Planning funds will be used in three ways: to prepare candidate projects to become “ready” for the next OBAG cycle; to document, develop, or prioritize transportation needs in under-developed or emerging PDAs, and to support joint land use transportation planning. In addition to the PDA comparison criteria discussed above, some additional criteria considered include the level of need for additional planning support, geographic equity among PDAs, whether the funding will allow the project to achieve a distinct milestone or deliverable, and what other funding sources the project may be able to access. The SF Planning is leading the process to prioritize this fund source. San Francisco agencies were polled for candidate planning efforts, and the Department convened two meetings with San Francisco agency executive leadership to come to consensus regarding the selected planning efforts. Figure 5-8 indicates the draft projects identified for funding.

**Figure E-8 Draft Projects Identified for PDA Planning Funds in San Francisco**

Project	PDA Supported	Funding Level
Rail Storage Alternatives Analysis & Boulevard Feasibility Study	Multiple (Mission Bay, Eastern Neighborhoods, Transbay Terminal)	\$700,000
Embarcadero Multi-Modal Planning	Multiple (Port of San Francisco, Mission Bay, Eastern Neighborhoods, Transbay Terminal, Downtown/Van Ness/Geary)	\$300,000
Second Street Environmental Impact Report	Multiple (Eastern Neighborhoods, Transbay Terminal, Downtown/Van Ness/Geary)	\$250,000
Bayshore Station Re-location	San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area	\$400,000
M-Ocean View Re-Alignment Project Development, Project Study Report	19 <sup>th</sup> Avenue Corridor	\$500,000
Better Market Street Environmental Impact Report	Multiple (Downtown/Van Ness Veary, Transbay Terminal, Market/Octavia)	\$111,000

For the OBAG block grant program, the programming approach for current cycle funds has preceded development of the TIGS. The process is described in detail on the Authority’s OBAG website ([www.sfcta.org/obag](http://www.sfcta.org/obag)); however, the evaluation criteria used, which were adopted by the Authority Board in September 2012, generally included the same factors described above. In October 2012, the Authority received 12 applications for the OBAG program totaling just over \$62 million against \$35 million in available OBAG funding. In December 2012, the Authority Board used these criteria as well as criteria related to complete streets and project readiness to approve the initial pool of OBAG candidate projects, advancing 10 of the 12 applications. These projects underwent a project development phase and project sponsors submitted 9 revised applications in April, and were re-evaluated against the Board-adopted criteria. The final program of projects shown in Figure E-9 will be adopted at the June 2013 meeting of the Authority Board.

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

**Figure E-9 Projects Approved for OBAG Funding in San Francisco**

Project	PDA Supported
Longfellow Safe Routes to School	Mission-San Jose Corridor
ER Taylor Safe Routes to School	
Chinatown Broadway Phase IV Street Design	Downtown/Van Ness/Geary
Masonic Avenue Complete Streets	Proximate access to Downtown/Van Ness/Geary
Transbay Center Bike and Pedestrian Improvements (partial funding)	Transbay Terminal
Second Street Streetscape Improvement	Eastern Neighborhoods
Mansell Corridor Improvement (partial funding)	Proximate access to Bayview/Hunters Point + Mission-San Jose

Future cycles of OBAG are expected to use a similar approach as the current cycle, but are expected to benefit from a larger set of competitive, ready-to-go (i.e. well-prepared to meet federal timely-use-of-funds requirements) projects as result of the planning support provided by the PDA Planning funds. Additionally, the evaluation of projects will benefit from the information now available and under development comparing PDAs as described in the previous section.

**Conclusion**

This is San Francisco's first TIGS, and it is required to be regularly updated. Generally, it synthesizes the work that has been done in myriad different comprehensive land use and transportation planning efforts into one document that can be used to inform future transportation funding decisions. What is clear, is that while significant work has been done and San Francisco's PDAs are already being transformed into sustainable transit-oriented developments, there is much more work to be done to further identify needs and get projects ready for implementation, as well as to identify significant new sources of revenue to meet needs related to transportation, affordable housing, as well as other aspects of complete communities. Ultimately, San Francisco must partner with the region to achieve these ambitious goals. As a leader in innovation within the country and the world, San Francisco and the Bay Area are assuredly up to this challenging yet important task.

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## Background

In May 2012, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) adopted a funding framework for Cycle 2 federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funds for the next four-year cycle (Fiscal Years 2012-13 through 2015-16). This includes the OneBayArea Grant program (OBAG), part of the Bay Area's work to integrate land use and transportation planning activities in order to reduce automobile travel and greenhouse gas emissions as required under Senate Bill 375 (Steinberg, 2008, see sidebar for more information). The Bay Area's congestion management agencies (CMAs) are responsible for administration of these funds to support eligible projects; as San Francisco's CMA, the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (Authority) is responsible for administration of San Francisco's \$38.8 million share of OBAG funds.

Approval of the Cycle 2 framework also included a new requirement that CMAs in large counties such as San Francisco program 70% of the OBAG funding to transportation projects or programs that support designated infill development areas near transit, called Priority Development Areas (PDAs). PDAs are locally-identified infill development opportunity areas near transit within the 9-county Bay Area region. San Francisco has identified 12 PDAs. These areas are generally in the eastern half of the city where the city has already approved Area Plans entitling more growth.

PDAs were originally identified by local governments in 2007 as part of the FOCUS program, a regional development and conservation strategy that promoted a more compact land use pattern for the Bay Area. When the regional PDA framework was introduced in 2007, the goal was to provide additional resources to support the build out of PDAs into sustainable, transit-oriented complete communities. The distribution of OBAG funding is the first time distribution of capital transportation funds has been linked to PDAs, as well as the first time the distribution formula has considered jurisdictions' track record and future plans for producing housing and affordable housing. These aspects of the program are

### Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) and the Sustainable Communities Strategy

SB 375 aims to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles through better coordination between transportation investments and land use decisions. One key mechanism it uses to achieve this is directly connecting the region's primary transportation funding instrument with regional growth projections. SB 375 requires every regional Metropolitan Planning Organization (MTC in the Bay Area) to incorporate a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) into the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The SCS, which in the Bay Area is to be jointly prepared with ABAG, is a regional land use strategy that illustrates how to house all projected population growth within the region across all income levels. The Bay Area's first joint RTP and SCS is known as Plan Bay Area and must achieve a 15% per capita reduction in greenhouse gas emissions in 2035.

## SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

ones that San Francisco advocated strongly in favor of. FOCUS also included designation of Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs), regionally significant open space areas that have an urgent need for protection, and the Cycle 2 framework also dedicates \$10 million to support PCAs, with \$5 million available through a competitive grant process that San Francisco's PCAs are eligible for.

To ensure that CMAs have a transportation project priority-setting process for OBAG funding that supports and encourages development of the region's PDAs, each CMA must prepare a Transportation Investment and Growth Strategy (TIGS, referred to at MTC/ABAG as the PDA Investment and Growth Strategy).

The Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) is a process required under State law by which each city in the region is assigned an 8-year housing target by income level that must be accommodated in the city's Housing Element. The total housing needs number for the Bay Area region is assigned by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). How that number is shared among Bay Area jurisdictions is determined by ABAG. The eight-year RHNA must be consistent with Plan Bay Area. Local jurisdictions must update the Housing Element of their General Plan to accommodate their local RHNA allocation within three years of the adoption of the Final RHNA by ABAG. CMAs are required to report on progress in achieving RHNA goals by identifying current local housing policies that encourage affordable housing production and community stabilization in the TIGS.

The same Cycle 2 programming framework also includes a \$40 million investment in a PDA Planning program that supports land use and transportation planning work within designated PDAs. Half of these funds, or \$20 million, are to be administered at the county level and are distributed to each county using the same formula as OBAG capital funds<sup>2</sup>. In San Francisco, these funds are being administered by the SF Planning with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency acting as the fiscal agent. San Francisco's share of PDA Planning funds is \$2.38 million over the four-year cycle. As with the Authority's future cycle OBAG funds, the use of San Francisco's share of PDA Planning funds is also informed by the TIGS.

### Overview of TIGS

San Francisco's PDA planning context is unique compared to other counties in the region. San Francisco's PDAs are among the most ready for, or are already experiencing, growth because they have benefitted from significant comprehensive land use and transportation planning work that has been completed through adopted Area Plans. San Francisco also has among the strongest affordable housing policies in the region. Additionally, San Francisco has just one jurisdiction within its county, as compared to tens of cities in other counties.

The TIGS provides a framework for ensuring that San Francisco's decision-making process for future rounds of OBAG funding supports and encourages development of the city's PDAs. Of course, OBAG is just one of many sources of funding available to support PDAs, and San Francisco's funding and implementing agencies have long been supporting its PDAs through transportation investments.

---

<sup>2</sup> Of the \$20 million retained at the regional level, \$10 million will support the Transit-Oriented Affordable Housing revolving loan fund, \$2 million will support ABAG's continued involvement in the PDA program, and \$8 million will be administered as a competitive grant program.

## SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY

### San Francisco County Transportation Authority

The Authority has led the development of the TIGS, in cooperation with the Planning Department and other city agencies that are involved in PDA development including the Mayor's Office of Housing, Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, and Port of San Francisco.

This remainder of this document is organized as follows:

**Chapter 2** provides an overview of San Francisco's PDAs and PCAs, including the number of housing units and jobs entitled in each and how this compares to the City's regional allotment of growth in Plan Bay Area.

**Chapter 3** provides more detail on each individual PDA, including its planning context and identified needs. Because a prime purpose of the TIGS is to inform transportation investment, the focus of this chapter is on transportation needs, although complete communities needs, such as parks, schools or grocery stores that have been identified through Area Plan processes are also described here.

**Chapter 4** describes housing policies that the city has in place to support affordable housing, the current pipeline of affordable housing projects, and presents San Francisco's share of the current Regional Housing Needs Allocation process underway for years 2014 through 2022.

**Chapter 5** describes criteria that can be used to inform prioritization of funds for current and future OBAG and PDA Planning cycles including comparing PDAs on measures such as their pace of growth and the amount of housing and jobs they are taking on.

## **2 SAN FRANCISCO'S PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT AND PRIORITY CONSERVATION AREA OVERVIEW**

### **OVERVIEW OF SAN FRANCISCO'S PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT AREAS**

San Francisco has engaged in significant planning in order to manage the city's growth by focusing on planned areas that are well-served by transit. These planning efforts include:

- Area Plans (portions of the General Plan which focus on a particular part of the City)
- Redevelopment Plans (community revitalization plans authorized and organized under the provisions of the former California Redevelopment Law)
- Major development projects accomplished through partnership among multiple City agencies

About 25 percent of the city's total land area has been planned for in these types of efforts, and collectively, they make up the city's 12 designated Priority Development Areas (PDAs). San Francisco's PDAs have the capacity to absorb over 80% of the projected residential growth and almost 60% of the projected employment growth that has been forecast in San Francisco in Plan Bay Area (see sidebar on pg. 1-1 for more information).

Under the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG)'s FOCUS framework (see Chapter 1), each PDA was designated as "Planned" or "Potential" depending on the level of planning that has been completed for the area. Nearly all San Francisco's PDAs are classified as Planned. The Mission-San Jose corridor is the only location considered Potential. At the time of initial designation of the PDAs, this corridor was an area considered as one with potential for the city to pursue additional land use planning; however, currently, there are no plans for land use planning in the corridor. The only location within the PDA with a governing area plan is the Glen Park Community Plan for a small subset of the corridor surrounding the Glen Park BART station that was adopted in 2002.

Figure 2-1 presents the relevant plans governing each PDA and Figure 2-2 shows the most recent designation of San Francisco's PDAs.

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority


**Figure 2-1 List of PDAs, Place Types, Related Plans and Planning Status**

<b>Priority Development Area</b>	<b>Relevant Plans</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>19th Avenue - Park Merced</b>	Parkmerced Design Standards and Guidelines, Sustainability Plan, Transportation Plan, and Infrastructure Report, San Francisco State University Campus Master Plan	Planned
<b>Balboa Park</b>	Balboa Park Area Plan	Planned
<b>Bayview/Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point</b>	Bayview Hunters Point Area Plan & Redevelopment Plan, Hunters Point Shipyard Area Plan, Candlestick Point Sub-Area Plan, Candlestick Point - Hunters Point Shipyard Phase I & II Development Plan	Planned
<b>Downtown/Van Ness/Geary</b>	Downtown Area Plan, development plans for the 5M Project	Planned
<b>Eastern Neighborhoods</b>	Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and Implementation Document, Eastern Neighborhoods Transportation Implementation Planning Study, Western SoMa Area Plan; draft Central Corridor Plan	Planned
<b>Market/Octavia</b>	Market & Octavia Area Plan and Community Improvements Program, Upper Market Community Plan	Planned
<b>Mission Bay</b>	Mission Bay Redevelopment Plan & Design for Development: North; Mission Bay Redevelopment Plan & Design for Development: South	Planned
<b>Mission-San Jose Corridor</b>	Glen Park Community Plan	Potential
<b>Port of San Francisco</b>	Waterfront Land Use Plan; development plans for Piers 30 & 32 /Warriors Arena, Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 48/ Mission Rock Development, Pier 70 Master Plan.	Planned
<b>San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area</b>	Executive Park Sub-Area Plan, Visitacion Valley Master Plan and Design for Development, Hope SF Sunnydale Master Plan	Planned
<b>Transbay Terminal</b>	Transit Center District Plan and Implementation Document, Transbay Redevelopment Plan	Planned
<b>Treasure Island</b>	Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan	Planned



**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
 San Francisco County Transportation Authority

**Figure 2-2 Map of PDAs (original boundaries)**



**PDA HISTORY AND PROPOSED BOUNDARY CHANGES**

The majority of San Francisco's PDAs were established in 2007, based on planning efforts accomplished or underway at that time, and were approved by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. The 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue/Parkmerced corridor was added in 2008. Since these original PDA designations, a number of planning efforts have been adopted or initiated that impact PDA boundaries:

**Upper Market Community Plan** – Through this planning effort, endorsed by the Planning Commission in October 2008, the neighborhoods along Upper Market Street developed a

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

community vision and design guidelines that built upon, and slightly expanded, the vision and intention of the Market & Octavia Plan.<sup>3</sup> The Upper Market area was primarily included in the original Market/Octavia PDA, with the exception of some parcels along Market Street between Noe and 16<sup>th</sup> streets to Castro Street which were added to the study area.

**Sunnydale HOPE SF Master Plan** – This plan, completed in 2010, includes replacing the public housing at Sunnydale with new homes for its 1,700 existing residents and adding another 900 units of tax-credit affordable and market rate units, along with a new recreational and educational center, new parks, a community garden, farmer’s market, neighborhood-serving retail, and other community services. <sup>4</sup> The City is in the process of pursuing entitlements for the development. This site was not included in any of the original PDAs, and was proposed for inclusion in 2011 during the most recent PDA nomination process administered by ABAG, although ABAG has been unable to confirm whether the new boundaries have been incorporated into the regional designation.

**Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island Area Development Plan** – In summer 2011, the Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island Development Plan and its implementing legislation was adopted.<sup>5</sup> This 360-acre master-planned urban project includes some development on Yerba Buena Island, which was not considered during the 2007 designation of the Treasure Island PDA.

**Western SoMa Plan Area** – Arising out of the Eastern Neighborhoods planning process, Western SoMa was defined as a separate plan area in 2004, and developed under a community planning process led by the Western SoMa Citizens Planning Task Force. The Plan and its associated rezoning were adopted in March 2013.<sup>6</sup> The Western SoMa area was included in the original Downtown/Van Ness/ Geary PDA.

While most of these planning efforts represent areas that were originally within PDAs, adoption of more recent plans affects the PDA boundaries originally adopted in 2007 and 2008. To ensure that the City’s PDAs closely resemble the planning efforts that they are a reflection of, the TIGS proposes several small changes to PDA boundaries:

- **Downtown/Van Ness/Geary:** Amend boundaries to exclude the Western SoMa Plan Area.
- **Eastern Neighborhoods:** Amend boundaries to add the Western SoMa Plan Area.
- **Market/Octavia:** Amend boundaries to add parcels covered in the Upper Market Community Plan, and change name to reflect both plans.
- **Mission-San Jose Corridor:** Amend boundaries to remove parcels covered in the Upper Market Community Plan.
- **Treasure Island:** Amend boundaries to add Yerba Buena Island.
- **San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area:** Amend boundaries to add the Sunnydale/ Hope SF site (as proposed in late 2011).

---

<sup>3</sup> Please see <http://uppermarket.sfplanning.org> for more detail.

<sup>4</sup> Please see <http://hope-sf.org/sunnydale.php> for more detail.

<sup>5</sup> Please see <http://www.sftreasureisland.org/> for more detail.

<sup>6</sup> Please see [http:// westernsoma.sfplanning.org](http://westernsoma.sfplanning.org) for more detail.

## SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

These changes are illustrated the proposed PDA Boundaries Map, Figure 2-3.




Figure 2-3 Proposed PDA Boundaries Map

### CAPACITY WITHIN SAN FRANCISCO'S PDAS

According to current plans, San Francisco's PDAs collectively have the capacity to absorb over 85% of the projected residential growth, and almost 75% of the projected employment growth that has been allocated to San Francisco in Plan Bay Area (see Chapter 1 for more information). The city's adopted plans and projects have substantially increased the capacity of San Francisco to absorb growth, providing space for over 70,000 new units of housing and 140,000 new jobs. There are also several currently active planning processes that could increase the capacity of the city's PDAs even further, providing another 4,250 new housing units and 28,000 jobs.

Planning efforts and major projects that are still underway include:

**Central Corridor Plan:** Funded by a Transportation Planning Grant from Caltrans, this plan takes a second look at parcels previously covered in the Downtown and Eastern SoMa Area Plans due to their location along the Central Subway rail corridor. The draft Central Corridor Plan,

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

released in March 2013, proposes land use and height changes as well as a strategy for improving the transit, bike and pedestrian experience in this area. Environmental analysis is currently underway, and adoption of the plan is expected in late 2014.<sup>7</sup> The Central Corridor area is within the Downtown/Van Ness/Geary and the Eastern Neighborhoods PDAs.

**5M Project:** The Planning Department and other agencies are collaborating with project sponsors of this proposed mixed use project at Fifth and Mission streets, one block south of the Powell Street BART and Muni Metro stations, in the southern Financial District and SoMa neighborhoods. The project could result in up to 1.8 million gross square feet of new and renovated residential units and commercial space, several new public spaces and improved alleyways. This project is currently undergoing environmental review, and adoption of the project and its associated rezonings is expected in mid-2014. It is located within the new proposed boundaries of the Eastern Neighborhoods PDA.

**Mission Rock, Seawall Lot 337/Pier 48:** The Planning Department and other agencies are collaborating with the San Francisco Giants, in conjunction with Cordish Companies, on a mixed use project that would contain up to 1.7 million square feet of office use, between 650 to 1,000 apartment and townhouse dwelling units, 125,000 square feet of commercial retail uses, up to 180,000 square feet of exhibit and event space at Pier 48 as well as seven acres of open space. This project is currently undergoing environmental review, and adoption of the project and its associated rezonings is expected in mid-2014. It is located in the Port PDA.

**Golden State Warriors, Piers 30 and 32:** The Golden State Warriors are proposing a new arena on Piers 30-32. While currently still in conceptual phases, the 13-acre pier site and potentially adjacent seawall lot are anticipated to accommodate the arena, ancillary retail, public assembly/open space and possibly parking. This project is currently undergoing environmental review. It is located in the Port PDA.

**Pier 70:** Based on the Master Plan developed by the Port of San Francisco with its regulatory partners and the community, the Port is working with two development partners for sub-areas of Pier 70, the Pier 70 Waterfront Sub-Area and the Historic Core Sub-Area. These projects could add up to 2,000 units and 12,000 jobs to the Port PDA.

**Caltrain/4<sup>th</sup> & King Railyards:** The Caltrain station at 4<sup>th</sup> and King streets is an essential and invaluable regional transit terminus supporting many of San Francisco's PDAs. Its 19-acre railyard also represents a potential opportunity for significant transit-oriented development in conjunction with station and railyard operations. To further examine this possibility, San Francisco is partnering with Caltrain to determine the amount of space that is actually needed in the yard for Caltrain operational needs, as a part of their North Terminal Study; this effort will also further analyze land use opportunity in the broader area around the station. This area is located in the Mission Bay PDA.

Figure 2-4 indicates total capacity by PDA according to San Francisco's plans compared to the Regional Plan Bay Area projections. The plans and projects described here are shown in the "Projects Under Development" column.

---

<sup>7</sup> Please see <http://centralcorridor.sfplanning.org> for more detail.

## **COMPLETE COMMUNITIES INFRASTRUCTURE**

### **Creating Livability in PDAs**

The quality of life provided in San Francisco's PDAs depends not just on land uses and transportation options, but also on overall livability. In its Better Neighborhoods Program, the Planning Department defined the "eight elements of a great neighborhood":

1. Stores and services within an easy walk from home
2. Safe and friendly streets
3. A range of travel options
4. A variety of housing types
5. Places for people to gather
6. Public services (parks, schools, police and fire stations, libraries, other amenities)
7. Its unique neighborhood character
8. A function as part of the larger whole of the city

Using these elements as a framework, planning efforts in each of the PDAs have aimed to create complete neighborhoods that meet the needs of existing and projected populations. Each adopted plan for growth includes a community improvements program or similar implementation program, which identifies transportation, open space, recreational, and public realm amenities planned for the area over a 20-year period.

Many plans include a development impact fee charged to new development to fund necessary infrastructure. Projected impact fee revenue generally fund 30% of the total capital costs for plan implementation. Other revenue sources include federal, state, and regional grants, local public infrastructure funds such as Prop K sales tax revenue and general funds, and in some cases additional tools like tax increment financing, Mello Roos Districts, etc.

Most community improvements identified are expected to be built over a 20-year time period. City agencies, such as the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, Department of Public Works, Recreation and Parks Department, Human Services Agency, and the San Francisco Public Library, will build, operate and maintain the proposed community improvements. Chapter 3 includes a discussion of complete communities infrastructure planned for particular PDAs.

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

**Figure 2-4 Housing and Job Growth Capacity and Projections by PDA**

Area Name	2010-2040 Housing Unit Growth					2010-2040 Job Growth				
	In Pipeline	Additional Capacity	Projects Under Development	Total Local	Plan Bay Area	In Pipeline	Additional Capacity	Projects Under Development	Total Local	Plan Bay Area
19th Avenue - Park Merced	5,680	-		5,680	5,950	900	-		900	3,580
Balboa Park	90	1,690		1,780	1,850	32	693		725	770
Bayview/Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point	10,820	-		10,820	10,900	14,726	-		14,726	9,660
Downtown/Van Ness/Geary	7,760	6,098	750	14,608	27,140	10,583	8,557	4,000	23,140	52,580
Eastern Neighborhoods	6,140	6,760	3,500	16,400	11,420	5,666	10,134	24,000	39,800	9,820
Market/Octavia	2,450	3,530		5,980	6,210		3,000		3,000	2,940
Mission Bay	590	2,374		2,964	3,380	7,583	3,417		11,000	24,430
Mission - San Jose Corridor	100	978		1,078	1,260	33	1,467		1,500	6,080
Port of San Francisco	3,120*	-		3,120	1,830	20,150*	-		20,150	18,970
San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area**	120	4,944		5,064	5,250		575		575	860
Transbay Terminal	590	3,960		4,550	4,720	10,074	14,926		25,000	29,710
Treasure Island	7,800	-		7,800	7,270	1,270	1,480		2,750	2,750
<b>Total Development</b>	<b>42,140</b>	<b>30,334</b>	<b>4,250</b>	<b>79,844</b>	<b>92,410</b>	<b>68,516</b>	<b>46,750</b>	<b>28,000</b>	<b>143,266</b>	<b>190,740</b>

\* Projects shown as "In Pipeline" in the Port PDA have been formally submitted to the Planning Department or the Department of Building Inspection (DBI). However, in these cases, the Port is working with developers through Request for Proposals or Request for Qualifications processes on specific sites and formal submittals are pending.

\*\*The numbers shown for the San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area represent only the growth expected in the San Francisco portion of the PDAs.

1342

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

## **OVERVIEW OF SAN FRANCISCO'S PCAS**

Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs) were also defined as part of the regional FOCUS program. PCAs are regionally significant open space areas that have an urgent need for protection. The goal of designating PCAs is to accelerate protection of key open space areas, agricultural resources, and areas with high ecological value to the regional ecosystem. Historical, scenic, and cultural resources are also considered.

While San Francisco already has a significant open space network, it has designated four PCAs through the FOCUS Program to accelerate their protection and restoration or use as recreational space. Under the OBAG program, \$10 million was set aside for PCAs. Half of these funds will go to a PCA pilot program in the North Bay; the remaining half will be available to PCA projects outside of the North Bay through a competitive grant process administered by the California Coastal Conservancy, with eligible uses including: planning activities, pedestrian and bicycle facilities and infrastructure, visual enhancements, habitat/environmental enhancements, and protection.

The PCA program is administered by ABAG and allows local governments, CMAs, tribes, water/utility districts, resource conservation districts, park and/or open space districts, land trusts and other land/resource protection nonprofit organizations in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area to nominate PCAs.

As a result of the multitude of entities that can nominate PCAs, two of San Francisco's PCAs were nominated by a non-profit organization, the California Native Plant Society (Sutro Tower, Inc., and Bayview Hill Radio Property) and two were nominated by SF Planning (the Aquavista/Twin Peaks site, and the Paulo/Phelps open space). For the TIGS, the most recent status of each site was determined and is reported below. However, in light of these updates and the potential funding available through the PCA program, the relevant City agencies and private entities (most likely the SF Planning, the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department, and the California Native Plants Society) should coordinate to clarify priorities in advance of the call for projects for this upcoming funding source.

San Francisco's four PCAs are shown in Figure 2-5 and described below:

**Aquavista/Twin Peaks Site:** This site, adjacent to Twin Peaks, has been identified as having the opportunity to extend the natural habitat that exists in the established public open space. The natural vegetation in Twin Peaks supports the habitat of the Mission Blue Butterfly, as well as a number of California native plants. The site has been incorporated into the City of San Francisco's General Plan, and added as a priority site in the Plan's Recreational and Open Space Chapter. Purchase of this site is no longer a priority, as the City has determined that existing Homeowner Covenants make development of this site virtually impossible, and it is likely to remain in its current natural state.

**Bayview Hill Radio Property:** This site lies adjacent to City-owned (San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department) property at the top of Bayview Hill. This private property is in excellent biological health. It has a high concentration of native plants, including grasses, wildflowers, and shrubs. The various owners have given the California Native Plant Society permission to work there, controlling invasive plants, and the Society continues that work to this day. No action has been taken towards purchase of this site.

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

**Palou/Phelps Open Space:** The Palou/Phelps Open Space already exists, and this PCA would connect the remaining adjoining private parcels in the area. This would offer the Bayview neighborhood a complete and substantial park space. The existing open space has been the product of many community members and organizations coming together to create such an urban amenity. The site has been incorporated into the City of San Francisco's General Plan, and added as a priority site in the Plan's Recreational and Open Space Chapter. The City attempted purchase of this site at its fair market value, but the property owner was unwilling to accept the offer. The City will continue exploring other avenues including private sponsorship to ensure preservation of this site.

**Sutro Tower:** This site is a connecting corridor between Mount Sutro Twin Peaks, with many native plants still surviving there. It is important for both wildlife and human recreation. The parcel has no access to roads or infrastructure, and is unlikely to develop. However, the Bay Area Ridge Trail Council considers this a priority route for the proposed Ridge Trail. No action has been taken towards purchase of this site.




Figure 2-5 San Francisco's Priority Conservation Areas



## 3 PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT AREA NEEDS

### OVERVIEW OF NEEDS

San Francisco's Priority Development Areas (PDAs) have a diverse set of needs. In terms of transportation needs, San Francisco has identified overarching citywide transportation needs that impact the needs related to growth within PDAs. These foundational needs include: a backlog of roads in need of resurfacing, transit capital in need of rehabilitation or replacement, a structural transit operating deficit, a transportation network that is burdened by traffic congestion, significant transit crowding and transit reliability issues, and cycling and pedestrian facilities that lack the level of safety or attractiveness needed for many San Franciscans to choose to travel by these modes.

Beyond such foundational needs are needs more specific to the geography of particular PDAs. Some PDAs represent locations where plans have been approved for entirely new neighborhoods replacing former industrial areas that have gone into disuse (e.g. Treasure Island, Mission Bay, or Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyards). The approach to addressing transportation for these PDAs has required planning a multi-modal sustainable transportation system, essentially from scratch, including entirely new street grids. Other PDAs are existing dynamic neighborhoods with existing transportation needs, but with plans to grow upwards or fill in with higher density housing and office space (e.g. Transbay Center, Market/Octavia or Eastern Neighborhoods). In these PDAs, the challenge is more about how to retrofit existing streets to rebalance the distribution of right-of-way among the different modes of transportation, and identifying strategic investments that can both address existing needs as well as future needs created by new development.

The identification of transportation needs within San Francisco's PDAs has been approached in a variety of ways. In some cases, a specific set of transportation improvements were planned concurrent to the entitlement of new land uses, in particular in the case of master developments that are consummated in development agreements between the City and County of San Francisco and developers (e.g. Treasure Island, Parkmerced, and Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyards). In other cases, following adoption of an Area Plan that upzoned a PDA, a multi-modal transportation analysis has been completed that prioritizes a set of improvements that respond to identified needs (e.g. ENTRIPS followed adoption of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, the Central Freeway and Octavia Boulevard Circulation Study followed adoption of the Market-Octavia Area Plan, and the Balboa Park Station Capacity Study followed adoption of the Balboa Park Area Plan.). Responding to constraints in available funding, these plans focused on prioritizing a set of improvements responding to the most pressing needs, rather than comprehensively addressing "what it would take" to fully accommodate existing and future transportation needs within a PDA.

## SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY

### San Francisco County Transportation Authority

This chapter profiles each of San Francisco's PDAs, summarizing known transportation needs identified during Area Plan processes or subsequent focused transportation analyses as well as other complete communities infrastructure that has been identified. It begins by summarizing the foundational needs of San Francisco's transportation system common to all PDAs and the city as a whole and summarizes the major capital improvements that have been planned to address both existing needs and PDA-supportive needs. Then, for each PDA, it summarizes both the type of investments that have been identified as well as noting where more planning work is needed or underway to be able to better articulate the cost and types of investments needed.

In addition to the summary in this chapter, the Authority polled agencies that have expertise in each PDA to identify the latest information related to each PDA's transportation needs. Altogether, the amount of needs identified on this list total \$4.1 billion (excluding major capital projects discussed in the following section); although in some cases not all needs are documented or cost estimates for documented needs do not yet exist. Among the largest costs for each of the PDAs is the cost of street grids, which, while in many cases is mostly or entirely funded by developers, shortfalls do exist. For the four PDAs that represent Master Development by one developer (Mission Bay, Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyards, Treasure Island, Parkmerced), \$1.4 billion out of \$1.7 billion of development-supporting transportation improvements identified are committed through Development Agreement contributions. In other Area Plans, forecasts regarding expected revenue relative to need do not exist, but mechanisms such as development impact fees to support community facilities have been established, or increases in general fund revenue due to increased tax base are expected to also contribute to funding these improvements.

### CITYWIDE NEEDS AND PROJECTS SERVING MULTIPLE PDAS

*Planning Context:* San Francisco, an aging city with some infrastructure approaching or beyond the end of its useful life, has significant existing transportation needs. Some of these needs are not location-specific, but are so foundational that they must be addressed to enable sustainable build out of San Francisco's PDAs. While existing and future transportation needs countywide will be discussed comprehensively in the San Francisco Transportation Plan (SFTP) under development by the Authority, this section simply highlights the most pressing needs that are most universal and must be addressed to meet the needs of today's residents as well as to enable sustainable growth. These needs reflect sector plans and strategies developed by San Francisco implementing agencies including the SFMTA's Bicycle Strategy, Pedestrian Strategy, Fleet Plan, and Capital Improvement Plan, local streets and roads maintenance needs identified by the Department of Public Works, as well as transit capital maintenance and operating needs developed by the SFMTA and regional transit operators serving San Francisco.

*Transportation Needs:* A variety of investments are needed to support existing communities as well as new growth. As the city grows, a share of these needs should be addressed concurrent to growth. These areas include:

- **Transit capital maintenance.** This includes rehabilitation and replacement of assets ranging from vehicles to tracks to storage and maintenance facilities. Citywide, these needs, including both the needs of the SFMTA as well as San Francisco's share of

## SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

regional operators' needs, are \$12.13 billion between now and 2040, with a shortfall of \$1.03 billion forecast<sup>8</sup>.

- **Local streets and roads maintenance.** Maintenance needs to achieve a Pavement Condition Index score of 70 (the goal established by the San Francisco Department of Public Works) require more significantly revenue than is currently expected.
- **Transit operations.** There's a shortfall to maintain today's service levels for SFMTA and regional operator service into the future. To address new demand for transit as a result of growth and to alleviate crowding, more revenue will be needed. The SFMTA's Fleet Plan, under development, will identify the costs to expand service to meet these needs and could cost several hundred million dollars between now and 2040.
- **Transit reliability/efficiency.** San Francisco's transit system often suffers from poor reliability as a result of delays caused by bottleneck or choke points within the system. An emerging need has been identified to develop capital improvements to alleviate bottleneck points through capital improvements that will provide operational benefits. Examples include the Embarcadero Muni Metro turnaround, J-Church and N-Judah and West Portal merge points, and have been defined programmatically as the Transit Performance Initiative. Early planning and project development work is needed to technically vet and conceptually design ideas such as these, especially to be prepared for funding of the new regional Transit Performance Initiative program that received a \$500 million funding commitment in Plan Bay Area over the 28 year horizon of the plan. In addition, reliability issues are also caused by constraints posed by outdated and lack of facility space; the SFMTA Real Estate plan has identified ways to address these shortfalls but requires significant additional funding.
- **Freeway reliability/efficiency.** Congestion on San Francisco's freeway network is common during peak hours. Yet, San Francisco lacks the level of planning work that has been occurring throughout the rest of the region to create a network of High-Occupancy Vehicle or Express Lanes and beginning this type of corridor planning is another emerging need. In San Francisco, such a strategy could be implemented through conversion of general purpose lanes to HOV/Express lanes, but requires initial conceptual planning work. Concurrently, such work needs to consider the existing on- and off-ramps, which are often below current design standards, with close spacing that may result in less capacity than could be achieved through proper management. While a regional Freeway Performance Initiative has existed since the 2009 Regional Transportation Plan, San Francisco has not yet been a part of this initiative. A Caltrans Planning Grant was recently submitted to begin to study and define such ideas for San Francisco's freeway system.
- **Bicycling improvements.** While there are many bike lanes and routes throughout the city, many San Franciscans will not feel comfortable choosing biking over other modes of transportation without higher quality facilities with greater protection from traffic. Some newer generation facilities such as cycletracks or buffered bike lanes

---

<sup>8</sup> Need for replacement of revenue vehicles at the end of their useful lives and other Score 16 assets. Source: Metropolitan Transportation Commission, with needs submitted by each transit operator. Plan Bay Area Transit Operating and Capital Needs and Revenue Assessment.  
<[http://onebayarea.org/pdf/Draft\\_Plan\\_Bay\\_Area/Draft\\_PBA\\_Transit\\_Operating\\_and\\_Capital\\_Needs\\_and\\_Revenue\\_Assessment.pdf](http://onebayarea.org/pdf/Draft_Plan_Bay_Area/Draft_PBA_Transit_Operating_and_Capital_Needs_and_Revenue_Assessment.pdf)>

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

have been implemented, and the SMTA Bicycle Strategy envisions a network of over 100 miles of treatments of this level along with supportive facilities such as secure bike parking, education, and enforcement. The Strategy identifies three scenarios of varying levels of capital investment, \$500 million, \$200 million, or \$60 million, over a six-year period, while noting only \$30 million in funding expected during this time period.

- **Pedestrian improvements.** Notable attention has been focused on the pedestrian sector in San Francisco, and in particular on the need for improvements to address safety. San Francisco’s Pedestrian Strategy, released in April 2013, identifies a set of 44 miles of High Priority Segments to focus implementation of safety and walkability projects and programs over an 8-year time period. The Strategy estimates a total need of \$363 million during this timeframe, with a shortfall of \$215 million.

In addition to foundational transportation needs, several major projects have been identified that will support multiple PDAs. These are described in more detail in the PDA-specific sections to which they most pertain. Figure 3-2 indicates each of these investments, as well as the PDAs each would benefit.

**Figure 3-1 Major Projects Serving Multiple PDAs**

	19 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	Balboa Park	Bayview/Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point	Downtown-Van Ness-Geary	Eastern Neighborhoods	Market/Octavia	Mission Bay	Mission-San Jose	Port of San Francisco	SF/San Mateo Bi-County	Transbay Terminal	Treasure Island
Better Market Street (\$210)				X	X	X					X	
Bi-County Program (Geneva-Harney BRT, Geneva Avenue extension, Bayshore intermodal terminal, Candlestick interchange) (\$548)		X	X							X		
Bicycling improvements (\$500)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Caltrain Electrification and Service Frequency Improvements (\$1,456)			X	X	X					X	X	
Central Subway (\$1,580)				X	X		X			X	X	
Downtown Congestion Pricing (NE Cordon) (\$100 up-front, \$60-80 annual net revenue)				X	X	X	X		X		X	
Downtown Extension of Caltrain, Transbay Transit Center Phase 2 (\$2,596)			X	X	X		X			X	X	
Geary BRT (\$180 M)				X	X						X	
Pedestrian improvements (\$363)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Transit Effectiveness Project (\$190)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X


**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Transbay Transit Center (\$1,590)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Van Ness BRT (\$130)				X	X							
West-side Grade-Separated M-Ocean View on 19 <sup>th</sup> Avenue (TBD)	X			X		X						
*Note all costs use Year of Expenditure Costs as shown in Plan Bay Area except Bicycling improvements and pedestrian improvements, where the need number is based on the SFMTA's Bicycle and Pedestrian strategies, respectively.												

**NEEDS BY PDA**

**19th Avenue Corridor**

*Planning Context:* The 19th Avenue corridor is home to Parkmerced and San Francisco State University (SF State), both of which have significant growth plans. The Parkmerced Vision Plan was approved in May 2011, and at build out will result in an approximate tripling of the existing residential population, from about 8,000 residents to 22,000. Meanwhile, SF State completed a Campus Master Plan that was approved in November, 2007 and plans for an increase from 20,000 to 25,000 full-time student enrollment-equivalents. Finally, General Growth Properties, owners of Stonestown Galleria, immediately north of SF State, may also be considering additional growth on their site. In this PDA, transportation needs were identified during both the Parkmerced Vision and SF State Campus Master Planning processes, as well as the 19th Avenue Corridor Study (completed in 2010) that examined the transportation impacts of multiple tiers of land use intensification. Some ideas that emerged in the Corridor Study, known as “Tier 5” ideas, are just now being technically vetted and conceptually designed through the 19th Avenue Transit Study.



*Transportation Needs:* Some transportation needs identified through the 19th Avenue Corridor Study are planned to be fully implemented and funded by the developer as a part of the Development Agreement between the City and County of San Francisco and Parkmerced Investors. This includes a comprehensive upgraded street grid, including pedestrian and cycling improvements, streetscape improvements, traffic calming, new transit and shuttle stops, and implementation of two regular shuttle lines: one between Parkmerced and Daly City BART and a second between Parkmerced and the Westlake Shopping Center and Stonestown Galleria. The Agreement also includes a provision to bring the M-Ocean View through Parkmerced with two new stations, one re-located station and a turn-around track in the development to allow for short operation (service between Downtown and Parkmerced) and long operation (service between Downtown and Balboa Park). This investment will be fully paid for by the developer.

An effort currently underway, the 19th Avenue Transit Study contemplates a larger scale investment that would build upon this re-alignment plan, but bring the M-Ocean View to the west side of 19th Avenue as it first enters the corridor near Stonestown Galleria and grade separate the two crossings of 19th Avenue that the M-Ocean View makes. Such an investment would support the plans of Parkmerced and SF State, as well as address a confluence of existing issues experienced in the corridor including transit reliability and slow speeds, pedestrian safety, and

## SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

traffic congestion. Because the benefits would be broader, this idea would require funding from additional stakeholders.

Another idea that was identified in the Corridor Study was improved connections from SF State and Parkmerced to the Daly City BART station. While existing bus and shuttle service operates in the corridor, there is a need to speed travel time and improve reliability. The 19th Avenue Transit Study is also in process of technical analysis to compare the benefits and costs of either extending the M-Ocean View to Daly City BART or investing in improvements to make the existing bus and shuttle service faster and more reliable.

Finally, a more near-term set of projects have been identified that would address existing needs while also serve planned growth including:

- A program of improvements to the Daly City BART station to enhance the attractiveness and efficiency of making connections between modes as defined in the Daly City Station Access Study;
- Transit signal priority along 19th Avenue as a part of the Transit Effectiveness Project; and
- Improving bicycle and pedestrian access between SF State and Parkmerced and Lake Merced, a major recreational area.

### Balboa Park

*Planning Context:* The Balboa Park area is home to the Balboa Park BART Station and adjacent terminuses of the Muni Metro J-Church, K-Ingleside and M-Ocean View lines to the east of Interstate 280 (I-280), and the City College of San Francisco main campus and Ocean Avenue corridor to the west. The area includes a number of large, publicly-owned sites on which redevelopment is planned, with an emphasis on affordable housing. The Balboa Park Station Area Plan was adopted in 2009, and the Balboa Park Station Capacity Study that prioritized capital improvements in the vicinity of the station was completed in 2012. The Balboa Park Circulation Study, an Authority-led study of potential circulation improvements including reconfiguring freeway access to alleviate station conflicts, re-arranging station functions to improve access, and exploring bus lane and signal priority strategies, is now underway.

The Balboa Park Station site includes Muni's Curtis E. Green Light Rail Center light-rail vehicle storage yard and maintenance facility. Transportation connections are complicated by site constraints including the design of the complex, sloping topography, and the below-grade I-280 to the west as well as surrounding arterial streets (Geneva Avenue to the south, San Jose Avenue to the east, and Ocean Avenue to the north). Boarding and alighting locations for the Muni Metro J-Church and K-Ingleside lines are located within the Green Yard, while the Muni Metro M-Ocean View stops in the median of San Jose Avenue south of Geneva Avenue. Muni bus stops are located along both Geneva and Ocean avenues. I-280 and its associated ramps at Geneva and Ocean, which experience peak period congestion, act as barriers to pedestrian and bicycle access.

*Transportation Needs:* Projects planned in this area generally fall into one of two categories: improvements to the station property itself (including adjacent on-street transit facilities), and improvements to multimodal station access and circulation throughout the area.

## SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

A number of improvements to multimodal connectivity in the vicinity of the station have already been completed or fully funded, including construction of a new west entrance to the station and pedestrian path enabling access to Ocean and City College without accessing the Green Yard. The Station Capacity Study identified \$107 million worth of short-, mid- and long-term needs, including \$65 million for an elevated roadway on the west side of the station providing safe, convenient kiss-and-ride access (an issue that is now undergoing further study as part of the Balboa Park Circulation Study). The Station Capacity Study also recommended:

- Reconfiguration of the adjacent Muni Metro stops.
- New pedestrian pathways through the station site, including the Green Yard
- Construction of “transit plazas” on the north and south sides of Geneva, including an station elevator on the south side of Geneva
- A westbound transit-only lane on Ocean
- Reconfiguration of the southbound off-ramp from I-280 at Ocean to improve pedestrian safety and access to CCSF and the BART station
- Extension of Class II bicycle lanes on area streets
- A number of other pedestrian, wayfinding and streetscape improvements

The study did not recommend, or found to be infeasible within the 20-year timeframe of the study, more expensive Area Plan measures including a deck over the Green Yard allowing for development of air rights and a deck over I-280 accompanied by a new single-point urban interchange.

**Complete Communities:** Because new development proposed in the Balboa Park Station Area Plan is primarily on publicly-owned land, complete communities aspects of the plan place particular emphasis on affordable housing:

- **Affordable Housing** – The plan proposes housing development on *SFMTA’s Upper Yards* at the southwest corner of San Jose and Geneva avenues. Preliminary conclusions regarding SFMTA’s vacation of this site and the potential for transit-oriented development will be addressed in SFMTA’s Strategic Real Estate and Facilities Plan, although the Board has already officially indicated support reuse of the site. The Phelan Loop project, which will reconfigure the current Muni bus loop to improve the existing transit facility, while also creating a new space for a public plaza and development of 70 units of mixed-use affordable housing with supportive services space, is underway.
- **New Open Space and Open Space Improvements** – A number of additional open spaces are proposed in the plan area, including the Geneva Plaza, open space along Brighton Avenue, the Library playground, and the proposed Balboa Reservoir open space. The City is working to identify grant funding sources for these projects. The Trust for Public Land is working with the Department of Recreation and Parks on improvements to Balboa Park to deal with current deficiencies as well as accommodate planned growth.

### Bayview/Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point

See San Francisco-San Mateo Bi-County Area PDA below.

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

## **Downtown-Van Ness/Geary**

*Planning Context:* The Downtown-Van Ness/Geary PDA is unique in that its governing Area Plan dates back to 1984 when it was adopted. To accommodate increase in office supply without the negative impacts of vehicle congestion, one important idea that was first recommended in this plan was that there should be no aggregate increase to the existing commuter parking supply. While there has not been an updated focused downtown-wide transportation assessment in this PDA, Downtown remains the largest job center within San Francisco and its needs have been considered in countywide transportation planning efforts such as the 2003 San Francisco Countywide Transportation plan and its update—the San Francisco Transportation Plan approaching adoption in Fall 2013. In addition, the Rincon Hill Streetscape Master Plan identified a series of transportation needs in the form streetscape improvements for that particular area within downtown, and the Tenderloin-Little Saigon Neighborhood Transportation Plan identified short-term improvements to address transportation needs in the Tenderloin neighborhood.

*Transportation Needs:* Many of the major identified needs for Downtown were mentioned in the Citywide needs section and include:

- The Van Ness Avenue and Geary Avenue Bus Rapid Transit projects which will feature bus-only lanes in the center of the street, with high-quality relatively widely spaced stops, transit signal priority, and other BRT elements. The Van Ness project will serve Muni's 47-Van Ness and future 49L-Van Ness-Mission Limited lines, as well as Golden Gate Transit regional buses, and the Geary BRT project will serve Muni's 38-Geary and 38L-Geary Limited lines
- The Better Market Street project that will re-design and improve Market Street (and potentially Mission Street) for transit, bicycling, and pedestrians between Octavia Boulevard and Steuart Street.
- The under-construction Central Subway project that will extend the T-Third light rail north from King Street along Third Street, entering a new Central Subway near Bryant Street to Chinatown with new underground stations at Moscone Center, Third and Market Street, Union Square, and Clay Street.
- Continued consideration of a downtown congestion pricing program as identified in the 2010 Mobility, Access, and Pricing Study. Such a program would increase transit speeds by 20-25%, reduce vehicle delay by 21%, reduce greenhouse gas emissions 5% citywide, reduce pedestrian incidents by 12%, and generate \$60-\$80 million in net revenue to be reinvested in mobility improvements including more frequent transit service. The next step to move forward from the feasibility study would be an environmental impact report and preliminary system design work. The Authority Board directed staff to pursue funding for this work at the time of the Study's adoption.
- Improvements to increase capacity at the Downtown BART stations at Embarcadero and Montgomery BART. Such an effort requires conceptual planning work, which is the subject of a Caltrans Planning Grant that was submitted by BART in partnership with SFCTA during the 2013 application process and is a need shared with neighborhood PDAs including Transbay Center and the Port.



## SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

- The Rincon Hill Streetscape Master Plan identifies a series of improvements to Harrison, Fremont, Main, and Spear streets in the Rincon Hill area, including reductions in the number of travel lanes, addition of bike lanes, and mid-block crosswalks. Many of these streetscape improvements have already been completed through in-kind agreements with development projects.
- The Tenderloin Neighborhood Transportation Plan identifies traffic calming and safety improvements including converting Ellis and Eddy streets from 1-way to 2-way. The Authority Board recently awarded the Ellis-Eddy project Lifeline transportation funds to support implementation of this project.

*Complete Communities:* Planned community infrastructure that was identified in the Rincon Hill plan area includes:

- **New Open Space** – There are two ongoing open space projects. Guy Place Park is projected to cost \$3 million, and impact fee revenues are anticipated to partially fund construction of this park. Rincon Hill Park is being partially constructed by the adjacent development at 333 Harrison Street on one third of their lot, and the community is working to establish a community benefits district (CBD) that could fund the maintenance and operations of the park.
- **Community Facilities** –The historic Sailor’s Union of the Pacific building is proposed to be rehabilitated as a community recreation, arts and educational facilities for community use.

### Eastern Neighborhoods

*Planning Context:* The Eastern Neighborhoods PDA is made up of diverse communities including the Mission District, South of Market (SoMa), and Central Waterfront, Showplace Square, and Potrero Hill neighborhoods. As home to much of San Francisco’s industrial land supply, the transformation of these neighborhoods over the last 15 years resulted in growing land use conflicts. Responding to these needs, SF Planning created Area Plans for the Mission District, Central Waterfront, Showplace Square, the Eastern SoMa neighborhoods, and Potrero Hill that addressed affordable housing, transportation, parks and open space, urban design, and community facilities. Adopted in early 2009, the plans call for up to 10,000 units of transit-oriented housing and 13,000 new jobs over the next 20 years. The plans also identify the types of infrastructure improvements necessary to enhance livability, enable development intensity, and serve community needs in these changing neighborhoods.



Following adoption of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans, the Planning Department completed the Mission District Streetscape Master Plan that identified needed improvements to streets, sidewalks and public spaces throughout the Mission District; and, the SFMTA conducted the Eastern Neighborhoods Transportation Implementation Planning Study (ENTRIPS) that identified transportation needs within the area and identified three priority corridors for improvements; further development and refinement of some of these ideas has occurred in concert with the under development Central Corridor Plan, which identifies additional transportation needs for the streets within the plan area between 2<sup>nd</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> streets, and Mission and Townsend streets. The Authority’s Core Network Circulation Study has been conducted in parallel to the Central Corridor Plan, looking at the cumulative impact of land use and transportation plans in the greater SoMa area and the remaining needs to be addressed.

## SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

In the Western SoMa neighborhood, a Citizen's Planning Task force was formed that created a neighborhood plan through an intensive, community-driven process in collaboration with the Planning Department. This plan was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in March 2013. The Western SoMa Neighborhood Transportation Plan, led by the Authority, was completed in parallel to this process, identifying and conceptually designing a set of improvements to complement the land use changes envisioned.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PDA is also home to the Potrero Annex and Terrace public housing sites on south Potrero Hill. Plans to demolish and rebuild these sites into a mixed income community are underway as a part of the HOPE SF initiative managed by the Mayor's Office of Housing. A Master Plan for these sites is currently undergoing environmental review and includes major infrastructure needs to completely re-grid the site. Concurrently, some efforts are underway to identify transportation improvements for this area, including a focused look at these sites' transportation needs as a component of the Planning Department's Green Connections Study, as well as through a follow-up Potrero Neighborhood Transportation Plan to be led by the Authority that can further advance ideas identified in this work.

*Transportation Needs:* Some of the key needs identified through these planning processes include:

- Re-design of Folsom and Howard streets between 2<sup>nd</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> Streets to make improvements for pedestrians, cyclists, and potential transit priority. Conceptual design options were developed in ENTRIPS and have been refined and will undergo environmental review as a part of the Central Corridor Plan.
- Re-design of 7<sup>th</sup>/8<sup>th</sup> Street to improve pedestrian and bicycling conditions. Some changes to improve conditions through removal of a travel lane and buffered bike lane striping have already been implemented. Other recommendations, such as for a cycletrack and widened sidewalks have not yet progressed to the next stage of planning.
- Implementation of major transit priority treatments on the 16th Street corridor in the Mission District and Potrero Hill for the re-aligned 22-Fillmore bus service, as well as streetscape and bicycle improvements.
- The 2<sup>nd</sup> Street project under development by the Department of Public Works to make streetscape, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements on 2nd Street in SoMa.
- Improvements to other streets in the Central Corridor plan area including widened sidewalks, cycletracks, and protected transit lanes on 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and Brannan streets, and transit-only lanes on portions of Harrison and Bryant streets.
- Improvements to alleyways and arterial crossings in Western SoMa through streetscape improvements for Minna and Natoma alleys between 7<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> streets, new signalized crossings of 7<sup>th</sup>/Minna and 8<sup>th</sup>/Natoma, and a new shared street alleyway design for Ringold alley between 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> Street, adjacent to a major planned residential development. Funding for the signalized crossings at Minna and Natoma has been programmed through Prop AA and an in-kind agreement opportunity is being explored to allow the developer of 350 8<sup>th</sup> Street to implement the Ringold alleyway.
- The Core Network Circulation Study suggests a need for even more upgrade to protect transit and non-motorized modes from multi-modal conflicts due to the magnitude of trip-making increases expected as a result of growth planned in SoMa. In particular, an emerging need that requires additional development is to consider the need for additional transit-only lanes in SoMa that may be needed as development plans build out. For example, the Study

## SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

recommends additional north-south pair of transit-only lanes on 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> streets are needed in addition to the existing 3<sup>rd</sup>/4<sup>th</sup> pair. The Study also recommends an additional east-west pair of transit-only lanes south of the freeways may be needed, given this is where much of the Central Corridor growth is expected, such as Brannan Street in addition to the existing transit-only lanes on Market and Mission streets.

- ENTRIPS and the Core Network Circulation Study both identify the need for Grid Repair to improve the ways connections occur between street grids. For example, as land use redevelopment occurs, 15<sup>th</sup> Street could be connected between Harrison Street and Potrero Avenue to serve as a parallel facility to 16<sup>th</sup> street. Similarly, opportunities may exist to improve connections across Division Street from around Bryant Street to 8<sup>th</sup> Street to rationalize movements and improve legibility of connections between the Mission and Mission Bay street grids. Or, depending on what plans move forward where the I-280 corridor and Caltrain tracks divide Potrero Hill and Mission Bay, additional opportunities could exist to connect more streets across this barrier, to create a grid where there are currently only three existing connecting streets (16<sup>th</sup> street, 3<sup>rd</sup> street, 4<sup>th</sup> street). This is another example of an emerging need that would require additional planning work to do conceptual designs and technical work.
- The Mission Streetscape Plan identified needed improvements to streets, sidewalks and public spaces throughout the Mission District. These include: new gateway plazas; traffic calming ideas for several residential streets; greening of mixed use streets in the Northeast Mission; a re-envisioning of residential throughways; an alley network strategy for small residential streets; and design improvements for several existing public spaces. Several of these projects are underway, including pedestrian amenities and plaza upgrade at the 24th Street BART Station, the Mission and Capp plaza, and lane reductions, traffic calming, and greening along Bryant Street.
- HOPE SF Potrero has identified a currently un-funded, approximately \$40 million need for an entirely new street grid to support development there, including re-alignment of existing streets and addition of new streets to improve circulation within the site and surrounding neighborhoods as well as providing multi-modal improvements including traffic calming, bike lanes, landscaping, and street lights.

*Complete Communities:* Several community assets have been identified to support new residents and workers in the Eastern Neighborhoods:

- **Open Space** – The plan calls for a new open space of at least 1 acre in each of the neighborhoods. Open space opportunities have been identified and are under development in the Mission (17<sup>th</sup> and Folsom Park, which is fully funded through a State grant and impact fee funds), and Potrero Hill (the Daggett Triangle Park, being constructed as a part of an adjacent residential development). In SoMa, plans are underway for rehabilitation of South Park.
- **Child Care** – The Potrero Launch Childcare Center establishes a new childcare center at 2235 Third Street, as part of the Potrero Launch mixed-use development, which opened for services in Fall 2012. The center is expected to serve roughly 66 children and be ready for operation by Fall 2013.

### Market/Octavia and Upper Market

## SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

*Planning Context:* The Market and Octavia Neighborhood Plan was adopted in 2007 and its vision and boundaries expanded slightly in the Upper Market Community Plan adopted in 2008. These land use planning efforts were followed by the Central Freeway and Octavia Boulevard Circulation Study which was completed in 2012. The Plans and Study cover an area in central San Francisco roughly centered on the intersection of Market Street, Octavia Boulevard and the Central Freeway and including the Hayes Valley neighborhood as well as portions of western SoMa, the northwest Mission District, Duboce Triangle and the Market Street corridor extending from just east of Van Ness Avenue to Noe Street in the Castro District. The Neighborhood Plan envisions transit-oriented infill development (6,000 additional housing units, and another 3,000 jobs) within walking distance of the Van Ness and Church Street Muni Metro stations, and the Circulation Study is focused on supportive transportation infrastructure.

*Transportation Needs:* Improvements identified for Market/Octavia include:

- Pedestrian improvements are recommended on arterial streets such as Franklin, Gough, 9th, 10th, Larkin, Hyde, Leavenworth, Duboce and 13th, as well as at six-way intersections along Market Street including the intersection of Market and Noe Street. "Living streets" streetscape improvements are also planned.
- Recommended bicycle improvements are focused on network connectivity, including connections across Market Street; improvements to existing bike routes such as Polk, Page, 14th and 15th Streets; and new routes such as Turk Street and Golden Gate Avenue.
- Recommended improvements to transit service include dedicated rights-of-way and other measures to improve speed and reliability on major transit corridors such as Mission, McAllister and 16th streets. The study recommends conversion of Haight Street to two-way traffic near Market in order to accommodate bidirectional service on the 6-Parnassus, 71-Haight Noriega and 71L-Haight Noriega; this project is in progress.
- The Circulation study prioritizes three near-term project concepts including 1) opening closed cross walks at Gough/Fell, Franklin/Fell, and Franklin/Oak, 2) making operations and design improvements to Octavia Boulevard, in particular at Oak through corner bulbs, extensions of the Octavia median, installation of safe-hit posts to improve channelization, and reducing roadway capacity from three to two lanes east of Octavia and 3) modifications to San Jose Avenue to reduce through capacity on the "expressway" segment of northbound San Jose.

*Complete Communities:* A number of infrastructure projects have been completed in preparation for the area's 6,000 new residents. Projects of note include major capital improvements to Hayes Valley Playground, Duboce Park, and Koshland Park. However, many improvements proposed by the Market and Octavia Plan require further refinement, development and funding.

- **Open Space Improvements** – A renovation of Hayward Park is proposed in coordination with the next Park and Open Space Bond. An evaluation of the existing conditions indicates that capital investments on the order of \$11 to \$15 million are necessary to improve Hayward Park.
- **New Open Space** – There are two parks proposed by the Market and Octavia Plan – McCoppin Square, which is slated for construction in 2012/13, and Brady Park, which could be built in coordination with redevelopment of the surrounding lots. An additional park is under exploration within the block bounded by Market, 12th, Otis, and Gough Streets. Brady

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Park will take advantage of underutilized parcels within the center of the block as well as a unique network of alleys that connect these parcels to the streets that surround the block.

- **Livability** – DPW, in coordination with the Authority, has begun implementing a number of infrastructure projects adjacent to Octavia Boulevard (partially funded by the sale of one former freeway parcel) including a new skate park below the freeway.

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

## **Mission Bay**

*Planning Context:* The Mission Bay redevelopment site consists of 303-acres on either side of Mission Creek, extending from SoMa south to the Dogpatch, generally between the eastern waterfront and I-280. The Mission Bay North and South Redevelopment Project Areas were established in 1998, and redevelopment has proceeded according to the development agreements and related City commitments to development of supporting infrastructure. The site, which primarily consists of former railyards and light industry, will at full buildout feature 6,000 units of housing, 4.4 million square feet of office and Research and Development space, 500,000 square feet of retail, a new hotel and open space in addition to the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) Mission Bay campus and UCSF Medical Center at Mission Bay. The northern segment of the new neighborhood and elements of the southern segment including the UCSF campus and hospital are nearing completion. The T-Third Muni Metro line, with stops at Fourth and King streets adjacent to the Caltrain terminus, Mission Rock Street, UCSF, and Mariposa Street, opened in 2007, and the street grid, including pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, remains in development.



*Transportation Needs:* Transportation needs in the Mission Bay area have largely to do with completion of the Mission Bay street network, including pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, as well as a number of upgrades to transit infrastructure, including: realignment of Muni's 22 Fillmore line to serve Mission Bay; construction of a rail loop just south of Mission Bay to allow more frequent T-Third Street service between Mission Bay and downtown; and a new ferry terminal near the site on Port property.

SFMTA's busiest Muni crosstown route, the 22-Fillmore currently operates on 16th Street between Church and Kansas streets, and terminates at 3rd and 20th streets. Under a Transit Effectiveness Project recommendation, the 33-Stanyan would serve segments south of 16<sup>th</sup> Street, while the 22-Fillmore would continue on 16th to 3rd Street, terminating at Mission Bay Boulevard. This would provide a direct connection between Mission Bay and the 16th Street Mission BART Station. The project would be supported by the 16th Street transit-only lanes (see Eastern Neighborhoods). The 22-Fillmore is an electric trolleybus line, so realignment would require new segments of overhead wiring, including a crossing of the Caltrain right-of-way, which would be problematic if Caltrain were electrified and its intersection with 16th Street was not grade-separated.

## **Mission-San Jose Corridor**

*Planning Context:* The Mission-San Jose Corridor PDA encompasses a long stretch of Mission Street and San Jose Avenue from the Market-Octavia PDA to the San Mateo county line. The only planning effort in this area has focused on the Glen Park BART Station area where the Glen Park Community Plan was adopted in 2002. The rest of this PDA has not undergone major land use or transportation planning efforts, which is why its status remains as Potential, rather than Planned.



*Transportation Needs:* Identified transportation needs in this area

## SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

are focused on the Glen Park BART Station area, where the Glen Park Plan made a number of transportation-related recommendations. These include redesign of the station plaza to improve pedestrian access to the station; pedestrian, streetscape and traffic calming improvements throughout the area, including a “greenway” on the north side of Bosworth Street extending to Glen Canyon Park; and improved transit connections such as a possible bus loop within the station site and an improved pedestrian connection to the Muni Metro J-Church platform in the median of San Jose Avenue, including an elevator to the platform allowing access for persons unable to use the existing staircase.

The Plan also proposes further study of conversion of San Jose Avenue, a divided, limited-access highway in an open cut, to an at-grade boulevard. Modifications to this corridor were also called for in the Market-Octavia Circulation Study and the SFMTA submitted a Caltrans Planning Grant during the 2013 cycle to study this idea further.

*Complete Communities:* The Glen Park Community Plan also identifies three specific open space opportunities that overlap with transportation needs. The greenway and BART plaza redesign ideas described above, as well as an opportunity on Kern Street. Since it does not function as a through street, Kern Street provides a unique opportunity to provide new public space in downtown, and relate to potential development site at an adjacent parking lot.

### Port of San Francisco

*Planning Context:* the Port is one of San Francisco’s PDAs where needs are still emerging and are less well-defined. Several major land use projects are under consideration on Port land, in particular the proposed re-location of the Golden State Warriors to Piers 30-32, the Seawall Lot 337/Mission Rock mixed use development, and the Pier 70 mixed use development and restoration of historic buildings. A Waterfront Transportation Assessment is currently underway at the SFMTA in partnership with the Office of Economic and Workforce Development that will inventory the transportation networks along the waterfront and identify transportation investments. This work precedes the environmental review of these land use proposals.



*Transportation Needs:* While the assessment is still underway, this section summarizes expected needs based on the current status of the planning process.

They include new ideas such as:

- A separated (cycletrack) bike treatment along the Embarcadero
- Providing a southern terminal and loop to allow for frequent E-line service between 4th and King and Fisherman’s Wharf.
- Extension of the planned Mission Bay Loop to 20th Street to allow for a stop serving the Pier 70 development
- Extension of the planned Muni 58-24<sup>th</sup> Street line into Pier 70
- A suite of innovative demand management strategies such as the development of an employer trip cap program; transit fees bundled with hotel and event tickets; and establishment of a Transportation Management Association (TMA) for the area.

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

The Waterfront Assessment may also suggest contributions to Citywide needs or needs identified for neighboring PDAs in Downtown, the Eastern Neighborhoods, or the Transbay Center District such as acceleration Caltrain electrification, contributing to station capacity improvements at Montgomery and Embarcadero BART, supporting the 22-Fillmore extension to Mission Bay, supporting expansion of the downtown ferry terminal, as well as supporting more frequent ferry service.

**San Francisco-San Mateo Bi-County Area  
(including Bayview/Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point)**

*Planning Context:* The San Francisco-San Mateo Bi-County Area encompasses several development areas: Executive Park, Schlage Lock/Visitacion Valley, and the Sunnydale and Hunters View HOPE-SF sites in San Francisco, as well as the Brisbane Baylands and East Daly City/Cow Palace areas in San Mateo County.

Although it is actually considered a distinct PDA, this section also discusses the Bayview/Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point PDA because the transportation needs for these two PDAs are so linked. Together, these areas are planned for transformative growth, on the order of 15,600 more housing units and 14.3 million additional square feet of commercial office space. Of these development areas, the only that is fully entitled is the Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyards project. Some transportation projects specific to each development area have been identified through their respective Area Plan processes; additionally, the Bi-County Transportation Study (just recently adopted by the Authority Board in March 2013) identified a prioritized set of improvements that would collectively benefit these projects, as well as a cost-sharing framework that identified how funding might be shared among the developers of these sites, and among San Francisco and San Mateo county jurisdictions.



*Transportation Needs:* Seven projects have been prioritized as shared Bi-County priorities for funding as identified in the Bi-County Transportation Study. They are:

- Harney-Geneva Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Line to provide BRT vehicles, exclusive bus lanes where feasible, signal priority, and enhanced stations from the proposed Hunters Point Shipyard Transit Center to the Balboa Park BART station, by way of the Brisbane Baylands and the Bayshore Caltrain Station.
- T-Third Light Rail Transit (LRT) line extension from Sunnydale station to the Bayshore Caltrain Station.
- US 101 Candlestick interchange re-configuration to tight-diamond design, and a new US 101 over- or under-crossing to connect with Harney Way and the new proposed Geneva Avenue Extension
- Geneva Avenue Extension from Bayshore Boulevard to the new proposed US 101 Candlestick Point interchange connecting to Harney Way, and including a grade-separated Caltrain crossing.
- Area-wide traffic calming to respond to traffic speeding and cut-through issues arising from Bi-County development-related local traffic increases.
- Bicycle-pedestrian connections to close gaps between the Bay Trail on the east side of US 101 and three destinations on the west side of US 101: the Bayshore Caltrain station, Geneva



## SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Avenue west of Bayshore Boulevard, and the planned Bay Trail through the Brisbane Baylands.

- Bayshore Intermodal Station Re-Design to accommodate new transit connections, including a platform for the T-Third LRT Extension, stations and vertical circulation elements for the Harney-Geneva BRT line, loading areas for other local bus and shuttle connections, and any other needed station access elements and passenger amenities.

Collectively, these projects would cost \$548 million. The Bi-County Study also identifies an “interim solution” of a smaller set of projects that could be built if development does not move forward as quickly as envisioned originally. The interim solution includes a version of the Geneva-Harney BRT with fewer dedicated lanes, a Geneva Avenue extension with half the number of travel lanes, and a smaller set of bicycle-pedestrian connections, and would only cost \$153 million.

Additional needs that are more specific to particular developments and the existing residents within this PDA include:

- New or re-gridded multi-modal street grids for Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyards, Hunters View, Executive Park, and Schlage Lock
- An infill Caltrain station between Oakdale and Palou Avenues, near the commercial core of the Bayview/Hunters Point neighborhood.
- The Bayview Transportation Improvement Program (BTIP) a set of multimodal local street improvements to support improved access within the Southeast neighborhoods
- Express bus service between Candlestick Point and Hunters Point Shipyards and downtown San Francisco (CPX and HPX)
- Palou and Evans Avenue Transit Preferential Street (TPS) treatments including enhanced stops, transit signal priority, and other traffic management changes to improve bus travel reliability.
- Bridge over Yosemite Slough that would extend Arelious Walker Drive into Hunters Point Shipyard development across Yosemite Slough. It includes dedicated transit lanes for use by proposed Harney-Geneva BRT project
- New street grid to support the rebuild of the Sunnydale HOPE-SF site. Similar to Potrero, this includes an approximately \$40 million unfunded need for an entirely new street grid to support development there, including re-alignment of existing streets and addition of new streets to improve circulation within the site and surrounding neighborhoods as well as providing multi-modal improvements including traffic calming, bike lanes, landscaping, and street lights.

*Complete Communities:* Key complete community infrastructure in this PDA includes:

- **Significant New Open Space** – Over 300 acres of new waterfront parks are planned for the Hunters Point Shipyard and Candlestick Point sites, including a new “Crissy Field of the South”. Construction of the first phase of the Shipyard’s development is already underway (Shipyard Phase 1), and will bring 25 acres of open space on Shipyard “Parcel A” with the first 1,600 homes. The Schlage Lock project will include 3 new public parks as a part of its development. Because recent changes to State law eliminated the potential for tax increment financing, these parks are unfunded, and the City has initiated a new planning process for this site to revise the development plan to increase its feasibility

## SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

- **Community Facilities** – Space for several community facilities, including an indoor African Marketplace, a library reading room to be operated by the San Francisco Public Library, and a “welcome” or information center are also included in the development. The development will also support existing community health facilities and potentially contribute to the development of a pediatric wellness center, based on project feasibility. The Sunnydale project will include a new “Life Center” with early childhood education, arts and enrichment programs, fitness facility, 6.4 acres of new parks and playgrounds, a community garden, a farmer’s market, a corner grocery, financial services, healthy eating establishments, community services building for seniors, and job training for youth and adults
- **Fire Station** – a new fire station is planned within the Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyards development.

### Transbay Terminal

*Planning Context:* The Transit Center District Plan envisions the area around the Transbay Transit Center as the heart of the new downtown. The Transbay project will replace the former terminal at 1<sup>st</sup> and Mission Street, extend Caltrain and California high-speed rail underground into the new transit center, and create a new neighborhood with homes, offices, parks and shops surrounding the new center. Phase one, construction of the Terminal, is now under construction, with a target opening date of 2017. In Plan Bay Area, the Downtown Extension of Caltrain is called out as one the region’s two new priorities for New Starts funds (in addition to BART to San Jose). Additionally, a Memorandum of Understanding between nine key Bay Area agencies committing to a High-Speed Rail Early Investment Strategy for a Blended System in the San Francisco to San Jose Segment Known as the Peninsula Corridor of the Statewide High-Speed Rail System was executed in 2012. The Transbay District has been targeted for dramatic growth, including construction of the tallest building in the region, the 61-story Transbay Tower. The Redevelopment Plan adopted for the area in 2005 calls for 3 million additional square feet of office space and 2,600 new housing units in a 40-acre area. The Transit Center District Plan calls for a variety of upgrades to transportation infrastructure in the area.

*Transportation Needs:* The Transit Center District Plan includes a range of transportation-related recommendations. In general, vehicular capacity would be reduced on area streets to better accommodate other users. New transit and bicycle lanes are proposed, as well as extensive sidewalk widenings. New alleys and an off-street pedestrian and bicycle path in the Essex Street right-of-way would be provided in order to improve connectivity. Widespread landscaping improvements also are planned, including “living streets” treatments. A pedestrian tunnel connecting the Transbay Transit Center to the Embarcadero BART/Muni Station has also been proposed.

*Complete Communities:* To respond to and support the construction of the new Transbay Transit Center project, including the Downtown Rail Extension, this plan includes a comprehensive plan for its public realm and open space, as well as “green” infrastructure improvements to reduce dependency on increasingly scarce land, energy and water resources.

## SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

- **District streetscape and open space** – The Transit Center District Plan will create more than 11 acres of new public open space in the district. The most significant open space will be the 5.4 acre Transbay Transit Center Rooftop Park. Others will include the new Transbay Park bounded by Main, Beale, Tehama, and Clementina Streets; Oscar Park incorporating areas under the freeway ramps; and new plazas at Mission Square, 2nd and Howard, and Shaw Alley, and linear open spaces along Natoma, Spear, Main, Beale and Essex Streets.
- **Green infrastructure** – The plan includes district-scale energy and heat production systems, high-performance buildings, and district-scale water efficiency to address environmental and economic performance. Specific systems to be included in construction are a combined heating, cooling, and power district; recycled/non-potable water service, and built-in systems to reduce energy consumption.

### Treasure Island

*Planning Context:* Plans to redevelop Treasure Island date back to the 1990s, when the island, then a military base, was selected for closure and disposition. Since that time, the Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA) has been created to oversee the planning and redevelopment of the island, and various pieces of legislation authorizing a major transit-oriented development project have been approved by the Board of Supervisors including a Disposition and Development Agreement and certification of the project's Environmental Impact Report. The Development Project includes 8,000 new housing units (at least 25% below market rate), 207,000 square feet of retail, 244,000 square feet of adaptive reuse, up to 500 hotel rooms, up to 100,000 square feet of office space and over 300 acres of public open space. A set of transportation improvements to support this development were first identified in a Draft Transportation Plan in 2006 and are further specified in the Treasure Island Transportation Implementation Plan. An additional study to complete technical and planning work to support the island's innovative pricing and mobility management aspects, the Treasure Island Mobility Management Study is now underway.



*Transportation Needs:* The Treasure Island Transportation Implementation Plan (TITIP) includes a variety of transportation programs, policies, and infrastructure, to encourage non-auto travel. Transportation improvements identified in the Plan include the following alternative transportation elements:

- Enhanced bus service, including frequent service between Treasure Island and San Francisco (downtown and Civic Center) and Oakland (downtown);
- Ferry service to downtown San Francisco;
- Fare free on-island circulator shuttles;
- Bicycle infrastructure and on-island bicycle library; and
- Pedestrian amenities and pathways.

The TITIP also calls for demand management elements to discourage peak period vehicle trips. The centerpiece of this innovative approach to mobility management is an integrated congestion

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

pricing demonstration program that applies user fees for resident motorists traveling to or from Treasure Island during peak hours, generating revenue to support operations of the transportation services described above. Demand management elements also include unbundled parking, required purchase of pre-paid transit vouchers for residents, and pricing of all non-resident parking on the Island. Transit operating subsidies for the private developer of up to \$30 million are available during the implementation phase of the Development Project until the project is self-sustaining, starting from the point at which the first residents take occupancy.

*Complete Communities:* The existing site has few public amenities for the approximately 2,000 residents who currently reside there, and thus the plan includes complete communities elements to ensure that existing and new residents can enjoy high quality of life on the islands:

- **Open Space** – The Open Space plan for the islands totals to almost 300 acres of new parks and habitat areas. Specific investments include a series of parks along the waterfront that are linked by the Bay Trail to the vast network of parks in the East Bay; a new Sports Park to host open lawn sports and recreation activities; and a 25 acre organic farm that is shared between production farming and community farming / community gardens.
- **Community Serving Retail** – The plan creates a new retail main street linked to the ferry and bus terminal, with restaurants, retail, and entertainment venues.
- **Public Services and Community Facilities** – Development will include a new 30,000 square foot police / fire station, 75,000 square feet of cultural / museum space, 48,500 square feet of community facilities and a 105,000 square foot school.
- **Habitat Management** – The plan also features protection of existing ecologically rich habitats and the increased habitat management of degraded areas that will transform the island into an ecologically rich habitat area located in the middle of San Francisco Bay. One key element is the 5 acre Hilltop Park.
- **District Sustainability Systems** – Systems planned with the new development include a wastewater recycling system that will re-use 25% of on-site wastewater, and recaptures biogas from the treatment to address heat and power demands; as well as demonstration wind turbines and roof mounted photovoltaics to help meet 100% renewable power goals.

## **4 AFFORDABLE HOUSING POLICIES AND PRODUCTION**

Housing costs in San Francisco are amongst the highest in the nation. City agencies, particularly the Planning Department and the Mayor's Office of Housing, have for decades made affordable housing a top policy priority. Below is a description of San Francisco's policies and programs designed to build and protect affordable housing. Policies are of two major types: (1) legal protections that serve to prevent the loss of affordable housing stock and to reduce displacement of low-income individuals, and (2) City investments in affordable housing development and preservation. This chapter describes these policies in greater detail and concludes by discussing how they relate to anticipated production. Approximately \$3 billion in additional funding would be needed in order for San Francisco to fulfill its 2014-2022 Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) obligation assigned to San Francisco by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG).

### **LEGAL ANTI-DISPLACEMENT PROTECTIONS**

#### **Rent Ordinance**

The San Francisco Rent Ordinance was enacted effective June 13, 1979 by the Board of Supervisors and signed by the Mayor as emergency legislation to alleviate the city's housing crisis. The Ordinance created the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board "in order to safeguard tenants from excessive rent increases and, at the same time, to assure landlords fair and adequate rents consistent with Federal Anti-Inflation Guidelines."

The Ordinance applies to approximately 170,000 rental units in the city and, among other things, places limits on the amount of rent increases which can be charged by the landlord and on the reasons for evicting a tenant.

Under the Rent Ordinance, a landlord is only permitted to impose the "annual allowable rent increase" on current tenants; they may not increase rent more than this amount. The "annual allowable increase" each year is based on 60% of the increase in the Consumer Price Index (CPI). When leasing vacant units, the landlord may charge market rate rent at the outset of a new tenancy. Rent increases are restricted in subsequent years to the annual allowable increase for as long as the same tenant(s) remain.

In order to evict a tenant from a rental unit covered by the Rent Ordinance, a landlord must have a "just cause" reason that is the dominant motive for pursuing the eviction. The landlord also needs a "just cause" reason to remove, reduce or sever certain housing services from a tenancy, including garage facilities, parking facilities, driveways, storage spaces, laundry rooms, decks, patios, or gardens on the same lot, or kitchen facilities or lobbies in single room occupancy hotels.

## **SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**

### San Francisco County Transportation Authority

There are 15 just cause reasons for eviction under Ordinance Section 37.9(a). The most common are non-payment of rent, habitual late payment of rent, and failure to cure a breach of a rental agreement or lease.

### **Condo Conversion Restrictions**

Condominium conversions in San Francisco have been tightly restricted since 1981. Under SF's law, existing apartment or mixed-use buildings with more than six residential units cannot be converted, and conversions of 3-6 unit buildings are subject to an annual ceiling. Buildings with two residential units are automatically qualified to convert from rental status to ownership. However, 3-6 unit buildings must be selected in an annual lottery to be allowed to convert. Up to 200 units are converted through the lottery each year, representing approximately 50-60 buildings.

### **Single Room Occupancy (SRO) Conversion Restrictions**

Small rooms in Single Room Occupancy Hotels provide housing to 20,000 low-income residents in San Francisco. To protect this "naturally affordable" housing stock, the San Francisco Residential Hotel Demolition and Conversion Ordinance (1981) prevents demolition or conversion of SROs to apartments or a tourist hotel unless an in-lieu fee is paid to the city's affordable housing replacement fund.

### **Restrictions on Conversion to Student Housing**

Given that over 15 postsecondary schools are located in San Francisco, the City has taken the policy stance to encourage construction of new student housing, rather than acquisition of existing residences. Conversions from any form of housing to student housing is prohibited by the Planning Code, subsection 317(f) (1).

### **Prohibitions on Housing Demolition**

The General Plan recognizes that existing housing is the greatest stock of rental and financially accessible residential units, and is a resource in need of protection; the Plan enables older housing stock to be considered for demolition and replacement only when the resulting project results in a significant increase in unit affordability. Residential demolitions are not only discouraged, but severely restricted through San Francisco's Planning Code and its Planning Commission guidelines. These requirements mandate a public hearing and deliberation for demolition of units, discourage the demolition of sound housing stock, especially historically significant structures, and require that replacement projects be entitled before demolition permits. To enable demolition, findings must evaluate numerous criteria, including whether the project converts rental housing to other forms of tenure or occupancy; whether the project removes rental units subject to the Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance; whether the project conserves existing housing to preserve cultural and economic neighborhood diversity; whether the project conserves neighborhood character to preserve neighborhood cultural and economic diversity; whether the project protects the relative affordability of existing housing; whether the project increases the number of permanently affordable units; and whether the project creates quality, new family or supportive housing.

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

## **AFFORDABLE HOUSING POLICIES AND INVESTMENTS**

The mission of the Mayor's Office of Housing (MOH) is to create affordable housing by providing financing for the development, rehabilitation and purchase of affordable housing in San Francisco. MOH administers a variety of programs to finance the development of affordable housing by non-profit and for profit developers, provide financial and educational assistance to first-time homebuyers and finance housing rehabilitation costs for low-income homeowners

### **New Affordable Housing Production**

#### **Affordable Multifamily Development**

There are few market-driven incentives associated with developing low-cost housing; therefore non-profit housing developers require the help of public financing to make development of affordable units viable. The Mayor's Office of Housing (MOH) provides financial assistance to non-profit affordable housing developers to make affordable rental housing development economically feasible. Funds are used to plan and develop new affordable units or to acquire and rehabilitate existing units, restricting them for long-term affordability.

Long-term or permanent affordability is a priority for the programs of the MOH. For almost all programs in which MOH invests, affordability terms of 55 to 99 years are now standard. The term of affordability is greater than the anticipated life of the buildings funded by public funds. Where project sponsors have sought additional money from the City to extend the useful life of the building, MOH requires an extension of the term of affordability.

#### **Inclusionary Program**

San Francisco's Inclusionary Housing policy is one of the strongest and most effective in the state. Developers of projects that are at least ten units in size must select one of the following options to comply with Inclusionary Housing Program requirements:

- Pay an Affordable Housing fee which is calculated as the difference between real development costs and affordable sales prices, applied to 20% of the number of units to be developed
- 12% of the total units constructed are affordable units located onsite, seamlessly integrated into the development
- 20% of total units constructed are affordable units and located offsite within one mile of the principal development

The Inclusionary Housing Program administers over 1,000 of for-sale and below market rate (BMR) rental units produced by the City's Inclusionary Ordinance.

### **Acquisition/Rehabilitation to Protect "Naturally" Affordable Housing**

The Mayor's Office of Housing partners with affordable housing developers to purchase and rehabilitate existing apartment buildings and single room occupancy hotels that are under private ownership and have been providing "naturally affordable" lower-cost housing to low and moderate income tenants (often due to poor building conditions or deferred maintenance issues). MOH provides financial assistance for the purchase and necessary improvements to the building in exchange for affordability restrictions that ensure the building will continue to provide

## **SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**

### San Francisco County Transportation Authority

affordable housing into the future. Transportation investments as well as increased density in San Francisco will increase property values near many of San Francisco's transit hubs. Acquisition and rehabilitation will be a particularly important strategy to prevent displacement and preserve affordability in desirable neighborhoods. To that end, MOH is expanding the current Acquisition/Rehabilitation program to include smaller buildings (under 25 apartments) that house low and moderate income tenants in neighborhoods with high displacement risks.

### **Investments to Preserve Existing Deed-Restricted Housing**

#### **HOPE SF/Public Housing**

The San Francisco Housing Authority (SFHA) owns 6,262 units of public housing, making it one of the largest property owners in the City, responsible for 19% of all publicly-supported affordable rental housing.

While the entire SFHA public housing stock has significant maintenance needs, there are four highly distressed sites that MOH is actively pursuing redevelopment of, including Hunters View and Alice Griffith in Bayview-Hunters Point, Potrero Terrace and Annex on the south side of Potrero Hill, and Sunnydale in Visitacion Valley. These sites were developed in the 1940s and 1950s and the buildings are now dilapidated beyond repair. HOPE SF will use local, state, and federal funds to finance the rebuilding of 2,500 deteriorating public housing apartments with 6,000 new public, affordable and market-rate homes. Other sites also require work to upgrade to appropriate levels of quality and address deferred maintenance although no financing has been identified to address these needs.

#### **Aging Affordable Stock**

Most housing stock in San Francisco is over 50 years old. As buildings age, they require maintenance and rehabilitation work, and owners of affordable housing often have difficulty obtaining the complete financing necessary from private sources. To maintain affordability for existing residents, affordable developments require public funds to address substantial rehabilitation needs and/or to refinance their existing debt. MOH provides financing for capital improvements to existing affordable housing to ensure that affordable housing in San Francisco is safe, healthy, and accessible.

#### **Buildings with Expiring Affordability Restrictions**

The acquisition of affordable housing units at risk of converting to market rate due to expiring HUD mortgages or other subsidies has been an important part of the City's efforts to increase the stock of affordable housing. Concerted efforts by MOH have resulted in securing financing for most of these properties to come under non-profit ownership and ensure permanent affordability. From 1999 to 2006, a total of 1,661 affordable units were preserved through these efforts. MOH will continue to provide financial assistance to these and other at-risk units to ensure long term affordability.

### **Loan Programs for Low/Moderate Income First-Time Homebuyers**

The City administers a variety of down-payment and mortgage assistance programs that assist low- and moderate-income, first time homebuyers to purchase market rate and below market rate



## **SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

(BMR) homes in San Francisco. The Down-payment Assistance Loan Program (DALP) is a local bond-capitalized fund that provides payment deferred, shared equity loans to low- and moderate-income first-time homebuyers to assist them in the purchase of market priced homes. Special forgivable down-payment assistance loans are also available for qualified teachers employed by the San Francisco Unified School District and qualified police officers in the San Francisco Police Department. The City Second program also provides payment deferred loans to low- and moderate-income residents purchasing selected City-funded homeownership developments. Mortgage Credit Certificates (MCCs) are available through the City to qualified first-time homebuyers to provide additional tax credits to offset mortgage payments.

### **Proposition C**

On February 1, 2012, pursuant to passage of Assembly Bill 1x 26, all California redevelopment agencies were required to dissolve and their assets and functions were transferred to “successor agencies,” including the Mayor’s Office of Housing. Although housing assets were preserved, the dissolution of redevelopment resulted in the loss of redevelopment tax increment as a source of funding for the production of new affordable housing. San Francisco’s Redevelopment Agency had previously invested 50% of all tax increment toward the creation of affordable housing, representing approximately \$50 million in annual funding for new production. This loss, coupled with recent declines in funding from federal sources such as HOME and CDBG, and a lack of affordable housing fee income due to continued sluggishness in the overall economy, struck a serious blow to San Francisco’s ability to address housing needs through new production, rehabilitation and preservation.

In response, and recognizing the important role affordable housing plays in our local economy, Mayor Edwin Lee convened a working group to design a permanent local replacement source to support housing production for low and moderate income San Franciscans. Following months of discussion and analysis, the Working Group put forward a proposal for a 30-year amendment to the City’s charter which establishes a general fund set aside to a) fund affordable housing production for lower-income households, b) increase homeownership opportunities for moderate income households; and, c) stimulate market-rate production across the City with a particular focus in areas zoned for increased growth and density.

In November, the Housing Trust Fund Charter Amendment (Prop C) was approved by San Francisco voters by a wide margin. Beginning in fiscal year 2013/14, \$20 million will be set aside for housing uses. This amount grows annually until it reaches \$50.8 million in year 12. Over the 30 year life of the fund, approximately \$1.2B will be directed toward affordable housing. Approximately 90% of the funding going to the production and rehabilitation of multifamily affordable housing, with approximately 10% of the fund directed toward programs such as down payment assistance, foreclosure prevention, and neighborhood infrastructure improvements.


### **AFFORDABLE HOUSING PRODUCTION**

There are 1,375 affordable housing units currently under construction in San Francisco and 7,169 in pre-construction planning.<sup>9</sup> A map of the locations of affordable housing projects that are in the pipeline is shown in Figure 4-1 on the following page; PDAs are highlighted in green. As illustrated, most of the active affordable housing projects are located in PDAs.

---

<sup>9</sup> San Francisco Mayor’s Office of Housing, Sept 2012.

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority



**Figure 4-1 Affordable Housing Pipeline Projects (green dots) and PDAs**

*Data Source: Mayor's Office of Housing, Spring 2012*

### **Regional Housing Needs Allocation**

Even with Prop C funding for affordable housing development and preservation, the City is projected to fall short of its RHNA obligation for very low, low, and moderate income housing. As shown in Figure 4-2, ABAG estimates that San Francisco should build an additional 6,207 very low income housing units, 4,619 low income units, and 5,437 moderate income units. Optimistic projections anticipate about 3,800 very low income units, and about 2,400 moderate income units will be built between 2014 and 2022 under current policies and funding conditions, even with the addition of Prop C.<sup>10</sup> In order to achieve our RHNA obligation, San Francisco would need

---

<sup>10</sup> Methodology: Includes the anticipated Affordable and BMR units that have funding commitments and plan to complete construction between 2015-2022. The following lists and project areas were included: MOH/SFRA Affordable Pipeline, Inclusionary development, Mission Bay, Transbay, HP/Candlestick Point, Treasure Island, Park Merced, HOPE SF. To this sum, additional very low income affordable development funded by prop C is added. Estimate of Prop C-funded development was based on a \$35 million annual allocation and a cost of \$200,000 per unit.

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

over \$3 billion dollars in additional funding for affordable and moderate income housing development.<sup>11</sup>

**Figure 4-2 San Francisco's RHNA Allocation vs. Local Projections**

	RHNA Allocation (2014-2022)	Local Projection
Very Low	6,207	3,800
Low	4,619	2,400
Moderate	5,437	

---

<sup>11</sup> Assumes a \$300,000 total cost per unit for low and moderate income unit. Assumes a \$400,000 total cost per unit for very low income units. No leveraging of local funds is assumed, as leveraging sources would be exhausted in building the housing described in footnote 1.

## **5 INFORMING TRANSPORTATION FUNDING DECISIONS**

The Transportation Investment and Growth Strategy (TIGS) is an opportunity to think strategically about how to use two types of funding to meet the transportation needs of San Francisco's PDAs: PDA Planning funds and OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) capital funds (both described in Chapter 1). This chapter first shares some ways the different San Francisco PDAs can be compared in terms of key regional factors identified in the Cycle 2 OBAG framework (full guidance available in Appendix A). It then discusses additional criteria that the city considers in prioritizing candidate projects for each of these fund sources. While the focus here is on these two fund sources given the requirements of MTC, it is worth noting that San Francisco funding and implementing agencies has long been supporting its PDAs through transportation investments.

### **PDA COMPARISON**

OBAG guidance states that several factors should be considered in establishing local funding priorities, including projects: located in high-impact areas, located in Communities of Concern, those in PDAs with affordable housing preservation and creation strategies, and those that overlap or are co-located with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE) Program. This section describes an approach to comparing the PDAs on each of the criteria, as well as an additional criterion related to pace of growth.

#### **Location in High-Impact Areas**

OBAG guidance defines High-Impact Areas as projects in PDAs taking on significant housing and job growth, as well as projects that provide improved transportation choices for all income levels and are consistent with regional Transportation for Livable Communities design guidelines or are within project areas with parking management and pricing policies. While the former two can be used to compare San Francisco's PDAs, the latter three are more relevant to consider when evaluating specific transportation projects, and are unlikely to be distinguishers among San Francisco transportation projects. Figure 5-2 shows how the PDAs compare in terms of level of housing and job growth that is planned or in the pipeline (using capacity numbers shown in Chapter 2, Figure 2-4). Each PDA is given a rating of Low, Medium, or High, using the thresholds shown in Figure 5-1, which were seen as natural breaks between the level of growth planned in PDAs. On these metrics, PDAs such as Downtown/Van Ness/Geary and Eastern Neighborhoods receive ratings of High for both level of housing and job growth, while PDAs such as Mission-San Jose Corridor and Balboa Park receive ratings of Low for both these metrics.

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
 San Francisco County Transportation Authority

**Figure 5-1 Level of Housing and Job Growth by PDA Thresholds**

	Housing	Jobs
Low	<2,000	<6,000
Medium	2,000-7,000	6,000-20,000
High	>7,000	>20,000


**Figure 5-2 Comparison of PDAs in Level of Housing and Job Growth**

	19th Avenue	Balboa Park	Bayview/Hunters Point	Downtown-Van Ness-Geary	Eastern Neighborhoods	Market/Octavia	Mission Bay	Mission-San Jose*	Port of San Francisco	SF/San Mateo County	Transbay Terminal	Treasure Island
Amount of Housing Growth	Med	Low	High	High	High	Med	Med	Low	Med	Med	Med	High
Amount of Job Growth	Low	Low	Med	High	High	Low	Med	Low	High	Low	High	Low

**Location in Communities of Concern**

MTC recently underwent a process to re-define criteria used to identify Communities of Concern within the region. While previously Communities of Concern were defined as areas with concentrations of either 70% minority or 30% low-income residents, MTC decided to update the methodology during the Plan Bay Area process because about 40% of the region’s population would be considered a Community of Concern under this metric. The new definition identifies communities with multiple overlapping “disadvantage factors”: minority, low income, limited English proficiency, zero-vehicle households, seniors 75 and over, population with a disability, female-headed families with children, and cost-burdened renters. To be considered a Community of Concern, a geographic area must exceed concentration thresholds for four of these eight measures or be communities that are both low-income and minority. Figure 5-3 shows a map of the resultant Communities of Concern in San Francisco.

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority




**Figure 5-3: Overlap of PDAs and MTC Communities of Concern**

MTC also gives discretion to localities to define local Communities of Concern. In San Francisco, local knowledge and analysis to identify disadvantaged communities does not entirely overlap with these designations. In particular, some areas that are included in the MTC designation that are not intuitive locally include Mission Bay and segments of the Inner Richmond that overlap with the Presidio Terrace neighborhood. Additionally, some areas that locally have been identified as economically disadvantaged, such as the HOPE SF Sunnydale and Potrero sites do not appear in this map. A possible explanation for this discrepancy is that these are calculated using MTC's Transportation Analysis Zones, which can be of a relatively large geographic area and may obscure important differences that exist on a finer scale. Finally, using zero-car households as a metric of disadvantage may be less appropriate in San Francisco, given the level of density and supportive transit.

For example, Figure 5-4 shows economically disadvantaged communities as identified by the Planning Department as a part of the Green Connections project using a finer scale of data. Figure 5-5 shows how San Francisco's PDAs compare for both the MTC and Planning Department designations. Going forward, San Francisco city agencies should coordinate to agree upon a consistent definition for defining Communities of Concern locally. This might entail applying the MTC methodology at a finer geographic scale, simply adding or removing particular areas based on particular criteria, or some other methodology.

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority



1375

**Figure 5-4 San Francisco Planning Department Analysis of Economically Disadvantaged Communities for Green Connections**

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

**Figure 5-5 Location within Community of Concern, MTC Designations and Planning Department Analysis of Economically Disadvantaged Communities**

	19 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	Balboa Park	Bayview/Hunters Point	Downtown-Van Ness-Geary	Eastern Neighborhoods	Market/Octavia	Mission Bay	Mission-San Jose*	Port of San Francisco	SF/San Mateo Bi-County	Transbay Terminal	Treasure Island
MTC CoC	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
SF Planning Economic-ally Dis-advantaged Community	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No

**PDA's with Affordable Housing Preservation and Creation Strategies**

As described in Chapter 4, the city has notable affordable housing preservation and production policies that apply to all of the City's PDAs. The OBAG criteria to prioritize locations with these types of policies is more relevant for CMAs with multiple jurisdictions with varying levels of supportive affordable housing policies and less relevant for a combined city and county like San Francisco. Yet, within San Francisco, PDAs differ in terms of whether the mandatory inclusionary requirements are exceeded. As shown in Figure 5-6, some PDAs significantly exceed the 12% minimum inclusionary requirement, with the Bayview/Hunters Point and Transbay Center District Plan PDAs both anticipated to result in more than 30% of housing units as affordable by plan build-out.

**Overlap with CARE Communities**

OBAG guidelines call for identifying PDAs that overlap or are co-located with populations exposed to outdoor toxic air contaminants as identified in the Air District's Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE) program such that projects in jurisdictions that employ best management practices to mitigate particulate matter and toxic air contaminants are favorably considered. As shown in Figure 5-5, PDAs have been distinguished in terms of whether or not they are located within a CARE community (see map of CARE communities in Figure 5-7).



**Figure 5-6 CARE Communities in San Francisco**  
Data Source: <http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Planning-and-Research/CARE-Program.aspx>



**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

**Figure 5-7 Affordable Housing Preservation and Production Policies**

	19th Avenue	Balboa Park	Bayview/Hunters Point	Downtown-Van Ness-Geary	Eastern Neighborhoods	Market/Octavia	Mission Bay	Mission-San Jose*	Port of San Francisco	SF/San Mateo Bi-County	Transbay Terminal	Treasure Island
Inclusionary Affordable Housing Req's <sup>1</sup>	Yes	Yes	#	Yes	Yes	Yes	#	Yes	Yes	Yes	#	#
Jobs-Housing Linkage Fees <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Additional Plan Area Affordable Housing Req's <sup>3</sup>	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No*	Yes	Yes
Estimated Affordable Units (as % of Plan Build-Out) <sup>4</sup>	12%	12%	32%	12%	25%	20%	30%	12%	12%	12%	35%	25%

<sup>1</sup> A fee or on-site requirements apply to any housing project that consists of ten or more units.

<sup>2</sup> A fee applies to all projects that increase the total amount of any combination of entertainment, hotel, integrated PDR, office, research and development, retail, and/or Small Enterprise Workspace uses, by 25,000 or more gross square feet. It is not applicable in some areas under the jurisdiction of the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII), as the Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency, or the Port of San Francisco.

<sup>3</sup> Many plans include additional requirements to achieve higher affordability, in the form of required land dedication, additional impact fees and deeper affordability requirements.

<sup>4</sup> Total includes potential on-site inclusionary units, publicly funded deed-restricted new construction, and rehabilitated units converted to permanent affordability.

# As Redevelopment Areas, these PDAs are not subject to the City's Inclusionary Affordable Housing Requirements. However, inclusionary units may be provided as a result of negotiations.

\*The Schlage Lock area lost its status as a redevelopment area in 20012, which rendered moot the additional requirements that accompanied that redevelopment plan. However, that project area is currently under evaluation by the City, and may result in updated controls that include updated affordable housing requirements.

**Figure 5-8 Overlap with CARE Communities Ratings**

	19th Avenue	Balboa Park	Bayview/Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point	Downtown-Van Ness-Geary	Eastern Neighborhoods	Market/Octavia	Mission Bay	Mission-San Jose*	Port of San Francisco	SF/San Mateo Bi-County	Transbay Terminal	Treasure Island
In CARE Community	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
 San Francisco County Transportation Authority

**Pace of Growth**

Finally, while not discussed in the OBAG criteria, another useful way to compare PDAs is in terms of their pace of growth. In some cases new houses and jobs are already under construction or have been built, while in other cases, ground has not yet broken or may not for some time. Some types of transportation improvements would not make sense to make before the construction of new land uses moves forward. The Planning Department will undertake an annual analysis of recent housing and jobs activity by PDA, based on its consolidated pipeline<sup>12</sup> in order to provide a point of comparison on this factor, and that will be provided in the format shown in Figure 5-8.

**Figure 5-8 Pace of Growth**

	19th Avenue		Balboa Park		Bayview/Hunters Point		Downtown-Van Ness-Geary		Eastern Neighborhoods		Market/Octavia	
	Net Housing Units	Net Comm'l Sq. Ft.	Net Housing Units	Net Comm'l Sq. Ft.	Net Housing Units	Net Comm'l Sq. Ft.	Net Housing Units	Net Comm'l Sq. Ft.	Net Housing Units	Net Comm'l Sq. Ft.	Net Housing Units	Net Comm'l Sq. Ft.
Completed												
Authorized or Under Construction												
Filed												

<sup>12</sup> The San Francisco consolidated pipeline consists of development projects that would add residential units or commercial space, applications for which have been formally submitted to the Planning Department or the Department of Building Inspection (DBI). Pipeline projects are at various stages of development: from applications having been filed to entitlements secured; from building permits approved and issued to projects under construction. The pipeline includes only those projects with a land use or building permit application. It does not include projects undergoing preliminary Planning Department project review or projections based on area plan analysis. Projects vary in size from single units to larger multi-year development programs undergoing environmental review.

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

	Mission Bay		Mission-San Jose*		Port of San Francisco		SF/San Mateo Bi-County		Transbay Terminal		Treasure Island	
	Net Housing Units	Net Comm'l Sq. Ft.	Net Housing Units	Net Comm'l Sq. Ft.	Net Housing Units	Net Comm'l Sq. Ft.	Net Housing Units	Net Comm'l Sq. Ft.	Net Housing Units	Net Comm'l Sq. Ft.	Net Housing Units	Net Comm'l Sq. Ft.
Completed												
Authorized/In Construction												
Filed												

**PROCESS FOR PRIORITIZING FUNDS**

**PDA Planning Funds**

PDA Planning funds will be used in three different ways:

- To help prepare candidate projects to become “ready” for federal OBAG funds, which have strict timely use of funds requirements. The next 4-year cycle of funds is expected for Fiscal Years 2016-17 to FY 2019-2020. An example of this type of use would be to take a project identified as short-term transportation need for a PDA, but that currently lacks conceptual planning, cost estimates, environmental review, and/or a community process to carry out these activities to get the project “ready” for the next cycle of OBAG. In particular, PDA Planning funds are one of the few sources that can be used to fund environmental review.
- To document and help develop or prioritize transportation needs in under-developed, early-stage or emerging PDAs, or citywide needs that impact PDAs. Examples here could include an additional transportation study to support a PDA where needs are less clear.
- Although generally, San Francisco’s PDAs have already completed their land use planning work, the source can also be used for land use or coordinated land use/transportation planning as well. An example of this is the work currently underway examining the 4<sup>th</sup>/King railyards as described in Chapter 2.

In addition to the PDA comparison criteria discussed above, some additional criteria considered include the level of need for additional planning support, geographic equity among PDAs, whether the funding will allow the project to achieve a distinct milestone or deliverable, and what other funding sources the project may be able to access.

SF Planning is leading the process to prioritize this fund source. San Francisco agencies were polled for candidate planning efforts, and the Department convened two meetings with San

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Francisco agency executive leadership to come to consensus regarding the selected planning efforts. Figure 5-8 indicates the draft projects identified for funding.

**Figure 5-9 Draft Projects Identified for PDA Planning Funds in San Francisco**

Project	PDA Supported	Funding Level
Rail Storage Alternatives Analysis & Boulevard Feasibility Study	Multiple (Mission Bay, Eastern Neighborhoods, Transbay Terminal)	\$700,000
Embarcadero Multi-Modal Planning	Multiple (Port of San Francisco, Mission Bay, Eastern Neighborhoods, Transbay Terminal, Downtown/Van Ness/Geary)	\$300,000
Second Street Environmental Impact Report	Multiple (Eastern Neighborhoods, Transbay Terminal, Downtown/Van Ness/Geary)	\$250,000
Bayshore Station Re-location	San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area	\$400,000
M-Ocean View Re-Alignment Project Development, Project Study Report	19 <sup>th</sup> Avenue Corridor	\$500,000
Better Market Street Environmental Impact Report	Multiple (Downtown/Van Ness Veary, Transbay Terminal, Market/Octavia)	\$111,000

## OneBayArea Grant

### Current Cycle

The programming approach for current OBAG funds has preceded development of the TIGS. In September 2012, the Authority Board approved an OBAG funding framework that set aside \$3.5 million for the Authority's CMA planning activities and dedicated the remaining \$35 million for OBAG projects. The Authority Board also adopted prioritization criteria (available in Appendix C) that centered on three main themes: 1) complete streets, 2) project readiness, and 3) high impact areas as defined by MTC OBAG guidance.

Specific to the third theme, the Authority prioritized projects that were:

- In PDAs or provided proximate access to PDAs.
- Located in a Community of Concern.
- In high impact areas by using the land use distribution from Plan Bay Area to identify those Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZs) that had an overlap of the following characteristics by TAZ: 1) the top 1/3 of housing growth, 2) the top 1/3 of job growth, 3) planning area with parking management plans or SFpark meters, and 4) 1/4- mile from high frequency transit (i.e. BART, Muni Metro, Caltrain, Muni Rapid Network). The map also added another overlay of planned affordable housing to create an equity tie-in to the growth criteria.

In October 2012, the Authority received 12 applications for OBAG funding totaling just over \$62 million (almost twice the level of funding available). In December 2012, the Authority Board used this criterion and the complete streets and project readiness criteria mentioned above to approve

**SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY**  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

the initial pool of OBAG candidate projects, advancing 10 of the 12 applications, totaling \$54.6 million in OBAG requests, to the next round of the call for projects. These projects underwent a project development phase and submitted revised applications in April, and were re-evaluated against the Board-adopted criteria. The final program of projects shown in Figure 5-9 was adopted by the Authority Board in June 2013. More details on the process is available at [www.sfcta.org/obag](http://www.sfcta.org/obag)

**Figure 5-9 Projects Approved for OBAG Funding in San Francisco**

Project	PDA Supported
Longfellow Safe Routes to School	Mission-San Jose Corridor
ER Taylor Safe Routes to School	
Chinatown Broadway Phase IV Street Design	Downtown/Van Ness/Geary
Masonic Avenue Complete Streets	Proximate access to Downtown/Van Ness/Geary
Transbay Center Bike and Pedestrian Improvements (partial funding)	Transbay Terminal
Second Street Streetscape Improvement	Eastern Neighborhoods
Mansell Corridor Improvement (partial funding)	Proximate access to Bayview/Hunters Point + Mission-San Jose

**Future Cycles**

Future cycles of OBAG are expected to use a similar approach as the current cycle, but are expected to benefit from a larger set of competitive, ready-to-go (i.e. well-prepared to meet federal timely-use-of-funds requirements) projects as result of the planning support provided by the PDA Planning funds. Additionally, the evaluation of projects will benefit from the information now available and under development comparing PDAs as described in the previous section.

## 6 CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

This is San Francisco’s first TIGS, and it is required to be updated regularly. Generally, it synthesizes the work that has been done in myriad different comprehensive land use and transportation planning efforts into one document that can be used to inform future transportation funding decisions. What is clear, is that while significant work has been done and San Francisco’s PDAs are already being transformed into sustainable transit-oriented developments, there is much more work to be done to further identify needs and get projects ready for implementation, as well as to identify significant new sources of revenue to meet needs related to transportation, affordable housing, as well as other aspects of complete communities. In addition, some specific follow-up items have been identified in this report and are summarized in Figure 6-1.

The Authority’s San Francisco Transportation Plan, an update to the 2003 Countywide Transportation Plan expected to be complete in late 2013, will explore potential revenue sources to address these needs alongside existing and future transportation needs citywide.

Ultimately, San Francisco must partner with the region to achieve these ambitious goals. As a leader in innovation within the country and the world, San Francisco and the Bay Area are assuredly up to this challenging yet important task.

**Figure 6-1 Follow-Up Tasks and Responsibilities Identified through the TIGS**

	Responsibility
Confirm San Francisco Priority Conservation Area needs and priorities	SF Planning SF Recreation and Parks, California Native Plants Society
Confirm San Francisco’s local Communities of Concerns	SF Planning in partnership with other city agencies and stakeholders
Complete annual analysis of PDA pace of growth based on its consolidated pipeline	SF Planning

# ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

Representing City and County Governments of the San Francisco Bay Area



ABAG

August 10, 2015

Mr. Gil Kelley  
Director of Citywide Planning  
San Francisco Planning Division  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400  
San Francisco, CA 94103-2479

**Re: Mission-San Jose Corridor Priority Development Area (PDA) Resolution**

Dear Gil,

According to our records, we never received a resolution from the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in support of designating the Mission-San Jose Corridor as a PDA. ABAG staff made a request for this resolution in March and indicated that the deadline for receipt was June 30, 2015. **The ABAG Executive Board is approving the final inventory of PDAs on September 17, 2015. Without the resolution by this date, ABAG will remove the Mission San-Jose PDA from our regional inventory.** I have attached a sample resolution to assist you with this process.

Please contact Gillian Adams, Senior Regional Planner, at your earliest convenience:  
510-464-7911 or [GillianA@abag.ca.gov](mailto:GillianA@abag.ca.gov).

Sincerely,

Miriam Chion  
ABAG Planning & Research Director

CC: AnMarie Rodgers, San Francisco Planning Department  
Irene Cheng-Tam, San Francisco Planning Department  
Ryan Greene-Roesel, SFCTA

# Introduction Form

By a Member of the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor

Time stamp  
or meeting date \_\_\_\_\_

I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

- 1. For reference to Committee.  
An ordinance, resolution, motion, or charter amendment.
- 2. Request for next printed agenda without reference to Committee.
- 3. Request for hearing on a subject matter at Committee.
- 4. Request for letter beginning "Supervisor [ ] inquires"
- 5. City Attorney request.
- 6. Call File No. [ ] from Committee.
- 7. Budget Analyst request (attach written motion).
- 8. Substitute Legislation File No. [ ]
- 9. Request for Closed Session (attach written motion).
- 10. Board to Sit as A Committee of the Whole.
- 11. Question(s) submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the BOS on [ ]

Please check the appropriate boxes. The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following:

- Small Business Commission     Youth Commission     Ethics Commission
- Planning Commission     Building Inspection Commission

**Note: For the Imperative Agenda (a resolution not on the printed agenda), use a Imperative**

**Sponsor(s):**

Supervisors Avalos, Campos, Wiener, Yee


**Subject:**

Resolution - Application to Amend San Francisco's Priority Development Area Designation

**The text is listed below or attached:**

[Empty box for text listing]

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor: \_\_\_\_\_



**For Clerk's Use Only:**