

## Alonso, Rachel (DPW)

---

**From:** Seon Joo Kim <seonjoo.kim@sfcta.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 04, 2015 1:13 PM  
**To:** Kenneth Kao  
**Cc:** Alonso, Rachel (DPW); Amber Crabbe  
**Subject:** Re: 2016 STIP: Update  
**Attachments:** 2016 STIP SF PPR - PPM.xls; 2016 STIP SF PPR - Lombard.xlsm; Resolution of Local Support - Lombard (2015.11.04).pdf

Hi Kenny, please see below and attached for SF's 2016 STIP application.

- SFCTA Board resolution adopting SF 2016 RTIP priorities - [linked here](#); to be signed today
- SFCTA's PPM PPR - attached
- SF DPW's Lombard
  - PPR - attached\*
  - TIP - submitted on 11/4\*
  - Resolution of Local Support - draft attached, to be approved at 12/1 BOS meeting (might be pushed to 12/15 meeting given the holiday schedule)
  - PSR equivalent - please refer to ATP application
  - Complete Streets checklist - submitted on 10/13

\* Please see our notes and questions below:

- PSR approval: Does DPW have any restriction on other tasks until the full PSR is approved, e.g. on starting PS&E or finalizing NEPA? As you know, a full PSR is required for this project and will likely not be approved until July 2016.
- PS&E start/ENV end dates: Since DPW is starting design with local funds, the PS&E start date is shown to be earlier than ENV end date. Will this be an issue?
- ATP contingency: For now we have entered this as ATP Regional - Contingency in PPR and Other Federal in the TIP in case the contingency funds get freed up soon. Please advise/correct if needed.
- Other Local in the TIP refers to the SFPUC contribution. Would an email from SFPUC committing to fully fund the water/sewer portion be sufficient as a back-up?
- Please note the total in PPR and TIP differ just a tiny bit due to rounding. Please advise/correct if needed.

We greatly appreciate your ongoing guidance and support for this project. Please let us know if you need any other info.

Thanks,

Seon Joo (& Rachel)



RESOLUTION ADOPTING SAN FRANCISCO'S PROJECT PRIORITIES FOR THE 2016 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

WHEREAS, As Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for San Francisco, every two years the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (Transportation Authority) is responsible for establishing San Francisco project priorities for programming in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), subject to approval by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC); and

WHEREAS, MTC will submit the Bay Area's RTIP to the California Transportation Commission (CTC), which will combine it with other regions' RTIPs and California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) programs statewide and approve them as the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP); and

WHEREAS, Due to reduced revenues from fuel taxes, as well as the lack of an adequately funded multi-year federal transportation bill, CTC's 2016 STIP Fund Estimate for the five-year period between Fiscal Years (FY) 2016/17 and 2020/21 contains no new Regional Improvement Program (RIP) funds for CMAs; and

WHEREAS, As part of the Cycle 1 OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) County Program, MTC had assigned \$1.91 million in STIP Transportation Enhancement funds to San Francisco Public Works' (SFPWs') Chinatown Broadway IV streetscape project in FY 2014/15, to be programmed through the 2014 STIP; and

WHEREAS, Due to the lack of funding capacity in earlier years of the 2014 STIP period, CTC delayed the programming year to FY 2016/17; and

WHEREAS, In order to keep the Chinatown Broadway IV streetscape project on schedule, Transportation Authority staff worked with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency



(SFMTA) and MTC to swap the STIP funds with SFMTA's revenue bonds, and committed to reprogram the STIP funds to another San Francisco project as part of the 2016 STIP; and

WHEREAS, SFMTA and SFPW have proposed to reprogram the \$1.91 million from the Chinatown Broadway IV streetscape project to the Lombard Street US-101 Corridor project in FY 2016/17, with SFPW as the project lead; and

WHEREAS, The proposed project supports the Vision Zero policy by improving safety of the 1.1 miles stretch of a high injury corridor along Lombard Street between Van Ness Avenue and Richardson Avenue; and

WHEREAS, SFMTA and SFPW are coordinating this project with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and Caltrans and are committed to completing the project prior to a Caltrans paving project in 2018; and

WHEREAS, State statutes allow regional transportation agencies (e.g. MTC) and CMAs to use up to 5% of the county's RTIP share for planning, programming and monitoring (PPM) activities such as project delivery oversight, development of RTIPs and project study reports, and assistance with timely use of funds deadlines; and

WHEREAS, \$207,000 in PPM funds for MTC and \$1.114 million in PPM funds for San Francisco have been carried over from the 2014 STIP; and

WHEREAS, As shown on Attachment 2, Transportation Authority staff recommends programming \$1.91 million in RIP funds to the Lombard Street US-101 Corridor Improvement in FY 2016/17, as requested by SFPW; and reconfirming \$207,000 in PPM funds for MTC and \$1.114 million for the Transportation Authority, as carried over from the 2014 STIP; and

WHEREAS, Since the new RIP funds are generally available in the last two years of the STIP period, i.e. FYs 2019/20 and 2020/21, SFPWs' request is effectively an advancement of funds; and



WHEREAS, The actual amount and year of programming of San Francisco's 2016 RTIP priorities are subject to MTC approval, CTC approval, and state budget appropriation by the California State Legislature; and

WHEREAS, If the funds proposed for the Lombard Street US-101 Corridor Improvement project are not programmed in FY 2016/17, Transportation Authority staff will work with SFPW and SFMTA to seek CTC approval of an AB3090 to allow the project to advance with local funds and subsequently be paid back when the STIP funds become available; and

WHEREAS, San Francisco's final 2016 RTIP project priorities are due to the MTC by November 4, 2015, including all associated supporting documentation required by the MTC's RTIP guidelines; and

WHEREAS, At its September 30, 2015 meeting, the Citizens Advisory Committee considered San Francisco's proposed 2016 RTIP priorities and unanimously adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation; and

WHEREAS, At its October 20, 2015 meeting, the Plans and Programs Committee reviewed San Francisco's proposed 2016 RTIP priorities and unanimously recommended approval of the staff recommendation; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority hereby approves San Francisco's project priorities for the 2016 RTIP as presented in Attachment 2; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Executive Director is directed to submit San Francisco's 2016 RTIP project priorities and any associated documentation to the MTC by the established deadlines; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Capital Improvement Program of the Congestion Management Program is amended as appropriate.



Attachment :

1. Proposed 2016 RTIP Programming Priorities

**Attachment 1**

**San Francisco 2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) Programming Priorities - Proposed**

Agency	Project	Project Totals by Fiscal Year (\$ 1,000's)					Phase	
		Total	FY 2016/17	FY 2017/18	FY 2018/19	FY 2019/20		FY 2020/21
San Francisco Public Works	Lombard Street US-101 Corridor Improvement <sup>1</sup>	\$1,910	\$1,910					Construction
Metropolitan Transportation Commission	Planning, programming, and monitoring <sup>2</sup>	\$207	\$67	\$69	\$71			n/a
San Francisco County Transportation Authority	Planning, programming, and monitoring <sup>2</sup>	\$1,114	\$447	\$667				n/a
<b>RTIP Total</b>		<b>\$3,231</b>	<b>\$2,424</b>	<b>\$736</b>	<b>\$71</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	
<b>RTIP Funds Available</b>		<b>\$3,231</b>						
<b>Surplus/(shortfall)</b>		<b>\$0</b>						

<sup>1</sup> Previously programmed to the San Francisco Public Works' Chinatown Broadway IV project as part of the OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Cycle 1. The \$1.91 million had been swapped with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's local revenue bond funds because the OBAG project needed the funds sooner.

<sup>2</sup> Carryover from the 2014 STIP



# Memorandum

**Date:** 10.13.15 **RE:** Plans and Programs Committee  
October 20, 2015

**To:** Plans and Programs Committee: Commissioners Tang (Chair), Christensen (Vice Chair), Breed, Farrell, Yee and Wiener (Ex Officio)

**From:** Amber Crabbe – Assistant Deputy Director for Policy and Programming *Ac*

**Through:** Tilly Chang – Executive Director *TJC*

**Subject:** **ACTION** – Recommend Adopting San Francisco’s Project Priorities for the 2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program

## Summary

As Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for San Francisco, every two years the Transportation Authority is responsible for establishing project priorities for San Francisco’s county share funds from the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), subject to approval by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) through its Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) process. Due to reduced revenues from fuel taxes, as well as the lack of an adequately funded multi-year federal transportation bill, the fund estimate for the 2016 STIP leaves no new programming capacity for CMAs. Still, CMAs must submit carryover projects and any associated changes from the 2014 STIP to MTC. As shown in Attachment 2, we recommend reprogramming \$1.91 million from the San Francisco Public Works’ (SFPW’s) Broadway Chinatown IV streetscape project to its Lombard US-101 Corridor Improvement project since delays in STIP programming forced SFPW to use local funds to keep the Chinatown project on schedule. We also recommend carrying forward (essentially reconfirming) \$207,000 and \$1.114 million in existing Planning, Programming and Monitoring funds for MTC and the Transportation Authority, respectively.

## BACKGROUND

Every two years, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) adopts the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), a five-year program of projects for a number of state and federal transportation fund sources. While the overall STIP must be approved by the CTC, priorities for approximately 75% of the programming capacity are set by regional transportation planning agencies such as the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for the Bay Area, and the remaining 25% is established by the state. The Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) is MTC’s submittal to the state, which is merged with other regions’ RTIPs and additional CTC priorities to become the STIP. As the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for San Francisco, the Transportation Authority is responsible for establishing San Francisco’s project priorities for the RTIP. Attachment 1 shows the Transportation Authority’s Board-adopted list of San Francisco’s RTIP priorities, with a total remaining commitment of about \$147 million for four projects: Central Subway (first priority, \$75.5 million), payback to MTC of an advance for Presidio Parkway (second priority, \$34.0 million) Caltrain

Electrification (\$20 million), and Caltrain Downtown Extension to a Rebuilt Transbay Terminal (\$17.9 million).

**No New Programming for Locals:** The STIP used to be a significant, although highly variable source of state funds for highways, local streets and roads, transit rehabilitation and expansion projects, and pedestrian and bicycle projects. In recent cycles, the biennial STIP programming cycles have experienced a drastic reduction in available funding<sup>†</sup> due primarily to reduced revenues from fuel taxes, but also to the lack of an adequately funded multi-year federal transportation bill. Given that this year's fund estimate is only \$46 million statewide (vs. \$1.3 billion in 2014 STIP), CTC is making no funds available for CMAs. In accordance with MTC's 2016 RTIP Policies and Procedures, CMAs must still submit their carryover programming and any associated changes from the 2014 STIP to MTC.

## DISCUSSION

The purpose of this memorandum is to present our recommendation for reprogramming \$1.91 million in the Regional Improvement Program (RIP) funds (the project-specific portion of the STIP funds) from the Broadway IV streetscape project to the Lombard Street US-101 Corridor project and recommend adoption of San Francisco's project priorities for the 2016 RTIP as shown in Attachment 2.

**Need to Reprogram \$1.91 Million from Chinatown Broadway IV Streetscape Project:** As part of the Cycle 1 OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) County Program, MTC had assigned \$1.91 million in STIP Transportation Enhancement funds to San Francisco Public Works' (SFPW's) Chinatown Broadway IV streetscape project in Fiscal Year (FY) 2014/15, to be programmed through the 2014 STIP<sup>1</sup>. However, due to the lack of funding capacity in earlier years of the 2014 STIP period, CTC delayed the programming year to FY 2016/17. In order to keep the Chinatown Broadway IV streetscape project on schedule, we worked with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and MTC to swap the STIP funds with SFMTA's revenue bonds, and committed to reprogram the STIP funds to another San Francisco project as part of the 2016 STIP.

**Lombard Street US-101 Corridor Project:** Per the fund swap explained above, we are proposing to reprogram \$1.91 million from the Chinatown Broadway IV streetscape project to a project identified by SFMTA and SFPW: the Lombard Street US-101 Corridor project. The proposed project supports the Vision Zero policy by improving safety of the 1.1 miles stretch of a high injury corridor along Lombard Street between Van Ness Avenue and Richardson Avenue. This project is also the Transportation Authority's Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program (NTIP) project for District 2. Proposed improvements include curb extensions (pedestrian and transit bulb-outs), daylighting at intersections, signal timing improvements, advance stop bars and high visibility curb crosswalks. SFMTA and SFPW are coordinating this project with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and plan to complete the project prior to a Caltrans paving project in 2018. SFPW is the city's project lead.

The estimated total cost of the project is \$7.7 million. The Transportation Authority Board has already allocated \$646,586 in Prop K sales tax funds for design and early implementation construction. SFPW submitted an application for \$3.8 million in Active Transportation Program (ATP) funds to the state and MTC. The state application was unsuccessful, but yesterday MTC's Programming and Allocations Committee recommended \$1.9 million (due to a very competitive call for projects) while placing the Lombard project first in line on the wait list to receive any freed-up funds should other projects drop

---

<sup>1</sup> The State subsequently eliminated Transportation Enhancement funds from the STIP and reclassified the remaining Transportation Enhancements programming as Regional Improvement Program funds.



out or have cost savings. With the addition of the ATP funds and the proposed RTIP funds, the project will have a \$2 million funding gap. SFPW and SFMTA are currently considering other local funds, such as SFMTA's Prop A bond or the Transportation Authority's Prop AA vehicle registration fee funds, for which we plan to release a competitive call for projects later this month to reprogram over \$1.1 million in de-obligated funds.

The project is in the design phase, and needs to obtain both state and federal environmental clearance. The current project schedule calls for advertising the construction contract in fall 2016. This means that SFPW currently anticipates needing to allocate the STIP funds in FY 2016/17, the first year of the 2016 STIP cycle. Unfortunately, the CTC is expected to push projects out to the later years of the STIP (FY 2019/20 or FY 2020/21), since the earlier-year funds are already overcommitted. Therefore, we are working with SFPW, MTC, and CTC staff to identify alternatives that will still allow the project to move forward, such as getting CTC approval of an AB3090, which would allow the City to spend local funds on the project and get reimburse later when the STIP funds become available.

SFPW and SFMTA are committed to delivering the Lombard project prior to the planned Caltrans repaving project. Given all the uncertainties noted above and the tight timeline, we are working closely to support SFPW and SFMTA's efforts to develop an overall strategy for project delivery that includes a variety of contingency plans to mitigate some of the risks, such as identifying an alternative fund source.

**Planning, Programming and Monitoring Funds:** State statutes allow regional transportation agencies (e.g. MTC) and CMAs to use up to 5% of the county's RTIP share for PPM activities such as project delivery oversight, development of RTIPs and project study reports, and providing assistance to project sponsors with timely use of funds deadlines. Planning, Programming, and Monitoring funds for both MTC and San Francisco, as shown on Attachment 2, are carryover from the 2014 STIP. We are asking the CTC to re-confirm the existing programming, as required.

**Next Steps:** We will submit to MTC the draft listing of 2016 RTIP priorities by MTC's October 14 deadline. Following approval by the Transportation Authority Board, we will work with SFPW to provide MTC with the required documentation to support the proposed programming by its November 4 deadline. MTC staff will work with CMAs, Caltrans and project sponsors to develop a RTIP submittal and forward it to the CTC by December 15. We will continue to work with MTC and SFPW to advocate for CTC's approval of our 2016 RTIP recommendations as proposed.

## **ALTERNATIVES**

1. Recommend adopting San Francisco's project priorities for the 2016 RTIP, as requested.
2. Recommend adopting San Francisco's project priorities for the 2016 RTIP, with modifications.
3. Defer action, pending additional information or further staff analysis.

## **CAC POSITION**

The CAC considered this item at its September 30 meeting and unanimously adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation.

## **FINANCIAL IMPACTS**

Approval of San Francisco's project priorities for the 2016 RTIP would not impact the Transportation Authority's adopted Fiscal Year 2015/16 budget. The proposed reconfirmation of existing Planning, Programming, and Monitoring fund programming in FY 2016/17 and FY 2017/18 would be

incorporated into future year budgets.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Recommend adopting San Francisco's project priorities for the 2016 RTIP.

Attachments (2):

1. San Francisco's Remaining RIP Commitments
2. Proposed 2016 RTIP Programming Priorities

**Attachment 1**

**Remaining Regional Improvement Program (RIP) Commitments  
(Resolution 14-25, Approved 10.22.13)**

<b>Remaining RIP Commitments</b>			
<b>Project</b>	<b>RIP Commitment</b>	<b>Allocated or Programmed RIP Funds</b>	<b>Remaining RIP Commitment</b>
Presidio Parkway <sup>1</sup>	\$84,101,000	\$84,101,000	\$0
Central Subway <sup>2</sup>	\$92,000,000	\$16,498,000	\$75,502,000
MTC STP/CMAQ Advance for Presidio Parkway <sup>3</sup>	\$34,000,000	\$0	\$34,000,000
Caltrain Downtown Extension to a New Transbay Transit Center	\$28,000,000	\$10,153,000	\$17,847,000
Caltrain Electrification	\$24,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$20,000,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$262,101,000</b>	<b>\$114,752,000</b>	<b>\$147,349,000</b>

<sup>1</sup>The RIP commitment to Presidio Parkway, the highest RIP priority project, has been completed with adoption of the 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program.

<sup>2</sup>With completion of the RIP commitment to Presidio Parkway, Central Subway is now the highest priority for future RIP funds.

<sup>3</sup>Acronyms include the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), Surface Transportation Program (STP), and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ). Through Resolution 12-44, the Authority accepted MTC's proposed advance of \$34 million in STP/CMAQ funds for Presidio Parkway to be repaid with future county share RIP funds. Repayment of the advance, i.e. by programming \$34 million in RIP funds to a project or projects of MTC's choice, is a third priority after fulfilling Central Subway's remaining RIP commitment.

**PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST**

DTP-0001 (Revised April 2015)

General Instructions

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Project					Date:	11/5/15
District	EA	Project ID		PPNO	MPO ID	TCRP No.
04						
County	Route/Corridor	PM Bk	PM Ahd	Project Sponsor/Lead Agency		
SF	101			San Francisco Public Works (SFPW)		
				MPO	Element	
				MTC		
Project Manager/Contact		Phone		E-mail Address		
Rachel Alonso		(415) 558-4034		<a href="mailto:rachel.alonso@sfdpw.org">rachel.alonso@sfdpw.org</a>		
Project Title						
Lombard Street Vision Zero Project						
Location, Project Limits, Description, Scope of Work						<input type="checkbox"/> See page 2
In San Francisco: On Lombard/US-101 between Broderick St and Franklin St; Install curb extensions (pedestrian and transit bulbs), implement parking removal at intersections (daylighting), implement signal timing improvements, and potentially install advanced stop bars and high visibility crosswalks.						
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Includes ADA Improvements		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Includes Bike/Ped Improvements				
Component	Implementing Agency					
PA&ED	SFPW					
PS&E	SFPW					
Right of Way	SFPW					
Construction	SFPW					
Purpose and Need						<input type="checkbox"/> See page 2
Every day, over 40,000 vehicles travel in each direction and over 80,000 pedestrians travel along or across the corridor. Some of the pedestrian activity is generated by transit use, as Muni has five key routes on, intersecting, or adjacent to the corridor. Construction of curb extensions will improve safety of users on a high injury corridor and improve transit reliability, thus encouraging residents and visitors to choose these alternative modes of transport rather than drive.						
Project Benefits						<input type="checkbox"/> See page 2
Improvement in transit reliability and safety; increase in alternative modes of transport; reduction in emissions that contribute to respiratory ailments and global warming; reduction in volume and severity of collisions						
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supports Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) Goals			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reduces Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
Project Milestone					Proposed	
Project Study Report Approved					07/31/16	
Begin Environmental (PA&ED) Phase					10/01/15	
Circulate Draft Environmental Document				Document Type		
Draft Project Report						
End Environmental Phase (PA&ED Milestone)					06/30/16	
Begin Design (PS&E) Phase					05/01/15	
End Design Phase (Ready to List for Advertisement Milestone)					08/31/16	
Begin Right of Way Phase					08/01/16	
End Right of Way Phase (Right of Way Certification Milestone)					08/31/16	
Begin Construction Phase (Contract Award Milestone)					01/01/17	
End Construction Phase (Construction Contract Acceptance Milestone)					03/30/18	
Begin Closeout Phase					04/01/18	
End Closeout Phase (Closeout Report)					09/30/18	

**ADA Notice**

For individuals with sensory disabilities, this document is available in alternate formats. For information call (916) 654-6410 or TDD (916) 654-3880 or write Records and Forms Management, 1120 N Street, MS-89, Sacramento, CA 95814.

**PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST**

DTP-0001 (Revised April 2015)

Date: 11/5/15

District	County	Route	EA	Project ID	PPNO	TCRP No.
04	SF	101				
<b>Project Title:</b> Lombard Street Vision Zero Project						

Proposed Total Project Cost (\$1,000s)									Notes
Component	Prior	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22+	Total	
E&P (PA&ED)	224							224	
PS&E	1,608							1,608	
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)		745						745	
R/W									
CON	43	14,845						14,888	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,875</b>	<b>15,590</b>						<b>17,465</b>	

<b>Fund No. 1:</b>	<b>RIP</b>								<b>Program Code</b>
<b>Proposed Funding (\$1,000s)</b>									
Component	Prior	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									MTC
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)		249						249	
R/W									
CON		1,661						1,661	
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>1,910</b>						<b>1,910</b>	

<b>Fund No. 2:</b>	<b>ATP - Regional</b>								<b>Program Code</b>
<b>Proposed Funding (\$1,000s)</b>									
Component	Prior	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)		242						242	
R/W									
CON		1,613						1,613	
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>1,855</b>						<b>1,855</b>	

<b>Fund No. 3:</b>	<b>ATP - Regional Contingency</b>								<b>Program Code</b>
<b>Proposed Funding (\$1,000s)</b>									
Component	Prior	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)		254						254	
R/W									
CON		1,692						1,692	
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>1,946</b>						<b>1,946</b>	

**PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST**

DTP-0001 (Revised April 2015)

Date: 11/5/15

District	County	Route	EA	Project ID	PPNO	TCRP No.
04	SF	101				
<b>Project Title:</b> Lombard Street Vision Zero Project						

Fund No. 4: Proposition K Sales Tax									Program Code
Proposed Funding (\$1,000s)									
Component	Prior	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									SFCTA
PS&E	613							613	
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON	33	979						1,012	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>646</b>	<b>979</b>						<b>1,625</b>	

Fund No. 5: SFPUC									Program Code
Proposed Funding (\$1,000s)									
Component	Prior	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)	114							114	SFPUC
PS&E	678							678	water and sewer
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON		8,900						8,900	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>792</b>	<b>8,900</b>						<b>9,692</b>	

Fund No. 6: General Fund									Program Code
Proposed Funding (\$1,000s)									
Component	Prior	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)	50							50	City & County of SF
PS&E	300							300	
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>350</b>							<b>350</b>	

Fund No. 7: Operating and WalkFirst Funds									Program Code
Proposed Funding (\$1,000s)									
Component	Prior	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)	60							60	SFMTA
PS&E	17							17	
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON	10							10	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>87</b>							<b>87</b>	

**PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST**

DTP-0001 (Revised April 2015)

Date: 11/5/15

District	County	Route	EA	Project ID	PPNO	TCRP No.
04	SF	101				
<b>Project Title:</b> Lombard Street Vision Zero Project						

<b>Fund No. 8:</b>									<b>Program Code</b>
<b>Proposed Funding (\$1,000s)</b>									
Component	Prior	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
<b>TOTAL</b>									

<b>Fund No. 9:</b>									<b>Program Code</b>
<b>Proposed Funding (\$1,000s)</b>									
Component	Prior	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
<b>TOTAL</b>									

<b>Fund No. 10:</b>									<b>Program Code</b>
<b>Proposed Funding (\$1,000s)</b>									
Component	Prior	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
<b>TOTAL</b>									

## Universal Application

<b>TIP ID</b>		<b>Project Version number</b>	0	<b>FMS ID</b>	
<b>County</b>	San Francisco	<b>Implementing agency</b>	SF DPW	<b>Submode</b>	
<b>Project name</b>	Lombard Street Vision Zero Project				

**Project Submitted**
[Glossary](#) [Application Assistant](#) [Contact Us](#)

This project was submitted to MTC on 11/04/2015

[Go to bottom of page](#)[Back to Project Listing](#)[Print](#)**General Information - Step 1:**

TIP ID	
Version	0
Project name	Lombard Street Vision Zero Project
Primary Program Being Modified	Regional Improvement Program
County	SF
Sponsor	SF DPW
Implementing Agency	SF DPW
Reason for Revision	Add new project
Description of Change	Program \$1.9m in STIP funds and \$1.854M in ATP Cycle 2 funds.
Is project completed/open for traffic	No
RTP Cycle	PLANBAYAREA
RTP ID	240543
RTP Title	Modify local road intersections (includes safety upgrades, signalization, and realignment)
RTP Project Cost	\$100.58
RTP Page Number	

**Description - Step 2:**

Primary Submode	PEDESTRIAN - 60%
Secondary Submode	BUS - 40%
Tertiary Submode	
Quaternary Submode	
Quinary Submode	
Senary Submode	
Type	
Purpose	
Project Description	In San Francisco: On Lombard/US-101 between Broderick St and Franklin St; Install curb extensions and other pedestrian safety and transit features.
Expanded Project Description	In San Francisco: On Lombard/US-101 between Broderick St and Franklin St; Install curb extensions (pedestrian and transit bulbs), implement parking removal at intersections (daylighting), implement signal timing improvements, and potentially install advanced stop bars and high visibility crosswalks.
Transportation Problem to be addressed	Construction of curb extensions will improve safety of users on a high injury corridor and improve transit reliability, thus encouraging residents and visitors to choose these alternative modes of transport rather than drive, reducing emissions that contribute to respiratory ailments and global warming.

**Location - Step 3:**

Location	San Francisco
----------	---------------



Route	101
Post Miles	From: (Miles) To: (Miles)
Map	
Area	Urbanized Area
State Assembly Districts	<input type="checkbox"/> 02 <input type="checkbox"/> 04 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 11 <input type="checkbox"/> 14 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 16 <input type="checkbox"/> 17 <input type="checkbox"/> 18 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 19 <input type="checkbox"/> 20 <input type="checkbox"/> 22 <input type="checkbox"/> 24 <input type="checkbox"/> 25 <input type="checkbox"/> 27 <input type="checkbox"/> 28 <input type="checkbox"/> 29 <input type="checkbox"/> 30
State Senate Districts	<input type="checkbox"/> 02 <input type="checkbox"/> 03 <input type="checkbox"/> 07 <input type="checkbox"/> 09 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 11 <input type="checkbox"/> 13 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 17
Congressional Districts	<input type="checkbox"/> 02 <input type="checkbox"/> 03 <input type="checkbox"/> 05 <input type="checkbox"/> 09 <input type="checkbox"/> 11 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12 <input type="checkbox"/> 13 <input type="checkbox"/> 14 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 17 <input type="checkbox"/> 18 <input type="checkbox"/> 19 <input type="checkbox"/> 20

**Funding Information - Step 4:**

Note: Non-editable fund lines represent data from the active project and are only displayed for informational purposes. Only the editable fund lines will be added to the project revision. To deleted newly added fund lines simply click the link that corresponds to the fund line(s) to be deleted. For historical purposes, existing fund lines cannot be deleted, users can only update a zero amount to the fund line to indicate that the Fund Source is no longer used.

Fund Code	Phase	Appn Year	Program Year	Prog Amount	PPNO	Fed Proj ID	FHWA Authorization Date	FHWA Authorization Amount	FTA Grant No.	FTA Grant Date	FTA Grant Amount	CTC Allocation Date	CTC Allocation Amount	Award Deadline Date
OTHER LOCAL	CON		2016	10,000										
SALESTAX-MEASURE-SF	CON		2016	33,000										
SALESTAX-MEASURE-SF	CON		2017	852,000										
OTHER LOCAL	ENV		2016	175,000										
OTHER LOCAL	CON-CE		2017	1,161,000										
ATP-REG-T4-2-FED	CON-CE		2017	242,000										
GENERAL FUND	PSE		2016	300,000										
GENERAL FUND	ENV		2015	50,000										
ATP-REG-T4-2-FED	CON		2017	1,613,000										
OTHER LOCAL	CON		2017	7,740,000										
OTHER FED	CON-CE		2017	254,000										
OTHER FED	CON		2017	1,692,000										
RIP-T4-14-FED-SF	CON-CE		2017	249,000										
RIP-T4-14-FED-SF	CON		2017	1,661,000										
SALESTAX-MEASURE-SF	CON-CE		2017	128,000										
OTHER LOCAL	PSE		2016	695,000										
SALESTAX-MEASURE-SF	PSE		2016	613,000										

**Total Funding by Jurisdiction**

Status	Federal	State	Regional	Local	Total Project Cost
Submitted	3,856,000	1,855,000		11,757,000	17,468,000

**Total Funding by Phase**

Status	CON	CON-CT	ENV	PE	PSE	ROW	ROW-CT	Total Project Cost
Submitted	13,601,000		225,000		1,608,000			17,468,000

**Delivery Milestones - Step 5:**

	Document Type	Date
Project Study Report (PSR) Complete		
Scheduled Circulation of Draft Environmental Document		
	Month	Year
Begin Environmental Studies?		
End Environmental Studies?		
Begin Design Engineering?		
End Plans, Specs, and Estimates?		
Begin R/W Certification?		
Advertise Construction (Ready to list)?		
Begin Construction (Award)?		
Project Completion?		

**Project Screening Criteria - Step 6:**

Is your project an Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) project or does it include ITS components?	Yes
Is your ITS project classified as 'low risk' or 'high risk' under FHWA/Caltrans ITS guidance? Please answer even if your project is FTA funded.	Low Risk
Is your project included in the Bay Area Regional ITS Architecture?	Yes
Does your ITS Project include a construction phase that is more than 10% of the cost of the project?	No
Does your project comply with MTC Resolution 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan)?	N/A
Have the needs of non-motorized travelers been considered in the design of the project and is the project consistent with Caltrans Deputy Directive 64?	Yes
Is non-motorized travel impeded by this project?	No
If yes, has a cross-facility, non-motorized access been included in the project?	
Has a parallel non-motorized facility been designed to accommodate non-motorized travelers?	N/A
Have you reviewed local county, and regional bike plans for roadway design consistency?	Yes
Is project consistent with MTC's RTP, other regional, local plans and programs (e.g. most recently adopted Shortly Range Transit Plan)?	Yes
SRTP Reference	FY: SRTP Page:
List other applicable plans	
Is project supported by an adequate financial plan with all sources of funding identified and has a logical cash flow?	Yes
Is project well defined and well justified. It has clear project limits, intended for scope of work, and project concept?	Yes
Does project meet or support the requirements of the American with Disabilities Act (ADA)?	Yes
Is this project a Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) capacity increasing project?	No

**Contact Information - Step 7:**

	Sponsor	Implementing Agency	MTC Contact
Agency Name	San Francisco Dept of Public Works (SFDPW)	San Francisco Dept of Public Works (SFDPW)	
First Name	Rachel	Rachel	
Middle Initial			

Last Name	Alonso	Alonso	
Title	Transportation Finance Analyst	Transportation Finance Analyst	
Mailing Address Line 1	1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.	1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.	
Mailing Address Line 2	City Hall, Room 340	City Hall, Room 340	
City	San Francisco	San Francisco	
State			
Zip Code			
Telephone	<a href="tel:(415)554-4890">(415) 554-4890</a>	<a href="tel:(415)554-4890">(415) 554-4890</a>	
Fax			
E-mail	rachel.alonso@sfdpw.org	rachel.alonso@sfdpw.org	

**STIP Requirements - Step 8:**

AB3090 - PA & ED	false
AB3090 - R/W	false
AB3090 - PS & E	false
AB3090 - CON	false
Expected Source(s) of Additional Funding	
Special Funding Conditions or Terms	
FTA Grant Type	
FTA Application Date	
FTA Grantee	
RTIP Program Code	
ITIP Program Code	
GF Program Code	
Non-STIP Fund Type 1	
Non-STIP Fund Type 2	
Non-STIP Fund Type 3	

**RTIP Requirements - Step 9:**

RTIP Certification Assurances Agreement: Read and agreed to the terms and conditions	true
--	------

[Go to top of page](#)
[Back to Project Listing](#)
[Print](#)

FILE NO.

RESOLUTION NO.

1 [Apply for, Accept, and Expend Grant – State Transportation Improvement Program -  
2 \$1,910,000]

3 **Resolution authorizing the filing of an application for funding assigned to the**  
4 **Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC); committing any necessary matching**  
5 **funds; stating assurance to complete the projects; and authorizing the Department of**  
6 **Public Works (DPW) to accept and expend \$1,910,000 in State Transportation**  
7 **Improvement Program grant funds awarded through MTC.**  
8

9 WHEREAS, The State Transportation Improvement Program (herein referred to as  
10 PROGRAM) is a five-year program of projects for state and federal transportation fund  
11 sources; and

12 WHEREAS, The PROGRAM includes federal funding administered by the Federal  
13 Highway Administration (FHWA) and federal or state funding administered by the California  
14 Transportation Commission (CTC) such as Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding,  
15 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) funding, Transportation  
16 Alternatives (TA)/Active Transportation Program (ATP) funding, and Regional Transportation  
17 Improvement Program (RTIP) funding; and

18 WHEREAS, The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Act (Public Law 112-  
19 141, July 6, 2012) and any extensions or successor legislation for continued funding  
20 (collectively, MAP-21) authorize various federal funding programs including, but not limited to  
21 the Surface Transportation Program (STP) (23 U.S.C. § 133), the Congestion Mitigation and  
22 Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) (23 U.S.C. § 149) and the Transportation  
23 Alternatives Program (TA) (23 U.S.C. § 213); and  
24  
25

1           WHEREAS, Every two years the California Transportation Commission (CTC) adopts  
2 the PROGRAM based on priorities set by regional transportation planning agencies (RTPAs);  
3 and

4           WHEREAS, The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the RTPA for the  
5 Bay Area region; and

6           WHEREAS, MTC is responsible for programming \$3,231,000 in state and federal funds  
7 (herein referred to as REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING) through the Regional  
8 Competitive PROGRAM; and

9           WHEREAS, As Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for San Francisco, the San  
10 Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) is responsible for establishing San  
11 Francisco project priorities for programming in the Regional Transportation Improvement  
12 Program (RTIP), subject to approval by MTC; and

13           WHEREAS, MTC must submit its priorities for the 2016 PROGRAM to CTC by  
14 December 15, 2015; and

15           WHEREAS, As part of the Cycle 1 OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) County Program, MTC  
16 had assigned \$1,910,000 in REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING to San Francisco  
17 Public Works (herein referred to as DPW)'s Chinatown Broadway IV; and

18           WHEREAS, Due to the lack of funding capacity in earlier years of the 2014 STIP  
19 period, CTC delayed the programming year to Fiscal Year 2016-2017; and

20           WHEREAS, In order to keep the Chinatown Broadway IV streetscape project on  
21 schedule, SFCTA staff worked with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency  
22 (SFMTA) and MTC to swap the STIP funds with SFMTA's revenue bonds, and committed to  
23 reprogram the STIP funds to another San Francisco project as part of the 2016 STIP; and  
24  
25

1           WHEREAS, SFMTA and DPW have proposed to reprogram the \$1,910,000 in  
2 REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING from the Chinatown Broadway IV streetscape  
3 project to the Lombard Street Vision Zero Project (herein referred to as PROJECT); and

4           WHEREAS, On October 27, 2015 the SFCTA Board approved this and other project  
5 priorities; and

6           WHEREAS, State statutes, including California Streets and Highways Code §182.6,  
7 §182.7, and §2381(a)(1), and California Government Code §14527, provide various funding  
8 programs for the programming discretion of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)  
9 and the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA); and

10           WHEREAS, Pursuant to MAP-21 and any regulations promulgated thereunder, eligible  
11 project sponsors wishing to receive federal or state funds for a regionally-significant project  
12 shall submit an application first with the appropriate MPO, or RTPA, as applicable, for review  
13 and inclusion in the federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and

14           WHEREAS, MTC is the MPO and RTPA for the nine counties of the San Francisco Bay  
15 region; and

16           WHEREAS, MTC has adopted a Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC  
17 Resolution No. 3606, revised) that sets out procedures governing the application and use of  
18 REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING; and

19           WHEREAS, DPW is an eligible sponsor for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING;  
20 and

21           WHEREAS, As part of the application for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING,  
22 MTC requires a resolution adopted by the responsible implementing agency stating the  
23 following:

- 24           1. The commitment of any required matching funds;
- 25

- 1           2. That the sponsor understands that the REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING is  
2           fixed at the programmed amount, and therefore any cost increase cannot be  
3           expected to be funded with additional REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING;
- 4           3. That the PROJECT will comply with the procedures, delivery milestones and  
5           funding deadlines specified in the Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC  
6           Resolution No. 3606, revised);
- 7           4. The assurance of the sponsor to complete the PROJECT as described in the  
8           application, subject to environmental clearance, and if approved, as included in  
9           MTC's federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP);
- 10          5. That the PROJECT will have adequate staffing resources to deliver and complete  
11          the PROJECT within the schedule submitted with the project application; and
- 12          6. That the PROJECT will comply with all project-specific requirements as set forth in  
13          the PROGRAM;
- 14          7. That DPW has assigned, and will maintain a single point of contact for all FHWA-  
15          and CTC-funded transportation projects to coordinate within the agency and with  
16          the respective Congestion Management Agency (CMA), MTC, Caltrans, FHWA,  
17          and CTC on all communications, inquires or issues that may arise during the federal  
18          programming and delivery process for all FHWA- and CTC-funded transportation  
19          and transit projects implemented by DPW;
- 20          8. In the case of an RTIP project, state law requires PROJECT be included in a local  
21          congestion management plan, or be consistent with the capital improvement  
22          program adopted pursuant to MTC's funding agreement with the countywide  
23          transportation agency; and

24           WHEREAS, That DPW is authorized to submit an application for REGIONAL  
25   DISCRETIONARY FUNDING for the PROJECT; and

1 WHEREAS, There is no legal impediment to DPW making applications for the funds;  
2 and

3 WHEREAS, There is no pending or threatened litigation that might in any way  
4 adversely affect the proposed PROJECT, or that might impair the ability of DPW to implement  
5 the PROJECT; and

6 WHEREAS, The Director of DPW or his or her designee is authorized to execute and  
7 file an application with MTC for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING for the PROJECT  
8 as referenced in this resolution; and

9 WHEREAS, MTC requires that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the MTC in  
10 conjunction with the filing of the application; and

11 WHEREAS, The grants do not require an ASO amendment; and

12 WHEREAS, The grant budgets include indirect costs in the amount of \$97,645; now,  
13 therefore, be it

14 RESOLVED, That DPW is authorized to execute and file an application for funding for  
15 the PROJECT for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING under MAP-21 or continued  
16 funding; and, be it

17 FURTHER RESOLVED, That DPW by adopting this resolution does hereby state that:

- 18 1. DPW will commit any required matching funds;
- 19 2. DPW understands that the REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING for the  
20 projects is fixed at the MTC-approved programmed amount, and that any cost  
21 increases must be funded by DPW from other funds, and that DPW does not  
22 expect any cost increases to be funded with additional REGIONAL  
23 DISCRETIONARY FUNDING;
- 24 3. DPW understands the funding deadlines associated with these funds and will  
25 comply with the provisions and requirements of the Regional Project Funding



1 Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606, revised) and DPW has, and will  
2 retain the expertise, knowledge and resources necessary to deliver federally-  
3 funded transportation projects, and has assigned, and will maintain a single  
4 point of contact for all FHWA- and CTC-funded transportation projects to  
5 coordinate within the agency and with the respective Congestion Management  
6 Agency (CMA), MTC, Caltrans, FHWA, and CTC on all communications,  
7 inquires or issues that may arise during the federal programming and delivery  
8 process for all FHWA- and CTC-funded transportation projects implemented by  
9 DPW;

10 4. PROJECT will be implemented as described in the complete applications and in  
11 this resolution, subject to environmental clearance, and, if approved, for the  
12 amount approved by MTC and programmed in the federal TIP;

13 5. DPW has reviewed the PROJECT and has adequate staffing resources to  
14 deliver and complete the PROJECT within the schedule submitted with the  
15 project application;

16 6. That the PROJECT will comply with the requirements as set forth in MTC  
17 programming guidelines and project selection procedures for the PROGRAM;

18 7. In the case of an RTIP project, state law requires PROJECT is included in a  
19 local congestion management plan, or is consistent with the capital improvement  
20 program adopted pursuant to MTC's funding agreement with the countywide  
21 transportation agency; and, be it

22 FURTHER RESOLVED, That DPW is an eligible sponsor of REGIONAL  
23 DISCRETIONARY FUNDING funded projects; and, be it

24 FURTHER RESOLVED, That DPW is authorized to submit an application for  
25 REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING for the PROJECT; and, be it

1 FURTHER RESOLVED, That there is no legal impediment to DPW making applications  
2 for the funds; and, be it

3 FURTHER RESOLVED, That there is no pending or threatened litigation that might in  
4 any way adversely affect the proposed PROJECT, or the ability of DPW to deliver such  
5 PROJECT; and, be it

6 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Director of DPW or his or her designee is authorized  
7 to execute and file an application with MTC for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING for  
8 the PROJECT as referenced in this resolution; and, be it

9 FURTHER RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution will be transmitted to the MTC in  
10 conjunction with the filing of the application; and, be it

11 FURTHER RESOLVED, That MTC is requested to support the application for the  
12 PROJECT described in the resolution, and if approved, to include the PROJECT in MTC's  
13 federal TIP upon submittal by the project sponsor for TIP programming; and, be it

14 FURTHER RESOLVED, That DPW is authorized to accept and expend \$1,910,000  
15 awarded by MTC through the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP); and, be it

16 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Director of DPW or his or her designee is authorized  
17 to execute all documents pertaining to the project with Caltrans.

18  
19

20 Recommended: Approved: \_\_\_\_\_  
21 Mayor

22  
23 \_\_\_\_\_  
24 Mohammed Nuru  
25 Director of Public Works Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

Controller

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25



---

Project:

**Lombard Street Vision Zero Project**

Checklist:

## **Lombard Street Vision Zero Project**

CREATED 2015-06-01 (5 months ago)    UPDATED 2015-06-01 (5 months ago)

### **City**

San Francisco

### **Status**

In Progress

### **Description**

Curb extensions (pedestrian and transit bulbs), parking removal at intersections (daylighting), signal timing improvements, advanced stop bars and high visibility crosswalks are proposed.

### **Contact Name**

Rachel Alonso

### **Contact Email**

rachel.alonso@sfdpw.org

### **Contact Phone**

[415.554.4890](tel:415.554.4890)

### **Contact Address**

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, Room 340  
San Francisco, CA 94102

#### **1a What accommodations for bicycles and pedestrians are now included on the current facility and on facilities that it intersects or crosses?**

Class III bicycle routes

Bicycle parking

Sidewalks on one side or both sides of street

Frequent crosswalks

ADA-compliant ramps

Transit shelter

Transit vehicle stops

**Other**

**Please provide specifics of any items checked above.**

only 2 transit shelters and only 4 bike racks

- 1b If there are no existing pedestrian or bicycle facilities, how far from the proposed project are the closest parallel bikeways and walkways?**

None selected

**Other**

- 1c Please indicate any particular pedestrian uses or needs along the project corridor that you have observed or have been informed of.**

Lack of sidewalk

Intersection improvements

Elderly or disabled

School age children

Transit shelter

Lack of bicycle parking

**Other**

- 1d What existing challenges could the proposed project improve for bicycle, pedestrian, or transit travel in the vicinity of the proposed project?**

Lack of bicycle parking

Wide roadway crossings

Transit vehicle stops

**Other**

- 2a What trip generators (existing and future) are in the vicinity of the proposed project that might attract walking or bicycling customers, employees, students, visitors or others?**

Educational institutions

Transit stations  
Senior centers  
Shopping areas  
Medical centers  
Major public venues  
Parks

**Other**

**3a Have you considered collisions involving bicyclists and pedestrians along the route of the facility?**

Yes

**If so, what resources have you consulted?**

SWITRS

**4a Do any adopted plans call for the development of bicycle or pedestrian facilities on, crossing or adjacent to the proposed facility/project?**

Specific plan

**Other**

Vision Zero Two-Year Action Strategy, WalkFirst

**Is the proposed project consistent with these plans?**

Yes

**5a Do any local, statewide or federal policies call for incorporating bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities into this project?**

None selected

**Other**

Vision Zero Policy

**If so, have the policies been followed?**

Yes

**5b If this project includes a bicycle and/or pedestrian facility, have all applicable design standards or guidelines been followed?**

Yes

**6a** If there have been BPAC, stakeholder and/or public meetings at which the proposed project has been discussed, what comments have been made regarding bicycle and pedestrian accommodations?

Safety, protective streetscape

**7a** What accommodations, if any, are included for bicyclists and pedestrians in the proposed project design?

Bicycle parking

Widened sidewalks

High visibility crosswalks

**Other**

leading pedestrian intervals, daylighting, advanced stop bar, shelters

**8a** Will the proposed project remove an existing bicycle or pedestrian facility or block or hinder bicycle or pedestrian movement?

No

If yes, please describe situation in detail.

**8b** If the proposed project does not incorporate either bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or if the proposed project would hinder bicycle or pedestrian travel, list reasons why the project cannot be re-designed to accommodate these facilities.

What would be the cost of the bicycle and/or pedestrian facility?

What is the bicycle and/or pedestrian facility's proportion of the total project cost?

Right-of-way. (Did an analysis lead to this conclusion?)

**9a** How will access for bicyclists and pedestrians be maintained during project construction?

Alternative signed bicycle route

Alternative signed pedestrian route

Separated pedestrian pathway

**Other**

**10a What agency will be responsible for ongoing maintenance of the facility?**

SFMTA, Public Works

**10b How will ongoing maintenance be budgeted?**

Operating funds





**Seon Joo Kim**

Senior Transportation Planner  
Policy and Programming  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority  
1455 Market Street, 22nd Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
415.522.4837

On Thu, Sep 24, 2015 at 10:56 AM, Kenneth Kao <[kkao@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:kkao@mtc.ca.gov)> wrote:

Greetings CMA staff,

As discussed at the PDWG meeting on Monday, MTC has adopted the 2016 RTIP Policies and Procedures. The item is available here:

<https://mtc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4026149&GUID=08E4893C-499A-4B5F-AD81-B11FF31605D3>

Note the fund estimate targets and schedule are attached separately.

**Notable Dates**

**October 14** – list of expected/draft project changes to the RTIP. Does not have to be approved by your board. List of projects needing project-level performance analysis. Deadline to submit complete streets checklist for new projects.

**November 4** – All PPRs to MTC. Resolution of board support for any changes to the 2014 RTIP (including net-zero changes, funding changes, etc.). Deadline to submit PSRs and Resolutions of Local Support for new projects. (Note: if you need more time, please let me know)

**December 2** – MTC releases the draft RTIP for public review

**December 9** – PAC meeting

**December 16** – Commission meeting

**Project Programming Request (PPR) Forms**

Please go to this website to download pre-populated PPR forms for current projects, and blank PPR forms for new projects.

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/ocip/2016stip.htm>

Note that ALL projects programmed in the 2016 STIP period (FY 16/17- FY 20/21) should submit a PPR, whether there are changes or not.

### **Funding**

As previously discussed, there is no new programming capacity in the 2016 STIP, including no new PPM funds. Any PPM funds that are currently programmed are safe. CTC will allow net-zero changes (i.e. deleting an existing project and substituting it with another).

### **Additional Changes Allowed**

CTC will allow delays of projects programmed in FY 15/16 (current year) to a later year as part of the 2016 STIP. In order to do this, I would need an updated PPR, as well as board action (since you are delaying funding and in essence adding a new project into the STIP from a prior year).

I look forward to receiving your RTIP proposals. Please let me know if you have any questions in the meantime.

Thanks,  
Kenneth

---

[Kenneth Kao](#)

Senior Planner, Programming and Allocations

Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)

101 8th St., Oakland, CA 94607-4700

w [\(510\) 817-5768](tel:(510)817-5768) f [\(510\) 817-5848](tel:(510)817-5848)