

File No. 160514 Committee Item No. 3
 Board Item No. _____

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
 AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Government Audit and Oversight Date July 21, 2016

Board of Supervisors Meeting Date _____
 Cmte Board

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Motion |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | MTA Reso No. 16-050 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | BAC Reso 03/28/16 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | MTA TDA Project Application |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | PW TDA Project Applications |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | PW TDA Budget 04/11/16 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Planning CEQA Exemption 11/18/14 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | PW Ltr 02/20/15 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | MTC Reso No. 4220 02/10/16 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | PW Ltr 04/21/16 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Referral FYI 05/17/16 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | MTC Reso. 4108 02/24/16 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Committee Report Request 07/14/16 |

Completed by: Erica Major Date July 15, 2016
 Completed by: _____ Date _____

1 [Accept and Expend Grant - State Transportation Development Act, Article 3 - Pedestrian and
2 Bicycle Projects - \$995,524]

3 **Resolution authorizing the acceptance and expenditure of a State Transportation**
4 **Development Act, Article 3, Pedestrian and Bicycle Project grant, in the amount of**
5 **\$995,524 including \$497,762 for Public Works and \$497,762 for the San Francisco**
6 **Municipal Transportation Agency, for a three-year period of July 1, 2016, through**
7 **June 30, 2019.**

8
9 WHEREAS, Article 3 of the Transportation Development Act (TDA), California Public
10 Utilities Code, Section 99230 *et seq.*, authorizes the submission of claims to a regional
11 transportation planning agency for the funding of projects exclusively for the benefit or use of
12 pedestrians and bicyclists; and

13 WHEREAS, The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), as the regional
14 transportation planning agency for the San Francisco Bay region, has adopted MTC
15 Resolution No. 4108, entitled "Transportation Development Act, Article 3, Pedestrian and
16 Bicycle Projects," which delineates the procedures and criteria for submission of requests for
17 the allocation of TDA Article 3 funding; and

18 WHEREAS, MTC Resolution No. 4108 requires that requests for the allocation of TDA
19 Article 3 funding be submitted as part of a single, countywide coordinated claim from each
20 county in the San Francisco Bay region; and

21 WHEREAS, The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and San
22 Francisco Public Works (SFPW) desire to submit a request to MTC for the allocation of TDA
23 Article 3 Funds to support the projects and project categories described below, which are for
24 the exclusive benefit or use of pedestrians or bicyclists; and
25

1 WHEREAS, The SFMTA has identified \$497,762 in projects for the engineering,
2 construction, maintenance, and project management of pedestrian and bicycle project
3 categories in San Francisco to be funded from FY2016-2017 TDA Article 3 grant funds; and

4 WHEREAS, The SFMTA will not proceed with any project until there has been
5 complete compliance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act
6 (CEQA, Public Resources Code, Sections 21000 et seq.) and the City's environmental quality
7 regulations for each pedestrian and bicycle project; specifically, the SFMTA retains the
8 absolute discretion to (1) modify the project to mitigate significant adverse environmental
9 impacts; (2) select feasible alternatives which avoid significant adverse impacts of the project;
10 (3) require the implementation of specific measures to mitigate the significant adverse
11 environmental impacts of the project; (4) reject the project if the economic and social benefits
12 of the project do not outweigh otherwise unavoidable significant adverse environmental
13 impacts; or (5) approve the project upon a finding that the economic and social benefits of the
14 project outweigh otherwise unavoidable significant adverse impacts; and

15 WHEREAS, On April 19, 2016, the SFMTA Board of Directors adopted Resolution
16 No. 16-050, authorizing the Director of Transportation of the SFMTA (or his designee) to
17 accept and expend \$497,762 of FY2016-2017 TDA Article 3 grant funds for pedestrian and
18 bicycle project categories; and

19 WHEREAS, SFPW has identified \$248,881 in work for the preliminary engineering and
20 design of curb ramps to be constructed at various locations throughout San Francisco, as
21 required by the federal Americans with Disabilities Act, to be funded from FY2016-2017 TDA
22 Article 3 grant funds; and

23 WHEREAS, SFPW has identified \$248,881 in work to repair public sidewalks at various
24 locations throughout San Francisco to be funded from FY2016-2017 TDA Article 3 grant
25 funds; and

1 WHEREAS, The City's Planning Department has determined that SFPW's actions
2 contemplated in this Resolution are in compliance with the requirements of the California
3 Environmental Quality Act (CEQA, Public Resources Code, Sections 21000 et seq.);
4 specifically, curb ramps are categorically exempt and public sidewalk reconstruction is
5 deemed not a project activity requiring review under CEQA; said determinations are
6 incorporated herein by reference; and

7 WHEREAS, SFMTA and SFPW are not legally impeded from submitting a request to
8 the Metropolitan Transportation Commission for the allocation of TDA Article 3, nor are
9 SFMTA and SFPW legally impeded from undertaking the projects; and

10 WHEREAS, The SFMTA and SFPW have committed adequate staffing resources to
11 complete the projects; and

12 WHEREAS, A review of the projects and project categories has resulted in the
13 consideration of all pertinent matters, including those related to environmental and right-of-
14 way permits and clearances, attendant to the successful completion of the projects; and

15 WHEREAS, Issues attendant to securing environmental and right-of-way permits and
16 clearances for the projects have been reviewed and will be concluded in a manner and on a
17 schedule that will not jeopardize the deadline for the use of the TDA funds being requested;
18 and

19 WHEREAS, The project categories are included in a locally approved bicycle,
20 pedestrian, transit, multimodal, complete streets, or other relevant plan; and

21 WHEREAS, Any project that is a bikeway will meet the mandatory minimum safety
22 design criteria published in Chapter 1000 of the California Highway Design Manual; and

23 WHEREAS, That as described in the budgets for the projects, the sources of funding
24 other than TDA are assured and adequate for completion of the projects; and

25 WHEREAS, The projects within the project categories will be completed before the
grant funds expire; and

1 WHEREAS, The SFMTA and SFPW agree to maintain, or provide for the maintenance
2 of, the projects and facilities for the benefit of and use by the public; and

3 WHEREAS, SFPW's proposed grant budget includes indirect costs of \$169,006, and
4 the SFMTA's grant budget includes indirect costs of \$235,889; now, therefore, be it

5 RESOLVED, That the SFMTA and SFPW are eligible to request an allocation of TDA
6 Article 3 funds pursuant to Section 99234 of the Public Utilities Code; and, be it

7 FURTHER RESOLVED, That there is no pending or threatened litigation that might
8 adversely affect the projects and project categories described above, or that might impair the
9 ability of the SFMTA or SFPW to carry out the projects within the project categories; and, be it


10 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the projects and project categories have been reviewed
11 by the Bicycle Advisory Committee of the City and County of San Francisco; and, be it

12 FURTHER RESOLVED, That a certified copy of this resolution and its attachments,
13 and any accompanying supporting materials shall be forwarded to the congestion
14 management agency, countywide transportation planning agency, or county association of
15 governments, as the case may be, of San Francisco for submission to MTC as part of the
16 countywide coordinated TDA Article 3 claim; and, be it

17 FURTHER RESOLVED, That this Board of Supervisors authorizes the SFMTA and
18 SFPW to accept and expend up to \$995,524 in state TDA Article 3 Funds for FY2016-2017 for
19 the projects described above and to execute all required documents for receipt of such funds.


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

Recommended:




Edward D. Reiskin
Director of Transportation, SFMTA

Approved:




Mayor

Recommended:



Mohammed Nuru
Director of Public Works

Approved:



for Controller

File Number: 160514
(Provided by Clerk of Board of Supervisors)

Grant Resolution Information Form
(Effective May 2011)

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

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

1. Grant Title: Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3
2. Department: Municipal Transportation Agency and Public Works
3. Contact Person: Rachel Alonso Telephone: 415.558.4034
4. Grant Approval Status (check one):
 Approved by funding agency Not yet approved
5. Amount of Grant Funding Approved or Applied for: \$995,524 (\$497,762 DPW and \$497,762 SFMTA)
Grant Code: PWMT31/17
- 6a. Matching Funds Required: none
b. Source(s) of matching funds (if applicable):
- 7a. Grant Source Agency: Metropolitan Transportation Commission
b. Grant Pass-Through Agency (if applicable):
8. Proposed Grant Project Summary:

SFMTA: Implementation of bicycle and pedestrian spot improvements along the Vision Zero high injury corridor (HIC) network; Expansion of Bicycle Strategy corridors

DPW: Preliminary engineering (planning and design) of curb ramps for compliance with the Federal Americans with Disabilities Act; Public sidewalk reconstruction and replacement.
9. Grant Project Schedule, as allowed in approval documents, or as proposed:

Start-Date: July 1, 2016 End-Date: June 30, 2019
10. Number of new positions created and funded: none
11. Explain the disposition of employees once the grant ends? N/A
- 12a. Amount budgeted for contractual services: none
b. Will contractual services be put out to bid? N/A

c. If so, will contract services help to further the goals of the Department's Local Business Enterprise (LBE) requirements? N/A

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

13a. Does the budget include indirect costs? Yes (DPW and MTA)

b1. If yes, how much? \$169,006 DPW; \$235,889 MTA

b2. How was the amount calculated? DPW: 15/16 Indirect Cost Plan; MTA: FY2016 Overhead Rate

c. If no, why are indirect costs not included?

Not allowed by granting agency

To maximize use of grant funds on direct services

Other (please explain):

c2. If no indirect costs are included, what would have been the indirect costs?

14. Any other significant grant requirements or comments:

****Disability Access Checklist****

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

Existing Site(s)

Existing Structure(s)

Existing Program(s) or Service(s)

Rehabilitated Site(s)

Rehabilitated Structure(s)

New Program(s) or Service(s)

New Site(s)

New Structure(s)

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

Comments:

Departmental ADA Coordinator or Mayor's Office of Disability Reviewer:

Kevin Jensen

(Name)

ADA/Disability Access Coordinator, SF Public Works

(Title)

Date Reviewed: 4/19/2014


(Signature Required)

Overall Department Head or Designee Approval:

Mohammed Nuru

(Name)

Director, SF Public Works

(Title)

Date Reviewed:

4/19/16 Mohammed Nuru



(Signature Required)

160514

Date: June 26, 2013
W.I.: 1514
Referred By: PAC
Revised: 02/24/16-C

ABSTRACT

Resolution No. 4108, Revised

This resolution establishes policies and procedures for the submission of claims for Article 3 funding for pedestrian and bicycle facilities as required by the Transportation Development Act in Public Utilities Code (PUC) Section 99401.(a). Funding for pedestrian and bicycle projects is established by PUC Section 99233.3.

This resolution supersedes MTC Resolution No. 875, Revised commencing with the FY2014-15 funding cycle.

This resolution was revised on February 24, 2016 to make pedestrian safety education projects eligible for funding, in accordance with recent state law changes.

Further discussion of these procedures and criteria are contained in the Programming and Allocations Summary Sheet dated June 12, 2013 and February 10, 2016.

Date: June 26, 2013
W.I.: 1514
Referred By: PAC

RE: Transportation Development Act, Article 3. Pedestrian and Bicycle Projects.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

RESOLUTION NO. 4108

WHEREAS, the Transportation Development Act (TDA), Public Utilities Code (PUC) Section 99200 et seq., requires the Transportation Planning Agency to adopt rules and regulations delineating procedures for the submission of claims for funding for pedestrian and bicycle facilities (Article 3, PUC Section 99233.3); state criteria by which the claims will be analyzed and evaluated (PUC Section 99401(a); and to prepare a priority list for funding the construction of pedestrian and bicycle facilities (PUC Section 99234(b)); and


WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), as the Transportation Planning Agency for the San Francisco Bay Region, adopted MTC Resolution No. 875 entitled "Transportation Development Act, Article 3, Pedestrian/Bicycle Projects", that delineates procedures and criteria for submission of claims for Article 3 funding for pedestrian and bicycle facilities; and

WHEREAS, MTC desires to update these procedures and criteria commencing with the FY2014-15 funding cycle, now therefore be it

RESOLVED, that MTC adopts its policies and procedures for TDA funding for pedestrian and bicycle facilities described in Attachment A ; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the prior policy governing allocation of funds contained in Resolution No. 875 is superseded by this resolution, effective with the FY 2014-15 funding cycle.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION



Amy Rein Worth, Chair

The above resolution was approved by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission at a regular meeting of the Commission held in Oakland, California, on June 26, 2013.

Date: June 26, 2013
W.I.: 1514
Referred By: PAC
Revised: 02/24/16-C

Attachment A
Resolution No. 4108
Page 1 of 7

TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT, ARTICLE 3,
PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE PROJECTS
Policies and Procedures

Eligible Claimants

The Transportation Development Act (TDA), Public Utilities Code Sections 99233.3 and 99234, makes funds available in the nine-county Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Region for the exclusive use of pedestrian and bicycle projects. MTC makes annual allocations of TDA Article 3 funds to eligible claimants after review of applications submitted by counties or congestion management agencies.

All cities and counties in the nine counties in the MTC region are eligible to claim funds under TDA Article 3. Joint powers agencies composed of cities and/or counties are also eligible provided their JPA agreement allows it to claim TDA funds.

Application

1. Counties or congestion management agencies will be responsible for developing a program of projects not more than annually, which they initiate by contacting the county and all cities and joint powers agencies within their jurisdiction and encouraging submission of project applications.
2. Claimants will send one or more copies of project applications to the county or congestion management agency (see "Priority Setting" below).
3. A project is eligible for funding if:
 - a. The project sponsor submits a resolution of its governing board that addresses the following six points:
 1. There are no legal impediments regarding the project.
 2. Jurisdictional or agency staffing resources are adequate to complete the project.
 3. There is no pending or threatened litigation that might adversely affect the project or the ability of the project sponsor to carry out the project.
 4. Environmental and right-of-way issues have been reviewed and found to be in such a state that fund obligation deadlines will not be jeopardized.
 5. Adequate local funding is available to complete the project.

6. The project has been conceptually reviewed to the point that all contingent issues have been considered.
- b. The funding requested is for one or more of the following purposes:
 1. Construction and/or engineering of a bicycle or pedestrian capital project
 2. Maintenance of a multi-purpose path which is closed to motorized traffic
 3. Bicycle safety education program (no more than 5% of county total).
 4. Development of a comprehensive bicycle or pedestrian facilities plans (allocations to a claimant for this purpose may not be made more than once every five years).
 5. Restriping Class II bicycle lanes.Refer to Appendix A for examples of eligible projects.
- c. The claimant is eligible to claim TDA Article 3 funds under Sections 99233.3 or 99234 of the Public Utilities Code.
- d. If it is a Class I, II or III bikeway project, it must meet the mandatory minimum safety design criteria published in Chapter 1000 of the California Highway Design Manual (Available via Caltrans headquarters' World Wide Web page); or if it is a pedestrian facility, it must meet the mandatory minimum safety design criteria published in Chapter 100 of the California Highway Design Manual (Available via Caltrans headquarters' World Wide Web page).
- e. The project is ready to implement and can be completed within the three year eligibility period.
- f. *If the project includes construction, that it* meets the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA, Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.) and project sponsor submits an environmental document that has been stamped by the County Clerk within the past three years.
- g. A jurisdiction agrees to maintain the facility.
- h. The project is included in a locally approved bicycle, pedestrian, transit, multimodal, complete streets, or other relevant plan.

Priority Setting

1. The county or congestion management agency (CMA) shall establish a process for establishing project priorities in order to prepare an annual list of projects being recommended for funding.
2. Each county and city is required to have a Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) to review and prioritize TDA Article 3 bicycle and pedestrian projects and to participate in the

development and review of comprehensive bicycle plans. BACs should be composed of both bicyclists and pedestrians.

A city BAC shall be composed of at least 3 members who live or work in the city. More members may be added as desired. They will be appointed by the City Council. The City or Town Manager will designate staff to provide administrative and technical support to the Committee.

An agency can apply to MTC for exemption from the city BAC requirement if they can demonstrate that the countywide BAC provides for expanded city representation.

A county BAC shall be composed of at least 5 members who live or work in the county. More members may be added as desired. The County Board of Supervisors or Congestion Management Agency (CMA) will appoint BAC members. The county or congestion management agency executive/administrator will designate staff to provide administration and technical support to the Committee.

3. All proposed projects shall be submitted to the County or congestion management agency for evaluation/prioritization. Consistent with the county process, either the Board of Supervisors or the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) will adopt the countywide list and forward it to MTC for approval.
4. The county or congestion management agency will forward to MTC a copy of the following:
 - a) Applications for the recommended projects, including a governing body resolution, stamped environmental document, and map for each, as well as a cover letter stating the total amount of money being claimed; *and confirmation that each project meets Caltrans' minimum safety design criteria and can be completed before the allocation expires.*
 - b) The complete priority list of projects with an electronic version to facilitate grant processing.
 - c) A Board of Supervisors' or CMA resolution approving the priority list and authorizing the claim.

MTC Staff Evaluation

MTC Staff will review the list of projects submitted by each county. If a recommended project is eligible for funding, falls within the overall TDA Article 3 fund estimate level for that county, and has a completed application, staff will recommend that funds be allocated to the project.

Allocation

The Commission will approve the allocation of funds for the recommended projects. The County Auditor will be notified by allocation instructions to reserve funds for the approved projects. Claimants will be sent copies of the allocation instructions and funds should be invoiced in accordance with the “Disbursement” section below.

Eligible Expenditures

Eligible expenditures may be incurred from the start of the fiscal year of award plus two additional fiscal years. Allocations expire at the end of third fiscal year following allocation. For example, if funds are allocated to a project in October 2014, a claimant may be reimbursed for eligible expenses that were incurred on or after July 1, 2014. The allocation expires on June 30, 2017 and all eligible expenses must be incurred before this date. All disbursement requests should be submitted by August 31, 2017.

Disbursement

1. The claimant shall submit to MTC the following, no later than two months after the grant expiration date:
 - a) A copy of the allocation instructions along with a dated cover letter referring to the project by name, dollar amount and allocation instruction number and the request for a disbursement of funds;
 - b) Documents showing that costs have been incurred during the period of time covered by the allocation.
 - c) With the final invoice, the claimant shall submit a one paragraph summary of work completed with the allocated funds. This information may be included in the cover letter identified in bullet “a” above and is required before final disbursement is made. If the project includes completion of a Class I, II or III bicycle facility, this information should be added to Bikemapper or a request should be made to MTC to add it to Bikemapper.
2. MTC will approve the disbursement and, if the disbursement request was received in a timely fashion and the allocation instruction has not expired, been totally drawn down nor been rescinded, issue an authorization to the County Auditor to disburse funds to the claimant.

Rescissions and Expired Allocations

Funds will be allocated to claimants for specific projects, so transfers of funds to other projects sponsored by the same claimant may not be made. If a claimant has to abandon a project or cannot complete it within the time allowed, it should ask the county or congestion management

agency to request that MTC rescind the allocation. Rescission requests may be submitted to and acted upon by MTC at any time during the year. Rescinded funds will be returned to the county's apportionment.

Allocations that expire without being fully disbursed will be disencumbered in the fiscal year following expiration. The funds will be returned to county's apportionment and will be available for allocation.

Fiscal Audit

All claimants that have received an allocation of TDA funds are required to submit an annual certified fiscal and compliance audit to MTC and to the Secretary of Business and Transportation Agency within 180 days after the close of the fiscal year, in accordance with PUC Section 99245. Article 3 applicants need not file a fiscal audit if TDA funds were not expended (that is, costs incurred) during a given fiscal year. However, the applicant should submit a statement for MTC's records certifying that no TDA funds were expended during the fiscal year. Failure to submit the required audit for any TDA article will preclude MTC from making a new Article 3 allocation. For example, a delinquent Article 4.5 fiscal audit will delay any other TDA allocation to the city/county with an outstanding audit. Until the audit requirement is met, no new Article 3 allocations will be made.

TDA Article 3 funds may be used to pay for the fiscal audit required for this funding.

Appendix A: Examples of Eligible Projects

1. Projects that eliminate or improve an identified problem area (specific safety hazards such as high-traffic narrow roadways or barriers to travel) on routes that would otherwise provide relatively safe and direct bicycle or pedestrian travel use. For example, roadway widening, shoulder paving, restriping or parking removal to provide space for bicycles; a bicycle/pedestrian bridge across a stream or railroad tracks on an otherwise useful route; a segment of multi-purpose path to divert young bicyclists from a high traffic arterial; a multi-purpose path to provide safe access to a school or other activity center; replacement of substandard grates or culverts; adjustment of traffic-actuated signals to make them bicycle sensitive. Projects to improve safety should be based on current traffic safety engineering knowledge.
2. Roadway improvements or construction of a continuous interconnected route to provide reasonably direct access to activity centers (employment, educational, cultural, recreational) where access did not previously exist or was hazardous. For example, development of Multi-purpose paths on continuous rights-of-way with few intersections (such as abandoned railroad rights-of-way) which lead to activity centers; an appropriate combination of Multi-purpose paths, Class II, and Class III bikeways on routes identified as high demand access routes; bicycle route signs or bike lanes on selected routes which receive priority maintenance and cleaning.
3. Secure bicycle parking facilities, especially in high use activity areas, at transit terminals, and at park-and-ride lots. Desirable facilities include lockers, sheltered and guarded check-in areas; self-locking sheltered racks that eliminate the need to carry a chain and racks that accept U-shaped locks.
4. Other provisions that facilitate bicycle/transit trips and walk/transit. For example, bike racks on buses, paratransit/trailer combinations, and bicycle loan or check-in facilities at transit terminals, bus stop improvements, wayfinding signage.
5. Maintenance of multiple purpose pathways that are closed to motorized traffic or for the purposes of restriping Class II bicycle lanes (provided that the total amount for Class II bicycle lane restriping does not exceed twenty percent of the county's total TDA Article 3 allocation).
6. Funds may be used for construction and plans, specification, and estimates (PS&E) phases of work. Project level environmental, planning, and right-of-way phases are not eligible uses of funds.
7. Projects that enhance or encourage bicycle or pedestrian commutes, including Safe Routes to Schools projects.

8. Intersection safety improvements including bulbouts/curb extensions, transit stop extensions, installation of pedestrian countdown or accessible pedestrian signals, or pedestrian signal timing adjustments. Striping high-visibility crosswalks or advanced stop-back lines, where warranted.
9. Purchase and installation of pedestrian traffic control devices, such as High-intensity Activated crossWalk (HAWK) beacons, rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFB), or pedestrian safety “refuge” islands, where warranted.
10. Projects that provide connection to and continuity with longer routes provided by other means or by other jurisdictions to improve regional continuity.
11. The project may be part of a larger roadway improvement project as long as the funds are used only for the bicycle and/or pedestrian component of the larger project.
12. Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Education Programs. Up to five percent of a county's Article 3 fund may be expended to supplement monies from other sources to fund public bicycle and pedestrian safety education programs and staffing.
13. Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Plan. Funds may be allocated for these plans (emphasis should be for accommodation of bicycle and walking commuters rather than recreational uses). A city or county may not receive allocations for these plans more than once every five years. Environmental documentation and approval necessary for plan adoption is an eligible expense.

SAN FRANCISCO
MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

RESOLUTION No. 16-050

WHEREAS, With input from the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition, the Board of Supervisors' Bicycle Advisory Committee, and community groups, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) has identified a need for various bicycle and pedestrian project categories and programs to improve and enhance bicycling and walking as a safe, viable transportation option; and,

WHEREAS, The SFMTA has applied to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for up to \$497,762 in FY 2016/17 Transportation Development Act, Article 3 (TDA) funds for bicycle and pedestrian project categories; and,

WHEREAS, The SFMTA intends to fund the following bicycle and pedestrian project categories (Bicycle and Pedestrian Project Categories) with the FY 2016/17 TDA funds, which projects are described in detail on the TDA Article 3 Project Application Form:

1. Vision Zero Bike and Pedestrian Safety Spot Treatments
2. Bicycle Strategy Corridor Upgrades; and,

WHEREAS, The bicycle and pedestrian projects to be funded by TDA are from a pool of project categories identified in the Capital Improvement Plan approved by the SFMTA Board in May 2014; and,

WHEREAS, The SFMTA will not proceed with any project until there has been complete compliance with CEQA and the City's Environmental Quality Regulations. Specifically, the SFMTA retains the absolute discretion to (1) modify the project to mitigate significant adverse environmental impacts; (2) select feasible alternatives which avoid significant adverse impacts of the project; (3) require the implementation of specific measures to mitigate the significant adverse environmental impacts of the project; (4) reject the project if the economic and social benefits of the project do not outweigh otherwise unavoidable significant adverse environmental impacts; or (5) approve the project upon a finding that the economic and social benefits of the project outweigh otherwise unavoidable significant adverse impacts; and,

WHEREAS, SFMTA will provide California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) determinations for individual bicycle and pedestrian projects as they are approved for implementation in accordance with CEQA and S. F. Administrative Code Chapter 31; and,

WHEREAS, As part of the application for TDA grant funds, MTC requires a resolution adopted by the SFMTA Board stating the following:

1. That the SFMTA will commit adequate staffing resources to complete the bicycle and pedestrian projects within the project categories;

2. A review of the bicycle and pedestrian projects within the project categories has resulted in the consideration of all pertinent matters, including those related to environmental review and right-of-way permits attendant to the successful completion of the project(s);
3. Issues attendant to securing environmental and right-of-way permits and clearances for the bicycle and pedestrian projects have been reviewed and will be concluded in a manner and on a schedule that will not jeopardize the deadline for the use of the TDA funds being requested;
4. That the bicycle and pedestrian projects within the project categories will comply with the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code Sections 21000, *et seq.*);
5. That as portrayed in the budgetary description(s) of the bicycle and pedestrian project categories, the sources of funding other than TDA are assured and adequate for completion of the project(s);
6. That the FY 2016/17 TDA funds will be used for capital construction and/or design engineering of bicycle and pedestrian projects within the project categories;
7. That the bicycle facility projects within the project categories have been included in a detailed bicycle circulation element included in an adopted general plan, or included in an adopted comprehensive bikeway plan (such as outlined in Section 2377 of the California Bikeways Act, Streets and Highways Code section 2370, *et seq.*);
8. That the bicycle and pedestrian projects within the project categories will be ready to commence implementation during the project performance period of the requested allocation and will be completed before the funds expire;
9. That the bicycle and pedestrian projects within the project categories that are bikeways meet mandatory minimum safety design criteria published in Chapter 1000 of the California Highway Design Manual;
10. That the SFMTA agrees to maintain, or provide for the maintenance of, the bicycle and pedestrian facility projects for the benefit of and use by the public; and

WHEREAS, If any of the projects within the project categories and programs do not receive funding, this will not affect SFMTA's other projects and programs; now, therefore, be it,

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board of Directors authorizes the SFMTA, through its Director of Transportation (or his designee), to accept and expend up to \$497,762 in FY 2016/17 Transportation Development Act, Article 3 funds for bicycle and pedestrian project categories, as set forth in the TDA Article 3 Project Application Form; and be it further,

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board of Directors, by adopting this resolution, does affirm that (1) the SFMTA will commit adequate staffing resources to complete the bicycle and pedestrian projects within the project categories; (2) a review of the bicycle and pedestrian projects has resulted in the consideration of all pertinent matters, including those related to environmental and right-of-way permits and clearances, attendant to the successful completion of the project(s); (3) issues attendant to securing environmental and right-of-way permits and clearances for the bicycle and pedestrian projects have been reviewed or will be reviewed and will be concluded in a manner and on a schedule that will not jeopardize the deadline for the use


of the TDA funds being requested; (4) the bicycle and pedestrian projects will comply with the requirements of CEQA, Public Resources Code Sections 21000, *et seq.*); (5) as portrayed in the budgetary description(s) of the bicycle and pedestrian project categories, the sources of funding other than TDA will be assured and adequate for completion of the project(s); (6) the FY 2016/17 TDA Funds will be used for capital construction and/or design engineering of bicycle and pedestrian project categories; (7) the bicycle facility project categories have been included in a detailed bicycle circulation element included in an adopted general plan, or included in an adopted comprehensive bikeway plan (such as outlined in Section 2377 of the California Bikeways Act, Streets and Highways Code section 2370, *et seq.*); (8) the bicycle and pedestrian projects will be ready to commence implementation during the project performance period of the requested allocation and will be completed before the funds expire; (9) that the bicycle and pedestrian projects that are bikeways meet mandatory minimum safety design criteria published in Chapter 1000 of the California Highway Design Manual; and (10) the SFMTA agrees to maintain, or provide for the maintenance of, the bicycle and pedestrian projects for the benefit of and use by the public; and be it further,

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board recommends that the Board of Supervisors approve the acceptance and expenditure of the aforementioned grant funds as part of a countywide application with San Francisco Public Works; and be it further,

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board authorizes the Director of Transportation (or his designee) to execute agreements and provide documents required for receipt of these funds, pending approval of the Board of Supervisors; and be it further,

RESOLVED, That the Director of Transportation (or his designee) shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.

I certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors at its meeting of April 19, 2016.



Secretary to the Board of Directors
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency



San Francisco Bicycle Advisory Committee
City Hall, Room 408
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Resolution in Support of the SFMTA Transportation Development Act Request for FY 2016/17

WHEREAS, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors' Bicycle Advisory Committee supports the SFMTA Bicycle Program's identified needs and priorities for engineering and construction work on various bicycle projects to improve and enhance bicycling as a safe, viable transportation option; and,

WHEREAS, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors' Bicycle Advisory Committee promotes the safe sharing of public roadways; and,

WHEREAS, The Metropolitan Transportation Commission requires that each city and county request for Transportation Development Act Article 3 (TDA3) funds for bicycle network and pedestrian improvements be reviewed and approved by the local Bicycle Advisory Committee; and,

WHEREAS, San Francisco Public Works and SFMTA propose to split the funds available to the City and County of San Francisco in fiscal year 2016-2017 between the two departments, as they have in past years; and,

WHEREAS, The SFMTA plans to submit a claim for \$497,762 in 2016-2017 TDA3 funds to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission for engineering and implementation of various bicycle projects, including bicycle lanes, routes, paths and parking, and,

WHEREAS, Public Works plans to submit a claim for \$248,881 in 2016-2017 TDA3 funds to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission for preliminary engineering and design of curb ramps to be constructed at various locations throughout San Francisco, as required by the federal Americans with Disabilities Act; and,

WHEREAS, Public Works plans to submit a claim for \$248,881 in 2016-2017 TDA3 funds to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission to repair public sidewalks at various locations throughout San Francisco; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, The San Francisco Bicycle Advisory Committee endorses and supports the City and County of San Francisco's 2016-2017 TDA3 claim for these worthwhile needs.

Passed unanimously March 28, 2016

District 1- Vacant, District 2 Winston Parsons (Absent), District 3- Marc Brandt, District 4- Edward Nicholson, (Absent) District 5 –Melyssa Mendoza, District 6- Vacant, District 7- Bert Hill, District 8- Diane Serafini, District 9- Ilyse Magy, District 10- Paul Wells, District 11 -Casey dos Santos-Allen

Signed

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Bert Hill".

Bert Hill, Chair

Attachment A

TDA Article 3 Project Application Form

Fiscal Year of this Claim: 2016/17 Applicant: City and County of San Francisco – SF Municipal Transportation Agency

Contact person: Suzanne Sui Wang, Principal Analyst

Mailing Address: 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 8th FL, San Francisco, CA 94103

E-Mail Address: Suzanne.Wang@sfmta.com Telephone: (415) 701-4541

Secondary Contact (in event primary not available): Derek Bower, Principal Analyst

E-Mail Address: Derek.Bower@sfmta.com Telephone: (415) 579-9737

Short Title Description of Project: Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Project Categories

Amount of claim: \$497,762

Functional Description of Project Categories and Financial Plan:

Short Title	Functional Description	TDA 3.0 Amount	Total Project Cost
Vision Zero Bike and Pedestrian Safety Spot Treatments	This project category would implement 1-3 spot improvements related to bicycle and pedestrian safety on the Vision Zero High Injury Corridors (HIC). The Pedestrian HICs include six percent of streets and intersections that accounted for 60 percent of severe and fatal pedestrian injuries, while the Cyclist HICs include four percent of San Francisco's street miles, and include 60 percent of severe and fatal cyclist injuries and 50% of total cyclist injuries. Improvements could include, but not be limited to: striping and signing changes, signal hardware and/or timing modifications, bulb-outs, flashing or HAWK beacons, safe hit posts, concrete islands, colored markings, bike boxes, bike turn lanes, etc.	\$ 248,881	\$ 248,881
Bicycle Strategy Corridor Improvements	This project category would implement the enhancement of 1-2 existing corridors included in the Bicycle Strategy. Corridors have been identified through analysis of crash data, comfort studies, and community outreach input. Improvements could include, but not be limited to: striping and signing changes, signal hardware or timing modifications, addition/modification of raised elements like safe hit posts and concrete islands, addition of colored markings, bike boxes, bike turn lanes, etc.	\$ 248,881	\$ 248,881
	Total	\$ 497,762	\$ 497,762

Funding Source	All Prior FYs	Application FY	Next FY	Following FYs	Totals
TDA Article 3		\$497,762			\$497,762
list all other sources:					
1.					
2.					
3.					
Totals		\$497,762			\$497,762

Project Eligibility:	YES?/NO?
A. Has the project been approved by the claimant's governing body? (If "NO," provide the approximate date approval is anticipated).	Yes
B. Has this project previously received TDA Article 3 funding? If "YES," provide an explanation on a separate page.	No
C. For "bikeways," does the project meet Caltrans minimum safety design criteria pursuant to Chapter 1000 of the California Highway Design Manual? (Available on the internet via: http://www.dot.ca.gov).	Yes
D. Has the project been reviewed by a Bicycle Advisory Committee? (If "NO," provide an explanation).	Yes
E. Has the public availability of the environmental compliance documentation for the project (pursuant to CEQA) been evidenced by the dated stamping of the document by the county clerk or county recorder? (required only for projects that include construction). **	No
F. Will the project be completed before the allocation expires? Enter the anticipated completion date of project (month and year) <u>June 2018</u>	Yes
G. Have provisions been made by the claimant to maintain the project or facility, or has the claimant arranged for such maintenance by another agency? (If an agency other than the Claimant is to maintain the facility provide its name: _____)	Yes

** (E) SFMTA will provide documentation of CEQA clearance for the bicycle projects as they are approved for implementation. Such documentation will be provided with invoices for project reimbursement. SFMTA will not proceed with any project until there has been complete compliance with CEQA and the City's Environmental Quality Regulations. Specifically, the SFMTA retains the absolute discretion to (1) modify the project to mitigate significant adverse environmental impacts; (2) select feasible alternatives which avoid significant adverse impacts of the project; (3) require the implementation of specific measures to mitigate the significant adverse environmental impacts of the project; (4) reject the project if the economic and social benefits of the project do not outweigh otherwise unavoidable significant adverse environmental impacts; or (5) approve the project upon a finding that the economic and social benefits of the project outweigh otherwise unavoidable significant adverse impacts.

TDA Article 3 Project Application Form

Fiscal Year of this Claim: 2016-17 Applicant: City and County of San Francisco

Contact person: Rachel Alonso

Mailing Address: SF Public Works, 30 Van Ness – 5th floor, San Francisco, CA 94102

E-Mail Address: rachel.alonso@sfdpw.org Telephone: 415.558.4034

Secondary Contact (in event primary not available) Keith DeMartini

E-Mail Address: keith.demartini@sfdpw.org Telephone: 415.554.6230

Short Title Description of Project: Preliminary engineering (planning and design) of curb ramps

Amount of claim: \$248,881

Functional Description of Project:

Preliminary engineering of curb ramps for compliance with the Federal Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Financial Plan: TDA funds will pay for curb ramp program planning and preliminary engineering of curb ramps at various locations throughout the City. Locations will be based on public requests and prioritized by the Public Works Disability Access Coordinator and Mayor's Office of Disability. In 2016-17, TDA Article 3 funds will allow Public Works to design approximately 80 curb ramps and continue the curb ramp planning process. These curb ramps will be constructed in the following fiscal year using grant funds provided through the local sales tax measure.

Project Elements: Preliminary engineering and construction of curb ramps

Funding Source	All Prior FYs	Application FY	Next FY	Following FYs	Totals
TDA Article 3		\$248,881			\$248,881
list all other sources:					
1. Local Sales Tax		\$804,084			\$804,084
2.					
3.					
4.					
Totals		\$1,052,965			\$1,052,965

Project Eligibility:	YES?/NO?
A. Has the project been approved by the claimant's governing body? (If "NO," provide the approximate date approval is anticipated). <u>Anticipated approval date: 5/17/2016</u>	NO
B. Has this project previously received TDA Article 3 funding? If "YES," provide an explanation on a separate page.	NO
C. For "bikeways," does the project meet Caltrans minimum safety design criteria pursuant to Chapter 1000 of the California Highway Design Manual? (Available on the internet via: http://www.dot.ca.gov).	N/A
D. Has the project been reviewed by a Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC)? (If "NO," provide an explanation). Enter date the project was reviewed by the BAC: <u>Anticipated review date: 3/28/2016</u>	NO
E. Has the public availability of the environmental compliance documentation for the project (pursuant to CEQA) been evidenced by the dated stamping of the document by the county clerk or county recorder? (required only for projects that include construction).	YES
F. Will the project be completed before the allocation expires? Enter the anticipated completion date of project (month and year) <u>June 2017</u>	YES
G. Have provisions been made by the claimant to maintain the project or facility, or has the claimant arranged for such maintenance by another agency? (If an agency other than the Claimant is to maintain the facility provide its name: _____)	YES

TDA Article 3 Project Application Form

Fiscal Year of this Claim: 2016-17 Applicant: City and County of San Francisco

Contact person: Rachel Alonso

Mailing Address: SF Public Works, 30 Van Ness- 5th floor, San Francisco, CA 94102

E-Mail Address: rachel.alonso@sfdpw.org Telephone: 415.558.4034

Secondary Contact (in event primary not available) Keith DeMartini

E-Mail Address: keith.demartini@sfdpw.org Telephone: 415.554.6230

Short Title Description of Project: Public sidewalk repair and reconstruction

Amount of claim: \$248,881

Functional Description of Project:

Public sidewalk repair and reconstruction

Financial Plan:

TDA funds will pay for labor and materials for public sidewalk repair and reconstruction.

Project Elements: Public Works' Cement Shop estimates an average cost of \$20 per square foot of sidewalk repair. In 2016-17, TDA Article 3 funds will allow Public Works to repair approximately 12,129 square feet of sidewalk.

Funding Source	All Prior FYs	Application FY	Next FY	Following FYs	Totals
TDA Article 3		\$248,881			\$248,881
list all other sources:					
1. Local Sales Tax		\$537,494			\$537,494
2.					
3.					
4.					
Totals		\$786,375			\$786,375

Project Eligibility:	YES?/NO?
A. Has the project been approved by the claimant's governing body? (If "NO," provide the approximate date approval is anticipated). <u>Anticipated approval date: 5/17/2016</u>	NO
B. Has this project previously received TDA Article 3 funding? If "YES," provide an explanation on a separate page.	NO
C. For "bikeways," does the project meet Caltrans minimum safety design criteria pursuant to Chapter 1000 of the California Highway Design Manual? (Available on the internet via: http://www.dot.ca.gov).	N/A
D. Has the project been reviewed by a Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC)? (If "NO," provide an explanation). Enter date the project was reviewed by the BAC: <u>Anticipated review date: 3/28/2016</u>	YES
E. Has the public availability of the environmental compliance documentation for the project (pursuant to CEQA) been evidenced by the dated stamping of the document by the county clerk or county recorder? (required only for projects that include construction).	YES
F. Will the project be completed before the allocation expires? Enter the anticipated completion date of project (month and year) <u>June 2017</u>	YES
G. Have provisions been made by the claimant to maintain the project or facility, or has the claimant arranged for such maintenance by another agency? (If an agency other than the Claimant is to maintain the facility provide its name: _____)	YES

**Transportation Development Act, Article 3 (TDA) Budget
Public Works Curb Ramp Planning and Design Services
FY 2016-17**

Position	Hourly Rate	Fully Burdened Hourly Rate (including MFB & Overhead)	Hours	Amount
Engineer (5211)	\$ 79.85	\$ 215.93	39.18	\$ 8,460
Associate Engineer (5207)	\$ 59.59	\$ 161.14	236.29	\$ 38,076
Assistant Engineer (5203)	\$ 51.19	\$ 138.42	370.89	\$ 51,338
Junior Engineer (5201)	\$ 45.34	\$ 122.61	252.24	\$ 30,926
Student Intern (5382)	\$ 30.08	\$ 81.35	415.98	\$ 33,842
Civil Engineering Associate I (5364)	\$ 42.36	\$ 114.55	162.00	\$ 18,556
Project Manager I (5502)	\$ 63.91	\$ 172.83	261.08	\$ 45,122
Business Analyst (1052)	\$ 49.37	\$ 133.50	169.00	\$ 22,561
Total IDC			1,907	\$248,881

Note: Hourly rates include fringe benefits and departmental overhead but not COWCAP

**Transportation Development Act, Article 3 (TDA) Budget
Public Works Cement Shop Sidewalk Repair Services
FY 2016-17**

Position	Hourly Rate	Fully Burdened Hourly Rate (including MFB & Overhead)*	Hours	Amount
Cement Finisher Supervisor II (7211)	\$ 54.04	\$ 136.84	15	\$ 2,115
Inspector (3435)	\$ 34.83	\$ 88.19	24	\$ 2,115
Cement Finisher Supervisor I (7227)	\$ 49.35	\$ 124.97	34	\$ 4,231
Cement Mason (7311)	\$ 36.66	\$ 92.84	1,960	\$ 181,932
Truck Driver (7355)	\$ 39.15	\$ 99.14	213	\$ 21,155
Subtotal - DPW Labor				<u>\$ 211,549</u>
Materials - Cement Mix and Lumber				\$ 37,332
Subtotal - Materials				<u>\$ 37,332</u>
Total Cement Shop			2,246	<u>\$ 248,881</u>

Note: Hourly rates include fringe benefits and departmental overhead but not COWCAP



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Address		Block/Lot(s)	
DPW Annual Curb Ramp Program for FY2014-2015		N/A	
Case No.	Permit No.	Plans Dated	
2014-000656ENV		Project description letter dated 10/29/14	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addition/ Alteration	<input type="checkbox"/> Demolition (requires HRER if over 45 years old)	<input type="checkbox"/> New Construction	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Modification (GO TO STEP 7)
Project description for Planning Department approval. Sixty intersections. Involves demolition of sidewalk, curb, gutter and roadway as needed; resetting utility boxes and castings; installation of curb ramps, sidewalk, curb gutter, and roadway; and restriping of crosswalks. Four sites are in Article 11 Conservation Districts and two sites are in Article 10 Historic Districts.			

STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

Note: If neither class applies, an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> is required.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Class 1 – Existing Facilities. Interior and exterior alterations; additions under 10,000 sq. ft.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Class 3 – New Construction/ Conversion of Small Structures. Up to three (3) new single-family residences or six (6) dwelling units in one building; commercial/office structures; utility extensions; change of use under 10,000 sq. ft. if principally permitted or with a CU.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Class 1(c)(2) - existing facilities: work on sidewalks, curbs, and gutters.

STEP 2: CEQA IMPACTS

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

If any box is checked below, an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> is required.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Transportation: Does the project create six (6) or more net new parking spaces or residential units? Does the project have the potential to adversely affect transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle safety (hazards) or the adequacy of nearby transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities?
<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality: Would the project add new sensitive receptors (specifically, schools, day care facilities, hospitals, residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities within an Air Pollution Exposure Zone? Does the project have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g., backup diesel generators, heavy industry, diesel trucks, etc.)? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Air Pollution Exposure Zone)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hazardous Materials: If the project site is located on the Maher map or is suspected of containing hazardous materials (based on a previous use such as gas station, auto repair, dry cleaners, or heavy manufacturing, or a site with underground storage tanks): Would the project involve 50 cubic yards or more of soil disturbance - or a change of use from industrial to residential? If yes, this box must be checked and the project applicant must submit an Environmental Application with a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. <i>Exceptions: do not check box if the applicant presents documentation of enrollment in the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) Maher program, a DPH waiver from the</i>

	<i>Maheer program, or other documentation from Environmental Planning staff that hazardous material effects would be less than significant (refer to EP_ArcMap > Maheer layer).</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Soil Disturbance/Modification: Would the project result in soil disturbance/modification greater than two (2) feet below grade in an archeological sensitive area or eight (8) feet in a non-archeological sensitive area? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Archeological Sensitive Area)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise: Does the project include new noise-sensitive receptors (schools, day care facilities, hospitals, residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities) fronting roadways located in the noise mitigation area? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Noise Mitigation Area)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment: Does the project site involve a subdivision or lot line adjustment on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Slope = or > 20%: Does the project involve excavation of 50 cubic yards of soil or more, square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft., shoring, underpinning, retaining wall work, or grading on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? <i>Exceptions: do not check box for work performed on a previously developed portion of site, stairs, patio, deck, or fence work.</i> (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required and a Certificate or higher level CEQA document required
<input type="checkbox"/>	Seismic: Landslide Zone: Does the project involve excavation of 50 cubic yards of soil or more, square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft., shoring, underpinning, retaining wall work, grading –including excavation and fill on a landslide zone – as identified in the San Francisco General Plan? <i>Exceptions: do not check box for work performed on a previously developed portion of the site, stairs, patio, deck, or fence work.</i> (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required and a Certificate or higher level CEQA document required
<input type="checkbox"/>	Seismic: Liquefaction Zone: Does the project involve excavation of 50 cubic yards of soil or more, square footage expansion greater than 1000 sq ft, shoring, underpinning, retaining wall work, or grading on a lot in a liquefaction zone? <i>Exceptions: do not check box for work performed on a previously developed portion of the site, stairs, patio, deck, or fence work.</i> (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones) If box is checked, a geotechnical report will likely be required
<input type="checkbox"/>	Serpentine Rock: Does the project involve any excavation on a property containing serpentine rock? <i>Exceptions: do not check box for stairs, patio, deck, retaining walls, or fence work.</i> (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Serpentine)
*If no boxes are checked above, GO TO STEP 3. <u>If one or more boxes are checked above, an Environmental Evaluation Application is required, unless reviewed by an Environmental Planner.</u>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project can proceed with categorical exemption review. The project does not trigger any of the CEQA impacts listed above.
Comments and Planner Signature (optional): Jean Poling	

**STEP 3: PROPERTY STATUS – HISTORIC RESOURCE
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING: (refer to Parcel Information Map)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Category A: Known Historical Resource. GO TO STEP 5.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Category B: Potential Historical Resource (over 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 4.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Category C: Not a Historical Resource or Not Age Eligible (under 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 6.

STEP 4: PROPOSED WORK CHECKLIST
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

Check all that apply to the project.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Change of use and new construction. Tenant improvements not included.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Regular maintenance or repair to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Window replacement that meets the Department's Window Replacement Standards. Does not include storefront window alterations.
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Garage work. A new opening that meets the <i>Guidelines for Adding Garages and Curb Cuts</i> , and/or replacement of a garage door in an existing opening that meets the Residential Design Guidelines.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Deck, terrace construction, or fences not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
<input type="checkbox"/>	6. Mechanical equipment installation that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
<input type="checkbox"/>	7. Dormer installation that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under <i>Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows</i> .
<input type="checkbox"/>	8. Addition(s) that are not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way for 150 feet in each direction; does not extend vertically beyond the floor level of the top story of the structure or is only a single story in height; does not have a footprint that is more than 50% larger than that of the original building; and does not cause the removal of architectural significant roofing features.
Note: Project Planner must check box below before proceeding.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project is not listed. GO TO STEP 5.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project does not conform to the scopes of work. GO TO STEP 5.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project involves four or more work descriptions. GO TO STEP 5.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project involves less than four work descriptions. GO TO STEP 6.

STEP 5: CEQA IMPACTS – ADVANCED HISTORICAL REVIEW
TO BE COMPLETED BY PRESERVATION PLANNER

Check all that apply to the project.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Project involves a known historical resource (CEQA Category A) as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Interior alterations to publicly accessible spaces.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Window replacement of original/historic windows that are not "in-kind" but are consistent with existing historic character.
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Façade/storefront alterations that do not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Raising the building in a manner that does not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
<input type="checkbox"/>	6. Restoration based upon documented evidence of a building's historic condition, such as historic photographs, plans, physical evidence, or similar buildings.
<input type="checkbox"/>	7. Addition(s) , including mechanical equipment that are minimally visible from a public right-of-way and meet the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation</i> .

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>8. Other work consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (specify or add comments):</p> <p>Proposed work is limited to public right-of-way (sidewalk and roadway) and will occur at limited number of intersections within each district. The work will not impact historic fabric or character-defining features of the Article 11 (KMMS and NMMS) Conservation Districts or Article 10 (Jackson Sq. and Alamo Sq.) Landmark Districts.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>9. Other work that would not materially impair a historic district (specify or add comments):</p> <p>(Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator) _____</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>10. Reclassification of property status to Category C. (Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator)</p> <p>a. Per HRER dated: _____ (attach HRER)</p> <p>b. Other (specify): _____</p>
<p>Note: If ANY box in STEP 5 above is checked, a Preservation Planner MUST check one box below.</p>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Further environmental review required. Based on the information provided, the project requires an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> to be submitted. GO TO STEP 6.</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Project can proceed with categorical exemption review. The project has been reviewed by the Preservation Planner and can proceed with categorical exemption review. GO TO STEP 6.</p>
<p>Comments (optional):</p>	
<p>Preservation Planner Signature: Pilar LaValley <small>Digitally signed by Pilar LaValley DN: cn=Pilar LaValley, o=City of San Francisco, ou=City Planning, email=p.lavalley@sfgov.org</small></p>	

**STEP 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Further environmental review required. Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either (check all that apply):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Step 2 – CEQA Impacts <input type="checkbox"/> Step 5 – Advanced Historical Review <p>STOP! Must file an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i>.</p>				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>No further environmental review is required. The project is categorically exempt under CEQA.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td> <p>Planner Name:</p> </td> <td> <p>Signature:</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td> <p>Project Approval Action: DPW Order to adv. for bids *If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project.</p> </td> <td> <p>Jean Poling</p> <p><small>Digitally signed by Jean Poling DN: dc=org, dc=sfgov, dc=cityplanning, ou=CityPlanning, ou=Environmental Planning, cn=Jean Poling, email=jeanie.poling@sfgov.org Date: 2015.03.18 16:38:12 -07'00'</small></p> </td> </tr> </table> <p>Once signed or stamped and dated, this document constitutes a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code.</p> <p>In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of an exemption determination can only be filed within 30 days of the project receiving the first approval action.</p>	<p>Planner Name:</p>	<p>Signature:</p>	<p>Project Approval Action: DPW Order to adv. for bids *If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project.</p>	<p>Jean Poling</p> <p><small>Digitally signed by Jean Poling DN: dc=org, dc=sfgov, dc=cityplanning, ou=CityPlanning, ou=Environmental Planning, cn=Jean Poling, email=jeanie.poling@sfgov.org Date: 2015.03.18 16:38:12 -07'00'</small></p>
<p>Planner Name:</p>	<p>Signature:</p>				
<p>Project Approval Action: DPW Order to adv. for bids *If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project.</p>	<p>Jean Poling</p> <p><small>Digitally signed by Jean Poling DN: dc=org, dc=sfgov, dc=cityplanning, ou=CityPlanning, ou=Environmental Planning, cn=Jean Poling, email=jeanie.poling@sfgov.org Date: 2015.03.18 16:38:12 -07'00'</small></p>				

**STEP 7: MODIFICATION OF A CEQA EXEMPT PROJECT
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, when a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exempt project changes after the Approval Action and requires a subsequent approval, the Environmental Review Officer (or his or her designee) must determine whether the proposed change constitutes a substantial modification of that project. This checklist shall be used to determine whether the proposed changes to the approved project would constitute a "substantial modification" and, therefore, be subject to additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Address (If different than front page)		Block/Lot(s) (If different than front page)
Case No.	Previous Building Permit No.	New Building Permit No.
Plans Dated	Previous Approval Action	New Approval Action
Modified Project Description:		


DETERMINATION IF PROJECT CONSTITUTES SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

Compared to the approved project, would the modified project:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Result in expansion of the building envelope, as defined in the Planning Code;
<input type="checkbox"/>	Result in the change of use that would require public notice under Planning Code Sections 311 or 312;
<input type="checkbox"/>	Result in demolition as defined under Planning Code Section 317 or 19005(f)?
<input type="checkbox"/>	Is any information being presented that was not known and could not have been known at the time of the original determination, that shows the originally approved project may no longer qualify for the exemption?

If at least one of the above boxes is checked, further environmental review is required **CATEX FORM**

DETERMINATION OF NO SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposed modification would not result in any of the above changes.
If this box is checked, the proposed modifications are categorically exempt under CEQA, in accordance with prior project approval and no additional environmental review is required. This determination shall be posted on the Planning Department website and office and mailed to the applicant, City approving entities, and anyone requesting written notice.	
Planner Name:	Signature or Stamp:



Edwin M. Lee
Mayor

Mohammed Nuru
Director

Patrick Rivera
Manager

Infrastructure Design
and Construction
30 Van Ness Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94102
tel 415-558-4000

sfpublicworks.org
facebook.com/sfpublicworks
twitter.com/sfpublicworks

Date: February 20, 2015
To: Robert Quan
From: Frank Filice, Manager of Regulatory Affairs, IDC *EFF*
Subject: CEQA STATUS – 2035D-9
As-Needed Sidewalk Inspection and Repair Program (SIRP) No. 9

The As-Needed Sidewalk Inspection and Repair Program (SIRP) No. 9 (project) is not an activity subject to further review under the **California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)**.

Project Location: Various Locations, San Francisco, CA

Scope of Work: Scope of work consists of concrete work for the reconstruction of sidewalks, driveways, curbs and curb ramps; replacement of utility boxes and covers; trimming/pruning of trees and hedges and all appurtenant work in accordance with drawings and specifications.

This determination was based on a review of the scope of work submitted and in accordance with guidelines prepared by Planning. Refer to the memorandum "Processing Guidance: Not a project under CEQA" issued by Planning on September 18, 2013. The aforementioned memorandum was prepared as a guide for private projects and will serve as an interim guide for public projects until further notice. The Department of Public Works (DPW) is working with Planning on a similar memo to formalize processing guidance for public projects. Future guidance will include a list of improvements that will not be considered "a project" as defined by the CEQA, Section 21065.

Interim Guidance

Consistent with the 9/18/13 memo, an activity that "may cause either a direct physical change in the environmental or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environmental" is defined as a "project" under CEQA. The key differences between public and private projects are the definition of public space and how Bulletin 16 requirements come into play to assess buildings and interior spaces over 50 years old¹.

Activities that have been deemed as "not a project" by the San Francisco Planning Department include¹:

- Interior renovations of non-public spaces involving no change or expansion of use
- Interior work involving mechanical, electrical, HVAC system repairs and replacements
- Street/sidewalk use and maintenance activities that require administrative actions by DPW
- Exterior in-kind repair or replacement work on portions of an existing structure, involving no expansion of the structure (ie. in-kind repair or replacement of windows, stairs, fences, stucco, siding, roofing, decks, painting)

¹ As outlined in the 9/18/13 memo, activities that involve sites/buildings that are historically significant and/or contribute to the site/building's historic signatures will be reviewed outside the purview of the memo and in accordance with Planning's Bulletin 16.

**Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Programming and Allocations Committee**

February 10, 2016

Commission
Agenda Item 7c

Resolution No. 4220

Subject: Annual Fund Estimate and proposed apportionment and distribution of \$626 million in Transportation Development Act (TDA), State Transit Assistance (STA) Population-Based funds, Assembly Bill 1107 (AB 1107), and transit-related bridge toll funds for FY 2016-17.

Background: The following are highlights of the fund estimate for FY 2016-17:

1. **Economic Overview:** The Bay Area economy continues its robust performance with gains in employment, decreases in unemployment rates, rising real estate values, and continued growth in taxable sales.
2. **Transportation Development Act (TDA):** State law requires county auditors to submit annual estimates of the ¼-cent TDA sales tax revenue generation to MTC by February 1st. A summary of the county auditors' mid-year estimates indicate that regional TDA revenue generation is expected to increase by 6% in FY 2015-16, with an additional increase of 2% in FY 2016-17. However some counties estimate significant decreases. Specific areas of note include:
 - The auditors in Contra Costa and Sonoma counties reduced their revised FY 2015-16 revenue estimates creating a lower base for the FY 2016-17 Fund Estimate.
 - The San Francisco auditor's revised FY 2015-16 forecast is 12% higher than actual TDA revenue for FY 2014-15. While San Francisco is experiencing strong sales tax growth, this level of growth may be optimistic. Staff is advising San Francisco TDA claimants to conservatively claim funds to avoid any possible rescissions.

Despite robust sales tax growth since the Great Recession and that the Bay Area is at all time highs of population and employment, overall sales tax revenue in inflation adjusted terms remains 13% below the "dotcom boom" peak reached in FY 2000-01 and 1% below the pre-recession peak reached in FY 2005-06. The Bay Area's challenge in returning to previous levels of sales tax revenue highlights significant structural changes in the regional economy away from goods (subject to sales tax) towards untaxed services. This structural change is significant as sales tax revenues account for 40% of operating revenues for transit and are the entire underpinning of the county-based self-help funding movement.

3. **AB 1107:** A portion (25%) of BART's half-cent sales tax revenue generated in Alameda, Contra Costa, and San Francisco counties is subject to allocation by MTC, and in turn, MTC staff is responsible for estimating the annual revenue generation. Based on trends in actual revenues, and this fiscal year's second quarter actual receipts, staff recommends increasing the current-year FY 2015-16 estimate from \$77.6 million to \$79.2 million (a 2% increase over actual FY 2014-15 revenues). Staff proposes an additional increase of 2% in FY 2016-17 (\$80.7 million).

Date: February 24, 2016
W.I.: 1511
Referred by: PAC

ABSTRACT

Resolution No. 4220

This resolution approves the FY 2016-17 Fund Estimate, including the distribution and apportionment of Transportation Development Act (TDA), State Transit Assistance (STA), Assembly Bill (AB) 1107 sales tax, and transit-related bridge toll funds.

Further discussion of these actions is contained in the MTC Programming and Allocations Summary Sheet dated February 10, 2016.

Date: February 24, 2016
W.I.: 1511
Referred by: PAC

RE: Determination of Transportation Development Act (TDA) Area Apportionments and Proposed Distribution of Operating Funds for FY 2016-17

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO. 4220

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the regional transportation planning agency for the San Francisco Bay Area pursuant to Government Code Section 66500 *et seq.*; and

WHEREAS, the Transportation Development Act (TDA), Public Utilities Code (PUC) Sections 99200 *et seq.*, provides that funds are made available from the Local Transportation Fund (LTF) for various transportation purposes; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to 21 California Code of Regulations Section 6620, the County Auditor for each of the nine counties in the Bay Area has submitted the revised and new TDA fund estimates for FY 2015-16 and FY 2016-17 as shown in Attachment A to this resolution, attached hereto and incorporated herein as though set forth at length; and

WHEREAS, MTC is required to determine and advise all prospective claimants, prior to March 1 each year, of all area apportionments from the LTF for the following fiscal year pursuant to 21 California Code of Regulations Section 6644; and

WHEREAS, all area apportionments of TDA funds for the 2016-17 fiscal year are shown in Attachment A to this resolution, attached hereto and incorporated herein as though set forth at length; and

WHEREAS, MTC has prepared a proposed distribution of operating assistance funds, including TDA, State Transit Assistance (STA) pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 99310 *et seq.*, the twenty-five percent (25%) of the one-half cent transaction and use tax collected pursuant to PUC Section 29142.2 (AB 1107), and estimates of certain toll bridge revenues (SHC §§ 30910 *et seq.*), in order to provide financial information to all prospective claimants to assist them in developing budgets in a timely manner; and

WHEREAS, the proposed distribution of such operating assistance funds is also shown in Attachment A; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that MTC approves the area apportionments of TDA funds, and the proposed distribution of operating assistance funds for the 2016-17 fiscal year as shown in Attachment A, subject to the conditions noted therein; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that MTC intends to allocate operating assistance funds for the 2016-17 fiscal year, based on the area apportionments of TDA funds, the proposed distribution of operating assistance funds and upon the receipt of appropriate claims from eligible claimants; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that Attachment A may be revised by the MTC Executive Director or his designee to reflect funds returned to the Local Transportation Fund and expired capital allocations or by approval of the MTC Programming and Allocations Committee, except that any significant changes shall be submitted to the full Commission for approval.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Dave Cortese, Chair

The above resolution was approved by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission at a regular meeting of the Commission held in Oakland, California, on February 24, 2016.

**FY 2016-17 FUND ESTIMATE
TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT FUNDS
SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY**

Attachment A
Res No. 4220
Page 6 of 17
2/24/2016

FY2015-16 TDA Revenue Estimate		FY2016-17 TDA Revenue Estimate	
FY2015-16 Generation Estimate Adjustment		FY2016-17 County Auditor's Generation Estimate	
1. Original County Auditor Estimate (Feb, 15)	48,421,155	13. County Auditor Estimate	50,724,425
2. Revised Estimate (Feb, 15)	52,465,784	FY2016-17 Planning and Administration Charges	
3. Revenue Adjustment (Lines 2-1)	4,044,629	14. MTC Administration (0.5% of Line 13)	253,622
FY2015-16 Planning and Administration Charges Adjustment		15. County Administration (0.5% of Line 13)	253,622
4. MTC Administration (0.5% of Line 3)	20,223	16. MTC Planning (3.0% of Line 13)	1,521,733
5. County Administration (Up to 0.5% of Line 3)	20,223	17. Total Charges (Lines 14+15+16)	2,028,977
6. MTC Planning (3.0% of Line 3)	121,339	18. TDA Generations Less Charges (Lines 13-17)	48,695,448
7. Total Charges (Lines 4+5+6)	161,785	FY2016-17 TDA Apportionment By Article	
8. Adjusted Generations Less Charges (Lines 3-7)	3,882,844	19. Article 3.0 (2.0% of Line 18)	973,909
FY2015-16 TDA Adjustment By Article		20. Funds Remaining (Lines 18-19)	47,721,539
9. Article 3 Adjustment (2.0% of line 8)	77,657	21. Article 4.5 (5.0% of Line 20)	2,386,077
10. Funds Remaining (Lines 8-9)	3,805,187	22. TDA Article 4 (Lines 20-21)	45,335,462
11. Article 4.5 Adjustment (5.0% of Line 10)	190,259		
12. Article 4 Adjustment (Lines 10-11)	3,614,928		

TDA APPORTIONMENT BY JURISDICTION

Column	A	B	C=Sum(A:B)	D	E	F	G	H=Sum(C:G)	I	J=Sum(H:I)
Apportionment Jurisdictions	6/30/2015 Balance (w/o interest)	FY2014-15 Interest	6/30/2015 Balance (w/ interest) ¹	FY2014-16 Outstanding Commitments ²	FY2015-16 Transfers/ Refunds	FY2015-16 Original Estimate	FY2015-16 Revenue Adjustment	6/30/2016 Projected Carryover	FY2016-17 Revenue Estimate	FY 2016-17 Available for Allocation
Article 3	730,000	13,007	743,007	(1,656,353)	0	929,686	77,657	93,997	973,909	1,067,906
Article 4.5	(385)	618	233	(2,278,290)	(2,278,290)	2,277,731	190,259	(2,088,357)	2,386,077	297,720
SUBTOTAL	729,615	13,625	743,240	(3,934,643)	(2,278,290)	3,207,417	267,916	(1,994,360)	3,359,986	1,365,626
Article 4										
SFMTA	(4,203)	5,945	1,743	(43,280,753)	2,278,290	43,276,891	3,614,928	5,891,099	45,335,462	51,226,561
SUBTOTAL	(4,203)	5,945	1,743	(43,280,753)	2,278,290	43,276,891	3,614,928	5,891,099	45,335,462	51,226,561
GRAND TOTAL	\$725,412	\$19,571	\$744,983	(\$47,215,396)	\$0	\$46,484,308	\$3,882,844	\$3,896,739	\$48,695,448	\$52,592,187

1. Balance as of 6/30/15 is from MTC FY2014-15 Audit, and it contains both funds available for allocation and funds that have been allocated but not disbursed.

2. The outstanding commitments figure includes all unpaid allocations as of 6/30/15, and FY2015-16 allocations as of 1/31/16.



Edwin M. Lee
Mayor

Mohammed Nuru
Director

San Francisco Public Works
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
Room 348
San Francisco, CA 94102
tel 415-554-6920

sfpublicworks.org
facebook.com/sfpublicworks
twitter.com/sfpublicworks
twitter.com/mrcleansf

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
FROM: *MN* Mohammed Nuru, Director of SF Public Works
DATE: April 21, 2016
SUBJECT: Accept and Expend State Grant
GRANT TITLE: Transportation Development Act, Article 3 (TDA 3)

Attached please find the original and 2 copies of each of the following:

- Proposed grant resolution; original signed by Departments
- Grant information form, including disability checklist
- Draft SFMTA Board of Directors' Resolution for MTA bike projects
- SFMTA Bicycle Advisory Committee Resolution
- Grant applications for three projects: one for SFMTA, two for SFPW
- Grant budgets for SFPW curb ramp and sidewalk repair projects
- CEQA determinations for SFPW
- MTC Resolution 4220 (fund estimate for San Francisco)

Special Timeline Requirements:

Departmental representative to receive a copy of the adopted resolution:

Name: Rachel Alonso (rachel.alonso@sfdpw.org) Phone: 415.558.4034

Interoffice Mail Address: Public Works, 30 Van Ness – 5th floor

Certified copy required Yes No

Transportation Development Act, Article 3 State Grant Funds

Summary

The Municipal Transportation Agency and San Francisco Public Works request authorization to accept and expend \$995,524 in Transportation Development Act, Article 3 (TDA 3) state funds available for County bicycle and pedestrian projects. SFMTA will use \$497,762 for Vision Zero bicycle and pedestrian safety spot treatments and Bicycle Strategy corridor improvements. Public Works will use \$497,762 for planning and design of curb ramps, as well as sidewalk repair at various sites throughout the City.

Background

The TDA of 1971 earmarked $\frac{1}{4}$ percent of the general state sales tax for transit and created a Local Transportation Fund (LTF) in each county to receive the funds. The State Board of Equalization returns the general sales tax revenues to each county's Local Transportation Fund according to the sales tax collected in each county.

Article 3 of the TDA apportions 2% of the $\frac{1}{4}$ cent sales tax for the purpose of funding bicycle facility, education and safety projects as well as pedestrian, street, and road development projects. The funds are allocated by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) annually and disbursed under TDA Article 3 to the nine Bay Area counties. The grant does not have a matching fund requirement.

In FY 16-17, San Francisco will allocate \$995,524, including MTC's FY 16-17 revenue estimate of \$973,909 and \$21,614 (23%) of the projected adjustments and carryforwards. SFMTA and Public Works will split the 16-17 allocation equally. We are not allocating the full estimate in order to heed the warning MTC issued in Resolution 4220B "to conservatively claim funds to avoid any possible rescissions" because the auditor's "level of growth may be optimistic." If the adjustment is fully realized by MTC, San Francisco can allocate the excess funds in 17-18.

Project Selection

MTA proposes to use:

- \$248,881 to implement 1-3 spot improvements related to bicycle and pedestrian safety on the Vision Zero High Injury Corridors (HIC). The HICs were identified primarily through the crash analysis, bike strategy, and requests from stakeholders. Improvements could include but are

not limited to: striping and signage changes, signal hardware and/or timing modifications, bulb-outs, flashing or HAWK beacons, safe hit posts, concrete islands, colored markings, bike boxes, bike turn lanes, et cetera.

- \$248,881 to implement the enhancement of 1-2 existing corridors included in the Bicycle Strategy. Corridors have been identified through analysis of crash data, comfort studies, and community outreach input. Improvements could include but are not limited to: striping and signage changes, signal hardware or timing modifications, addition/modification of raised elements like safe hit posts and concrete islands, addition of colored markings, bike boxes, bike turn lanes etc

Public Works proposes to use:

- \$248,881 to repair public sidewalks at various locations in San Francisco. Sites for repair will be selected from SFPW's list of public requests and prioritized based on condition of sidewalk, extent of damage, level of pedestrian use, accidents, and complaints.
- \$248,881 for preliminary engineering (planning and design) of curb ramps at various sites throughout the City. Locations will be selected from a list developed by Public Works and the Mayor's Office of Disability (MOD). The city prioritizes curb ramp locations using guidelines established under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and the City's ADA Transition Plan for curb ramps and sidewalks. The top priorities are locations that residents with disabilities have identified as ramps they need in order to safely get to transit stops, civic buildings, and to and from work. Additionally, Public Works prioritizes public requests from areas with higher populations of people with disabilities and low numbers of usable curb ramps.

For questions, please contact Rachel Alonso, SF Public Works Transportation Finance Analyst, at 415.558.4034.

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ed Reiskin, Executive Director, Municipal Transportation Agency
Mohammed Nuru, Director, Public Works
Bert Hill, Bicycle Advisory Committee

FROM: Erica Major, Assistant Clerk, Government Audit and Oversight Committee,
Board of Supervisors

DATE: May 17, 2016

SUBJECT: LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

The Board of Supervisors' Government Audit and Oversight Committee has received the following proposed legislation, introduced by Mayor Lee on May 10, 2016:

File No. 160514

Resolution authorizing the acceptance and expenditure of a State Transportation Development Act, Article 3, Pedestrian and Bicycle Project grant, in the amount of \$995,524 including \$497,762 for Public Works and \$497,762 for the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, for a three-year period of July 1, 2016, through June 30, 2019.

If you have any additional comments or reports to be included with the file, please forward them to me at the Board of Supervisors, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102.

c:
Janet Martinsen, Municipal Transportation Agency
Kate Breen, Municipal Transportation Agency
Dillon Auyoung, Municipal Transportation Agency
Louis Liss, Municipal Transportation Agency
Frank Lee, Public Works
Fuad Sweiss, Public Works

COB, GAO, Leg
Dep

Member, Board of Supervisors
District 3



City and County of San Francisco

AARON PESKIN

DATE:	July 15, 2016	2016 JUL 15 AM 11:21 SEAL OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
TO:	Angela Calvillo Clerk of the Board of Supervisors	
FROM:	Supervisor Aaron Peskin Chairperson <i>AP</i>	
RE:	Government Audit and Oversight Committee COMMITTEE REPORTS	

Pursuant to Board Rule 4.20, as Chair of the Government Audit and Oversight Committee, I have deemed the following matters are of an urgent nature and request they be considered by the full Board on July 26, 2016, as Committee Reports:

160422 Fire, Housing, Building Codes - Fire Safety Requirements for Existing Buildings

Ordinance amending the Fire Code and the Housing Code to require building owners provide tenants with an annual written notice of smoke alarm requirements and require building owners file a statement of compliance with annual fire alarm testing and inspection requirements every two years; amending the Fire Code and Building Code to require building owners to upgrade existing fire alarm systems by July 1, 2021, or upon completion of \$50,000 or more of construction work, whichever occurs earlier; amending the Building Code to require owners of Apartment Houses damaged by fire to submit an Action Plan to the City within 30 days of the fire and requiring owners of buildings in Group R occupancies with six or more units to install fire blocks in open accessible attic when performing \$50,000 or more of construction work; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings under the California Health and Safety Code; and directing the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors to forward this ordinance to the California Building Standards Commission upon final passage as required by State law.

160514 Accept and Expend Grant - State Transportation Development Act, Article 3 - Pedestrian and Bicycle Projects - \$995,524

Resolution authorizing the acceptance and expenditure of a State Transportation Development Act, Article 3, Pedestrian and Bicycle Project grant, in the amount of \$995,524 including \$497,762 for Public Works and \$497,762 for the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, for a three-year period of July 1, 2016, through June 30, 2019.

160661 Settlement of Lawsuit - Wayne Kappelman - \$176,275

Ordinance authorizing settlement of the lawsuit filed by Wayne Kappelman against the City and County of San Francisco for \$176,275; the lawsuit was filed on September 2, 2014, in United States District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 14-CV-04434 MEJ; entitled Wayne Kappelman v. City and County of San Francisco; the lawsuit involves an employment dispute.

160703 Settlement of Lawsuit - Muaadh Alawadhi and Suad Mahyoub - \$156,250

Ordinance authorizing settlement of the lawsuit filed by Muaadh Alawadhi and Suad Mahyoub against the City and County of San Francisco for \$156,250; the lawsuit was filed on January 7, 2015, in San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CGC-15-543559; entitled Muaadh Alawadhi, et al. v. City and County of San Francisco, et al.; the lawsuit involves alleged medical negligence; other material terms of the settlement are co-defendant Regents of the University of California to pay \$156,250.

160704 Settlement of Lawsuit - Ricardo Palikiko-Garcia, Stanley Harris, and Keith Dwayne Richardson - \$90,000

Ordinance authorizing settlement of the lawsuit filed by Ricardo Palikiko-Garcia, Stanley Harris, and Keith Dwayne Richardson against the City and County of San Francisco for \$90,000; the lawsuit was filed on March 16, 2016, in United States District Court for the Northern District of California, Case No. C16-1305 JCS; entitled Ricardo Palikiko-Garcia, et al. v. City and County of San Francisco, et al.; the lawsuit involves allegations of excessive force, cruel and unusual punishment, and egregious government conduct.

160705 Settlement of Lawsuit - Blue Cross of California and Anthem Blue Cross Life and Health Insurance Company - City to Receive \$6,250,000 and Future Payments

Ordinance authorizing settlement of the lawsuit filed by the City Attorney, acting on behalf of the People of the State of California, against Blue Cross of California dba Anthem Blue Cross, Anthem Blue Cross Life and Health Insurance Company (collectively, "Blue Cross") and Health Net of California for the payment by Blue Cross of \$6,250,000 in restitution and civil penalties for under-reimbursing Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital and Trauma Center ("ZSFG") for emergency medical care provided to Blue Cross's insureds prior to July 1, 2015, and for the payment of additional amounts for such emergency medical care provided between July 1, 2015, and June 30, 2019; the lawsuit was filed on May 24, 2011, in San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. 11-511181; entitled People of the State of California v. Blue Cross of California, et al.; other material terms of said Settlement are that Blue Cross and the City will enter into a prompt payment agreement under which Blue Cross agrees to pay and ZSFG agrees to accept certain specified rates for treatment provided by ZSFG to Blue Cross's insureds for emergency medical services rendered from July 1, 2015, through at least June 30, 2019.

160706 Settlement of Lawsuit - State Farm General Insurance Company - \$90,000

Ordinance authorizing settlement of the lawsuit filed by State Farm General Insurance Company against the City and County of San Francisco for \$90,000; the lawsuit was filed on February 13, 2014, in San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CGC-14-537478; entitled State Farm General Insurance Company v. City and

County of San Francisco; the lawsuit involves alleged property damage arising From flooding.

160707 Settlement of Lawsuit - Paul Walker - \$80,000

Ordinance authorizing settlement of the lawsuit filed by Paul Walker against the City and County of San Francisco for \$80,000; the lawsuit was filed on November 10, 2015, in United States District Court, Northern District, Case No. CV-15-5129-JCS; entitled Paul Walker v. City and County of San Francisco; the lawsuit involves alleged Americans with Disabilities Act violations.

160708 Settlement of Lawsuit - Mery Perez - \$87,500

Ordinance authorizing settlement of the lawsuit filed by Mery Perez against the City and County of San Francisco for \$87,500; the lawsuit was filed on February 9, 2015, in San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CGC-15-544024; entitled Mery Perez v. City and County of San Francisco; the lawsuit involves a medical malpractice claim; other material terms of the settlement are that co-defendant Dr. Derrick Lung is to pay \$87,500.

**160709 Settlement of Lawsuit - People of the State of California
\$250,000**

Ordinance authorizing settlement of the lawsuit filed by the People of the State of California against the City and County of San Francisco for \$250,000; the lawsuit will be filed in Alameda County Superior Court; and be entitled People of the State of California v. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and the City and County of San Francisco; the lawsuit involves alleged violations of California pollution prevention and hazardous materials laws at Public Utilities Commission facilities near Sunol in Alameda.

**160738 Settlement of Lawsuit - Gary Frank and Debbie Frank -
\$245,000**

Ordinance authorizing settlement of the lawsuit filed by Gary Frank and Debbie Frank against the City and County of San Francisco for \$245,000; the lawsuit was filed on September 16, 2014, in San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CGC-14-541671; entitled Gary Frank and Debbie Frank v. City and County of San Francisco, et al.; the lawsuit involves alleged property damage arising from flooding.

160770 Settlement of Lawsuit - Sadeq Naji - \$30,000

Ordinance authorizing settlement of the lawsuit filed by Sadeq Naji against the City and County of San Francisco for \$30,000; the lawsuit was filed on February 3, 2015, in San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CGC 15-543936; entitled Sadeq Naji v. City and County of San Francisco; San Francisco Public Library; the lawsuit involves an employment dispute.

**160793 Resolution of Intention - Central Market Community Benefit District -
Modify the Management Plan and Engineer's Report**

Resolution declaring the intention of the Board of Supervisors to modify the management district plan and engineer's report for the property-based business improvement district (community benefit district) known as the "Central Market Community Benefit District" to remove the district-wide cap on annual assessment revenues; ordering and setting a time and place for a public hearing

thereon; approving the form of the Notice of Public Hearing and Assessment Ballot Proceeding and Assessment Ballot; and directing the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors to give notice of the public hearing and balloting as required by law.

These matters will be heard in the Government Audit and Oversight Committee on July 21, 2016, at 9:30 a.m.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



EDWIN M. LEE

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
FROM: Mayor Edwin M. Lee
RE: Accept and Expend Grant - State Transportation Development Act, Article
3 - Pedestrian and Bicycle Projects - \$995,524
DATE: May 10, 2016

Attached for introduction to the Board of Supervisors is a resolution authorizing the acceptance and expenditure of State Transportation Development Act, Article 3, Pedestrian and Bicycle Project funding, in the amount of \$995,524, including \$497,762 for Public Works and \$497,762 for the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, for the period of July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2019.

I respectfully request that this item be heard in Government Audit & Oversight Committee on June 2, 2016.

Should you have any questions, please contact Nicole Elliott (415) 554-7940.

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2016 MAY 10 PM 4:27
BY PC