

File No. 201425

Committee Item No. 6

Board Item No. 14

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Budget & Finance Committee

Date February 3, 2021

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date February 9, 2021

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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Introduction Form |
| <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 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"/> | <u>MTAB Resolution No. 200915-078</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>MTC Resolution No. 4402</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>Bicycle Advisory Committee Resolution</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>MTA CEQA Determination</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>Planning Department CEQA Determination</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>_____</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>_____</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>_____</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>_____</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>_____</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>_____</u> |

Completed by: Linda Wong Date January 29, 2021

Completed by: Linda Wong Date _____

1 [Accept and Expend Grant - Retroactive - State Transportation Development Act, Article 3 -
2 Pedestrian and Bicycle Projects - FY2020-2021 - \$1,215,999]

3 **Resolution retroactively authorizing the acceptance and expenditure of State**
4 **Transportation Development Act, Article 3, Pedestrian and Bicycle Project funding for**
5 **Fiscal Year (FY) 2020-2021, in the amount of \$1,215,999 which includes \$607,999 for**
6 **Public Works and \$608,000 for the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, for**
7 **the term of July 1, 2020, through June 30, 2023.**

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

18 WHEREAS, MTC Resolution No. 4108 requires that requests for the allocation of TDA
19 Funds be submitted as part of a single, countywide coordinated claim from each county in the
20 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
23 \$1,215,999 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2020-2021 TDA Funds to support the projects and project
24 categories described below, which are for the exclusive benefit or use of pedestrians or
25 bicyclists; and

1 WHEREAS, The TDA Funds are to be expended from July 1, 2020, through
2 June 30, 2023; and

3 WHEREAS, In its Project Application, the SFMTA seeks \$608,000 of the TDA Funds
4 for Vision Zero Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements; and

5 WHEREAS, On August 20, 2020, the SFMTA, under authority delegated by the
6 Planning Department, determined that acceptance and expenditure of the TDA Funds is not a
7 “project” under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Title 14 of the
8 California Code of Regulations Sections 15060(c) and 15378(b); and

9 WHEREAS, On September 15, 2020, the SFMTA Board of Directors adopted
10 Resolution No. 200915-078, authorizing the Director of Transportation (or his designee) to
11 accept and expend \$608,000 of the TDA Funds for Vision Zero Bicycle and Pedestrian
12 Improvements, as set forth in the Transportation Development Act, Article 3 Project
13 Application; and

14 WHEREAS, SFPW has identified \$304,000 in work for the preliminary engineering and
15 construction of curb ramps to be constructed at various locations throughout San Francisco,
16 as required by the federal Americans with Disabilities Act, to be funded from the TDA Funds;
17 and

18 WHEREAS, SFPW has identified \$303,999 in work to repair damaged public
19 sidewalks, curbs, gutters, and angular returns at various locations throughout San Francisco,
20 to be funded from the TDA Funds; and

21 WHEREAS, SFPW’s actions contemplated in this Resolution are part of the Better
22 Streets Plan (Project), for which the City’s Planning Department issued a Final Amended
23 Programmatic Mitigated Negative Declaration (PMND) on September 17, 2010, under CEQA,
24 finding that the Project could not have a significant effect on the environment; said PMND is
25 incorporated herein by reference; and

1 WHEREAS, As stated in the Opinion of Counsel accompanying this Resolution, the
2 SFMTA and SFPW are not legally impeded from submitting a request to the Metropolitan
3 Transportation Commission for the allocation of TDA Funds, nor are the SFMTA and SFPW
4 legally impeded from undertaking the projects; and

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

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

10 WHEREAS, Issues attendant to securing environmental and right-of-way permits and
11 clearances for the projects have been reviewed and will be concluded in a manner and on a
12 schedule that will not jeopardize the deadline for the use of the TDA Funds being requested;
13 and

14 WHEREAS, The project categories are included in a locally approved bicycle,
15 pedestrian, transit, multimodal, complete streets, capital improvement program, or other
16 relevant plan; and

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

19 WHEREAS, As described in the budgets for the projects, the sources of funding other
20 than TDA Funds are assured and adequate for completion of the projects; and

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

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

25

1 WHEREAS, SFPW's proposed grant budget includes indirect costs of \$229,915, and
2 the SFMTA's proposed grant budget includes indirect costs of \$245,448; and

3 WHEREAS, The projects and project categories have been reviewed by the Bicycle
4 Advisory Committee of the City and County of San Francisco; now, therefore, be it

5 RESOLVED, That this Board of Supervisors authorizes the SFMTA and SFPW to
6 accept and expend up to \$1,215,999 in state TDA Funds for FY2020-2021 for the projects
7 described above and to execute all required documents for receipt of such funds; and, be it

8 FURTHER RESOLVED, That a certified copy of this Resolution and its attachments,
9 and any accompanying supporting materials shall be forwarded to the congestion
10 management agency, countywide transportation planning agency, or county association of
11 governments, as the case may be, of San Francisco for submission to MTC as part of the
12 countywide coordinated Transportation Development Act, Article 3 claim.

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 Recommended:

Approved: /s/ _____

2

Mayor

3

4 /s/ _____

5 Jeffrey Tumlin

6 Director of Transportation, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

7

8 Recommended:

Approved: /s/ _____

9

Controller

10

11 /s/ _____

12 Alaric Degranfinried

13 Acting Director, San Francisco Public Works

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

Start-Date: 07/2020 End-Date: 06/2023

10. a. Amount budgeted for contractual services:

SFMTA: None

SFPW: TBD

b. Will contractual services be put out to bid?

Not Applicable

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

Not Applicable

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

Not Applicable.

11. a. Does the budget include indirect costs?

Yes (SFPW and SFMTA) No

b. 1. If yes, how much?

SFMTA: \$245,448

SFPW: \$229,915

b. 2. How was the amount calculated?

SFMTA: FY 20/21 FTA-approved Provisional Indirect Cost Rates

SFPW: FY20/21 indirect cost plan

c. 1. 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):

c. 2. If no indirect costs are included, what would have been the indirect costs?

Not Applicable

12. Any other significant grant requirements or comments:

Not applicable

****Disability Access Checklist** (Department must forward a copy of all completed Grant Information Forms to the Mayor's Office of Disability)**

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

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Existing Site(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Existing Structure(s) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Existing Program(s) or Service(s) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rehabilitated Site(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Rehabilitated Structure(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> New Program(s) or Service(s) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> New Site(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> New Structure(s) | |

14. 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 disability rights laws and regulations and will allow the full inclusion of persons with disabilities. These requirements include, but are not limited to:

1. Having staff trained in how to provide reasonable modifications in policies, practices and procedures;
2. Having auxiliary aids and services available in a timely manner in order to ensure communication access;
3. Ensuring that any service areas and related facilities open to the public are architecturally accessible and have been inspected and approved by the DPW Access Compliance Officer or the Mayor's Office on Disability Compliance Officers.

If such access would be technically infeasible, this is described in the comments section below:


Comments:

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

Kevin Jensen
(Name)

Disability Access Coordinator
(Title)

Date Reviewed: December 4, 2020



(Signature Required)

Department Head or Designee Approval of Grant Information Form:

Alaric Degrafinried
(Name)

Acting Director, San Francisco Public Works
(Title)

Date Reviewed: 12/6/2020 | 9:37:58 PM PST

DocuSigned by:

(Signature Required)

SAN FRANCISCO
MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

RESOLUTION No. 200915-078

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 improvements to enhance bicycling and walking as safe, viable transportation options; and,

WHEREAS, The SFMTA has applied to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for up to \$608,000 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2021 Transportation Development Act, Article 3 (TDA) funds for Vision Zero Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements, as identified in the SFMTA's Capital Improvement Program; and,

WHEREAS, The Designated Improvements that the SFMTA proposes for funding are listed in the TDA Article 3 project application; and,

WHEREAS, On August 20, 2020, the SFMTA, under authority delegated by the Planning Department, determined that acceptance and expenditure of the TDA Article 3 grant funds is not a "project" under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations Sections 15060(c) and 15378(b); and,

WHEREAS, A copy of the CEQA determination is on file with the Secretary to the SFMTA Board of Directors, and is incorporated herein by reference; 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 Designated Improvements;
2. A review of the Designated Improvements 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 Designated Improvements 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 Designated Improvements 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 Designated Improvements, the sources of funding other than TDA are assured and adequate for completion of the Improvements;
6. That the Fiscal Year 2021 TDA funds will be used for capital construction and/or design engineering of the Designated Improvements;
7. That the Designated Improvements have been included in a detailed bicycle and

- pedestrian element included in an adopted capital improvement program or plan;
8. That the Designated Improvements will be completed before the funds expire;
 9. That the Designated Improvements 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 Designated Improvements 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 the SFMTA's other projects and programs; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board of Directors authorizes the Director of Transportation (or designee), to accept and expend up to \$608,000 in Fiscal Year 2021 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 funds for Vision Zero Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements, 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, affirms that (1) the SFMTA will commit adequate staffing resources to complete the Designated Improvements; (2) a review of the Designated Improvements 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 Improvements; (3) issues attendant to securing environmental and right-of-way permits and clearances for the Designated Improvements 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 Designated Improvements will comply with the requirements of CEQA, Public Resources Code Sections 21000, *et seq.*); (5) as portrayed in the budgetary description(s) of the Designated Improvements, the sources of funding other than TDA will be assured and adequate for completion of the Improvements; (6) the Fiscal Year 2021 TDA Funds will be used for capital construction and/or design engineering of the Designated Improvements; (7) the designated Improvements have been included in a detailed bicycle and pedestrian element of an adopted bicycle and pedestrian program or plan; (8) the Designated Improvements will be completed before the funds expire; (9) that the Designated Improvements 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 Designated Improvements 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 September 15, 2020.

R. Boomer

Secretary to the Board of Directors
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

Resolution No. _____

Attachment B

page _____ of _____

TDA Article 3 Project Application Form

Fiscal Year of this Claim: 2020-21 Applicant: City and County of San Francisco

Contact person: Joel Goldberg, Manager, Programming & Grants

Mailing Address: San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 8th floor, San Francisco, CA 94103

E-Mail Address: Joel.Goldberg@sfmta.com Telephone: 415.646.2520

Secondary Contact (in event primary not available) Eileen Housteau, Principal Analyst

E-Mail Address: eileen.housteau@sfmta.com Telephone: 415.579.9713

Short Title Description of Project: Vision Zero Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements

Amount of claim: \$608,000

Functional Description of Project:

Vision Zero Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements

Financial Plan:

Short Title	TDA 3 Amount	Total Project Cost
Vision Zero Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 608,000	\$ 608,000
Total	\$ 608,000	\$ 608,000

Project Elements: Could include, but are not limited to, striping and signing changes, signal hardware and/or timing modifications, bulb-outs, flashing or High-intensity Activated crossWalk (HAWK) beacons, safe hit posts, concrete islands, colored markings, bike boxes, and bike turn lanes.

Environmental documentation & clearance (as needed).

Funding Source	All Prior FYs	Application FY	Next FY	Following FYs	Totals
TDA Article 3		\$608,000			\$608,000
list all other sources:					
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
Totals		\$608,000			\$608,000

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>The project is in the department's CIP, which was approved on April 21, 2020.</u>	Yes Sept 15, 2020
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 (BAC)? (If "NO," provide an explanation). Enter date the project was reviewed by the BAC. Review date: 08/24/2020	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>Spring 2023</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: <u>SFMTA will maintain capital improvements</u>)	YES

** (E) The 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. 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 impact.

TDA Article 3 Project Application Form

Fiscal Year of this Claim: 2020-21 **Applicant:** City and County of San Francisco

Contact person: Elizabeth Ramos

Mailing Address: San Francisco Public Works, 49 South Van Ness Ave, 16th Fl, San Francisco CA 94103

E-Mail Address: Elizabeth.Ramos@sfdpw.org Telephone:

Secondary Contact (in event primary not available): Oscar Quintanilla

E-Mail Address: Oscar.Quintanilla@sfdpw.org Telephone:

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

Amount of claim: \$304,000

Functional Description of Project:
 Preliminary engineering and construction of curb ramps for compliance with the Federal Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Financial Plan: TDA funds will pay for curb ramp program planning, preliminary engineering, and construction 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.

Project Elements: Preliminary engineering and construction of curb ramps.

Funding Source	All Prior FYs	Application FY	Next FY	Following FYs	Totals
TDA Article 3		\$304,000			\$304,000
list all other sources:					
1. Local Sales Tax		\$1,189,076			\$1,189,076
2.					
3.					
4.					
Totals		\$1,493,076			\$1,493,076

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: 01/29/2021</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>Review date: 08/24/2020</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 2023</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

Resolution No. _____

Attachment B

page _____ of _____

TDA Article 3 Project Application Form

Fiscal Year of this Claim: 2020-21 **Applicant:** City and County of San Francisco

Contact person: Elizabeth Ramos

Mailing Address: San Francisco Public Works, 49 South Van Ness Ave, 16th Fl, San Francisco CA 94103

E-Mail Address: Elizabeth.Ramos@sfdpw.org **Telephone:**

Secondary Contact (in event primary not available): Oscar Quintanilla

E-Mail Address: Oscar.Quintanilla@sfdpw.org **Telephone:**

Short Title Description of Project: Public Sidewalk Repair and Reconstruction

Amount of claim: \$303,999

Functional Description of Project:

Public sidewalk repair and reconstruction.

Financial Plan:

TDA funds will pay for labor and materials to repair damaged public sidewalks, curbs, gutters, and angular returns at various locations throughout San Francisco.

Project Elements: Public Works' Cement Shop estimates an average cost of \$24 per square foot of sidewalk repair. In 2020-21, TDA Article 3 funds will allow Public Works to repair approximately 12,567 square feet of sidewalk.

Funding Source	All Prior FYs	Application FY	Next FY	Following FYs	Totals
TDA Article 3		\$303,999			\$303,999
list all other sources:					
1. Local Sales Tax		\$584,632			\$584,632
2.					
3.					
4.					
Totals		\$888,631			\$888,631

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: 01/29/2021</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>Review date: 08/24/2020</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 2021</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 Ramps Planning, Design, and Construction

Position		Hourly Rate	Fully Burdened Hourly Rate (including MFB & Overhead)	Hours	Amount
5201	Junior Engineer	51.02 \$	152.70	99.54 \$	15,200
5203	Assistant Engineer	57.61 \$	172.42	1,022.62 \$	176,320
5211	Engineer/Architect/Landscape Architect Senior	89.85 \$	268.93	11.30 \$	3,040
5241	Engineer	77.64 \$	232.39	327.04 \$	76,000
5382	Student Design Trainee III, Arch, Engr, & Planning	33.20 \$	99.37	152.97 \$	15,200
5502	Project Manager I	71.92 \$	215.27	56.49 \$	12,160
1822	Administrative Analyst	49.19 \$	147.22	41.30 \$	6,080
<u>Total</u>					<u>\$304,000</u>



Transportation Development Act, Article 3 (TDA) Budget
Public Works Sidewalk Repair and Reconstruction

	Position	Hourly Rate	Fully Burdened Hourly Rate (including MFB, PTO, and Overhead)	Hours	Amount
7211	Cement Finisher Supervisor II	61.51	\$ 169.08	15.28	\$ 2,584
7227	Cement Finisher Supervisor I	58.03	\$ 159.49	32.40	\$ 5,168
7311	Cement Mason	43.14	\$ 118.57	1,895.96	\$ 224,808
7355	Truck Driver	46.05	\$ 126.58	204.14	\$ 25,840
	Materials - Cement Mix and Lumber				45,599
		<u>Total</u>			<u>\$303,999</u>



Transportation Development Act Article 3 Grant Acceptance, Fiscal Year 2021

The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) requests authority to accept and expend up to approximately \$608,000 in Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 grant funds in the Fiscal Year 2021 for various Vision Zero bicycle and pedestrian improvements. The improvements have not yet been identified and as such have no direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical changes to the environment. Any projects that are funded by TDA Article 3 awards that would result in a direct or indirect physical change to the environment will undergo environmental review required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) before a project approval is taken by the SFMTA Board of Directors or any SFMTA official to whom that authority has been delegated by the Board of Directors.

Not a “project” pursuant to CEQA as defined in CEQA Guidelines Sections 15060(c) and 15378(b) because the action would not result in a direct or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change to the environment.

Andrea Contreras

August 20, 2020

Andrea Contreras

Date

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

ABBREVIATED CEQA CHECKLIST

For Better Streets Plan Related Improvement Projects

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Please include the following supporting materials enclosed with this checklist:

1. Project description: **San Francisco Public Works Roadway Resurfacing, As-Needed Sidewalk Repair, and Curb Ramp Programs.** See attached project description
2. **Existing and Proposed** site plans: N/A
3. Site photos: N/A
4. Scope of work for
Air Quality Analysis Tech Memo¹ N/A
5. Green House Gas Emission
Checklist² N/A

I- Basic Project Information		
Project Name:	Roadway Resurfacing, As-Needed Sidewalk Repair, and Curb Ramp Programs	
Responsible Agency:	San Francisco Public Works	Date: 1/30/17
Project Contact: (Address/phone/email)	Oliver Iberien	
Project Location	Throughout San Francisco in the public right-of-way	
Timeline for the proposed project	Through June 2022	
II- Project Characteristics		
Street Type ³ All types	Street Name Multiple streets	⁴From (Cross-street 1) To (Cross-street 2)

¹ Individual projects prepared pursuant to the BSP would be required to undergo a separate environmental review that would consider whether the Proposed Project's location and construction plan could affect nearby sensitive receptors - p. 123 of the BSP's PMND - [Contact EP planner for a copy of scope of work outline].

² Individual streetscape projects would be required to undergo a separate environmental review pursuant to CEQA. The environmental review would include an analysis of the individual project's potential to emit GHGs. p.128 of the BSP's PMND. [Contact EP planner for a copy of GHG Checklist].

³ See Table 1 in PMND and verify final list of street types with the online version of the BSP.

⁴ Street type determines what elements are appropriate for a design element. Different blocks of the same street may be characterized as different street types pursuant to BSP. Therefore, need to provide boundaries for project segments.

III- Project Screening Part 1 (On the table below, please identify BSP's design elements that are part of the proposed project.)

Detailed Design Elements			
Number	Name	Project Element	Requires Subsequent Environmental Review⁵ (EP PLANNER DETERMINATION ONLY)
Standard Improvements			
SI-1	Accessible curb ramps	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SI-2	Marked crosswalks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SI-3	Pedestrian signal timing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SI-4	Curb radii guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SI-5	Corner curb extensions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SI-6	Street trees	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SI-7	Tree basin furnishing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SI-8	Sidewalk planters	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SI-9	Stormwater management tools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SI-10	Street lighting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SI-11	Special paving	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SI-12	Site furnishings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

⁵ Please check analysis in PMND to determine if design element has been cleared under CEQA. For example, as stated in p.89 of the BSP's PMND the implementation of RTOR prohibition at intersections that experience high volumes of right-turning movements (greater than 300 vehicles in the peak hour) or have near-side bus stops would require additional study and environmental review.

Project Screening Part 1 Cont.

Number	Name	Project Element	Requires Subsequent Environmental Review ⁶ (DO NOT FILL IN, THIS SECTION IS FOR EP PLANNER DETERMINATION ONLY)
Case-by-Case Improvements			
CBC-1	High-visibility crosswalk	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CBC-2	Special crosswalk	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CBC-3	Vehicle turning movements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CBC-4	Removal or reduction of permanent crosswalk closures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CBC-5	Mid-block crosswalks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CBC-6	Raised crosswalks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CBC-7	Extended bulb-outs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CBC-8	Mid-block blub-out	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CBC-9	Center or side medians	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CBC-10	Pedestrian refugee islands	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CBC-11	Transit bulb-out	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CBC-12	Transit boarding islands	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CBC-13	Perpendicular or angled parking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CBC-14	Flexible use of parking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CBC-15	Parking lane planters	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CBC-16	Chicanes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

⁶ Please check analysis in PMND to determine if design element has been cleared under CEQA. For example, as stated in p.89 of the BSP's PMND the implementation of RTOR prohibition at intersections that experience high volumes of right-turning movements (greater than 300 vehicles in the peak hour) or have near-side bus stops would require additional study and environmental review.

Project Screening Part 1 Cont.

Number	Name	Project Element	Requires Subsequent Environmental Review⁷ (FOR EP PLANNER DETERMINATION ONLY)
CBC-17	Traffic calming circles	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CBC-18	Roundabouts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CBC-19	Pocket parks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CBC-20	Reuse of 'pork chops'	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CBC-21	Boulevard treatments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CBC-22	Shared public ways	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CBC-23	Pedestrian-only streets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CBC-24	Public stairs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CBC-25	Multi-use paths	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CBC-26	Above-ground landscaping	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other Design Improvements in the Better Streets Plan (BSP) but not identified above			
Design Element Name	BSP Page Number	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(EP PLANNER COMMENTS): Project can proceed with review. No subsequent environmental review is required.			

⁷ Please check analysis in PMND to determine if design element has been cleared under CEQA. For example, as stated in p.89 of the BSP's PMND the implementation of RTOR prohibition at intersections that experience high volumes of right-turning movements (greater than 300 vehicles in the peak hour) or have near-side bus stops would require additional study and environmental review.

Project Screening Part 1 Cont.

III – Identify Storm Water Facilities that are part of the project			
	Yes	No	Requires Subsequent Environmental Review⁸ (FOR EP PLANNER DETERMINATION ONLY)
Permeable Paving	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bioretention Facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Swales	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Infiltration Boardwalks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Infiltration and Soakage Trench	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Channels and Runnels	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vegetated Buffer Strip	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vegetated Gutter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (describe stormwater improvements)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(EP PLANNER COMMENTS): Project can proceed with review. The proposed project does not include any of the items listed above.			

⁸ Please check analysis in PMND to determine if design element has been cleared under CEQA. For example, as stated in p.89 of the BSP's PMND the implementation of RTOR prohibition at intersections that experience high volumes of right-turning movements (greater than 300 vehicles in the peak hour) or have near-side bus stops would require additional study and environmental review.

IV- Project Screening Part 2 (If you answer “YES” to any of the questions listed below, this checklist may not be utilized, and therefore, an Environmental Evaluation application must be filled.

Transportation/Circulation	
Does the project include right turn on red (RTOR) at locations where the peak hour right-turning traffic volume exceeds 300 vehicles per hour; or require any removal of multiple turn lanes; or the bus stop is located in the near side?	Yes___ No_x_
Does the project include removal of crosswalk closures?	Yes___ No_x_
Does the project include mid-block crosswalks on a two-way street where traffic volumes exceed 500 vehicles per hour in either direction during the peak hour?	Yes___ No_x_
Does the project include roundabouts?	Yes___ No_x_
Does the project include pedestrian-only streets on a street where through traffic is greater than 100 vehicles per hour in the peak hour, or there is transit service, or there are driveways or parking garages, or loading activities cannot be accommodated during off-peak hours?	Yes___ No_x_
Does the project include multi-use paths? ⁹	Yes___ No_x_
Does the project include shared public ways on streets with park garages with parking spaces > 100, or through traffic > 100 cars per hours, or transit service?	Yes___ No_x_
V- Project elements that will require Tech Spec Evaluation:¹⁰ (If the project includes any of the elements listed below, the project will require Tech Spec Evaluation).	
Historical/Archeo Resources	
<i>All applications need preliminary review for potential impacts to archeological and historic resources pursuant to EP practice.</i>	
Is the proposed project located within a potential historic district or on a street adjacent to a historic landmark? Please state the name of the historic district or historic landmark: <u>To be determined</u>	Yes_x No_
Does the proposed project involve an identified historic resource among the following: street furniture, light standards, signage, curbs, places, bricks, walls, and other paving materials? Please identify the historic elements that are part of the proposed project: <u>To be determined.</u>	Yes_x No_
Does the proposed project involve removal of trees adjacent to historic resources?	Yes_X No_x_

⁹ The BSP does not provide guidance on the location or design of Multi-use Paths. Therefore, at the time a location for implementation is proposed, it would be subject to site-specific environmental review.

¹⁰ EP NEEDS TO DETERMINE HOW COORDINATION WILL OCCUR

VI- Project Screening Part 3 – Project elements that would require implementation of Mitigation Measures and Monitoring Reports organized by CEQA Topic.

CEQA Topic	Sub-topic	Meet criteria/threshold:¹¹ Yes/No or N/A	Requires mitigation measure: Yes/No	Potential impacts differ from PMND analysis (Y/N). If “Yes” briefly describe on a separate sheet.	Comments and PMND reference page.
Aesthetics					
Does the proposed project involve removal of significant trees? <u>no</u>	Significant trees	N/A			
Does the project involve tree root trimming? <u>yes</u> Is tree root trimming greater than two inches? <u>yes</u>		Yes	Aesthetics Tree Root Protection Mitigation Measure M-AE-1 applies if trimming of roots are greater than two (2) inches in diameter (p.53).		FMND page 53
Historical/Archeological Resources					
Could the project have an effect on individual historic resources or historic districts?	Historic resources	Yes	No; however page 59 of the FMND states :Streetscape improvements in [historic] areas would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis by a preservation technical specialist at the Planning Department		FMND page 59
Does the project require excavation depth greater than two (2) feet? <u>yes</u>	Accidental discovery	Yes	Archeological Accidental Discovery mitigation measure Cul-1 applies to all projects except for those occurs in an area within Hispanic Period Archeological District (p.64).		FMND page 64
Does the project occur in an area within the Hispanic Period Archeological District? ¹² <u>yes</u>	Hispanic Period District	Yes	Archeological Monitoring Hispanic Period mitigation measure Cul-2 applies (p.64).		FMND page 64
Transportation and Circulation					
Does the project include removal of loading spaces? <u>TBD</u>	Loading		Provision of New Loading Space, Mitigation Measure TR-1 (p.78).		
Air Quality					

¹¹ The Project sponsor should discuss with EP planner how to proceed with projects that do not meet the PMND’s thresholds.

¹² **TO BE EVALUATED BY EP PLANNER.** The Spanish Period Map is not available for public review due to the sensitivity of the archeological resources encountered in the area.

	Construction impacts		Dust Control Plan, Mitigation Measure AQ-1 applies to ALL projects (p.120).		Compliance with Dust Control Ordinance supersedes Mitigation Measure AQ-1.
Biological Resources					
Does the project include tree removal? <u>no</u>	Nesting birds	N/A	Nesting Birds Mitigation Measure M-Bio-1 (p.151).		
CEQA Topic	Sub-topic	Meet criteria/threshold: ¹³ Yes/No or N/A	Requires mitigation measure: Yes/No	Potential impacts differ from PMND analysis (Y/N). If “Yes” briefly describe on a separate sheet.	Comments and PMND reference page.
Biological Resources (Cont.)					
What is the expected duration period of construction? <u>TBD</u>	Nesting birds	N/A	Nesting Birds Mitigation Measure M-Bio-1 (p.151).		
Which months would construction occur? <u>TBD</u>	Nesting birds	N/A	Nesting Birds Mitigation Measure M-Bio-1 (p.151).		
Hazardous Materials					
Does the project occur in an area within the Maher-designated area? ¹⁴ <u>Yes</u>	Determination of contaminated soil	N/A	Hazardous Materials Mitigation Measure M-HAZ-1 (p.161).		Maher compliance is mandatory for all SFPW projects
(EP PLANNER COMMENTS): Project can proceed with review. The project sponsor agrees to implement the applicable Mitigation Measures listed above (MM-TR-1).					

Mitigation Measure M-AE-1: Tree Root Protection.

Mitigation Measure Cul-1: Archeological Resources – Accidental Discovery

Mitigation Measure Cul-2: Archeological Monitoring: Hispanic Period Archeological District

Sponsor agrees that projects that could have an effect on historic resources would be reviewed by a preservation technical specialist.

¹³ The Project sponsor should discuss with EP planner how to proceed with projects that do not meet the PMND’s thresholds.

¹⁴ www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/HazWaste/MaherSiteMap.asp



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

This section is to be filled by EP Planner. Use "N/A" next to check boxes for topics that are not applicable to this submittal.

- Project was screened for potential impacts to archeological resources pursuant to EP practice.
- Project was screened by a Tech Spec for potential impacts to historical resources pursuant to EP practice.
- NA Applicable Mitigation Measures are applied to the project.
- NA Green House Gas analysis performed and approved by EP.
- NA Air Quality Memo approved by EP.
- NA The project was reviewed by DPH and DTSC, and a memo of concurrence was submitted to EP (for projects within the Maher Layer only).
- PMND was reviewed and no items were identified that would require subsequent environmental review.

CEQA Determination

- Note to file, contingent upon regulatory agency approval or other information, as follows:
- Note to file (no additional documentation required)
- Addendum
- Supplemental EIR or MND

Notes:

See SFPW directive, which includes agreement to implement mitigation measures and historic resource screening.

EP Signature

Signee: Jeanie Poling

Date:

2/8/17



Edwin M. Lee
Mayor

Mohammed Nuru
Director

John Thomas
Division Manager


Project Management
and Construction

30 Van Ness Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94102
tel 415-558-4000

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

DIRECTIVE

Directive Topic: Roadway Resurfacing, As-Needed Sidewalk Repair, and Curb Ramp Programs

Issued By: John Thomas, Acting City Engineer 

Issue Date: January 30, 2017

Effective Date: February 2017 - June 2022

Affected parties: All Design and Engineering Division Staff

1. Purpose

San Francisco Public Works has responsibility for the City of San Francisco's ("City") approximately 1,260 miles of streets and sidewalks. In order to maintain transportation and pedestrian usability, safety, and access on the City's streets and sidewalks, maintenance and repair must be performed on an ongoing basis. Roadway repair triggers federally mandated upgrades of any sidewalk curb ramps that may be touched by resurfacing to meet current Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA") standards, and installation of new curb ramps. Curb-ramp installation or upgrade is also required under the ADA Transition Plan as a result of citizen requests or as a function of San Francisco Public Works stewardship of the public right-of-way.

This Directive addresses Public Works' Resurfacing and Curb Ramp Programs for roadway resurfacing and curb ramp construction activities. Upon the effective date of this Directive, Public Works staff and their contractors are authorized to carry out the resurfacing and curb ramp programs as described herein during the period from February 2017 to June 2022.

2. Project Description: Public Works Resurfacing and Curb Ramp Programs

The maintenance and repair work described in this Directive will continue a program of construction activities necessary to maintain City streets and sidewalks in good repair and maintain ADA standards for street facilities as required by law. These activities are as follows:

Resurfacing of Existing Streets

Street resurfacing will take place within the existing right-of-way, and is conducted for street segments of varying length. Work packages are typically between approximately 120 and approximately 360 days in duration, with specific construction at locations requiring three to fourteen days of work for preparation, placement, and curing (pending on the type of resurfacing method applied).

Street resurfacing activities range in scale from processes which simply apply a new layer of material to the existing street surface (micro-surfacing) to full rehabilitation of the street section; descriptions of the work are provided below.

Street resurfacing activities range in scale from processes which simply apply a new layer of material to the existing street surface (micro-surfacing) to full rehabilitation of the street section; descriptions of the work are provided below.

- **Surface Sealing:** This is the application of a thin layer of material composed of small rocks, emulsions and additives to the roadway surface; examples of industry-standard surface-seal techniques include micro-surfacing. Before surface sealing a roadway, weeds from cracks are removed, the cracks are sealed, existing pavement markings removed, utility castings protected and the roadway swept. This method is typically performed on streets showing minimal signs of surface distress.
- **Grinding and Paving with Localized Base Repairs:** Street base failures are identified and saw cut in a rectangular fashion, the street dug out to the subgrade, the subgrade compacted, and the new street base placed. The top layer of asphalt is then cold planed (ground down) for the entire roadway and then topped with a new asphalt wearing surface, typically placed by a paving machine. This method is typically performed on streets showing moderate signs of surface distress.
- **Complete Reconstruction:** The entire roadway and roadway base are removed. The subbase is compacted, and a new concrete street base is placed and topped with an asphalt wearing surface. The asphalt wearing surface is typically placed by a paving machine. This method is typically performed on streets showing signs of heavy surface distress.

For all resurfacing methods, utility castings such as manhole covers, catch basins, and similar street iron will be protected and will be adjusted to meet the new resurfaced street surface. The removal of rail lines is not covered by this directive. After resurfacing, pavement markings will be reapplied.

Curb Ramp Installation

Existing curb ramps or existing sidewalk and curbs at street crosswalks will be demolished, and new ADA-compliant curb ramps will be constructed or reconstructed, with new curb, gutter, sidewalk and minimally regraded roadway (to meet ADA requirements for traversability) as needed. Maximum depth of excavation for curb ramps alone is approximately eight inches. In some cases catch basins must be moved short distances horizontally (<10') or vertically (<1'), which also involves adjustment or replacement of the laterals into which they feed. Approximate depth of excavation in these cases is five feet and the maximum depth of excavation is the depth of sewer mains, approximately 12 feet. Work may extend horizontally up to eight feet into the street from the edge of the curb line. Other facilities in the immediate area of curb-ramp work, such as utility vaults, electrical cabinets, etc., may need to be adjusted vertically (< 6") or moved horizontally short distances (< 2'). Maximum depth of excavation for these adjustments is approximately two feet.

Sidewalk Repair

Sidewalk repair is provided through two programs (the As-Needed Sidewalk Inspection and Repair Program (SIRP) and the As-Needed Sidewalk Repair for Accelerated Sidewalk

Abatement Program (ASAP)) on an as-needed, work order basis at various locations throughout the City. Work comprises repair and reconstruction of existing concrete sidewalk, including curbs and curb ramps, to Public Works standard specifications. Work also includes the repair or replacement of small in-sidewalk facilities such as utility-boxes and utility-box covers, and may include tree and hedge trimming in order to facilitate repairs. Maximum depth of soil disturbance for these activities is two feet.

Emergency Subsidewalk Basement Repair

Work at locations where subsidewalk basements have previously been identified is excluded from this directive. Public Works will conduct due-diligence reviews to prevent, to the extent practicable, that any work be done under this directive that impacts subsidewalk basements. These reviews will include:

- Record requests to Department of Building Inspection
- Review of Sanborn maps
- Review of Bureau of Street Use and Mapping mapping, which identifies known subsidewalk basements and suspected-sidewalk basement locations
- Mail distribution of surveys
- Engineering inspection of existing sidewalks for indicators of the presence of subsidewalk basements, which may include vaults, vents, changes in sidewalk grade, light prisms, and elevators

In the event that previously unidentified subsidewalk basements are inadvertently breached during construction, or if it is discovered during the course of construction that a structurally unsafe condition exists under the sidewalk or roadway as a consequence of the presence of subsidewalk basements, this will be repaired and work will proceed to its conclusion. This emergency-repair work will comprise construction of new subsurface structural support for replacement sidewalk and/or roadway surface and repair as needed of the basement ceiling.

Sidewalk Planting Areas/Tree Protection

Installation of curb ramps may require the use of small areas of existing landscaped areas adjacent to the construction area. No trees may be removed under this directive, and no more than the minimum of landscaped area needed to construct an ADA-compliant curb ramp will be used for construction.

If trimming of roots greater than 2-inches in diameter is necessary during the course of construction, a licensed arborist possessing a valid specialty class C61-D49 Contractor's License shall supervise the trimming of such roots. Pruning of trees shall be performed in conformance with the City of San Francisco Pruning Standards for Trees (June 27, 2006) (available at http://sfdpw.org/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/234-SF_Pruning_Std_6.27approved.pdf) and under the supervision of the qualified arborist. This is consistent with Mitigation Measure M-AE-1, Tree Root Protection, of the Better Streets Mitigated Negative Declaration (see Attachment A).

Archaeological Resources

The Accidental Discovery archeological mitigation measure shall apply to any soils disturbing activities below a depth of two (2) feet below grade surface (bgs), except within the Hispanic Period Archeological District (see Attachment B), where the Archeological Monitoring mitigation measure shall apply (see Attachment A).

Historic Resources

Projects shall aim to avoid damaging or the removal of historic or potentially historic sidewalk elements such as brick surfacing, brick gutters, granite curbs, cobblestones and non-standard sidewalk scoring, streetlights, sidewalk lights, sidewalk elevators and chutes, benches, and utility plates. Attachment C identifies Article 10 and 11 landmark and conservation historic districts in San Francisco. For any work in this area involving sidewalk elements such as brick surfacing, brick gutters, granite curbs, cobblestones and non-standard sidewalk scoring, streetlights, sidewalk lights, sidewalk elevators and chutes, benches, and utility plates, the project manager must coordinate with the Design and Engineering Regulatory Affairs Section Manager to submit Attachment D, the Historic Resources Screening Request. For some projects an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness or a Minor Permit to Alter may be required and will be determined as part of the screening process. For those locations, historic materials will either be salvaged and re-installed or replaced in-kind to match the existing color, texture, material, and character of the existing condition. These locations and specific strategies will be determined during the design development phase. For projects in the remaining areas of the City, sidewalk elements such as brick surfacing, brick gutters, granite curbs, cobblestones and non-standard sidewalk scoring, streetlights, sidewalk lights, sidewalk elevators and chutes, benches, and utility plates should be protected from project activities or salvaged and reinstalled. If replacement in kind or removal is required the project manager must coordinate with the Design and Engineering Regulatory Affairs Section Manager to submit Attachment D, the Historic Resources Screening Request. Removal of any features without replacement is explicitly not covered by this directive.

Hazardous Materials

Attachment E identifies areas of known contamination in San Francisco ("Maher Zone"). Any project involving disturbance of 50 cubic yards or more of soil is subject to Health Code Section 22A (the "Maher Ordinance"). See Attachment F, and submit the Maher Ordinance Screening Request to the Public Works Site Assessment & Remediation Regulatory Affairs Manager. Small areas of soil disturbance are associated with each location for curb ramp construction. Areas of temporary excavation will be backfilled with excavated native material. Small amounts of surplus material may be generated by locations where no ramps currently exist. The project will be screened by San Francisco, and construction specifications provided as needed for compliance.

3. Roles & Responsibilities

The responsibility to implement the measures specified by this Directive rests with each Project Manager in the Resurfacing and Curb Ramp Programs. The following Public Works staff have responsibility for ensuring compliance with this Directive:

- The Resurfacing and Curb Ramp Program Managers, the Central Operations Assistant Manager, and Project Managers for the four programs are responsible, through regular coordination with the Design and Engineering Regulatory Affairs Section Manager, for ensuring that current regulatory- and environmental-compliance information necessary for the implementation of Measures is conveyed to Public Works staff.
- The Streets and Highways Section Manager and the Central Operations Manager are responsible for assuring that his or her staff are aware of this Directive and that the final design and construction of all projects addressed by this Directive incorporates the Measures.
- The Design and Engineering Regulatory Affairs Section Manager is responsible for ongoing evaluation of the general work program and task-specific or site-specific conditions to identify applicable regulatory and environmental requirements; and, through the existing Public Works Quality Control/Quality Assurance process, ensure that the Measures are properly incorporated into final designs.

ATTACHMENT A – MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure M-AE-1: Tree Root Protection

If trimming of roots greater than two inches in diameter is necessary during construction of the project, a qualified arborist would be on site during construction to ensure that trimming does not cause an adverse impact to the trees. Pruning would be done using a Vermeer root pruning machine (or equivalent) to sever the uppermost 12 inches of the soil profile. Roots would be pruned approximately 12 to 20 linear inches back (toward tree trunks) from the face of the proposed excavation.

Mitigation Measure Cul-1: Archeological Resources - Accidental Discovery

The following archeological mitigation measure shall apply to any soils disturbing activities resulting from the Proposed Project excepting soils disturbing activities below a depth of two (2) feet below grade surface (bgs) within the Hispanic Period Archeological District. The following mitigation measure is required to avoid any potential adverse effect from the proposed project on accidentally discovered buried or submerged historical resources as defined in *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5(a)(c). The project sponsor shall distribute the Planning Department archeological resource "ALERT" sheet to the project prime contractor; to any project subcontractor (including demolition, excavation, grading, foundation, pile driving, etc. firms); or utilities firm involved in soils disturbing activities within the project site. Prior to any soils disturbing activities being undertaken each contractor is responsible for ensuring that the "ALERT" sheet is circulated to all field personnel including, machine operators, field crew, pile drivers, supervisory personnel, etc. The project sponsor shall provide the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) with a signed affidavit from the responsible parties (prime contractor, subcontractor(s), and utilities firm) to the ERO confirming that all field personnel have received copies of the Alert Sheet. Should any indication of an archeological resource be encountered during any soils disturbing activity of the project, the project Head Foreman and/or project sponsor shall immediately notify the ERO and shall immediately suspend any soils disturbing activities in the vicinity of the discovery until the ERO has determined what additional measures should be undertaken. If the ERO determines that an archeological resource may be present within the project site, the project sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified archeological consultant. The archeological consultant shall advise the ERO as to whether the discovery is an archeological resource, retains sufficient integrity, and is of potential scientific/historical/cultural significance. If an archeological resource is present, the archeological consultant shall identify and evaluate the archeological resource. The archeological consultant shall make a recommendation as to what action, if any, is warranted. Based on this information, the ERO may require, if warranted, specific additional measures to be implemented by the project sponsor. Measures might include: preservation in situ of the archeological resource; an archaeological monitoring program; or an archeological testing program. If an archeological monitoring program or archeological testing program is required, it shall be consistent with the Environmental Planning division guidelines for such programs. The ERO may also require that the project sponsor immediately implement a site security program if the archeological resource is at risk from vandalism, looting, or other damaging actions.

Human Remains, Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects. The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal Laws, including immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, ERO and MLD shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an

agreement for the treatment of, with appropriate dignity, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (CEQA Guidelines. Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, curation, possession, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.

The project archeological consultant shall submit a Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archeological resource and describing the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report.

Copies of the Draft FARR shall be sent to the ERO for review and approval. Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The E division of the Planning Department shall receive three copies of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest or interpretive value, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.

Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Archeological Monitoring: Hispanic Period Archeological District

The following archeological mitigation measure shall apply to any soils disturbing activities below a depth of two (2) feet below grade surface (bgs) resulting from the Proposed Project within the Hispanic Period Archeological District.

Based on the reasonable potential that archeological resources may be present within the project site, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect from the proposed project on buried or submerged historical resources. The project sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified archeological consultant having expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology. The archeological consultant shall undertake an archeological monitoring program. All plans and reports prepared by the consultant as specified herein shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Archeological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the project for up to a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less than significant level potential effects on a significant archeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Sect. 15064.5 (a)(c).

Archeological monitoring program (AMP). The archeological monitoring program shall minimally include the following provisions:

- The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to any project-related soils disturbing activities commencing. The ERO in consultation with the project archeologist shall determine what project activities shall be archeologically monitored. In most cases, any soils disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archeological monitoring because

of the potential risk these activities pose to archaeological resources and to their depositional context;

- The archeological consultant shall advise all project contractors to be on the alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resource(s), of how to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and of the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archeological resource;
- The archaeological monitor(s) shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with the archeological consultant, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archeological deposits;
- The archeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifact actual/ecof actual material as warranted for analysis;
- If an intact archeological deposit is encountered, all soils disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archeological monitor shall be empowered to temporarily redirect demolition/excavation/pile driving/construction crews and heavy equipment until the deposit is evaluated. If in the case of pile driving activity (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile driving activity may affect an archeological resource, the pile driving activity shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of the encountered archeological deposit. The archeological consultant shall, after making a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archeological deposit, present the findings of this assessment to the ERO.

If the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant determines that a significant archeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed project, at the discretion of the project sponsor either:

C) The proposed project shall be re-designed so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archeological resource; or

D) An archeological data recovery program shall be implemented, unless the ERO determines that the archeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible.

If an archeological data recovery program is required by the ERO, the archeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accord with an archeological data recovery plan (ADRP). The project archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP. The archeological consultant shall prepare a draft ADRP that shall be submitted to the ERO for review and approval. The ADRP shall identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information the archeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the ADRP will identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical

property that could be adversely affected by the proposed project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archeological resources if nondestructive methods are practical.

The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:


- *Field Methods and Procedures.* Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations.
- *Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis.* Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis procedures.
- *Discard and Deaccession Policy.* Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies.
- *Interpretive Program.* Consideration of an on-site/off-site public interpretive program during the course of the archeological data recovery program.
- *Security Measures.* Recommended security measures to protect the archeological resource from vandalism, looting, and non-intentionally damaging activities.
- *Final Report.* Description of proposed report format and distribution of results.
- *Curation.* Description of the procedures and recommendations for the curation of any recovered data having potential research value, identification of appropriate curation facilities, and a summary of the accession policies of the curation facilities.

Human Remains, Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects. The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal Laws, including immediate notification of the of the Draft FARR shall be sent to the ERO for review and approval. Once approved by the ERO copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Environmental Planning division of the Planning Department shall receive three copies of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, ERO, and MLD shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of, with appropriate dignity, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (CEQA Guidelines. Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, curation, possession, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.

Final Archeological Resources Report. The archeological consultant shall submit a Draft Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archeological resource and describes the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological testing/monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the draft final report.

Copies of the Draft FARR shall be sent to the ERO for review and approval. Once approved by the ERO copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Environmental Planning division of the Planning Department shall receive three copies of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest or interpretive value, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.

Attachment C - Historic Districts



The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) does not guarantee the accuracy, adequacy, completeness or usefulness of any information. CCSF provides this information on an "as is" basis without warranty of any kind, including but not limited to warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose, and assumes no responsibility for anyone's use of the information.

0 2,200 4,400 8,800 Feet

Attachment D - Historic Resource Screening Request

From San Francisco Public Works to San Francisco Planning Department

Date:

Public Works Project Manager:

Project Name or Address:

PROJECT INFORMATION

Please include the following:

- Detailed plans clearly indicating what is being retained, salvaged and restored, or replaced in kind. Whenever possible, including details showing existing and replacement items.
- Short project description identifying items that are being salvaged and restored, including any information on a salvage plan, and identification of items that are being replaced with detailed description on if they are being replaced in kind or not.
- Identification of known historical resources within or adjacent to project areas.

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT PRESERVATION PLANNER CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Attachment F

Maher Ordinance Screening Request

For a project to which you have been assigned as a Public Works project manager, complete the top of this form and submit to SAR, with plan showing the limits of excavation and of known Maher locations in the work area.

Project Name: _____ JO# _____ Date submitted: _____

Submitted by: _____ Date requested by (minimum of 20 working days): _____

Describe the general project scope, and give details of ground-disturbing activities:

Describe the project location(s). For work in parcels, provide street addresses. For work in the public right-of-way, provide street addresses for the beginning and ends of each street segment in which work will be done:

Estimated volume of excavated native material or earthen fill that the project will generate: yd³ Does the project require a building or grading permit from DBI? Yes No

FOR SITE ASSESSMENT & REMEDIATION USE

SA&R: Complete this section, initial, and forward to Project Manager and Regulatory Affairs Manager:

Date returned to PM: _____ Initial: _____ Date forwarded to RA: _____ Initial: _____

- Project does not meet excavation-volume threshold and/or intersect with a known Maher site. Maher does not apply.
- Project does not require a building or grading permit from the Department of Building Inspection. This includes all projects for the repair and replacement ("R&R") of existing structures in the public right-of-way for end-of-life replacement and/or to address structural inadequacies found during regular inspection. Per Health Code §22A.3 and Building Code §106A.2.4, the Maher Ordinance does not apply.
- Project does not require a building or grading permit and Maher does not apply, but the project will require construction specifications for protection for workers and the public, and for hazardous-materials handling and disposal to meet state and federal regulatory requirements. Please budget an estimated \$_____ for specification development.
- Project requires a building permit and/or grading permit and will bring to the surface 50 or more cubic yards of native material or earthen fill. A Maher application is required. Please budget an initial \$_____ in SFPH fees. We anticipate that the following will also be required:
 - Site history (Phase I ESA).
 - Phase II / Phase II workplan.
 - With site mitigation plan.
 - With site mitigation report/
Environmental inspection.

Recommended by: _____

Signature

Print Name

Date

To complete this form, you will need the following information:

You will need to know that approximate total amount of excavated earth and earthen fill your project will bring to the surface, both permanent excavation and excavation that later will be backfilled. The key to whether or not activities add to your Maher total is whether or not the material brought up is earth or earthen fill -- roadway base, for example, does not count -- and whether or not it is brought to the surface -- pile driving does not count, but the spoils of holes drilled for piles will.

The easiest way to arrive at an approximate total is to classify excavations by type. For example, your project may have 12 pole footings, and two linear trenches. Each footing requires excavation of an area approximately 5' x 5' to a depth of 5'. There are 12 of these, so $5' \times 5' \times 5' \times 12 = 1,500$ ft³. For the trenches, one is 10' deep, 5' wide, and 40' long, and the other is 8' deep, 5' wide, and 20' long. This would be $(10' \times 5' \times 40') + (8' \times 5' \times 20') = 2,800$ ft³. Together, the total excavation for Maher is about 150 yd³, which would go over the 50 yd³ limit that triggers Maher screening.

You'll need to provide a brief description of your project. Provide a general scope of your project (whether it is a streetscape project, a building-rehabilitation project, etc.) and provide details on the construction activities that will disturb the soil. For example, discuss the pole footings and the excavation that will accompany their construction. Provide identifiable project location(s). If your project is on a parcel, give the project address. If the project is in the public right-of-way, give, at a minimum, the street addresses at the beginning and end of each street segment. If the project is on a large public parcel (such as a park/open space), give enough information so that the location can clearly be identified.

You will need to provide mapping of your excavations with the Maher mapping overlain in order to facilitate SAR's presentation of your project information to San Francisco Public Health (SFPH), who oversee Maher compliance. Present the layers of your plans that contain the bulk of your excavation activities, and overlay the Maher Map. Maher mapping in GIS and DWG form can be found on the Public Works GIS server at \\dpwhyd1\boe5m\sfgGeology\MaherSitesAndBlocks. (You may have \\dpwhyd1\boe5m mapped as the K: drive.)

Email this mapping along with the filled-out (top section only) digital version of the PDF form to the Site Assessment and Remediation (SAR) section. SAR will respond (after a minimum of 20 working days) with an assessment of whether or not your project requires further action, and what this action will be.

SAR: Stanley DeSouza <stanley.desouza@sfdpw.org>

Regulatory Affairs: Boris Deunert <boris.deunert@sfdpw.org>



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

PMND Date: September 17, 2010
Case No.: 2007.1238 E
Project Title: **Better Streets Plan Project**
BPA Nos.: NA
Zoning: Various
Block/Lot: Various
Lot Size: Various
Project Sponsor: Adam Varat – San Francisco Planning Department
(415) 558-6405
Lead Agency: San Francisco Planning Department
Staff Contact: Devyani Jain – (415) 575-9051, devyani.jain@sfgov.org
Monica Pereira – (415) 575-9107, monica.pereira@sfgov.org

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

To Interested Parties Regarding the Attached Final Amended Programmatic Mitigated Negative Declaration (PMND):

A Final Mitigated Negative Declaration is being sent to you because you either submitted comments or have expressed an interest in the Better Streets Plan Draft PMND. Where applicable, edits have been incorporated to the PMND. New and revised text is presented as underlined text in the PMND. Deleted texts have been ~~strickedthrough~~. Please note that comments related to the merits of the project and/or to the City's processes are not part of the environmental review under CEQA and therefore not addressed in the PMND.

The preparation or finalization of a Mitigated Negative Declaration does not indicate a decision by the City to approve or to disapprove the proposed project. However, prior to making any such decision, the decision makers must review and consider the information contained in the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

If you have any questions concerning the attached materials or this process, please contact the planner identified as the "Agency Contact Person" on the Preliminary Mitigated Negative Declaration cover page.



DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney

ROBIN M. REITZES
Deputy City Attorney

Direct Dial: (415) 554-4260
Email: robin.reitzes@sfcityatty.org

October 6, 2020

Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Bay Area Metro Center
375 Beale Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94105-2066

Re: Opinion of Counsel
SFMTA and SFPW Request for an Allocation of TDA funds

To Whom It May Concern:

This communication will serve as the requisite opinion of counsel in connection with the Transportation Development Account Article 3 (TDA3) FY20/21 claim for San Francisco Public Works (SFPW) and the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) for design and construction of curb ramps, sidewalk repairs, as well as Vision Zero Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements including, but not limited to, striping and signing changes, signal hardware and/or timing modifications, bulb-outs, flashing or High-intensity Activated crossWalk (HAWK) beacons, safe hit posts, concrete islands, colored markings, bike boxes, and bike turn lanes, as set forth in the TDA Article 3 Project Application Forms.

1. The SFMTA and SFPW are eligible recipients of MTC TDA funds for the projects described above.
2. I have reviewed the pertinent state laws and I am of the opinion that there is no legal impediment to the SFMTA and SFPW making an application for TDA funds for the projects described above, or the ability of the SFMTA and SFPW to carry out such projects.
3. Further, there is no pending or threatened litigation that might in any way adversely affect the proposed project, or the ability of the SFMTA and SFPW to undertake such projects.

Very truly yours,

DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney

Robin Reitzes
Robin M. Reitzes
Deputy City Attorney

October 6, 2020

**FY 2020-21 FUND ESTIMATE
TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT FUNDS
SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY**

Attachment A
Res No. 4402
Page 6 of 20
2/26/2020

FY2019-20 TDA Revenue Estimate			FY2020-21 TDA Revenue Estimate		
FY2019-20 Generation Estimate Adjustment			FY2020-21 County Auditor's Generation Estimate		
1. Original County Auditor Estimate (Feb, 19)	49,262,500		13. County Auditor Estimate	53,477,500	
2. Revised Revenue (Feb, 20)	52,957,500		FY2020-21 Planning and Administration Charges		
3. Revenue Adjustment (Lines 2-1)		3,695,000	14. MTC Administration (0.5% of Line 13)	267,388	
FY2019-20 Planning and Administration Charges Adjustment			15. County Administration (0.5% of Line 13)	267,388	
4. MTC Administration (0.5% of Line 3)	18,475		16. MTC Planning (3.0% of Line 13)	1,604,325	
5. County Administration (Up to 0.5% of Line 3)	18,475		17. Total Charges (Lines 14+15+16)	2,139,101	
6. MTC Planning (3.0% of Line 3)	110,850		18. TDA Generations Less Charges (Lines 13-17)	51,338,399	
7. Total Charges (Lines 4+5+6)		147,800	FY2020-21 TDA Apportionment By Article		
8. Adjusted Generations Less Charges (Lines 3-7)		3,547,200	19. Article 3.0 (2.0% of Line 18)	1,026,768	
FY2019-20 TDA Adjustment By Article			20. Funds Remaining (Lines 18-19)	50,311,631	
9. Article 3 Adjustment (2.0% of line 8)	70,944		21. Article 4.5 (5.0% of Line 20)	2,515,582	
10. Funds Remaining (Lines 8-9)		3,476,256	22. TDA Article 4 (Lines 20-21)	47,796,049	
11. Article 4.5 Adjustment (5.0% of Line 10)	173,813				
12. Article 4 Adjustment (Lines 10-11)		3,302,443			

TDA APPORTIONMENT BY JURISDICTION

Column	A	B	C=Sum(A:B)	D	E	F	G	H=Sum(C:G)	I	J=Sum(H:I)
	6/30/2019	FY2018-19	6/30/2019	FY2018-20	FY2019-20	FY2019-20	FY2019-20	6/30/2020	FY2020-21	FY2020-21
Apportionment Jurisdictions	Balance (w/o interest)	Interest	Balance (w/ interest) ¹	Outstanding Commitments ²	Transfers/ Refunds	Original Estimate	Revenue Adjustment	Projected Carryover	Revenue Estimate	Available for Allocation
Article 3	1,491,449	42,283	1,533,733	(2,361,286)	0	945,840	70,944	189,231	1,026,768	1,215,999
Article 4.5	177,607	1,386	178,993	0	(2,494,916)	2,317,308	173,813	175,198	2,515,582	2,690,780
SUBTOTAL	1,669,056	43,669	1,712,726	(2,361,286)	(2,494,916)	3,263,148	244,757	364,429	3,542,350	3,906,779
Article 4										
SFMTA	3,374,551	26,357	3,400,908	(49,898,323)	2,494,916	44,028,851	3,302,443	3,328,795	47,796,049	51,124,844
SUBTOTAL	3,374,551	26,357	3,400,908	(49,898,323)	2,494,916	44,028,851	3,302,443	3,328,795	47,796,049	51,124,844
GRAND TOTAL	\$5,043,607	\$70,027	\$5,113,634	(\$52,259,609)	\$0	\$47,291,999	\$3,547,200	\$3,693,224	\$51,338,399	\$55,031,623

1. Balance as of 6/30/19 is from the MTC FY2018-19 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 6/30/19, and FY2019-20 allocations as of 1/31/20.



San Francisco Bicycle Advisory Committee

City Hall, Room 408

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

San Francisco, CA 94102

Resolution in Support of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Transportation Development Act Article 3 Request for FY2020-21:

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 FY20-21 between the two departments, as they have in past years; and,

WHEREAS, The SFMTA plans to submit a claim for up to \$608,000 in FY20-21 TDA3 funds to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission for engineering and implementation of various Vision Zero Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements,

WHEREAS, Public Works plans to submit a claim for \$304,000 in FY20-21 TDA3 funds to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission for preliminary engineering and construction 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 \$303,999 in FY20-21 TDA3 funds to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission to repair damaged public sidewalks, curbs, gutters, and angular returns 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 FY20-21 TDA3 claim for these worthwhile needs.

District 1: Kristin Tieche - Aye
District 2: Open
District 3: Marc Brandt - Absent
District 4: Anne Brask - Aye
District 5: Melyssa Mendoza - Aye
District 6: Mary Kay Chin - Absent
District 7: Bert Hill - Aye
District 8: Diane Serafini - Aye
District 9: Kisai Henriquez - Absent
District 10: Paul Wells - Aye
District 11: Jeffrey Taliaferro - Aye

Signed Bert Hill

Date: 8/24/2020

Bert Hill, Chair