

File No. 100010

Committee Item No. 3

Board Item No. 31

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Land Use and Economic Development Date February 8, 2010

Board of Supervisors Meeting Date February 23, 2010

Cmte Board

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

OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____

Completed by: Alisa Somera Date February 4, 2010

Completed by: Alisa Somera Date February 10, 2010

An asterisked item represents the cover sheet to a document that exceeds 25 pages.
The complete document can be found in the file and the online version.

10

(

(

(

1 [Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment]

2
3 **Resolution supporting the findings of the California Statewide Local Streets and Roads**
4 **Needs Assessment.**

5
6 WHEREAS, Cities and counties own and operate over 81% of the roads in California,
7 where every trip begins and ends, and the local system is critical for safety and mobility of the
8 traveling public, farm to market needs, multimodal needs, and commerce; and

9 WHEREAS, The local street and road system provides a two-fold opportunity for
10 economic recovery during the worst fiscal crisis in California in decades. The maintenance
11 and preservation of the local transportation network provides both public and private sector
12 jobs and thus supports economic recovery in every corner of the state. Furthermore, well
13 maintained infrastructure is critical for economic development by attracting businesses and
14 providing for the safe and efficient movement of both people and goods; and

15 WHEREAS, While federal and state governments regularly assess their transportation
16 system needs, no such data existed for the local component of the State's transportation
17 network; and

18 WHEREAS, The California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment
19 provides critical analysis and information on the local transportation network's condition and
20 funding needs; and

21 WHEREAS, The study surveyed all of California's 58 counties and 478 cities in 2007-
22 08, resulting in data that represents 93% of local street and road miles in the state; and

23 WHEREAS, The results show that California's local streets and roads are on a path of
24 significant decline. On a scale of zero (failed) to 100 (excellent), the statewide average
25 pavement condition index (PCI) is 68, placing it in the "at risk category"; and

1 WHEREAS, If current funding remains the same, the statewide condition is projected to
2 deteriorate to a PCI of 58 in 10 years, and further to 48 ("poor" category) by 2033; and

3 WHEREAS, The City and County of San Francisco has a PCI of 63; and

4 WHEREAS, Ongoing road maintenance is a significant public safety concern. Fatality
5 rates on county roads already exceed those of the State's freeway system. Maintaining the
6 paved road network (potholes filling, sealing, overlays, etc.), traffic signals, signs, and street
7 lights has a direct correlation to improving public safety thus reducing traffic accidents, injuries
8 and deaths; and

9 WHEREAS, To spend the taxpayer's money cost-effectively, preserving and
10 maintaining the local system in good condition, or at a level of best management practices, is
11 less costly in the long term; and

12 WHEREAS, In order to bring the local system back into a cost-effective condition,
13 thereby preserving the public's \$271 billion pavement investment and stopping further costly
14 deterioration, at least \$7 billion annually in new money going directly to cities and counties
15 over a period of ten years is needed to stop the further decline and deterioration of our streets
16 and roads; and

17 WHEREAS, The City and County of San Francisco has a funding shortfall of \$504
18 million over the next ten years, which is needed to improve the PCI score to 70; and

19 WHEREAS, The City and County of San Francisco has a deferred maintenance
20 backlog of \$477 million; now, therefore, be it

21 RESOLVED, That this Board of Supervisors supports the findings of the California
22 Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment; and be it

23 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Clerk of the Board shall send this resolution with an
24 accompanying letter from the Chair of the Board of Supervisors to the Governor and each
25 legislator, expressing vehement opposition to future cuts to vital transportation funding such

1 as Proposition 42 and the Highway User Tax Account (HUTA) and strong support for
2 adequate and stable funding sources for local street and road maintenance and rehabilitation;
3 and be it

4 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the City and County of San Francisco strongly urges the
5 state to identify sufficient and stable funding sources for local street and road maintenance
6 and rehabilitation.

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

