
LAW OFFICES OF
JAMES BIRKELUND

548 MARKET STREET, SUITE 11200
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
TEL: 415-602-6223; FAX: 415-789-4556
JAMES@BIRKELUNDLAW.COM

May 14, 2014

President and Board of Supervisors
c/o Ms. Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Email: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Notice and Letter of Appeal of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's Decision to Revoke Enforcement of Sunday Meters (Resolution No. 14-061)

Dear President Chiu and Board of Supervisors:

On behalf of Livable City, the San Francisco Transit Riders Union, and Mario Tanev (collectively, Appellants), this is a Notice and Letter of Appeal of all motions, resolutions, findings, and other actions by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) to eliminate enforcement of parking meters on Sundays between the hours of 12 p.m. and 6 p.m. (the Decision), as set forth in Resolution No. 14-061.

The enforcement of parking meters on Sunday in San Francisco has been doing exactly what it was designed to: reduce traffic congestion, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, increase parking availability (including in commercial areas), and increase revenues for the City and County of San Francisco (City). Yet SFMTA is proposing *without any meaningful analysis* to stop enforcing this policy even though it provides benefits to the City and local neighborhood communities. By taking away these benefits, the Decision also increases automobile traffic in direct contradiction to the City's Transit-First Policy, and, notably, on Sundays, a day when pedestrians and families spend significant time outdoors walking and traversing the streets to enjoy City events.

SFMTA specifically failed to analyze and consider the traffic and environmental impacts of its Decision as required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Cal. Pub. Res. Code (PRC) § 21000, *et seq.* CEQA is designed to inform decision-makers and the public about potential, significant environmental effects of the Decision. 14 Cal. Code of Reg. (CCR) § 15002(a)(1). Here, the public and decision-makers were not fully informed as to the impacts of the Decision – in fact they were given almost no information at all – and the purpose of CEQA was thwarted.

Notice and Letter of Appeal
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
May 14, 2014

These comments are prepared with the assistance of a technical expert, Robert M. Shanteau, PhD, PE. The comments of this expert and his curriculum vitae are appended hereto as Exhibit A. Please note that these expert comments supplement the issues addressed below and should be addressed and responded to separately.

This Notice and Letter of Appeal is filed pursuant to CEQA, Public Resources Code sections 21000, *et. seq.*, and San Francisco Administrative Code section 31.16. Grounds for appeal lie in the SFMTA's violations of CEQA and such other laws that may apply. Enclosed is a check for \$534; a copy of the Planning Commission's concurrence of a CEQA exemption, dated April 11, 2014, which is also being appealed (attached as Exhibit B); and a true and correct copy of Resolution 14-061 (attached as Exhibit C). *See* Admin. Code Section 31.16(b)(1) (requirements for CEQA appeals).

Requested Action: Appellants respectfully request that the Board of Supervisors reverse SFMTA's decision to eliminate enforcement of parking meters on Sunday and direct SFMTA to fully comply with CEQA and engage in an environmental analysis prior to considering further action on this matter.

I. PARTIES

Livable City is a non-profit organization with a mission to create a balanced transportation system and promote complementary land use that supports a safer, healthier and more accessible San Francisco for everyone. Among Livable City's goals are to promote policies that shift travel from automobiles to more appropriate means and improve the pedestrian environment. Both of these goals are frustrated by the SFMTA's Decision to stop enforcing metered parking.

San Francisco Transit Riders Union (SFTRU) is a rider-based, grassroots organization working to improve transit in San Francisco. SFTRU fights for an excellent, affordable, and growing public transit system because it is essential to the character and soul of San Francisco. SFTRU is concerned with the negative impacts to the City transit system of SFMTA's decision to stop enforcing metered parking on Sundays, including increased traffic congestion which directly impacts and slows Muni and other transport modes, endangers pedestrian and bicyclist safety and puts Muni at risk of service cuts and fare increases due to the loss of revenue. SFTRU believes the Decision is a step backwards in developing a progressive transit system.

Mario Tanev is a San Francisco resident who is directly affected by the Decision. Mr. Tanev is concerned that discontinuation of metered parking on Sundays will increase traffic congestion in the City to the detriment of all residents and have other negative impacts, such as impeding Muni and other transport modes, endangering pedestrian and bicyclist safety, and causing Muni to increase fares or cut services to make up for lost revenue.

II. BACKGROUND

On January 6, 2013, SFMTA began operating parking meters throughout the City from 12-6 p.m. on Sundays with four-hour time limits. Traffic justifications for this decision were and remain persuasive. Before 2013, Sunday parking meter hours in San Francisco had remained basically the same since 1947, when most businesses weren't open on Sundays or after 6 p.m. and the demand for parking was low. The action to enforce metered parking on Sundays was a progressive transit decision that helped alleviate traffic congestion, increased revenue for the City, improved the environment by reducing greenhouse gas emissions, improved pedestrian and bicyclist safety, and, overall, offered a net benefit to the City.

By SFMTA's own assessment, in its study an "Evaluation of Sunday Parking Management," dated December 10, 2013, all of the expected benefits from enforcing metered parking on Sundays – for example, increasing parking availability, increasing pedestrian and bicyclist safety, reducing traffic circling, and reducing climate change emissions – have proven true. *See Exhibit A*, pp. 1-2. These benefits are not only important and wide-ranging but also serve to promote the City's long-standing Transit-First Policy. In short, *there are very persuasive reasons to continue enforcing metered parking on Sundays*.

Nonetheless, on April 15, 2014, the SFMTA Board voted in favor of eliminating the enforcement of parking meters on Sundays without any meaningful discussion of the reasons for reversing its 2013 policy or, as discussed below, without the required analysis under CEQA.

III. THE DECISION PLAINLY VIOLATES CEQA

CEQA embodies our state's policy that "the long term protection of the environment ... shall be the guiding criterion in public decisions." PRC § 21001(d). CEQA requires "governmental agencies at all levels" to document and consider the environmental implications of their actions. *See* PRC §§ 21000-21003. Based on years of judicial decisions, the goal of CEQA is irrefutably clear: "The foremost principle under CEQA is that the Legislature intended the Act 'to be interpreted in such manner as to afford the fullest possible protection to the environment within the reasonable scope of the statutory language.'" *Laurel Heights Improvement Ass. v. Regents*, (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 390 (citations omitted). In addition to this overarching goal of CEQA, there is another important purpose of CEQA: "to provide public agencies and the public in general with detailed information about the effect which a proposed project is likely to have on the environment." PRC § 21061; *see also* PRC § 21002.1.

CEQA identifies certain classes of projects or decisions that are exempt from the provisions of CEQA. These are called statutory exemptions. 14 CCR §§ 15268, *et seq.* But "[e]xemptions to CEQA are narrowly construed and "[e]xemption categories are not to be expanded beyond the reasonable scope of their statutory language.'" *Mountain Lion Foundation v. Fish & Game Com.* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 105, 125. The decision to invoke statutory exemptions

Notice and Letter of Appeal
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
May 14, 2014

must be based on substantial evidence in the record. In this case, the Planning Commission concurred with SFMTA's conclusion in Resolution 14-061 that the CEQA statutory exemption for "Rates, Tolls, Fares and Charges" applied to certain budgetary decisions. *See Exhibit B*; PRC §21080(b)(8); 14 CCR §15273.

However, the Rates, Tolls, Fees and Charges exemption being relied on here is a strict and unique exemption. In addition to the general rules that require exemptions (statutory and categorical) to be narrowly construed, the limited applicability of this particular exemption is underscored by specificity requirements that require express written findings be made by the agency applying the exemption. PRC § 21080(b)(8). As the CEQA guidelines instruct, "[t]he public agency shall incorporate written findings in the record of any proceeding in which an exemption under this section is claimed setting forth with specificity the basis for the claim of exemption." 14 CCR § 15723(c). The requirement of specific findings justifying a claim of exemption for Rates, Tolls, Fares and Charges is an unusual requirement not included in the other statutory exemptions. These findings are ordinarily not required when an agency determines that a project is statutorily exempt.

A. As a Matter of Law, SFMTA's Findings Fail to Meet the Specificity Requirements of the CEQA Exemption for Rates, Tolls, Fees and Charges

The City is not specific in its CEQA findings. SFMTA generically found that Resolution No. 14-061 is exempt from CEQA review pursuant to the "Rates, Tolls, Fees and Charges" CEQA exemption, set forth at 14 Cal. Code Regs. §15723. *See Exhibit C*, p. 3 (SFMTA's asserted exemption from CEQA).

When a project is found to be exempt under this specific section, the agency must incorporate written findings in the record of any proceeding in which this exemption is claimed, setting forth with specificity the basis for the claim of exemption. PRC §21080(b)(8); 14 CCR §15273. Here, SFMTA clearly violated this legal requirement by failing to make *any* mandatory findings setting forth with specificity the basis of this claimed exemption as it relates to the Decision. Our expert, Robert Shanteau, reviewed the record and found absolutely no evidence of specific findings that might justify a CEQA exemption or that otherwise explain the impacts of eliminating enforcement of metered parking on Sundays. *Exhibit A*, pp. 2-3.

The resolution also identifies the SFMTA actions that are purportedly exempt from CEQA as being listed on a referenced "Attachment A." *See Exhibit C*, p. 3. But there is no evidence that Attachment A includes or references the Decision on metered parking. It appears, therefore, that SFMTA did not apply any CEQA analysis (under an exemption or otherwise) to examine the Decision. At best, the City made a statutory claim for the entire budget without addressing anything in specificity.

Under no reasonable interpretation of the Rates, Tolls, Fees and Charges exemption could merely citing the statutory language without explaining the connection with the Decision or complying with the requirement for specific findings be sufficient to fulfill the mandates of CEQA. *See, e.g., Bus Riders Union v. Los Angeles County Metro. Transp. Agency* (2009) 179 CA4th 101, 107. The City here has expanded the statutory exemption far beyond any reasonable interpretation of its scope.

B. The Decision to Eliminate Metered Parking Is Not for Any Purpose that Qualifies for an Exemption under CEQA

The Rates, Tolls, Fees and Charges exemption is plainly intended to exempt only certain classes of actions. Specifically, the exemption only applies to decisions with the purpose of (A) meeting operating expenses, including employee wage rates and fringe benefits, (B) purchasing or leasing supplies, equipment, or materials, (C) meeting financial reserve needs and requirements, (D) obtaining funds for capital projects necessary to maintain service within existing service areas, or (E) obtaining funds necessary to maintain those intracity transfers as are authorized by city charter. PRC § 20180(b)(8); 14 CCR § 15723; *see also Great Oaks Water Co. v. Santa Clara Valley Water Dist.* (2009) 170 CA4th 956, 969.

Robert Shanteau, our expert, has reviewed the record and determined that there are no evidentiary findings to support a showing that one of these five purposes apply to the Decision. Exhibit A, p. 3. There's no evidence that the Decision is designed to increase revenues to meet operating expenses or otherwise falls under one of the enumerated purposes for the exemption. And this is not a decision driven by budgetary concerns. The simple truth is that the proposal to stop enforcing metered parking was ultimately driven to appease drivers that disliked paying for parking on Sundays.¹ Appeasing drivers is not a valid purpose for a CEQA statutory exemption.

C. The Decision Will Have Environmental Impacts That Must Be Examined Under CEQA

The crux of CEQA is that an agency must provide the public with information regarding its decision-making. *See* PRC §§ 21000-21003. SFMTA, the agency charged with great responsibilities to advance and maintain transit in the City, should openly reveal the impacts of its important decisions. There has never been any CEQA analysis of the enforcement of parking meters on Sunday and the potential impacts of stopping this practice. The District's failure to comply with the informational requirements of CEQA before making the Decision is an abuse of discretion. *See, e.g., Gentry v Murrieta*, (1995) 36 Cal. App. 4th 1359, 1407 (failure to develop pertinent facts in the record).

¹ According to Mayor Edward Lee, "[r]epealing Sunday parking meters is about making San Francisco a little more affordable for our families and residents on Sunday, plain and simple." *See Sunday Meters Junked under New SFMTA Budget*, SFBay Media Associates, <http://sfbay.ca/2014/04/16/sfmta-repeals-sunday-parking-enforcement-in-two-year-budget/#ixzz31dVhmQVc>.

Robert Shanteau, our expert, has identified a number of negative environmental impacts that would result from eliminating metered parking on Sundays. Exhibit A, pp. 1-2. Most notably, all of the positive environmental benefits identified in SFMTA's "Evaluation of Sunday Parking Management," dated December 10, 2013, would be lost. *Id.* SFMTA by its own analysis concurs that there will be secondary impacts created by the parking shortage including: impacts on air quality, transit/traffic, and pedestrian safety from "excess driving." *Id.* The Decision will increase the chances that cars will circle, thereby delaying Muni buses and other transport modes and endangering pedestrians and bicyclists. *Id.* The Decision will result in loss of revenue, putting Muni at risk of service cuts and fare increases. *Id.* To comply with CEQA, all of these impacts need to be fully examined in any future environmental determination.

IV. THE DECISION VIOLATES THE CITY'S GENERAL PLAN AND CHARTER

SFMTA's Decision also contravenes and is inconsistent with numerous policies and objectives set forth in the City's General Plan and Charter. The Decision violates the City's long-standing Transit-First Policy and, among other things, the following policies in the General Plan:

- **Policy 1.2** to "[e]nsure the safety and comfort of pedestrians throughout the city" and to give priority to pedestrian safety where conflicts exist with other modes of transportation. Contrary to this policy, the Decision gives priority to *drivers* not pedestrians and in doing so compromises pedestrian safety.
- **Policy 19.2** to "[p]romote increased traffic safety, with special attention to hazards that could cause personal injury," including injuries to pedestrians and bicyclists. Contrary to this policy, the Decision creates excessive driving and thereby increases the risk of personal injury to both pedestrians and bicyclists.

The Decision further contravenes the mandates that govern SFMTA in the City Charter, including:

- **Section 8A.103(c)** that sets "minimum standards for on-time performance and service" by Muni and requires that "at least 85 percent of [Muni] vehicles must run on-time." SFMTA has never achieved or gotten close to these standards of performance, and ceasing Sunday meter enforcement will only exacerbate this problem by increasing traffic circling and reducing SFMTA service reliability.
- **Section 8A.103(f)** that (1) requires SFMTA to issue periodic Climate Action Plans describing "measures taken and progress made toward the goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions from San Francisco's transportation sector to 80% of 1990 levels by 2012," (2) promotes the goal of "reducing private vehicle trips

within the City,” and (3) requires “increasing the use of bicycling and walking as alternate forms of transportation.” The Decision will frustrate all three of these goals by increasing private vehicle traffic (with congestion and circling) at the expense of other forms of transit.

- **Section 8A.113(a)** that, among other things, requires SFMTA to manage parking and traffic so as to: “[p]rovide priority to transit services in the utilization of streets;” “enhance alternative forms of transit, such as pedestrian, bicycle, and pooled or group transit;” give “the highest priority to public safety and to impacts on public transit, pedestrians, commercial delivery vehicles, and bicycles;” and “[e]nsure that parking policies and facilities contribute to the long term financial health of the Agency.” The Decision runs counter to all of these policies by creating excess driving instead of giving the highest priority to public safety and other forms of transit.
- **Section 8A.115**, under the Transit-First Policy, that, among other things, requires SFMTA to make decisions that prioritize, encourage, and protect the use of right of ways by pedestrians, bicyclists, and public transit. In contradiction to this policy, the Decision prioritizes the use of right of ways to serve drivers that don’t want to pay for metered parking.

Finally, the Decision runs afoul of SFMTA’s own implementing document to reduce climate change, as set forth in the “2011 Climate Action Strategy for San Francisco’s Transportation System.” See <http://archives.sfmta.com/cms/cmta/documents/4-19-11item13CAS-citywide.pdf>. By increasing traffic and greenhouse gases, the Decision is a step in the wrong direction away from SFMTA’s own calls to reduce climate change.

Simply put, by discontinuing metered parking on Sunday, the City is simultaneously making transit less attractive by increasing the perception that parking is cheaper (even though it will be scarcer) while increasing the chances that cars will circle, delaying Muni buses and other transport modes, endangering pedestrians and bicyclists, and putting Muni at risk of service cuts. As such, the Decision and its impacts are in direct conflict with the goals and policies of the General Plan, SF City Charter, and SFMTA’s implementing document for climate action.

V. SUPPLEMENTING THE RECORD

Appellants reserve the right to submit additional written and oral comments, and additional evidence in support of this Appeal, to the City and its departments and to the Board of Supervisors, up to and including the final hearing on this Appeal and any and all subsequent permitting proceedings or approvals undertaken by the City or any other permitting agency for the Decision. PRC § 21177(a); *Bakersfield Citizens for Local Control v. Bakersfield* (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 1184, 1199-1203; Admin Code § 31.16(b)(4)-(6).


Notice and Letter of Appeal
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
May 14, 2014

VI. CONCLUSION

Transit decisions should avoid stepping backwards in time and creating overall negative impacts to the community. Appellants are not convinced that the decision to revoke metered parking on Sundays is being thoughtfully made in a transit-friendly manner. At the very least, the City must analyze and fully consider the impacts of this Decision as required under CEQA.

Thank you for accepting this Appeal. Please notify us of the date of the hearing and all other actions on this Appeal and on the Decision.

Sincerely,



James M. Birkelund

Enclosures

Cc: Sarah B. Jones, Environmental Review Officer (sarah.b.jones@sfgov.org)
John.Avalos@sfgov.org
London.Breed@sfgov.org
David.Campos@sfgov.org
David.Chiu@sfgov.org
Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org
Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org
Jane.Kim@sfgov.org
Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org
Katy.Tang@sfgov.org
Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org
Norman.Yee@sfgov.org

EXHIBIT A

Robert M. Shanteau, Ph.D., P.E.
Registered Traffic Engineer
13 Primrose Circle
Seaside, CA 93955
(831) 394-9420
email: RShant@gmail.com

May 13, 2014

James Birkelund, Attorney at Law
548 Market St, #11200
San Francisco, CA 94104

By email to <james@birkelundlaw.com>

Subject: Review of SFMTA Resolution 14-061
Eliminating enforcement of metered parking on Sundays

Dear Mr. Birkelund:

At your request, I reviewed SFMTA Resolution 14-0161 dated April 15, 2014, relative to eliminating enforcement of metered parking on Sundays. The purpose of this letter is twofold:

1. To provide an analysis of potential impacts of the decision to eliminate enforcement of Sunday metering parking; and
2. To provide technical review of the decision from a CEQA compliance perspective.

In summary, (1) the action envisioned in the Resolution will have multiple negative environmental impacts and impede traffic, and it will reverse the environmental benefits identified in SFMTA's *Evaluation of Sunday Parking Management* dated December 10, 2013; (2) the Resolution does not "incorporate written findings in the record of any proceeding in which an exemption under this paragraph is claimed setting forth with specificity the basis for the claim of exemption" as required for changes in rates to be statutorily exempt from CEQA by Public Resources Code 21080(b)(8); and (3) the changes in rates are not for the purpose of "(A) meeting operating expenses, including employee wage rates and fringe benefits, (B) purchasing or leasing supplies, equipment, or materials, (C) meeting financial reserve needs and requirements, (D) obtaining funds for capital projects necessary to maintain service within existing service areas, or (E) obtaining funds necessary to maintain those intracity transfers as are authorized by city charter" as required for changes in rates to be statutorily exempt from CEQA by Public Resources Code 21080(b)(8).

1. Eliminating enforcement of metered parking on Sundays will reverse the environmental benefits identified in SFMTA's own report

SFMTA's *Evaluation of Sunday Parking Management* dated December 10, 2013, identifies these positive environmental impacts of enforcing metered parking on Sundays that started on January 6, 2013:

- Between 2012 and 2013, the average parking availability on Sunday doubled during metered hours, increasing from 15% to 31%.
- Prior to metering on Sundays, half of all cars parked for less than three hours, while half

stayed for three or more hours. After metering on Sundays, 76% of cars stayed for up to three hours (with 50% staying for less than one hour), and less than one quarter of all cars parked stayed for three or more hours.

- Sunday meters both made it easier to find an on-street space and encouraged more drivers to go directly to a garage rather than circle for free on-street parking: garage occupancy on Sundays from 12pm to 6pm increased by 13%.
- Prior to metering on Sundays, data indicate that drivers would circle for an average of over four minutes to find a parking space. After metering on Sundays, the average search time in the same areas was reduced to under two minutes.
- The reduction in circling time improves the experience of driving to visit these areas, and also reduces both congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.
- The variability of parking search time, or how consistent or predictable the parking experience is, also improved. The amount of time a driver reasonably should budget to find a parking space (measured by the 95th percentile) decreased from about 14 minutes in 2012 to about four minutes in 2013.
- Increased net revenue to help pay for Muni. Parking provides one source of SFMTA's revenue, helping to pay for the services SFMTA provides, such as Muni service on Sundays. After taking account of ongoing costs, operating meters on Sundays generated \$3,143,000 in FY2013 (January 1 through June 30) and \$1,869,000 in the first three months of FY2014 (July 1 through September 30).

The proposed action to eliminate enforcement of metered parking on Sunday is not a favorable policy for motorists, bicyclists, pedestrians and transit users as a whole because it will cause harm to the environment and to the welfare of the City by undoing the benefits listed above.

In particular, the proposed action will cause additional congestion that directly impacts and slows Muni and other transport modes, endangers pedestrian and bicyclist safety. Furthermore, the loss of revenue would put Muni at risk of service cuts and fare increases.

Besides, by their very nature changes in parking meter enforcement will be unpopular to some citizens even though the net benefit may be positive. If the City changed its mind on parking meters rates or enforcement every time some group of citizens complained, it would be constantly reversing itself. Such reversals are clearly not in the public interest.

If the City and County believes that the elimination of enforcement of metered parking on Sundays would be a net benefit to the environment, then preparation of a new report documenting those positive impacts would need to be prepared.

2. The Resolution does not incorporate written findings as required by Public Resources Code 21080(b)(8)

In order for changes in rates to be statutorily exempt from CEQA, Public Resources Code 21080(8)(b) requires that a public agency "incorporate written findings in the record of any proceeding in which an exemption under this paragraph is claimed setting forth with specificity the basis for the claim of exemption." Neither the Resolution nor any other document related to the

May 13, 2014

Robert M Shanteau, PhD, PE

Eliminating enforcement of metered parking on Sundays

3

elimination of enforcement of metered parking on Sundays incorporates such findings.

3. The elimination of enforcement of Sunday metered parking is not for one of the purposes in Public Resources Code 21080(b)(8)

Changes in rates are only statutorily exempt if they are for one of the purposes listed in Public Resources Code 21080(b)(8). These purposes are

- (A) Meeting operating expenses, including employee wage rates and fringe benefits;
- (B) Purchasing or leasing supplies, equipment, or materials;
- (C) Meeting financial reserve needs and requirements;
- (D) Obtaining funds for capital projects necessary to maintain service within existing service areas;
or
- (E) Obtaining funds necessary to maintain those intracity transfers as are authorized by city charter.

Without specific findings, it is impossible to know exactly what the purpose is of the proposed elimination of enforcement of metered parking on Sundays. Nevertheless, in his State of the City Address, Mayor Edward Lee stated that the actual purpose for eliminating enforcement of metered parking on Sundays is that "Nobody likes it. Not parents. Not our neighborhood small businesses. Not me." That a fare increase is unpopular among certain segments of the public or City leaders is not one of the purposes for which a change in fares is statutorily exempt from CEQA.

Sincerely,



Robert M. Shanteau

enclosures: 1. Curriculum Vitae of Robert M Shanteau, PhD., PE
2. Pages 1-6, *SFMTA Resolution 14-0161* dated April 15, 2014
3. SFMTA's *Evaluation of Sunday Parking Management* dated December 10, 2013
4. Mayor Lee's *2014 State of the City Address*, available at <http://sfmayor.org/index.aspx?page=983>

ENCLOSURE 1

Curriculum Vitae of Robert M Shanteau, PhD., PE

Robert M. Shanteau, Ph.D., P.E.
13 Primrose Circle Voice: (831) 394-9420
Seaside, CA 93955-4133 FAX: (831) 394-6045
email: rmshant@gmail.com

CURRICULUM VITAE

EDUCATION:

Ph.D. Transportation Engineering, University of California at Berkeley, 1980
M.S. Transportation Engineering, University of California at Berkeley, 1976
B.S. Physics, San Jose State University, 1970

PRESENT POSITION:

Consulting Engineer specializing in the technical aspects of traffic engineering, highway design, and accident reconstruction.

INDUSTRIAL, PUBLIC AGENCY AND ACADEMIC POSITIONS:

Consulting Engineer: 1994-present
Higgins Associates: 1996-1997
Principal Associate
City of Monterey, California: 1989-1994
Traffic Engineer
Dowling Transportation Engineering: 1988-1989
Principal Associate
City of Concord, California: 1986-1988
Traffic Operations Engineer
Acting Transportation Services Manager
Associate Traffic Engineer
Indiana Department of Highways: 1985-1986
Research Engineer
Purdue University: 1980-1985
Assistant Professor of Transportation Engineering

REGISTRATION:

Registered Professional Traffic Engineer
State of California (February 26, 1988)
Certificate Number TR 1476

TRIAL EXPERIENCE:

Qualified as expert 5 times in Monterey County Superior courts, once in Santa Cruz County, twice in Alameda County, once in Los Angeles County, once in Kern County, once in San Francisco City and County, once in Hawaii County, Hawaii

HONORS:

Wayne T. VanWagoner Award for Best Article in ITE Journal, 1988, District 6 Institute of Transportation Engineers
Award of Excellence, Halliburton Educational Foundation, 1984

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETY MEMBERSHIPS:

Institute of Transportation Engineers
Society of Forensic Engineers and Scientists

UNIVERSITY LEVEL COURSES TAUGHT:

Traffic Engineering, Mass Transit Engineering, Airport Engineering, Highway Engineering, Finite Mathematics, Civil Engineering Case Studies

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION COURSES TAUGHT:

Highway Lighting, Traffic Signal Capacity, Traffic Control Device Inventories, Congestion Management, Isolated Signal Timing, Signal Coordination

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS:

Shanteau, R.M., "Signal Timing for Isolated Congested Intersections," ITE District 6 Meeting, Boise, Idaho, July 1990.

Shanteau, R.M., "Using Cumulative Curves to Measure Saturation Flow and Lost Time," ITE Journal, October 1988.

Sinha, Kumares C., Tien-Fang Fwa, Edward C. Ting, Mitsuru Saito, H.L. Michael, and R.M. Shanteau, Interim Report, Indiana Cost Allocation Study: A Report of Methodology, Joint Highway Research Project, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana, March 1984

Fricker, Jon D., James M. Poturalski, and R.M. Shanteau, Small City Transit Strategies Under the New Federalism, Report CE-TRA-83-1, School of Civil Engineering, Purdue University, December 1983

Shanteau, R.M., "Considerations in the Length of the Yellow Interval," in Proceedings of the 69th Annual Road School, Purdue University, 1983.

Shanteau, R.M., P.B. Satterly and G.K. Stafford, Traffic Speed Report No. 117, Joint Highway Research Project, Purdue University, 1983

Shanteau, R.M., "Improved Manual Methods of Coordinated Signal Timing," in Proceedings of the 68th Annual Road School, Purdue University, 1982.

Shanteau, R.M., "Estimating the Contributions to Variations of Passenger Loads on Buses at a Point," Transportation Research Record 798, 1981.

"Techniques for Traffic Planning as Related to Bicycles," Technical Council Information Report, ITE Journal, pp. 26-33, December 1980 (co-authored with ITE Committee 6Y-14).

Satterly, G.T., and R.M. Shanteau, "A Study of Commuter Shuttle Bus Service on the West Lafayette Campus of Purdue University," School of Civil Engineering, Purdue University, May 1980.

Shanteau, R.M., Analysis of an Urban Bus Line Servicing a Rapid Transit Station, Dissertation Series UCB-ITS-DS-79-3, Institute of Transportation Studies, University of California, Berkeley, December 1979.

Shanteau, R.M., "Financial District Route Improvement Program," Recommended Bus System Improvements in San Francisco, Implementation Program, Golden Gate Corridor Project - Phase II, Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District, 1979.

Shanteau, R.M., "Impact of the Rockridge BART Station on AC Transit's 51-58 Bus Line," Technical Memorandum No. 3, BART Impact Project - Traffic, Institute of Transportation Studies, University of California, Berkeley, May 1978.

Shanteau, R.M., "Bicycle Bottlenecks: Bicycle Planning from a Bicyclist's Point of View," Third National Seminar on the Planning, Design and Implementation of Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities, Metropolitan Association of Urban Designers and Environmental Planners, December 1974.

SELECTED PRESENTATIONS:

"Railroad-Highway Grade Crossing Protection in California," at the fall meeting of the Society of Forensic Engineers and Scientists, October 7, 2006

"Signal Timing for Isolated Congested Intersections" at the Institute of Transportation Engineers District 6 Annual Meeting, Boise, Idaho, 1992.

"Level of Service" Transportation Agency for Monterey County, 1991.

"ITE Committee 4A-36 Report: Location of Detector Loops to Reduce Congestion at Intersections," at the Institute of Transportation Engineers Annual Meeting, Orlando, Florida, 1990.

- "Signal Timing for Congestion," East Bay Traffic Engineers, 1989.
- "Do Circular 212 and the new Highway Capacity Manual Fit Together? - Yes!" East Bay Traffic Engineers, 1987.
- "The New Highway Capacity Manual," TRANSPAC (Transportation Advisory Committee of Contra Costa County), 1986.
- "Indiana's Pavement Management System," at the 72nd Annual Purdue Road School, 1986.
- "State Highway Detours and Their Effects on Local Roads and Streets," at the 70th Annual Purdue Road School, 1984 (chairman of session).
- "NETSIM - A Traffic Simulation Model," at the 69th Annual Purdue Road School, 1983 (panelist).
- "Advancements in the Manual Timing of Coordinated Traffic Signals on Arterials," at the 1982 Joint National Meeting of Operations Research Society of America/The Institute of Management Sciences, San Diego, CA, 1982.
- "Estimating the Contributions to Variations in Bus Passenger Loads at a Point," at the 60th Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C., January, 1981.
- "Analysis of Loads on Buses at a Point," at the 10th Joint Meeting of the Operations Research Society of America and the Institute of Management Science, Colorado Springs, Colorado, November 10-12, 1980.

RESPONSIBLE POSITIONS:

- Member, National Cooperative Highway Research Program, Panel 3-46, Unsignalized Intersections: 1992-1996
- Member, Subcommittee on Bicycle Capacity, Transportation Research Board: 1990-1995
- Member, ITE Committee, Closed Loop Signal Systems: 1990-1992
- Chairman, Technical Advisory Committee, Transportation Agency for Monterey County: 1992-1993
- Member, ITE Intelligent Vehicle/Highway System Advisory Committee: 1990-1991
- Secretary, Northern California VMS Traffic Signal Computer Users Group: 1986-1988
- Member, ITE Committee on Intelligent Vehicle Highway Systems: 1990-1992
- Chairman, ITE Committee 4A-36, Location of Detector Loops to Reduce Congestion at Intersections: 1986-1990
- Member, ITE Committee 4A-16, Use and Timing of Signal Change Intervals: 1984-1986
- Member, ITE Committee 5EE, Bike Routes: 1981-1983
- Member, ITE Committee 6Y-14, Planning for Bicycle Transportation: 1978-1981
- Member, West Lafayette, Indiana, Traffic Commission: 1981-1986
- Member, Transportation Research Board Committee A3A11, Traffic Flow Theory Committee: 1984- 1986
- Member, Transportation Research Board Committee A3A18, Traffic Signal Systems Committee: 1984-1985
- Chairman, Technical Committee, Indiana Section ITE: 1982-1985
- Designated Advisor, Bus Priority Technique Study, Technical Advisory Committee, AC Transit: 1978
- Member, Chancellor's Ad Hoc Committee on Transportation and Parking, University of California, Berkeley: 1977

SPECIAL TRAINING/EXTENSION COURSES ATTENDED:

- Traffic Impact Studies, presented by ITE: 1990
- Highway Capacity Software, presented by the McTrans Center of the University of Florida: 1990
- Risk Management and Traffic Safety, presented by ITS Extension, UC Berkeley: 1989
- Safety through Construction and Maintenance Zones, presented by ITS Extension, UC Berkeley: 1986
- Transportation Studies: Data Collection and Analysis with Microcomputer, presented by ITS Extension, UC Berkeley: 1986
- Traffic Accident Reconstruction, presented by Traffic Institute of Northwestern University: 1985

ENCLOSURE 2

Pages 1-6, SFMTA Resolution 14-0161 dated April 15, 2014

SAN FRANCISCO
MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND
PARKING AUTHORITY COMMISSION

RESOLUTION No. 14-061

WHEREAS, The FY 2015 and FY 2016 Operating and Capital Budgets for the SFMTA are being prepared in accordance with the City Charter Section 8A.106 with the Operating Budget in the amount of \$943.2 million and \$962.6 million respectively, and the Capital Budget in the amount of \$562.9 million and \$669.0 million which includes additional revenue of \$32 million in FY 2016 contingent upon voter approval of possible November 2014 ballot initiatives and on an increased General Fund support from the City for transportation and street improvements; and

WHEREAS, Charter Section 8A.106(b) requires the SFMTA to certify that the budget is adequate in all respects to make substantial progress towards meeting the performance standards established pursuant to Section 8A.103 for the fiscal year covered by the budget; and

WHEREAS, The SFMTA's FY 2015 and FY 2016 Operating Budget includes the revenue and expenditure adjustments to reflect the Municipal Railway fare change for free service on New Year's Eve 2014 and 2015; and

WHEREAS, Authorizing the Director of Transportation to implement short-term experimental fares enables the SFMTA to respond effectively to community requests; and

WHEREAS, The SFMTA is proposing to change various fines, fees, fares, rates and charges, as itemized in Attachment A to this Resolution including Cash and Clipper® fares for Municipal Railway adult, senior, youth, disabled and low-income (Lifeline), including free Muni for low and moderate income youth who use a Clipper® card, and Free Muni for low and moderate income 18 year olds, senior and disabled customers who use a Clipper® card, Paratransit (Van and Taxi) fares, monthly passes and stickers; School Coupon Booklet; Visitor Passports, inter-agency monthly passes, fares and stickers; Special Event service fares; Project 20 (request for community service or installment payment) fees; Residential, Contractor, Business, Press, Vanpool, School, Fire Station, Foreign Consulate, Medical and Childcare, Farmer's Market, On-Street Car Sharing Vehicle, SFMTA, and daily temporary/visitor vehicle parking permit fees; boot removal fee; SFMTA towing and storage administrative fees; payment by telephone and on-line computer transaction fee; transit fare evasion/passenger conduct, parking citation, Transportation Code, and Vehicle Code fines, late penalties and special collections fees; taxi permit fees and administrative penalties; parking meter use fee; temporary exclusive use of parking meter fee; transit vehicle (cable car, historic street car, motor bus, light rail, trolley bus, GO-4) rental fees; temporary street closure and neighborhood block party fees, special traffic permit fees; temporary no-parking sign posting fees, parklet fees, designated shuttle stop use permit fees, color curb painting fees; off-street parking fees and garage rates; establishing a Lifeline ID card replacement fee; eliminating Vallejo and CalTrain Muni monthly pass discounts; establishing an interagency single ride adult fare discount for Clipper® card users; and eliminating the in-person Customer Service Center transaction fee; codifying the payment by telephone transaction fee, signs and parking space removal/relocation fee, intellectual property license fee (Film Permits), temporary no-parking sign self-posting fee for special events, SFMTA transit map fee, taxi permit fees, and bus substitution fee; and adding penalties for overtime parking meter violations; and

WHEREAS, The proposed amendments to the Transportation Code to increase parking citation late payment penalties, the special collections fee, boot removal fees, various parking citation, Transportation Code, and Vehicle Code penalties, color curb painting fees, towing and storage administrative fees, on-line computer transaction fee, motor vehicle for hire fine amounts, request for community service processing fee, parking meter use fee, parklet installation fee, temporary no-parking sign posting fees, special traffic permit fees, temporary exclusive use of parking meter fee, residential area and other parking permit fees, designated shuttle stop use permit fee, temporary street closure and neighborhood block party fees, and bus substitution fee, to eliminate the in-person customer service center fee and codify the SFMTA transit map fee, to increase and codify the payment by telephone transaction fee, to add penalties for parking at an inoperable or broken parking meter or pay station in excess of the maximum time permitted, and to codify the signs and parking space removal/relocation fee, intellectual property license fee, Lifeline ID card replacement fee, and taxi permit fees are included as part of the calendar item; and

WHEREAS, The proposed amendments to the Transportation Code include a provision that will eliminate both the payment by telephone and on-line computer transaction fees effective April 1, 2015, contingent upon a review and determination of the SFMTA's fiscal health in January 2015; and

WHEREAS, On April 1, 2014, the SFMTA Board accepted a gift from Google, Inc. to support the "Free Muni for Low and Moderate Income Youth who use a Clipper® card" pilot program for FY 2015 and FY 2016; and

WHEREAS, The SFMTA Board desires to eliminate enforcement of parking meters on Sundays between the hours of 12 pm and 6 pm including the four-hour time limit for parking at a meter on Sundays effective July 1, 2014;

WHEREAS, The changes in various fees, fares, rates and charges itemized in Attachment A are necessary to meet SFMTA operating expenses, including employee wages and benefits or to purchase and lease essential supplies, equipment and materials; and

WHEREAS, On March 28, 2014, the SFMTA Board approved up to a twelve percent transit service increase recommended by the Transit Effectiveness Project, ten percent of which is funded in the FY 2015 and FY 2016 budget ; and

WHEREAS, The proposed seven percent transit service increase for FY 2016 is contingent upon a review and determination of the SFMTA's fiscal health in January 2015; and

WHEREAS, Additional funding in the amount of \$0.6 million in FY 2015 and \$1.2 million for FY 2016 for transit vehicle cleanliness and fleet appearance is proposed to be allocated contingent upon a review and determination of the SFMTA's fiscal health in January 2015; and

WHEREAS, The Capital Budget includes projects within 16 capital programs: Accessibility; Bicycle; Central Subway; Facility; Fleet; Information Technology/Communications; Parking; Pedestrian; Safety; School; Security; Taxi; Traffic Calming; Traffic/Signals; Transit Fixed Guideway; and Transit Optimization/Expansion of which \$32 million in FY 2016 is contingent upon voter approval of possible November 2014 ballot initiatives and on an increase in General Fund support for transportation and street improvements; and

WHEREAS, Pursuant Charter Section 16.112 and the SFMTA Board's Rules of Order, advertisements were placed in the City's official newspaper, the San Francisco Chronicle, to provide published notice of the April 15th public hearing which ran starting on March 25, 2014, for five consecutive days; and

WHEREAS, SFMTA staff, under authority delegated by the Planning Department, has been determined that the proposed modifications to fines, fees, fares, rates and charges included in the FY 2015 and FY 2016 Operating and Capital Budgets, as itemized in Attachment A, including continuing free Muni for low and moderate income youth who use a Clipper® card pilot program, and providing free Muni for low and moderate income 18 year olds, seniors, and/or disabled riders who use a Clipper® card, contingent upon a review and determination of the SFMTA's fiscal health, are statutorily exempt from environmental review pursuant to California Public Resources Code section 21080(b)(8) and CEQA implementing guidelines because the anticipated revenues will be used to meet SFMTA operating expenses, including employee wage rates and fringe benefits, or to purchase or lease supplies, equipment, or materials; and

WHEREAS, Said CEQA determination is on file with the Secretary to the SFMTA and is incorporated herein by this reference. The proposed action is the Approval Action as defined by the S.F. Administrative Code Chapter 31; and;

WHEREAS, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 applies to programs and services receiving federal funding and prohibits discrimination based on race, color, or national origin from federally funded programs such as transit and in order to remain compliant with Title VI requirements and ensure continued federal funding, the SFMTA must analyze the impacts of fare changes on minority and low income populations in compliance with the FTA's updated Circular 4702.1B; and

WHEREAS, The SFMTA prepared a comprehensive Title VI analysis of the impacts of the proposed fare changes on low-income and minority communities in San Francisco and has determined that there is no disparate impact to minority populations or disproportionate burden to low-income populations which is attached as Attachment D; and,

WHEREAS, Section 10.104.15 of the San Francisco Charter allows City departments to contract for services where such services can be practically performed under private contract at a lesser cost than similar work performed by employees of the City and County, as determined by the Controller and approved annually by the Board of Supervisors; and,

WHEREAS, The SFMTA has ongoing contracts for parking citation processing and collection; facility security services; paratransit services; parking meter collection and coin counting services; low-level platform maintenance services; and vehicle towing, storage and disposal services; and,

WHEREAS, The SFMTA plans to contract out for employment-related medical examinations starting July 1, 2014; and,

WHEREAS, The Controller has determined, or is expected to determine, that for FY 2015 and FY 2016, parking citation processing and collection; facility security services; paratransit services; parking meter collection and coin counting services; low-level platform maintenance services; vehicle towing, storage and disposal services; and employment related medical examinations services can be practically performed by private contractors at a lesser cost than if they were performed by employees of the City; and,

WHEREAS, In January 2015, the SFMTA Board will review the Agency's fiscal health for FY 2015 and FY 2016 to confirm the Agency's ability to financially support a seven percent transit service increase for FY 2016 for the Transit Effectiveness Project, allocating additional funding in the amount of \$0.6 million in FY 2015 and \$1.2 million for FY 2016 for transit vehicle fleet cleaning and appearance, providing Free Muni for low and moderate income 18 year olds, seniors, and/or disabled customers who use a Clipper® card, and eliminating the telephone and on-line computer transaction fees; and

WHEREAS, A motion was made at the April 15, 2014 SFMTA Board meeting to delay both the proposed September 2014 increase to the discount senior, disabled, and youth cash fare and monthly pass until July 1, 2015 when the proposed FY 2016 fares would take effect, to amend Attachment A to reflect these changes, and to revise the Title VI report to reflect the delay in these fare increases; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board approves the delay of both the proposed September 2014 increase to the discount senior, disabled, and youth cash fare and monthly pass until July 1, 2015 when the proposed FY 2016 fares would take effect, the amendment to Attachment A to reflect these changes, and the revisions to the Title VI report to reflect the delay in these fare increases; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board approves the various fares, as itemized in Attachment A , including Cash and Clipper® fares for Municipal Railway adult, senior, youth, disabled and low-income (Lifeline), including free Muni for low and moderate income youth who use a Clipper® card , Paratransit (Van and Taxi) fares, monthly passes and stickers; School Coupon Booklet; Visitor Passports, inter-agency monthly passes, fares and stickers; and Special Event service fares; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board of Directors and Parking Authority Commission approves the various fines, fees, rates and charges, as itemized in Attachment A, including Project 20 (request for community service or installment payment) fees; Residential, Contractor, Business, Press, Vanpool, School, Fire Station, Foreign Consulate, Medical and Childcare, Farmer's Market, On-Street Car Sharing Vehicle, SFMTA, and daily temporary/visitor vehicle parking permit fees; boot removal fee; SFMTA towing and storage administrative fees; payment by telephone and on-line computer transaction fee; transit fare evasion/passenger conduct, parking citation, Transportation Code, and Vehicle Code fines, late penalties and special collections fees; taxi permit fees and administrative penalties; parking meter use fee; temporary exclusive use of parking meter fee; transit vehicle (cable car, historic street car, motor bus, light rail, trolley bus, GO-4) rental fees; temporary street closure and neighborhood block party fees, special traffic permit fees; temporary no-parking sign posting fees, parklet fees, designated shuttle stop use permit fees, color curb painting fees; and off-street parking fees and garage rates; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board approves the various fines, fees, rates and charges, as itemized in Attachment A, including providing Free Muni for low and moderate income 18 year olds, seniors, and/or disabled customers who use a Clipper® card contingent upon a review and determination of the SFMTA's fiscal health; establishing a Lifeline ID card replacement fee; eliminating Vallejo and CalTrain Muni monthly pass discounts; establishing an interagency single ride adult fare discount for Clipper® card users; eliminating the in-person Customer Service Center transaction fee; codifying the payment by telephone transaction fee, signs and parking space removal/relocation fee, intellectual property license fee (Film Permits), temporary no-parking sign self-posting fee for special events, SFMTA transit map fee, taxi permit fees, and bus substitution fee; and adding penalties for overtime parking meter violations; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board amends the Transportation Code to increase parking citation late payment penalties, the special collections fee, boot removal fees, various parking citation, Transportation Code, and Vehicle Code penalties, color curb painting fees, towing and storage administrative fees, on-line computer transaction fee, motor vehicle for hire fine amounts, request for community service processing fee, parking meter use fee, parklet installation fee, temporary no-parking sign posting fees, special traffic permit fees, temporary exclusive use of parking meter fee, residential area and other parking permit fees, designated shuttle stop use permit fee, temporary street closure and neighborhood block party fees, and bus substitution fee, to eliminate the in-person customer service center fee and codify the SFMTA transit map fee, to increase and codify the payment by telephone transaction fee, to add penalties for parking at an inoperable or broken parking meter or pay station in excess of the maximum time permitted; and to codify the signs and parking space removal/relocation fee, intellectual property license fee, Lifeline ID card replacement fee, and taxi permit fees; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board further amends the Transportation Code to eliminate both the payment by telephone and on-line computer transaction fees effective April 1, 2015, contingent upon a review and determination by the SFMTA Board of the SFMTA's fiscal health in January 2015; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board authorizes the Director of Transportation to implement a three percent transit service increase for FY 2015, and, contingent upon a review and determination by the SFMTA Board of the SFMTA's fiscal health in January 2015, a seven percent transit service increase for FY 2016 for the Transit Effectiveness Project; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board allocates additional funding in the amount of \$600,000 in FY 2015 and \$1,200,000 for FY 2016 for transit fleet cleanliness and appearance to be provided April 1, 2015, contingent upon a review and determination by the SFMTA Board of the SFMTA's fiscal health in January 2015; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board approves the Title VI analysis of the impacts of the proposed fare changes on low-income and minority communities in San Francisco which determined that there is no disparate impact to minority populations or disproportionate burden to low-income populations which is attached as Attachment D; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board eliminates enforcement of parking meters on Sundays between the hours of 12 pm and 6 pm including the four-hour time limit for parking at a meter on Sundays; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board approves the continuation of free Muni for low and moderate income youth who use a Clipper® card for FY 2015 and FY 2016; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board declares the Agency's intention to prioritize the continuation of the free Muni for low and moderate income youth program in FY 2017 and thereafter; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board may provide free Muni for low and moderate income 18 year olds, seniors, and/or disabled customers who use a Clipper® card for FY 2015 and FY 2016 effective June 1, 2015, contingent upon a review and determination by the SFMTA Board of the Agency's fiscal health in January 2015; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board of Directors approves the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 and FY 2016 Operating Budget, in the amount of \$943.2 million and \$962.6 million respectively, and FY 2015 and FY 2016 Capital Budget, in the amount of \$562.9 million and \$669.0 million respectively which includes additional revenue of \$32 million in FY 2016 contingent upon voter approval of possible November 2014 ballot initiatives and on an increased General Fund support from the City for transportation and street improvements; and be it further

RESOLVED, That in accordance with the requirements of Charter Section 8A.106(b), the SFMTA certifies that the FY 2015 and FY 2016 Operating and Capital Budget is adequate in making substantial progress towards meeting the performance standards established pursuant to Section 8A.103 for 2015 and 2016; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board approves a waiver of fares on New Year's Eve 2014, between 8 PM on December 31, 2014 and 5 a.m. January 1, 2015 and on New Year's Eve 2015, between 8 PM on December 31, 2015 and 5 a.m. January 1, 2016; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Director of Transportation is hereby authorized to implement short-term experimental fares; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board of Directors concurs with the Controller's certification that facility security services; paratransit services; low-level platform maintenance services; parking meter collection and coin counting services; vehicle towing, storage and disposal services; and employment related medical examinations can be practically performed by private contractors at a lesser cost than to provide the same services with City employees; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board approves contracting out services for parking citation processing and collection subject to the condition subsequent that the Controller certify that contracting out for these services can be practically performed by private contractors at a lesser cost than to provide the same services with City employees; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board will continue to work diligently with the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor's Office to develop new sources of funding for SFMTA operations pursuant to Charter Section 8A.109 including an increase to the City parking tax; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Director of Transportation is hereby authorized to make any necessary technical and clerical corrections to the approved budget of the SFMTA and to allocate additional revenues and/or City and County discretionary revenues in order to fund additional adjustments to the operating and capital budget, provided that the Director of Transportation shall return to the SFMTA Board of Directors for approval of technical or clerical corrections that, in aggregate, exceed a five percent increase of the SFMTA operating and capital budget respectively.

I certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors and the Parking Authority Commission at their meeting of April 15, 2014.

Secretary to the Board of Directors
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency and
Parking Authority Commission

ENCLOSURE 3

SFMTA's Evaluation of Sunday Parking Management dated December 10, 2013

Evaluation of Sunday Parking Management

December 10, 2013

Executive Summary

On January 6, 2013, the SFMTA began operating parking meters throughout the city from 12-6pm on Sundays with four-hour time limits. The SFMTA gathered data to evaluate how well this change in parking management achieves the following goals:

- Make it easier to find a parking space in commercial areas on Sundays (and thereby improve access, driver convenience, and economic vitality).
- Reduce double parking and circling, which supports goals for reducing delays for Muni, greenhouse gas emissions, and congestion, and improving safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and other drivers.
- Off-set the costs of operating Muni.

This evaluation shows that as a result of operating meters on Sundays, we have seen:

1. **It is now easier to find parking spaces in commercial and mixed use areas on Sundays.** Prior to operating meters on Sundays, it was hard to find parking in almost every commercial area in the city. Now parking availability is much higher, so it is easier for drivers—many of whom are likely customers of neighborhood businesses—to access commercial areas. Between 2012 and 2013, the average parking availability on Sunday doubled during metered hours, increasing from 15% to 31%.
2. **More people can park because there is more turnover.** Prior to operating meters on Sundays, some drivers would park in metered spaces on Saturday evening or Sunday morning and not move their car until Monday morning, reducing turnover and the parking availability in commercial areas on Sundays. We now see less of this behavior: the number of cars that parked in each space per day increased by at least 20% from 0.5 per hour to 0.6 per hour during Sunday afternoons, and the percentage of spaces occupied on Saturday night through Sunday afternoon decreased by two thirds, from 6% to 2%. Prior to metering on Sundays, half of all cars parked for less than three hours, while half stayed for three or more hours. After metering on Sundays, 76% of cars stayed for up to three hours (with 50% staying for less than one hour), and less than one quarter of all cars parked stayed for three or more hours.
3. **More people park in SFMTA parking garages, opening up more on-street spaces.** Sunday meters both made it easier to find an on-street space and encouraged more drivers to go directly to a garage rather than circle for free on-street parking: garage occupancy on Sundays from 12pm to 6pm increased by 13%. Getting more drivers off the road and into garages quickly opens up on-street parking spaces for others, effectively increasing the usable parking supply. It also improves the utilization of these important city resources.
4. **People have to spend less time circling to find a parking space.** Prior to metering on Sundays, data indicate that drivers would circle for an average of over four minutes to find a parking space. After metering on Sundays, the average search time in the same areas is now

under two minutes. This reduction improves the experience of driving to visit these areas, and also reduces both congestion and greenhouse gas emissions. And the variability of parking search time, or how consistent or predictable the parking experience is, also improved. The amount of time a driver reasonably should budget to find a parking space (measured by the 95th percentile) decreased from about 14 minutes in 2012 to about four minutes in 2013.

5. **Increased net revenue to help pay for Muni.** Parking provides one source of SFMTA's revenue, helping to pay for the services SFMTA provides, such as Muni service on Sundays. After taking account of ongoing costs, operating meters on Sundays generated \$3,143,000 in FY2013 (January 1 through June 30) and \$1,869,000 in the first three months of FY2014 (July 1 through September 30).

Introduction

The SFMTA uses parking meters to manage parking demand at approximately 28,900¹ spaces in San Francisco. The purpose of these meters is to create parking availability (or open parking spaces) in commercial and mixed use areas so drivers can more easily find a parking space, especially when businesses are open.

Better parking availability also helps the city's transportation system function more smoothly for everyone and supports economic vitality. While the majority of customers in many San Francisco neighborhood commercial districts do not arrive by car², parking meters help those who do drive find a parking space quickly. This helps reduce congestion caused by circling and double parking, which helps those who walk, bike, or take transit.

For many years, parking meters in San Francisco were enforced Monday through Saturday from 9am to 6pm. Most businesses were closed on Sundays when parking meters were first installed in San Francisco in 1947, but that has changed significantly over the last 60 years. According to a survey of 32 neighborhood commercial districts, 72% of San Francisco businesses are open on Sunday.³

To help open up parking spaces for these businesses that are open on Sundays, on January 6, 2013 the SFMTA began operating parking meters on Sundays from 12pm to 6pm with four-hour time limits. This policy was designed to open up parking spaces for business, but it also aims to meet the needs of the broader community. After extensive conversations between the SFMTA and various community groups, the policy changed to meet as many of these needs as possible; metering hours start at noon instead of at 9am, as they do on Saturday. Customers who park before noon are able to pre-pay for parking so they do not have to return to the meter in the middle of their day. For the first three weeks after the policy went into effect, SFMTA staff issued informational flyers instead of parking citations on Sundays. This report, which provides a data-driven analysis of the policy and its goals, also is a result of these discussions.

This report evaluates how well metering on Sundays achieved the following goals:

- Make it easier to find a parking space in commercial areas on Sundays (and thereby improve access, driver convenience, and economic vitality).
- Reduce double parking and circling, which supports goals for reducing delays for Muni, greenhouse gas emissions, and congestion, and improving safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and other drivers.
- Off-set the costs of operating Muni.

For this evaluation, the SFMTA used the following data sources:

- Parking occupancy data

¹ This does not include the 1,300 meters under the jurisdiction of the Port of San Francisco.

² Please see appendix A for a summary.

³ Please see appendix B for a summary.

- Parking turnover and length of stay surveys
- Parking search time surveys
- Revenue and expense data related to SFMTA parking meters and garages
- Feedback from the city's 311 service

Results and Analysis

Parking Availability

Parking availability, or the percent of parking spaces on a block that are not occupied and therefore available at a given time, is the core measure of how effectively parking policies manage parking demand. Parking availability is measured by parking occupancy data, or the percentage of parking spaces on a block that are occupied by a parked vehicle at a given time. This is the inverse of parking availability, so a block of 20 spaces with 18 cars has 90% occupancy and 10% availability.

The SFMTA aims to see parking availability that is neither too low nor too high; when it is too low, drivers have difficulty finding a parking space, and they must circle to find a space or are tempted to double park. They may even give up and have to drive somewhere else and then choose to avoid visiting that neighborhood in the future. When parking availability is too high, the street space is being underutilized. The SFMTA's goal is to have an average parking occupancy between 60% and 80% on any given block, so that parking is well-utilized but drivers can find a space easily and quickly.

In 2009, the SFMTA conducted parking occupancy surveys across the city. Manual surveys from 32 neighborhood commercial areas demonstrated that it is hard to find open parking spaces when meters are not operating. On Sundays, parking occupancy was higher than 85% overall in 30 out of 32 areas (see Figure 1).

Figure 1: Sunday parking occupancy in commercial districts, 2009

Neighborhood	Street	From	To	9:30 to 11:30 a.m.	11:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.	3:30 to 5:30 p.m.	Overall
Bayview	3rd St.	Thomas	McKinnon	< 85%	< 85%	< 85%	< 85%
Castro	Castro St.	Market St.	19th St.	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%
Chinatown	Grant	Bush	Jackson	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%
Cow Hollow	Union	Steiner	Van Ness	85% to 100%	85% to 100%	85% to 100%	85% to 100%
Downtown	Sutter	Kearny	Stockton	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%
Excelsior	Mission St.	Geneva	Silver	< 85%	85% to 100%	85% to 100%	85% to 100%
Fillmore	Fillmore	Jackson	Post	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%
Financial District	Kearny	Geary	Sutter	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%
	Jackson	Grant	Montgomery	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%
	Battery	Jackson	California	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%
	Sansome	California	Pacific	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	85% to 100%	85% to 100%
Fisherman's Wharf	Beach	Hyde	Polk	< 85%	85% to 100%	≥ 100%	85% to 100%
Japantown	Post	Fillmore	Laguna	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%
Lower Pacific Heights	Divisadero	Geary	California	≥ 100%	85% to 100%	< 85%	85% to 100%
Mission	Mission St.	26th St.	19th St.	85% to 100%	≥ 100%	85% to 100%	85% to 100%
	Valencia St.	19th St.	Duboce	85% to 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%
Noe Valley	24th St.	Castro	Chattanooga	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%
North Beach	Columbus	Pacific	Greenwich	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%
Parkside	Taraval	29th Ave.	14th Ave.	< 85%	85% to 100%	85% to 100%	85% to 100%
Portola	San Bruno Ave.	Silver St.	Wayland	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%
Richmond	Clement	Arguello	Funston	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	85% to 100%	≥ 100%
	Geary	14th Ave.	28th Ave.	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%
SoMa	Folsom	5th St.	Fremont St.	85% to 100%	≥ 100%	85% to 100%	≥ 100%
	Howard	Fremont	3rd St.	< 85%	85% to 100%	< 85%	< 85%
Sunset	Irving	15th Ave.	27th Ave.	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%
	Irving	7th Ave.	12th Ave.	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%
Union Square	Stockton	Sutter	Geary	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%
	Geary	Stockton	Van Ness	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%	≥ 100%
Upper Haight	Haight	Stanyan	Masonic	85% to 100%	≥ 100%	85% to 100%	85% to 100%
Upper Market	Market St.	Duboce	Castro St.	< 85%	85% to 100%	≥ 100%	85% to 100%
West Portal	West Portal Ave.	Ulloa	15th Ave	85% to 100%	85% to 100%	85% to 100%	85% to 100%
Western Addition	Divisadero	Fell	McAllister	< 85%	85% to 100%	≥ 100%	85% to 100%

Note: Occupancies can exceed 100% if cars are parked illegally.

To evaluate how effectively meters help to achieve a minimum level of parking availability on Sundays, the SFMTA gathered and analyzed additional parking occupancy data in sample neighborhoods.

Between 2012 and 2013, the average parking availability on Sunday in the sample neighborhoods⁴ doubled during metered hours, going from 15% to 31%. This increase is likely the direct result of Sunday metering, as parking availability on other days of the week increased only slightly over the same time period. Additionally, the change between 2012 and 2013 was not part of a historical trend, as availability remained constant from 2011 to 2012. While parking availability increased the most during metered hours, the availability before and after metering hours also increased, indicating that the six hours of metering also opened up some spaces during the morning and evening on Sundays.

From 2012 to 2013, garage occupancy on Sundays from noon until 6pm increased by 13%. This indicates that the policy change did not deter people from visiting the neighborhoods surveyed. Rather, it

⁴ Mission, Marina, Union Street, Hayes Valley, Civic Center, Fillmore, and Richmond.

encouraged more drivers to go directly to a garage rather than circling for free on-street parking, thereby opening more parking spaces on-street for other drivers.

The following sections outline the data collection and detailed findings.

DATA COLLECTION

The SFMTA analyzed data from parking sensors in six areas covering approximately 4,530 metered parking spaces (or 16% of the city's total metered spaces) in the following neighborhoods: Mission, Marina, Union Street, Hayes Valley, Civic Center, Fillmore, and Richmond. The data are from the months of April and September in 2012 and 2013.⁵

The SFMTA also gathered occupancy data from 12 city-owned garages⁶: 16th and Hoff Garage, Civic Center Garage, Ellis O'Farrell Garage, Fifth and Mission Garage, Golden Gateway Garage, Japan Center Garage, Lombard Street Garage, Mission Bartlett Garage, Moscone Center Garage, St. Mary's Square Garage, Sutter Stockton Garage, and Union Square Garage. The data are from the months of April and September in 2012 and 2013.

FINDINGS

On-street parking availability results


Between 2012 and 2013, parking availability on Sundays increased as a result of Sunday metering, making parking easier to find.

In 2012, available on-street parking spaces were scarce during the day on Sunday but were more available in the early morning hours and late at night. In 2013, parking spaces were more likely to be available during the day on Sunday, both during metered hours as well as in the morning. Parking demand peaked during the afternoon and evening, but the highest occupancies remained within the target occupancy range, shown in the horizontal green band in Figure 2 below. The graph shows the average parking occupancy at each hour across Sundays in the sample months in 2012 and 2013.

⁵ Sensor occupancy data in Richmond and Union was not available beyond July 31, 2013, so the 2013 data from these areas is from April and July.

⁶ Garage data does not include the Performing Arts Garage, which is not typically open on the weekends (it opens only for some special events).


Figure 2: On-street occupancy across hours on Sunday, 2012 and 2013



Analysis of the average occupancy from 12pm to 6pm across the week showed a slight decrease in occupancy across all days of the week. However, occupancy decreased more on Sundays than on any other day of the week. The decrease in occupancy between noon and 6pm on Sundays was 19%, versus 7% on Saturday and during the week. This decrease in occupancy on Sunday brought the average occupancy during metered hours from 85% to just under 70%, which is within the target occupancy range and consistent with other days of the week (see Figure 3).

Figure 3: Average percent on-street occupancy from 12pm – 6pm by day of week

Day of week	Percent occupancy 12pm - 6pm		Percent change
	2012	2013	
Monday	70	65	6%
Tuesday	74	68	7%
Wednesday	74	69	7%
Thursday	75	68	8%
Friday	75	70	7%
Saturday	75	70	7%
Sunday	85	69	19%




Finally, this change in occupancy on Sunday is not simply a historic trend; parking occupancy on Sundays from 12pm to 6pm was the same in 2011 as 2012.

Off-street parking availability results

Operating parking meters on Sundays appears to have contributed to increase in parking occupancy at SFMTA parking garages. Occupancy increased particularly during the hours when meters were operating on Sundays, but also before meters began operating at noon. Figure 4 shows how occupancy changed over the course of the day on Sundays. The lines show the average at each hour across Sundays in the sample months in 2012 and 2013.

Figure 4: Garage occupancy across hours on Sunday, 2012 and 2013



In general, parking occupancy increased between 2012 and 2013 at the city-owned garages considered in this evaluation. However, from 2012 to 2013, Sunday occupancy increased by 15%, versus 4% on Saturday and an average of 4% on the weekdays (See Figure 5). This indicates that Sunday metering prompted many drivers to go directly to a garage and park rather than circling for free parking on the street.

Figure 5: Average garage occupancy from 12pm – 6pm by day of week

Day of week	Percent occupancy 12pm - 6pm		Percent change
	2012	2013	
Monday	54	57	5%
Tuesday	63	67	6%
Wednesday	65	67	4%
Thursday	66	67	1%
Friday	61	62	2%
Saturday	59	61	4%
Sunday	41	47	15%

Parking Search Time

One goal of metering on Sundays is to shorten the amount of time it takes to find a parking space on Sundays. This makes driving more convenient, improves the driving experience, and also reduces congestion related to circling and therefore should help to make Muni, bicycling, and walking safer and more efficient.

In addition to reducing the amount of time that people spend looking for parking, operating meters on Sundays is intended to make the amount of time that it takes to find parking more predictable. For the people who drive in order to get to a particular neighborhood, having a shorter and more predictable parking search is an incentive to come to the neighborhood to shop or eat, because they do not have to budget as much time to find parking.

The SFMTA conducted parking search time surveys to evaluate the experience of finding a parking space on Sunday. Between 2012 and 2013, the average parking search time during metered hours on Sundays decreased by 61% from over four minutes to 1.6 minutes. Other days of the week did not experience the same decrease, and the change on Sundays between 2012 and 2013 was much greater than the gradual decrease in the previous year. While the search times decreased the most during metered hours, the search times before and after metering hours also decreased, indicating that the six hours of metering made it easier to find parking spaces all day.

The variability of parking search time during metered hours also decreased between 2012 and 2013. In 2012, it was reasonable to expect to find a parking spot in 14 minutes in 2012. In 2013, it was reasonable to expect to find a parking spot within four minutes. These improvements in parking search time and predictability were evident in April and May of 2013, after only a few months of Sunday metering.

The following sections outline the data collection and detailed findings.

DATA COLLECTION

Using set routes in Civic Center, Fillmore, Marina, Mission, Richmond, and Union Street commercial districts, the SFMTA measured parking search time in April and May of 2012 and April and May of 2013. The parking search time surveys were conducted over the course of the day, starting at 8am, noon, 4pm, and 8pm. In the parking search time survey, a surveyor followed a set route in each commercial district and recorded the time it took to find a parking space.⁷ The SFMTA conducted more than 4,800 parking search runs in 2012 and 2013, with 1,600 on Sundays. The SFMTA also has the same historical data from Spring 2011.


FINDINGS

Change in parking search time

⁷ The full parking search time survey methodology is in Appendix C.

In 2012, surveys from 8am through 8pm show that the longest parking search times tend to be at 12pm and 4pm, which are both within Sunday metering hours (12pm until 6pm). Between 2012 and 2013, the average parking search time decreased by 61% during Sunday metering hours from more than four minutes in 2012 to 1.6 minutes in 2013. In 2012, it took an average of more than 5.4 minutes to find a parking space at noon on Sundays. In 2013, this decreased by 65% to under two minutes. Similarly, finding a space at 4pm decreased 54% from almost three minutes in 2012 to 1.3 minutes in 2013 (see Figure 6).

Figure 6: Average parking search time on Sundays, 2012 and 2013



Metering from 12pm to 6pm also appears to have affected parking search time outside of metering hours. Including searches at 8am and 8pm, the average search decreased by more than 60%, from an average of more 2.7 minutes in 2012 to about one minute in 2013: at 8am, the search time decreased from 30 to 21 seconds, and the search time at 8pm decreased 76% from over two minutes to just 30 seconds. By discouraging people from parking overnight and storing cars on-street in commercial areas for part of the weekend, data suggest that metering on Sundays affected parking search times throughout the day, including outside of metered hours.

This decrease in parking search time across the entire day did not occur during other days of the week; search times decreased more on Sunday than they did on any other day. Across all times, parking search time on weekdays decreased by 34% between 2012 and 2013, and they increased by 46% on Saturdays. On Sundays, parking search time decreased by more than 53% (See Figure 7).

Figure 7: Percent change in parking search time from 2012-2013 by Weekdays, Saturday, and Sunday
Rows in gray are during Sunday metering hours.

Time of day	Weekdays	Saturday	Sunday
8am	2%	16%	-44%
12pm	9%	26%	-70%
4pm	-45%	26%	-47%
8pm	-70%	33%	-66%
All times	-34%	46%	-53%

Finally, historic data suggests that the decrease in parking search time on Sundays between 2012 and 2013 was not part of a trend for the past few years. Between spring 2011 and spring 2012, overall parking search time decreased by 6%. The 51% decrease from 2012 to 2013 is likely a direct result of implementing metering on Sundays.

Variability of parking search time

One of the challenges of parking in San Francisco is that the time it takes to find parking varies greatly, and budgeting time to find a parking space is difficult because it is unpredictable. One goal of metering on Sundays was to make the amount of time it takes to find a parking space more predictable, or less variable, so people can budget less time for the parking part of their trip.

One measure of variability is the 95th percentile, or the amount of time that a surveyor was able to find a parking space 95% of the time. This value is a reasonable estimate for the longest that a driver would need to budget to find a parking space. In 2012, between 12pm and 6pm on Sundays, surveyors had a 95% chance of finding a parking space within 14 minutes. In 2013, surveyors had a 95% chance of finding a parking space in less than four minutes between during the same period. This decrease means that drivers experience less uncertainty and can plan accordingly, making parking more predictable and convenient.

Parking Length of Stay and Turnover

One factor that lowers parking availability on Sundays is cars that are stored for long periods of time in commercial areas. This includes cars parked all day Sunday as well as cars parked on Saturday evening and stored through business hours on Sunday. Length of stay and parking turnover, or how many cars park in one space over time, are related measures of how parking spaces are used.

Drivers left their cars parked for shorter periods of time in 2013 than they did in 2012. In 2012, 50% of cars were parked for three or more hours. In 2013, only 24% cars parked for three or more hours, while

76% parked for less than three hours. There was also a decrease in the number of spaces that were occupied by the same car from Saturday evening and into Sunday afternoon; this figure decreased from 6% in 2012 to 2% in 2013.

A shorter length of stay means that more cars have access to each parking space. Between 2012 and 2013, parking turnover on Sunday increased from an average of 0.5 cars per hour to 0.6 cars per hour, increasing the number of cars that could use a space by 20%.

The following sections outline the data collection and detailed findings.

DATA COLLECTION

The SFMTA conducted parking turnover surveys before and after the implementation of Sunday metering. These surveys included license plate data from the preceding Saturday evening to determine what percentage of cars are stored in commercial areas from Saturday evening through Sunday. The survey was conducted across 85 blocks in the following areas: Mission, Marina, Hayes Valley, Richmond, and Fillmore. Surveyors visited each route on at least two Sundays every hour between 12pm and 5pm, as well as at 6pm and 9pm on the preceding Saturday.⁸ Data was gathered in the fall of 2012 and 2013.

FINDINGS

Length of stay

In 2012, cars tended to remain parked for longer than they did in 2013. In 2012, 50% of cars parked for less than three hours, and 50% parked for three or more hours. In 2013, 76% cars stayed for less than three hours (see Figure 8); 50% stayed for less than one hour, and 26% stayed for two hours. Less than one quarter of all cars parked stayed for three or more hours in 2013.

⁸ The full turnover and length of stay survey methodology is in Appendix D.

Figure 8: Percent of cars staying two hours or less versus three or more hours by year




Figure 9 summarizes the shift in percent of cars staying for one, two, three, four, and five or more hours. Between 2012 and 2013, the percent of vehicles staying for up to one hour increased by 20%, while the percent of vehicles staying for five hours or more decreased by 20%.

Figure 9: Percent of cars by length of stay of time, 2012 and 2013

Sunday length of stay	2012	2013	Difference
1 hour	30%	50%	+20%
2 hours	20%	26%	+6%
3 hours	13%	11%	-2%
4 hours	10%	6%	-4%
5 or more hours	28%	8%	-20%

The data suggest that cars stayed longer in parking spaces on Sundays in 2012 and were also more likely to have been parked there since Saturday evening. In 2012, 6% of the spaces surveyed had the same car parked on Saturday evening at 9pm and Sunday at 12pm. In 2013, only 2% of the spaces surveyed were occupied by the same car on Saturday evening and Sunday at noon.

Turnover

The decrease in length of stay allows for 20% more cars to access each space. Turnover, or the number of cars that are parked in a space over a period of time, increased in the surveyed areas between 2012 and 2013. In 2012, there was an average of 2.5 cars parked in every legal, publicly-available parking space on Sunday afternoon (from 12pm until 5pm), or 0.5 cars per hour. In 2013, there was an average of

3 cars per parking space across Sunday afternoon, or 0.6 cars per hour (See Figure 10). In other words, a 15-block neighborhood with 150 parking spaces could accommodate up to 450 cars over a six-hour span from noon until 6pm in 2012, and the same 150 spaces could accommodate up to 540 cars during that time in 2013.

Figure 10: Sunday parking turnover, 2012 and 2013⁹

Average cars per space	2012	2013
Afternoon (12pm-5pm)	2.5	3
Hourly	0.5	0.6

Operating Costs

Operating and enforcing parking meters on Sundays has generated additional revenue and costs (both initial and ongoing) for the SFMTA. The SFMTA budgeted \$900,000 for fiscal year (FY) 2013 and \$1,900,000 for FY2014 for Sunday metering. For FY2013 (January 1 through June 30), the net revenue for Sunday metering was \$3,143,000. For the first three months of FY2014 (July 1 through September 30), the net revenue was \$1,869,000. The revenue and expenses associated with Sunday metering are outlined below and detailed in Appendix E. In all calculations below, FY2014 includes July 1 through September 29.

EXPENSES

The SFMTA incurred one-time, initial startup costs to implement metering on Sundays. These one-time start-up costs are outlined below.

- **Equipment purchases**

- Metering on Sundays required the purchase of 27 handheld electronic enforcement units, which cost \$3,930 each and amortize over a six-month period. The total cost for these handheld units was \$106,110 in FY2013 and \$53,055 in FY2014.
- Enforcement also required the purchase of 33 enforcement vehicles, which cost \$34,503 each and amortize over three years. The total cost of the enforcement vehicles was \$189,767 in FY2013 and \$94,883 in FY2014.

- **Signage purchases.** The meters needed three different updated signs or decals to reflect the new operating schedule. The SFMTA purchased 25,000¹⁰ of each:

⁹ The actual number of cars parked per space is likely slightly higher than these figures. Surveyors recorded vehicles parked every hour, so any car that came and went between surveys would not be captured in these numbers.

¹⁰ Of the SFMTA's 28,900 metered spaces, some spaces in Fisherman's Wharf and in metered lots already had Sunday metering hours. Additionally, only spaces with single-space meters (rather than multi-space meters) needed new signage.

- D-plates, or the metal plate in the city's older single space parking meters that indicates the rates and days of operations, cost \$2 each;
- Enforcement hours plates, or the small plates on the back of the meter with enforcement hours, cost \$1.25 each; and
- Decals with operating hours and days of operation on smart meters cost \$2.00 each.

The total cost for all of these signs was \$142,734 in FY2013. The SFMTA also purchased 4,500 L-bracket overhead signs, costing \$25.00 per sign plus sales tax (8.75%), totaling \$122,344 in FY2013.

- **Installation labor.** The installation of these new signs required 5,470 hours of labor across five different employee classes. The total labor costs were \$363,376 in FY2013.
- **Database administrator (DBA) engineer.** Preparing the SFMTA's parking management system for Sunday metering required 80 hours of DBA engineer labor, with a total cost of \$16,505 in FY2013 and \$4,126 in FY2014 for evaluation.
- **Community outreach and communications.** The SFMTA conducted a broad outreach and communications effort for this policy change. The communications program included administrative, web design, graphic design, media relations, and translation labor, totaling 373 hours at a cost of \$40,419 in FY2013. The SFMTA also spent \$13,375 in FY2013 to print flyers, posters, Muni vehicle advertisements, and advertisements in 16 different local newspapers.
- **Implementation oversight.** Implementing the Sunday metering policy required labor from seven SFMTA employees and contractors. The cost of oversight and management labor to implement Sunday metering was \$69,393 in FY2013. These costs for evaluation were \$24,336 in FY2014.

The Sunday metering operation also has several ongoing labor costs, outlined below.

- **Meter maintenance labor.** Operating meters on Sunday requires the SFMTA to staff a skeleton meter maintenance crew to address maintenance needs that arise on the weekend. This crew consists of one supervisor and two employees. The incremental cost for this team, including the costs for benefits and overhead (such as radios, uniforms, etc.), was \$47,617 in FY2013 and \$23,809 in FY2014.
- **Enforcement labor.** Enforcing meters on Sundays requires an additional two supervisors and 30 parking control officers (PCOs). The cost for these additional employees, including the costs for benefits and overhead (such as printers, radios, uniforms, etc.), was \$405,192 in FY2013 and \$202,596 in FY2014. Enforcement began on January 27th, 2013, and PCOs worked on the first three Sundays in January to hand out flyers explaining the policy change rather than issuing citations.

- **Coin collections and counting labor.** With another day of coin revenue, Sunday metering requires additional coin collection labor for single space meters.¹¹ The total cost of this additional labor was \$24,004 in FY2013 and \$20,210 in FY2014.
- **Ongoing oversight.** Sunday metering requires ongoing labor costs of eight SFMTA employees and contractors. The cost of this labor, including benefits and overhead, was \$28,104 in FY2013 and \$14,052 in FY2014.

REVENUE

- **Meter payment revenue.** Parking meters at the city's 28,900 metered spaces began operating on Sundays on January 6, 2013, but there was a broadly-advertised, three-week grace period before meter payment was enforced on January 27, 2013.¹² The meters generated \$2,404,000 in FY2013 and \$1,238,000 in FY2014 in payment revenue on Sundays.¹³ This is the total amount collected in coin, phone, credit card, and parking card payments minus fees the SFMTA pays for credit card transactions.
- **Citation revenue.** The SFMTA began enforcing Sunday metering on January 27th.¹⁴ The SFMTA issues citations for vehicles that park at a meter without paying. The SFMTA issued 37,000 parking citations on Sundays in FY2013, generating a net \$2,292,000 and 17,000 citations on Sundays in FY2014, generating a net \$1,065,000. These revenue estimates reflect the face value of citations issued (rather than citations actually paid) minus the processing fee per citation.

The pattern of citations issued on each Sunday from January through September shows that the number of citations issued appeared to stabilize in July (see Figure 11).


¹¹ There are no extra shifts required for multi-space meter collection or coin counting.

¹² Some meter payments were made starting January 6th, 2013, which are included in this analysis.

¹³ The SFMTA can extract the exact amount of revenue generated on Sundays for the city's smart meters, which manage almost 29% of the city's metered spaces. Appendix F outlines how the revenue was estimated for the remaining 71% of the metered spaces.

¹⁴ Although enforcement officially began at the end of January, the full deployment of PCOs was not in effect until April 2013.

Figure 11: Number of meter-related citations on Sundays in 2013



Additional data: 311 calls and emails

The city offers 311 service, which is a 24-hour customer-service call center. From December 1, 2012 (one month before the Sunday metering went into effect) to mid-September, 2013, 311 has a record of 41 calls and emails related to Sunday metering.

Twenty-three of these calls, or 56%, were complaints about the policy. The remaining calls covered a variety of topics: eight calls requesting enforcement, five questions about the policy, four prepay issues regarding an isolated glitch in the system that was resolved in January, and one compliment.

While there was a limited feedback via 311, the SFMTA is aware that there continue to be concerns about the policy of metering on Sundays.

Appendix A: Arrivals to commercial districts by mode

Excerpt from SFMTA “Extended Meter Hours Study”


March 5, 2009

Intercept Survey

We conducted intercept surveys asking San Francisco residents about their traveling habits and whether they would support extending the hours of operations of the parking meters into the evenings and on Sundays. We qualified the support questions by explaining that revenues from extending the hours would go towards better Muni service and pedestrian and bicycle improvements, and that there would be no time limits after 6 p.m. and on Sundays. We surveyed 165 residents one Wednesday evening on August 5 between 6 p.m. and 8 p.m. in the commercial areas of the Castro, Inner Sunset, Mission, and Marina. Please see Appendix C for the survey form.

We asked residents what mode of transportation they had used to get to their destination in the neighborhood on the day of the survey (Figure 7). Of the 25 percent of respondents who drove that day, 90 percent found on-street parking. The average time reported to find a parking space was 5.5 minutes.

Figure 7. Mode Split of Travel on Day of Survey



Of those who did not drive that day, we asked whether they ever drive and how often, qualifying it with “never,” “rarely,” “sometimes,” or “at least once/week.” We grouped responses from the people who never drive and the ones who drive only rarely and compared them to those who drove that day and those who drive regularly.

Appendix B: Business hours

Excerpt from SFMTA “Extended Meter Hours Study”


March 5, 2009


Business Hours Survey

To evaluate how well parking meter hours align with when businesses are actually open, we recorded the hours of operation for 1,130 businesses in operation in each of the study’s 32 areas. During the survey, we recorded hours posted on storefronts; when no hours were posted, we asked an employee. When businesses were closed that day, we made follow-up phone calls or researched the businesses online as necessary. Only businesses that were in operation as of July 2009 (and for the 10 additional areas, October 2009) are included in the data and analysis.

Based on the survey, a high percentage of businesses are open later than 6 p.m., when most parking meters currently stop operating (Figure 5). Though parking occupancies are the primary consideration for when to operate parking meters, when businesses are open is another consideration. Even a small number of businesses, such as restaurants, theaters, or nightclubs, can generate significant parking demand and would like their customers to be able to easily find available parking spaces.


Figure 5. Percent of Businesses Open on Wednesdays and Fridays, by Hour





We also found that a clear majority of businesses are open on Sundays in most parts of the City (Figure 6). These results reflect the change that has occurred since 1947 when parking meters were first installed in San Francisco. At that time, relatively few businesses were open on Sundays. Now, in many parts of the city, Sundays are just as busy, if not busier, than other days of the week.

Figure 6. Percentage of Businesses Open on Sundays by Area



Appendix C: Parking Search Time Methodology

In practice, drivers have different ways of searching for parking, and they take different routes and experience varying search times for parking near the same destinations. To best estimate parking search time, pre-assigned starting points and carefully detailed search routes were used to ensure that data collection methodology was replicable, consistent, and comprehensible by surveyors.

Each sample area has a set route, which was selected to exclude streets with peak-period tow-away zones or with planned closure for construction. Surveyors traveled by bicycle¹⁵ along the set route and recorded the amount of time it took to find the first legal parking space along the route.

Surveyors had up to 30 minutes to find a parking space. The surveyor recorded the time when a legal space (as defined by a set of consistent rules) was located, returned to the starting point, and waited four minutes before starting another run. If the surveyor did not find a parking spot within 30 minutes, the run was recorded as a failed run, and the surveyor returned to the starting point to begin a new run.¹⁶

In each sample area, surveyors made parking search runs from 8-10am, 12-2pm, 4-6pm, and 8-10pm on Tuesday through Thursday, Saturday, and Sunday. A sample data collection form is included below.

¹⁵ This methodology is consistent with previous SFMTA parking search time surveys, which were conducted on bicycle. Drivers looking for parking in the surveyed neighborhoods tend to slow to about 12 mph, and surveyors on bicycle are able, when safe, to maneuver through traffic like a car. Surveys conducted by bicycle avoid double parking or distracted driving, and they also require less personnel and equipment than surveys conducted by car.

¹⁶ A 30 minute cap on parking search time was chosen as a reasonable threshold for estimating the point when drivers will become frustrated and either (a) leave the area, (b) park in a garage or lot, or (c) park in an adjacent residential neighborhood. From a methodological perspective, it is also necessary to cap the time surveyors spend searching for parking, as it is possible that during peak times it may take much longer than 30 minutes to find a parking space, making it difficult for SFMTA to collect a sample size large enough to allow for statistical analysis.

Name: _____

Route: _____

Date: _____

Time (circle one): 8-10am 12-2pm 4-6pm 8-10pm

Survey Run	Start Time (Hour:Min)	Elapsed Time (min & sec)	Number of Laps	Failed Search? (Y/N)	Meter ID of found metered parking space OR Nearest address of found unmetered parking space		
Sample	8:15	1:36	0	N	60600190 S#3		
Search 0					Mark blocked at bottom of page.		
Search 1							
Search 2							
Search 3							
Search 4							
Search 5							
Search 6							
Search 7							
Search 8							
Search 9							
Search 10							
Search 11							
Search 12							
Search 13							
Search 14							
Search 15							
Search 16							
Search 17							
Search 18							
Search 19							
Search 20							
Blocked (reason)	Street	Start Street	End Street	# of spaces	Dates	Times	Notes

1. A failed search means that you could not find a vacant legal parking space able to accommodate an average-sized passenger vehicle after 30 minutes of searching.

2. Mark the number of times you passed the starting point in "laps". If you did not pass the starting point, mark "0" in "laps".

Appendix D: Parking Length of Stay and Turnover Methodology

Surveyors followed carefully detailed routes in each survey area, walking along the route to stop at each parking space and record the relevant information. The surveyor ran completely through the route at 6pm and 9pm on Saturday evening and at 12pm, 1pm, 2pm, 3pm, and 4pm on Sunday afternoon.

Surveyors made a note for each space in the survey route, recording whether or not the space was occupied or vacant. For each occupied space, the surveyor noted the last four digits of the license plate. This is enough to track parking trends but does not allow drivers to be identified through their registration information.

The surveyor also recorded all parking regulations as well as any street closures, special events, or irregularly parked vehicles. The surveyor repeated this process in each identified time band. A sample data form is included below.

Sunday Metering "Before" Data Collection

		STREET		SURVEYOR					
		BLOCK		DATE					
		SIDE		REGULATION					
PARKED CARS (If occupied, mark last four digits of license plate. Mark " - " if no vehicle in space.)									
Space	Reg'l'n/ Meter Color	SATURDAY (DATE _____)		SUNDAY (DATE _____)					NOTES
		6 - 7 PM	9 - 10 PM	12 - 1 PM	1 - 2 PM	2 - 3 PM	3 - 4 PM	4 - 5 PM	
1									
2									
3									
4									
5									
6									
7									
8									
9									
10									

Appendix E: Sunday Metering Revenue and Expenses

Net Revenue: Gross Revenue and Expenses, January 6 – September 29, 2013

Category	FY 2013 (6 months: January through June)			FY 2014 (3 months: July through September)		
	Revenue YTD	Costs YTD	Net YTD	Revenue YTD	Costs YTD	Net YTD
Smart Meter Revenue & CC fees (IPS and Duncans)	\$ 1,384,635	\$ 75,019	\$ 1,309,617	\$ 716,800	\$ 40,189	\$ 676,611
Legacy Meter Revenues (MacKay and Reinos)	\$ 1,094,154	\$ -	\$ 1,094,154	\$ 561,421	\$ -	\$ 561,421
Citations (all meters) & processing	\$ 2,399,059	\$ 107,138	\$ 2,291,921	\$ 1,112,756	\$ 48,130	\$ 1,064,626
Meter Maintenance Labor	\$ -	\$ 47,617	\$ (47,617)	\$ -	\$ 23,809	\$ (23,809)
Enforcement Labor (PCOs)	\$ -	\$ 405,192	\$ (405,192)	\$ -	\$ 202,596	\$ (202,596)
Enforcement Handhelds	\$ -	\$ 106,110	\$ (106,110)	\$ -	\$ 53,055	\$ (53,055)
Enforcement Vehicles	\$ -	\$ 189,767	\$ (189,767)	\$ -	\$ 94,883	\$ (94,883)
Coin Collections and Counting Labor	\$ -	\$ 24,004	\$ (24,004)	\$ -	\$ 20,749	\$ (20,749)
Implementation	\$ -	\$ 52,888	\$ (52,888)	\$ -	\$ 20,210	\$ (20,210)
Ongoing Oversight	\$ -	\$ 28,104	\$ (28,104)	\$ -	\$ 14,052	\$ (14,052)
DBA Engineer	\$ -	\$ 16,505	\$ (16,505)	\$ -	\$ 4,126	\$ (4,126)
Meter Decals	\$ -	\$ 142,734	\$ (142,734)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Additional Signage	\$ -	\$ 122,344	\$ (122,344)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Installation Labor (decals and extra signage)	\$ -	\$ 363,376	\$ (363,376)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Communications labor	\$ -	\$ 40,419	\$ (40,419)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Communications printing costs	\$ -	\$ 13,375	\$ (13,375)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total:	\$ 4,877,848	\$ 1,734,593	\$ 3,143,255	\$ 2,390,977	\$ 521,800	\$ 1,869,177

Appendix F: Methodology for calculating legacy meter revenue

Of the city's 28,900 metered spaces, 7,640 are managed by smart meters which can directly report how much revenue was generated on Sundays. The remaining 21,000 metered spaces, which have older meters, report the exact amount of revenue, but the revenue is reported for each coin collection cycle (e.g., every three to eight days). To estimate the revenue generated by these older meters on Sundays, the SFMTA calculated the average hourly rate for each meter at every collection period following a Sunday and multiplied this number by the number of operating hours on a Sunday (six hours, except for in 24-hour lots).

ENCLOSURE 4

Mayor Lee's 2014 State of the City Address

Mayor Lee's 2014 State of the City Address

2014 STATE OF THE CITY ADDRESS

January 17, 2014

The Shipyard, San Francisco

Text of State of the City Address

Jobs, Housing and People: An Affordability Agenda for San Francisco's Future

I wanted to come here and talk to you about the State of our City because this place, the Shipyard, links our proud past to an even more promising future.

Behind me, hundreds - and soon thousands - of new homes for middle class families are under construction.

The Shipyard represents the remarkable progress we have made as a City...recovering from the depths of the Great Recession these last three years.

It also represents the challenges that remain to ensure that San Francisco is still a place where our working families, our teachers and firefighters, our artists and our seniors can always call home.

You know, a year ago, we gathered not too far from here, and I declared the State of our City to be vital, resurgent and strong, with San Francisco moving in the right direction.

And throughout 2013, because of our relentless focus on jobs, fixed on a steady path of fiscal prudence, and through the extraordinary innovation of our people, our robust economic recovery continued.

Last year, San Francisco was the nation's number one large county for job growth, adding jobs in every sector, from technology to health care to construction to manufacturing.

Unemployment today stands at just 5.2%, down from 9.5% when I first took office. My fellow San Franciscans that means 42,452 jobs were created since 2011 and residents are back to work in our City. And as a result of our broad-based recovery, healthy budget reserves and fiscal discipline, our City's credit rating is the highest in history.

And at the dawn of this new year, 2014, the State of our great City is still vital and strong - indeed, as strong, financially and economically, as we have ever been in our history.

But we must also recognize that there are still fractures in the strong foundation we have built, tears in the social fabric that, if we do not attend to with all our energies, will erode that foundation and reverse our dramatic progress.

Jobs and confidence are back, but our economic recovery has still left thousands of people behind.

Our neighborhoods are revitalized and new construction is all around us, but some still look to the future, anxiously, and wonder whether there's room for them in a changing San Francisco.

And too many of our residents, people who work hard and make a decent wage, men and women squarely in the middle class, grow frustrated, as the City becomes ever more expensive, and their dream of starting a family or owning a home falls further out of reach.

This rising cost of living, the financial squeeze on our City's working families and middle class - these are the fundamental challenges of our time, not just for our City, but for great cities around the world.

And to sustain our economic recovery and this renewed confidence in our City, we must confront these challenges of affordability directly, in the San Francisco way, big-hearted, but clear-headed.

In the Chinese zodiac, this is the Year of the Horse.

A person born in the Year of the Horse tends towards strength, confidence, and financial success.

But they are also among the most compassionate, attentive to the troubles of others, and quick to protect those who cannot fight for themselves.

Well, appropriately, these are exactly the qualities our City demands in 2014 to meet the challenges before us.

Because it is that same economic strength, that same renewed confidence in our future, that provides us with the resources and the resolve to do so.

My fellow San Franciscans, this is the "affordability agenda" that I bring to you today as our priority for the year ahead.

Economy: It Still Starts With Good Jobs

And that affordability agenda still starts with making sure every one of our residents, whether young or old, from the Westside or the Southeast, or whether a new immigrant or a returning veteran, has a good job or can access the skills and training to get one.

There's no wider income gap than between those who have a job, and those who don't.

And while our economic recovery is the envy of the world, there are still more than 24,000 of our fellow San Franciscans out of work, with perhaps twice that underemployed, in need of training for better opportunities.

And that's why we must never relent on our efforts to grow jobs in our City across every sector - in tech, biotech and cleantech, in international trade and tourism, in film and video production, in advanced manufacturing, construction and health care - all growing parts of our diverse economy, creating good-paying jobs for people from every background.

I haven't forgotten the recent days of double-digit unemployment, endless red ink and deep cuts to our vital services.

But incredibly, it's become fashionable for some people lately to dismiss the significance of our broad-based recovery.

They speak of it, remarkably, only in terms of the negative, perhaps the first time in history that the creation of too many good jobs has been criticized.

My friends, we must not take these better times for granted.

I speak frequently to other mayors, and believe me when I tell you, there is not a City on the planet that would refuse to trade places with our robust economic condition right now.

And all this has come in spite of the outright harm imposed upon thousands of our own residents by politicians in Washington, where Republicans in Congress refuse to pass comprehensive immigration reform and have stymied efforts to extend unemployment insurance for the long-term jobless. I say, shame on them.

And that's why, more than ever, we here in San Francisco must and will continue to invest in workforce training and in people like Iman Rodney, who is here with us today.

Iman is from the Bayview, and recently completed our TechSF training at BayCat.

Now he's working as a Production Assistant on HBO's new show "Looking," set right here in San Francisco.

We're investing in people like Marc Roth. Two years ago, Marc was homeless, sleeping in shelters. He had some programming experience, but not enough to land a job. So he plunked down the last of his money to take a few advanced classes at TechShop, and then started his own business called SFLaser.

But while the tech sector is growing, it's still just a piece of our diverse economy.

That's why we'll keep investing in people like Darryl Bishop and Lorenzo Beasley two young men from the Bayview who work right here at the Shipyard.

Behind me, Astron Development Corporation is building the framing for new housing, maintaining a 65% local hire rate - I know Supervisor Avalos likes the sound of that - with most of the men and women coming through our Citybuild construction academy, folks like Andre Larrimore, also here with us.

Those cranes you see downtown, in Mission Bay and in Central Market don't just mean thousands of good construction jobs.

They also mean hundreds of millions of dollars in development impact fees. Over the next five years, we will collect \$110 million

from big developers for new parks, better public transit and new affordable housing.

And, we know that our young people suffer from unemployment at a far higher rate than adults, and so I'm proud that in 2013 our Summer Jobs Plus initiative provided more than 6,800 summer job opportunities in the public and private sector. More than half of the youth placed were from underserved neighborhoods like the Bayview and Western Addition.

And we will continue to invest in the cornerstones of our diverse economy - our infrastructure.

The five hospitals under construction in our City today will cement San Francisco's standing as a cutting-edge center for quality health care in this new era of digital health and national, universal health care.

They will guarantee good jobs in our health care sector for decades to come, jobs for people like Kaya Lewis, , who graduated from our healthcare academy, and who now works at UCSF.

And in a City that will always rely a great deal on tourism, hospitality and entertainment, it's critical that we continue to make improvements to our international airport, and support the major expansion of the Moscone Convention Center, so we can compete once again for the world's biggest conventions and trade shows.

We will continue to support the improvement and expansion of our arts and cultural institutions, like the rebuild of the Opera House, the new Mexican Museum, the new wing of the SFMOMA, and if the members of the Board of Trustees agree, a wonderful new museum in the Presidio for George Lucas' unique American art and cultural collection.

In 2016, we'll host Super Bowl 50. Thank you, Daniel Lurie and our Super Bowl Host Committee for putting together the winning bid.

And in 2017, we'll bring back the America's Cup, applying the valuable and sometimes hard lessons we learned last year, for an even more spectacular, focused series of sailboat racing on our Bay.

Congratulations Larry Ellison, Russell Coutts, and Oracle TeamUSA for that amazing come-from-behind victory!

And we will work with the Golden State Warriors to bring them back home to San Francisco, to a spectacular new basketball and entertainment pavilion on the waterfront!

Thank you to Peter Guber and Joe Lacob and the Warriors' ownership for your investment in our City's future. I know Rick Welts is here today as well. Rick, we are all behind you for another exciting playoff run this year.

We will continue to invest in our neighborhoods, targeting our resources first within our 25 Invest in Neighborhoods commercial corridors throughout the City, places like Geary Boulevard in Supervisor Mar's district, Third Street in Supervisor Cohen's district and Taraval Street in Supervisor Tang's district.

I'd also like to thank our 2010 and 2012 World Series Champions, the San Francisco Giants -- along with CEO Larry Baer and even guys like Hunter Pence - for giving back to the City and helping clean up our neighborhoods through the "Giants Sweep" campaign last year.

In 2013, we brought free Wi-Fi to Market Street and announced a partnership with Google, thanks to Supervisor Farrell, to bring free Wi-Fi to 31 of our City's parks and playgrounds.

In 2014, we will continue to connect our residents to the cloud by bringing free Wi-Fi to several of our Invest in Neighborhoods commercial corridors.

And we will continue to invest in the quiet engine of job creation in San Francisco - our small businesses, with our new ADA Assistance Program, revolving loan programs, our Jobs Squad and our new online small business portal.

And we must continue to support our City's thriving nonprofit organizations and workers. They provide vital frontline services to our neighborhoods and to our most vulnerable residents.

And just like many of their clients on limited incomes, for many nonprofits and arts organizations it's tough to absorb an increase in the rent. So, I applaud Supervisor Kim and President Chiu for their work on this subject, and look forward to working closely with them to find consensus around practical solutions.

In 2013, President Chiu authored groundbreaking legislation that I was proud to sign that placed San Francisco at the forefront of guaranteeing a more family-friendly workplace.

This year, our City can be at the national forefront once again - by raising the minimum wage.

How many of us could get by in this town on our current minimum wage of \$10.74 an hour?

There's a growing consensus among liberals and conservatives alike that raising the minimum wage will help lift thousands of our fellow residents out of poverty and keep people off public assistance, saving taxpayers millions.

And so, this November, with Supervisor Kim's leadership and others, let's make it a little easier for some of our hardest-working residents to get by in this City, by placing a ballot measure before the voters to raise the minimum wage in San Francisco.

We'll approach it the way we've approached our other challenges, like business tax reform and housing and transportation. We will reach out to impacted sectors, small businesses, workers, experts and others to seek consensus around a significant minimum wage increase for working families.

We've already begun the dialogue, and I look forward to working with all of you. Let's get this done in 2014.

And there's one more thing we must continue to guarantee for all our people, and that's affordable, quality health care. In 2007, under Mayor Gavin Newsom, we became the first City in America to provide universal health care through Healthy San Francisco. In 2013, thanks to the leadership of Leader Nancy Pelosi and President Obama, it finally came to the rest of the country through the Affordable Care Act.

I recently convened a Universal Health Care Council of health, business, labor and community leaders to study the new national health laws, as well as our own, to ensure that no one in San Francisco falls through the cracks -- not our seniors, not our workers, not our immigrants.

Now it's all our job to make sure every person in our City is enrolled and insured through Covered California or Healthy San Francisco.

Education

And if we want our families to stay and grow here, if we want employers to stay and grow here, we must strive for the best public schools, anywhere. I know that Supervisor Yee and the rest of the Board share this value.

I say the best public schools "anywhere" because we're not just competing with other cities in California anymore.

For the jobs of the future, our students will have to compete with the rest of the world.

Like all parents, I once had to decide where to send my children to school. I chose to send my daughters to the San Francisco Unified School District, and today, I'm thrilled that every year, more and more families are doing the same.

My friends, make no mistake, believe the hype. We are in the midst of a renaissance in our public schools. We have one of the top performing urban school districts in California, and by many measures, in the nation.

In 2014, by partnering with the School District and with our flourishing private sector, we will do even more to prepare our young people for their future.

For example, look at the incredible contribution and support of our Middle School Leadership Initiative by Marc and Lynne Benioff, and the Salesforce.com Foundation.

With the Benioff's support - along with the support of other San Francisco technology companies and foundations, and a lot of great teachers, we are helping middle schoolers focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Math, or "steam," because we know that's what the jobs of tomorrow will require.

And today, I am pleased to announce that this year, we will expand my initiative to middle schoolers in all of our K-8 Schools, so schools like Bessie Carmichael, Lawton, Paul Revere and others will be a part of this exciting initiative.

Last year, we passed a budget with a record investment in our public schools. This year, we will surpass even that. In 2014, I will propose to fund the school district at a level never seen before in San Francisco history, with \$66 million for our public schools and \$27 million more for universal pre-school.

And now, along with our own historic investments, and with Governor Brown's commitment to greater funding for schools proposed last week in his budget, San Francisco will be among the highest in per-student spending in the State of California.

Thank you, Governor Brown, and thank you, Superintendent Carranza and members of the Board of Education.

And a special thanks to Board Member Hydra Mendoza, who also happens to be my education policy advisor in the Mayor's Office, for her passion and thoughtful leadership on education issues.

But when it comes to education and services for our young people, we're not done.

This November, we will ask San Francisco voters to renew the Children's Fund and the Public Education Enrichment Fund. But we can't be satisfied with the status quo.

To all those parents and aspiring parents in our City, I say, we hear you. We are working with the School Board, Superintendent Carranza and with you to craft a long term vision, so that your investment today will directly lead to a world class public school system, starting with universal pre-school and continuing through college.

City College

And that means making sure City College continues with long-overdue reforms and remains open and accredited, today and for the future.

I am 100% confident that we will not only save City College, we'll make it stronger and more sustainable than ever.

Go ahead and enroll. It's going to be there for you, and for us. It is too important.

I'm upset too with the Accreditation Commission's process and decision. But let's be frank. Putting all our focus on them is a distraction.

City College was on an unsustainable course because of years of unsustainable financial and governance decisions. Just because we don't like the diagnosis doesn't mean we can ignore the urgent need for treatment.

But because of our work together and collaboration with the new, strong leadership team in place, City College is on the mend and on a path to a full recovery.

Under the leadership of new Chancellor Art Tyler and our Special Trustee Bob Agrella, and with the full support of California Chancellor Brice Harris, we are making tough decisions and applying long-overdue reforms for the long-term health of the institution.

City College has earned the right to be taken off this cliff of uncertainty.

Given the enormous improvements already made, I will ask the State of California to guarantee continued stable funding for City College, in spite of recent enrollment dips.

And I call upon the Accreditation Commission to immediately lift the cloud that still hangs over City College and our students' future.

Transportation

A true affordability agenda for our City must also include having a great public transportation system, one that's safe, affordable and reliable for everyone.

More than ever, our aging fleet, our deteriorating roads and our growing population demand that we make greater investments in our transportation infrastructure for the future.

We made some modest progress last year. As a result of the Street Repaving Bond passed by voters in 2011 and the leadership of Public Works Director Mohammed Nuru, we have repaved a record 854 blocks and our street conditions are slowly improving.

Under the direction of Ed Reiskin and Board Chair Tom Nolan, the SFMTA added nearly 200 new and rehabbed buses to our fleet last year, with a goal of replacing the entire fleet in five years.

And along with other cities in the region and our friends at the Bike Coalition, we launched Bay Area Bikeshare, whose membership is growing monthly, demonstrating the strong demand and public support for expanding the program to other parts of our City, in 2014 and beyond.

But when it comes to having the transportation system our residents deserve, we still have a ways to go.

And so in 2013, with President Chiu and Supervisor Wiener, we convened all the transportation experts and advocates for our Transportation 2030 Task Force, chaired by Gabe Metcalf, Director of SPUR and Monique Zmuda, our Deputy City Controller.

Their recommendations include investing in the core systems of Muni and our streets with a rehabilitated fleet, more vehicles, updated maintenance facilities, critical pedestrian and bike safety improvements, and repaving more of our crumbling streets.

It's not a small price tag: \$10.1 billion to improve core service, as well as meet the needs of our planned growth here along the waterfront and in other parts of town.

But they also gave us a roadmap to leverage federal, state and local monies and fund our system in a responsible, more sustainable way, if only we show the resolve to finally tackle our long-term transportation challenges.

In November, working with the Board of Supervisors, I will support the Transportation 2030 Task Force's two recommendations for 2014, bringing to the voters a \$500 million general obligation transportation bond and a measure to increase the local vehicle license fee

I recognize that asking voters to pay more for their vehicle license fee may be an uphill battle, especially at a time when the cost of living in our City is already so high.

But the cost of ignoring Muni's problems, the cost of falling further behind in the condition of our streets, the cost of jamming more people onto already overcrowded and aging streetcars - is far higher.

And while we're at it - if we're finally going to take a comprehensive approach to Muni's funding - let's tear off a band-aid we applied in more dire financial times that made our residents' lives a little more frustrating and expensive.

I'm talking about "Sunday meters." It generated several million dollars last year, almost half of it from parking tickets, and I hear about it. **Nobody likes it. Not parents. Not our neighborhood small businesses. Not me.**

With a more sustainable approach to funding our transportation system, we can give our meters, our parking control officers and most importantly, our families a rest on Sunday.

And so today I call upon the SFMTA Board of Directors to suspend Sunday meters in our City beginning with the new fiscal year. I'm grateful that Board Chair Tom Nolan has already signaled his support.

Let's stop nickel and diming people at the meter and work together to pass a transportation bond and vehicle license fee increase in 2014, instead.

And there's one more thing we can do for our working families who rely on Muni, especially our low-income families. Last year, the SFMTA, at the urging of Supervisor Campos and many in the community, began a pilot program to fund free muni for low-income youth.

The results are in. It's a hit. And our kids need it. It's time to make it permanent, and I call upon the SFMTA to do just that in its next two-year budget.

Again, with a comprehensive funding strategy in place, we won't be robbing our maintenance dollars to pay for it. And it's the right thing to do for our lower and middle-income families to make this City a little more affordable.

Budget

Affordability is also about having a City government that the taxpayers can afford.

In the last three years, under the leadership of former Budget Chair and now Assessor-Recorder Carmen Chu, and more recently under the leadership of Budget Chair Mark Farrell, we have for the first time adopted Five-Year financial plans, two-year budgets, and made dramatic progress towards reducing our annual shortfalls and eliminating our structural deficit.

Thanks to the wisdom of the voters, we are among just a handful of cities in the nation to confront our unfunded pension and retiree health liabilities.

Better times have returned, but we must not be tempted to stray from the path of fiscal discipline, and as we craft our next two-year budget, we must be sure we are only investing in services and staffing that we can afford over the long term.

Public Safety

And one of those fundamental responsibilities is ensuring public safety. In 2014, San Francisco remains one of the safest big cities in America. Thank you, Chief Suhr, Chief Hayes-White, Adult Probation Chief Still, Juvenile Probation Chief Nance and District Attorney George Gascon.

Two years ago, alongside Supervisor Cohen, our police department and with partners in the community, we launched the IPO Strategy - Interrupt, Predict and Organize, and we've seen remarkable results.

Homicides are down 30 percent from last year, among the lowest in 40 years, with shootings half of what they were 10 years ago.

But we can do better.

With new police and fire academies made possible by our economic recovery, we'll hire and train more first responders, from 911 dispatch operators to firefighters to police officers. Soon you'll see more officers walking a neighborhood beat, from Haight Street to Third Street to the Tenderloin and Central Market.

And a big thank you to the men and women of our police officers and firefighters' unions for agreeing to multi-year labor contracts that will allow us to move forward with these ambitious hiring plans.

And let me say a few words about another public safety challenge on our City's streets that last year grew at an alarming rate, and that's the safety of our pedestrians and bicyclists.

This week I announced a renewed strategy to keep people safe, including stepped up enforcement, especially against reckless drivers, better training for commercial drivers and those who drive the most, our "Be Nice, Look Twice" public education campaign, and improvements in places like Polk Street and South Van Ness, where we most urgently need improvements.

It's another reason the transportation measures I discussed earlier are so important, so we can dramatically expand our segregated bike lanes and pedestrian bulb-outs.

I also support the goals of Vision Zero to eliminate traffic-related deaths in our City, but to get there, we need a little more commonsense as well. For everyone, be more aware of your surroundings. And drivers slow down and don't ever text and drive.

San Francisco is one of the most pedestrian and bicycle-friendly cities in America. Let's work together in 2014 to make it the safest city in America for those activities as well.

And there's another daily threat to our public safety in California -- earthquakes.

We don't know when it will strike, but someday, it will, and it is up to us to make sure we've done all we can to prepare.

And so in June, I will ask you to join me in supporting a \$400 million Earthquake Safety Emergency Response General Obligation Bond.

Part of our Ten-Year Capital Plan, this 2014 Earthquake Safety Bond will fund critical seismic improvements to our fire and police stations, our emergency firefighting water system and other core assets that our first responders will rely on to save lives and property, all without raising property taxes.

It follows the important seismic improvements we've already made to our Hetch Hetchy water system, our General Hospital and key roads and bridges to make San Francisco the most resilient and seismically-prepared city in California.

Environment

A January day like this and this bone-dry winter, remind us that the threat of climate change is very real.

An hour ago, our Governor formally declared that we are in a drought in California. It's more important than ever to continue our global leadership on the environment.

We'll do that by ensuring that our new housing and commercial office spaces are the greenest possible. Thanks to our green building laws, we have significantly reduced our greenhouse gas emissions, even as construction booms.

I'm proud that San Francisco was ranked among the top energy-efficient cities in the nation in 2013, #1 in LEED Platinum and Gold Commercial projects, and that our waste diversion rate continues to lead the nation.

We're also a national leader in electric vehicle charging stations and building out our EV infrastructure for the future.

And we're helping homeowners and businesses become more energy-efficient by installing rooftop solar through our GoSolarSF and through our recently-announced PACE programs.

And through our Public Utilities Commission and Recreation & Parks Departments, thank you General Managers Harlan Kelly and Phil Ginsburg, we're investing in water recycling and greater water conservation for current and future droughts.

Homelessness

And ladies and gentlemen, there's another public health, public safety, and fundamental human challenge on our streets - and that's too many people without a home.

While we have the strongest social safety net in the nation, we still have far too many homeless people suffering on our streets, and too many people unable to make the choices they need to save their own lives because of severe mental health and substance abuse problems.

In the last 10 years, begun under the leadership of former Mayor Gavin Newsom, nearly 11,000 people have moved off of our streets, thanks in part to thousands of units of supportive housing we have built, where we continue to provide intensive services.

And we've changed 11,000 lives for the better, including the lives of people like Todd Leachman, a single dad, who is here today with his daughter. Last year, Todd lost his job and became homeless. But now Todd is well on his way to self-sufficiency again after receiving move-in assistance and a temporary rental subsidy through the Hamilton Family Center's First Avenues program.

Todd is housed along with many other families thanks to programs that prevent at-risk families from becoming homeless through our Human Services Agency, under the steady leadership of Director Trent Rhorer.

But we need to do more, and the proof is what we see on the streets every day, too many people dealing with serious mental health issues like schizophrenia, often self-medicating with drugs and alcohol.

We won't turn our backs on them. But we do have to change how we help those who are clearly suffering, and who cannot help themselves.

For these folks, no matter how many times we offer them housing and services, they decline. It's not a lack of resources. No City spends more than we do, \$2.7 billion every year, on the social and human safety net.

Our Department of Public Health started the San Francisco Community Independence Placement Program two years ago, I've called it San Francisco's version of "Laura's Law."

The results are in, and it's working. Through this program, we are reducing hospital stays and jail time, increasing access to stabilizing services and treatment, and saving lives.

Health experts estimate that there are hundreds of people who could immediately benefit from a stronger public conservatorship program encompassing mental health and substance abuse like this one.

In 2014, we must expand and make permanent this kind of strong Public Conservatorship program.

First, I will ask the Board of Supervisors to adopt a required resolution allowing our City to fully move forward with our own community-based mental health program.

Second, I will work with the Superior Courts to educate our judges about the positive benefits of this program.

And third, I will work with other Mayors and a statewide coalition to propose changes to state law in Sacramento that will boost our local ability to implement a public conservatorship program that works.

Folks, I know this will not come without controversy, but I refuse to let people die on our streets any longer because we refused to compel them to help themselves.

I'm grateful that City Attorney Dennis Herrera, our Public Health Director Barbara Garcia, and a growing number of mental health experts and homeless advocates have endorsed this new approach.

This is still the City of St. Francis, and we have a moral obligation to help those who are chronically homeless because they simply do not have the capacity to make decisions that will save their own lives.

Housing for All

But housing in San Francisco, especially in 2014, is not just a concern for those still on our streets.

And that brings us back to where we are today, this place, the Shipyard, which we see today at long last is reclaimed and reborn, from a foundry for ships to the crucible of a new community. Mayor Brown, we're finally realizing your vision here and honoring the commitment you made to this community and to the Southeast sector so many years ago.

And thank you Senator Feinstein and Leader Pelosi for your unwavering support all these years for the revitalization of the Shipyard and for your leadership in winning \$850 million over the last two decades for a thorough cleanup and smooth transition from the Navy to the City.

Around us - under construction before our very eyes - are hundreds - and soon thousands -- of new homes, some of them two and three bedroom homes for families. More than 25% of them will be permanently affordable and onsite. And the rest will be priced

according to the market, many fully in reach of our City's middle class families.

You heard me right - family housing, with these views of the waterfront and our downtown skyline, all priced at the market rate for middle income families and individuals, ready to move in as early as this summer. You can even see the Willie L. Brown, Jr. Bay Bridge from your front porch!

And while the 49ers will never play at Candlestick again, soon thousands of children will be playing there instead, as we replace the old stadium with thousands of new homes and parks for middle class families, beginning next year.

The shortage of housing affordable to working and middle income people is a problem we've let fester for so long in this town, it's become a genuine crisis.

It's a crisis that sparks genuine fear in too many longtime residents, worried that speculators looking to make a quick buck in a hot market will soon threaten them with eviction.

It's a crisis that pushes young couples starting a family out of town, because once you have a kid, there's only so long that one bedroom apartment is going to work.

And it's a crisis that threatens to choke off our economic growth and prosperity for the future, as companies move elsewhere because their employees simply can't afford to live here anymore.

It's a crisis made all the more daunting because there are no easy solutions, and so, too often, in frustration, some people turn to easy targets instead - a commuter shuttle bus or a company's IPO, or even, toast.

My fellow San Franciscans what our housing crisis demands are real solutions and a shared vision, not easy slogans and scapegoating.

Because let's be clear: we are all responsible - this is a crisis of our own making.

For too long in San Francisco, we've tried to have it both ways. We want more money for affordable housing, but too often we oppose or scale back the very projects that generate those funds.

We demand that developers build more housing affordable for working people and middle income families, but then we slow them down at every step, severely limit where and what they can build, and then express surprise when new market-rate housing is affordable only to the wealthy.

A great example of these problems is the place where we are standing right now.

Some of those who decry our housing crisis were the same folks who opposed building these new homes, and slowed their approval for years beyond just the pace of cleanup.

You see, I know something about these issues. It's where I got my start in politics more than 35 years ago, as an advocate for some of our City's poorest tenants.

In 1977, as Reverend Norman Fong, Gordon Chin, Jeff and Sandy Mori and so many others will remember, we stood together to stop the wrongful eviction of hundreds of our seniors and immigrants from the International Hotel.

One summer night, while the rest of the City slept, an army of riot police, many on horseback, marched on the I-Hotel.

In defiance, some 3,000 of us banded together and surrounded the building, singing "We Shall Overcome."

In the end, we only slowed the evictions, but it was a turning point for the Pan-Asian and tenant movements in our City.

Our resistance that night helped pave the way for the passage of rent control by the Board of Supervisors two years later.

And all these years later, as Mayor, though I may be a little less angry, my passion for housing - and making sure San Francisco is still a place where people of every background can call home - still burns hot.

That's why housing is a central part of my economic plan.

And why, in the first year of my full term as Mayor, we worked together to place an Affordable Housing Trust Fund on the ballot, which the voters adopted, to create a \$1.5 billion stream of funding for affordable housing for low and middle-income residents over the next 30 years.

But I will be the first to say, it's only a start.

So today I lay out an ambitious new challenge for our City, by setting an aggressive goal to complete at least 30,000 new and rehabilitated homes by 2020.

Additionally, my challenge is to ensure that at least one-third of those will be permanently affordable to low and moderate income families.

And the majority of them will be within reach of working, middle income San Franciscans - our retail and service workers; our teachers and electricians; our homecare workers and nurses.

And today I'm announcing the seven pillars of a plan to reach this ambitious goal - seven principles around which we must rally our efforts and marshal our resources to ensure we build these 30,000 homes and meet our affordability targets.

First, we must protect our residents from eviction and displacement.

We have some of the best tenant protections in the country, but unchecked real estate speculation threatens too many of our residents.

I've joined Senator Leno, Assemblyman Ting, President Chiu, Supervisor Campos and a diverse coalition of supporters, including business leaders, property owners and developers, to reform the Ellis Act in Sacramento.

Second, we must stabilize and protect at-risk rent-controlled units.

Rent control is still the core protection that allows many of our residents to remain in our City.

Third, we must revitalize and rebuild our public housing.

As I said last year, it's time to end the cycle of "poverty housing" in San Francisco. Supervisor Breed, who grew up in Plaza East, knows exactly what I'm talking about.

In 2013, with new leadership at our Housing Authority, and with the full support of the Obama Administration and HUD Secretary Shaun Donovan, we now have a set of recommendations to reform the way we provide safe, clean housing for our poorest residents.

Thank you, City Administrator Naomi Kelly and members of the Housing Authority Commission.

We are building on and expanding the principles of HOPE SF a plan that will transform four public housing sites into integrated, mixed income communities. We have already started with Hunters View, and next, in partnership with Lennar Urban, we'll begin at nearby Alice Griffith Housing.

Problems decades in the making won't be solved overnight, but we're making progress.

Last year, HUD rewarded our reform efforts with \$6.5 million more for basic operations, and today there are new maintenance mechanics at every property, 25% of these positions filled by residents themselves.

Next week, I'll be traveling to Washington to ask HUD for even more flexibility on how we spend our limited federal dollars.

This will allow us to leverage even more funds for our re-imagined vision of public housing, so we can rebuild 4,000 housing units by 2020.

The fourth pillar of my agenda will double our downpayment loan programs and create more middle income homeownership opportunities.

Our City's middle class is deeply affected by the housing crunch - they make too much to qualify for our traditional affordable housing, but not enough to afford much of the new market rate construction.

And so we must explore new public-private partnerships and launch a wave of innovative land-use experiments to build thousands of new homes in reach of the middle class, including new incentives for more onsite inclusionary housing, land trusts and use of our publicly-owned lands.

And today I am announcing an immediate expansion to double the amount of the City's down-payment program, to increase assistance to first-time and below-market-rate homebuyers.

Together, these acts can help more than 2,500 additional middle-income families buy a home in our City by 2020.

Fifth, we must build more affordable housing, faster. We're a national leader in production of permanently affordable housing, but we need to build more of it, and with fewer delays.

In December, I signed an Executive Order directing our permitting agencies to prioritize affordable projects.

If we continue these efforts, we can add as many as 4,000 new permanently affordable rentals by 2020.

Sixth, we must continue to build market rate units, especially rental units.

The laws of supply and demand still apply, even in San Francisco. The more options for housing our residents have, the less difficult it becomes to find a home.

In particular, by building in neighborhoods outside of our central core, like here in the Shipyard or nearby Candlestick, at Parkmerced, or at the old Schlage Lock site in Visitacion Valley we will dramatically expand the number of homes naturally affordable to middle income families.

And finally, we must make construction of new housing easier.

To get tens of thousands of homes built faster, we need to reduce the obstacles that can slow or even stop their construction.

I know this one is especially clear to Supervisor Wiener.

And we need new ways to support neighborhood infrastructure - through the re-investment of property taxes or infrastructure financing districts.

Some of you will look at this plan and say "But Ed, this will require us to do more than we've ever done before!"

And to them I say, exactly.

When it comes to housing production, we can't keep doing the same things but expect better results.

We have to set aside the politics and traditional ideologies and instead work together, in the service of real solutions for housing.

Next month, I will once again convene housing experts who know this issue best - the developers - market rate and affordable - City departments, tenant and housing advocates, realtors and property owners.

I'll ask them to work with me and with the Board of Supervisors to achieve the goal of 30,000 new and rehabilitated homes by 2020 and implement the seven pillars of this housing plan.

CONCLUSION

Ladies and gentlemen, I know we can do it, because in the relatively short life of our City, we have faced and overcome even more daunting challenges.

And I'm not just talking about earthquakes or pandemics.

From the Gold Rush to the building of the railroad, through wars, liberation movements, the AIDS crisis and the dot.com boom, the story of San Francisco is one of rapid spurts of growth.

It's a story of new industries and movements that brought new waves of people, all seeking the better life and opportunities that San Francisco, more than most places, has always represented.

Over time our growing City covered the hills.

We grew West and South, turning cemeteries and sand dunes into neighborhoods like the Western Addition, the Richmond and the Sunset.

Today we grow again in places like the Shipyard, the new Transbay District or along our eastern waterfront in places like Mission Rock or Pier 70.

And whether it was the Irish who came to pan for gold...
the Chinese who came to work on the railroad...
the African-Americans who came to work in the shipyards...
Latinos who fled civil war at home in search of work...
or gay, lesbian and transgender people who came seeking freedom and self-expression...
with each wave of newcomer has come a degree of tension.

But my fellow San Franciscans, our City has never been a postcard frozen in time.

We have never been a City that closed our borders, and slammed shut the door of opportunity to those who came here after us.

And when we've tried to keep people out, or demonized and stereotyped a group of people, they have been our ugliest and most shameful chapters.

And so today, as our population once again grows in numbers, and our skyline grows upwards, I call upon the quality and tenor of our civic discussion to grow up as well.

My friends, keeping this City a place where everyone can live - whether you've been year for 60 years or 60 days - is the fundamental challenge of our time.

But it is a challenge we must confront together.

As usual, it was Dr. King who said it best, "We may have come on different ships, but we're in the same boat now."

It's a challenge we confront by ensuring every San Franciscan who can work has a job.

It's a challenge we confront by ensuring every San Franciscan can afford to stay here, and raise a family.

And it's a challenge we confront by improving our schools, our public transportation system and keeping our streets safe.

We are one city, where we celebrate the success of all our residents, and we all share in the responsibility to help those still left behind.

It's that same city where thousands will turn out to cheer on a little kid named Miles, who conquered cancer, and then came to live out his superhero dreams as Batkid.

And to the newcomers, to the young people who have come here, like so many generations before you, to find new opportunities,

I say: get involved.

You are now a part of this City, and must be a part of the solution.

Acknowledge your impact, and make it a good one.

Understand that the homeless man you see sleeping in the doorway probably once thought he was invincible too, but then made mistakes, or fell on hard times, and that one day, you may too.

Volunteer at your local school. Help clean up your local park.

Respect the history and the cultures of those who were here before you.

Shop and eat in your neighborhood, and break bread with your neighbors.

Because, it turns out... that San Francisco changes us more than any group of newcomers will ever change San Francisco.

It opens our eyes and our minds to new ideas and new ways of thinking, and that, my friends, is what makes this place so special, and keeps us at the cutting edge of this century as much, if not moreso, than the last.

My fellow San Franciscans, we have come a great distance these last few years, but there are still too many in our City we must lift up and too many we must still help to ensure that this will always be their City too.

Our work is far from done.

Nelson Mandela taught the world a thing or two about bridging divides and bringing people together.

And he reminded us that, after climbing a great hill, one only finds that there are many more hills to climb.

We may take a moment to rest, and look back at the distance we have come. But only for a moment.

We have responsibilities, and we dare not linger. Our long walk together is not yet ended.

Let us go forward together in 2014 to keep the State of our City vital and strong, and ensure that San Francisco remains a place where everyone can afford to call home.

Thank you.

EXHIBIT B

2014.0433E



SFMTA
Municipal
Transportation
Agency

Edwin M. Lee, Mayor

Tom Nolan, Chairman

Malcolm Heintz, Director

Joel Barios, Director

Edward D. Reiskin, Director of Transportation

Cheryl Brinkman, Vice-Chairman

Jerry Lee, Director

Cristina Rubke, Director

March 25, 2014

Gerald Robbins
Acting Director-Sustainable Streets Division
1 South Van Ness, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

Subject: Environmental Review Request- SFMTA two-year Capital Budget

Dear Mr. Robbins:

The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and Parking Authority Commission are requesting environmental review of the SFMTA's FY2015-2016 two-year Capital Budget. Prior to the upcoming meeting on April 1, 2014, the SFMTA held public hearings to consider various proposed changes to charges, fees, fines, fares and rates on February 18, March 4, and March 18, 2014.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Sonali Bose', written over a horizontal line.

Sonali Bose, CFO

Statutorily Exempt from Environmental Review - Section 15273
Rates, Tolls, Fares and Charges: CEQA does not apply to the
establishment, modification, structuring, restructuring or approval
of rates, tolls, fares or other charges by public agencies.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Gerald Robbins', written over a horizontal line.

Gerald Robbins

3-25-14

Date

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jeanie Poling', written over a horizontal line.
4/11/14
Approved Planning Dept. Jeanie Poling
Concurred

EXHIBIT C

SAN FRANCISCO
MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND
PARKING AUTHORITY COMMISSION

RESOLUTION No. 14-061

WHEREAS, The FY 2015 and FY 2016 Operating and Capital Budgets for the SFMTA are being prepared in accordance with the City Charter Section 8A.106 with the Operating Budget in the amount of \$943.2 million and \$962.6 million respectively, and the Capital Budget in the amount of \$562.9 million and \$669.0 million which includes additional revenue of \$32 million in FY 2016 contingent upon voter approval of possible November 2014 ballot initiatives and on an increased General Fund support from the City for transportation and street improvements; and

WHEREAS, Charter Section 8A.106(b) requires the SFMTA to certify that the budget is adequate in all respects to make substantial progress towards meeting the performance standards established pursuant to Section 8A.103 for the fiscal year covered by the budget; and

WHEREAS, The SFMTA's FY 2015 and FY 2016 Operating Budget includes the revenue and expenditure adjustments to reflect the Municipal Railway fare change for free service on New Year's Eve 2014 and 2015; and

WHEREAS, Authorizing the Director of Transportation to implement short-term experimental fares enables the SFMTA to respond effectively to community requests; and

WHEREAS, The SFMTA is proposing to change various fines, fees, fares, rates and charges, as itemized in Attachment A to this Resolution including Cash and Clipper® fares for Municipal Railway adult, senior, youth, disabled and low-income (Lifeline), including free Muni for low and moderate income youth who use a Clipper® card, and Free Muni for low and moderate income 18 year olds, senior and disabled customers who use a Clipper® card, Paratransit (Van and Taxi) fares, monthly passes and stickers; School Coupon Booklet; Visitor Passports, inter-agency monthly passes, fares and stickers; Special Event service fares; Project 20 (request for community service or installment payment) fees; Residential, Contractor, Business, Press, Vanpool, School, Fire Station, Foreign Consulate, Medical and Childcare, Farmer's Market, On-Street Car Sharing Vehicle, SFMTA, and daily temporary/visitor vehicle parking permit fees; boot removal fee; SFMTA towing and storage administrative fees; payment by telephone and on-line computer transaction fee; transit fare evasion/passenger conduct, parking citation, Transportation Code, and Vehicle Code fines, late penalties and special collections fees; taxi permit fees and administrative penalties; parking meter use fee; temporary exclusive use of parking meter fee; transit vehicle (cable car, historic street car, motor bus, light rail, trolley bus, GO-4) rental fees; temporary street closure and neighborhood block party fees, special traffic permit fees; temporary no-parking sign posting fees, parklet fees, designated shuttle stop use permit fees, color curb painting fees; off-street parking fees and garage rates; establishing a Lifeline ID card replacement fee; eliminating Vallejo and CalTrain Muni monthly pass discounts; establishing an interagency single ride adult fare discount for Clipper® card users; and eliminating the in-person Customer Service Center transaction fee; codifying the payment by telephone transaction fee, signs and parking space removal/relocation fee, intellectual property license fee (Film Permits), temporary no-parking sign self-posting fee for special events, SFMTA transit map fee, taxi permit fees, and bus substitution fee; and adding penalties for overtime parking meter violations; and

WHEREAS, The proposed amendments to the Transportation Code to increase parking citation late payment penalties, the special collections fee, boot removal fees, various parking citation, Transportation Code, and Vehicle Code penalties, color curb painting fees, towing and storage administrative fees, on-line computer transaction fee, motor vehicle for hire fine amounts, request for community service processing fee, parking meter use fee, parklet installation fee, temporary no-parking sign posting fees, special traffic permit fees, temporary exclusive use of parking meter fee, residential area and other parking permit fees, designated shuttle stop use permit fee, temporary street closure and neighborhood block party fees, and bus substitution fee, to eliminate the in-person customer service center fee and codify the SFMTA transit map fee, to increase and codify the payment by telephone transaction fee, to add penalties for parking at an inoperable or broken parking meter or pay station in excess of the maximum time permitted, and to codify the signs and parking space removal/relocation fee, intellectual property license fee, Lifeline ID card replacement fee, and taxi permit fees are included as part of the calendar item; and

WHEREAS, The proposed amendments to the Transportation Code include a provision that will eliminate both the payment by telephone and on-line computer transaction fees effective April 1, 2015, contingent upon a review and determination of the SFMTA's fiscal health in January 2015; and

WHEREAS, On April 1, 2014, the SFMTA Board accepted a gift from Google, Inc. to support the "Free Muni for Low and Moderate Income Youth who use a Clipper® card" pilot program for FY 2015 and FY 2016; and

WHEREAS, The SFMTA Board desires to eliminate enforcement of parking meters on Sundays between the hours of 12 pm and 6 pm including the four-hour time limit for parking at a meter on Sundays effective July 1, 2014;

WHEREAS, The changes in various fees, fares, rates and charges itemized in Attachment A are necessary to meet SFMTA operating expenses, including employee wages and benefits or to purchase and lease essential supplies, equipment and materials; and

WHEREAS, On March 28, 2014, the SFMTA Board approved up to a twelve percent transit service increase recommended by the Transit Effectiveness Project, ten percent of which is funded in the FY 2015 and FY 2016 budget ; and

WHEREAS, The proposed seven percent transit service increase for FY 2016 is contingent upon a review and determination of the SFMTA's fiscal health in January 2015; and

WHEREAS, Additional funding in the amount of \$0.6 million in FY 2015 and \$1.2 million for FY 2016 for transit vehicle cleanliness and fleet appearance is proposed to be allocated contingent upon a review and determination of the SFMTA's fiscal health in January 2015; and

WHEREAS, The Capital Budget includes projects within 16 capital programs: Accessibility; Bicycle; Central Subway; Facility; Fleet; Information Technology/Communications; Parking; Pedestrian; Safety; School; Security; Taxi; Traffic Calming; Traffic/Signals; Transit Fixed Guideway; and Transit Optimization/Expansion of which \$32 million in FY 2016 is contingent upon voter approval of possible November 2014 ballot initiatives and on an increase in General Fund support for transportation and street improvements; and

WHEREAS, Pursuant Charter Section 16.112 and the SFMTA Board's Rules of Order, advertisements were placed in the City's official newspaper, the San Francisco Chronicle, to provide published notice of the April 15th public hearing which ran starting on March 25, 2014, for five consecutive days; and

WHEREAS, SFMTA staff, under authority delegated by the Planning Department, has been determined that the proposed modifications to fines, fees, fares, rates and charges included in the FY 2015 and FY 2016 Operating and Capital Budgets, as itemized in Attachment A, including continuing free Muni for low and moderate income youth who use a Clipper® card pilot program, and providing free Muni for low and moderate income 18 year olds, seniors, and/or disabled riders who use a Clipper® card, contingent upon a review and determination of the SFMTA's fiscal health, are statutorily exempt from environmental review pursuant to California Public Resources Code section 21080(b)(8) and CEQA implementing guidelines because the anticipated revenues will be used to meet SFMTA operating expenses, including employee wage rates and fringe benefits, or to purchase or lease supplies, equipment, or materials; and

WHEREAS, Said CEQA determination is on file with the Secretary to the SFMTA and is incorporated herein by this reference. The proposed action is the Approval Action as defined by the S.F. Administrative Code Chapter 31; and;

WHEREAS, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 applies to programs and services receiving federal funding and prohibits discrimination based on race, color, or national origin from federally funded programs such as transit and in order to remain compliant with Title VI requirements and ensure continued federal funding, the SFMTA must analyze the impacts of fare changes on minority and low income populations in compliance with the FTA's updated Circular 4702.1B; and

WHEREAS, The SFMTA prepared a comprehensive Title VI analysis of the impacts of the proposed fare changes on low-income and minority communities in San Francisco and has determined that there is no disparate impact to minority populations or disproportionate burden to low-income populations which is attached as Attachment D; and,

WHEREAS, Section 10.104.15 of the San Francisco Charter allows City departments to contract for services where such services can be practically performed under private contract at a lesser cost than similar work performed by employees of the City and County, as determined by the Controller and approved annually by the Board of Supervisors; and,

WHEREAS, The SFMTA has ongoing contracts for parking citation processing and collection; facility security services; paratransit services; parking meter collection and coin counting services; low-level platform maintenance services; and vehicle towing, storage and disposal services; and,

WHEREAS, The SFMTA plans to contract out for employment-related medical examinations starting July 1, 2014; and,

WHEREAS, The Controller has determined, or is expected to determine, that for FY 2015 and FY 2016, parking citation processing and collection; facility security services; paratransit services; parking meter collection and coin counting services; low-level platform maintenance services; vehicle towing, storage and disposal services; and employment related medical examinations services can be practically performed by private contractors at a lesser cost than if they were performed by employees of the City; and,

WHEREAS, In January 2015, the SFMTA Board will review the Agency's fiscal health for FY 2015 and FY 2016 to confirm the Agency's ability to financially support a seven percent transit service increase for FY 2016 for the Transit Effectiveness Project, allocating additional funding in the amount of \$0.6 million in FY 2015 and \$1.2 million for FY 2016 for transit vehicle fleet cleaning and appearance, providing Free Muni for low and moderate income 18 year olds, seniors, and/or disabled customers who use a Clipper® card, and eliminating the telephone and on-line computer transaction fees; and

WHEREAS, A motion was made at the April 15, 2014 SFMTA Board meeting to delay both the proposed September 2014 increase to the discount senior, disabled, and youth cash fare and monthly pass until July 1, 2015 when the proposed FY 2016 fares would take effect, to amend Attachment A to reflect these changes, and to revise the Title VI report to reflect the delay in these fare increases; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board approves the delay of both the proposed September 2014 increase to the discount senior, disabled, and youth cash fare and monthly pass until July 1, 2015 when the proposed FY 2016 fares would take effect, the amendment to Attachment A to reflect these changes, and the revisions to the Title VI report to reflect the delay in these fare increases; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board approves the various fares, as itemized in Attachment A , including Cash and Clipper® fares for Municipal Railway adult, senior, youth, disabled and low-income (Lifeline), including free Muni for low and moderate income youth who use a Clipper® card , Paratransit (Van and Taxi) fares, monthly passes and stickers; School Coupon Booklet; Visitor Passports, inter-agency monthly passes, fares and stickers; and Special Event service fares; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board of Directors and Parking Authority Commission approves the various fines, fees, rates and charges, as itemized in Attachment A, including Project 20 (request for community service or installment payment) fees; Residential, Contractor, Business, Press, Vanpool, School, Fire Station, Foreign Consulate, Medical and Childcare, Farmer's Market, On-Street Car Sharing Vehicle, SFMTA, and daily temporary/visitor vehicle parking permit fees; boot removal fee; SFMTA towing and storage administrative fees; payment by telephone and on-line computer transaction fee; transit fare evasion/passenger conduct, parking citation, Transportation Code, and Vehicle Code fines, late penalties and special collections fees; taxi permit fees and administrative penalties; parking meter use fee; temporary exclusive use of parking meter fee; transit vehicle (cable car, historic street car, motor bus, light rail, trolley bus, GO-4) rental fees; temporary street closure and neighborhood block party fees, special traffic permit fees; temporary no-parking sign posting fees, parklet fees, designated shuttle stop use permit fees, color curb painting fees; and off-street parking fees and garage rates; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board approves the various fines, fees, rates and charges, as itemized in Attachment A, including providing Free Muni for low and moderate income 18 year olds, seniors, and/or disabled customers who use a Clipper® card contingent upon a review and determination of the SFMTA's fiscal health; establishing a Lifeline ID card replacement fee; eliminating Vallejo and CalTrain Muni monthly pass discounts; establishing an interagency single ride adult fare discount for Clipper® card users; eliminating the in-person Customer Service Center transaction fee; codifying the payment by telephone transaction fee, signs and parking space removal/relocation fee, intellectual property license fee (Film Permits), temporary no-parking sign self-posting fee for special events, SFMTA transit map fee, taxi permit fees, and bus substitution fee; and adding penalties for overtime parking meter violations; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board amends the Transportation Code to increase parking citation late payment penalties, the special collections fee, boot removal fees, various parking citation, Transportation Code, and Vehicle Code penalties, color curb painting fees, towing and storage administrative fees, on-line computer transaction fee, motor vehicle for hire fine amounts, request for community service processing fee, parking meter use fee, parklet installation fee, temporary no-parking sign posting fees, special traffic permit fees, temporary exclusive use of parking meter fee, residential area and other parking permit fees, designated shuttle stop use permit fee, temporary street closure and neighborhood block party fees, and bus substitution fee, to eliminate the in-person customer service center fee and codify the SFMTA transit map fee, to increase and codify the payment by telephone transaction fee, to add penalties for parking at an inoperable or broken parking meter or pay station in excess of the maximum time permitted; and to codify the signs and parking space removal/relocation fee, intellectual property license fee, Lifeline ID card replacement fee, and taxi permit fees; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board further amends the Transportation Code to eliminate both the payment by telephone and on-line computer transaction fees effective April 1, 2015, contingent upon a review and determination by the SFMTA Board of the SFMTA's fiscal health in January 2015; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board authorizes the Director of Transportation to implement a three percent transit service increase for FY 2015, and, contingent upon a review and determination by the SFMTA Board of the SFMTA's fiscal health in January 2015, a seven percent transit service increase for FY 2016 for the Transit Effectiveness Project; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board allocates additional funding in the amount of \$600,000 in FY 2015 and \$1,200,000 for FY 2016 for transit fleet cleanliness and appearance to be provided April 1, 2015, contingent upon a review and determination by the SFMTA Board of the SFMTA's fiscal health in January 2015; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board approves the Title VI analysis of the impacts of the proposed fare changes on low-income and minority communities in San Francisco which determined that there is no disparate impact to minority populations or disproportionate burden to low-income populations which is attached as Attachment D; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board eliminates enforcement of parking meters on Sundays between the hours of 12 pm and 6 pm including the four-hour time limit for parking at a meter on Sundays; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board approves the continuation of free Muni for low and moderate income youth who use a Clipper® card for FY 2015 and FY 2016; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board declares the Agency's intention to prioritize the continuation of the free Muni for low and moderate income youth program in FY 2017 and thereafter; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board may provide free Muni for low and moderate income 18 year olds, seniors, and/or disabled customers who use a Clipper® card for FY 2015 and FY 2016 effective June 1, 2015, contingent upon a review and determination by the SFMTA Board of the Agency's fiscal health in January 2015; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board of Directors approves the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 and FY 2016 Operating Budget, in the amount of \$943.2 million and \$962.6 million respectively, and FY 2015 and FY 2016 Capital Budget, in the amount of \$562.9 million and \$669.0 million respectively which includes additional revenue of \$32 million in FY 2016 contingent upon voter approval of possible November 2014 ballot initiatives and on an increased General Fund support from the City for transportation and street improvements; and be it further

RESOLVED, That in accordance with the requirements of Charter Section 8A.106(b), the SFMTA certifies that the FY 2015 and FY 2016 Operating and Capital Budget is adequate in making substantial progress towards meeting the performance standards established pursuant to Section 8A.103 for 2015 and 2016; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board approves a waiver of fares on New Year's Eve 2014, between 8 PM on December 31, 2014 and 5 a.m. January 1, 2015 and on New Year's Eve 2015, between 8 PM on December 31, 2015 and 5 a.m. January 1, 2016; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Director of Transportation is hereby authorized to implement short-term experimental fares; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board of Directors concurs with the Controller's certification that facility security services; paratransit services; low-level platform maintenance services; parking meter collection and coin counting services; vehicle towing, storage and disposal services; and employment related medical examinations can be practically performed by private contractors at a lesser cost than to provide the same services with City employees; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board approves contracting out services for parking citation processing and collection subject to the condition subsequent that the Controller certify that contracting out for these services can be practically performed by private contractors at a lesser cost than to provide the same services with City employees; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board will continue to work diligently with the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor's Office to develop new sources of funding for SFMTA operations pursuant to Charter Section 8A.109 including an increase to the City parking tax; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Director of Transportation is hereby authorized to make any necessary technical and clerical corrections to the approved budget of the SFMTA and to allocate additional revenues and/or City and County discretionary revenues in order to fund additional adjustments to the operating and capital budget, provided that the Director of Transportation shall return to the SFMTA Board of Directors for approval of technical or clerical corrections that, in aggregate, exceed a five percent increase of the SFMTA operating and capital budget respectively.

I certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors and the Parking Authority Commission at their meeting of April 15, 2014.

Secretary to the Board of Directors
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency and
Parking Authority Commission

RESOLUTION NO. 14-061

[Transportation Code – Division II of the San Francisco Transportation Code – Fees and Penalties.]

Resolution amending Division II of the Transportation Code to increase parking citation late payment penalties, the special collections fee, boot removal fees, various parking citation, Transportation Code, and Vehicle Code penalties, color curb painting fees, towing and storage administrative fees, on-line computer transaction fee, motor vehicle for hire fine amounts, request for community service processing fee, parking meter use fee, parklet installation fee, temporary no-parking sign posting fees, special traffic permit fees, temporary exclusive use of parking meter fee, residential area and other parking permit fees, designated shuttle stop use permit fee, temporary street closure and neighborhood block party fees, and bus substitution fee, to eliminate the in-person customer service center fee and codify the SFMTA transit map fee, to increase and codify the payment by telephone transaction fee, and adding penalties for parking at an inoperable or broken parking meter or pay station in excess of the maximum time permitted; to codify the signs and parking space removal/relocation fee, intellectual property license fee, Lifeline ID card replacement fee, and taxi permit fees; and to eliminate the payment by telephone and on-line computer transaction fee effective April 1, 2015, following a determination by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors in January 2015, that the Agency can financially support the elimination of this fee.

NOTE: Additions are single-underline Times New Roman;
deletions are ~~strike-through Times New Roman~~.

The Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors of the City and County of San Francisco enacts the following regulations:

Section 1. Articles 300 and 900 of Division II of the Transportation Code is hereby amended by amending Sections 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 316, 902 and 914, and adding new Sections 317, 318, 319, and 320 to read as follows:

SEC. 301. LATE PAYMENT; SPECIAL COLLECTIONS AND BOOT REMOVAL FEE.

Except as otherwise specified in this Code, the SFMTA may charge the following penalties and fees to persons to whom civil citations have been issued or to owners of cited vehicles for failure to either pay the citations or to contest the underlying citations by the due date affixed to the notice of violation:

(a) The penalty for failure to pay a citation penalty or contest the underlying citation by the first due date affixed to the notice of violation shall be ~~\$27.00 effective July 1, 2012~~\$29.00 effective July 1, 2014, and ~~\$28.00 effective July 1, 2013~~\$30.00 effective July 1, 2015.

(b) The penalty for failure to pay a citation penalty or contest the underlying citation by the second due date affixed to the notice of violation shall be ~~\$37.00 effective July 1, 2012~~\$39.00 effective July 1, 2014, and ~~\$38.00 effective July 1, 2013~~\$40.00 effective July 1, 2015.

(c) The fee to reimburse the City for collection costs incurred as a result of a citation that is not either contested or paid by the first due date affixed to the notice of violation shall be ~~\$42.00 effective July 1, 2012~~\$45.00 effective July 1, 2014, and ~~\$44.00 effective July 1, 2013~~\$46.00 effective July 1, 2015.

(d) A fee to reimburse the City for the costs of removing boots from scofflaw vehicles in the amount of ~~300.00 effective July 1, 2012~~\$314.00 effective July 1, 2014, and ~~\$312.00 effective July 1, 2013~~\$316.00 effective July 1, 2015.

Sec. 302. TRANSPORTATION CODE PENALTY SCHEDULE.

Violation of any of the following subsections of the San Francisco Transportation Code shall be punishable by the fines set forth below.

FORMER CODE SECTION	TRANSPORTATION CODE SECTION	DESCRIPTION	FINE AMOUNT Effective July 1, 2013*	<u>FINE AMOUNT</u> Effective July 1, 2014**	<u>FINE AMOUNT</u> Effective July 1, 2015**
PEDESTRIANS AND SIDEWALKS					
Traffic Code Sections 77, 78	Div I 7.2.10	Pedestrian Crossings	\$58.00	<u>\$60.00</u>	<u>\$62.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 104	Div I 7.2.11	Electric Assistive Personal Mobility Devices	\$58.00	<u>\$60.00</u>	<u>\$62.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 96	Div I 7.2.12	Bicycle Riding Restricted	\$100.00	<u>\$100.00</u>	<u>\$100.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 100	Div I 7.2.13	NUV Violation	\$58.00	<u>\$60.00</u>	<u>\$62.00</u>
ON-STREET PARKING					
Traffic Code Section 315(a)	Div I 7.2.20	Residential Parking	\$74.00	<u>\$76.00</u>	<u>\$78.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 37(c)	Div I 7.2.22	Street Cleaning	\$64.00	<u>\$66.00</u>	<u>\$68.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 202.1	Div I 7.2.23(a)	Parking Meter-Downtown Core	\$74.00	<u>\$76.00</u>	<u>\$78.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 202	Div I 7.2.23(b)	Parking Meter-Outside Downtown Core	\$64.00	<u>\$66.00</u>	<u>\$68.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 38A	Div I 7.2.25	Red Zone	\$100.00	<u>\$103.00</u>	<u>\$106.00</u>
Traffic Code Sections 38B, 38B.1	Div I 7.2.26	Yellow Zone	\$85.00	<u>\$88.00</u>	<u>\$91.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 38C	Div I 7.2.27	White Zone	\$100.00	<u>\$103.00</u>	<u>\$106.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 38D	Div I 7.2.28	Green Zone	\$74.00	<u>\$76.00</u>	<u>\$78.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 37(a)	Div I 7.2.29	Parking for Three Days	\$100.00	<u>\$103.00</u>	<u>\$106.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 32(c)(1)	Div I 7.2.30(a)	Overtime Parking Downtown Core	\$74.00	<u>\$76.00</u>	<u>\$78.00</u>

Traffic Code Section 32(c)(2)	Div I 7.2.30(b)	Overtime Parking Outside Downtown Core	\$64.00	<u>\$66.00</u>	<u>\$68.00</u>
<u>Not applicable</u>	<u>Div I 7.2.30(c)</u>	<u>Overtime Meter Parking Downtown Core</u>		<u>\$76.00</u>	<u>\$78.00</u>
<u>Not applicable</u>	<u>Div I 7.2.30(d)</u>	<u>Overtime Meter Parking Outside Downtown Core</u>		<u>\$66.00</u>	<u>\$68.00</u>
Traffic Code Sections 32.13, 55	Div I 7.2.32	Angled Parking	\$58.00	<u>\$60.00</u>	<u>\$62.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 32.21	Div I 7.2.33	Blocking Residential Door	\$46.00	<u>\$47.00</u>	<u>\$48.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 56	Div I 7.2.34	Median Dividers and Islands	\$74.00	<u>\$76.00</u>	<u>\$78.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 58(a)	Div I 7.2.35	Parking on Grades	\$58.00	<u>\$60.00</u>	<u>\$62.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 61	Div I 7.2.36	100 Feet Oversize	\$110.00	<u>\$110.00</u>	<u>\$110.00</u>
Traffic Code Sections 27, 219	Div I 7.2.37	Motorcycle Parking	\$100.00	<u>\$103.00</u>	<u>\$106.00</u>
Traffic Code Sections 33.5, 39(b), 66	Div I 7.2.38	Parking in Stand	\$100.00	<u>\$103.00</u>	<u>\$106.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 53(a)	Div I 7.2.39	Parking Transit-Only	\$110.00	<u>\$110.00</u>	<u>\$110.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 32(a)(1)	Div I 7.2.40	Tow-Away Zone-Downtown Core	\$95.00	<u>\$98.00</u>	<u>\$101.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 32(a)(2)	Div I 7.2.41	Tow-Away Zone-Outside Downtown Core	\$85.00	<u>\$88.00</u>	<u>\$91.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 32(b), 32.6.2, 32.6.3, 32.6.7, 32.6.8, 32.1.10, 32.6.13, 32.6.16, 32.6.18, 32.6.19, 32.6.20, 32.6.21, 32.6.22, 32.6.23,	Div I 7.2.42	Parking Restrictions	\$85.00	<u>\$88.00</u>	<u>\$91.00</u>

32.6.24, 32.6.25, 32.6.26, 32.6.27, 32.6.29, 32.6.30, 32.6.31, 32.6.32, 32.6.34, 32.6.35					
Traffic Code Section 32, 32.1, 32.1.1, 32.1.2, 32.1.3, 32.1.11, 32.1.4, 32.1.7, 32.1.9, 32.2, 32.2.1, 32.2.2, 32.2.3, 32.3, 32.3.1, 32.5, 32.6, 32.6.5, 32.6.6, 32.6.11	Div I 7.2.43	Parking-Public Property	\$64.00	<u>\$66.00</u>	<u>\$68.00</u>
<u>Not Applicable</u>	Div I 7.2.44	Misuse Disabled Parking Placard/License	\$877.00	<u>\$880.00*</u>	<u>\$875.00*</u>
Traffic Code Section 33(c)	Div I 7.2.45	Temporary Parking Restriction	\$64.00	<u>\$66.00</u>	<u>\$68.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 33.1	Div I 7.2.46	Temporary Construction Zone	\$64.00	<u>\$66.00</u>	<u>\$68.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 21	Div I 7.2.47	Remove Chalk	\$110.00	<u>\$110.00</u>	<u>\$110.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 65	Div I 7.2.48	Repairing Vehicle	\$79.00	<u>\$81.00</u>	<u>\$83.00</u>
Traffic Code Sections 315(c), 412(c), 712(c)	Div I 7.2.49	Permit on Wrong Car	\$110.00	<u>\$110.00</u>	<u>\$110.00</u>
Traffic Code Sections 315(d), 412(d), 712(d)	Div I 7.2.50	Invalid Permit	\$110.00	<u>\$110.00</u>	<u>\$110.00</u>
Traffic Code Sections 32.4.2(b), 32.14, 58(c)	Div I 7.2.51	Parking Marked Space	\$58.00	<u>\$60.00</u>	<u>\$62.00</u>
Not Applicable	Div I 7.2.52	<u>On-Street</u> Car Share Parking	\$110.00	<u>\$110.00</u>	<u>\$110.00</u>

Not Applicable	Div I 7.2.54	Large Vehicle	\$110.00	<u>\$110.00</u>	<u>\$110.00</u>
OFF-STREET PARKING					
Traffic Code Sections 32.10, 32.11	Div I 7.2.60	Parking Facility Charges	\$58.00	<u>\$60.00</u>	<u>\$62.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 32.15	Div I 7.2.61	Entrance/Exit Parking Facility	\$100.00	<u>\$100.00</u>	<u>\$100.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 32.14	Div I 7.2.62	Blocking Space Parking Facility	\$58.00	<u>\$60.00</u>	<u>\$62.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 32.16	Div I 7.2.63	Speeding within Parking Facility	\$100.00	<u>\$100.00</u>	<u>\$100.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 32.21A	Div I 7.2.64	Block Charging Bay	\$110.00	<u>\$110.00</u>	<u>\$110.00</u>
Not Applicable	Div I 7.2.65	Overtime Parking - Off-Street Parking Meter	\$64.00	<u>\$66.00</u>	<u>\$68.00</u>
<u>Not Applicable</u>	Div I 7.2.66	Misuse Disabled Parking Placard/ License Plate	\$877.00	<u>\$880.00*</u>	<u>\$875.00*</u>
Not Applicable	Div II 1009	SFMTA Property	\$64.00	<u>\$66.00</u>	<u>\$68.00</u>
TRAFFIC REGULATIONS					
Traffic Code Section 70	Div I 7.2.70	Obstruction of Traffic-Vehicle	\$110.00	<u>\$110.00</u>	<u>\$110.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 194.3	Div I 7.2.71	Obstruction of Traffic Without Permit	\$530.00	<u>\$546.00</u>	<u>\$563.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 194.3	Div I 7.3.3	Obstruction of Traffic Without Permit	\$1,000.00, or six months in jail, or both (4th or more offenses within one year)	<u>\$1,000.00, or six months in jail, or both (4th or more offenses within one year)</u>	<u>\$1,000.00, or six months in jail, or both (4th or more offenses within one year)</u>
Traffic Code Sections 31, 31.2	Div I 7.2.72	Driving in Transit-Only Area	\$69.00	<u>\$71.00</u>	<u>\$73.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 103	Div I 7.2.73	Driving Through Parades	\$100.00	<u>\$100.00</u>	<u>\$100.00</u>
Traffic Code	Div I 7.2.74	Streetcar Right-	\$100.00	<u>\$100.00</u>	<u>\$100.00</u>

Section 121		of-Way			
Traffic Code Section 122	Div I 7.2.75	Passing Safety Zones	\$100.00	<u>\$100.00</u>	<u>\$100.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 25	Div I 7.2.76	Removal of Vehicles-Collision	\$100.00	<u>\$100.00</u>	<u>\$100.00</u>
Traffic Code Sections 28.1	Div I 7.2.77	Weight Restricted Streets	\$100.00	<u>\$100.00</u>	<u>\$100.00</u>
COMMERCIAL VEHICLES					
Traffic Code Section 63.2	Div I 7.2.80	Vehicles for Hire Parking	\$110.00	<u>\$110.00</u>	<u>\$110.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 63.3	Div I 7.2.81	Advertising Sign	\$110.00	<u>\$110.00</u>	<u>\$110.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 68	Div I 7.2.82	Selling from Vehicle	\$110.00	<u>\$110.00</u>	<u>\$110.00</u>
Traffic Code Sections 33.3, 33.3.2	Div I 7.2.83	Truck Loading Zone	\$85.00	<u>\$88.00</u>	<u>\$91.00</u>
Traffic Code Sections 63, 63(A), 63.1	Div I 7.2.84	Commercial Vehicle Parking Restrictions	\$110.00	<u>\$110.00</u>	<u>\$110.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 60.5	Div I 7.2.86	Idling Engine While Parked	\$100.00	<u>\$100.00</u>	<u>\$100.00</u>
Police Code Sections 1183-1183.40	Div I 7.2.87	Commercial Passenger Vehicle Street Restrictions	\$100.00	<u>\$103.00</u>	<u>\$106.00</u>
Police Code Section 710.2	Div. I 7.2.88	For Sale Sign	\$58.00	<u>\$60.00</u>	<u>\$62.00</u>
TRANSIT VIOLATIONS					
Traffic Code Section 127	Div I 7.2.101	Fare Evasion	\$106.00	<u>\$109.00</u>	<u>\$112.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 128	Div I 7.2.102	Passenger Misconduct	\$106.00	<u>\$109.00</u>	<u>\$112.00</u>
Traffic Code Section 128.5	Div I 7.2.103	Conversing with Operator	\$53.00	<u>\$55.00</u>	<u>\$57.00</u>
Not Applicable	Div I 7.2.104	Fare Evasion – Clipper Card	\$106.00	<u>\$109.00</u>	<u>\$112.00</u>

* This fine includes a 10% additional penalty assessment as mandated by California Vehicle Code 40203.6.

**** Note:**

The California State Legislature has imposed additional fees applicable to all parking citations. As a result, the total fine amount for parking citations includes the following fees: \$4.50 for the state courthouse construction fee, \$2.50 for the local courthouse construction fee, and \$3.00 for the Trial Court Trust Fund fee.

SEC. 303. CALIFORNIA VEHICLE CODE PENALTY SCHEDULE.

Violation of any of the following subsections of the Vehicle Code (VC) shall be punishable by the fines set forth below. The fine amounts listed in this Section 303 shall apply to any citation issued using a former Traffic Code section number that is listed next to the corresponding Vehicle Code section below.

CODE	DESCRIPTION	<u>FINE AMOUNT</u> Effective July 1, 2013**	<u>FINE AMOUNT</u> Effective July 1, 2014**	<u>FINE AMOUNT</u> Effective July 1, 2015**
VC4461C	Displaying Placard Not Issued to Person	\$880.00*	\$880.00*	\$875.00*
VC4462B	Improper Registered Plates	\$114.00	\$117.00	\$121.00
VC4463C	Fraudulent Display of Placard	\$880.00*	\$880.00*	\$875.00*
VC4464	Altered Plates	\$114.00	\$117.00	\$121.00
VC5200	Display Lic Plates	\$114.00	\$117.00	\$121.00
VC5201	Plates/Mounting	\$114.00	\$117.00	\$121.00
VC5201 FB	Plate Cover	\$114.00	\$117.00	\$121.00
VC5202	No Plates	\$114.00	\$117.00	\$121.00
VC5204A	Tabs	\$114.00	\$117.00	\$121.00
VC21113A	School/Pub Ground	\$69.00	\$71.00	\$73.00
VC21211 (38N)	Bicycle Path/Lanes	\$116.00	\$119.00	\$123.00
VC22500A	Parking in Intersection	\$100.00	\$103.00	\$106.00
VC22500B	Parking in Crosswalk	\$100.00	\$103.00	\$106.00
VC22500C	Safety Zone	\$100.00	\$103.00	\$106.00
VC22500D	15 ft. Fire Station	\$100.00	\$103.00	\$106.00
VC22500E	Driveway	\$100.00	\$103.00	\$106.00
VC22500F	On Sidewalk	\$110.00	\$110.00	\$110.00
VC22500G	Excavation	\$58.00	\$60.00	\$62.00
VC22500H	Double Parking	\$110.00	\$110.00	\$110.00
VC22500I	Bus Zone	\$271.00	\$279.00	\$288.00
VC22500J	Tube or Tunnel	\$58.00	\$60.00	\$62.00
VC22500K	Bridge	\$58.00	\$60.00	\$62.00
VC22500L	Wheelchair Access	\$271.00	\$279.00	\$288.00
VC22500.1 (32.4.A)	Parking in Fire Lane	\$74.00	\$76.00	\$78.00
VC22502A	Over 18 inches From Curb	\$58.00	\$60.00	\$62.00

VC22502B	Wrong Way Parking	\$58.00	\$60.00	\$62.00
VC22502E	One-Way Road/Parking	\$58.00	\$60.00	\$62.00
VC22505B	Signs Unauthorized Stopping	\$58.00	\$60.00	\$62.00
VC22507.8A	Parking in Blue Zone Without Placard/Plate	\$880.00*	\$880.00*	\$875.00*
VC22507.8B	Blocking Access to Blue Zone	\$880.00*	\$880.00*	\$875.00*
VC22507.8C	Parking in the Crosshatch Area Adjacent to a Blue Zone	\$880.00*	\$880.00*	\$875.00*
VC22514	Fire Hydrant	\$100.00	\$103.00	\$106.00
VC22515A	Unattended Motor Vehicle	\$85.00	\$88.00	\$91.00
VC22515B	Unsecured Motor Vehicle	\$85.00	\$88.00	\$91.00
VC22516	Locked Vehicle	\$69.00	\$71.00	\$73.00
VC22521	Railroad Tracks	\$90.00	\$93.00	\$96.00
VC22522	W/3 ft Wheelchair Ramp	\$298.00*	\$298.00*	\$298.00*
VC22523A	Abandoned Vehicle/Highway	\$229.00	\$229.00	\$229.00
VC22523B	Abandoned Vehicle/Public or Private Prop	\$229.00	\$229.00	\$229.00
VC22526A	Blocking Intersection	\$100.00	\$103.00	\$106.00
VC22526B	Blocking Intersection While Turning	\$116.00	\$110.00	\$110.00
VC23333	Park/Veh Crossing	\$85.00	\$85.00	\$85.00

* This fine includes a 10% additional penalty assessment as mandated by California Vehicle Code 40203.6.

**** Note:**

The California State Legislature has imposed additional fees applicable to all parking citations. As a result, the total fine amount for parking citations includes the following fees: \$4.50 for the state courthouse construction fee, \$2.50 for the local courthouse construction fee, and \$3.00 for the Trial Court Trust Fund fee.

SEC. 304. COLOR CURB PAINTING FEES.

(a) **Fees.** When a request for color curb markings is received by the SFMTA, the City Traffic Engineer is authorized to administer and collect a processing fee, a painting fee, and a renewal fee from the requestor. The fees shall be as follows:

Table 304: WHITE AND GREEN ZONE FEE SCHEDULE

Zone Length	Processing	Processing	Processing	Paint	Paint	Paint	New Request Total	Biennial Renewal					
	FY 2014 Effective	FY 2015 Effective	FY 2016 Effective	FY 2014 Effective	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2013	FY 2014 Effec-	FY 2013 Effec-	FY 2014	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2014

	7-1-2013	7-1-2014	7-1-2015	7-1-2013	Effective 7-1-2014	Effective 7-1-2015	Effective 7-1-2012	Effective 7-1-2013	Effective 7-1-2012	Effective 7-1-2013	Effective 7-1-2012	Effective 7-1-2013
1 to 22 feet	\$765	\$784	\$804	\$765	\$368	\$377	\$336	\$359	\$1,051	\$1,124	\$336	\$359
23 to 44 feet	\$1,527	\$1,565	\$1,604	\$1,527	\$738	\$756	\$673	\$720	\$2,100	\$2,247	\$673	\$720
45 to 66 feet	\$2,291	\$2,348	\$2,407	\$2,291	\$1,105	\$1,133	\$1,007	\$1,078	\$3,148	\$3,369	\$1,007	\$1,078
More than 66 feet	\$3,056	\$3,132	\$3,210	\$3,056	\$1,473	\$1,510	\$1,343	\$1,437	\$4,199	\$4,493	\$1,343	\$1,437
Green Zone Meter				\$765								
Red Zone	\$180			\$168			Initial painting and renewal: \$157 per 6 linear feet or fraction thereof effective July 1, 2012, and \$168 effective July 1, 2013					

<u>Zone Length</u>	<u>FY 2015 Effective 7-1-2014</u>	<u>FY 2016 Effective 7-1-2015</u>
<u>Processing:</u>		
1 to 22 feet	<u>\$784.00</u>	<u>\$804.00</u>
23 to 44 feet	<u>\$1,565.00</u>	<u>\$1,604.00</u>
45 to 66 feet	<u>\$2,348.00</u>	<u>\$2,407.00</u>
More than 66 feet	<u>\$3,132.00</u>	<u>\$3,210.00</u>
<u>Painting:</u>		
1 to 22 feet	<u>\$368.00</u>	<u>\$377.00</u>
23 to 44 feet	<u>\$738.00</u>	<u>\$756.00</u>
45 to 66 feet	<u>\$1,105.00</u>	<u>\$1,133.00</u>
More than 66 feet	<u>\$1,473.00</u>	<u>\$1,510.00</u>
<u>Green Zone Meter</u>	<u>\$784.00</u>	<u>\$804.00</u>
<u>Red Zone Processing</u>	<u>\$185.00</u>	<u>\$190.00</u>
<u>Painting/Renewal</u>	<u>Initial</u>	<u>Initial</u>

<u>Fee</u>	<u>painting and renewal: \$172.00 per 6 linear feet or fraction thereof</u>	<u>painting and renewal: \$176.00 per 6 linear feet or fraction thereof</u>
<u>New Request Total</u>		
<u>1 to 22 feet</u>	<u>\$1,152.00</u>	<u>\$1,181.00</u>
<u>23 to 44 feet</u>	<u>\$2,303.00</u>	<u>\$2,360.00</u>
<u>45 to 66 feet</u>	<u>\$3,453.00</u>	<u>\$3,540.00</u>
<u>More than 66 feet</u>	<u>\$4,605.00</u>	<u>\$4,720.00</u>
<u>Biennial Renewal</u>		
<u>1 to 22 feet</u>	<u>\$368.00</u>	<u>\$377.00</u>
<u>23 to 44 feet</u>	<u>\$738.00</u>	<u>\$756.00</u>
<u>45 to 66 feet</u>	<u>\$1,105.00</u>	<u>\$1,133.00</u>
<u>More than 66 feet</u>	<u>\$1,473.00</u>	<u>\$1,510.00</u>

(b) **Exemptions from White Zone Fees.** The following entities shall be exempt from paying white zone fees so long as such entities are primarily conducting nonprofit activities at the location of the white zone:

- (1) Government buildings open to the public;
- (2) Buildings occupied by private nonprofit organizations whose exclusive function is serving senior citizens and persons with disabilities; and
- (3) Private nonprofit educational institutions whose exclusive function is providing education to students in any grade from kindergarten through eighth grade.

(c) Nothing in this Section is intended to limit the SFMTA's ability to install color curb markings on its own initiative.

SEC. 305. TOWING AND STORAGE ADMINISTRATIVE FEES.

The SFMTA shall charge the owner of a towed vehicle a fee in the amount of ~~\$243.00 effective July 1, 2012~~ \$263.00 effective July 1, 2014, and ~~\$254.00 effective July 1, 2013~~ \$266.00 effective July 1, 2015, to reimburse the City for administrative costs related to the removal, impound, or release of vehicles towed from the public right-of-way. In addition, the SFMTA shall charge the vehicle owner a fee to reimburse the City for administrative costs related to the storage of such towed vehicles in the amount of ~~\$2.60 effective July 1, 2012~~ \$2.75 effective July 1, 2014, and ~~\$2.70 effective July 1, 2013~~ \$3.00 effective July 1, 2015, for the first day of storage (24 hours or less), and ~~\$2.95 effective July 1, 2012~~ \$3.25 effective July 1, 2014, and ~~\$3.05 effective July 1, 2013~~ \$3.50 effective July 1, 2015, for each day, or part thereof, that the vehicle remains in storage after the first 24 hours. The administrative fees imposed pursuant to this Section shall be in addition to the fee charged by a tow car operator to the owner of a towed vehicle for the costs of towing and storing the vehicle. The administrative fees imposed pursuant to this Section shall not be taken into account in determining the maximum fee that may lawfully be charged by the tow car operator to the owner of a removed vehicle, nor shall the administrative fees imposed pursuant to this Section be taken into account in determining

whether a fee charged by the tow car operator to the owner of a removed vehicle is excessive as a matter of law.

SEC. 308. SFMTA TRANSIT MAP FEE IN-PERSON CUSTOMER SERVICE CENTER TRANSACTION FEE.

~~A fee for the purchase of a SFMTA transit map. The fee amount shall be \$5.00 effective July 1, 2014, and \$7.00 effective July 1, 2015. A fee to reimburse the SFMTA for costs incurred for administrative processing of in-person transactions at any SFMTA customer service center designated by the Director of Transportation for those transactions that may be completed through alternatives means. The administrative fee shall be in addition to any costs, fees or fines association with the subject transaction. The amount for this fee shall be \$3.00.~~

SEC. 309. ON-LINE COMPUTER AND PAYMENT BY TELEPHONE TRANSACTION FEE.

A fee to reimburse the SFMTA for costs associated with processing on-line computer transactions made through the SFMTA's website or transactions made by telephone. The administrative fee shall be in addition to any costs, fees or fines associated with the subject transaction. The amount for this fee shall be \$2.50 effective July 1, 2014, and \$3.00 effective July 1, 2015.

SEC. 310. SCHEDULE OF FINES. Violation of any of the following subsections of the San Francisco Transportation Code governing the operation of a motor vehicle for hire shall be punishable by the administrative fines set forth below.

TRANSPORTATION CODE SECTION	DESCRIPTION	FINE AMOUNT Effective July 1, 2012 1st/2nd/3rd offense	FINE AMOUNT Effective July 1, 2013 1st/2nd/3rd offense	<u>Fine Amount Effective July 1, 2014</u>	<u>Fine Amount Effective July 1, 2015</u>
CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL PERMITS					
Div II § 1105(a)(14)	Current address	\$26.00	\$27.00	<u>\$28.00</u>	<u>\$29.00</u>
Div II § 1105(a)(9)	Continuous operation	<u>\$52.00 per day</u>	<u>\$53.00 per day</u>	<u>\$55.00 per day</u>	<u>\$57.00 per day</u>
Div II § 1114(a)	Records	\$78.00	\$80.00	<u>\$82.00</u>	<u>\$85.00</u>
Div II § 1105(a)(17)	Response time goals	\$155.00	\$159.00	<u>\$164.00</u>	<u>\$169.00</u>
Div II § 1105(a)(7)	Compliance with lawful orders	\$206.00	\$211.00	<u>\$217.00</u>	<u>\$224.00</u>
Div II § 1105(a)(6)	Compliance with laws and regulations	\$463.00	\$475.00	<u>\$489.00</u>	<u>\$504.00</u>

Div II § 1105(a)(13)	Shift Change; Unattended Vehicle	\$463.00	\$475.00	\$489.00	\$504.00
Div II § 1105(a)(13)	Improper shift change	\$463.00	\$475.00	\$489.00	\$504.00
Div II § 1105(a)(18 19)	Retaliation against permit holder	\$463.00	\$475.00	\$489.00	\$504.00
Div II § 1105(a)(8)	Cooperation w/ regulatory entities; False statements	\$514.00	\$528.00	\$544.00	\$561.00
Div II § 1105(a)(12)	Compliance with Paratransit Program	\$514.00	\$528.00	\$544.00	\$561.00
Div II § 1105(a)(10)	Accepting/ soliciting gifts from Drivers	\$617.00	\$633.00	\$652.00	\$672.00
Div II § 1105(a)(1)	Operating without a permit	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$5,153.00	\$5,310.00
CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO COLOR SCHEME PERMITS					
Div II § 1106(s)	Dissolution plan	\$52.00 per day	\$53.00 per day	\$55.00 per day	\$57.00 per day
Div II § 1114(e)(8)	Emissions reduction plan	\$52.00 per day	\$53.00 per day	\$55.00 per day	\$57.00 per day
Div II § 1106(n)	Required postings	\$78.00	\$80.00	\$82.00	\$85.00
Div II § 1106(o)	Required notifications	\$78.00	\$80.00	\$82.00	\$85.00
Div II § 1113(d)(3)	Required PIM	\$78.00	\$80.00	\$82.00	\$85.00
Div II § 1114(e)(3)	Receipts	\$78.00	\$80.00	\$82.00	\$85.00
Div II § 1114(e)(5)	Vehicle inventory changes	\$78.00	\$80.00	\$82.00	\$85.00
Div II § 1114(e)(7)	Weekly reporting requirements	\$78.00	\$80.00	\$82.00	\$85.00
Div II § 1106(e)	Transfer of business; New location	\$257.00 per day	\$264.00 per day	\$272.00 per day	\$280.00 per day
Div II § 1106(k)(1)	Facility to clean vehicles	\$257.00	\$264.00	\$272.00	\$280.00

Div II § 1106(i)	Workers' Compensation	\$309.00 per day	\$317.00 per day	\$327.00 per day	\$337.00 per day
Div II § 1106(p)	Obligations related to Drivers	\$411.00	\$422.00	\$435.00	\$448.00
Div II § 1106(r)	Found property	\$411.00	\$422.00	\$435.00	\$448.00
Div II § 1114(e)(1)	Waybills	\$411.00	\$422.00	\$435.00	\$448.00
Div II § 1114(e)(2)	Medallion Holder files	\$411.00	\$422.00	\$435.00	\$448.00
Div II § 1114(e)(6)	Current business information	\$411.00	\$422.00	\$435.00	\$448.00
Div II § 4122 <u>1124</u> (b)(5)	Retaliation re credit card processing	\$411.00	\$422.00	\$435.00	\$448.00
Div II § 4122 <u>1124</u> (c)	Overcharging gate fees	\$514.00	\$528.00	\$544.00	\$561.00
Div II § 1106(c)	Use of Dispatch Service	\$463.00	\$475.00	\$489.00	\$504.00
Div II § 1106(d)	Business premises	\$463.00	\$475.00	\$489.00	\$504.00
Div II § 1106(h)	Staffing requirements	\$463.00	\$475.00	\$489.00	\$504.00
Div II § 1106(1)(2-7)	Use of spare vehicles	\$463.00	\$475.00	\$489.00	\$504.00
Div II § 1106(f)	Telephone directory	\$514.00	\$528.00	\$544.00	\$561.00
Div II § 1106(j)	Paratransit Broker contract	\$514.00	\$528.00	\$544.00	\$561.00
Div II § 1114(e)(8)	Required information	\$514.00	\$528.00	\$544.00	\$561.00
Div II § 1114(e)(9)	Required information	\$514.00	\$528.00	\$544.00	\$561.00
Div II § 1106(k)(2)-(4)	Unsafe/n Nonworking equipment	\$1,027.00	\$1,055.00	\$1,087.00	\$1,120.00
Div II § 1106(q)(4)	Driver operating under the influence	\$1,027.00	\$1,055.00	\$1,087.00	\$1,120.00
Div II § 1106(a)	Color Scheme Permit required	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$5,153.00	\$5,310.00

Div II § 1106(1)(8)	Leasing spare vehicles	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00	<u>\$5,153.00</u>	<u>\$5,310.00</u>
CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO DISPATCH PERMITS					
Div II § 1107(a)	Emergency plan	\$52.00 per day	\$53.00 per day	<u>\$55.00 per day</u>	<u>\$57.00 per day</u>
Div II § 1107(e)	Adequate communications equipment	\$52.00 per day	\$53.00 per day	<u>\$55.00 per day</u>	<u>\$57.00 per day</u>
Div II § 1114(f)(1)	Dispatch Service report	\$52.00 per day	\$53.00 per day	<u>\$55.00 per day</u>	<u>\$57.00 per day</u>
Div II § 1107(d)	Service call records	\$78.00	\$80.00	<u>\$82.00</u>	<u>\$85.00</u>
Div II § 1107(f) <u>(b)-(e)</u>	Serving dispatch customers	\$78.00	\$80.00	<u>\$82.00</u>	<u>\$85.00</u>
Div II § 1114(f)(2)	Found property recordkeeping	\$78.00	\$80.00	<u>\$82.00</u>	<u>\$85.00</u>
Div II § 1107(m)	Workers' Compensation	\$309.00 per day	\$317.00 per day	<u>\$327.00 per day</u>	<u>\$337.00 per day</u>
Div II § 1107(c)	Ramp Taxi response	\$411.00	\$422.00	<u>\$435.00</u>	<u>\$448.00</u>
Div II § 1107(k)	Improper dispatching	\$514.00	\$528.00	<u>\$544.00</u>	<u>\$561.00</u>
CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO DRIVER PERMITS					
Div II § 1108(c)	Color Scheme affiliation	\$6.00 per day	\$6.00 per day	<u>\$6.00 per day</u>	<u>\$6.00 per day</u>
Div II § 1108(a)	Driver identification	\$26.00	\$27.00	<u>\$28.00</u>	<u>\$29.00</u>
Div II § 1108(d)(2)	Duties at beginning of shift	\$26.00	\$27.00	<u>\$28.00</u>	<u>\$29.00</u>
Div II § 1108(d)(3)	Designated items in vehicle	\$26.00	\$27.00	<u>\$28.00</u>	<u>\$29.00</u>
Div II § 1108(e)(2)	Transporting passenger property	\$26.00	\$27.00	<u>\$28.00</u>	<u>\$29.00</u>
Div II § 1108(e)(5)	Loading and unloading assistance	\$26.00	\$27.00	<u>\$28.00</u>	<u>\$29.00</u>
Div II § 1108(e)(8)	Additional passengers	\$26.00	\$27.00	<u>\$28.00</u>	<u>\$29.00</u>

Div II § 1108(e)(10)-(12)	Mobile telephones; Other audible devices	\$26.00	\$27.00	<u>\$28.00</u>	<u>\$29.00</u>
Div II § 1108(e)(18)-(20), (22)	Driver duties re fares	\$26.00	\$27.00	<u>\$28.00</u>	<u>\$29.00</u>
Div II § 1108(e)(26)	Loose items	\$26.00	\$27.00	<u>\$28.00</u>	<u>\$29.00</u>
Div II § 1108(e)(27)	Trunk and/or baggage area	\$26.00	\$27.00	<u>\$28.00</u>	<u>\$29.00</u>
Div II § 1108(e)(31)	Clean in dress and person	\$26.00	\$27.00	<u>\$28.00</u>	<u>\$29.00</u>
Div II § 1108(e)(32)	Taximeter violation	\$26.00	\$27.00	<u>\$28.00</u>	<u>\$29.00</u>
Div II § 1108(e)(33)	Smoking, drinking or eating	\$26.00	\$27.00	<u>\$28.00</u>	<u>\$29.00</u>
Div II § 1108(f)(1)-(3)	Duties at end of shift	\$26.00	\$27.00	<u>\$28.00</u>	<u>\$29.00</u>
Div II § 1114(b)(2)	Badge	\$26.00	\$27.00	<u>\$28.00</u>	<u>\$29.00</u>
Div II § 1114(b)(3)	Medical certificate	\$26.00	\$27.00	<u>\$28.00</u>	<u>\$29.00</u>
Div II § 1114(b)(4)	Waybills	\$26.00	\$27.00	<u>\$28.00</u>	<u>\$29.00</u>
Div II § 1108(e)(4)	Service animals or contained animals	\$52.00	\$53.00	<u>\$55.00</u>	<u>\$57.00</u>
Div II § 1108(d)(1)	Safety check	\$78.00	\$80.00	<u>\$82.00</u>	<u>\$85.00</u>
Div II § 1108(e)(1)	Refusal to convey	\$78.00	\$80.00	<u>\$82.00</u>	<u>\$85.00</u>
Div II § 1108(e)(7)	Servicing dispatch calls	\$78.00	\$80.00	<u>\$82.00</u>	<u>\$85.00</u>
Div II § 1108(e)(9)	Splitting fares	\$78.00	\$80.00	<u>\$82.00</u>	<u>\$85.00</u>
Div II § 1108(e)(16)	Requesting gratuities	\$78.00	\$80.00	<u>\$82.00</u>	<u>\$85.00</u>
Div II § 1108(e)(24)	Found property	\$78.00	\$80.00	<u>\$82.00</u>	<u>\$85.00</u>
Div II § 1124 (f) 1122(b)(5)	Passenger payment choice	\$78.00	\$80.00	<u>\$82.00</u>	<u>\$85.00</u>

Div II § 1108(e)(3)	Transporting person with a disability in front seat	\$155.00	\$159.00	\$164.00	\$169.00
Div II § 1108(e)(6)	Assisting and securing person with a disability	\$155.00	\$159.00	\$164.00	\$169.00
Div II § 1108(e)(14)	Reckless or dangerous driving	\$155.00	\$159.00	\$164.00	\$169.00
Div II § 1108(e)(15)	Ramp Taxi rules	\$155.00	\$159.00	\$164.00	\$169.00
Div II § 1108(e)(35) - (36) & (37)	Paratransit Debit Card	\$155.00	\$159.00	\$164.00	\$169.00
Div II § 4122 1124(d)	Luggage charges	\$155.00	\$159.00	\$164.00	\$169.00
Div II § 1108(e)(25)	Unsafe taxi	\$206.00	\$211.00	\$217.00	\$224.00
Div II § 1108(e)(30)	Excessive force	\$206.00	\$211.00	\$217.00	\$224.00
Div II § 1108(b)(3)	Criminal convictions	\$514.00	\$528.00	\$544.00	\$561.00
Div II § 1108 (b)(4)(B)	Controlled substances	\$514.00	\$528.00	\$544.00	\$561.00
Div II § 1108 (e) (38) (3)	Tampering with equipment	\$514.00	\$528.00	\$544.00	\$561.00
CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO TAXI AND RAMP TAXI EQUIPMENT					
Div II § 1113(b) (g)-(e) , (g)-(j)	Equipment and display requirements	\$26.00	\$27.00	\$28.00	\$29.00
Div II § 1113 (m)	Vehicle windows	\$26.00	\$27.00	\$28.00	\$29.00
Div II § 1113 (o)	Sanitary condition	\$26.00	\$27.00	\$28.00	\$29.00
Div II § 1113 (a)	Safe operating condition	\$78.00	\$80.00	\$82.00	\$85.00
Div II § 1113 (k)	Standard vehicle equipment	\$78.00	\$80.00	\$82.00	\$85.00
Div II § 1113 (k)(13)-(15)	Vehicle tires and wheels	\$78.00	\$80.00	\$82.00	\$85.00
Div II § 1113 (m)	Security cameras	\$78.00	\$80.00	\$82.00	\$85.00
Div II § 1113 (n)	Condition of vehicle	\$78.00	\$80.00	\$82.00	\$85.00

Div II § 1113 (u)	Working Taxi ramp	\$78.00	\$80.00	\$82.00	\$85.00
Div II § 1113 (p)	Vehicle title requirements	\$257.00	\$264.00	\$272.00	\$280.00
Div II § 1113 (q)-(r)	Excessive vehicle mileage or age	\$257.00	\$264.00	\$272.00	\$280.00
Div II § 1113 (s)	Vehicle inspections	\$257.00	\$264.00	\$272.00	\$280.00
Div II § 1113(s)(7)	Fraud related to inspection	\$257.00	\$264.00	\$272.00	\$280.00
Div II § 1113(t)	Replacement vehicle	\$257.00	\$264.00	\$272.00	\$280.00
Div II § 1113(v)	Retired vehicles	\$257.00	\$264.00	\$272.00	\$280.00
Div II § 1113(f)	Taximeters	\$309.00	\$317.00	\$327.00	\$337.00
CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO TAXI AND RAMP TAXI MEDALLIONS					
Div II § 1109(ba)(1)	Use of Dispatch Service	\$78.00	\$80.00	\$82.00	\$85.00
Div II § 1110(a)(1)-(3)	Wheelchair priority	\$155.00	\$159.00	\$164.00	\$169.00
Div II § 1110(a)(3)	Eight Wheelchair pickups monthly	\$155.00	\$159.00	\$164.00	\$169.00
Div II § 1110(b)	Ramp Taxi Medallion in spare taxi	\$155.00	\$159.00	\$164.00	\$169.00
Div II § 1110(d)	Ramp Taxi qualifications	\$155.00	\$159.00	\$164.00	\$169.00
Div II § 1109(c)	Full-time driving requirement	\$24,000.00 multiplied by percentage of hours short of the full time driving requirement	\$24,000.00 multiplied by percentage of hours short of the full time driving requirement	\$24,000.00 multiplied by percentage of hours short of the full time driving requirement	\$24,000.00 multiplied by percentage of hours short of the full time driving requirement

SEC. 311. REQUEST FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE PROCESSING FEE.

A fee to reimburse the SFMTA for costs associated with processing requests for community service in-lieu of payment for parking or transit violation citations. The amount for this fee shall be \$20.00 effective July 1, 2012, \$26.00 effective July 1, 2014, and \$25.00 effective July 1, 2013, \$27.00 effective July 1, 2015.

SEC. 312. PARKING METER USE FEE.

A fee charged for rendering Parking meters inaccessible to parking due to activities that are non-construction related and do not require either a Temporary Exclusive Use Parking Meter Permit issued pursuant to Section [904](#) of this Code, or a Temporary Use or Occupancy of Public Streets permit issued pursuant to [Article 6](#) of this Code. The fee shall be ~~\$6.00~~\$8.00 per day per metered Parking space effective July 1, 2014. The fee shall be ~~\$7.00~~\$9.00 per day per metered Parking space effective July 1, 2013July 1, 2015.

SEC. 313. PARKLET INSTALLATION FEE.

A fee to reimburse the SFMTA for costs associated with the removal of a parking space and installation of a parklet including staff time for planning, design, and engineering analysis, and the physical removal and relocation of any parking meter. The amount for this fee shall be ~~\$1,269.00 effective July 1, 2012~~\$1,340.00 effective July 1, 2014, and ~~\$1,297.00 effective July 1, 2013~~\$1,355.00 effective July 1, 2015. If the installation of a parklet exceeds two parking spaces, the fee shall be an additional ~~\$600~~\$650.00 effective July 1, 2014, and \$650.00 effective July 1, 2015 per additional parking space.

SEC. 316. TEMPORARY NO-PARKING SIGN POSTING FEE.

A fee to reimburse the SFMTA for costs incurred for posting temporary no-parking signs for Special Events, Film Production, and Residential or Commercial Moves based on the number of signs posted. The fee shall be as follows:

Table 316: TEMPORARY NO-PARKING SIGN POSTING FEE SCHEDULE

Number of Signs Posted	FY 2013	FY 2014	<u>FY 2015</u> <u>Effective</u> <u>July 1, 2014</u>	<u>FY 2016</u> <u>Effective</u> <u>July 1, 2015</u>
1 to 4	\$163.00	\$167.00	<u>\$177.00</u>	<u>\$182.00</u>
5 to 9	\$217.00	\$223.00	<u>\$236.00</u>	<u>\$243.00</u>
10 to 15	\$271.00	\$278.00	<u>\$295.00</u>	<u>\$304.00</u>
16 to 21	\$325.00	\$334.00	<u>\$354.00</u>	<u>\$365.00</u>
22 to 28	\$379.00	\$389.00	<u>\$412.00</u>	<u>\$424.00</u>
29 to 35	\$433.00	\$445.00	<u>\$472.00</u>	<u>\$486.00</u>
36 to 43	\$488.00	\$501.00	<u>\$531.00</u>	<u>\$547.00</u>
44 to 51	\$542.00	\$557.00	<u>\$590.00</u>	<u>\$608.00</u>
52 or more	\$10.00 for each additional sign	\$10.25 for each additional sign	<u>\$11.00 for each additional sign</u>	<u>\$12.00 for each additional sign</u>
<u>Self-Posting Fee for Special Events</u>			<u>\$2.50 per sign</u>	<u>\$3.00 per sign</u>

SEC. 317. SIGNS AND PARKING SPACE REMOVAL/RELOCATION FEE.

A fee to reimburse the SFMTA for costs incurred for the removal or relocation of SFMTA signs and poles due to projects related to tree planting, sidewalk widening or reconstruction, new commercial or residential developments, or other projects which require the removal or relocation of SFMTA signs or poles. The fee shall be as follows:

<u>Description</u>	<u>Current Fee</u>	<u>FY 2015 Proposed Effective July 1, 2014</u>	<u>FY 2016 Proposed Effective July 1, 2015</u>
<u>Removal/Relocation of each sign</u>	<u>\$50.00</u>	<u>\$158.00</u>	<u>\$161.00</u>
<u>Removal/Relocation of each pole</u>	<u>\$75.00</u>	<u>\$320.00</u>	<u>\$340.00</u>
<u>Temporary relocation of colored curb zones</u>	<u>\$200.00</u>	<u>\$362.00</u>	<u>\$362.00</u>
<u>Permanent relocation of colored curb zones</u>	<u>\$350.00</u>	<u>\$362.00</u>	<u>\$362.00</u>

SEC. 318. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LICENSE FEE (FILM PERMITS).

A license fee shall be charged in conjunction with every Use Agreement issued by the Film Commission for filming that may include visual images of SFMTA trademarks or service marks. The fee shall be \$1,500.00 effective July 1, 2014, and \$2,000.00 effective July 1, 2015. The Director of Transportation or his or her designee shall have the discretion to waive or reduce this license fee for student filming, filming by government agencies, or filming by non-profit agencies if requested by the Film Commission.

SEC. 319. LIFELINE ID CARD REPLACEMENT FEE

<u>Description</u>	<u>Current Fee</u>	<u>FY 2015 Proposed Effective July 1, 2014</u>	<u>FY 2016 Proposed Effective July 1, 2015</u>
<u>Lifeline ID Card Replacement Fee</u>	<u>\$5.00</u>	<u>\$5.00</u>	<u>\$5.00</u>

SEC. 320. TAXI PERMIT FEES.

The following is the schedule for taxi-related permit and permit renewal fees:

<u>Permit Type *</u>	<u>Current Fee</u>	<u>FY 2015 Proposed Effective July 1, 2014</u>	<u>FY 2016 Proposed Effective July 1, 2015</u>
<u>Driver Permit Application</u>	<u>\$152.00</u>	<u>\$252.00</u>	<u>\$265.00</u>
<u>Permit Holders Applications</u>	<u>\$1,863.00</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>Ramp Taxi Applications</u>	<u>\$766.00</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>

<u>Monthly Ramp Taxi Medallion Use Fee</u>	<u>\$500.00</u>	<u>\$500.00</u>	<u>\$500.00</u>
<u>Monthly Taxi Medallion Use Fee (8000 series)</u>	<u>\$2,000.00/</u> <u>\$100 .00 to</u> <u>Driver Fund</u>	<u>\$2,000.00/</u> <u>\$100 .00 to</u> <u>Driver Fund</u>	<u>\$2,000.00/</u> <u>\$100 .00 to</u> <u>Driver Fund</u>
<u>Medallion Waiting List Applications</u>	<u>\$505.00</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>Dispatch Applications</u>	<u>\$5,688.00</u>	<u>\$5,688 .00</u>	<u>\$5,972.00</u>
<u>Color Scheme Change</u>	<u>\$608.00</u>	<u>\$608.00</u>	<u>\$638.00</u>
<u>Lost Medallions</u>	<u>\$227.00</u>	<u>\$100.00</u>	<u>\$105.00</u>
<u>Metal Medallions</u>	<u>\$71.00</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>New Color Schemes 1 to 5</u>	<u>\$1,805.00</u>	<u>\$1,805.00</u>	<u>\$1,895 .00</u>
<u>New Color Schemes-6 to 15 Medallions</u>	<u>\$2,647.00</u>	<u>\$2,647.00</u>	<u>\$2,779.00</u>
<u>New Color Schemes-16 to 49 Medallions</u>	<u>\$5,299.00</u>	<u>\$5,299.00</u>	<u>\$5,564.00</u>
<u>New Color Schemes-50 or more Medallions</u>	<u>\$6,621.00</u>	<u>\$6,621.00</u>	<u>\$6,952.00</u>
<u>Taxi Wraps-Fee is per vehicle/month</u>	<u>\$162.00</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>Renewal Application:</u>			
<u>Driver Renewals</u>	<u>\$98.00</u>	<u>\$98.00</u>	<u>\$103.00</u>
<u>Permit Holders Renewals</u>	<u>\$1,410.00</u>	<u>\$1,000.00</u>	<u>\$1,010.00</u>
<u>Ramp Taxi Renewals</u>	<u>\$244.00</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>Color Scheme Renewal -1 to 5</u>	<u>\$1,485.00</u>	<u>\$1,485.00</u>	<u>\$1,559.00</u>
<u>Color Scheme Renewal- 6 to 15 Medallions</u>	<u>\$2,182.00</u>	<u>\$2,182.00</u>	<u>\$2,291.00</u>
<u>Color Scheme Renewals-16 to 49 Medallions</u>	<u>\$4,534.00</u>	<u>\$4,534.00</u>	<u>\$4,761.00</u>
<u>Color Scheme Renewals-50 to 149</u>	<u>\$6,802.00</u>	<u>\$6,802.00</u>	<u>\$7,142.00</u>
<u>Color Scheme Renewals - 150 or More</u>	<u>\$9,069.00</u>	<u>\$9,069.00</u>	<u>\$9,522.00</u>
<u>Dispatch Renewals</u>	<u>\$6,284.00</u>	<u>\$6,284.00</u>	<u>\$6,598.00</u>

* In order to recover the cost of appeals, a \$5.00 surcharge will be added to the above amounts effective July 1, 2014, and \$6.00 will be added to the above amounts effective July 1, 2015.

SEC. 902. GENERAL PERMIT CONDITIONS.

The following general provisions apply to all permits issued under this Article.

(a) **Application and Renewal.** Permit applications must be submitted on a form supplied by the SFMTA. All required application and any other fees must be paid and all permit requirements satisfied before a permit may be issued. The SFMTA may require any information of the applicant which it deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Article. Permits may

be renewed annually in compliance with any renewal procedures established by the SFMTA.

(b) **Display of Permit.** Permittees must maintain the permit at the site of the permitted activity and available for inspection in accordance with any requirements for permit display as may be established by the SFMTA, and shall make all permits available for inspection upon request by an employee of the Police Department or SFMTA.

(c) **Prior Payments Required.** No permit shall be issued or renewed until the applicant has paid all permit fees that are due to the SFMTA. No permit shall be issued to any applicant who is responsible for payment of one or more delinquent citations for violation of any provision of this Code or the Vehicle Code until all fines and fees associated with the citation are paid in full.

(d) **Permit Fees.** Fees for permits issued pursuant to this Code are as follows:

**Table 902(d)
Permit Fee Schedule**

	Fee Amount	<u>Effective July 1, 2014</u>	<u>Effective July 1, 2015</u>
Special Traffic Permit (§ 903)			
Base Permit Fee:	\$179.75	<u>\$179.75</u>	<u>\$179.75</u>
Daily Fee:	\$37.00	<u>\$37.00</u>	<u>\$37.00</u>
Late Fee:	\$201.25	<u>\$201.25</u>	<u>\$201.25</u>
Removal/Relocation Fee			
Removal or relocation of each sign:	\$50.00	<u>\$158.00</u>	<u>\$161.00</u>
Removal or relocation of each pole:	\$75.00	<u>\$320.00</u>	<u>\$340.00</u>
	\$200.00	<u>\$362.00</u>	<u>\$362.00</u>
Parking Space for the temporary relocation of colored curbs zones:	\$350.00	<u>\$362.00</u>	<u>\$362.00</u>
Parking Space for permanent relocation of colored curb zones, including painting:			
Temporary Exclusive Use of Parking Meters (§ 904)			
Base Permit Fee: per 25 linear feet of construction frontage per day, including weekends and holidays:	\$7.00	<u>\$8.00</u>	<u>\$9.00</u>

Residential Area Parking Permit (§ 905) Resident/Business School/Fire Station/Foreign Consulate/Medical & Childcare Provider Base Permit Fee:			
(one year):	\$109.00	<u>\$110.00</u>	<u>\$111.00</u>
(Less than 6 months):	\$54.00	<u>\$55.00</u>	<u>\$55.00</u>
Permit Transfer:	\$16.00	<u>\$17.00</u>	<u>\$18.00</u>
1-Day Flex Permit:			
1-5 permits per order	\$12.00 each permit	<u>\$12.00 each permit</u>	<u>\$13.00 each permit</u>
6-15 permits per order	\$10.00 each permit	<u>\$10.00 each permit</u>	<u>\$11.00 each permit</u>
15 16-20 permits per order	\$8.00 each permit	<u>\$8.00 each permit</u>	<u>\$9.00 each permit</u>
Short Term Permits			
2 weeks:	\$37.00	<u>\$37.00</u>	<u>\$38.00</u>
4 weeks:	\$54.00	<u>\$55.00</u>	<u>\$56.00</u>
6 weeks:	\$72.00	<u>\$73.00</u>	<u>\$73.00</u>
8 weeks:	\$93.00	<u>\$94.00</u>	<u>\$95.00</u>
Contractor Permit (§ 906)			
Base Permit Fee			
Annual/Renewal:	\$920.00	<u>\$929.00</u>	<u>\$938.00</u>
Less than 6 Months:	\$460.00	<u>\$465.00</u>	<u>\$469.00</u>
Permit Transfer Fee:	\$37.00	<u>\$41.00</u>	<u>\$42.00</u>

Vanpool Permit (§ 907) Base Permit Fee (per year): (Less than 6 months):	 \$109.00 \$54.00	 <u>\$110.00</u> <u>\$55.00</u>	 <u>\$111.00</u> <u>\$55.00</u>
SFMTA Permit (§ 910) (Based on the Annualized Parking Meter Use Fee calculation as set forth in Section 910)	 \$7.00	 <u>\$2,080.00</u>	 <u>\$2,340.00</u>
On-Street Car Share Vehicle Permit (§ 911) Base Permit Fee Zone 1 Zone 2 Zone 3	 \$2,700.00 (\$225 per month) \$1,800.00 (\$150 per month) \$600.00 (\$50 per month)	 <u>\$2,700.00</u> (\$225 per month) <u>\$1,800.00</u> (\$150 per month) <u>\$600.00</u> (\$50 per month)	 <u>\$2,700.00</u> (\$225 per month) <u>\$1,800.00</u> (\$150 per month) <u>\$600.00</u> (\$50 per month)
Vehicle Press Permit (§ 912) Base Permit Fee: The permit fee shall only be increased pursuant to the Automatic Indexing Implementation Plan approved by the SFMTA Board of Directors.	 \$54.00	 <u>\$56.00</u>	 <u>\$58.00</u>
<u>Designated Shuttle Stop Use Permit (§ 914)</u>		 <u>\$1.06</u>	 <u>\$1.10</u>
Farmer's Market Parking Permit (§ 801(c)(17)) Base Permit Fee (quarterly):	 \$170.00	 <u>\$172.00</u>	 <u>\$173.00</u>
Temporary Street Closures Permits (Division I, Article 6)			

Neighborhood Block Party	\$158.00	<u>\$167.00</u>	<u>\$177.00</u>
More than 60 days in advance:	\$210.00	<u>\$223.00</u>	<u>\$236.00</u>
Fewer than 60 days in advance:	\$420.00	<u>\$445.00</u>	<u>\$472.00</u>
Fewer than 30 days in advance:	\$473.00	<u>\$501.00</u>	<u>\$531.00</u>
Fewer than 7 days in advance:			
All Other Events	\$522.00	<u>\$553.00</u>	<u>\$586.00</u>
More than 60 days in advance:	\$632.00	<u>\$670.00</u>	<u>\$710.00</u>
Fewer than 60 days in advance:	\$741.00	<u>\$785.00</u>	<u>\$832.00</u>
Fewer than 30 days in advance:	\$852.00	<u>\$903.00</u>	<u>\$957.00</u>
Fewer than 7 days in advance:			
<u>Bus Substitution Fee (Division I, Article 6.2(f))</u>		<u>\$22.19</u>	<u>\$22.88</u>

(e) **Indemnification.** The permit application for Special Traffic Permits issued pursuant to Section 903, and permits for the Temporary and Exclusive Use of Parking Meters issued pursuant to Section 904, shall require the applicant to acknowledge that the Permittee, by acceptance of the permit, agrees to indemnify and hold the City and County of San Francisco, its departments, commissions, boards, officers, employees and agents ("Indemnitees") harmless from and against any and all claims, demands, actions or causes of action which may be made against the Indemnitees for the recovery of damages for the injury to or death of any person or persons or for the damage to any property resulting directly or indirectly from the activity authorized by the permit regardless of the negligence of the Indemnitees.

(f) **Rules and Regulations.** Compliance with all applicable rules and regulations and with all permit conditions shall be a material condition for the issuance or renewal of a permit.

(g) **Permit Revocation.** The Director of Transportation is authorized to revoke the permit of any Permittee found to be in violation of this Article and, upon written notice of revocation, the Permittee shall surrender such permit in accordance with the instructions in the notice of revocation.

SEC. 914. SHUTTLE STOP PERMITS

(a) Definitions

As used in this Section 914, the following words and phrases shall have the following meanings:

Designated Stop. An SFMTA bus stop designated by SFMTA as a stop available for loading and/or unloading of passengers by Shuttle Service Providers that have been issued a Shuttle Permit under this Section 914.

Director. The Director of Transportation or his or her designee.

Shuttle Bus. A motor vehicle designed, used or maintained by or for a charter-party

carrier of passengers, a passenger stage corporation, or any highway carrier of passengers required to register with the California Public Utilities Commission that is being operated in Shuttle Service.

Shuttle Permit. A permit issued by the SFMTA that authorizes a Shuttle Service Provider to load and/or unload passengers at specified Designated Stops in one or more Shuttle Buses.

Shuttle Placard. A placard issued by SFMTA that is visible from outside the Shuttle Bus at front and rear locations as specified by the SFMTA and that identifies the Shuttle Permit authorizing the Shuttle Bus to use Designated Stops.

Shuttle Service. Transportation by ~~Private~~Shuttle Buses offered for the exclusive or primary use of a discrete group or groups, such as clients, patients, students, paid or unpaid staff, visitors, and/or residents, between an organization or entity's facilities or between the organization or entity's facilities and other locations, on a regularly-scheduled basis.

Shuttle Service Provider. Any Person using Shuttle Buses to provide Shuttle Service within the City.

Stop Event. An instance of stopping by a Shuttle Bus at a Designated Stop for the purpose of loading and/or unloading passengers.

(b) **Findings.**

(1) The use of Shuttle Buses for the purpose of providing Shuttle Service is a growing means of transportation in San Francisco and the greater Bay Area.

(2) Shuttle Service provides significant benefits to the community by replacing single occupant trips with more efficient transportation, contributing to a reduction in parking demand, and supporting the City's goal of having of 50 percent of all trips made by sustainable modes by 2018.

(3) Shuttle Service currently operating in San Francisco reduces vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in the City by at least 45 million miles annually, and reduces greenhouse gas emissions from trips originating or ending in the City by 671,000 metric tons annually.

(4) Unregulated use of Muni stops by Shuttle Service Providers has resulted in unintended adverse impacts, including delaying transit bus service, increasing traffic congestion, diverting bicyclists from bicycle lanes into mixed-flow lanes, and diverting motor vehicle traffic into adjacent travel lanes, and preventing transit buses from being able to access the curb in order to load and unload passengers.

(5) The SFMTA's lack of complete information about Shuttle Service operations, including routes, frequency of service and stops has been a barrier to resolving and preventing conflicts with Shuttle Service Providers' operations, including adverse impacts on Muni service and increased traffic congestion.

(6) Inconsistent or inaccurate identification of, and lack of contact information for, Shuttle Service Providers has made it difficult for the SFMTA to effectively and timely communicate with Shuttle Service Providers to prevent or resolve conflicts and makes enforcement of traffic and parking regulations difficult.

(7) Regulation by the SFMTA of stop use by Shuttle Services to provide safe loading and unloading zones for Shuttle Services, whose cumulative ridership is equivalent to that of a small transit system, is consistent with City's Transit First policy.

(8) The pilot program established under this Section 914 is intended to enable SFMTA to evaluate whether shared use of Muni stops by Shuttle Buses is consistent with efficient operation of the City's public transit system.

(c) **General Permit Program Requirements.**

(1) The Director is authorized to implement a pilot program for the issuance of Shuttle Permits beginning on a date designated by the Director. The duration of the pilot program shall not exceed 18 months from the date of commencement designated by the Director.

(2) The Director may issue a Shuttle Permit for the use of Designated Stops upon receipt of an application from a Shuttle Service Provider on a form prescribed by the SFMTA which application meets the requirements of this Section 914.

(3) The Shuttle Permit shall authorize the Shuttle Service Provider to receive a specified number of Shuttle Placards issued by SFMTA.

(4) The Director is authorized to establish up to 200 Designated Stops for the purposes of this pilot program. The Director may establish additional Designated Stops following a public hearing.

(d) **Application Requirements.** Each application for a permit or renewal of a permit shall contain the following information:

(1) The name, business location, telephone number, fax number and email address of the Shuttle Service Provider;

(2) The name, title and contact information of one or more persons representing the Shuttle Service Provider to be notified by SFMTA in the event of a problem or permit violation relating to the Permittee's Shuttle Service;

(3) The total number of Shuttle Buses the Shuttle Service Provider intends to use to deliver Shuttle Service using Designated Stops, and the make, passenger capacity and license plate number of each of its Shuttle Buses that would be authorized, when bearing a Shuttle Placard, to use one or more Designated Stops;

(4) The total number of Shuttle Placards requested;

(5) The number of shuttle routes for which the permit applicant is proposing to provide Shuttle Service, including the frequency of service on each route, the neighborhoods served by each route, the origin and terminus of each route, and the frequency of Shuttle Service on each route. In lieu of a map, the permit applicant may provide a narrative statement describing the routes. The applicant need only identify the route to the extent that it lies within the City. Where the point of origin or termination is outside of the City, the applicant need only provide the county in which the point of origin or termination is located;

(6) A list of the Designated Stops the permit applicant proposes to use on each shuttle route, along with the proposed frequency of use of each Designated Stop per day, resulting in a calculation of the total number of Stop Events per day at Designated Stops; and

(7) Documentation of the Applicant's registration status with the California Public Utilities Commission ("CPUC"), including any Charter Party Carrier ("TCP") authorization or permits, or registration as a private carrier of passengers, and documentation that the Applicant maintains insurance in compliance with the applicable requirements imposed by the CPUC.

(e) **Permit Issuance.** After evaluating an applicant's permit application, the Director shall grant the Permit as requested, or grant the Permit with modifications, or deny the Permit. Where the Permit is granted with modifications or denied, the notice shall explain the basis for the Director's decision. The Director may issue procedures for reviewing the Director's decision upon request of the permit applicant.

(f) **Permit Terms and Conditions.** The Director shall establish terms and conditions for Permits. In addition to any other requirements imposed by the Director, Permits shall include the following terms:

(1) Any Shuttle Bus being operated in Shuttle Service shall be listed on the permit application and shall display a valid SFMTA-issued Shuttle Placard visible from outside the Shuttle Bus at front and rear locations on the Shuttle Bus as specified by the SFMTA, at all times such vehicle is being operated in Shuttle Service in the City. Shuttle Placards may be transferred between any Shuttle Buses in the Shuttle Service Provider's fleet that are listed on the Permit.

(2) A Shuttle Bus bearing valid Shuttle Placards shall be allowed to stop at any Designated Stop subject to the following conditions:

(A) The Shuttle Bus shall give priority to any transit buses that are approaching or departing a Designated Stop;

(B) The Shuttle Bus shall not stop at any Muni stops other than Designated Stops;

(C) The Shuttle Bus shall use Designated Stops only for active loading or unloading of passengers, and such loading and unloading shall be conducted as quickly as possible without compromising the safety of passengers, pedestrians, bicyclists or other motorists;

(D) Loading and unloading of passengers shall not take place in, or impede travel in, a lane of traffic or bicycle lane.

(3) A Shuttle Permit and Shuttle Placard shall not exempt a Shuttle Bus from any other Parking restrictions or traffic regulations except as authorized by this Section 914, and a Shuttle Bus stopping or parking at any Muni stop, including a Designated Stop, in violation of the terms and conditions set forth in this Subsection (f) may be cited for violation of California Vehicle Code Section 22500(i).

(4) The Permittee shall comply with all applicable federal, state and local laws, including this Code, the California Vehicle Code and CPUC requirements, including those for registration, insurance, vehicle inspection and regulation of drivers;

(5) The Permittee shall equip each Shuttle Bus with an on-board device capable of providing real-time location data to the SFMTA in accordance with specifications issued by the Director, and shall maintain a continuous feed of the specified data at all times when the Shuttle Bus is being used to provide Shuttle Service within the City. The Permittee shall begin providing a continuous feed of such data to the SFMTA on the first day that the Permittee begins providing Shuttle Service under the Permit unless the Director establishes an alternate date. Notwithstanding the foregoing requirements stated in this subsection (f)(5), if the Permittee is unable to provide the required data in accordance with specifications issued by the Director, the Permittee shall install an on-board device (OBD) prescribed by the SFMTA in each Shuttle Bus. The SFMTA shall not be responsible for any equipment, or for the failure of any equipment, installed inside any Shuttle Bus for any reason, including for the purpose of complying with this Section 914. If a Shuttle Bus becomes unable to provide the required data for any reason, Permittee shall not operate that Shuttle Bus in Shuttle Service without first notifying SFMTA of the identity of the bus, the route affected and the time at which Permittee expects the data transmission to be restored. To facilitate SFMTA's monitoring of Shuttle Bus operations, the Director may issue regulations limiting the duration that a Shuttle Bus may operate in Shuttle Service without being able to provide the required data.

(6) The Permittee shall, in a timely manner and as otherwise required by law, pay all traffic and parking citations issued to its Shuttle Buses in the course of providing Shuttle Service, subject to the Permittee's right under applicable law to contest such citations.

(7) Where the Director determines that the continued use of a particular Shuttle Bus listed on a Shuttle Provider's permit application would constitute a risk to public safety, the Director shall notify the Shuttle Provider in writing, and said Shuttle Bus shall immediately be ineligible to use any Designated Stops unless and until the Shuttle Provider has proven to the satisfaction of the Director that the Shuttle Bus no longer constitutes a risk to public safety.

(g) **Duration of Shuttle Permit.** Shuttle Permits initially issued under this Section shall expire six months from the date of commencement of the pilot program designated by the Director pursuant to subsection (c)(1), unless a shorter term is requested by the Permittee, the Permit is revoked, or the Director for good cause finds a shorter term is warranted. Permits issued or renewed on or after that six months' date shall expire 18 months from the date of program commencement, unless a shorter term is requested by the Permittee, the Permit is revoked or the Director for good cause finds a shorter term is required.

(h) **Fees.**

(1) Shuttle Service Providers shall pay a Designated Stop use and permit fee as set forth ~~below~~ in Section 902. The fee is intended to cover the cost to SFMTA of permit program implementation, administration enforcement and evaluation. The Designated Stop use fee component shall be determined by multiplying the total number of anticipated daily Stop Events stated in the permit application by the per stop fee set forth below. The Director is authorized, in his or her discretion, to impose pro-rated Designated Stop use fees where a Shuttle Service Provider applies for a permit or permit modification following date of commencement of the pilot program.

~~(2) The Designated Stop use and permit fees shall be \$1 per Stop Event.~~

~~(32)~~ Permittees shall be billed for the Designated Stop use and permit fee upon issuance or renewal of the Permit. The Designated Stop use and permit fee shall be due and payable within 30 days from the date of invoice. Fees remaining unpaid 30 days after the date of invoice shall be subject to a 10 percent penalty plus interest at the rate of one percent per month on the outstanding balance, which shall be added to the fee amount from the date that payment is due.

~~(33)~~ SFMTA shall reconcile the number of Stop Events for each Shuttle Service Provider against the actual stop data provided to the SFMTA on a semi-annual basis, but reserves the right to conduct such reconciliation on a more frequent basis if necessary. Where the SFMTA determines that a Shuttle Service Provider has used Designated Stops more frequently than authorized under the Provider's Permit, the Provider shall pay the additional Designated Stop use fee due. Where SFMTA determines that the Permittee's use of Designated Stops exceeds the authorized number of daily Stop Events by 10 percent or more, the Provider shall pay the additional Designated Stop use fee due, plus a 10 percent penalty. All such fees shall be due within 30 days from the date of invoice. Fees remaining unpaid after that date shall be subject to interest at the rate of one percent per month on the outstanding balance, which shall be added to the fee amount from the date that payment is due.

(i) **Grounds for suspension or revocation.**

(1) The Director may suspend or revoke a permit issued under this Section 914 upon written notice of revocation and opportunity for hearing. The Director is authorized to promulgate hearing and review procedures for permit suspension and revocation proceedings. Upon revocation or suspension, the Shuttle Service Provider shall surrender such Permit and the Shuttle Placards authorized under the Permit in accordance with the instructions in the notice of

suspension or revocation.

(2) Where the Director determines that public safety is at risk, or where the Permittee's continued operation as a Shuttle Service Provider would be in violation of the California Public Utilities Code or the California Vehicle Code, the Director is authorized to suspend a permit issued under this Section 914 immediately upon written notice of suspension to the Permittee, provided that the Director shall provide the Permittee with the opportunity for a hearing on the suspension within five business days of the date of notice of suspension.

(3) A permit issued under this Section 914 may be suspended or revoked under this paragraph following the Director's determination after an opportunity for hearing that:

- (A) the Permittee has failed to abide by any permit condition;
- (B) the Permittee knowingly or intentionally provided false or inaccurate information on a permit application;
- (C) one or more of Permittee's Shuttle Buses have, in the course of providing Shuttle Service, repeatedly and egregiously violated parking or traffic laws;
- (D) the Permittee's continued operation as a Shuttle Service Provider would constitute a public safety risk; or
- (E) the Permittee's continued operation as a Shuttle Service Provider would be in violation of the California Public Utilities Code or the California Vehicle Code.

(j) **Administrative Penalties.**

(1) This Section shall govern the imposition, assessment and collection of administrative penalties imposed for violations of permit conditions set forth under Subsection 914(f).

(2) The SFMTA Board of Directors finds:

- (A) That it is in the best interest of the City, its residents, visitors and those who travel on City streets to provide an administrative penalty mechanism for enforcement of Shuttle Bus permit conditions; and
- (B) That the administrative penalty scheme established by this section is intended to compensate the public for the injury or damage caused by Shuttle Buses being operated in violation of the permit conditions set forth under Subsection 914(f). The administrative penalties authorized under this section are intended to be reasonable and not disproportionate to the damage or injury to the City and the public caused by the prohibited conduct.

(C) The procedures set forth in this Section are adopted pursuant to Government Code Section 53069.4 which governs the imposition, enforcement, collection, and administrative review of administrative citations and fines by local agencies, and pursuant to the City's home rule power over its municipal affairs.

(3) Any Service Provider that is operating a Shuttle Bus in violation of the permit conditions set forth under Subsection 914(f) may be subject to the issuance of a citation and imposition of an administrative penalty under this Subsection 914(j).

(4) Administrative penalties may not exceed \$250 for each violation. In determining the amount of the penalty, the officer or employee who issued the citation may take any or all of the following factors into consideration:

- (A) The duration of the violation;
- (B) The frequency, recurrence and number of violations by the same violator;

- (C) The seriousness of the violation;
- (D) The good faith efforts of the violator to correct the violation;
- (E) The economic impact of the fine on the violator;
- (F) The injury or damage, if any, suffered by any member of the public;
- (G) The impact of the violation on the community;
- (H) The amount of City staff time expended investigating or addressing the violation;
- (I) The amount of fines imposed by the charging official in similar situations;
- (J) Such other factors as justice may require.

(5) The Director of Transportation is authorized to designate officers or employees of the Municipal Transportation Agency to issue citations imposing administrative penalties for violations of the permit conditions set forth in Subsection 914(f), hereafter referred to as the "Charging Official."

(6) Administrative Citation. A Charging Official who determines that there has been a violation of the permit conditions set forth in Subsection 914(f), may issue an administrative citation to the Shuttle Service Provider permitted under this Section 914. The Charging Official shall either serve the citation personally on the Shuttle Service Provider or serve it by certified U.S. mail sent to the address indicated on the Shuttle Service Provider's permit application.

(7) The citation shall contain the following information: the name of the person or entity cited; the date, time, address or location and nature of the violation; the date the citation is issued; the name and signature of the Charging Official; the amount of the administrative penalty, acceptable forms of payment of the penalty; and that the penalty is due and payable to the SFMTA within 15 business days from (A) the date of issuance of the citation if served personally, or (B) the date of receipt of the citation if served by certified U.S. Mail. The citation shall also state that the person or entity cited that it has the right to appeal the citation, as provided in Subsection 914(j).

(8) Request for Hearing; Hearing.

(A) A person or entity may appeal the issuance of a citation by filing a written request with the SFMTA Hearing Division within 15 business days from (i) the date of the issuance of a citation that is served personally or (ii) the date of receipt if the citation is served by certified U.S. Mail. The failure of the person or entity cited to appeal the citation shall constitute a failure to exhaust administrative remedies and shall preclude the person or entity cited from obtaining judicial review of the validity of the citation.

(B) At the time that the appeal is filed, the appellant must deposit with the SFMTA Hearing Division the full amount of the penalty required under the citation.

(C) The SFMTA Hearing Division shall take the following actions within 10 days of receiving an appeal: appoint a hearing officer, set a date for the hearing, which date shall be no less than 10 and no more than 60 days from the date that the appeal was filed, and send written notice of the hearing date to the appellant and the Charging Official.

(D) Upon receiving notice that the SFMTA Hearing Division has scheduled a hearing on an appeal, the Charging Official shall, within three City business

days, serve the hearing officer with records, materials, photographs, and other evidence supporting the citation. The hearing officer may grant a request to allow later service and may find good cause to continue the hearing because of the delay.

(E) The hearing officer shall conduct all appeal hearings under this Chapter and shall be responsible for deciding all matters relating to the hearing procedures not otherwise specified in this Section. The Charging Official shall have the burden of proof in the hearing. The hearing officer may continue the hearing at his or her own initiative or at the request of either party, and may request additional information from either party to the proceeding. The hearing need not be conducted according to technical rules of evidence and witnesses. Any relevant evidence is admissible if it is the sort of evidence on which responsible persons are accustomed to rely in the conduct of serious affairs.

(F) The following provisions shall also apply to the appeal procedure:

(i) A citation that complies with the requirements of Section 914(j)(7) and any additional evidence submitted by the Charging Official shall be prima facie evidence of the facts contained therein;

(ii) The appellant shall be given the opportunity to present evidence concerning the citation; and

(iii) The hearing officer may accept testimony by declaration under penalty of perjury relating to the citation from any party if he or she determines it appropriate to do so.

(iv) After considering all of the testimony and evidence submitted by the parties, the hearing officer shall issue a written decision upholding, modifying or vacating the citation and shall set forth the reasons for the determination. This shall be a final administrative determination.

(v) If the hearing officer upholds the citation, the hearing officer shall inform the appellant of its right to seek judicial review pursuant to California Government Code Section 53069.4. If the citation is upheld the City shall retain the amount of the fine that the appellant deposited with the City.

(vi) If the hearing officer vacates the citation, the City shall promptly refund the deposit. If the hearing officer partially vacates the citation, the City shall promptly refund that amount of the deposit that corresponds to the hearing officer's determination. The refund shall include interest at the average rate earned on the City's portfolio for the period of time that the City held the deposit as determined by the Controller.

(G) Any person aggrieved by the action of the hearing officer taken pursuant to this Chapter may obtain review of the administrative decision by filing a petition for review in accordance with the timelines and provisions set forth in California Government Code Section 53069.4.

(H) If a final order of a court of competent jurisdiction determines that the SFMTA has not properly imposed a fine pursuant to the provisions of this Section, and if the fine has been deposited with the SFMTA as required by Section 914(j)(8)(B), the SFMTA shall promptly refund the amount of the deposited fine, consistent with the court's determination, together with interest at the average rate earned on the City's portfolio.

(9) Administrative penalties shall be deposited in the Municipal

Transportation Fund and may be expended only by the SFMTA.

Section 2. Article 300 of Division II of the Transportation Code is hereby amended by repealing Section 309 in its entirety:

~~SEC. 309. ON-LINE COMPUTER AND PAYMENT BY TELEPHONE~~

~~TRANSACTION FEE.~~

~~A fee to reimburse the SFMTA for costs associated with processing on-line computer transactions made through the SFMTA's website or transactions made by telephone. The administrative fee shall be in addition to any costs, fees or fines associated with the subject transaction. The amount for this fee shall be \$2.50 effective July 1, 2014, and \$3.00 effective July 1, 2015.~~

Section 3. Effective and Operative Dates. This ordinance shall become effective 31 days after enactment. Enactment occurs when the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors approves this ordinance. Section 1 shall become operative on July 1, 2014. Section 2 shall become operative on April 1, 2015, provided that, no earlier than January 2015, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors makes a determination that the Agency can financially support the elimination of the on-line computer and payment by telephone transaction fee.

Section 4. Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors intends to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles, numbers, letters, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the Transportation Code that are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions or deletions in accordance with the "Note" that appears under the official title of the ordinance.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

By: _____
JOHN I. KENNEDY
Deputy City Attorney

I certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the San Francisco
Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors at its meeting of April 15, 2014.

Secretary to the Board of Directors
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency