

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

Grant Ordinance Information Form
(Effective May 2011)

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

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

1. Grant Title: Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3
2. Department: Municipal Transportation Agency and Public Works
3. Contact Person: Rachel Alonso Telephone: 415.554.4890
4. Grant Approval Status (check one):
 Approved by funding agency Not yet approved
5. Amount of Grant Funding Approved or Applied for: \$1,014,983 (\$503,135 DPW and \$511,848 SFMTA)
Grant Code:
- 6a. Matching Funds Required: none
- b. Source(s) of matching funds (if applicable):
- 7a. Grant Source Agency: Metropolitan Transportation Commission
- b. Grant Pass-Through Agency (if applicable):
8. Proposed Grant Project Summary:

SFMTA: Implementation of spot improvements along the high injury corridor (HIC) network; Expansion of Bicycle Strategy corridors; and Enhancement of Bicycle Strategy routes.

DPW: Preliminary engineering (planning and design) of curb ramps for compliance with the Federal Americans with Disabilities Act; Public sidewalk reconstruction and replacement.

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

Start-Date: July 1, 2015

End-Date: June 30, 2018

10. Number of new positions created and funded: none
11. Explain the disposition of employees once the grant ends? N/A
- 12a. Amount budgeted for contractual services: none
- b. Will contractual services be put out to bid? N/A
- c. If so, will contract services help to further the goals of the Department's Local Business Enterprise (LBE)

requirements? N/A

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

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

b1. If yes, how much? \$174,502 DPW; \$230,331 MTA

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

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

- Not allowed by granting agency To maximize use of grant funds on direct services
 Other (please explain):

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

14. Any other significant grant requirements or comments:

****Disability Access Checklist****

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

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

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

Comments:

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

Kevin Jensen
(Name)

ADA/Disability Access Coordinator, SF Public Works
(Title)

Date Reviewed: 21 MAY 2015


(Signature Required)

Overall Department Head or Designee Approval:

Mohammed Nuru

(Name)

Director, SF Public Works

(Title)

Date Reviewed:

5/26/15



(Signature Required)