CAC Meeting June 26, 2024 Item 6 Enclosure 2

2023 Prop L 5-Year Prioritization Program

# **Equity Priority Transportation Program**

Draft Report: July 2024



This report was prepared by the San Francisco County Transportation Authority in coordination with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, the San Francisco Planning Department, and San Francisco Public Works.







#### **Table of Contents**

1.	Introduction	2
2.	Eligibility and Expected Fund Leveraging	3
3.	Public Engagement	4
4.	Performance Measures	5
5.	Project Delivery Snapshot	6
6.	Project Prioritization	7
7.	Project List	8
	Project Scoring Table	9
	<ul> <li>5-Year Program of Projects (Project List)</li> </ul>	10
	Anticipated Leveraging	12
Αŗ	opendices	
•	Appendix A: Map of Equity Priority Communities	13
•	Appendix B: Project Information Forms	
	1. Brotherhood Way Safety and Circulation Plan Implementation Placehold	er15
	2. Citywide Equity Planning Placeholder	22
	3. Community Based Transportation Plan Implementation Placeholder	27
	4. Community Based Transportation Plan Placeholder (e.g. Mission, Ingleside/Oceanview, Excelsior/Outer Mission/Crocker Amazon)	32
	5. Visitacion Valley & Portola Community Based Transportation Plan Implementation Placeholder	39

#### 1. Introduction

In November 2022, San Francisco voters approved Proposition L (Prop L), extending the ½-cent sales tax to fund transportation improvements and approving a new 30-year Expenditure Plan, which superseded the prior Proposition K Expenditure Plan. The Prop L Expenditure Plan determines eligibility for sales tax funds through a list of 28 programs. It also sets caps for the maximum amount of Prop L funds that will be available for specific programs over the 30-year Expenditure Plan period, totaling up to an estimated \$2.6 billion (2020 \$'s). In order to fully fund the programs, the Expenditure Plan assumes that the Prop L dollars will leverage (or match) another \$23.7 billion (2020 \$'s) in other federal, state, regional, and local funds for a total program cost of \$26.3 billion (2020 \$'s). Some of those leveraged funds will be distributed to San Francisco through funding formulas. In other cases, San Francisco project sponsors will have to aggressively compete for discretionary funds in order to fully fund the Expenditure Plan programs.

The Expenditure Plan includes a number of requirements, including the development of 5-Year Prioritization Programs (5YPPs) as a condition for receiving allocations in each program in the Expenditure Plan. The 5YPPs are intended to provide a stronger link between project selection and expected project performance, to support on time, on-budget project delivery, and optimize use of federal, state and regional matching funds. Other major benefits of the 5YPPs include:

- Provide transparency about how Prop L projects are prioritized,
- Enable public input early and throughout the planning process, and
- Improve agency coordination within and across projects at the earlier stages of the planning process.

The desired outcome of the 5YPPs is the establishment of a strong pipeline of grant-ready transportation projects that can be advanced as soon as funds (including Prop L, federal, state, and other funds) are available. The 5YPPs are critically important to help achieve the leveraging needed to fully fund the Expenditure Plan programs.

As its centerpiece, each 5YPP contains a 5-year Program of Projects (or project list), ideally including project descriptions, schedule milestones, cost estimates, and full funding plans showing Prop L funds by fiscal year and other matching funds. The Program of Projects (project list) for the Equity Priority Transportation Program is contained in Section 7 of this document.

# 2. Eligibility and Expected Fund Leveraging

#### 2.1 | ELIGIBILITY

Eligibility for the Equity Priority Transportation Program as identified in the voter approved Prop L Expenditure Plan is as follows, with amounts shown in millions of 2020 dollars:

"The Equity Priority Transportation Program (EPTP) funds equity priority community-based projects in underserved neighborhoods and areas with vulnerable populations (e.g., low-income communities, seniors, children, and/or people with disabilities) as well as citywide equity evaluations and planning efforts. The EPTP has a planning component to fund community-based planning efforts, and a capital component to provide local match funds to help advance and implement capital investment and pilot recommendations stemming from community-based planning and equity assessments. Eligible project types are those that are eligible for other 2022 Transportation Expenditure Plan programs, as well as projects that help reduce disparities and gaps in equitable access (physical, geographic, affordability) to jobs and key services. Includes planning, project development, and capital costs. Sponsor Agencies: SFCTA, SFMTA, SFPW, Planning. Includes \$42M in Priority 1 and the remainder is Priority 2. Total Funding: \$192.2M; EP: \$47M."

A map of Equity Priority Communities (EPCs) is included in Appendix A.

SFCTA stands for San Francisco County Transportation Authority, SFMTA stands for the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, SFPW stands for San Francisco Public Works, and Planning stands for the San Francisco Planning Department. Priority 1 funds correspond to the conservative sales tax revenue forecast and Priority 2 to the optimistic forecast.

#### 2.2 | EXPECTED FUND LEVERAGING

Leveraging Prop L funds against non-Prop L fund sources is necessary to fully fund the Expenditure Plan programs. Prop L sales tax funds will be used as seed funding for planning and project development to make projects competitive for discretionary fund sources, and to serve as local match needed to secure federal, state, regional, and other grant funding.

Based on Priority 1 (conservative forecast) funding levels, for the Equity Priority Transportation Program, the Prop L Expenditure Plan assumes that for every \$1 of sales tax revenue spent, on average it would be leveraged by about \$3.46 in non-Prop L funds. The Transportation Authority reviews leveraging at the project and project

phase (e.g. planning, design, construction) levels as well as for each Expenditure Plan program as a whole.

#### 3. Public Engagement

Transportation Authority staff conducted public engagement to inform the development of the 5YPPs. This section summarizes feedback heard from that engagement, as well as information provided by project sponsors regarding public engagement and community support.

During the Prop L Expenditure Plan development, the Transportation Authority conducted a robust outreach process from Spring 2021 - Winter 2022 and was guided by an advisory committee of 27 community members representing equity- and neighborhood-focused representatives as well as business, labor, civic, and environmental groups. The reauthorization effort placed equity at the forefront, with equity considerations flowing through all of the key takeaways. Areas of concern included focusing investment in Equity Priority Communities, recognizing that needs are different in each communities, serving low income communities, and ensuring all communities have good access to transportation options. The New Expenditure Plan for San Francisco's Half-Cent Sales Tax for Transportation: Outreach Findings report can be found on the Transportation Authority website.

As part of development of the 5YPPs, the Transportation Authority conducted outreach and hosted public meetings to gather input about which specific projects and project types should be funded through Prop L in the next five years and to seek input on how to select projects for each Expenditure Plan program. The meetings included a virtual meeting for interested members of the former Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee who helped develop Prop L and representatives of equity-focused community-based organizations; a virtual town hall; and presentations at community group meetings, as requested. There was also an online multi-lingual survey and opportunities for public input through the Transportation Authority's website and at multiple Transportation Authority Community Advisory Committee and Transportation Authority Board meetings. The Transportation Authority website also includes a list of staff contacts to facilitate public engagement directly with project sponsors.

The key themes emerging from our public engagement were similar to what we heard during the Expenditure Plan development effort including:

• There are varied needs and desires from different communities based in different parts of the city.

- Improving transit had broad support, including improvements to reliability, customer experience, better connections, and additional service.
- Safety and accessibility were a primary concern for many, including improving pedestrian and bicyclist safety and accessibility for seniors and people with disabilities.
- Putting equity at the forefront, including focusing investment in Equity Priority Communities and serving people with low incomes, was critical for many.
- Better connections between neighborhoods, especially considering changing pandemic travel patterns, and localized engagement around transportation solutions were emphasized.

To learn more about our engagement process and findings, visit sfcta.org/ExpenditurePlan.

#### 4. Performance Measures

Prop L requires the establishment of performance measures for each program in the Expenditure Plan. The intent is to demonstrate the system performance benefits of sales tax projects (e.g. reduced transit travel time), to ensure funds are being used cost effectively, and to inform programming of future Prop L funds, as well as programming and prioritization of other funds by the Transportation Authority (e.g. Transportation Fund for Clean Air, Prop AA Vehicle Registration Fee funds).

After reviewing San Francisco's Congestion Management Program and consulting with eligible sponsoring agencies, the Transportation Authority recommends that the following performance measures be applied to projects included in the Equity Priority Transportation Program 5YPP:

- Vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian collisions
- Accessibility for EPCs
- Investment in EPCs areas, including distribution of Prop L projects located in EPCs and/or benefitting disadvantaged populations
- Other performance measures to be established based on the goals of the projects funded by this Prop L program

While not recommended as performance measures, the Transportation Authority will also track the following metrics for this program:

- Number of Community Based Transportation Plans (CBTPs) completed
- Geographic coverage of all EPCs

- Number of citywide equity plans/studies completed
- Number of CBTP or citywide equity planning recommendations being advanced/implemented
- Other metrics depending on the plans/projects that move forward

#### 5. Project Delivery Snapshot

Since this is the inaugural Prop L 5YPP, we are looking to the prior Prop K sales tax program to assess project delivery trends for similar types of projects. Project delivery for previously-funded projects is one important consideration when we evaluate project sponsors' proposed requests for Prop L funding, particularly with respect to project readiness.

As required by the Prop L Expenditure Plan, the next 5YPP update will be informed by a citywide geographic distribution of sales tax project allocations and the distribution of projects located in Equity Priority Communities and/or benefiting disadvantaged populations.

#### **Prop K Project Delivery**

While there was not a directly comparable predecessor program in Prop K, Prop K funded the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's CBTPs in Equity Priority Communities. Table 1 shows the project status of open CBTP grants under Prop K.

Table 1. Prop K Project Status- Open Grants

SPONSOR	PROJECT NAME	PHASE(S) FUNDED	FY OF ALLOCATION	ALLOCATED (AS OF JUNE 2023)	REMAINING BALANCE (AS OF 5/30/24)	OPEN FOR USE?
SFMTA	Bayview Community Based Transportation Plan Implementation	Construction	2022/23	\$2,767,500	\$2,754,664	
SFMTA	Visitacion Valley & Portola CBTP Implementation	Planning, Design	2022/23	\$435,000	\$435,000	

Prop K funds have been allocated for the construction of pedestrian safety improvements developed through the Bayview Community Based Transportation Plan, a two-year community-driven planning effort in partnership with the SFMTA, District 10 Supervisor's office, and local stakeholders. Improvements include Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons at Innes Avenue at Arelious Walker Drive and

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Apollo Street at Williams Avenue and fifteen bulbouts at high priority locations identified in the Plan.

Prop K funds were also allocated for the implementation of recommendations from the Visitacion Valley & Portola CBTP. Specific improvements would include traffic calming and pedestrian safety devices, and locations will be drawn from the map of recommended locations.

#### 6. Project Prioritization

The intent of establishing and documenting a methodology to select proposed projects is to provide the Transportation Authority Board, the public, and project sponsors with a clear understanding of how projects are prioritized for funding within each Prop L program. Working in consultation with project sponsors and drawing upon the Transportation Authority's experience with prioritizing projects for grant funding, Transportation Authority staff developed a set of Prop L program-wide criteria to help select projects in each of the 28 Prop L programs. In addition, most programs also have program-specific criteria to inform priorities such as improving transit reliability and travel time or replacing assets at the end of their useful lives. The Prop L program-wide criteria include:

- Project readiness
- Relative level of need or urgency
- Benefit to disadvantaged populations
- Level and diversity of community support
- Leveraging

The above criteria, along with any program-specific criteria, are scored for each proposed project. In addition, the evaluation process also considers a fair geographic distribution and cost-effectiveness.

San Francisco's <u>Equity Priority Communities</u> are an important factor in assessing projects and benefits to disadvantaged populations. See the map on the Transportation Authority's website: <a href="https://epc-map.sfcta.org/">https://epc-map.sfcta.org/</a>

The Project Scoring Table in Section 7 shows the Prop L program-wide criteria, the program-specific criteria, criteria definitions, and maximum possible points for projects proposed for the Equity Priority Transportation Program 5YPP. For each proposed project, the project sponsors first scored the project and then Transportation Authority staff reviewed and refined the scoring, as needed, to ensure consistent application of the prioritization criteria.

#### 7. Project List

This section shows how each project proposed for funding from the Equity Priority Transportation Program ranked based on the prioritization methodology described in Section 6; the 5-Year Program of Projects or Project List recommended for Prop L funds; and Anticipated Leveraging. The Project Information Forms with details on scope, schedule, cost, funding are included in Appendix B.

As shown in the project list, the Transportation Authority has not requested advancement of funds beyond the pay-go amounts in the Strategic Plan Baseline for the Equity Priority Transportation Program.

#### Prop L Project Submissions Evaluation - EP 26 Equity Priority Transportation Program

		Prop L-Wide Criteria										
District	Projects	Project Readiness	Relative Level of Need or Urgency (time sensitive)	Benefits to Disadvantaged Populations	Level and Diversity of Community Support	Leveraging	Safety	Supports Equitable Access	Geographic Distribution	Limited Other Funding Options	Total	
7, 11	Brotherhood Way Safety and Circulation Plan Implementation Placeholder		This is a placeholder. Project(s) will be scored at time of allocation.									
Cltywide	Citywide Equity Planning Placeholder				This is a place	eholder. Project(s) w	vill be scored at tin	me of allocation.				
TBD	Community Based Transportation Plan Implementation Placeholder				This is a place	eholder. Project(s) w	vill be scored at tin	ne of allocation.				
TBD	Community Based Transportation Plan Placeholder (e.g. Mission, Ingleside/Oceanview, Excelsior/Outer Mission/Crocker Amazon)		This is a placeholder. Project(s) will be scored at time of allocation.									
9, 10	Visitacion Valley & Portola CBTP Implementation Placeholder				This is a place	eholder. Project(s) w	vill be scored at tin	ne of allocation.				
	Total Possible Score	5	4	5	5	4	4	4	3	3	37	
	<b>Project Scoring Key:</b> Projects are assessed using Trans project is assigned.	portation Authorit	ty Board adopted	Prop L-wide criteria	a and program spe	ecific prioritization c	: riteria. In general,	, the better a projec	ct meets the criteri	a as defined, the mo	re points the	
	community opposition or other factors pose a significar  Relative Level of Need or Urgency (time sensitive): H to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. significant)	nt risk to project ac	dvancement, as proceed to the core is 4. Project no	eeds to proceed in		eframe to enable co	onstruction coordi	ination with anothe	r project (e.g. mini			
	Relative Level of Need or Urgency (time sensitive):	it risk to project ac lighest possible so nal conduit install ible score is 5. Pro illity of disadvanta	dvancement, as proceed to the core is 4. Project no lation coordination opject provides direged populations to	eeds to proceed in n with a street resur ect benefits to disad o access transporta	the proposed time facing project) or t lvantaged populat tion (e.g. new or e	eframe to enable co to meet timely use o ions, including com nhanced infrastruct	onstruction coordi of funds deadlines nmunities historica	ination with anothe s associated with m	or project (e.g. mini natching funds.	mize costs and cons	truction impacts	
	Relative Level of Need or Urgency (time sensitive): It to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. signered) by the support of the su	it risk to project ac lighest possible so gnal conduit install sible score is 5. Pro illity of disadvanta are based on the o possible score is 5. nity based plan or based plan, but with	dvancement, as procore is 4. Project no lation coordination object provides direged populations to description of ben benchmarked. Project has clear with evidence of such evidence of suphericans as project no supplies the project has clear with evidence of suphericans as project no supplies the project no supplies th	eeds to proceed in n with a street resurect benefits to disad o access transportatefits presented in the and diverse (neighborhoupport from both neoort from either nei	the proposed time facing project) or to ivantaged populat tion (e.g. new or e he Project Informati unity support, inclu- ood level and cityve eighborhood stakel ighborhood stakel	eframe to enable co to meet timely use o ions, including com nhanced infrastruct tion Form. uding from disadva wide) community su eholders and citywinolders or citywide	onstruction coordi of funds deadlines amunities historica ture, new service of ntaged population upport and 2) has de groups. Project d	ination with anothe s associated with m ally harmed by disp or improved service ans and/or was deve documented support t does not have do	or project (e.g. mini natching funds. placement, transpo e, improved safety, eloped out of a cor ort from disadvants ocumented suppor	mize costs and cons rtation policies, and etc.), whether or no nmunity-based plan aged populations. t from disadvantage	projects that it the project is ning process.	
	Relative Level of Need or Urgency (time sensitive): He to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. signs s	it risk to project actification in the state of the state	dvancement, as price is 4. Project no lation coordination object provides dire ged populations to description of ben a project has clear with evidence of swith evidence of supplement of planning proportential leveraging	eeds to proceed in n with a street resur- ect benefits to disad o access transporta lefits presented in the and diverse community of the proof from both in port from either nei ocess nor has other g of Prop L funds, a	the proposed time facing project) or to a series of the project Information (e.g. new or ender ende	eframe to enable co to meet timely use of ions, including com- nhanced infrastruct tion Form.  uding from disadvaluding from disadvaluding community sucholders and citywinolders or citywide trated community sucholders or citywide	onstruction coordi of funds deadlines munities historica ture, new service of ntaged population upport and 2) has de groups. Project groups. Project d upport.	ination with anothe s associated with mally harmed by disport improved services and/or was develocumented support does not have doors not have do	or project (e.g. mini natching funds.  placement, transpo e, improved safety,  ploped out of a cor ort from disadvant, commented support from	mize costs and construction policies, and etc.), whether or no numerity-based plan aged populations. It from disadvantaged pom disadvantaged pand the likely compe	projects that it the project is ning process.  d populations. opulations.	
	Relative Level of Need or Urgency (time sensitive): In to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. significant signifi	it risk to project actification in the state of the score is 5. Provided in the score is 5. Provided in the score is 5. Provided in the score is 5. In the score is 5	dvancement, as procore is 4. Project no lation coordination object provides dire ged populations to description of ben a Project has clear with evidence of sufficiency of such evidence of supplemental leveraging proceeding the proceeding of the project has clear and the project	eeds to proceed in n with a street resurect benefits to disad o access transportatefits presented in the and diverse (neighborhoupport from both noort from either neiocess nor has other g of Prop L funds, a ions from prior Con	the proposed time facing project) or to ivantaged population (e.g. new or either Project Information (e.g. new or either eit	eframe to enable co to meet timely use of ions, including com- nhanced infrastruct tion Form.  uding from disadval wide) community sucholders and citywin holders or citywide trated community s	onstruction coordi of funds deadlines munities historica ture, new service of ntaged population upport and 2) has de groups. Project d upport.  ers to consider incl o compete for disc	ination with anothe s associated with mally harmed by disport improved services and/or was developmented support does not have dooes not have dooes not have documented support does not have documented support documented support does not have documented support documented	or project (e.g. mini natching funds.  Placement, transpo e, improved safety,  Ploped out of a cor- ort from disadvant: commented support mented support from	mize costs and construction policies, and etc.), whether or no numerity-based plan aged populations. It from disadvantaged pom disadvantaged pand the likely compense.	projects that the project is ning process.  d populations. opulations.	
	Relative Level of Need or Urgency (time sensitive): He to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. signature) signature. Benefits to Disadvantaged Populations: Highest possibilized eminent domain. Project directly impacts the abdirectly located in an Equity Priority Community. Points  Level and Diversity of Community Support: Highest prive points for a project that 1) is in an adopted community. One point for a project not in an adopted community. One points for a project that was neither developed out a project that was neither developed out the project that was neither developed out the project demonstration of the project demonstration. Prop L funds from discretionary sources. For a project funds from discretionary sources.	lighest possible sognal conduit install sible score is 5. Properties of the conduit install sible score is 5. Properties of the conduit install sible score is 5. Properties of the conduit install sible score is 5. Inity based plan or based plan, but with the community of a community of a community of a community of the communit	dvancement, as pro- core is 4. Project no lation coordination opject provides dire ged populations to description of ben  Project has clear with evidence of swith evidence of sup based planning pro- cotential leveraging nee recommendation vissue(s), reduces projects that help phic benefits and/	eeds to proceed in n with a street resur- ect benefits to disad o access transporta lefits presented in the and diverse community of the proof from either nei ocess nor has other g of Prop L funds, a ions from prior Compotential conflict be reduce disparities a for significantly impired.	the proposed time facing project) or to a construct the proposed time facing project or to the project Information (e.g. new or ene Project Information (e.g. n	eframe to enable contour meet timely use of the community such of the community such olders and citywinolders or citywide trated community such olders or citywide trated community such on sportation Plans to do not consport to the community such of the community such olders and city such olders and c	onstruction coording funds deadlines in munities historical ture, new service of ture, Project of ture, Project of ture, afficial ture, Points are ball, geographic, affic	ination with anothers associated with mally harmed by disport improved services and/or was developmented support does not have dooes not have dooes not have door indeed the status of or cretionary sources ased on the safety in ordability) to jobs a	or project (e.g. mini natching funds.  placement, transpo e, improved safety, eloped out of a corrort from disadvant ocumented support from the fund sources a will receive priority information present and key services su	rtation policies, and etc.), whether or no numerity-based plan aged populations. It from disadvantaged pom disadvantaged	projects that the project is ning process.  d populations. opulations. opulations.	
	Relative Level of Need or Urgency (time sensitive): He to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. signature): Benefits to Disadvantaged Populations: Highest possibilized eminent domain. Project directly impacts the abdirectly located in an Equity Priority Community. Points  Level and Diversity of Community Support: Highest private points for a project that 1) is in an adopted community. One point for a project not in an adopted community. One points for a project not in an adopted community by Zero points for a project that was neither developed out that was neither developed out the securing non-Prop L funds from discretionary sources. For Safety: Highest possible score is 4. Project addresses described by the securing non-Prop L funds from discretionary sources. Supports Equitable Access: Highest possible score is 4 other community sites. Full points for projects that provides that provides the projects that provides the project that project that provides the project that provides the project that project the project that provides the project that project that project the projec	lighest possible sognal conduit install sible score is 5. Properties of disadvantage are based on the consistency of the second	dvancement, as pricore is 4. Project no lation coordination object provides dire ged populations to description of ben a Project has clear with evidence of such evidence of such evidence of supposed planning proportion of the project that help phic benefits and/advantaged popul	eeds to proceed in n with a street resur- ect benefits to disad o access transporta  lefts presented in the  and diverse common  diverse (neighborhoupport from both no  poort from either nei  locess nor has other  g of Prop L funds, a  lions from prior Com- potential conflict be  reduce disparities a  lor significantly impolation.	the proposed time facing project) or to a serious project or the project Information (e.g. new or ender Project Information (e.g. new) or ender project Information (e.g. new) or the pr	eframe to enable contour meet timely use of the community such of the community such olders and citywin olders or citywide trated community such olders or cityw	onstruction coordi of funds deadlines munities historica ture, new service of ntaged population upport and 2) has de groups. Project d groups. Project d upport.  The sto consider incle of compete for disc urity. Points are ba I, geographic, affic antaged population	ination with anothers associated with mally harmed by disport improved services and/or was developed to does not have documented support does not have documented support does not have documented support and the status of or cretionary sources are don the safety in ordability) to jobs a on. Partial points for	er project (e.g. mini natching funds.  Placement, transpo e, improved safety, eloped out of a cor out from disadvant. ocumented support from the fund sources a will receive priority information present and key services sur projects that provents.	rtation policies, and etc.), whether or no numerity-based plan aged populations. It from disadvantaged pom disadvantaged	projects that the project is ning process.  d populations. opulations. opulations.	

## 2023 Prop L 5-Year Project List (FY 2023/24 - FY 2027/28) 26- Equity Priority Transportation Program Programming Year

Pending July 2024 Board Meeting

Agency	Project Name	Phase	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	Total
TBD	Brotherhood Way Safety and Circulation Plan Implementation Placeholder	TBD			\$1,000,000			\$1,000,000
TBD	Citywide Equity Planning Placeholder	TBD		\$300,000				\$300,000
TBD	Community Based Transportation Plan Implementation Placeholder	TBD			\$600,000			\$600,000
TBD	Community Based Transportation Plan Implementation Placeholder	TBD				\$600,000		\$600,000
TBD	Community Based Transportation Plan Placeholder (e.g. Mission, Ingleside/Oceanview, Excelsior/Outer Mission/Crocker Amazon )	Planning/ Conceptual Engineering		\$100,000				\$100,000
TBD	Community Based Transportation Plan Placeholder (e.g. Mission, Ingleside/Oceanview, Excelsior/Outer Mission/Crocker Amazon)	Planning/ Conceptual Engineering			\$100,000			\$100,000
TBD	Community Based Transportation Plan Placeholder (e.g. Mission, Ingleside/Oceanview, Excelsior/Outer Mission/Crocker Amazon)	Planning/ Conceptual Engineering				\$100,000		\$100,000
SFMTA	Visitacion Valley & Portola Community Based Transportation Plan Implementation Placeholder	TBD		\$400,000				\$400,000
SFMTA	Visitacion Valley & Portola Community Based Transportation Plan Implementation Placeholder	TBD			\$600,000			\$600,000
	Funds Request	ed in 2023 5YPP	\$0	\$800,000	\$2,300,000	\$700,000	\$0	\$3,800,000
	Funds Programmed in 2023 Draft Strate		\$441,548	\$883,095	\$883,095	\$883,095	\$883,095	\$3,973,928
	Cumulative Remaining Progra	\$441,548	\$524,643	(\$892,262)	(\$709,167)	\$173,928	\$173,928	

#### 2023 Prop L 5-Year Project List (FY 2023/24 - FY 2027/28)

### 26- Equity Priority Transportation Program Cash Flow (Maximum Annual Reimbursement)

Pending July 2024 Board Meeting

				iscal Year of R	eimbursemen	t		
Project Name	Phase	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	Total
Brotherhood Way Safety and Circulation Plan Implementation Placeholder	TBD			\$300,000	\$600,000	\$100,000		\$1,000,000
Citywide Equity Planning Placeholder	TBD			\$150,000	\$150,000			\$300,000
Community Based Transportation Plan Implementation Placeholder	TBD			\$300,000	\$300,000			\$600,000
Community Based Transportation Plan Implementation Placeholder	TBD					\$300,000	\$300,000	\$600,000
Community Based Transportation Plan Placeholder (e.g. Mission, Ingleside/Oceanview, Excelsior/Outer Mission/Crocker Amazon )	Planning/ Conceptual Engineering		\$50,000	\$50,000				\$100,000
Community Based Transportation Plan Placeholder (e.g. Mission, Ingleside/Oceanview, Excelsior/Outer Mission/Crocker Amazon)	Planning/ Conceptual Engineering			\$50,000	\$50,000			\$100,000
Community Based Transportation Plan Placeholder (e.g. Mission, Ingleside/Oceanview, Excelsior/Outer Mission/Crocker Amazon)	Planning/ Conceptual Engineering				\$50,000	\$50,000		\$100,000
Visitacion Valley & Portola Community Based Transportation Plan Implementation Placeholder	TBD		\$200,000	\$200,000				\$400,000
Visitacion Valley & Portola Community Based Transportation Plan Implementation Placeholder	TBD			\$300,000	\$300,000			\$600,000
Cash Flow Reques	ted in 2023 5YPP	\$0	\$250,000	\$1,350,000	\$1,450,000	\$450,000	\$300,000	\$3,800,000
Cash Flow in 2023 Draft Strate			\$883,095	\$883,095	\$883,095	\$883,095	\$0	\$3,973,928
Cumulative Remaining Ca	sh Flow Capacity	\$441,548	\$1,074,643	\$607,738	\$40,833	\$473,928	\$173,928	\$173,928

#### **Anticipated Leveraging**


The table below compares Prop L Expenditure Plan assumptions with anticipated leveraging for the recommended projects based on the Project Information Forms. At time of allocation, Transportation Authority staff will again compare the actual leveraging to the expected leveraging.

Table 2. Prop L Leveraging: Expected vs. Proposed for Fiscal Years 2023/24 - 2027/28

PROJECT	EXPECTED LEVERAGING IN EP (NON-PROP L FUNDS)	
Brotherhood Way Safety and Circulation Implementation Placeholder	77.6%	TBD
Citywide Equity Planning Placeholder	77.6%	TBD
Community Based Transportation Plan Implementation Placeholder	77.6%	TBD
Community Based Transportation Plan Placeholder (e.g. Mission, Ingleside/Oceanview, Excelsior/Outer Mission/Crocker Amazon)	77.6%	TBD
Visitacion Valley & Portola Community Based Transportation Plan Implementation	77.6%	TBD
Equity Priority Transportation Program Total	77.6%	TBD

All of the proposed programming are placeholders at this time. When specific projects are proposed for placeholder funding, we will evaluate their proposed leveraging of sales tax funds. There are discretionary grant opportunities for these types of community based and equity focused planning efforts (e.g., Caltrans Planning Grants and Metropolitan Transportation Commission Community Based Transportation Planning funds) and many sources available for project development and implementation depending on the types of projects recommended.

#### **Appendix A**




# San Francisco Equity Priority Communities 2021

https://www.sfcta.org/policies/equity-priority-communities






<sup>\*</sup>Supplemental boundaries based on analysis conducted at block group-level, any block group meeting MTC's Equity Priority Community definition and contiguous with MTC identified census tracts are included.





1	Due to at Name and Change
Project Name:	Project Name and Sponsor  Brotherhood Way Safety and Circulation Plan Implementation Placeholder
	TBD
Implementing Agency:	
Duran I Duranusana	Prop L Expenditure Plan Information
Prop L Program:	26- Equity Priority Transportation Program
Prop L Sub-Program (if applicable):	
Second Prop L Program (if applicable):	
	Project Information
Brief Project Description for MyStreetSF (80 words max):	This is a placeholder with funds to implement recommendations identified in the Brotherhood Way Safety and Circulation Plan.
Project Location and Limits:	The project area is bounded approximately by Highway 1 to the West, Randolph St. to the North, I-280 to the South and Orizaba to the East.
Supervisorial District(s):	District 07, District 11
Is the project located on the 2022 Vision Zero High Injury Network?	Yes  Is the project located in an Equity Priority Community (EPC)?
Which EPC(s) is the project located in?	The project area is not within an EPC, but is surrounded on all sides by EPCs (Outer Mission Oceanview, Ingleside). By improving community connectivity, the project will better connect adjacent EPC residents with amenties in the project area eg. H-Mart grocery store and Daly City BART station
Detailed Scope (may attach Word document): Please describe in detail the project scope, any planned community engagement, benefits, considerations for climate adaptation and resilience (if relevant), and coordination with other projects in the area (e.g. paving, Vision Zero).	The project would implement recommendations from the ongoing Brotherhood Way Safety and Circulation Plan (BWSC), estimated completion September 2025.  BWSC will make recommendations about how to improve safety, circulation, and connectivity through two key corridors. In the first corridor, two major arterial streets: Brotherhood Way and Alemany Boulevard run on roughly paralell alignments. There are very limited north/south crossings by any mode and conditions for people walking are extremely poor. The second corridor is St. Charles street which provides a criticial North-South connection through the neighborhood to regional transit at Daly City BART station.  Although BWSC recommendations will not be made until 2025, it is very likely that major road diets or reconfigurations will be brought forward for consideration as alternatives. Examples of possible recommendations include a Mansell Boulevard-style treatement to Brotherhood Way or a realignment of Brotherhood Way which would significantly alter vehicle circulation patterns and create up to 7 acres of new space for community priorities.  Recommendations emerging from the plan will also be supportive of development projects in the study area (eg. new Oceanview Branch Library) or adjacent the study area (eg. 5000 new homes at Parkmerced)
Attachments: Please attach maps, drawings, photos of current conditions, etc. to support understanding of the project.  Type of Environmental Clearance Required:	Attachment 1: Map of the project area



Coordinating Agencies: Please list partner agencies and identify a staff contact at each agency.

SFCTA - David Long
SFMTA - Casey Hildreth
SF Public Library - Maureen Singleton (COO), John Cunha (Chief of Facilities)



Project Delivery Milestones	Status	Work	Sta	art Date	E	nd Date
Phase	% Complete	In-house - Contracted - Both	Quarter	Fiscal Year (starts July 1)	Quarter	Fiscal Year (starts July 1)
Planning/Conceptual Engineering	25%		Q1-Jul- Aug-Sep	2023/24	Q1-Jul- Aug-Sep	2025/26
Environmental Studies (PA&ED)						
Right of Way						
Design Engineering (PS&E)						
Advertise Construction						
Start Construction (e.g. Award Contract)						
Operations (i.e. paratransit)						
Open for Use						
Project Completion (means last eligible expenditure)						

This is a placeholder for projects to be determined.



Project Name: Brotherhood Way Safety and Circulation Plan Implementation Placeholder

Project Cost Estimate	Funding Source					
Phase	Cost		Prop L		Other	Source of Cost Estimate
Planning/Conceptual Engineering	\$ -	\$	-	\$	-	
Environmental Studies (PA&ED)	\$ -	\$	-	\$	-	
Right of Way	\$ -	\$	-	\$	-	
Design Engineering (PS&E)	\$ -			\$	-	
Construction	\$ -			\$	-	
Operations (i.e. paratransit)	\$ -	\$	-	\$	-	
TBD	\$ 1,000,000	\$	1,000,000	\$	-	Placeholder
Total Project Cost	\$ 1,000,000	\$	1,000,000	\$	-	
Percent of Total			100%		0%	


Funding Plan - All Phases - All Sources

	Cash Flow for Prop L Only (i.e. Fiscal Year of Reimbursement)										
<b>a</b>	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28						

Fund Source	Prop L Program	Phase	Fund Source Status	Fiscal Year of Allocation (Programming Year)	Total Funding	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28
Prop L	26- Equity Priority Transportation Program	TBD	Planned	2025/26	\$ 1,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 100,000
				Total By Fiscal Year	\$ 1,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 100,000

#### Notes

This is a placeholder for projects to be determined. Projects seeking funds from this placeholder will be evaluated for leveraging of other funds.




Plea	Prop L Supplemental Information Please fill out each question listed below (rows 2-8) for all projects.					
Project Name	Brotherhood Way Safety and Circulation Plan Implementation Placeholder					
Relative Level of Need or Urgency (time sensitive)						
Prior Community Engagement/Level and Diversity of Community Support (may attach Word document):						
Benefits to Disadvantaged Populations and Equity Priority Communities						
Compatability with Land Use, Design Standards, and Planned Growth						
San Francisco Transportation Plan Alignment (SFTP)						



The next section includes criteria that are specific to each Expenditure Plan program. The questions that are required to be filled out for each program will auto-populate once the Prop L program is selected on the Scope & Schedule tab.

	26- Equity Priority Transportation Program
Safety	
Supports Equitable Access	
•	
Geographic Distribution	
3 1	
Limited Other Funding	
Options Chief Full allig	
Pilot Program Funding Plan	
This cell intentionally left blank.	





	Project Name and	d Sponsor	
Project Name:	Citywide Equity Planning Placeh	older	
Implementing Agency:	TBD		
	Prop L Expenditure Plant		
Prop L Program:	26- Equity Priority Transportatio	n Program	
Prop L Sub-Program (if applicable):			
Second Prop L Program (if applicable):			
	Project Inforn	nation	
Brief Project Description for MyStreetSF (80 words max):	include equity priority communi and gaps in equitable access (p	ent citywide equity plans and studies. Po ty-based planning projects that help red hysical, geographic, affordability) to job ons (e.g. seniors, children, and/or people	duce disparities and key services
Project Location and Limits:	Citywide		
Supervisorial District(s):	Citywide		
Is the project located on the 2022 Vision Zero High Injury Network?	TBD	Is the project located in an Equity Priority Community (EPC)?	TBD
Which EPC(s) is the project located in?			
Detailed Scope (may attach Word document): Please describe in detail the project scope, any planned community engagement, benefits, considerations for climate adaptation and resilience (if relevant), and coordination with other projects in the area (e.g. paving, Vision Zero).	include equity priority communi and gaps in equitable access (p or address vulnerable population Potential projects may be identi	ent citywide equity plans and studies. Porty-based planning projects that help rechysical, geographic, affordability) to jobons (e.g. seniors, children, and/or peoplefied through, but are not limited to recortation Plan (SFTP) 2050 or its update SF	duce disparities and key services with disabilities).
Attachments: Please attach maps, drawings, photos of current conditions, etc. to support understanding of the project.			
Type of Environmental Clearance Required:	TBD, Categorically Exempt		
Coordinating Agencies: Please list partner agencies and identify a staff contact at each agency.	TBD		



<b>Project Delivery Milestones</b>	Status	Work	Sta	rt Date	End Date		
Phase	% Complete	In-house - Contracted - Both	Quarter	Fiscal Year (starts July 1)	Quarter	Fiscal Year (starts July 1)	
Planning/Conceptual Engineering							
Environmental Studies (PA&ED)							
Right of Way							
Design Engineering (PS&E)							
Advertise Construction							
Start Construction (e.g. Award Contract)							
Operations (i.e. paratransit)							
Open for Use							
Project Completion (means last eligible expenditure)							

N	Ο.	toc	:

This is a placeholder for projects to be determined.



Project Name: Citywide Equity Planning Placeholder


Project Cost Estimate				Fundi			
Phase		Cost		Prop L	Other		Source of Cost Estimate
Planning/Conceptual Engineering	\$	300,000	\$	300,000	\$	-	placeholder for local match
Environmental Studies (PA&ED)	\$		\$	-	\$		
Right of Way	\$		\$	-	\$	-	
Design Engineering (PS&E)	\$		\$	-	\$		
Construction	\$		\$	-	\$		
Operations (i.e. paratransit)	\$		\$	-	\$		
Total Project Cost	\$	300,000	\$	300,000	\$	-	_
Percent of Total				100%		0%	

#### Funding Plan - All Phases - All Sources

Fund Source	Prop L Program	Phase	Fund Source Status	Fiscal Year of Allocation (Programming Year)	Total Funding	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28
Prop L	26- Equity Priority Transportation Program	Planning/Conceptual Engineering	Planned	2024/25	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ -
					\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
					\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
				Total By Fiscal Year	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ -

#### Notes

This is a placeholder for projects to be determined. Plans or studies seeking funds from this placeholder will be evaluated using the SYPP prioritization criteria, including leveraging.



	Prop L Supplemental Information					
	se fill out each question listed below (rows 2 8) for all projects.					
Project Name	Citywide Equity Planning Placeholder					
Relative Level of Need or Urgency (time sensitive)						
Prior Community						
Engagement/Level and Diversity of Community Support (may attach Word document):						
Benefits to Disadvantaged Populations and Equity Priority Communities						
Compatability with Land Use, Design Standards, and Planned Growth						
San Francisco Transportation Plan Alignment (SFTP)						



The next section includes criteria that are specific to each Expenditure Plan program. The questions that are required to be filled out for each program will auto populate once the Prop L program is selected on the Scope & Schedule tab.

	26 Equity Priority Transportation Program
Safety	
Supports Equitable Access	
•	
Geographic Distribution	
Geograpine Distribution	
Limited Other Funding	
Options	
D'I - D Di	
Pilot Program Funding Plan	
This cell intentionally left	
blank.	



	Project Name and	d Sponsor					
Project Name:		on Plan Implementation Placeholder					
Implementing Agency:	TBD		,				
	Prop L Expenditure Pl	an Information					
Prop L Program:	26- Equity Priority Transportatio	n Program	3				
Prop L Sub-Program (if			)				
applicable):							
Second Prop L Program (if							
applicable):							
	Project Inforn	nation					
Brief Project Description for	This is a placeholder with funds to implement recommendations from completed						
MyStreetSF (80 words max):	Community-Based Transportation Plans (CBTPs) developed with Equity Priority Communities.						
Project Location and Limits:	TBD						
Supervisorial District(s):	TBD						
Is the project located on the 2022 Vision Zero High Injury Network?	TBD	Is the project located in an Equity Priority Community (EPC)?	TBD				
Which EPC(s) is the project located in?	TBD						
Detailed Scope (may attach Word document): Please describe in detail the project scope, any planned community engagement, benefits, considerations for climate adaptation and resilience (if relevant), and coordination with other projects in the area (e.g. paving, Vision Zero).	plans (CBTPs) are intended to be transportation agencies togethe equity priority communities (EPC communities, seniors, children, and develop strategies to address to position them to compete fo CBTP's should contain, among of transportation gaps and barrier solutions to address these gaps		ations and allenges facing ow-income ntify, prioritize, f projects, helping rants. Completed ritized crategies or				
	including additional project dev local match, but will also take in	to implement recommendations from covelopment. The Prop L funds are intendented to consideration whether recommendate neering) to be competitive for other sour ular type of project.	ed to provide ions need further				
Attachments: Please attach maps, drawings, photos of current conditions, etc. to support understanding of the project.							
Type of Environmental Clearance Required:	TBD						
Coordinating Agencies: Please list partner agencies and identify a staff contact at each agency.	TBD						



Project Delivery Milestones	Status	Work	Sta	art Date	End Date		
Phase	% Complete	In-house - Contracted - Both	Quarter	Fiscal Year (starts July 1)	Quarter	Fiscal Year (starts July 1)	
Planning/Conceptual Engineering							
Environmental Studies (PA&ED)							
Right of Way							
Design Engineering (PS&E)							
Advertise Construction							
Start Construction (e.g. Award Contract)							
Operations (i.e. paratransit)							
Open for Use							
Project Completion (means last eligible expenditure)							

A.	

This is a placeholder for projects to be determined.



**Project Name:** Community Based Transportation Plan Implementation Placeholder


Project Cost Estimate			urce				
Phase		Cost		Prop L		Other	Source of Cost Estimate
Planning/Conceptual Engineering	\$	=	\$	ů.	\$	=	
Environmental Studies (PA&ED)	\$	=	\$	Ū.	\$	=	
Right of Way	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
Design Engineering (PS&E)	\$	-			\$	-	
Construction	\$	1,200,000	\$	1,200,000	\$	-	Placeholder for matching funds
Operations (i.e. paratransit)	\$	=	\$	-	\$	=	
Total Project Cost	\$	1,200,000	\$	1,200,000	\$	=	
Percent of Total				100%		0%	

#### Funding Plan - All Phases - All Sources

Funding Plan - All Phases - All Sources						Cash Flow for					
Fund Source	Prop L Program	Phase	Fund Source Status	Fiscal Year of Allocation (Programming Year)	Total Funding	2023/24 2024/25		2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29
Prop L	26- Equity Priority Transportation Program	TBD	Planned	2025/26	\$ 600,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ -
Prop L	26- Equity Priority Transportation Program	TBD	Planned	2027/28	\$ 600,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000
			Total By Fiscal Year	\$ 1,200,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	

#### Notes

This is a placeholder for projects to be determined. Projects seeking funds will be evaluated using this 5YPP project prioritization criteria including but not limited to assessing leveraing of Prop L funds.




Plea	Prop L Supplemental Information Please fill out each question listed below (rows 2-8) for all projects.									
Project Name	Community Based Transportation Plan Implementation Placeholder									
Relative Level of Need or Urgency (time sensitive)										
Prior Community Engagement/Level and Diversity of Community Support (may attach Word document):										
Benefits to Disadvantaged Populations and Equity Priority Communities										
Compatability with Land Use, Design Standards, and Planned Growth										
San Francisco Transportation Plan Alignment (SFTP)										



The next section includes criteria that are specific to each Expenditure Plan program. The questions that are required to be filled out for each program will auto-populate once the Prop L program is selected on the Scope & Schedule tab.

26- Equity Priority Transportation Program								
Safety								
Supports Equitable Access .								
Geographic Distribution								
Limited Other Funding Options								
Pilot Program Funding Plan								
This cell intentionally left blank.								



	Project Name an	nd Sponsor								
Project Name:	Placeholder (e.g. Mission, Ingle Amazon)	Program - Community Based Transportationside/Oceanview, Excelsior/Outer Missio								
Implementing Agency:	TBD									
	Prop L Expenditure P									
Prop L Program:	26- Equity Priority Transportation	on Program								
Prop L Sub-Program (if applicable):										
Second Prop L Program (if applicable):										
	Project Infor	mation								
Placeholder funds from the Prop L Equity Priority Transportation Program to undert Community-Based Transportation Plans (CBTPs) in Equity Priority Communities (EPC The CBTPs are intended to bring local residents, community organizations and transportation agencies together to identify important transportation challenges fac EPCs, and identify, prioritize, and develop strategies to address them. The CBTPs is a pipeline of projects, helping to posiition them to compete for other Prop L funds a discretionary grants. This placeholder would provide matching funds for three CBT over this 5-year period, with priority to EPCs that have not yet participated in a CBT										
Project Location and Limits:	TBD	TBD								
Supervisorial District(s):	TBD									
Is the project located on the 2022 Vision Zero High Injury Network?	TBD	Is the project located in an Equity Priority Community (EPC)?	Yes							
Which EPC(s) is the project located in?	TBD									
Detailed Scope (may attach Word document): Please describe in detail the project scope, any planned community engagement, benefits, considerations for climate adaptation and resilience (if relevant), and coordination with other projects in the area (e.g. paving, Vision Zero).	undertake Community-Based T (EPCs). The CBTPs are intended transportation agencies togethe EPCs, and identify, prioritize, a a pipeline of projects, helping discretionary grants. Complet community-prioritized transposimplementation strategies or so This placeholder would provided with priority to EPCs that have Communities (EPC) San Francis	e matching funds for three CBTPs over the not yet participated in a CBTP. There are see, 3 of which have not participated in a Excelsior/Outer Mission/Crocker Amazo information form.  s and Year of Last CBTP: District 11) 2007 rict 5) 2007	ority Communities ganizations and nallenges facing The CBTPs set up rop L funds and elements, a list of and and set of and the community of the communities of the communi							
	- Bayview/Hunters Point (District 7 - SFSU/Lake Merced (District 7 - Western Addition (District 6) 2 - Portsmouth Square (District 3	) 2021 2021								



Attachments: Please attach maps, drawings, photos of current conditions, etc. to support understanding of the project.	Attachment 1: Map of the EPCs
Type of Environmental Clearance Required:	
Coordinating Agencies: Please list partner agencies and identify a staff contact at each agency.	TBD



<b>Project Delivery Milestones</b>	Status	Work	Sta	art Date	End Date		
Phase	% Complete	In-house - Contracted - Both	Quarter	Fiscal Year (starts July 1)	Quarter	Fiscal Year (starts July 1)	
Planning/Conceptual Engineering							
Environmental Studies (PA&ED)							
Right of Way							
Design Engineering (PS&E)							
Advertise Construction							
Start Construction (e.g. Award Contract)							
Operations (i.e. paratransit)							
Open for Use							
Project Completion (means last eligible expenditure)							


This is a placeholder for projects to be determined.



Project Name: Equity Priority Transportation Program - Community Based Transportation Plan Placeholder (e.g. Mission, Ingleside/Oceanview, Excelsior/Outer Mission/Crocker Amazon)

Project Cost Estimate		Fundi	ng Source		
Phase	Cost	Prop L	Other		Source of Cost Estimate
Planning/Conceptual Engineering	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000			placeholder for 3 CBTPs, matching funds.
Environmental Studies (PA&ED)	\$ -	\$ -	\$	-	
Right of Way	\$	\$ -	\$	-	
Design Engineering (PS&E)	\$	\$ -	\$	-	
Construction	\$ -	\$ -	\$	-	
Operations (i.e. paratransit)	\$ -	\$ -	\$	-	
Total Project Cost	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$	-	
Percent of Total		100%		0%	

#### Funding Plan - All Phases - All Sources

Cash Flow for Prop L Only (i.e. Fiscal Year of Reimbursement)

Fund Source	Prop L Program	Phase	Fund Source Status	Fiscal Year of Allocation (Programming Year)	Total Funding	g	2023/24	2	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2	2027/28
Prop L	26- Equity Priority Transportation Program	Planning/Conceptual Engineering	Planned	2024/25	\$ 100,0	000	\$ -	\$	50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$	-
Prop L	26- Equity Priority Transportation Program	Planning/Conceptual Engineering	Planned	2025/26	\$ 100,0	000	\$ -	\$	-	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$	-
Prop L	26- Equity Priority Transportation Program	Planning/Conceptual Engineering	Planned	2026/27	\$ 100,0	000	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$	50,000
					\$		\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$	-
					\$	-	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$	-
					\$	-	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$	-
					\$ 300,0	00	\$ -	\$	50,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$	50,000

#### Notes

This is a placeholder for 3 CBTPs . The estimated cost for a CBTP depends on the amount of outreach. evaluation, and engineering required. Based on recent experience, we are assuming CBTP typically in the \$200,000-\$300,000 range. Prop L funds are intended to match CBTPs Funding to complete each CBTP could come from a combination of sources (e.g., MTC CBTP funds, Caltrans Planning Grant, agency funds (including in-kind), etc.).



Prop L Supplemental Information Please fill out each question listed below (rows 2 8) for all projects.						
Project Name	Equity Priority Transportation Program - Community Based Transportation Plan					
Relative Level of Need or Urgency (time sensitive)	Equity Priority Transportation Program - Community based Transportation Plan					
Prior Community Engagement/Level and Diversity of Community Support (may attach Word document):						
Benefits to Disadvantaged Populations and Equity Priority Communities						
Compatability with Land Use, Design Standards, and Planned Growth						
San Francisco Transportation Plan Alignment (SFTP)						




The next section includes criteria that are specific to each Expenditure Plan program. The questions that are required to be filled out for each program will auto populate once the Prop L program is selected on the Scope & Schedule tab.

	26 Equity Priority Transportation Program
Safety	
Supports Equitable Access .	
Geographic Distribution	
Limited Other Funding Options	
Pilot Program Funding Plan	
This cell intentionally left blank.	

#### **Attachment 1**

#### Map of San Francisco Equity Priority Communities (EPCs) for Inner Mission, Oceanview-Ingleside, and Excelsior-Outer Mission-Crocker Amazon





	Project Name and Sponsor							
Project Name:	Visitacion Valley & Portola Community Based Transportation Plan Implementation Placeholder							
Implementing Agency:	SFMTA							
Prop L Expenditure Plan Information								
Prop L Program:	26- Equity Priority Transportation Program							
Prop L Sub-Program (if applicable):								
Second Prop L Program (if applicable):								
	Project Information							
Brief Project Description for MyStreetSF (80 words max):	f Project Description for Implement recommendations from the Visitacion Valley & Portola Community Based							
Project Location and Limits:	Visitacion Valley, Portola							
Supervisorial District(s):	District 09, District 10							
Is the project located on the 2022 Vision Zero High Injury Network ?	Yes  Is the project located in an Equity Priority Community (EPC)?  Yes							
Which EPC(s) is the project located in?	Visitacion Valley-Portola, Bayview							
Detailed Scope (may attach Word document): Please describe in detail the project scope, any planned community engagement, benefits, considerations for climate adaptation and resilience (if relevant), and coordination with other projects in the area (e.g. paving, Vision Zero).	The Visitacion Valley and Portola Community-Based Transportation Plan (CBTP), completed in 2023, is a planning and engagement effort led by the SFMTA with District of Supervisor Ronen, District 10 Supervisor Walton, and strong local stakeholder partnerships. The project includes Visitacion Valley and portions of the Portola District in southeastern San Francisco, adjacent to the Bayview to the east, Highway 280 to the nort John McLaren Park to the west, and Daly City to the south. Visitacion Valley is an Equity Priority neighborhood. The SFMTA has partnered directly with community-based organizations to build neighborhood relationships and conduct a robust engagement process with youth, seniors, residents, merchants, faith organizations, people of color, armore.  Prop L funds would be used to implement recommendations from the Visitacion Valley 8 Portola CBTP. In all, the plan recommendations represent over \$25 million of potential projects in Visitacion Valley & Portola. The top Visitacion Valley projects identified in the plan include the following: 1) San Bruno Ave bike lanes and traffic safety, 2) Mansell St Streetscape, 3) Connect Visitacion Valley Greenway, 4) Sunnyday transit access and Safer The top Portola projects identified in the plan include the following: 5) Connecting to Alemany Farmer's Market, 6) Lighting & safety, and 7) Traffic calming near McLaren Park. SFMTA is submitting a request for a federal grant for planning and design of the Mansell Street Streetscape project. If successful, SFMTA may request a portion of the Prop L funds to implement recommendations from the CBTP.  Specific improvements will include traffic calming and pedestrian safety devices, and potential locations were identified through CBTP's outreach efforts, and in consultation with the District 9 and District 10 Supervisor's offices. The goal of projects proposed for the Vis Valley & Portola community is to improve safety and accessibility by funding top voted projects. Most potential projects focus on pedestrian improveme							



	Pedestrian Bulbs Pedestrian bulbs are an extension of the sidewalk at an intersection expanding space where people may safely pause or wait while crossing a street. They increase pedestrian visibility and safety when crossing the street. Pedestrian bulbs may be expanded to include landscaping. A similar treatment to pedestrian bulbs is a pedestrian safety zone - a painted buffered curb-side space between the sidewalk and moving vehicles. Their footprint resembles a bulb out, helping to emphasize that the space should not be treated as part of the roadway. Painted safety zones are a low-cost, easily implemented treatment that enhance pedestrian safety.  Raised Crosswalks Raised crosswalks are roadway crossing where pavement is raised to the level of the sidewalk. This street design channels pedestrians and promotes safety by slowing vehicles as they approach the crossing.  Rapid Rectangular Flashing Beacons Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons are solar-powered lights at the side of a roadway that flash when activated by a person walking. RRFBs are treatments designed to increase motorist yielding to people walking in crosswalks at key locations.  Speed Cushions Speed Cushions are a traffic calming measure that is a rounded device across the roadway that causes vehicles to reduce their speed. Speed cushions can be designed to accommodate emergency vehicle access.
Attachments: Please attach maps, drawings, photos of current conditions, etc. to support understanding of the project.	Attachment 1: Project maps including Top Visitacion Valley Projects and Top Portola Projects
Type of Environmental Clearance Required:	Categorically Exempt
Coordinating Agencies: Please list partner agencies and identify a staff contact at each agency.	



Project Delivery Milestones	Status	Work	Sta	rt Date	E	nd Date
Phase	% Complete	In-house - Contracted - Both	Quarter	Fiscal Year (starts July 1)	Quarter	Fiscal Year (starts July 1)
Planning/Conceptual Engineering	100%		Q3-Jan- Feb-Mar	2020/21	Q3-Jan- Feb-Mar	2022/23
Environmental Studies (PA&ED)						
Right of Way						
Design Engineering (PS&E)						
Advertise Construction						
Start Construction (e.g. Award Contract)						
Operations (i.e. paratransit)						
Open for Use						
Project Completion (means last eligible expenditure)						

#### Notes

This is a placeholder. When the project sponsor is prepared to seek Prop L funds for specific projects, the project sponsor will provide project delivery milestones for all relevant project phases.



Project Name: Visitacion Valley & Portola Community Based Transportation Plan Implementation Placeholder

Project Cost Estimate		Fundi			
Phase	Cost	Prop L	Other	Source of Cost Estimate	
Planning/Conceptual Engineering	\$ 398,000	\$ -	\$ 398,000	actuals	
Environmental Studies (PA&ED)	\$	\$ -	\$ -		
Right of Way	\$	\$ -	\$ -		
Design Engineering (PS&E)	\$ -		\$ -		
Construction	\$ 1,435,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 435,000	Placeholder based on funds available, Other is \$435,000 in Prop K sales tax	
Operations (i.e. paratransit)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
Total Project Cost	\$ 1,833,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 833,000		
Percent of Total		55%	22%		

#### Funding Plan - All Phases - All Sources

Cash Flow for Prop L Only (i.e. Fiscal Year of Reimbursement)

Fund Source	Prop L Program	Phase	Fund Source Status	Fiscal Year of Allocation (Programming Year)	Total Funding		-		2023/24		2024/25		024/25 2025/2		2025/26 2026/27		2027/28	
Prop K		Planning/Conceptual Engineering	Allocated	2020/21	\$	45,651	\$	-	\$		\$		\$	-	\$	-		
Caltrans Planning Grant		Planning/Conceptual Engineering	Allocated	2020/21	\$	352,349	\$	-	\$		\$		\$	-	\$	-		
Prop K		Construction	Allocated	2022/23	\$	435,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$		\$	-	\$	-		
Prop L	26- Equity Priority Transportation Program	TBD	Planned	2024/25	\$	400,000	\$	-	\$	200,000	\$	200,000	\$	-	\$	-		
Prop L	26- Equity Priority Transportation Program	TBD	Planned	2025/26	\$	600,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	300,000	\$ 3	300,000	\$	-		
				Total By Fiscal Year	\$	1,833,000	\$		\$	200,000	\$	500,000	\$ 3	00,000	\$	-		

#### Notes

This is a placeholder to implement projects recommended in the subject CBTP. The Transportation Authority will consider amendment of the 5YPP to replace all or part of this placeholder with specific projects. We will evaluate the proposed projects including anticipated leveraging and may suggest changes to programming and cash flow at that time.

In 2023, the Board allocated \$435,000 in District 10 Prop K Neighborhood Program funds for the implementation of recommendations from the Visitacion Valley & Portola Community Based Transportation Plan. The funds were placed on reserve, pending SFMTA Board approval of the CBTP (which happened in 2023) and may be released by the Board following submittal of an Allocation Request Form detailing the proposed scope, schedule, cost, and funding for the proposed recommendations to be implemented with Prop K funds.




Plea	Prop L Supplemental Information se fill out each question listed below (rows 2-8) for all projects.
Project Name	Visitacion Valley & Portola Community Based Transportation Plan Implementation
Relative Level of Need or	Visitación Valley & Fortola Community based Transportation Flan Implementation
Urgency (time sensitive)	
Prior Community	
Engagement/Level and	
Diversity of Community	
Support (may attach Word document):	
a de camena,	
Benefits to Disadvantaged	
Populations and Equity	
Priority Communities	
Compatability with Land	
Use, Design Standards, and	
Planned Growth	
San Francisco	
Transportation Plan	
Alignment (SFTP)	



The next section includes criteria that are specific to each Expenditure Plan program. The questions that are required to be filled out for each program will auto-populate once the Prop L program is selected on the Scope & Schedule tab.


26- Equity Priority Transportation Program						
Safety						
Supports Equitable Access .						
Geographic Distribution						
Limited Other Funding Options						
Pilot Program Funding Plan						

# All Projects




О

## Portola Projects



Rank	Portola Projects	Project	Why
1	Portola Freeway Greenway Con- nector	Pedestrian-scale lighting on San Bruno Avenue between Silver Avenue and Alemany Boulevard. Upgraded crosswalks at Hale Street, Gaven Street, and Rickard Street.	Create safe and comfortable conditions for people walking to the Alemany Farmer's Market.
2	San Bruno Ave Protected Bike- way	Protected 2-way bikeway on the west side of San Bruno Avenue between Rickard Street and the Alemany Interchange.	Create safe and comfortable bike network connection between the Alemany Farmer's Market and the Girard bikeway.
3	Girard/Wool- sey/University Bikeway	Neighborhood bike route along Barneveldt Avenue and Girard Street from Rickard Street in the north to Woolsey Street in the south; neighborhood bike route between San Bruno Avenue and Silver Ave- nue on Woolsey Street and University Street.	Provide low-volume, low-stress north/south and east/west bike network altneratives to San Bruno Avenue or Silver Avenue that are direct and with few hills. Connects to other proposed bike network projects
4	Bacon Street Traffic Calming	Speed humps on Bacon Street between University Street and Oxford Street.	Reduce neighborhood speeding.
5	Park & Stairway Crosswalks	Crosswalks and curb ramp upgrades at: Gambier Street at Burrows Street; University Street at Woolsey Street; University Street at Dwight Street; Goettingen Street at Dwight Street.	Improve pedestrian visibility and access at park entrances and at public stairways.
6	Undercrossing Improvements	Pedestrian-scale lighting in the Bacon Street and Paul Avenue Hwy 101 underpasses; mid-block rais- ed crosswalk on Bacon Street.	Improve pedestrian visibility and comfort in freeway underpasses; connect the segments of the Portola Freeway Greenway.
7	San Bruno Ave Bike Lanes - Portola	Remove 1 northbound travel lane to install bike lanes between Mansell Street and Paul Avenue.	Connects bike network between Mansell Street, San Bruno Aveue, Paul Avenue, and the proposed Woolsey/University Bikeway and Girard Bikeway.
8	Mansell Stre- etscape	Protected bikeway, transit bulbs, and landscaped median open space along Mansell Street between San Bruno Avenue and Visitacion Avenue.	Transform Mansell Street median into linear park for the community.

## Visitacion Valley Projects



Rank	Vis Valley Projects	Project	Why					
1	San Bruno Ave Bike Lanes - Vis Valley	Uphill-only bike lane from Bayshore Boulevard to Campbell Avenue; rapid flashing beacons at existing crosswalk at Beeman Lane Stairway.	Provides separated space for slow-moving bicyclists going uphill without removing street parking; improve pedestrian safety and slow driver speeds.					
2	Little Hollywood Projects	Pedestrian bulb out on Hester Avenue at Bayshore Boulevard; crosswalk and curb ramp upgrades on Blanken Avenue at Tunnel Avenue, Wheeler Avenue, Peninsula Avenue, and Gillette Avenue.	Improve pedestrain safety and visibility.					
3	Sunnydale Transit Improvements	Transit bulbs, bus shelters, and arrival time signage for bus stops on Hahn Street at Visitacion Avenue and at Sunnydale Avenue.	Improve transit access & comfort for Sunnydale residents & park users.					
4	Vis Valley Greenway Connector	Decorative raised crosswalks mid-block on Raymond Avenue, Arleta Avenue and Teddy Avenue; Pedestrian bulb-outs on Arleta Avenue at Alpha Street and at Rutland Street; decorative crosswalk on Rutland Street at Campbell Avenue.	Connect the Vis Valley Greenway in a continuous pedestrian path.					
5	Leland Ave Traffic Calming	Speed humps on Leland Avenue between Schwerin Street and Hahn Street.	Slow driver speeds and improve pedestrian safety.					
6	Visitacion Ave Traffic Calming	Raised crosswalk on Cora Street at Visitacion Avenue; upgraded crosswalks and curb ramps on Visitacion Avenue at Rey Street, Britton Street, and Loehr Street.	Slow driver speeds and improve pedestrian safety.					
7	Sunnydale Avenue Bike Lane	Uphill-only westbound bike lane on Sunnydale Avenue from Schwerin Street to Hahn Street.	Separated space for slow-moving bicyclists going uphill without removing parking; connects to uphill-only bike lane being built on Sunnydale Avenue west of Hahn Street.					
8	Mansell Streetscape	Protected bikeway, transit bulbs, and landscaped median open space along Mansell Street between San Bruno Avenue and Visitacion Avenue.	Transform Mansell Street median into linear park for the community.					


### **CBTP Projects**

The final map for the Vis Valley & Portola Community Based Plan consists of 45 different projects across the plan area.

Proposed projects were designed in collaboration with the community over 3 phases of outreach, and are meant to directly respond to the needs, challenges, and values of residents.

Proposed projects are also meant to coordinate with, and build off of, ongoing transportation projects in the plan area.

In all, this map represents over \$25 million of potential projects in Visitacion Valley & Portola.



#### Mansell Streetscape Concepts

Mansell Street, from San Bruno Avenue in the east to Visitacion Avenue in the west, was identified as a street with a high level of interest from the community and the potential for a transformative project competitive for future grant funding. There have been previous community efforts at beautifying Mansell Street and there is high community interest in supporting this project.

Mansell Street currently has a large, planted median that divides a single westbound travel lane and a single east bound travel lane. It climbs a substantial hill in the westbound direction towards McLaren Park and the median within the divided road has a substantial cross-slope on some blocks. The divided roadway on either side of the median is excessively wide (approximately 42'), with a standard bike lane and a parking lane. The 29 Sunset and 56 Rutland Muni bus lines run on this portion of Mansell Street. To the west of University Street, Mansell Street enters McLaren Park and two-way vehicle traffic is restricted only to the southern half of the divided roadway west of Visitacion Avenue in the park. The northern half of the divided roadway is reserved only for people walking and bicycling within

McLaren Park – dubbed the "Mansell Promenade".

The project team sought to develop concept designs for Mansell Street that could accomplish the following goals:

- Improve safety for all roadway users
- Better connect the bike network between Bayview-Hunters Point and McLaren Park
- Improve transit service for the 29 Sunset and 56 Rutland Muni lines
- Increase access to the median for surrounding neighbors
- Create opportunities for programed open space and public art within the median

The three streetscape concept designs are show on the following pages. Due to significant crossslope in sections of the median, a combination or blending of elements of the three concept designs may be required in any eventual project.

As the SFMTA pursues grant funding, additional rounds of public engagement and design, especially focused on the activation of the median open space, will be conducted with partners in the community.



# Top Vis Valley Projects:


San Bruno Ave bike lanes & traffic safety

Mansell St Streetscape

Connect Vis Valley Greenway

Sunnydale transit access & safety

Final Project Ranking, Vis Valley



# Top Portola Projects:

Connecting to Alemany Farmer's Market

Lighting & safety

Traffic calming near McLaren Park

#### Final Project Ranking, Portola

