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Clerk: Steve Stamos
Page

1. Roll Call
2. Citizens Advisory Committee Report - INFORMATION*
3. Chair's Report - INFORMATION
4. Executive Director's Report - INFORMATION

## Consent Agenda

5. Approve the Minutes of the October 24, 2017 Meeting - ACTION*
6. [Final Approval] Approve the San Francisco Transportation Demand Management Plan-ACTION*
7. Internal Accounting and Investment Report for the Three Months Ending September 30, 2017 - INFORMATION*

## End of Consent Agenda

8. Allocate $\$ 2,941,939$ in Prop K Sales Tax Funds for Five Requests, with Conditions ACTION*
Projects: (SFMTA) Upgrade Life and Fire Safety Systems (\$1,837,137); Valencia Street Bikeway Implementation Plan [NTIP Planning] (\$145,000); Youth Bicycle Safety Education
(SFPW) Curb Ramps $(\$ 804,084)$
9. Award Three-Year Professional Services Contracts, with an Option to extend for Two Additional One-Year Periods, to WSP USA and Resource Systems Group, Inc. ACTION*

The Transportation Authority relies on on-call consultants to support the Technology, Data, and Analysis Division with various services related to travel modeling and analysis. On-call modeling services include model development, model maintenance, model application, data collection, and other related activities. This action would award contracts to two highly qualified and deeply experienced teams to support these needs.

## 10. Presentation on the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's 2017 Facilities Framework - INFORMATION*

## Other Items

## 11. Introduction of New Items - INFORMATION

During this segment of the meeting, Commissioners may make comments on items not specifically listed above, or introduce or request items for future consideration.
12. Public Comment
13. Adjournment
*Additional Materials

Items considered for final approval by the Board shall be noticed as such with [Final Approval] preceding the item title.
The meeting proceedings can be viewed live or on demand after the meeting at www.sfgovtv.org. To know the exact cablecast times for weekend viewing, please call SFGovTV at (415) 554-4188 on Friday when the cablecast times have been determined.

The Legislative Chamber (Room 250) and the Committee Room (Room 263) in City Hall are wheelchair accessible. Meetings are real-time captioned and are cablecast open-captioned on SFGovTV, the Government Channel 26. Assistive listening devices for the Legislative Chamber and the Committee Room are available upon request at the Clerk of the Board's Office, Room 244. To request sign language interpreters, readers, large print agendas or other accommodations, please contact the Clerk of the Board at (415) 522-4800. Requests made at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting will help to ensure availability. Attendees at all public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical-based products.
The nearest accessible BART station is Civic Center (Market/Grove/Hyde Streets). Accessible MUNI Metro lines are the F, J, K, L, M, N, T (exit at Civic Center or Van Ness Stations). MUNI bus lines also serving the area are the 5, 6, 7, 9, 19, 21, 47, and 49. For more information about MUNI accessible services, call (415) 701-4485. There is accessible parking in the vicinity of City Hall at Civic Center Plaza and adjacent to Davies Hall and the War Memorial Complex. Accessible curbside parking is available on Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place and Grove Street.

If any materials related to an item on this agenda have been distributed to the Board after distribution of the meeting packet, those materials are available for public inspection at the Transportation Authority at 1455 Market Street, Floor 22, San Francisco, CA 94103, during normal office hours.
Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign \& Governmental Conduct Code Sec. 2.100] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the San Francisco Ethics Commission at 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102; (415) 252-3100; www.sfethics.org.

# CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE 

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

## 1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Vice Chair Sachs called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.
CAC members present: Myla Ablog, Hala Hijazi, Becky Hogue, Brian Larkin, Peter Sachs, Shannon Wells-Mongiovi and Bradley Wiedmaier (7)
CAC Members Absent: John Larson (entered during Item 6), Peter Tannen (entered during Item 6) and Chris Waddling (3)

Transportation Authority staff members present were Amber Crabbe, Andrew Heidel, Jeff Hobson, Anna LaForte, Mike Pickford, Alberto Quintanilla, Steve Rehn and Steve Stamos.

## 2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Vice Chair Sachs reported that Santiago Lerma had resigned from his seat on the CAC to tend to his growing family, but that staff thanked him for his service and the valuable input he provided. He said the CAC would be seeking a new representative for District 9 in the coming months, and also welcomed the newest CAC member, Hala Hijazi, who was representing District 2.
Vice Chair Sachs announced that the Transportation Authority had issued its first sales tax revenue bonds on October 19. He noted that five bids were received from Bank of America, JP Morgan, Citigroup, Morgan Stanley, and Wells Fargo. He said that the winning bid had gone to Bank of America Merrill Lynch with an interest of rate of $2.39 \%$. He mentioned that San Francisco would be hosting the Focus on the Future annual conference from October 29-31 and that Chair Aaron Peskin would be providing welcoming remarks. He stated that Commissioners Tang, Sheehy and Peskin had led discussions among staff from the Transportation Authority, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), the Department of Public Health, and the San Francisco Unified School District on a range of Safe Routes to School (SRTS) issues. He said that at the request of Commissioner Kim, a special Transportation Authority Board meeting had been scheduled on November 28 at 11:00 a.m. to hold a hearing on school transportation in San Francisco. He said that the Transportation Authority was aiming to bring back a recommendation for programming the remaining $\$ 2.8$ million in One Bay Area Grant SRTS funding at the December Board meeting.
Vice Chair Sachs welcomed the Transportation Authority's new Clerk of the Board, Alberto Quintanilla. Vice Chair Sachs announced that former Clerk, Steve Stamos, had moved to the Finance Division as a Management Analyst.

There was no public comment.
Amber Crabbe, Assistant Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, stated that the school transportation hearing on November 28 would likely need to be rescheduled due to a scheduling conflict.

## Consent Agenda

3. Approve the Minutes of the September 27, 2017 Meeting - ACTION
4. Adopt a Motion of Support for the Award of Three-Year Professional Services Contracts, with an Option to Extend for Two Additional One-Year Periods, to WSP USA and Resource Systems Group, Inc. in a Combined Amount Not to Exceed \$400,000 for OnCall Modeling Services - ACTION
5. Internal Accounting and Investment Report for the Three Months Ending September 30, 2017 - INFORMATION
There was no public comment on the Consent Agenda.
Becky Hogue moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Brian Larkin.
The Consent Agenda was approved by the following vote:
Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Hijazi, Hogue, Larkin, Sachs, Wells-Mongiovi and Wiedmaier (7)

Absent: CAC Members Larson, Tannen and Waddling (3)

## End of Consent Agenda

6. Adopt a Motion of Support for Allocation of $\$ 2,941,939$ in Prop K Sales Tax Funds for Five Requests, with Conditions - ACTION

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Vice Chair Sachs stated that he recalled a fire life safety item the prior year. Ms. LaForte replied that the prior request was for the design phase of this project.
Peter Tannen commented that he was pleased that the Valencia Bikeway project would consider safety measures for pedestrians in addition to bicyclists and that he was supportive of a potential pilot project. He asked that the stakeholder interviews include the Bicycle Advisory Committee. Ms. LaForte replied that SFMTA would include the BAC on its list of stakeholders.

Myla Ablog asked about the purpose of the Valencia Bikeway project video and if there were any projects planned for the McCoppin and Market Street intersection. She said that she often used McCoppin Street to cross Market Street and was afraid it would become a dangerous crossing, especially with the upcoming daylight savings. Kimberly Leung, Project Manager with the SFMTA, replied that the video would be used for data collection. She added that the purpose of the data collection was to get a better understanding of the behavior of vehicles, including Transportation Network Company (TNC) vehicles operating in the area. She said the SFMTA would look at the McCoppin Street segment near Valencia Street, as well as how all of the cross streets interacted in relation to the bike facility designs.
Vice Chair Sachs noted that the city of Portland had created a standard toolkit for bike lane infrastructure upgrades and asked if San Francisco had a similar toolkit. Ms. Leung replied that bicycle facility designs depended on the context of the project and noted that the designs for each project tended to vary depending on the type of street. Vice Chair Sachs said that the cities of Chicago and Minneapolis had similar toolkits but also recognized that different streets had different needs, and that that as San Francisco did more bike lane projects, having a toolkit could help streamline the process. Mr. Tannen stated that as a former bicycle program manager, he could confirm that the SFMTA had a bicycle lane construction toolkit.

Bradley Wiedmaier asked if anything was planned to help transition and absorb bicycle and pedestrian travel at the southern terminus of Valencia at Mission Street. Ms. Leung replied that the Valencia Street study would look at all key intersections along the Valencia corridor. She added that the Valencia Bikeway project ended on Mission Street, but that the study would look into how bike lanes connected with other facilities which could include that intersection.

During public comment, Edward Mason asked if any lessons were learned from the current Valencia street design, and asked why Valencia Street bike facility needed to be redesigned. He asked if the youth bicycle safety education curriculum included a lesson on how to stop at stop signs, as well as how many people biked to work on Bike to Work Day in actual numbers, not just the percentages. He noted that new curb ramps often had hairline cracks soon after installation.

Julia Raskin, Community Organizer with the San Francisco Bike Coalition, spoke in support of the Valencia Street Bikeway Implementation Plan. She said that the Valencia Street bike lanes were last striped in 1999. She said that San Francisco's population had grown and that more people were biking, particularly on Valencia Street which connected Market and Mission Streets. She said that she supported protected bike lanes on Valencia to improve safety and slow down vehicle traffic. She said she looked forward to near-term improvements in the next year and to working with the SFMTA on a longer term vision for the corridor.

Jackie Sachs said that the CAC used to have some votes against the Bike to Work Day request and said that the funds should instead go to a capital project.
Matt Dove, Director of Bike Programs at the YMCA, commented that the youth bike education program taught riders to stop at stop signs. He said he stopped using Valencia Street as a northsouth connection after 15 years as a daily bike commuter due to having a small child. He said the last time he rode on Valencia Street he became a witness to an accident by an unaware TNC driver dropping off their customer in the bike lane. He said he would like Valencia Street to become a safe bike route that he could take with his child.
Ivan Abasouth, resident on $19^{\text {th }}$ Street off of Valencia Street, spoke in support of the Valencia Bikeway project and added that while the bike lanes helped transform Valencia Street and the neighborhood, they were now outdated. He said that the current bike lanes did not consider the impacts from TNC and food delivery vehicles. He said that the traffic in and out of bike lanes was a significant issue and he knew of several people who had stopped using the bike lanes as a result.

Matt Brassina commented that he organized a group to form "People Protected Bike Lanes" that blocked bike lanes from vehicles. He said the Valencia bike lane was constructed in 1999 and was used by more capable riders, but needed to be designed for bicyclists with varying degrees of experience. He requested that the CAC vote in favor of funding the project.

Peter Tannen moved to approve the item, seconded by Shannon Wells-Mongiovi.
The item was approved without objection by the following vote:
Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Hijazi, Hogue, Larkin, Larson, Sachs, Tannen, WellsMongiovi and Wiedmaier (9)
Absent: CAC Member Waddling (1)
Brian Larkin moved to rescind the vote and sever the request for Bike to Work Day, seconded by Myla Ablog.

The motion was approved by the following vote:
Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Hogue, Larkin, Sachs, Tannen and Wiedmaier (6)

Nays: CAC Members Hijazi, Larson and Wells-Mongiovi (3)
Absent: CAC Member Waddling (1)
John Larson moved to approve the underlying requests, seconded by Brian Larkin.
The underlying item was approved without objection by the following vote:
Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Hijazi, Hogue, Larkin, Larson, Sachs, Tannen, WellsMongiovi and Wiedmaier (9)
Absent: CAC Member Waddling (1)
Peter Tannen moved to approve the severed request for Bike to Work Day, seconded by Peter Sachs.

The severed item was approved by the following vote:
Ayes: CAC Members Ablog, Hijazi, Larson, Sachs, Tannen, Wells-Mongiovi and Wiedmaier (7)

Nays: CAC Members Hogue and Larkin (2)
Absent: CAC Member Waddling (1)

## 7. Presentation on the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's 2017 Facilities

 Framework - INFORMATIONAnna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, introduced the item and Jonathan Rewers, Design Strategy and Delivery Manager at the SFMTA, who presented the item.

Hala Hijazi commented that some of the SFMTA facilities were over 100 years old and asked if any of the facilities were historically significant. Mr. Rewers replied that the Potrero, Presidio, and $120015^{\text {th }}$ Street facilities had initial historic evaluations and did not have historic qualities. Ms. Hijazi suggested that another column be added to slide 6 of the presentation to indicate which facilities were owned or leased by the city and county of San Francisco. Mr. Rewers replied that the Facilities Framework identified only the facilities owned by the city and county of San Francisco.

Vice Chair Sachs asked if the SFMTA would be able to locate a suitable plot of land that was also affordable. Mr. Rewers replied that finding, building, and affording a suitable plot of land would be a challenge to do all at once, but that the SFMTA was working on it and believed that joint development opportunities could be an option. He said the SFMTA had been actively working on all three phases for the past two years, but would make a final decision by February 2018 on whether to continue seeking joint development opportunities.

Becky Hogue requested that Treasure Island be included on all city maps. Mr. Rewers replied that he would have Treasure Island added to the SFMTA's official map.
During public comment, Edward Mason noted that the SFMTA had sold the Upper Yard to the Mayor's Office for housing, and asked how emerging technology would be incorporated into the facility upgrades.

## 8. Update on Southern Bayfront Development and Transportation - INFORMATION

Jeff Hobson, Deputy Director for Planning, introduced the item and Adam Van de Water, Project Manager at the Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development, and Carlin Paine, Land Use Development and Transportation Integration Manager at the SFMTA, who presented the item.

Brian Larkin asked what constituted a negotiated development agreement. Ms. Paine replied that negotiated development agreements generally were large scale and involved zoning changes. Mr. Van De Water added that the projects highlighted in the presentation were multi-acre, had historic rehabilitation, brought substantial influx of housing, office, or open spaces, and included development agreements. He said that the development agreements were enabled by state law and allowed changes to standard building approvals which could lead to improved public benefits. He noted an example of a public benefit could be granting an extra floor of height if the project contributed to transit improvements.

Mr. Larkin asked how difficult it would be to get approval to proceed with a negotiated development agreement and said that it sounded like an exception was needed to the normal process. Mr. Van De Water replied that there was an extensive process for each development agreement, which included a one to three-year environmental impact report. He said that approvals would be needed throughout the various city agencies and that in many cases the projects were located on the Port of San Francisco's property. Mr. Larkin asked for clarification about the phrase "use centralized utility systems to reduce resource consumption". Mr. Van De Water replied that the phrase fell under sustainability and said that sometimes master developers prepared multiple vertical parcels for development. He explained that in the case of an office building being built next to a residential building, more efficient centralized heating or cooling plants could be installed as opposed to individual chillers and boilers on different floors or buildings.

During public comment, Edward Mason commented that he would like to see a matrix for the Transportation Sustainability Fee that would show the project and the fee paid compared to the cost to the transit entity to provide additional service required as a result of the project. He asked if the development agreements and the timeline of their approvals would be available to the public. He asked what the public process was for negotiating an extra floor on projects and if the fees collected would be required to be used in that area of the city.

## 9. Update on the Core Capacity Transit Study - INFORMATION

Andrew Heidel, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.
Brian Larkin asked how the Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project would increase capacity, because he had heard that it would use the same number of buses but would be able to do a few more runs. Mr. Heidel replied that the capacity increase noted in the final environmental document was about 300 people per peak hour. He said that given the current land use forecast, the projected growth in demand was also relatively small, but still more than these 300 passengers. Mr. Larkin asked what the next steps would be for the Core Capacity Transit Study. Mr. Heidel replied that were short and medium phases, and that the study documented for the first time every project that was under consideration and how they could be coordinated. He said identifying and obtaining funding for the pre-requisite projects and receiving recommendations from all the relevant operating agencies were part of the short-term phase. He said that the long-term phases had a long lead time and could take 20 years or more.

John Larson asked if the Sunset sub area included the planned development in Park Merced and the Balboa Reservoir. Mr. Heidel responded that the planned development did include Park Merced, but he would follow up about the Balboa Reservoir. Mr. Larson said that the plan represented a large density increase to the area and that even a medium forecast was already strained. He asked if the pre-requisite projects included the $19^{\text {th }}$ Avenue project or M-Line improvements. Mr. Heidel replied that neither were included in the pre-requisite projects. Mr. Larson said that he would like an update at some point on the status of the $19^{\text {th }}$ Avenue project.

Bradley Wiedmaier asked if the Core Capacity study included any long-term planning for additional subways in San Francisco, especially on the west side of the city. Mr. Heidel replied that the Core Capacity study did not take a close look at the long term in San Francisco, but that subway work would be included as part of the ongoing Connect SF effort. He said in context of this study, big regional investments such as a second Transbay crossing would have a major impact on core capacity efforts throughout the city. He said that the Core Capacity study identified some routes for a second Transbay crossing that could serve other corridors within San Francisco that were currently at capacity and that both efforts would need to work together.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi commented that the results of survey on new subway tunnels had previously been presented and that it showed a lot of the development seemed to be focused on east side of the city. She said she hoped that the results of the survey would lead to a study regarding increased east-west connectivity.
During public comment, Jackie Sachs said that she was one of 55 individuals that wrote Prop B in 1989. She said one of the light-rail projects that was included was for Geary Boulevard and that she had been involved with transit on Geary since 1986. She said the Geary BRT project wassupposed to be light-rail ready, but that it would not happen due to side boarding on half of the project and middle boarding on the other half.

## 10. Update on the San Francisco Transportation Climate Sector Action Strategy INFORMATION

Tim Doherty, Senior Planner at the SFMTA, presented the item.
Myla Ablog commented that she was glad to see a study on urban heat effects and that she had seen the issue in her apartment complex with a lack of education on native plants. She recommended that the SFMTA look into pilot projects involving seawalls and living shorelines, but noted that hopefully those projects would not interfere with water taxis, privately owned water vessels, or ferries.

Bradley Wiedmaier asked if it was possible to assess the retrograde impact of TNCs on emissions levels. He said that new developments added extra trips and mileage and seemed like one of the biggest issues. He added that transit to the San Francisco International Airport and to downtown San Francisco were especially being affected by TNCs. Mr. Doherty replied that there was somewhat of a lag in quantifying emissions as the numbers presented were from 2015. He said that the Transportation Authority had been a global pioneer in researching the impact of TNCs, as shown in their TNCs Today report. He said that he was confident the city would receive greenhouse gas emission data from TNC trips, but that the most recent report did not provide that information. Mr. Doherty said that collaborative efforts with various public agencies had started to show how TNCs impacted the transportation sector and that future pilot programs and policies would incorporate TNC emissions.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi asked if TNCs were ultimately a help or hindrance to public transit and said that TNCs had been successful because transit options were not meeting commuter needs. She said that reliability, capacity, regularity, and location would drive the success of these alternate transportation systems, and questioned if it would be helpful to create an incentive program for TNCs to use alternative fuel.

John Larson commented that he did not understand the connection between complete streets as a strategy and climate mitigation and asked for an example. Mr. Doherty replied that investments that shifted people out of single occupancy vehicles and into more environmentally sustainable travel modes, such as biking or walking, would be helpful strategies. He said that land use changes and projects like Better Market Street would inform what transportation mode people chose, and
would have long-term ramifications around carbon footprint.
Mr. Wiedmaier commented that he thought it would make more sense to push development up towards the city's hilltops, instead of focusing development on waterfronts, but was not sure of the impacts on transit. Mr. Dougherty said that the SFMTA had reached out to the New York Metropolitan Transportation Authority to learn about the effects of super storm Sandy. He said that the SFMTA had been working closely with other city departments on a vulnerability assessment of the entire multi-modal transportation, as well as land use, housing, open space, and utilities. He added that all those findings should be available in 2018. Vice Chair Sachs said that he would like to see those findings when they became available.

During public comment Edward Mason said that people did not make the connection between impacts to the environment and using TNCs. He suggested installing a carbon-dioxide monitor along the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge to replicate the bicycle counters along Market Street. He said that announcements encouraging commuters to take public transit should be placed on bus head signs such as other local agencies did. He also said that Muni should be maintained to discourage commuters from choosing a ridesharing vehicle, and that commuters should recognize that TNCs were not environmentally sound since they involved drivers from the central valley.

## Vice Chair Sachs called Item 11 before Item 10.

## 11. State and Federal Legislative Update - INFORMATION

Amber Crabbe, Assistant Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, presented the item.
Brian Larkin asked which state bill was vetoed by Governor Brown. Ms. Crabbe replied that Assembly Bill 17 was vetoed by the Governor.

During public comment, Edward Mason said that he was pleased Senate Bill 493 had been rejected.

## Other Items

## 12. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

John Larson commented that TNC drivers frequently double parked and questioned how the city could address the issue. He said that companies like Uber and Lyft should provide guidelines to their drivers and noted that taxis typically did not block driving and biking lanes. He added that double parking was dangerous and created traffic congestion and should not just be a law enforcement issue.

Shannon Wells-Mongiovi asked if any studies were available for improving parking in residential areas in the city. She said that it was not possible to park in her driveway without encroaching on the sidewalk and that she had ideas about potential legislation. She said that a former supervisor for District 9 had suggested to change some streets to lateral parking and wanted to know if that was progressing. She also asked if there was an update on the status of the BART and Muni escalators on Market and Church Streets and why there was such a long delay to fix broken escalators, and whether it was BART or Muni who were responsible for maintenance. Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, replied that this topic had previously been raised and that staff had invited Tim Chan from BART to give a presentation on the status of elevator and escalator improvements. She added that materials would be available to the CAC in the next couple weeks.
Bradley Wiedmaier said he agreed with the comments on the driving behavior of TNC drivers and asked if the CAC could get a presentation on the congestion management pricing system in place in Manhattan, New York.

Peter Tannen commented that he had watched the video of the October 24 Board meeting and noted that the Board had a thorough discussion on the major delays and cost overruns for the Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit project. He requested that the CAC also receive the project updates that the Board had requested on the progress of the project.

Hala Hijazi requested a presentation from both Uber and Lyft's compliance, regulatory, or government affairs teams to speak to how their drivers can be directed to pull over in a safe place. She also requested a presentation from the city's resiliency group and how sea level rise would impact transportation.
Vice Chair Sachs asked if it was possible for staff from the San Francisco International (SFO) Airport to present to the CAC. He said that SFO was one of the few major airports that did not have dedicated drop off locations for TNC vehicles, and wanted to know if they had a plan for addressing the impact of TNC vehicles on congestion.

## 13. Public Comment

During public comment, Edward Mason provided an update on commuter buses at $24^{\text {th }}$ and Church Streets. He said two new white zones had been created for people to board Muni, but that there was a recent situation where a third bus blocked the intersection because two other buses were at the bus stop. He said that there continued to be an issue with bus departure times and had noticed that Muni buses and ridesharing services, like Chariot, double parked nearby and idled.
Jackie Sachs asked for an update on the "Other 9 to 5" study, which she had been participating in since 2015. She said that instead of using morning rush hour as a basis for capacity, the study should instead look at transportation use throughout the day. She said that bus lines like the 38Geary, which provided service to students, senior citizens, and people of all ages, should be considered before any route changes.

## 14. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:09 p.m.

## DRAFT MINUTES

# SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY 

Tuesday, October 24, 2017

## 1. Roll Call

Chair Peskin called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m.
Present at Roll Call: Commissioners Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Sheehy, Tang and Yee (7)

Absent at Roll Call: Commissioners Breed (entered during Item 2), Cohen (entered during item 2), Safai (entered during Item 3) and Farrell (entered during item 4) (4)

## 2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Peskin expressed support for the North Bay communities that suffered great losses during the recent fires. He said the Board was thinking of those communities and would stand ready to support them as they rebuild in the days ahead. He said that the Transportation Authority had sold its first long-term bonds the week prior and raised a total of $\$ 248.5$ million for Muni vehicle purchases and other projects citywide. He said that five underwriters participated in the sale and that it was awarded to Bank of America, with a winning bid of $2.39 \%$. He said that prior to the bond sale, Fitch Ratings and Standard \& Poor's (S\&P) Financial Services had each upgraded their credit ratings on the Transportation Authority. He said the new AAA rating from Fitch and AA+ rating from S\&P reflected the strength and diversity of San Francisco's economic base and the Transportation Authority's strong financial position, which enabled a low cost of borrowing, leaving more funds for capital projects. He congratulated the Transportation Authority's bond team and recognized Deputy Directors Cynthia Fong and Anna LaForte, Chief Deputy Director Maria Lombardo and Executive Director Tilly Chang. He also thanked San Francisco City Controller Ben Rosenfeld and Nadia Sesay, Director of the Controller's Office of Public Finance, and her staff who advised the agency throughout the bond process.
Chair Peskin reported that the Transportation 2045 Task Force held its fifth meeting the day prior and that discussions focused on a potential package of new local revenue measures for the 2018 ballot and beyond. He said that among the revenue options that the group considered was a sales tax and vehicle license fee which had been identified by previous task forces, as well as new options such as a gross receipts tax on commercial rent and Transportation Network Company fees. He noted that the proposed tax on Uber and Lyft trips by the City of Chicago could raise $\$ 20$ million per year for Chicago's transit system. He said that in November, the Task Force would continue its revenue discussion as well as focus on potential expenditure plan structures, and that more information was available at sftransportation2045.com.

Finally, Chair Peskin stated that staff were developing independent oversight task orders to review the agency's sales tax program, payment systems and annual budget. He said it was important to
conduct these reviews periodically to ensure best practices of the agency's operations. He added that he was also looking forward to the peer review he requested in September on the Sener analysis of the Downtown Extension track design.
There was no public comment.

## 3. Executive Director's Report - INFORMATION

Tilly Chang, Executive Director, presented the Executive Director's Report.
There was no public comment.

## Consent Agenda

4. Approve the Minutes of the October 17, 2017 Meeting - ACTION
5. [Final Approval] Approve San Francisco's Program of Projects for the 2018 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and a Fund Exchange of \$13,752,000 in RTIP Funds with an Equivalent Amount of Prop K Funds for the Central Subway Project, with Conditions - ACTION
6. [Final Approval] Allocate $\$ 890,000$ in Prop K Sales Tax Funds for Two Requests and $\$ 2,465,316$ in Prop AA Vehicle Registration Fee Funds for One Request, with Conditions - ACTION
7. [Final Approval] Adopt the 2017 San Francisco Transportation Plan Update - ACTION There was no public comment.
Commissioner Tang moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Commissioner Breed. The Consent Agenda was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Farrell, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy, Tang and Yee (11)

## End of Consent Agenda

8. Accept the San Francisco Transportation Demand Management Plan - ACTION

Jeff Hobson, Deputy Director for Planning, presented the item per staff memorandum.
Commissioner Sheehy moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Yee.
The item was approved without objection by the following vote:
Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy, Tang and Yee (10)

Absent: Commissioner Farrell (1)
9. Update on the San Francisco Transportation Sector Climate Action Strategy INFORMATION

Tim Doherty, Senior Planner at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), presented the item.
Commissioner Tang asked if the SFMTA was working on any initiatives to address the transportation sector's climate goals. Mr. Doherty replied that the reconvening of the SFMTA's electrical vehicle working group at the end of October would help with the reduction of emissions
from the transportation sector. He said that he anticipated that the working group would allow the transportation sector to better integrate renewable energy and lead to a reduction of emissions.
Commissioner Tang asked which segment of vehicles were being targeted by the SFMTA. Mr. Doherty replied that the emissions slide in the presentation demonstrated that all cars and trucks moving in San Francisco were captured in the climate action strategy, including city-owned vehicles, municipal vehicles, as well as Muni's transit fleet. Commissioner Tang stated that she previously worked on legislation for city-owned sedans and noted that a city ordinance existed for the municipal fleet of sedans and light-duty vehicles. She said that all city departments should think outside the box in trying to reduce emissions and noted that the Department of the Environment was a good example. She suggested that the transportation sector issue a Request for Information, like other cities such as Los Angeles had done, with the goal of identifying a zero-emissions truck that all municipalities could use. She said she would ensure that all city departments considered zero-emission standards during budget discussions moving forward. Mr. Doherty said that he was thankful for the zero-emission legislation and said that battery technology was improving each year and should eventually lead to electric large vehicles that the city could pilot.

Commissioner Tang said that given the input from the electrical vehicle working group meetings and from prior budget discussions, she knew there was considerable resistance from many city departments to switch over to different types of vehicles or zero-vehicles. She said that she hoped the transportation sector would encourage city departments to recognize that zero-emission vehicles were necessary for the city to reach its climate goals.
Chair Peskin noted recent news articles regarding automatic shutoff systems on the Muni fleet that stopped them from idling. He said that only half of the fleet had the automatic shutoff feature and that he had discussed that with SFMTA Director Edward Reiskin. He asked about the status of procuring the feature for the rest of the Muni fleet. Mr. Doherty replied that he did not have that information but would follow up.
There was no public comment.

## Other Items

10. Introduction of New Items - INFORMATION

There were no new items introduced.

## 11. Public Comment

During public comment, Andrew Yip spoke about political freedom.

## 12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:44 a.m.
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RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (TDM) PLAN WHICH IDENTIFIES A FRAMEWORK OF TDM EFFORTS FOR ALL RESIDENTS, TENANTS, EMPLOYEES, AND VISITORS TO MAKE SURE THEY HAVE THE TOOLS THEY NEED TO GET AROUND USING SUSTAINABLE MODES OF TRAVEL SUCH AS TRANSIT, WALKING, AND BICYCLING IN SUPPORT OF SAN FRANCISCO'S TRANSPORTATION GOALS

WHEREAS, In years past, San Francisco City and County departments provided Transportation Demand Management (TDM) services and support in agency-oriented siloes; and

WHEREAS, The San Francisco Department of the Environment (SFE), San Francisco Planning Department (SF Planning), San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) finalized a TDM Strategy for collaborative work in August 2014; and

WHEREAS, The "Transit First Policy" in the City Charter declares that public transit is "an economically and environmentally sound alternative to transportation by individual automobiles", and that within the City, "travel by public transit, by bicycle and on foot must be an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile"; and

WHEREAS, The City has many plans, policies, and initiatives that seek to encourage travel by and safety of active modes of transportation including the San Francisco Bicycle Plan, the Green Connections Plan, the Better Streets Plan, Vision Zero, and others; and

WHEREAS, Travel by transit, bicycle, or on foot are considered to be trips made by sustainable modes of transportation; and

WHEREAS, For most families, transportation is the second-largest part of the household budget; and

WHEREAS, A successful TDM program can significantly lower transportation costs, helping to make San Francisco a more affordable and inclusive city; and

WHEREAS, According to Plan Bay Area 2040, the Bay Area's Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Community Strategy, San Francisco is expected to grow by approximately 191,000 jobs and 102,000 households between 2010 and 2040; and

WHEREAS, This growth will generate an increased demand for transportation infrastructure and services on an already constrained transportation system; and

WHEREAS, One of the challenges posed by this growth is the increased number of single occupancy vehicle trips, and the pressure they add to San Francisco's limited public streets and rights-of-way, contributing to congestion, transit delays, and public health and safety concerns, and the air pollution, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and noise caused by motorized vehicles, which negatively impact the quality of life in the City and health of people living in the Bay Area and our planet; and

WHEREAS, Various policies have been adopted at the state level that set GHG reduction targets including, Assembly Bill 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Chapter 488, Statutes of 2006), Executive Orders B-30-15, S-3-05 and B-16-12, Senate Bill 375, the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 (Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008); and

WHEREAS, Local plans and policies including Plan Bay Area 2040 and the GHG Reduction Ordinance also set GHG reduction targets; and

WHEREAS, Local plans including the San Francisco 2013 Climate Action Strategy and its 0-50-100 Roots framework establish climate goals; and

WHEREAS, The transportation sector contributes significantly to GHG emissions and, as a result, many GHG emissions reduction targets are accompanied by targets to reduce vehicle miles traveled and to increase non-automobile mode share; and one of the ways identified to achieve these targets is through a collaboration of TDM projects across agencies; and

WHEREAS, The importance of TDM strategies are acknowledged in the Transportation Element of the General Plan and the San Francisco Transportation Plan; and

WHEREAS, Many Area Plans including each of the Area Plans within Eastern Neighborhoods and the Transit Center District Plan identify policies for the development of a TDM program for the Plan Area; and

WHEREAS, The proposed plan seeks to promote sustainable travel modes by encouraging policies and programs that support transit, ride-sharing, walking, and bicycle riding for residents, tenants, employees, and visitors; and

WHEREAS, A successful TDM program can ensure access and mobility for all; and
WHEREAS, The goals of the plan are to help keep San Francisco moving as the city grows, and to promote better equity, environmental, health and safety outcomes, consistent with state, regional and local policies; and

WHEREAS, As Congestion Management Agency (CMA), the SFCTA produces the longrange Countywide Transportation Plan and the Congestion Management Program and develops the travel demand forecasting model for San Francisco; and

WHEREAS, The SFCTA, SFMTA and SF Planning Department adopted a "Interagency Transportation Demand Management Strategy" to identify and analyze the major sources of single occupant vehicle travel in San Francisco; and

WHEREAS, The upcoming major update of the San Francisco Transportation Plan depends on a Transportation Demand Management Modal Plan; and

WHEREAS, At its June 28, 2017 meeting, the Citizens Advisory Committee was briefed and unanimously adopted a motion of support to accept the San Francisco Transportation Demand Management Plan; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Board hereby accepts the San Francisco Transportation Demand
Management Plan.

Enclosure:

1. San Francisco Transportation Demand Management Plan

## Memorandum

Date: October 11, 2017; Revised October 19, 2017
To: Transportation Authority Board
From: Jeff Hobson - Deputy Director for Planning
Subject: 10/17/17 Board Meeting: Acceptance of the San Francisco Transportation Demand Management Plan

| RECOMMENDATION $\square$ Information $\boxtimes$ Action | $\square$ Fund Allocation |
| :--- | :--- |
| Accept the San Francisco Transportation Demand Management (TDM) | $\square$ Fund Programming |
| Plan for Z0162017-2020 | $\square$ Policy/Legislation |
| SUMMARY | $\boxtimes$ Plan/Study |
| This memo summarizes the purpose of the 20162017-2020 San | $\square$ Capital Project |
| Oversight/Delivery |  |
| Francisco TDM Plan, next steps for TDM projects, and previous | $\square$ Budget/Finance |
| expenditures related to this planning effort. The TDM Plan is a joint | $\square$ Contract/Agreement |
| effort between the Transportation Authority, San Francisco Municipal | $\square$ Procurement |
| Transportation Agency (SFMTA), Department of the Environment | $\square$ Other: |
| (SFE), and the Planning Department. The Plan, which follows the |  | Transportation Authority-supported 2014 TDM Strategy will be considered by each partner agency's board and represents the next step in collaborative TDM planning in San Francisco.

## FOLLOW-UP

Based on input from Commissioners Fewer and Yee the October 17 Board meeting, staff made two substantive changes to the Plan:

- Page 17: under "Geographies", staff revised the text to clarify the geographies in which TDM programs are expected to be effective. The highest priority locations in which to conduct the TDM program will be "Geographic Tier 1: Locations with high rates of driving, adequate transit service with available capacity, but lower than expected transit usage; situated near the bike network; and in proximity to vehicle sharing sites."
- Page 27 and Appendix E: under "Strategy 1" about public engagement, staff added a statement that the "Partners Working Group commits to conducting comprehensive outreach and engagement wherein community stakeholders are engaged in all TDM programs and projects in a proactive and meaningful way." The new Appendix E provides an example of this intended approach, SFMTA's "Public Outreach Notification Standards."


## DISCUSSION

## Background.

In 2014 the Transportation Authority, SFMTA, SFE and Planning Department supported the Interagency TDM Strategy as part of the TDM Partnership Project. The TDM Strategy identifies
shared goals and priority activities to deliver TDM programs in a coordinated manner throughout San Francisco. Together these four agencies will work collaboratively to achieve San Francisco's Transit First policy and adopted Climate Action Strategy. The 20162017-2020 TDM Plan is the next step towards this vision.

A successful TDM plan will reduce the cost of living for San Francisco residents by reducing reliance on driving in and to the city. Moreover, by reducing solo-driving trips and increasing mobility through more sustainable modes, air quality will also increase. Lastly, a successful TDM plan will complement larger infrastructure improvements by making our transportation system more efficient and sustainable.

## 20162017-2020 TDM Plan.

The TDM Plan is based on the 2014 Strategy and identifies policies, projects and programs San Francisco can implement to accomplish its TDM goals. The TDM Plan also identifies general roles for specific TDM strategies and assigns accountability to certain agencies. Finally, through inter-agency collaboration, we will evaluate the effectiveness of the TDM plan based on changes in singleoccupancy vehicle trips, vehicle miles traveled, and greenhouse gas emissions.

The four agencies have formed a TDM Partners Working Group that meets quarterly. During these meetings, agencies will provide each other with updates on program and policy activities. The meetings will also serve as a forum to collaborate, and propose new TDM ideas and strategies.

## TDM Plan Vision and Goals.

The Plan's vision is to encourage transit, walking, biking and shared rides as the preferred means of travel through San Francisco by reducing dependency on single occupancy trips.

Goal 1: Make it easy for residents, employees and visitors to travel by transit, foot, bike, or shared rides when traveling to, from, and within San Francisco.
Goal 2: Institutionalize a culture in San Francisco that embraces walking, bicycling, taking transit and sharing rides.
Goal 3: Collaborate on a wide variety of initiatives to leverage the impact of TDM.
Goal 4: Ensure and prioritize effective programs through monitoring and evaluation.

## Feedback.

The SFMTA developed the TDM Plan internally with support from agency stakeholders and partners. We request feedback from the Citizens Advisory Committee and Board in identifying if any major strategies are missing or that we should consider.

## Additional TDM Projects and Activities.

The TDM strategy projects, programs and initiatives are funded by Prop K funds designated for Citywide TDM programs in the current Prop K 5-Year Prioritization Program as well as Transportation Fund for Clean Air funds programmed by the Transportation Authority. The Citywide TDM programs include Citywide TDM Marketing, TDM Program Evaluation, Commuter Benefits Ordinance Employer Outreach, and Comprehensive Residential and Employee TDM Program.

Other TDM-related activities include the following:

- BART Perks Test Program
- Bayview Moves Pilot Program
- Freeway Corridor Management Study
- Late Night Transportation Plan
- Lombard Crooked Street Study
- Transportation Sustainability Program
- Treasure Island Mobility Management Agency Project


## FINANCIAL IMPACT

The recommended action would not have an impact on the adopted Fiscal Year 2017/18 budget.

## CAC POSITION

The CAC was briefed on this item at its June 28, 2017 meeting and unanimously adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation. Since June, the SFMTA has been making edits to the final plan to improve its readability and formatting.

## SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

Attachment 1 - Transportation Demand Management Partnership Project Fact Sheet


## TDM Interagency Strategy

Infrastructure alone (bicycle lanes, sidewalks, and transit) is not sufficient to achieve the City's goals for increasing the share of trips made by biking, walking, and riding mass transit. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies that reduce drive-alone trips and increase overall regional mobility are also needed.
The TDM Partnership, an effort of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA), the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), the Planning Department (DCP) , and SF Environment (SFE), jointly developed and coordinated a strategy to ensure an effective approach to TDM in San Francisco. The Interagency TDM Strategy identifies shared goals and priority activities for the coming five years.

## APPROACH

The TDM Partnership began by analyzing the current policies, programs, and practices that make up TDM in San Francisco now. It then reviewed the universe of potential TDM efforts. Staff completed a literature review and interviews with TDM experts from across the country to identify the most promising TDM measures. Examples of assessed TDM measures included pricing policies, HOV lanes, employer and residential outreach programs, bulk transit passes, parking management, carsharing, bikesharing, and others. As part of the analysis, the team also analyzed the major sources of single occupant vehicle travel in San Francisco. Findings suggest that San Francisco residents' and employees' commute trips generate the most single-occupancy vehicle driving trips in San Francisco (approximately 200 million single-occupant commute trips annually). Because regional commuting occurs within congested periods and locations, this compounds its environmental effects and impacts the most congested transit routes.

## WHY SAN FRANCISCO NEEDS TDM

A robust suite of TDM measures is critical to to support sustainable trip-making to achieve San Francisco's clean air and climate change goals. Measures are also needed to address the transportation system challenges associated with planned population and employment growth.

## TDM

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) is a set of programs and policies designed to reduce drivealone trips by removing potential barriers to using transit, bicycling, walking, and ridesharing. TDM strategies include information and education, incentives, technology, and policies.


The Interagency TDM strategy recommends the initiation of a comprehensive neighborhood-based residential and employer program.


The Interagency TDM Strategy recommends implementing a TDM framework for growth to reduce single-occupancy trips associated with new development.

## RESULTS

San Francisco residents' and employees' commute trips are the most significant generator of single-occupancy vehicle driving, and usually occur at peak congestion times periods and locations, compounding impacts on crowded transit routes and air pollution.
The TDM Partnership compared effectiveness, impact, and cost of scored TDM measures and identified priority policies, programs, and enforcement measures for San Francisco. These include existing measures that may be expanded, innovative pilot projects, and new practices. Overall, regulatory policies and pricing (e.g. parking pricing, congestion pricing) were found to be the most cost effective TDM measures. The analysis also revealed several gaps and opportunity areas for San Francisco's TDM programs, described below.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- Speak in a unified voice. San Francisco's TDM programs have historically been isolated; agencies should coordinate to present a unified program and brand.
- Programs should be comprehensive. Reinforce desired travel behavior changes through multiple channels, including residences and worksites.
- Provide high-quality, user-friendly transportation options. Effective TDM programs rely on alternatives to the automobile and transit capacity constraints must be addressed.
- TDM programs and services should be supported by strong, enforceable policies. Continue to study or pilot policies such as congestion or parking pricing to gauge support for ongoing implementation.
- Enforce existing and future regulation. Enforcing existing developer TDM commitments is critical for the future.
- Pursue comprehensive, systematic evaluation and report on the effectiveness of city TDM programs. Begin a bi-annual, outcomesbased evaluation of city TDM programs.
- Prioritize new ideas for projects or programs. The TDM Interagency Strategy outlined a five-year program, with recommendations grouped according to priority: core (essential), priority, and supportive.


The Interagency Transportation Demand Strategy is available upon request.

## CONTACT US

For more information, contact John Knox White at 415.701.4473 or john. knoxwhite@sfmta.com

## FUNDING

Funding provided by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Climate Initiatives Program, San Francisco's Prop K half-cent transportation sales tax, and the Transportation Fund for Clean Air.
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## Memorandum

Date: November 7, 2017
To: Transportation Authority Board
From: Cynthia Fong - Deputy Director for Finance and Administration
Subject: 11/14/17 Board Meeting: Internal Accounting and Investment Report for the Three Months Ending September 30, 2017

## RECOMMENDATION $\boxtimes$ Information $\square$ Action

None. This is an information item.

## SUMMARY

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide the quarterly internal accounting report and investment report for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2017/18 period ending September 30, 2017.

$\square$ Fund Allocation<br>$\square$ Fund Programming<br>$\square$ Policy/Legislation<br>$\square$ Plan/Study<br>$\square$ Capital Project Oversight/Delivery<br>区 Budget/Finance<br>$\square$ Contract/Agreement<br>Other:

## Background.

The Transportation Authority's Fiscal Policy (Resolution 18-07) establishes an annual audit requirement and directs staff to report to the Board, on at least a quarterly basis, the Transportation Authority's actual expenditures in comparison to the approved budget. The Transportation Authority's Investment Policy (Resolution 18-07) directs a review of portfolio compliance with the Investment Policy in conjunction with, and in the context of, the quarterly expenditure and budgetary report.

## Internal Accounting Report.

Using the format of the Transportation Authority's annual financial statements for governmental funds, the Internal Accounting Report includes a Balance Sheet (Attachment 1) and a Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balances, with Budget Comparison (Attachment 2). In Attachment 2, the last two columns show, respectively, the budget values, and the variance of revenues and expenditures as compared to the approved budget. For the three months ending September 30, 2017, the numbers in the approved budget column are one-fourth of the total approved annual budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2017/18, including the Treasure Island Mobility Management Agency. Although the sales tax (Prop K), vehicle registration fees (Prop AA), accruals and revolving credit loan are included for the three-month totals, the Internal Accounting Report does not include: 1) the Governmental Accounting Standards Board Statement Number 34 adjustments, or the other accruals, that are done at year-end, and 2) investment income from the deposits and income with the City Treasurer. The Balance Sheet values as of September 30, 2017 are used as the basis for the Investment Policy compliance review.

## Investment Report.

The investment policies and practices of the Transportation Authority are subject to and limited by applicable provisions of state law, and to prudent money management principles. All investable funds are invested in accordance with the Transportation Authority's Investment Policy and applicable provisions of Chapter 4 of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 5 of the California Government Code (Section 53600 et seq.). Any investment of bond proceeds will be further restricted by the provisions of relevant bond documents.

In managing its investment program, the Transportation Authority observes the "Prudent Investor" standard as stated in Government Code Section 53600.3, applied in the context of managing an overall portfolio. Investments are to be made with care, skill, prudence and diligence, taking into account the prevailing circumstances, including, but not limited to general economic conditions, the anticipated needs of the Transportation Authority and other relevant factors that a prudent person acting in a fiduciary capacity and familiar with those matters would use in the stewardship of funds of a like character and purpose.
The primary objectives, in priority order, for the Transportation Authority's investment activities are:

1) Safety. Safety of the principal is the foremost objective of the investment program. Investments of the Transportation Authority will be undertaken in a manner that seeks to ensure preservation of the principal of the funds under its control.
2) Liquidity. The Transportation Authority's investment portfolio will remain sufficiently liquid to enable the Transportation Authority to meet its reasonably anticipated cash flow requirements.
3) Return on Investment. The Transportation Authority's investment portfolio will be managed with the objective of attaining a market rate of return throughout budgetary and economic cycles commensurate with the Transportation Authority's investment risk parameters and the cash flow characteristics of the portfolio.

Permitted investment instruments are specifically listed in the Transportation Authority's Investment Policy, and include the San Francisco City and County Treasury Pool, certificates of deposit, and money market funds.

## Balance Sheet Analysis.

The Balance Sheet (Attachment 1) presents assets, liabilities, and fund balances as of September 30, 2017. Cash, deposits and investments total to $\$ 71.1$ million as of September 30, 2017. Other assets total $\$ 30.7$ million and includes $\$ 3.1$ million of program receivable, and $\$ 25.4$ million in sales tax receivable. Liabilities total $\$ 181.9$ million as of September 30, 2017 and include $\$ 40.8$ million in accounts payable and an outstanding revolving credit loan of $\$ 139.7$ million.

There is a negative of $\$ 81.0$ million in total fund balances, which is largely the result of how multiyear programming commitments are accounted for. Future sales tax revenues and grant reimbursements collected will fully fund this difference. This amount is obtained as follows: $\$ 10.7$ million is restricted for capital projects, and $\$ 91.8$ million is an unassigned negative fund balance. The unassigned negative fund balance reflects grant-funded capital projects that are scheduled to be implemented over the course of several fiscal years. The commitments are multi-year commitments and are funded with non-current (i.e. future) revenues. Commitments of future revenues are tracked through the grant administration process, and there is no issue with the availability of future revenues to honor them. A negative fund balance is a result of how these commitments are accounted for, and it does not affect the viability of the projects or grants. In addition, the Transportation Authority does not hold or retain title for the projects it has constructed or for the vehicles and system improvements
purchased with sales tax funds, which can result in a negative position. This reporting of all legal funding commitments without the corresponding revenue or assets creates or largely contributes to the $\$ 91.8$ million unassigned negative fund balance.

## Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balances Analysis.

The Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balances with Budget Comparison (Attachment 2) compares budget to actual levels for revenues and expenditures for the first three months of the fiscal year. The Transportation Authority earned $\$ 34.4$ million of revenues in the first quarter. Sales tax revenues $\$ 25.4$ million for the three months ending September 30, 2017 and program revenues total $\$ 7.7$ million.

As of September 30, 2017, the Transportation Authority incurred $\$ 4.3$ million of expenditures. Expenditures included $\$ 2.1$ million in capital projects costs, $\$ 271,926$ in debt service cost, and $\$ 2.0$ million for personnel and non-personnel expenditures.
For the three months ending September 30, 2017, revenues were higher than budgetary estimates by $\$ 766,839$ for all of the Transportation Authority's programs since a portion of FY 2016/17 revenues were received in FY 2017/18. Total expenditures were lower than the budgetary estimates by $\$ 86.8$ million. This amount includes a favorable variance of $\$ 728,722$ for personnel and non-personnel expenditures, $\$ 19.1$ million of debt service cost, and a favorable variance of $\$ 66.9$ million in capital project costs. The variance in capital project costs is due to costs from project sponsors that have not yet been received by the Transportation Authority for the first quarter. Consistent with normal prior year patterns, Transportation Authority staff anticipates a higher level of Prop K reimbursement requests during the next quarters.

## Investment Compliance.

As of September 30, 2017, approximately $72.9 \%$ of the Transportation Authority's investable assets were invested in the City and County of San Francisco Treasury Pool. These investments are in compliance with both the California Government Code and the Transportation Authority's Boardadopted Investment Policy, and provide sufficient liquidity to meet expenditures requirements for the next six months with the assistance of a sales tax revenue bond. We anticipate bond closing to occur in early November. Attachment 3 is the most recent investment report furnished by the Office of the Treasurer.

## FINANCIAL IMPACT

None. This is an information item.

## CAC POSITION

None. This is an information item.

## SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

Attachment 1 - Balance Sheet (unaudited)
Attachment 2 - Statement of Revenue, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance with Budget Comparison (unaudited
Attachment 3 - Investment Report for September 30, 2017






 Assets:
Cash In Bank
Deposits and Investments with City Treasurer Deposits and Investments with City Treasurer
Sales Tax Receivable Sales Tax Receivable
Vehicle Registration F Interest Receivable from the City and County of San Francisco Program Receivable Due From Other Funds Prepaid Costs and Deposits Total Assets
Liabilities: Accounts Payable Accrued Salaries and Taxes
Interest Payable
Due to Other Funds Revire
Total Liabilities
Deferred Inflows of Resources: Unavailable Program Revenues Fund Balances (Deficit):
Nonspendable
Restricted for Capital Projects Unassigned
Total Fund Balances (Deficit)
Total Liabilities, Deferred Inflows of
Resources, and Fund Balances




|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |  | 合 |  | 8 8 8 8 + |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


|  |  | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ n \\ n \\ j \\ m \\ m \end{array}\right\|$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{a} \\ & \hat{c} \\ & \hat{0} \\ & \dot{a} \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \widehat{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{6} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{n} \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | 8 <br> 0 <br> 8 <br> 8 <br> + | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


Revenues:
Vehicle Registration Fee Investment Income Program Revenue Ohr Ren
Total Revenues
Expenditures: Personnel Expenditures Non-personnel Expendit Capital Project Costs Total Expenditures Excess of Revenues over Other financing sources (uses):
Transfers In and out Net Change in Fund Balances Fund Balances (Deficit), Beginning
of the Period Fund Balances (Deficit), End of the Period

# Office of the Treasurer \& Tax Collector City and County of San Francisco 

Tajel Shah, Chief Assistant Treasurer
Robert L. Shaw, CFA, Chief Investment Officer

José Cisneros, Treasurer

The Honorable Edwin M. Lee<br>Mayor of San Francisco<br>City Hall, Room 200<br>1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place<br>San Francisco, CA 94102-4638

## The Honorable Board of Supervisors <br> City and County of San Franicsco City Hall, Room 244 <br> 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102-4638

Ladies and Gentlemen,
In accordance with the provisions of California State Government Code, Section 53646, we forward this report detailing the City's pooled fund portfolio as of September 30, 2017. These investments provide sufficient liquidity to meet expenditure requirements for the next six months and are in compliance with our statement of investment policy and California Code.

This correspondence and its attachments show the investment activity for the month of September 2017 for the portfolios under the Treasurer's management. All pricing and valuation data is obtained from Interactive Data Corporation.

CCSF Pooled Fund Investment Earnings Statistics *

| (in \$ million) | Current Month |  |  |  |  |  | Prior Month |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fiscal YTD September 2017 |  |  |  | Fiscal YTD |  | August 2017 |  |
| Average Daily Balance | \$ | 8,194 | \$ | 8,101 | \$ | 8,239 | \$ | 8,303 |
| Net Earnings |  | 28.52 |  | 9.51 |  | 19.01 |  | 9.99 |
| Earned Income Yield |  | 1.38\% |  | 1.43\% |  | 1.36\% |  | 1.42\% |

CCSF Pooled Fund Statistics *

| (in \$ million) Investment Type | \% of Portfolio |  | Book Value |  | Market Value | Wtd. Avg. Coupon | Wtd. Avg. YTM | WAM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| U.S. Treasuries | 5.93\% | \$ | 472.8 | \$ | 472.3 | 1.24\% | 1.43\% | 857 |
| Federal Agencies | 53.55\% |  | 4,269.5 |  | 4,261.3 | 1.35\% | 1.41\% | 718 |
| State \& Local Government |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agency Obligations | 3.61\% |  | 289.2 |  | 287.2 | 1.42\% | 1.35\% | 419 |
| Public Time Deposits | 0.01\% |  | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.33\% | 1.33\% | 184 |
| Negotiable CDs | 17.33\% |  | 1,377.8 |  | 1,378.7 | 1.47\% | 1.47\% | 192 |
| Commercial Paper | 10.20\% |  | 810.1 |  | 811.9 | 0.08\% | 1.35\% | 100 |
| Medium Term Notes | 0.80\% |  | 63.5 |  | 63.5 | 1.49\% | 1.43\% | 391 |
| Money Market Funds | 4.49\% |  | 357.2 |  | 357.2 | 0.95\% | 0.95\% | 1 |
| Supranationals | 4.08\% |  | 324.8 |  | 324.6 | 1.25\% | 1.51\% | 580 |
| Totals | 100.0\% | \$ | 7,966.0 | \$ | 7,957.6 | 1.22\% | 1.39\% | 521 |

In the remainder of this report, we provide additional information and analytics at the security-level and portfolio-level, as recommended by the California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission.

Very truly yours,


## José Cisneros <br> Treasurer

[^0]
## Portfolio Summary

| (in \$ million) Security Type | Par Value |  | Book Value |  | Market Value | Market/Book Price | Current \% Allocation | Max. Policy Allocation | Compliant? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| U.S. Treasuries | \$ 475.0 | \$ | 472.8 | \$ | 472.3 | 99.88 | 5.93\% | 100\% | Yes |
| Federal Agencies | 4,269.4 |  | 4,269.5 |  | 4,261.3 | 99.81 | 53.55\% | 100\% | Yes |
| State \& Local Government Agency Obligations | 287.1 |  | 289.2 |  | 287.2 | 99.31 | 3.61\% | 20\% | Yes |
| Public Time Deposits | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 100.00 | 0.01\% | 100\% | Yes |
| Negotiable CDs | 1,377.8 |  | 1,377.8 |  | 1,378.7 | 100.06 | 17.33\% | 30\% | Yes |
| Bankers Acceptances | - |  | - |  | - | - | 0.00\% | 40\% | Yes |
| Commercial Paper | 815.0 |  | 810.1 |  | 811.9 | 100.23 | 10.20\% | 25\% | Yes |
| Medium Term Notes | 63.5 |  | 63.5 |  | 63.5 | 100.04 | 0.80\% | 25\% | Yes |
| Repurchase Agreements | - |  | - |  | - | - | 0.00\% | 10\% | Yes |
| Reverse Repurchase/ Securities Lending Agreements | - |  | - |  | - | - | 0.00\% | \$75mm | Yes |
| Money Market Funds - Government | 357.2 |  | 357.2 |  | 357.2 | 100.00 | 4.49\% | 20\% | Yes |
| LAIF | - |  | - |  | - | - | 0.00\% | \$50mm | Yes |
| Supranationals | 325.3 |  | 324.8 |  | 324.6 | 99.92 | 4.08\% | 30\% | Yes |
| TOTAL | \$ 7,971.3 | \$ | 7,966.0 | \$ | 7,957.6 | 99.89 | 100.00\% | - | Yes |

[^1]City and County of San Francisco
Pooled Fund Portfolio Statistics
For the month ended September 30, 2017

| Average Daily Balance <br> Net Earnings <br> Earned Income Yield <br> Weighted Average Maturity |  | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 8,100,945,249 \\ \$ 9,513,577 \\ 1.43 \% \\ 521 \text { days } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Investment Type | (\$ million) | Par Value |  | Book Value |  | Market Value |
| U.S. Treasuries | \$ | 475.0 | \$ | 472.8 | \$ | 472.3 |
| Federal Agencies |  | 4,269.4 |  | 4,269.5 |  | 4,261.3 |
| State \& Local Government |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public Time Deposits |  | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |
| Negotiable CDs |  | 1,377.8 |  | 1,377.8 |  | 1,378.7 |
| Commercial Paper |  | 815.0 |  | 810.1 |  | 811.9 |
| Medium Term Notes |  | 63.5 |  | 63.5 |  | 63.5 |
| Money Market Funds |  | 357.2 |  | 357.2 |  | 357.2 |
| Supranationals |  | 325.3 |  | 324.8 |  | 324.6 |
| Total | \$ | 7,971.3 | \$ | 7,966.0 | \$ | 7,957.6 |
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|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of Investment | CUSIP |
| Federal Agencies | $3134 G 9 V R 5$ |
| Federal Agencies | $313378 J 77$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E H Z N 6$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3136 G 3 T K 1$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3136 G 4 N D 1$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3136 G 4 B L 6$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3134 G B F U 1$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3134 G B F U 1$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3134 G B L Y 6$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3134 G B P B 2$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E H N K 5$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E H N K 5$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3134 G B S T 0$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3134 G B T X 0$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3136 G 3 T G 0$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E H Q B 2$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3130 A B N V 4$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3134 G B X V 9$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3135 G 0 T 60$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3130 A B Z E 9$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3130 A B Z N 9$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3130 A B Z N 9$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3130 A C E 26$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3130 A C E 26$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3132 X 0 K R 1$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3134 G B L R 1$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E G X 75$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E F T X 5$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E G 4 T 9$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E G 4 T 9$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3130 A C 2 K 9$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3134 G B D 58$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3130 A A Y P 7$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3134 G B J 60$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3130 A C F 33$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3135 G 0 Q 89$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E G Z J 7$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E G Z J 7$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E G S 97$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E G S 97$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3130 A C B 60$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3134 G A K 52$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3135 G 0 T 45$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3134 G B Q G 0$ |
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| State/Local Agencies | 13063CFC9 | CALIFORNIA ST |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| State/Local Agencies | 13063CPN4 | CALIFORNIA ST |
| State/Local Agencies | 13063 CPN4 | CALIFORNIA ST |
| State/Local Agencies | 91411 SZ11 | UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA |
| State/Local Agencies | $91412 G L 52$ | UNIV OF CALIFORNIA CA REVENUE |
| State/Local Agencies | $546456 \mathrm{CY8}$ | LOUISIANA ST CITIZENS PROPERT |
| State/Local Agencies | $603786 G J 7$ | MINNEAPOLIS MN REVENUE |
| State/Local Agencies | $13063 C 4 V 9$ | CALIFORNIA ST |
| State/Local Agencies | $13063 D A B 4$ | CALIFORNIA ST |
| State/Local Agencies | 13063 CKL3 | CALIFORNIA ST |
| State/Local Agencies | $91412 G L 60$ | UNIV OF CALIFORNIA CA REVENUE |
| State/Local Agencies | $91412 G S B 2$ | UNIV OF CALIFORNIA CA REVENUE |
| State/Local Agencies | $91412 G S B 2$ | UNIV OF CALIFORNIA CA REVENUE |
| State/Local Agencies | $6055804 W 6$ | MISSISSIPPI ST |
| State/Local Agencies | $977100 C W 4$ | WISCONSIN ST GEN FUND ANNUAL |
| State/Local Agencies | 13066 YTY5 | CALIFORNIA ST DEPT OF WTR RES |
| State/Local Agencies | $91412 G F 59$ | UNIV OF CALIFORNIA CA REVENUE |
| Subtotals |  |  |


| Type of Investment |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Federal Agencies | 3133EHLY7 |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E H L Y 7$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3134 G B F 72$ |
| Federal Agencies | 3134GBUK6 |
| Federal Agencies | 3134GBXU1 |
| Federal Agencies | 3130AC7E8 |
| Subtotals |  |

State/Local Agencies
State/Local Agencies State/Local Agencies State/Local Agencies State/Local Agencies State/Local Agencies State/Local Agencies
 State/Local Agencies State/Local Agencies Local Agencies State/Local Agencies State/Local Agencies
State/Local Agencies State/Local Agencies State/Local Agencies
State/Local Agencies

| Public Time Deposits | PP9I2NRE9 | MISSION NATIONAL BK SF | 2/21/17 | 2/21/18 | 1.15 | \$ | 240,000 | \$ | 240,000 | \$ | 240,000 | \$ | 240,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Public Time Deposits | PP9F2HFF8 | TRANS-PAC NATIONAL BK | 3/21/17 | 3/21/18 | 1.35 |  | 240,000 |  | 240,000 |  | 240,000 |  | 240,000 |
| Public Time Deposits | PP302GIL3 | BANK OF SAN FRANCISCO | 4/11/17 | 4/11/18 | 1.37 |  | 240,000 |  | 240,000 |  | 240,000 |  | 240,000 |
| Public Time Deposits | PPA01U877 | PREFERRED BANK LA CALIF | 5/16/17 | 5/16/18 | 1.44 |  | 240,000 |  | 240,000 |  | 240,000 |  | 240,000 |
| Subtotals |  |  |  |  | 1.33 | \$ | 960,000 | \$ | 960,000 | \$ | 960,000 | \$ | 960,000 |
| Negotiable CDs | 06371ECR6 | BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO | 6/29/17 | 10/2/17 | 1.31 | \$ | 50,000,000 | \$ | 50,000,000 | \$ | 50,000,000 | \$ | 50,000,573 |
| Negotiable CDs | 06427KW29 | BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO | 4/6/17 | 10/16/17 | 1.38 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,006,307 |
| Negotiable CDs | 89113WH25 | TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY | 4/6/17 | 10/16/17 | 1.22 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,002,519 |
| Negotiable CDs | 89113XCY8 | TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY | 8/25/17 | 10/25/17 | 1.25 |  | 40,000,000 |  | 40,000,000 |  | 40,000,000 |  | 40,004,125 |
| Negotiable CDs | 89113WQN9 | TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY | 12/6/16 | 12/6/17 | 1.62 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,047,819 |
| Negotiable CDs | 06427KJV0 | BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO | 12/9/16 | 12/8/17 | 1.62 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,049,359 |
| Negotiable CDs | 78009NL61 | ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY | 12/8/16 | 12/8/17 | 1.62 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,049,359 |
| Negotiable CDs | 78009NM60 | ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY | 12/19/16 | 12/19/17 | 1.62 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,058,008 |
| Negotiable CDs | 78009NS56 | ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY | 3/20/17 | 12/20/17 | 1.50 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,044,476 |
| Negotiable CDs | 78009NV37 | ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY | 6/26/17 | 12/22/17 | 1.33 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,025,425 |
| Negotiable CDs | 96121T2D9 | WESTPAC BANKING CORP NY | 12/28/16 | 12/28/17 | 1.74 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,079,511 |
| Negotiable CDs | 06427KY84 | BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO | 5/3/17 | 1/29/18 | 1.39 |  | 25,000,000 |  | 25,000,000 |  | 25,000,000 |  | 25,017,182 |
| Negotiable CDs | 78009NW36 | ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY | 7/5/17 | 4/5/18 | 1.38 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,015,658 |
| Negotiable CDs | 78009NT63 | ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY | 5/10/17 | 5/10/18 | 1.47 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,043,519 |
| Negotiable CDs | 06417GXY9 | BANK OF NOVA SCOTIA HOUSTON | 8/30/17 | 5/25/18 | 1.48 |  | 35,000,000 |  | 35,000,000 |  | 35,000,000 |  | 35,036,165 |
| Negotiable CDs | 89113W2C9 | TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY | 6/2/17 | 6/4/18 | 1.46 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,045,413 |
| Negotiable CDs | 78009NU46 | ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY | 6/12/17 | 6/12/18 | 1.44 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,042,256 |
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| Commercial Paper | $06538 B X 24$ | BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Commercial Paper | $06538 B X 24$ | BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |
| Commercial Paper | $06538 B X C 2$ | BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |
| Commercial Paper | $06538 B X J 7$ | BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |
| Commercial Paper | $47816 F X Q 9$ | JOHNSON \& JOHNSON |
| Commercial Paper | $06538 B X R 9$ | BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |
| Commercial Paper | $06538 B X R 9$ | BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |
| Commercial Paper | $06538 B X R 9$ | BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |
| Commercial Paper | $06538 B X R 9$ | BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |
| Commercial Paper | $89233 G X R 2$ | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP |
| Commercial Paper | $06538 B X W 8$ | BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |
| Commercial Paper | $89233 G Z F 6$ | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP |
| Commercial Paper | $89233 G Z F 6$ | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP |
| Commercial Paper | $36164 L E N 5$ | GE CAPITAL TREASURY LLC |
| Commercial Paper | $89233 H C 28$ | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP |
| Commercial Paper | $89233 H C P 7$ | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP |
| Commercial Paper | $89233 H C W 2$ | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP |
| Commercial Paper | $36164 K E A 5$ | GE CAPITAL TREASURY LLC |
| Commercial Paper | $06538 C F 89$ | BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |
| Commercial Paper | $06538 C F F 3$ | BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |
| Subtotals |  |  | | Commercial Paper | 06538 BX24 | BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Commercial Paper | 06538 BX24 | BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |
| Commercial Paper | 06538 BXC2 | BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |
| Commercial Paper | 06538 BXJ7 | BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |
| Commercial Paper | 47816FXQ9 | JOHNSON \& JOHNSON |
| Commercial Paper | 06538 BXR9 | BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |
| Commercial Paper | 06538 BXR9 | BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |
| Commercial Paper | $06538 B X R 9$ | BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |
| Commercial Paper | 06538BXR9 | BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |
| Commercial Paper | 89233GXR2 | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP |
| Commercial Paper | $06538 B X W 8$ | BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |
| Commercial Paper | 89233GZF6 | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP |
| Commercial Paper | 89233GZF6 | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP |
| Commercial Paper | 36164 LEN5 | GE CAPITAL TREASURY LLC |
| Commercial Paper | 89233HC28 | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP |
| Commercial Paper | 89233HCP7 | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP |
| Commercial Paper | 89233HCW2 | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP |
| Commercial Paper | 36164KEA5 | GE CAPITAL TREASURY LLC |
| Commercial Paper | $06538 C F 89$ | BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |
| Commercial Paper | $06538 C F F 3$ | BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |
| Subtotals |  |  | $\begin{array}{lll}\text { Medium Term Notes } & 911312 \text { AP1 } & \text { UNITED PARCEL SERVICE } \\ \text { Medium Term Notes } & 459200 H K 0 & \text { IBM CORP }\end{array}$

Medium Term Notes

Medium Term Notes | Medium Term Notes | 459200HK0 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Medium Term Notes | 89236 TDN2 |
| Subtotals |  |

$$
0-2
$$

Money Market Funds Money Market Funds Money Markey Market Funds Money Market Funds 09248U718 Subtotals


| $\$ \$$ | $25,000,000$ | $\$$ | $24,983,194$ | $\$$ | $24,983,194$ | $\$$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $50,000,000$ |  | $49,978,333$ |  | $49,998,333$ | $49,998,333$ |
|  | $33,000,000$ | $32,981,144$ |  | $32,987,799$ | $32,987,900$ |  |
|  | $40,000,000$ | $39,961,733$ | $39,976,767$ | $39,977,333$ |  |  |
|  | $60,000,000$ | $59,826,933$ | $59,826,933$ | $59,954,000$ |  |  |
|  | $15,000,000$ | $14,973,958$ | $14,973,958$ | $14,988,000$ |  |  |
|  | $17,000,000$ | $16,982,575$ | $16,986,060$ | $16,986,400$ |  |  |
|  | $25,000,000$ | $24,945,313$ | $24,945,313$ | $24,980,000$ |  |  |
|  | $25,000,000$ | $24,950,521$ | $24,950,521$ | $24,980,000$ |  |  |
|  | $25,000,000$ | $24,947,938$ | $24,947,938$ | $24,980,000$ |  |  |
|  | $50,000,000$ | $49,632,000$ | $49,632,000$ | $49,951,667$ |  |  |
|  | $50,000,000$ | $49,538,000$ | $49,538,000$ | $49,872,917$ |  |  |
|  | $50,000,000$ | $49,671,833$ | $49,671,833$ | $49,872,917$ |  |  |
|  | $50,000,000$ | $50,000,000$ | $50,000,000$ | $49,802,250$ |  |  |
|  | $50,000,000$ | $49,482,611$ | $49,482,611$ | $49,723,444$ |  |  |
|  | $50,000,000$ | $49,456,250$ | $49,456,250$ | $49,685,236$ |  |  |
|  | $50,000,000$ | $49,440,042$ | $49,440,042$ | $49,650,000$ |  |  |
|  | $50,000,000$ | $49,480,833$ | $49,480,833$ | $49,570,278$ |  |  |
|  | $50,000,000$ | $49,417,167$ | $49,417,167$ | $49,486,111$ |  |  |
|  | $50,000,000$ | $49,417,167$ | $49,443,167$ | $49,471,722$ |  |  |
|  | $815,000,000$ | $\$$ | $810,067,546$ | $\$$ | $810,138,719$ | $\$$ |
|  |  |  | $811,917,675$ |  |  |  |
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Monthly Investment Earnings
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Monthly Investment Earnings





 に $\infty$

 $\stackrel{8}{3}$


| FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT GENERAL ELECTRIC CO |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  | BLACKROCK LIQ INST |
| BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO |  |
|  | FEDERAL HOME LOAN B |
| FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT |  |
| GENERAL ELECTRIC CO |  |
| BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |  |
| ED HOME LN DISCOU |  |
| BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |  |
| FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT |  |
| GENERAL ELECTRIC CO |  |
| FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT |  |
| GENERAL ELECTRIC CO |  |
| TREASURY BILL |  |
| FREDDIE MAC |  |
| FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT |  |
| GENERAL ELECTRIC CO |  |
| FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK |  |
| FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK |  |
| FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK |  |
| FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT |  |
| GENERAL ELECTRIC CO |  |
| FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT |  |
| GENERAL ELECTRIC CO |  |
| BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |  |
| BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |  |
| BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |  |
| FREDDIE MAC |  |
| FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT |  |
| GENERAL ELECTRIC CO |  |
| FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT |  |
| GENERAL ELECTRIC CO |  |
| FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT |  |
| GENERAL ELECTRIC CO |  |
| FREDDIE MAC |  |
| FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT |  |
| GENERAL ELECTRIC CO |  |
| FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK |  |
| COLGATE-PALMOLIVE CO |  |
| FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT |  |
| FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT |  |
| GENERAL ELECTRIC CO |  |
| BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |  |
| BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |  |
| FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT |  |
| GENERAL ELECTRIC CO |  |
| BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY |  |
| FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK |  |
| FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK |  |
| FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT |  |
|  | RAL ELECTRIC CO |


 Transaction Settle Date

| Transaction | Settle Date | Maturity Type of Investment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Purchase | 9/1/2017 | 9/5/2017 Federal Agencies |
| Purchase | 9/1/2017 | 9/5/2017 Commercial Paper |
| Purchase | 9/1/2017 | 10/1/2017 Money Market Funds |
| Purchase | 9/1/2017 | 7/2/2018 Negotiable CDs |
| Purchase | 9/1/2017 | 9/1/2022 Federal Agencies |
| Purchase | 9/5/2017 | 9/6/2017 Federal Agencies |
| Purchase | 9/5/2017 | 9/6/2017 Commercial Paper |
| Purchase | 9/5/2017 | 9/15/2017 Commercial Paper |
| Purchase | 9/5/2017 | 9/22/2017 Federal Agencies |
| Purchase | 9/5/2017 | 10/25/2017 Commercial Paper |
| Purchase | 9/6/2017 | 9/7/2017 Federal Agencies |
| Purchase | 9/6/2017 | 9/7/2017 Commercial Paper |
| Purchase | 9/7/2017 | 9/8/2017 Federal Agencies |
| Purchase | 9/7/2017 | 9/8/2017 Commercial Paper |
| Purchase | 9/7/2017 | 10/5/2017 U.S. Treasuries |
| Purchase | 9/7/2017 | 4/27/2020 Federal Agencies |
| Purchase | 9/8/2017 | 9/11/2017 Federal Agencies |
| Purchase | 9/8/2017 | 9/11/2017 Commercial Paper |
| Purchase | 9/8/2017 | 9/28/2020 Federal Agencies |
| Purchase | 9/8/2017 | 9/28/2020 Federal Agencies |
| Purchase | 9/8/2017 | 12/15/2021 Federal Agencies |
| Purchase | 9/11/2017 | 9/12/2017 Federal Agencies |
| Purchase | 9/11/2017 | 9/12/2017 Commercial Paper |
| Purchase | 9/12/2017 | 9/13/2017 Federal Agencies |
| Purchase | 9/12/2017 | 9/13/2017 Commercial Paper |
| Purchase | 9/12/2017 | 9/20/2017 Commercial Paper |
| Purchase | 9/12/2017 | 10/2/2017 Commercial Paper |
| Purchase | 9/12/2017 | 6/8/2018 Commercial Paper |
| Purchase | 9/12/2017 | 10/25/2019 Federal Agencies |
| Purchase | 9/13/2017 | 9/14/2017 Federal Agencies |
| Purchase | 9/13/2017 | 9/14/2017 Commercial Paper |
| Purchase | 9/14/2017 | 9/15/2017 Federal Agencies |
| Purchase | 9/14/2017 | 9/15/2017 Commercial Paper |
| Purchase | 9/15/2017 | 9/18/2017 Federal Agencies |
| Purchase | 9/15/2017 | 9/18/2017 Commercial Paper |
| Purchase | 9/15/2017 | 6/15/2022 Federal Agencies |
| Purchase | 9/18/2017 | 9/19/2017 Federal Agencies |
| Purchase | 9/18/2017 | 9/19/2017 Commercial Paper |
| Purchase | 9/18/2017 | 9/13/2021 Federal Agencies |
| Purchase | 9/19/2017 | 9/20/2017 Commercial Paper |
| Purchase | 9/19/2017 | 9/20/2017 Federal Agencies |
| Purchase | 9/19/2017 | 9/20/2017 Federal Agencies |
| Purchase | 9/19/2017 | 9/20/2017 Commercial Paper |
| Purchase | 9/19/2017 | 10/2/2017 Commercial Paper |
| Purchase | 9/19/2017 | 6/15/2018 Commercial Paper |
| Purchase | 9/20/2017 | 9/21/2017 Federal Agencies |
| Purchase | 9/20/2017 | 9/21/2017 Commercial Paper |
| Purchase | 9/20/2017 | 10/18/2017 Commercial Paper |
| Purchase | 9/20/2017 | 3/20/2020 Federal Agencies |
| Purchase | 9/20/2017 | 2/10/2021 Federal Agencies |
| Purchase | 9/21/2017 | 9/22/2017 Federal Agencies |
| Purchase | 9/21/2017 | 9/22/2017 Commercial Paper |



## 

## $50,213,750$ $25,000,000$



## $\infty$ <br> \＄ 213,750

### 00.001 <br> 응ㅇ

100.00
100.00


FREDDIE MAC

|  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0.91 | 0.91 | $\$$ | 100.00 |
| 1.30 | 1.30 |  | 100.12 |
| 1.24 | 1.42 |  | 100.02 |
| 1.26 | 1.25 |  | 100.03 |
| 0.00 | 1.30 | 99.93 |  |
| 1.27 | 1.28 |  | 100.12 |
| 0.00 | 0.95 |  | 99.94 |
| 1.23 | 1.06 |  | 99.96 |
| 1.24 | 1.32 | 100.08 |  |
| 1.25 | 1.32 | 100.10 |  |
| 0.90 | $\mathbf{1 . 1 8}$ | $\$$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 2}$ |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 8 \\
& 8 \\
& 8 \\
& 8 \\
& 0 \\
& 0 \\
& 0
\end{aligned}
$$

## MORGAN STANLEY INST GOV

$$
\$
$$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\$ 4, \mathbf{9} \mathbf{6}, \mathbf{9 8}, 840 \\
\hline \\
\$ \quad 50,000,000 \\
25,039743
\end{gathered}
$$ 0

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { Money Market Fund } \\
& \text { Federal Agencies } \\
& \text { Federal Agencies }
\end{aligned}
$$

LLOZ/L

$$
61747 \mathrm{C} 707
$$


10／1／2017 Money Market Funds
소NNNNN


000000

듣NNNNNNNNNN
넌 어NNNNN
ぁぁぁぁぁぁぁठ

ত্ত্ত্ত্ত্ত্ত্ত্ত

UO
$\begin{array}{rrr}53,389 \quad \$ & 50,053,389 \\ & 75,000,000 \\ & 100,000,000 \\ & 100,000,000 \\ & 100,000,000 \\ & 100,000,000 \\ & 100,000,000 \\ & 35,000,000 \\ & 50,000,000 \\ & 100,000,000 \\ 100,000,000\end{array}$ $\leftrightarrow$
88888888888 은우응ㅁㄴㅇㄴ으은은은



$\leftrightarrow$


BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { Maturity } & 9 / 1 / 2017 & 9 / 1 / 2017 & \text { Negotiable CDs } \\ \text { Maturity } & 9 / 1 / 2017 & 9 / 1 / 2017 \text { Commercial Paper } \\ \text { Maturity } & 9 / 1 / 2017 & 9 / 1 / 2017 & \text { Commercial Paper } \\ \text { Maturity } & 9 / 5 / 2017 & 9 / 5 / 2017 \text { Federal Agencies } \\ \text { Maturity } & 9 / 5 / 2017 & 9 / 5 / 2017 \text { Commercial Paper } \\ \text { Maturity } & 9 / 6 / 2017 & 9 / 6 / 2017 \text { Federal Agencies } \\ \text { Maturity } & 9 / 6 / 2017 & 9 / 6 / 2017 \text { Commercial Paper } \\ \text { Maturity } & 9 / 6 / 2017 & 9 / 6 / 2017 \text { Supranationals } \\ \text { Maturity } & 9 / 7 / 2017 & 9 / 7 / 2017 \text { Commercial Paper } \\ \text { Maturity } & 9 / 7 / 2017 & 9 / 7 / 2017 \text { Federal Agencies } \\ \text { Maturity } & 9 / 7 / 2017 & 9 / 7 / 2017 \text { Commercial Paper }\end{array}$


 ${ }^{\circ}$


888888888888888888888888888888888888888888888





| CUSIP | Par Value | Coupon | YTM |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 09248U718 | \$ | 29,201 | 0.88 |
| 3132X0JL6 | $50,000,000$ | 0.88 | 0.88 |
| 3133EEMH0 | $4,000,000$ | 1.28 | 1.31 |
| 3133EEMH0 | $35,000,000$ | 1.28 | 1.40 |
| 3133EGDM4 | $25,000,000$ | 1.39 | 1.39 |
| 3133EGN43 | $50,000,000$ | 1.39 | 1.39 |
| 3132X0KR1 | $25,000,000$ | 1.43 | 1.43 |
| 3133EEU40 | $69,000,000$ | 1.27 | 1.28 |
| 3133EG2V6 | $25,000,000$ | 1.28 | 1.28 |
| 3132X0PG0 | $50,000,000$ | 1.30 | 1.30 |
| 3135G0F57 |  | 1.24 | 1.42 |
| 45950VFH4 | $30,000,000$ | 1.25 | 1.47 |
| 3133EEAN0 | $25,000,000$ | 1.27 | 1.27 |
| 3133EEAN0 | $25,000,000$ | 1.27 | 1.34 |
| 3133EEAN0 | $50,000,000$ | 1.27 | 1.34 |
| 78009NW36 | $50,000,000$ | 1.38 | 1.38 |
| 06371EDT1 | $50,000,000$ | 1.43 | 1.43 |
| 96121T3R7 | $50,000,000$ | 1.38 | 1.38 |
| 89113WQQN9 | $50,000,000$ | 1.52 | 1.52 |
| 45950VKP0 | $50,000,000$ | 1.28 | 1.28 |
| 06427KJV0 | $50,000,000$ | 1.52 | 1.52 |
| 78009NL61 | $50,000,000$ | 1.52 | 1.52 |
| 3133EFCT2 | $25,000,000$ | 1.28 | 1.28 |
| 3133EFCT2 | $50,000,000$ | 1.28 | 1.28 |
| 06427KSW8 | $27,838,000$ | 1.50 | 1.50 |
| 3133EGS97 | $25,000,000$ | 1.50 | 1.50 |
| 3133EGS97 | $25,000,000$ | 1.50 | 1.50 |
| 3133EFNK9 | $25,000,000$ | 1.31 | 1.35 |
| 3133EGED3 | $25,000,000$ | 1.41 | 1.41 |
| 3133EGED3 | $25,000,000$ | 1.41 | 1.41 |
| 3133EEW48 | $50,000,000$ | 1.27 | 1.28 |
| 78009NU46 | $50,000,000$ | 1.36 | 1.36 |
| 3133EEBR0 | $25,000,000$ | 1.26 | 1.48 |
| 313378J77 | $15,710,000$ | 1.88 | 1.56 |
| 3133EGFQ3 | $25,000,000$ | 0.88 | 0.91 |
| 3133EEZC7 | $50,000,000$ | 1.28 | 1.30 |
| 3133EGFK6 | $25,000,000$ | 1.36 | 1.36 |
| 3133EGFK6 | $25,000,000$ | 1.36 | 1.36 |
| 06427KW29 | $50,000,000$ | 1.38 | 1.38 |
| 78009NM60 | $50,000,000$ | 1.62 | 1.62 |
| 3133EGBQ7 | $25,000,000$ | 1.37 | 1.37 |
| 3133EGBQ7 | $25,000,000$ | 1.37 | 1.37 |
| 3132X0ED9 | $40,000,000$ | 1.39 | 1.39 |
| 78009NS56 | $50,000,000$ | 1.49 | 1.49 |
| 3133EGGC3 | $25,000,000$ | 1.35 | 1.35 |
|  |  |  |  |



## RESOLUTION ALLOCATING \$2,941,939 IN PROP K SALES TAX FUNDS FOR FIVE REQUESTS, WITH CONDITIONS

WHEREAS, The Transportation Authority received five requests for a total of $\$ 2,941,939$ in Prop K local transportation sales tax funds, as summarized in Attachments 1 and 2 and detailed in the enclosed allocation request forms; and

WHEREAS, The requests seek funds from the following Prop K Expenditure Plan categories: Facilities-Muni, Bicycle Circulation/Safety and Curb Ramps; and

WHEREAS, As required by the voter-approved Expenditure Plans, the Transportation Authority Board has adopted a Prop K 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPP) for all of the aforementioned Expenditure Plan programmatic categories; and

WHEREAS, Three of the five requests are consistent with the 5YPPs for their respective categories; and

WHEREAS, The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA's) requests for Upgrade Life and Fire Safety Systems and Valencia Street Bikeway Implementation Plan [NTIP Planning] require 5YPP amendments as detailed in the enclosed allocation request forms; and

WHEREAS, After reviewing the requests, Transportation Authority staff recommended allocating a total of $\$ 2,941,939$ in Prop K funds, with conditions, for five projects, as described in Attachment 3 and detailed in the enclosed allocation request forms, which include staff recommendations for Prop K allocation amounts, required deliverables, timely use of funds requirements, special conditions, and Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules; and

WHEREAS, There are sufficient funds in the Capital Expenditures line item of the Transportation Authority's approved Fiscal Year 2017/18 budget to cover the proposed actions; and

WHEREAS, At its October 25, 2017 meeting, the Citizens Advisory Committee was briefed on the subject request and adopted motions of support for the staff recommendation; and

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority hereby amends the Facilities-Muni and Bicycle Circulation/Safety 5YPPs, as detailed in the enclosed allocation request forms; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority hereby allocates $\$ 2,941,939$ in Prop K sales tax funds for five requests, with conditions, as summarized in Attachment 3 and detailed in the enclosed allocation request forms; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority finds the allocation of these funds to be in conformance with the priorities, policies, funding levels, and prioritization methodologies established in the Prop K Expenditure Plan, Strategic Plan, and relevant 5YPPs; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority hereby authorizes the actual expenditure (cash reimbursement) of funds for these activities to take place subject to the Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules detailed in the enclosed allocation request forms; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Capital Expenditures line item for subsequent fiscal year annual budgets shall reflect the maximum reimbursement schedule amounts adopted and the Transportation Authority does not guarantee reimbursement levels higher than those adopted; and be it further

RESOLVED, That as a condition of this authorization for expenditure, the Executive Director shall impose such terms and conditions as are necessary for the project sponsors to comply with applicable law and adopted Transportation Authority policies and execute Standard Grant Agreements to that effect; and be it further

RESOLVED, That as a condition of this authorization for expenditure, the project sponsors
shall provide the Transportation Authority with any other information it may request regarding the use of the funds hereby authorized; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Capital Improvement Program of the Congestion Management
Program, the Prop K Strategic Plan and the relevant 5YPPs are hereby amended, as appropriate.

Attachments (4):

1. Summary of Applications Received
2. Project Descriptions
3. Staff Recommendations
4. Prop K Allocation Summary - FY 2017/18

Enclosure:

1. Prop K/AA Allocation Request Forms (5)

|  |  |  | Project Name | Current <br> Prop K <br> Request |  | Total Cost for Requested Phase(s) |  | Leveraging |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source | EP Line No./ <br> Category ${ }^{1}$ | Project <br> Sponsor ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  | Expected Leveraging by EP Line ${ }^{3}$ | Actual <br> Leveraging by <br> Project Phase(s) ${ }^{4}$ | Phase(s) <br> Requested | District(s) |
| Prop K | 20M | SFMTA | Upgrade Life and Fire Safety Systems | \$ | 1,837,137 |  |  | \$ | 3,900,000 | 90\% | 53\% | Construction | 3, 9, 10, 11 |
| Prop K | 39 | SFMTA | Valencia Street Bikeway Implementation Plan [NTIP Planning] | \$ | 145,000 | \$ | 145,000 | 28\% | 0\% | Planning | 8, 9 |
| Prop K | 39 | SFMTA | Youth Bicycle Safety Education Classes | \$ | 117,243 | \$ | 117,243 | 28\% | 0\% | Construction | Citywide |
| Prop K | 39 | SFMTA | Bike to Work Day 2018 | \$ | 38,475 | \$ | 38,475 | 28\% | 0\% | Construction | Citywide |
| Prop K | 41 | SFPW | Curb Ramps | \$ | 804,084 | \$ | 950,281 | 45\% | 15\% | Construction | 1, 9, 10 |

${ }^{4}$ "Actual Leveraging by Project Phase" is calculated by dividing the total non-Prop K or non-Prop AA funds in the funding plan by the total cost for the requested phase or phases. If the percentage in the "Actual Leveraging" column is lower than in the "Expected Leveraging" column, the request (indicated by yellow highlighting) is leveraging fewer non-Prop K dollars than assumed in the Expenditure Plan. A project that is well leveraged overall may have lower-than-expected leveraging for an individual or partial phase.

## Attachment 1: Summary of Applications Received

${ }^{2}$ Acronyms: SFMTA (San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency), SFPW (San Francisco Public Works).
"Expected Leveraging By EP Line" is calculated by dividing the total non-Prop K funds expected to be available for a given Prop K Expenditure Plan line item (e.g. Pedestrian
Circulation and Safety) by the total expected funding for that Prop K Expenditure Plan line item over the 30 -year Expenditure Plan period. For example, expected leveraging of $90 \%$ indicates that on average non-Prop K funds should cover $90 \%$ of the total costs for all projects in that category, and Prop K should cover only $10 \%$.

| EP Line No./ Category | Project <br> Sponsor | Project Name | Prop K Funds Requested | Project Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20M | SFMTA | Upgrade Life and Fire Safety Systems | \$1,837,137 | Project will upgrade and/or replace fire alarm systems reaching the end of their useful lives with building code compliant systems at the Curtis R. Green light rail maintenance facility shops and yard, the Curtis R. Green Annex, the Scott Division non-revenue vehicle maintenance facility, the Potrero Division trolleybus maintenance facility, the Flynn Division motor coach maintenance facility, and the Kirkland Division motor coach storage facility. Construction will be complete in Spring 2019. |
| 39 | SFMTA | Valencia Street Bikeway Implementation Plan [NTIP Planning] | \$145,000 | Commissioner Sheehy has requested this District 8 Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program (NTIP) Planning project to develop recommendations for upgrading existing bike lanes on Valencia Street between Market Street and Mission Street. The study will conduct analysis and stakeholder outreach to identify issues and constraints for the various segments of the corridor. The resulting implementation plan will include near- and longterm recommendations for each segment of Valencia Street. Potential recommendations include, but are not limited to, protected bike lanes, parking and loading changes, and enforcement needs. The project is expected to be complete by October 2018. |
| 39 | SFMTA | Youth Bicycle Safety Education Classes | \$117,243 | SFMTA is requesting funds to conduct a series of two-week in-school bicycle safety Physical Education (PE) classes at up to 10 SFUSD middle and high schools and 3 elementary schools during the January - June 2018 semester. The series teaches students how to bike and bike safely on streets. The program also provides training for participating PE teachers to integrate the Bicycle Safety Education programs into their schools' PE curriculum in subsequent school years. A state Active Transporation Program (ATP) grant is funding these classes during the fall 2017 semester. Funding for bicycle education in Fiscal Years 2018/19-2020/21 will come from ATP and proposed One Bay Area Grant funds, though additional future Prop K funds may be required to sustain the program at current levels. |

## Attachment 2: Brief Project Descriptions

| EP Line No./ <br> Category Project <br> Sponsor  Project Name |
| :--- |

## Attachment 2: Brief Project Descriptions ${ }^{1}$

${ }^{1}$ See Attachment 1 for footnotes.
Attachment 3: Staff Recommendations ${ }^{1}$

| EP Line No./ Category | Project Sponsor | Project Name |  | K Funds mended | Recommendations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20M | SFMTA | Upgrade Life and Fire Safety Systems | \$ | 1,837,137 | 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPP) Amendment: The recommended allocation is contingent upon a concurrent amendment to the Facilities - Muni 5YPP to add the subject project with $\$ 987,137$ in deobligated funds from projects completed under budget, and $\$ 850,000$ in funds programmed for the Paint Booth Upgrade project. SFMTA is considering adding the paint booth upgrade work to the scope of the Muni Metro East expansion project, which is currently in the planning phase. |
| 39 | SFMTA | Valencia Street Bikeway Implementation Plan [NTIP Planning] | \$ | 145,000 | 5YPP Amendment: The recommended allocation is contingent upon a concurrent Bicycle Circulation and Safety 5YPP amendment. See attached 5YPP amendment for details. |
| 39 | SFMTA | Youth Bicycle Safety Education Classes | \$ | 117,243 |  |
| 39 | SFMTA | Bike to Work Day 2018 | \$ | 38,475 |  |
| 41 | SFPW | Curb Ramps | \$ | 804,084 |  |
| TOTAL \$ 2,941,939 |  |  |  |  |  |


| PROP K SALES TAX |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CASH FLOW |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total |  | FY 2017/18 |  | FY 2018/19 |  | FY 2019/20 |  | FY 2020/21 |  | FY 2021/22 |  |
| Prior Allocations | \$ | 67,419,676 | \$ | 31,832,566 | \$ | 34,453,722 | \$ | 645,389 | \$ | 97,600 | \$ | 97,600 |
| Current Request(s) | \$ | 2,941,939 | \$ | 1,062,994 | \$ | 1,878,945 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| New Total Allocations | \$ | 70,361,615 | \$ | 32,895,560 | \$ | 36,332,667 | \$ | 645,389 | \$ | 97,600 | \$ | 97,600 |

The above table shows maximum annual cash flow for all FY 2017/18 allocations approved to date, along with the current recommended allocation(s).

Investment Commitments, per Prop K Expenditure Plan


Prop K Investments To Date


## Memorandum

Date：November 7， 2017
To：Transportation Authority Board
From：Anna LaForte－Deputy Director for Policy and Programming
Subject：$\quad 11 / 14 / 2017$ Board Meeting：Allocation of $\$ 2,941,939$ in Prop K Sales Tax Funds for Five Requests，with Conditions

## RECOMMENDATION $\square$ Information 区 Action

－Allocate $\$ 2,137,855$ in Prop K sales tax funds to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency for four requests：
1．Upgrade Life and Fire Safety Systems $(\$ 1,837,137)$
2．Valencia Street Bikeway Implementation Plan［NTIP Planning］ （\＄145，000）
3．Youth Bicycle Safety Education Classes $(\$ 117,243)$
4．Bike to Work Day $2018(\$ 38,475)$
－Allocate $\$ 804,084$ in Prop K sales tax funds to San Francisco Public Works for one request：
5．Curb Ramps

## SUMMARY

We have received five requests totaling $\$ 2,941,939$ in Prop K sales tax funds．Attachment 1 lists the requests，including requested phase（s）and supervisorial district（s）for each project．Attachment 2 provides a brief description of each project．Attachment 3 contains the staff recommendations．

区 Fund Allocation<br>区 Fund Programming<br>$\square$ Policy／Legislation<br>$\square$ Plan／Study<br>$\square$ Capital Project Oversight／Delivery<br>$\square$ Budget／Finance<br>$\square$ Contracts<br>$\square$ Other：

$\qquad$

## DISCUSSION

Attachment 1 summarizes the subject allocation requests，including information on proposed leveraging（i．e．stretching Prop K dollars further by matching them with other fund sources） compared with the leveraging assumptions in the Prop K Expenditure Plan．Attachment 2 includes a brief description of each project．A detailed scope，schedule，budget and funding plan for each project is included in the enclosed Allocation Request Forms．Attachment 3 summarizes the staff recommendations for the requests，highlighting special conditions and other items of interest．

## FINANCIAL IMPACT

The recommended action would allocate $\$ 2,941,939$ in Fiscal Year（FY）2017／18 Prop K sales tax funds．The allocations would be subject to the Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules contained in the enclosed Allocation Request Forms．
Attachment 4 shows the total approved FY 2017／18 allocations and appropriations to date，with associated annual cash flow commitments as well as the recommended allocations and cash flow
amounts that are the subject of this memorandum.
Sufficient funds are included in the FY 2017/18 budget to accommodate the recommended actions. Furthermore, sufficient funds will be included in future budgets to cover the recommended cash flow distribution for those respective fiscal years.

## CAC POSITION

The CAC was briefed on this item at its October 25, 2017 meeting and severed the request for Bike to Work Day 2018. The underlying requests were unanimously approved without objection. The severed request was approved by a $7-2$ vote.

## SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

Attachment 1 - Summary of Applications Received
Attachment 2 - Project Descriptions
Attachment 3 - Staff Recommendations
Attachment 4 - Prop K/AA Allocation Summaries - FY 2017/18
Enclosure - Prop K/AA Allocation Request Forms (5)

RESOLUTION AWARDING THREE-YEAR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACTS, WITH AN OPTION TO EXTEND FOR TWO ADDITIONAL ONE-YEAR PERIODS, TO WSP USA, INC. AND RESOURCE SYSTEMS GROUP, INC. IN A COMBINED AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$400,000 FOR ON-CALL MODELING SERIVCES, AND AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO NEGOTIATE CONTRACT PAYMENT TERMS AND NON-MATERIAL CONTRACT TERMS AND CONDITIONS

WHEREAS, The Transportation Authority relies on on-call consultants to support the Technology, Data, and Analysis Division with various services related to travel modeling and analysis; and

WHEREAS, On-call modeling services include assistance with travel demand model development, dynamic traffic assignment modeling, project-level modeling assistance, data collection, traffic operations analysis and data warehousing and visualization in support of the Congestion Management Program, Connect SF, the San Francisco Transportation Plan update, the Freeway Corridor Management Study, Travel Demand Management strategy evaluation, Transportation Network Company research and numerous other local and regional studies; and

WHEREAS, Given the wide range of desired proficiencies and experience, the amount and complexity of the Transportation Authority's work program, and occasional conflicts of interest or availability that arise for specific efforts, staff propose to contract with two consultant teams with which the Transportation Authority may call upon on a task order basis; and

WHEREAS, On September 5, 2017, the Transportation Authority and the Treasure Island Mobility Management Agency (TIMMA) issued a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for on-call modeling services to support the Transportation Authority's work program over the next three years; and

WHEREAS, The Transportation Authority received three Statements of Qualifications (SOQs) in response to the RFQ by the due date of October 4, 2017; and

WHEREAS, A selection panel comprised of San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency and Transportation Authority staff evaluated the SOQs based on qualifications and other criteria identified in the RFQ; and

WHEREAS, Interviews were not conducted nor deemed necessary due to the quality of the SOQs and the familiarity of staff with previous work performed by the majority of firms who submitted SOQs; and

WHEREAS, Based on the competitive process defined in the evaluation criteria of the RFQ document, the selection panel recommended awarding contracts to the two highest-ranked firms: WSP USA Inc. (WSP) and Resource Systems Group, Inc. (RSG); and

WHEREAS, The selection panel recommended that the Transportation Authority and TIMMA both award contracts to the same two firms as the agencies' share modeling staff resources which will enhance staff efficiency in issuing task orders and supporting project needs; and

WHEREAS, The Transportation Authority' portion of the scope of work described in the RFQ is anticipated in the Transportation Authority's adopted Fiscal Year (FY) 2017/18 work program and budget through relevant projects and studies, and sufficient funds will be included in future fiscal year budgets to cover the cost of these contracts; and

WHEREAS, The professional services will be funded by a combination of federal Surface Transportation Planning grants, federal and/or state grants from Caltrans and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, local agency contributions and Prop K sales tax funds; and

WHEREAS, At its October 25, 2017 meeting, the Citizens Advisory Committee considered and unanimously adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation; and

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority hereby awards three-year professional
services contracts, with an option to extend for two additional one-year periods, to WSP and RSG in a combined amount not to exceed $\$ 400,000$ for on-call modeling services; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Executive Director is hereby authorized to negotiate contract payment terms and non-material contract terms and conditions; and be it further

RESOLVED, That for the purposes of this resolution, "non-material" shall mean contract terms and conditions other than provisions related to the overall contract amount, terms of payment, and general scope of services; and be it further

RESOLVED, That notwithstanding the foregoing and any rule or policy of the Transportation Authority to the contrary, the Executive Director is expressly authorized to execute agreements and amendments to agreements that do not cause the total agreement value, as approved herein, to be exceeded and that do not expand the general scope of services.

Attachment:

1. Scope of Services

## Attachment 1 - Transportation Authority Scope of Services

The Transportation Authority seek consultant teams with expertise in multimodal activity-based modeling, dynamic traffic/transit assignment, land use modeling, and data collection, analysis, visualization and warehousing in complex urban settings. It is the intent of the Transportation Authority to pre-qualify multiple consultant firms and/or teams of firms in the major tasks described below that will collectively provide the best overall service packages, inclusive of fee considerations, on an as-needed basis for modeling projects through the issuance of Task Orders. The Transportation Authority will separately contract with the selected teams for a three-year term, with an option to extend, which may be exercised at the discretion of the Transportation Authority, for two additional one-year periods (up to a total of five years). Consultant firms will be pre-qualified to perform services for the Transportation Authority. The Transportation Authority has budgeted $\$ 400,000$ for these contracts for the first three-year term, with the value of subsequent one-year extensions to be determined by future Transportation Authority budgets.
Travel Model Technical Assistance Required: As noted above, it is the intent of the Transportation Authority to contract with one or more modeling consultant teams, with whom the Transportation Authority shall select prospective consultants on a Task Order basis for modeling development and application projects. The establishment of contracts with one or more consultant teams will enable the Transportation Authority to enlist the services of a broad range of modeling specialists on an on-call, as-needed basis. As needs arise, the Transportation Authority will share outline scopes of work with lead firms to obtain more detailed team task order proposals (scopes, schedules/availability, personnel, budgets). The Transportation Authority will assign tasks on these criteria as well as conflicts of interest, if any. No selected team is guaranteed a Task Order under this contract.
A list of six general areas of expertise sought in prospective teams is provided below, lettered A through F. The Transportation Authority will favorably consider teams that have capabilities in all six areas of expertise, but specialized teams may also submit responses for one or more areas of expertise that match the team's capabilities. Teams must declare which of these areas of expertise they are qualified to support.

## A. Activity-Based Travel Model ("ABM") Development

- Developing and managing travel model source code using git/github version control
- Update individual subcomponents of SF-CHAMP to provide enhanced analytic capabilities
- Enhance local-area validation for specific corridors as project studies arise; for example, improve the peninsula roadway validation in support of San Francisco's Freeway Corridor Management Study
- Support estimation and calibration of DaySim subcomponents within SF-CHAMP
- Evaluate the latest technologies in activity-based travel models around the globe, and prioritize next steps for continuing the incremental advancement of SF-CHAMP capabilities based on the needs of planners in San Francisco
- Evaluate areas for improving computational efficiency, legibility, and maintainability
- Develop comprehensive SF-CHAMP model documentation
- Further develop the Transportation Authority's Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) process for network coding
- Economic, land use, and demographic forecasting to support ABM


## Attachment 1 - Transportation Authority Scope of Services

## B. Dynamic Traffic Assignment ("DTA") and/or Dynamic Transit Assignment

- Update the Transportation Authority's DTA model and expand the network regionally
- Update regional activity-based model and DTA demand and supply integration
- Validate and apply the DTA model for various projects
- Support continuing development of fast-trips dynamic transit assignment model
C. Model Applications
- Provide modeling support for various upcoming ABM and/or DTA model applications
- Develop, code, run, and provide insight on modeling scenarios
- Update Network Wrangler project files based on recently adopted Plan Bay Area 2040 and a forthcoming refinement of MTC's zone system and network (as part of Travel Model Two)
D. Data Collection and Analysis
- Traffic data collection and surveying
- Collection and analysis of passively collected and/or location-based data


## E. Traffic Operations Analysis

- Evaluate roadway operations
- Conduct traffic microsimulation analysis
- Analysis and forecasting of toll roads, managed lanes, transportation pricing, and travel demand management policies
- Advise on transportation facility design regarding operational performance and geometric or technological constraints


## F. Data Warehouse and Visualization

- Data warehouse system development
- Data warehouse maintenance
- Graphical representation, mapping, and visualization
- Web-based data presentation and interactive tools
- Develop data delivery methods (i.e. open application programming interfaces (APIs)) for public data per open data and Gov 2.0 ideals

The above-mentioned areas of expertise and example task types are representative of needs in the coming three years - additional undetermined task types are anticipated to be needed and not all task types listed above will necessarily be produced under this contract in the next three years.

## Memorandum

Date: November 7, 2017
To: Transportation Authority Board
From: Joe Castiglione - Deputy Director for Technology, Data and Analysis
Subject: 11/14/17 Board Meeting: Award Three-Year Professional Services Contracts, with an Option to Extend for Two Additional One-Year Periods, to WSP USA Inc. and Resource Systems Group, Inc. in a Combined Amount Not to Exceed $\$ 400,000$ for On-Call Modeling Services

## RECOMMENDATION $\square$ Information $\boxtimes$ Action <br> - Award three-year professional services contracts, with an option to extend for two additional one-year periods, to WSP USA Inc. (WSP) and Resource Systems Group, Inc. (RSG) in a combined amount not to exceed $\$ 400,000$ for on-call modeling services <br> - Authorize the Executive Director to negotiate contract payment terms and non-material terms and conditions <br> SUMMARY

The Transportation Authority relies on on-call consultants to support the Technology, Data, and Analysis Division with various services related to travel modeling and analysis. On-call modeling services include model development, model maintenance, model application, data collection, and other related activities. This action would award contracts to two highly qualified and deeply experienced teams to support these needs.

## DISCUSSION

## Background.

The Transportation Authority seeks on-call transportation modeling services to support the Transportation Authority's Fiscal Year (FY) 2017/18 and future year activities, including assistance with travel demand model development, dynamic traffic assignment modeling, project-level modeling assistance, data collection, traffic operations analysis and data warehousing and visualization in support of the Congestion Management Program, Connect SF, the San Francisco Transportation Plan update, the Freeway Corridor Management Study, Travel Demand Management strategy evaluation, Transportation Network Company research and numerous other local and regional studies. The complete scope of services is included as Attachment 1.

The Transportation Authority's current on-call modeling services contract, with a team led by WSP (formerly Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc.), has served the Transportation Authority well over the past five years and is approaching the end of its contract term.

## Transportation Authority Models.

The Transportation Authority maintains and applies a travel demand forecasting model known as the San Francisco Chained Activity Modeling Process (SF-CHAMP). SF-CHAMP incorporates a disaggregate approach to forecasting travel demand. This activity-based model is more sensitive than traditional four-step models to a broader array of conditions that influence travelers' choices. SFCHAMP v5.2, the current version of SF-CHAMP, includes geographic coverage of the entire ninecounty San Francisco Bay Area, provides detailed sensitivity to pricing effects, includes support for toll/non-toll choice, has more detail in time-of-day decision-making, and has both cordon- and areabased toll operations capabilities. Recent advances to SF-CHAMP include updates to input assumptions, functional additions, and operational improvements.

The next generation of SF-CHAMP, currently under development, will replace the current choice model core with an implementation of the DaySim activity-based travel simulator. The transition to DaySim will occur during the period of performance for this on-call services contract. The future DaySim-based model update will add more spatial, temporal, activity purpose, and land use detail and will introduce new capabilities to represent important conditions such as transit station parking lot capacity constraints and overall parking availability by type (on-street/off-street, paid/free) transit pass availability, and more. This significant model upgrade will further enhance the SF-CHAMP's role as a valuable tool supporting project analysis at the Transportation Authority and across partner agencies.

Other Transportation Authority models include dynamic traffic assignment (DTA) and dynamic transit assignment models. The Transportation Authority developed these models to give planners a more fine-grained view of transportation system performance, as well as a better understanding of why and how drivers route themselves within San Francisco and how transit riders negotiate a complex a transit system.

## Procurement Process.

The Transportation Authority and the Treasure Island Mobility Management Agency (TIMMA) issued a joint Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for on-call modeling services on September 5, 2017. We held a pre-response conference on September 11, 2017, which provided opportunities for small businesses and larger firms to meet and form partnerships. 8 firms attended the conference.

We took steps to encourage participation from small and disadvantaged business enterprises, including advertising in five local newspapers: the San Francisco Examiner, the San Francisco Bay View, Nichi Bei, the Small Business Exchange, and the Western Edition. We also distributed the RFQ, sign-in sheets for the pre-response conference, and periodic updates on the RFQ to certified small, disadvantaged and local businesses, Bay Area and cultural Chambers of Commerce, the Small Business Councils, as well as the Travel Model Improvement Program.
By the due date of October 4, 2017, we received three Statements of Qualifications (SOQs) in response to the RFQ. Interviews were not conducted nor deemed necessary due to the quality of the SOQs and the familiarity of staff with previous work performed by the majority of firms who submitted SOQs. A selection panel comprised of San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency and Transportation Authority staff evaluated the SOQs based on qualifications and other criteria identified in the RFQ. Based on the competitive process, defined in the evaluation criteria of the RFQ document, the selection panel recommends awarding contracts to the two highest-ranked firms: WSP and RSG. The selection panel recommends that the Transportation Authority and TIMMA both
award contracts to the same two firms, as the agencies' share modeling staff resources. Awarding contracts to the same on-call modeling consultant teams will enhance staff efficiency in issuing task orders and supporting project needs. The contract award for TIMMA's portion of the contract will be considered by the TIMMA Committee at its October 24, 2017 meeting.
Both WSP and RSG have unique skills, technical expertise, and project experience in relevant areas. Both firms have provided modeling services to the Transportation Authority in the past, have strong track records of providing modeling services on time and on budget, and have established teams with specialized knowledge and abilities.

Given the wide range of desired proficiencies and experience, the amount and complexity of the Transportation Authority's work program, and occasional conflicts of interest or availability that arise for specific efforts, there is a need for broad and deep access to transportation modeling skills in the on-call modeling services contract. We propose to contract with two consultant teams with whom the Transportation Authority may call upon on a task order basis. Such an arrangement has been used in the past for the Transportation Authority's previous on-call modeling services contracts, which has proved beneficial to the Transportation Authority's Technology, Data and Analysis Division's work program.

Consultants selected for a contract will remain eligible for consideration for task order negotiation on an as-needed basis for the initial three-year term plus two optional one-year extensions. While the Transportation Authority intends to engage pre-qualified firms based on capabilities, experience and availability, no selected team is guaranteed a task order.

We expect to receive federal financing assistance to fund a portion of this contract, and will adhere to federal procurement regulations. For this contract, we established a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) goal of 5\%, accepting certifications by the California Unified Certification Program. SOQs from both teams meet the DBE goal. The WSP team includes $12.5 \%$ DBE participation from two subconsultants: Asian Subcontinent-owned W\&S Solutions, LLC and Women-owned Transportation Analytics, in addition to two other subconsultants: INRO Consultants, Inc. and the University of Kentucky. The RSG team includes $10 \%$ DBE participation from one subconsultant: Asian-Subcontinent-owned TJKM, in addition to two other subconsultants: INRO and Bowman Research and Consulting.

## FINANCIAL IMPACT

The scope of work described in the RFQ is anticipated in the Transportation Authority's adopted Fiscal Year 2017/18 work program and budget through relevant projects and studies, including the San Francisco Transportation Plan. Budget for these activities will be funded by a combination of federal Surface Transportation Planning grants, federal and/or state grants from Caltrans and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, local agency contributions and Prop K sales tax funds. The first year's activities are included in the Transportation Authority's adopted Fiscal Year 2017/18 budget, and sufficient funds will be included in future fiscal year budgets to cover the cost of these contracts.

## CAC POSITION

The CAC was briefed on this item at its October 25, 2017 meeting and unanimously adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation.

## SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

Attachment 1 - Scope of Services
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2017 Facilities Framework \& Facilities Capital Program
The San Francisco Municipal Transportation
Agency's facility campus includes a diverse
group of buildings, grounds and stations
These facilities support the SFMTA's ability
to provide reliable transit service, maintain
street infrastructure, and store, protect and
maintain its diverse transit fleet.

What is the 2017 Facilities Framework?


$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { It includes costs and realistic, } \\
& \text { constrained financial scenarios. }
\end{aligned}
$$

BUILDINGPROGRESS

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Red: Bus Facilities/Rail Facilities } \\
& \text { Green: Streets Facilities } \\
& \text { Blue: Support Facilities }
\end{aligned}
$$

(4) 0
2013

| - The SFMTA Real Estate and Facilities Vision for the 21 was presented to the SFMTA Board of Directors in Jan |
| :---: |
| - The report evaluated the Agency's facilities challenge ways to reconfigure, consolidate, or expand existing meet operational needs while identifying cost saving revenue-generating opportunities. |
| - An addendum was presented to the Board in July 2014 included regional growth assumptions. |
| The 2013 Facilities Vision Report largely dealt with the $n$ Muni Transit Fleet, but did not fully consider the oper needs of other SFMTA Divisions or units. |
| ment-coach-facilities |

## Repair

Good


| Facility | Building(s) | Site |  | 2016 |  | 2017-2036 Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flynn | 266,000 sf | 6.2 acres | \$ | 6,658,000 | \$ | 18,767,000 |
| Kirkland | 13,200 sf | 2.6 acres | \$ | 1,542,000 | \$ | 1,689,000 |
| Woods | 158,000 sf | 8.2 acres | \$ | 16,648,000 | \$ | 12,405,000 |
| Presidio | 158,000 sf | 5.4 acres | \$ | 593,000 | \$ | 14,140,000 |
| Potrero | 155,000 sf | 4.4 acres | \$ | 4,700,000 | \$ | 6,705,000 |
| Cable Car | 83,700 sf | 1 acre | \$ | 6,858,000 | \$ | 7,372,000 |
| Green | 191,000 sf | 6.7 acres | \$ | 6,234,000 | \$ | 24,967,000 |
| MME | 163,000 sf | 16.9 acres | \$ | 6,747,000 | \$ | 14,363,000 |
| Alameda | 7,000 sf | N/A | \$ | 344,000 | \$ | 10,333,000 |
| Bancroft | 90,000 sf | 1 acre | \$ | 501,000 | \$ | 2,172,000 |
| Bryant | 48,000 sf | 1.1 acres | \$ | 3,107,000 | \$ | 1,368,000 |
| Burke | 103,000 sf | 2.4 acres | \$ | 2,571,000 | \$ | 1,928,000 |
| Lenox | 10,000 sf | NA | \$ | 356,000 | \$ | 853,000 |
| Pennsylvania | 88,000 sf | 2 acres | \$ | 171,000 | \$ | 15,501,000 |
| Scott | 118,000 sf | 1.1 acres | \$ | 989,000 | \$ | 7,613,000 |
| Total | 1,651,900 sf | 59 acres | \$ | 60,388,000 | \$ | 140,168,000 |

SFMTA Muni Fleet Replacement and Growth
Francisco's
The Agency has secured funds for both replacement and
expansion taking advantage of procurement opportunities and
supply chains
This replacement and growth requires modernization of the
SFMTA's facilities campus.
By $2025 \mathbf{7 7}$ more buses than can be stored
By $2030 \mathbf{1 3 2}$ more buses than can be stored
By $2040 \quad 46$ more LRVs than can be stored
Framework Scenario 1: New Facility \& Facility Reconstruction

Framework Scenario 2: Facility Reconstruction and Optimization

| MME <br> Build for trolley coach swing, convert to rail and shop uses | Potrero <br> Rebuild as multi-level trolley and motor coach facility with private development above | Presidio <br> Rebuild as multi-level trolley and motor coach facility with private development adjacent | Kirkland <br> Rebuild as motor coach facility |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |

Use MME for swing while rebuilding Potrero \& Presidio and lease while rebuilding Kirkland




2017
2023 - 2030

- Complete
- Rebuild/C
$87^{\circ}$
SFMTA Facilities Capital Program Projected Cashflow (July 2017) $\$ 400,000,000$
$\$ 350,000,000$
$\$ 300,000,000$
\$250,000,000
\$200,000,000
\$150,000,000
\$100,000,000
\$50,000,000


[^0]:    cc: Treasury Oversight Committee: Aimee Brown, Ron Gerhard, Reeta Madhavan, Charles Perl Ben Rosenfield, Controller, Office of the Controller
    Tonia Lediju, Internal Audit, Office of the Controller
    Mayor's Office of Public Policy and Finance
    San Francisco County Transportation Authority
    San Francisco Public Library
    San Francisco Health Service System

[^1]:    The City and County of San Francisco uses the following methodology to determine compliance: Compliance is pre-trade and calculated on both a par and market value basis, using the result with the lowest percentage of the overall portfolio value. Cash balances are included in the City's compliance calculations.

    Please note the information in this report does not include cash balances. Due to fluctuations in the market value of the securities held in the Pooled Fund and changes in the City's cash position, the allocation limits may be exceeded on a post-trade compliance basis. In these instances, no compliance violation has occurred, as the policy limits were not exceeded prior to trade execution.

    The full Investment Policy can be found at http://www.sftreasurer.org/, in the Reports \& Plans section of the About menu.
    Totals may not add due to rounding.
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