## AGENDA

# SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY Meeting Notice 

Date: Tuesday, July 24, 2018; 10:00 a.m.<br>Location: Legislative Chamber, Room 250, City Hall<br>Commissioners: Peskin (Chair), Tang (Vice Chair), Brown, Cohen, Fewer, Kim, Mandelman, Ronen, Safai, Stefani and Yee

Clerk: Alberto Quintanilla

1. Roll Call
2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION
3. Executive Director's Report - INFORMATION

## Consent Agenda

4. Approve the Minutes of the July 10, 2018 Meeting - ACTION* 5
5. [Final Approval] State and Federal Legislation Update - ACTION* 15 Support if Amended: Senate Bill (SB) 1014 (Skinner)
6. [Final Approval] Amend the 2019 Prop K Strategic Plan Baseline, Allocating $\$ 19,999,636$ in Prop K Funds for Two Requests, with Conditions, and Appropriating \$600,000 for One Request - ACTION*
Projects: (TJPA) Downtown Extension - 30\% Design Part 1 (\$9,678,626); (SFMTA) Paratransit and Shop-a-Round/Van Gogh Shuttles, Ramp Taxi Incentive (\$10,321,010) and (SFCTA) Downtown Extension - 30\% Design Oversight and Support Part 1 ( $\$ 600,000$ )
7. [Final Approval] Allocate $\$ 2,442,213$ in Prop K Sales Tax Funds for Four Requests, with Conditions, and Appropriation of $\$ 854,000$ in Prop K Funds for One Request - ACTION*

Projects: (SFMTA) (SFMTA) Geary Bus Rapid Transit - Phase 1 Near Term (\$1,392,213), Alemany and Rousseau Traffic Signal Conduits $(\$ 150,000)$ and Local Track Application Based Traffic Calming Program ( $\$ 200,000$ ); (BART) Balboa Park Station Area Improvements ( $\$ 700,000$ ); (SFCTA) Geary Bus Rapid Transit - Additional Funds $(\$ 854,000)$
8. [Final Approval] Approve Part 1 of the Fiscal Year 2018/19 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program of Projects, Programming $\$ 388,003$ to Four Projects ACTION*
9. [Final Approval] Adopt a Three-Year Professional Services Contract with Civic Edge Consulting in an Amount Not to Exceed \$150,000 for Strategic Communications, Media and Community Relations Services for the ConnectSF Program - ACTION*
10. [Final Approval] Adopt the Emerging Mobility Evaluation Report - ACTION*
11. [Final Approval] Adopt the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) Perks Evaluation Findings Document-ACTION*

## End of Consent Agenda

12. [Final Approval on First Appearance] Adopt an Oppose Position on Proposition 6, the Voter Approval for Future Gas and Vehicle Taxes and 2017 Tax Repeal Initiative - ACTION*
13. Update on the Independent Analysis and Oversight Services with Sjoberg Evashenk Consulting, Inc. - INFORMATION
At the January 2017 Board meeting, Chair Peskin called for the Board to enter into a contract for independent analysis and oversight services to aid on a variety of potential areas as a means of supporting Transportation Authority Commissioners and their staffs in assessing the agency's effectiveness and efficiency in achieving its mission. In July 2017 the Board awarded a professional services contract to Sjoberg Evashenk Consulting Inc., with a focus on assessing three functional areas of the agency's operations: 1) Prop K Capital Program Administration; 2) Budget Review and Analysis; and 3) Prop K Sponsor Reimbursements.
14. Update on the Muni Service Equity Strategy Report - INFORMATION* 79
15. Update on the District 10 Mobility Study [NTIP Planning] - INFORMATION*
16. Investment Report and Debt Expenditure Report for the Quarter Ended June 30, 2018 - INFORMATION*

## Other Items

17. 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.
18. Public Comment
19. 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.
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## DRAFT MINUTES

# SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY 

Tuesday, July 10, 2018

## 1. Roll Call

Chair Peskin called the meeting to order at 10:06 a.m.
Present at Roll Call: Commissioners Cohen, Fewer, Peskin, Ronen, Stefani and Tang (6)
Absent at Roll Call: Commissioners Breed (entered during Item 2), Kim (entered during Item 2), Yee (entered during Item 2), Safai (entered during Item 4) and Sheehy (entered during Item 4) (5)

## 2. Citizens Advisor Committee Report - INFORMATION

John Larson, Chair of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), reported that the CAC recommended a motion of support for item 5 on the agenda, amendment of the 2019 Prop K Strategic Plan Baseline, but elected to continue the selection of the Pennsylvania Alignment as the preferred alternative for grade separations at $16^{\text {th }}$ Street and Mission Bay Drive on the approach to the Caltrain Downtown Extension (DTX). He said the CAC wanted to know potential relocation areas of the railyard before recommending approval and requested a presentation of the proposed 7th street alignment that had been previously rejected. He said regarding item 6, allocation and appropriation of Prop K funds, the CAC asked if lessons learned from the Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project were being applied to the Geary BRT project. He said the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) staff stated that unlike the Van Ness BRT project, the Geary BRT work was divided into two projects; one contract for the underground sewer water and fiber-optic cable work and another for the surface signal and paving work. Mr. Larson said there was objection to the Geary BRT project during public comment, stating that the original project called for a light rail service.

Mr. Larson said the CAC supported the Balboa Park station improvement plan request and showed interest in the redesigned passenger drop-off area that could also be closed and used for public events. He said in response to public comment about better integrating the Muni M Line terminus with the Balboa Park station improvements, Transportation Authority staff noted a current Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program (NTIP) for District 11 that was studying the area as well as the San Jose Avenue and Geneva Avenue intersection. He reported that the CAC discussed the scalability of newer autonomous technology like drones for item 9 on the agenda, Adoption of the Emerging Mobility Evaluation Report. He said Transportation Authority staff remarked that they were working with the SFMTA regarding sidewalk robots and with the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) and San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) regarding autonomous vehicles with passengers. He said the CAC pointed out that the Federal Aviation Administration would need to be consulted about drone technology.

During public comment Roland Lebrun thanked Mr. Larson for allowing him extra time to explain the 7th street alignment to the CAC and summarized the contents of an email he had previously sent to the Board.

After public comment Chair Peskin stated that the Planning Department and Transportation Authority staff would further brief the CAC on the Pennsylvania Alignment and railyard options at the July CAC meeting and that the item would be before the Board in September.

## 3. Approve the Minutes of the June 26, 2018 Meeting - ACTION

There was no public comment.
Commissioner Cohen moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Commissioner Ronen.
The minutes were approved without objection by the following vote:
Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Stefani, Tang and Yee (9)

Absent: Commissioners Safai and Sheehy (2)

## 4. State and Federal Legislation Update - ACTION

Mark Watts, State Legislative Advocate, presented the item.
Chairs Peskin asked if helmets were already required under state law for e-scooters.
Mr. Watts said they were not previously required under state law. He said the first set of amendments to Assembly Bill (AB) 2989 did mandate helmets, and the most recent set included a mandate that only applied to users under the age of 18.

With respect to Senate Bill (SB) 1014, Commissioner Cohen said bike share and scooter miles travelled accounted for only $3.5 \%$ of the total vehicle miles travelled in San Francisco and asked what the harm was in counting bikes and scooters. She noted that the goal of the legislation was to establish greenhouse gas emission baselines for Transportation Network Companies (TNCs). She questioned whether the $3.5 \%$ was significant enough to move the Board's position and instead suggested working with TNC companies to reduce their emissions. She also asked how the word vehicle was being defined in SB 1014.

Director Chang said the intent of SB 1014 was to reduce motor vehicle emissions for the fleet of TNCs rather than all vehicles. She said vehicle trips by bicycles and scooters were not meant to be the focus of the bill and would dilute the intent of reducing motor vehicle emissions.
Commissioner Cohen asked which cities in California had the largest active transportation programs.

Director Chang said she was not sure but noted San Francisco likely had one of the most robust markets for scooter and bike share in the state.

Commissioner Cohen asked if the percentage of total vehicle miles travelled by bikes and scooters was known.

Director Chang said there were not specific mode share studies but said the $3.5 \%$ was likely not too far off.

Commissioner Cohen said she understood that bikes and scooters were not the focus but reiterated that they were only $3.5 \%$ share of vehicle miles traveled in San Francisco.

Director Chang said the policy call was based on the principle to encourage the bill to focus on motor vehicles.

Amber Crabbe, Public Policy Manager, said the bill was looking at the percent share of miles completed by qualified zero emission vehicles, where "vehicle" included walking, biking, and other modes of active transportation as well as zero-emission passenger vehicles. She said the intent was to not just have bicycle sharing and scooters to count toward the targets, but also to be able to count the walking that the passengers did to get to shared passenger vehicles. She said looking at passenger vehicles only was a simpler way to look at it and a way to make sure that the targets were consistent and focused as the use of other various modes evolved.

Commissioner Cohen said there was room to make an amendment for supporting SB 1014 since expanded to bikes and scooters and helped San Francisco. She said San Francisco's focus was beyond vehicles.

Chair Peskin asked if the most recent amendment related to subsidies of Lyft and Uber driver vehicles using public dollars.
Mr. Watts said that was correct and that the subsidies were intended to be part of the prior set of amendments, before being withdrawn.

Commissioner Cohen said the subsidies were not shared with her when briefed by Transportation Authority staff.

Ms. Crabbe said the original version of the bill included a $\$ 30$ million a year subsidy that would go toward assisting TNC drivers in purchasing electric vehicles. She said Transportation Authority staff moved to support the bill after the subsidy was removed. She said the current version of the bill introduced language requiring the state to work with the TNCs and other stakeholders to evaluate incentives that could be provided. She said the revised bill produced an opportunity and a framework for providing public subsidies in the future, which was why staff sought moving towards a seek amendment position to address both amendments.

There was no public comment.
Commissioner Stefani moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Tang.
The item was approved without objection by the following vote:
Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy, Stefani, Tang and Yee (11)
5. Amend the 2019 Prop K Strategic Plan Baseline, Allocating \$19,999,636 in Prop K Funds for Two Requests, with Conditions, and Appropriating $\$ 600,000$ for One Request ACTION

Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming and Eric Cordoba, Deputy Director for Capital Projects, presented the item per the staff memorandum.
During public comment Roland Lebrun said the full board had not yet decided on the Pennsylvania Avenue alignment and felt the allocation of Prop K funds was premature. He suggested that the Board consider the entire alignment from 22nd Street all the way up to the Transbay center. He said the appropriation of $\$ 600,000$ for oversight was inadequate and should be increased to $\$ 2$ million to avoid not being able to hire top class engineering firms.

Mr. Cordoba said the Pennsylvania Avenue alignment was a separate and independent utility and had to do with the more southern portion of the DTX project. He said the Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA) Board and their staff were working towards getting the federal record of decision later this year. He said regarding oversight efforts, there was significant additional oversight that would be needed for the project to move forward and that staff would seek further funds next year. He explained that the current appropriation was just meant to cover the next year's work of work.

Mark Zabaneh, Executive Director at the TJPA, said phase two of the project would be completed through partnership effort with the Transportation Authority, the SFMTA, County of San Francisco, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), Caltrain and high-speed rail. He said the TJPA would seek the assistance of the Transportation Authority and experts to conduct peer reviews as needed.
Commissioner Breed moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Cohen.
The item was approved without objection by the following vote:
Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy, Stefani, Tang and Yee (11)
6. Allocate $\$ 2,442,213$ in Prop K Sales Tax Funds for Four Requests, with Conditions, and Appropriation of $\$ 854,000$ in Prop K Funds for One Request - ACTION
Oscar Quintanilla, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.
There was no public comment.
Commissioner Cohen moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Stefani.
The item was approved without objection by the following vote:
Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy, Stefani, Tang and Yee (11)

## 7. Approve Part 1 of the Fiscal Year 2018/19 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program of Projects, Programming \$388,003 to Four Projects - ACTION

Oscar Quintanilla, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.
During public comment Clarrissa Cabansagan, New Mobility Policy Director at TransForm, urged the Board to include bike share access funding and investment for low income students at San Francisco State University (SFSU) and stated that it was one of the best investments with demonstrable results. She said because of TransForm's advocacy and dedicated funds from MTC, Ford Go Bike and Bay Area cities; Ford GoBike was leading the nation with the highest proportion of low income riders using bike share. She noted San Francisco's underwhelming percentage of low income residents who used bike share when compared to other Bay Area cities that had invested in public outreach.
After public comment, Commissioner Cohen said she was concerned about the recommendation to remove funding to provide Ford GoBike memberships for up to 400 SFSU Pell Grant eligible students, along with 150 free yearly passes and 300 single month passes for students who were not Pell Grant eligible but met the low-income requirements. She said the pilot program was approved by the Transportation Authority CAC and initially recommended for adoption by Transportation Authority staff. Commissioner Cohen continued to note that in 2016 the transportation survey at

SFSU showed that nearly half of their students got to campus by Muni or BART. She said the percentage of SFSU students who arrived on foot increased by $42 \%$ between 2008-2014 and felt the Board should support students in the last mile that got them to class. She said she understood the policy direction set forth toward not providing public funds for TNCs but felt an exception could be made for the proposed pilot program. She said the pilot program would remove barriers to activate transportation for young people at one of the least accessible college campuses in one of the most expensive cities in the world. She asked Transportation Authority staff where they drew the line for working with private companies.
Deputy Director for Policy and Programming Anna LaForte said the Air District at the regional and state levels had a history of funding both public and private entities in the spirit of improving air quality for all. She said Transportation Authority staff looked at eligibility from the grant guidelines when determining whether to recommend a project.
Commissioner Cohen motioned to amend item 7 to restore the Ford GoBike memberships for SFSU students to the list of projects recommended for the funds. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kim.

Chair Peskin appreciated the sentiments expressed by his colleagues and said the recommendation for the Ford GoBike pilot program at SFSU was inconsistent with previous actions of the Board. He said Lyft was a company with a valuation of $\$ 7.5$ billion and that their acquisition of Motivate was reported to be about $\$ 250$ million. Chair Peskin stated that Lyft had refused to reveal data and information to the Transportation Authority, but research by staff had revealed that at peak, up to $26 \%$ of the downtown congestion in Districts 3 and 6 was a result of TNCs. He said the Board had voted last year to restrict funds from the emergency ride home program, to not go to TNCs. He said he did not want to penalize low income SFSU students but felt Lyft had the wherewithal to subsidize the proposed pilot program. Chair Peskin said he would oppose the motion to amend item 7.

Commissioner Yee asked if Lyft had offered a matching fund for the Ford GoBike membership program for SFSU students.
Mr. Quintanilla said the grant was going to be administered by SFSU. He explained that Ford GoBike currently offers discounted memberships for low-income individuals: $\$ 5$ for the first year and $\$ 60$ for the second-year membership. He said the proposed TFCA subsidy would go toward covering the discounted membership.

Chair Peskin asked if the proposed program would fund the $\$ 60$ discounted membership fee.
Mr. Quintanilla replied in the affirmative and said SFSU would administer the grant and either provide the subsidy to the Pell Grant-eligible students or on a first come-first serve basis for other low-income students.

Commissioner Yee asked if it was a one-year grant.
Mr. Quintanilla stated that it was a two-year pilot.
Commissioner Yee asked what the intent of the program was after the two-year pilot.
Mr. Quintanilla said the grant was coordinated with the expansion of the Ford GoBike station network around the SFSU campus, so the intent of the pilot was to encourage students to use a new alternative mode of transportation.
Chair Peskin asked if the contract that the MTC entered into with Motivate required not only
subsidies to low-income individuals but also geographic equity.
Mr. Quintanilla said he was not certain but stated that the grant would not subsidize operations or the expansion. He said it would cover the extra $\$ 5$ or $\$ 60$ that a low-income student would pay for a membership.

Chair Peskin asked if all the eligible recipients were Pell Grant students.
Mr. Quintanilla said that most recipients were Pell Grant students, but that staff could work with SFSU to ensure there were enough eligible students to cover the full grant if the desire was to only subsidize Pell Grant students.

Jeff Hobson, Deputy Director for Planning, said there were requirements about geographic equity that would require Motivate to expand into communities of concern.

Commissioner Yee asked if provisions could be added to ask Motivate to provide additional funding for eligible students.

Ms. LaForte said a condition could be added and that funding agreement would have to be between SFSU and Motivate.

Chair Peskin said he would like to hear from Motivate at the next Board meeting if that was acceptable to the members.

Commissioner Yee said he would support continuing the item to hear from Motivate.
Commissioner Ronen said she would support a motion to continue the item and felt Lyft had an opportunity to step up and provide a benefit to students that deserved it and needed it. She highlighted her previous communication with Lyft in which they replied to her concerns around TNCs blocking bike lanes on Valencia Street. She said Lyft began a geo-fencing pilot program and was sharing the data with District 9 .
Commissioner Safai said he would support an opportunity to continue the item and agreed with the sentiments of Commissioner Cohen and Chair Peskin. He asked if the current contract between Motivate and SFSU required Lyft to subsidize any programs related to income-based recipients.

Tom Maguire, Director of Sustainable Streets at the SFMTA, said the current thinking was that Lyft would take on the current contract and would have the same relationship with the MTC. He said the SFMTA had sent a letter to the MTC to confirm that understanding. He said when the contract was finalized, there was a provision that $20 \%$ of the bikes were required to be in communities of concern and that Motivate was required to offer Bike Share for All, a $\$ 5$ first-year membership for any applicant that qualified for the lifeline transit pass program. He said it was one of the most comprehensive income-based equity programs of any of the bike share systems in the country.
Commissioner Safai asked if the lifeline transit pass program was based on income and if it had any impact on students
Mr. Maguire said the lifeline transit pass program was based on income and that he would like to return to the Board at a future date to report if there were any restrictions or special conditions for students to participate in the program.

Commissioner Safai said it did not make sense to double subsidize if Lyft was already required to provide the lifeline transit pass program. He said would also be in favor of continuing the item.

Chair Peskin said that the four projects seeking approval could move forward and come before a vote.

Commissioner Cohen said the Ford Go bike memberships for SFSU students was a pilot program and that the conversation with SFSU had begun prior to the acquisition of Motivate by Lyft. She said the pilot program was encompassing Pell Grant students as well as students that met the basic requirements. She said she was happy to support the continuance of the item to allow the representatives of the respective companies to come and present.
Director Chang said the Board could agree to support the Transportation Authority staff recommendations for the other four projects without continuing the item. She said a new item could be brought to the Board for the GoBike project, inviting Lyft and SFSU.

Commissioner Cohen and Commissioner Kim withdrew their motion and second to amend the item.

Chair Peskin reopened public comment without objection.
During public comment Liore Milgrom-Gartner spoke in support of the proposal for the Grace Cathedral DC Fast Chargers and said installing electric vehicle charging spaces would provide an opportunity for individuals who worship there and to the many houses of worship across San Francisco to be inspired to reduce vehicle emissions.

Commissioner Yee moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Sheehy.
The item was approved without objection by the following vote:
Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Sheehy, Stefani, Tang and Yee (10)

Absent: Commissioner Safai (1)
8. Approve a Three-Year Professional Services Contract with Civic Edge Consulting in an Amount Not to Exceed $\$ 150,000$ for Strategic Communications, Media and Community Relations Services for the ConnectSF Program - ACTION

Eric Young, Senior Communications Officer, presented the item per the staff memorandum.
There was no public comment.
Commissioner Safai moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Cohen.
The item was approved without objection by the following vote:
Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy, Stefani, Tang and Yee (11)

## 9. Adopt the Emerging Mobility Evaluation Report - ACTION

Jeff Hobson, Deputy Director for Planning, presented the item per the staff memorandum.
During public comment Paloma Hernandez, Summer Associate on the Environmental Equity team at Greenlining Institute, said Greenlining was a 25 -year old non-profit fighting racial and economic injustice in California. She said she was in support of Item 9 and wanted to emphasize the principles of equitable access and collaboration. She said communities of concern were hit the hardest by the transportation costs. She said the Greenlining Institute strongly encouraged the Transportation Authority to maximize equitable outcomes by incorporating Greenlining Institute's framework into the implementation of its emerging mobility work.

Bob Walsh, General Manager for Scoot Networks, spoke in support of Item 9 and emphasized how important and vital the report was. He said understanding the city's needs was complicated, but the report created and shared a framework that was very helpful for Scoot to understand how it was perceived by the city and where it could thrive as a business while remaining a responsible and effective player within San Francisco's transportation networks. He said Scoot aligned with the report's guiding principles for emerging mobility and proactively worked with the SFMTA to create a shared electric moped permit. Mr. Walsh hoped the report remained a living document and would establish a solid basis for all shared mobility companies to work effectively with the city.

Nadia Marquez, Government Relations for Cruise Automation, spoke in support for Item 9 and the Transportation Authority and SFMTA's guiding principles for emerging mobility services and technologies. She said from Vision Zero to Transit First, companies like Cruise played an integral role in moving San Francisco forward and believed that their mission and commitment were complimentary to the city's principles for emerging mobility and technologies.

Josie Ahrens, Senior Community Organizer at Walk San Francisco, spoke in support of Item 9 and thanked Transportation Authority staff for including Walk SF in the process. She said the report set the foundation for the city to be able to prioritize a mass public transportation system, including walking and biking infrastructure that would be the backbone of the city while accommodating new mobility options. She said she looked forward to the city implementing all the recommendations listed at the end of the report.
Bryan Goebel, Executive Officer of LAFCo, spoke in support of Item 9 and said LAFCo would be partnering with the Transportation Authority to examine emerging mobility services and the effect on labor.

Alexa Diaz, Summer Associate on the equity team at the Greenlining Institute, spoke in support of Item 9 and emphasized the principle of equitable access. She encouraged the Transportation Authority to incorporate strategies in its emerging mobility work that both increased access to reliable internet and addressed language and awareness barriers for underserved communities. She said the Greenlining Institute recommended that the Transportation Authority continue to engage and collaborate with community groups and equity and transportation justice stakeholders to ensure that emerging mobility would help create a just and fair San Francisco.

Joel Espino, Environmental Equity Legal Counsel at the Greenlining Institute, spoke in support of Item 9 and recognized the work of Warren Logan of the Transportation Authority and Danielle Harris of the SFMTA and their colleagues who were critical in advancing San Francisco's policy framework on emerging mobility services and technologies.
Clarrissa Cabansagan spoke in support of item 9 and shared the need for emerging mobility in the southeast neighborhoods of San Francisco. She highlighted Lyft desire to partner with TransForm and community partners.
Danielle Harris, Senior Transportation Planner for the Office of Innovation at the SFMTA, spoke in support of Item 9 and thanked Transportation Authority staff for the collaborative effort involving advocacy departments and the companies. She said the SFMTA Office of Innovation would continue to work in the development of the emerging mobility strategy to ensure the implementation of San Francisco's goals for a safe, sustainable, and equitable transportation network.

Arielle Fleischer, Senior Transportation Policy Associate at SPUR, spoke in support of Item 9 and
said the report was developed through a great deal of research and outreach and dialogue with the public and private transportation sectors. She said SPUR appreciated the emphasis not just on regulation, but also on how public transportation could grow and take advantage of new technologies. She said a regionwide approach would further learning and growing and make it easy for people and Bay Area cities to engage with new emerging services.

Jason Haight, employee at AAA of Northern California and Gig Carshare, spoke in support of item 9 and said AAA and Gig had been active in the discussions with the Transportation Authority and the SFMTA that shaped the guiding principles for emerging mobility and services technology. He said the developed standards would help ensure the accelerated and safe adoption of new mobility services; which would bring convenience, affordability, and improved air quality to the residents of San Francisco.

Megan Mitchell, employee for JUMP Bikes, said it was an honor to launch the service in District 10 and Hunters Point where she was born and raised. She said JUMP Bikes was committed to working with communities of concern, of color, and supporting the adoption of the Emerging Mobility Evaluation Report.
After public comment Chair Peskin commented on the feedback from the public and addressed the recommendation referenced on Page 72 regarding an Emerging Mobility tax due to agencies not paying their full and fair share. He asked that Transportation Authority staff to prepare an information item on decongestion pricing and incentives. Chair Peskin also called attention to Recommendation \#7 on Curb Management and asked the Transportation Authority staff to agendize a time to talk about curb management and mobility services.
Commissioner Fewer addressed the third recommendation related to labor and total costs such as those that will affect taxi drivers, the displacement of their vehicles, and how this will economically impact the city of San Francisco. Commissioner Fewer commented on the ten guiding principles and the impact of the existing labor force with emerging mobility in San Francisco. She highlighted the importance of cost recovery beyond vehicle miles travelled and capturing the costs of added enforcement; citing the significant increase in TNC rides to and from the airport.
Commissioner Ronen moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Sheehy.
The item was approved without objection by the following vote:
Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy, Stefani, Tang and Yee (11)

## 10. Adopt the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) Perks Evaluation Findings Document ACTION

Camille Guiriba, Transportation Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.
There was no public comment.
Commissioner Cohen moved to approve the item, seconded by Commissioner Tang.
The item was approved without objection by the following vote:
Ayes: Commissioners Breed, Cohen, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy, Stefani, Tang and Yee (11)

## 11. Transportation Management for Major Corridor Projects Update - INFORMATION

Eric Cordoba, Deputy Director for Capital Projects, Tom Maguire, Director of Sustainable Streets
at the SFMTA, and John Thomas, Deputy Director for Infrastructure Design and Construction at San Francisco Public Works presented the item per the staff memorandum.
Chair Peskin asked if there were project managers tasked with compiling and reviewing lookaheads.

Mr. Maguire said look-aheads were done in a couple of different scales. He said the SFMTA traffic routing group scheduled 60 -to- 100 -day look-aheads for the most congested parts of the city and looked for cumulative impacts. He said the traffic routing groups also adjusted contractors permits as necessary to make sure that two parallel streets, for example, were not both impacted on the same block at the same time. He said more broadly, the SFMTA worked with Public Works and the Transportation Authority to make ensure staging was being done at a city-wide scale and on a longer term.

Chair Peskin asked if it was the Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation (ISCOTT) or a separate section within the SFMTA that provided the look aheads.

Mr. Maguire said ISCOTT dealt with temporary street closures largely related public events. He said the SFMTA traffic routing staff regularly conducted cumulative 60 -to 100 -day look-aheads.
Chair Peskin asked if the SFMTA had standard measurements for traffic barriers and sidewalks and remarked that he had witnessed tourists on Van Ness Avenue and Broadway having to bike around barriers because they did not provide space for bikes.

Mr. Maguire said the SFMTA had standards and had published the "blue book" that laid out the minimum width of sidewalks, appropriate size of traffic lanes and the appropriate height for barriers. He said an SFMTA inspector would go out and inspect the intersection of Van Ness Avenue and Broadway.

There was no public comment.
12. Update on the Independent Analysis and Oversight Services with Sjoberg Evashenk Consulting, Inc. - INFORMATION

Commissioner Safai moved to continue Item 12 to the next Board meeting, seconded by Commissioner Sheehy.
The motion was approved without objection.

## Other Items

## 13. Introduction of New Items - INFORMATION

There were no new items introduced.

## 14. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

## 15. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:14 p.m.

# RESOLUTION ADOPTING A REVISED POSITION OF SUPPORT IF AMENDED ON STATE SENATE BILL (SB) 1014 (SKINNER) 

WHEREAS, The Transportation Authority approves a set of legislative principles to guide transportation policy advocacy in the sessions of the Federal and State Legislatures; and

WHEREAS, With the assistance of the Transportation Authority's legislative advocate in Sacramento, staff has reviewed pending legislation for the current Legislative Session and analyzed it for consistency with the Transportation Authority's adopted legislative principles and for impacts on transportation funding and program implementation in San Francisco; and

WHEREAS, On June 26, 2018, through approval of Resolution 18-59 the Transportation Authority adopted a support position on SB 1014 (Skinner) which was subsequently significantly amended as shown in the attached Table 1; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority hereby adopts a revised position of support if amended on SB 1014 (Skinner); and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Executive Director is directed to communicate this position to all relevant parties.

Attachment: Table 1

## Attachment 1

## San Francisco County Transportation Authority

State Legislation - July 2018 (Revised July 13, 2018)
To view documents associated with the bill, click the bill number link.
Staff is recommending changing the Transportation Authority's support position on Senate Bill (SB) 1014 (Skinner) to support if amended, as shown in Table 1. Table 2 provides an update on AB 2865 (Chiu) which the Transportation Authority is sponsoring. Table $\mathbf{3}$ indicates the status of all bills on which the Board has already taken a position this session.

Table 1. Recommendations for New Positions

| Recommended <br> Position | Bill \# <br> Author | Title and Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Support if Amended |  | California Clean Miles Standard and Incentive Program: zero-emission vehicles. <br> Would require that by January 1, 2020, the State Air Resources Board (ARB) establish a greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions baseline for transportation network companies (TNCs) on a per-passenger-mile basis. It would also require that by January 1, 2021, the ARB establish, and the Public Utilities Commission implement, annual targets and goals starting in 2023 for the reduction of GHG emissions per passenger mile driven on behalf of a transportation network company, including miles completed by modes of active transportation. <br> The Transportation Authority Board adopted a support position on this bill in June. Staff is now recommending a support if amended position given two sets of recent amendments. The first would allow companies like Uber or Lyft to count miles traveled by their bike, electric bike, and/or electric scooter fleets toward its annual targets. We feel the program should focus exclusively on trips taken by passenger vehicles driven on their behalf, and therefore do not recommend supporting the bill unless the prior language is reinstated or higher targets are established to account for the additional modes. recommendation. More significantly, amendments subsequent to posting of the July 10 Board agenda require the State Air Resources Board to evaluate the role of using public funds to incentivize TNC drivers to purchase zero emission vehicles. Staff recommends seeking amendments that state that TNC drivers shall not be prioritized for public incentive funds above any other consumers who are also eligible for these incentives. |

Table 2. Notable Updates on Bills in the 2017-2018 Session

| Adopted <br> Position | Bill \# <br> Author | Title and Update <br> Support / <br> Sponsor |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| AB 2865 <br> Chiu D | High-occupancy toll lanes: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority <br> (VTA). <br> If the Board votes to approve a managed lanes (e.g. carpool/transit lane) project <br> on US-101 and I-280 north of the divide in San Francisco, this bill would give <br> the Transportation Authority the option of asking the Santa Clara Valley <br> Transportation Authority (VTA) or, with recent amendments, the Bay Area <br> Infrastructure Financing Authority (BAIFA) to operate the lanes on San |  |
| Francisco's behalf. Revenues would be spent according to a Board-approved |  |  |
| expenditure plan on transportation projects that benefit transit riders, |  |  |
| carpoolers, and drivers in the corridor. |  |  |
| On June 26, the Senate Transportation and Housing Committee passed the |  |  |
| amended bill and referred it to the Senate Appropriations Committee. We |  |  |
| appreciate the continued efforts of Assemblymember Chiu and his staff to |  |  |
| introduce the amendments and advance the bill through the Senate with |  |  |
| continued coordination work by staff at VTA, San Mateo transportation |  |  |
| agencies, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. SPUR, |  |  |
| TransForm, the Natural Resources Defense Council, and the Bay Area Council |  |  |
| all submitted letters of support for the bill in advance of the Senate committee |  |  |
| meeting. |  |  |

Table 3. Proposition or Bill Status for Active Positions Taken in the 2017-2018 Session ${ }^{1}$

| Adopted <br> Positions | Proposition or Bill \# Author | Proposition or Bill Title | Status and Changes Since <br> Last Report ${ }^{1}$ <br> (as of 6/29/18) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Support | AB 1 <br> Frazier D | Transportation funding | Assembly Dead |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \underline{\text { AB } 17} \\ & \underline{\text { Holden } D} \end{aligned}$ | Transit Pass Program: free or reduced-fare transit passes | Vetoed |
|  | $\frac{\mathrm{AB} 87}{\text { Ting } D}$ | Autonomous vehicles | Passed out of Committee into Senate Appropriations |
|  | $\frac{\mathrm{AB} 342}{\mathrm{Chiu} D}$ | Vehicles: automated speed enforcement: five-year pilot program | Assembly Dead |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\mathrm{AB} 2304} \\ & \underline{\text { Holden } \mathrm{D}} \end{aligned}$ | Reduced fare transit pass programs: report. | Re-referred to Senate Rules |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\mathrm{AB} 2363} \\ & \text { Friedman D } \end{aligned}$ | Vision Zero Task Force. | Passed out of Committee into Senate Appropriations |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\text { AB } 2865}{\text { Chiu D }} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | High-occupancy toll lanes: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA). | Passed out of Committee into Senate Appropriations |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\mathrm{AB} 3059} \\ & \text { Bloom D } \end{aligned}$ | Go Zone demonstration projects. | Assembly Dead |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AB } 3124 \\ & \text { Bloom D } \end{aligned}$ | Vehicles: length limitations: buses: bicycle transportation devices | Chaptered |


|  | $\begin{aligned} & \underline{\text { SB 422 }} \\ & \text { Wilk R } \end{aligned}$ | Transportation projects: comprehensive development lease agreements: Public Private Partnerships | Senate Dead |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\text { SB 760 }}{\text { Wiener D }} \end{aligned}$ | Bikeways: design guides | Amended in Assembly Transportation. Scaled back to now require Caltrans to consider NACTO's Urban Street Design Guide. |
|  | $\text { SB } 768$ <br> Allen, <br> Wiener D | Transportation projects: comprehensive development lease agreements: Public Private Partnerships | Senate Dead |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\text { SB } 1014} \\ & \underline{\text { Skinner } D} \end{aligned}$ | Zero-emission vehicles. | Passed out of Committee into Assembly <br> Appropriations, recommend new Support if Amended position due to recent amendments (see Table 1) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { SB } 1119 \\ \text { Newman D } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | Low Carbon Transit Operations Program. | Passed out of committee into Assembly Appropriations |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SB 1328 } \\ & \text { Beall D } \end{aligned}$ | Mileage-based road usage fee. | Passed out of committee into Assembly Appropriations |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\text { SB } 1376} \\ & \text { Hill D } \end{aligned}$ | Transportation network companies: accessibility plans | Passed out of committee into Assembly Appropriations |
|  | Prop 69 | Transportation Taxes and Fees Lockbox and Appropriations Limit Exemption Amendment. Legislative Constitutional Amendment on California's June 5, 2018 ballot | Passed by California voters on June 5, 2018 |
| Support if Amended | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SB } 936 \\ & \text { Allen, Ben D } \end{aligned}$ | Office of Planning and Research: Autonomous Vehicles Smart Planning Task Force. | Senate Dead |
| Oppose | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\text { AB } 65} \\ & \text { Patterson R } \end{aligned}$ | Transportation bond debt service | Assembly Dead |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\text { AB } 1756} \\ & \text { Brough R } \end{aligned}$ | Transportation Funding | Assembly Dead |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \underline{\text { AB } 2530} \\ & \underline{\text { Melendez }} \mathrm{R} \end{aligned}$ | Bonds: Transportation | Assembly Dead |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\text { AB } 2712} \\ & \text { Allen, } \\ & \text { Travis R } \end{aligned}$ | Bonds: Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century | Assembly Dead |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\text { AB } 2989} \\ & \text { Flora R } \end{aligned}$ | Standup electric scooters. | Passed out of committee into Senate Appropriations |
|  | SB 182 <br> Bradford D | Transportation network company: participating drivers: single business license | Chaptered |
|  | $\text { SB } 423$ <br> Cannella R | Indemnity: design professionals | Senate Dead |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\text { SB 493 }}{\text { Hill D }} \end{aligned}$ | Vehicles: right-turn violations | Assembly Appropriations |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\text { SB } 1132} \\ & \text { Hill D } \end{aligned}$ | Vehicles: right turn violations. | Passed out of committee into Assembly Appropriations |

${ }^{1}$ Under this column, "Chaptered" means the bill is now law.

# RESOLUTION AMENDING THE 2019 PROP K STRATEGIC PLAN BASELINE, ALLOCATING \$19,999,636 IN PROP K FUNDS FOR TWO REQUESTS, WITH CONDITIONS, AND APPROPRIATING \$600,000 FOR ONE REQUEST 

WHEREAS, The Transportation Authority received three requests for a total of \$20,599,636 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: Downtown Extension (DTX) to a Rebuilt Transbay Terminal and Paratransit; and

WHEREAS, Both of the categories are for projects named in the Prop K Expenditure Plan, and therefore funds are programmed to these projects directly in the 2019 Prop K Strategic Plan rather than through a 5-Year Prioritization Program; and

WHEREAS, The Prop K Strategic Plan Baseline left all remaining funds for the DTX unprogrammed to allow time for the Board, Mayor, San Francisco agencies and the Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA) to move toward consensus on how to proceed with the project; and

WHEREAS, The TJPA's request for Downtown Extension - 30\% Design Part 1 requires a concurrent Prop K Strategic Plan amendment to advance \$9,678,626 to Fiscal Year 2018/19; and

WHEREAS, Transportation Authority staff's request for Downtown Extension - 30\% Design Oversight and Support Part 1 requires a concurrent amendment of the Prop K Strategic Plan Baseline to advance $\$ 600,000$ to Fiscal Year 2018/19; and

WHEREAS, In May 2018 the Transportation Authority Board approved programming recommendations for San Francisco's Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 5 Program of Projects, including the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA's) Shop-a-Round/Van

Gogh Shuttles and Ramp Taxi Incentives Program; and
WHEREAS, The SFMTA's request for Prop $K$ funds for the Paratransit, Shop-aRound/Van Gogh Shuttles, Ramp Taxi Incentives require amendment of the Paratransit category in the Prop K Strategic Plan Baseline to make minor programming adjustments to reflect the final Lifeline Transportation Program recommendations, specifically advancing $\$ 128,000$ to Fiscal Year 2018/19, $\$ 25,000$ to Fiscal Year 2019/20 and $\$ 25,000$ to Fiscal Year 2020/21 to fully fund the Shop-a-Round/Van Gogh Shuttles and Ramp Taxi Incentives through Fiscal Year 2020/21 as detailed in the enclosed allocation request forms and Attachment 5; and

WHEREAS, Until Prop K sales tax funds for Caltrain are exhausted, Prop K is providing San Francisco's annual local capital match contribution as a member county of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board, temporarily relieving the SFMTA of that financial burden; and

WHEREAS, Fully funding San Francisco's Fiscal Year 2018/19 member share contribution to Caltrain's capital budget requires an amendment to the Prop K Strategic Plan Baseline to advance \$2,598,158 in New and Renovated Vehicles - Caltrain funds and \$670,492 in Guideways - Caltrain funds to Fiscal Year 2018/19 as detailed in Attachment 5, and

WHEREAS, In aggregate, the requested Strategic Plan amendments would result in a relatively small increase ( $\sim 0.32 \%$ ) to the assumed level of financing costs over the 30 -year life of the Prop K Expenditure Plan; and

WHEREAS, After reviewing the requests, Transportation Authority staff recommended amending the Prop K Strategic Plan Baseline as described above, allocating \$19,999,636 in Prop K funds for two requests, with conditions, and appropriating $\$ 600,000$ for one request, as described in Attachments 3 and 5 and as 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 2018/19 budget to cover the proposed actions; and

WHEREAS, At its June 27, 2018 meeting, the Citizens Advisory Committee was briefed on the subject request and unanimously adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority hereby amends the Prop K Strategic Plan Baseline to advance a total of $\$ 10,278,626$ in the Downtown Extension to a Rebuilt Transbay Terminal category to Fiscal Year 2018/19; amend programming in the Paratransit category to advance $\$ 128,000$ to Fiscal Year 2018/19, $\$ 25,000$ to Fiscal Year 2019/20 and $\$ 25,000$ to Fiscal Year 2020/21; and advance $\$ 2,598,158$ in New and Renovated Vehicles - Caltrain funds and \$670,492 in Guideways - Caltrain funds to Fiscal Year 2018/19, as summarized in Attachment 5; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority hereby allocates $\$ 19,999,636$ in Prop K funds for two requests, with conditions, and appropriates $\$ 600,000$ for one request, 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, the Prop K Strategic Plan, and the relevant 5-Year Prioritization Programs; 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, and the relevant Prop K 5YPPs are hereby amended, as appropriate.

Attachments:

1. Summary of Applications Received
2. Project Descriptions
3. Staff Recommendations
4. Prop K Allocation Summaries - Fiscal Year 2018/19
5. 2019 Prop K Strategic Plan Baseline - Proposed Amendments

Enclosure:
Prop K/AA Allocation Request Forms (3)
Attachment 1: Summary of Applications Received

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Leveraging |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source | EP Line No./ <br> Category ${ }^{1}$ | Project Sponsor ${ }^{2}$ | Project Name |  | Current Prop K Request |  | Total Cost for Requested Phase(s) | Expected Leveraging by EP Line ${ }^{3}$ | Actual <br> Leveraging by Project Phase(s) ${ }^{4}$ | Phase(s) <br> Requested | District(s) |
| Prop K | 5 | TJPA | Downtown Extension - 30\% Design Part 1 | \$ | 9,678,626 | \$ | 176,134,322 | 86\% | $\begin{aligned} & 97.2 \% \text { per DTX } \\ & \text { funding plan } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Design | 6 |
| Prop K | 5 | SFCTA | Downtown Extension - 30\% Design Oversight and Support Part 1 | \$ | 600,000 | \$ | 176,134,322 | 38\% | $\begin{aligned} & 97.2 \% \text { per DTX } \\ & \text { funding plan } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Design | 6 |
| Prop K | 23 | SFMTA | Paratransit, Shop-a-Round/Van Gogh Shuttles, Ramp Taxi Incentives |  | 10,321,010 | \$ | 29,171,627 | 27\% | 65\% | Operations | Citywide |

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

| EP Line No./ Category | Project Sponsor | Project Name | Prop K Funds Requested | Project Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | TJPA | Downtown Extension - 30\% <br> Design Part 1 | \$9,678,626 | Extension of Caltrain 1.3 miles from Fourth and King Streets to the new Transbay Transit Center at First and Mission Streets, with accommodations for future high-speed rail. Requested funds will support the progress of the project toward $30 \%$ design on the new and modified elements of the project, such as the relocation of the 4th and Townsend underground station to beneath Townsend Street from its original location beneath the Caltrain yard. It will also support follow-up to the Tunnel Options Study, value engineering and development of bottom-up cost estimates. While TJPA expects to complete $30 \%$ design by September 2019, the work to be funded by the subject request will be complete in March 2019. |
| 5 | SFCTA | Downtown Extension - 30\% Design Oversight and Support Part 1 | \$600,000 | Extension of Caltrain 1.3 miles from Fourth and King Streets to the new Transbay Transit Center at First and Mission Streets, with accommodations for future high-speed rail. Requested funds will allow for SFCTA to conduct enhanced project delivery oversight and support as the Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA) prepares $30 \%$ design submittals for new and modified elements of the project. Focus areas will include, but are not limited to follow-on work to the recently completed Tunnel Options Study and Operations Study, value engineering, project delivery and procurement plan, contracting and funding plan. While TJPA expects to complete $30 \%$ design by September 2019, the work to be funded by the subject request will be complete in March 2019. |
| 23 | SFMTA | Paratransit, Shop-a- <br> Round/Van Gogh Shuttles, <br> Ramp Taxi Incentives | \$10,321,010 | The SFMTA provides paratransit services to persons with disabilities, in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Since 2004 Prop K funds have supported the program's sedan and ramp taxi trips, ACCESS van prescheduled trips, intercounty trips, and group van trips to senior centers. This Prop K request also includes funds for the Shop-a-Round and Van Gogh shuttles, which provide transportation to grocery stores and recreational destinations, respectively, for senior and disabled passengers. |
|  |  | TOTAL | \$20,599,636 |  |

Attachment 3: Staff Recommendations ${ }^{1}$

| EP Line No./ Category | Project Sponsor | Project Name | Prop K Funds <br> Recommended | Recommendations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | TJPA | Downtown Extension - 30\% Design Part 1 | \$ 9,678,626 | Strategic Plan Baseline Amendment: Allocation is contingent upon amendment of the Strategic Plan Baseline to advance $\$ 9,678,626$ to FY 2018/19 for the subject request. Finance costs in the category would increase by $1.95 \%$ (from $9.43 \%$ to $11.38 \%$ ) over the 30 -year life of the Expenditure Plan as a result of this amendment, which includes the subject allocation and the $\$ 600,000$ request from the SFCTA (see below). See Attachment 5 and the enclosed Allocation Request Form for details. |
| 5 | SFCTA | Downtown Extension - 30\% Design Oversight and Support Part 1 | \$ 600,000 | Strategic Plan Baseline Amendment: Appropriation is contingent upon amendment of the Strategic Plan Baseline to advance $\$ 600,000$ to FY 2018/19 for the subject request. Finance costs in the category would increase by $1.95 \%$ (from $9.43 \%$ to $11.38 \%$ ) over the 30 -year life of the Expenditure Plan as a result of this amendment, which includes the subject request and the above $\$ 9,678,626$ request from the TJPA. See Attachment 5 and the enclosed Allocation Request Form for details. |
| 23 | SFMTA | Paratransit, Shop-a-Round/Van Gogh Shuttles, Ramp Taxi Incentives | \$ 10,321,010 | Strategic Plan Baseline Amendment: Allocation is contingent upon amendment of the Strategic Plan Baseline to advance $\$ 128,000$ to FY 2018/19, $\$ 25,000$ to FY 2019/20 and $\$ 25,000$ to FY 2020/21 to fully fund the Shop-a-Round Shuttles and Ramp Taxi Incentives Programs, which is consistent with the final Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 5 programming recommendations. Amendment would increase financing costs in the category by $0.08 \%$ (from $13.67 \%$ to $13.75 \%$ ) over the 30-year Expenditure Plan. FY 2019/20 and FY 2020/21 funding is subject to future allocation by the Board. See Attachment 5 and the enclosed Allocation Request Form for details. |
|  |  | TOTAL | \$20,599,636 |  |

## PROP K SALES TAX

|  | Total |  | FY 2018/19 | FY 2019/20 | FY 2020/21 | FY 2021/22 | FY 2022/23 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Prior Allocations | $\$$ | $9,701,076$ | $\$$ | $7,842,928$ | $\$$ | $1,844,071$ | $\$$ | 14,077 | $\$$ |

The above table shows maximum annual cash flow for all FY 2018/19 allocations and appropriations approved to date, along with the current recommended allocation(s).


Prop K Investments To Date

Attachment 5:
2019 Strategic Plan Baseline - Proposed Amendments
Pending July 2018 Board Actio



Date: June 18, 2018
To: Transportation Authority Board
From: Anna LaForte - Deputy Director for Policy and Programming
Subject: 7/10/2018 Board Meeting: Amendment of the Prop K Strategic Plan Baseline, Allocation of $\$ 19,999,636$ in Prop K Funds for Two Requests, with Conditions, and Appropriation of $\$ 600,000$ for One Request

## RECOMMENDATION $\square$ Information 区 Action

- Amend the 2019 Prop K Strategic Plan Baseline to advance funds to Fiscal Year (FY) 2018/19 in the Downtown Extension to a Rebuilt Transbay Terminal, Vehicles-Caltrain, Guideways-Caltrain, and Paratransit categories to fully fund three Prop K requests and program sufficient funds for San Francisco's annual member share contribution to Caltrain's capital budget.
- Allocate $\$ 9,678,626$ in Prop K sales tax funds to the Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA) for one request:

1. Downtown Extension - 30\% Design Part 1

- Allocate $\$ 10,321,010$ in Prop K sales tax funds to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) for one request:

2. Paratransit, Shop-a-Round/Van Gogh Shuttles, Ramp Taxi Incentives Program

- Appropriate $\$ 600,000$ in Prop $K$ sales tax funds for one request:

3. Downtown Extension - 30\% Design Oversight and Support Part 1

## SUMMARY

We are presenting three requests totaling $\$ 20,599,636$ in Prop K sales tax funds to the Board for approval. 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. Attachment 5 provides details of the proposed 2019 Prop K Strategic Plan Baseline amendment incorporating programming changes to accommodate the three subject requests and San Francisco's annual member share contribution to the FY 2018/19 Caltrain capital budget, anticipated to be considered by the Board in September.

## 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. An Allocation Request Form for each project is enclosed, with more detailed information on scope, schedule, budget and funding. Attachment 3 summarizes the staff recommendations for the requests, highlighting special conditions and other items of interest.

## Proposed Amendments to the Prop K Strategic Plan Baseline.

The three subject requests are conditioned upon amendments to the Prop K Strategic Plan Baseline. In addition, we are recommending amendments to the Vehicles-Caltrain and Guideways-Caltrain categories to support Caltrain's annual local capital match contribution from San Francisco. Those allocation requests are expected to be before the Board in September.

Caltrain Downtown Extension (DTX) to the Salesforce Transit Center: We are recommending an amendment to the Strategic Plan Baseline to program a total of $\$ 10,278,626$ in FY 2018/19 to fully fund the TJPA's and Transportation Authority's requests from the Downtown Extension to a Rebuilt Transbay Terminal category. When the Transportation Authority Board adopted the Baseline in May 2018, it left all remaining Prop K funds in the category unprogrammed for the DTX to allow time for the Board, Mayor, San Francisco agencies and the TJPA to move toward consensus on how to proceed with the project. Given the recent completion of/near completion of several studies and the fact that the City is moving toward consensus on the alignment for the DTX, the TJPA is requesting $\$ 9,678,626$ to continue advancing the project toward $30 \%$ design of the new and modified elements of the DTX. Concurrently, we are requesting $\$ 600,000$ for project delivery oversight and support as the TJPA prepares draft $30 \%$ design submittals. Finance costs in this category would increase by $1.95 \%$ (from $9.43 \%$ to $11.38 \%$ ) over the 30 -year life of the Expenditure Plan as a result of this amendment.

Paratransit: We are recommending minor programming adjustments to the Strategic Plan Baseline to advance funds in the Paratransit category to reflect the final Lifeline Cycle 5 programming recommendations, including modifications for funding eligibility. Our recommendation is detailed in the table below, which shows that Prop K funds in the Paratransit category will be used to fund SFMTA's paratransit operations, the Shop-a-Round/Van Gogh Shuttles, and the Ramp Taxi Incentive Program.

Table 1. Proposed Strategic Plan Baseline Amendment - Paratransit Category

$\left.$| Paratransit <br> Category | FY 2018/19 Prop K <br> Amount | FY 2019/20 Prop K <br> Amount | FY 2020/21 Prop K <br> Amount |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Paratransit | No change. Baseline <br> includes $\$ 10,193,010$ | No change. Baseline <br> includes $\$ 10,193,010$ | No change. Baseline <br> includes $\$ 10,193,010$ |
| Shopations |  |  |  |
| Gogh Shuttles |  |  |  |$\quad$| $\$ 78,000$ increase. |
| ---: |
| Baseline is $\$ 0$. |$\quad$| No change. Baseline |
| ---: |
| includes $\$ 150,000$ |$\quad$| No change. Baseline |
| ---: |
| includes $\$ 150,000$ | \right\rvert\,

The 2019 Prop K Strategic Plan Baseline includes \$10,193,010 in annual programming for the SFMTA's general Paratransit operations through FY 2024/25 and a partial year of funding in FY $2025 / 26$. The Shop-a-Round group van service and Van Gogh recreational shuttle would be funded in part with Prop K and Lifeline Transportation Program funds through FY 2020/21. The proposed
amendment would increase financing costs in the category by $0.08 \%$ (from $13.67 \%$ to $13.75 \%$ ) over the 30 -year Expenditure Plan.

San Francisco's Member Share Contribution to Caltrain's FY 2018/19 Capital Budget: We are recommending an amendment to the Strategic Plan Baseline to advance a total of $\$ 3,268,650$ from the out-years to FY 2018/19 in the Caltrain-Vehicles and Caltrain-Guideways categories to help fully fund San Francisco's member share contribution to Caltrain's capital budget. Annually, Caltrain requests an equal contribution from each of the three Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB) member counties (San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Clara) to their capital budget. In FY 2018/19, each member has agreed to provide $\$ 7.5$ million, up from last year's member contribution of $\$ 5$ million. The Strategic Plan Baseline includes $\$ 4,231,350$ in FY 2018/19 in the Prop K categories for Caltrain state of good repair projects (i.e. Capital Improvement Program, Vehicles, Facilities, and Guideways), thus we are recommending advancing funds to fully fund San Francisco's share. This continues the trend of advancing Prop K sales tax funds in the four Caltrain categories so that Prop K can temporarily provide San Francisco's annual local capital match contribution, relieving the SFMTA of this financial burden until Prop K sales tax funds are exhausted for Caltrain, which is likely to be within the next 3 to 5 years.

## FINANCIAL IMPACT

The recommended action would allocate $\$ 19,999,636$ and appropriate $\$ 600,000$ in FY 2018/19 Prop K sales tax funds. The allocations and appropriation would be subject to the Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules contained in the enclosed Allocation Request Forms.
Attachment 4 shows the approved FY 2018/19 allocations and appropriations to date, with associated annual cash flow commitments as well as the recommended allocations, appropriation, and cash flow amounts that are the subject of this memorandum.

In all, the proposed amendments to the 2019 Prop K Strategic Plan Baseline would advance a total of $\$ 8,468,346$ in out-year programming to FYs 2018/19 through 2020/21. The proposed amendments would cumulatively result in an increase of $0.32 \%$ ( $\$ 8,864,124$ ) in anticipated finance costs over the 30-year life of the Expenditure Plan. See Attachment 5 for details.
Sufficient funds are included in the adopted FY 2018/19 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 June 27, 2018 meeting and adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation by a vote of 7-1.

## SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

Attachment 1 - Summary of Applications Received
Attachment 2 - Project Descriptions
Attachment 3 - Staff Recommendations
Attachment 4 - Prop K Allocation Summaries - FY 2018/19
Attachment 5-2019 Prop K Strategic Plan Baseline - Proposed Amendments
Enclosure - Prop K/AA Allocation Request Forms (3)

## 32
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# RESOLUTION ALLOCATING \$2,442,213 IN PROP K SALES TAX FUNDS FOR FOUR REQUESTS, WITH CONDITIONS, AND APPROPRIATING \$854,000 IN PROP K FUNDS FOR ONE REQUEST 

WHEREAS, The Transportation Authority received five requests totaling \$3,296,213 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: Bus Rapid Transit/Transit Preferential Streets/MUNI Metro Network, Balboa Park BART/Muni Station Access, New Signals \& Signs and Traffic Calming; 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 each of the aforementioned Expenditure Plan programmatic categories; and

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

WHEREAS, Our request for Geary Bus Rapid Transit - Additional Funds requires an amendment to the Bus Rapid Transit/Transit Preferential Streets 5YPP as detailed in the enclosed allocation request form; and

WHEREAS, After reviewing the requests, Transportation Authority staff recommended allocating a total of $\$ 2,442,213$ in Prop K Sales Tax Funds for four requests, with conditions, and appropriating $\$ 854,000$ in Prop K Funds for one request, as described in Attachment 3 and detailed in the enclosed allocation request forms, which include staff recommendations for Prop K allocation and appropriation 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 2018/19 budget to cover the proposed actions; and

WHEREAS, At its June 27, 2018 meeting, the Citizens Advisory Committee was briefed on the subject request and severed the request for BART Balboa Park Station Area Improvements at the request of one CAC member to avoid a conflict of interest; and

WHEREAS, That the Citizens Advisory Committee adopted a motion of support for the underlying staff recommendation; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority hereby amends the Prop K Bus Rapid Transit/Transit Preferential Streets 5YPP, as detailed in the enclosed allocation request form; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority hereby allocates $\$ 2,442,213$ in Prop K Sales Tax Funds for four requests, with conditions, and appropriates $\$ 854,000$ in Prop K Funds for one request, 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 and appropriation of these funds to be in conformance with the priorities, policies, funding levels, and prioritization methodologies established in the Prop K Expenditure Plan and Strategic Plan, as well as the relevant 5 YPPs ; 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:

1. Summary of Applications Received
2. Brief Project Descriptions
3. Staff Recommendations
4. Prop K Allocation Summaries - FY 2018/19

Enclosure:
Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Forms (5)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Leveraging |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source | EP Line No./ Category ${ }^{1}$ | Project Sponsor ${ }^{2}$ | Project Name |  | Current <br> Prop K <br> Request | Current <br> Prop AA <br> Request |  | Total Cost for Requested Phase(s) | Expected Leveraging by EP Line ${ }^{3}$ | Actual <br> Leveraging by Project Phase(s) | Phase(s) <br> Requested | District(s) |
| Prop K | 1 | SFMTA | Geary Bus Rapid Transit - Phase 1 (Geary Rapid) | \$ | 1,392,213 |  |  | 30,332,954 | 82\% | 95\% | Construction | 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 |
| Prop K | 1 | SFCTA | Geary Bus Rapid Transit - Additional Funds | \$ | 854,000 |  | \$ | 9,547,146 | 82\% | $0 \%$ (phase fully funded by Prop K) | Environmental | 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 |
| Prop K | 13 | BART | Balboa Park Station Area Improvements | \$ | 700,000 |  | \$ | 1,050,000 | 72\% | $33 \%$ | Design | 7,11 |
| Prop K | 31 | SFMTA | Alemany and Rousseau Traffic Signal Conduits | \$ | 150,000 |  | \$ | 150,000 | 26\% | 0\% | Design, Construction | 8,11 |
| Prop K | 38 | SFMTA | Local Track Application-Based Traffic Calming Program | \$ | 200,000 |  | \$ | 200,000 | 51\% | 0\% | Planning | Citywide |

[^0]Attachment 2: Brief Project Descriptions ${ }^{1}$

| EP Line No./ <br> Category | Project Sponsor | Project Name | Prop K Funds Requested | Project Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | SFMTA | Geary Bus Rapid Transit Phase 1 (Geary Rapid) | \$1,392,213 | The Geary Rapid project will make traveling on Geary a more reliable and safer experience with dedicated bus-lanes and safety improvements for people walking between Market and Stanyan streets. The requested funds are for one element of the Geary Rapid scope - fiber optic conduit infrastructure - which is necessary to construct prior to surface improvements and will allow for reliable traffic signal coordination on the corridor to optimize traffic flow for all users. This scope will be included in the Public Utility Commission's contract for sewer and water main improvements on the corridor. The Geary Rapid project will be open for use by fall 2021. |
| 1 | SFCTA | Geary Bus Rapid Transit Additional Funds | \$854,000 | The Geary BRT Project will create dedicated bus-only lanes along the seven-mile 38/38R route, enhance the existing bus-only lanes on Geary and O'Farrell Streets from Market Street to Gough Street, and construct new bus-only lanes on Geary Boulevard from Gough Street to 34th Avenue. The project will also provide other pedestrian- and transit-supportive improvements such as bulb-outs, highamenity stations, and signal improvements. The requested funds will support the final elements of a revised and expanded scope of work required to complete the environmental and initial preliminary engineering phase. The Transportation Authority is leading the environmental phase of the project, in close coordination with SFMTA. |
| 13 | BART | Balboa Park Station Area Improvements | \$700,000 | Requested funds will be used for the design phase of a new plaza at the southern end of the Balboa Park Station in the current passenger drop-off area. The plaza will create a flexible space that meets the needs of the community, enhances safety, and encourages multi-modal access to the station. To create the new plaza area, vehicular access through San Jose Avenue will be redesigned to create a passenger drop-off area loop, while closing off vehicular access to Geneva Avenue. This project is being planned and designed in coordination with multiple stakeholders including the Balboa Park Station Community Advisory Committee, BART, SFMTA, and the Mayor's Office. Design is expected to be completed by December 2019 and the plaza is anticipated to be open for use by December 2021. |


| EP Line No./ Category | Project Sponsor | Project Name | Prop K Funds Requested | Project Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31 | SFMTA | Alemany and Rousseau Traffic Signal Conduits | \$150,000 | Design of a new signal at the intersection of Alemany Boulevard and Rousseau Street, which is on the Vision Zero High Injury Network, and installation of signal conduits and pullboxes. Project is coordinated with SFPW's SB 1 funded Alemany Boulevard paving project between Seneca Avenue and Congdon Street. SFPW will install the signal conduit and pull boxes as part of the paving contract. Coordinating the subsurface work with the paving project will allow SFMTA to comply with the City's 5 -year moratorium on post-paving excavations and still be able to signalize the intersection within the next few years. The paving project is scheduled to be open for use by summer 2020. |
| 38 | SFMTA | Local Track Application-Based Traffic Calming Program | \$200,000 | Funds will support citywide program outreach, evaluation and prioritization of all eligible applications (up to 100 per year), planning recommendations for traffic calming devices, project development including balloting and targeted community outreach where needed, and conceptual engineering of traffic calming measures for approximately 50 site-specific locations. Application materials are available in English, Spanish and Chinese at www.sfmta.com, and must be submitted to SFMTA or before June 30, 2018. SFMTA staff will evaluate whether the street is eligible for acceptance into the program (i.e. on a residential street with a demonstrated speeding program). Eligible applications will then be ranked to determine the locations most in need of traffic calming, with the highest ranked locations getting prioritized based on funding availability. |
|  |  | TOTAL | \$3,296,213 |  |

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

| EP Line No./ Category | Project Sponsor | Project Name | Prop K Funds <br> Recommended |  | Recommendations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | SFMTA | Geary Bus Rapid Transit - Phase 1 (Geary Rapid) | \$ | 1,392,213 |  |
| 1 | SFCTA | Geary Bus Rapid Transit - Additional Funds | \$ | 854,000 | 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPP) Amendment: <br> Recommendation is contingent on an amendment to the Bus Rapid Transit/ Transit Preferential Streets 5YPP to reprogram $\$ 854,000$ in Prop K funds from the Planning/Conceptual Engineering phase to the Environmental phase of the project. See attached 5YPP amendment for details. |
| 13 | BART | Balboa Park Station Area Improvements | \$ | 700,000 |  |
| 31 | SFMTA | Alemany and Rousseau Traffic Signal Conduits | \$ | 150,000 | Multi-phase allocation is recommended given the short duration of the design phase and the concurrent schedule for SFMTA's design of the signal and SFPW's construction phase to install conduit to support future signal construction. |
| 38 | SFMTA | Local Track Application-Based Traffic Calming Program | \$ | 200,000 |  |
|  |  | TOTAL |  | ,296,213 |  |

[^1]| PROP K SALES TAX |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  | FY 2018/19 |  | FY 2019/20 |  | FY 2020/21 |  | FY 2021/22 |  | FY 2022/23 |  | FY 2023/24 |  |
| Prior Allocations | \$ | 30,300,712 | \$ | 28,442,564 | \$ | 1,844,071 | \$ | 14,077 |  |  | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Current Request(s) | \$ | 3,296,213 | \$ | 3,066,213 | \$ | 230,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| New Total Allocations | \$ | 33,596,925 | \$ | 31,508,777 | \$ | 2,074,071 | \$ | 14,077 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |

The above table shows maximum annual cash flow for all FY 2018/19 allocations and appropriations approved to date, along with the current recommended allocation(s).

Investment Commitments, per Prop K Expenditure Plan



## Memorandum

Date: June 14, 2018
To: Transportation Authority Board
From: Anna LaForte - Deputy Director for Policy and Programming
Subject: $\quad 07 / 10 / 2018$ Board Meeting: Allocation of $\$ 2,442,213$ in Prop K Sales Tax Funds for Four Requests, with Conditions, and Appropriation of $\$ 854,000$ in Prop K Funds for One Request

| RECOMMENDATION $\quad \square$ Information $\quad$ Action | $\boxtimes$ Fund Allocation |
| :--- | :--- |
| - Allocate $\$ 1,742,213$ in Prop K funds to the San Francisco Municipal | $\boxtimes$ Fund Programming |
| Transportation Agency (SFMTA) for three requests: | $\square$ Policy/Legislation |
| 1. Geary Bus Rapid Transit - Phase 1 (Geary Rapid) (\$1,392,213) | $\square$ Plan/Study |
| 2. Alemany and Rousseau Traffic Signal Conduits (\$150,000) | $\square$ Capital Project |
| 3. Local Track Application-Based Traffic Calming Program | Oversight/Delivery |
| $\quad$ (\$200,000) | $\square$ Budget/Finance |
| - Allocate $\$ 700,000$ in Prop K funds to the Bay Area Rapid Transit | $\square$ Contracts |
| District (BART) for one request: | $\square$ Other: |
| 4. Balboa Park Station Area Improvements | $\square$ |

- Appropriate $\$ 854,000$ in Prop K funds for one request:

5. Geary Bus Rapid Transit - Additional Funds

## SUMMARY

We are presenting five requests totaling $\$ 3,296,213$ in Prop K funds to the Board for approval. 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.

## DISCUSSION

Attachment 1 summarizes the subject allocation requests, including information on proposed leveraging (i.e. stretching Prop K sales tax 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. Attachment 3 summarizes the staff recommendations for the requests, highlighting special conditions and other items of interest. An Allocation Request Form for each project is enclosed, with more detailed information on scope, schedule, budget and funding.

## FINANCIAL IMPACT

The recommended action would allocate and appropriate \$3,296,213 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2018/19 Prop K sales tax funds. The allocations and appropriation would be subject to the Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules contained in the enclosed Allocation Request Forms.

Attachment 4 shows the approved FY 2018/19 allocations and appropriations to date, with associated annual cash flow commitments as well as the recommended allocations, appropriation and cash flow amounts that are the subject of this memorandum.

Sufficient funds are included in the adopted FY 2018/19 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 June 27, 2018 meeting and severed the request for BART Balboa Park Station Area Improvements at the request of one CAC member to avoid a conflict of interest. The underlying requests were approved without objection. The severed request was approved by a vote of 6 ayes and 2 abstentions.

## SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

Attachment 1 - Summary of Applications Received
Attachment 2 - Project Descriptions
Attachment 3 - Staff Recommendations
Attachment 4 - Prop K Allocation Summaries - FY 2018/19
Enclosure - Prop K/AA Allocation Request Forms (5)

RESOLUTION APPROVING PART 1 OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2018/19 TRANSPORTATION
FUND FOR CLEAN AIR PROGRAM OF PROJECTS, PROGRAMMING \$388,003 TO FOUR
PROJECTS, AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT
WITH THE BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT FOR \$811,737 IN FISCAL
YEAR 2018/19 FUNDS AND TO ENTER INTO AGREEMENTS WITH APPLICABLE PUBLIC AGENCIES, ESTABLISHING CONDITIONS FOR THE USE OF THESE FUNDS

WHEREAS, On June 15, 1992, the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco designated the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (Transportation Authority) as the Program Manager of the local guaranteed portion of the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) funds; and

WHEREAS, As County Program Manager, the Transportation Authority is required to file an expenditure plan application with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Air District) for the upcoming fiscal year's funding cycle, which was submitted to the Air District on March 5, 2018; and

WHEREAS, After netting out $6.25 \%(\$ 47,494)$ for administrative expenses, as allowed by Air District guidelines, and including deobligated and previously unallocated funds, the Transportation Authority has $\$ 764,243$ in Fiscal Year (FY) 2018/19 TFCA funds to program to eligible projects; and

WHEREAS, On March 2, 2018, the Transportation Authority solicited applications for projects for FY 2018/19 TFCA funds, and by April 20, 2018, received six applications requesting a total of $\$ 1,209,996$ in TFCA funds compared to $\$ 764,243$ available; and

WHEREAS, Transportation Authority staff, working in consultation with project sponsors, reviewed and prioritized the applications for funding based on Air District TFCA guidelines and the Transportation Authority's adopted Local Expenditure Criteria (Resolution 18-36); and

WHEREAS, The Transportation Authority's adopted Local Expenditure Criteria, shown in

Attachment 1, include review of eligibility per the Air District's guidelines, calculation of the cost effectiveness ratio for each project, and other factors; and

WHEREAS, Transportation Authority staff recommended programming a total of \$388,003 to four of the six candidate projects and placing the remaining $\$ 376,249$ on reserve to be programmed through a subsequent call for projects as shown in Attachments 2 and 3; and

WHEREAS, At its June 27, 2018 meeting, the Citizens Advisory Committee was briefed and unanimously adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation which, at the time, included a recommendation to fund San Francisco State University's Ford GoBike Memberships for SF State Students project; and

WHEREAS, On July 2, 2018, subsequent to the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting, Lyft announced that it had acquired Motivate, the operator of Ford GoBike, and to be consistent with past Board policy direction that these public funds are not to be used on rides provided by Transportation Network Companies (TNCs such as Lyft and Uber), and at the request of Chair Peskin, staff are no longer recommending funds for the Ford GoBike Memberships for SF State Students project; and

WHEREAS, after discussing the item, the Board directed staff to invite Lyft and San

## Francisco State University representatives to a future meeting to answer questions raised by the

Board about the Ford GoBike Memberships for SF State Students project so that the Board
could consider whether or not to direct TFCA funds to the project; now, therefore, be it
RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority hereby approves programming a total of $\$ 388,003$ to four projects in FY 2018/19 TFCA funds and placing the remaining $\$ 376,240$ on reserve to be programmed through a subsequent call for projects as shown in Attachment 2 and 3; and

RESOLVED, That the Executive Director is authorized to execute any agreements with the Air District necessary to secure $\$ 764,243$ for projects and $\$ 47,494$ for administrative expenses for a total of $\$ 811,737$ in FY 2018/19 TFCA Program Manager funds; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Executive Director is authorized to execute funding agreements with each implementing agency to pass-through these funds for implementation of projects, establishing such terms and conditions governing cash drawdowns, financial and program audits, and reporting as necessary to comply with the requirements imposed by the Air District for the use of the funds and as required by the Transportation Authority in order to optimize the use of these of funds.

Attachments (3):
Attachment 1 - FY 2018/19 TFCA Local Expenditure Criteria
Attachment 2 - FY 2018/19 TFCA Program of Projects - Detailed Staff Recommendation
Attachment 3 - FY 2018/19 TFCA Program of Projects - Summary of Staff Recommendation

## Attachment 1

# Fiscal Year 2018/19 Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) 

LOCAL EXPENDITURE CRITERIA (Adopted 2/27/2018)


#### Abstract

The following are the Fiscal Year 2018/19 Local Expenditure Criteria for San Francisco’s TFCA County Program Manager Funds.


## ELIGIBILITY SCREENING

In order for projects to be considered for funding, they must meet the eligibility requirements established by the Air District's TFCA County Program Manager Fund Policies for Fiscal Year 2018/19. Consistent with the policies, a key factor in determining eligibility is a project's cost effectiveness (CE) ratio. The TFCA CE ratio is designed to measure the cost effectiveness of a project in reducing motor vehicle air pollutant emissions and to encourage projects that contribute funding from non-TFCA sources. TFCA funds budgeted for the project are divided by the project's estimated emissions reduction. The estimated reduction is the weighted sum of reactive organic gases (ROG), oxides of nitrogen (NOx), and particulate matter (PM) emissions that will be reduced over the effective life of the project, as defined by the Air District's guidelines.
TFCA CE is calculated by inputting information provided by the applicant into the Air District's CE worksheets. Transportation Authority staff will be available to assist project sponsors with these calculations, and will work with Air District staff and the project sponsors as needed to verify reasonableness of input variables. The worksheets also calculate reductions in carbon dioxide $\left(\mathrm{CO}_{2}\right)$ emissions, which are not included in the Air District's official CE calculations, but which the Transportation Authority considers in its project prioritization process.
Consistent with the Air District's Guidelines, in order to be eligible for Fiscal Year 2018/19 TFCA funds, a project must meet the CE ratio for emissions (i.e., ROG, NOx, and PM) reductions as specified in the guidelines for each project type. Projects that do not meet the appropriate CE threshold cannot be considered for funding.

## PROJECT PRIORITIZATION

Candidate projects that meet the cost effectiveness thresholds will be prioritized for funding based on the two-step process described below:
Step 1 - TFCA funds are programmed to eligible projects, as prioritized using the Transportation Authority Board-adopted Local Priorities (see next page).

Step 2 - If there are TFCA funds left unprogrammed after Step 1, the Transportation Authority will work with project sponsors to develop additional TFCA candidate projects. This may include refinement of projects that were submitted for Step 1, but were not deemed eligible, as well as new projects. This approach is in response to an Air District policy that does not allow County Program Managers to rollover any unprogrammed funds to the next year's funding cycle. If Fiscal Year 2018/19 funds are not programmed within 6 months of the Air District's approval of San Francisco's funding allocation, expected in June 2018, funds can be redirected (potentially to non-San Francisco projects) at the Air

District's discretion. New candidate projects must meet all TFCA eligibility requirements and will be prioritized based on the Transportation Authority Board's adopted Local Priorities.

## Local Priorities

The Transportation Authority's Local Priorities for prioritizing TFCA funds include the following factors:
Project Type - In order of priority:

1) Zero emissions non-vehicle projects including, but not limited to, bicycle and pedestrian facility improvements, transit priority projects, traffic calming projects, and transportation demand management projects;
2) Shuttle services that reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT);
3) Alternative fuel vehicles and alternative fuel infrastructure; and
4) Any other eligible project.

Emissions Reduced and Cost Effectiveness - Priority will be given to projects that achieve high CE (i.e. a low cost per ton of emissions reduced) compared to other applicant projects. The Air District's CE worksheet predicts the amount of reductions each project will achieve in ROG, NOx, PM, and $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions. However, the Air District's calculation only includes the reductions in ROG, NOx, and PM per TFCA dollar spent on the project. The Transportation Authority will also give priority to projects that achieve high CE for $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emission reductions based on data available from the Air District's CE worksheets. The reduction of transportation-related $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions is consistent with the City and County of San Francisco's 2013 Climate Action Strategy.
Project Readiness - Priority will be given to projects that are ready to proceed and have a realistic implementation schedule, budget, and funding package. Projects that cannot realistically commence in calendar year 2019 or earlier (e.g. to order or accept delivery of vehicles or equipment, begin delivery of service, award a construction contract, start the first TFCA-funded phase of the project) and be completed within a two-year period will have lower priority. Project sponsors may be advised to resubmit these projects for a future TFCA programming cycle.
Program Diversity - Promotion of innovative TFCA projects in San Francisco has resulted in increased visibility for the program and offered a good testing ground for new approaches to reducing motor vehicle emissions. Using the project type criteria established above, the Transportation Authority will continue to develop an annual program that contains a diversity of project types and approaches and serves multiple constituencies. The Transportation Authority believes that this diversity contributes significantly to public acceptance of and support for the TFCA program.
Other Considerations - Projects that are ranked high in accordance with the above local expenditure criteria may be lowered in priority or restricted from receiving TFCA funds if either of the following conditions applies or has applied during Fiscal Years 2016/17 or 2017/18:

- Monitoring and Reporting - Project sponsor has failed to fulfill monitoring and reporting requirements for any previously funded TFCA project.
- Implementation of Prior Project(s) - Project sponsor has a signed Funding Agreement for a TFCA project that has not shown sufficient progress; the project sponsor has not implemented the project by the project completion date without formally receiving a time extension from the Transportation Authority; or the project sponsor has violated the terms of the funding agreement.

| Attachment 2 <br> San Francisco County Transportation Authority <br> Draft Fiscal Year 2018/2019 TFCA Program of Projects - Detailed Staff Recommendations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PROJECTS RECOMMENDED FOR TFCA FUNDS [sorted by cost-effectiveness (CE) ratio] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. | Sponsor ${ }^{1}$ | Project Description | District | Project Type ${ }^{2}$ | Prop K Eligible | $\begin{gathered} \text { CE } \\ \text { Ratio }^{3} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{c\|} \mathrm{CO}_{2} \\ \text { Tons } \\ \text { Reduced } \end{array}$ |  | TFCA <br> Amount <br> Requested | TFCA <br> Amount <br> Proposed |
|  <br>  <br>  <br> 1 | SFE | Emergency Ride Home - Provides a free or low cost ride home in cases of emergency for employees who use alternative modes to get to work. The ride comes in the form of taxi, carshare or rental car reimbursement to employees of businesses participating in the program when a supervisor-approved unscheduled overtime or an emergency situation occurs. This program provides one year of funding for processing employer registrations and reimbursements. | Citywide |  <br>  <br> 1 <br> 1 | Yes | \$15,064 | 1,814.2 | \$50,734 | \$50,734 | \$ 50,734 |
| 2 | SFSU | Bike Cage at SF State Thornton Hall - The Thornton Hall bicycle storage cage will provide secure storage for 118 bicycles. The cage will use an automated door with card access to provide 24 -hour access. SF State affiliates will gain access using their campus ID cards and members of the public will be able to request a card for access. The locker will contain racks, basic repair tools and an air pump. | 7 | 1 | Yes | \$225,521 | 71.9 | \$40,069 | \$40,069 | 40,069 |
| 3 | EVgo | Off-Street Car Share Electrification - DC Fast Chargers - SFE is collaborating with EVgo, an electric car charger operator, and Maven, a carshare company, to provide the first all-electric carshare vehicle option in San Francisco. This project would provide 2 DC Fast Chargers at a to be determined location in central San Francisco for Maven carshare vehicles. EVgo will work with SFE and the Planning Department to identify the two designated car share spaces. <br> Requires TFCA Policy Waiver - Funding this project requires a waiver from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District to allow the chargers to be dedicated for carshare vehicles instead of publicly available to any electric vehicle. Electric carshare vehicles require that the charger be available once the user returns the car to the designated carshare parking spot. A decision on the waiver is expected in Fall 2018. If the waiver is not approved by the Air District, we will add the funds to the reserve for reprogramming. | TBD | 3 | No | \$239,735 | 544.1 | \$182,200 | \$127,200 | \$ 127,200 |
| 4 | ABM <br> Parking <br> Service | Grace Cathedral DC Fast Chargers - The Grace Cathedral parking garage has 120 self park spaces. The garage is used by monthly parkers, tourists, chuch members, employees of the Cathedral and neighboring businesses. Grace Cathedral would install two DC Fast chargers for electric vehicles. The chargers would be installed near existing power panels ( 1200 AMPS). The chargers would be available seven days a week. | 3 | 3 | No | \$246,203 | 708.1 | \$170,000 | \$170,000 | \$ 170,000 |

Attachment 2
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
Draft Fiscal Year 2018/2019 TFCA Program of Projects - Detailed Staff

| No. | Sponsor ${ }^{1}$ | Project Description | District | Project <br> Type ${ }^{2}$ | Prop K Eligible | CE <br> Ratio ${ }^{3}$ | $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ <br> Tons <br> Reduced | Total Project Cost | TFCA <br> Amount Requested | TFCA <br> Amount <br> Proposed |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Dynamic Carpool Pickup Curbs - Project would create new passenger pickup curb zones in the downtown that provide safe, convenient and preferential locations for drivers to pick up passengers traveling eastbound on the Bay Bridge primarily during the evening commute. Project seeks to reduce travel times, idling, and conflicts with public transit, pedestrians and cyclists. Beyond promoting traditional casual carpool activity, these curb zones could stimulate the adoption of smartphone carpool matching services and make carpooling a more convenient option. <br> Project Does Not Meet CE Ratio Requirement, Making It Ineligible to Receive <br> Funds: To be cost-effective, the project would need to result in nearly double the number of current casual carpool users, which is unlikely given that there is no cost- |  |  | Project \$150,00 reduced projects receive f | eeds Air D er ton of reshold for d is there ds. | strict's missions rideshare re, inelgib |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | SFMTA |  | 3,6 | 2 or 4 | Yes | \$237,480 | 1733.6 | \$3,443,674 | \$764,243 | \$ | - |
|  |  | Ford GoBike Memberships for SF State Students - San Francisco State University is requesting funds for a 2 -year pilot program that will provide free "Bike Share for All" memberships to Ford GoBike for up to 400 Pell Grant-eligible students at San Francisco State University. It will also provide 150 free yearly passes and 300 single month passes for students who are not Pell-Grant eligible. <br> We are not recommending FY 2018/19 TFCA funds for the Ford GoBike Memberships for SF State Students project to be consistent with past Board policy direction, and at the request of Chair Peskin, that these public funds are not to be used on rides provided by Transportation Network Companies (TNCs such as Lyft and Uber). At its June 2017 meeting, the Transportation Authority Board approved FY 2017/18 TFCA funds for the Emergency Ride Home program with the condition that the TFCA funds are not to be used on rides provided by TNCs. On July 2, 2018, Lyft announced that it has acquired Motivate, the operator of Ford GoBike. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | SFSU |  | 7 | 1 | No | \$73,416 | 311.5 | \$56,500 | \$56,500 | \$ | - |

${ }^{1}$ Sponsor acronyms include Department of the Environment (SFE), San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and San Francisco State University (SFSU).
 alternative fuel vehicle projects, and finally any other eligible project.
 from non-TFCA sources. CE ratio limits vary by project type: for FY 18/19 the limit for Ridesharing/Trip Reduction Projects, which encompasses Emergency Ride Home, Ford GoBike
 $\$ 250,000$ per ton of emissions reduced.
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| RECOMMENDED PROJECTS (sorted by cost-effectiveness (CE) ratio) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sponsor ${ }^{2}$ | Project | Total Project Cost | TFCA Requested | TFCA Recommended |
| SFE | Emergency Ride Home | \$50,734 | \$50,734 | \$50,734 |
| SFSU | Bike Cage at SF State Thornton Hall | \$40,069 | \$40,069 | \$40,069 |
| EVgo | Off-Street Car Share Electrification (DC Fast Chargers) | \$182,200 | \$127,200 | \$127,200 |
| ABM Parking <br> Service | Grace Cathedral Electric Car Chargers | \$170,000 | \$170,000 | \$170,000 |
|  | Totals: | \$443,003 | \$388,003 | \$388,003 |
| Total TFCA Funding Available for Projects: <br> Reserve (to be programmed through a second call for projects and approved by the Board by November 2, 2018) $\square$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{1}$ Projects are listed in ranked order by cost-effectiveness ratio. ${ }^{2}$ See Attachment 2 for acronyms and other notes |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## Memorandum

Date: June 20, 2018
To: Transportation Authority Board
From: Anna LaForte - Deputy Director for Policy and Programming
Subject: 07/10/18 Board Meeting: Approve Part 1 of the Fiscal Year 2018/19 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program of Projects, Programming $\$ 388,003$ to Four Projects

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

- Approve Part 1 of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2018/19 Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program of Projects, Programming $\$ 388,003$ to Four Projects:

O Emergency Ride Home ( $\$ 50,734$ to San Francisco Environment)
o Bike Cage at SFSU Thornton Hall (\$40,069 to SFSU)
o Off-Street Car Share Electrification DC Fast Chargers (\$127,200 to EVgo)
o Grace Cathedral DC Fast Chargers (\$170,000 to ABM Parking Service)

- Place $\$ 376,240$ in FY 2018/19 TFCA funds on reserve, to be programmed following a second call for projects this fall


## SUMMARY

As the San Francisco TFCA County Program Manager, the Transportation Authority annually develops the Program of Projects for San Francisco's share of TFCA funds. Funds come from a portion of a $\$ 4$ vehicle registration fee in the Bay Area and are used for projects that reduce motor vehicle emissions. For FY 2018/19, we are recommending fully funding four of the six project applications received. We are not recommending the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's Dynamic Carpool Pickup Curbs project because it does not meet the Air District's applicable cost-effectiveness threshold and thus is not eligible for TFCA funds. Consistent with past policy direction that TFCA funds not be used for rides provided by Transportation Network Companies (e.g., Uber and Lyft), and at the direction of Chair Peskin, we are not recommending the Ford GoBike Memberships for San Francisco State University Students project given that the operator Motivate, was recently acquired by Lyft.
$\square$ Fund Allocation
$\boxtimes$ Fund Programming
$\square$ Policy/Legislation
$\square$ Plan/Study
$\square$ Capital Project
Oversight/Delivery
$\square$ Budget/Finance
$\square$ Contracts
$\square$ Procurement
$\square$ Other:Other:

## DISCUSSION

## Background.

The TFCA Program was established to fund the most cost-effective transportation projects that achieve emission reductions from motor vehicles in accordance with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (Air District) Clean Air Plan. Funds are generated from a $\$ 4$ surcharge on the vehicle registration fee collected by the Department of Motor Vehicles on motor vehicles registered in the nine Bay Area counties. Forty percent of the revenues are distributed on a return-to-source basis to Program Managers for each of the nine counties in the Air District. The Transportation Authority is the designated County Program Manager for the City and County of San Francisco. The remaining sixty percent of the revenues, referred to as the TFCA Regional Fund, are distributed to applicants from the nine Bay Area counties via programs administered by the Air District.
On March 2, 2018 we issued the FY 2018/19 TFCA San Francisco County Program Manager call for projects. We received six project applications by the April 20, 2017 deadline, requesting $\$ 1,209,996$ in TFCA funds compared to $\$ 764,243$ available.

## Available Funds.

As shown in the table below, the amount of available funds is comprised of estimated FY 2018/19 TFCA revenues, interest income, and de-obligated funds from completed and canceled prior-year TFCA projects.

| Estimated TFCA Funds Available for Projects <br> FY 2018/19 |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Estimated TFCA Revenues (FY 2018/19) | $\$ 759,899$ |
| Interest Income | $\$ 1,549$ |
| De-obligated Funds from Prior Cycles | $\$ 50,289$ |
|  | Total Funds |
| $6.25 \%$ Administrative Expense | $\$ 811,737$ |
|  | $(\$ 47,494)$ |

After netting out $6.25 \%$ for Transportation Authority staff administrative expenses as allowed by the Air District, the estimated amount available to program to projects is $\$ 764,243$.

## Prioritization Process.

We evaluated the TFCA project applications following the Board adopted prioritization process for developing the TFCA Program of Projects shown in Attachment 1. The first step involved screening projects to ensure eligibility according to the Air District's TFCA guidelines. One of the most important aspects of this screening was ensuring a project's cost effectiveness (CE) ratio was calculated correctly and was low enough to be eligible for consideration. The Air District's CE ratio, described in detail in Attachment 1, is designed to measure the cost effectiveness of a project in reducing air pollutant emissions and to encourage submittal of projects that leverage funds from non-TFCA sources. CE ratio limits vary by project type: for 2018/19 the limit for Ridesharing Projects, which encompasses transit and transportation demand management projects, is $\$ 150,000$ per ton of emissions reduced, the limit for the Bicycle Projects and Alternative Fuel Infrastructure categories is $\$ 250,000$ per ton of emissions reduced.

We performed our review of the CE ratio calculations in consultation with project sponsors and the Air District. The focus was to ensure that the forms were completed correctly, that values other than default values had adequate justification, and that assumptions were consistently applied across all project applications for a fair evaluation. Inevitably, as a result of our review, we had to adjust some of the submitted CE worksheets. In these cases, we worked with the project sponsor to determine the correct CE ratio and whether or not it exceeded the Air District's CE threshold.

We then prioritized projects that passed the eligibility screening using factors such as project type (e.g., first priority to zero emission projects), cost effectiveness, program diversity, project delivery (i.e., readiness), and other considerations (e.g., a sponsor's track record for delivering prior TFCA projects). Our prioritization process also considered carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions reduced by each project. CO2 emissions are estimated in the Air District's CE worksheets but are not a factor in the CE calculations.

## Staff Recommendation.

We are recommending programming a total of $\$ 388,003$ to four of the six candidate projects and placing the remaining $\$ 376,240$ on reserve to be programmed through a subsequent call for projects. Attachment 2 contains two tables: projects recommended for funding and projects not recommended for funding. Both tables include a brief project description, total project cost, the amount of TFCA funds requested, the cost-effectiveness ratio, and other information.
Of the four projects recommended for funding, two are zero emissions non-vehicle projects, which is the top priority project type in the Board-adopted prioritization criteria, and two are electric vehicle infrastructure projects. The Off-Street Car Share Electrification DC Fast Chargers project, recommended for $\$ 127,200$, requires a policy waiver from the Air District to allow the chargers to be dedicated for carshare vehicles instead of publicly available to any electric vehicle. We are optimistic that we will receive the waiver from the Air District in Fall 2018. If the waiver is not approved by the Air District, we will add the funds to the reserve for reprogramming.
The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA's) Dynamic Carpool Pickup Curbs project does not meet the Air District's cost-effectiveness threshold for ridesharing projects and thus is not eligible for TFCA funds. The project is primarily focused on increasing eastbound carpools in the evening commute across the Bay Bridge, and to meet cost-effectiveness guidelines would have to almost double the total number of current casual carpool users. The project would provide little to no cost-saving or time-saving incentives to encourage single-occupant vehicle drivers to carpool, as the project would primarily offer convenient pickup spots to encourage carpooling in the evening commute. People joining new carpools in the evening commute would likely be current transit riders, in which case these new carpools would not reduce emissions from car trips. The SFMTA is considering requesting Prop K funds to further develop and implement the project through the underway 5-Year Prioritization Program update.
We are not recommending TFCA funds for the San Francisco State University's Ford GoBike Memberships for SF State Students project to be consistent with past Board policy direction that these public funds are not to be used on rides provided by Transportation Network Companies (TNCs such as Lyft and Uber). Subsequent to the June 27 Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting, Lyft announced that it had purchased Motivate, the operator of Ford GoBike. At the direction of Chair Peskin, we have revised the staff recommendation accordingly..

## Additional Call for Projects.

We anticipate releasing the additional call for projects in July 2018 to program the remaining $\$ 376,240$ in San Francisco TFCA funds. We have already begun working with project sponsors to identify potential TFCA project candidates. We plan to present a recommendation to the CAC in September and Board in October 2018.

## Schedule for Funds Availability.

We expect to enter into a master funding agreement with the Air District by August 2018 after which we will issue grant agreements for the recommended FY 2018/19 TFCA funds. Pending timely review and execution of the grant agreements by the Air District and project sponsors, we expect funds to be available for expenditure beginning in September 2018.

## FINANCIAL IMPACT

The estimated total budget for the recommended FY 2018/19 TFCA program is $\$ 811,737$. This includes $\$ 764,243$ for projects and $\$ 47,494$ for administrative expenses. Revenues and expenditures for the TFCA program are included in the adopted Transportation Authority FY 2018/19 budget.

## CAC POSITION

The CAC was briefed on this item, which, at the time, included a recommendation to fund SFSU's Ford GoBike Memberships for SF State Students project, at its June 27, 2018 meeting and unanimously adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation.

## SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

Attachment 1 - FY 2018/19 TFCA Local Expenditure Criteria
Attachment 2 - FY 2018/19 TFCA Program of Projects - Detailed Staff Recommendation
Attachment 3 - FY 2018/19 TFCA Program of Projects - Summary of Staff Recommendation

## RESOLUTION APPROVING A THREE-YEAR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT

 WITH CIVIC EDGE CONSULTING IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$150,000 FOR STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS, MEDIA AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICES FOR THE CONNECTSF PROGRAMWHEREAS, The Transportation Authority is collaborating with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and the San Francisco Planning Department to facilitate the ConnectSF program, which is a multi-agency, collaborative, long-range planning process to build an effective, equitable, and sustainable transportation system for San Francisco's future; and

WHEREAS, The Transportation Authority is seeking consultant services to provide strategic communications, media and community relations for the ConnectSF Program; and

WHEREAS, On May 4, 2018, the Transportation Authority issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for strategic communications, media and community relations services; and

WHEREAS, On May 16, 2018, the Transportation Authority hosted a pre-proposal conference for small businesses and larger firms to meet and form partnerships; and

WHEREAS, The Transportation Authority received four proposals in response to the RFP by the due date of June 5, 2018; and

WHEREAS, A review panel comprised of staff from the SFMTA, San Francisco Planning Department, and the Transportation Authority interviewed the three top-ranked firms on June, 2018; and

WHEREAS, Based on the results of this competitive selection process, the panel recommends the Transportation Authority Board approve a consultant contract with the highest-ranked firm Civic Edge Consulting; and

WHEREAS, The Transportation Authority has budgeted $\$ 150,000$ for the requested services,
funded by a Memorandum of Agreement with the Planning Department and a federal Surface Transportation Planning grant; and

WHEREAS, The adopted Fiscal Year 2018/19 budget will include this year's activities, and future budgets will include sufficient funds for the remaining activities; and

WHEREAS, At its June 27, 2018 meeting, the Citizens Advisory Committee was briefed on and unanimously adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority hereby awards a Three-Year Professional Services Contract with Civic Edge Consulting in an Amount Not to Exceed \$150,000 for Strategic Communications, Media and Community Relations Services for the ConnectSF Program; 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

Scope of Services

ConnectSF seeks assistance with developing a strong, integrated public outreach plan for its Transportation Network Development, the Transit Corridors Study and the Streets and Freeways Study (also known as ConnectSF Phase 2). The Transit Corridors Study and the Streets and Freeway Study are two stand-alone studies that will be prepared in parallel to identify the long-term projects and policies needed on the City's transit system, streets, and freeways to achieve the ConnectSF vision. Given the studies' broad reach and long-range horizon, an effective communications and engagement plan is needed to inform stakeholders and the general public about these efforts and solicit feedback on their development and content.

In seeking assistance with the ConnectSF program's communications, outreach and engagement efforts, the Transportation Authority seeks to advance the following goals and objectives:

- Raise awareness about ConnectSF to the general public.
- Provide consistent and easy-to-understand public communication regarding ConnectSF and Phase 2 efforts.
- Create messaging, collateral, and branding that is informative, relevant, and engaging to the general public.
- Maintain a common voice and look and feel for ConnectSF materials.
- Strengthen quality assurance/quality control, while maintaining the flexibility for rapid responses.
- Engage with, and solicit input from, policymakers, the public, and stakeholder groups about Phase 2 activities, and in particular develop methods to obtain meaningful input from hard-to-reach-population segments.

The following Scope of Services is to be used as a general guide and is not intended to be a complete list of all work necessary to build an integrated communications and engagement plan for Phase 2 of the ConnectSF program.

Specific tasks include: 1) Project Kick-Off Meeting, Information Review, and Work Plan, 2) Planning for Public Outreach and Engagement, 3) Outreach Support Services, 4) Data Visualization, and 5) Administration and Reporting. The tasks are detailed below:

## Task 1. Project Kick-Off Meeting, Information Review, and Work Plan

Work Plan will include analysis of different groups for outreach and preferred methods to reach each one. Key audiences to targeted include, but are not limited to:
a. Community-based Organizations, including transportation-focused groups and others
b. General public
c. Underrepresented groups, including youth, minorities, and low-income residents
d. Groups representing the elderly or people with disabilities
e. Employers
f. Tourism interests
g. ConnectSF Futures Task Force
h. Transportation Authority Citizens Advisory Committee
i. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Citizens' Advisory Council
j. Boards and Commissions
k. Other transportation agencies

Deliverables:

## Attachment 1 <br> Scope of Services

1. W ork plan outlining outreach methods, including specific outreach techniques for the various communities and entities identified above

Task 2. Planning for Public Outreach and Engagement
a. Develop and implement a robust outreach strategy and communications plan covering 18month processes
b. Support the development and/or review of project communications collateral, such as inlanguage fact sheets, flyers, handouts, posters, mailers, surveys, social media, content and attachments for the website, and frequently asked questions

## Deliverables:

1. Execute the outreach plan, develop supporting collateral

## Task 3. Outreach Support Services

a. Secure venues for public meetings
b. Develop and vet open house and workshop outreach plan
c. Translation of materials
d. Public notifications for open house, workshop events, or other public meetings
e. Provide materials and logistical support for open house, workshop events, or other public meetings

## Deliverables:

1. Public meeting spaces identified and secured
2. Translation services secured
3. Meeting notifications

## Task 4. Data Visualization

Provide support to staff to create compelling visualizations, "games," and/or other materials to engage the public.

## Deliverables:

## 1. Data visualization platform selected

## Task 5. Administration and Reporting

Weekly/monthly project phone calls/in-person progress meetings with ConnectSF staff, including agendas and meeting minutes. Management of overall project tasks and invoice preparation.

## Deliverables:

1. Meeting notes, progress updates
2. Project reporting and monthly invoices by task.

## Memorandum

Date: June 21, 2018
To: Transportation Authority Board
From: Eric Young - Senior Communications Officer
Subject: 07/10/18 Board Meeting: Approve a Three-Year Professional Services Contract with Civic Edge Consulting in an Amount Not to Exceed \$150,000 for Strategic Communications, Media and Community Relations Services for the ConnectSF Program

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

- Approve a three-year professional services contract with Civic Edge Consulting in an amount not to exceed $\$ 150,000$ for strategic communications, media and community relations services for the ConnectSF Program
- Authorize the Executive Director to negotiate contract payment terms and non-material terms and conditions


## SUMMARY

We are seeking consultant services to provide strategic communications, media and community relations for the ConnectSF Program, which is a multi-agency, collaborative, long-range planning process to build an effective, equitable, and sustainable transportation system for San Francisco's future. We issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) in May. By the proposal due date, we received four proposals. Following interviews with three firms, the review panel recommended Civic Edge Consulting to provide the requested services.

## DISCUSSION

## Background.

The Transportation Authority is collaborating with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and the San Francisco Planning Department to facilitate the ConnectSF program. Phase 1 of ConnectSF has defined a 50-year vision of San Francisco's future that represents San Francisco's goals and aspirations as a city within the larger Bay Area. The vision will be used as a framework for future studies related to transportation and land use planning in San Francisco and constitutes ConnectSF's first phase of work. The vision is available on connectsf.org/about/components/vision.

Phase 2 of ConnectSF, now underway, involves several major efforts that support the transportation vision. Those efforts and the time frames in which they are anticipated to take place include: the Transportation Needs Assessment (2018), Transportation Network Development for the San Francisco Transportation Plan (2018), Transit Corridors Study (2018-19) and Streets and Freeways

Study (2018-19). The outcome of Phase 2 will be a prioritized list of projects and strategies that are needed to move the city towards meeting the goals and objectives agreed upon in the Phase 1 Vision. Phase 3 of ConnectSF will include a new Transportation Element of the City's General Plan and an update to the countywide transportation plan or San Francisco Transportation Plan (SFTP 2050). Outreach for Phase 3 will be a subsequent effort and not part of the subject contract.

Given the ConnectSF vision's emphasis on equity and diversity, it is critical that communications and outreach for the program reach the broadest audience possible. Program staff are highly interested in engaging people of color, people with low incomes, persons with disabilities, and other vulnerable populations, as well as non-governmental organizations that support these communities. The above studies listed are complex and different from each other. Yet, they are tied together by the ConnectSF vision goals and objectives and time horizon (2050). We are seeking consultant services to help all participating agencies devise effective ways of communicating to the public, community benefit organizations, elected leaders and others in a way that is seamless and that communicates why the studies are important and why people should be engaged.

## Procurement Process.

We issued a RFP for strategic communications, media and community relations services on May 4, 2018. We hosted a pre-proposal conference at the Transportation Authority's offices on May 16, which provided opportunities for small businesses and larger firms to meet and form partnerships. Twenty-two firms attended the conference.. We took steps to encourage participation from small and disadvantaged business enterprises, including advertising in six local newspapers: the San Francisco Examiner, the San Francisco Bay View, Nichi Bei, the Small Business Exchange, the Western Edition and the San Francisco Bayview, as well as on LinkedIn. We also distributed the RFP and questions and answers to certified small, disadvantaged and local businesses, Bay Area and cultural chambers of commerce, and small business councils.

By the due date of June 5, 2018, we received four proposals in response to the RFP. A selection panel comprised of Transportation Authority, San Francisco Planning Department and San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency staff evaluated the proposals based on qualifications and other criteria identified in the RFP, including the proposer's understanding of project objectives, technical and management approach, and capabilities and experience. The panel selected three firms to interview on June 19. Based on the competitive process defined in the RFP, the panel recommends that the Board award the contract to the highest-ranked firm: Civic Edge Consulting.

The panel unanimously agreed that Civic Edge Consulting distinguished itself through a number of criteria. The assembled team has a breadth of capabilities, including project management, grassroots outreach, communications, and digital organizing skills. The team has recent experience coordinating across agencies through the Vision Zero initiative. The team also stood out for its experience working on long-term planning efforts including Plan Bay Area 2040. The team's strong references and awareness of transportation and land use issues contributed to an overall strong proposal. Team members have many years of experience and have worked jointly or independently for clients including the San Francisco Planning Department, Office of Economic and Workforce Development, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, among others.

We established a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) goal of 14\% for this contract. Proposals from all three firms that were interviewed met or exceeded the goal. The Civic Edge Consulting team includes $17 \%$ DBE participation from two subconsultants: RDJ Enterprises, a San Francisco-based African American-owned firm, and TransSight, an Asian Subcontinent-owned firm.

## FINANCIAL IMPACT

We have budgeted $\$ 150,000$ for the requested services, funded by a Memorandum of Agreement with the Planning Department and a federal Surface Transportation Planning grant The adopted Fiscal Year 2018/19 budget will include this year's activities, and future budgets will include sufficient funds for the remaining activities.

## CAC POSITION

The CAC was briefed on this item at its June 27, 2018 meeting and unanimously adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation.

## SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

Attachment 1 - Scope of Services
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## RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE EMERGING MOBILITY EVALUATION REPORT

WHEREAS, The San Francisco Charter mandates Transit First, charging the City and County of San Francisco with providing for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods in San Francisco; and

WHEREAS, In the last decade, San Francisco has seen dramatic growth of many emerging mobility services and technologies (EMST) that present opportunities while also challenging that core policy; and

WHEREAS, These services and technologies include everything from mobile applications that connect passengers with demand-responsive transportation vehicles to self-driving and connected vehicles; and

WHEREAS, These technological advances in transportation services have resulted in services that may complement and conflict with the City's Transit First and other policies and likely require updates to existing transportation infrastructure, rules, regulations and policies; and

WHEREAS, The Transportation Authority and the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) collaboratively developed Guiding Principles for Emerging Mobility Services, adopted in June 2017, that serve as a framework both for proactive public-sector development of policies and programs, and for the formulation of sound, consistent responses when warranted; and

WHEREAS, Together with the SFMTA, the Transportation Authority has engaged in an EMST study that includes several core tasks such as documentation of existing services and technology, developing a policy framework, and evaluating existing services and their ability to meet San Francisco Transportation Plan and citywide goals; and

WHEREAS, For the EMST, staff developed evaluation criteria based on the Guiding Principles for Emerging Mobility, engaging a wide range of community, industry and civic
stakeholders in the process; and
WHEREAS, Staff used a data-driven process to develop the Draft Emerging Mobility Evaluation Report, documenting how emerging mobility services were aligned or misaligned with the Guiding Principles and providing recommendations for sector management, research, and partnerships; and

WHEREAS, At its May 8, 2018 meeting, the Transportation Authority Board was briefed on the Draft Emerging Mobility Evaluation Report and provided input and feedback to staff which has been incorporated into the final Emerging Mobility Evaluation Report (enclosed); and

WHEREAS, The evaluation determined the following major takeaways:

- Companies that performed pilots with and provided data to San Francisco public agencies have informed development of permit systems for those mobility types and have guided those mobility types to be more aligned with the Guiding Principles;
- We do not have adequate data to fully evaluate alignment with our Guiding Principles. Other researchers have produced important studies and findings, but more traveler trip data and surveys are needed to characterize San Francisco travel markets;
- Many emerging mobility services are available during late-night hours, on weekends, and/or in areas less well covered by public transit. This may provide opportunities to increase mobility and access for people with disabilities and people underserved by public transit;
- While some services play a useful first/last-mile connection, very few emerging mobility companies have implemented design features or policies that our methodology identified as directly supportive of transit;
- Operator training is inconsistent among emerging mobility services; many services
exhibit conflicts at curbs, in transit-priority lanes and on sidewalks;
- The City and the emerging mobility companies have not consistently coordinated to develop a robust curb management approach;
- The Transportation Authority's TNCs Today study found that ride-hail vehicles in San Francisco are concentrated during times of day and neighborhoods of the city where traffic is most congested; and

WHEREAS, Based on the study findings, the final report recommends that the city implement the following recommendations:

- Partner: The SFMTA and the Transportation Authority should develop a framework for emerging mobility pilots to proactively partner with companies to develop innovative solutions to address unmet city transportation needs;
- Measure: San Francisco public agencies should develop a data reporting and warehouse strategy to coordinate and consolidate existing data streams;
- Regulate: The SFMTA should harmonize existing permit programs related to emerging mobility and create a framework for new services;
- Bridge: The City should develop a user study to understand who uses emerging mobility services and focus on equity gaps for low-income users and issues related to disabled access;
- Prioritize: The Transportation Authority and the SFMTA should continue to support the expansion of transit-priority facilities and conduct pilot programs that improve first and last mile connectivity to transit stations;
- Enforce: The SFMTA and the Police Department should increase enforcement of known conflict areas and automate some enforcement duties to promote safety;
- Price: The SFMTA and the Transportation Authority should prioritize developing a curb management strategy that allocates and prices curb access appropriately. Based on current congestion levels on San Francisco roadways, San Francisco should move toward implementing a decongestion pricing and incentives system; and

WHEREAS, At its June 27, 2018 meeting, the Citizens Advisory Committee was briefed on and unanimously adopted a motion of support for the adoption of the final Emerging Mobility Evaluation Report; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority hereby adopts the final Emerging Mobility Evaluation Report; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Executive Director is hereby authorized to communicate this information to all relevant agencies and interested parties.

Enclosure:

1. Final Emerging Mobility Evaluation Report

## Memorandum

Date: June 27, 2018
To: Transportation Authority Board
From: Jeff Hobson - Deputy Director of Planning
Subject: 07/10/2018 Board Meeting: Adoption of Emerging Mobility Evaluation Report
 evaluation report, and a few examples of how we and the SFMTA are already addressing some of the report's recommendations. There have been no substantive changes to the report since the draft was released, though we have made slight adjustments to scores for some of the providers in response to additional data that they provided to us. The final report is included as an enclosure.

## DISCUSSION

## Background

In the last decade, a number of emerging mobility services and technologies have emerged that increase mobility choices and transportation benefits for some travelers, while also presenting challenges or impacts to other travelers, or to the attainment of key city transportation policies and goals, such as Transit First, Vision Zero, climate and equity. These services and technologies include everything from mobile applications that connect passengers with demand-responsive transportation services to self-driving and connected vehicles.

The 10 Guiding Principles for Emerging Mobility, adopted in June 2017 serve as a framework both for proactive public-sector development of policies and programs, and for formulation of sound, consistent responses when warranted. They also provide a clear indication to mobility companies about what the City seeks and expects from emerging mobility service providers.

For the Emerging Mobility Evaluation Report, we developed evaluation criteria based on the adopted

Guiding Principles for Emerging Mobility, engaging a wide range of community, industry and civic stakeholders in the process. Using a data-driven process, we developed and released the Draft Emerging Mobility Evaluation Report in May 2018 documenting how emerging mobility services were aligned or misaligned with the Guiding Principles and providing recommendations for sector management, research, and partnerships.

## Draft Report Feedback

In addition to presenting the draft report to the Board and Citizens Advisory Committee, we solicited feedback on the draft report from community stakeholders, advocacy groups, and emerging mobility companies. Some emerging mobility companies provided additional data and information about their services, which resulted in minor changes to some service evaluation scores. Several stakeholders encouraged the city to prioritize opportunities to improve public transit and make it competitive with emerging mobility services. Advocacy groups encouraged the city to partner with, and when possible require, emerging mobility services to bridge gaps for low-income people and people with disabilities. Finally, Transportation Commissioners urged us to be more proactive in our efforts, work collaboratively with other city agencies including the Mayor's Office, and increase enforcement efforts when possible. To that end, we have continued outreach to emerging mobility companies to understand their company's next steps and goals. Additionally, we are developing future strategies with the Committee on Information Technology, the Mayor's Office of Civic Innovation, SF Environment, and the SFMTA.

## Evaluation Results Overview

Our evaluation determined the following major takeaways:

- Companies that performed pilots with and provided data to San Francisco public agencies have informed development of permit systems for those mobility types and have guided those mobility types to be more aligned with the Guiding Principles.
- We do not have adequate data to fully evaluate alignment with our Guiding Principles. Other researchers have produced important studies and findings, but more traveler trip data and surveys are needed to characterize San Francisco travel markets.
- Many emerging mobility services are available during late-night hours, on weekends, and/or in areas less well covered by public transit. This may provide opportunities to increase mobility and access for people with disabilities and people underserved by public transit.
- While some services play a useful first/last-mile connection, very few emerging mobility companies have implemented design features or policies that our methodology identified as directly supportive of transit.
- Operator training is inconsistent among emerging mobility services; many services exhibit conflicts at curbs, in transit-priority lanes and on sidewalks.
- The City and the emerging mobility companies have not consistently coordinated to develop a robust curb management approach.
- Our TNCs Today study found that ride-hail vehicles in San Francisco are concentrated during times of day and neighborhoods of the city where traffic is most congested.


## Recommendations

## Agenda Item 10

Based on the findings of the Emerging Mobility Evaluation Report, we recommend the city implement the following recommendations:

- Partner: The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and the Transportation Authority should develop a framework for emerging mobility pilots to proactively partner with companies to develop innovative solutions to address unmet city transportation needs.
- Measure: San Francisco public agencies should develop a data reporting and warehouse strategy to coordinate and consolidate existing data streams.
- Regulate: The SFMTA should harmonize existing permit programs related to emerging mobility and create a framework for new services.
- Bridge: The City should develop a user study to understand who uses emerging mobility services and focus on equity gaps for low-income users and issues related to disabled access.
- Prioritize: The Transportation Authority and the SFMTA should continue to support the expansion of transit-priority facilities and conduct pilot programs that improve first and last mile connectivity to transit stations.
- Enforce: The SFMTA and the Police Department should increase enforcement of known conflict areas and automate some enforcement duties to promote safety.
- Price: The SFMTA and the Transportation Authority should prioritize developing a curb management strategy that allocates and prices curb access appropriately. Based on current congestion levels on San Francisco roadways, San Francisco should move toward implementing a decongestion pricing and incentives system.


## Emerging Mobility Initiatives Underway

The Transportation Authority and the SFMTA have taken steps to advance several priority recommendations, including:

- We are working together with the Mayor's Office to develop a strategy for collaboration that includes a framework for future pilot projects.
- The Transportation Authority has partnered with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to conduct a travel behavior survey about emerging mobility and we are developing strategies to bridge access gaps in District 10 through our D10 Multimodal Mobility Management Study.
- The SFMTA is working to harmonize emerging mobility permits, coordinate data they receive through those permits and is developing a curb management strategy to improve roadway safety and reduce congestion.


## FINANCIAL IMPACT

The recommended action does not impact the adopted Fiscal Year 2018/19 budget. Funding for the underway activities is included in the adopted Fiscal Year 2018/19 agency budget.

## CAC POSITION

Agenda Item 10
The CAC was briefed on this item at its June 27, 2018 meeting and unanimously adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation.

## SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

Enclosure - Final Emerging Mobility Evaluation Report

RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT (BART) PERKS EVALUATION FINDINGS DOCUMENT

WHEREAS, From August 2016 through February 2017, the Transportation Authority and BART offered a test program that provided incentives to riders for travelling during the shoulder hours (also known as bonus hours) of the morning peak period instead of during the peak hour; and

WHEREAS, Since completion of the test, staff conducted a comprehensive evaluation of the program and prepared the enclosed draft document with the findings as stated below:

- Incentives worked. The Perks program demonstrated that incentives can be successfully used to shift the departure times of peak period travelers. Program participants reduced inbound Transbay peak hour travel by $10.9 \%$, and overall peak hour system travel by $9.6 \%$;
- Small shifts in departure time. Participants were more likely to travel in one of the bonus hours if it was close to their typical departure time;
- Persistent behavior change. While some participants returned to traveling during the peak hour after the program ended, Perks had some lingering effects on travel behavior. Of the peak hour trips that were cut during the program, $35 \%$ of those trips continued to happen outside of the peak hour in the four months after the program; and

WHEREAS, BART received a grant from the Federal Transit Administration to conduct another phase of BART Perks; and

WHEREAS, The enclosed "Lessons from Perks: Evaluations Findings from the BART Perks Test Program" Draft Document details lessons learned from the initial test and recommendations for future programs that address program design, marketing and recruitment, and user experience; and

WHEREAS, BART will use the lessons learned and recommendations from the first pilot to inform the next phase of BART Perks; and

WHEREAS, The recommended action would not have an impact on the adopted Fiscal Year 2018/19 budget; and

WHEREAS, At its June 27, 2018, the Citizens Advisory Committee unanimously adopted a motion of support to accept the BART Perks Evaluation Findings Document.; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Board hereby adopts the BART Perks Evaluation Findings Document.
RESOLVED, That the Executive Director is hereby authorized to communicate this information to all relevant agencies and interested parties.

Enclosure:

1. "Lessons from Perks: Evaluations Findings from the BART Perks Test Program" Draft Document

## Memorandum

Date: June 18, 2018
To: Transportation Authority Board
From: Jeff Hobson - Deputy Director of Planning
Subject: 7/10/18 Board Meeting: Adoption of BART Perks Evaluation Findings Document


## DISCUSSION

## Background.

From August 2016 through February 2017, the Transportation Authority and BART offered a test program that provided incentives to riders for travelling during the shoulder hours (also known as bonus hours) of the morning peak period instead of during the peak hour. Nearly 18,000 participants enrolled in the program through a mobile-friendly website. Participants' points were redeemed automatically each week, and cash rewards were paid out monthly via PayPal. The program was funded primarily with a grant from the Federal Highway Administration's Value Pricing Pilot Program. BART Perks also received BART and Prop K sales tax funds.

## Full Evaluation.

Since completion of the test, staff conducted a comprehensive evaluation of the program and prepared a draft document with the findings. This memorandum outlines the report findings.

## Key Findings.

- Incentives worked. The Perks program demonstrated that incentives can be successfully used to shift the departure times of peak period travelers. Program participants reduced inbound Transbay peak hour travel by $10.9 \%$, and overall peak hour system travel by $9.6 \%$.
- Small shifts in departure time. Participants were more likely to travel in one of the bonus hours if it was close to their typical departure time.
- Persistent behavior change. While some participants returned to traveling during the peak hour after the program ended, Perks had some lingering effects on travel behavior. Of the peak hour trips that were cut during the program, $35 \%$ of those trips continued to happen outside of the peak hour in the four months after the program.


## Recommendations for Future Programs.

BART received a grant from the Federal Transit Administration to conduct another phase of BART Perks. Below are some lessons learned from the initial test and recommendations for future programs:

- Program Design
o Focus rewards on bebavior change and tailor rewards based on participant characteristics. Many participants already traveled in the bonus hours before the program started. To avoid this kind of self-selection, future programs should ideally be structured to rewards behavior change rather than pre-existing behavior.
o More precisely target congested periods. Rather than setting a single peak hour for everyone, future programs could more precisely target congested periods by tailoring the incentivized time periods to actual (or expected) congestion levels on BART and riders' origin and destination stations.
o Consider social equity implications. Participants tended to be higher income and less ethnically diverse than BART riders as a whole. To reward a broader group of riders while retaining program cost-effectiveness, future programs would need to expand objectives beyond peak period crowding reductions.
o Consider risk in partnering with a start-up company. The Perks platform was developed by a local Bay Area technology start-up. When a start-up is successful, it is common for it to be acquired by a larger company. This was the case with Perks, and the parent company decided not to continue to provide the platform as a service moving forward. When start-ups are not successful, there is also a risk that they could dissolve and thus can no longer provide services.
- Marketing \& Recruitment
o Obtain sufficient peak travelers. To have a true impact on volumes, future programs would need to enroll a much higher number of peak period Transbay travelers and/or significantly increase how much they shift.
o Address employer barriers to shifting later and personal barriers to shifting earlier. Work-related constraints were identified as the top barriers for participants to arrive at work late. Future employer engagement could encourage employers to allow workers to arrive late. Participants cited personal reasons as the top barrier to arriving at work early. Future programs might explore partnerships to encourage early arrival, such as discounts at gyms near their offices or discounts on foods/beverages purchased early in the morning.
- User Experience
o Create seamless payment options. Participants redeemed points via PayPal. Many participants experienced payment delay if they did not have a PayPal account or if they registered for Perks with an email different from their PayPal account. A top request was to load incentives payments back on the user's Clipper card, or to at least provide options that do not require having a separate account and credentials to receive payment.


## FINANCIAL IMPACT

The recommended action would not have an impact on the adopted Fiscal Year 2018/19 budget.

## CAC POSITION

The CAC was briefed on this item at its June 27, 2018 meeting and unanimously adopted a motion of support for the staff recommendation.

## SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

Enclosure - "Lessons from Perks: Evaluation Findings from the BART Perks Test Program" Draft Document
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RESOLUTION ADOPTING AN OPPOSE POSITION ON PROPOSITION 6 THE VOTER APPROVAL FOR FUTURE GAS AND VEHICLE TAXES AND 2017 TAX REPEAL INITIATIVE

WHEREAS, The Transportation Authority approves a set of legislative principles to guide transportation policy advocacy in the sessions of the Federal and State Legislatures; and

WHEREAS, With the assistance of the Transportation Authority's legislative advocate in Sacramento, staff has reviewed pending legislation for the current Legislative Session and analyzed it for consistency with the Transportation Authority's adopted legislative principles and for impacts on transportation funding and program implementation in San Francisco; and

WHEREAS, At its July 24, 2018 meeting, the Board reviewed and discussed Proposition 6 the Voter Approval for Future Gas and Vehicle Taxes and 2017 Tax Repeal Initiative; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Transportation Authority hereby adopts an oppose position for Proposition 6 the Voter Approval for Future Gas and Vehicle Taxes and 2017 Tax Repeal Initiative; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Executive Director is directed to communicate this position to all relevant parties.

Attachment: Table 1

State Legislation - July 24, 2018
To view documents associated with the proposition, click the bill number link.

As shown in Table 1, staff is recommending the Board consider adopting an oppose position on Proposition 6 on the first read, given the importance of communicating the agency's position now that the measure has qualified for the November 2018 ballot and in light of the upcoming Board recess.

Table 1. Recommendation for New Position

| $\begin{array}{l}\text { Recommended } \\ \text { Position }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Bill \# } \\ \text { Author }\end{array}$ | Title and Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Oppose | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Prop 6 } \\ \text { Legislative } \\ \text { Constitutional } \\ \text { Amendment } \\ \text { on California's } \\ \text { November 6, } \\ 2018 \text { ballot }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Senate Bill 1 (SB 1) Repeal Initiative. } \\ \text { Proposition 6 would provide that any tax on motor vehicle fuel or vehicles } \\ \text { themselves must be subject to a vote of the people and would apply } \\ \text { retroactively to January 1, 2017, as shown in Attachment A. As a result, this } \\ \text { measure would not only repeal the new revenues put into place by SB 1, it } \\ \text { would also set a very high bar for any future effort to raise revenue from } \\ \text { transportation user fees. } \\ \text { SB 1 provides San Francisco with over } \$ 60 \text { million per year in formula-based }\end{array}$ |
| funds that will be used to repave and maintain our roads, maintain and upgrade |  |  |
| our rail infrastructure, and increase Muni service on our city's most crowded |  |  |
| lines. In addition, regional transit providers like BART, Caltrain, and the San |  |  |
| Francisco Bay Ferry will receive over \$25 million per year for much-needed |  |  |
| improvements including escalator upgrades, hiring more police officers and |  |  |
| station cleaners, improving safety and reliability, and enhanced ferry service. SB |  |  |$\}$

## Memorandum

Date: July 18, 2018
To: Transportation Authority Board
From: Camille Guiriba - Transportation Planner, Planning
Subject: 7/24/18 Board Meeting: Update on Latest Muni Service Equity Strategy Report

| RECOMMENDATION $\triangle$ Information $\square$ Action | $\square$ Fund Allocation <br> $\square$ Fund Programming |
| :---: | :---: |
| SUMMARY | $\square$ Policy/Legislation |
| Every two years, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency | 区 Plan/Study |
| (SFMTA) is required to update the Service Equity Strategy in order to assess Muni service performance in select low income and minority | $\square$ Capital Project |
| cighborhoods and develop strategies to address transit relate | $\square$ Budget/Finance |
| challenges impacting these neighborhoods. This memo summarizes | $\square$ Contract/Agreement |
| findings from the most recent update of the Service Equity Strategy which was completed in March 2018. The most recent update resulted in | $\square$ Other: | the addition of Oceanview/Ingleside as a new Equity Strategy neighborhood and the recommendation of capital and service strategies for all eight Equity Strategy neighborhoods (see Tables 1 and 2 in the memo). Per the adopted Muni Service Equity Policy, SFMTA is required to present the Equity Strategy to the Transportation Authority Board for input as part of the two-year update process as well as report back on the effectiveness of strategies on an annual basis.

## DISCUSSION

## Background.

In 2014, the SFMTA Board of Directors adopted a Muni Service Equity Policy requiring the submission of a biennial Service Equity Strategy to assess Muni service performance in select low income and minority neighborhoods, identify major Muni transit related challenges impacting selected neighborhoods, and develop strategies to address those major challenges before the SFMTA's twoyear budget request. The impetus for the Equity Policy came from the Transportation 2030 Task Force discussions between members of the Transportation Authority and SFMTA leadership and advocates, Board members, SFMTA staff and advocates and drawing inspiration from equity analyses performed for the 2013 San Francisco Transportation Plan.

The first Equity Strategy Report was adopted in 2016. The SFMTA Board of Directors adopted the most recent Service Equity Strategy in March 2018. SFMTA reports that this update reflects data analysis to investigate transit needs in Equity Strategy Neighborhoods, extensive outreach to the Equity Service Neighborhoods that begun in Spring 2018 and input from the Muni Service Equity Strategy Working Group, whose members represent advocacy and community-based organizations, and Muni data analysis.

## Key Findings and Recommendations.

Addition to Service Equity Strategy Neighborboods. The Service Equity Policy directs SFMTA staff to identify equity neighborhoods based on percentage of low-income households, private vehicle availability, race/ethnicity demographics, and disability status. In collaboration with the Muni Service Equity Strategy Working Group, SFMTA staff identified seven Equity Strategy neighborhoods in 2016: Chinatown, Tenderloin/SoMa, Western Addition, Mission, Bayview, Visitacion Valley, and Excelsior/Outer Mission. For this year's update to the Equity Strategy, SFMTA staff and the Muni Service Equity Strategy Working Group identified one additional neighborhood, Oceanview/Ingleside, for a total of eight neighborhoods.

Key Needs and Recommended Strategies: SFMTA staff identified two to three key needs for each neighborhood and for routes heavily used by seniors and people with disabilities based on feedback received during stakeholder outreach and where data revealed underperformance relative to peer lines. SFMTA staff then developed the following new capital and service strategies to address them.

| NEIGHBORHOOD / TARGET | ROUTE | PROJECT DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ocean View-Ingleside | K Ingleside and M Ocean View | Explore solutions to train congestion at West Portal |
| Western Addition | 5/5R Fulton | Implement Muni Forward improvements on Fulton from Arguello to 25th Avenue |
| Accessibility, Chinatown, Excelsior-Outer Mission, Visitacion Valley | 8/8AX/8BX <br> Bayshore | Explore transit reliability improvements in Visitacion Valley and on 3rd Street in SoMa <br> Explore adding NextMuni to more stops |
| Chinatown, Inner Mission, SoMa-Tenderloin | 12 Folsom | Explore transit-only lanes on Folsom Street in SoMa to improve reliability |
| Accessibility, Excelsior- <br> Outer Mission, Inner <br> Mission, SoMa-Tenderloin | 14/14R Mission | Explore transit reliability improvements on downtown Mission and in the Excelsior Explore adding NextMuni to more stops |
| Accessibility, Chinatown | 30 Stockton and 45 Union Stockton | Explore travel time and reliability improvements in SoMa (e.g. 3rd Street) |
| Accessibility, SoMaTenderloin, Western Addition | 31 Balboa | Explore opportunities for quick and effective travel time improvements throughout the line |

Table 2. New Service Strategies

| NEIGHBORHOOD / TARGET | ROUTE | PROJECT DESCRIPTION | FUNDING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ocean View-Ingleside | K Ingleside | Increase service frequency | SFMTA FY19-20 operating budget addition |
| Ocean View-Ingleside | M Ocean View | Increase service frequency | SFMTA FY19-20 operating budget addition |
| Bayview, Visitacion Valley | T Third | Increase service frequency | Added to SFMTA FY19-20 operating budget addition |
| Western Addition | 7 Haight-Noriega | Switch to 60' buses 7 days per week | TBD |
| Chinatown, ExcelsiorOuter Mission, Visitacion Valley | 8/8AX/8BX <br> Bayshore | Increase service frequency | SFMTA FY19-20 operating budget addition |
| Inner Mission, Visitacion Valley | 9/9R San Bruno | Switch to $60^{\prime}$ buses on the 9 Rapid | SFMTA FY19-20 operating budget addition |
| Chinatown | 10 Townsend | Focus on active line management to address gaps in service in peak periods | Already included in operating budget |
| Chinatown, Inner Mission, SoMa-Tenderloin | 12 Folsom | Increase service frequency <br> Vet a more direct route to 24th Street BART Station | SFMTA FY19-20 operating budget addition |
| Bayview | 23 Monterey | Exploring possibility of running on Industrial and Palou instead of deviating to Produce Market pending further outreach | Already included in operating budget |
| Excelsior-Outer Mission, Ocean View-Ingleside | 29 Sunset | Increase service frequency all-day | SFMTA FY19-20 operating budget addition |
| Chinatown | 30 Stockton | Switch to 60' buses for all trips | SFMTA FY19-20 operating budget addition |
| Bayview | 44 O'Shaughnessy | Increase service frequency all-day | SFMTA FY19-20 <br> operating budget addition |
| SoMa-Tenderloin | 47 Van Ness | Explore possibility of routing adjustments in SoMa | Already included in operating budget addition |
| Inner Mission | 48 Quintara-24th St | Extend service to the Beach in midday | SFMTA FY19-20 operating budget |

$\left.\begin{array}{lll}\hline & & \text { addition } \\ \hline \text { Visitacion Valley } & 56 \text { Rutland } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Implement schedule enhancements to } \\ \text { improve reliability }\end{array}\end{array} \begin{array}{l}\text { SFMTA FY19-20 } \\ \text { operating budget } \\ \text { addition }\end{array}\right]$

These projects were incorporated in the SFMTA Fiscal Year 2018/19 and 2019/20 budget which was adopted by the SFMTA board on April 3, 2018. The service recommendations in this round of the Equity Strategy are fully funded through SFMTA's budget. Certain capital projects are partially or fully funded in the most recent SFMTA Capital Improvement Program, while others may be pursued through new funding sources, such as grants. SFMTA staff has not identified a need for Prop K funding for these projects at this time, although it may be sought in the future for certain capital projects. SFMTA could propose funding for capital strategies in Fiscal Year 2018/19 or propose Equity Strategy recommendations for funding through the underway 2019 5-Year Prioritization Program updates.

## FINANCIAL IMPACT

None. This is an information item.

## CAC POSITION

None. This is an information item. The CAC will be briefed on this item at its July 25, 2018 meeting.

## SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

Enclosure - Muni Service Equity Strategy Fiscal Year 2018-19 and 2019-20
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## Memorandum

Date: July 18, 2018
To: Transportation Authority Board
From: Cynthia Fong - Deputy Director for Finance and Administration
Subject: 07/24/18 Board Meeting: Investment Report and Debt Expenditure Report for the Quarter Ended June 30, 2018

## RECOMMENDATION $\triangle$ Information $\square$ Action

None. This is an information item.

## SUMMARY

The Transportation Authority's Investment Policy directs that a review of portfolio compliance be presented quarterly. As year-end closing is just wrapping up, the investment report for the quarter ended June 30, 2018 is presented independently. Following the annual audit, the Basic Financial Statements will be presented to the Board along with the results of the fiscal audit, single audit, and management review. With the issuance of additional debt, a report on quarterly debt expenditures funded by the bond is now included for Board oversight of the debt issuance program.

| $\square$ Fund Allocation |
| :--- |
| $\square$ Fund Programming |
| $\square$ Policy/Legislation |
| $\square$ Plan/Study |
| $\square$ Capital Project |
| Oversight/Delivery |
| ® Budget/Finance |
| $\square$ Contract/Agreement |
| $\square$ Procurement |
| $\square$ Other: |

$\square$ Fund Programming
$\square$ Policy/Legislation
$\square$ Plan/Study
Capital Project Oversight/Delivery
B Budget/Finance
$\square$ Contract/Agreement
$\square$ Procurement
$\square$ Other:

## DISCUSSION

## Background.

Our Investment Policy directs a submittal of portfolio compliance with the Investment Policy at the end of the quarter. Usually, this is presented in conjunction with, and in the context of, a quarterly Internal Accounting Report. However, since fiscal year-end project accruals are still being submitted, the Internal Accounting Report is not available at this time.

As defined by the our Administrative Code and the Debt Policy, the Board shall be responsible for oversight of the debt issuance program for the Transportation Authority. The purpose of the Debt Expenditure Report is to update the Board on quarterly expenditures funded by the Bond issued in the fall of 2017 to ensure debt proceeds are spent within the required period following debt issuance, and to provide transparency and accountability in the expenditure of these debt proceeds.

## Investment Report.

Our investment policies and practices are subject to, and limited by, applicable provisions of state law and prudent money management principles. All investable funds are invested in accordance with our Investment Policy and applicable provisions of 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 our investment program, we observe the "Prudent Investor" standard as stated in Government Code Section 53600.3. we will act with care, skill, prudence, and diligence under the circumstances then prevailing, including, but not limited to, the general economic conditions and our anticipated needs, that a prudent person acting in a like capacity and familiarity with those matters would use in the conduct of funds of a like character and with like aims, to safeguard the principal and maintain the liquidity needs.

The primary objectives for the investment activities, in order of priority, are:

1) Safety. Safety of the principal is the foremost objective of the investment program. Investments will be undertaken in a manner that seeks to ensure preservation of the principal of the funds under its control.
2) Liquidity. The investment portfolio will remain sufficiently liquid to enable us to meet its reasonably anticipated cash flow requirements.
3) Return on Investment. The investment portfolio will be managed with the objective of attaining a market rate of return throughout budgetary and economic cycles, commensurate with the investment risk parameters and the cash flow characteristics of the portfolio.
Permitted investment instruments are specifically listed in our Investment Policy and include the San Francisco City and County Treasury Pool (Treasury Pool), certificates of deposit, and money market funds.

As of June 30, 2018, the Transportation Authority's bank accounts total to $\$ 43.6$ million, excluding the bond proceeds held by US Bank per the terms in debt indenture, and approximately 47 percent of this amount was invested in the City and County of San Francisco Treasury Pool. The remaining funds are held in bank accounts for daily operations. These investments are in compliance with the California Government Code and our Board-adopted Investment Policy and provide sufficient liquidity to meet expenditure requirements. Attachment 1 is the investment report furnished by the Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector for the period ending on June 30, 2018.

## Debt Expenditure Report.

In June 2018, Transportation Authority entered into a new Revolving Credit (loan) Agreement with State Street Public Lending Corporation and US Bank for a total amount of $\$ 140$ million for the next 3 years. On June $27^{\text {th }}, 2018$, we made a payment of $\$ 24$ million to further reduce the outstanding balance. As of June 30 2018, the Transportation Authority has $\$ 24.7$ million outstanding in the Revolver Loan.

As of June 30, 2018, the cumulative total of Prop K capital expenditures paid with bond proceeds is $\$ 88.1$ million. The available balance of remaining bond proceeds to be spent is $\$ 115.9$ million. Total earned interest to date from bond proceeds amount to $\$ 1.1$ million. More details on these expenditures are included in Attachment 2.

## FINANCIAL IMPACT

None. This is an information item.

## CAC POSITION

None. This is an information item.

## SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

Attachment 1 - City and County of San Francisco Investment Report for the Month of June 2018 Attachment 2 - Debt Expenditure Report

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

The Honorable London N. Breed
Mayor of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 200
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 June 30, 2018. 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 June 2018 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 | June 2018 | Fiscal YTD | May 2018 |
| Average Daily Balance | \$ 9,179 | \$ 10,871 | \$ 9,028 | \$ 10,294 |
| Net Earnings | 149.48 | 17.96 | 131.51 | 16.63 |
| Earned Income Yield | 1.63\% | 2.01\% | 1.59\% | 1.90\% |

## CCSF Pooled Fund Statistics *

| (in \$ million) Investment Type | Portfolio |  | Book Value |  | Market Value | Wtd. Avg. Coupon | Wtd. Avg. YTM | WAM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| U.S. Treasuries | 10.10\% | \$ | 1,075.1 |  | \$ 1,070.0 | 0.90\% | 1.91\% | 430 |
| Federal Agencies | 46.45\% |  | 4,973.7 |  | 4,922.5 | 1.89\% | 1.97\% | 725 |
| State \& Local Government |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agency Obligations | 1.79\% |  | 192.9 |  | 189.5 | 1.93\% | 1.68\% | 535 |
| Public Time Deposits | 0.24\% |  | 25.2 |  | 25.2 | 2.08\% | 2.08\% | 151 |
| Negotiable CDs | 20.65\% |  | 2,187.8 |  | 2,188.6 | 2.21\% | 2.21\% | 127 |
| Commercial Paper | 8.70\% |  | 917.4 |  | 922.2 | 0.00\% | 2.27\% | 83 |
| Medium Term Notes | 0.93\% |  | 98.4 |  | 98.2 | 2.35\% | 2.48\% | 318 |
| Money Market Funds | 3.84\% |  | 407.0 |  | 407.0 | 1.72\% | 1.72\% | 1 |
| Supranationals | 7.30\% |  | 778.5 |  | 773.7 | 2.76\% | 2.03\% | 543 |
| Totals | 100.0\% |  | 10,656.0 |  | \$ 10,596.9 | 1.66\% | 2.03\% | 466 |

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

[^2]As of June 30, 2018

| (in \$ million) Security Type | Par Value | Book Value | Market Value | Market/Book Price | Current \% Allocation | Max. Policy Allocation | Compliant? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| U.S. Treasuries | \$ 1,085.0 | \$ 1,075.1 | \$ 1,070.0 | 99.53 | 10.10\% | 100\% | Yes |
| Federal Agencies | 4,976.9 | 4,973.7 | 4,922.5 | 98.97 | 46.45\% | 100\% | Yes |
| State \& Local Government Agency Obligations | 191.1 | 192.9 | 189.5 | 98.25 | 1.79\% | 20\% | Yes |
| Public Time Deposits | 25.2 | 25.2 | 25.2 | 100.00 | 0.24\% | 100\% | Yes |
| Negotiable CDs | 2,187.8 | 2,187.8 | 2,188.6 | 100.03 | 20.65\% | 30\% | Yes |
| Bankers Acceptances | - | - | - | - | 0.00\% | 40\% | Yes |
| Commercial Paper | 927.0 | 917.4 | 922.2 | 100.52 | 8.70\% | 25\% | Yes |
| Medium Term Notes | 98.5 | 98.4 | 98.2 | 99.81 | 0.93\% | 25\% | Yes |
| Repurchase Agreements | - | - | - | - | 0.00\% | 10\% | Yes |
| Reverse Repurchase/ Securities Lending Agreements | - | - | - | - | 0.00\% | \$75mm | Yes |
| Money Market Funds - Government | 407.0 | 407.0 | 407.0 | 100.00 | 3.84\% | 20\% | Yes |
| LAIF | - | - | - | - | 0.00\% | \$50mm | Yes |
| Supranationals | 782.3 | 778.5 | 773.7 | 99.38 | 7.30\% | 30\% | Yes |
| TOTAL | \$ 10,680.8 | \$ 10,656.0 | \$ 10,596.9 | 99.44 | 100.00\% | - | Yes |

[^3]
## Portfolio Summary



## City and County of San Francisco

Pooled Fund Portfolio Statistics
For the month ended June 30, 2018



## Portfolio Analysis
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## Maturity Counon

©

| $\begin{array}{r}\text { Settle } \\ \frac{\text { Date }}{}\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}\text { Maturity } \\ 2 / 13 / 2018\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Date }\end{array}$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $2 / 16 / 2018$ |  |  |
| $2 / 14 / 2018$ | $8 / 31 / 2018$ |  |
| $3 / 29 / 2018$ | $9 / 27 / 2018$ |  |
| $3 / 29 / 2018$ | $9 / 27 / 2018$ |  |
| $12 / 13 / 2017$ | $10 / 15 / 2018$ |  |
| $1 / 10 / 2018$ | $10 / 15 / 2018$ |  |
| $2 / 15 / 2018$ | $10 / 31 / 2018$ |  |
| $12 / 19 / 2017$ | $10 / 31 / 2018$ |  |
| $6 / 25 / 2018$ | $1 / 15 / 2019$ |  |
| $2 / 15 / 2018$ | $1 / 31 / 2019$ |  |
| $4 / 12 / 2018$ | $2 / 15 / 2019$ |  |
| $3 / 1 / 2018$ | $2 / 28 / 2019$ |  |
| $5 / 10 / 2018$ | $4 / 15 / 2019$ |  |
| $6 / 7 / 2018$ | $4 / 15 / 2019$ |  |
| $5 / 10 / 2018$ | $5 / 15 / 2019$ |  |
| $5 / 24 / 2018$ | $5 / 23 / 2019$ |  |
| $6 / 20 / 2017$ | $5 / 31 / 2019$ |  |
| $5 / 18 / 2018$ | $10 / 15 / 2019$ |  |
| $1 / 16 / 2018$ | $12 / 31 / 2019$ |  |
| $6 / 20 / 2017$ | $6 / 15 / 2020$ |  |
| $8 / 15 / 2017$ | $6 / 30 / 2021$ |  |
| $11 / 10 / 2016$ | $10 / 31 / 2021$ |  |
| $12 / 13 / 2016$ | $11 / 30 / 2021$ |  |
| $8 / 15 / 2017$ | $6 / 30 / 2022$ |  |

$\begin{array}{ll}2 / 13 / 2018 & 8 / 16 / 201 \\ 2 / 14 / 2018 & 8 / 31 / 201 \\ 3 / 29 / 2018 & 9 / 27 / 2018 \\ 3 / 29 / 2018 & 9 / 27 / 2018\end{array}$
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FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
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FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
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FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK
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FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK
FREDDIE MAC
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK
FARMER MAC

[^5]As of June 30, 2018

| As of June 30, 2018 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Type of Investment | CUSIP | Issuer Name |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912796 NQ8 | TREASURY BILL |
| U.S. Treasuries | $9128282 C 3$ | US TREASURY |
| U.S. Treasuries | $912796 Q A 0$ | TREASURY BILL |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912796 QA0 | TREASURY BILL |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828 L81 | US TREASURY |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828 L81 | US TREASURY |
| U.S. Treasuries | $912828 T 83$ | US TREASURY |
| U.S. Treasuries | $912828 W D 8$ | US TREASURY |
| U.S. Treasuries | $912828 N 63$ | US TREASURY NB |
| U.S. Treasuries | $912828 V 56$ | US TREASURY |
| U.S. Treasuries | $912828 P 53$ | US TREASURY |
| U.S. Treasuries | $912796 P T 0$ | TREASURY BILL |
| U.S. Treasuries | $912828 Q 52$ | US TREASURY |
| U.S. Treasuries | $912828 Q 52$ | US TREASURY |
| U.S. Treasuries | $912828 R 44$ | US TREASURY |
| U.S. Treasuries | $912796 Q H 5$ | TREASURY BILL |
| U.S. Treasuries | $912828 X S 4$ | US TREASURY |
| U.S. Treasuries | $912828 T 59$ | US TREASURY |
| U.S. Treasuries | $9128283 N 8$ | US TREASURY |
| U.S. Treasuries | $912828 X U 9$ | US TREASURY |
| U.S. Treasuries | $912828 S 27$ | US TREASURY |
| U.S. Treasuries | $912828 T 67$ | US TSY NT |
| U.S. Treasuries | $912828 U 65$ | US TSY NT |
| U.S. Treasuries | $912828 X W 5$ | US TREASURY |
| Subtotals |  |  |
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 | Public Time Deposits |
| :--- |
| Public Time Deposits |
| Public Time Deposits |
| Public Time Deposits |
| Subtotals |
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\begin{gathered}
\substack{3 \\
\hline \\
\hline}
\end{gathered}
$$




| Type of Investment | CUSIP | Issuer Name | Par Value |  | Coupon | YTM ${ }^{1}$ | Settle Date $\begin{array}{r}\text { Maturity } \\ \text { Date }\end{array}$ |  | Earned Interest |  | Amort. <br> Expense |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Realized } \\ \text { Gain/(Loss) } \end{array}$ |  | Earned Income Net Earnings |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912796NQ8 | TREASURY BILL | \$ | 50,000,000 | 0.00 | 1.77 | 2/13/18 | 8/16/18 | \$ | - | \$ | 72,917 | \$ | , | \$ | 72,917 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912796PT0 | TREASURY BILL |  | 50,000,000 | 0.00 | 2.06 | 3/1/18 | 2/28/19 |  | - |  | 84,167 |  | - |  | 84,167 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912796QA0 | TREASURY BILL |  | 50,000,000 | 0.00 | 1.92 | 3/29/18 | 9/27/18 |  | - |  | 79,063 |  | - |  | 79,063 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912796QA0 | TREASURY BILL |  | 50,000,000 | 0.00 | 1.90 | 3/29/18 | 9/27/18 |  | - |  | 78,583 |  | - |  | 78,583 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912796QH5 | TREASURY BILL |  | 60,000,000 | 0.00 | 2.33 | 5/24/18 | 5/23/19 |  | - |  | 113,750 |  | - |  | 113,750 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 9128282C3 | US TREASURY |  | 25,000,000 | 0.75 | 1.82 | 2/14/18 | 8/31/18 |  | 15,285 |  | 21,603 |  | - |  | 36,888 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 9128283N8 | US TREASURY |  | 50,000,000 | 1.88 | 2.01 | 1/16/18 | 12/31/19 |  | 77,651 |  | 5,416 |  | - |  | 83,067 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828L81 | US TREASURY |  | 50,000,000 | 0.88 | 1.68 | 12/13/17 | 10/15/18 |  | 35,861 |  | 32,744 |  | - |  | 68,604 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828L81 | US TREASURY |  | 50,000,000 | 0.88 | 1.75 | 1/10/18 | 10/15/18 |  | 35,861 |  | 35,409 |  | - |  | 71,270 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828N63 | US TREASURY NB |  | 15,000,000 | 1.13 | 2.16 | 6/25/18 | 1/15/19 |  | 2,797 |  | 2,516 |  | - |  | 5,313 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828P53 | US TREASURY |  | 50,000,000 | 0.75 | 2.10 | 4/12/18 | 2/15/19 |  | 31,077 |  | 54,612 |  | - |  | 85,689 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828Q52 | US TREASURY |  | 50,000,000 | 0.88 | 2.25 | 5/10/18 | 4/15/19 |  | 35,861 |  | 55,492 |  | - |  | 91,352 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828Q52 | US TREASURY |  | 50,000,000 | 0.88 | 2.31 | 6/7/18 | 4/15/19 |  | 28,689 |  | 46,575 |  | - |  | 75,263 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828R44 | US TREASURY |  | 35,000,000 | 0.88 | 2.31 | 5/10/18 | 5/15/19 |  | 24,966 |  | 40,572 |  | - |  | 65,538 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828 S27 | US TREASURY |  | 25,000,000 | 1.13 | 1.64 | 8/15/17 | 6/30/21 |  | 23,295 |  | 10,187 |  | - |  | 33,482 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828T59 | US TREASURY |  | 25,000,000 | 1.00 | 2.47 | 5/18/18 | 10/15/19 |  | 20,492 |  | 29,581 |  | - |  | 50,073 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828 T67 | US TSY NT |  | 50,000,000 | 1.25 | 1.43 | 11/10/16 | 10/31/21 |  | 50,951 |  | 7,034 |  | - |  | 57,985 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828T83 | US TREASURY |  | 25,000,000 | 0.75 | 1.92 | 2/15/18 | 10/31/18 |  | 15,285 |  | 23,733 |  | - |  | 39,018 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828U65 | US TSY NT |  | 100,000,000 | 1.75 | 1.90 | 12/13/16 | 11/30/21 |  | 143,443 |  | 11,376 |  | - |  | 154,819 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828 V 56 | US TREASURY |  | 50,000,000 | 1.13 | 2.03 | 2/15/18 | 1/31/19 |  | 46,616 |  | 36,496 |  | - |  | 83,112 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828WD8 | US TREASURY |  | 50,000,000 | 1.25 | 1.71 | 12/19/17 | 10/31/18 |  | 50,951 |  | 18,542 |  | - |  | 69,493 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828XF2 | US TREASURY |  | - - | 1.13 | 1.26 | 6/14/17 | 6/15/18 |  | 21,635 |  | 2,615 |  | - |  | 24,249 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828XS4 | US TREASURY |  | 50,000,000 | 1.25 | 1.36 | 6/20/17 | 5/31/19 |  | 51,230 |  | 4,374 |  | - |  | 55,603 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828XU9 | US TREASURY |  | 50,000,000 | 1.50 | 1.51 | 6/20/17 | 6/15/20 |  | 61,633 |  | 483 |  | - |  | 62,116 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828XW5 | US TREASURY |  | 25,000,000 | 1.75 | 1.77 | 8/15/17 | 6/30/22 |  | 36,237 |  | 379 |  | - |  | 36,616 |
| Subtotals |  |  | \$ | 1,085,000,000 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 809,815 | \$ | 868,216 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,678,031 |


$\leftrightarrow$
'

$\leftrightarrow$












$\leftrightarrow$

$\qquad$

㾁


気 눈 를 둔

악 べすが －
$25,000,000$
$15,000,000$
$16,000,000$
$14,200,000$

| 8 |
| :--- |
| 0 |
| i |

is







Federal Agencies
 Federal Agencies




 Federal Agencies













 ederal Agencies



 Federal Agencies
 Federal Agencies




 Federal Agencies Federal Agencies

## Monthly Investment Earnings


 ¢N









| Type of Investment | CUSIP | Issuer Name |  | Par Value | Coupon | YTM ${ }^{1}$ | Settle Date | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Maturity } \\ \text { Date } \end{array}$ | Earned Interest |  |  | Amort. Expense |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Realized } \\ \text { Gain/(Loss) } \end{array}$ |  | arned Income Net Earnings |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Federal Agencies | 3136G3LV5 | FANNIE MAE |  | 8,950,000 | 1.35 | 1.35 | 5/26/16 | 11/26/19 |  | 10,069 |  | - |  | - |  | 10,069 |
| Federal Agencies | 3136G3QP3 | FANNIE MAE |  | 10,000,000 | 1.25 | 1.25 | 5/24/16 | 5/24/19 |  | 10,417 |  | - |  | - |  | 10,417 |
| Federal Agencies | 3136G3TG0 | FANNIE MAE |  | 15,000,000 | 1.38 | 1.38 | 6/30/16 | 6/30/20 |  | 14,469 |  | - |  | - |  | 14,469 |
| Federal Agencies | 3136G3TK1 | FANNIE MAE |  | 25,000,000 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 7/6/16 | 4/6/20 |  | 31,250 |  | - |  | - |  | 31,250 |
| Federal Agencies | 3136G3X59 | FANNIE MAE |  | 25,000,000 | 1.10 | 1.10 | 8/23/16 | 8/23/19 |  | 22,917 |  |  |  | - |  | 22,917 |
| Federal Agencies | 3136G4BL6 | FANNIE MAE |  | 15,000,000 | 1.25 | 1.25 | 10/17/16 | 4/17/20 |  | 15,625 |  | - |  | - |  | 15,625 |
| Federal Agencies | 3136G4EZ2 | FANNIE MAE |  | 50,000,000 | 1.13 | 1.16 | 10/28/16 | 10/30/19 |  | 46,875 |  | 1,367 |  | - |  | 48,242 |
| Federal Agencies | 3136G4FJ7 | FANNIE MAE |  | 25,000,000 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 10/25/16 | 10/25/19 |  | 25,000 |  | - |  | - |  | 25,000 |
| Federal Agencies | 3136G4KQ5 | FANNIE MAE |  | 1,000,000 | 1.65 | 1.84 | 11/17/17 | 1/17/20 |  | 1,375 |  | 149 |  | - |  | 1,524 |
| Federal Agencies | 3136G4KQ5 | FANNIE MAE |  | 31,295,000 | 1.65 | 1.84 | 11/17/17 | 1/17/20 |  | 43,031 |  | 4,665 |  | - |  | 47,695 |
| Federal Agencies | 3137EADZ9 | FREDDIE MAC |  | 19,979,000 | 1.13 | 2.29 | 5/10/18 | 4/15/19 |  | 18,730 |  | 18,845 |  | - |  | 37,575 |
| Federal Agencies | 3137EAEK1 | FREDDIE MAC |  | 50,000,000 | 1.88 | 1.91 | 11/15/17 | 11/17/20 |  | 78,125 |  | 1,311 |  | - |  | 79,436 |
| Federal Agencies | 3137EAEL9 | FREDDIE MAC |  | 22,000,000 | 2.38 | 2.47 | 2/16/18 | 2/16/21 |  | 43,542 |  | 1,590 |  | - |  | 45,131 |
| Federal Agencies | 3137EAEM7 | FREDDIE MAC |  | 35,000,000 | 2.50 | 2.51 | 4/19/18 | 4/23/20 |  | 72,917 |  | 314 |  | - |  | 73,231 |
| Subtotals |  |  | \$ | 4,976,915,000 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 7,558,407 | \$ | 499,767 | \$ | - | \$ | 8,058,174 |
| State/Local Agencies | 13063C4V9 | CALIFORNIA ST | \$ | 50,000,000 | 1.05 | 0.90 | 11/3/16 | 11/1/18 | \$ | 43,750 | \$ | $(6,078)$ | \$ | - | \$ | 37,672 |
| State/Local Agencies | 13063CKL3 | CALIFORNIA ST |  | 4,750,000 | 2.25 | 1.15 | 10/27/16 | 5/1/19 |  | 8,906 |  | $(4,227)$ |  | - |  | 4,679 |
| State/Local Agencies | 13063DAB4 | CALIFORNIA ST |  | 23,000,000 | 1.59 | 1.59 | 4/27/17 | 4/1/19 |  | 30,533 |  | - |  | - |  | 30,533 |
| State/Local Agencies | 13063DGA0 | CALIFORNIA ST |  | 33,000,000 | 2.80 | 2.80 | 4/25/18 | 4/1/21 |  | 77,000 |  | (37) |  | - |  | 76,963 |
| State/Local Agencies | 13066YTY5 | CALIFORNIA ST DEPT OF WTR RESO |  | 28,556,228 | 1.71 | 2.30 | 2/6/17 | 5/1/21 |  | 40,764 |  | 9,382 |  | - |  | 50,146 |
| State/Local Agencies | 546456CY8 | LOUISIANA ST CITIZENS PROPERTY |  | 1,000,00- | 6.13 | 1.30 | 11/30/16 | 6/1/18 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| State/Local Agencies | 603786GJ7 | MINNEAPOLIS MN REVENUE |  | 1,000,000 | 4.88 | 1.40 | 12/1/16 | 8/1/18 |  | 4,063 |  | $(2,814)$ |  | - |  | 1,249 |
| State/Local Agencies | 6055804W6 | MISSISSIPPI ST |  | 8,500,000 | 6.09 | 1.38 | 4/23/15 | 10/1/19 |  | 43,130 |  | $(31,767)$ |  | - |  | 11,364 |
| State/Local Agencies | 91412GF59 | UNIV OF CALIFORNIA CA REVENUES |  | 1,769,000 | 1.91 | 1.40 | 8/9/16 | 5/15/21 |  | 2,816 |  | (719) |  | - |  | 2,097 |
| State/Local Agencies | 91412GL60 | UNIV OF CALIFORNIA CA REVENUES |  | 2,000,000 | 1.23 | 1.23 | 6/30/16 | 5/15/19 |  | 2,047 |  | - |  | - |  | 2,047 |
| State/Local Agencies | 91412GSB2 | UNIV OF CALIFORNIA CA REVENUES |  | 4,180,000 | 1.80 | 1.57 | 10/5/15 | 7/1/19 |  | 6,256 |  | (757) |  | - |  | 5,499 |
| State/Local Agencies | 91412GSB2 | UNIV OF CALIFORNIA CA REVENUES |  | 16,325,000 | 1.80 | 1.56 | 10/2/15 | 7/1/19 |  | 24,433 |  | $(2,996)$ |  | - |  | 21,437 |
| State/Local Agencies | 977100CW4 | WISCONSIN ST GEN FUND ANNUAL A |  | 18,000,000 | 1.45 | 1.45 | 8/16/16 | 5/1/20 |  | 21,690 |  | - |  | - |  | 21,690 |
| Subtotals |  |  | \$ | 191,080,228 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 305,387 | \$ | $(40,013)$ | \$ | - | \$ | 265,374 |
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 Subtotals


 NATIXIS NY BRANCH
NATIXI NY BRANH
NORINCHUKIN BANK（N

ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY下号 78009N5M4 78009N6F8
$78009 \mathrm{NU46}$ $78009 \mathrm{NX50}$ 78012 UAW5 78012UCE3合 운 $\stackrel{\circ}{n}$ 89113XAT1 89113XBV5
8913XJJ4
$89113 \times 1 / 27$
 89113XX41


 － n $63873 N R L$ 63873NTL5

| Type of Investment | CUSIP | Issuer Name |  | Par Value | Coupon | YTM ${ }^{1}$ | Settle Date | $\frac{\text { Maturity }}{\text { Date }}$ | Earned Interest |  |  | Amort. Expense | RealizedGain/(Loss) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Commercial Paper | 25214PG31 | DEXIA CREDIT LOCAL SA NY |  | 40,000,000 | 0.00 | 2.20 | 4/24/18 | 7/25/18 |  | 这 |  | 73,000 |  |  |  | 73,000 |
| Commercial Paper | 25214PH22 | DEXIA CREDIT LOCAL SA NY |  | 50,000,000 | 0.00 | 2.51 | 5/15/18 | 2/5/19 |  | - |  | 102,500 |  |  |  | 102,500 |
| Commercial Paper | 25214PHLO | DEXIA CREDIT LOCAL SA NY |  | 25,000,000 | 0.00 | 2.39 | 6/4/18 | 12/10/18 |  | - |  | 44,250 |  |  |  | 44,250 |
| Commercial Paper | 62479MGB3 | MUFG BANK LTD |  | 20,000,000 | 0.00 | 2.33 | 4/11/18 | 7/11/18 |  | - |  | 38,667 |  |  |  | 38,667 |
| Commercial Paper | 62479MH89 | MUFG BANK LTD |  | 35,000,000 | 0.00 | 2.35 | 5/1/18 | 8/8/18 |  | - |  | 67,958 |  |  |  | 67,958 |
| Commercial Paper | 62479MJ53 | MUFG BANK LTD |  | 40,000,000 | 0.00 | 2.42 | 4/24/18 | 9/5/18 |  | - |  | 80,000 |  |  |  | 80,000 |
| Commercial Paper | 62479MJM6 | MUFG BANK LTD NY |  | 13,000,000 | 0.00 | 2.29 | 6/19/18 | 9/21/18 |  | - |  | 9,880 |  |  |  | 9,880 |
| Commercial Paper | 62479MJM6 | MUFG BANK LTD |  | 50,000,000 | 0.00 | 2.43 | 4/3/18 | 9/21/18 |  | - |  | 100,000 |  |  |  | 100,000 |
| Commercial Paper | 62479MK51 | MUFG BANK LTD |  | 19,000,000 | 0.00 | 2.32 | 6/19/18 | 10/5/18 |  |  |  | 14,567 |  |  |  | 14,567 |
| Commercial Paper | 62479MPL1 | MUFG BANK LTD |  | 30,000,000 | 0.00 | 2.59 | 6/8/18 | 2/20/19 |  | - |  | 48,683 |  |  |  | 48,683 |
| Commercial Paper | 63873KFE2 | NATIXIS NY BRANCH |  | - | 0.00 | 1.69 | 6/12/18 | 6/14/18 |  | - |  | 2,817 |  |  |  | 2,817 |
| Commercial Paper | 63873KFK8 | NATIXIS NY BRANCH |  |  | 0.00 | 1.89 | 6/18/18 | 6/19/18 |  |  |  | 2,625 |  |  |  | 2,625 |
| Commercial Paper | 63873KFL6 | NATIXIS NY BRANCH |  | - | 0.00 | 1.89 | 6/19/18 | 6/20/18 |  | - |  | 788 |  |  |  | 788 |
| Commercial Paper | 63873KFS1 | NATIXIS NY BRANCH |  |  | 0.00 | 1.89 | 6/25/18 | 6/26/18 |  | - |  | 788 |  |  |  | 788 |
| Commercial Paper | 63873KFT9 | NATIXIS NY BRANCH |  | - | 0.00 | 1.89 | 6/26/18 | 6/27/18 |  | - |  | 788 |  |  |  | 788 |
| Commercial Paper | 88580DFR0 | 3M COMPANY |  |  | 0.00 | 1.86 | 6/8/18 | 6/25/18 |  | - |  | 21,958 |  |  |  | 21,958 |
| Commercial Paper | 89233HGP3 | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP |  | 50,000,000 | 0.00 | 2.34 | 3/28/18 | 7/23/18 |  | - |  | 96,667 |  |  |  | 96,667 |
| Commercial Paper | 89233HH64 | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP |  | 40,000,000 | 0.00 | 2.37 | 4/10/18 | 8/6/18 |  | - |  | 78,333 |  |  |  | 78,333 |
| Commercial Paper | 89233HJM7 | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORPORATII |  | 25,000,000 | 0.00 | 2.29 | 5/29/18 | 9/21/18 |  | - |  | 47,292 |  |  |  | 47,292 |
| Commercial Paper | 89233HL93 | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP |  | 50,000,000 | 0.00 | 2.24 | 2/15/18 | 11/9/18 |  | - |  | 91,667 |  |  |  | 91,667 |
| Commercial Paper | 89233HLS1 | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP |  | 50,000,000 | 0.00 | 2.37 | 5/31/18 | 11/26/18 |  | - |  | 97,500 |  |  |  | 97,500 |
| Commercial Paper | 89233HN75 | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORPORATII |  | 25,000,000 | 0.00 | 2.46 | 6/21/18 | 1/7/19 |  | - |  | 16,875 |  |  |  | 16,875 |
| Subtotals |  |  | \$ | 927,000,000 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 15,167 | \$ | 1,742,019 | \$ |  | \$ | 1,757,186 |
| Medium Term Notes | 037833AQ3 | APPLE INC | \$ | 18,813,000 | 2.10 | 2.37 | 5/31/18 | 5/6/19 | \$ | 32,923 | \$ | 4,167 | \$ |  | \$ | 37,089 |
| Medium Term Notes | 742718EG0 | THE PROCTER \& GAMBLE CO |  | 9,650,000 | 1.90 | 2.62 | 6/20/18 | 11/1/19 |  | 5,602 |  | 2,049 |  |  |  | 7,651 |
| Medium Term Notes | 89236TDN2 | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP |  | 50,000,000 | 2.59 | 2.59 | 1/9/17 | 1/9/19 |  | 107,943 |  | - |  |  |  | 107,943 |
| Medium Term Notes | 89236TEJ0 | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP |  | 20,000,000 | 2.20 | 2.25 | 1/11/18 | 1/10/20 |  | 36,667 |  | 733 |  |  |  | 37,399 |
| Subtotals |  |  | \$ | 98,463,000 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 183,135 | \$ | 6,948 | \$ |  | \$ | 190,082 |
| Money Market Funds | 09248U718 | BLACKROCK LIQ INST GOV FUND | \$ | 64,268 | 1.65 | 1.65 | 6/29/18 | 7/1/18 | \$ | 10,958 | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | 10,958 |
| Money Market Funds | 31607A703 | FIDELITY INST GOV FUND |  | 225,893,517 | 1.73 | 1.73 | 11/4/15 | 7/1/18 |  | 593,725 |  | - |  |  |  | 593,725 |
| Money Market Funds | 61747C707 | MORGAN STANLEY INST GOVT FUND |  | 181,065,081 | 1.72 | 1.72 | 12/31/12 | 7/1/18 |  | 117,822 |  | - |  |  |  | 117,822 |
| Subtotals |  |  | \$ | 407,022,866 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 722,504 | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | 722,504 |
| Supranationals | 458182DX7 | INTER-AMERICAN DEVEL BK | \$ | 5,000,000 | 1.00 | 2.43 | 6/11/18 | 5/13/19 | \$ | 2,778 | \$ | 3,869 | \$ |  | \$ | 6,647 |
| Supranationals | 458182DX7 | INTER-AMERICAN DEVEL BK |  | 14,270,000 | 1.00 | 2.41 | 6/6/18 | 5/13/19 |  | 9,910 |  | 13,584 |  |  |  | 23,494 |
| Supranationals | 458182DX7 | INTER-AMERICAN DEVEL BK |  | 20,557,000 | 1.00 | 2.30 | 6/1/18 | 5/13/19 |  | 17,131 |  | 21,727 |  |  |  | 38,858 |
| Supranationals | 4581 X0BR8 | INTER-AMERICAN DEVEL BK |  | 16,000,000 | 1.75 | 1.72 | 12/28/17 | 8/24/18 |  | 23,333 |  | (321) |  |  |  | 23,012 |
| Supranationals | 4581X0CX4 | INTER-AMERICAN DEVEL BK |  | 10,000,000 | 1.63 | 2.72 | 5/17/18 | 5/12/20 |  | 13,542 |  | 8,704 |  |  |  | 22,246 |
| Supranationals | 4581X0CX4 | INTER-AMERICAN DEVEL BK |  | 25,000,000 | 1.63 | 1.72 | 4/12/17 | 5/12/20 |  | 33,854 |  | 1,579 |  |  |  | 35,433 |
| Supranationals | 4581 X0DB1 | INTER-AMERICAN DEVEL BK |  | 45,000,000 | 2.63 | 2.70 | 4/19/18 | 4/19/21 |  | 98,438 |  | 2,710 |  |  |  | 101,147 |
| Supranationals | 4581 X0DB1 | INTER-AMERICAN DEVEL BK |  | 50,000,000 | 2.63 | 2.84 | 5/16/18 | 4/19/21 |  | 109,375 |  | 8,588 |  |  |  | 117,963 |
| Supranationals | 459053C85 | INTL BK RECON \& DEVELOP |  | 25,000,000 | 0.00 | 1.92 | 5/24/18 | 8/22/18 |  |  |  | 39,792 |  |  |  | 39,792 |
| Supranationals | 459053D27 | INTL BK RECON \& DEVELOP DISCOUN |  | 30,000,000 | 0.00 | 1.87 | 4/9/18 | 8/24/18 |  | - |  | 46,500 |  |  |  | 46,500 |
| Supranationals | 459053G40 | INTL BK RECON \& DEVELOP DISC |  | 15,000,000 | 0.00 | 1.94 | 5/30/18 | 9/19/18 |  | - |  | 24,125 |  |  |  | 24,125 |
| Supranationals | 459053YV0 | INTL BK RECON \& DEVELOP DISC |  | 15,000,000 | 0.00 | 1.80 | 6/5/18 | 7/2/18 |  | - |  | 19,500 |  |  |  | 19,500 |
| Supranationals | 459053YV0 | INTL BK RECON \& DEVELOP DISC |  | 25,000,000 | 0.00 | 1.80 | 6/6/18 | 7/2/18 |  | - |  | 31,250 |  |  |  | 31,250 |
| Supranationals | 459053YZ1 | INTL BK RECON \& DEVELOP DISCOUN |  | 35,000,000 | 0.00 | 1.81 | 4/6/18 | 7/6/18 |  | - ${ }^{-}$ |  | 52,500 |  |  |  | 52,500 |
| Supranationals | 459058ER0 | INTL BK RECON \& DEVELOP |  | 25,000,000 | 1.00 | 1.07 | 10/7/15 | 10/5/18 |  | 20,833 |  | 1,165 |  |  |  | 21,999 |
| Supranationals | 459058EV1 | INTL BK RECON \& DEVELOP |  | 10,000,000 | 1.25 | 2.47 | 6/28/18 | 7/26/19 |  | 1,042 |  | 987 |  |  |  | 2,029 |
| Supranationals | 459058FQ1 | INTL BANK RECON \& DEVELOPMENT |  | 50,000,000 | 1.20 | 1.75 | 11/6/17 | 9/30/19 |  | 50,000 |  | 22,342 |  |  |  | 72,342 |
| Supranationals | 459058FZ1 | INTL BK RECON \& DEVELOP |  | 50,000,000 | 1.88 | 1.92 | 3/21/17 | 4/21/20 |  | 78,125 |  | 1,158 |  |  |  | 79,283 |
| Supranationals | 459058GA5 | INTL BK RECON \& DEVELOPMENT |  | 50,000,000 | 1.63 | 1.63 | 8/29/17 | 9/4/20 |  | 67,708 |  | 286 |  |  |  | 67,994 |
| Supranationals | 45905UQ80 | INTL BK RECON \& DEVELOP |  | 50,000,000 | 1.95 | 1.97 | 11/9/17 | 11/9/20 |  | 81,250 |  | 958 |  |  |  | 82,208 |
| Supranationals | 45905UQ80 | INTL BK RECON \& DEVELOP |  | 50,000,000 | 1.95 | 2.15 | 12/20/17 | 11/9/20 |  | 81,250 |  | 8,005 |  |  |  | 89,255 |
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Attachment 2

Debt Expenditure Report
As of June 30, 2018

| Bond Proceed Uses | Bond Proceeds |  | Spent Bond Proceeds | Remaining Balance |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capital Project Fund | $\$$ | $204,003,258$ | $\$$ | $88,073,222$ | $\$$ | $115,930,036$ |
| Revolver Refinancing | $\$$ | $46,000,981$ | $\$$ | $46,000,981$ | $\$$ | - |
| Total | $\$$ | $\mathbf{2 5 0 , 0 0 4 , 2 3 9}$ | $\$$ | $\mathbf{1 3 4 , 0 7 4 , 2 0 3}$ | $\$$ | $\mathbf{1 1 5 , 9 3 0 , 0 3 6}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Earned |  |  |  | $\$$ | $1,315,413$ |  |


| Sponsor | Bond-Eligible Reimbursement Requests Paid | Previous |  | Current |  | Cumulative Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SFMTA | Motor Coach Procurement1 | \$ | 11,717,890 | \$ | 11,979,819 | \$ | 23,697,709 |
| SFMTA | Radio Communications System \& CAD Replacement1 |  | 18,616,664 |  | 5,849,865 |  | 24,466,529 |
| SFMTA | Trolley Coach Procurement1 |  | 2,237,129 |  | 9,808,819 |  | 12,045,948 |
| TJPA | Transbay Transit Center |  | 6,197,433 |  | 137,130 |  | 6,334,563 |
| SFMTA | Guideway Improvements (e.g. MME, Green Light Rail Facility, OCS) |  | 1,365,718 |  | 2,288,404 |  | 3,654,122 |
| SFMTA | Signals - New and Upgraded |  | 2,902,974 |  | 333,389 |  | 3,236,363 |
| SFMTA | Central Control and Communications (C3) Program1 |  | 866,805 |  | 1,858,610 |  | 2,725,415 |
| PCJPB | Caltrain Early Investment Program - Electrification |  | 2,475,172 |  | 38,776 |  | 2,513,948 |
| PCJPB | Caltrain Early Investment Program - CBOSS |  | 1,393,683 |  | 226,329 |  | 1,620,012 |
| SFMTA | Escalators |  | 984,631 |  | 631,582 |  | 1,616,213 |
| SFMTA | 1570 Burke Avenue Maintenance Fadility |  | 1,109,337 |  | 461,114 |  | 1,570,451 |
| SFMTA | Light Rail Vehide Procurement1 |  | 1,329,105 |  | - |  | 1,329,105 |
| SFMTA | Geary Bus Rapid Transit |  | 682,767 |  | 352,461 |  | 1,035,228 |
| SFMTA | Muni Forward |  | 917,165 |  | - |  | 917,165 |
| SFMTA | Fall Protection Systems |  | - |  | 597,849 |  | 597,849 |
| SFMTA | Balboa Park Station Area and Plaza Im provements |  | 205,968 |  | 374,840 |  | 580,808 |
| SFMTA | Traffic Calming Implementation (Prior Areawide Plans) |  | 131,795 |  | - |  | 131,795 |
|  | Total | \$ | 53,134,236 | \$ | 34,938,987 | \$ | 88,073,223 |
|  | Percentage of Capital Project Fund Spent on Bond Proceed |  | 26.05\% |  | 17.13\% |  | 43.17\% |
| 1 Major Cash Flow Drivers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


[^0]:     Plan, including: Street Repair and Reconstruction (Street), Pedestrian Safety (Ped), and Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements (Transit).
    
     cover $90 \%$ of the total costs for all projects in that category, and Prop K should cover only $10 \%$. A project that is well leveraged overall may have lower-than-expected leveraging for an individual or partial phase.

[^1]:    See Attachment 1 for footnotes.

[^2]:    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

[^3]:    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.

[^4]:    Source: Bloomberg

[^5]:    
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