Item 10 Enclosure Citizens Advisory Committee October 24, 2018

2019 PROPOSITION K
5-YEAR PRIORITIZATION PROGRAM

## TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT/ PARKING MANAGEMENT

Pending Board Approval: November 27, 2018

Prepared for the San Francisco County Transportation Authority

By San Francisco County Transportation Authority

In coordination with Department of Public Works, Planning Department, San Francisco Environment, and San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency









SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

1455 Market Street, 22nd Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103
TEL 415.522.4800 FAX 415.522.4829
EMAIL info@sfcta.org WEB www.sfcta.org



## Table of Contents

- Eligibility
- Prioritization Criteria
- Stretching Your Prop K Sales Tax Dollars Farther
- Performance Measures
- Table 2 Project Delivery Snapshot
- Table 3 Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table
- Table 4 Prop K 5-Year Project List (FY 2019/20 FY 2023/24)
- Project Information Forms
- 2014 Prop K 5-Year Prioritization Program Program of Projects (as adopted)
- 2014 Prop K 5-Year Prioritization Program Program of Projects (as proposed)
- 2014 Prop K 5-Year Prioritization Program Project Information Forms

## Eligibility

Eligibility as identified in the voter approved Prop K Expenditure Plan is as follows:

"Develop and support continued Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and parking requirements for downtown buildings, special event sites, and schools and universities. Includes neighborhood parking management studies. Support related projects that can lead to reduction of single-occupant vehicle dependence and encourage alternative modes such as bicycling and walking, including Pedestrian Master Plan development and updates (Priority 1), citywide Bicycle Plan updates, and traffic circulation plans. Conduct transit service planning such as route restructuring studies to optimize connectivity with rapid bus network and major transit facilities (e.g. Transbay Terminal and Balboa Park BART station). Funds for studies and projects to improve access of disadvantaged populations to jobs and key services. Includes planning, project development and capital costs. Sponsoring Agencies: MUNI, DPT, Planning, SFCTA, DOE, DAS. The first \$11.6M is Priority 1 and the remainder is Priority 2. Total Funding: \$28.9M; Prop K: \$13.2M."

DAS stands for Department of Administrative Services, DOE stands for Department of the Environment (SF Environment or SFE), DPW stands for Department of Public Works, DPT stands for Department of Parking and Traffic, and MUNI stand for San Francisco Municipal Railway. DPT and MUNI are now under the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA). DAS eligibility for this category is assumed by DOE (SFE).

## Prioritization Criteria

## Prioritization Criteria

One of the key required elements of the 5YPPs is a transparent process for how projects get selected. Prop K requires at a minimum that each category include prioritization criteria that address project readiness, community support, and relative level of need or urgency. For the 2014 5YPP update, the Citizens Advisory Committee requested that the Transportation Authority and project sponsors develop a user-friendly, transparent scoring table that could apply to all 5YPPs, and that the scoring prioritize safety and community input highly. For the 2019 5YPP update, changes to the subcategory names and prioritization criteria have been made to better align the criteria with the goals of the category. For example, Vehicular Trip Reduction was added as a criterion to the Demand and Pricing Management subcategory.

Table 3 shows the Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table. Each project can receive a maximum of 10 points for program wide criteria and between 6 and 14 points for category specific criteria.

The Expenditure Plan also requires consideration of geographic equity in terms of project distribution that takes into account the various needs of San Francisco's neighborhoods. A majority of funds from the TDM/Parking Management category are used for programs and studies that impact San Francisco citywide.

## Stretching Your Prop K Sales Tax Dollars Farther

Leveraging Prop K funds against non-Prop K fund sources (e.g., federal, state, other local funds) is necessary to fully fund the Expenditure Plan projects and programs. For the Transportation Demand Management/Parking Management category, the Prop K Expenditure Plan assumes that every \$1 of sales tax revenue spent would leverage about \$1 in non-Prop K funds. The table below compares Prop K Expenditure Plan assumptions with proposed leveraging in the 2014 5-year project lists.

Table 1. Prop K Leveraging<sup>1</sup>

| Category                | Expected Leveraging<br>(Non-Prop K Funds) | Proposed Leveraging<br>(Non-Prop K Funds) |
|-------------------------|---|---|
| TDM/ Parking Management | 54%                                       | 54%                                       |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> This table compares the expected leveraging assumed in the Expenditure Plan with the proposed leveraging assumed in the 5-Year Project List.

This project list contains one or more placeholders which have not yet identified leveraging. When the project sponsors submit allocation requests for specific projects, we will expect to see appropriate leveraging of non-Prop K funds..

## Performance Measures

Prop K requires the establishment of performance measures for each programmatic category in the Expenditure Plan. The intent is to demonstrate the system performance benefits of sales tax projects (e.g. reduced transit travel time), to ensure funds are being SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

used cost effectively, and to inform allocation of Prop K funds and programming and prioritization of other funds by the Transportation Authority (e.g. Transportation Fund for Clean Air, Prop AA Vehicle Registration Fee funds).

The goal of programming projects within this category is to develop and support planning and programs that lead to the reduction of single-occupant vehicle dependence and to encourage other modes, such as transit, bicycling and walking, and to improve access of disadvantaged populations to jobs and key services.

The performance measure that will be applied to completed projects in this category vary by subcategory.

## Performance Measures for Subcategory 1: Citywide TDM

This subcategory includes projects intended to achieve a reduction in vehicle miles traveled and a shift in mode from single occupant auto to other sustainable modes such as transit or biking. Long term performance of these projects will be tracked through updates to the measurement and projection of congestion, crowding, and parking space utilization in the Countywide Transportation Plan and Congestion Management Program. In the near term, individual TDM projects and programs will include evaluation components to track behavior changes directly attributable to the project (per unit cost), including as relevant, but not limited to reduction in vehicle miles traveled, and shift in mode from single occupant auto to sustainable modes. Projects will also track, as relevant, response and participation rates.

## Performance Measures for Subcategory 2: Demand and Pricing Management

This sub-category provides funding to efforts that use pricing and/or incentives to encourage behavior change with the aim of reducing congestion, encouraging travel by transit/bike/foot/carpool, and/or increasing transportation network efficiency (person throughput vs. vehicles). Long term performance of these projects will be tracked through updates to the measurement and projection of congestion, transit crowding, person throughput, and parking space utilization in the Countywide Transportation Plan and Congestion Management Program.

In the near term, the effectiveness of spending in this category will be shown through evaluation conducted by individual projects detailing behavior changes directly attributable to the project (per unit cost), including as relevant, but not limited to measuring changes in congestion, transit crowding, use of sustainable travel modes, person throughput and vehicle throughput, and parking turnover.

## Performance Measures for Subcategory 3: Modal Plans

This subcategory includes planning projects that will guide development of and investment in transportation networks as well as make recommendations for related policies and operational changes. As a condition of funding, the modal plans will be required to include evaluation of the proposed projects, policies and operational changes that include as relevant, but are not limited to their effectiveness and cost effectiveness in reducing vehicles miles travelled, congestion, and transit crowding; increasing person

throughput (vs. vehicle throughput); supporting mode shift from single occupant vehicles to sustainable modes; and increasing parking turnover. The modal plans shall also include, as relevant, evaluation of how the proposed projects, policies and operational changes improve access of disadvantaged populations to jobs and key services.

## Performance Measures for Subcategory 4: Communities of Concern Access

This subcategory includes projects intended to improve access to jobs and key services for disadvantaged populations. Individual projects will include, but are not limited to evaluation metrics to assess improvements in access for disadvantages populations, participation rates and cost effectiveness behavior changes directly attributable to the project.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Parking Management Table 2. Project Delivery Snapshot

| 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPP) Period *     | Programmed<br>(Available for<br>Allocation) | Total Allocated as of 7/24/2018 | % Allocated |
|---|---|---------------------------------|-------------|
| 2005 5YPP (FY 2004/05-2008/09)                    | \$ 1,947,984 \$                             | \$ 1,521,619                    | %82         |
| 2009 5YPP (FY 2009/10-2013/14)                    | \$ 2,239,300                                | \$ 1,474,008                    | %99         |
| 2014 5YPP (FYs 2014/15 - 2018/19) as of 7/24/2018 | \$ 4,096,289                                | \$ 2,262,692                    | 9/25        |
| Total   |   | \$ 5,258,320                    |             |

<sup>\*</sup>Unallocated funds are carried forward for programming in the following 5YPP period.

Table below shows percent complete as reported by project sponsors in July 2018.

Completed Projects/Project Phases (sorted by allocation year, then sponsor, then project name)

| Complete | d Frojecis/ Fio              | Completed Figlects/ Figlect Finases (solded by anocadon year, then sponsor, then project manne) |                 |                             |                           |
|----------|------------------------------|---|-----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Sponsor  | Fiscal Year of<br>Allocation | Project Name  | Phase(s) Funded | Allocated (as of July 2018) | % Complete (as July 2018) |
| DCP      | 2004/05                      | City Carshare Operating Support   | Operations      | \$ 100,000                  | 100%                      |
| DOE      | 2004/05                      | SF Environment - (CECAP) Clean Air Program (FY04/05)  | Operations      | \$ 302,849                  | 100%                      |
| SFMTA    | 2004/05                      | Bicycle Plan Update Policy Framework Env Review   | Environmental   | \$ 24,000                   | 100%                      |
| DOE      | 2005/06                      | SF Environment Clean Air Program  | Operations      | \$ 109,374                  | 100%                      |
| SFCTA    | 2005/06                      | On-Street Parking Management Study  | Planning        | \$ 45,000                   | 100%                      |
| SFMTA    | 2005/06                      | Pedestrian Master Plan  | Environmental   | \$ 115,854                  | 100%                      |
| SFMTA    | 2005/06                      | Pedestrian Master Plan Part 2   | Environmental   | \$ 42,760                   | 100%                      |
| DOE      | 2006/07                      | Clean Air Program FY06/07 - Bicycle Program   | Construction    | \$ 10,000                   | 100%                      |
| DOE      | 2006/07                      | Clean Air Program FY06/07 - Commuter Benefits Program   | Construction    | \$ 000,66                   | 100%                      |
| DOE      | 2006/07                      | Clean Air Program FY06/07 - Emergency Ride Home   | Construction    | \$ 11,000                   | 100%                      |
| SFCTA    | 2006/07                      | Congestion Pricing Feasibility Study  | Planning        | \$ 70,000                   | 100%                      |
| SFCTA    | 2006/07                      | SFCTA Portion - Pedestrian Master Plan - Part 3   | Planning        | \$ 108,000                  | 100%                      |
| SFMTA    | 2006/07                      | DPT - Pedestrian Master Plan - Part 3   | Environmental   | \$ 131,983                  | 100%                      |
| DOE      | 2007/08                      | DOE - Clean Air Program - Bicycle Program   | Construction    | \$ 19,833                   | 100%                      |
| DOE      | 2007/08                      | DOE - Clean Air Program - Commuter Benefits Program   | Construction    | \$ 99,079                   | 100%                      |
| DOE      | 2007/08                      | DOE - Clean Air Program - Emergency Ride Home Program   | Construction    | \$ 10,902                   | 100%                      |
| DOE      | 2008/09                      | Clean Air Program - Bicycle Program   | Construction    | \$ 9,094                    | 100%                      |
| DOE      | 2008/09                      | Clean Air Program - Commuter Benefits   | Construction    | \$ 119,790                  | 100%                      |
| DOE      | 2008/09                      | Clean Air Program - Emergency Ride Home   | Construction    | \$ 13,310                   | 100%                      |
|          |                              |   |                 |                             |                           |

## Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Parking Management Table 2. Project Delivery Snapshot

| Sponsor | Fiscal Year of<br>Allocation | Project Name   | Phase(s) Funded           | Allocated (as of July 2018) | % Complete (as July 2018) |
|---------|------------------------------|--|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| DOE     | 2008/09                      | Clean Air Program - Regional Rideshare Program Delegate County | Construction              | \$ 28,757                   | 100%                      |
| SFCTA   | 2008/09                      | Urban Partnership Program Pre-Implementation - Local Match     | Planning                  | \$ 77,890                   | 100%                      |
| DOE     | 2009/10                      | Clean Air Program - Bicycle Program (\$10,000)                 | Construction              | \$ 10,000                   | 100%                      |
| DOE     | 2009/10                      | Clean Air Program - Commuter Benefits Program (\$119,790)      | Construction              | \$ 119,039                  | 100%                      |
| DOE     | 2009/10                      | Clean Air Program - Emergency Ride Home Program (\$13,310)     | Construction              | \$ 13,310                   | 100%                      |
| DOE     | 2009/10                      | Clean Air Program - Regional Rideshare Program (\$35,000)      | Construction              | \$ 35,000                   | 100%                      |
| DOE     | 2010/11                      | Bicycle Program  | Construction              | \$ 18,000                   | 100%                      |
| DOE     | 2010/11                      | Commuter Benefits Program                                      | Construction              | \$ 120,100                  | 100%                      |
| DOE     | 2010/11                      | Emergency Ride Home Program                                    | Construction              | \$ 15,000                   | 100%                      |
| DOE     | 2010/11                      | Regional Rideshare Program                                     | Construction              | \$ 34,999                   | 100%                      |
| DOE     | 2011/12                      | Clean Transportation Program - Bicycle Program                 | Construction              | \$ 11,986                   | 100%                      |
| DOE     | 2011/12                      | Clean Transportation Program - Commuter Benefits Program       | Construction              | \$ 86,258                   | 100%                      |
| DOE     | 2011/12                      | Clean Transportation Program - Emergency Ride Home             | Construction              | 0006 \$                     | 100%                      |
| DOE     | 2011/12                      | Clean Transportation Program - Regional Rideshare              | Construction              | \$ 17,500                   | 100%                      |
| SFCTA   | 2011/12                      | Integrated TDM Public-Private Partnership Project              | Planning,<br>Construction | \$ 78,866                   | 100%                      |
| SFCTA   | 2011/12                      | San Francisco Parking Pricing and Regulation Study             | Construction              | 000,09 \$                   | 100%                      |
| DOE     | 2012/13                      | Clean Transportation Program - Bicycle Program                 | Construction              | \$ 30,640                   | 100%                      |
| DOE     | 2012/13                      | Clean Transportation Program - Commuter Benefits Program       | Construction              | \$ 182,487                  | 100%                      |
| DOE     | 2012/13                      | Clean Transportation Program - Emergency Ride Home             | Construction              | \$ 15,500                   | 100%                      |
| DOE     | 2012/13                      | Clean Transportation Program - Regional Rideshare              | Construction              | \$ 35,000                   | 100%                      |
| DOE     | 2013/14                      | Clean Transportation Program - Bicycle Program                 | Construction              | \$ 59,961                   | 100%                      |
| DOE     | 2013/14                      | Clean Transportation Program - Commuter Benefits Program       | Construction              | \$ 188,118                  | 100%                      |
| DOE     | 2013/14                      | Clean Transportation Program - Emergency Ride Home Program     | Construction              | \$ 18,646                   | 100%                      |
| DOE     | 2013/14                      | Clean Transportation Program - Regional Rideshare              | Construction              | \$ 34,936                   | 100%                      |
| DOE     | 2013/14                      | Clean Transportation Program - SchoolPool                      | Construction              | \$ 41,173                   | 100%                      |
| SFCTA   | 2013/14                      | Bike Sharing SAR   | Planning                  | \$ 18,000                   | 100%                      |
| SFMTA   | 2013/14                      | WalkFirst Investment Strategy                                  | Planning                  | \$ 206,000                  | 100%                      |

## Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Parking Management Table 2. Project Delivery Snapshot

| Sponsor | Fiscal Year of<br>Allocation | Project Name   | Phase(s) Funded | Allocated (as of July 2018) | % Complete<br>(as July 2018) |
|---------|------------------------------|--|-----------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| DOE     | 2014/15                      | 2014/15 Commuter Benefits Ordinance Employer Outreach      | Construction    | \$ 77,546                   | 100%                         |
| SFCTA   | 2014/15                      | 2014/15 San Francisco Bay Area Transit Core Capacity Study | Planning        | \$ 450,000                  | 100%                         |
| SFMTA   | 2014/15                      | 2014/15 Comprehensive TDM Program                          | Construction    | \$ 30,646                   | 100%                         |
| DOE     | 2015/16                      | 2015/16 Commuter Benefits Ordinance Employer Outreach      | Construction    | \$ 73,872                   | 100%                         |
| SFCTA   | 2015/16                      | 2015/16 Bayview Moves Van Sharing Pilot                    | Construction    | \$ 54,225                   | 100%                         |
| SFCTA   |                              | 2015/16 San Francisco BART Travel Incentive Program        | Construction    | \$ 45,800                   | 100%                         |

Projects/Project Phases Underway (sorted by allocation year, then sponsor, then project name)

| Sponsor | Fiscal Year of<br>Allocation | Project Name  | Phase(s) Funded | Allocated (as of July 2018) | % Complete (as July 2018) |
|---------|------------------------------|---|-----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| SFCTA   | 2014/15                      | San Francisco Freeway Corridor Management Study (SF FCMS)                         | Planning        | \$ 300,000                  | %66                       |
| SFCTA   | 2014/15                      | Treasure Island Mobility Management Program - FY14/15<br>Appropriation            | Planning        | \$ 150,000                  | 54%                       |
| SFCTA   | 2015/16                      | Treasure Island Mobility Management Program                                       | Design          | \$ 210,000                  | 54%                       |
| SFMTA   | 2015/16                      | Potrero Hill Pedestrian Safety and Transit Stop Improvements [NTIP Capital]       | Construction    | \$ 60,000                   | 0%0                       |
| SFCTA   | 2016/17                      | Lombard Crooked Street Congestion Management System<br>Development [NTIP Capital] | Planning        | \$ 250,000                  | 5%                        |
| SFCTA   | 2017/18                      | Freeway Corridor Management Study Pre-environmental                               | Planning        | \$ 200,000                  | 30%                       |
| SFMTA   | 2017/18                      | Business Relocation Transportation Demand Management - Phase 1                    | Planning        | \$ 100,000                  | 1%                        |
| SFMTA   | 2017/18                      | Business Relocation Transportation Demand Management - Phase 2                    | Planning        | \$ 150,000                  | 1%                        |
| SFMTA   | 2017/18                      | Business Relocation Transportation Demand Management - Phase 3                    | Planning        | \$ 133,000                  | 1%                        |

For more information about the projects funded by the Transportation Authority, as well as projects for which we help oversee in our role as the Congestion Management Agency for San Francisco, visit our interactive project map at mystreetsf.sfcta.org.

Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Parking Management (EP 43)

|   | PROP K PRO           | OGRAM-WIDE CRITERIA   | CRITERIA                     | Ö                   | CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERIA   | CIFIC CRITER                           | IA          |       |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|--|--|-------------|-------|
|   | Project<br>Readiness | Community<br>Support  | Time<br>Sensitive<br>Urgency | Safety              | Vehicular Trip<br>Reduction  | Cost<br>Effectiveness                  | Leveraging  | Total |
| Total Possible Score                                | 4                    | 3                     | 3                            | 3                   | 4  | 4                                      | 3           | 24    |
| Citywide TDM  |                      |                       |                              |                     |  |  |             |       |
| SF Safe Routes to Schools Program<br>Administration | 4                    | 3                     | 2                            | 3                   | 3  | 1                                      | 3           | 19    |
| Commuter Benefits Ordinance Update                  | 3                    | 2                     | 2                            | 0                   | 4  | 3                                      | 0           | 14    |
| TSP Evaluation Tool                                 | 4                    | 1                     | 1                            | 3                   | 2  | 4                                      | 3           | 18    |
| Mobility as a Service Pilot - Placeholder           |                      |                       |                              |                     |  |  |             | 0     |
| TDM for Tourists - Placeholder                      | oroiocte will be     | scored at the time    | Sof allocation See           | paiord bac typical  | scored at the time of allocation. See text and Droiert Information Form for more details                   | for more details                       |             | 0     |
| Residential TDM Program - Placeholder               | רו טובננט איווו אפ   | ארסובת שו נוום נוווונ | מוסכמנוטוו. ספ               | ב נבער מוומ בו סובר |  | יייי מיייייייייייייייייייייייייייייייי | 1           | 0     |
| Employer TDM Program - Placeholder                  |                      |                       |                              |                     |  |  |             | 0     |
|   | Project<br>Readiness | Community<br>Support  | Time<br>Sensitive<br>Urgency | Safety              | Vehicular Trip<br>Reduction  | Cost<br>Effectiveness                  | Leveraging  | Total |
| Total Possible Score                                | 4                    | 3                     | 3                            | 3                   | 4  | 4                                      | 3           | 24    |
| Demand and Pricing Management                       |                      |                       |                              |                     |  |  |             |       |
| Demand and Pricing - Placeholder                    | Projects v           | vill be scored at t   | he time of allocat           | ion. See text and   | Projects will be scored at the time of allocation. See text and Project Information Form for more details. | ion Form for moi                       | re details. | 0     |
|   | Project<br>Readiness | Community<br>Support  | Time<br>Sensitive<br>Urgency | Safety              | Leveraging   |  |             | Total |
| Total Possible Score                                | 4                    | 3                     | 3                            | 3                   | 3  |  |             | 16    |
| Modal Plans   |                      |                       |                              |                     |  |  |             |       |
| ConnectSF Modal Study Follow On                     | 3                    | 3                     | 2                            | 3                   | 2  |  |             | 13    |
|   | Project<br>Readiness | Community<br>Support  | Time<br>Sensitive<br>Urgency | Safety              | Leveraging   | Benefits COC                           |             | Total |
| Total Possible Score                                | 4                    | 3                     | 3                            | 4                   | 3  | 3                                      |             | 20    |
| Communities of Concern Access                       |                      |                       |                              |                     |  |  |             |       |
| NTIP Placeholder                                    | Projects v           | vill be scored at tl  | ne time of allocat           | ion. See text and   | Projects will be scored at the time of allocation. See text and Project Information Form for more details. | ion Form for mo                        | re details. | 0     |
|   |                      |                       |                              |                     |  |  |             |       |

# Table 3 - Prioritization Criteria and Scoring Table Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Parking Management (EP 43)

|                           | Total                        |  |  |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
| IA                        | Leveraging                   |  |  |
| CIFIC CRITER              | Cost<br>Effectiveness        |  |  |
| CATEGORY SPECIFIC CRITERI | Vehicular Trip<br>Reduction  |  |  |
| CA                        | Safety                       |  |  |
| CRITERIA                  | Time<br>Sensitive<br>Urgency |  |  |
| OGRAM-WIDE CRITERI        | Community<br>Support         |  |  |
| PROP K PR                 | Project<br>Readiness         |  |  |
|                           |                              |  |  |
|                           |                              |  |  |
|                           |                              |  |  |
|                           |                              |  |  |

## Prioritization Criteria Definitions:

Project Readiness: Project likely to need funding in fiscal year proposed. Factors to be considered include adequacy of scope, schedule, budget and funding plan relative to current project status (e.g. expect more detail and certainty for a project about to enter construction than design); whether prior project phases are completed or expected to be completed before beginning the next phase; and whether litigation, community opposition or other factors may significantly delay project.

Community Support: Project has clear and diverse community support and/or was it identified through a community-based planning process. An example of a community-based plan is a neighborhood transportation plan, but not a countywide plan or agency capital improvement program.

Three points for a project in an adopted community based plan with evidence of diverse community support.

Two points for a project with evidence of support from both neighborhood stakeholders and groups and citywide groups.

One point for a project with evidence of support from either neighborhood stakeholders and groups or citywide groups.

Time Sensitive Urgency: Project needs to proceed in proposed timeframe to enable construction coordination with another project (e.g. minimize costs and construction impacts), to support another funded or proposed project (e.g. new signal controllers need to be installed to support TEP implementation) or to meet timely use of funds deadlines associated with matching funds.

Leveraging: Project leverages non-Prop K funds.

## All categories except Communities of Concern Access:

Safety: (1 point for each): Project addresses documented safety issue; reduces potential conflicts between modes; benefits users of multiple modes.

Vehicular Trip Reduction: Project leads to reduction in number of single-occupancy vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled.

0-2 points for number of SOV trips and/or miles reduced;

point for peak trip reduction;

point for long-term viability (benefits of program continue after program completion);

Cost Effectiveness: Cost effectiveness can be demonstrated by status as RTP high-performer, cost per single-occupancy vehicle trip reduced, or cost-effectively increasing person throughput.

## Communities of Concern Access:

(1 point for each): Project addresses documented safety issue; reduces potential conflicts between modes; benefits users of multiple modes; and increases security.

Full points for projects that provide broad geographic benefits and/or significantly improve access in a COC, partial points for projects that provide benefits with limited geographic Benefits to Communities of Concern (CoC): Project supports improved access and/or mobility for San Francisco's low-income populations or CoCs, as defined by MTC. distribution and/or moderate access improvements in a CoC.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Parking Management Category (EP 43) 2019 Prop K 5-Year Prioritization Program - Program of Projects Programming

| Phase  | Status  |   |   |  |   |   | Total   |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| - Hab  | Catter  | 2019/20   | 2020/21   | 2021/22  | 2022/23   | 2023/24   | LOCAL   |
|  |   | -   |   |  |   |   |   |
| NOO  | Planned   | \$200,000   |   |  |   |   | \$200,000   |
| CON  | Planned   |   | \$240,000   |  |   |   | \$240,000   |
| Employer TDM Program - Placeholder PLAN / CER  | Planned   | \$240,000   |   |  |   |   | \$240,000   |
| PLAN/ CER  | Planned   |   | \$140,000   |  |   |   | \$140,000   |
|  | Planned   |   |   | \$156,000  |   |   | \$156,000   |
| J  | Planned   |   | \$350,000   |  |   |   | \$350,000   |
|  | Planned   |   |   |  | \$350,000   |   | \$350,000   |
|  | Planned   | \$130,000   |   |  |   |   | \$130,000   |
| PLAN/ CER  | Planned   |   |   | \$130,000  |   |   | \$130,000   |
| PLAN/ CER  | Planned   |   |   |  |   | \$65,000  | \$65,000  |
| PLAN/ CER  | Planned   | \$100,610   |   |  |   |   | \$100,610   |
| Mobility as a Service Pilot - Placeholder ANY  | Planned   | \$200,000   |   |  |   |   | \$200,000   |
| ANY  | Planned   | \$100,000   |   |  |   |   | \$100,000   |
| PLAN/ CER  | Planned   | \$80,000  |   |  |   |   | \$80,000  |
| PLAN/ CER  | Planned   |   |   | \$80,000   |   |   | \$80,000  |
| PLAN/ CER  | Planned   |   |   |  |   | \$40,000  | \$40,000  |
|  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |
| ANY  | Planned   |   | \$200,000   |  |   |   | \$200,000   |
|  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |
| PLAN/ CER  | Planned   |   |   | \$300,000  |   |   | \$300,000   |
|  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |
| PS&E, CON  | Planned   | \$500,000   |   |  |   |   | \$500,000   |
|  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |
| Funds Requested  | l in 2019 5YPP  | \$1,550,610   | \$930,000   | \$666,000  | \$350,000   | \$105,000   | \$3,601,610   |
| mmed in 2019 Strategic   | Plan Baseline <sup>1</sup>  | \$630,000   | \$355,705   | \$375,424  | \$395,110   | \$415,791   | \$2,172,030   |
| ve Remaining Program   | ning Capacity   | (\$920,610)   | (\$1,494,905)   | (\$1,785,481)  | (\$1,740,371)   | (\$1,429,580)   | (\$1,429,580)   |
| SF Safe Routes to Schools Program Administration SF Safe Routes to Schools Program Administration Employer TDM Program - Placeholder TDM for Tourists - Placeholder TSP Evaluation Tool TSP Evalu | CON CON PLAN/ CER ANY ANY ANY ANY ANY ANY ANY ANY ANY PLAN/ CER | CON CON PLAN/ CER ANY ANY ANY ANY ANY ANY PLAN/ CER | CON Planned \$  CON Planned \$  PLAN/ CER Planned \$  ANY Planned \$  FLAN/ CER Planned \$  ANY Planned \$  ANY Planned \$  ANY Planned \$  FLAN/ CER Planned \$  ANY Planned \$  FLAN/ CER Planned \$  ANY Planned \$  FLAN/ CER Planned \$  ANY Planned \$  ANY Planned \$  FLAN/ CER Planned \$  ANY Planned \$  ANY Planned \$  FLAN/ CER Planned \$  FLAN/ CER Planned \$  ANY Planned \$  FLAN/ CER Planned \$  ANY Planned \$  ANY Planned \$  FUAN/ CER Planned \$  FUAN/ CER Planned \$  ANY Planned Planned \$  FUAN/ CER Planned \$  FUAN/ CER Planned \$  ANY Planned \$  A | CON Planned \$200,000 \$  CON Planned \$240,000 \$  PLAN/ CER Planned \$130,000 \$  PLAN/ CER Planned \$130,000 \$  PLAN/ CER Planned \$130,000 \$  PLAN/ CER Planned \$100,610 \$  PLAN/ CER Planned \$100,000 \$  PLAN/ CER Planned \$100,000 \$  PLAN/ CER Planned \$100,000 \$  PLAN/ CER Planned \$200,000 \$  PLAN/ CER Planned \$200,000 \$  ANY Planned \$200,000 \$  PLAN/ CER Planned \$500,000 \$  PRAN/ CER PLAN/ CER PLAN | CON Planned \$200,000   \$140,000   PLAN/ CER Planned   \$100,000   \$140,000   PLAN/ CER Planned   \$130,000   \$1550,000   PLAN/ CER Planned   \$130,000   \$150,000   PLAN/ CER Planned   \$100,010   \$150,000   PLAN/ CER Planned   \$100,000   PLAN/ CER Plan | CON Planned \$200,000   \$140,000   \$156,000   \$156,000   \$156,000   \$156,000   \$156,000   \$156,000   \$156,000   \$156,000   \$150,000   \$156,000   \$156,000   \$156,000   \$156,000   \$156,000   \$156,000   \$150,000 | CON   Planned   \$200,000   \$240,000   \$140,000   \$150,000   \$140,000   \$150 |

Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Parking Management Category (EP 43) 2019 Prop K 5-Year Prioritization Program - Program of Projects Cash Flow (Maximum Annual Reimbursement)

| Project Name                                     | Phase                            |             |               |               |               |               | Total         |
|--|----------------------------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
|  |                                  | 2019/20     | 2020/21       | 2021/22       | 2022/23       | 2023/24       |               |
| Citywide TDM                                     |                                  |             |               |               |               |               |               |
| SF Safe Routes to Schools Program Administration | CON                              | \$200,000   |               |               |               |               | \$200,000     |
| SF Safe Routes to Schools Program Administration | CON                              |             | \$240,000     |               |               |               | \$240,000     |
| Employer TDM Program - Placeholder               | PLAN/ CER                        | \$240,000   |               |               |               |               | \$240,000     |
| Employer TDM Program - Placeholder               | PLAN/ CER                        |             | \$140,000     |               |               |               | \$140,000     |
| Employer TDM Program - Placeholder               | PLAN/ CER                        |             |               | \$56,000      | \$50,000      | \$50,000      | \$156,000     |
| Residential TDM Program - Placeholder            | PLAN/ CER                        |             | \$175,000     | \$175,000     |               |               | \$350,000     |
| Residential TDM Program - Placeholder            | PLAN/ CER                        |             |               |               | \$175,000     | \$175,000     | \$350,000     |
| TDM for Tourists - Placeholder                   | PLAN/ CER                        | \$65,000    | \$65,000      |               |               |               | \$130,000     |
| TDM for Tourists - Placeholder                   | PLAN/ CER                        |             |               | \$65,000      | \$65,000      |               | \$130,000     |
| TDM for Tourists - Placeholder                   | PLAN/ CER                        |             |               |               |               | \$65,000      | \$65,000      |
| Commuter Benefits Ordinance Update               | PLAN/ CER                        | \$100,610   |               |               |               |               | \$100,610     |
| Mobility as a Service Pilot - Placeholder        | ANY                              | \$75,000    | \$75,000      | \$50,000      |               |               | \$200,000     |
| Emerging Mobility Services Pilot - Placeholder   | ANY                              | \$50,000    | \$50,000      |               |               |               | \$100,000     |
| TSP Evaluation Tool                              | PLAN/ CER                        | \$40,000    | \$40,000      |               |               |               | \$80,000      |
| TSP Evaluation Tool                              | PLAN/ CER                        |             |               | \$40,000      | \$40,000      |               | \$80,000      |
| TSP Evaluation Tool                              | PLAN/ CER                        |             |               |               |               | \$40,000      | \$40,000      |
| Demand and Pricing Management                    |                                  | -           | ł             | <u> </u>      | 1             | . <u>-</u>    |               |
| Demand and Pricing - Placeholder                 | ANY                              |             | \$100,000     | \$100,000     |               |               | \$200,000     |
| Modal Plans                                      |                                  | -           |               |               | -             | -             |               |
| ConnectSF Modal Study Follow On                  | PLAN/ CER                        |             |               | \$100,000     | \$100,000     | \$100,000     | \$300,000     |
| Communities of Concern Access                    |                                  |             |               |               |               |               |               |
| NTIP Placeholder                                 | PS&E, CON                        | \$250,000   | \$250,000     |               |               |               | \$500,000     |
|  |                                  |             |               |               |               |               |               |
| Cash Flow Reque                                  | Cash Flow Requested in 2019 5YPP | \$1,020,610 | \$1,135,000   | \$586,000     | \$430,000     | \$430,000     | \$3,601,610   |
| Cash Flow in 2019 Strategic Plan Baseline        | gic Plan Baseline <sup>1</sup>   | \$630,000   | \$355,705     | \$375,424     | \$395,110     | \$415,791     | \$2,172,030   |
| Cumulative Remaining Cash Flow Capacity          | ash Flow Capacity                | (\$390,610) | (\$1,169,905) | (\$1,380,481) | (\$1,415,371) | (\$1,429,580) | (\$1,429,580) |



|  | Prop K Project Information Form  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Project Name:  | SF Safe Routes To Schools Program Administration   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implementing Agency:   | San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Prop K Expenditure Plan Information  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Category:  | D. TSM/Strategic Initiatives   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subcategory:   | i. TDM/Parking Management  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EP Line (Primary):   | 43-Transportation Demand Mgmt  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other EP Line Number/s:  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fiscal Year of Allocation:   | 2018/19, 2019/20, 2020/21  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Project Information  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Location:  | TBD  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supervisorial District(s):   | TBD  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Manager:   | Miriam Sorell  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Phone Number:  | 415.646.2412   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Email:   | Miriam.Sorell@sfmta.com  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brief Project Description for MyStreetSF (80 words max):   | Administration of San Francisco's comprehensive Safe Routes to Schools Program to enable the city to meet the program's safety goal to reduce school-related collisions by 50% and mode shift goal to reduce single family vehicle trips from the current 48% to 30%, all by 2030.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detailed Scope (may attach Word document): Please describe the project goals, scope, benefits and how the project was prioritized. Also, describe any coordination with other projects (e.g. paving, MuniForward, Vision Zero).                                    | The SF Safe Routes to School (SRTS) program seeks to support the development of future multimodal walkers, bikers and transit users in support of the city's transportation and climate goals. This program will implement the core goals of school transportation: safety and mode shift. Specifically, by 2030, the program will:  * Reduce single family vehicle trips from the current 48% to 30% (a 37.5% reduction), which is a transportation goal adopted by SFUSD's Board  * Reduce school-related collisions by 50%: from an annual average of 2 severe and 32 injury collisions a year.  The SFMTA is requesting to program FY 18/19 Prop K funds for the first year of the program, and will ensure that there is a SRTS coordinator in place during the two-year implementation of the One Bay Area Grant funded program starting in FY 19/20.  This program will use new and best-practices to expand the SRTS program to all 103 SFUSD schools and provide a more coordinated and proactive school safety program. When successful, more people will walk, bike and take transit to and from school, reducing congestion and increasing safety in support of Vision Zero throughout San Francisco.  The safety and mode shift goals were included in the 2018 SF Safe Routes to Schools framework presented to the Transportation Authority Board on June 26, 2018. The framework provides an overview of the SFMTA's school safety and transportation management programs, and is organized into six focus areas: engineering, education, encouragement, environmental safety, evaluation, and transportation services for a comprehensive SRTS program. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prior Community Engagement/Support (may attach Word document): Please reference any community outreach that has occurred and whether the project is included in any plans (e.g. neighborhood transportation plan, corridor improvement study, station area plans). | In January 2018, the Transportation Authority programmed \$2.8 million in One Bay Area Grant funds to the San Francisco Safe Routes to Schools Program. This program is identified in the SF TDM Plan and the Vision Zero Two Year Action Strategy.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Partner Agencies: Please list partner agencies and identify a staff contact at each agency.  | SFUSD - Nik Kaestner, SFDPH - Ana Validzic, SFPD - Teresa Ewins, SFFD - Chad Law, SFE - Cara Gurney  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Type of Environmental Clearance<br>Required:   | Categorically Exempt   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Attachments:</b> Please attach maps, drawings, photos of current conditions, etc. to support understanding of the project.  | No   |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Project Delivery Milestones                          | Status     | Work                            | Start 1        | Date        | End I          | Pate        |
|--|------------|---------------------------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| Phase  | % Complete | In-house -<br>Contracted - Both | Quarter        | Fiscal Year | Quarter        | Fiscal Year |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering                      |            |                                 |                |             |                |             |
| Environmental Studies (PA&ED)                        |            |                                 |                |             |                |             |
| Right of Way   |            |                                 |                |             |                |             |
| Design Engineering (PS&E)                            |            |                                 |                |             |                |             |
| Advertise Construction                               |            |                                 |                |             |                |             |
| Start Construction (i.e. Award Contract)             | 5%         | In-house                        | Q1-Jul-Aug-Sep | 2018/19     |                |             |
| Operations (i.e. paratransit)                        |            |                                 |                |             |                |             |
| Open for Use   |            |                                 |                |             | Q4-Apr-May-Jun | 2020/21     |
| Project Completion (means last eligible expenditure) |            |                                 |                |             | Q2-Oct-Nov-Dec | 2021/22     |

| expenditure)      |  |  | Q2-Oct-Nov-Dec | 2021/22 |
|-------------------|--|--|----------------|---------|
| Comments/Concerns |  |  |                |         |
|                   |  |  |                |         |
|                   |  |  |                |         |
|                   |  |  |                |         |
|                   |  |  |                |         |



San Francisco County Transportation Authority Proposition K Sales Tax Program Project Information Form

Vame: SF Safe Routes To Schools Program Administration

| Project Cost Estimate           |              | Funding Source | rce          |
|---------------------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|
| Phase                           | Cost         | Prop K         | Other        |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering | · ·          |                |              |
| Environmental Studies (PA&ED)   | \$           | \$             | \$           |
| Right of Way                    | \$           | - \$           | \$           |
| Design Engineering (PS&E)       | - \$         | - \$           | \$           |
| Construction                    | \$ 3,413,000 | 000'009 \$     | \$ 2,813,000 |
| Operations (i.e. paratransit)   | - \$         | - \$           | \$           |
| Total Project Cost              | \$ 3,413,000 | 000'009 \$     | \$ 2,813,000 |
| Percent of Total                |              | 18%            | 82%          |

| Funding Plan - All Phases |                                  |              |                       |  |               | Cash Flow for Pro                     | p K Only (i.e. Fisc | Cash Flow for Prop K Only (i.e. Fiscal Year of Reimbursement) | rsement) |          |             |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|--|---------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---|----------|----------|-------------|
| Fund Source               | Prop K Expenditure<br>Line       | Phase        | Fund Source<br>Status | Fiscal Year of Allocation (Programming Year) | Total Funding | Previous                              | 2019/20             | 2020/21   | 2021/22  | 2022/23  | 2023/24     |
| Prop K                    | 43-Transportation<br>Demand Mgmt | Construction | Planned               | Previous                                     | \$ 160,000 \$ | \$ 70,000                             | \$ 90,000           | · ·   | · ·      | €9:      | ss.         |
| Prop K                    | 43-Transportation<br>Demand Mgmt | Construction | Planned               | 2019/20                                      | \$ 200,000 \$ | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | \$ 200,000 \$       | · •   | ·<br>•   | €9:      | <i>s</i> >  |
| Prop K                    | 43-Transportation<br>Demand Mgmt | Construction | Planned               | 2020/21                                      | \$ 240,000 \$ | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | €9:                 | \$ 240,000 \$   | ·<br>•   | <b>∽</b> | <b>6</b> 5- |
| OBAG2                     |                                  | Construction | Programmed            | 2019/20                                      | \$ 2,813,000  |                                       | \$ 1,406,500 \$     | \$ 1,406,500 \$   | \$       | \$       | s           |
|                           |                                  |              |                       |  |               | \$                                    | \$                  | \$  | \$       | \$       | ss.         |
|                           |                                  |              |                       |  | - \$          | - \$                                  | - \$                | - \$  | - \$     | \$       | \$          |
|                           |                                  |              |                       | Total By Fiscal Year \$                      | 3,413,000     | \$ 70,000                             | \$ 1,696,500 \$     | \$ 1,646,500  | - \$     | \$       | \$          |

Comments



|  | Prop K Project Information Form  |
|--|--|
| Project Name:  | Employer TDM Program - Placeholder   |
| Implementing Agency:   | San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency  |
|  | Prop K Expenditure Plan Information  |
| Category:  | D. TSM/Strategic Initiatives   |
| Subcategory:   | i. TDM/Parking Management  |
| EP Line (Primary):   | 43-Transportation Demand Mgmt  |
| Other EP Line Number/s:  |  |
| Fiscal Year of Allocation:   | 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22  |
|  | Project Information  |
| Project Location:  | TBD  |
| Supervisorial District(s):   | TBD  |
| Project Manager:   | John Knox White  |
| Phone Number:  | 415.701.4473   |
| Email:   | John.KnoxWhite@sfmta.com   |
| Brief Project Description for<br>MyStreetSF (80 words max):  | This is a placeholder for funds to develop, pilot and implement an on-going program for working with employees of existing employers in San Francisco to increase the number of people walking, bicycling, and taking transit, and reduce single occupant vehicle use. SFMTA will establish goals and evaluation metrics for the program; design and implement an initial employer pilot program; and then based on a successful evaluation of the pilot program, roll out an on-going employer-based information and education outreach program.  |
| Detailed Scope (may attach Word document): Please describe the project goals, scope, benefits and how the project was prioritized. Also, describe any coordination with other projects (e.g. paving, MuniForward, Vision Zero).                                    | This is a placeholder for funds to develop, pilot and implement an on-going program for working with employees of existing employers in San Francisco to increase the number of people walking, bicycling, and taking transit, and reduce single occupant vehicle use.  The scope of this program is focused on three distinct phases of work. These phases focus on achieving two goals: first, developing active business partners with the city in addressing mode share and second, impacting employee transportation use. The program's focus is based on learnings from a number of CCSF business TDM outreach projects which found that San Francisco has been less successful than other country programs in meaningfully engaging local businesses in providing transportation education and encouragement programs.  Phase One will conduct research and testing will identify private sector partners and research effective ways to engage businesses in medium to high drive areas of the city in supporting their employees driving less. Success will be measured by identifying how to attract active business partners in transportation and developing materials that have been tested for both successful distribution and messaging. Based on a successful completion of Phase One, Phases Two and Three will leverage non-Prop K funds to roll out a demonstration program based on the learnings of the pilot and finally a large-scale program.  The program will initially build and strengthen working relationships within SF's business community, including organizations and associations to support the planning and engineering work throughout the city. All three phases will target areas of the city that are identified as having available transportation options, having a barrier to use based on information deficit and/or perception of service, and having an ability to shift modes. This program will build on best-practice research and experience to support existing SF employees in better utilizing the multimodal options available to them in their local and regional co |
| Prior Community Engagement/Support (may attach Word document): Please reference any community outreach that has occurred and whether the project is included in any plans (e.g. neighborhood transportation plan, corridor improvement study, station area plans). | The SF TDM Plan identified as one of 12 key strategies, Strategy 7: develop programs for employer and residential communities to ensure residents/employees are fully aware of their transportation options.   |



| Partner Agencies: Please list partner  | SF Department of   | the Environment |
|--|--------------------|-----------------|
| agencies and identify a staff contact at   |                    |                 |
| each agency.   |                    |                 |
| Type of Environmental Clearance Required:  | Categorically Exem | npt             |
| Attachments: Please attach maps, drawings, photos of current conditions, etc. to support understanding of the project. | No                 |                 |

| Project Delivery Milestones                          | Status     | Work                            | Start 1 | Date        | End I   | Date        |
|--|------------|---------------------------------|---------|-------------|---------|-------------|
| Phase  | % Complete | In-house -<br>Contracted - Both | Quarter | Fiscal Year | Quarter | Fiscal Year |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering                      | 0%         | In-house                        |         |             |         |             |
| Environmental Studies (PA&ED)                        |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |
| Right of Way   |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |
| Design Engineering (PS&E)                            |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |
| Advertise Construction                               |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |
| Start Construction (i.e. Award Contract)             |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |
| Operations (i.e. paratransit)                        |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |
| Open for Use   |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |
| Project Completion (means last eligible expenditure) |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |

| Com    | ments/Concerns   |
|--------|--|
| This i | s a placeholder. The SFMTA will provide a detailed scope, schedule, budget and funding plan to support allocation of Prop K funds. |
|        |  |
|        |  |
|        |  |

## San Francisco County Transportation Authority Proposition K Sales Tax Program Project Information Form

| TO THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERT |
|--|
|--|

| Project Name:                  | Employer TDM Program - Placeholder | Placeholder    |            |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|------------|
|                                |                                    |                |            |
| Project Cost Estimate          |                                    | Funding Source | eo.        |
| Phase                          | Cost                               | Prop K         | Other      |
| lanning/Conceptual Engineering | \$ 953,000                         | \$ 236,000     | \$ 417,000 |
| Environmental Studies (PA&ED)  | - \$                               | - \$           | \$         |
| Right of Way                   | -                                  | \$             | -          |
| Design Engineering (PS&E)      | - \$                               | \$             | \$         |
| Sonstruction                   | - \$                               | \$             | \$         |
| perations (i.e. paratransit)   | - \$                               | \$             | \$         |
| Total Project Cost             | \$ 953,000                         | \$ 536,000     | \$ 417,000 |
| Percent of Total               |                                    | 56%            | 44%        |

| Funding Plan - All Phases |                                  |   |                       |  |               | Cash Flow for P | Cash Flow for Prop K Only (i.e. Fiscal Year of Reimbursement) | Fiscal Year of Re | imbursement) |           |                |         |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------|--|---------------|-----------------|---|-------------------|--------------|-----------|----------------|---------|
| Fund Source               | Prop K Expenditure<br>Line       | Phase   | Fund Source<br>Status | Fiscal Year of Allocation (Programming Year) | Total Funding | Previous        | 2019/20   | 2020/21           | 2021/22      | 2022/23   | 20             | 2023/24 |
| Prop K                    | 43-Transportation<br>Demand Mgmt | Planning/Conceptual Engineering,<br>Consstruction | Planned               | 2019/20                                      | \$ 240,000    |                 | \$ 240,000  | \$                | · ·          | <b>6</b>  | \$÷            | '       |
| Prop K                    | 43-Transportation<br>Demand Mgmt | Planning/Conceptual Engineering,<br>Consstruction | Planned               | 2020/21                                      | \$ 140,000    | ·<br>&          | · ·   | \$ 140,000        | \$           | €5        | <i>€</i> -     | '       |
| Prop K                    | 43-Transportation<br>Demand Mgmt | Planning/Conceptual Engineering.<br>Construction  | Planned               | 2021/22                                      | \$ 156,000    | - \$            |   | \$                | \$ 56,000    | \$ 50,000 | \$ 00          | 50,000  |
| TBD                       |                                  | Planning/Conceptual Engineering                   | Planned               | 2020/21                                      | \$ 417,000    | •               | \$  | €                 | \$           | <b>65</b> | \$             | 1       |
|                           |                                  |   |                       |  | - \$          |                 | - \$  | \$                | \$           | s         | \$             | '       |
|                           |                                  |   |                       |  | - \$          | - \$            | - \$  | · ·               | \$           | \$        | 6 <del>5</del> |         |
|                           |                                  |   |                       |  | \$            | -               | - \$  | · ·               | - \$         | 8         | 69             |         |
|                           |                                  |   |                       |  | \$            | -               | - \$  | · ·               | - \$         | 8         | 69             |         |
|                           |                                  |   |                       |  | \$            | -               | - \$  | · ·               | - \$         | 8         | 69             |         |
|                           |                                  |   |                       |  | \$            | -               | - \$  | · ·               | - \$         | 8         | <b>69</b>      | 1       |
|                           |                                  |   |                       |  |               |                 | *   | \$                | - \$         | \$        | \$ -           | -       |
|                           |                                  |   |                       |  |               | . \$            | -   | \$                | - \$         | \$        | \$ -           | '       |
|                           |                                  |   |                       | Total By Fiscal Year \$                      | \$ 953,000    | -               | \$ 240,000  | \$ 140,000        | \$ 56,000    | \$ 50,000 | \$ 00          | 50,000  |

## Comments

Prop K is expected to leverage Transportation for Clean Air, Active Tranportation Program, and other sources as available.



| Prop K Project Information Form  |
|--|
| Residential TDM Program - Placeholder  |
| San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency  |
| Prop K Expenditure Plan Information  |
| D. TSM/Strategic Initiatives   |
| i. TDM/Parking Management  |
| 43-Transportation Demand Mgmt  |
|  |
| 2018/19, 2021/22 2022/23   |
| Project Information  |
| TBD  |
| TBD  |
| John Knox White  |
| 415.701.4473   |
| John.KnoxWhite@sfmta.com   |
| This is a placeholder for funding to develop, pilot and launch a program for working with residents of existing housing units in San Francisco to reduce single-occupancy vehicle use. Through this program, SF will establish goals and evaluation metrics for the program; design and implement an initial residential pilot program; and then based on a successful evaluation of the pilot program, roll out an on-going resident-based information and education outreach program.  |
| The scope of this program is focused on three distinct phases of work beginning in FY19. These phases focus on achieving a goal consistent with the SF TDM Plan developing an active neighborhood residential reduction in single-occupancy vehicle use by working with residents in 2-3 targeted neighborhoods. The three phase proposal reflects the recognition that the SF Moves program, which was based on well-tested methodologies in Portland, was unsuccessful and a need to identify program methodologies that can be successful in San Francisco.  Phase One will conduct research and testing will conduct community outreach and focus groups to research effective ways to engage SF residents in neighborhoods with medium to high drive rates to reduce the amount that they drive. Success will be measured by identifying how to attract active business partners in transportation and developing materials that have been tested for both successful distribution and messaging. Based on a successful completion of Phase One, Phases Two and Three will leverage TFCA funds to roll out a demonstration program based on the learnings of the pilot and finally a large-scale program.  The program will identify methodologies for outreach in multiple neighborhoods in San Francisco. All three phases will target areas of the city that are identified as having available transportation options, having a barrier to use based on information deficit and/or perception of service, and having an ability to shift modes in support of the Transportation Demand Management Strategy.  This program will build on new and best-practice research and experience to support existing residents in better utilizing the multimodal options available to them in their local and regional commutes. When successful, more people will be bicycling, walking and taking transit, reducing congestion pressures and increasing safety in support of Vision Zero throughout the entire city.  Proposed funds for phases two and three are a placeholder for a multi-year program based on the propose |
| Working with San Francisco's TDM partners, the SFCTA developed the Inter-Agency Transportation Demand Strategy that identified key strategies for SF's TDM program. This included a \$1.5 million "Residential TDM Pilot program and expansion" strategy. This was then identified in the SF TDM Plan as one of 12 key strategies: Strategy 7: develop programs for employer and residential communities to ensure residents/employees are fully aware of their transportation options." Within this plan, "Implement neighborhood-specific TDM programs that help residents know and understand how to navigate the travel options available in their community." The SF Transportation Demand Management Plan approved the SFCTA, SFMTA, SFE and SF Planning boards/committees after a process that involved interviews, input and meetings with city and community stakeholders over three years.   |
|  |

## **5160-19**

## San Francisco County Transportation Authority Proposition K Sales Tax Program Project Information Form

| Partner Agencies: Please list partner agencies and identify a staff contact at each                                    | SF Department of   | the Environment |  |
|--|--------------------|-----------------|--|
| agencies and identity a start contact at each  | i e                |                 |  |
| agency.  |                    |                 |  |
| Type of Environmental Clearance<br>Required:   | Categorically Exem | npt             |  |
| Attachments: Please attach maps, drawings, photos of current conditions, etc. to support understanding of the project. | No                 |                 |  |

| Project Delivery Milestones                          | Status     | Work                            | Start 1 | Date        | End I   | Date        |
|--|------------|---------------------------------|---------|-------------|---------|-------------|
| Phase  | % Complete | In-house -<br>Contracted - Both | Quarter | Fiscal Year | Quarter | Fiscal Year |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering                      | 0%         | In-house                        |         |             |         |             |
| Environmental Studies (PA&ED)                        |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |
| Right of Way   |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |
| Design Engineering (PS&E)                            |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |
| Advertise Construction                               |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |
| Start Construction (i.e. Award Contract)             |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |
| Operations (i.e. paratransit)                        |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |
| Open for Use   |            | In-house                        |         |             |         |             |
| Project Completion (means last eligible expenditure) |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |

## Comments/Concerns

This is a placeholder for the subject program with funds proposed in FY 18/19 for Phase 1 program development and funds proposed in FY 2020/21 and FY 2022/23 for Phase 2 pilot implementation and evaluation and Phase 3 full program rollout. The schedule will be updated when SFMTA provides a detailed scope, schedule, budget and funding plan to support allocation of Prop K funds.

| ODSIGNATION ALL PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY OF TH |
|--|
|  |

| Project Name:                   | Residential TDM Program - Placeholder | - Placeholder  |            |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------|
|                                 |                                       |                |            |
| Project Cost Estimate           |                                       | Funding Source | rce        |
| Phase                           | Cost                                  | Prop K         | Other      |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering | \$ 1,694,809                          | \$ 000,508     | 608,667 \$ |
| Environmental Studies (PA&ED)   | -                                     | \$             | -          |
| Right of Way                    | - \$                                  | \$             | - \$       |
| Design Engineering (PS&E)       | - \$                                  | \$             | - \$       |
| Construction                    | - \$                                  | \$             | \$         |
| Operations (i.e. paratransit)   | - \$                                  | \$             | - \$       |
| Total Project Cost              | \$ 1,694,809                          | \$ 895,000     | \$ \$      |
| Percent of Total                |                                       | 53%            | 47%        |

| Funding Plan - All Phases |                                  |  |                       |  |               | Cash Flow for F | Cash Flow for Prop K Only (i.e. Fiscal Year of Reimbursement) | iscal Year of Rei | mbursement) |            |            |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------|--|---------------|-----------------|---|-------------------|-------------|------------|------------|
| Fund Source               | Prop K Expenditure<br>Line       | Phase  | Fund Source<br>Status | Fiscal Year of<br>Allocation<br>(Programming Year) | Total Funding | Previous        | 2019/20   | 2020/21           | 2021/22     | 2022/23    | 2023/24    |
| Prop K                    | 43-Transportation<br>Demand Mgmt | Planning/Conceptual Engineering,<br>Construction | Planned               | Previous   | \$ 195,000 \$ | \$ 50,000       | \$ 145,000  | · ·               | \$          | \$         | -<br>-     |
| Ргор К                    | 43-Transportation<br>Demand Mgmt | Planning/Conceptual Engineering,<br>Construction | Planned               | 2020/21  | \$ 350,000    | \$              | ·<br>&  | \$ 175,000 \$     | \$ 175,000  | \$         | \$         |
| Ргор К                    | 43-Transportation<br>Demand Mgmt | Planning/Conceptual Engineering,<br>Construction | Planned               | 2022/23  | \$ 350,000 \$ | · ·             | · ·   | · ·               | -<br>-      | \$ 175,000 | \$ 175,000 |
| TBD                       |                                  | Planning/Conceptual Engineering                  | Planned               | 2020/21  | \$ 799,809    | \$              | \$  | . \$              |             | - \$       | - \$       |
|                           |                                  |  |                       |  | - \$          | - \$            | - \$  | . \$              | \$ -        | - \$       | - \$       |
|                           |                                  |  |                       |  | - \$          | - \$            | - \$  | \$                | - \$        | - \$       | - \$       |
|                           |                                  |  |                       |  | - \$          | - \$            | - \$  | \$                | · \$        | - \$       | - \$       |
|                           |                                  |  |                       |  | - \$          | - \$            | - \$  | - \$              | - \$        | - \$       | - \$       |
|                           |                                  |  |                       |  | - \$          | - \$            | - \$  | - \$              | - \$        | - \$       | - \$       |
|                           |                                  |  |                       |  | - \$          | - \$            | - \$  | \$                | - \$        | - \$       | - \$       |
|                           |                                  |  |                       |  | - \$          | \$              | \$  | . \$              | - \$        | - \$       | - \$       |
|                           |                                  |  |                       |  | \$            | \$              |   | \$                | \$ -        | \$         | \$         |
|                           |                                  |  |                       | Total By Fiscal Year \$                            | \$ 1,694,809  | 000.05          | \$ 145,000  | \$ 175,000        | \$ 175,000  | \$ 175,000 | \$ 175,000 |

## Comments

Proposed programming is a placeholder. The SFMTA will provide a detailed scope, schedule, cost and funding plan as a prerequisite for allocation of funds. This should include adquate leveraging which may be considered on a project basis and in the TDM category as a whole. The Prop K Expenditure Plan expects leveraging of 54% (roughly dollar for dollar match) for the TDM category. Possible sources of matching funds include: Transportation Fund for Clean Air, Active Transportation Program, and other new sources.

## E100-21

|  | Prop K Project Information Form  |
|--|--|
| Project Name:  | TDM for Tourists   |
| Implementing Agency:   | San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency  |
|  | Prop K Expenditure Plan Information  |
| Category:  | D. TSM/Strategic Initiatives   |
| Subcategory:   | i. TDM/Parking Management  |
| EP Line (Primary):   | 43-Transportation Demand Mgmt  |
| Other EP Line Number/s:  |  |
| Fiscal Year of Allocation:   | 2019/20, 2021/22, 2023/24  |
|  | Project Information  |
| Project Location:  | Citywide   |
| Supervisorial District(s):   | Citywide   |
| Project Manager:   | John Knox White  |
| Phone Number:  | 415.701.4473   |
| Email:   | John.KnoxWhite@sfmta.com   |
| Brief Project Description for MyStreetSF (80 words max):   | This is a placeholder for funding to launch and operate a five-year program that involves working with hotels, travel agents, and on-line travel services to provide materials, outreach, and marketing to increase the number of people who use transit to come into SF and increase the use of non-automotive uses while visiting SF's many sites  |
| Detailed Scope (may attach Word document): Please describe the project goals, scope, benefits and how the project was prioritized. Also, describe any coordination with other projects (e.g. paving, MuniForward, Vision Zero).                                    | The scope of this annual program is focused on implementing phases two and three of this three phase program aimed at impacting the transportation choices of tourists who visit San Francisco from over 250 miles away. Phase one provides research into how tourists make their transportation decisions choices, at what point in their travel planning and ultimately what those choices are. Phase Two of the program is an 18 month initial pilot program built on this research, testing delivery methods including on-line travel site messaging, hotel and accommodation messaging and strategic partnerships with the Hotel Concierge Council, and other travel partners. Phase Three will implement the on-going program based on the findings of the pilot program.  Phase One, funded entirely by the SFMTA, was developed and implemented in partnership with SF Travel, Hotels Council, Hotels Concierge Council and key tourism stakeholders throughout San Francisco. With the implementation of Phases two and three, the program will engage tourists during their trip planning, helping them to understand the transportation landscape in San Francisco and how it can support a successful and enjoyable trip to our City. Through this program, tourists will be provided access to convenient transportation ticketing, information on options that work for their travel needs and suggestions on how to visit out-of-town areas (Napa, Muir Woods, etc.) without needing to rent a car for their full trip.  Through this program, the SFMTA will provide materials, outreach, and marketing to increase the number of people who use transit to come into SF and increase the use of non-automotive uses while visiting SF's many sites. The program will increase the use of bicycles, walking and transit and reduce the number of drivers on City Streets who are not familiar with San Francisco, reducing collisions and safety issues in support of Vision Zero. The project was identified through the SFCTA's TDM Strategy development process and further prioritized during the developm |
| Prior Community Engagement/Support (may attach Word document): Please reference any community outreach that has occurred and whether the project is included in any plans (e.g. neighborhood transportation plan, corridor improvement study, station area plans). | The SF TDM Plan identified as one of 12 key strategies, Strategy 6: Develop visitor-oriented and event-related TDM services to facilitate and encourage visitors' understanding and use of sustainable options when in San Francisco.  |
| Partner Agencies: Please list partner agencies and identify a staff contact at each agency.  | SF Environment   |
| Type of Environmental Clearance<br>Required:   | Categorically Exempt   |
| Attachments: Please attach maps, drawings, photos of current conditions, etc. to support understanding of the project.   | No   |



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

| Comments/Concerns  |
|--|
| This is a placeholder. SFMTA will provide a detailed scope, schedule, budget and funding plan to support allocation of Prop K funds. |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

| Project Cost Estimate Phase Planning/Conceptual Engineering Francemental Studies (PAR-ET) | Cost 325,000                          | \$ 325,000 \$ | · · · · |
|---|---------------------------------------|---------------|---------|
| ()  | · · · ·                               | · ·           | s s     |
| Design Engineering (PS&E)   | · ·                                   | -             | - &     |
|   | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | -             | - *     |
| Operations (i.e. paratransit)   | \$                                    |               | \$ -    |
| Total Project Cost  | \$ 325,000                            | 325,000       | TBD     |
| Percent of Total  |                                       | 100%          |         |

| Funding Plan - All Phases |                                  |                                 |                       |  |               | Cash Flow for I | Cash Flow for Prop K Only (i.e. Fiscal Year of Reimbursement) | Fiscal Year of Rei | imbursement) |           |           |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--|---------------|-----------------|---|--------------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|
| Fund Source               | Prop K Expenditure<br>Line       | Phase                           | Fund Source<br>Status | Fiscal Year of<br>Allocation<br>(Programming Year) | Total Funding | Previous        | 2019/20   | 2020/21            | 2021/22      | 2022/23   | 2023/24   |
| Prop K                    | 43-Transportation<br>Demand Mgmt | Planning/Conceptual Engineering | Planned               | 2019/20  | \$ 130,000    | •               | \$ 65,000   | \$ 65,000          | -            | · ·       | -         |
| Ргор К                    | 43-Transportation<br>Demand Mgmt | Planning/Conceptual Engineering | Planned               | 2021/22  | \$ 130,000    |                 | ·<br>&  |                    | \$ 65,000    | \$ 65,000 | ·<br>&    |
| Prop K                    | 43-Transportation<br>Demand Mgmt | Planning/Conceptual Engineering | Planned               | 2023/24  | \$ \$5,000    | \$              | -<br>&  | - \$               | - \$         | \$        | \$ 65,000 |
|                           |                                  |                                 |                       |  | - \$          | -               | - \$  | - \$               | - \$         | \$        | - \$      |
|                           |                                  |                                 |                       |  | - \$          | -               | -   | - \$               | - \$         | · •       | - \$      |
|                           |                                  |                                 |                       |  | - \$          | \$              | - \$  | - \$               | - \$         | - \$      | - \$      |
|                           |                                  |                                 |                       |  | - \$          | \$              | - \$  | - \$               | - \$         | - \$      | - \$      |
|                           |                                  |                                 |                       |  | - \$          | \$              | - \$  | \$                 | - \$         | \$        | - \$      |
|                           |                                  |                                 |                       | Total By Fiscal Year \$                            | \$ 325,000    | - \$            | \$ 65,000   | \$ 65,000          | \$ 65,000    | \$ 65,000 | \$ 65,000 |

Comments
Prop K is expected to Ieverage Transportation for Clean Air, Active Tranportation Program, and other sources as available.



|  | Prop K Project Information Form   |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Project Name:  | Commuter Benefits Ordinance Update  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implementing Agency:   | Department of the Environment   |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Prop K Expenditure Plan Information   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Category:  | D. TSM/Strategic Initiatives  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subcategory:   | i. TDM/Parking Management   |  |  |  |  |  |
| EP Line (Primary):   | 43-Transportation Demand Mgmt   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other EP Line Number/s:  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fiscal Year of Allocation:   | 2019/20   |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Project Information   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Location:  | Citywide  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supervisorial District(s):   | Citywide  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Manager:   | Asia Meshack  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Phone Number:  | 415-355-3788  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Email:   | asia.meshack@sfgov.org  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brief Project Description for MyStreetSF (80 words max):   | Review and consider amendments to the San Francisco Commuter Benefits Ordinance (CBO) in light of the 2017 update to the Federal Tax Code, and information gathered on the needs and concerns of San Francisco businesses and non-profits. The SF CBO applies to businesses and nonprofits that have 20 or more employees nationwide and a location in San Francisco. This project will 1) engage stakeholders 2) consider effects of amending the ordinance on SF employers and employees 3) engage in best-practice research to offer increased resources to employers in supporting their employees in commuting sustainably 4) revise, create and translate guidance materials and employee communication templates, 5) revise CBO language as needed, and 6) provide guidance to businesses subject to the Bay Area program. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detailed Scope (may attach Word document): Please describe the project goals, scope, benefits and how the project was prioritized. Also, describe any coordination with other projects (e.g. paving, MuniForward, Vision Zero).                                    | Please see attached Word document.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prior Community Engagement/Support (may attach Word document): Please reference any community outreach that has occurred and whether the project is included in any plans (e.g. neighborhood transportation plan, corridor improvement study, station area plans). | As part of introducing the CBO, outreach was conducted to the San Francisco business community, including the Chamber of Commerce and the Building Owners & Managers Association (BOMA). Also, "Review the Commuter Benefits Ordinance and consider amendments" is a Key Action under Strategy 7 of the San Francisco TDM Plan.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Partner Agencies: Please list partner agencies and identify a staff contact at each agency.  | SFMTA: John Knox White  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Type of Environmental Clearance<br>Required:   | Categorically Exempt  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attachments: Please attach maps, drawings, photos of current conditions, etc. to support understanding of the project.   | Yes Detailed Scope  |  |  |  |  |  |





## Commuter Benefits Ordinance Update Pro K 5YPP EP43: Detailed Scope San Francisco Department of the Environment

## **Project Summary**

The purpose of this project is to review and consider amendments to the San Francisco Commuter Benefits Ordinance (SFCBO) in light of the 2017 update to Federal Tax Code, and information gathered on the needs and concerns of San Francisco businesses and nonprofits.

goal of reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. Previously, the Planning Department has The SFCBO was originally passed in 2010, and last updated in 2014. The SFCBO furthers San Francisco's Transit First Policy, requiring businesses to support their employees' sustainable commute mode choices. By doing so, the program helps in meeting the city's larger determined that "the actions contemplated in this Ordinance are in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act," and it is expected that this process and any potential amendment would meet the same determination. The San Francisco Department of the Environment (SFE) administers the SFCBO for San Francisco employers, out-of-city and out-of-state employers with an office in San Francisco, and anyone commuting to their job in San Francisco. SFE regularly fields inquiries via phone and email and offers consultations on how to set up a commuter benefits program and comply with the SFCBO. Per the 2017 Federal Tax Code update, businesses can no longer write off transportation subsidies they offer employees. Additionally, the new tax law imposes an unrelated business income tax (UBIT) penalty on the amount tax-exempt employers pay for employees' transportation benefits, such as commuting/parking expenses. Tax-exempt employers may still subsidize employees' commuting/parking expenses so that the payments are excluded from the employees' W-2s, but nonprofit employers will have to pay UBIT (a flat tax set at 21%) on those amounts. Previously, nonprofits did not have to pay taxes on these employee benefits. As the SFCBO was created under a different tax code, it is time to revisit the Ordinance. This process should explore the tax burden on nonprofits required to offer commuter benefits under the SFCBO, as well as the benefit to employees of receiving said benefits. While an exemption for small to midsize nonprofits (20-49 employees) may be considered, this will have to be balanced with a consideration for employee's transportation incentives and expenses, as well as the City's GHG emissions reduction goals.

This project will coordinate with the Bay Area Commuter Benefits Program. The SFCBO applies to businesses and nonprofits that have 20 or more employees nationwide and a location in San Francisco. Since the launch of the Bay Area program, businesses that have 50 or more employees report directly to the Bay Area program.

## 2019-2020 Project Scope

The project will

- engage stakeholders impacted by the SFCBO, including the Bay Area Commuter Benefits Program, and the nonprofit community
  - consider effects on SF employers and employees of amending the ordinance 33
- engage in best-practice research to offer increased resources to employers in supporting their employees in commuting sustainably
- revising, creating and translating guidance materials and employee communication templates, 4) revising, creating and translating guidance5) revising SFCBO language as needed, and6) providing guidance to businesses subject t
- providing guidance to businesses subject to the Bay Area program.

This project budget assumes approx. 20% of FTE (approx. 425 hours) for a 5642 Senior Environmental Specialist for one year.

## E-1-Q-27

| Project Delivery Milestones                          | Status     | Work                            | Start I        | Date        | End I          | Date        |
|--|------------|---------------------------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| Phase  | % Complete | In-house -<br>Contracted - Both | Quarter        | Fiscal Year | Quarter        | Fiscal Year |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering                      | 0%         | In-house                        | Q1-Jul-Aug-Sep | 2019/20     | Q4-Apr-May-Jun | 2019/20     |
| Environmental Studies (PA&ED)                        |            |                                 |                |             |                |             |
| Right of Way   |            |                                 |                |             |                |             |
| Design Engineering (PS&E)                            |            |                                 |                |             |                |             |
| Advertise Construction                               |            |                                 |                |             |                |             |
| Start Construction (i.e. Award Contract)             |            |                                 |                |             |                |             |
| Operations (i.e. paratransit)                        |            |                                 |                |             |                |             |
| Open for Use   |            |                                 |                |             |                |             |
| Project Completion (means last eligible expenditure) |            |                                 |                |             |                |             |

| Project Completion (means last eligible expenditure) |  |   |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| Comments/Concerns                                    |  | - |  |  |
|  |  |   |  |  |
|  |  |   |  |  |
|  |  |   |  |  |
|  |  |   |  |  |

| THE MALISTON OF STATE | TRANS | STATION POLICE |
|--|-------|----------------|
|  |       |                |

| Project Name:                   | Commuter Benefits Ordinance Update | ance Update                        |                       |  |               |                 |   |                  |                                       |  |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|---------------|-----------------|---|------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Project Cost Estimate           |                                    | Funding Source                     | ce                    |  |               |                 |   |                  |                                       |  |
| Phase                           | Cost                               | Prop K                             | Other                 |  |               |                 |   |                  |                                       |  |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering | \$ 100,610                         | \$ 100,610                         | \$                    |  |               |                 |   |                  |                                       |  |
| Environmental Studies (PA&ED)   | · ·                                | · ·                                | · ·                   |  |               |                 |   |                  |                                       |  |
| Right of Way                    | · ·                                | _                                  | · •                   |  |               |                 |   |                  |                                       |  |
| Design Engineering (PS&E)       | · ·                                | _                                  | \$                    |  |               |                 |   |                  |                                       |  |
| Construction                    | · ·                                |                                    | \$                    |  |               |                 |   |                  |                                       |  |
| Operations (i.e. paratransit)   | \$                                 | -                                  | - \$                  |  |               |                 |   |                  |                                       |  |
| Total Project Cost              | \$ 100,610                         | \$ 100,610                         | - \$                  |  |               |                 |   |                  |                                       |  |
| Percent of Total                |                                    | 100%                               | 0/00                  |  |               |                 |   |                  |                                       |  |
| Funding Plan - All Phases       |                                    |                                    |                       |  |               | Cash Flow for P | Cash Flow for Prop K Only (i.e. Fiscal Year of Reimbursement) | iscal Year of Re | imbursement)                          |  |
| Fund Source                     | Prop K Expenditure<br>Line         | Phase                              | Fund Source<br>Status | Fiscal Year of Allocation (Programming Year) | Total Funding | Previous        | 2019/20   | 2020/21          | 2021/22                               |  |
| Ргор К                          | 43-Transportation<br>Demand Mgmt   | Planning/Conceptual<br>Engineering | Planned               | 2019/20                                      | \$ 100,610    | · ·             | \$ 100,610  | \$               | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |  |
|                                 |                                    |                                    |                       |  | ·<br>•        | ·<br>\$         | · ·   | \$               | · ·                                   |  |
|                                 |                                    |                                    |                       |  | ·<br>•        | ·<br>\$         | · ·   | \$               | · ·                                   |  |
|                                 |                                    |                                    |                       |  | - \$          |                 | •   | \$               | · ·                                   |  |
|                                 |                                    |                                    |                       |  | -             | - \$            | *   | - \$             | •                                     |  |
|                                 |                                    |                                    |                       |  |               | - \$            |   | \$               | *                                     |  |
|                                 |                                    |                                    |                       |  | - \$          | - \$            | *   | \$               | *                                     |  |
|                                 |                                    |                                    |                       |  | - \$          | \$              | •   |                  | · •                                   |  |
|                                 |                                    |                                    |                       |  |               | *               |   |                  | *                                     |  |
|                                 |                                    |                                    |                       |  |               | \$              |   | - \$             | \$                                    |  |
|                                 |                                    |                                    |                       |  | •             | - \$            | - \$  | \$               | \$                                    |  |
|                                 |                                    |                                    |                       |  |               | *               |   | *                | *                                     |  |
|                                 |                                    |                                    |                       | Total By Fiscal Year                         | \$ 100,610    | - \$            | \$ 100,610  | \$               | \$                                    |  |
| Comments                        |                                    |                                    |                       |  |               |                 |   |                  |                                       |  |
|                                 |                                    |                                    |                       |  |               |                 |   |                  |                                       |  |
|                                 |                                    |                                    |                       |  |               |                 |   |                  |                                       |  |
|                                 |                                    |                                    |                       |  |               |                 |   |                  |                                       |  |

2023/24

2022/23



|  | Prop K  | Project Information Form  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Project Name:  | Mobility as a Service I   | Pilot   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implementing Agency:   | San Francisco County  | Transportation Authority  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Prop K  | Expenditure Plan Information  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Category:  | D. TSM/Strategic Init   | iatives   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subcategory:   | i. TDM/Parking Mana   | gement  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EP Line (Primary):   | 43-Transportation De  | mand Mgmt   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other EP Line Number/s:  | 16-Other Transit Enh  | ancements   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fiscal Year of Allocation:   | 2019/20   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |   | Project Information   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Location:  | San Francisco Treasur   | re Island, District 10, and / or Downtown/SOMA  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supervisorial District(s):   | District 03, District 00  | i, District 10  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Manager:   | Rachel Hiatt  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Phone Number:  | 415-522-4809  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Email:   | rachel.hiatt@sfcta.org  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brief Project Description for MyStreetSF (80 words max):   | Island, Downtown/So<br>operators (water taxi,<br>single user interface fo<br>with incentives and di   | uthority and TIMMA seek to design and pilot an aggregated mobility services pilot on Treasure DMA, and/or District 10. The objective is to aggregate the area public and private transit ferry, AC Transit, and Muni); toll; parking; and emerging mobility service information into a or trip planning, booking, payment, and navigation. This pilot application could coordinate scount programs, and should focus on including benefits and service for Communities of his pilot could inform future research, transit incentives programs, and citywide expansions. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detailed Scope (may attach Word document): Please describe the project goals, scope, benefits and how the project was prioritized. Also, describe any coordination with other projects (e.g. paving, MuniForward, Vision Zero).                                    | See Attached.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prior Community Engagement/Support (may attach Word document): Please reference any community outreach that has occurred and whether the project is included in any plans (e.g. neighborhood transportation plan, corridor improvement study, station area plans). | See Attached.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Partner Agencies: Please list partner agencies and identify a staff contact at each agency.  | Partner Agencies: Please list partner agencies and identify a staff contact at each SFMTA, MTC/Clipper, Treasure Island public and private transportation service providers (WETA, Fagencies and identify a staff contact at each Transit, shuttle operator, carshare vendor, bikeshare vendor) |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Type of Environmental Clearance<br>Required:   | N/A   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attachments: Please attach maps, drawings, photos of current conditions, etc. to support understanding of the project.   | Yes De  | tailed Scope and Prior Community Engagement   |  |  |  |  |  |

## **Mobility as a Service Pilot**

## **Detailed Scope**

The proposed programming is a placeholder to plan and design an aggregated mobility services pilot on Treasure Island, Downtown/SOMA, and /or District 10. The Transportation Authority and TIMMA seek to design and pilot an aggregated mobility services pilot on Treasure Island. The objective is to aggregate the Island's public and private transit operators (water taxi, ferry, AC Transit, and Muni); tolls; parking; and emerging mobility service information into a single user interface for trip planning, booking, payment, and navigation. This pilot application could coordinate with incentives and discount programs. Results of this pilot could inform future research, transit incentives programs, and citywide expansions.

In a downtown or D10 version, the Transportation Authority and the SFMTA would pilot opportunities to aggregate transit, parking, road user charges, and emerging mobility service information into a single user interface, such as a mobile application, to provide a more seamless travel experience. Functions to integrate could encompass trip planning, booking, payment, and navigation / wayfinding. This pilot application could coordinate with incentives and discount programs. Results of this pilot could inform future research, transit incentives programs, and updates to other local and regional transportation software applications, such as Clipper or the Muni mobile application. The SFMTA could also upgrade the Muni Transit rider mobile application to provide discounts to users who allow mobile tracking and travel diary surveying. The upgraded mobile application could also allow mobile application users to verify bus time arrivals and bus tracking against estimated data to better inform bus riders of bus schedules.

This request covers the Planning / Conceptual design phase. The scope of work includes:

- 1. Project Management and TAC Involvement
- 2. Concept Exploration
- 3. Preliminary Design (Concept of Operations)
- 4. Outreach

## **Prioritization Criteria**

Vehicular Trip Reduction: The objective is to reduce vehicle driving on and off of Treasure Island, and/or downtown/SOMA and District 10. All trip types, or a mix, could be targeted through this tool. Research from the MaaS application WHIM in Helsinki, Finland, has shown reductions in driving from 40% mode share to 20% mode share of participants' trips.

Community Support: The 2016 Treasure Island Preliminary Toll Policies call for: a) toll credits for frequent transit use; and b) a Transportation Affordability Program that can provide travel incentives and rewards. The 2011 TITIP calls for TIMMA to administer a comprehensive TDM program that integrates all the public and private mobility choices available to the island, and also calls for a multiagency mandatory transit pass. Outreach conducted by TIMMA since 2016 indicates that residents strongly prefer a transit pass that integrates all operators. In addition, residents and community groups seek to integrate public transit mobility options with other private and public mobility options, such as

carshare, ridehailing, and ferry, as well as with other on-Island services provided by the One Treasure Island umbrella organization. Finally, outreach and Board sentiments conveyed in 2016 indicate strong desire for a transportation affordability program that supports low income users of all modes and offers rewards and cash incentives for sustainable travel choices.

Cost Effectiveness: MaaS platforms increase transit uptake without requiring investments in physical infrastructure or capital capacity. In addition, the MaaS platform will raise toll revenue from SOV drivers, to provide the incentives and rewards for travelers who choose sustainable modes.

*Readiness/Urgency:* We seek to have the MaaS platform available at the time of the launch of the overall TIMM Program, or July 2021. This is the milestone when tolls and other driving fees, as well as expanded public and private transit services, will be available. We seek for new TI residents moving on to the Island to form their travel behavior habits with the MaaS application in-hand.

Additionally, this timeframe parallels the design of second generation Clipper (C2). Conducting the work in this timeframe will allow San Francisco agencies to provide essential input to the C2 design process to ensure that it can accommodate MaaS features.

Leveraging Other Funds: Many additional sources of funding are available to be matched by this Prop K request, and to provide primary funding support for final design, implementation, ongoing operation, and incentives. Moreover, future TIMMA toll revenues will provide a source of ongoing operations funding and incentives for the MaaS platform. However, those funds will not be available until 2021-2022.

For a list of potential other federal, state, and regional funds for MaaS, see the Comments section below the funding plan in the Project Information Form.

*Increase Safety*: Lack of real-time travel information is a well-documented safety concern for Treasure Island residents. Muni shelters on-Island lack real time transit arrival information. In addition, ride sharing information is unreliable, according to reports from community outreach. The lack of information and unreliability of services contribute to a sense of safety concerns among TI travelers.

The MaaS app will primarily benefit users of multiple modes, especially at the point of inter-modal connections.

Benefit Communities of Concern: Treasure Island is a community of concern. Moreover, the MaaS platform would be part of the Island Transportation Affordability Program, targeted to the very low income and below market rate households currently living on-Island, and who will move on in future. The MaaS platform will, however, be available to all TI residents, employees, and visitors.

## **Prior Community Engagement / Support:**

This project advances the work of several planning efforts: Treasure Island Transportation Implementation Plan (TITP); Emerging Mobility Services and Technologies Evaluation (EMST) Report; and the District 10 Mobility Study.

TITIP: Calls for a comprehensive suite of TDM programs. Requires integration of multiple transit operators, local, regional, public, and private. Supports a broader tolling program that depends on mode shift. The TIMMA Board in 2016 called for staff to develop a Transportation Affordability Program

(TAP) to reduce transportation cost burdens for low income TI households. In addition, the Board called for staff to explore the idea of providing toll credits for frequent transit use, in lieu of direct toll discounts for all low income travelers. Since then, staff have developed draft TAP proposals. These concepts include a MaaS tool to support TI households' trip planning, payment, and navigation needs, and which would incorporate incentives and rewards for sustainable transportation choices.

EMST Evaluation Report: The 2018 EMST Evaluation Report screened, prioritized, and recommended several pilots to better incorporate innovative service types and new companies into the city's permitting and planning systems. These pilots include MaaS components: a mobile application pilot that studies traveler choices and factors that inform them; and a decongestion pricing and incentives system, which could be delivered through a MaaS tool.

District 10 Mobility Study: The D10 Mobility Study, currently underway, will recommend non-infrastructure pilots that can be deployed as partnerships between the community, developers, private transportation providers, and agencies. Through outreach conducted to date, staff has heard interest in MaaS applications.



| Project Delivery Milestones                          | Status     | Work                            | Start I | Date        | End I   | Date        |
|--|------------|---------------------------------|---------|-------------|---------|-------------|
| Phase  | % Complete | In-house -<br>Contracted - Both | Quarter | Fiscal Year | Quarter | Fiscal Year |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering                      | 0%         | In-house and<br>Contracted      |         |             |         |             |
| Environmental Studies (PA&ED)                        |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |
| Right of Way   |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |
| Design Engineering (PS&E)                            |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |
| Advertise Construction                               |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |
| Start Construction (i.e. Award Contract)             |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |
| Operations (i.e. paratransit)                        |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |
| Open for Use   |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |
| Project Completion (means last eligible expenditure) |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |

| 1 /  |                                     |    |  |  |
|--|-------------------------------------|----|--|--|
| omments/Concerns                               |                                     |    |  |  |
| chedule TBD with future allocation request sin | ice this is placeholder programming | ζ. |  |  |
| •  |                                     |    |  |  |
|  |                                     |    |  |  |
|  |                                     |    |  |  |
|  |                                     |    |  |  |
|  |                                     |    |  |  |

Mobility as a Service Pilot

Project Name:

| ALIVO PILA PILA PILA PILA PILA PILA PILA PILA |  |
|---|--|
|   |  |

| ase         Cost           tual Engineering         \$         200,000         \$           udies (PA&ED)         \$         -         -           udies (PAED)  | Project Cost Estimate            |         | Funding Source | ırce  |
|--|----------------------------------|---------|----------------|-------|
| tual Engineering \$  udies (PA&ED) \$  sg (PS&E) \$  tratransit) \$  st   st   st  st  st  st  st  st  st  | Phase                            | Cost    | Prop K         | Other |
| ndies (PA&ED) \$ B (PS&E) \$ - B (PS&E) \$ B (PS&E) \$ B (PS&E) \$ B (PS&E) \$ - B (PS&E) \$ | ing/Conceptual Engineering \$\\$ | 200,000 | \$ 200,000     | \$    |
| 9g (PS&E) \$ ratransit) \$ \$ st   | onmental Studies (PA&ED) \$      | -       | \$             | \$    |
| ug (PS&E)       \$       -         tratransit)       \$       -         st       200,000   | of Way                           | -       | \$             | \$    |
| st \$ 200,000  | gn Engineering (PS&E)            | -       | \$             | \$    |
| ratransit) \$  | truction \$                      | -       | \$             | \$    |
| st \$  | ations (i.e. paratransit)        | -       | \$             | \$    |
| T. H.  | 1 Project Cost                   | 200,000 | \$ 200,000     | \$    |
| Percent of I of all  | ent of Total                     |         | 100%           | %0    |

|   | 2023/24                                      | \$                              | \$   | \$   | \$   | ·  | s  | \$   | \$   | \$   | \$   | \$   | \$   | •                       |
|---|--|---------------------------------|------|------|------|----|----|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------------------------|
|   | 2022/23                                      | - \$                            | - \$ | - \$ | - \$ | -  | -  | - \$ | - \$ | - \$ | - \$ | *    | \$   | - \$                    |
| bursement)  | 2021/22                                      | \$ 50,000                       | - \$ | - \$ | - \$ | \$ | \$ | - \$ | - \$ | \$   | -    | -    | - \$ | \$ 50,000               |
| cal Year of Rein  | 2020/21                                      | 75,000 \$                       | 1    | -    | -    | -  | -  | -    | -    | -    | \$ - | -    | -    | 75,000                  |
| K Only (i.e. Fis  | 2019/20                                      | \$ 000,57                       | -    | -    | -    | 9  | 9  | \$   | -    | \$   | -    | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 000,57               |
| Cash Flow for Prop K Only (i.e. Fiscal Year of Reimbursement) | Previous                                     | 55                              | 5    | -    | -    | 5  | 5  | \$   | \$   | \$   | -    | \$ - | \$   | -                       |
| C   | Total Funding                                | \$ 200,000 \$                   | \$   | \$   | \$   | \$ | \$ | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$   | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 200,000 \$           |
|   | Fiscal Year of Allocation (Programming Year) | \$ 2019/20 \$                   | \$   | \$   | \$   | \$ | \$ | \$   | \$   | S    | \$   | \$   | \$   | Total By Fiscal Year \$ |
|   | Fund Source<br>Status                        | Planned                         |      |      |      |    |    |      |      |      |      |      |      |                         |
|   | Phase  | Planning/Conceptual Engineering |      |      |      |    |    |      |      |      |      |      |      |                         |
|   | Prop K Expenditure<br>Line                   | 43-Transportation               |      |      |      |    |    |      |      |      |      |      |      |                         |
| Funding Plan - All Phases                                     | Fund Source                                  | Prop K                          |      |      |      |    |    |      |      |      |      |      |      |                         |

## Comments

Proposed programming is a placeholder. Appropriate leverage will be expected when an allocation request is submitted for a specific project. Potential leveraging opportunities include:

Federal – MOD Sandbox (FTA), ATCMTD (FHWA), Multimodal Payment Integration (New; FTA); State – TIRCP (CalSTA); Caltrans); Strategic Growth Council Transformative Climate Communities (SGC); Regional / Local – BAAQMD (FFCA Plot Trip Reduction, Climate Protection Innovative Strategies); MTC (Climate Initiatives); Bay Bridge Forward; Prop K Transit Enhancements; TIDA (for match only)

## E100.35

|  | Prop K Project Information Form  |
|--|--|
| Project Name:  | Emerging Mobility Pilots   |
| Implementing Agency:   | San Francisco County Transportation Authority  |
|  | Prop K Expenditure Plan Information  |
| Category:  | D. TSM/Strategic Initiatives   |
| Subcategory:   | i. TDM/Parking Management  |
| EP Line (Primary):   | 43-Transportation Demand Mgmt  |
| Other EP Line Number/s:  |  |
| Fiscal Year of Allocation:   | 2019/20  |
|  | Project Information  |
| Project Location:  | TBD  |
| Supervisorial District(s):   | TBD  |
| Project Manager:   | Rachel Hiatt   |
| Phone Number:  | 415-522-4809   |
| Email:   | rachel.hiatt@sfcta.org   |
| Brief Project Description for MyStreetSF (80 words max):   | The proposed funding is a placeholder for up to two emerging mobility pilots which lead to reduction in single-occupant vehicle dependence, encourage alternative modes such as cycling or walking, and/or improve access of disadvantaged populations to jobs and key services. These pilots will be used to collect data from emerging mobility companies to evaluate how well emerging mobility services are aligned with the Board-adopted Guiding Principles. Pilots will also analyze increases in access for people underserved by public transit; safety effects; and effects on vehicle trip-making. Candidate locations include, but are not limited to San Francisco Communities of Concern, Treasure Island, and District 10.  |
| Detailed Scope (may attach Word document): Please describe the project goals, scope, benefits and how the project was prioritized. Also, describe any coordination with other projects (e.g. paving, MuniForward, Vision Zero).                                    | The proposed funding is a placeholder for up to two emerging mobility pilots. The Transportation Authority's 2018 Emerging Mobility Evaluation Report screened, prioritized, and recommended several pilots to better incorporate innovative service types and new companies into the city's permitting and planning systems. The attached document provides descriptions of potential pilot projects identified in the 2018 report.  The requested Prop K funding would be used to develop pilot opportunities with private partners, evaluate pilot concepts and results, and implement pilot projects. Potential pilot projects will be selected based on their ability to reduce single occupancy vehicle trips, increase mobility in Communities of Concern and leverage private partner funds.  Additional Background Information:  In January 2018, the Transportation Authority and the SFMTA facilitated a design-thinking workshop with agency staff. The purpose of the workshop was to gain a greater understanding about the challenges and opportunities related to managing emerging mobility in San Francisco, and to brainstorm pilot project ideas for emerging mobility. Stakeholders identified a series of challenges, constraints and opportunities. Following this round of engagement, stakeholders provided high-level and in-depth concepts for potential pilot projects that may sereve as testing opportunities to partner with private companies to resolve conflicts and improve transportation options.  In March 2018, Transportation Authority staff and SFMTA staff facilitated executive director workshops to develop prioritization criteria for screening and implementing pilot projects and other policies/strategies. Executive |
| Prior Community Engagement/Support (may attach Word document): Please reference any community outreach that has occurred and whether the project is included in any plans (e.g. neighborhood transportation plan, corridor improvement study, station area plans). | TBD when the pilot(s) are identified.  SFMTA, OCII, Office of City Administration (OCA), Recreation and Parks Department.  |
| Partner Agencies: Please list partner agencies and identify a staff contact at each agency.  | STALLA, OCH, OHICE OF CHY Administration (OCA), Recreation and Parks Department.   |
| Type of Environmental Clearance<br>Required:   | N/A  |
| Attachments: Please attach maps, drawings, photos of current conditions, etc. to support understanding of the project.   | Description of Potential Emerging Mobility Pilots  Yes   |



| <b>Project Delivery Milestones</b>                   | Status     | Work                            | Start   | Date        | End 1   | Date        |
|--|------------|---------------------------------|---------|-------------|---------|-------------|
| Phase  | % Complete | In-house -<br>Contracted - Both | Quarter | Fiscal Year | Quarter | Fiscal Year |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering                      | 0%         | In-house and<br>Contracted      |         |             |         |             |
| Environmental Studies (PA&ED)                        |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |
| Right of Way   |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |
| Design Engineering (PS&E)                            |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |
| Advertise Construction                               |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |
| Start Construction (i.e. Award Contract)             |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |
| Operations (i.e. paratransit)                        |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |
| Open for Use   |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |
| Project Completion (means last eligible expenditure) |            |                                 |         |             |         |             |

| 1 ,                                 |                              |                      |                       |                      |  |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|--|
| Comments/Concerns                   | -                            |                      |                       |                      |  |
| Proposed funds are a placeholder. S | Schedule will be provided wh | en an allocation req | uest is submitted for | a specific pilot(s). |  |
|                                     |                              |                      |                       |                      |  |
|                                     |                              |                      |                       |                      |  |
|                                     |                              |                      |                       |                      |  |
|                                     |                              |                      |                       |                      |  |

| Project Name:                   | Emerging Mobility Pilots |                |       |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|-------|
|                                 |                          |                |       |
| Project Cost Estimate           |                          | Funding Source | rce   |
| Phase                           | Cost                     | Prop K         | Other |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering | · •                      | \$             |       |
| Environmental Studies (PA&ED)   |                          | \$             |       |
| Right of Way                    |                          | \$             |       |
| Design Engineering (PS&E)       | -<br>-                   | \$             |       |
| Construction                    | \$ 100,000               | \$ 100,000     |       |
| Operations (i.e. paratransit)   | · ·                      | - \$           |       |
| Total Project Cost              | \$ 100,000               | \$ 100,000     |       |
| Percent of Total                |                          | 100%           | %0    |

|   | 2023/24                                      | \$                | \$  | \$   | · ·  | \$ <del>\$</del> | \$ <del>\$</del> | \$   | \$ - | \$ - | \$ · | · ·  | \$   | 55                      |
|---|--|-------------------|-----|------|------|------------------|------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------------------------|
|   | 2022/23                                      | s                 | \$  | \$   | \$   | \$               | \$               | \$   | \$   | \$   | \$   | s÷   | \$   | 45                      |
| nbursement)   | 2021/22                                      |                   | \$  | \$   | s    | s                | s                | s    | \$   | \$   | s    | \$   | s    | •                       |
| Cash Flow for Prop K Only (i.e. Fiscal Year of Reimbursement) | 2020/21                                      | \$ 50,000         | - 8 | - \$ | - \$ |                  |                  | - \$ | - \$ | - \$ | - \$ | - \$ | - \$ | \$ 50,000               |
| op K Only (i.e. Fi  | 2019/20                                      | \$ 50,000         | -   | - \$ | - \$ | -                | -                | - \$ | -    | - \$ | -    |      | - \$ | 20.000                  |
| Zash Flow for Pro   | Previous                                     | - \$              | -   |      |      | -                | -                | - \$ | - \$ | \$   |      |      |      | •                       |
|   | Total Funding                                | \$ 100,000        | -   | -    | -    | \$               | -                | -    | - \$ | - \$ | - \$ |      | \$   | 100.000                 |
|   | Fiscal Year of Allocation (Programming Year) | 2019/20           |     |      |      |                  |                  |      |      |      |      |      |      | Total By Fiscal Year \$ |
|   | Fund Source<br>Status                        | Planned           |     |      |      |                  |                  |      |      |      |      |      |      |                         |
|   | Phase  | Any Phase         |     |      |      |                  |                  |      |      |      |      |      |      |                         |
|   | Prop K Expenditure<br>Line                   | 43-Transportation |     |      |      |                  |                  |      |      |      |      |      |      |                         |
| Funding Plan - All Phases                                     | Fund Source                                  | Prop K            |     |      |      |                  |                  |      |      |      |      |      |      |                         |

## Comments

Depending on the scope, potential sources include: Federal – MOD Sandbox (FTA), ATCMTD (FHWA), Multimodal Payment Integration (New; FTA); State – TIRCP (CalSTA); Caltrans); Strategic Growth Council Transformative Climate Protection Innovative Strategics); MTC (Climate Initiatives); Bay Bridge Forward (if on Treasure Island); Prop K Transit Enhancements; TIDA (if on Treasure Island)

Sufficient leveraging of Prop K funds with other funds will be expected as part of the allocation request(s).

## **Potential Emerging Mobility Pilots**

The following are summaries of emerging mobility pilots identified during the Emerging Mobility Evaluation Report workshops and subsequent efforts. Draft evaluation metrics are also provided for each pilot. The draft statements identified below are intended as opportunities and will be refined further through agency and community stakeholder review and prioritization before the Transportation Authority pursues any next steps and implementation for the EP43 TDM EMST Pilot placeholder funding. These summaries include:

Mobility as a Service Application
Single Payment Platform
Late Night Transportation Options
First and Last Mile Connections to Transit
School Transportation Services
Autonomous Transit Service
Autonomous Vehicle Shuttle
Affordability Pass
Smart Mobility Kiosks
Sustainable Trip Competition
Develop Curb Management Strategy
Implement Curb Management and Color Curb Program
Data Collaborative

## **Mobility as a Service Application**

The Transportation Authority and the SFMTA should pilot opportunities to aggregate transit and emerging mobility service information into a mobile application to provide a more seamless travel experience. This pilot application could coordinate with incentives and discount programs. Results of this pilot should inform future research and transit incentives programs. The SFMTA should also upgrade the Muni Transit Rider mobile application to provide discounts to users who allow mobile tracking and travel diary surveying. The upgraded mobile application should also allow mobile application users to groundtruth bus time arrivals and bus tracking to better inform bus riders of bus schedules.

## **Metrics:**

- -Community Outreach: Number of outreach events conducted for CoCs, neighborhood groups, advocacy groups, and other city stakeholders
- -User Data Compliance: Compliance with providing aggregated and anonymized user data to local planning agencies
- -Service VMT: Net changes in VMT during AM peak, PM peak, and daily VMT on a long and/or short term basis
- -Average Vehicle Occupancy (by mode): People miles traveled divided by Vehicle Miles Traveled for the service type
- -Service Emissions: Net increase/decrease in GHG

- -Increasing Access and Mobility for People with Disabilities: Total trips provided to people with disabilities
- -User Statistics: Percentage of service users who identify as people with disabilities
- -Increasing Access and Mobility: Availability of service on weekends, availability between 9pm-5am, and coverage in underserved areas

## **Single Payment Platform**

There are a couple ways the Transportation Authority could support a single payment platform or the availability of single payment platforms in the marketplace. First, MTC could, as part of C2 or as part of C1 continued development, develop a modern API that allows payment aggregator platforms to integrate Clipper accounts. Second, agencies could work with private organizations such as employers, institutions, etc., to pilot platforms that aggregate payment, transportation choices, and include built in financial incentives to discourage automobile use including car buy-back program, company TDM plans, a point reward system, credit donation and trading, local hire programs/platforms. The public sector's role could be to subsidize an initial launch, provide promotion or incentives such as transit fare value, or marketing and promotion. The public sector could also pilot a TDM program educating employers and institutions about the aggregator platforms available in the marketplace and comparisons of features etc. The Treasure Island Mobility Management Program will include a TDM plan managed by TIMMA, who could perform this role as part of a pilot. TMAs throughout the city could consider including these tools as a feature in their TDM plans.

## **Metrics:**

- -Transit Discounts: Service provides discounted fares to transit hubs
- -User Statistics: Percentage of service users who identify as people with disabilities
- -Transit Competition: Net change in transit revenue due to the emerging payment platform
- -Service VMT: Net changes in VMT during AM peak, PM peak, and daily VMT on a long and/or short term basis
- -Service Emissions: Net increase/decrease in GHG
- -First and Last Mile: Total trips provided to transit stations and as a share of all trips.

## **Late Night Transportation Options**

The city should develop opportunities for emerging mobility services to provide shared mobility options during late night hours, 9 p.m. to 5 a.m., that complement the regional all-nighter transit network while helping meet the need areas identified in the 2015 report. In 2015, the San Francisco Late Night Transportation Working Group released *The Other 9-to-5*, the final report of its first phase of work to evaluate transportation needs during the period from 9 p.m. to 5 a.m.<sup>31</sup> The report identified five need areas to address in the transportation system: availability and coverage; speed and reliability; safety and security; awareness and comfort; and cost and equity, as well as recommendations to begin to address each area. The second phase of the Late Night Transportation Study has implemented the major recommendations from the first phase, including a reevaluation of the regional all-nighter bus network.

The final report from this second phase of the study, a draft of which was endorsed by the Working Group on February 6, 2018,<sup>32</sup> identifies the need to "consider whether some form of public-private partnership with taxis, transportation network companies, carpooling systems, shuttle providers or other services might boost access to local transit hubs or better address first or last mile challenges to increase use of the existing AllNighter system."

## **Metrics:**

- -Increasing Access and Mobility: Availability of service on weekends, availability between 9pm-5am, and coverage in underserved areas
- -Access Time: Average access times for trips originating from CoCs (compared to the average access time for trips not originating in a CoC)
- -Traffic Speeds: Net change in vehicle and traffic speeds due to this P3 process
- -Transit Competition: Net change in transit revenue (as applicable) due to a P3 with another service provider (e.g. taxi, TNC, etc.)
- -Operational Safety: Number of collisions per 100,000 service miles
- -First and Last Mile: Total trips provided to transit stations and as a share of all trips.
- -Fiscal Impact: Net marginal roadway maintenance cost due to the emerging mobility service

## **First and Last Mile Connections to Transit**

The Transportation Authority and the SFMTA should explore methods to incentivize traveling to major transit hubs such as BART stations, Caltrain among others. This pilot should consider curb management strategies adjacent to these transit hubs that may facilitate pickups and drop offs. Additionally, this pilot should identify methods of discouraging competition with mass transit within, to and from San Francisco.

## **Metrics:**

- -First and Last Mile: Total trips provided to transit stations and as a share of all trips.
- -Transit Competition: Total and percentage of trips shifted to/from transit to an emerging mobility service.
- -Increasing Access and Mobility: Total trips provided to people with disabilities
- -User Statistics: Percentage of service users who identify as people with disabilities
- -Access Time: Average access times for trips using accessible vehicles compared to the average access times for all San Francisco trips
- -Fiscal Impact: Net marginal roadway maintenance cost due to the emerging mobility service

## **School Transportation Services**

The Transportation Authority, San Francisco Department of Rec and Parks, and San Francisco Unified School District could develop opportunities for emerging mobility services to provide shared mobility options for San Francisco youth to travel to and from home, school, and after school programs.

Many emerging mobility services are do not serve minors because this required an additional permit and license and that is another cost. The public sector could subsidize a pilot based on the incremental cost associated with opening up an emerging mobility service to minors, such as for school and recreational / extracurricular travel needs. The public sector could help support the incremental cost of additional training and licenses associated with transporting minors, seniors, etc.

## Metrics:

- -First and Last Mile: Total trips provided to transit stations and as a share of all trips.
- -Transit Competition: Total and percentage of trips shifted to/from transit to an emerging mobility service.
- -Increasing Access and Mobility: Total trips provided to people with disabilities
- -Local Hire: Percent of employees with Bay Area residency 7+ years
- -Fiscal Impact: Net marginal roadway maintenance cost due to the emerging mobility service

## **Autonomous Transit Service**

The SFMTA could support transit line service with autonomous shuttle service along core transit routes to improve transit frequency and reliability. Pilot program could also test what labor implications a blended or completely autonomous transit service may look like. This pilot could also work to understand how to improve mobility in the city's parks, recreation facilities and visitor destinations. Lastly, such a pilot could be implemented as part of a TDM solution for planned unit developments.

## **Metrics:**

- -Operational Safety: Number of collisions per 100,000 service miles
- -First and Last Mile: Total trips provided to transit stations, and as a share of all trips
- -Increasing Access and Mobility: Percentage of trips provided to and from CoCs (compared with all vehicle trips)
- -Increasing Access and Mobility #2: Total trips provided to people with disabilities
- -Employee/Contractor Earnings and Benefits: Mobility service operator net hourly median earnings minus job-related expenses; net value of mobility service operator benefits, including medical, dental, and retirement benefits for employees and/or contractors.
- -Local Hire: Percent of employees with Bay Area residency 7+ years
- -Traffic Speeds: Net change in vehicle and traffic speeds due to this emerging mobility service, OR net change in vehicle and transit delay due to this emerging mobility service

## **Autonomous Vehicle Shuttle**

SFCTA or SFMTA could partner with an independent AV operator to provide trips in a specific area. One potential location for such a shuttle would be for trips between the Shipyard residential center, in the Bayview neighborhood, to the Third Street light rail corridor. SFCTA could partner with Shipyard developer Fivepoint and an AV operator. Core goals would be to reduce emissions through reduction in vehicular

trips. The AV operator would apply for SFMTA PTV permit to operate the publicly available AV pilot. The pilot could also partner with SFMTA's curb management team. SFCTA would evaluate how this service provided trips to transit as TDM and reduced emissions by reducing vehicle trips.

## Metrics:

- -Operational Safety: Number of collisions per 100,000 service miles
- -First and Last Mile: Total trips provided to transit stations, and as a share of all trips
- -Increasing Access and Mobility: Percentage of trips provided to and from CoCs (compared with all vehicle trips)
- -Increasing Access and Mobility #2: Total trips provided to people with disabilities
- -Employee/Contractor Earnings and Benefits: Mobility service operator net hourly median earnings minus job-related expenses; net value of mobility service operator benefits, including medical, dental, and retirement benefits for employees and/or contractors.
- -Local Hire: Percent of employees with Bay Area residency 7+ years
- -Traffic Speeds: Net change in vehicle and traffic speeds due to this emerging mobility service, OR net change in vehicle and transit delay due to this emerging mobility service

## **Affordability Pass**

The Transportation Authority, the SFMTA and MTC could test a low-income subsidy for emerging mobility services that align with the Guiding Principles. This pilot could also serve as an opportunity to test innovative community outreach that targets specific low-income communities and works to understand how these services may improve mobility for them. Treasure Island is a potential location to pilot an affordable fare or rate for emerging mobility.

## **Metrics:**

- -Transit Discounts: Percentage of riders that the pass provides discounted fares to compared to the overall share of riders
- -Increasing Access and Mobility: Percentage of trips provided to CoCs (compared with all vehicle trips)
- -User Statistics: percentage of service users who identify as people with disabilities and/or low income (compared with the general population)

## **Smart Mobility Kiosks**

The SFMTA and other City agencies could test mobility kiosks similar to those implemented in New York City and Chicago to aggregate transportation options, wayfinding and emerging mobility service. Pilot should evaluate how kiosks increase mobility options for people without smartphones and in areas identified as Communities of Concern.

## **Metrics:**

- -User Statistics: Percentage of users who are defined as low income (compared with the general population)
- -User Statistics: Percentage of users who identify as people with disabilities
- -Increasing Access and Mobility: Total services provided to people with disabilities.
- -Increasing Access and Mobility: Total services provided to people who live within CoCs

## **Sustainable Trip Competition**

Similar to BART Perks, the Transportation Authority, the SFMTA, MTC and SF Environment could incentivize travelers during a pilot period to track their mobility habits and gain "points" towards some reward for choosing the most sustainable trip options. This pilot could also provide data insights into how people chain trips, connect to transit using emerging mobility, and other behavior study indicators.

## **Metrics:**

- -Transit Competition: Total and percentage of trips shifted to and from transit to an emerging mobility service
- -User Statistics: Average access times for trips originating from CoCs (compared to the average access time for trips that do not originate from CoCs)
- -Increasing Access and Mobility: Total trips provided to people with disabilities
- -User Statistics: Percentage of service users who are defined as low income (compared with the general population)
- -Average Vehicle Occupancy: People Miles Traveled divided by Vehicle Miles Traveled for the service type

## **Develop Curb Management Strategy**

The SFMTA and the Transportation Authority should develop an inventory of curb space and curb use throughout the city in addition to demand for curb space by user and mode type. The results of this study will inform potential pilot programs to test with emerging mobility companies and ultimately produce a curb management strategy.

The SFMTA could identify locations throughout San Francisco's retail and business districts where innovative curb management strategies may be employed. This curb management pilot could test opportunities during the most congested period of the day (e.g. a.m. and p.m. peaks) during which onstreet parking may be restricted to allow for passenger pick-up, loading and goods delivery. The pilot could also consider how to improve safety and access for vulnerable roadway users including people walking and bicycling, as well as access for people with disabilities. The pilot could also measure person throughput gained or lost by increasing loading zones in place of on-street parking. Lastly, the pilot could be used to develop a data driven process for understanding curb space demand in near real time.

The results of the curb management study and pilot would shape the final curb management strategy. This strategy should prioritize outcomes identified in the City's Guiding Principles for Emerging Mobility

Services and Technologies. Furthermore, the strategy should aim to reduce conflicts between vehicle loading needs behavior and vulnerable roadway users including people walking and bicycling.

## **Metrics:**

- -Fiscal Impact: Net marginal roadway maintenance cost due to the emerging mobility service
- -Traffic Speeds: Net change in vehicle and traffic speeds due to this emerging mobility service, OR net change in vehicle and transit delay due to this emerging mobility service
- -Access Time: Average access times for trips using accessible vehicles, compared to average access times for all San Francisco trips
- -User Statistics: Percentage of service users who identify as people with disabilities
- -State of Good Repair: Service's total vehicular VMT on San Francisco's roadways on a typical weekday (or total reduction VMT due to curb management)

## **Implement Curb Management and Color Curb Program**

The SFMTA's Color Curb Program currently allows adjacent businesses to apply for loading zones outside of their storefronts. The SFMTA could test how emerging mobility companies may apply for loading zones throughout the city through the color curb program. This pilot could encourage emerging mobility companies to work with local business communities to develop curb management strategies that support commercial areas. Similarly, it could allow emerging mobility companies to identify the locations throughout the city where they have the greatest demand for access points/pickup and drop off needs.

## **Metrics:**

- -Fiscal Impact: Net marginal roadway maintenance cost due to the emerging mobility service
- -Traffic Speeds: Net change in vehicle and traffic speeds, OR net change in vehicle and transit delay due to this program
- -Access Time: Average access times for trips using accessible vehicles, compared to average access times for all San Francisco trips
- -User Statistics: Percentage of service users who identify as people with disabilities
- -State of Good Repair: Service's total vehicular VMT on San Francisco's roadways on a typical weekday (or total reduction VMT due to curb management)

## **Data Collaborative**

MTC, the Transportation Authority and the SFMTA could pilot a third-party data collaborative. Public agencies should identify what research questions they have and should share them with a non-governmental, third-party research institution. Private emerging mobility companies would share data with the third-party researchers. Together, the researchers could answer key questions for San Francisco public agencies without disclosing company-specific information.

## **Metrics:**

- -User Data Compliance: Number of entities in compliance with providing aggregated and anonymized user data to local planning agencies
- -User Statistics: Percentage of service users who identify as people with disabilities



|  | Prop K Project Information Form   |
|--|---|
| Project Name:  | TSP Evaluation Tool   |
| Implementing Agency:   | San Francisco County Transportation Authority   |
|  | Prop K Expenditure Plan Information   |
| Category:  | D. TSM/Strategic Initiatives  |
| Subcategory:   | i. TDM/Parking Management   |
| EP Line (Primary):   | 43-Transportation Demand Mgmt   |
| Other EP Line Number/s:  |   |
| Fiscal Year of Allocation:   | 2018/19, 2019/20, 2021/22, 2023/24  |
|  | Project Information   |
| Project Location:  | Citywide  |
| Supervisorial District(s):   | Citywide  |
| Project Manager:   | Joe Castiglione   |
| Phone Number:  | (415) 522-4810  |
| Email:   | joe.castiglione@sfcta.org   |
| Eman.  | The Transportation Sustainability Program (TSP) Evaluation Tool will provide decision-makers with the ability   |
| Brief Project Description for MyStreetSF (80 words max):   | to quantify the effectiveness of travel demand management (TDM) strategies included in the TSP program that are intended to shift travel behavior away from single-occupant motor vehicles to sustainable forms of travel like transit, biking and walking. The effort involves identifying the tool's performance requirements based on user needs; collecting, warehousing and analyzing data; and implementing a tool that can easily be used by developers, planners, decision-makers and the public.   |
| Detailed Scope (may attach Word document): Please describe the project goals, scope, benefits and how the project was prioritized. Also, describe any coordination with other projects (e.g. paving, MuniForward, Vision Zero).                                    | The Transportation Sustainability Program (TSP) seeks to improve and expand upon San Francisco's transportation system to help accommodate new growth by requiring new developments to provide on-site travel demand management (TDM) amenities that prioritize sustainable alternatives to driving. This project supports the guiding principles identified in the San Francisco TDM Plan and supports the TSP goal of prioritizing sustainable alternatives by providing comprehensive, systematic evaluation of the effectiveness of TDM strategies, allowing these strategies to be refined and expanded over time.  Task 1: Identify Performance Requirements: Identify what types of strategies the tool will be sensitive to (e.g. free transit passes), the attributes of these strategies (e.g. who those passes are given to), and the related factors which may influence the effectiveness of these strategies (e.g. living in a transit-rich area). Strategies to be evaluated will likely include parking in addition to other strategies to be identified in coordination with the Planning Department and SFMTA.  Task 2: Identify Methods and Required Data: Research the specific analysis methods, formulations and data needed to support development of a tool with the required sensitivities. Data to be collected through the MTC's Travel Decisions Survey, etc.  Task 3: Collect, Warehouse and Analyze Data: Collect and analyze data to evaluate the effectiveness of an initial set of key TSP / TDM strategies, and to demonstrate the viability of on-going data collection methods.  Task 4: Implement Tool: Implement the TSP Evaluation Tool so that it provides the required sensitivities using the data collected and methods identified. Tool will be web-based and available to the public.  This effort will help fulfill principles of the San Francisco TDM Plan, including the "comprehensive, systematic evaluation and reporting on the effectiveness of city TDM programs," and will also help fulfill the implementation strategies within the San Francisco TDM Plan Strategy |
| Prior Community Engagement/Support (may attach Word document): Please reference any community outreach that has occurred and whether the project is included in any plans (e.g. neighborhood transportation plan, corridor improvement study, station area plans). | Prior public outreach was performed in support of the Transportation Sustainability Program (TSP).  Additional outreach TBD as part of future allocation requests.  |



| Partner Agencies: Please list partner  | San Francisco Plan | nning Department - Wade Wietgrefe (wade.wietgrefe@sfgov.org)        |
|--|--------------------|---|
| agencies and identify a staff contact at each  | San Francisco Mui  | nicipal Transportation Agency - Carli Paine (carli paine@sfmta.org) |
| agency.  |                    |   |
| Type of Environmental Clearance  | N/A                |   |
| Required:  | 11/11              |   |
| Attachments: Please attach maps, drawings, photos of current conditions, etc. to support understanding of the project. | No                 |   |

| <b>Project Delivery Milestones</b>                   | Status     | Work                            | Start I        | Date        | End I          | Pate        |
|--|------------|---------------------------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| Phase  | % Complete | In-house -<br>Contracted - Both | Quarter        | Fiscal Year | Quarter        | Fiscal Year |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering                      | 0%         | In-house and<br>Contracted      | Q2-Oct-Nov-Dec | 2018/19     | Q4-Apr-May-Jun | 2023/24     |
| Environmental Studies (PA&ED)                        |            |                                 |                |             |                |             |
| Right of Way   |            |                                 |                |             |                |             |
| Design Engineering (PS&E)                            |            |                                 |                |             |                |             |
| Advertise Construction                               |            |                                 |                |             |                |             |
| Start Construction (i.e. Award Contract)             |            |                                 |                |             |                |             |
| Operations (i.e. paratransit)                        |            |                                 |                |             |                |             |
| Open for Use   |            |                                 |                |             |                |             |
| Project Completion (means last eligible expenditure) |            |                                 |                |             |                |             |

| Comments/Concerns   |
|---|
| Schedule show covers the duration of the 2019 5YPP period. Each future allocation have a specific scope and schedule for the funds requested. |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |



San Francisco County Transportation Authority Proposition K Sales Tax Program Project Information Form

| Project Name:                      | TSP Evaluation Tool |                |            |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|------------|
|                                    |                     |                |            |
| Project Cost Estimate              |                     | Funding Source | rce        |
| Phase                              | Cost                | Prop K         | Other      |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering \$ | 000'009 \$          | \$ 000,000     | \$ 200,000 |
| Environmental Studies (PA&ED)      | \$                  | -              | \$         |
| Right of Way                       | \$                  | -              | \$         |
| Design Engineering (PS&E)          | \$                  | -              | \$         |
| Construction                       | - \$                | \$             | - \$       |
| Operations (i.e. paratransit)      | - \$                | \$             | - \$       |
| Total Project Cost                 | 000'009 \$          | \$ 400,000     | \$ 200,000 |
| Percent of Total                   |                     | %29            | 33%        |

| Funding Plan - All Phases               |                                  |                                 |                       |  |               | Cash Flow for ] | Cash Flow for Prop K Only (i.e. Fiscal Year of Reimbursement) | Fiscal Year of Rei | imbursement) |           |           |
|---|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--|---------------|-----------------|---|--------------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|
| Fund Source                             | Prop K Expenditure<br>Line       | Phase                           | Fund Source<br>Status | Fiscal Year of<br>Allocation<br>(Programming Year) | Total Funding | Previous        | 2019/20   | 2020/21            | 2021/22      | 2022/23   | 2023/24   |
| Ргор К                                  | 43-Transportation<br>Demand Mgmt | Planning/Conceptual Engineering | Planned               | Previous   | \$ 200,000 \$ | \$ 200,000      |   |                    |              |           |           |
| Prop K                                  | 43-Transportation<br>Demand Mgmt | Planning/Conceptual Engineering | Planned               | 2019/20  | \$ 80,000     |                 | \$ 40,000   | \$ 40,000          |              |           | · ·       |
| Prop K                                  | 43-Transportation<br>Demand Mgmt | Planning/Conceptual Engineering | Planned               | 2021/22  | \$ 80,000     | \$              | 8   | - \$               | \$ 40,000    | \$ 40,000 | ·<br>•    |
| Prop K                                  | 43-Transportation                | Planning/Conceptual Engineering | Planned               | 2023/24  | \$ 40,000     | . \$            | \$  | - \$               | - \$         | \$        | \$ 40,000 |
| Planning Department TDM Ordinance Funds | ice Funds                        | Planning/Conceptual Engineering | Planned               | 2019/20  | \$ 200,000    | . \$            | \$  | - \$               | - \$         | \$        | -         |
|   |                                  |                                 |                       |  | \$ -          | - \$            | \$  | *                  | - \$         | \$        |           |
|   |                                  |                                 |                       |  | - \$          | . \$            | - \$  | - \$               | - \$         | - \$      | \$        |
|   |                                  |                                 |                       |  | \$            | - \$            | \$  | *                  | - \$         | \$        |           |
|   |                                  |                                 |                       |  | \$            | - \$            | \$  | - \$               | - \$         | \$        |           |
|   |                                  |                                 |                       |  | \$            | - \$            | \$  | - \$               | - \$         | \$        |           |
|   |                                  |                                 |                       |  | \$            | *               | \$  | - \$               | \$           | - \$      | . \$      |
|   |                                  |                                 |                       |  | - \$          | - \$            | \$  | ·                  | - \$         | ·         |           |
|   |                                  |                                 |                       | Total By Fiscal Year                               | \$ 600,000    | \$ 200,000      | \$ 40,000   | \$ 40,000          | \$ 40,000    | \$ 40,000 | \$ 40,000 |

Comments

Each allocation request will be evaluated for appropriate leveraging.



|  | Prop K Project Information Form  |
|--|--|
| Project Name:  | Demand & Pricing - Placeholder   |
| Implementing Agency:   | San Francisco County Transportation Authority or San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency   |
|  | Prop K Expenditure Plan Information  |
| Category:  | D. TSM/Strategic Initiatives   |
| Subcategory:   | i. TDM/Parking Management  |
| EP Line (Primary):   | 43-Transportation Demand Mgmt  |
| Other EP Line Number/s:  |  |
| Fiscal Year of Allocation:   | 2020/21  |
|  | Project Information  |
| Project Location:  | TBD  |
| Supervisorial District(s):   | TBD  |
| Project Manager:   |  |
| Phone Number:  |  |
| Email:   |  |
| Brief Project Description for MyStreetSF (80 words max):   | This is a placeholder for one or more potential efforts that use pricing and/or incentives to encourage behavior change with the aim of reducing congestion, encouraging travel by transit/bike/foot/carpool, and/or increasing transportation network efficiency (person throughput vs. vehicles).  |
| Detailed Scope (may attach Word document): Please describe the project goals, scope, benefits and how the project was prioritized. Also, describe any coordination with other projects (e.g. paving, MuniForward, Vision Zero).                                    | This is a placeholder for one or more potential efforts that use pricing and/or incentives to encourage behavior change with the aim of reducing congestion, encouraging travel by transit/bike/foot/carpool, and/or increasing transportation network efficiency (person throughput vs. vehicles). A specific scope, schedule, cost and funding plan will be provided as part of a future allocation request. |
| Prior Community Engagement/Support (may attach Word document): Please reference any community outreach that has occurred and whether the project is included in any plans (e.g. neighborhood transportation plan, corridor improvement study, station area plans). | TBD  |
| Partner Agencies: Please list partner agencies and identify a staff contact at each agency.  | TBD  |
| Type of Environmental Clearance<br>Required:   | TBD  |
| <b>Attachments:</b> Please attach maps, drawings, photos of current conditions, etc. to support understanding of the project.  | No   |



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

| Comments/Concerns  |
|--|
| This is a placeholder. Project specific schedule details will be included with any allocation request for these funds. |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

| Sit.         | IN ALI | YOR TO THE |
|--------------|--------|------------|
| DOSIDNARY CO |        | 5          |
|              | 3 TR   |            |

| Project Cost Estimate           |            | Funding Source | rce   |
|---------------------------------|------------|----------------|-------|
| Phase                           | Cost       | Prop K         | Other |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering | \$ 200,000 | \$ 200,000     | \$    |
| Environmental Studies (PA&ED)   | -          | \$             | ·     |
| Right of Way                    | -          | \$             | ·     |
| Design Engineering (PS&E)       | - \$       | \$             | \$    |
| Construction                    | \$         | - \$           | \$    |
| Operations (i.e. paratransit)   | \$         | - \$           | \$    |
| Total Project Cost              | \$ 200,000 | \$ 200,000     | \$    |
| Percent of Total                |            | 100%           | %0    |

Demand & Pricing - Placeholder

Project Name:

| Funding Plan - All Phases |                            |       |                       |  | 0                      | Cash Flow for P | rop K Only (i.e. I | Cash Flow for Prop K Only (i.e. Fiscal Year of Reimbursement) | nbursement) |         |         |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---|-------------|---------|---------|
| Fund Source               | Prop K Expenditure<br>Line | Phase | Fund Source<br>Status | Fiscal Year of Allocation (Programming Year) | Total Funding Previous | Previous        | 2019/20            | 2020/21   | 2021/22     | 2022/23 | 2023/24 |
| Prop K                    | EP 43                      | Any   | Planned               | 2020/21                                      | \$ 200,000             | -               | - \$               | \$ 100,000  | \$ 100,000  | •       | -       |
|                           |                            |       |                       |  | \$                     | - \$            | - \$               | - \$  | - \$        | - \$    | - \$    |
|                           |                            |       |                       |  | \$                     | - \$            | - \$               | •   | - &         | - \$    | - 9     |
|                           |                            |       |                       |  | \$                     | - \$            | - \$               | •   | - &         | - \$    | - 9     |
|                           |                            |       |                       |  | \$                     | - \$            | - \$               | - \$  | - \$        | - \$    | - \$    |
|                           |                            |       |                       | Total By Fiscal Vear                         | 300.000                | 5               | 5                  | \$ 100.000 \$   | 100.000     | 5       | 5       |

## Comments

Proposed programming is a placeholder. Future allocation request(s) will be expected to have appropriate leveraging.



|  | Prop K Project Information Form  |
|--|--|
| Project Name:  | ConnectSF Modal Study Follow On  |
| Implementing Agency:   | San Francisco County Transportation Authority  |
|  | Prop K Expenditure Plan Information  |
| Category:  | D. TSM/Strategic Initiatives   |
| Subcategory:   | i. TDM/Parking Management  |
| EP Line (Primary):   | 43-Transportation Demand Mgmt  |
| Other EP Line Number/s:  |  |
| Fiscal Year of Allocation:   | 2021/22  |
| Tiscai Teai of Anocation.  | Project Information  |
| Project Location:  | Citywide   |
| •  | Citywide   |
| Supervisorial District(s):   | Linda Meckel   |
| Project Manager:   |  |
| Phone Number:  | (415) 522-4823   |
| Email:   | linda.meckel@sfcta.org  ConnectSF is San Francisco's multi agency, long range transportation planning program. Studies and projects  |
| Brief Project Description for MyStreetSF (80 words max):   | proposed under the program umbrella, including the Streets and Freeways Study (SFS) and the Transit Corridors Study (TCS) are designed to help San Francisco reach the 50-year vision for our transportation system. This project is a placeholder for ConnectSF Modal Study Follow on work which will take recommendations from the SFS and TCS - such as proposed projects, operational strategies and policies, and develop them further for potential implementation.  |
| Detailed Scope (may attach Word document): Please describe the project goals, scope, benefits and how the project was prioritized. Also, describe any coordination with other projects (e.g. paving, MuniForward, Vision Zero).                                    | Connect SF is San Francisco's multi-agency, long-range transportation planning program. In 2018, Phase 1 of the program was completed with adoption of a 50-year vision for San Francisco's transportation system. The 50-year vision seeks to achieve objectives in five goal areas: Equity, Economic Vitality, Environmental Sustainability, Safety and Livability and, Accountability and Engagement.  Initiated in 2018 as part of Connect Phase 2, the Streets and Freeways Study (SFS) and the Transit Corridors Study (TCS) will identify projects and policies that will help San Francisco work towards the 50-year vision and will feed into the next countywide transportation plan update, known as the San Francisco Transportation Plan 2050 or SFTP 2050. The SFS and TCS will result in screened, preliminary prioritized list of potential projects, operations strategies and policies for further planning, refinement, and consideration for inclusion in the SFTP 2050. The intent of the ConnectSF Modal Study Follow on work will be to take some of the projects, operational strategies and preliminary policies identified in the SFS and TCS and develop them further for potential implementation. |
| Prior Community Engagement/Support (may attach Word document): Please reference any community outreach that has occurred and whether the project is included in any plans (e.g. neighborhood transportation plan, corridor improvement study, station area plans). | The 50-year vision was developed with broad public engagement at the citywide level throughout its year long development. This included focus groups, online surveys, targeted outreach and the use of a Futures Task Force. Additional, coordinated community outreach will be done for ConnectSF Phase 2 studies including the TCS and SFS, which, will feed into work funded through the ConnectSF Modal Study Follow on effort(s). More information on outreach to date can be found on the ConnectSF website (https://connectsf.org/).  |
| Partner Agencies: Please list partner agencies and identify a staff contact at each agency.  Type of Environmental Clearance   | SF Planning (Doug Johnson); SFMTA (Kansai Uchida)  |
| Required:  | N/A  |
| Attachments: Please attach maps, drawings, photos of current conditions, etc. to support understanding of the project.   |  |



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

| Comments/Concerns   |  |
|---|--|
| This is a placeholder. A schedule will be included with any allocation request for these funds. |  |
|   |  |
|   |  |
|   |  |
|   |  |

| TO THE PARTY OF TH |
|--|
|--|

| Project Name:                   | ConnectSF Modal Study Follow On | ollow On       |       |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|-------|
|                                 |                                 |                |       |
| Project Cost Estimate           |                                 | Funding Source | ce    |
| Phase                           | Cost                            | Prop K         | Other |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering | \$ 000'000 \$                   | 300,000        |       |
| Environmental Studies (PA&ED)   | \$                              | - \$           | - \$  |
| Right of Way                    | - \$                            | - \$           | - \$  |
| Design Engineering (PS&E)       | - \$                            | - \$           | - \$  |
| Sonstruction                    | - \$                            | - \$           | - \$  |
| Operations (i.e. paratransit)   | - \$                            | - \$           | - \$  |
| Total Project Cost              | \$ 300,000                      | \$ 300,000     | - \$  |
| Percent of Total                |                                 | 100%           | %0    |

| Funding Plan - All Phases |                            |                                 |                       |  |               | Cash Flow for ] | Cash Flow for Prop K Only (i.e. Fiscal Year of Reimbursement) | iscal Year of Rei | mbursement)   |            |            |  |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--|---------------|-----------------|---|-------------------|---------------|------------|------------|--|
| Fund Source               | Prop K Expenditure<br>Line | Phase                           | Fund Source<br>Status | Fiscal Year of<br>Allocation<br>(Programming Year) | Total Funding | Previous        | 2019/20   | 2020/21           | 2021/22       | 2022/23    | 2023/24    |  |
| Prop K                    | 43-Transportation          | Planning/Conceptual Engineering | Planned               | 2021/22  | \$ 300,000    | \$              | - \$  | - \$              | \$ 100,000    | \$ 100,000 | \$ 100,000 |  |
|                           |                            |                                 |                       |  | - \$          | \$              | - \$  | - \$              | \$            | - \$       | -          |  |
|                           |                            |                                 |                       |  | - \$          | \$              | - \$  | - \$              | \$            | - \$       | -          |  |
|                           |                            |                                 |                       |  | - \$          | \$              | - \$  | - \$              | - \$          | - \$       | -          |  |
|                           |                            |                                 |                       |  | - \$          | \$              | - \$  | - \$              | \$            | - \$       | -          |  |
|                           |                            |                                 |                       |  | - \$          | \$              | - \$  | - \$              | - \$          | - \$       | - \$       |  |
|                           |                            |                                 |                       |  | - \$          | *               | - \$  | - \$              | - \$          | - \$       | -          |  |
|                           |                            |                                 |                       |  | - \$          | *               | - \$  | - \$              | \$            | - \$       | -          |  |
|                           |                            |                                 |                       |  | - \$          | - \$            | - \$  | - \$              | - \$          | - \$       | - 8        |  |
|                           |                            |                                 |                       |  | - \$          | *               | - \$  | - \$              | - \$          | - \$       | -          |  |
|                           |                            |                                 |                       |  | - \$          | - \$            | - \$  | - \$              | - \$          | - \$       | -          |  |
|                           |                            |                                 |                       |  |               | - \$            | - \$  | - \$              | - \$          | - \$       | - \$       |  |
|                           |                            |                                 |                       | Total By Fiscal Year \$                            | \$ 300,000    | - \$            | - \$  | - \$              | \$ 100,000 \$ | \$ 100,000 | \$ 100,000 |  |

Comments
This is placeholder programming. The allocation request should reflect appropriate kvraging of non-Prop K funds.



|  | Prop  | K Project Information Form  |
|--|---|---|
| Project Name:  | NTIP Capital Plac   | ,   |
| Implementing Agency:   | -   |   |
|  | Pro   | p K Expenditure Plan Information  |
| Category:  | C. Street & Traffic   | Safety  |
| Subcategory:   | iv. Bicycle and Ped   | estrian Improvements  |
| EP Line (Primary):   | 38-Traffic Calming  |   |
| Other EP Line Number/s:  | 30, 39, 40, 43, 44  |   |
| Fiscal Year of Allocation:   |   |   |
|  |   | Project Information   |
| Project Location:  | TBD   |   |
| Supervisorial District(s):   | TBD   |   |
| Project Manager:   |   |   |
| Phone Number:  |   |   |
| Email:   |   |   |
| Brief Project Description for MyStreetSF (80 words max):   | based neighborhoo<br>populations (e.g. so<br>component to fund  | n Authority's Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program (NTIP) funds community- nd-scale transportation projects, especially in underserved neighborhoods and areas with vulnerable eniors, children, and/or people with disabilities). The NTIP has two components: a planning d community-based planning efforts in each Supervisorial district; and a capital component to hing funds for neighborhood-scale projects in each district. This placeholder is for capital funds.   |
| Detailed Scope (may attach Word document): Please describe the project goals, scope, benefits and how the project was prioritized. Also, describe any coordination with other projects (e.g. paving, MuniForward, Vision Zero).                                    | based neighborhor<br>populations (e.g. so<br>Transportation Pla<br>projects and transi<br>based planning eff<br>component (\$600, | n Authority's Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program (NTIP) funds community- od-scale transportation projects, especially in underserved neighborhoods and areas with vulnerable eniors, children, and/or people with disabilities). The NTIP program came out of the San Francisco n's needs assessment that identified significant unmet demand for pedestrian and bicycle circulation t reliability initiatives. The NTIP has two components: a planning component to fund community- orts in each Supervisorial district (\$100,000 for each district over the next 5 years); and a capital 000 for each district over the next 5 years) to provide local matching funds for about two e projects in each district in the next five years. This is the second cycle of the NTIP program. This capital funds. |
| Prior Community Engagement/Support (may attach Word document): Please reference any community outreach that has occurred and whether the project is included in any plans (e.g. neighborhood transportation plan, corridor improvement study, station area plans). | 1 0   | specifically designed to be community-based, with priority given to projects in underserved a areas with vulnerable populations (e.g. seniors, children, and/or people with disabilities).  |
| Partner Agencies: Please list partner agencies and identify a staff contact at each agency.  | TBD   |   |
| Type of Environmental Clearance<br>Required:   | TBD   |   |
| Attachments: Please attach maps, drawings, photos of current conditions, etc. to support understanding of the project.   | No  |   |

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

## Comments/Concerns

This is a placeholder. Schedule will be determined once a specific NTIP plan proposal is developed. Sufficient detail will be required when the allocation request is submitted.



San Francisco County Transportation Authority Proposition K Sales Tax Program Project Information Form

| Project Name:                   | NTIP Capital Placeholder |                |       |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|-------|
|                                 |                          |                |       |
| Project Cost Estimate           |                          | Funding Source | eo.   |
| Phase                           | Cost                     | Prop K         | Other |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering | •                        | - \$           | - \$  |
| Environmental Studies (PA&ED)   | \$                       | - \$           | - \$  |
| Right of Way                    | \$                       | - \$           | - \$  |
| Design Engineering (PS&E)       | \$                       | - \$           | - \$  |
| Construction                    | \$ 6,600,000             | \$ 6,600,000   | - \$  |
| Operations (i.e. paratransit)   | \$                       | - \$           | - \$  |
| Total Project Cost              | \$ \$                    | \$             | ΠBD   |
| Percent of Total                |                          | 100%           |       |

| Funding Plan - All Phases |  |       |                       |  |               | Cash Flow for P | rop K Only (i.e. I | Cash Flow for Prop K Only (i.e. Fiscal Year of Reimbursement) | mbursement) |         |         |
|---------------------------|--|-------|-----------------------|--|---------------|-----------------|--------------------|---|-------------|---------|---------|
| Fund Source               | Prop K Expenditure<br>Line                 | Phase | Fund Source<br>Status | Fiscal Year of<br>Allocation<br>(Programming Year) | Total Funding | Previous        | 2019/20            | 2020/21   | 2021/22     | 2022/23 | 2023/24 |
| Ргор К                    | 30-Other Upgrades to<br>Major Arterials    | Any   | Planned               | 2019/20  | \$ 250,000    |                 | \$ 125,000         | \$ 125,000  |             |         |         |
| Prop K                    | 38-Traffic Calming                         | Any   | Planned               | 2019/20  | \$ 2,850,000  |                 | \$ 1,425,000       | \$ 1,425,000  |             |         |         |
| У ф                       | 39-Bicycle<br>Circulation/Safety           | Any   | Planned               | 2019/20  | \$ 1,000,000  |                 | \$ 500,000         | \$ 500,000  |             |         |         |
| Ртор К                    | 40-Pedestrian<br>Circulation/Safety        | Any   | Planned               | 2019/20  | \$ 1,100,000  |                 | \$ 550,000         | \$ 550,000  |             |         |         |
| Ргор К                    | 43-Transportation<br>Demand Mgmt           | Any   | Planned               | 2019/20  | \$ 500,000    |                 | \$ 250,000         | \$ 250,000  |             |         |         |
| Prop K                    | 44-Transportation/Land<br>Use Coordination | Any   | Planned               | 2019/20  | \$ 900,000    |                 | \$ 450,000 \$      | \$ 450,000  |             |         |         |
|                           |  |       |                       |  |               |                 |                    |   |             |         |         |
|                           |  |       |                       | Total By Fiscal Year \$                            | 6,600,000     | - \$            | * 3,300,000 \$     | 3,300,000   | - \$        | - \$    | •       |

Comments

The NTIP includes \$600,000 for each supervisorial district over the next 5 years to implement capital projects. When NTIP capital projects are identified, they are expected to include appropriate leveraging.

# 2014 Prop K 5-Year Project List (FY 2014/15 - 2018/19) Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Parking Management (EP 43)

## Programming

|              |   | į            | Ċ       |           |           | Fiscal Year |           |           |           |
|--------------|---|--------------|---------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Agency       | Project Name  | Fhase        | Status  | 2014/15   | 2015/16   | 2016/17     | 2017/18   | 2018/19   |           |
| Citywide TDM |   |              |         |           |           |             |           |           |           |
| Any Eligible | Citywide TDM Marketing                                | CON          | Planned | \$100,000 |           |             |           |           | \$100,000 |
| Any Eligible | Any Eligible   Citywide TDM Marketing                 | CON          | Planned |           |           |             | \$50,000  |           | \$50,000  |
| Any Eligible | TDM Program Evaluation                                | PLAN/<br>CER | Planned | \$100,000 |           |             |           |           | \$100,000 |
| Any Eligible | Any Eligible TDM Program Evaluation                   | PLAN/<br>CER | Planned |           |           | \$100,000   |           |           | \$100,000 |
| Any Eligible | TDM Program Evaluation                                | PLAN/<br>CER | Planned |           |           |             |           | \$100,000 | \$100,000 |
| Any Eligible | Comprehensive Residential and<br>Employee TDM Program | CON          | Planned | \$100,000 |           |             |           |           | \$100,000 |
| Any Eligible | Comprehensive Residential and<br>Employee TDM Program | CON          | Planned |           | \$350,000 |             |           |           | \$350,000 |
| Any Eligible | Comprehensive Residential and<br>Employee TDM Program | CON          | Planned |           |           | \$350,000   |           |           | \$350,000 |
| Any Eligible | Comprehensive Residential and<br>Employee TDM Program | CON          | Planned |           |           |             | \$350,000 |           | \$350,000 |
| Any Eligible | Comprehensive Residential and<br>Employee TDM Program | CON          | Planned |           |           |             |           | \$350,000 | \$350,000 |
| SFE          | Commuter Benefits Ordinance<br>Employer Outreach      | CON          | Planned | \$77,546  |           |             |           |           | \$77,546  |
| SFE          | Commuter Benefits Ordinance<br>Employer Outreach      | CON          | Planned |           | \$79,872  |             |           |           | \$79,872  |
| Modal Plans  |   |              |         |           |           |             |           |           |           |
| SFCTA        | Transit Core Capacity Study                           | PLAN/<br>CER | Planned | \$450,000 |           |             |           |           | \$450,000 |
| SFMTA        | WalkFirst Data Refresh                                | PLAN/<br>CER | Planned |           | \$200,000 |             |           |           | \$200,000 |

2014 Prop K 5-Year Project List (FY 2014/15 - 2018/19)

Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Parking Management (EP 43)

## Programming

| Agent                  | Droinet Name                                       | Dlace          | Status                                    |             |               | Fiscal Year   |               |               |               |
|------------------------|--|----------------|---|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| 138CIIC)               |  | 111430         | Status                                    | 2014/15     | 2015/16       | 2016/17       | 2017/18       | 2018/19       |               |
| Demand and F           | Demand and Pricing Management                      |                |   |             |               |               |               |               |               |
| SFCTA,<br>SFMTA        | Congestion/Trip Management Plan                    | PLAN/<br>CER   | Planned                                   |             | \$200,000     |               |               |               | \$200,000     |
| SFCTA                  | San Francisco Freeway Corridor<br>Management Study | PLAN/<br>CER   | Planned                                   | \$300,000   |               |               |               |               | \$300,000     |
| SFCTA                  | San Francisco Freeway Corridor<br>Management Study | PA&ED          | Planned                                   |             |               | \$200,000     |               |               | \$200,000     |
| SFCTA                  | Treasure Island Mobility<br>Management Program     | PLAN/<br>CER   | Planned                                   | \$150,000   |               |               |               |               | \$150,000     |
| SFCTA                  | Treasure Island Mobility<br>Management Program     | PS&E           | Planned                                   |             | \$210,000     |               |               |               | \$210,000     |
| Communities (          | Communities of Concern Access                      |                |   |             |               |               |               |               |               |
| SFMTA, Any<br>Eligible | SFMTA, Any NTIP Placeholder Eligible               | CON            | Planned                                   |             | \$300,000     |               |               |               | \$300,000     |
| SFCTA                  | Bayview Mobility Solutions                         | CON            | Planned                                   | \$54,225    |               |               |               |               | \$54,225      |
|                        |  |                |   |             |               |               |               |               |               |
|                        |  | Total Prog     | Total Programmed in 5YPP                  | \$1,331,771 | \$1,339,872   | \$650,000     | \$400,000     | \$450,000     | \$4,171,643   |
|                        | Total Programmed in 2013 Strategic Plan Baseline   | in 2013 Strate | gic Plan Baseline                         | \$400,000   | \$412,000     | \$424,360     | \$437,091     | \$450,204     | \$2,123,655   |
|                        | Cumulative Rema                                    | aining Progr   | Cumulative Remaining Programming Capacity | (\$931,771) | (\$1,859,643) | (\$2,085,283) | (\$2,048,192) | (\$2,047,988) | (\$2,047,988) |

# 2014 Prop K 5-Year Project List (FY 2014/15 - 2018/19) Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Parking Management (EP 43) Cash Flow

| Designet Marso  | Dhasa        |             |           | Fiscal Year | Year      |           |          | 1,040]    |
|---|--------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| rioject iname   | гпазе        | 2014/15     | 2015/16   | 2016/17     | 2017/18   | 2018/19   | 2019/20  | 1 Otal    |
| Citywide TDM  |              |             |           |             |           |           |          |           |
| Citywide TDM Marketing                                | CON          | \$50,000    | \$50,000  | 0\$         | 0\$       | 0\$       |          | \$100,000 |
| Citywide TDM Marketing                                | CON          |             |           | 0\$         | \$50,000  | 0\$       |          | \$50,000  |
| TDM Program Evaluation                                | PLAN/<br>CER | \$50,000    | \$50,000  |             |           |           |          | \$100,000 |
| TDM Program Evaluation                                | PLAN/<br>CER |             |           | \$50,000    | \$50,000  |           |          | \$100,000 |
| TDM Program Evaluation                                | PLAN/<br>CER |             |           |             |           | \$50,000  | 000'05\$ | \$100,000 |
| Comprehensive Residential and<br>Employee TDM Program | CON          | \$100,000   |           |             |           |           |          | \$100,000 |
| Comprehensive Residential and<br>Employee TDM Program | CON          | 0\$         | \$350,000 | 0\$         | \$0       | 0\$       |          | \$350,000 |
| Comprehensive Residential and<br>Employee TDM Program | CON          | 0\$         | 0\$       | \$350,000   | \$0       | 0\$       |          | \$350,000 |
| Comprehensive Residential and<br>Employee TDM Program | CON          | 0\$         | 0\$       | 0\$         | \$350,000 | 0\$       |          | \$350,000 |
| Comprehensive Residential and<br>Employee TDM Program | CON          | 0 <b>\$</b> | 0\$       | <b>\$</b>   | \$0       | \$350,000 |          | \$350,000 |
| Commuter Benefits Ordinance<br>Employer Outreach      | CON          | \$77,546    | 0\$       | \$0         | \$        | 0\$       |          | \$77,546  |
| Commuter Benefits Ordinance<br>Employer Outreach      | CON          | 0\$         | \$79,872  | 0\$         | 0\$       | 0\$       |          | \$79,872  |
| Modal Plans   |              |             |           |             |           |           |          |           |
| Transit Core Capacity Study                           | PLAN/<br>CER | \$315,000   | \$135,000 |             |           |           |          | \$450,000 |
| WalkFirst Data Refresh                                | PLAN/<br>CER |             | \$200,000 |             |           |           |          | \$200,000 |

2014 Prop K 5-Year Project List (FY 2014/15 - 2018/19)

Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Parking Management (EP 43)

Cash Flow

| Devicet Name                                       | Dhase                  |              |               | Fiscal Year   | Year          |               |               | Total         |
|--|------------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| 110)0011   | 111430                 | 2014/15      | 2015/16       | 2016/17       | 2017/18       | 2018/19       | 2019/20       | 10141         |
| Demand and Pricing Management                      |                        |              |               |               |               |               |               |               |
| Congestion/Trip Management Plan                    | PLAN/<br>CER           |              | \$100,000     | \$100,000     |               |               |               | \$200,000     |
| San Francisco Corridor Management<br>Study         | PLAN/<br>CER           | \$75,000     | \$125,000     | \$100,000     |               |               |               | \$300,000     |
| San Francisco Corridor Management<br>Study         | PA&ED                  |              |               | \$100,000     | \$100,000     |               |               | \$200,000     |
| Treasure Island Mobility<br>Management Program     | PLAN/<br>CER           | \$150,000    |               |               |               |               |               | \$150,000     |
| Treasure Island Mobility<br>Management Program     | H8S4                   |              | \$105,000     | \$105,000     |               |               |               | \$210,000     |
| Communities of Concern Access                      |                        |              |               |               |               |               |               |               |
| NTIP Placeholder                                   | CON                    |              | \$150,000     | \$150,000     |               |               |               | \$300,000     |
| Bayview Mobility Solutions                         | CON                    | \$54,225     |               |               |               |               |               | \$54,225      |
|  |                        |              |               |               |               |               |               |               |
| Total Cash Flow in 5YPP                            | w in 5YPP              | \$871,771    | \$1,344,872   | \$955,000     | \$550,000     | \$400,000     | \$50,000      | \$4,171,643   |
| Total Cash Flow in 2013 Strategic Plan<br>Baseline | tegic Plan<br>Baseline | \$649,000.00 | \$412,000     | \$424,360     | \$437,091     | \$450,204     | \$463,710.00  | \$2,836,365   |
| Cumulative Remaining Cash Flow Capacity            | v Capacity             | (\$222,771)  | (\$1,155,643) | (\$1,686,283) | (\$1,799,192) | (\$1,748,988) | (\$1,335,278) | (\$1,335,278) |

# Prop K 5-Year Project List (FY 2014/15 - 2018/19) Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Parking Management (EP 43) Programming and Allocations to Date

Pending November 27, 2018

|              |  |           | 9           | , |         |             |           |           |                    |
|--------------|--|-----------|-------------|---|---------|-------------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|
| V Section 1  | Decioet Mosso  | Dhass     | O to the    |   | I       | Fiscal Year |           |           | T <sub>O</sub> tol |
| Agency       | TO)ect iname   | Luase     | Status      | 2014/15                                 | 2015/16 | 2016/17     | 2017/18   | 2018/19   | 10141              |
| Citywide TDM | M  |           |             |   |         |             |           |           |                    |
| SFMTA        | SF Safe Routes to Schools Program<br>Administration                        | PLAN/ CER | Planned     |   |         |             |           | \$160,000 | \$160,000          |
| SFMTA        | Citywide TDM Marketing   | CON       | Programmed  | 0\$                                     |         |             |           |           | 0\$                |
| SFMTA        | Citywide TDM Marketing   | CON       | Programmed  |   |         |             | 0\$       |           | \$0                |
| SFMTA        | TDM Program Evaluation   | PLAN/ CER | Programmed  | 0\$                                     |         |             |           |           | 0\$                |
| SFMTA        | TDM Program Evaluation   | PLAN/ CER | Programmed  |   |         | 0\$         |           |           | 0\$                |
| SFMTA        | TDM Program Evaluation   | PLAN/ CER | Programmed  |   |         |             |           | 0\$       | <b>\$</b> 0        |
| SFCTA        | TSP Evaluation Tool  | PLAN/ CER | Pending     |   |         |             |           | \$200,000 | \$200,000          |
| SFMTA        | Comprehensive TDM Program  | CON       | Allocated   | \$100,000                               |         |             |           |           | \$100,000          |
| SFMTA        | Comprehensive TDM Program  | CON       | Deobligated | (\$69,354)                              |         |             |           |           | (\$69,354)         |
| SFMTA        | Residential TDM Program -<br>Placeholder                                   | PLAN/ CER | Planned     |   |         |             |           | \$195,000 | \$195,000          |
| SFMTA        | Comprehensive Residential and<br>Employee TDM Program                      | CON       | Programmed  |   | 0\$     |             |           |           | 0\$                |
| SFMTA        | Business Relocation Transportation<br>Demand Management (TDM) -<br>Phase 1 | PLAN/ CER | Allocated   |   |         |             | \$100,000 |           | \$100,000          |
| SFMTA        | Business Relocation Transportation<br>Demand Management (TDM) -<br>Phase 2 | PLAN/ CER | Allocated   |   |         |             | \$150,000 |           | \$150,000          |
| SFMTA        | Business Relocation Transportation<br>Demand Management (TDM) -<br>Phase 3 | PLAN/ CER | Allocated   |   |         |             | \$133,000 |           | \$133,000          |
| SFMTA        | Comprehensive Residential and<br>Employee TDM Program                      | CON       | Programmed  |   |         | 0\$         |           |           | 80                 |
| SFMTA        | Comprehensive Residential and<br>Employee TDM Program                      | CON       | Programmed  |   |         |             | 0\$       |           | \$0                |
| SFMTA        | Comprehensive Residential and<br>Employee TDM Program                      | CON       | Programmed  |   |         |             |           | 0\$       | 0\$                |
|              |  |           |             |   |         |             |           |           |                    |

|                        |  |           |              |           | 1         | Fiscal Vear |           |           |   |
|------------------------|--|-----------|--------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|---|
| Agency                 | Project Name   | Phase     | Status       |           |           | Iscal 1 cal |           |           | Total                                   |
| 118cmc)                |  | 11000     | Catta        | 2014/15   | 2015/16   | 2016/17     | 2017/18   | 2018/19   | 1 C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C |
| SFE                    | Commuter Benefits Ordinance<br>Employer Outreach                                     | CON       | Allocated    | \$77,546  |           |             |           |           | \$77,546                                |
| SFE                    | Commuter Benefits Ordinance<br>Employer Outreach                                     | CON       | Allocated    |           | \$79,872  |             |           |           | \$79,872                                |
| SFE                    | Commuter Benefits Ordinance<br>Employer Outreach                                     | CON       | Deobligated  |           |           |             | (\$6,000) |           | (\$6,000)                               |
| Modal Plans            |  |           |              |           |           |             |           |           |   |
| SFCTA                  | San Francisco Bay Area Transit<br>Core Capacity Study                                | PLAN/ CER | Appropriated | \$450,000 |           |             |           |           | \$450,000                               |
| SFMTA                  | WalkFirst Data Refresh   | PLAN/ CER | Programmed   |           | 0\$       |             |           |           | 0\$                                     |
| SFCTA                  | Streets and Freeways Study   | PLAN/ CER | Allocated    |           |           |             |           | \$150,000 | \$150,000                               |
| Demand and ]           | Demand and Pricing Management  |           |              |           |           |             |           |           |   |
| SFCTA,<br>SFMTA        | Congestion/Trip Management Plan  | PLAN/ CER | Programmed   |           | \$        |             |           |           | 0\$                                     |
| SFMTA                  | Curb Management Strategy   | PLAN/ CER | Planned      |           |           |             |           | \$200,000 | \$200,000                               |
| SFCTA                  | Lombard Crooked Street<br>Congestion Management System<br>Development [NTIP Capital] | PLAN/ CER | Allocated    |           |           | \$250,000   |           |           | \$250,000                               |
| SFCTA                  | San Francisco BART Travel<br>Incentive Program                                       | CON       | Allocated    |           | \$45,800  |             |           |           | \$45,800                                |
| SFCTA                  | San Francisco Freeway Corridor<br>Management Study                                   | PLAN/ CER | Appropriated | \$300,000 |           |             |           |           | \$300,000                               |
| SFCTA                  | Freeway Corridor Management<br>Study Pre-environmental                               | PA&ED     | Appropriated |           |           |             | \$200,000 |           | \$200,000                               |
| SFCTA                  | Treasure Island Mobility<br>Management Program                                       | PLAN/ CER | Appropriated | \$150,000 |           |             |           |           | \$150,000                               |
| SFCTA                  | Pricing and Incentives   | PLAN/ CER | Planned      |           |           |             |           | \$500,000 | \$500,000                               |
| SFCTA                  | Treasure Island Mobility<br>Management Program                                       | PS&E      | Appropriated |           | \$210,000 |             |           |           | \$210,000                               |
| Communities            | Communities of Concern Access  |           |              |           |           |             |           |           |   |
| SFMTA, Any<br>Eligible | NTIP Placeholder   | CON       | Programmed   |           |           |             |           | \$240,000 | \$240,000                               |
| SFMTA                  | Potrero Hill Pedestrian Safety and<br>Transit Stop Improvements [NTIP]               | CON       | Allocated    |           | \$60,000  |             |           |           | \$60,000                                |
| SFCTA                  | Bayview Moves Van Sharing Pilot  | CON       | Allocated    |           | \$54,225  |             |           |           | \$54,225                                |
|                        |  |           |              |           |           |             |           | •         |   |

| V      |                | 1             | 3   |             | 4           | Fiscal Year  |                 |             | F                                 |
|--------|----------------|---------------|---|-------------|-------------|--|-----------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|
| Agency | rtoject mame   | глаѕе         | Status  | 2014/15     | 2015/16     | 2016/17  | 2017/18 2018/19 | 2018/19     | LOTAL                             |
|        |                |               |   |             |             |  |                 |             |                                   |
|        |                | Total Prog    | <b>Total Programmed in 5YPP</b> \$1,008,192 \$449,897 \$250,000 | \$1,008,192 | \$449,897   | \$250,000  | \$577,000       | \$1,645,000 | \$577,000 \$1,645,000 \$3,930,089 |
|        | Total Pro      | grammed in 2  | Total Programmed in 2014 Strategic Plan \$1,331,771             | \$1,331,771 | \$1,339,872 | \$1,339,872 \$650,000                                  | \$400,000       | \$450,000   | \$450,000 \$4,171,643             |
|        | Cumulative Ren | naining Progr | Cumulative Remaining Programming Capacity                       | \$345,976   | \$1,235,951 | \$1,235,951 \$1,635,951 \$1,458,951 \$263,951 \$241,55 | \$1,458,951     | \$263,951   | \$241,554                         |

Programmed
Pending Allocation/Appropriation
Board Approved Allocation/Appropriation

1 Comprehensive 2014 5YPP amendment concurrent with 2019 5YPP adoption (resolution XX, approved YY).

Citywide TDM Marketing: Reduced from \$150,000 to \$0 in FY 14/15 and 17/18. Project not advancing. Allocation request was not approved at May 2018 SFCTA Board. TDM Program Evaluation: Reduced from \$4,200 to \$0 in FY 14/15. Evaluation of Prop K funded TDM projects will be budgeted through individual Prop K requests.

Comprehensive Residential and Employee TDM Program: Reduced from \$1,017,000 to \$0 in FY 16/17, FY 17/18 and FY 18/19. Project not advancing. Project goals will be pursued through proposed residential and employer TDM programs.

WalkFirst Data Refresh: Reduced from \$50,000 to \$0 in FY 15/16. SFMTA is not planning to advance the latter program because work has advanced through the data analysis done by the Department of Public Health's High Injury Corndors project.

SF Safe Routes to School: Added project with \$160,000 in FY 18/19 for planning.

Residential TDM Program - Placeholder: Added project with \$195,000 in FY 18/19 for planning

Pricing and Incentives: Added project with \$500,000 in FY 18/19 for planning.

Curb Management Strategy: Added project with \$200,000 in FY18/19 for planning

TSP Evaluation Tool: Added project with \$200,000 in Fiscal Year 2018/19 for planning

NTIP Placeholder: Programming shifted from FY 2015/16 to FY 2018/19 with a corresponding cash flow adjustment.

# Prop K 5-Year Project List (FY 2014/15 - 2018/19) Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Parking Management (EP 43) Cash Flow (\$) Maximum Annual Reimbursement

Pending November 27, 2018

|  | Ē         |         |            |         | Fisc    | Fiscal Year |           |         |         | F           |
|--|-----------|---------|------------|---------|---------|-------------|-----------|---------|---------|-------------|
| Project Name   | rhase     | 2014/15 | 2015/16    | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | 2018/19     | 2019/20   | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | І отап      |
| Citywide TDM   |           |         |            |         |         |             |           |         |         |             |
| SF Safe Routes to Schools Program<br>Administration                        | PLAN/ CER |         |            |         |         | \$70,000    | \$90,000  |         |         | \$160,000   |
| Citywide TDM Marketing   | CON       | 0\$     | \$0        |         |         |             |           |         |         | 0\$         |
| Citywide TDM Marketing   | CON       |         |            |         | 0\$     |             |           |         |         | 0\$         |
| TDM Program Evaluation   | PLAN/ CER | 0\$     | 0\$        |         |         |             |           |         |         | O <b>\$</b> |
| TDM Program Evaluation   | PLAN/ CER |         |            | 0\$     | 0\$     |             |           |         |         | 0\$         |
| TDM Program Evaluation   | PLAN/ CER |         |            |         |         | 0\$         | 0\$       |         |         | 0\$         |
| TSP Evaluation Tool  |           |         |            |         |         | \$100,000   | \$100,000 |         |         | \$200,000   |
| Comprehensive TDM Program  | CON       | 0\$     | \$100,000  |         |         |             |           |         |         | \$100,000   |
| Comprehensive TDM Program  | CON       |         | (\$69,354) |         |         |             |           |         |         | (\$69,354)  |
| Residential TDM Program -<br>Placeholder                                   |           |         |            |         |         | \$50,000    | \$145,000 |         |         | \$195,000   |
| Comprehensive Residential and<br>Employee TDM Program                      | CON       |         | \$0        |         |         |             |           |         |         | 0\$         |
| Business Relocation Transportation<br>Demand Management (TDM) -<br>Phase 1 | PLAN/ CER |         |            |         |         | \$100,000   |           |         |         | \$100,000   |
| Business Relocation Transportation<br>Demand Management (TDM) -<br>Phase 2 | PLAN/ CER |         |            |         |         | \$75,000    | \$75,000  |         |         | \$150,000   |
| Business Relocation Transportation<br>Demand Management (TDM) -<br>Phase 3 | PLAN/ CER |         |            |         |         |             | \$133,000 |         |         | \$133,000   |
| Comprehensive Residential and<br>Employee TDM Program                      | CON       |         |            | \$0     |         |             |           |         |         | 0\$         |
| Comprehensive Residential and<br>Employee TDM Program                      | CON       |         |            |         | 0\$     |             |           |         |         | 0           |
| Comprehensive Residential and<br>Employee TDM Program                      | CON       |         |            |         |         | 0\$         |           |         |         | 0\$         |

|  | Ē         |           |           |           | Fisca     | Fiscal Year |           |           |          | -<br>E    |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| Project Name   | Phase     | 2014/15   | 2015/16   | 2016/17   | 2017/18   | 2018/19     | 2019/20   | 2020/21   | 2021/22  | Iotal     |
| Commuter Benefits Ordinance<br>Employer Outreach                                     | CON       | \$77,546  |           |           |           |             |           |           |          | \$77,546  |
| Commuter Benefits Ordinance<br>Employer Outreach                                     | CON       |           | \$59,904  | \$19,968  |           |             |           |           |          | \$79,872  |
| Commuter Benefits Ordinance<br>Employer Outreach                                     | CON       |           |           |           | (\$6,000) |             |           |           |          | (\$6,000) |
| Modal Plans  |           |           |           |           |           |             |           |           |          |           |
| San Francisco Bay Area Transit<br>Core Capacity Study                                | PLAN/ CER | \$315,000 | \$135,000 |           |           |             |           |           |          | \$450,000 |
| WalkFirst Data Refresh   | PLAN/ CER |           | 0\$       |           |           |             |           |           |          | 0         |
| Streets and Freeways Study   | PLAN/ CER |           |           |           |           | \$75,000    | \$75,000  |           |          | \$150,000 |
| Demand and Pricing Management  |           |           |           |           |           |             |           |           |          |           |
| Congestion/Trip Management Plan  | PLAN/ CER |           | 0\$       | 0\$       |           |             |           |           |          | 0\$       |
| Curb Management Strategy   | PLAN/ CER |           |           |           |           | \$50,000    | \$50,000  | \$50,000  | \$50,000 | \$200,000 |
| Lombard Crooked Street<br>Congestion Management System<br>Development [NTIP Capital] | PLAN/ CER |           |           |           | \$250,000 |             |           |           |          | \$250,000 |
| San Francisco BART Travel<br>Incentive Program                                       | CON       |           | 15,572    | 15,114    | 15,114    |             |           |           |          | \$45,800  |
| San Francisco Freeway Corridor<br>Management Study                                   | PLAN/ CER | \$75,000  | \$125,000 | \$100,000 |           |             |           |           |          | \$300,000 |
| Freeway Corridor Management<br>Study Pre-environmental                               | PA&ED     |           |           |           | \$100,000 | \$100,000   |           |           |          | \$200,000 |
| Treasure Island Mobility<br>Management Program                                       | PLAN/ CER | \$150,000 |           |           |           |             |           |           |          | \$150,000 |
| Pricing and Incentives   |           |           |           |           |           | \$200,000   | \$200,000 | \$100,000 |          | \$500,000 |
| Treasure Island Mobility<br>Management Program                                       | PS&E      |           | \$105,000 | \$105,000 |           |             |           |           |          | \$210,000 |
| Communities of Concern Access  |           |           |           |           |           |             |           |           |          |           |
| NTIP Placeholder   | CON       |           |           |           |           | \$120,000   | \$120,000 |           |          | \$240,000 |
| Potrero Hill Pedestrian Safety and<br>Transit Stop Improvements [NTIP]               | CON       |           | \$60,000  |           |           |             |           |           |          | \$60,000  |
| Bayview Moves Van Sharing Pilot  | CON       |           | \$27,113  | \$27,112  |           |             |           |           |          | \$54,225  |
|  |           |           |           |           |           |             |           |           |          |           |

| D. C. | 70                      |           |             |             | Fisca           | Fiscal Year             |                     |           |           | T           |          |
|---|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|----------|
| riojectivame                              | rmase                   | 2014/15   | 2015/16     | 2016/17     | 2017/18 2018/19 |                         | 2019/20             | 2020/21   | 2021/22   | 10121       | <u> </u> |
|   |                         |           |             |             |                 |                         |                     |           |           |             | ı        |
| Total C                                   | Total Cash Flow in 5YPP | \$617,546 | \$558,235   | \$267,194   | \$359,114       |                         | \$870,000 \$898,000 | \$150,000 | \$50,000  | \$3,770,089 | U        |
| Total Cash Flow in 2014 Strategic Plan    | 2014 Strategic Plan     | \$871,771 | \$1,344,872 | \$955,000   | \$550,000       | \$400,000               | \$50,000            |           |           | \$4,171,643 | <u></u>  |
| Cumulative Remaining Cash Flow Capacity   | ash Flow Capacity       | \$276,621 | \$1,063,259 | \$1,751,065 | \$1,941,951     | \$1,941,951 \$1,471,951 | \$623,951           | \$473,951 | \$423,951 | \$401,555   |          |

Programmed
Pending Allocation/Appropriation
Board Approved Allocation/Appropriation

## **100-67**

|  | Prop K Project Information Form  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Project Name:  | Curb Management Strategy   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implementing Agency:   | San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Prop K Expenditure Plan Information  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Category:  | D. TSM/Strategic Initiatives   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subcategory:   | i. TDM/Parking Management  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EP Line (Primary):   | 43-Transportation Demand Mgmt  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other EP Line Number/s:  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fiscal Year of Allocation:   | 2018/19  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Project Information  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Location:  | Citywide   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supervisorial District(s):   | Citywide   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Manager:   | Hank Willson   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Phone Number:  | 415-646-2341   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Email:   | Hank.Willson@sfmta.com   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brief Project Description for MyStreetSF (80 words max):   | Develop a curb management strategy that emphasizes access for people and goods rather than private car storage, and determines how to allocate curb space both across time and physical space, where to allocate space (proximity) for different users, and how to manage curb space across physical space and time. Full project scope includes Phase 1: data collection/analysis and development of a policy framework, Phase 2: development of tools, procedures and strategies, informed by pilot projects, and Phase 3: implementation and evaluation. Prop K is requested to fund Phase 1. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detailed Scope (may attach Word document): Please describe the project goals, scope, benefits and how the project was prioritized. Also, describe any coordination with other projects (e.g. paving, MuniForward, Vision Zero).                                    | Please see attached word document for the project scope.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prior Community Engagement/Support (may attach Word document): Please reference any community outreach that has occurred and whether the project is included in any plans (e.g. neighborhood transportation plan, corridor improvement study, station area plans). | No outreach has been done yet as we are in the initial stages of this work. The project is not included in any existing plans.  The SFMTA has identified as an action item in the agency's Strategic Plan the development of a Curb Management Strategy under the Strategic Objective 2.3: Manage congestion and parking demand to support the Transit First Policy.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Partner Agencies: Please list partner agencies and identify a staff contact at each agency.  | SFCTA - Warren Logan<br>SF Planning - Manoj Madhavan   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Type of Environmental Clearance<br>Required:   | Categorically Exempt   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attachments: Please attach maps, drawings, photos of current conditions, etc. to support understanding of the project.   | yes scope of work  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Curb Management Strategy Pilots & Implementation – Scope of Work

In support of the SFMTA's Strategic Plan, the Parking and Curb Management group is developing a Curb Management Strategy. The project is envisioned to consist of three phases; 1) Data collection/analysis and Curb Management Framework; 2A) Curb Management Strategy 2B) Pilot Projects; and 3) Implementation and evaluation. In addition, the Parking and Curb Management group will also be participating in and overseeing several pilot projects as part of this work, which serve to inform the Curb Management Strategy.

## Purpose and Goals

Curb space is a limited resource serving a wide range of users with competing desires and varying levels of demand. Currently, the lack of available curb space contributes to double parking resulting in:

- Congestion
- Safety concerns
- Conflicts between users
- Equity issues

The purpose of this work is to; 1) provide a data driven framework/metrics by which curb access is allocated and prioritized between a diverse set of users; 2) ensure that decision making process and prioritization is data driven and transparent to the public: and 3) make curb allocation decisions with the context of a larger neighborhood/district rather than only on a block by block basis. A number of pilots will be utilized to collect data on the impacts of potential curb management applications and policies and will inform the Curb Management Strategy.

The development of a Curb Management Strategy will prioritize curb users and provide direction on how curb allocation decisions can support the SFMTA's and City of San Francisco's larger goals:

- Improve safety and support Vision Zero
- Support Transit First by reducing congestion and delays to transit
- Access for all modes
- o Reduce greenhouse gas emissions
- Support for adjacent and surrounding land uses
- Reduce SOV trips
- Equity

With regards to SOV reduction, which is the key objective of the EP43 category, the Curb Management Strategy will support this objective of encouraging the use of non-SOV modes by prioritizing curb space for transit, cyclists, other non-auto modes, and shared rides. In addition, a key metric of evaluation for the pilots will be the reduction in conflicts between vehicles and cyclists and transit, with the objective of reducing delays to Muni and increasing safety for cyclist; both of which make these modes a more attractive choice.

## Phase 1 – Data Collection/Analysis and Framework

The objective of the first phase is to create a framework documenting how the SFMTA "allocates" curb space. It is imagined that this document will be similar to the Strategic Plan or the Guiding Principles for Emerging Mobility Services and Technology in that it aims to clearly state what the SFMTA's vision and goals around curb allocation and management are at a high level.

The purpose of this document is to provide a high level policy framework that outlines how curb access is allocated and prioritized between a diverse set of users in different contexts. It will be a brief document that strives to shift the role of curb away from private car storage to a flexible space that enables access by all modes.

Considerable data collection in specific locations with different curb uses and pressures will be undertaken to inform both the framework and the later Strategy document. This data will inform things like: how much space should be devoted to loading of goods and people, how long loading zones should be to be effectively used, and whether newly installed loading zones are used and have the effect of reducing double parking and making loading more efficient.

Contents of the framework include:

- Identification of the issue
- Purpose of the document
- Goals
- Hierarchy/process for allotting curb space in different contexts

Key questions that this document will address are:

- How is space prioritized?
- How do these priorities change throughout the city?

Timeline: Underway, to be completed in FY18/19

Funding Request: \$200,000

## Phase 2A – Curb Management Strategy

Phase 2 focuses on developing tools/procedures for allocating curb space and strategies for how the SFMTA "manages" curb space once it has been allocated. The purpose of this document is to evaluate current processes and tools, identify gaps, and based on the gaps analysis provide data and tools for determining how to <u>allocate</u> space both across time and physical space, where to allocate space (proximity) for different users, and how to manage curb space across physical space and time.

The objective of the second phase is to: 1) clearly understand the needs and gaps in the system of allocating and managing the curb as well as future needs that may emerge as a result of our changing transportation landscape, 2) use the gaps and needs analysis findings to develop legislation, policies, work flow processes, and tools that can address them. The types of recommendations would be wide ranging looking at topics such as the pricing of the curb, curb typologies, communication and legibility of the curb, internal SFMTA structural changes and workflow changes, new legislation, data collection standards, and curb metrics, and 3) provide guidance how to approach curb management and allocation at the project level since each project context will be unique. For example, what types of data should be

collected? How should that data be analyzed? How is that data applied to curb allocation decisions? What tools are available to manage different issues that are identified?

Phase 2A will also have an outreach component. Listed below are the key steps in this outreach process.

- 1. SFMTA stakeholders
  - a) Gather feedback and additional information on existing conditions/processes did we miss anything, get anything wrong?
  - b) Gather insight on gaps and needs did we miss anything?
- 2. SFMTA & City Agency stakeholders
  - a. Gather feedback on potential tools, strategies, changes are these the right tool for addressing gaps, what challenges do you foresee, did we miss anything?
- 3. External stakeholders
  - a. Present gaps and needs (tailored to audience) and potential strategies for addressing these gaps gather feedback.
- 4. Share draft strategies/plan
  - a. MTAB PAG
  - b. Briefings for elected officials, community groups
  - c. Larger public engagement
    - i. Open house, pop-ups
- 5. Final plan
  - a. MTAB PAG
  - b. Briefings for elected officials, community groups
  - c. Larger public engagement
    - i. Open house, pop-ups
  - d. MTAB informational item
- 6. Key stakeholders
  - a. Internal SFMTA/City Agencies: SSD Planning, Innovation, Transportation Engineering, Livable Streets, Transit, SSD Enforcement, Taxi & Accessible Services, SSD Parking, Public Works, Planning Department, Mayor's Office, BOS, SFCTA, Port, Rec & Park, DPH, SFE
  - b. External: CPUC, TNCs, PTVs, shuttle companies, tour bus companies, casino bus companies, tourism industry, delivery companies, small business groups, merchant groups, neighborhood groups, Bicycle Coalition, Walk SF, major attractions such as Chase Stadium and AT&T Ballpark

Timeline: Underway, to be completed in FY19/20

Funding Request: None

Funding uses: staff or consultant time for data collection/analysis; drafting of strategy and policy documents and potential legislative changes; materials such as curb paint and signage; outside consultant to help with data collection and analysis, evaluation

## Phase 2B - Pilot Projects

Concurrent to the development of the Curb Management Strategy the SFMTA will use pilot projects to test out strategies and tools and collect data. Findings/lessons learned from the pilots will inform the curb management strategy. Potential examples include:

- Caltrain at 4<sup>th</sup> and King how to manage space around a transit hub with many different users
- Hayes Valley loading zone neighborhood commercial district attracting customers, deliveries, longer-term parkers
- Valencia collect data to inform longer term planning effort for the corridor
- Loading pilot work with businesses in a district to define loading needs and placement

Outreach will be a key component of this phase. SFMTA staff will work with elected officials, community groups, residents, and business in each of the pilot areas to gather feedback on potential curb changes and new policies, refine conceptual designs, and get post-implementation feedback.

The SFMTA will work with outside consultants for the purposes of pre and post pilot data collection. Types of data that may be collected utilizing cameras as well as in person observations include number of overall loading events, types of loading events, dwell time, instances of double parking, conflicts between curb users such as vehicles in the bicycle lane.

Timeline: FY19/20 Funding Request: None

## Phase 3 - Implementation & Evaluation

Based on the outreach done in Phase 2a and 2b, the findings of the pilot projects and subsequent recommendations made in the Curb Management Strategy, an implementation plan would be created. The purpose of the implementation plan is to prioritize the tools/recommendations/policies/work flow processes and changes that are identified in the Curb Management Strategy and determine which measures will be implemented and in what order.

Phase 3 is comprised of the following sub-phases; 3A) the creation of the implementation strategy which identifies who internally and externally will be responsible for the implementation of these measures and the timeline for implementation based on prioritization; 3B) Implementation of the strategies which will include making changes to legislation, signage, communications, pricing and curb management policies that are needed to support implementation of the prioritized changes; and 3C) Evaluation of the implemented strategies to measure effectiveness with respect to the larger objectives defined in the Curb Management Strategy. This sub-phase would include data collection to determine the impacts of new tools and polices that are being used.

Timeline: FY20/21, FY21/22 Funding Request: None



| Project Delivery Milestones                          | Status     | Work                            | Start 1        | Date        | End I          | Date        |
|--|------------|---------------------------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| Phase  | % Complete | In-house -<br>Contracted - Both | Quarter        | Fiscal Year | Quarter        | Fiscal Year |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering                      | 0%         | In-house                        | Q3-Jan-Feb-Mar | 2018/19     | Q4-Apr-May-Jun | 2018/19     |
| Environmental Studies (PA&ED)                        |            |                                 |                |             |                |             |
| Right of Way   |            |                                 |                |             |                |             |
| Design Engineering (PS&E)                            |            |                                 |                |             |                |             |
| Advertise Construction                               |            |                                 |                |             |                |             |
| Start Construction (i.e. Award Contract)             | 0%         | In-house and<br>Contracted      | Q3-Jan-Feb-Mar | 2018/19     |                |             |
| Operations (i.e. paratransit)                        |            |                                 |                |             |                |             |
| Open for Use   |            |                                 |                |             | Q4-Apr-May-Jun | 2020/21     |
| Project Completion (means last eligible expenditure) |            |                                 |                |             | Q4-Apr-May-Jun | 2021/22     |

## Comments/Concerns

Planning/conceptual engineering and construction (implementation of pilots, evaluation, permanent implementation) will overlap given the proposed scope of work. SFMTA will provide a task-based scope, schedule and milestones when requesting allocation of the Prop K funds.

| Form  |  |
|---|--|
| San Francisco County Transportation Authority<br>Proposition K Sales Tax Program Project Information Form |  |
|   |  |

| Project Name:                   | Curb Management Strategy         |                                 |                       |  |               |  |                   |                 |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--|---------------|--|-------------------|-----------------|
| Project Cost Estimate           |                                  | Funding Source                  | ce                    |  |               |  |                   |                 |
| Phase                           | Cost                             | Prop K                          | Other                 |  |               |  |                   |                 |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering | \$ 200,000                       | \$ 200,000                      | - \$                  |  |               |  |                   |                 |
| Environmental Studies (PA&ED)   | *                                |                                 |                       |  |               |  |                   |                 |
| Right of Way                    | - *                              | - *                             | - \$                  |  |               |  |                   |                 |
| Design Engineering (PS&E)       | - \$                             | - \$                            | - \$                  |  |               |  |                   |                 |
| Construction                    | \$ 300,000                       | \$                              | \$ 300,000            |  |               |  |                   |                 |
| Operations (i.e. paratransit)   | - \$                             | - \$                            | - \$                  |  |               |  |                   |                 |
| Total Project Cost              | \$ 500,000                       | \$ 200,000                      | \$ 300,000            |  |               |  |                   |                 |
| Percent of Total                |                                  | 40%                             | %09                   |  |               |  |                   |                 |
|                                 |                                  |                                 |                       |  |               |  |                   |                 |
| Funding Plan - All Phases       |                                  |                                 |                       |  |               | Cash Flow for Prop K Only (i.e. Fiscal Year of Rei | op K Only (i.e. F | iscal Year of R |
| Fund Source                     | Prop K Expenditure<br>Line       | Phase                           | Fund Source<br>Status | Fiscal Year of<br>Allocation<br>(Programming Year) | Total Funding | 2018/19  | 2019/20           | 2020/21         |
| Prop K                          | 43-Transportation<br>Demand Mgmt | Planning/Conceptual Engineering | Planned               | Previous   | \$ 200,000    | \$ 1000,000  | \$ 100,000 \$     | \$              |
| IPIC - Market Octavia           |                                  | Construction                    | Programmed            | 2019/20  | \$ 000,000 \$ |  | - \$              | \$              |
|                                 |                                  |                                 |                       |  |               |  |                   |                 |

| ,                     |                                  |                                 |                       |  |               |              | (was a second of the second of |         | ()      |         |         |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--|---------------|--------------|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Fund Source           | Prop K Expenditure<br>Line       | Phase                           | Fund Source<br>Status | Fiscal Year of<br>Allocation<br>(Programming Year) | Total Funding | 2018/19      | 2019/20  | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 |
| Prop K                | 43-Transportation<br>Demand Mgmt | Planning/Conceptual Engineering | Planned               | Previous   | \$ 200,000    | \$100,000 \$ | \$ 100,000 \$  | - \$    | · ·     | - \$    | \$      |
| IPIC - Market Octavia |                                  | Construction                    | Programmed            | 2019/20  | \$ 300,000    | \$           | - \$   | - \$    | - \$    | - \$    | - \$    |
|                       |                                  |                                 |                       |  | - \$          | \$           | - \$   | - \$    | •       | - \$    | *       |
|                       |                                  |                                 |                       |  | - \$          | \$           | - \$   | - \$    | •       | - \$    | •       |
|                       |                                  |                                 |                       |  | - \$          | - \$         | - \$   | - \$    | - \$    | - \$    | - \$    |
|                       |                                  |                                 |                       |  | - \$          | \$           | - \$   | - \$    | •       | - \$    | •       |
|                       |                                  |                                 |                       |  | - \$          | - \$         | - \$   | - \$    | - \$    | - \$    | - \$    |
|                       |                                  |                                 |                       |  | - \$          | - \$         | - \$   | - \$    | - \$    | - \$    | - \$    |
|                       |                                  |                                 |                       |  | - \$          | - \$         | - \$   | - \$    | - \$    | - \$    | - \$    |
|                       |                                  |                                 |                       |  | - \$          | - \$         | - \$   | - \$    | - \$    | - \$    | - \$    |
|                       |                                  |                                 |                       |  | - \$          | - \$         | - \$   | - \$    | - \$    | - \$    | - \$    |
|                       |                                  |                                 |                       |  | - \$          | - \$         | - \$   | - \$    | - \$    | - \$    | - \$    |
|                       |                                  |                                 |                       | Total By Fiscal Year \$                            | \$ 500,000    | \$ 100,000   | \$ 100,000   | - \$    | *       | - \$    | *       |
|                       |                                  |                                 |                       |  |               |              |  |         |         |         |         |



|  | Prop K Project Information Form  |
|--|--|
| Project Name:  | Pricing & Incentives   |
| Implementing Agency:   | San Francisco County Transportation Authority  |
|  | Prop K Expenditure Plan Information  |
| Category:  | D. TSM/Strategic Initiatives   |
| Subcategory:   | i. TDM/Parking Management  |
| EP Line (Primary):   | 43-Transportation Demand Mgmt  |
| Other EP Line Number/s:  |  |
| Fiscal Year of Allocation:   | 2018/19  |
|  | Project Information  |
| Project Location:  | San Francisco County Transportation Authority  |
| Supervisorial District(s):   | TBD  |
| Project Manager:   | Colin Dentel-Post  |
| Phone Number:  | 522-4836   |
| Email:   | colin.dentel-post@sfcta.org  |
| Brief Project Description for MyStreetSF (80 words max):   | Placeholder for one or more of the following potential efforts 1) Decongestion Pricing and Incentives Study, 2) Incentives Programs, 3) Lombard Crooked Street Management System Implementation, and 4) Freeway Managed  |
| Detailed Scope (may attach Word document): Please describe the project goals, scope, benefits and how the project was prioritized. Also, describe any coordination with other projects (e.g. paving, MuniForward, Vision Zero).                                    | See attached.  |
| Prior Community Engagement/Support (may attach Word document): Please reference any community outreach that has occurred and whether the project is included in any plans (e.g. neighborhood transportation plan, corridor improvement study, station area plans). | See attached.  |
| Partner Agencies: Please list partner agencies and identify a staff contact at each agency.  | - Decongestion Pricing/Incentives Implementation Study and potential implementation next steps -Colin Dentel-Post - Incentives Program - SFMTA (Staff TBD), BART (Ryan Greene-Roesel) - Lombard Crooked Street Management System Implementation - SFMTA (Sarah Jones, Ricardo Olea) - Freeway Managed Lanes Project Development - SFMTA, Caltrans, CCAG, SMCTA, SamTrans |
| Type of Environmental Clearance<br>Required:   | TBD  |
| Attachments: Please attach maps, drawings, photos of current conditions, etc. to support understanding of the project.   | No   |

## **EP43** Pricing and Incentives

## Scope

This is a placeholder for one or more of the following potential efforts:

- Decongestion Pricing and Incentives Study and potential implementation next steps Conduct a study of potential pricing and incentive programs to reduce single-occupant vehicle trips and address traffic congestion in downtown San Francisco and SoMa. This would build on and update the recommendations in the 2010 Mobility Access and Pricing Study, which included implementation of a toll for vehicles crossing into and out of northeastern San Francisco during peak periods as well as a program of discounts for low-income and other disadvantaged populations and a program of investments to be funded by the toll revenue. The MAPS study found that the recommended cordon would reduce peak period auto trips by 12%, improve transit speeds by 20 to 25%, and reduce pedestrian collisions by 12% (notably, much of the city's Vision Zero Network includes downtown, SoMa, and Tenderloin streets that were included in the recommended cordon area). It also would generate \$60-80 million in annual net revenue to fund transit upgrades and increased service, pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure improvements, TDM measures, and incentive programs. This placeholder could also fund next steps toward implementation of a recommended pricing and incentives plan, including environmental analysis, system design, and construction.
- Incentives Programs This project would apply incentives to encourage behavior change with the goals of 1) mode shift away from drive alone to more sustainable modes and/or 2) efficient use of our transportation networks (as was the goal in BART Travel Incentives). Prop K previously provided funding for the BART Travel Incentives test program which demonstrated that small cash incentives can be used to change behavior. In that previous 6-month test program, incentives were used to get riders to shift the time they start their morning BART trips away from the peak hour. Using incentives to manage departure times and reduce peak crowding on transit has a secondary effect of making the transit experience more attractive, potentially resulting in more people choosing transit over driving. Successfully applying incentives to improve transit system efficiency can be a near-term solution to capacity issues which can help delay the need to seek much more expensive capital improvements that will take many more years to implement.
- Lombard Crooked Street Management System Implementation This project would be the implementation of one of the recommendations in the District 2 Managing Access to the Crooked Street Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Plan (SFCTA, 2017). The purpose of this project would be to decrease automobile congestion on the Lombard Crooked Street and surrounding neighborhood. It would involve completing final design, environmental clearance, regulatory approval, and implementation of a pricing and/or reservations based management system for the Lombard Crooked Street.
- **Freeway Managed Lanes Project Development** Conduct environmental clearance, design, and implementation of the priced and managed lane initial segment identified in the Freeway Corridor Management Study. The managed lanes would encourage alternatives to single-occupant vehicle trips by prioritizing HOVs and transit. They would also generate revenue to be used for multimodal improvements. This placeholder could also include a feasibility study of other potential managed-lane corridors identified through ConnectSF.

## **Prior Community Engagement:**

- Decongestion Pricing/Incentives Implementation Study and potential implementation next steps The 2010 Mobility, Access, and Pricing Study (MAPS) included extensive community outreach to over 1,000 individuals through series of four public workshops and meetings with a wide variety of community and stakeholder groups. The idea of pricing remains downtown streets remains controversial, particularly because it has not been implemented in North America, but nevertheless a survey of outreach participants near the end of the MAPS study found that 60% supported pilot or permanent implementation of cordon pricing within three to five years.
- Incentives Programs The previous BART Travel Incentives included outreach to San Francisco-based employers. Over a dozen employers partnered with the SFCTA to encourage their employees to sign-up for the program. Incentives programs are one of the strategies being considered as part of the District 10 Mobility Study. At the writing of this form, staff is conducting outreach in the district for this study. Implementation of an incentives program in District 10 would benefit Communities of Concern located in the Bayview and Hunter's Point neighborhoods.
- Lombard Crooked Street Management System Implementation The previous Crooked Street NTIP involved outreach via two public open houses and an online survey through which community members gave feedback on solutions to identified transportation issues. Staff is currently in the process of conducting a follow-up effort called the Crooked Street Reservations and Pricing Study. The purpose of this follow-up study is to advance the reservation and/or pricing recommendation of the NTIP study and identify physical and operational details as well as determine the expected outcomes on automobile and pedestrian circulation on the Crooked Street and the surrounding neighborhood. Staff will be conducting outreach in and around the neighborhood to inform the reservations and pricing system alternatives being developed. Staff is seeking funding for the implementation of the final recommended system alternative that will emerge from this second study.
- Freeway Managed Lanes Project Development- The FCMS study included meetings with community stakeholders and advocacy organizations and implementation next steps will include further community outreach. It was a recommendation of the 2017 San Francisco Transportation Plan update.



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

## Comments/Concerns

This is a placeholder. Project specific schedule details will be included with any allocation request for these funds. Below are schedule estimates for potential projects:

- Decongestion Pricing/Incentives Implementation Study and potential implementation next steps The 2010 MAPS effort concluded that decongestion pricing would be a feasible way of meeting SF's goals for sustainability but additional study would be required before implementation. State elected officials are seeking legislation to allow test implementation of decongestion pricing. Additional study would be useful in near future in order to ensure SF is ready to test a system if/when legislation passes.
- Incentives Programs The BART Travel Incentives test program and evaluation finished in FY17/18. BART is currently conducting a second test phase which will conclude in Q2 of FY 19/20. Depending on findings from that test, there may be an opportunity to expand the program in FY19/20 and beyond. With lessons learned from these two BART test applications, there are opportunities to pilot incentive programs in other contexts (i.e. D10) and with other agencies (i.e. SFMTA) also after FY 19/20.
- Lombard Crooked Street Management System Implementation The Planning/Conceptual Engineering phase for the project is currently in progress via the existing Crooked Street Reservations and Pricing Study. This study is expected to be complete by Q3 of FY 18/19. Pending the passage of enabling state legislation (as noted above for Decongestion Pricing Study), the project would be ready to move into the subsequent implementation phases as soon as FY 19/20.
- Freeway Managed Lanes Development Next steps for the initial managed lane segment are to proceed with environmental review and design from 2019 through 2021, with construction to follow from 2021 to 2023.

# Proposition K Sales Tax Program Project Information Form San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Pricing & Incentives

Project Name:



| Project Cost Estimate           |            | Funding Source | rce   |
|---------------------------------|------------|----------------|-------|
| Phase                           | Cost       | Prop K         | Other |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering | \$ 500,000 | \$ \$00,000    | \$    |
| Environmental Studies (PA&ED)   | -          | •              | \$    |
| Right of Way                    | - \$       | \$             | \$    |
| Design Engineering (PS&E)       | - \$       | 4              | \$    |
| Sonstruction                    | -          | \$             | \$    |
| Operations (i.e. paratransit)   | - \$       | 4              | \$    |
| Total Project Cost              | \$ 500,000 | 000'009 \$     | \$    |
| Percent of Total                |            | 100%           | %0    |

| ases Cash Flow for Prop K Only (i.e. Fiscal Year of Reimbursement) | Prop K Expenditure Phase Fund Source Status (Programming Year)  Fund Source Status  (Programming Year) | EP 43 Planning/Conceptual Engineering Planned Previous \$ 500,000 \$ 200,000 \$ 100,000 \$ - \$ - \$ | s - s - s - s - s - s | s - s - s - s - s - s | + + + 000000 + 000000 + 000000 + 233 144 443 144 |
|--|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Funding Plan - All Phases  | Frop K.  | Prop K EP 43   |                       |                       |  |

## Comments

it time of allocation request.

Venceptual Engineering is the only phase identified in the funding plan above. Since this is a placeholder for projects that are in different phases, we request that funds be made available for any phase. Matching funds to be identified

Note other potential funding sources for each potential project in this placeholder request:

- Decongestion Pricing and Incentives Study and implementation Caltrans planning grant, SB1 Congested Corridors program. Once implemented, a pricing program would ultimately generate its own sustaining revenue (estimated in 2010 at \$60-80 million annually), unding ongoing improvements and transit service without external funding sources.
- Incentives Programs TFCA, contributions from other BART-serving counties (for BART Travel Incentives expansion)
- Lombard Crooked Street Management System Implementation A funding plan for the implementation of the system is one of the deliverables of the Crooked Street Reservations and Pricing Study to be concluded in FY 18/19. Once a system is implemented, evenues from the system can be used to pay for ongoing operations and maintenance.
- Freeway Managed Lanes Project Development RM3 Managed Lanes funds, SB1 Congested Corridors program. Again, once implemented, revenues from the project would fund ongoing operations and maintenance.