Prop K/AA Grouped Allocation Requests
February 2014 Board Action

## Enclosure Table of Contents

| No. | Fund <br> Source | Project Sponsor ${ }^{1}$ | EP ${ }^{2}$ Line Item/ Category Description | Project Name | Phase | Funds <br> Requested | Page No. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Prop K, Prop AA | SFMTA | New Signals \& Signs, Pedestrian Safety | New Signal Contract 62 | Design | \$370,000 | 1 |
| 2 | Prop K | SFMTA | Signals \& Signs | Masonic Avenue Signal Upgrade | Construction | \$259,000 | 19 |
| 3 | Prop K, Prop AA | SFMTA | Signals \& Signs, Pedestrian Safety | Eddy and Ellis Traffic Calming Improvement | Environmental, Design | \$365,000 | 39 |
| 4 | Prop K | DPW | Curb Ramps | Curb Ramps | Construction | \$867,000 | 65 |
| Total Requested |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,861,000 |  |

[^0]

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority <br> Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Form 

## FY of Allocation Action:

2013/14
Project Name:
New Signal Contract 62
Implementing Agency:

## EXPENDITURE PLAN INFORMATION

| Prop K Category: | C. Street \& Traffic Safety |  | Gray cells will <br> automatically be <br> filled in. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Prop K Subcategory: | ii. System Operations, Efficiency and Safety |  |  |
| Prop K EP Project/Program: | a. New Signals and Signs |  |  |


| Prop K EP Line Number (Primary): | 31 | Current Prop K Request: | \$ | 315,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prop K Other EP Line Numbers: |  |  |  |  |


| Prop AA Category: | Pedestrian Safety |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Current Prop AA Request: | 55,000 |
|  | Supervisorial District(s): | 1,3,4,5,6 |

## SCOPE

Sufficient scope detail should be provided to allow Authority staff to evaluate the reasonableness of the proposed budget and schedule. If there are prior allocations for the same project, provide an update on progress. Describe any outreach activities included in the scope. Long scopes may be provided in a separate Word file. Maps, drawings, etc. should be provided on Worksheet 7-Maps.or by inserting additional worksheets.

Project sponsors shall provide a brief explanation of how the project was prioritized for funding, highlighting: 1) project benefits, 2) level of public input into the prioritization process, and 3) whether the project is included in any adopted plans, including Prop K/Prop AA 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPPs). Justify any inconsistencies with the adopted Prop K/Prop AA Strategic Plans and/or relevant 5YPPs.

Indicate whether work is to be performed by outside consultants and/or by force account.

The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) requests an allocation of $\$ 315,000$ in Prop K funds and $\$ 55,000$ in Prop AA funds for a total of $\$ 370,000$ to fund the design phase of the New Signal Contract 62.

See background and scope details on the following pages.

## San Francisco County Transportation Authority Proposition K Sales Tax Program Allocation Request Form

## Background

The SFMTA is seeking $\$ 315,000$ from Prop K and $\$ 55,000$ from Prop AA for the design of new traffic signals and related pedestrian improvements to be constructed under New Signal Contract 62 at seven intersections. The Prop AA funds will be used to design new signal and pedestrian improvements at one location and the Prop K funds will be used for new signal improvements at the other six locations.

## Scope

The scope of the design phase is to produce plans, specifications, and contract cost estimates for construction of new signal infrastructure at the proposed locations. Design of the new traffic signals will include pedestrian countdown signals (PCS), controllers, conduit, wiring, poles, and mast-arm mounted signals. The scope also includes design of 20 curb ramps to replace all substandard curb ramps at the new signal locations. The Prop AA request will fund design of new signal and related pedestrian improvements at $8^{\text {th }}$ and Natoma Streets, including bulb-out(s), marked crosswalk and vehicle stop-bar striping.
The locations under this project are as follows:

| ID | Intersection | Existing <br> Control | District |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| A | 34th Avenue and Lincoln Way | One-way stop | 1,4 |
| B | 22nd Avenue and Geary Boulevard | Two-way stop | 1 |
| C | 26th Avenue and Geary Boulevard | Two-way stop | 1 |
| D | Sunset Boulevard and Yorba Street | Two-way stop | 4 |
| E | O'Farrell and Webster Streets | All-way stop | 5 |
| F | 8th and Natoma Streets | One-way stop | 6 |
| G | 350 Francisco Sreet (between <br> Powell and Stockton Streets) |  | 3 |

A new flashing beacon system is proposed to replace the existing in-pavement flashing crosswalk system on Francisco Street between Powell and Stockton Streets. The current flashing crosswalk system has been unreliable and is prone to failure. Agency staff has had to visit the site and make continual repairs. The site is especially important because students from Francisco Middle School cross at this midblock crosswalk during the school year. SFMTA staff recommends a pole-mounted flashing beacon system as a more reliable and effective traffic control device.

## Location Selection Criteria:

The intersections in this scope were selected after careful review by SFMTA staff of new signal requests received by the Agency each year, as well as locations nominated by staff. Locations are prioritized based on collision history, traffic volumes, benefits to roadway users including pedestrians, bicyclists, transit and motorists, proximity to schools or senior centers and any joint departmental opportunities (e.g. scheduled paving projects, corridor improvements). See Table 1 on Page 5 for prioritization considerations related to candidate locations for New Signal Contracts 61, 62 and 63.

## San Francisco County Transportation Authority Proposition K Sales Tax Program Allocation Request Form

All the locations proposed for signalization are intended to improve pedestrian safety on multi-lane arterial streets like Lincoln Way, Geary Boulevard, Sunset Boulevard, Webster Street and $8^{\text {th }}$ Street. Multi-lane streets are prone to the multiple threat condition where a motorist may stop for a pedestrian or other cross street traffic but motorists in the adjacent lane may not. Speeds can also be a factor. Lincoln Way and Sunset Boulevard have a 35 MPH speed limit. Even Geary Boulevard, Webster Street and $8^{\text {th }}$ Street, which have 25 MPH speed limits, can be very intimidating for pedestrians to cross. At all locations except $8^{\text {th }}$ and Natoma Streets the SFMTA has installed continental crosswalks, advance signage, and other traffic control devices to highlight these pedestrian crossings. At this time, however, SFMTA staff believes signalization is the appropriate form of control for these locations.

There is a Senior Housing facility at $8^{\text {th }}$ and Natoma Streets, but there are no marked crosswalks. The Western SOMA Neighborhood Transportation Plan identified this location as one that could be improved for pedestrians through the installation of a new signalized crosswalk crossing $8^{\text {th }}$ Street at this corner, and in October 2013 the Transportation Authority programmed proposition AA funds for the crosswalks, signals, and sidewalk bulb work at this intersection.

## Project Benefits

New traffic signals provide the benefits of improved right-of-way assignment and access across major streets. Five of the six intersections with proposed signal locations currently have stop sign controls on the side street, while the major street is uncontrolled. Motorists from the side street have to stop and proceed only when there is a safe gap in traffic. Most importantly, pedestrians who cross the major street must also choose a gap in traffic in determining when to cross and depend on motorists to yield to them once they legally enter the crosswalk. New traffic signals will improve conditions for pedestrians by stopping the major street and allowing pedestrians as well as cross-street traffic to proceed. The exception is O'Farrell and Webster Streets, which is currently an all-way stop, which will be replaced with new signals.

All new traffic signals the SFMTA installs will have Pedestrian Countdown Signals (PCS). PCSs have been effective in reducing the percentage of pedestrians remaining in the crosswalk at the beginning of the conflicting vehicle green light, thereby reducing the potential for vehicle-pedestrian conflicts. The countdown feature of the PCS is helpful for pedestrians to discern as to whether there is enough time left in a signal cycle to cross the intersection safely.

## Implementation

The SFMTA Sustainable Streets Division will manage the scope of the detailed design including design review and contract preparation. The Department of Public Works' (DPW's) Bureau of Engineering or the SFMTA's Muni Engineering Division will manage the issuance and administration of the contract for construction (by competitively bid contract).

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority Proposition K Sales Tax Program Allocation Request Form 

Task
Force Account Work Performed By

1. Design, Planning and Coordination

SFMTA Sustainable Streets Division Develop conceptual signal designs showing pole locations and signal heads
2. Detailed Electrical Design

SFMTA Sustainable Streets Division
Develop detailed signal design showing conduit, pullbox and controller locations
3. Detail Review

DPW or SFMTA Engineering Review SFMTA's detailed signal design and develop specs and bid item lists
4. Curb Ramp Design

DPW or SFMTA Engineering
Develop curb ramp designs based on locations of poles, pullboxes, controllers, etc.

TABLE 1. New Signal Candidates (Bolded signals are proposed for Contract 62)

| Intersection | Listed in 2009 <br> New Signals \& Signs 5YPP? | Current Status (December 2013) | Districts | Comment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 47th/Sloat | Yes | CT 61 | 4,7 | $3 \mathrm{inj} / 5$ years; 1 ped; Heavy ped volumes; would help Muni 18 make left turns |
| 16th/Capp | not listed | CT 61 | 6 | 11 injury collisions in last 5 years, incl 3 peds. Marked school crosswalk. Near BART |
| 6th/Minna | not listed | CT 61 | 6 | 8 injury collisions in last 5 years, incl 4 peds. |
| Lake Merced/ John Muir Drive | Yes | CT 61 | 7 | 9 injury collisions in last 5 years; requested multiple times in the last 3 years |
| Geary/Palm | not listed | CT 61 | 1,2 | Senior facility on major corridor |
| 34th/Lincoln | not listed | CT 62 | 1, 4 | $6 \mathrm{inj} / 5$ years; 2 peds |
| $22^{\text {nd }} /$ Geary | not listed | CT 62 | 1 | $9 \mathrm{inj}, / 5$ years, 2 peds. Multilane |
| 26 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ /Geary | not listed | CT 62 | 1 | $9 \mathrm{inj}, / 5$ years, 5 peds. Multilane, school |
| Sunset/Yorba | not listed | CT 62 | 4 | 9 inj ,/5 years, 5 peds. Multilane, 35 MPH |
| O'Farrell/Webster | not listed | CT 62 | 5 | 8 inj ,/5 years, 6 peds. School Crossing |
| Clay/Hyde | Yes | CT 63 - Candidate | 3 | 1 injury collision in the last 5 years; includes 1 ped collision; cable car |
| Crescent/Mission | Yes | CT 63 - Candidate | 9 | $4 \mathrm{inj} / 5$ years; incl 1 ped collision |
| Geneva/Louisburg | Yes | CT 63 - Candidate | 11 | $1 \mathrm{inj} / 5$ years; no ped collisions |
| Mission/Niagara | Yes | CT 63 - Candidate | 11 | $6 \mathrm{inj} / 5$ years; 1 ped collision |
| 16th/Utah | Yes | CT 63 - Candidate | 10 | $2 \mathrm{inj} / 5$ years; 0 ped collisions |
| Highland/Mission | Yes | CT 63 - Candidate | 9 | $3 \mathrm{inj} / 5$ years; 3 ped collision |
| 6th/Jessie | not listed | CT 63 - Candidate | 6 | $10 \mathrm{inj} / 5$ years; including 7 peds; there are other traffic calming efforts |
| Geneva/Stoneridge | not listed | CT 63 - Candidate | 10 | $3 \mathrm{inj} / 5$ years; 3 peds; private street |
| 14th/Harrison | not listed | CT 63 - Candidate | 6 | $6 \mathrm{inj} / 5$ years; 1 ped |
| Kezar/Lincoln | not listed | CT 63 - <br> Candidate/TEP | 1,5 | $7 \mathrm{inj} / 5$ years; no peds |
| Oakdale/Loomis | Not listed | CT 63 Candidate | 10 | $10 \mathrm{inj} / 5 y$ ears, 0 peds, |
| Arlington/Bosworth | Not listed | CT 63 Candidate | 8 | $8 \mathrm{inj} / 5 y e a r s, 1$ peds; to be funded by Glen Park FTA funds |
| Bosworth/Lippard | Not listed | CT 63 Candidate | 8 | Highest number of vehicles stopped an all-way STOP |
| $6{ }^{\text {th }} /$ Stevenson | Not listed | CT 63 Candidate | 6 | $6 \mathrm{inj} / 5 y$ ears, 3 peds |

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority <br> Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Form 

FY 2013/14

| Project Name: | New Signal Contract 62 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Implementing Agency: | San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency |
|  | ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE |
| Type : | Categorically Exempt |
| Status: | Underway | | Completion Date |
| :--- |
| $(\mathrm{mm} / \mathrm{dd} / \mathrm{yy})$ |

## PROJECT DELIVERY MILESTONES

Enter dates for ALL project phases, not just for the current request. Use July 1 as the start of the fiscal year. Use 1, 2, 3, 4 to denote quarters and XXXX/XX for the fiscal year (e.g. 2010/11). Additional schedule detail may be provided in the text box below.

Planning/Conceptual Engineering
Environmental Studies (PA\&ED)
R/W Activities/Acquisition
Design Engineering (PS\&E)
Prepare Bid Documents
Advertise Construction
Start Construction (e.g., Award Contract)
Procurement (e.g. rolling stock)
Project Completion (i.e., Open for Use)
Project Closeout (i.e., final expenses incurred)

| Start Date |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Quarter | Fiscal Year |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| 3 | $2013 / 14$ |
|  |  |
| 4 | $2014 / 15$ |
| 1 | $2015 / 16$ |
|  |  |
| N/A | N/A |
| 2 | $2016 / 17$ |


| End Date |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Quarter | Fiscal Year |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| 3 | $2014 / 15$ |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| 1 | $2016 / 17$ |
| 4 | $2016 / 2017$ |

## SCHEDULE COORDINATION/NOTES

Provide project delivery milestones for each sub-project in the current request and a schedule for public involvement, if appropriate. For planning efforts, provide start/end dates by task here or in the scope (Tab 1). Describe coordination with other project schedules or external deadlines (e.g., obligation deadlines) that impact the project schedule, if relevant.

Milestone
Design
Advertise for Construction
Construction Begins
Open for Use

## Complete

March 2015
May 2015
September 2015
September 2016

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority <br> Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Form 

FY 2013/14

| Project Name: | New Signal Contract 62 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Implementing Agency: | San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency |

## COST SUMMARY BY PHASE - CURRENT REQUEST

Allocations will generally be for one phase only. Multi-phase allocations will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
Enter the total cost for the phase or partial (but useful segment) phase (e.g. Islais Creek Phase 1 construction) covered by the CURRENT funding request.

Planning/Conceptual Engineering
Environmental Studies (PA\&ED)
Design Engineering (PS\&E)
R/W Activities/Acquisition
Construction
Procurement (e.g. rolling stock)


| Cost for Current Request/Phase |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Cost | Prop K - <br> Current Request | Prop AA - <br> Current Request |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| $\$ 370,000$ | $\$ 315,000$ | $\$ 55,000$ |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | $\$ 55,000$ |

## COST SUMMARY BY PHASE - ENTIRE PROJECT

Show total cost for ALL project phases based on best available information. Source of cost estimate (e.g. $35 \%$ design, vendor quote) is intended to help gauge the quality of the cost estimate, which should improve in reliability the farther along a project is in its development.

|  |  | Total Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering |  |  |  |
| Environmental Studies (PA\&ED) |  |  |  |
| Design Engineering (PS\&E) |  | \$ | 370,000 |
| R/W Activities/Acquisition |  |  |  |
| Construction |  | \$ | 1,845,000 |
| Procurement (e.g. rolling stock) |  |  |  |
|  | Total: | \$ | 2,215,000 |

Source of Cost Estimate

|  |
| :--- |
| SFMTA Estimate based on previous projects |
|  |
| SFMTA Estimate based on previous projects |
|  |

12/27/13

## MAJOR LINE ITEM BUDGET

1. Provide a major line item budget, with subtotals by task and phase. More detail is required the farther along the project is in the development phase. Planning studies should provide task-level budget information.
2. Requests for project development should include preliminary estimates for later phases such as construction.
3. Support costs and contingencies should be called out in each phase, as appropriate. Provide both dollar amounts and \% (e.g. \% of construction) for support costs and contingencies.
4. For work to be performed by agency staff rather than consultants, provide base rate, overhead multiplier, and fully burdened rates by position with

FTE (full-time equivalent) ratio. A sample format is provided below.

New Signal Contract 62

|  | Description | Cost | Perfomed <br> by | Budget <br> Detail <br> Reference |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | DESIGN PHASE (subject of request) |  |  |  |
| 1 | Design and | $\$$ | 67,558 | SFMTA |
| 2 | Detailed Electrical | $\$$ | 186,730 | SFMTA |
| 3 | Detail Review | $\$$ | 47,717 | DPW |
| 4 | Curb Ramp Design | $\$$ | 67,883 | DPW |
|  | Design Phase Total | $\$$ | 369,888 | $\underline{\text { Ia }}$ |
|  | Prop K \& Prop AA | $\$$ | $\mathbf{3 7 0 , 0 0 0}$ | $\underline{\mathrm{Ib}}$ |
|  |  | $\underline{\underline{I I}}$ |  |  |


| CONSTRUCTION PHASE | Cost- <br> Estimate | \% of Contract <br> Cost | Performed <br> by |  |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| 1 | Contract Cost | $\$ 1,100,000$ |  | Contractor |
| 2 | Contingency $(10 \%)$ | $\$ 110,000$ | $10.0 \%$ | N/A |
| 3 | Controllers | $\$ 120,000$ |  | Purchase Order |
| 4 | Elec. Service | $\$ 13,500$ | $1.2 \%$ | PG\&E, DTIS, SFMTA |
| 5 | Ct Prep \& DPW Eng Support | $\$ 55,000$ | $5.0 \%$ | DPW (Bureau of Engineering) |
| 6 | Construction Engineering/Inspection | $\$ 180,000$ | $16.4 \%$ | DPW (Bureau of Construction <br> Mgmt) |
| 8a | Public Affairs | $\$ 10,000$ |  | DPW (Bureau of Construction |
|  |  | $\$ 50,000$ |  | Mgmt) |
| 8b | Material Testing |  |  | DPW (Bureau of Construction |
|  |  | $\$ 5,000$ |  | DPmt) (Bureau of Construction |
| 8c | Wage Check | $\$ 11,000$ | $1.0 \%$ | DPW(Streets \& Highways) |
| 9 | Curb Ramp Construction Inspection | $\$ 190,000$ | $17 \%$ | SFMTA Estimate |


| Construction Phase Subtotal | $\$ 1,844,500$ |
| :---: | ---: |
| (Rounded) | $\$ 1,845,000$ |

TOTAL COST OF ALL PHASES
\$2,214,888

Ramps

| Number of Intersections | Ramps | Unit Cost | Ramp Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | 20 | $\$ 9,000$ | $\$ 180,000$ |

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

| MFB $=$ Mandatory Fringe Benefits |
| :--- |
| FTE $=$ Full Time Equivalent employee |

Ia. SFMTA Labor

| Position | Salary Per FTE | MFB for FTE |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Salary }+ \\ \text { MFB } \end{gathered}$ | Approved Overhead Rate |  | head $=$ <br> +MFB) <br> proved <br> ead Rate |  | Fully <br> dened) <br> lary + <br> MFB + <br> erhead | FTE <br> Ratio | Hours |  | ost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Electrician (7345)** | 95,905 | 54,195 | \$ | 150,100 | 0.803 | \$ | 120,530 | \$ | 270,630 | 0.036 | 75 | \$ | 9,758 |
| Senior Engineer (5211) | 146,952 | 75,733 | \$ | 222,685 | 0.803 | \$ | 178,816 | \$ | 401,501 | 0.019 | 40 | \$ | 7,721 |
| Engineer (5241) | 126,932 | 67,197 | \$ | 194,129 | 0.803 | \$ | 155,886 | \$ | 350,015 | 0.029 | 60 | \$ | 10,097 |
| Associate Engineer (5207) | 109,668 | 59,835 | \$ | 169,503 | 0.803 | \$ | 136,111 | \$ | 305,614 | 0.038 | 80 | \$ | 11,754 |
| Assistant Engineer (5203) | 94,276 | 53,744 | \$ | 148,020 | 0.803 | \$ | 118,860 | \$ | 266,880 | 0.106 | 220 | \$ | 28,228 |
| Total - Design |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.228 | 475 | \$ | 67,558 |

Ib. SFMTA Labor

| Position | Salary Per FTE | MFB for FTE |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Salary + } \\ \text { MFB } \end{gathered}$ | Approved Overhead Rate |  | head $=$ <br> +MFB) <br> proved <br> ead Rate |  | Fully <br> rdened) <br> alary + <br> MFB + <br> erhead | FTE <br> Ratio | Hours |  | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Electrician (7345)** | 95,905 | 54,195 | \$ | 150,100 | 0.803 | \$ | 120,530 | \$ | 270,630 | 0.087 | 180 | \$ | 23,420 |
| Senior Engineer (5211) | 146,952 | 75,733 | \$ | 222,685 | 0.803 | \$ | 178,816 | \$ | 401,501 | 0.048 | 100 | \$ | 19,303 |
| Engineer (5241) | 126,932 | 67,197 | \$ | 194,129 | 0.803 | \$ | 155,886 | \$ | 350,015 | 0.087 | 180 | \$ | 30,290 |
| Associate Engineer (5207) | 109,668 | 59,835 | \$ | 169,503 | 0.803 | \$ | 136,111 | \$ | 305,614 | 0.120 | 250 | \$ | 36,732 |
| Assistant Engineer (5203) | 94,276 | 53,744 | \$ | 148,020 | 0.803 | \$ | 118,860 | \$ | 266,880 | 0.288 | 600 | \$ | 76,985 |
| Total - Design |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.630 | 1,310 | \$ | 186,730 |


| II. DPW Bureau of Engine (BOE) |  | Overhead <br> Rate: |  | 2.71 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Position | Hours | Base Salary |  | Fully rdened | FTE |  |  |
| Senior Engineer (5211) | 20 | \$ 146,952 | \$ | 398,240 | 0.010 | \$ | 3,829 |
| Engineer (5241) | 80 | \$ 126,932 | \$ | 343,986 | 0.038 | \$ | 13,230 |
| Assistant Engineer (5203) | 200 | \$ 94,276 | \$ | 255,488 | 0.096 | \$ | 24,566 |
| Engineer Associate I (5364) | 60 | \$ 77,922 | \$ | 211,169 | 0.029 | \$ | 6,091 |
| Total - BOE | 360 |  |  |  | 0.173 | \$ | 47,717 |


| III. DPW Streets \& Highways <br> (S\&H) | Overhead <br> Rate: | 2.71 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Position | Hours | Base Salary | Fully <br> Burdened | FTE | Cost |

* Base Salary is step 5 for each classification in effect today.
** Electricians receive a $5 \%$ premium when assigned as traffic signal electricians
*** Construction Inspectors receive a $5 \%$ premium when acting in that capacity


## FUNDING PLAN - FOR CURRENT PROP K REQUEST

Prop K Funds Requested:


## FUNDING PLAN - FOR CURRENT PROP AA REQUEST

Prop AA Funds Requested:
5-Year Prioritization Program Amount:
Strategic Plan Amount for Requested FY:


If the amount requested is inconsistent (e.g., greater than) with the Prop K/Prop AA Strategic Plan amount and/or the 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPP), provide a justification in the space below including a detailed explanation of which other project or projects will be deleted, deferred, etc. to accommodate the current request and maintain consistency with the 5YPP and/or Strategic Plan annual programming levels.

Prop K: The Prop K 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPP) amount is the amount of Prop K funds available for allocation in Fiscal Year 2013/14 for New Signal Contract 62 in the New Signals and Signs 5YPP.

The Prop K Strategic Plan amount is the amount programmed for the entire New Signals and Signs category in Fiscal Year 2013/14 (\$2,025,000), programmed but unallocated funds from prior fiscal years (\$742,004), and cumulative remaining capacity (\$104,806).

Prop AA: The Prop AA 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPP) amount is the amount of Prop AA funds available for allocation to the subject project for design in Fiscal Year 2013/14.

The Prop AA Strategic Plan amount is the total amount of programming for the Pedestrian Safety category in Fiscal Year 2013/14.

Enter the funding plan for the phase or phases for which Prop K/Prop AA funds are currently being requested. Totals should match those shown on the Cost worksheet.

| Fund Source | Planned | Programmed | Allocated | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Prop K sales tax |  | $\$ 315,000$ |  | $\$ 315,000$ |
| Prop AA |  | $\$ 55,000$ |  | $\$ 55,000$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |  | $\$ 0$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\$ 370,000$ |

Actual Prop K Leveraging - This Phase:
Expected Prop K Leveraging per Expenditure Plan

| $14.86 \%$ |
| ---: |
| $26.13 \%$ |

Total from Cost worksheet

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority <br> <br> Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Form 

 <br> <br> Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Form}

Is Prop K/Prop AA providing local match funds for a state or federal grant?
No

|  |  | Required Local Match |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fund Source | \$ Amount | $\%$ | $\$$ |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## FUNDING PLAN - FOR ENTIRE PROJECT (ALL PHASES)

Enter the funding plan for all phases (environmental studies through construction) of the project. This section may be left blank if the current request covers all project phases. Totals should match those shown on the Cost worksheet.

| Fund Source | Planned | Programmed | Allocated | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prop K sales tax |  | \$1,850,000 |  | \$1,850,000 |
| Prop AA |  | \$365,000 |  | \$365,000 |
|  |  |  |  | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | \$0 |
| Total: |  | \$2,215,000 | \$2,215,000 | \$ 2,215,000 |
| Actual Prop K Leveraging - Entire Project: <br> Expected Prop K Leveraging per Expenditure Plan: Actual Prop AA Leveraging - Entire Project: |  |  | Total from Cost worksheet |  |
|  |  | 16.48\% |  |  |
|  |  | 26.13\% |  |  |
|  |  | NA |  |  |

## FISCAL YEAR CASH FLOW DISTRIBUTION FOR CURRENT PROP K REQUEST

Use the table below to enter the proposed cash flow distribution schedule (e.g. the maximum Prop K/Prop AA funds that are guaranteed to be available for reimbursement each fiscal year) for the current request. If the schedule is more aggressive than the Prop K/Prop AA Strategic Plan and/or 5YPP, please explain in the text box below how cash flow for other projects and programs will be slowed down to accommodate the current request without exceeding annual cash flow assumptions made in the Strategic Plan.

Prop K Funds Requested:

## \$315,000

| Sponsor Request - Proposed Prop K Cash Flow Distribution Schedule |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fiscal Year | Cash Flow | \% Reimbursed Annually | Balance |
| FY 2013/14 | \$75,000 | 24.00\% | \$240,000 |
| FY 2014/15 | \$240,000 | 76.00\% | \$0 |
|  |  | 0.00\% | \$0 |
|  |  | 0.00\% | \$0 |
|  |  | 0.00\% | \$0 |
| Total: | \$315,000 |  |  |

Prop AA Funds Requested:
\$55,000
Sponsor Request - Proposed Prop AA Cash Flow Distribution Schedule

| Fiscal Year | Cash Flow | \% Reimbursed <br> Annually | Balance |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| FY 2013/14 | $\$ 15,000$ | $27.00 \%$ | $\$ 300,000$ |
| FY $2014 / 15$ | $\$ 40,000$ | $73.00 \%$ | $\$ 260,000$ |
|  |  | $0.00 \%$ | $\$ 260,000$ |

## AUTHORITY RECOMMENDATION

This section is to be completed by Authority Staff.
Last Updated: $\square$ Resolution. No. $\square$ Res. Date: $\square$

| Project Name: New Signal Contract 62 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Implementing Agency: San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency |  |  |  |
| Funding Recommended: |  | mount | Phase: |
|  | Prop K Allocation | \$315,000 | Design Engineering (PS\&E) |
|  | Prop AA Allocation | \$55,000 | Design Engineering (PS\&E) |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Total: | \$370,000 |  |

Notes (e.g., justification for multi-phase recommendations, notes for multi-EP line item or multi-sponsor recommendations):

Cash Flow Distribution Schedule by Fiscal Year (for entire allocation/appropriation)

| Source | Fiscal Year | Maximum Reimbursement | $\%$ Reimbursable | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prop K EP 31 | FY 2013/14 | \$75,000 | 20.00\% | \$295,000 |
| Prop K EP 31 | FY 2014/15 | \$240,000 | 65.00\% | \$55,000 |
| Prop AA - Ped | FY 2013/14 | \$15,000 | 4.00\% | \$40,000 |
| Prop AA - Ped | FY 2014/15 | \$40,000 | 11.00\% | \$0 |
|  |  |  | 0.00\% | \$0 |
|  |  | \$370,000 | 100\% |  |

Cash Flow Distribution Schedule by Fiscal Year \& Phase (for entire allocation/appropriation)

| Source | Fiscal Year | Phase | Maximum Reimbursement | Cumulative \% <br> Reimbursable | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prop K EP 31 | FY 2013/14 | Design Engineering (PS\&E) | \$75,000 | 20\% | \$295,000 |
| Prop K EP 31 | FY 2014/15 | Design Engineering (PS\&E) | \$240,000 | 85\% | \$55,000 |
| Prop AA - Ped | FY 2013/14 | Design Engineering (PS\&E) | \$15,000 | 89\% | \$40,000 |
| Prop AA - Ped | FY 2014/15 | Design Engineering (PS\&E) | \$40,000 | 100\% | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | 100\% | \$0 |
| Total: |  |  | \$370,000 |  |  |

Prop K/Prop AA Fund Expiration Date: $9 / 30 / 2015$ Eligible expenses must be incurred prior to this date.

## AUTHORITY RECOMMENDATION

This section is to be completed by Authority Staff.


## Deliverables:

> 1. Quarterly progress reports shall include a percent complete for the design of improvements to each location in the scope in addition to the requirements described in the Standard Grant Agreement.
> 2. Upon project completion (anticipated March 2015), provide evidence of completion of $100 \%$ design (e.g. copy of certifications page).

## Special Conditions:



## Notes:

1. Project progress updates for the Prop AA grant may be included as part of the quarterly progress reports for the Prop K grant, and need not be reported separately.
2. Expenses related to the improvements at 8 th and Natoma Streets should be invoiced to Prop AA.


## AUTHORITY RECOMMENDATION

This section is to be completed by Authority Staff.
Last Updated: $\square$ Resolution. No. $\square$ Res. Date: $\square$

Project Name: New Signal Contract 62

Implementing Agency: San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

## SUB-PROJECT DETAIL

Sub-Project \# from SGA:

| Name: | New Signal Contract 62 - Prop K |
| :---: | :---: |
| Supervisorial District(s): | 1,3,4,5,6 |

Cash Flow Distribution Schedule by Fiscal Year \& Phase (for entire allocation/appropriation)

| Source | Fiscal Year | Phase | Maximum Reimbursement | Cumulative \% <br> Reimbursable | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prop K EP 31 | FY 2013/14 | Design Engineering (PS\&E) | \$75,000 | 24\% | \$240,000 |
| Prop K EP 31 | FY 2014/15 | Design Engineering (PS\&E) | \$240,000 | 100\% | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | 100\% | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | 100\% | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | 100\% | \$0 |
|  |  |  | \$315,000 |  |  |

Sub-Project \# from SGA:


Cash Flow Distribution Schedule by Fiscal Year \& Phase (for entire allocation/appropriation)

| Source | Fiscal Year |  | Maximum <br> Reimbursement | Cumulative \% <br> Reimbursable | Balance |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

## San Francisco County Transportation Authority Proposition K Sales Tax Program Allocation Request Form

## MAPS AND DRAWINGS

Insert or attach files of maps, drawings, photos of current conditions, photo compositions, etc. to support understanding of the project scope and evaluation of how geographic diversity was considered in the project prioritization process.

This text box and the blue header may be deleted to better accommodate any graphics.


| ID | Intersection | Type | Funding | Existing Control | District |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| A | 34th Avenue and Lincoln Way | Signal | Prop K - EP 31 | One-way STOP | 1,4 |
| B | 22nd Avenue and Geary BIvd | Signal | Prop K - EP 31 | Two-way STOP | 1 |
| C | 26th Avenue and Geary Blvd | Signal | Prop K - EP 31 | Two-way STOP | 1 |
| D | Sunset Blvd and Yorba St | Signal | Prop K - EP 31 | Two-way STOP | 4 |
| E | O'Farrell and Webster Sts | Signal | Prop K - EP 31 | All-way STOP | 5 |
| F | 8th and Natoma Sts | Signal | Prop AA | One-way STOP | 6 |
| G | 350 Francisco St | Beacon | Prop K - EP 31 |  | 3 |
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Pedestrian Countdown Signal

Traffic Controller and new curb ramps


Mast Arm Signal

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority <br> Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Form 

| Current Prop K Request: | $\$$ | 315,000 |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Current Prop AA Request: | $\$$ | 55,000 |
|  |  |  |

Project Name:
New Signal Contract 62

Implementing Agency:
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

## Signatures

By signing below, we the undersigned verify that: 1) the requested sales tax and/or vehicle registration fee revenues shall be used to supplement and under no circumstance replace existing local revenues used for transportation purposes and 2) the requested sales tax and/or vehicle registration fee funds will not be used to cover expenses incurred prior to Authority Board approval of the allocation.
Project Manager
Name (typed): Manito Velasco
Title: Engineer
Phone: (415) 701-4447
Fax:
Email: manito.velasco@sfmta.com
Address: Francisco, CA 94103-5417

Signature: $\qquad$

Date: $\qquad$

Grants Section Contact

Joel C. Goldberg

Manager, Capital Procurement \&
Management
(415) 701-4499

Joel.Goldberg@sfmta.com

1 South Van Ness, 8h floor San
Francisco, CA 94103-5417
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
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# San Francisco County Transportation Authority Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Form 



| Prop AA Category: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
|  | Current Prop AA Request: $\$$ |
|  | Supervisorial District(s): $\quad 1,2,5$ |

## SCOPE

Sufficient scope detail should be provided to allow Authority staff to evaluate the reasonableness of the proposed budget and schedule. If there are prior allocations for the same project, provide an update on progress. Describe any outreach activities included in the scope. Long scopes may be provided in a separate Word file. Maps, drawings, etc. should be provided on Worksheet 7-Maps.or by inserting additional worksheets.

Project sponsors shall provide a brief explanation of how the project was prioritized for funding, highlighting: 1) project benefits, 2) level of public input into the prioritization process, and 3) whether the project is included in any adopted plans, including Prop K/Prop AA 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPPs). Justify any inconsistencies with the adopted Prop K/Prop AA Strategic Plans and/or relevant 5YPPs.

Indicate whether work is to be performed by outside consultants and/or by force account.

The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) requests $\$ 259,000$ in Prop K funds for the construction phase of the Masonic Avenue Traffic Signal Upgrade project. Requested funds will leverage $\$ 739,000$ in Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds for a total project cost of $\$ 999,000$.

Please see next page for details on the scope of work.

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority Proposition K Sales Tax Program Allocation Request Form 

## Background

The Masonic Avenue Traffic Signal Upgrade project will improve traffic signal visibility on the Masonic Avenue corridor between Geary Boulevard and Fell Street.
In March 2012, through Resolution 12-052 the Transportation Authority allocated $\$ 44,000$ in design funds from Prop K for the design phase for this project.

## Scope

The project scope includes the following streets and treatments along Masonic Avenue:

1. Turk Street - larger signal heads; new mast-arms, pole locations, pedestrian countdown signals (PCS), controller and conduits; and transit signal priority (TSP) hardware.
2. Golden Gate Avenue - larger signal heads; new mast-arms, pole locations, controller and conduits; and TSP hardware.
3. Fulton Street - larger signal heads; new mast-arms and controller; and TSP hardware.
4. Grove Street - larger signal heads and TSP hardware.
5. Hayes Street - larger signal heads; new mast-arms, poles and controller; and TSP hardware.

Planned improvements for the proposed locations are summarized in Table 1 below.
Table 1 - Masonic Avenue Signal Upgrades

| Cross Street | Larger <br> Signal <br> Heads | Mast <br> Arms | New <br> Poles | New <br> PCS | Controller <br> / Cabinet | New <br> Conduit | TSP | \# of <br> Ramps |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Turk Street | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | 4 |
| Golden Gate <br> Avenue | X | X | X |  | X | X | X | 8 |
| Fulton Street | X | X |  |  | X | X | X | 6 |
| Grove Street | X |  |  |  |  |  | X | 6 |
| Hayes Street | X | X | X |  | X | X | X | 0 |

SFMTA and Department of Public Works (DPW) staff have been coordinating closely, especially as it relates to the upcoming Masonic Avenue Streetscape project funded by the One Bay Area Grant program. Based on this coordination effort, staff from both agencies jointly resolved to include construction of certain curb ramps as part of this signal project. The Streetscape project will construct the remaining curb ramps, including all of the curb ramps at the intersection of Masonic Avenue and Hayes Street.

There are two related SFMTA projects that complement the proposed project. The first is a component of the scope of the Signal Modification Contract 33 project at Anza and Masonic. The scope for that project includes adding an overhead mast-arm signal and larger signal heads on Masonic at Anza. The second is related to the newly opened Target in the large retail space at Geary and Masonic. Target Corporation approached the SFMTA with an offer to pay for an additional improvement at Anza and Masonic to mitigate impacts of its

## San Francisco County Transportation Authority Proposition K Sales Tax Program Allocation Request Form

proposed store in the vicinity. Target requested a protected southbound left turn phase from Masonic onto Anza. It also offered to fund a new traffic signal at the Ewing and Masonic intersection. These improvements will be constructed as part of Signal Modification Contract 33, which is already underway and should be completed by summer 2014.

## Project Benefits

Masonic Avenue is a major north-south arterial that connects multiple neighborhoods in the geographic center of the city. It also carries the crosstown Muni 43-Masonic line. Several Muni lines ( $5,21,38,38 \mathrm{~L}$ ) cut across the spine of Masonic Avenue. The street is approximately 60 feet wide, with most of the intersections only having side-mounted traffic signals. By the SFMTA's current design standards, streets this wide should have overhead mast-arm signals to enable drivers to have better visibility of the signal controls. For example, Turk and Masonic has been the subject of red light camera requests by residents because of their observations of red light running. Adding mast-arm signals and larger signal heads would best address those concerns.

Upgrading the signal controllers along the corridor can also help further the SFMTA's ability to provide transit signal priority. The new controllers are equipped with features to take advantage of transit friendly timing schemes.

The Masonic Avenue corridor was identified by the SFMTA for improvements in previous years. Using Prop K funds, the SFMTA undertook the Masonic Avenue Street Design Study in 2010 and engaged the community in a number of design options for bike and pedestrian improvements, transit improvements, and other streetscape features. There were three major neighborhood meetings held over the course of the study, with participation from key stakeholders including local residents, merchants, University of San Francisco Day School, and the San Francisco Bike Coalition. The signal upgrade project is consistent with at least three of the project objectives, namely increasing the safety of pedestrian crossings (4), increasing motorist compliance with traffic rules and regulations (5), and reducing the number of vehicular collisions, especially those involving pedestrians and bicyclists.

## Implementation

SFMTA's Sustainable Streets Division has been managing the scope of the detailed design including design review and contract preparation. DPW's Bureau of Engineering will manage the issuance and administration of the contract for construction.

Task
Design
Curb Ramps
Review of Electrical Design
Construction Management

Force Account Work Performed By
SFMTA Sustainable Streets Division staff
DPW or SFMTA Engineering
DPW-Bureau of Engineering
DPW- Bureau of Construction

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority Proposition K Sales Tax Program Allocation Request Form 

## Construction Budget

The maximum amount of HSIP funds for the construction phase of this project is $\$ 739,000$, which is $90 \%$ of an allowable construction phase cost of $\$ 821,111$. The minimum required match is $\$ 82,111(10 \%)$.

However, because the cost is estimated to be $\$ 999,000$, the project needs $\$ 259,000$ in local funds to be complete, and SFMTA will be providing more than the required match. Federal fund programs like HSIP also cap the amount that can be spent on construction engineering and inspection at $10 \%$ of contract costs, where typical City projects are usually in the range of $20-25 \%$.

## Prioritization

Of the $\$ 259,000$ request, $\$ 196,000$ is programmed in Fiscal Year 2011/12 in the Signals and Signs Maintenance and Renovation 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPP) for the subject project. Therefore, the SFMTA request includes a 5YPP amendment to reprogram $\$ 32,364$ in Fiscal Year 2011/12 funds from those programmed for Signal Modifications Contract 33 and $\$ 30,636$ in Fiscal Year 2011/12 funds from those programmed for Traffic Signal Controller Hardware Upgrades to the subject project. Both projects are fully funded and require no additional Prop K funds.

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Form 

FY 2013/14
Project Name:
Masonic Avenue Signal Upgrade

Implementing Agency: San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

## ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE

| Type : | Categorically Exempt | Completion Date <br> $(\mathrm{mm} / \mathrm{dd} / \mathrm{yy})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Completed | $06 / 18 / 13$ |

## PROJECT DELIVERY MILESTONES

Enter dates for ALL project phases, not just for the current request. Use July 1 as the start of the fiscal year. Use 1, 2, 3, 4 to denote quarters and XXXX/XX for the fiscal year (e.g. 2010/11). Additional schedule detail may be provided in the text box below.

Planning/Conceptual Engineering
Environmental Studies (PA\&ED)
R/W Activities/Acquisition
Design Engineering (PS\&E)
Prepare Bid Documents
Advertise Construction
Start Construction (e.g., Award Contract)
Procurement (e.g. rolling stock)
Project Completion (i.e., Open for Use)
Project Closeout (i.e., final expenses incurred)

| Start Date |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Quarter | Fiscal Year |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| 4 | $2011 / 12$ |
|  |  |
| 3 | $2013 / 14$ |
| 4 | $2013 / 14$ |
|  |  |
| N/A | N/A |
| 1 | $2015 / 16$ |


| End Date |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Quarter | Fiscal Year |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| 3 | $2013 / 14$ |
|  |  |
| N/A | N/A |
| N/A | N/A |
|  |  |
| 4 | $2014 / 15$ |
| 3 | $2015 / 16$ |

## SCHEDULE COORDINATION/NOTES

Provide project delivery milestones for each sub-project in the current request and a schedule for public involvement, if appropriate. For planning efforts, provide start/end dates by task here or in the scope (Tab 1). Describe coordination with other project schedules or external deadlines (e.g., obligation deadlines) that impact the project schedule, if relevant.

| $\underline{\text { Milestone }}$ | $\underline{\text { Date }}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Advertise for Construction | February 2014 |
| Notice To Proceed | May 2014 |
| Open for Use | May 2015 |

Masonic Avenue Signal Upgrade

Implementing Agency:
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

## COST SUMMARY BY PHASE - CURRENT REQUEST

Allocations will generally be for one phase only. Multi-phase allocations will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Enter the total cost for the phase or partial (but useful segment) phase (e.g. Islais Creek Phase 1 construction) covered by the CURRENT funding request.

Planning/Conceptual Engineering
Environmental Studies (PA\&ED)
Design Engineering (PS\&E)
R/W Activities/Acquisition
Construction
Procurement (e.g. rolling stock)

| Cost for Current Request/Phase |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Cost | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Prop K - } \\ \text { Current Request }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Prop AA - } \\ \text { Current Request }\end{array}$ |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| $\$$ |  | 259,000 |$) \$$| - |
| :--- |

## COST SUMMARY BY PHASE - ENTIRE PROJECT

Show total cost for ALL project phases based on best available information. Source of cost estimate (e.g. $35 \%$ design, vendor quote) is intended to help gauge the quality of the cost estimate, which should improve in reliability the farther along a project is in its development.

San Francisco County Transportation Authority
Proposition K Sales Tax Program Allocation Request Form

| MAJOR LINE ITEM BUDGET |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1．Provide a major line item budget，with subtotals by task and phase．More detail is required the farther along the project is in the development phase．Planning studies |
| should provide task－level budget information． |
| 2．Requests for project development should include preliminary estimates for later phases such as construction． |
| 3．Support costs and contingencies should be called out in each phase，as appropriate．Provide both dollar amounts and \％（e．g．\％of construction）for support costs and |
| contingencies． |
| 4．For work to be performed by agency staff rather than consultants，provide base rate，overhead multiplier，and fully burdened rates by position with FTE（full－time |
| equivalent）ratio．A sample format is provided below． |

[^1]

E6－25
Curb Ramps

## Unit Cost Ramp Cost <br> Ramps 24

\section*{AGENCY STAFF (CONSTRUCTION PHASE)* <br> | MFB $=$ Mandatory Fringe Benefits |
| :--- |
| FTE $=$ Full Time Equivalent employee |}

Number of Intersections
5

| Position | Salary Per FTE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MFB for } \\ & \text { FTE } \end{aligned}$ |  | + MFB | Approved Overhead Rate | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Ov} \\ \text { (Sal } \\ \text { (S } \\ \mathrm{O} \\ \mathrm{O} \end{gathered}$ | verhead $=$ <br> lary + MFB <br> Approved <br> overhead <br> Rate |  | (Fully <br> rdened) <br> alary + <br> MFB + <br> verhead | FTE <br> Ratio | Hours |  | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Electrician (7345)** | 95,905 | 54,195 | \$ | 150,100 | 0.803 | \$ | 120,530 | \$ | 270,630 | 0.091 | 190 | \$ | 24,721 |
| Senior Engineer (5211) | 146,952 | 75,733 | \$ | 222,685 | 0.803 | \$ | 178,816 | \$ | 401,501 | 0.004 | 8 | \$ | 1,544 |
| Engineer (5241) | 126,932 | 67,197 | \$ | 194,129 | 0.803 | \$ | 155,886 | \$ | 350,015 | 0.010 | 20 | \$ | 3,366 |
| Associate Engineer (5207) | 109,668 | 59,835 | \$ | 169,503 | 0.803 | \$ | 136,111 | \$ | 305,614 | 0.043 | 90 | \$ | 13,224 |
| Assistant Engineer (5203) | 94,276 | 53,744 | \$ | 148,020 | 0.803 | \$ | 118,860 | \$ | 266,880 | 0.119 | 248 | \$ | 31,820 |
| Total - Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.267 | 556 | \$ | 74,675 |


| II | DPW Bureau of Engineering <br> (BOE) | Overhead <br> Rate: | 2.71 |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Hours | Position | Base Salary | Fully <br> Burdened | FTE | Cost |

San Francisco County Transportation Authority
Proposition K Sales Tax Program Allocation Request Form

| III | DPW Streets \& Highways (S\&H) | Overhead <br> Rate: |  | 2.71 |  | FTE | Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hours | Position |  | Salary |  | Fully rdened |  |  |  |
| 26 | Associate Engineer (5207) | \$ | 109,668 | \$ | 297,200 | 0.013 | \$ | 3,715 |
| 74 | Assistant Engineer (5203) | \$ | 94,276 | \$ | 255,488 | 0.036 | \$ | 9,089 |
| 100 | Total |  |  |  |  | 0.048 | \$ | 12,804 |
| IV | DPW Streets \& Highways (BCM) | Overhead Rate: |  | 2.71 |  |  |  |  |
| Hours | Position | Base Salary |  | Fully Burdened |  | FTE | Cost |  |
| 10 | Senior Engineer (5211) | \$ | 146,952 | \$ | 398,240 | 0.005 | \$ | 1,915 |
| 36 | Administrative Engineer (5174) | \$ | 136,630 | \$ | 370,267 | 0.017 | \$ | 6,408 |
| 540 | Construction Inspector (6318)*** | \$ | 99,945 | \$ | 270,852 | 0.260 | \$ | 70,317 |
| 136 | Office Support Inspector (6318) | \$ | 95,186 | \$ | 257,954 | 0.065 | \$ | 16,866 |
| 722 | Total |  |  |  |  | 0.347 | \$ | 95,507 |
| 1,113 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.88 | \$ | 142,082 |

* Base Salary is step 5 for each classification in effect today.
** Electricians receive a $5 \%$ premium when assigned as traffic signal electricians


## FUNDING PLAN - FOR CURRENT PROP K REQUEST

Prop K Funds Requested:
5-Year Prioritization Program Amount:
Strategic Plan Amount for Requested FY:


If the amount requested is inconsistent (e.g., greater than) with the Prop K/Prop AA Strategic Plan amount and/or the 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPP), provide a justification in the space below including a detailed explanation of which other project or projects will be deleted, deferred, etc. to accommodate the current request and maintain consistency with the 5YPP and/or Strategic Plan annual programming levels.

The Prop K 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPP) amount is the amount of Prop K funds available for allocation in Fiscal Year 2013/14 for the Masonic Avenue Signal Upgrade project in the Traffic Signal subcategory of the Signals and Signs Maintenance and Renovation 5YPP.

Fully funding the request requires a 5YPP amendment to reprogram a total of $\$ 63,000$ in Fiscal Year 2011/12 funds from the following projects to Masonic Ave Signal Upgrade in Fiscal Year 13/14: \$32,364 in unallocated funds programmed to Signal Modification Contract 33; $\$ 30,636$ in unallocated funds programmed to Traffic Signal Controller Hardware Upgrades. See attached 5YPP amendment for details.

The Prop K Strategic Plan amount is the amount programmed for the entire Signals and Signs Maintenance and Renovation category in Fiscal Year 2013/14 (\$4,920,000), programmed but unallocated funds from prior fiscal years $(\$ 158,675)$, and cumulative remaining programming capacity ( $\$ 14,377$ ).

Enter the funding plan for the phase or phases for which Prop K/Prop AA funds are currently being requested. Totals should match those shown on the Cost worksheet.

| Fund Source | Planned | Programmed | Allocated | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Prop K sales tax | $\$ 63,000$ | $\$ 196,000$ |  | $\$ 259,000$ |
| HSIP |  | $\$ 739,000$ |  | $\$ 739,000$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |  | $\$ 0$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\$ 0$ |

Actual Prop K Leveraging - This Phase:
Expected Prop K Leveraging per Expenditure Plan

| $74.05 \%$ |
| ---: |
| $41.47 \%$ |

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority <br> <br> Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Form 
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Is Prop K/Prop AA providing local match funds for a state or federal grant?
Yes - Prop K

|  |  | Required Local Match |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fund Source | \$ Amount | $\%$ | $\$$ |
| HSIP | $\$ 739,000$ |  | $10.00 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |

## FUNDING PLAN - FOR ENTIRE PROJECT (ALL PHASES)

Enter the funding plan for all phases (environmental studies through construction) of the project. This section may be left blank if the current request covers all project phases. Totals should match those shown on the Cost worksheet.

| Fund Source | Planned | Programmed | Allocated | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prop K sales tax | \$63,000 | \$196,000 | \$44,000 | \$303,000 |
| HSIP |  | \$739,000 | \$161,000 | \$900,000 |
|  |  |  |  | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | \$0 |
| Total: | \$63,000 | \$935,000 | \$1,408,000 | \$ 1,203,000 |
|  |  |  | Total from Cost worksheet |  |
| Actual Prop K Leveraging - Entire Project: <br> Expected Prop K Leveraging per Expenditure Plan: Actual Prop AA Leveraging - Entire Project: |  | 74.81\% |  |  |
|  |  | 41.47\% |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## FISCAL YEAR CASH FLOW DISTRIBUTION FOR CURRENT PROP K REQUEST

Use the table below to enter the proposed cash flow distribution schedule (e.g. the maximum Prop K/Prop AA funds that are guaranteed to be available for reimbursement each fiscal year) for the current request. If the schedule is more aggressive than the Prop K/Prop AA Strategic Plan and/or 5YPP, please explain in the text box below how cash flow for other projects and programs will be slowed down to accommodate the current request without exceeding annual cash flow assumptions made in the Strategic Plan.

| Prop K Funds Requested: |  | \$259,000 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sponsor Request - Proposed Prop K Cash Flow Distribution Schedule |  |  |  |
| Fiscal Year | Cash Flow | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Reimbursed } \\ \text { Annually } \end{gathered}$ | Balance |
| FY 2013/14 | \$129,500 | 50.00\% | \$129,500 |
| FY 2014/15 | \$129,500 | 50.00\% | \$0 |
|  |  | 0.00\% | \$0 |
|  |  | 0.00\% | \$0 |
|  |  | 0.00\% | \$0 |
| Total: | \$259,000 |  |  |

Prop AA Funds Requested:

## AUTHORITY RECOMMENDATION

This section is to be completed by Authority Staff.
Last Updated: $1 / 16 / 2014$ Resolution. No. $\square$ Res. Date: $\square$

| Project Name: Masonic Avenue Signal Upgrade |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Implementing Agency: San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency |  |  |  |
| Funding Recommended: |  | mount | Phase: |
|  | Prop K Allocation | \$259,000 | Construction |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Total: | \$259,000 |  |

Notes (e.g., justification for multi-phase recommendations, notes for multi-EP line item or multi-sponsor recommendations):

Cash Flow Distribution Schedule by Fiscal Year (for entire allocation/appropriation)

| Source | Fiscal Year | Maximum <br> Reimbursement | $\%$ Reimbursable | Balance |
| :---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Prop K EP 33 | FY 2013/14 | $\$ 59,000$ | $23.00 \%$ | $\$ 200,000$ |
| Prop K EP 33 | FY 2014/15 | $\$ 200,000$ | $77.00 \%$ | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |  | $0.00 \%$ | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |  | $0.00 \%$ | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |  | $0.00 \%$ | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  | $\$ 259,000$ | $100 \%$ |  |

Cash Flow Distribution Schedule by Fiscal Year \& Phase (for entire allocation/appropriation)

| Source | Fiscal Year | Phase | Maximum Reimbursement | Cumulative \% Reimbursable | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prop K EP 33 | FY 2013/14 | Construction | \$59,000 | 23\% | \$200,000 |
| Prop K EP 33 | FY 2014/15 | Construction | \$200,000 | 100\% | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | 100\% | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | 100\% | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | 100\% | \$0 |
|  |  |  | \$259,000 |  |  |

Prop K/Prop AA Fund Expiration Date: $\qquad$ 6/30/2016 Eligible expenses must be incurred prior to this date.

## AUTHORITY RECOMMENDATION

This section is to be completed by Authority Staff.
Last Updated: $\quad 1 / 16 / 2014$ Resolution. No. $\square$ Res. Date: $\square$
Project Name: Masonic Avenue Signal Upgrade
Implementing Agency: San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

|  | Action | Amount | Fiscal Year | Phase |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Future Commitment to: |  |  |  |  |
|  | Trigger: |  |  |  |

## Deliverables:

| 1. With the first quarterly progress report, provide 1-2 digital photos of before conditions at each proposed for |
| :--- |
| signal upgrades. |
| 2.With the first quarterly progress report following the Open for Use date (anticipated for the progress report <br> due July 15, 2015), provide 1-2 digital photos of after conditions for each intersection proposed for signal <br> upgrades. |

## Special Conditions:

1. The recommended allocation is contingent on an amendment to the New Signals and Signs 5YPP to reprogram $\$ 32,364$ and $\$ 30,636$ in Fiscal Year 2011/12 construction funds from the Signal Modification Contract 33 and Traffic Signal Controller Hardware Upgrades projects, respectively, to the subject project. See attached 5YPP amendment for details.
2. SFMTA may not incur expenses for the construction phase until Transportation Authority staff releases the funds pending receipt of evidence of completion of design (e.g. copy of certifications page). This is a deliverable for design phase: Resolution 12-52, Project 133.907024.
3. The Transportation Authority will only reimburse SFMTA up to the approved overhead multiplier rate for the fiscal year that SFMTA incurs charges.

## Notes:



Sub-project detail? $\square$ No If yes, see next page(s) for sub-project detail.

$\square$

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority Proposition K Sales Tax Program Allocation Request Form 

## MAPS AND DRAWINGS

Insert or attach files of maps, drawings, photos of current conditions, photo compositions, etc. to support understanding of the project scope and evaluation of how geographic diversity was considered in the project prioritization process.

This text box and the blue header may be deleted to better accommodate any graphics.

## Project Map - Masonic Signal Improvements (HSIP)



San Francisco County Transportation Authority
Proposition K Sales Tax Program Allocation Request Form


Pedestrian Countdown Signal

Traffic Controller


Mast Arm Signal

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority <br> Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Form 

FY of Allocation Action:

Project Name:

2013/14

| Current Prop K Request: | $\$$ | 259,000 |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Current Prop AA Request: | $\$$ | - |

Implementing Agency:
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

## Signatures

By signing below, we the undersigned verify that: 1) the requested sales tax and/or vehicle registration fee revenues shall be used to supplement and under no circumstance replace existing local revenues used for transportation purposes and 2) the requested sales tax and/or vehicle registration fee funds will not be used to cover expenses incurred prior to Authority Board approval of the allocation.
Project Manager
Name (typed): Manito Velasco
Title: Engineer

Phone: $\underline{\text { Fax: } 415 \text { ) 701-4447 }}$| Email: manito.velasco@sfmta.com |
| :--- |
| Address: Francisco, CA 94103-5417 San |

Signature: $\qquad$

Date: $\qquad$

Grants Section Contact

Joel C. Goldberg

Manager, Capital Procurement \&
Management
(415) 701-4499

Joel.Goldberg@sfmta.com

1 South Van Ness, 8h floor San
Francisco, CA 94103-5417
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
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2009 Prop K 5YPP - Program of Projects
Signals and Signs (EP 33)
Programming and Allocations T
ndment for February Board Approval
Last Update: January 16, 2014

| Agency | Project Name | Phase | Status | Fiscal Year |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 2009/10 | 2010/11 | 2011/12 | 2012/13 | 2013/14 |  |
| Pavement Markings |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SFMTA | Raised Pavement Markers ${ }^{15}$ | PROC, CON | Programmed |  |  | \$22,450 |  |  | \$22,450 |
| SFMTA | Eddy and Ellis Traffic Calming Improvement ${ }^{15}$ | ENV | Pending |  |  |  |  | \$27,550 | \$27,550 |
| Sign Upgrades |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SFMTA | Traffic Sign Graffiti and Upgrade Program | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PROC, } \\ \text { CON } \end{gathered}$ | Allocated | \$250,000 |  |  |  |  | \$250,000 |
| SFMTA | Traffic Sign Graffiti Program | CON | Allocated |  | \$320,000 |  |  |  | \$320,000 |
| SFMTA | 15 MPH Zone Near Schools ${ }^{2}$ | PLAN, PS\&E, CON | Allocated |  |  | \$321,700 |  |  | \$321,700 |
| SFMTA | Traffic Sign Graffiti Program ${ }^{7}$ | CON | Programmed |  |  | \$0 |  |  | \$0 |
| SFMTA | Traffic Sign Graffiti Program ${ }^{7}$ | CON | Programmed |  |  |  | \$136,000 |  | \$136,000 |
| SFMTA | Traffic Sign Graffiti Program | CON | Programmed |  |  |  |  | \$320,000 | \$320,000 |
| Traffic Signal Upgrades |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SFMTA | Golden Gate Signal Upgrade (Divisadero to Franklin) | PS\&E | Programmed |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |
| SFMTA | Golden Gate Signal Upgrade (Divisadero to Franklin) | CON | Programmed |  |  |  |  | \$1,800,000 | \$1,800,000 |
| SFMTA | Highway 1 Signal Upgrades (Lake St. to Junipero Serra) Phase 3 | PS\&E, CON | Programmed |  |  |  |  | \$2,750,000 | \$2,750,000 |
| SFMTA | Light Rail Corridor Signal and Pavement Marking Improvements ${ }^{1}$ | PS\&E, CON, PROC | Allocated |  | \$98,755 |  |  |  | \$98,755 |
| SFMTA | Bayshore Blvd and Paul Ave - Traffic Signal Upgrade ${ }^{6}$ | CON | Allocated |  |  |  | \$58,340 |  | \$58,340 |
| SFMTA | Joint Opportunity Fund (Conduits for future signals) ${ }^{1}$ | TBD | Programmed | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \$0 |
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| 뎅 | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { た్ర } \\ & \text { ते } \\ & \underset{\sim}{8} \end{aligned}$ |  | $$ | \＆ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 8_{2} \\ & \delta_{2} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{n} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\left.\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 8 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \infty \\ \infty \end{gathered} \right\rvert\,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 8 \\ 8 \\ 0 \\ \hat{\omega} \\ \stackrel{n}{\infty} \end{array}$ |  |  | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 8. } \\ & \text { ô } \\ & \underset{\sim}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & \text { on } \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & \underset{\&}{f} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{ \pm}{ \pm}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 <br> 8 <br>  <br> N <br> N <br> Hin |  |  | 8 8 0 N N |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{m}{\mathrm{~N}} \\ \stackrel{\sim}{\mathrm{~N}} \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { in } \\ & \text { i } \\ & \underset{\&}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { in } \\ & \text { ふे } \\ & \text { むे } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{L}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{y}{\mathrm{y}} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 8 \\ 8 \\ 0_{0} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \omega \\ n \end{array}$ |  | 8 8 ut I． |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\theta$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{i}{N} \\ \underset{\sim}{n} \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { of } \\ & \text { of } \\ & 0 \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ |  | $$ | 8 8 ले O on |  | 8 8 f ¢ |
| $\exists$ $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{3}$ $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{3}$ $\stackrel{1}{2}$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 8_{8} \\ \mathbf{n}_{2} \\ \stackrel{n}{n} \\ \sim \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{2} \\ & \stackrel{\text { Bin }}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\infty$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 己 } \\ & \text { E } \\ & \text { EIIN } \\ & \text { E0 } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ت} \\ & 0 \\ & \tilde{U} \\ & 0 \\ & \text { O } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ت } \\ & \text { E } \\ & \text { E } \\ & \text { ED } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | ت ¢ ¢ \％ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \ddot{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{\text { ch}}{\approx} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\rho}{\mathrm{F}}$ | $\stackrel{\rho}{\mathrm{F}}$ | $\hat{\sim}$ | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { T1 } \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\rho}{\mathrm{F}}$ | $$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ \underset{\sim}{\omega} \\ \varrho \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & Z \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & Z \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Z | $\frac{\text { 霏 }}{}$ | $\begin{aligned} & Z \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{1} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Z} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hat{10} \\ & \dot{\omega} \\ & \hat{\omega} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | N |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Masonic Avenue Signal Upgrade 4，5， 14 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { U. } \\ & \text { ت0. } \\ & \text { C } \end{aligned}$ | $\sum_{\infty}^{E}$ | $\sum_{\substack{E}}^{\mathbb{E}}$ | $\sum_{\substack{E}}^{\mathbb{E}}$ | $\sum_{\substack{E}}^{\mathbb{E}}$ | $\sum_{\substack{E}}^{\mathbb{E}}$ | $\sum_{\substack{E}}^{\mathbb{E}}$ | $\sum_{\substack{E}}^{E}$ | $\stackrel{E}{E}$ | 荡 | $\sum_{E}^{E}$ |  | $\sum_{\substack{E}}^{\mathbb{E}}$ | $\mid$ | $\sum_{\underset{\sim}{E}}^{E}$ | $\sum_{\substack{E}}^{E}$ | $\sum_{\infty}^{E}$ | $\sum_{\infty}^{E}$ | $\sum_{i=3}^{E}$ | $\sum_{\substack{E}}^{E}$ |


| Agency | Project Name | Phase | Status | Fiscal Year |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 2009/10 | 2010/11 | 2011/12 | 2012/13 | 2013/14 |  |
| SFMTA | Franklin Street Signal Upgrades Conduit ${ }^{9}$ | PS\&E | Allocated |  |  |  | \$715,447 |  | \$715,447 |
| SFMTA | New Pedestrian Signals ${ }^{13}$ | CON | Allocated |  |  |  | \$432,139 |  | \$432,139 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Programmed in 5YPP |  |  |  | \$250,000 | \$735,755 | \$1,381,845 | \$3,444,831 | \$7,481,550 | \$13,293,981 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Allocated and Pending in 5YPP |  |  |  | \$250,000 | \$735,755 | \$1,359,170 | \$3,351,736 | \$286,550 | \$5,983,211 |
| Total Deobligated in 5YPP |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | (\$42,905) | \$0 | (\$42,905) |
| Total Unallocated in 5YPP |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0 | \$22,675 | \$136,000 | \$7,195,000 | \$7,353,675 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Programmed in Amended 2009 Strategic Plan * |  |  |  | \$750,000 | \$370,000 | \$3,270,000 | \$370,000 | \$4,920,000 | \$9,680,000 |
| Deobligated from Prior 5YPP Cycles ** |  |  |  | \$3,628,358 |  |  |  |  | \$3,628,358 |
| Cumulative Remaining Programming Capacity |  |  |  | \$4,128,358 | \$3,762,603 | \$5,650,758 | \$2,575,927 | \$14,377 | \$14,377 |

* The 2009 Strategic Plan was adopted on July 28,2009 through Res. 10-07.
** "Deobligated from prior 5YPP cycles" includes deobligations from allocations approved prior to the current 5YPP period, excluding deobligations incorporated in the first 2009 Strategic Plan amendment, as of December 31, 2012.
Programmed

| Pending Allocation/Appropriation |
| :--- |
| Board Approved Allocation/Appro |

$\$ 50,000$ in FY 2009/10 Joint Opportunity funds and $\$ 48,755$ in FY 2010/11 Joint Opportunity funds were redirected to FY 2010/11 for the Light Rail Corridor Signal and Pavement Marking Improvements project.
${ }^{2}$ 5YPP amendment to add the 15 MPH Zones Near Schools project and reprogram $\$ 321,700$ Fiscal Year 2007/08 Prop K funds deobligated from Park Presidio 19th Ave Signal Upgrades, Phase II (Res. 08-60, Project 133.907013) (Res. 11-63, 06.28.11). The deobligation is included in the "Deobligated from prior 5YPP cycles."
5YPP amendment to add the Mission-Geneva Transit and Pedestrain Improvements project and reprogram \$60,470 Fiscal Year 2007/08 Prop K funds deobligated from Park Presidio 19th Ave Signal Upgrades, Phase II (Res. 08-60, Project 133.907013) (Res. 11-63, 06.28.11). The deobligation is included in the "Deobligated from prior 5YPP cycles."
${ }^{4} 5 \mathrm{YPP}$ amendment (Res. 12-08, 07.19.11) to reprogram $\$ 3,273,534$ in cost savings deobligated from Park Presidio/19th Ave Signal Upgrades, Phase II (Res. 08-60, Project 133.907013) to the following projects, in addition to the two aforementioned projects approved by the Authority Board in June 2011:
$\$ 129,000$ in Fiscal Year 2011/12 for the Sunset Boulevard Pedestrian Improvement project.
$\$ 187,364$ in Fiscal Year 2011/12 for the Masonic Avenue Signal Upgrades project. An additional $\$ 52,636$ was shifted from the construction phase of Contract 33 for a total programmed amount of $\$ 240,000$. (Resolution 12-52, 03.27.12).
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# San Francisco County Transportation Authority Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Form 

FY of Allocation Action:

Project Name:
Eddy and Ellis Traffic Calming Improvement
Implementing Agency:
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

## EXPENDITURE PLAN INFORMATION

| Prop K Category: | C. Street \& Traffic Safety |  | Gray cells will <br> automatically be <br> filled in. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Prop K Subcategory: | iii. System Maintenance and Renovation |  |  |
| Prop K EP Project/Program: | a. Signals and Signs |  |  |

Prop K EP Line Number (Primary):
Prop K Other EP Line Numbers:

| 33 |
| :---: |
|  |



| Prop AA Category: | Pedestrian Safety |
| :--- | :--- |



## SCOPE

Sufficient scope detail should be provided to allow Authority staff to evaluate the reasonableness of the proposed budget and schedule. If there are prior allocations for the same project, provide an update on progress. Describe any outreach activities included in the scope. Long scopes may be provided in a separate Word file. Maps, drawings, etc. should be provided on Worksheet 7-Maps.or by inserting additional worksheets.

Project sponsors shall provide a brief explanation of how the project was prioritized for funding, highlighting: 1) project benefits, 2) level of public input into the prioritization process, and 3) whether the project is included in any adopted plans, including Prop K/Prop AA 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPPs). Justify any inconsistencies with the adopted Prop K/Prop AA Strategic Plans and/or relevant 5YPPs.

Indicate whether work is to be performed by outside consultants and/or by force account.

Please see next page for scope of work.

## San Francisco County Transportation Authority Proposition K and AA Allocation Request Form

## Project Goals

In April 2013, the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) approved the recommendation to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to program the Eddy and Ellis Traffic Improvement Project for Lifeline Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding for $\$ 1,175,104$. Lifeline STP funding is in the process of being programmed for the construction phase of the project that will occur in FY 2015. This request is to fund the environmental phase with $\$ 27,550$ in Prop $K$ funds and the design phase with $\$ 337,450$ in Prop AA funds.

A 2009 survey indicated that District 6 is a densely populated neighborhood with over 22,600 residents located adjacent to downtown, where large volumes of vehicular traffic pass through to get to and from the Bay Bridge, downtown, and other areas of the city. The project length along Eddy Street is two blocks from Jones Street to Mason Street and the project length on Ellis Street is three blocks from Leavenworth Street to Mason Street. Ellis Street is a two-lane westbound street and Eddy Street is a 2-lane eastbound street. The goal of the proposed project is to increase pedestrian safety and calm traffic by reducing area vehicular traffic speeds to be consistent with the 25 MPH speed limit on both streets.

## Scope of Work

The SFMTA proposes to implement the following improvements:

1. Upgrade the traffic signals at the intersections of Ellis and Taylor Streets and Eddy and Taylor Streets, including the addition of Pedestrian Countdown Signals (PCS). The new PCS will be timed to adhere to the SFMTA's pedestrian signal timing guidelines.
2. Installation of signal hardware modifications at three intersections to convert both Ellis and Eddy Streets to two-way streets from Jones Street to Mason Street, and Leavenworth Street to Mason Street, respectively:

- Ellis and Mason Streets
- Eddy and Leavenworth Streets
- Eddy and Jones Streets

The project scope also includes force account work towards striping, signage, and meter changes required for the two-way conversion.
3. Install corner bulbouts at Eddy and Leavenworth Streets and Ellis and Taylor Streets

The feasibility of the bulbs is contingent on the constructability of the curb return area relative to presence of sub-sidewalk basements at the proposed corners. In the event that bulbs are not feasible, the SFMTA will work with the stakeholders and Department of Public Works (DPW) to develop alternative designs or substitute bulbs at other corners within the project area.

## San Francisco County Transportation Authority Proposition K and AA Allocation Request Form

The proposed project is related to other recommended improvements that were identified in the Tenderloin-Little Saigon Neighborhood Transportation Plan (NTP) and have been implemented:

1. The two-way conversion of McAllister Street between Market and Larkin Streets was completed with sidewalk bulbs on Jones Street.
2. Portions of Ellis Street (between Jones and Polk) and Eddy Streets (Leavenworth to Larkin) were converted to two-way traffic in a 2012 Ellis and Eddy pavement project.
3. Three corner bulbs at Ellis and Hyde Streets, Eddy and Hyde Streets, and Ellis and Mason Streets were also constructed as part of the Ellis/Eddy projects.
4. Successive DPW paving projects installed special street-print type crosswalk treatments at several Tenderloin intersections:

- Eddy and Leavenworth Streets
- Eddy and Jones Streets
- Eddy and Taylor Streets
- Ellis and Leavenworth Streets
- Ellis and Jones Streets
- Turk and Taylor Streets

5. SFMTA added PCSs at the following locations in 2010:

- Ellis and Polk Streets
- Ellis and Larkin Streets
- Eddy and Polk Streets
- Eddy and Larkin Streets

The key pieces from that NTP roadmap that remain to be implemented is the full conversion of Eddy and Ellis Streets to two-way streets, which is a key component of the proposed request. The portions that were converted to two-way in 2012 were constructed by SFMTA with existing signal conduits and hardware. The complete implementation of the two-way conversion was not possible in 2012 because of the poor condition of the signal hardware at the intersections of Ellis and Taylor Streets and Eddy and Taylor Streets. The hardware and underground conduit conditions at these intersections precluded the addition of PCS and the new signals to face the new directions of traffic.

## Project Benefits

The proposed pedestrian and traffic calming improvements benefit the walking public by improving safety and decreasing vehicular speeding.

More specifically, installation of PCSs have been effective in reducing the percentage of pedestrians remaining in the crosswalk at the beginning of the conflicting vehicle green light, thereby reducing the potential for vehicle-pedestrian conflicts. The countdown feature of the PCS is helpful for pedestrians to discern whether there is enough time left in a signal cycle to cross the intersection safely.

## San Francisco County Transportation Authority Proposition K and AA Allocation Request Form

In addition, installation of corner sidewalk bulbs will increase sidewalk widths by at least 6 feet, shorten crossing distances, improve pedestrian visibility to motorists, and slow right turning vehicles.

Finally, the hardware modifications to convert Ellis and Eddy from one to two-way streets are intended to slow vehicular traffic speeds and reduce traffic volumes to improve safety for pedestrians.

## Community Based Transportation Plan and Needs Assessment

The proposed Lifeline STP scope was developed as a part of a larger planning effort. In March of 2007, the SFCTA adopted the Tenderloin-Little Saigon NTP, which was the product of a collaborative effort with several community based organizations, City agencies and numerous public outreach efforts. City agencies working with the SFCTA included the SFMTA, DPW, the Planning Department, and the Department of Public Health.

The NTP identified four critical needs for the project area including:

1. Improve pedestrian safety
2. Improve transit service reliability and accessibility to low income individuals.
3. Reduce the speed of traffic through the neighborhood.
4. Use the street environment as a tool to enhance security and improve the community experience.

The NTP included recommendations of near and medium-term solutions to the problem areas. The proposed SFMTA project is consistent with these recommendations, specifically the first, third, and fourth needs.

## Characteristics of the Tenderloin Neighborhood Residents

The Tenderloin-Little Saigon area is one of San Francisco's oldest neighborhoods with high density housing, employment, and shops. The project area is also one of the most ethnically diverse communities, providing a home to many recent immigrants. It is also an ideal candidate for Lifeline Transportation funding because it benefits the "Tenderloin/Civic Center" Community of Concern designated by MTC. The neighborhood population has the following characteristics based upon the most recent Census data from 2010:

- 70\% Minority population
- 30\% Low income
- $80 \%$ Non-English proficient
- $10 \%$ Senior population 75 year or older
- $25 \%$ Household with a disability
- $15 \%$ Residents whose rent is over $50 \%$ of income

A majority of Tenderloin residents walk and use transit as their primary mode of transportation; only $10 \%$ of residents own a car. A 2009 survey indicated that the average income of neighborhood residents was approximately $\$ 25,471$ relative to average of $\$ 70,770$ for the city as a whole.

## San Francisco County Transportation Authority Proposition K and AA Allocation Request Form

## Public Outreach Efforts

During the development of the NTP in 2006 and 2007, the SFCTA led an extensive outreach process to residents, neighborhood organizations, implementing agencies, and technicians to ensure that the benefits of the study would go beyond a traditional planning and engineering study. The Tenderloin Housing Clinic, the Southeast Asian Community Center, and Asian Neighborhood Design were the three Community Based Organization (CBO) consultants tasked with organizing outreach to the community. The outreach process began in 2006 with CBO-led walking tours of the neighborhood, where each participant was given a disposable camera to document problem areas to address. Outreach efforts also included focus groups and stakeholder interviews (representing senior, youth, and civic non-profit organizations), merchant interviews, multi-lingual surveys and two community-wide workshops. The SFCTA used print, online, and ethnic media to advertise outreach events as well as email updates to the District 6 mailing list.

The SFMTA will conduct public hearings to obtain input from the local community stakeholders regarding the project, particularly the proposed bulbouts which will result in some loss of parking. The Agency will continue working with the Supervisor Jane Kim to engage residents and businesses in the area.

## Cost Effectiveness and Performance Indicators/Evaluation

The NTP identified the needs of the low-income population of the Tenderloin-Little Saigon neighborhood to provide cost effective and measurable improvements based upon the priorities set by all stakeholders.

One of the proven ways of improving pedestrian safety and comfort is the addition of PCS. As part of the full signal upgrade at Eddy and Taylor and Ellis and Taylor, the project will also relocate signal heads and signal poles to maximize their visibility to motorists and pedestrians. New underground conduits will be installed. Curb ramps will also be constructed. New street lighting will be installed where deficient to ensure corners, roadway, and crosswalks are properly lighted, using the SFMTA's long-standing design philosophy to combine traffic signal and streetlight poles. The Public Utility Commission's Bureau of Light, Heat and Power will be responsible for maintaining the lighting. All project elements will be completed as part of the project, which helps ensure costs are kept low compared to implementing each element as a stand-alone project.

SFMTA has baseline data of traffic volumes and speeds along both corridors. The SFMTA plans on collecting the same data at the completion of the project to track how closely the project is adhering to the goals. As pedestrian safety is an ongoing priority for the SFMTA, it will continue to review signal timing, evaluate public input, and collision statistics to implement additional pedestrian countermeasures as needed. This could include special pedestrian phasing like leading pedestrian intervals where pedestrians are given a WALK signal a few seconds before drivers are shown green, or in extreme cases exclusive pedestrian phases where all traffic is stopped while pedestrians are crossing. These are to be evaluated in the future. Without this project, special phasing is not possible because the signal hardware (i.e., PCS) is not currently in place to enable implementation.

## San Francisco County Transportation Authority Proposition K and AA Allocation Request Form

## Implementation

The SFMTA will manage the scope of detailed design including design review and contract preparation. The DPW Bureau of Engineering will manage the issuance and administration of the contract for construction (by competitively bid contract).

| Task | Force Account Work Performed By |
| :--- | :--- |
| Environmental Clearance | SFMTA Sustainable Streets Division - Force Account |
| Design | SFMTA Sustainable Streets Division - Force Account |
| Curb Ramps | DPW Engineering |
| Review of Electrical Design | DPW-Bureau of Engineering |
| Construction Administration | DPW |
| Construction Management | DPW- Bureau of Construction Management |

The SFMTA will maintain the signal infrastructure including poles, vehicular signal heads, pedestrian countdown signals, conduits and controllers. As with other intersections in the city, DPW will maintain the corner curb return areas.

## Prioritization

The Prop AA Strategic Plan was amended by the SFCTA in October 2013 to include $\$ 365,000$ to fund the design phase of the Eddy and Ellis Traffic Calming Improvement Project in Fiscal Year 2014/15. The SFMTA is requesting a Prop AA Strategic Plan amendment to advance $\$ 337,450$ in Prop AA funds to Fiscal Year 2013/14 to accelerate the project's programming and cash flow from Fiscal Year 2014/15 to Fiscal Year 2013/14 to allow the SFMTA to begin design in February 2014. Sufficient funds are available to accommodate this request. The SFMTA is also requesting a Prop K 5-Year Prioritization Program amendment to the Signals and Signs category to use $\$ 27,550$ in Fiscal Year 2011/12 funds from the Raised Pavement Markers project to fully fund the project. This project is also included as a part of the SFMTA's Capital Investment Program.

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Form 

Project Name:
Eddy and Ellis Traffic Calming Improvement

Implementing Agency: San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

## ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE

Type :
Categorically Exempt
Completion Date
(mm/dd/yy)
Status:
Underway
12/31/14

## PROJECT DELIVERY MILESTONES

Enter dates for ALL project phases, not just for the current request. Use July 1 as the start of the fiscal year. Use 1, 2, 3, 4 to denote quarters and XXXX/XX for the fiscal year (e.g. 2010/11). Additional schedule detail may be provided in the text box below.

Planning/Conceptual Engineering
Environmental Studies (PA\&ED)
R/W Activities/Acquisition
Design Engineering (PS\&E)
Prepare Bid Documents
Advertise Construction
Start Construction (e.g., Award Contract)
Procurement (e.g. rolling stock)
Project Completion (i.e., Open for Use)
Project Closeout (i.e., final expenses incurred)

| Start Date |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Quarter | Fiscal Year |
| 3 | $2005 / 06$ |
| 4 | $2010 / 11$ |
|  |  |
| 3 | $2013 / 14$ |
| 3 | $2014 / 15$ |
| 3 | $2014 / 15$ |
| 1 | $2015 / 16$ |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| 2 | $2016 / 17$ |


| End Date |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Quarter | Fiscal Year |
| 3 | $2006 / 07$ |
| 2 | $2014 / 15$ |
|  |  |
| 2 | $2014 / 15$ |
| 3 | $2014 / 15$ |
| 4 | $2014 / 15$ |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| 1 | $2016 / 17$ |
| 4 | $2016 / 17$ |

## SCHEDULE COORDINATION/NOTES

Provide project delivery milestones for each sub-project in the current request and a schedule for public involvement, if appropriate. For planning efforts, provide start/end dates by task here or in the scope (Tab 1). Describe coordination with other project schedules or external deadlines (e.g., obligation deadlines) that impact the project schedule, if relevant.

Schedule Detail:
Environmental
CEQA was approved 4/12/12
NEPA approval anticipated December 2014
Design
Advertise
February 2014 - December 2014
March 2015
Construction/NTP
July 2015 - July 2016
Lifeline Transportation Program (LTP) Surface Transportation Program (STP) Obligation
Schedule (for construction):
SFMTA will submit the STP LTP federal obligation request for the construction phase by
November 2014 and receive the obligation approval before the anticipated advertisement date (March 2015), which is in advance of the regional obligation deadline, April 30, 2015.

| Project Name: | Eddy and Ellis Traffic Calming Improvement |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
| Implementing Agency: | San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency |

## COST SUMMARY BY PHASE - CURRENT REQUEST

Allocations will generally be for one phase only. Multi-phase allocations will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Enter the total cost for the phase or partial (but useful segment) phase (e.g. Islais Creek Phase 1 construction) covered by the CURRENT funding request.

Planning/Conceptual Engineering
Environmental Studies (PA\&ED)
Design Engineering (PS\&E)
R/W Activities/Acquisition
Construction
Procurement (e.g. rolling stock)


| Cost for Current Request/Phase |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total Cost | Prop K - <br> Current Request | Prop AA - <br> Current Request |
|  |  |  |
| $\$ 27,550$ | $\$ 27,550$ |  |
| $\$ 337,450$ |  | $\$ 337,450$ |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | $\$ 337,450$ |

## COST SUMMARY BY PHASE - ENTIRE PROJECT

Show total cost for ALL project phases based on best available information. Source of cost estimate (e.g. $35 \%$ design, vendor quote) is intended to help gauge the quality of the cost estimate, which should improve in reliability the farther along a project is in its development.

| Planning/Conceptual Engineering |  | Total Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Environmental Studies (PA\&ED) |  | \$ | 27,550 |
| Design Engineering (PS\&E) |  | \$ | 337,450 |
| R/W Activities/Acquisition |  |  |  |
| Construction <br> Procurement (e.g. rolling stock) |  | \$ | 1,344,925 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Total: |  | \$ | 1,709,925 |

Source of Cost Estimate

|  |
| :--- |
| SFMTA Staff Estimate |
| SFMTA Staff Estimate |
|  |
| SFMTA Staff Estimate |
|  |

12/27/13
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See next page.

Eddy and Ellis Traffic Calming Improvement



II DPW Eng \& Signal Shop

| Position | Salary Per FTE | MFB for FTE |  | Salary + MFB | Approved rate | Overhead = <br> (Salary+MFB) <br> x Approved Rate | (Fully <br> Burdened) <br> Salary + <br> MFB + <br> Overhead | FTE Ratio | Hours |  | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Electrician (7345)** | 95,905 | 54,195 | \$ | 150,100 | 0.803 | \$ 120,530 | \$ 270,630 | 0.045 | 94 | \$ | 12,230 |
| Senior Engineer (5211) | 146,952 | 75,733 | \$ | 222,685 | 0.803 | \$ 178,816 | \$ 401,501 | 0.029 | 60 | \$ | 11,582 |
| Engineer (5241) | 126,932 | 67,197 | \$ | 194,129 | 0.803 | \$ 155,886 | \$ 350,015 | 0.077 | 160 | \$ | 26,924 |
| Associate Engineer (5207) | 109,668 | 59,835 | \$ | 169,503 | 0.803 | \$ 136,111 | \$ 305,614 | 0.163 | 340 | \$ | 49,956 |
| Assistant Engineer (5203) | 94,276 | 53,744 | \$ | 148,020 | 0.803 | \$ 118,860 | \$ 266,880 | 0.058 | 120 | \$ | 15,397 |
| Total - Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.372 | 774 | \$ | 116,089 |


| III | DPW Electrical Engineering |
| :--- | :--- |
| Hour |  |
| s |  |
| 30 | Sosition |
| 156 | Enginer Engineer (5241) |
| 286 | Assistant Engineer (5203) |
| 82 | Engineer Associate I (5364) |
|  | Total |


| Overhead Rate: | 2.71 |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Base Salary | Fully <br> Burdened | FTE | Cost |
|  | $\$ 146,952$ | $\$ 398,240$ | 0.014 |
| $\$ 126,932$ | $\$ 343,986$ | 0.075 | $\$ 5,744$ |
| $\$ 94,276$ | $\$ 255,488$ | 0.138 | $\$ 25,799$ |
| $\$ 77,922$ | $\$ 211,169$ | 0.039 | $\$ 35,130$ |
|  |  | 0.266 | $\$ 74,325$ |
|  |  |  | $\$ 74$ |



* Base Salary is step 5 for each classification in effect today.
** Electricians receive a $5 \%$ premium when assigned as traffic signal electricians
*** Construction Inspectors receive a 5\% premium when acting in that capacity


## FUNDING PLAN - FOR CURRENT PROP K REQUEST

Prop K Funds Requested:


5-Year Prioritization Program Amount: \$5,093,052 (enter if appropriate)

Strategic Plan Amount for Requested FY:

## FUNDING PLAN - FOR CURRENT PROP AA REQUEST

Prop AA Funds Requested:
5-Year Prioritization Program Amount:
Strategic Plan Amount for Requested FY:


If the amount requested is inconsistent (e.g., greater than) with the Prop K/Prop AA Strategic Plan amount and/or the 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPP), provide a justification in the space below including a detailed explanation of which other project or projects will be deleted, deferred, etc. to accommodate the current request and maintain consistency with the 5YPP and/or Strategic Plan annual programming levels.

Prop K: The requested allocation requires a 5-Year Prioritization Program amendment to the Signals and Signs category to add the subject project and reprogram $\$ 27,550$ in unallocated FY 2011/12 funds from SFMTA's Raised Pavement Markers project to the subject project. See attached 5YPP amendments for details.

The Strategic Plan amount is the entire amount programmed in the Signals and Signs category in FY 2013/14 (\$4,920,000), programmed but unallocated funds from prior fiscal years $(\$ 158,675)$ and cumulative remaining programming capacity $(\$ 14,377)$.

Prop AA: The Prop AA 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPP) amount is the amount of Prop AA funds available for allocation for the subject project in Fiscal Year 2013/14. The Strategic Plan amount is the total amount of programming for the Pedestrian Safety category in Fiscal Year 2013/14, the year of the request. The proposed Strategic Plan amendment would advance $\$ 337,450$ from Fiscal Year 2014/15 to Fiscal Year 2013/14 for the subject project. See attached Prop AA Stratetgic Plan amendment for details.

Enter the funding plan for the phase or phases for which Prop K/Prop AA funds are currently being requested. Totals should match those shown on the Cost worksheet.

| Fund Source | Planned | Programmed | Allocated | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Prop AA - Pedestrian Safety |  | $\$ 337,450$ |  | $\$ 337,450$ |
| Prop K | $\$ 27,550$ |  |  | $\$ 27,550$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\$ 0$ |
|  | $\$ 365,000$ |  |  | $\$ 0$ |

Actual Prop K Leveraging - This Phase:
Expected Prop K Leveraging per Expenditure Plan
Actual Prop AA Leveraging - This Phase:
$\begin{array}{r}\$ 365,000 \\ \hline\end{array}$
Total from Cost worksheet

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority <br> <br> Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Form 
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Is Prop K/Prop AA providing local match funds for a state or federal grant?
No

|  |  | Required Local Match |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fund Source | \$ Amount | $\%$ | $\$$ |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## FUNDING PLAN - FOR ENTIRE PROJECT (ALL PHASES)

Enter the funding plan for all phases (environmental studies through construction) of the project. This section may be left blank if the current request covers all project phases. Totals should match those shown on the Cost worksheet.

| Fund Source | Planned | Programmed | Allocated | Tota |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prop AA |  | \$365,000 |  |  | \$365,000 |
| Prop K | \$169,821 |  |  |  | \$169,821 |
| Lifeline STP |  | \$1,175,104 |  |  | \$1,175,104 |
|  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |
| Total: |  | \$1,540,104 | \$1,709,925 | \$ | 1,709,925 |
| Actual Prop K Leveraging - Entire Project: Expected Prop K Leveraging per Expenditure Plan: Actual Prop AA Leveraging - Entire Project: |  | 90.07\% |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Total from Cost worksheet |  |  |
|  |  | 78.65\% |  |  |  |

## FISCAL YEAR CASH FLOW DISTRIBUTION FOR CURRENT PROP K REQUEST

Use the table below to enter the proposed cash flow distribution schedule (e.g. the maximum Prop K/Prop AA funds that are guaranteed to be available for reimbursement each fiscal year) for the current request. If the schedule is more aggressive than the Prop K/Prop AA Strategic Plan and/or 5YPP, please explain in the text box below how cash flow for other projects and programs will be slowed down to accommodate the current request without exceeding annual cash flow assumptions made in the Strategic Plan.

Prop K Funds Requested:
\$27,550

| Sponsor Request - Proposed Prop K Cash Flow Distribution Schedule |  |  |  | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fiscal Year |  | Cash Flow | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { \% Reimbursed } \\ \text { Annually } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| FY 2013/14 |  | \$27,550 | 100.00\% | \$0 |
|  |  |  | 0.00\% | \$0 |
|  |  |  | 0.00\% | \$0 |
|  |  |  | 0.00\% | \$0 |
|  |  |  | 0.00\% | \$0 |
|  | Total: | \$27,550 |  |  |

Prop AA Funds Requested:
\$337,450
Sponsor Request - Proposed Prop AA Cash Flow Distribution Schedule

| Fiscal Year | Cash Flow | \% Reimbursed <br> Annually | Balance |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| FY 2013/14 | $\$ 168,725$ | $50.00 \%$ | $(\$ 141,175)$ |
| FY $2014 / 15$ | $\$ 168,725$ | $50.00 \%$ | $(\$ 309,900)$ |
|  |  | $0.00 \%$ | $(\$ 309,900)$ |

## AUTHORITY RECOMMENDATION

This section is to be completed by Authority Staff.
Last Updated: $\square$ Resolution. No. $\square$ Res. Date: $\square$


Funding Recommended: | Prop K Allocation | Amount |
| :--- | ---: |
|  | Prop AA Allocation |
|  | $\$ 27,550$ |
|  | $\$ 337,450$ |
|  |  |
|  | Total: |

Phase:

| Environmental Studies (PA\&ED) |
| :--- |
| Design Engineering (PS\&E) |
|  |
|  |
|  |

Notes (e.g., justification for multi-phase recommendations, A multi-phase allocation for environmental studies (NEPA review) notes for multi-EP line item or multi-sponsor and design is appropriate given the concurrent nature of the work and level of environmental review anticipated.

Cash Flow Distribution Schedule by Fiscal Year (for entire allocation/appropriation)

| Source | Fiscal Year | Maximum <br> Reimbursement | $\%$ <br> Reimbursable | Balance |
| :---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Prop K EP 33 | FY 2013/14 | $\$ 27,550$ | $8.00 \%$ | $\$ 337,450$ |
| Prop AA - Ped | FY 2013/14 | $\$ 168,725$ | $46.00 \%$ | $\$ 168,725$ |
| Prop AA - Ped | FY 2014/15 | $\$ 168,725$ | $46.00 \%$ | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |  | $0.00 \%$ | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |  | $0.00 \%$ | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |  | $100 \%$ |  |

Cash Flow Distribution Schedule by Fiscal Year \& Phase (for entire allocation/appropriation)

| Source | Fiscal Year | Phase | Maximum <br> Reimbursement | Cumulative \% <br> Reimbursable | Balance |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Prop K/Prop AA Fund Expiration Date: $\qquad$ Eligible expenses must be incurred prior to this date.

## AUTHORITY RECOMMENDATION

This section is to be completed by Authority Staff.


Deliverables:

| 1. Upon completion of design (anticipated December 2014), provide evidence of $100 \%$ design (e.g. copy of |
| :--- |
| certifications page). |

## Special Conditions:

1. The recommended Prop AA allocation is contingent upon a Prop AA Strategic Plan amendment. See attached Strategic Plan amendment for details.
2. The recommended Prop K allocation is contingent upon a Signals and Signs Prop K 5YPP amendment. See attached 5YPP amendment for details.
3. The Transportation Authority will only reimburse SFMTA up to the approved overhead multiplier rate for the fiscal year that SFMTA incurs charges.

## Notes:



| Prop K proportion of <br> expenditures - this phase: | $7.55 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Prop AA proportion of <br> expenditures - this phase: | $92.45 \%$ |

Sub-project detail? Yes If yes, see next page(s) for sub-project detail.
SFCTA Project Reviewer: $\quad$ P\&PD $\square$

## Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Form

## AUTHORITY RECOMMENDATION

This section is to be completed by Authority Staff.


## SUB-PROJECT DETAIL

Sub-Project \# from SGA: $\quad$\begin{tabular}{r}
Name: <br>

| Supervisorial District(s): |
| :--- | | Eddy and Ellis Traffic Calming Improvement Project - |
| :--- |
| Environmental | <br>

\hline
\end{tabular}

Cash Flow Distribution Schedule by Fiscal Year \& Phase (for entire allocation/appropriation)

| Source | Fiscal Year | Phase | Maximum Reimbursement | Cumulative \% <br> Reimbursable | Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prop K EP 33 | FY 2013/14 | Environmental Studies (PA\&ED) | \$27,550 | 100\% | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | 100\% | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | 100\% | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | 100\% | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | 100\% | \$0 |
|  |  | Total: | \$27,550 |  |  |

Sub-Project \# from SGA:

| Name: | Eddy and Ellis Traffic Calming Improvement Project - <br> Design |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Supervisorial District(s): | $\mathbf{6}$ |

Cash Flow Distribution Schedule by Fiscal Year \& Phase (for entire allocation/appropriation)

| Source | Fiscal Year |  | Maximum <br> Reimbursement | Cumulative \% <br> Reimbursable | Balance |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |$|$| Phase |
| :--- |

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority <br> Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Form 
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## MAPS AND DRAWINGS

Insert or attach files of maps, drawings, photos of current conditions, photo compositions, etc. to support understanding of the project scope and evaluation of how geographic diversity was considered in the project prioritization process.

This text box and the blue header may be deleted to better accommodate any graphics.


# San Francisco County Transportation Authority <br> Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Form 

## FY of Allocation Action:

2013/14

|  | Current Prop K Request: | $\$$ |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Current Prop AA Request: | $\$$ | 27,550 |
|  |  | 337,450 |

Project Name:
Eddy and Ellis Traffic Calming Improvement

Implementing Agency:
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

## Signatures

By signing below, we the undersigned verify that: 1) the requested sales tax and/or vehicle registration fee revenues shall be used to supplement and under no circumstance replace existing local revenues used for transportation purposes and 2) the requested sales tax and/or vehicle registration fee funds will not be used to cover expenses incurred prior to Authority Board approval of the allocation.
Project Manager
Name (typed): Manito Velasco
Title: Project Manager
Phone:
Fax:
Email: Manito.Velasco@sfmta.com
Address: FL, SF, CA 94103
Signature:
Date:

## Grants Section Contact

Joel C. Goldberg
Manager, Capital Procurement and Management
(415) 701-4499
$\qquad$

Joel.Goldberg@sfmta.com

1 South Van Ness Avenue, 8th
FL, SF, CA 94103
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

| District | Project Name | Phase | Sponsor | $\begin{gathered} \text { Fiscal Year } \\ 2012 / 13 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fiscal Year } \\ & 2013 / 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Fiscal Year } \\ 2014 / 15 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Fiscal Year } \\ 2015 / 16 \end{gathered}$ | Fiscal Year 2016/17 | 5-Year Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Street Repair and Reconstruction

| Funds Available in Category |  |  |  | \$ | 4,358,888 | \$ | 2,210,086 | \$ | 2,210,086 | \$ | 2,210,086 | \$ | 2,210,086 | \$ | 13,199,232 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 9th Street Pavement Renovation | CON | DPW | \$ | 2,216,627 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 2,216,627 |
| 4 | 28th Ave Pavement Renovation | CON | DPW | \$ | 1,174,260 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 1,174,260 |
| 3 | Chinatown Broadway $\mathrm{St}^{4}$ | DES | DPW |  |  | \$ | 650,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 650,000 |
| 9,10,11 | Mansell Corridor Improvement Project ${ }^{4}$ | DES | SFMTA |  |  | \$ | 202,228 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 202,228 |
| 9,10,11 | Mansell Corridor Improvement Project ${ }^{4}$ | CON | RPD/SFMTA |  |  |  |  | \$ | 2,325,624 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 2,325,624 |
| 5,6 | McAllister St Pavement Renovation | CON | DPW |  |  | \$ | 2,210,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 2,210,000 |
| 8 | Dolores St Pavement Renovation | CON | DPW |  |  |  |  | \$ | 2,210,000 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 2,210,000 |
| 6 | Brannan St Pavement Renovation | CON | DPW |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 2,210,000 | \$ | 2,210,000 |
| Subtotal Programmed <br> (Over)/Under <br> Cumulative Remaining |  |  |  | \$ | 3,390,887 | \$ | 3,062,228 | \$ | 4,535,624 | \$ | - | \$ | 2,210,000 | \$ | 13,198,739 |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 968,001 | \$ | $(852,142)$ | \$ | $(2,325,538)$ | \$ | 2,210,086 | \$ | 86 | \$ | 493 |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 968,001 | \$ | 115,859 | \$ | $(2,209,680)$ | \$ | 407 | s | 493 | \$ | 493 |

Pedestrian Safety

| Funds Available in Category |  |  |  | \$ | 2,179,444 | \$ | 1,105,043 | \$ | 1,105,043 | \$ | 1,105,043 | \$ | 1,105,043 | \$ | 6,599,616 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Arguello Gap Closure ${ }^{2}$ | CON | Presidio |  |  | \$ | 350,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 350,000 |
| 6 | Mid-Block Crossing on Natoma/8th ${ }^{4}$ | DES | SFMTA |  |  | \$ | 55,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 55,000 |
| 6 | Mid-Block Crossing on Natoma/8th ${ }^{4}$ | CON | SFMTA |  |  |  |  | \$ | 310,000 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 310,000 |
| 6 | Ellis/Eddy Traffic Calming Improvement ${ }^{4,5}$ | DES | SFMTA |  |  | \$ | 337,450 | \$ | 27,550 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 365,000 |
| 2,5 | Franklin St Pedestrian Signals ${ }^{4}$ | DES | SFMTA |  |  | \$ | 830,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 830,000 |
| 2,5 | Franklin St Pedestrian Signals ${ }^{4}$ | CON | SFMTA |  |  |  |  | \$ | 720,000 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 720,000 |
| 1,2,3,5,6,8,9 | Pedestrian Countdown Signals | CON | SFMTA | \$ | 1,683,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 1,683,000 |
| 7 | Winston Drive Pedestrian Improments Phase ${ }^{6}$ | DES | SFSU |  | 146,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -146,000 |
| 7 | Winston Drive Pedestrian Improvements Phase ${ }^{6}$ | CON | SESU |  |  |  | 1,004,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,004,000 |
| 6 | McAllister St Campus Streetscape ${ }^{3}$ | DES | UC Hastings |  |  | \$ | 83,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 83,000 |
| 6 | McAllister St Campus Streetscape | CON | UC Hastings |  |  |  |  | \$ | 717,000 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 717,000 |
| 2,5 | Gough St Pedestrian Signals | DES/CON | SFMTA |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 337,000 |  |  | \$ | 337,000 |
| Subtotal Programmed (Over)/Under Cumulative Remaining |  |  |  | \$ | 1,683,000 | \$ | 1,655,450 | \$ | 1,774,550 | \$ | 337,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 5,450,000 |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 496,444 | \$ | $(550,407)$ | \$ | $(669,507)$ | \$ | 768,043 | \$ | 1,105,043 | \$ | 1,149,616 |
|  |  |  |  | s | 496,444 | \$ | $(53,963)$ | s | $(723,470)$ | s | 44,573 | \$ | 1,149,616 | \$ | 1,149,616 |

Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements

| Funds Available in Category |  |  |  | \$ | 2,179,444 | \$ | 1,105,043 | \$ | 1,105,043 | \$ | 1,105,043 | \$ | 1,105,043 | \$ | 6,599,616 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3,6 | Civic Center BART/Muni Bike Station | CON | BART |  |  | \$ | 248,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 248,000 |
| 7 | Phelan Loop Pedestrian Connector ${ }^{4}$ | DES | City College/ SFMTA |  |  | \$ | 65,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 65,000 |
| 7 | Phelan Loop Pedestrian Connector ${ }^{4}$ | CON | City College/ SFMTA |  |  |  |  | \$ | 872,000 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 872,000 |
| 10 | Hunters View Phase II: Transit Connection ${ }^{4}$ | DES | MOH |  |  | \$ | 195,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 195,000 |
| 10 | Hunters View Phase II: Transit Connection | CON | MOH |  |  | \$ | 1,649,994 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 1,649,994 |
| 9 | 24th St Mission SW BART Plaza and Pedestrian Improvements ${ }^{1}$ | CON | BART | \$ | 1,217,811 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 1,217,811 |
| TBD | Rapid Network Placeholder | DES/CON | SFMTA |  |  |  |  | \$ | 287,000 | \$ | 965,000 | \$ | 1,099,919 | \$ | 2,351,919 |
| Subtotal Programmed <br> (Over)/Under <br> Cumulative Remaining |  |  |  | \$ | 1,217,811 | \$ | 2,157,994 | \$ | 1,159,000 | \$ | 965,000 | \$ | 1,099,919 | \$ | 6,599,724 |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 961,633 | \$ | $(1,052,951)$ | \$ | $(53,957)$ | \$ | 140,043 | \$ | 5,124 | \$ | (108) |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 961,633 | \$ | $(91,318)$ | \$ | $(145,275)$ | \$ | $(5,232)$ | \$ | (108) | \$ | (108) |
| Total Programmed |  |  |  | \$ | 6,291,698 | \$ | 6,875,672 | \$ | 7,469,174 | \$ | 1,302,000 | \$ | 3,309,919 | \$ | 25,248,463 |
| (Over)/ Under |  |  |  | \$ | 2,426,077 | \$ | $(2,455,500)$ | \$ | $(3,049,002)$ | \$ | 3,118,172 | \$ | 1,110,253 | \$ | 1,150,000 |
| Cumulative |  |  |  | \$ | 2,426,077 | \$ | $(29,423)$ | \$ | $(3,078,425)$ | \$ | 39,747 | \$ | 1,150,000 |  |  |


|  | Allocated |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Pending |

## NOTES:

${ }^{1}$ 24th St Mission SW BART Plaza and Pedestrian Improvements: Reprogrammed $\$ 1,217,811$ in Fiscal Year 2013/14 funds to Fiscal Year 2012/13. Cash flow remains as $100 \%$ in Fiscal Year 2013/14. (Res. 13-30, approved 01.29.2013)
${ }^{2}$ Arguello Gap Closure: Reprogrammed design funds $(\$ 75,000)$ from Fiscal Year 2012/13 to Fiscal Year 2013/14 for use on the construction phase and delayed cash flow by one fiscal year. (Res. 14-05, approved 07.23.2013)
${ }^{3}$ McAllister St Campus Streetscape: Reprogrammed design funds ( $\$ 83,000$ ) from Fiscal Year 2014/15 to Fiscal Year 2013/14. Changed cash flow to $100 \%$ in Fiscal Year 2013/14. (Res. 14-20, approved 09.24.2013)
${ }^{4}$ Fiscal Year 2013/14 Strategic Plan amendment. (Res. 14-26, approved 10.22.2013)
Chinatown Broadway St: Reprogrammed design funds $(\$ 650,000)$ from Fiscal Year 2012/13 to Fiscal Year 2013/14
Mid-block Crossing on Minna/7th \& Natoma/8th: Removed Minna/7th from project scope and reduced programming by half of the design funds ( $\$ 55,000$ ) and half of the construction funds ( $\$ 310,000$ ); reprogrammed Natoma/8th design funds from Fiscal Year 2012/13 to Fiscal Year 2013/14 and construction funds from Fiscal Year 2013/14 to Fiscal Year 2014/15.
Ellis/Eddy Traffic Calming Improvement: Added project with $\$ 365,000$ in Fiscal Year 2014/15 for design.
Franklin St Pedestrian Signals: Reprogrammed design funds ( $\$ 830,000$ ) from Fiscal Year Fiscal Year 2012/13 to Fiscal Year 2013/14 and construction funds ( $\$ 720,000$ ) from Fiscal Year 2013/14 to Fiscal Year 2014/15.
Phelan Loop Pedestrian Connector: Added SFMTA as an eligible project sponsor and reprogrammed design funds from Fiscal Year 2012/13 to Fiscal Year 2013/14 and construction funds from Fiscal Year 2013/14 to Fiscal Year 2014/15.
Hunters View Phase II: Transit Connection: Reprogrammed the project design funds ( $\$ 195,000$ ) from Fiscal Year 2012/13 to Fiscal Year 2013/14. Mansell Corridor Improvement Project: Added SFMTA as an eligible project sponsor.
${ }^{5}$ Ellis/Eddy Traffic Calming Improvements: Reprogrammed $\$ 337,450$ from Fiscal Year 2014/15 to Fiscal Year 2013/14. (Res. 14-XX, approved MO.DA.YEAR)
${ }^{6}$ Winston Drive Pedestrian Improvements: Project cancelled by sponsor. Funds subject to competitive call for project in January 2014.

| District | Project Name | Phase | Sponsor | Fiscal Year $2012 / 13$ | Fiscal Year $2013 / 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fiscal Year } \\ & \text { 2014/15 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fiscal Year } \\ & \text { 2015/16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Fiscal Year } \\ 2016 / 17 \end{gathered}$ | 5-Year Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Street Repair and Reconstruction


Pedestrian Safety

| Funds Available in Category |  |  |  | \$ | 2,179,444 | \$ | $\begin{array}{r\|} \hline 1,105,043 \\ \hline 350,000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | \$ | 1,105,043 | \$ | 1,105,043 | \$ | 1,105,043 | \$ | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 6,599,616 \\ \hline 350,000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Arguello Gap Closure ${ }^{2}$ | CON | Presidio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Mid-Block Crossing on Natoma/8th ${ }^{4}$ | DES | SFMTA |  |  | \$ | 15,000 | \$ | 40,000 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 55,000 |
| 6 | Mid-Block Crossing on Natoma/8th ${ }^{4}$ | CON | SFMTA |  |  |  |  | \$ | 310,000 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 310,000 |
| 6 | Ellis/Eddy Traffic Calming ${ }^{4,5}$ | DES | SFMTA |  |  | \$ | 168,725 | \$ | 196,275 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 365,000 |
| 2,5 | Franklin St Pedestrian Signals ${ }^{4}$ | DES | SFMTA |  |  | \$ | 830,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 830,000 |
| 2,5 | Franklin St Pedestrian Signals ${ }^{4}$ | CON | SFMTA |  |  |  |  | \$ | 720,000 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 720,000 |
| 1,2,3,5,6,8,9 | Pedestrian Countdown Signals | CON | SFMTA | \$ | 841,500 | \$ | 841,500 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 1,683,000 |
| 7 | Winston Drive Pedestrian Imprens Phase ${ }^{6}$ | DES | SFSU | \$ | 97,333 | \$ | 48,667 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 146,000 |
| 7 | Winston Dive Pedestrian Improvements Phase ${ }^{6}$ | CON | SESU |  |  |  | 334,000 |  | 197,000 |  | 204,000 |  | 269,000 |  | 1,004,000 |
| 6 | McAllister St Campus Streetscape ${ }^{3}$ | DES | UC Hastings |  |  | \$ | 83,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 83,000 |
| 6 | McAllister St Campus Streetscape | CON | UC Hastings |  |  |  |  | \$ | 717,000 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 717,000 |
| 2,5 | Gough St Pedestrian Signals | DES/CON | SFMTA |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 337,000 |  |  | \$ | 337,000 |
| Subtotal Programmed <br> (Over)/Under <br> Cumulative Remaining |  |  |  | \$ | 841,500 | \$ | 2,288,225 | \$ | 1,983,275 | \$ | 337,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 5,450,000 |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 1,337,944 | \$ | $(1,183,182)$ | \$ | $(878,232)$ | \$ | 768,043 | \$ | 1,105,043 | \$ | 1,149,616 |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 1,337,944 | \$ | 154,762 | \$ | $(723,470)$ | \$ | 44,573 | \$ | 1,149,616 | \$ | 1,149,616 |

Transit Reliability and Mobility Improvements


| Allocated <br> Pending |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| NOTES: |  |
| ${ }^{1}$ 24th St Mission SW BART Plaza and Pedestrian Improvements: Reprogrammed $\$ 1,217,811$ in Fiscal Year 2013/14 funds to Fiscal Year 2012/13. Cash flow remains as $100 \%$ in Fiscal Year 2013/14. (Res. 13-30, approved 01.29.2013) |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ Arguello Gap Closure: Reprogrammed design funds (\$75,000) from Fiscal Year 2012/13 to Fiscal Year 2013/14 for use on the construction phase and delayed cash flow by one fiscal year. (Res. 14-05, approved 07.23.2013) |  |
| ${ }^{3}$ McAllister St Campus Streetscape: Reprogrammed design funds (\$83,000) from Fiscal Year 2014/15 to Fiscal Year 2013/14. Changed cash flow to $100 \%$ in Fiscal Year 2013/14. (Res. 14-20, approved 09.24.2013) |  |
| ${ }^{4}$ Fiscal Year 2013/14 Strategic Plan amendment. (Res. 14-26, approved 10.22.2013) |  |
| Chinatown Broadway St: Reprogrammed design funds (\$650,000) from Fiscal Year 2012/13 to Fiscal Year 2013/14. |  |
| Mid-block Crossing on Minna/7th \& Natoma/8th: Removed Minna/7th from project scope and reduced programming by half of the design funds ( $\$ 55,000$ ) and half of the construction funds $(\$ 310,000)$; reprogrammed Natoma/8th design funds from Fiscal Year 2012/13 to Fiscal Year 2013/14 and construction funds from Fiscal Year 2013/14 to Fiscal Year 2014/15. |  |
| Ellis/Eddy Traffic Calming Improvement: Added project with \$365,000 in Fiscal Year 2014/15 for design. |  |
| Franklin St Pedestrian Signals: Reprogrammed design funds ( $\$ 830,000$ ) from Fiscal Year Fiscal Year 2012/13 to Fiscal Year 2013/14 and construction funds ( $\$ 720,000$ ) from Fiscal Year 2013/14 to Fiscal Year 2014/15. |  |
| Phelan Loop Pedestrian Connector: Added SFMTA as an eligible project sponsor and reprogrammed design funds from Fiscal Year 2012/13 to Fiscal Year 2013/14 and construction funds from Fiscal Year 2013/14 to Fiscal Year 2014/15. |  |
| Hunters View Phase II: Transit Connection: Reprogrammed the project design funds $(\$ 195,000)$ from Fiscal Year 2012/13 to Fiscal Year 2013/14. Mansell Corridor Improvement Project: Added SFMTA as an eligible project sponsor. |  |
|  |  |
| ${ }^{5}$ Ellis/Eddy Traffic Calming Improvements: Reprogrammed \$337,450 from Fiscal Year 2014/15 to Fiscal Year 2013/14. (Res. 14-XX, approved MO.DA.YEAR) |  |
| ${ }^{6}$ Winston Drive Pedestrian Improvements: Project cancelled by sponsor. Funds subject to competitive call for project in January 2014. |  |

E6-61
2009 Prop K 5YPP - Program of Projects
Signals and Signs (EP 33)
Programming and Allocations T
Programming and Allocations To-date
ndment for February Board Approval
Last Update: January 16, 2014

| Agency | Project Name | Phase | Status | Fiscal Year |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 2009/10 | 2010/11 | 2011/12 | 2012/13 | 2013/14 |  |
| Pavement Markings |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SFMTA | Raised Pavement Markers ${ }^{15}$ | PROC, CON | Programmed |  |  | \$22,450 |  |  | \$22,450 |
| SFMTA | Eddy and Ellis Traffic Calming Improvement ${ }^{15}$ | ENV | Pending |  |  |  |  | \$27,550 | \$27,550 |
| Sign Upgrades |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SFMTA | Traffic Sign Graffiti and Upgrade Program | PROC, CON | Allocated | \$250,000 |  |  |  |  | \$250,000 |
| SFMTA | Traffic Sign Graffiti Program | CON | Allocated |  | \$320,000 |  |  |  | \$320,000 |
| SFMTA | 15 MPH Zone Near Schools ${ }^{2}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { PLAN, } \\ \text { PS\&E, CON } \end{array}$ | Allocated |  |  | \$321,700 |  |  | \$321,700 |
| SFMTA | Traffic Sign Graffiti Program ${ }^{7}$ | CON | Programmed |  |  | \$0 |  |  | \$0 |
| SFMTA | Traffic Sign Graffiti Program ${ }^{7}$ | CON | Programmed |  |  |  | \$136,000 |  | \$136,000 |
| SFMTA | Traffic Sign Graffiti Program | CON | Programmed |  |  |  |  | \$320,000 | \$320,000 |
| Traffic Signal Upgrades |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SFMTA | Golden Gate Signal Upgrade (Divisadero to Franklin) | PS\&E | Programmed |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |
| SFMTA | Golden Gate Signal Upgrade (Divisadero to Franklin) | CON | Programmed |  |  |  |  | \$1,800,000 | \$1,800,000 |
| SFMTA | Highway 1 Signal Upgrades (Lake St. to Junipero Serra) Phase 3 | PS\&E, CON | Programmed |  |  |  |  | \$2,750,000 | \$2,750,000 |
| SFMTA | Light Rail Corridor Signal and Pavement Marking Improvements ${ }^{1}$ | PS\&E CON, PROC | Allocated |  | \$98,755 |  |  |  | \$98,755 |
| SFMTA | Bayshore Blvd and Paul Ave - Traffic Signal Upgrade ${ }^{6}$ | CON | Allocated |  |  |  | \$58,340 |  | \$58,340 |
| SFMTA | Joint Opportunity Fund (Conduits for future signals) ${ }^{1}$ | TBD | Programmed | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \$0 |


| 뎅 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { た్ర } \\ & \text { ते } \\ & \underset{\sim}{8} \end{aligned}$ |  | $$ | \＆ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 8_{2} \\ & \delta_{2} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{n} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\left.\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 8 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \infty \\ \infty \end{gathered} \right\rvert\,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 8 \\ 8 \\ 0 \\ \hat{\omega} \\ \stackrel{n}{\infty} \end{array}$ |  |  | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 8. } \\ & \text { ô } \\ & \underset{\sim}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & \text { on } \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & \underset{\&}{f} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{ \pm}{ \pm}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 <br> 8 <br>  <br> N <br> N <br> Hin |  |  | 8 8 0 N N |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{m}{\mathrm{~N}} \\ \stackrel{\sim}{\mathrm{~N}} \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { in } \\ & \text { i } \\ & \underset{\&}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { in } \\ & \text { ふे } \\ & \text { むे } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{L}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{y}{\mathrm{y}} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 8 \\ 8 \\ 0_{0} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \omega \\ n \end{array}$ |  | 8 8 ut I． |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\theta$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{i}{N} \\ \underset{\sim}{n} \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { of } \\ & \text { of } \\ & 0 \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ |  | $$ | $$ |  | 8 8 f ¢ |
| $\exists$ $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{3}$ $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{3}$ $\stackrel{1}{2}$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 8_{8} \\ \mathbf{n}_{2} \\ \stackrel{n}{n} \\ \sim \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{2} \\ & \stackrel{\text { Bin }}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\infty$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 己 } \\ & \text { E } \\ & \text { EIIN } \\ & \text { E0 } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ت} \\ & 0 \\ & \tilde{U} \\ & 0 \\ & \text { O } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ت } \\ & \text { E } \\ & \text { E } \\ & \text { ED } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | ت ¢ ¢ \％ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \ddot{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{\text { ch}}{\approx} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\rho}{\mathrm{F}}$ | $\stackrel{\rho}{\mathrm{F}}$ | $\hat{\sim}$ | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { T1 } \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\rho}{\mathrm{F}}$ | $$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ \underset{\sim}{\omega} \\ \varrho \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & Z \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & Z \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Z | $\frac{\text { 霏 }}{}$ | $\begin{aligned} & Z \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{1} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Z} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hat{10} \\ & \dot{\omega} \\ & \hat{\omega} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | N |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Masonic Avenue Signal Upgrade 4，5， 14 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { U. } \\ & \text { ت0. } \\ & \text { C } \end{aligned}$ | $\sum_{\infty}^{E}$ | $\sum_{\substack{E}}^{\mathbb{E}}$ | $\sum_{\substack{E}}^{\mathbb{E}}$ | $\sum_{\substack{E}}^{\mathbb{E}}$ | $\sum_{\substack{E}}^{\mathbb{E}}$ | $\sum_{\substack{E}}^{\mathbb{E}}$ | $\sum_{\substack{E}}^{E}$ | $\stackrel{E}{E}$ | 荡 | $\sum_{\infty}^{E}$ |  | $\sum_{\substack{E}}^{\mathbb{E}}$ | $\mid$ | $\sum_{\underset{\sim}{E}}^{E}$ | $\sum_{\substack{E}}^{E}$ | $\sum_{\infty}^{E}$ | $\sum_{\infty}^{E}$ | $\sum_{i=3}^{E}$ | $\sum_{\substack{E}}^{E}$ |


| Agency | Project Name | Phase | Status | Fiscal Year |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 2009/10 | 2010/11 | 2011/12 | 2012/13 | 2013/14 |  |
| SFMTA | Franklin Street Signal Upgrades Conduit ${ }^{9}$ | PS\&E | Allocated |  |  |  | \$715,447 |  | \$715,447 |
| SFMTA | New Pedestrian Signals ${ }^{13}$ | CON | Allocated |  |  |  | \$432,139 |  | \$432,139 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Programmed in 5YPP |  |  |  | \$250,000 | \$735,755 | \$1,381,845 | \$3,444,831 | \$7,481,550 | \$13,293,981 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Allocated and Pending in 5YPP |  |  |  | \$250,000 | \$735,755 | \$1,359,170 | \$3,351,736 | \$286,550 | \$5,983,211 |
| Total Deobligated in 5YPP |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | (\$42,905) | \$0 | (\$42,905) |
| Total Unallocated in 5YPP |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0 | \$22,675 | \$136,000 | \$7,195,000 | \$7,353,675 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Programmed in Amended 2009 Strategic Plan * |  |  |  | \$750,000 | \$370,000 | \$3,270,000 | \$370,000 | \$4,920,000 | \$9,680,000 |
| Deobligated from Prior 5YPP Cycles ** |  |  |  | \$3,628,358 |  |  |  |  | \$3,628,358 |
| Cumulative Remaining Programming Capacity |  |  |  | \$4,128,358 | \$3,762,603 | \$5,650,758 | \$2,575,927 | \$14,377 | \$14,377 |

* The 2009 Strategic Plan was adopted on July 28, 2009 through Res. 10-07.
** "Deobligated from prior 5YPP cycles" includes deobligations from allocations approved prior to the current 5YPP period, excluding deobligations incorporated in the first 2009 Strategic Plan amendment, as of December 31, 2012.

> Programmed

| Programmed |
| :--- |
| Pending Alloca |

Pending Allocation/ Appropriation
$\$ 50,000$ in FY 2009/10 Joint Opportunity funds and $\$ 48,755$ in FY 2010/11 Joint Opportunity funds were redirected to FY 2010/11 for the Light Rail Corridor Signal and Pavement Marking Improvements project.
${ }^{2} 5$ YPP amendment to add the 15 MPH Zones Near Schools project and reprogram $\$ 321,700$ Fiscal Year 2007/08 Prop K funds deobligated from Park Presidio 19th Ave Signal Upgrades, Phase II (Res. 08-60, Project 133.907013) (Res. 11-63, 06.28.11). The deobligation is included in the "Deobligated from prior 5YPP cycles."
5YPP amendment to add the Mission-Geneva Transit and Pedestrain Improvements project and reprogram \$60,470 Fiscal Year 2007/08 Prop K funds deobligated from Park Presidio 19th Ave Signal Upgrades, Phase II (Res. 08-60, Project 133.907013) (Res. 11-63, 06.28.11). The deobligation is included in the "Deobligated from prior 5YPP cycles."
${ }^{4} 5 \mathrm{YPP}$ amendment (Res. 12-08, 07.19.11) to reprogram $\$ 3,273,534$ in cost savings deobligated from Park Presidio/19th Ave Signal Upgrades, Phase II (Res. 08-60, Project 133.907013) to the following projects, in addition to the two aforementioned projects approved by the Authority Board in June 2011:
$\$ 2,275,000$ in Fiscal Year 2013/14 for the design phase of Van Ness BRT SFgo signal improvements.
$\$ 300,000$ in Fiscal Year 2011/12 for 19th Avenue Accessible Pedestrian Signals.
$\$ 129,000$ in Fiscal Year 2011/12 for the Sunset Boulevard Pedestrian Improvement project.
$\$ 187,364$ in Fiscal Year 2011/12 for the Masonic Avenue Signal Upgrades project. An additional $\$ 52,636$ was shifted from the construction phase of Contract 33 for a total programmed amount of $\$ 240,000$.
(Resolution 12-52, 03.27.12).

E6-64


# San Francisco County Transportation Authority Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Form 

| FY of Allocation Action: | 2013/14 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: | Curb Ramps |  |  |  |
| Implementing Agency: | Department of Public Works |  |  |  |
|  | EXPENDITURE PLAN INFORMATION |  |  |  |
| Prop K Category: | C. Street \& Traffic Safety |  |  | Gray cells will |
| Prop K Subcategory: | iv. Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements |  |  | filled in. |
| Prop K EP Project/Program: | d. Curb Ramps |  |  |  |
| Prop K EP Line Number (Primary): Prop K Other EP Line Numbers: | 41 Current Prop K Request: | \$ 867,000 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Prop AA Category: | Pedestrian Safety |  |  |  |
|  | Current Prop AA Request: | \$ | - |  |
|  | Supervisorial District(s): |  | , 11 |  |

## SCOPE

Sufficient scope detail should be provided to allow Authority staff to evaluate the reasonableness of the proposed budget and schedule. If there are prior allocations for the same project, provide an update on progress. Describe any outreach activities included in the scope. Long scopes may be provided in a separate Word file. Maps, drawings, etc. should be provided on Worksheet 7-Maps.or by inserting additional worksheets.

Project sponsors shall provide a brief explanation of how the project was prioritized for funding, highlighting: 1) project benefits, 2) level of public input into the prioritization process, and 3) whether the project is included in any adopted plans, including Prop K/Prop AA 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPPs). Justify any inconsistencies with the adopted Prop K/Prop AA Strategic Plans and/or relevant 5YPPs.

Indicate whether work is to be performed by outside consultants and/or by force account.

The Department of Public Works (DPW) requests $\$ 867,000$ in Fiscal Year 2013/14 Prop K funds for the Curb Ramp program. See background and scope details starting on the following page.

## San Francisco County Transportation Authority Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Form

## Background

Curb ramp construction meets the City's obligations under federal and state accessibility statues, regulations and policies to provide sidewalks and crosswalks that are readily and easily usable by people with disabilities.

A fundamental provision of Title II of the Federal Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requires state and local governments to provide curb ramps. The U.S. Department of Justice (USDOJ) ADA Handbook states: "The legislative history of Title II of the ADA makes it clear that, under Title II, local and state governments are required to provide curb cuts on public streets... (and)... the employment, transportation, and public accommodation sections of ... [the ADA] would be meaningless if people who use wheelchairs were not afforded the opportunity to travel on and between streets." ADA Section 35.151(e) establishes accessibility requirements for new construction and alterations, requiring all newly constructed and altered streets, roads, or highways must contain curb ramps or other sloped areas at any intersection having curbs or other barriers to entry from a street level pedestrian walkway. Paragraph (d)(2) clarifies the application of the general requirement for program accessibility to the provision of curb ramps at existing crosswalks.

## Scope

The scope of this work is the construction and reconstruction of accessible curb ramps and related sidewalk, curb, gutter, and roadway work in the public right-of-way. Based on historical cost data and condition assumptions, DPW anticipates the work funded by $\$ 867,000$ in Prop K sales tax funds will construct 99 curb ramps at 15 intersections. DPW will use $\$ 146,723$ from Fiscal Year 2013/14 Transportation Development Act, Article 3 funds for planning and design of these curb ramps. This brings the total project cost to $\$ 1,013,723$ for an average per ramp cost of $\$ 10,240(\$ 8,758$ construction and $\$ 1,482$ for planning and design). The average cost per ramp has increased by $\$ 119$ because of topographic and infrastructure obstacles. Prop $K$ funds will be used for preparation of bid documents and construction activities.

## Implementation

DPW, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), and the Mayor's Office on Disability (MOD) developed a preliminary list of curb return locations requiring curb ramp upgrades during the planning phase of this project (see page 5). The planning phase for the subject project will be completed during the third quarter of Fiscal Year 2013/14. The list includes locations identified through citizen complaints and requests. This year it does not include locations identified during Federal Transit Administration audits of Muni Key stations or other locations identified by Muni. DPW will advertise for competitive bids on the construction contract, and provide construction management and design support during the construction phase.

## Outreach

An equitability assessment of curb ramps throughout the city was conducted in May 2009 to assist in the prioritization process. The distribution of recently constructed curb ramps was compared to the distribution of missing or poorly constructed curb ramps. The assessment clearly indicated that the southern part of the city, in particular Supervisorial Districts 7, 8, 10 and 11 have historically had fewer curb ramps constructed, and also have a greater need for accessible curb ramps. This is in great part due to the lack of complaints and requests received. To promote awareness about how people with disabilities can request curb ramps, DPW and the Mayor's Office on Disability (MOD) began a targeted public outreach campaign in June 2009. These efforts included creation and distribution of several thousand $4 " \times 6$ " trilingual postcards with information on how to request curb ramps through 3-1-1. The postcards were included in a para-transit mailing in 2009. Another mailing to para-transit riders went out in Fall 2013 with the postcard size increased to 5 " $\times 7$ ". 3-1-1 request postcards are regularly provided to each Supervisor's office, and at key public events, including ADA Anniversary celebrations, Mayor's Disability Council meetings, and Department of Public Health "Community Vital Signs" workshop for hospitals, clinics and community health organizations. Postcards are also distributed to people with disabilities at disability cultural community events. DPW employees hand out postcards during regular field work when asked about curb ramps or general accessibility issues.

From June 2010 through June 2011, DPW displayed 400 interior and 20 exterior ads on Citywide bus lines, with heavy concentration in the southeast sector of the City. Another ad campaign is planned for FY 13-14. Continual monthly advertisements in neighborhood newspapers (i.e., San Francisco Bay View, Central City Extra, Potrero View, etc.) started in the Fall of 2013. MOD ran an ad in the November 2012 voter information booklet encouraging people to request curb ramps. Public Works participated in the 2013 Sunday Streets in the Tenderloin, Western Addition and Excelsior neighborhoods as well as the Visitacion Valley Festival at the end of October 2013 and plan on continuing next season.

## San Francisco County Transportation Authority Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Form

Citizens can request curb ramps through the City's 3-1-1 Customer Service line which provides translators in multiple languages. All requests and comments received are reviewed by DPW's ADA/Disability Access Coordinator to ensure that curb ramps are installed according to the priorities under the ADA Transition Plan for Curb Ramps and Sidewalks.
Locations that serve government facilities, transportation services, and commercial corridors are being evaluated in the ADA Transition Plan prioritization process to help increase representation of curb ramp work in the southern part of the city.

## Prioritization

The attached Curb Ramp Locations Priority Matrix, consistent with the ADA requirements and Department of Public Works (DPW) policies, requires that locations where citizens with disabilities request curb ramps be given the highest priority under the City's obligations to provide accessibility to its programs, services, activities, and facilities.

The subject request is consistent with programming levels for Fiscal Year 2013/14 in the 5-Year Prioritization Program for the Curb Ramps category of the Prop K Expenditure Plan.
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Form

|  |  | ADA 35.151(d)(2) Geospatial Proximity Priorities |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | A | B | c | D | E |
| SFDPW Order 169,270 Curb Ramp Installation Priorities (Condition) | Priority Description | Locations of Citizen Complaints I Requests (ADA Title II Program Access) | Locations Serving Govern-ment Offices \& Public Facilities | Locations Serving Transport-ation | Locations Serving Places of Public Accom modation, Employers | Locations Serving Other Areas |
| 1 | Non-conforming Curb Ramp or Landing / High condition score | A1 | B1 | C1 | D1 | E1 |
| 2 | No Curb Ramp Yet Constructed | A2 | B2 | C2 | D2 | E2 |
| 3 | Single or NonDirectional Curb Ramp, Two Can Fit | A3 | B3 | C3 | D3 | E3 |
| 4 | Extremely Difficult Physical or Legal Constraints | A4 | B4 | C4 | D4 | E4 |
| 5 | Curb Ramp Does Not Meet Current Standards, lower condition score | A5 | B5 | C5 | D5 | E5 |

Preliminary FY 2013/14 Locations - Reconstructed/ Retrofitted Curb Ramps


Note: This is a preliminary list. During detail design, unforeseen conditions may present itself and affect the number and location of returns and ramps designed and constructed

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority <br> Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Form 

FY 2013/14

## Project Name:

Implementing Agency:

## Curb Ramps

## Department of Public Works

## ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE

| Type : | Categorically Exempt, Class 1C | Completion Date <br> $(\mathrm{mm} / \mathrm{dd} / \mathrm{yy})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Existing |  |
|  |  |  |

## PROJECT DELIVERY MILESTONES

Enter dates for ALL project phases, not just for the current request. Use July 1 as the start of the fiscal year. Use 1, 2, 3, 4 to denote quarters and XXXX/XX for the fiscal year (e.g. 2010/11). Additional schedule detail may be provided in the text box below.

Planning/Conceptual Engineering
Environmental Studies (PA\&ED)
R/W Activities/Acquisition
Design Engineering (PS\&E)
Prepare Bid Documents
Advertise Construction
Start Construction (e.g., Award Contract)
Procurement (e.g. rolling stock)
Project Completion (i.e., Open for Use)
Project Closeout (i.e., final expenses incurred)

| Start Date |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Quarter | Fiscal Year |
| 2 | $2013 / 14$ |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| 3 | $2013 / 14$ |
| 4 | $2013 / 14$ |
| 1 | $2014 / 15$ |
| 2 | $2014 / 15$ |
|  |  |
| N/A | N/A |
| 2 | $2015 / 16$ |


| End Date |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Quarter | Fiscal Year |
| 3 | $2013 / 14$ |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| 4 | $2013 / 14$ |
| 4 | $2013 / 14$ |
| N/A | N/A |
| N/A | N/A |
|  |  |
| 2 | $2015 / 16$ |
| 3 | $2015 / 16$ |

## SCHEDULE COORDINATION/NOTES

Provide project delivery milestones for each sub-project in the current request and a schedule for public involvement, if appropriate. For planning efforts, provide start/end dates by task here or in the scope (Tab 1). Describe coordination with other project schedules or external deadlines (e.g., obligation deadlines) that impact the project schedule, if relevant.

No coordination issues or external deadlines are likely to affect this year's curb ramp installations.

## Estimated project benchmark dates

Planning phase complete:
Design phase complete:
Start of construction:
Project completion:

March 2014
May 2014
December 2014
December 2015

## San Francisco County Transportation Authority Prop K/Prop AA Sales Allocation Request Form

## FY 2013/14

## Project Name:

Curb Ramps
Implementing Agency:
Department of Public Works

## COST SUMMARY BY PHASE - CURRENT REQUEST

Allocations will generally be for one phase only. Multi-phase allocations will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
Enter the total cost for the phase or partial (but useful segment) phase (e.g. Islais Creek Phase 1 construction) covered by the CURRENT funding request.

Planning/Conceptual Engineering
Environmental Studies (PA\&ED)
Design Engineering (PS\&E)
R/W Activities/Acquisition
Construction
Procurement (e.g. rolling stock)


| Cost for Current Request/Phase |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Cost | Prop K - <br> Current Request | Prop AA - <br> Current Request |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| $\$$ | 867,000 | $\$$ |
|  | 867,000 |  |
|  |  |  |
| $\$ 867,000$ | $\$ 867,000$ |  |

## COST SUMMARY BY PHASE - ENTIRE PROJECT

Show total cost for ALL project phases based on best available information. Source of cost estimate (e.g. $35 \%$ design, vendor quote) is intended to help gauge the quality of the cost estimate, which should improve in reliability the farther along a project is in its development.


## MAJOR LINE ITEM BUDGET

1. Provide a major line item budget, with subtotals by task and phase. More detail is required the farther along the project is in the development phase. Planning studies should provide task-level budget information.
2. Requests for project development should include preliminary estimates for later phases such as construction.
3. Support costs and contingencies should be called out in each phase, as appropriate. Provide both dollar amounts and \% (e.g. \% of construction) for support costs and contingencies.
4. For work to be performed by agency staff rather than consultants, provide base rate, overhead multiplier, and fully burdened rates by position with FTE (full-time equivalent) ratio. A sample format is provided below.
5. For construction costs, please include budget details. A sample format is provided below. Please note if work will be performed through a contract.
6. For any contract work, please provide the LBE/SBE/DBE goals as applicable to the contract.

| Prop K Fiscal Year 2013/14 Allocation Request/Cost Summary by Phase |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | :--- |
| Item | \% of <br> Construction | Cost | Notes * |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering | $3 \%$ | $\$ 20,008$ | Funded by TDA; Preliminary location selection, <br> identify utility conflicts, NOI, subsidewalk <br> basement investigation |
| Design Engineering (PS\&E) | $19 \%$ | $\$ 126,715$ | Funded by TDA; Survey, drafting, engineering <br> design, PS\&E |
| Construction Contract | $100 \%$ | $\$ 666,923$ | Funded by Prop K FY 13/14 |
| Construction Contingency | $10 \%$ | $\$ 66,692$ | Funded by Prop K FY 13/14 |
| Construction Management | $15 \%$ | $\$ 100,038$ | Funded by Prop K FY 13/14 |
| Construction Design Support Services | $5 \%$ | $\$ 33,346$ | Funded by Prop K FY 13/14 |
|  |  |  |  |

* TDA = California Transportation Development Act Article 3 funds
\$146,723 TDA Total
\$867,000 Prop K FY 13/14 Total


## Total Construction Cost for 99 Curb Ramps:

\$1,013,723
Unit Cost: \$10,240

DPW Labor Cost Breakdown for Prop K funded Construction Management and Construction Design Support Services FTE = Full Time Equivalent
Overhead Multiplier $\mathbf{=} 2.59$
Construction Management

|  | Unburdened <br> Hrly Rate | Overhead <br> Multiplier | Fully Burdened <br> Hrly Rate | Total Hrs | FTE Ratio | Amount |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Position | $\$$ | 70.650 | 2.59 | $\$$ | 182.98 | 60 | 0.03 |
| Senior Engineer (5211) | $\$$ | 45.763 | 2.59 | $\$$ | 118,979 |  |  |
| Construction Inspector (6318) | $\$$ | 30.675 | 2.59 | $\$$ | 79.45 | 751 | 0.36 |
| Sr. Clerk Typist (1426) |  |  |  |  | 89,059 |  |  |
|  |  |  | 811 | 0.39 | $\$ 100,038$ |  |  |

## Construction Design Support Services

|  | Unburdened <br> Hrly Rate | Overhead <br> Multiplier | Fully Burdened <br> Hrly Rate | Total Hrs | FTE Ratio | Amount |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Position | $\$$ | 70.650 | 2.59 | $\$$ | 182.98 | 3 | 0.00 | $\$ 49$ |
| Senior Engineer (5211) | $\$$ | 61.025 | 2.59 | $\$$ | 158.05 | 40 | 0.02 | $\$ 0,322$ |
| Engineer (5241) | $\$$ | 45.325 | 2.59 | $\$$ | 117.39 | 226 | 0.11 | $\$ 26,475$ |
| Assistant Engineer (5203) | $\$$ | 30.675 | 2.59 | $\$$ | 79.45 | 0 | 0.00 | $\$$ |
| Sr. Clerk Typist (1426) |  |  |  |  | 269 | 0.13 | $\$ 33,346$ |  |

# San Francisco County Transportation Authority Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Form 

| $F Y$ | $2013 / 14$ |
| :--- | :--- |

## Project Name:

Curb Ramps

## FUNDING PLAN - FOR CURRENT PROP K REQUEST

Prop K Funds Requested:


5-Year Prioritization Program Amount: $\square$ (enter if appropriate)

Strategic Plan Amount for Requested FY:
\$868,166

## FUNDING PLAN - FOR CURRENT PROP AA REQUEST

Prop AA Funds Requested:


5-Year Prioritization Program Amount:


Strategic Plan Amount for Requested FY: $\square$
If the amount requested is inconsistent (e.g., greater than) with the Prop K/Prop AA Strategic Plan amount and/or the 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPP), provide a justification in the space below including a detailed explanation of which other project or projects will be deleted, deferred, etc. to accommodate the current request and maintain consistency with the 5YPP and/or Strategic Plan annual programming levels.

The 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPP) amount is the amount of Prop K funds available for allocation in Fiscal Year 2013/14 in the 5YPP for Curb Ramps.

The Strategic Plan amount is the amount programmed in the entire Curb Ramp category in Fiscal Year 2013/14, including $\$ 867,000$ in Fiscal Year 2013/14 funds and $\$ 1,166$ in cumulative remaining capacity.

Enter the funding plan for the phase or phases for which Prop K/Prop AA funds are currently being requested. Totals should match those shown on the Cost worksheet.

| Fund Source | Planned | Programmed | Allocated | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Prop K sales tax |  |  | $\$ 87,000$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\$ 867,000$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\$ 0$ |

Actual Prop K Leveraging - This Phase:

| $0.00 \%$ |
| ---: |
| $45.45 \%$ |

\$867,000
Total from Cost worksheet

## San Francisco County Transportation Authority Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Form

Is Prop K/Prop AA providing local match funds for a state or federal grant?

|  |  | Required Local Match |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Fund Source | \$ Amount | $\%$ | \$ |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## FUNDING PLAN - FOR ENTIRE PROJECT (ALL PHASES)

Enter the funding plan for all phases (environmental studies through construction) of the project. This section may be left blank if the current request covers all project phases. Totals should match those shown on the Cost worksheet.

| Fund Source | Planned | Programmed | Allocated | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Prop K sales tax |  | $\$ 867,000$ |  | $\$ 867,000$ |
| Transportation Development Act (TDA) |  | $\$ 146,723$ |  | $\$ 146,723$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\$ 1,013,723$ |

## FISCAL YEAR CASH FLOW DISTRIBUTION FOR CURRENT PROP K REQUEST

Use the table below to enter the proposed cash flow distribution schedule (e.g. the maximum Prop K/Prop AA funds that are guaranteed to be available for reimbursement each fiscal year) for the current request. If the schedule is more aggressive than the Prop K/Prop AA Strategic Plan and/or 5YPP, please explain in the text box below how cash flow for other projects and programs will be slowed down to accommodate the current request without exceeding annual cash flow assumptions made in the Strategic Plan.

Prop K Funds Requested:
\$867,000
Sponsor Request - Proposed Prop K Cash Flow Distribution Schedule

| Fiscal Year | Cash Flow | \% Reimbursed <br> Annually | Balance |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| FY 2013/14 | $\$ 26,010$ | $3.00 \%$ | $\$ 840,990$ |
| FY 2014/15 | $\$ 840,990$ | $97.00 \%$ | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  | $0.00 \%$ | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  | $0.00 \%$ | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  | $0.00 \%$ | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |  |  |

Prop AA Funds Requested:
\$0
Sponsor Request - Proposed Prop AA Cash Flow Distribution Schedule

| Fiscal Year | Cash Flow | \% Reimbursed <br> Annually | Balance |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Total: | $\$ 0$ |  |

## San Francisco County Transportation Authority <br> Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Form

AUTHORITY RECOMMENDATION
This section is to be completed by Authority Staff.
Last Updated: $\quad 1 / 17 / 2013$ Resolution. No. $\square$ Res. Date: $\square$
Project Name: Curb Ramps


Notes (e.g., justification for multi-phase recommendations, notes for multi-EP line item or multi-sponsor recommendations):

Cash Flow Distribution Schedule by Fiscal Year (for entire allocation/appropriation)

| Source | Fiscal Year | Maximum <br> Reimbursement | $\%$ <br> Reimbursable | Balance |
| :---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Prop K EP 41 | FY 2013/14 | $\$ 26,010$ | $3 \%$ | $\$ 840,990$ |
| Prop K EP 41 | FY 2014/15 | $\$ 840,990$ | $97 \%$ | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |  | $0 \%$ | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |  | $0 \%$ | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |  | $0 \%$ | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |  | $100 \%$ |  |

Cash Flow Distribution Schedule by Fiscal Year \& Phase (for entire allocation/appropriation)

| Source | Fiscal Year | Phase | Maximum <br> Reimbursement | Cumulative \% <br> Reimbursable | Balance |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Prop K EP 41 | FY 2013/14 | Construction | $\$ 26,010$ | $3 \%$ | $\$ 840,990$ |
| Prop K EP 41 | FY 2014/15 | Construction | $\$ 840,990$ | $100 \%$ | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |  |  | $100 \%$ | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |  |  | $100 \%$ | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |  |  | $100 \%$ | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  | Total: | $\$ 867,000$ |  |  |

## San Francisco County Transportation Authority <br> Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Form

AUTHORITY RECOMMENDATION
This section is to be completed by Authority Staff.

| Last Updated: | 1/17/2013 | Resolution. No. | Res. Date: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: | Ramps |  |  |

Implementing Agency:Department of Public Works


## Deliverables:

| 1. Quarterly progress reports shall provide the number of curb ramps constructed the preceeding quarter. |
| :--- |
| 2. Upon project completion, provide a GIS map and shapefiles of completed curb ramp locations that are |
| compatible with the Authority's GIS software. |
| 4. Upon project completion, provide 2-3 digital photos of after conditions. |

## Special Conditions:

1. DPW may not incur expenses for the construction phase until Transportation Authority staff releases the funds $(\$ 867,000)$ pending receipt of evidence of completion of design (e.g. copy of certifications page) and provision of a list of curb ramp locations and corresponding supervisorial districts that were designed and will be advertised for construction. See Deliverable \#1.
2. $\qquad$
Notes:


| Prop K proportion of <br> expenditures - this phase: | $100.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Prop AA proportion of <br> expenditures - this phase: | $0.00 \%$ |



## San Francisco County Transportation Authority <br> Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Form

| FY of Allocation Action: | 2013/14 | Current Prop K Request: | \$ | 867,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Current Prop AA Request: | \$ |  |

Project Name:
Curb Ramps

Implementing Agency:
Department of Public Works

## Signatures

By signing below, we the undersigned verify that: 1) the requested sales tax and/or vehicle registration fee revenues shall be used to supplement and under no circumstance replace existing local revenues used for transportation purposes and 2) the requested sales tax and/or vehicle registration fee funds will not be used to cover expenses incurred prior to Authority Board approval of the allocation.

| Project Manager | Grants Section Contact |
| :---: | :---: |
| Name (typed): Ken Spielman | Rachel Alonso |
| Title: Project Manager | Administrative Analyst |
| Phone: (415)437-7002 | 415.554.4890 |
| Fax: |  |
| Email: kenneth.spielman@sfdpw.org | $\underline{\text { rachel.alonso@sfdpw.org }}$ |
| 1680 Mission Street, 4th floor, San Address: Francisco, CA, 94103 | 1 Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room 340 San Francisco, CA 94102 |
| Signature: |  |
| Date: |  |


[^0]:    1 Acronyms include SFMTA (San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency) and DPW (San Francisco Department of Public Works).
    ${ }^{2}$ EP stands for Expenditure Plan.

[^1]:    $$
    \square
    $$

    Masonic Ave Signal Upgrade
    Description
    ヨヨコーゴ

    Performed
    Contra
    Contractor
    N／A
    Purchase Or $\begin{array}{r}\text { Cost－} \\ \text { Estimate } \\ \$ 637,067 \\ \$ 63,707 \\ \$ 20,000 \\ \$ 2,000 \\ \$ 33,771 \\ \$ 95,507 \\ \$ 8,000 \\ \$ 16,000 \\ \$ 5,000 \\ \$ 12,804 \\ \$ 74,675 \\ \$ 29,000 \\ \$ 997,531 \\ \$ 998,000 \\ \$ 739,000 \\ \hline \$ 259,000 \\ \hline\end{array}$
    Cost
    $\$ 205,000$
    Cost
    $\$ 205,000$

    ## Perfomed by SFMTA，DPW

    $$
    \begin{aligned}
    & \text { N/A } \\
    & \text { Purchase Order }
    \end{aligned}
    $$

    PG\&E, DTIS, SFMTA

    $$
    \begin{aligned}
    & \text { PG\&E, DTIS, SFMTA } \\
    & \text { DPW (Bureau of Engineering) } \\
    & \text { DPW (Bureau of Construction Mgmt) } \\
    & \text { DPW (Bureau of Construction Mgmt) } \\
    & \text { DPW (Bureau of Construction Mgmt) }
    \end{aligned}
    $$ DPW（Bureau of Construction Mgmt）

    $$
    \begin{aligned}
    & \text { DPW(Streets \& Highways) } \\
    & \text { SFMTA Eng \& Shops }
    \end{aligned}
    $$

    $$
    5 \%
    $$

    Budget Detail Reference
    苞

    | $\$ 1,203,000$ |
    | :--- |

    
    
    
    

