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## BACKGROUND

On the February 16, 2017 Planning Commission hearing, an informational presentation will be provided on the Annual Interagency Plan Implementation Committee (IPIC) Report. Planning staff is required to provide the Commission with an informational on IPIC every year (Admin Code Article 36).

The IPIC Report provides status updates of the implementation of recently approved Area Plans (Rincon Hill, Market Octavia, Eastern Neighborhoods, Transit Center District, Balboa Park and Visitacion valley); the Report describes how revenue from Area Plan based impact fees will be used in furthering the goals of the respective Area Plans.

## AREA PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

The IPIC process is administered by the Department's Plan Implementation Group. This group helps to turn the visions from the City's recently-adopted Area Plans into built improvements, working with community members, development project sponsors, and City agencies. The Plan Implementation Group works with other City agencies to identify funding, pursue grants, and identify opportunities for project coordination to help make these projects a reality. In order to carry out its responsibilities to implement the Area Plan Community Improvements Programs, the Plan Implementation Group convenes and chairs the Interagency Plan Implementation Committee. In addition, the Plan Implementation Group:

- Staffs Area Plan Community Advisory Committees to obtain community input on plan implementation and use of impact fee revenue;
- Coordinates specific capital projects with other agencies to ensure implementation;
- Coordinates with other agencies to develop and implement community and economic development programs pursuant to the Area Plans;
- Monitors the progress of Area Plan implementation.


## IPIC ANNUAL REPORT

In October of 2006, the Board of Supervisors passed legislation to formalize interagency coordination for Area Plan-identified community improvements through the establishment of the IPIC. The Planning Department, as designated by the legislation, has taken the lead in coordinating the IPIC. This report required by Article 36 of the Administrative Code.

The IPIC makes recommendations for Area Plans with respect to capital project implementation, funding and programming, intra-departmental collaboration, coordinates with the Area Plans' Citizen Advisory Committees (CACs), and produces this annual report.

## Attachments:
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## INTRODUCTION

The Interagency Plan Implementation Committee (IPIC) is comprised of City staff members from various City Departments who are collectively charged with implementing capital improvements in connection with six Area Plans: Eastern Neighborhoods (comprised of separate Area Plans for East Soma, Western Soma, Mission, Central Waterfront, and Showplace Square / Potrero), Market Octavia, Rincon Hill, Transit Center District, Balboa Park and Visitacion Valley (including the Executive Park Subarea Plan and the Schlage Lock Master Development). Developments within these area plan boundaries are required to pay impact fees specific to the respective Plan geographies. As the Area Plans were created to encourage and guide additional development, the capital projects associated with them are to serve the new growth.

IPIC is the forum through which the City allocates impact fee revenue generated in the respective areas. For each Plan Area, this report provides a description of trends and issues
experienced in the past year and lays out expenditure plans for the next five years.

While each of the Plan Areas originally identified different funding categories unique to their community planning processes, these categories have recently been consolidated with the adoption of the Citywide Needs Assessment and Citywide Nexus Study.

In general, each Plan Area funds projects under the following five categories: (1) Transit, (2) Complete Streets, (3) Recreation and Open Space); (4) Child Care, and (5) Administration. There are a nuances and slight differences within several of the Plan Area. For example, Eastern Neighborhoods, includes a "Affordable Housing" category for portions of the Mission and South of Market; The Transit Center does not include a Child Care category, and the Visitacion Valley fees are not applied to Transit.

## MAP OF PLAN AREAS



## HIGHLIGHTS FROM THE PAST YEAR

## IPIC Guidelines

This year, the Committee sought to establish clearer procedural guidelines regarding the Committee's activities and prioritization and decision-making processes.. Given the dramatic increase in fee revenue and growing demand on capital agencies to provide expected community improvements over the last two years, members felt there was a need to establish more formal procedures for tracking, implementing, and prioritizing capital projects funded by Plan Area impact fees. As the Department that leads the IPIC, Planning led a series of in-house workshops on how to improve and formalize decision-making around fee revenue appropriation. The IPIC explored the process by which capital plans within the Plan Areas are identified and then selected for funding. The Committee considered the dynamics of balancing community's desires with the need to deliver projects efficiently through the implementing agencies. The IPIC also explored what type of infrastructure projects were at the core of Area Plans' goals and objectives. The results were the creation of a formalized process by which an exhaustive list of known infrastructure projects are assembled (through either the Mini-Capital Plans or Community Improvement Master List) and then later used for potential impact fee funding. The resulting IPIC Guidelines sets forth a Mission Statement, a set list of deliverables and annual calendar; it provides guidelines on IPIC membership, decision making, and administrative procedures.

## Mini-Capital Plans

The City's Bi-Annual Capital Plan 2016-2025 included Mini-Capital Plans for Eastern Neighborhoods and Market Octavia Plan Areas. These Capital Plans looked beyond capital projects financed through the impact fees to consider the entire capital needs for the two plan areas.

For this year's Bi-Annual Capital Plan (2018-2027) MiniCapital Plans were revised for Eastern Neighborhoods and Market Octavia, and created for Balboa Park, Visitacion Valley, Transit Center, and Rincon Hill. These Plans identify broad range of capital projects that have either been proposed through the original implementation documents, subsequent public realm plans, or proposed through community engagement and Citizen Advisory Committees.

The Mini-Capital Plans look at the list of capital projects through two lens: one lens looks at an unconstrained exhaustive list of all known proposed projects; a second lens looks at a pared down list of only those projects that were identified in the Area Plan's original approvals. The intent is to gage the success of delivering project as originally set forth.

## OVERVIEW OF IPIC AND THE IPIC PROCESS

## IPIC Background

In October of 2006, the Board of Supervisors passed legislation to formalize interagency coordination for Area Plan-identified community improvements through the establishment of the IPIC (Article 36 of the San Francisco Administrative Code). The IPIC was developed "to provide mechanisms that will enhance the participation in the preparation and implementation of the Community Improvements Plans and Implementation Programs by the various City departments, offices, and agencies that will be responsible for their implementation and provide a means by which the various parties interested in realization of the Community Improvements Plans and Implementation Programs can remain informed about and provide input to and support for their implementation." ${ }^{1}$

The IPIC makes recommendations for Area Plans with respect to capital project implementation, funding and programming, intra-departmental collaboration, coordinates with the Area Plans' Citizen Advisory Committees (CACs), and produces this annual report. The IPIC is chaired by Planning Department and includes representatives from the Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA), Department of Public Works (DPW), Recreation and Parks Department (RPD), San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA), the Human Services Agency (HSA), Mayor's Office of Finance, and Capital Planning Committee, among other agencies.

The goals of the IPIC annual process include:

1. Identify all funding sources for infrastructure projects to serve the impacts of new growth in Area Plans.
2. Program expected revenues over 10 years, including revenue generated from development impact fees, so that priority plan area capital projects can be completed.

This report serves as the annual progress report required by Administrative Code Article 36.4. ${ }^{\text {² }}$

## IPIC Budget Cycle Process

The IPIC began meeting in October 2007 to develop capital plans for each Area Plan. The IPIC meets annually to update the capital plans for each Area Plan and make recommendations for impact fee expenditure. This section briefly discusses the IPIC process and coordination with the city budget cycle.

Each summer, the Planning Department generates updated development impact fee projections based on known development projects and an assumed rate of planned growth. The updated projections provide a working 'budget' for each area plan. The IPIC and the CACs review the previous year's Board endorsed capital plan and updated impact fee projections. The IPIC then updates the status of ongoing projects, grants, and future projects.

Over the fall, the IPIC and the CACs (or other means of community input) develop an area-specific expenditure plans for each plan area through an iterative process. The community provides recommendations regarding community priorities. The IPIC provides input on project readiness and the next steps to move community priorities forward. The expenditure plans are fiscally constrained by projected revenue for each area.

Every other year, the expenditure plans and related minicapital plans for each area are incorporated into the City's 10 Year Capital Plan. Staff presents the IPIC recommendations annually to the Capital Planning Committee, Planning Commission, and Land Use and Transportation Committee of the Board of Supervisors. These hearings are generally held before agencies submit their budgets for Board of Supervisor approval.

Upon agency budget approval, impact fee funds can be drawn for projects identified in the IPIC report as funds become available.

[^0]
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## AREA PLAN REPORTS

The following Chapters provide summaries each Plan Area.
Each of these Chapters provides a brief description of highlights from the previous year, a five-year expenditure plan related to Area Plan fee revenue, a map of capital projects, and a list and description of capital projects moving forward.

## BALBOA PARK

## Background and Highlights

The Balboa Park Station Area Plan was adopted in the spring of 2009. The plan calls for a number of major transportation and public realm infrastructure improvements and 1,780 new housing units. With few of those units built or proposed, the Planning Department projects approximately $\$ 1,068,000$ in impact fee revenue in the Plan Area over thro ugh Fiscal Year 2022.

The plan is not expected to generate a significant amount of impact fee revenue in the next five years for two reasons. First, a significant majority of expected new development is proposed on publicly-owned land, which prioritizes affordable housing. Second, the plan area contains generally few privately owned developable sites. The current projections are based both on actual development projects in the pipeline and expected additional development project in future years.

Despite the minimal impact fees, the Balboa Park Station Area continues to be in great need of safety, access and mobility improvements for pedestrians, cyclists and transit riders. To that end, several transportation projects were recently completed while still more are in planning. In addition to transportation projects, the City College Facilities Master Plan, the Balboa Reservoir, and the Upper Yard project are all in planning.

The Balboa Park Mini Capital Plan, which includes an exhaustive list of all known proposed capital projects that further the Balboa Park Plan, identifies a $\$ 43,931,000$ funding gap. This funding gap is reduced to $\$ 12,085,000$, when the list of project is constrained to only those that are specifically identified in the Balboa Park Plan.

Due to the several on going planning efforts and projected funding needs beyond the scale of projected impact fees, the IPIC recommends keeping funds flexible in the immediate future and unprogrammed further out. IPIC funds could help close funding gaps or help complete projects. However, assessing the best use of funds will not be possible until current development projects and planning efforts are closer to completion.

## COMPLETED PROJECTS

» Unity Plaza, adjacent to the City College Bus Terminal, opened in 2016. The plaza is landscaped with trees, benches, lighting, and special paving. It includes a play structure and pedestrian connection to City College. This project did not use impact fees. (Map No. 1)
» The Ocean \& Geneva Corridor Design plan recommends streetscape improvements in the short-term along Ocean Avenue (west of Phelan) and in the long-term on Ocean and Geneva Avenues (east of Phelan). The short-term improvements, including pedestrian seating, new trees, greening, and new sidewalk surfaces were completed in 2016. This project did not use impact fees. (Map No. 2)
" Supervisor Yee's office, in coordination with DPW, the SFPUC and the Library completed the Ingleside Library Garden project in 2015, behind the library at Ocean and Plymouth Avenues. The pocket park includes a variety of interactive play areas and seating. This project did not use impact fees. (Map No. 3)
» Several Balboa Park Station Area and Plaza improvements were completed in recent years. In 2016, SFMTA widened sidewalks, added transit lanes, and installed a landscaped median along Geneva Avenue. In prior years, SFMTA installed real-time transit arrival signs; an accessible boarding platform for the J and K; signal-protected pedestrian crossings and other improvements in the Station Area. (Map No. 4)

## TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROJECTS

» The SFCTA and Caltrans are currently studying I-280 Interchange Modifications at Balboa Park, including potential traffic operations and impacts of southbound ramp alternatives at Ocean Avenue and of closing the northbound on ramp at Geneva Avenue.
» The Ocean and Geneva Corridor Design from Phelan to San Jose, includes concept designs to improve pedestrian and cyclist safety along Ocean Avenue; re-align the Ocean/Phelan/Geneva intersection; and add bike facilities, pedestrian bulbouts, trees, and lighting. (Map No. 5)
» A number of additional Balboa Park Station and Plaza improvements are ready for construction, including flashing beacons, signal upgrades, and track work.
» BART is planning construction for the Balboa Park Eastside Connection: a pedestrian bridge to connect the new Westside Walkway to Muni light rail boarding areas. Construction is expected to begin in 2017.
» With the San Jose - Geneva Intersection Study, SFMTA is developing short, medium and long-term transit access and safety improvements at San Jose and Geneva. The study will complement BART's Station Modernization, the Upper Yard and the Geneva Car Barn projects. The study scope was developed in coordination with the Balboa Park Station Citizens Advisory Committee (BPSCAC) and District 11 Supervisor Avalos' office.

## DEVELOPMENT PLANNING PROJECTS

» The Balboa Reservoir Site is a 17-acre parking lot owned by the SFPUC and leased to City College. It lies between Ocean Avenue residences, City College, Riordan High School and the Westwood Park neighborhood. As part of San Francisco's Public Lands for Housing program, a mix of affordable housing, market-rate aciohousing and open space is planned for the site. A community design process will begin after the RFP process to select a developer team concludes in 2017.
» MOHCD is working with SFMTA and BART to develop affordable housing on the Upper Yard of Balboa Park Station. A developer team was chosen in 2016, community design workshops are expected in early 2017.
» The City College Facilities Master Plan provides a strategy for facilities improvement, renovation, replacement, and new construction over the next 10 years in order to support the Education Master Plan. Public meetings and ongoing dialogue will continue until the plan's expected completion in 2017.
» In 2004, SFMTA transferred ownership of the Geneva Car Barn to the Recreation and Park Department. In partnership with the non-profit Friends of the Geneva Office Building \& Powerhouse, RPD is planning the restoration of the car barn into an arts space with galleries, classrooms, and community facilities. RPD is expecting to release an RFP in 2017. (Map No. 6)
Balboa Park ${ }_{\text {-IPIC Revenue and Expenditure Plan - January } 2017}$


| 11 | Plaza ( $n$-Kind) | IN-KIND | s | 1,579,000 | \$ | - | s | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | s | - | \$ | . | \$ | - | \$ | 1,579,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,579,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | Transit: Planning and Near-Term Improvements Enhancement Fund | MTA | s | . | \$ | 36,000 | s | 52,000 | s | 64,000 | \$ | . | s | - |  |  | \$ | 116,000 | \$ | 152,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 152,000 |
| 13 | Transit Unprogrammed |  | s | - | \$ | - | s | - | s | - | \$ | 14,000 | \$ | 14,000 | s | 14,000 | \$ | 42,000 | \$ | 42,000 | \$ | 70,000 | \$ | 112,000 |
| 14 | Category Expenditure Sub Total |  | \$ | 1,579,000 | \$ | 36,000 | \$ | 52,000 | \$ | 64,000 | \$ | 14,000 | \$ | 14,000 | \$ | 14,000 | \$ | 3,302,000 | \$ | 4,917,000 | \$ | 70,000 | \$ | 264,000 |
| 15 | Category Balance Per Year |  |  |  | \$ | $(36,000)$ | \$ | $(19,000)$ | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | Category Cummulative Balance Per Year |  | \$ | 52,000 | \$ | 19,000 | \$ | - | \$ | . | \$ | . | \$ | . | \$ | . | \$ | . | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |
| Complete Streets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | Pedestrain, Bicycle and Streetscape Enhancement Fund | DPW | \$ | . | s | 103,000 | s | 157,000 | \$ | 187,000 | \$ | - | s | - |  |  | \$ | 344,000 | \$ | 447,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 447,000 |
| 18 | Complete Streets Unprogrammed |  | s | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | s | - | s | 39,000 | s | 39,000 | s | 39,000 | \$ | 117,000 | \$ | 117,000 | \$ | 195,000 | \$ | 312,000 |
| 19 | Category Expenditure Sub Total |  | \$ | - | \$ | 103,000 | \$ | 157,000 | \$ | 187,000 | \$ | 39,000 | \$ | 39,000 | \$ | 39,000 | \$ | 422,000 | \$ | 525,000 | \$ | 195,000 | \$ | 759,000 |
| 20 | Category Balance Per Year |  |  |  | \$ | $(102,000)$ | \$ | $(61,000)$ | \$ | . | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | Category Cummulative Balance Per Year |  | \$ | 142,000 | \$ | 61,000 | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ | $\cdot$ | \$ |  | \$ | $\cdot$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recreation and Open Space |  |  | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 22 | Recreation and Open Space: Planning and Near-Term Improvements Fund | RPD | s | . | s | 79,000 | \$ | 120,000 | s | 143,000 | s |  | \$ | - |  |  | \$ | 263,000 | \$ | 342,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 342,000 |
| 23 | Recreation and Open Space Unprogrammed |  | \$ | . | \$ | - | s | . | s | - | S | 30,000 | s | 30,000 | \$ | 30,000 | \$ | 90,000 | \$ | 90,000 | \$ | 150,000 | \$ | 240,000 |
| 24 | Category Expenditure Sub Total |  | \$ | . | \$ | 79,000 | \$ | 120,000 | \$ | 143,000 | \$ | 30,000 | \$ | 30,000 | \$ | 30,000 | \$ | 323,000 | \$ | 402,000 | \$ | 150,000 | \$ | 582,000 |
| 25 | Category Balance Per Year |  |  |  | \$ | $(78,000)$ | \$ | $(46,000)$ | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | . | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26 | Category Cummulative Balance Per Year |  | \$ | 108,000 | \$ | 46,000 | \$ | - | \$ | . | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | . |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Balboa Park ${ }_{\text {- IPIC Revenue and Expenditure Plan - January } 2017}$
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## Balboa Park Projects

1. Unity Plaza
2. Ocean \& Geneva Corridor Design
3. Ingleside Library Garden
4. Balboa Park Station Area and Plaza improvements
5. Geneva Car Barn


## BALBOA PARK

1. Ocean Avenue Streetscape Improvements
2. Unity Plaza
3. Ingelside Branch Library Garden rendering
4. Ocean Avenue streetscape improvements
5. Proposed Balboa Park gateway and longer term proposed streetscape improvements

## VISITACION VALLEY

## Background and Highlights

The Visitacion Valley Community Facilities and Infrastructure Fee and Fund was established in 2006 in anticipation of moderate to high density development at Executive Park (located immediately east of the Highway 101 at the southern San Francisco border) and in other areas within the Visitacion Valley area. Unlike most other impact fee areas, Visitacion Valley does not have a comprehensive Area Plan. Portions of Visitacion Valley are included in other plans; most notably, the Executive Park Subarea Plan, the Visitacion Valley / Schlage Lock Development Project, and the Sunnydale HOPE SF project site.

Between these three developments, a net increase of 4,800 units, 140,000 square feet of commercial/retail space, and 75,000 square feet of community space is expected; build out would occur over at least ten years. Over the next five years, the Planning Department projects approximately $\$ 15.1$ million in fee revenue and in-kind improvement value. The Planning Department, in collaboration with SFMTA, Public Works, and Recreation and Parks, has continued to engage the Visitacion Valley community to identify and prioritize projects for impact fee spending.

## SCHLAGE LOCK

In 2014, the Board of Supervisor's approved a master development for Schlage Lock. The Schlage Lock site is now proposed to include 1,679 housing units, and 46,700 square feet of retail. The Schlage Lock development will include a minimum of two interior parks, an interior street grid of public streets, and the designation of $25 \%$ of the existing on-site office building for community use. The Schlage Lock Development Agreement ("DA") stipulates that because of their commitment to these improvements, the recreation and open space portion of their Visitacion Valley fee will be waived. The Development Agreement also stipulates that the transportation portion of the fee will be specifically dedicated to transportation improvements called out in the Bi-County Transportation Study, as described below under "Complete Streets."

## SUNNYDALE HOPE SF

In January 2017, the Board of Supervisors approved a master development for Sunnydale HOPE SF. As a part of the HOPE SF Program, the entire 50 -acre Housing Authority site will be completely rebuilt over multiple phases. The project includes adding an addition of roughly 1,000 units, 60,000 gross square feet of community and retail uses, and 3.5 acres of additional parks. Like Schlage Lock, it will feature a new interior street grid integrated into Visitacion Valley's
street network. As a HOPE SF Project, a major feature of the development will be the inclusion of market rate units along with the rebuilt Housing Authority and other affordable units. While the affordable housing of the component will not be subject to the Visitacion Valley impact fees, the market rate portion will.

## COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IN 2016

Because the Visitacion Valley fee area is not a comprehensive pan area like the other fee areas, there is not a master list of expected community benefits. Therefore, the Planning Department, SFMTA, Public Works, and the Recreation and Parks Department are engaged with the Visitacion Valley community on an ongoing basis to prioritize for the use of impact fees. Per the Schlage Lock DA, the City is required to hold two community meetings in the first two years after adoption of the Schlage Lock master approvals (certified by the Board of Supervisors on May 19, 2015), for a total of four meetings. The first two meetings were held on May 30 and September 26, 2015, and were summarized in the 2016 IPIC Annual Report. The third meeting was held on July 16, 2016, and the fourth is planned for the first quarter of 2017. The City will hold at least one meeting each subsequent year after May 19, 2017. The purpose of these community meetings is to enable community input into the IPIC process and understand community priorities for the programming of projected impact fees.

During the community meeting on July 16, 2016, City staff presented a suite of specific projects that had previously been identified at the conceptual level by the community and staff as neighborhood priorities in the following categories: park and playground improvements, bike and transit improvements, McLaren Park access improvements, and intersection and pedestrian safety improvements. For each proposed project, City staff performed an initial assessment of feasibility and identified an estimated scope and budget. In addition to providing detailed feedback at the meeting, community members were invited to rank their project preferences via paper or online survey in the weeks following the meeting. A total of 95 surveys were submitted, which will be used to inform the initial round of project selection. Additional opportunities for community input will occur before any projects are selected and implemented.

## COMPLETE STREETS

Of the $\$ 6,400,000$ that is expected to be available for transportation spending between FY17 and FY 22, \$1,012,000 is expected to come from the Schlage Lock development; these funds will be earmarked specifically for Bi-County priority projects. The Bi-County Study calls for a wide range of transportation improvements in both San Francisco and San Mateo counties that would serve development
projects on both sides of the county-line. Bi-County projects include a new bus rapid transit line on Geneva Avenue and Harney Way; improvements to and possible relocation of the Bayshore CalTrain Station, connecting Harney Way with Geneva Avenue, and smaller-scale pedestrian and bicycle improvements.

The remainder of Visitacion Valley transportation funds are programmed for other complete streets line items. Based on community input collected in 2015, the complete streets projects listed below were presented by City staff and discussed at the July 2016 community workshop. Informed by community feedback at the workshop as well as the community preference ballot, City staff have continued to refine the scope of work and budget for the proposed projects. The revised project scopes will be presented at
the next community meeting in the first quarter of 2017 to confirm ongoing community support along with a projected implementation schedule based on the anticipated timing of impact fee collection.

For IPIC, revenue is proposed to be held in a flexible "Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Streetscape Enhancement Fund" in FY 18 and FY 19. This will enable the funds to be made available within the same fiscal year. In FY 18 and FY 19, $\$ 3.2$ million and $\$ 1.5$ million are expected to be available respectively. (Expenditure Plan Line Item 12)

| LOCATION | DESCRIPTION / SCOPE | ESTIMATE COST | MAP LOCATION NO. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Visitacion Avenue between Hahn \& Visitation Valley Middle School parking lot | Install sidewalk on east side of street (currently no sidewalk for access to McLaren Park) | \$450,000 | 12a |
| Elliot Street between Raymond \& Arleta | Install pedestrian staircase (improves neighborhood access and access to McLaren Park) | \$460,000 | 12 b |
| Leland Avenue @ Cora Street | Install landscaped bulbout (pedestrian safety in front of Vis Valley Boys and Girls Club) | \$240,000 | 12c |
| Blanken Avenue Tunnel (101 Underpass) | Install lighting in tunnel for pedestrian and bike safety | \$60,000 | 12d |
| Arleta Ave \& Bayshore Blvd (high injury intersection, Muni Forward corridor) | » Signal retiming <br> » New signal / signal infrastrure <br> »Striping <br> » Transit stop and bike lane configuration <br> » curb and/or pedestrian island extensions <br> » Utility relocation | \$1,500,000 | 12 e |
| Raymond, Arleta, and Teddy between Rutland and Alpha (mid-block); Tucker and Campbell at Rutland (intersection) | Install raised mid-block crosswalks connecting Visitacion Valley Greenway segments; upgrade intersection crosswalks. | \$325,000 | 12 f |
| Visitacion Avenue at McLaren Park trailhead near Visitation Valley Middle School parking lot | » Install pedestrian refuge, crosswalk, and rapid flashing beacon to connect east sidewalk to McLaren Park trailhead | \$300,000 | 12 g |

## OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION

Similar to the Transportation / Streetscape category, much of the Recreation and Open Space funds outside of Schlage Lock have been left unprogrammed. The proposed projects presented at the July 2016 community workshop are listed in Table XX; in addition to these projects, community members requested the allocation of funds for the renovation of Little Hollywood Park on Lathrop Avenue and for the conversion of the Visitacion Valley Ballfield to a soccer field. City staff is studying both proposals and will define a initial scope and budget in preparation for the next community meeting.

Similar to the Transportation category, Recreation and Open Space funding is being kept flexible in FY 18 and 19 to allow access to the funds once projects are identified. For FY 18 and $\mathrm{FY} 19, \$ 1.3 \mathrm{M}$ and 1.1 M is expected to be available respectively. (Expenditure Plan Line Item 19)

| LOCATION | DESCRIPTION / SCOPE | ESTIMATE COST | MAP LOCATION NO. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Herz Playground Renovation | "New fencing <br> "ADA access upgrades <br> " New playground equipment <br> " Replace sand w/rubber safety surface | $\$ 2.5$ million | 19 a |
| Vistacion Valley Playground <br> Renovation | "New fencing <br> "Add lighting <br> "New backstop \& furniture, ADA accessibility <br> "Natural turf replacement, new irrigation | $\$ 2.5$ million | 19 b |
| Vistacion Valley Ballfield <br> Renovation | Install landscaped bulbout (pedestrian safety in front of Vis <br> Valley Boys and Girls Club) | $\$ 1.8$ million | 19c |

Visitacion Valley -ric feverue end Expenditue Plan - Januay 2017




Visitacion Valley - IPIC Revenue and Expenditure Plan - January 2017

|  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { THROUGH FY } \\ 16 \end{gathered}$ |  | FY 17 (BUDGET YEAR) |  | FY 18 |  | FY 19 |  | FY 20 |  | FY 21 |  |  | FY 22 | FY 18 - FY 22 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL TO FY } \\ & 22 \end{aligned}$ |  | FY23-FY 27 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL TO FY } \\ & 27 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Childcare |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | Child Care Unprogrammend | HAS | \$ | - | s | 1,249,000 | s | 1,020,000 | s | 758,000 | s | 513,000 | s | 285,000 | \$ | 600,000 | \$ | 3,176,000 | \$ | 202,000 | \$ | 4,829,000 | \$ | 5,031,000 |
| 26 | Category Expenditure Sub Total |  | \$ | - | \$ | 1,249,000 | \$ | 1,020,000 | \$ | 758,000 | \$ | 513,000 | \$ | 285,000 | \$ | 600,000 | \$ | 2,576,000 | \$ | 202,000 | \$ | 4,829,000 | \$ | 5,031,000 |
| 27 | Category Balance Per Year |  |  |  | \$ | $(232,000)$ | \$ | $(9,000)$ | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | $\cdot$ | \$ | . |  |  | \$ | 78,000 |  |  |  |  |
| 28 | Category Cummulative Balance |  | \$ | 241,000 | \$ | 9,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | . | \$ | - | \$ | . | \$ | . | \$ | 78,000 |  |  |  |  |
| Visitacion Valley Library |  |  | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  | \$ | - |  |  |
|  |  | LIB | \$ | 1,328,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 1,328,000 | \$ | 1,328,000 |
| 29 | Category Expenditure Sub Total |  | \$ | 1,328,000 | \$ | . | \$ | . | \$ | - | \$ | . | \$ | . | \$ | . | \$ | 2,656,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,328,000 | \$ | 1,328,000 |
| 30 | Category Balance Per Year |  |  |  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  | \$ | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| 31 | Category Cummulative Balance |  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | . | \$ | $\cdot$ | \$ | $\cdot$ | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  | \$ | - |  |  |
| Program Administration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32 | Admin | DCP | \$ | 43,000 | \$ | 74,000 | \$ | 204,000 | s | 181,000 | s | 136,000 | s | 68,000 | s | 144,000 | \$ | 733,000 | \$ | 67,000 | \$ | 984,000 | \$ | 1,051,000 |
| 33 | Admin Transfer to Programs |  |  |  | s | 161,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 161,000 |
| 34 | Category Expenditure Sub Total |  | \$ | 43,000 | \$ | 235,000 | \$ | 204,000 | \$ | 181,000 | \$ | 136,000 | \$ | 68,000 | \$ | 144,000 | \$ | 650,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35 | Category Balance Per Year |  |  |  | \$ | 8,000 | \$ | 38,000 | \$ | - | \$ | $(13,000)$ | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 36 | Category Cummulative Balance Per Year |  | \$ | $(8,000)$ | \$ | . | \$ | 38,000 | \$ | 38,000 | \$ | 25,000 | \$ | 25,000 | \$ | 25,000 | \$ | 25,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 37 | Bi-County Transportation Improvements (per DA) | MTA | \$ | - | \$ | 570,000 | \$ | . | \$ | - | \$ | 208,000 | s | . | s | 804,000 | \$ | 1,012,000 | \$ | 573,000 |  |  |  |  |
| 38 | Schlage Lock Parks (In-Kind per DA) | IN-KIND | \$ | - | s | 670,000 | \$ | . | s | . | s | 245,000 | s | . | s | 946,000 | \$ | 1,191,000 | \$ | 420,000 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { THROUGH FY } \\ 16 \end{gathered}$ |  | FY 17 <br> (BUDGET YEAR) |  |  | FY 18 |  | FY 19 |  | FY 20 |  | FY 21 |  | FY 22 | FY 18 - FY 22 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL TO FY } \\ & 22 \end{aligned}$ |  | FY23-FY 27 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL TO FY } \\ & 27 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 39 | Revenue Totals |  | \$ | 2,111,000 | \$ | 4.864,000 | \$ | 4,839,000 | s | 3,627,000 | \$ | 2,456,000 | 5 | 1,365,000 | \$ | 2,910,000 | s | 15,197,000 | \$ | 1,361,000 | \$ | 24,894,000 | \$ | 26,255,000 |
| 40 | Total Expenditures |  | \$ | 3,295,000 | \$ | 2,710,000 | \$ | 5,809,000 | \$ | 3,627,000 | \$ | 2,456,000 | s | 1,365,000 | \$ | 2,910,000 | \$ | 16,167,000 | \$ | 1,262,000 | \$ | 24,696,000 | \$ | 25,958,000 |
| 41 | Annual Surplus (Deficit) |  |  |  | \$ | 2,154,000 | s | (970,000) | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  |  |  | \$ | 99,000 |  |  |  |  |
| 42 | Cummulate Suplus (Deficit) |  | s | (1,184,000) | \$ | 970,000 | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | s |  | s |  | \$ | 99,000 |  |  |  |  |



## Visitacion Valley Pipeline

Residential Pipeline
Net Units

- | $13-13$ |
| ---: |
| $101-500$ |
| $>500$ |

Commercial Pipeline
Net Gross Square Feet
$0 \quad<10,000$
$10,000-100,000$
$100,001-1,000,000$


## VISITACION VALLEY PROJECTS

12a. Visitacion Avenue Sidewalks to McLaren Park (poten tial project)
12b. Elliot Street Stair (potential project)
12c. Leland Bulbout (potential project)
12d. Blanken Avenue improvement (potential project)
12e. Aleta Avenue Intersection Improvements (potential project)
12f. Mid-block crossings (potential project)

12g. Pedestrian improvements at McLaren Park trailhead (potential project)
19a. Herz Playground Renovation (potential project)
19b. Visitacion Valley Playground Revovation (potential project)
29. Visitacion Valley Library (completed project)


## VISITACION VALLEY

1. Community visioning
2. Community work on the Visitacion Valley Greenway
3. Visitacion Valley Branch Library
4. Herz Playground existing condition
5. New park at Schlage Lock rendering
6. Proposed McLaren Park Trail
7. Proposed Visitacion Valley Greenway Pedestrain Crossings

## RINCON HILL

## Background and Highlights

The Rincon Hill Plan, adopted in 2005, enabled over 2,500 additional residential units in the Rincon Hill neighborhood, situated between Downtown and the Bay Bridge. Since plan adoption over 1,900 units have been built. Since last year's IPIC process two new development projects have been approved by the Planning Commission including 350 units in total. Most fee revenue expected to be generated from the Rincon Hill Area Plan has been received totaling roughly $\$ 26$ million when including in-kind improvements (this is inclusive of $\$ 6$ million that is required to be transferred to the Soma Stabilization Fund per Planning Code Section 418.5(b)(2)).

The Planning Department projects about $\$ 3.8$ million in impact fee revenue available for infrastructure impact fees over the next five years.

The Mini-Capital Plan for Rincon Hill has identified approximately $\$ 46.6$ million in total need for Rincon Hill infrastructure of which approximately $\$ 26.2$ million will be supported through impact fees leaving an unmet funding need of $\$ 20.4$ million.

## ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES

As a part of the Rincon Hill Area Plan, the City adopted the legal setting for establishing a dedicated funding source through an Infrastructure Finance District (IFD). This funding mechanism would allow the City to set aside a certain percentage of the General Fund from the property tax increment generated from the Rincon Hill development. As of FY17, the City's has not used this IFD.

## INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS

After adoption of the Rincon Hill Plan, the Planning Department drafted the Rincon Hill Streetscape Plan to guide design and implementation of the streetscape improvements in the neighborhood. The Streetscape Plan includes detailed designs for all streets segments within the Rincon Hill Plan Area. The Streetscape Plan was adopted in 2015.

Because the City has known that impact fees will not pay for the entire costs of proposed streetscape improvements, Planning, Public Works, along with the local community
has prioritized the streetscape projects as either"Priority 1 " or"Priority 2". Priority 1 projects, which include completing Harrison Street and Fremont Street, are fully funded are expected to complete design this year, with construction beginning in 2018; Priority 2 project are not fully funded.

Priority 2 projects are identified in the following Expenditure Plan, Map, and Project Descriptions, as potentially using the additional impact fee revenue. Public Works has conducted additional community outreach, including a survey, to further identify which of the Priority 2 projects to implement first.
Rincon Hill - IPIC Revenue and Expenditure Plan - January 2017

 | $\$$ | - | $\$$ | $21,079,000$ | $\$$ | - | $\$$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $31,079,000$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\$$ | 626,000 | $\$$ | $1,849,000$ | $\$$ | - | $\$$ |
|  | 129,000 | $\$$ | $1,390,000$ | $\$$ | - | $\$$ |
|  | 1,3990000000 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $3,844,000$ | $\$$ | $33,443,000$ | $\$$ |  | $\$$ |



| 626,000 | $\$$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

$000^{\prime} \varepsilon \angle S \quad \$ \quad-\quad \$ 000^{\prime} \varepsilon \angle S$

| $1,110,000$ | $\$$ | - |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $12,565,000$ | $\$$ | - |


| $5,873,000$ | $\$$ | - | $\$$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $5,873,000$ |  |  |  |




Rincon Hill Pipeline

| Residential Pipeline <br> Net Units | Commercial Pipeline <br> Net Gross Square Feet |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | $<13$ | 0 |$<10,000$



## Rincon Hill Projects

[^1]

## RINCON HILL

1. Rincon Hill Park
2. Lansing Street streetscape improvements
3. Midblock pedestrian throoughway between Fremont and Beale
4. Guy Place Mini Park rendering
5. Fremont Street streetscape improvements

6. First Street streetscape improvements
7. Harrison Streetscape improvements

## Rincon Hill Project Descriptions

MID-BLOCK PEDESTRIAN PATH BETWEEN
FREMONT AND BEALE (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 7)

Project Description:
A mid-block pedestrian path was constructed between Fremont and Beale in conjunction with the construction of 333 Fremont Street.

Project Status and Delivery:
Complete
Total Costs:
\$573,000

## IPIC Funds:

\$573,000 (In-Kind)

FIRST STREET AND HARRISON STREET - ONE RINCON IMPROVEMENTS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 8)

## Project Description:

The southernmost block of First Street and the southern side of Harrison Street between First Street and Fremont Street were improved in conjunction with the construction of One Rincon Hill. Improvements included new widened sidewalks, street tree and understory plantings, and special paving within the roadway.

Project Status and Delivery:
Complete
Total Costs:
\$1,100,000
IPIC Funds:
\$1,100,000 (In-Kind)

## HARRISON STREET - STREETSCAPE PRIORITY 1

(MAP NO. 9A / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 9)

## Project Description:

Streetscape improvements for Harrison Street would run along both side of Harrison Street from Essex Street to Embarcadero Street. Improvements include lane reduction and narrowing, sidewalk widening to 12', corner bulb-outs, pedestrian lighting and new trees.

Project Status and Delivery:
Design and engineering to be complete in 2017.
Construction expected to commence 2018.
Total Costs:
\$13,205,000
IPIC Funds:
$\$ 3,178,000$ is programmed in FY 18 for a total of $\$ 12,565,000$ of IPIC funds going to this project.

FREMONT STREET - STREETSCAPE PRIORITY 1 (MAP NO. 9B / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 9)

Project Description:
The improvements between Folsom and Harrison include widening sidewalks to 15', trees and understory planting and bulb-outs.

Project Status and Delivery:
Much of Fremont Street improvements are anticipated to be completed as part of individual development projects' conditions of approval as required by the Planning Code. The remaining Fremont Street would be constructed by Public Works as a "Priority 1 " project.

Total Costs:
These costs are included in the Harrison Street costs above.

## IPIC Funds:

See Harrison Street above.

## LIVING STREETS (SPEAR, MAIN, AND BEALE) - STREETSCAPE PRIORITY 2 (MAP 10A / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 10)

## Project Description:

The primary goal of Living Streets is to prioritize pedestrian activity and usable open space over traffic to calm traffic. The major design strategy to achieve this goal is to significantly widen pedestrian space on one side. Such space would accommodate amenities including pocket parks, seating areas, community gardens, dog runs, public art, and the like.

## Project Status and Delivery:

Living Streets have been identified as a lower priority and therefore would not be implemented until after Harrison Street and Fremont Street.

## Total Costs:

\$15,316,000

## IPIC Funds:

$\$ 5,873,000$ have been programmed as "Priority 2" projects, which could be used for these projects.

## MID-BLOCK CROSSINGS - STREETSCAPE PRIORITY 2 (MAP 10B / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 10)

## Project Description:

In working with the community, Public Works has identified mid-block pedestrian crossings on Spear, Main, and Beale and Fremont as important projects.

## Project Status and Delivery:

The Mid-Block Crossings have been identified by the community as a lower priority and therefore, given the shortage of impact fee funds, would not be implemented until after Harrison and Fremont Streets. Further prioritization with the community may occur before deciding with "Priority 2" project to move forward on after Harrison Street.

Total Costs:
\$3,695,000

## IPIC Funds:

$\$ 5,300,000$ has been programmed as "Priority 2" projects, which could be used for this project.

## GUY PLACE STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS - STREETSCAPE PRIORITY 2 (MAP 10C / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 10)

## Project Description:

Guy Place Streetscape project would complete the Lansing/ Guy streetscape improvements for the rest of the loop created by the two streets.

## Status and Delivery:

Guy Place Streetscape improvements have been identified by the community as a lower priority and therefore, given the shortage of impact fee funds, would not be implemented until after Harrison and Fremont Streets. Further prioritization with the community may occur before deciding with "Priority 2" project to move forward on after Harrison Street.

## Total Costs:

\$2,800,000

## IPIC Funds:

$\$ 5,300,000$ has been programmed as "Priority 2" projects, which could be used for this project.

## FIRST STREET IMPROVEMENTS (MAP NO. 10D / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM 10)

## Project Description:

Streetscape improvements for First Street would run along both sides of First Street from Folsom Street to Harrison Street. Improvements include sidewalk widening, corner bulb-outs, a mid-block pedestrian crossing, pedestrian lighting and new trees and understory planting.

## Status and Delivery:

First Street improvements have been identified by the community as a lower priority and therefore, given the shortage of impact fee funds, would not be implemented until after Harrison and Fremont Streets. Further prioritization with the community may occur before deciding with "Priority 2" project to move forward on after Harrison Street.

Total Costs:
\$4,500,000

## IPIC Funds:

$\$ 5,300,000$ has been programmed as "Priority 2" projects, which could be used for this project.

## LANSING STREET IMPROVEMENTS (MAP NO. 20)

## Project Description:

Street improvements include single surface "shared" street treatment, street trees and landscaping, street lights and furniture.

Status and Delivery:
Complete.
Total Costs:

## N/A

## IPIC Funds:

This project was completed as part of the adjacent development (45 Lansing) required open space component.

## GUY PLACE PARK (MAP NO. / EXPENDITURE

 PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 11)
## Project Description:

This small intimate pocket park will feature living green columns, water features, seating areas and other landscaping.

## Project Origin:

Rincon Hill Area Plan
Status and Delivery:
RPD is expecting to release an RFP for construction in 2017.

## Total Costs:

\$5,528,000

## IPIC Funds:

$\$ 4,836,000$ previously appropriated; $\$ 850,000$ appropriated from Transit Center Open Space fund in FY 18.

## RINCON HILL PARK (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN

LINE ITEM NO. 19)

Project Description:
The 333 Harrison Street development coordinated with the City to create a public park on one third of their lot, as called for in the Rincon Hill Area Plan. The developers of this project decided to create a public easement on this park instead of providing the park in-kind of their impact fee revenues.

Project Status and Delivery:
Complete
Total Costs:
N/A
IPIC Funds:
No IPIC Funds were used.

## TRANSIT CENTER DISTRICT

## Background and Highlights

The Transit Center District Plan (TCDP), adopted in 2012, enables about 4,800 additional residential units and about 6.5 million square foot of new commercial space (office and retail) near the future Transbay Terminal. The TCDP area is situated between Market, Steuart, Folsom and Second Streets. The new Transbay Terminal would serve as the new heart of downtown San Francisco and a new terminus for Caltrain and eventually High Speed Rail. A major infrastructure improvement in Transit Center District is the Transbay Transit Center project, which consists of Phase I: the terminal building, and Phase II: the Downtown Rail Extension (DTX), which would extend the Caltrain and eventually High Speed Rail terminus to the new Transbay Transit Center.

The Transit Center District Plan and the related Transbay Redevelopment Plan are being carried out by several agencies: Planning, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII) and the Transbay Joint Authorities Board (TJPA). This discussion here focuses on improvements funded through Planning Department administered impact fees.

The TCDP Implementation Document established a list of infrastructure improvement projects to enhance pedestrian and transit infrastructure to accommodate the forthcoming growth in the Transit Center District as a major regional transit hub.

Since plan adoption, about 3,070 units and 2.4 million square footage of commercial space have been entitled by the Planning Department. The TCDP established two impact fees for new development in the Transit Center District: one for open space and a second for transportation. In addition to the impact fees, a Community Facilities District (CFD or Mello-Roos District), has been established to help fund the DTX as well as the streetscape and open space improvements. The Transbay CFD includes an additive tax per square foot on properties within the TCDP area plan that will see significant new development. (Existing buildings would not be required to join the Mello-Roos District.) The CFD is projected to raise over $\$ 800$ million towards construction of the Transbay Terminal projects and other streetscape and open space improvements.

The Planning Department projects over $\$ 134$ million in impact fee revenues available for infrastructure impact fees in the Transit Center District through the next five years. Nearly $\$ 35$ million of these impact fees are open space impact fees set aside for open space improvement projects, and the other $\$ 99$ million are transportation impact fees set aside for transit as well as streetscape improvements.

The original plan estimated an entire need of $\$ 591$ million that would be paid through either the Transit Center impact fees or proceeds from the Mello Roos District. Based on pipeline projects under the jurisdiction of the Planning Department, $\$ 116$ million is expected to be collected through the end of this fiscal year, with an additional $\$ 18.4$ million in the next five years. For the time being, much of the funds have been left unprogrammed. IPIC is working with the TJPA, the Controller's Office and the Mayor's Budget Office to strategize how best to distribute transportation funds in the most effective way possible
Transit Center - IPIC Revenue and Expenditure Plan - January 2017

|  |  |  | THROUGH FY 16 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY } 17 \\ \text { (BUDGET YEAR) } \end{gathered}$ |  | FY 18 |  |  | FY 19 | FY 20 |  | FY 21 |  |  | FY 22 |  |  | FY 18 - FY 22 (PROJECTIONS) |  | total to fy 22 |  | FY23 - FY 27(PROJECTIONS) |  | TOTAL TO FY 27 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| REVENUE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | transportation / transit |  | s | 5,458,000 | s | 82,306,000 | s | 7,094,000 | s | . | s | 6,048,000 | s |  |  | s |  |  | \$ | 13,142,000 | \$ | 100,906,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 100,906,000 |
| 2 | ReCreation and open space |  | \$ | 1,886,000 | s | 26,440,000 | s | 3,267,000 | s | . | s | 1,978,000 | s |  | . | s |  | . | \$ | 5,245,000 | \$ | 33,571,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 33,571,000 |
| 3 | Total |  | \$ | 7,344,000 |  | 108,746,000 | \$ | 10,418,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 8,026,000 | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |  |  | \$ 18,444,000 |  | 134,534,000 | \$ |  |  | 134,534,000 |
| EXPENDITURE: <br> APPROPRIATION FY 17 AND PRIOR; PLANNED FY 18 AND FORWARD |  | DEPT. | THROUGH FY 16 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY } 17 \\ \text { (BUDGET YEAR) } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  | FY 19 |  | FY 20 |  | FY 21 |  |  |  |  | FY 18 - FY 22 (PROJECTIONS) |  | total to fy 22 |  | FY23 - FY 27(PROIECTIONS (PROJECTIONS) |  | total to fy 27 |  |
| Transportation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Transit Center Streetscape Plan - Project Management | DPW | \$ | - |  |  |  |  | s | . | s | . | s |  | . | s |  | . | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 5 | Downtown Rail Extension Design Work | DPW | \$ | 1,900,000 | s | $(1,900,000)$ | s | - | s | . | s | - | s |  | . |  |  |  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 6 | Streetscape Design and Construction for Transbay Terminal Opening | DPW | \$ | 2,650,000 | s | 12,920,000 | s | 11,000,000 | s | . | s | . | s |  | . | s |  | . | \$ | 11,000,000 | \$ | 26,570,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 26,570,000 |
| 7 | Mid-Block Crossings (In-Knd - Transit Tower) | IN-KIND | \$ | - | s | 1,000,000 | 5 | - | $s$ | . | s | . | s |  | . | s |  | . | \$ | - | \$ | 1,000,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,000,000 |
| 8 | Natoma (In-kind - Transit Tower) | IN-KIND | \$ | - | \$ | 11,000,000 | s | . | 5 | . | 5 | . | s |  | . | s |  | . | \$ | - | \$ | 11,000,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 11,000,000 |
| 9 | Bus Boarding island on Mission Street (In-kind - Transit Tower) | IN-KIND | \$ | - | s | 500,000 | s | - | s | . | s | . | s |  | $\cdot$ | s |  | - | \$ | - | \$ | 500,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 500,000 |
| 10 | Transit Tower In-Kind Agreement | IN-KIND | \$ | - | s | 15,200,000 | s | - | s | - | s | - | s |  | - | s |  | . | \$ | - | \$ | 15,200,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 15,200,000 |
| 12 | Phase I DTX | TJPA | \$ | 884,000 | s | 2,000,000 | s | - | s | - | s | . | s |  | . | s |  | - | \$ | - | \$ | 2,884,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 2,884,000 |
| 11 | Adminitration (Planning) | DCP |  |  |  |  | s | 35,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Transportation and Streetscape Improvements upprogrammed |  | \$ |  | s | - | s | - | s | 35,944,000 | s | 7,827,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 43,771,000 | \$ | 43,771,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 43,771,000 |
| 14 | Category Expenditure Sub Total |  | \$ | 5,434,000 | \$ | 40,720,000 | \$ | 11,035,000 | \$ | 35,944,000 | \$ | 7,827,000 | \$ |  |  | \$ |  | - | \$ | 64,790,000 | \$ | 110,944,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 100,960,000 |
| 15 | Category Balance Per Year |  |  |  | \$ | 41,586,000 | \$ | $(3,887,000)$ | \$ | $(35,944,000)$ | \$ | $(1,779,000)$ | \$ |  |  | \$ |  | $\cdot$ |  |  |  |  | \$ | $\cdot$ |  |  |
| 16 | Category Cummulative Balance |  | \$ | 24,000 | \$ | 41,610,000 | \$ | 37,723,000 | \$ | 1,779,000 | \$ | . | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | \$ - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |
| Recreation and Open Space |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | City Park (In-Kind - Transit Tower) | IN-KIND | \$ | - | s | 8,500,000 | s | - | s | - | s | - | s |  | $\cdot$ | s |  | - | \$ | - | \$ | 8,500,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 8,500,000 |
| 20 | IPIC Park (per Famis Report) |  | \$ | 100,000 | s | $(100,000)$ | s | - | s | - | s | - | s |  | . |  |  |  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 21 | Improvements to Downtown/Chinatown Parks | RPD | \$ | - | s | . | s | 1,352,000 | s | - | s | . | s |  | - | s |  | $\cdot$ | \$ | 1,352,000 | \$ | 1,352,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,352,000 |
| 22 | Central Subway Open Space | MTA | \$ | 3,000,000 | s | 4,000,000 | s | . | s | - | s | . | s |  | - | s |  | . | \$ | - | \$ | 7,000,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 7,000,000 |
| 23 | Portsmouth Square improvements (RPD) | RPD | \$ | 365,000 | s | 513,000 | s | . | s | . | S | . | \$ |  | - | 5 |  | . | \$ | - | \$ | 878,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 878,000 |
| 24 | Portsmouth Square improvements (Planning) | DCP | \$ | 500,000 | s | $(217,000)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - | 5 | 283,000 |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | Recreation and Open Space unprogrammed | RPD | \$ | - |  |  |  |  | S | 12,730,000 | s | 1,978,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 14,708,000 | \$ | 14,708,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 14,708,000 |
| 26 | Guy Place Park | RPD |  |  |  |  | s | 850,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |
| 27 | Category Expenditure Sub Total |  | \$ | 3,965,000 | \$ | 12,696,000 | \$ | 2,202,000 | \$ | 12,730,000 | \$ | 1,978,000 | \$ |  | $\cdot$ | \$ |  | - | \$ | 21,975,000 | \$ | 38,636,000 | S | $\cdot$ | \$ | 33,571,000 |
| 28 | Category Balance Per Year |  |  |  | \$ | 13,744,000 | \$ | 1,065,000 | \$ | $(12,730,000)$ | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  |
| 29 | Category Cummulative Balance |  | \$ | $(2,079,000)$ | \$ | 11,665,000 | \$ | 12,730,000 | \$ | - | \$ | $\cdot$ | \$ |  |  | \$ |  | - | \$ | \$ - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |
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Transit Center District Pipeline

Residential Pipeline Net Units
• $<13$
$13-100$
$101-500$
$>500$

Commercial Pipeline Net Gross Square Feet

- $<10,000$

O 10,000-100,000
100,001-1,000,000
$\bigcirc>1,000,000$


## Transit Center District Pipeline

```
Streetscape Design and Construction for Transbay Terminal Opening
Mid-Block Crossings (In-Kind - Transit Tower)
Natoma (In-Kind - Transit Tower)
Transit Tower In-Kind Agreement
Phase IDTX
City Park (In-Kind - Transit Tower)
Central Subway Open Space
Portsmouth Square improvements (RPD)
```




## TRANSIT CENTER DISTRICT

1. Transbay Center rendering
2. Transbay Center construction underway
3. Streetscape Implementation Plan
4. Pedestrian improvements
5. Transbay cross section
6. Folsom Street streetscape improvements

## Transit Center Project Descriptions

## TRANSBAY TRANSIT CENTER AND DOWNTOWN RAIL EXTENSION (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO 12)

## Project Description:

The Program will be completed in two phases. Phase 1 comprises design and construction of the above-grade levels of the Transit Center and its related components, including the Roof Top Park (City Park), the core and shell of the below-grade train box, a bus ramp connecting the station to the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, bus storage for off-peak bus layovers, and a temporary terminal, which has been completed and is currently operating.

The Downtown Rail Extension, the build-out of the Transit Center's below-grade train station, a pedestrian tunnel to BART/Muni Metro, a new underground station at Fourth and Townsend Streets, and an intercity bus facility will follow in Phase 2.

## Project Origin:

In 1999, San Francisco voters voted to make it a city policy to extend the Caltrain station from Fourth and King Streets up to a new or rebuilt station on the site of the Transbay Terminal located on Mission and First Streets. (Proposition H).

## Project Status and Delivery:

Preliminary engineering (PE) (30\% design level) for many components of the DTX, including the Fourth and Townsend Street Station, was completed in July 2010. Subsequently, new requirements by the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA), as well as other factors, have added or modified elements of the DTX. These additions and modifications are included in a draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/EIR) released in December 2015 for public comment. Further design work on these new or modified elements will be required to return the full DTX design to the $30 \%$ PE level and is currently underway. Final Design is anticipated to begin in Later 2017 and be finished by 2020.

Total Costs:
Total estimated cost of Phase 2 is $\$ 3.93$ billion

## IPIC Funds:

The use of Transit Center Transportation funds is still being considered.

TRANSIT CENTER STREETSCAPE PHASE I (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO 12)

## Project Description:

The Transit Center Plan assumes streetscape and public right-of-way improvements on almost all of District's streets. As an initial phase, priority street segments have been identified for a first round of construction to coincide with the opening of the Transbay station. These street segments include the west side of 1st Street between Mission and Minna, the north side of Mission Street between 1st and Fremont Streets, a pedestrian crosswalk with signal across Mission Street at Shaw Alley with accompanying sidewalk widening, and the construction of a bus island on eastbound Mission between 1st and Fremont Streets.

## Project Origin:

The Transit Center District Plan / Transit Center
Implementation Plan

## Project Status and Delivery:

Currently in design and engineering. Construction anticipated to commence July 2017

## Total Costs:

\$26,570,000 (current estimate - to be updated)

## IPIC Funds:

\$26,570,000 (FY17, FY18 and FY19)

## TRANSIT CENTER STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS PROVIDED THROUGH 101 FIRST STREET IN-KIND AGREEMENT

## Project Description / IPIC Funding:

The Transit Tower project will meet the majority of its impact fee obligations through provision of infrastructure identified in the Area Plan. The Transit Tower will provide the following infrastructure improvements as part of an in-kind agreement with the City (Note: in some cases the in-kind contribution does not cover the full cost of the infrastructure improvement):

1. Fremont and First mid-block crossings $\$ 1$ million (Map / Expenditure Plan Line Item No. 7)
2. Natoma Street: \$11 million (Map / Expenditure Plan Line Item No. 8)
3. Bus boarding island on Mission Street $\$ 500,000$ (Map / Expenditure Plan Line Item No. 9)
4. DTX, phase I (Trainbox): \$15.2 million (Map / Expenditure Plan Line Item No. 12)

## TRANSIT CENTER CITY PARK (MAP / <br> EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 19)

## Project Description:

City Park, a 5.4-acre rooftop public park that is 1,400 -footlong will include a variety of activities and amenities, including an open air amphitheater, gardens, trails, open grass areas, children's play space, as well as a restaurant and café.

## Project Origin:

In 1999, San Francisco voters voted to make it a city policy to extend the Caltrain station from Fourth and King Streets up to a new or rebuilt station on the site of the Transbay Terminal located on Mission and First Streets. (Proposition H).

## IPIC Funds:

$\$ 8.5$ million through in-kind agreement (FY 17)

## CENTRAL SUBWAY CHINATOWN STATION OPEN SPACE (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO 22)

## Project Description:

The Transit Center District Plan explicitly anticipated sharing impact fees for park improvements in nearby Chinatown. A part of these funds have been appropriated for the Chinatown Station Open Space.

Project Origin:
The Transit Center District Plan; Central Subway
Project Status and Delivery:
Under Construction

## Total Costs:

## IPIC Funds:

$\$ 3,000,000$ in FY 16 and prior and $\$ 4,000,000$ in FY 17

## PORTSMOUTH SQUARE (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NOS. 23, AND 24)

## Project Description:

The Transit Center District Plan explicitly anticipated sharing impact fees for park improvements in nearby Chinatown. Portsmouth Square is currently undergoing study and conceptual design. Improvements could include but would not be limited to renovation and/or reconfiguration of all existing park features including plazas, children's play areas, buildings, pedestrian bridge, landscaping, adjacent streetscape and associated site work. The parking garage is not included in the scope of work.

## Project Origin:

The Transit Center District Plan
Project Status and Delivery:
Currently undergoing study and conceptual design; community engagement planned for spring 2017.

Total Costs:
TBD

## IPIC Funds:

\$2,230,000

## MARKET OCTAVIA

## Background and Highlights

## THE MARKET AND OCTAVIA PLAN AREA

The Market and Octavia Plan has been in effect since May 2007. The Plan envisions a neighborhood that functions holistically as a truly urban place by providing mixed-use infill development and affordable housing, buildings and open spaces that foster a unique sense of place, and a street and public realm experience that is inviting to pedestrians and cyclists and provides balanced transportation options.

The Plan included zoning actions to encourage the development of mixed-use infill projects. Since 2008, nearly 2,500 net new units have been added in the Plan Area; of these, just over 600 units are affordable Below Market Rate (BMR) rental or ownership units, representing roughly 25 percent of new units delivered to date. Another fifty-two development projects, totaling approximately 4,500 units, were in the Planning Department's development pipeline as of the third quarter of 2016, including those currently under construction.

In support of this growth and the Plan Area vision, the Plan also included a list of programmatic and discrete community improvements (Market and Octavia Plan, Appendix C), many of which are underway or have been completed, and many of which have not commenced or are ongoing in nature. These improvements and others that support the goals and objectives of the Plan draw on a number of funding sources, which are detailed below.

More information, visit the Plan Area website:
http://sf-planning.org/market-octavia-area-plan

## THE MARKET STREET HUB PROJECT

In 2015, the Planning Department began a study to update a portion of the Market and Octavia Plan historically called the Hub, and previously known in the Plan as "SOMAWest." This study includes developing both a public realm plan and rezoning to support housing affordability and transit improvements as well as outline a more robust neighborhood vision for public space. This effort is expected to allow for approximately 1,700 additional units in the area; this includes significant new development in the pipeline over the next five years, which will generate impact fee revenue that could fund capital improvements and infrastructure projects that were identified in the Market and Octavia Plan. In 2016, the Planning Department launched a public engagement process, holding workshops and attending neighborhood meetings to get feedback on specific topics including land use, urban form, the public
realm and public benefits. Input received from this process will inform preliminary recommendations for new land use and heights controls, a public realm plan and a public benefits strategy.

More information, visit the project website: http:///s-planning.org/market-street-hub-project

## COMMUNITY BENEFITS FUNDING

Projects in the Plan Area are subject to the Market and Octavia Community Infrastructure Fee. The revenue from this fee must be allocated to projects within the Plan Area for transportation, complete streets, recreation and open space, childcare, and program administration in the proportion set out in the Planning Code, as shown below. Based on the current development pipeline, the Department projects $\$ 43.5$ million in revenue from this fee over the next five fiscal years (July 1, 2017 - June 30, 2022).

In addition, many proposed projects are also located within the Van Ness and Market Special Use District (SUD), an area which roughly corresponds to the area included in the Market Street Hub Project. Projects in this SUD that exceed a specified Floor Area Ratio are also subject to the Van Ness and Market Neighborhood Infrastructure Fee. Funds collected under this fee are required to be allocated to the same funding categories, but revenue must be prioritized for community improvement projects located with the SUD area. Revenue from this fee is projected at a total of \$17.1 million over the next five years.

| Fee Category | MO Fee <br> Revenue | SUD Fee <br> Revenue | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Transportation/Transti | $\$ 9,550,000$ | $\$ 3,750,000$ | $\$ 13,300,000$ |
| Recreation and Open <br> Space | $\$ 9,000,000$ | $\$ 3,600,000$ | $\$ 12,600,000$ |
| Complete Streets | $\$ 19,550,000$ | $\$ 7,500,000$ | $\$ 27,050,000$ |
| Child Care | $\$ 3,300,000$ | $\$ 1,350,000$ | $\$ 4,650,000$ |
| Program Administration | $\$ 2,100,000$ | $\$ 900,000$ | $\$ 3,000,000$ |
| Total | $\$ 43,500,000$ | $\$ 17,100,000$ | $\$ 60,000,000$ |

In addition to impact fee revenue, other funding sources have been identified for Plan Area improvements, including revenues from the sale of the Central Freeway parcels. Parcel sales through FY16 have yielded a total of $\$ 33.2$ million. Most of these revenues have been spent on a series of community amenities adjacent to the Central Freeway, including the West SoMa skate park and dog run, and the McCoppin Hub Plaza. An additional $\$ 12.7$ million has been dedicated to maintaining a state of good repair for Van Ness Avenue, and $\$ 2.3$ million has been programmed for several projects to be delivered by SFMTA in the near-term. These
projects are detailed below. In addition, proceeds from the sale of remaining parcels are projected to yield a total of between $\$ 7$ million and $\$ 9$ million by 2021. These funds have not yet been programmed, but must be dedicated to transportation and streetscape improvements in the Market and Octavia area.

| Funding <br> Source | FY 2017 and <br> prior | FY 2018-2022 | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Market and <br> Octavia Infra. <br> Fee | $\$ 26,400,000$ | $\$ 43,500,000$ | $\$ 69,900,000$ |
| Van Ness and <br> Market Infra. <br> Fee | $\$ 1,400,000$ | $\$ 17,100,000$ | $\$ 18,500,000$ |
| Central <br> Freeway Parcel <br> Sales | $\$ 33,200,000$ | $\$ 7,800,000$ | $\$ 41,000,000$ |
| Other sources <br> (General Fund, <br> G0 Bonds, <br> State/Federal) | $\$ 33,200,000$ | $\$ 7,800,000$ | $\$ 41,000,000$ |
|  | $\$ 62,500,000$ | $\$ 69,350,000$ | $\$ 131,850,000$ |

## THE MARKET AND OCTAVIA COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee (CAC) is a representative body that provides advice to the City regarding implementation of the Market and Octavia Plan and the Plan's community improvements. The Market and Octavia CAC meets on a monthly basis and is composed of nine members of the public, appointed by the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor.

In November 2016, the CAC passed a resolution in support of the proposed IPIC capital plan for Market and Octavia infrastructure funds. Throughout the IPIC process, the CAC stressed the need for traffic calming and bicycle infrastructure throughout the plan area and for new pedestrian and open space improvements in the Van Ness and Market SUD area, to complement the significant level of anticipated new development there.

## COMPLETED PROJECTS

A number of infrastructure projects consistent with the Market and Octavia Plan have been completed in preparation for the area's anticipated development, including the signature Octavia Boulevard and Patricia's Green projects. The list below highlights infrastructure projects that have been completed as of mid-2016:
» The Hayes Street two-way project, which was supported in part by impact fee revenue, reorganized east-west traffic in Hayes Valley to reduce pedestrian conflicts and eliminate confusion. The project restored Hayes Street to a two-way local street to support its commercial nature and role as the heart of Hayes Valley. (Map / Expenditure Plan Line Item 21)
» The Haight Street two-way project, which was supported in part by impact fees, returned buses to a dedicated transit lane on Haight Street between Octavia and Market, and added pedestrian amenities at the Market/ Haight/Gough intersection. (Map / Expenditure Plan Line Item 11)
» The Polk Street contra flow lane, completed in spring 2014, provides a northbound bike facility on the one-way portion of Polk between Market and Grove. This project was funded in part by impact fees, which provided a local match for grant funds. (Map / Expenditure Plan Line Item 14)
»An in-kind agreement at Dolores and Market Street created traffic calming across Dolores Street, and a new public plaza at the southwest corner of the intersection. (Map / Line Item 20)
» An expanded bulbout at the southeast corner of 14th and Market streets reduces the crossing distance across 14th Street and provides additional space for pedestrians.
» At the intersection of Market and Octavia Streets, a right turn enforcement camera for eastbound traffic was installed to address bicycle safety. This was one of the short-term projects funded by the sale of the Central Freeway Parcels.
» Bicycle improvements at the intersection of Buchanan and Market guide cyclists entering and exiting the wiggle through this complicated intersection. This was another short-term project funded by the sale of the Central Freeway Parcels.
» In late 2013, the MTA launched the 5L Pilot, which provides limited stop bus service along the busy 5 Fulton corridor.
» The McCoppin Hub Park, one of the Central Freeway Ancillary Projects, was constructed in the existing public right-of-way at the western end of McCoppin Street.
"A new skate park and dog play area, another of the Central Freeway Ancillary Projects, was constructed below a portion of the Central Freeway.
» The Octavia Boulevard Enhancement Project, one of several projects funded under the Streetscape Enhancement Fund saw steady progress in 2016; completed phases include crosswalk upgrades, intersection daylighting, pedestrian bulb outs, and spot safety improvements on Hayes from Laguna to Buchanan, on Laguna from Fell to Oak, and at the Page and Octavia intersection.
» The Pedestrian Improvements to Franklin and Gough Intersections project was substantially complete as of 2016, though a small number of intersections will be completed in the coming year to accommodate street repaving schedule. Specifically, pedestrian bulb outs have been added on Gough at Oak, Fell, Hayes, and Grove; on Franklin at Hayes and Grove; the closed crossing at Fell and Gough has been opened; and numerous intersections on both streets now include pedestrian countdown signals. (Map / Expenditure Line Item 27)
» The Sidewalk Greening Program is an ongoing program funding tree plantings, planter basin expansions, and sidewalk garden installations through the Plan Area; in 2016 projects were completed on Pierce between Duboce and Waller and on Hermann between Steiner and Fillmore. (Map / Expenditure Plan 31)

## PLANNED AND ONGOING IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

In addition to completed infrastructure, progress has been made on many more transportation and open space projects in the Plan Area. Many of these improvements were proposed by the Market and Octavia Plan and are being further refined as City agencies perform additional study, develop project designs, secure funding, or conduct additional community outreach. Other new project ideas have been generated through the work of the IPIC and the CAC to help implement the Market and Octavia Plan.

Many of the projects discussed below will utilize impact fee revenue. However, the majority of funding for ongoing infrastructure projects relies heavily on other public funding sources.

The Market Octavia Mini Capital Plan, which includes an exhaustive list of all known proposed capital projects that further the Market Octavia Plan, identifies a \$17,275,000 funding gap over the next 10 years. This funding gap is reduced to $\$ 2,500,000$, when the list of project is constrained to only those that are specifically identified in Market Octavia Appendix C.
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19,399,471



 1,145,000 \$ $\quad 6,533,415$
 84, 243,413 FY 18 - FY $22 \quad$ TOTAL TO FY $22 \quad$ FY23 - FY $27 \quad$ TOTAL TO FY 27

| MTA | \$ | 330,000 | \$ | - | \$ | . | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 660,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 330,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MTA | \$ | 300,000 | \$ | . | \$ | . | s | 2,448,670 | \$ | . | \$ | . | s | . | \$ | 2,448,670 | \$ | 3,048,670 | \$ | - | \$ | 2,748,670 |
| mTA | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 5,250,000 | \$ | . | \$ | - | \$ | . | \$ | . | \$ | 5,250,000 | \$ | 5,250,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 5,250,000 |
| MTA | \$ | 50,000 | \$ | . | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | . | \$ | . | \$ | - | \$ | 100,000 | \$ | - | 5 | 50,000 |
| MTA | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 1,500,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 1,500,000 | \$ | 1,500,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,500,000 |
| DCP | \$ | - | \$ | 250,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 500,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 250,000 |
|  | \$ | 680,000 | \$ | 250,000 | \$ | 6,750,000 | \$ | 2,448,670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 9,198,670 | \$ | 11,058,670 | \$ | - | \$ | 10,128,670 |
|  |  |  | \$ | 2,064,000 | \$ | $(4,675,529)$ | \$ | 1,863,330 | \$ | 1,874,000 | \$ | 655,000 | \$ | 631,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \$ | 3,704,000 | \$ | 5,768,000 | \$ | 1,092,471 | \$ | 2,955,801 | \$ | 4,829,801 | \$ | 5,484,801 | \$ | 6,115,801 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




## Transit

[^2]Greening / Complete Streets
$20 \quad$ Dolores and Market Intersection Improvements (In-kind)
21 Hayes Two-way
22 Living Alleys Community Challenge Grants 23 Better Market Street - Market from 10th to Octavia 24 Page Street Green Connection 25 Patricia's Green Rotating Art Project 26 Market/Octavia Plazas Rotating Art Project $27 \quad$ Pedestrian Improvements Franklin and Gough intersections
Market Octavia－pIc Revenue and Expenditure Plan－January 2017

Recreation and Open Space

| RPD | \＄ | 2，884，000 | \＄ | 1，000，000 | \＄ | 4，100，000 | \＄ | － | \＄ | － | \＄ | － | \＄ |  | \＄ | 4，100，000 | \＄ | 11，868，000 | \＄ | － | \＄ | 7，984，000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DCP | \＄ | 200，000 | \＄ | － | \＄ |  | \＄ | 2，500，000 | \＄ | － | \＄ |  | \＄ |  | \＄ | 2，500，000 | \＄ | 2，900，000 | \＄ | － | \＄ | 2，700，000 |
| CCG | \＄ | 410，000 | \＄ | ． | \＄ | ． | \＄ |  | \＄ | ． | \＄ |  | \＄ |  | \＄ |  | \＄ | 820，000 | \＄ |  | \＄ | 410，000 |
| RDP | \＄ | － | \＄ | 100，000 | \＄ | ． | \＄ | － | \＄ | － | \＄ |  | \＄ |  | \＄ | － | \＄ | 200，000 | \＄ | － | \＄ | 100，000 |
|  | \＄ | 3，494，000 | \＄ | 1，100，000 | \＄ | 4，100，000 | \＄ | 2，500，000 | \＄ | － | \＄ | － | \＄ | － | \＄ | 10，574，000 | \＄ | 15，788，000 | \＄ | － | \＄ | 11，194，000 |
|  |  |  | \＄ | 1，099，000 | \＄ | $(2,120,709)$ | \＄ | 1，506，000 | \＄ | 1，789，000 | \＄ | 625，000 | \＄ | 602，000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \＄ | $(175,000)$ | \＄ | 924，000 | \＄ | $(1,196,709)$ | \＄ | 309，291 | \＄ | 2，098，291 | \＄ | 2，723，291 | \＄ | 3，325，291 | \＄ | 3，325，291 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 48 | 2015 NOFA for new／expanded facilities | \＄ | 1，273，000 | \＄ | ． | s | － | \＄ | ． | \＄ | ． | s | － | \＄ | － | \＄ | － | \＄ | 2，546，000 | \＄ | － | \＄ | 1，273，000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 49 | Child Care（unprogrammed） |  |  | \＄ | ． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | Category Expenditure Sub Total | \＄ | 1，273，000 | \＄ | － | s | － | s | － | \＄ | － | \＄ | － | \＄ | － | \＄ | － | \＄ | 2，546，000 | \＄ | － | \＄ | 1，273，000 |
| 51 | Category Annual Balance |  |  | \＄ | 828，000 | \＄ | 753，415 | \＄ | 1，411，000 | S | 682，000 | S | 238，000 | \＄ | 229，000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 52 | Category Cummulative Balance |  |  | S | 802，000 | \＄ | 1，555，415 | \＄ | 2，966，415 | \＄ | 3，648，415 | \＄ | 3，886，415 | \＄ | 4，115，415 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Program Administration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54 | Admin Fees | \＄ | 226，587 | \＄ | 183，511 | \＄ | 411，000 | s | 1，087，000 | \＄ | 426，000 | \＄ | 149，000 | s | 143，000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 55 | Admin Fees Transferred back to Programs |  |  | \＄ | 962，902 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 56 | Category Expenditure Sub Total | \＄ | 226，587 | \＄ | 1，146，413 | \＄ | 411，000 | \＄ | 1，087，000 | \＄ | 426，000 | \＄ | 149，000 | \＄ | 143，000 | \＄ | 2，478，487 | \＄ | － |  |  |  |  |
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Market-Octavia Pipeline

| Residential Pipeline <br> Net Units | Commercial Pipeline <br> Net Gross Square Feet |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | $<13$ | $\circ$ |
| $13-100$ | $<10,000$ |  |
| $101-500$ | $10,000-100,000$ |  |
| $>500$ | $100,001-1,000,000$ |  |



## Market-Octavia Projects

```
Haight Two-way Transportation and Streetscape Muni Forward
Light Rail Service Enhancement
Polk Street northbound bicycle improvements
Van Ness BRT - Van Ness and Mission ped. improvements Hub Transportation Improvements Study Dolores and Market Intersection Improvements (In-kind) Hayes Two-way
```

22. Living Alleys Community Challenge Grants
23. Better Market Street - Market from 10th to Octavia
24. Page Street Green Connection

Patricia's Green Rotating Art Project
Market/Octavia Plazas Rotating Art Project
7. Pedestrian Improvements Franklin and Gough intersections
. Upper Market Pedestrian Improvements
Predevelopment - Upper Market Pedestrian Improvements

Re-establish Octavia Boulevard ROW with Hayward Park
Sidewalk Greening Program
Streetscape Enhancement Fund
Koshland Park Access Improvements
Van Ness BRT - Van Ness and Mission ped
Neighborhood Heritage Program
Hayward Park
Brady Block Park - design


## MARKET AND OCTAVIA

1. The newly completed Waller Park steps
2. Rotating Art
3. Patricia's Green Rotating Art Project
4. New plaza at 55 Laguna
5. Market Street
6. Pedestrian crossing and Plaza at Dolores
7. Market and Octavia

## Market Octavia Project Descriptions

## MUNI FORWARD (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 12)

## Project Description:

Improve service on core transit routes throughout the city, including improvements on the 5-Fulton route through the Market and Octavia Area. Impact fee revenue will be used to partially fund these improvements, including sidewalk bulb-outs at intersection the McAllister/Laguna Street intersection, and relocated bus stops are the McAllister/Gough Street and McAllister/Laguna Street intersections.

Project Origin:
SFMTA

Project Status and Delivery:
ongoing
Total Costs:
approx. \$40 million

MO Impact Fee Funds:
$\$ 2.7$ million

## LIGHT RAIL SERVICE ENHANCEMENT (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 13)

## Project Description:

The Light Rail Vehicle enhancement will allow MTA to run two-car trains on lines currently running only one-car trains; vehicle availability is one of the major reasons MTA must run one-car trains on some lines. Additional vehicles will also allow MTA to provide more targeted demand-based service deployments, such as like the Cole Valley and Castro shuttles that have launched recently. As the max load point in the city's rail system, the Muni stations and stops in the Market and Octavia Area benefit greatly from additional capacity due to these shuttles.

## Project Origin:

SFMTA

Project Status and Delivery:
2017

Total Costs:
\$5,250,000

MO Impact Fee Funds:
\$5,250,000

VAN NESS BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT) VAN NESS AND MISSION PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 15)

## Project Description:

The Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project will project rapid bus service along the Van Ness corridor. Impact fee revenues will be used to support related pedestrian improvements including station and platform work in the portion of the corridor contained in the Plan Area.

## Project Origin:

SFMTA

Project Status and Delivery:
2018-2019

## Total Costs:

approx. \$125 million
MO Impact Fee Funds:
\$2,000,000

## HUB TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS STUDY (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 16)

## Project Description:

As part of the Market Street Hub Project, detailed design work regarding transportation and right-of-way improvements in the Hub area is being completed by Planning and MTA. This effort will include circulation changes to the adjacent street network, potentially including Mission, Otis, 11th, 12th, Gough, and McCoppin Streets. This project would fund circulation analysis and inform recommended street and transportation changes for the Hub area.

## Project Origin:

Market and Octavia CAC

Project Status and Delivery:
underway; conclude in 2017
Total Costs:
\$250,000
MO Impact Fee Funds: \$250,000

## LIVING ALLEYS COMMUNITY CHALLENGE

 GRANTS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 22)
## Project Description:

The Living Alleyways Community Challenge Program is an ongoing effort led by SF Planning to engage residents in re-imagining the area's extensive network of alleyways as an alternative transportation network and opportunity for community-scale places for public life. This program makes impact fee revenue available through the city's Community Challenge Grant program to community sponsors seeking to design, build, and maintain living alleyway projects in their neighborhoods.

## Project Origin:

Market and Octavia Plan
Project Status and Delivery:
ongoing

## Total Costs:

\$5,000,000 over 10 years; $\$ 33$ million lifetime buildout

## MO Impact Fee Funds:

\$3,000,000

## BETTER MARKET STREET - MARKET FROM 10TH TO OCTAVIA (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 23)

Project Description:
Better Market Street, a major effort to envision a more lively public space and effective transit corridor, includes the stretch of Market Street from 10th Street to Octavia Boulevard in the Plan Area. Impact fee revenue will partially fund pedestrian, bicycle, and public realm improvements along Market Street.

## Project Origin:

Better Market Street Project
Project Status and Delivery:
This set of projects is currently undergoing environmental review.

## EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 24)

## Project Description:

The Page Street Green Connection is an effort to transform Page Street into a "Green Connection" that seeks to foster a bicycle priority transportation corridor that offers improved functionality and safety for bicyclists and pedestrians. Improvements in the Market and Octavia Area portion of the corridor (from Franklin/Market to Webster), possibly including bicycle lanes, green paint, "bike boxes", sidewalk bulbouts, and intersection daylighting, will be funded by impact fee revenues.

## Project Origin:

Market and Octavia Plan

Project Status and Delivery:
Design near complete; Construction in 2017
Total Costs:
\$1,250,000
MO Impact Fee Funds:
\$1,250,000

## PATRICIA'S GREEN ROTATING ART PROJECT (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 25)

## Project Description:

The Patricia's Green Rotating Art Project brings a variety of art installations to this central open space. Impact fee revenue will continue supporting the Arts Commission's ongoing programing of this project.

## Project Origin:

Market and Octavia Plan

Project Status and Delivery: ongoing

Total Costs:
$\$ 500,000$ over 10 years
MO Impact Fee Funds:
\$360,000

## Total Costs:

TBD

## MO Impact Fee Funds:

\$3,500,000

PAGE STREET GREEN CONNECTION (MAP /

## MARKET/OCTAVIA PLAZAS ROTATING ART PROJECT (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 26)

## Project Description:

Work with the Arts Commission to provide a rotating public art installation at one or more of the pedestrian plazas located at the intersection of Market and Octavia Blvd.

## Project Origin:

Market and Octavia CAC
Project Status and Delivery:
Newly proposed project; funds for the program's first year, with the possibility of extending this appropriation in future years to fund an ongoing program.

Total Costs:
\$50,000
MO Impact Fee Funds:
\$50,000

## RE-ESTABLISHING THE OCTAVIA BOULEVARD RIGHT-OF-WAY WITH HAYWARD PARK (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 30)

## Project Description:

Re-establishing the Octavia Boulevard Right-of-Way between Fulton and Golden Gate Streets has been identified as a community improvement project in the Area Plan with the goal of reconnecting the neighborhood street grid and increasing access to Margaret Hayward Park and Jefferson Square. The Planning Department will work with residents of the Freedom West coop housing community, which currently owns the former right-of-way, and other partners to explore the long-term feasibility of this project.

## Project Origin:

Market and Octavia Plan
Project Status and Delivery: TBD

Total Costs:
TBD
MO Impact Fee Funds:
\$650,000

## SIDEWALK GREENING PROGRAM (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 31)

## Project Description:

The Sidewalk Greening Program (formerly the Street Tree Planting Program) is an initiative to facilitate new community-maintained street trees and sidewalk gardens throughout the Plan Area. The Planning Department works with non-profit partners and interested community members to implement this ongoing program.

## Project Origin:

Market and Octavia Plan
Project Status and Delivery:
ongoing
Total Costs:
$\$ 1,000,000$ over 10 years; $\$ 21$ million lifetime buildout
MO Impact Fee Funds:
\$700,000

## STREETSCAPE ENHANCEMENT FUND

## Project Description:

The Streetscape Enhancement Fund sets aside impact fee funding to enhance street projects that may not otherwise include pedestrian safety or greening components. The scope of work for this fund will includes several related pedestrian and bicycle safety improvement and traffic projects and traffic flow modifications in the Plan Area; specifically, funding will support the Octavia Boulevard Enhancement Project; Market and Octavia safety improvements; and Oak-Octavia-Laguna Safety Improvements projects.

## Project Origin:

Market and Octavia Plan; Vision Zero
Project Status and Delivery:
partially complete; construction anticipated in 2017

## Total Costs:

\$6,200,000
MO Impact Fee Funds:
\$6,200,000

## KOSHLAND PARK ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 33)

## Project Description:

Project proposed to enhance safe access to Koshland Park at Rose and Buchanan Streets. The park is heavily used by neighborhood teenagers and children as it includes playground space and a basketball court. There is currently no marked crossing at this location, though it is frequently used by children and others to access the park. Access improvements at this location would improve pedestrian safety and access to open space.

## Project Origin:

Market and Octavia CAC

Project Status and Delivery:
in planning
Total Costs:
\$450,000

MO Impact Fee Funds:
\$450,000

## NEIGHBORHOOD HERITAGE PROGRAM (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 35)

## Project Description:

Fund a coordinated program of educational or interpretive signage, honorary plaques, or public art installations to commemorate selected individual figures, community movements, or other historical events of significance to the history and character of the neighborhoods contained within the Market and Octavia Plan Area. This project should provide installations at multiple locations distributed throughout the Plan Area.

## Project Origin:

Market and Octavia CAC
Project Status and Delivery:
Newly proposed project; It is anticipated that the Planning Department will facilitate work with relevant city agencies or community groups to facilitate the scoping of this project, at the guidance of the Market and Octavia CAC. Funds may be transferred or re-appropriated in future years.

Total Costs:
\$50,000

## MO Impact Fee Funds:

\$50,000

## Open Space

There are six existing parks in the Plan Area, of which Margaret Hayward Park has the highest renovation and capital needs. One additional park, Brady Block Park, is proposed for construction by the Market and Octavia Plan, as discussed below.

Open space projects supported in full or in part by impact fees include:

## HAYWARD PARK RENOVATION (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 41)

## Project Description:

Margaret Hayward Park has been identified as having major capital improvement needs by the Recreation \& Parks Department. Impact fee funds will be used to support a series of planned improvements, including playground improvements, removal of certain existing structures and replacement with a new field house, and the replacement of existing fields with synthetic fields supplemented by organic infill turf.

## Project Origin:

Market and Octavia Plan

Project Status and Delivery: in design

## Total Costs:

\$6,500,000
MO Impact Fee Funds:
\$6,500,000

## BRADY BLOCK PARK (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 42)

Project Description:
The Brady Block Park was originally proposed in the Market and Octavia Plan to create a unique open space in the center of the block bounded by Market, 12th, Otis, and Gough Streets. Consistent with the Hub planning effort, the Planning Department is working with developers of adjacent parcels to secure in-kind agreements that will deliver this open space as well as complementary living alleyway improvements on the connecting side streets. The project is in early planning and design phases.

## Project Origin:

Market and Octavia Plan

Project Status and Delivery:
in planning
Total Costs:
TBD

MO Impact Fee Funds:
\$2,500,000 (most likely through in-kind)

## RE-CONNECT BUCHANNAN MALL ROW STUDY <br> (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 44)

## Project Description:

Study the re-connection of Buchanan Street Mall to the Hayes Valley neighborhood. Buchanan Street Mall extends from Grove to Eddy Streets, and provides a vital green connection between Hayes Valley and Western Addition, as well as play and recreation space for neighboring residents. The City will study the possibility for re-connecting the Mall to Hayes Valley, as access to the neighborhood is currently cut off by the fenced parking lot of the below market rate Ammel Park coop community located in the block between Grove and Fulton Streets. Further allocation of funds for the rehabilitation of the park facilities located in this block would be contingent upon the findings of this study.

Project Origin:
Market and Octavia CAC
Project Status and Delivery:
in planning
Total Costs:
\$100,000 for pre-development
MO Impact Fee Funds:
\$100,000

## Childcare

A portion of Market and Octavia impact fee funds are dedicated to supporting the provision of new or expanded licensed childcare facilities within the plan area. These funds are administered by the Office of Early Care and Education (OECE), which is currently soliciting applications for new or expanded facilities through May 2016.

## EASTERN NEIGHBORHOODS

## Background and Highlights

The Eastern Neighborhoods (EN) Area Plan, adopted in early 2009, provided new land use policies and regulations that, among other things, preserved land specifically for production, distribution and repair uses (PDR), opened up previously industrial neighborhoods to mixed use development, and set forth policies that require new mixed use and residential neighborhoods be developed as complete neighborhoods.

According to the Eastern Neighborhoods Monitoring Report, 1,400 units and 460,000 square feet of non-residential use have been completed since 2011; an additional 11,700 units and 4,900,000 square feet of non-residential are in the current development Project pipeline.

The original approvals for the Plan included an implementation document that laid out the types of infrastructure improvements that should be pursued along with suggested sources of funding. The Plan included the establishment of the Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee, as a key funding mechanism. The Implementation Document projected that impact fees would only cover a third of costs for growth-serving capital projects.

Unlike other Area Plans, which included specific lists of capital improvements, the EN Area Plans identifies capital projects on a much more conceptual and programmatic level. For example, the Implementation Document established the goal of constructing one new park and rehabilitating an existing park in each of the EN Neighborhoods.

To further identify and define capital projects, the Planning Department has published several implementation plans. These Plans include The Mission District Streetscape Plan, the Showplace Square Open Space Plan, EN Trips, and is currently working on the Central Waterfront / Dogpatch Public Realm Plan

On top of these Plans, the Planning Department entered into an MOU with DPW, SFMTA, and Rec and Park, in part, to assure the delivery of a small set of priority projects. The list of Infrastructure Projects below include indications of which are Priority Projects. The MOU stipulates that 80 percent of impact fee revenue be spent on the priority projects until they are fully funded.

Because capital improvements were described at a fairly high level in the initial Eastern Neighborhoods approvals, Planning works with the implementing agencies, the CAC, and community to identify and prioritize projects on an ongoing basis. As impact fees are only expected to fund
roughly a third of project costs, staff is constantly trying to find ways to fund the rest.

The Eastern Neighborhoods Mini Capital Plan, which includes an exhaustive list of all known proposed capital projects that further the EN Plan, identifies a $\$ 226,000,000$ funding gap. This funding gap is reduced to $\$ 109,000,000$, when the list of project is constrained to only those that are specifically identified in an Eastern Neighborhoods related planning documents.

In the next five years, the City expects to collect $\$ 83,519,000$ in impact fees.

## ONGOING PLANNING - CENTRAL SOMA

In the next year, the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors are expected to take action on the Central Soma Plan. The Central Soma Plan proposes to enable greater development potential within the portions of South of Market in close proximity to the Central Subway alignment. The Plan's approval would include new zoning, public realm improvements and a community benefits package that would be implemented through new development requirements and fees. Staff projects that the Plan will result in a net gain of 35,000 jobs and 5,000 housing units above what would currently be created under existing zoning. New requirements and fees associated with the Plan are expected to result in $\$ 2$ billion in public benefits to serve the neighborhood.

In the year ahead, Planning will be working with IPIC to integrate the Central Soma Public Benefits Plan into the overall IPIC Program.

## ONGOING PLANNING - CENTRAL WATERFRONT / DOGPATCH PUBLIC REALM PLAN

Planning staff is completing work on the Central Waterfront / Dogpatch Public Realm Plan. As mentioned above, because the overall Eastern Neighborhoods Plan discuss public benefits on a very programmatic level, the Planning Department has been following up on subsequent efforts to more fully flesh out and define community improvements for each of the neighborhoods. The Dogpatch Public Realm Plan will include an analysis of the neighborhood's open space and streetscape needs with a prioritized list of projects for implementation.

## EASTERN NEIGHBORHOODS CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (EN CAC)

The EN CAC started meeting on a monthly basis in October 2009. The CAC is comprised of 19 members of the public appointed by the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor. The

CAC focus on implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Implementation Program and priority projects. In November 2016 the Eastern Neighborhoods CAC voted to support the IPIC's Capital Plan.

This past year, the CAC also focused on scoping the recently released Five-Year Monitoring Report. The Monitoring Report is required by the City's Administrative Code to report on development and infrastructure activity and progress in carrying out the Implementation Measures as established at the time of EN Plan adoption. As a result of the Monitoring Report, the CAC produced their own document that outlined how they believed the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan has been successful, how it has not been, and suggestions on policy changes. One of the CAC's major concerns is the inadequate delivery of infrastructure relative to level of development, both in terms of quantity and timing.

By Motion No. 2016-11-02, the CAC endorsed the 20182027 EN IPIC Expenditure Plan.

## COMPETED INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

Since the adoption of the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan, the following infrastructure projects that were anticipated by the Plan, have been completed:

[^3]» Folsom Street (Mission District) Improvements. A road diet reducing the travel lanes to one in each direction, establishing bike lanes, and bus bulb-outs and other pedestrian amenities between 13th Street and Cesar Chavez Street has been completed per the Mission District Streetscape Plan.

San Francisco Bicycle Plan Improvement. New Class II and III bike facilities have been established throughout the Eastern Neighborhoods including but not limited to: Folsom Street (between Division and 15th Street, 23rd Street between Potrero and Kansas Streets, Kansas Street between 23rd Street and 26th Street, Cesar Chavez between Highway 101 and 3rd Street. Class III facilities have been established on Indiana between Mariposa and 26th Street, and Illinois between Mariposa and Illinois Street.

Phase I Street Improvements on 7th and 8th Streets. As an initial phase in the reconfiguration of 7th and 8th Streets as envisioned by EN Trips, the streets have been restriped with reduced travel lanes and more robust protected bike lanes with stripped buffers.

Phase I Street Improvements on Folsom and Howard Streets. Similar to the above, as an initial phase in the reconfiguration of Folsom and Howard Streets as envisioned by EN Trips, the streets have been restriped with reduced travel lanes and more robust protected bike lanes with stripped buffers.

Potrero Kids Daycare Center. A daycare center at the Potrero Launch development project was established through an in-kind agreement and opened two years ago.

Brannan Street Wharf. Located on The Embarcadero Promenade between Pier 30-32 and Pier 38, the Brannan Street Wharf is a new 57,000 square foot public park over the water and parallel to the Embarcadero Promenade, the park was completed by the Port in the summer of 2013.

Cesar Chavez Street Streetscape Improvements. The Cesar Chavez Street project, which included wider planting medians, bike lanes, corner bulb-outs featuring storm water features between Hampshire and Guerrero Streets was completed two years ago.
» 24th Street Bart Plaza. The southwest 24th Street Bart Plaza was completed as anticipated by the Mission District Streetscape Plan.

## PROJECTS UNDERWAY

Other projects that are funded through other sources are finishing up design and planning phases or are under construction include:
» Crane Cove Park. CLocated within Pier 70 has completed its planning and design has been partially funded by the 2008 and 2012 Park Bonds. Its current funding includes community planning, design and construction for Phase I. Construction is to begin at the beginning of 2016.
» 14-Mission Street Muni Forward Project. As part of the Muni Forward program, SFMTA is planning a wide range of transit improvements along Mission Street for the 14-Mission Rapid bus line. Improvements will include, but will not be limited to new bus and pedestrian bulb outs, reconfiguration of bus stops, priority lanes and signal timing, among other improvements.
» Vision Zero Streetscape Improvements. As part of the City's Vision Zero effort, MTA, DPW are making pedes-trian-related improvements identified as part of the City's high-injury corridors network. This project will design and implement pedestrian safety improvements at the following eleven intersections: Howard and 6th; Mission and 6th, 7th, 9th, 13th, 14th, 16th, 18th, 19th, 22nd; and South Van Ness and 16th. Proposed improvements include three painted safety zones, seven temporary medians, four turn prohibitions, one protected left turn pocket, four leading pedestrian intervals, three daylighting locations, seven signal timing changes, and seven locations with reduced lane widths.
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| $11,380,000$ | $\$$ | $52,498,000$ | $\begin{aligned} \text { 4，222，000 } & 11,118,000 & \$ 11,380,000 & \$ 2,498,000\end{aligned}$





|  |  |  | THROUGH FY <br> 16 |  | FY 17 (BUDGET YEAR) |  |  | FY 18 |  | FY 19 |  | FY 20 |  | FY 21 |  | FY 22 | FY 18 - FY 22 (PROJECTIONS) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL TO FY } \\ & 22 \end{aligned}$ |  | FY23-FY 27 <br> (PROJECTIONS) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL TO FY } \\ & 27 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 54 | The Loop Phase 1 (Caltrans Row) | DPW |  |  |  |  | \$ | 1,250,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 1,250,000 | \$ | 1,250,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 55 | Community Challenge Grant | ADMIN | \$ | 425,000 | \$ | 200,000 | s | 200,000 | \$ | 200,000 | \$ | 200,000 | \$ | 200,000 | \$ | 200,000 | \$ | 1,000,000 | \$ | 1,625,000 | \$ | 1,000,000 | \$ | 2,625,000 |
| 56 | Recreation and Open Space Unprogrammed |  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 4,387,000 | \$ | 3,301,000 | \$ | 3,287,000 | s | 10,975,000 | \$ | 10,975,000 | \$ | 16,435,000 | \$ | 27,410,000 |
| 57 | Category Expenditure Sub Total |  | \$ | 11,545,000 | \$ | 11,496,000 | \$ | 14,906,000 | \$ | 2,157,000 | \$ | 7,255,000 | \$ | 3,501,000 | \$ | 3,487,000 | \$ | 31,306,000 | \$ | 54,347,000 | \$ | 17,435,000 | \$ | 71,782,000 |
| 58 | Category Balance Per Year |  |  |  | \$ | $(304,000)$ | \$ | $(6,678,000)$ | \$ | 1,656,000 | \$ | - | \$ | . | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 59 | Category Cummulative Balance Per Year |  | \$ | 5,326,000 | \$ | 5,022,000 | \$ | $(1,656,000)$ | \$ | . | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | . |  |  | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |
| Childcare |  |  | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 | Potrero Launch Childcare Center (In-Kind) | IN-KIND | \$ | 1,916,000 | s | - | \$ | - | s | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | s | - | \$ | 1,916,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,916,000 |
| 61 | H.S.A. Childcare NOFA Program | DHS | \$ | 85,000 | s | 1,322,000 | \$ | 1,584,000 | \$ | 527,000 | \$ | 952,000 | \$ | 482,000 | \$ | 477,000 | \$ | 4,022,000 | \$ | 5,429,000 | \$ | 2,385,000 | \$ | 7,814,000 |
| 62 | Category Expenditure Sub Total |  | \$ | 2,001,000 | \$ | 1,322,000 | \$ | 1,584,000 | \$ | 527,000 | \$ | 952,000 | \$ | 482,000 | \$ | 477,000 | \$ | 4,022,000 | \$ | 7,345,000 | \$ | 2,385,000 | \$ | 9,730,000 |
| 63 | Category Balance Per Year |  |  |  | \$ | 260,000 | \$ | $(649,000)$ | \$ | 17,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 64 | Category Cummulative Balance Per Year |  | \$ | 372,000 | \$ | 632,000 | \$ | $(17,000)$ | \$ | - | \$ | . | \$ | . | \$ | - |  |  | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Library Materials |  | LIB | \$ | 765,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 765,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 765,000 |
| Program Administration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 66 | Admin | DCP |  |  | \$ | 793,000 | \$ | 1,113,000 | \$ | 457,000 | s | 1,288,000 | \$ | 378,000 | \$ | 367,000 | \$ | 3,603,000 |  |  | \$ | 1,835,000 | \$ | 7,642,000 |
| 67 | Admin Transfer to Programs |  |  |  | \$ | 1,395,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  | \$ | - | \$ | 1,395,000 |
| 68 | Category Expenditure Sub Total |  | \$ | 1,411,000 | \$ | 2,188,000 | \$ | 1,113,000 | \$ | 457,000 | \$ | 1,288,000 | \$ | 378,000 | \$ | 367,000 | \$ | 3,603,000 | \$ | 7,202,000 | \$ | 1,835,000 | \$ | 9,037,000 |
| 69 | Category Balance Per Year |  |  |  | \$ | $(819,000)$ | \$ | 511,000 | \$ | 38,000 | \$ | $(50,000)$ | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 | Category Cummulative Balance Per Year |  | \$ | 795,000 | \$ | $(24,000)$ | \$ | 487,000 | \$ | 525,000 | \$ | 475,000 | \$ | 475,000 | \$ | 475,000 |  |  | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | THROUGH FY 16 |  | FY 17 (BUDGET YEAR) |  |  | FY 18 |  | FY 19 |  | FY 20 |  | FY 21 |  | FY 22 | FY 18 - FY 22 (PROJECTIONS) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL TO FY } \\ & 22 \end{aligned}$ |  | FY23 - FY 27 (PROJECTIONS) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL TO FY } \\ & 27 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 72 | Revenue Totals |  | 5 | 50,571,000 | \$ | 27,379,000 | \$ | 33,945,000 | S | 9,905,000 | s | 24,763,000 | s | 7,565,000 | s | 7,341,000 | s | 83,519,000 |  | 161,469,000 | \$ | 36,705,000 | \$ | 198,174,000 |
| 73 | Total Expendifures |  | s | 38,396,000 | \$ | 30,699,000 | \$ | 42,278,000 | 5 | 10,427,000 | 5 | 24,763,000 | \$ | 7,565,000 | s | 7,341,000 | \$ | 92,374,000 | 5 | 161,469,000 | s | 36,705,000 | s | 198,174,000 |
| 74 | Annual Surplus (Deficit) |  |  |  | \$ | (3,320,000) | S | (8,333,000) | \$ | $(522,000)$ | s |  | \$ |  | \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 75 | Cummulate Suplus (Deficit) |  | s | 12,175,000 | \$ | 8,855,000 | \$ | 522,000 | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## Eastern Neighborhoods Pipeline

Residential Pipeline Net Units

| • | $<13$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $13-100$ |  |
| $101-500$ |  |
| $>500$ |  |

Commercial Pipeline Net Gross Square Feet

- $<10,000$

O 10,000-100,000
$\bigcirc$
$100,001-1,000,000$
$\bigcirc>1,000,000$


## Eastern Neighborhoods Projects

[^5]37.
39.
44.
45.
46.
47.
48. Jose Coronado Playground

[^6]

## EASTERN NEIGHBORHOODS

1. Soma Alley improvements
2. Bartlett streetscape improvements
3. South Park rehabilitation
4. Dog run at the newly completed Daggett Park
5. Folsom Street bicycle improvements
6. Bartlett Street new pergolas
7. Dogpatch proposed streetscape projects
8. 17th and Folsom Park under construction


## EASTERN NEIGHBORHOODS

9. Newly completed Daggett Park
10. 17th and Folsom Street Park rendering
11. "The Loop" Open Space and Streetscape Project rendering
12. 16th Street / 22 Filmore revisions
13. 2nd Street multi-modal improvements rendering

## Eastern Neighborhoods Project Descriptions

## 16TH STREET / 22-FILLMORE IMPROVEMENTS <br> (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO 12)

## Project Description:

The 16th Street Improvement Project envisions the transformation of the 16th Street corridor into a highly efficient transit corridor along with pedestrian and streetscape improvements between Church Street and 3rd Street with more intensive BRT-like improvements between Potrero Avenue and 3rd Street. The project will be phased with initial lane striping and improved service and later hardscape improvements that will include, but not be limited to center running boarding islands, bus bulbs and other landscaping and hardscaping.

## Project Origin:

Original Eastern Neighborhoods Implementation Document, EN Plan Area Infrastructure Maps, EN Trips. 16th Street is an EN Priority Project.

## Project Status and Delivery:

Increase service has been implemented. Hardscape improvements are planned to commence 2018 and be complete by 2020.

Total Costs:
Approximately $\$ 70$ million

## IPIC Funds:

\$14.6 million are programmed from FY 18 through FY 22 , with $\$ 8.9$ million budgeted for FY 18 and $\$ 2.2$ million budgeted for FY 19. For FY 18 and FY 19, costs may cover any aspect of design, engineering or construction.

## RINGOLD ALLEY IMPROVEMENTS (MAP / LINE ITEM NO. 15)

## Project Description:

Ringold Alley Improvements between 8th Street and 9th Street includes enhanced lighting, landscaping, paving, furnishings, and integrated public art. The proposed streetscaping project also includes undergrounding utility lines. The Project looks to celebrate of memorialize the history of the LGBT community in South of Market.

## Project Origin:

The Western SOMA Implementation Document; The Soma Neighborhood Transportation Plan.

Project Status and Delivery:
Under Construction; Expected Completion 2017

## Total Costs:

Approximately $\$ 2$ million
IPIC Funds:
$\$ 1.8$ million through an In-Kind Agreement

## POTRERO AVENUE STREETSCAPE (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 17)

## Project Description:

The Potrero Avenue project includes, but is not limited to, roadway repaving, new transit only lanes, protected bike lanes, widen sidewalks, corner bulbouts, street trees and other landscaping and amenities.

## Project Origin:

EN Area Plan Implementation Maps
Project Status and Delivery:
Under Construction

## Total Costs:

Approximately $\$ 19.8$ million
IPIC Funds:
$\$ 1.4$ million in FY 17 for construction

## FOLSOM STREET / HOWARD STREET STREETSCAPE PROJECT (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 23)

## Project Description:

The proposal is to reconstruct Folsom and Howard Street as "complete streets" between 2nd Street and 13th Streets. Project features could include: converting the streets to two-way traffic, establishing robust bicycle facilities, expanding sidewalks, and providing new landscaping.

## Project Origin:

Original Eastern Neighborhoods Implementation Document, EN Plan Area Infrastructure Maps, EN Trips. Folsom Street has long been envisioned to serve as the main civic corridor of South of Market and is a major infrastructure component of the East Soma Plan, Western Soma Plan and Central Soma Plan. This is an EN Priority Project.

## Project Status and Delivery:

Environmental Review is expected to be completed by winter 2017. Community engagement and design planned 2017-2018. Construction planned to commence 2020.

Total Costs:

## TBD

IPIC Funds:
$\$ 9.2$ million are programmed from FY 18 through FY 22, with $\$ 4.9$ million budgeted for FY 19. For FY 18 and FY 19, costs may cover any aspect of design, engineering or construction.

## 22ND STREET GREEN CONNECTIONS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 24)

## Project Description:

Streetscape improvements along 22nd Street in the Dogpatch neighborhood between Illinois Street and Pennsylvania includes new lighting, paving, corner bulbouts, drought tolerate landscaping, and special cross walk treatments.

## Project Origin:

EN Area Plan Implementation Maps; Green Connections Plan

As a "Green Connections" project, the streetscape improvements highlight the streets connection to open space and parks and include ecological features. This Project is rooted in a community initiated and sponsored streetscape plan.

## Project Status and Delivery:

Construction planned to begin summer 2017 and be complete by summer 2018

Total Costs:
Approximately $\$ 3.8$ million

## IPIC Funds:

\$3.15 million; Funds appropriated in 2016 and Prior;

## 2ND STREET IMPROVEMENTS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 13, 25 AND 26)

## Project Description:

The project, located on Second Street between Market and King streets, will include: widened sidewalks between Harrison and Townsend streets; one-way cycle track bicycle facilities in the northbound and southbound directions; transit boarding islands at most transit stops along with planted medians; Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)compliant curb ramps; new street trees; site furnishings (trash receptacles, bike racks, benches, and pedestrian lighting); uprgrades to the traffic signal system; and a repaved street, curb-to-curb.

## Project Origin:

EN Area Plan Implementation Maps

## Project Status and Delivery:

Construction planned to begin summer 2017 and be complete by 2019

Total Costs:
Approximately $\$ 13$ million

## IPIC Funds:

$\$ 4$ million are proposed for IPIC funding in FY 18 for streetscape elements within the Eastern Neighborhoods boundaries.

## BARTLETT STREET STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 27)

## Project Description:

The Barlett Streetscape Project (aka the Mission Mercado Community Market project) includes the construction of sidewalk widening, shared public ways, landscaping and the installation of pergola market structures along Bartlett Street between 22nd Street and 23rd Street.

## Project Origin:

Mission District Streetscape Master Plan. The Project was envisioned to both facilitate the Mission Mercado Public Market and create a plaza-like space on this underutilized block of Bartlett Street.

Project Status and Delivery:
Complete (2016)

## Total Costs:

Approximately \$2,000,000

## IPIC Funds:

No IPIC project funds were used. Planning Department administrative funds contributed to final design.

## PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE, AND STREETSCAPE ENHANCEMENT FUND (EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 29)

Project Description:
To enable flexible, nimble, and strategic spending of Eastern Neighborhood transportation dollars in the short term, this fund was created. The funds are to provide Public Works access to funds that can fill the last gaps of projects and/or to prioritize Eastern Neighborhood projects above others for implementation.

## Project Origin:

IPIC
Project Status and Delivery:
Funds are available to streetscape, bike and pedestrian projects upon request and after consultation with IPIC and the EN CAC. Eligible project could include, but would not be limited to streetscape projects that are being identified in the Central Waterfront Dogpatch Public Realm Plan.

Total Costs:
\$1,032,000

## IPIC Funds:

\$1,032,000 available in FY18

## 17TH STREET AND FOLSOM STREET PARK (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 35)

## Project Description:

This new .8 acre park located at 17th and Folsom Street in the Mission District includes a children's play area, demonstration garden, outdoor amphitheater, and seating among other amenities.

## Project Origin:

Original Implementation Document (this document promised one new park in each of the EN Neighborhoods); EN Area Plan Implementation Maps; this is a Priority Project

## Project Status and Delivery:

Under Construction; Completion expected winter 2017
Total Costs:
\$5,500,000

## IPIC Funds:

\$3,120,000 appropriated in 2016 and prior

## DAGGETT PARK (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 36)

## Project Description:

This new .9 acre park located in the previous Daggett Street right-of-way between 16th Street and 7th Street includes a large unprogrammed lawn area, architectural features that double as play and sitting areas, fenced-off dog run, and public art among other features.

## Project Origin:

Original Implementation Document (the document promised one new neighborhood in each of the EN Neighborhoods); EN Area Plan Implementation Maps; Showplace Square Open Space Plan; this is a Priority Project.

## Project Status and Delivery:

Complete

Total Costs:
\$5,500,000
IPIC Funds:
\$2,300,000 through an in-kind

## SOUTH PARK (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 37)

## Project Description:

The complete rehabilitation of park includes a variety of different programmatic spaces, including a children's play area, a large open meadow, plazas of varying scales, and a variety of areas designed for sitting and/or picnicking to increase park capacity. Additional improvements will include bulb-outs and chicanes for traffic calming, bio-infiltration swales, and possibly a rainwater cistern for irrigation usage.

## Project Origin:

Original Implementation Document (the document promised one rehabilitated park in each of the EN Neighborhoods)

## Project Status and Delivery:

Under Construction; Completion expected 2017
Total Costs:
\$3,000,000
IPIC Funds:
1,500,000

## NEIGHBORHOOD ACTIVATION OF EXISTING <br> PARKS - INITIAL PROJECTS (MAP I EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 38)

## Project Description:

In 2014, Recreation and Park staff developed a Five Year Rehabilitation of Parks program for the Eastern Neighborhoods. As an initial step in this effort, \$658K was set aside last year to pay for initial cost estimating, planning and for a few near-term small scale capital projects. Recreation and Park has identified three additional projects for this fund: (1) Franklin Square fitness course (Map No. 38a); (2) Potrero Recreation Center "walking school bus" lighting (Map No. 38b); (3) Jackson Playground near-term improvements.

## Project Origin:

These short term improvements were initiated in response to the CAC's request to provide funds sooner for community based projects that could be implemented quickly.

Project Status and Delivery:
Franklin Square - under construction;
Potrero Recreation Center - plans approved by Rec and Park Commission; Construction to commence 2017

Total Costs:
\$658,000

IPIC Funds:
\$658,000 appropriated in 2015 and Prior

## GENE FRIEND / SOMA RECREATION CENTER (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 43)

## Project Description:

Gene Friend / Soma Recreation Center is located at Folsom Street and 6t Street, and is largely comprised of a single-story recreational facility. The proposal is to demolish the existing structure and construct a three story recreational center in its place and make additional improvements to the outdoor portions of the site.

## Project Origin:

Original Implementation Document (the document promised one rehabilitated park in each of the EN Neighborhoods)

## Project Status and Delivery:

under development

## Total Costs:

\$30,000,000

IPIC Funds:
\$658,000 appropriated in 2015 and Prior

## MISSION RECREATION CENTER (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 44)

## Project Description:

Located on a through block facing both Harrison Street and Treat Avenue between 20th and 21st Street, the facility includes an interior gymnasium and fitness center, along with an outdoor playground located in an interior courtyard. Recreation and Park staff is planning for a major renovation and reconfiguration of the facility that could relocation of the play equipment, and expansion of sports courts.

## Project Origin:

Original Implementation Document (the document promised one rehabilitated park in each of the EN Neighborhoods)

## Project Status and Delivery:

Under Development
Total Costs:
TBD

IPIC Funds:
\$1,000,000 FY17; \$2,740,000 FY18

## JACKSON PLAYGROUND (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 45)

## Project Description:

Located at the southern foot of Potrero Hill, Jackson Playground features a clubhouse, children's play area, picnic areas, tennis court, basketball court and two ball fields. Recreation and Park staff is currently working with the community and local developers to scope a full rehabilitation of the park, which could potentially include relocating the clubhouse, adding a gymnasium with indoor basketball, reconfiguring the space.

## Project Origin:

Original Implementation Document (the document promised one rehabilitated park in each of the EN Neighborhoods)

## Project Status and Delivery:

Under Development
Total Costs:
TBD

## IPIC Funds:

\$640,000 appropriated in 2016 and Prior; \$1,000,000 in FY 17 (IPIC contribution to act as seed funds for later additional funds)

## GARFIELD SQUARE AQUATICS CENTER (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 46)

## Project Description:

The project includes the full rehabilitation of the pool into a higher capacity Aquatics Center, which, besides refurbishing the pool, would also include adding additional amenities for a wider range of users such a multi-purpose room and possibly a slide. Other possible improvements could include a redesign of the pool structure.

## Project Origin:

Recreation and Park Staff

Project Status and Delivery:
Completion of Concept Design: late winter 2017;
Construction anticipated to begin July 2018
Total Costs:
16,500,000

## IPIC Funds:

\$1,225,000 FY17; \$4,313,000 FY18

## JURI COMMONS (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 47)

## Project Description:

The project is to rebuild the existing playground on this small park located within an old railroad right of way.

## Project Origin:

Recreation and Park Staff recommendation is response to CAC request to identify small near-term open space projects.

Project Status and Delivery:
The project will begin the planning phase in summer 2017.
Total Costs:
\$825,000

## IPIC Funds:

\$825,000 FY17 and FY18

## JOSE CORONADO PLAYGROUND (MAP / <br> EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 48)

## Project Description:

The proposal is to resurface the courts and provide more inviting fencing for the park.

## Project Origin:

Recreation and Park Staff recommendation in response to CAC request to identify small near-term open space projects.

## Project Status and Delivery:

The project will begin planning when full funding is available in FY 2019.

## Total Costs:

TBD

## IPIC Funds:

\$1,869,000 (FY19 and FY20)

## DOGPATCH ART PLAZA (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 49)

## Project Description:

Located at the dead-end portion of 19th Street just west of Indiana Street and east of the I-280, the project is to construct pedestrian plaza that would include an 8,000 square foot level plaza designed to accommodate special events and rotating art exhibits, Indiana Street bulb-outs, cafe and other movable seating, and bleacher seating

## Project Origin:

Proposed by Build Inc. developer of the adjacent 650 Indiana Street development project.

Project Status and Delivery:
Construction anticipated to commence in 2017
Total Costs:
\$1,500,000
IPIC Funds:
\$850,000 through an In-Kind Agreement

## EAGLE PLAZA (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 50)

## Project Description:

The Project is to construct a plaza within the 12th Street right-of-way at Harrison Street; the plaza would feature a single-surface shared-way treatment with a single lane of travel reconfigured for in a curvilinear pattern to slow traffic and define two distinct zones for the plaza.

## Project Origin:

Western Soma Priority Project as described in the Western Soma Implementation Document.

Project Status and Delivery:
Currently in permitting and design
Total Costs:
\$2,000,000
IPIC Funds:
\$1,500,000 through an In-Kind Agreement

## NEW PARK IN SOMA (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 51)

## Project Description:

Recreation and Park is in the process of aquiring a site at 11th and Natoma, where they plan to build a new park.

## Project Origin:

Original Implementation Document (the document promised one new neighborhood in each of the EN Neighborhoods);

Project Status and Delivery:
Site has been acquired. Design and community engagement planned for FY. Construction anticipated to commence [date].

Total Costs:
\$18,810,000

## IPIC Funds:

$\$ 8,810,000$ FY 16 and FY 17 from Eastern Neighborhoods

## THE LOOP

## Project Description:

The Loop project consists of a series of open space and streetscape improvements under and around Highway 101 between 17th Street and Mariposa. The first phase of the project will include two open space plazas at 17th and Vermont, and 17th and San Bruno along with streetscape improvements along 17th Street.

## Project Orgin:

Community sponsored and proposed project.
Project Status and Delivery:
in design and engineering;
Total Costs:
\$3,573,000 (Phase I)
IPIC Funds:
\$1,800,000 (\$300K from FY17 Ped and Bike Fund;
\$1.5 M FY 18)

## COMMUNITY CHALLENGE GRANT (MAP / EXPENDITURE PLAN LINE ITEM NO. 55)

## Description:

The Eastern Neighborhoods Community Challenge Grant Program is modeled after the City Administrator's Community Challenge Grant Program, encouraging community members to propose improvements public space and rights-of-way. This program was proposed by the EN CAC and is currently being implemented by the City's Administrator's Office. So far, three rounds of grants have been announced in the first two years of this programming, which include five community projects in Central Waterfront and Potrero Hill.

## Project Orgin:

EN CAC

## Project Status and Delivery:

Ongoing. Two rounds of applications and grants are offered each year.

## Total Costs:

\$200,000 / year

## IPIC Funds:

\$200,000 / year

## CHILD CARE

## Project Description:

The Eastern Neighborhood Plan calls for the construction of new childcare facilities to meet the needs of future residents and employees. To spend the funds, IPIC proposes to have the Human Services Agency work with childcare operators to identify new opportunities for childcare in the plan area and to develop new facilities. For example, for the Market Octavia Plan Area, the Child Care Facilities Interagency Committee has developed an RFA for Early Childcare Education providers specific to the Market Octavia funds. Funds will reside with the Low Income Investment Fund and will be distributed under a separate contract to qualified Early Childcare Education providers.

## Project Origin:

EN Implementation Document
Project Status and Delivery: Ongoing

## IPIC Funds:

\$1,584,000 in FY 17 and \$527,000 in FY18

## APPENDIX 1

Article 36. Community Improvements Area Plans and Programs

## SEC. 36.1. - APPLICABILITY.

(a) The Planning Department is currently engaged in comprehensive planning of areas of the City being referred to as the proposed Market/Octavia, East SOMA, West SOMA, Inner Mission, Lower Potrero/Showplace Square, and Central Waterfront plan areas. These efforts are expected to lead to new or modified area plans of the City's General Plan ("Area Plans") that address urban design, open space, transportation, housing, and community facilities and present detailed rezoning and policy proposals that cover land use, housing, community facilities, open space, and transportation. The boundaries of these areas are generally as outlined in documents posted from time to time on the Planning Department's web page.
(b) As part of the comprehensive planning leading to preparation and adoption of each Area Plan, the Planning Department, and, in the West SOMA area, the Planning Department with the advice and input of the Western SoMa Citizens Planning Task Force, is analyzing the existing deficiencies and improvement needs of each area and the deficiencies and improvement needs that will be created by or exacerbated by the new development permitted by the proposed Area Plan. In the other areas covered by this legislation, the Planning Department should also consider the advice and input of citizen groups, Based on this analysis, the Planning Department shall prepare for each area a document that identifies the various facilities, infrastructure and other community improvements needed to address the identified conditions and needs (the "Community Improvements Plan") and an implementation program that summarizes the estimated costs of the various facilities and improvements identified in the Community Improvements Plan, proposes specific funding strategies and sources to finance them, identifies the responsible and supporting agencies, and outlines the steps, including as may be needed more detailed planning, program design, and environmental evaluation, required to refine the proposals and implement them (the "Implementation Program. "). In the West SOMA area the City is preparing the Community Improvements Plan and Implementation Program with the advice and in put of the Western SoMa Citizens Planning Task Force. In the other areas covered by this legislation, the Planning Department should also consider the advice and input of citizen groups. The funding sources proposed in the Implementation Program may include, but are not limited to, use of federal, State, and local public resources, community facility, community benefit or other forms of assessment
districts, and area-specific development impact fees, as may be detailed in the final adopted respective area plans.

## SEC. 36.2. - INTENT.

This Article 36 is intended to provide mechanisms that will enhance the participation in the preparation and implementation of the Community Improvements Plans and Implementation Programs by the various City departments, offices; and agencies that will be responsible for their implementation and provide a means by which the various parties interested in realization of the Community Improvements Plans and Implementation Programs can remain informed about and provide input to and support for their implementation.

## SEC. 36.3. - INTERAGENCY PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEES.

For each area subject to the provisions of this Article, there shall be an Interagency Planning and Implementation Committee that shall be comprised of representatives of the departments, offices, and agencies whose responsibilities include provision of one of more of the community improvements that are likely to be needed or desired in a Plan Area. In addition to the Planning Department, these departments, offices, and agencies shall, if relevant, include, but are not limited to, the County Transportation Authority, Municipal Transportation Agency, Department of Public Works, Library Commission, Redevelopment Agency, Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development, Mayor's Office of Community Development, Public Utilities Commission, Department of Recreation and Parks, Department of the Environment, and the Office of City Greening. The Interagency Planning and Implementation Committees shall be chaired by the Planning Director or his or her designee. It shall be the responsibility of each such department, office, or agency to participate, using its own administrative funds, in the preparation of that portion of a Community Improvements Plan falling within its area of responsibility and, after Area Plan adoption, to participate in the detailed design of the community improvement or improvements and to seek the funding for its implementation as provided in the Implementation Program, as amended from time to time.

SEC. 36.4. - ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORTS.
Preparation. After the final adoption of an Area Plan, including the Community Improvements Plan and Implementation Program, for a portion of the City subject to the provisions of this Article, the Planning Department
shall prepare for each Area Plan a brief Annual Progress Report indicating the status of implementation of the Area Plan and its various components. It shall contain information regarding the progress made to date in implementing the Area Plan and its various components, including a summary of the individual development projects, public and private, that have been approved during the report period, and shall also describe the steps taken regarding implementation of the various community improvements in accordance with the Plan's projected phasing and update and, if necessary, modify and amend, the contents and/or phasing of the Community Improvements Plan and Implementation Program. It shall also include proposed departmental work programs and budgets for the coming fiscal year that describe the steps to be taken by each responsible department, office, or agency to implement the Community Improvements Plan. It shall be the responsibility of each department, office and agency to provide to the Planning Department the following: (i) information regarding its progress in implementing the community improvement(s) for which it is responsible; (ii) any changes in the time-phased schedule for implementing the improvement(s); and (iii) information regarding its relevant proposed work program and efforts to secure the funding sources for implementing the improvement(s) in the coming year. The Planning Department shall summarize this information together with information regarding it's own progress and relevant proposed work program and budget into the Annual Progress Report.
(b) Annual Hearing at Planning Commission. Prior to the annual submission of the Planning Department budget requests to the Mayor's Budget Office, the Planning Commission shall hold a public hearing on each Area Plan's Annual Progress Report. Notice of the hearing shall be provided at least 30 days prior to the meeting as follows: mailed notice to all organizations and individuals who have specifically requested mailed notice and published notice at least once in an official newspaper of general circulation. The Report shall be posted on the Department's web page for at least 30 days before the hearing. This hearing may be held as part of the Planning Commission's hearing on the Departmental budget request.
(c) Submission to Relevant Committee of the Board of Supervisors. The Annual Progress Report shall also be submitted to the committee of the Board of Supervisors responsible for land use matters, which Committee may schedule a public hearing. Further, the Board urges the Planning Department Director and/or his or her designee who chairs the Interagency Planning and Implementation Committee for each Area Plan to be available to provide a briefing and answer questions about the Report at the appropriate Board of Supervisors committee hearing.
(d) Termination. This Annual Progress Report requirement
may be terminated by the Planning Commission upon its determination after a public hearing, noticed at least 30 days prior to the meeting, that full implementation of the Community Improvements Plan and Implementation Program has been substantially achieved and that continuation of the Annual Progress Report requirement would serve no useful purpose.


[^0]:    1 Article 36.2, Administrative Code. See attachment one for a full Copy of the Article 36 of the Administrative Code.

[^1]:    6. Harrison Street (Betweent Essex and First - North Side) (In-Kind)
    7. Ped Mid-block ped path between Folsom and Harrison near Fremont (In-Kind)
    . First Street and Harrison Street (In-Kind)
    8. Streetscape Priority 1 - Harrison Street and Fremont Street

    10a. Living Streets (Potential Priority 2 Project)
    10b. Guy Place Streetscape (Potential Priority 2 Project)
    10d. First Street (Potential Priority 2 Project)
    11. Guy Place Park
    19. Rincon Hill Park

[^2]:    11 Haight Two-way Transportation and Streetscape 12 Muni Forward
    $\begin{array}{cl}14 & \text { Polk Stret } \\ 15 & \text { Van Ness BRT - Van Ness and Mission ped. improvements }\end{array}$
    16 Hub Transportation Improvements Study
    17 Category Expenditure Sub Total
    18 Category Annual Balance
    19 Category Cummulative Balance

[^3]:    » Phase I of the Soma Alley Improvement Projects. DPW has completed the first phase of the Soma Alley Improvement Projects. These improvements included traffic calming and pedestrian improvements on Harriet Street (Folsom Street to Howard Street), Harriet Street (Folsom Street to Howard Street), Moss Street (Folsom Street to Howard Street), Russ Street (Folsom StreetHoward Street), Natoma Street (6th Street to7th Street), Minna Street (6th Street to 7th Street),
    » Phase II of the Soma Alley Improvements. As the second phase of the Soma Alley Streetscape Project DPW improved Minna and Natoma Streets from 6th to Mary St; Tehama, Clementina, Shipley and Clara Streets from 6th to 5th Streets with traffic calming and pedestrian improvements.
    »Victoria Manolo Draves Mid-Block Crossing. Pedestrian signal between 6th and 7th Streets at Victoria Manalo Draves Park was completed by DPW. This was identified as a priority project for Eastern Neighborhoods implementation.
    » Bryant Street Improvements. Traffic calming and greening on Bryant Street between 26th Street and Cesar Chavez Streets has been completed per the Mission District Streetscape Plan.

[^4]:    －

[^5]:    16th Street/22-Fillmore Improvements
    2nd Street Improvments
    5. Ringold Alley Improvements
    6. Franklin Square Par Course

    Potrero Avenue/9-Rapid Muni Forward Improvements
    Folsom and Howard Street Improvements
    Bartlett Street Pedestrian Improvements/Mission Mercado Community Market 17th Street and Folsom Street Park
    Daggett Park

[^6]:    Dogpatch Art Plaza
    Eagle Plaza
    New Park(s) in South of Market
    Central Waterfront Recreation and Open Space Tunnel Top Park (Community Challenge Grant) Angel Alley (Community Challenge Grant)
    Fallen Bridge Park (Community Challenge Grant)
    Connecticut Friendship Garden (Community Challenge Grant)
    Potrero Kids Child Care Center

